



J.W. Fanning Institute
for Leadership Development
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA



ATHENS PEER COURT
IMPACT REPORT
APRIL 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3 SECTION 1 ABOUT THE PROGRAM

4 SECTION 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

5 SECTION 3 METHODOLOGY

5 SECTION 4 RESULTS & FINDINGS

10 SECTION 5 IMPLICATIONS & NEXT STEPS

11 SECTION 6 APPENDIX



SECTION 1

ABOUT THE PROGRAM



Athens Peer Court was founded in 2012 through a collaboration with the Athens-Clarke County Juvenile Court, the Department of Juvenile Justice, law students at the University of Georgia's Law School, and the J.W. Fanning Institute for Leadership Development. Athens Peer Court is a youth leadership program in which youth volunteers serve as the lawyers, judge and jury in sentencing hearings for youth offenders who have been arrested (respondents). The Fanning Institute trains and manages youth volunteers, while the Juvenile Court refers appropriate cases to Athens Peer Court. In addition, law students from the UGA's School of Law help to train and mentor the youth volunteers as well as provide guidance and insight into how to improve their craft. The Department of Juvenile Justice manages the youth offenders once they have received a disposition.

The youth volunteers receive training on leadership skills, public speaking and restorative justice. Athens Peer Court gives customized sentences to respondents that focus on the harm caused to the community by the crime and creates opportunities for those youth to connect to their community. Youth offenders who successfully complete a disposition (such as community service, jury duty, and/or written apologies) avoid a permanent record and contact with the juvenile court system.

The Athens Peer Court curriculum follows a restorative justice model that stresses the importance of repairing the harm caused to the community. The 14-hour training includes a mock hearing and covers topics on the law, different models of justice, and disposition hearing components and guidelines. Upon completion of the training, youth volunteers serve as the judge, bailiff, advocates and jury in the disposition hearings each month.

The first cohort of youth volunteers was trained in February 2012 and the first hearing was held on March 6th of that year. Since then, 19 different cohorts have completed the 14-hour training, building the capacity of over 300 youth volunteers to effectively serve their roles during the hearing process. (See Appendix 1)

SECTION 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Founded in 2012 through a collaboration with the Athens-Clarke County Juvenile Court, the Department of Juvenile Justice, the University of Georgia School of Law, and the J.W. Fanning Institute for Leadership Development, Athens Peer Court has made a difference in the lives of hundreds of young people and their families.



More than
300

youth volunteers in the Athens Peer Court program

Almost

6,000

hours in hearings for young people in Clarke County



Every youth who completes Athens Peer Court training receives 14 hours of leadership training before ever attending a hearing. Through Athens Peer Court, youth volunteers learn to lead and set an example for their peers, speak in public, set goals for themselves and build relationships through the community. One peer court judge thinks “the volunteers get more than the respondents (and) can see themselves and their friends in the respondents’ cases.”

Meanwhile, youth who have their cases heard in Athens Peer Court say they appreciate the program’s confidentiality and the opportunity to not have a record in the court system.



663

youth have had hearings in Athens Peer Court

60%

of those were within 30 days of being charged



Nationwide, studies show that peer courts result in reduced recidivism rates and an opportunity for diversion, which has real economic impact on communities. As one peer court director said, without a peer court, some of these youth “would go the wrong way.”



18% to 22%

Athens Peer Court Recidivism Rate

\$1.7 to \$5.3

million dollars is the cost of diverting a youth from more serious interactions in the justice system



Across America, peer courts:

- Provide an opportunity for youth to understand and learn from their mistakes
- Divert young people from more serious interactions with the juvenile justice system
- Reduce recidivism rates
- Provide legal education and community service opportunities for youth volunteers

In its first nine years, Athens Peer Court has given hundreds of young people in Clarke County a second chance, while developing a future generation of leaders with a commitment to helping others and serving their community. Moving forward, evaluations will continue to determine the long-term benefits for those who volunteer with Athens Peer Court. In addition, opportunities exist to further explore how Peer Court impacts respondents over the long-term by giving them second opportunities and how the community benefits over the long-term from reduced recidivism rates and diverting youth from more serious interactions with the juvenile justice system.

SECTION 3

METHODOLOGY

Three (3) different methods have been used to validate Athens Peer Court outcomes and to understand the impact it has in communities. To demonstrate short-term and intermediate outcomes, reporting and tracking data on youth volunteers and the peer court hearings (cases and youth offenders) were used. A literature review and an exploratory qualitative study were conducted on peer courts to articulate and demonstrate the long-term impact of Athens Peer Court.

SECTION 4

RESEARCH & FINDINGS

SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

The short-term impact of the 14-hour volunteer training and evaluation data is summarized with information tracked for the life of the program. Athens Peer Court developed and implemented a customized and unique leadership training program for youth volunteers. During the training, youth practice public speaking, learn the parts of the hearing, and develop trust within their cohort. They work with law students to learn, develop and practice interviewing skills as well as how to prepare a statement. Youth volunteers also work in groups to practice jury deliberations and to discuss professionalism and confidentiality.

Through their work at Athens Peer Court, youth volunteers develop and practice skills such as writing opening and closing statements, public speaking and teamwork. While serving as youth advocates (defense attorneys), volunteers interview their peers to learn about the person as well as the crime. Advocates ask questions that help the offender reflect on what has happened and identify strategies to avoid reoffending in the future. Upon completion of the training, which includes a mock hearing for family and friends, youth volunteers are ready to serve in a peer court hearing. The trainings occur twice a year, and the hearings are held as often as once a week if cases are ready to be heard. Together, these youth volunteers have given over 1300 community service hours to Athens Peer Court.

Youth volunteers most frequently join as 8th graders (43%), but volunteers have joined as early as 7th graders and as late as 12th graders. (See Data Table 3, Appendix) In addition, volunteers come from public middle and high schools in Clarke County and neighboring counties, as well as local private schools. (See Data Table 4, Appendix) Youth who successfully complete the training are expected to serve in all of the hearing roles on court days, but are able to begin with the smaller roles like bailiff and work their way up to the role of the judge. Of the 340 youth who have completed the training, more than 57% percent attended at least 5 hearings, and 20% attended more than 15. (See Data Table 5, Appendix)

Reporting data from Athens Peer Court volunteers cite four reasons for persisting as a volunteer in the program:

- **Learn new skills:** Youth volunteers develop leadership skills as well as practice public speaking, writing, and setting goals.
- **Meet new people:** As a member they meet new people from around Athens, learn to solve problems and work as a team.
- **Be a leader:** Volunteers have the opportunity to improve and grow the program and take on leadership roles.
- **Serve their community:** Athens Peer Court members play a role in changing the lives of their peers and completing community service.

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

Teen courts are recognized by the United States Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention as a model program for providing immediate sanctions.¹ By definition, in a peer court – also known as a teen or youth court – youth offenders (respondents) interact with youth volunteers who serve as the lawyers (advocates), judge, bailiff and jury in disposition hearings for the respondent. The hearing is an open and transparent decision-making process in which the respondent has a chance to share their perspective and be represented by their peers.

Intermediate outcomes include the number of hearings held and dispositions completed from the respondents. In its nine (9) years, the youth volunteers have held hearings for 663 youth respondents with 20 of those being held virtually throughout the pandemic. (See Data Table 2, Appendix)

The types of charges heard by the youth volunteers include shoplifting, curfew violation, underage drinking, and affray or school fights. All low-risk, first-time offenders that are charged with a misdemeanor or status offense are offered the opportunity to participate in Athens Peer Court. Youth offenders first meet with the Department of Juvenile Justice's probation officers or a court official to admit to the charges and accept peer court as a diversion option. No youth is required to participate if he or she does not want to participate. At this informal adjustment meeting, parents also consent to attend peer court.

Youth offenders attend peer court once for their disposition hearing. Youth volunteers work together, utilizing their training, on the night of the hearing to render fair and appropriate dispositions. All youth volunteers and jury members are required to take an oath of confidentiality. Upon receipt of the disposition from a jury of their peers, youth offenders have 90 days to complete their assignment. The disposition includes community service hours, as well as possibly jury duty, an apology to a parent, or an essay. According to respondents, they choose APC for both confidentiality and the second chance it provides to not have a record in the court system.

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES

While it is easier to demonstrate the achievement of the short-term and intermediate outcomes of Athens Peer Court (data has been tracked for the life of the program), it is necessary to learn more about the intended long-term outcomes of this type of program. This learning was done by conducting a review of the literature on teen courts and by conducting interviews with peer court directors/administrators across the nation.

PEER COURT LONG-TERM OUTCOMES FROM THE LITERATURE

According to the literature, reduced recidivism rates and opportunity for diversion are the two most common long-term outcomes for teen courts.

The 2018 review by Cotter and Evans offers suggestions for how to measure these two outcomes over time. The biggest difference in tracking recidivism rates is tracking separately those cases that would have gone to the juvenile justice system if not for peer court, and those that would have been dealt with outside of the system anyway.

Additionally, the 2018 published study by Cotter and Evans indicated the following additional outcomes for peer and teen courts other than recidivism from a scan of 46 articles covering 35 evaluation studies of peer courts:

- Satisfaction of programming
- Youth voice, identity status, self-perception
- Increased engagement in positive behavior
- Increased community engagement
- Participant perception of jury
- Individual learning of restorative justice principles and knowledge of the legal system

¹ <http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/progTypesTeenYouth.aspx>

These outcomes help to build the case for why a peer or teen court is of benefit to not only the respondents who go through the system, but to the community at large.

Furthermore, the following quote around monetary community benefit appeared in a 2013 study by Crisler:

Studies suggest that “each successive arrest places the offender at a higher risk of continued delinquency” (Dick, 2004). The younger an individual begins along the path of being a criminal, the more costly that individual is to society. Indeed, the costs of diverting a youth from a lifetime of crime varies greatly in studies but is significant nonetheless, ranging from \$1.7 to \$2.3 million in 1998 (Cohen M. A., 1998) to \$2.6 to \$5.3 million in 2008 (Cohen M. A., 2009). Additionally, in 2008 teens comprised 16% of all arrests (CDC).

While there are no studies that demonstrate peer or teen courts save the court system monetary value, the statement above lends itself to considering that the youth respondents who do not reoffend are saving the community future financial strain. Decreased recidivism remains one of the key outcomes for youth courts across the country. One challenge with exploring recidivism is the inconsistent definition and measurement across teen courts. In fact, a lack of consistent definitions and measurement has led to a gap in comparing outcomes across programs and studies.

PEER COURT LONG-TERM OUTCOMES FROM THE QUALITATIVE STUDY

To complement the learning from the literature review and understand further what the long-term societal impacts are for a teen or peer court, twelve (12) semi-structured interviews were conducted with program directors and administrators from around the country over a five-month span from July to October 2020. The interview participants were chosen based on a broad internet search for peer courts situated in similarly sized communities to Athens-Clarke County, Georgia that had been in existence for more than five years. More than 30 peer court contacts were made and those directors who responded to an initial email inquiry were interviewed via Zoom or the phone. The interview protocol and a list of interviewees is found in the appendix (A,B).

Twelve (12) program directors from around the United States participated in the interviews. Some of these programs are administered by their local county or city. In the latter, directors often have additional responsibilities outside of peer court administration. Other peer courts are one specific program under the umbrella of youth-serving, nonprofit organizations. One peer court interviewed is its own nonprofit organization, while another is partnered with a law school. The purpose of the interviews was to understand from the perspective of the program director the impact that a peer court program has on its own community. Community was left broadly defined and could include the respondents, families, volunteers, or juvenile justice system, as well as the community in which the program exists.

The specifics and logistics of how the peer court programs are conducted varied; this variation adds to the richness of the data and demonstrates that regardless of administration, key themes are consistent across program type. The themes that emerged from the interviews are useful in understanding why a community or court might support a peer court, as well as the benefits to those who interact with the program. This is also consistent with literature scans of similar program evaluations for peer and teen courts.

Some programs rely on adult volunteers to serve in volunteer hearing roles, such as the judge or advisor, while others depend entirely on youth volunteers to carry out the process. Most programs call the process by which a youth respondent participates a “hearing,” while some refer to the actual engagement with peer court as a restorative justice circle or a conference.

Overall, program directors agreed that the peer courts were beneficial to their youth volunteers, to the experience of the respondents served, and to the broader community as a means of diversion from future harm. The identified interview themes were consistent regardless of type of program or model used to train volunteers or conduct hearings. The primary theme articulated by interviewees was that peer courts benefit the respondent by providing an opportunity for the youth respondent to understand their mistake and learn from it. A second related theme is the importance of diverting a young person from more serious or lengthy interactions with the juvenile justice system. A third theme, articulated in half of the interviews, was the concept of recidivism reduction. A fourth theme noted by about half of those interviewed was the value of legal education and community service for the youth volunteers. In several peer court models, these opportunities were also available (or mandatory) for the respondents, creating engagement between the youth respondents and youth volunteers. Below see the description of each one of the long-term outcomes identified along with

the supporting evidence that shows that Athens Peer Court is already making societal impact in the community.

Opportunities for the Youth Respondent

Interviewees stated that a peer court's main or principal purpose was to give the respondent an opportunity to learn from their mistake and participate in learning opportunities or receive services to avoid breaking the law again. This idea was expressed in several ways, including providing a chance for kids to "right wrongs" or "take what they learned with them into the future." For example, one interviewee noted that "youth can understand why they are there and be held accountable by the jury of their peers." Another stated that "the kids have the opportunity to learn and understand that their mistake doesn't define who they are."

The dispositions assigned by youth jurors typically include community service, but several program directors made clear the jurors use a strength-based or restorative approach to determining dispositions. This meant that dispositions differed based on the assessed needs and could include educational classes, reflective essays, or more creative options such as being a pen pal to a young person or planning a family event. Some programs pay to support pro-social activities such as participating in soccer or an art class.

Quotes regarding loss of peer court in the community for the respondent:

"Biggest loss would be community of potential wrong-doers. So that they wouldn't get the second chance, not having that opportunity."

"If Teen Court was lost, that would be a big problem for this community. Heavily community orientated, go out and learn about law enforcement agencies. The community and TC are very interactive, mentorship, outreaches to the youth. No mentorship, no diversion. Biggest loss would be the kids, they would go the wrong way if we didn't interject in this way. If they don't get involved in second chance. Might lose these kids to that lifestyle."

"Biggest reason to support is these children are our future and we need to continue to support these kids, somewhere they can feel they feel okay. That's the reason we continue, for education. Basically making them to try and make them feel that someone still cares. Wanting kids to know they went to Teen Court and they treated us well, not pointing fingers. Make them feel like supported."

The all-youth jury model of Athens Peer Court allows for respondents to participate in jury duty as part of their community service. Jury duty allows youth to engage in the decision-making process for their peers and interact with the youth volunteers in a collaborative discussion. Since its inception, approximately 1700 hours of jury duty have been served by 411 respondents, with an average serving 4 hours, or two court sessions. One additional opportunity that Athens Peer Court could offer is additional leadership training to these respondents once they have completed their dispositions.

Diversion from the Juvenile Justice System

Directors interviewed also noted the impact of diversion from the "normal" or "typical" juvenile court process. This theme was articulated in two ways. One, when peer courts divert youth from more traditional court processes it means a respondent avoids the stigma or association with being a part of the criminal justice system. One director stated that peer court is a way to intervene early with the goal of preventing another incident that would send the respondent further into the justice system. Further, all peer courts interviewed stated that a respondent who successfully completes peer court and the associated disposition would no longer have a charge on their record. The opportunity to "keep their records clean" was stated as a benefit. Additionally, in at least one program, successful participation in peer court meant that the respondent could avoid suspension or expulsion from school for offenses originating at school.

The second impact of diversion noted was the value of interacting in a process led by a respondent's peers. While the types of dispositions assigned in peer court are aimed at addressing the harm caused to the community and may be similar to those offered by a juvenile court, it is the act of diverting the respondent from a process run by adults to one administered by peers that is viewed as an important impact for the youth respondent. Respondents see in a peer court process that "these are my peers telling me what to do," not just adults for whom this is their everyday job.

Athens Peer Court is a diversion program and does provide respondents with a chance to share their perspective and speak to their experience in front of their peers, as well as parents and adult volunteers. Without this hearing, youth would speak with DJJ or court staff about both the charge and the disposition. Furthermore, the year-round operation of Athens Peer Court ensures that 60% of youth respondents have their hearing within 30 days of the date of charge. (See Data Table 6, Appendix) A timely hearing ensures that youth see that they are held accountable for their actions and also alleviates the stress and uncertainty of not knowing what will happen to them relatively quickly. Per the literature review, APC has an opportunity to enhance tracking between those cases that would have gone through DJJ and those that would have been handled elsewhere.

Reduction in Youth Recidivism (Reoffending)

While no peer court director noted a low or lower recidivism rate as the *primary* reason or impact of a peer court, those that did mention recidivism noted that their program had a recidivism rate that was lower than the traditional system. One director compared the program recidivism rate of 18.2% to the state's recidivism rate of 40%. Another program director noted that while the last data study took place several years ago, the recidivism rate for respondents was between 8 and 15%. A third director stated that a three-year study found a 7% recidivism rate.

A few directors spoke of recidivism as the goal for each individual respondent. This outcome is connected to the opportunity or benefit for the respondent, in which the purpose of the program is that a particular respondent avoids further interaction with the juvenile justice system. One director stated peer court is “harm reduction” for the respondent. If the respondent understands that they made a mistake and thus does not reoffend, then the peer court has met its goal.

Throughout the existence of Athens Peer Court, the recidivism rate of those respondents who participate in a hearing has consistently stayed between 18 and 22%, depending on the measure used. As noted in the literature review, this number is challenging to capture depending on the definition of recidivism for the program. From January 2017 through December 2020, Athens Peer Court held hearings for 260 respondents. Of those 260 respondents, 56 reoffended (22%). Forty-five of these charges were delinquent (71%), and the remaining were status offenses or traffic violations. (See Recidivism Data, Appendix) For only delinquent offenses, the recidivism rate for the previous three years is 18%. Of those 56 respondents who were subsequently charged, 31 did so within six (6) months of their Athens Peer Court hearing (57%). While this data does not accurately reflect the impact that Peer Court has on youth respondents and their families or community at large, it provides a benchmark opportunity for APC to continue annual tracking of this data in comparison to county, state and national averages.

Opportunities for Youth Volunteers

Another important outcome for many of the programs is empowering the youth volunteers who participate in the program by providing them with legal education and unique community experiences. While some of the volunteers are former respondents who are completing their sanctions, most student volunteers hear about the program through school or friends. These students determine that participation in a program is both a benefit to themselves and their community. Some skills developed through peer court participation include practicing public speaking skills, engaging in leadership development, and meeting adult leaders in their community.

Directors and program administrators shared a variety of educational experiences and leadership opportunities that their programs offer for their volunteers. One program hosts an annual summit in which their volunteers design and lead sessions. Another program offers several classes on topics such as understanding how the law applies to minors, how to establish goals, and how to make good decisions. One program's youth volunteers participate in their state's Teen Court contest. Several programs make a point of empowering the youth volunteers to make decisions about how the peer court is administered.

Quotes regarding youth leadership development:

“[peer court] Almost like sports, learning to lose case/get outcome you wanted. Especially for bar association kids, making decision about the program is empowering. Learn how to make thoughtful decisions about an organization they are in charge of. That really upped the stakes.”

“Judge thinks the volunteers get more than the respondents. Can see themselves and their friends in the respondent’s cases.”

The opportunities for youth volunteers is where APC can provide the most significant contribution in the future. Even youth who complete the training and never attend a peer court hearing receive fourteen hours of intense leadership training plus information about the juvenile justice system and interaction with law students. Those youth that do attend at least one hearing (89%) see firsthand what happens when a young person in their community is charged with a crime. Those that serve as a youth advocate interact directly with a peer who has interacted with a police officer. The youth advocates listen to and advocate for their client in a hearing in front of their peers. All peer court participants practice public speaking in a formal setting and participate in a collaborative decision-making process to determine a disposition for each respondent.

Additionally, Athens Peer Court provides additional training opportunities and an annual celebration that honors seniors and those that have given a certain number of hours as volunteers. In total, peer court volunteers have served 5964 hours in hearings for young people in Clarke County.

SECTION 5

IMPLICATIONS & NEXT STEPS

Both the literature review and the interviews provide an opportunity for future exploration of Athens Peer Court. A gap exists in the literature on the benefit of these teen or peer courts to the volunteers who are trained and serve as the peer advocates. Athens Peer Court is poised to take this on through their network of previous volunteers. The interviews demonstrate that despite the different models, training, and court processes across peer courts the same four themes are important for their continuation in the community. This provides an opportunity for continued data tracking of volunteer hours, hearings, diversion efforts, and recidivism rates as compared to the local community and state.

A first next step is to revisit and articulate the outcomes for the program so that it provides an understanding of what needs to be included to demonstrate the overall impact of the program in the future. A second next step is to design and implement an evaluation plan that incorporates instruments to collect data from parents/guardians and respondents, such as a brief exit survey to be administered right after the hearings and ask for consent to be able to contact them in the future.

Appendix 1

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. How long has your peer court been in existence?
2. How many youth volunteers do you serve/train a year/month?
3. How many youth respondents do you serve a year/month?
4. If you know, why did your peer court begin? What were the original goals/objectives of the program?
5. What are the reasons, in your view, that peer court continues to function? What would be the biggest loss if your peer court no longer existed?
6. Has your community changed? If you define community as the participants? Volunteers? Court employees? Geographical? People living in the city/county?
7. Please speak to how leadership development or training is incorporated in your peer court? Lx development might mean
8. Have you thought about your short/medium/long term outcomes for your program? What if we consider what do you hope to see in 6 months, 3 years, 8 years?

Appendix 2

INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Program Name	Location	Interviewee	# Years Existence	Model Type	Sponsoring Organization
Vance County Teen Court	Henderson, NC	Jaleel Johnson	10 (2010)	Adult judges; youth clerks, bailiffs, attorneys, jurors	Vance County
Merrimack County New Hampshire Teen Court	Concord, NH	Jessica Klingerman	19 (2001)	Adult judges; youth clerks, bailiffs, attorneys, jurors (have a teen bar association)	Merrimack County
Vanderburgh County Teen Court	Evansville, IN	Blake Palmer	16 (2004)	Adult judges; youth clerks, bailiffs, attorneys, jurors	Teen Advisory Council (Nonprofit)
Maine Youth Court	Portland, ME	Michael Freysinger	8 (2012)	Youth advocates and facilitators	Restorative Justice Project in Maine (Nonprofit)
Charles County Teen Court	La Plata, MD	Sarah Vaughan, Lt. Grove	19 (2001)	Adult judges and court monitors; youth lawyers, bailiffs, and jurors	Sherriff's Office
Aurora Teen Court	Aurora, CO	Sandra Sarmiento	10+	Adult judges; youth clerks, bailiffs, attorneys, jurors	City of Aurora
Teen Court of Jefferson County, Birmingham and Bessemer County	Birmingham, AL	Alan Stevens	15 (ended in 2018)	Adult judges; youth clerks, bailiffs, attorneys, jurors	County Family Court System
Bastrop Teen Court	Bastrop, TX	Patsy Paranich	25 (1995)	Adult judges (occasional youth judges); youth attorneys	Bastrop Municipal Court of Record
Lawrence County Teen Court	Deadwood, SD	Alexandra Lux	25 (1995)	Adult judges; youth attorneys, bailiff, jurors	Nonprofit organization
Teen Court Program for Whatcom County in Washington State	Bellingham, WA	Bonnie Schultz-Lorentzen	20 (2000)	Youth judges, advocates, jurors, and bailiffs	Northwest Youth Services (Nonprofit)
Salt Lake City Peer Court	Salt Lake City, UT	Jenny Sanchez	30 (1990)	Youth panel, mentors	Utah Law Related Education (Nonprofit)
Teen Court	Surprise, AZ	Jamie Sandoval	26 (1994)	Youth judges, attorneys, and jurors	Maricopa County Diversion Program

Data Table 1

COHORT NUMBER	# OF PARTICIPANTS	%
1	13	4%
2	22	6%
3	17	5%
4	12	3%
5	27	8%
6	14	4%
7	14	4%
8	16	5%
9	20	6%
10	14	4%
11	23	7%
12	19	6%
13	11	3%
14	25	7%
15	16	5%
16	10	3%
17	33	10%
18	26	8%
19	12	3%

Data Table 2

YEAR	# OF HEARINGS	%
2012	52	8%
2013	129	19%
2014	83	13%
2015	76	11%
2016	63	10%
2017	82	12%
2018	59	9%
2019	72	11%
2020	27	4%
Virtual	20	3%
Total	663	

Data Table 3

GRADE WHEN JOINED	# PARTICIPANTS	PERCENT
7	25	7%
8	105	43%
9	69	20%
10	58	17%
11	61	18%
12	22	6%

Data Table 4

SCHOOL	NUMBER	PERCENT
Burney Harris Lyons Middle School	3	1%
Cedar Shoals High School	87	26%
Clarke Central High School	89	26%
Clarke Middle School	90	26%
Coile Middle School	11	3%
Hilsman Middle School	15	4%
Local Private	12	4%
Neighboring County	15	4%
Other	19	6%
Total	341	

Data Table 5

# TIMES PARTICIPATED	# STUDENTS	PERCENT TOTAL
15 and above	66	20%
10 to 14	42	13%
5 to 9	82	24%
1 to 4	106	32%
None	40	12%
Total	336	

Data Table 6

# DAYS	# RESPONDENTS	AVERAGE DAY	PERCENT
0-15	104	11.6	16%
16-30	294	21.7	44%
31-60	175	40.9	26%
More than 60	90	111	14%
Total	663	37.3	

Recidivism Data Table 1

RECIDIVISM	NUMBER
No new charges	203
Yes new charges	56

Recidivism Data Table 2

TYPE NEW CHARGE	NUMBER
Delinquent	45
Runaway	2
Ungovernable	7
Truancy	3
Traffic	6

Recidivism Data Table 3

TIME TO NEW CHARGE	NUMBER
0-6 months	31
6 months - 1 year	9
1-2 years	10
2 years+	5



UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

**J.W. Fanning Institute
for Leadership Development**



J.W. Fanning Institute for Leadership Development



@UGALeads

fanning.uga.edu | info@fanning.uga.edu | (706) 542-1108