

Article 32: Human Development and Juvenile Incarceration and Juvenile Incarceration Support Programs

Juvenile incarceration often traps youth in a cycle of isolation that separates them from essential developmental support (Barnert, 2024; Johnson et al., 2025; Lesnick et al., 2024). Therefore, **juvenile incarceration support programs** help bridge this gap by providing the mentorship and education necessary for successful community reintegration (Aceves et al., 2025; Davis et al., 2024; Gigante et al., 2022). Likewise, these initiatives significantly reduce recidivism and improve public safety by prioritizing proactive intervention over punitive confinement.

Causes and Scope of Juvenile Incarceration in the United States

Juvenile incarceration in the United States is primarily driven by systemic issues, including poverty, lack of educational resources, and racial disparities in sentencing. While national confinement rates have trended downward in recent years, thousands of minors remain held in residential facilities on any given day. Many of these youths are detained for non-violent offenses or technical violations, highlighting a broad scope of involvement within the legal system. This widespread reliance on detention underscores a persistent tension between punitive policies and the growing movement towards community-based reform (Barnert, 2024; Johnson et al., 2025; Lesnick et al., 2024).

A study assessed juvenile incarceration in the United States by looking at facility closure efforts to better understand the scope of youth confinement nationwide. Researchers compiled data on 118 youth detention and incarceration facilities across 33 states using publicly available records and reports from January 2010 through February 2023. These data tracked facility characteristics, stated reasons for closure, and whether closures were completed. The findings highlight that roughly 31,900 youths remain confined nationwide, even after youth confinement declined by more than 70% over the past 25 years. Despite these declines, the United States still incarcerates youth at rates three times higher than South America and eleven times higher than Western Europe. The research emphasizes that this scope is driven less by youth crime rates and more by systemic policy choices, including heavy reliance on detention and limited diversion. Racial disparities remain severe, with Black youth comprising about 47% of confined boys and 39% of confined girls, despite representing a far smaller share of the youth population. These inequities have persisted even as overall confinement has fallen. The researchers concluded that meaningful reductions in juvenile incarceration require addressing the underlying policies and practices that sustain confinement, not solely closing facilities (Johnson et al., 2025).

Another study explored current debates surrounding the U.S. juvenile legal system by gathering the perspectives of people connected to youth justice. This group of individuals included frontline staff, system-impacted youth, their families, and other involved professionals. Following that lead, researchers conducted nine focus groups with 92 participants from multiple U.S. regions to capture a range of claims linked to youth justice change. Hence, participants discussed reform trends rooted in recent decades of shifts in youth justice policy and practice, including changes to the age of criminal responsibility, sentencing standards, correctional conditions, responses to inequities, rehabilitative services, and alternatives to formal sanctions. The researchers framed these trends within a system that, despite some declines in confinement, still relies heavily on carceral responses to youth behavior rather than community-based support. Many participants pointed to persistent racial disparities, punitive practices, and slow implementation of reforms as ongoing causes of continued incarceration. They also

highlighted emerging paradigms such as developmental neuroscience, trauma-informed care, and racial equity as important lenses shaping reform efforts. However, these progressive ideas often conflicted with more traditional punitive models, slowing systemic change. The study found that while some reforms have reduced harsh practices and shifted policy language, implementation delays and threats to the sustainability of community alternatives contribute to continued confinement. The authors concluded that understanding these claims can help clarify why reforms stall and what kinds of shared priorities might move the juvenile legal system towards less punitive and more equitable practices (Lesnick et al., 2024).

On that same note, an article examined the scope of youth involvement in the U.S. juvenile legal system and the systemic factors that sustained confinement, including their impacts on health. Thus, the author examined existing research, policy analyses, and public health evidence to describe how youth entered and moved through the juvenile legal system. In this context, the review showed that the system disproportionately affected youth with marginalized identities, particularly Black, Indigenous, and other youth of color, contributing to persistent racial disparities in incarceration. Despite reform efforts aimed at treating children as children, many youths were still confined for nonviolent offenses or technical violations due to limited community-based alternatives. These practices often failed to address underlying developmental, behavioral, and social needs. Moreover, the research framed juvenile incarceration within a broader “cradle-to-prison pipeline” that worsened long-term health inequities. The author argued that meaningful reform was often linked to transformative childhood approaches, efforts towards racial equity, and a shift from punitive responses to reformative practices. Ultimately, they concluded that reducing juvenile incarceration requires addressing the structural conditions that sustain confinement rather than relying on incremental policy changes alone (Barnert, 2024).

Effectiveness and Impact of Juvenile Incarceration Support Programs

Juvenile incarceration support programs enhance public safety through skill-building and therapeutic intervention rather than standard punishment. Structured initiatives like cognitive-behavioral therapy and restorative justice offer a powerful alternative to traditional detention and lead to a notable decrease in reoffending. These programs address root causes such as trauma and educational gaps via community-based mentorship and vocational training to limit the need for long-term confinement. Sustained investment in these programs fosters rehabilitation and provides justice-involved youth a clear path towards a productive and stable adulthood (Aceves et al., 2025; Davis et al., 2024; Gigante et al., 2022).

For instance, a study assessed the effectiveness of rehabilitative programs for young adults at reducing reoffending, compared with traditional punitive criminal justice approaches. Specifically, the study focused on the Young Adult Deferred Entry of Judgement (YADEJ) program in Santa Clara County, California, which provided education, job training, housing support, and behavioral health services as alternatives to adult correctional sanctions. The researchers used administrative data on 392 eligible 18- to 20-year-olds whose cases began between 2020 and 2022, comparing outcomes for participants and similar non-participants. Moreover, data were collected from court and program records. The findings showed that YADEJ participants had recidivism rates about 20 percentage points lower than non-participants. Recidivism was about 28 percentage points lower for participants who successfully completed the program than for those in the comparison group. Furthermore, Latino participants

experienced an even larger reduction, with recidivism about 38 percentage points lower than for non-participating Latinos. These results showed meaningful improvements across groups. Overall, the researchers concluded that rehabilitative, service-based programs were far more effective at reducing reoffending than punitive justice models. The study suggests that expanding programs like YADEJ could improve outcomes for young adults and support successful reintegration into communities (Aceves et al., 2025).

Another study evaluated the effectiveness of the Juvenile Justice Collaborative (JJC)—a community-based diversion program in Cook County, Illinois, designed to help adolescents avoid deeper involvement in the juvenile justice system. In practice, the program provided care coordination and wraparound services to address youths’ mental health, education, family needs, and basic stability. The researchers used administrative data from the JJC and juvenile probation records to track program outcomes. Furthermore, the sample included young individuals aged 12–18 who were arrested for felony or violent misdemeanor charges between 2017 and 2019. Lastly, additional data were collected to assess changes in participants’ strengths and needs using the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths assessment, as well as recurrent referrals to court within one year after program exit. The findings showed that participants experienced substantial improvements, with average “needs” scores declining and “strengths” scores increasing over time. Moreover, youths who successfully completed the program had significantly lower rates of recidivism compared with those who did not complete or did not participate. Outcomes for program completers highlighted the program’s effectiveness, even though overall rereferral rates for the full JJC group did not differ from historical comparisons. More importantly, the study emphasized that addressing trauma, behavioral health needs, and social supports helped reduce justice involvement. These results suggest that community-based alternatives can help mitigate the disruptive effects of incarceration. Ultimately, the researchers concluded that holistic diversion programs like JJC offer a promising and scalable approach to reducing juvenile incarceration and promoting healthier long-term outcomes for youth (Gigante et al., 2022).

Lastly, a study assessed the effectiveness of a structured, detention-based support program in reducing repeat detention and arrests among youth. Particularly, the study focused on a series of youth outreach forums run at the Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center, where participants engaged in structured conversations with community members, authority figures, and individuals who had exited crime. Following that lead, researchers conducted a randomized controlled trial, assigning groups of detained youth either to be invited to the forums or to continue with usual detention programming. Additionally, they tracked outcomes on repeat detention stays and arrests over subsequent months and years using administrative justice system records. The findings showed that youth assigned to the outreach forums experienced an estimated 20% reduction in repeat detention stays within eight months compared with others. Total arrests in the first year were also about 18% lower for those assigned to the program. Reductions in arrests were particularly strong for violent crime (about 43% lower) and drug crime (about 40% lower). Furthermore, a 30% reduction in property crime arrests was also observed, though that estimate was less precise. These declines corresponded to substantial decreases in the social costs of crime for the community. Hence, the researchers concluded that dialogue-based, supportive programs within detention settings can reduce reoffending and improve outcomes for justice-involved youth (Davis et al., 2024).

References

- Aceves, E., Dhital, S., & D'zatko, K. (2025). Is rehabilitative approach to criminal justice better for young adults? Evidence from Santa Clara County, CA. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 99, 102441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2025.102441>
- Barnert, E. S. (2024). Childhood behind bars: Children and the U.S. juvenile legal system. *Advances in Pediatrics*, 71(1), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yapd.2024.01.002>
- Davis, J., Meares, T., & Arnesen, E. (2024). Improving programming in juvenile detention: The impact of project safe neighborhoods youth outreach forums. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 41, 23–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-024-09584-5>
- Gigante, C. I., Rak, K., Kaplan, A., Helmcamp, L., Otoo, C., & Sheehan, K. M. (2022). A community-based youth diversion program as an alternative to incarceration, Illinois, 2017–2019. *American Journal of Public Health*, 112(9), 1265–1268. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2022.306946>
- Johnson, E. J., Pluckebaum, H., Martin, K. D., Danielson, B., Majercin, B., Capestany, S. A., & Lyons, V. H. (2025). Youth detention and incarceration facilities in the United States (January 2010 to February 2023): Mapping closure intents and implementation. *American Journal of Public Health*, 115(8), 1299–1307. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2025.308118>
- Lesnick, J., Abrams, L. S., Angel, K., & Barnert, E. S. (2024). Envisioning the future of youth justice: A focus group study with youth, family, frontline staff, and subject experts. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 169, 108097. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2024.108097>