

LONE STAR JUSTICE ALLIANCE

THE PROBLEM

There is a clear gap between what all emerging adults, ages 17-24, need to become thriving adults and the interventions commonly employed by the adult criminal justice system, posing challenges to appropriate service delivery for this age group. We see the implications of this gap in state and national outcome data:

- Emerging adults make up only 11% of Texans, yet they account for over 29% of arrests.¹
- Nationally, over 75% of justice-involved emerging adults recidivate, the highest short-term rate of any age group.²
- In Texas, emerging adults sentenced to a term of probation are revoked at a rate three times higher than older adults.³
- Rates of confinement for emerging adults of color are 3 times higher than rates for white emerging adults.⁴
- Youth under 18 held in adult jails are 36 times more likely to commit suicide than youth held in juvenile detention.⁵
- Youth under the age of 18 are held in isolation in adult jails more often than their counterparts in the juvenile system, which can have negative effects on mental health.⁶

Institutional confinement grounded in purely punitive principles has little effect on, and may even increase the likelihood of recidivism among emerging adults.⁷ For this reason, the intervention model of choice for youth and emerging adults is individualized treatment in the least restrictive community-based setting.⁸ Texas communities need appropriately coordinated alternatives to incarceration that divert emerging adults away from the deeper ends of the criminal justice system and into intensive multi-disciplinary services and supports structured to address the factors that contributed to their system involvement, increasing public safety while reducing costs to taxpayers.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO JUSTICE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

Recent advances in neurobiology and psychology research demonstrate that adolescent brain development continues into the mid-twenties, making emerging adults cognitively and emotionally different than their older adult counterparts.⁹ Compounding these developmental factors, there are a multitude of factors that further disrupt healthy brain development and that increase their risk for justice system-involvement; the majority has: at least one diagnosable mental health disorder,¹⁰ untreated and unrecognized trauma,¹¹ a substance use disorders,¹² chronic unemployment,¹³ homelessness and housing security,¹⁴ involvement with the child protection and foster care systems,¹⁵ and limited academic and work readiness skills.¹⁶ However, youth and emerging adults are also especially susceptible to change, and individualized, community-based interventions can set them on the right path.¹⁷ Alternatives to incarceration for emerging adults need to comprehensively address these factors and the intersections between them in order to support positive health and safety outcomes that reduce continued justice system involvement.

***Emerging adults
develop an accelerator
long before they can
steer and brake.***

Ronald Dahl, MD pediatrician
and developmental psychologist

BEST PRACTICES IN DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVES FOR EMERGING ADULTS

The challenge for local and state governments in determining the most effective method of promoting emerging adult justice is that existing interventions are either very new or have operated on a small scale, so there is no study reaching conclusions about their results or cost-effectiveness.¹⁸ Most of the existing programs were developed based on personal interactions with emerging adults and observations and knowledge of the population.¹⁹ While outcomes and cost-effectiveness are unavailable, there are common elements among existing interventions that can provide an understanding of key principles for intervening with emerging adults when they make contact with the adult criminal justice system. These elements align with evidence-based methods for reducing recidivism in community settings²⁰:

Intensive, individualized case management: individualized services include education or vocational training, mental health and/or substance use recovery services, and assistance with housing and employment. Intensive refers to the level of oversight provided by the lead case manager. Most existing programs required frequent check-ins with program participants to ensure they achieve program goals.²¹ However, **the individual or entity providing case management is a critical variable toward promoting sustainable behavior change.** Research shows that behavior change that is attached to one's own values and reasons to change will last longer than change that is externally imposed.²² Interpersonal interactions with service providers trained in specialized cognitive behavior techniques, such as motivational interviewing, play a major role in

implementing this principle. Consequently, programs that employ probation or community supervision departments, trained to emphasize compliance monitoring, to serve as case managers may impede participants' ability to achieve behavior change.²³

Risk-Needs-Responsivity structure: The programs most effective at reducing recidivism conform to the principles of risk, needs and responsivity.²⁴ The risk principle advises services and supervision be applied in direct proportion to an individual's criminogenic risk, with lower-risk individuals receiving less-intensive interventions and higher-risk individuals receiving interventions of higher intensity.²⁵ The need principle promotes the administration of treatment and programming according to individuals' assessed needs that are amenable to change, such as time spent with antisocial peers and truancy.²⁶ The responsivity principle states that interventions should be tailored to an individual's learning style, level of motivation, abilities, and strengths so that services are delivered in a manner in which youth will be most receptive.²⁷ To ensure fidelity to RNR principles, programs should use risk-needs assessment tools that are developmentally tailored to emerging adults.²⁸

Integrating health and social service experts into the criminal justice decision-making process: In place of the current system of prosecutors using their discretion to make diversion decisions according to imprecise criteria and evaluation, the proposed "panel of experts" would be a separate, quasi-independent entity designed and staffed by behavioral health experts and experts from social services (i.e. social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, and other mental health, addiction, and neurocognitive professionals) that encompass the multitude of social determinants of health.²⁹ The panel of experts would be responsible for identifying a set of services and treatments that could meet the needs of participants and recommending those to the justice system stakeholders. The experts would also oversee participants' progress toward achieving the goals identified in their care plan and recommending adjustments as needed to promote participants' success in the program. The panel's recommendations would be advisory, allowing prosecutors to retain discretion over the panel's recommendations.³⁰

Community-based supports and services: Because treatment and services are most effective when they are provided in the least-restrictive environment, namely, communities and neighborhoods not jails or prisons, diversion and alternatives to incarceration for emerging adults should be structured through a public health lens that promotes community-based services.³¹ Community-based services to which participants are diverted would also be interdisciplinary and separately funded from prosecuting authorities to ensure that minimizing recidivism remains at the core of their mission.³² Fully funded programs run by experts in the field using evidence-based programs and practices have the prospect of substantially lowering recidivism rates.³³

Specialized skill training with directed practice: This evidence-based principle suggests that cognitive-behavioral techniques (CBT) and "social learning" should become a central part of programming.³⁴ Stakeholders involved in participants' criminal cases should receive specialized training in areas such as trauma, brain development, moral decision-making, and impulsivity among emerging adults. Training should include methods for employing these techniques beyond the boundaries of treatment to the everyday interaction between case managers, program administrators and participants, allowing staff to identify criminal thinking and antisocial behavior, redirect it, and promote prosocial behavior.³⁵

Culturally competent service delivery that promotes racial justice: All program staff, service providers, and criminal justice system stakeholders should be provided racial justice training, and the program should be structured to promote racial equity. Advancing racial equity is in itself a strategy for reducing emerging adults' criminal justice system involvement, as it has been widely documented that it is not simple poverty or lack of opportunity but inequity that drives crime and violence.³⁶

Accountability through restorative justice: Research shows connecting individuals with prosocial activities in their own community promotes positive behavior,³⁷ especially for emerging adults, who develop a moral compass calibrated to their environment, witnessing and internalizing the behavior of those around them.³⁸ In jail, emerging adults are exposed to a social context characterized by isolation, violence, and shame.³⁹ By contrast, restorative justice and harm reduction initiatives include support networks (i.e. family, friends, loved ones with a stake in the outcome) that bring emerging adults into moral community through accountability to bear the weight of their actions.⁴⁰ These initiatives require participants to perform some

Community-based services to support justice-involved emerging adults

- Mental Health treatment and recovery
- Substance use treatment and recovery
- Physical healthcare
- Dental care
- Education attainment
- Restorative justice
- Integrated health care
- Housing
- Workforce development
- Strengthening family relationships
- Trauma-informed care
- Parenting Support
- Therapy and counseling
- Access to local food pantries and clothing and furniture depots
- Life skills group sessions
- Civil legal services

type of reconciliation with individual victims or with the community. These initiatives should respond to emerging adults' developmental capacity while holding them accountable for their behavior.⁴¹ Programs should draw on local services and resources to respond to the needs of participants, promoting a local jurisdiction's ability to sustain the program over time.

Behavior response system that employs positive youth development principles: Positive reinforcement coupled with a set of clear boundaries is effective in supporting sustainable behavior change and developing consequential thinking.⁴² Existing programs may offer reduced sentencing or probation, expunging criminal records, or a reduction in charges as an incentive for achieving successful program completion. However, programs also need to employ a rewards response system throughout program participation in order to incentivize participants to achieve their goals and promote prosocial interactions.⁴³ In addition to providing emerging adults rewards for positive behavior, intervention programs need to apply consequences for non-compliance that are immediate, causal, proportionate, consistent, contextualized in community, and respectful.⁴⁴

Measure processes and practices and provide outcome feedback: Only those interventions that are consistently tracked and evaluated can truly be proven successful, emphasizing the need of programs to collect data on an ongoing basis, conduct rigorous analysis of procedures and outcomes, and regularly manage performance by providing feedback according to evaluation outcomes. Existing programs share the common goal of reducing the likelihood of future justice system involvement among program participants and accordingly rely on recidivism rates as the primary method of measuring the success of the intervention, requiring internal data tracking systems. However, programs should track additional measures that evaluate the multitude of factors that lead to justice system involvement, including health outcomes and the social determinants of health.⁴⁵

LEADERSHIP STAFF

Elizabeth A. Henneke, JD, Executive Director, graduated from Yale University where she earned a B.A. in History with a concentration on race relations in the American South. At Yale, Elizabeth worked for four years in the Jerome Frank Legal Services Organization, volunteered with the Southern Center for Human Rights, and taught biology to students in the Summer Bridge program in Atlanta. She then worked as a paralegal for Mayer Brown, where she helped prepare several death penalty appeals before attending law school at the University of Texas School of Law. During law school, Elizabeth was a Rapoport Human Rights Scholar and a member of the Texas Law Review. She worked with the Texas Defender Service, investigating and preparing federal habeas petitions for individuals on Texas' death row. She then represented Guantanamo detainees as a clinical instructor for the University of Texas' National Security & Human Rights Clinic, where she received the 2007 Frederick Douglass Human Rights Award. After graduation, Elizabeth served as a law clerk for the South Africa Constitutional Court and for Judge Edward C. Prado on the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit. She joined Williams & Connolly in Washington, D.C, where she engaged in high-stakes litigation. Elizabeth was the inaugural Audrey Irmis Clinical Teaching Fellow at the University of Southern California Gould School of Law. There, Elizabeth supervised students in the Post-Conviction Justice Project, the Immigration Clinic, and the International Human Rights Clinic, successfully receiving legal status for over 35 individuals and obtaining new sentencing hearings for more than 10 individuals facing life without parole sentences for crimes they committed while juveniles. She also taught first-year criminal law and a seminar on the death penalty at USC Law. Most recently, Elizabeth served as a Policy Attorney for the Texas Criminal Justice Coalition with the Solutions for Youth Justice project. Elizabeth is on the Juvenile Council for the State Bar of Texas, serves on Federal Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice, OJJDP Subcommittee on LGBTQ Issues and on the Board of Directors for the Campaign for Youth Justice, and is on the drafting committee for the Juvenile Records Advisory Committee, which recently rewrote the juvenile records code for the State of Texas. In May 2017, Elizabeth received the Travis County Women Lawyers' Association Attorney Award for her work in the Public Interest.

Alycia Welch, MPAff, MSSW, Director of Policy & Planning, completed her graduate studies at the University of Texas at Austin, earning a Master's of Public Affairs with specializations in Social and Economic Policy and Nonprofit Studies and a Master's of Science in Social Work with a concentration in Community and Administrative Leadership. She received her BA Degree from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, majoring in Political Science and Women's Studies. Alycia has extensive experience managing complex, multi-partner projects and facilitated cross-system collaboration with criminal and juvenile justice, health care, and behavioral health systems. The recipient of two policy research awards from the American Society for Public Administration, Alycia has authored several reports on the need for reforming the criminal and juvenile justice systems in Texas and has presented her findings to elected officials, state- and county-level agency leaders, and other key stakeholders. For the Office of the Independent Ombudsman (OIO) of Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD), Alycia designed a behavior response system to prevent violence at the agency's state secure facilities and appropriately intervene when violence occurs. The National Partnership for Juvenile Services and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention selected the model for inclusion in *Desktop Guide to Quality Practice for Working with Youth in Confinement*, a publication that is distributed to all local and state juvenile justice agencies across the country. She informed the interim work of the 83rd Texas House Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence, researching alternative approaches to justice-involved youth and adults with serious mental illness. Alycia convened a behavioral health task force to identify gaps in services and recommend reforms to reduce justice system involvement among this population. Her expertise also includes community-based practice research in the public health field. As Associate Director of Angela House, a transitional housing program for women exiting prison or jail, Alycia secured funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to conduct a program evaluation of "Healthy & Whole," an innovative health program provided through a collaborative partnership with a local federally qualified health center for Angela House residents. Alycia partnered with the Program Manager of Health & Whole, and researchers at the University of Texas School of Public Health's Health Science Center to design and implement the evaluation. Alycia was also a Policy Analyst for Former Texas State Representative Elliott Naishtat, Vice Chair of the Committee on Public Health during the 84th legislative session, and Texas State Representative Donna Howard, Vice Chair of the Committee on Calendars during the 85th session, analyzing criminal and juvenile justice, public health, and human services legislation and advancing bills that proposed reforms to the mental health and criminal justice systems, including several that were signed into law by the governor.

REFERENCES

- ¹ United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation (October 2013). "Crime in the United States, 2012." Data retrieved on 19 April 2017, from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2012/crime-in-the-u.s.-2012/resource-pages/download-printable-files>.
- ² Carson, E.A., and Golinelli, D. (2014). "Prisoners in 2012: Trends in Admissions and Releases, 1991-2012." U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics. The Bureau of Justice Statistics stopped publishing "admission" statistics by age in 2013, and now publishes only yearend (December 31) population of correctional facilities by age. 2012 is, thus, the most recent year data is available for comparison of admission rates by age;
- ³ Data retrieved from a Public Information Act request submitted by the Texas Criminal Justice Coalition.
- ⁴ Petteruti, A., Schindler, M., and Ziedenberg, J. (2014). *Sticker Shock: Calculating the Full Price Tag for Youth Incarceration*. Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute.
- ⁵ Deitch, M. (2011). "Juveniles in the Adult Criminal Justice System in Texas." Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, LBJ School of Public Affairs.
- ⁶ Deitch, 2011.
- ⁷ Mark W. Lipsey, "The Primary Factors that Characterize Effective Interventions with Juvenile Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Overview," *Victims & Offenders* 4, no. 2 (April 2009): 124–47; Jeffrey A. Butts, Gordon Bazemore, and Aundra Saa Meroe, *Positive Youth Justice: Framing Justice Interventions Using the Concepts of Positive Youth Development* (Washington, DC: Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2010); Brent B. Benda and Connie L. Tollett, "A Study of Recidivism of Serious and Persistent Offenders Among Adolescents," *Journal of Criminal Justice* 27, no. 2 (March–April 1999): 111–26; and Mark W. Lipsey and Francis T. Cullen, "The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 3 (December 2007): 297–320.
- ⁸ Vincent Schiraldi, Bruce Western, Kendra Bradner, "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults," National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, NCJ No. 248900 (September 2015): 10-14. <https://nij.gov/publications/pages/publication-detail.aspx?ncjnumber=248900>
- ⁹ Kathryn Monahan, Laurence Steinberg, Elizabeth Cauffman, and Edward Mulvey, "Psychosocial Immaturity from Adolescence to Early Adulthood: Distinguishing Between Adolescence-Limited and Persistent Antisocial Behavior," *Development and Psychopathology* 25, no. 4 (November 2013): 1093–1105; Sara Johnson, Robert Blum, and Jay Giedd, "Adolescent Maturity and the Brain: The Promise and Pitfalls of Neuroscience Research in Adolescent Health Policy," *Journal of Adolescent Health* 45, no. 3 (September 2009) 216–221; Elizabeth Shulman, Kathryn Paige Harden, Jason Chein, and Laurence Steinberg, "The Development of Impulse Control and Sensation-Seeking in Adolescence: Independent or Interdependent Processes?" *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 26, no. 1 (March 2016): 37–44; Kerstin Konrad, Christine Firk, and Peter Uhlhaas, "Brain Development During Adolescence: Neuroscientific Insights into this Developmental Period," *Deutsches Arzteblatt* 110, no. 25 (June 2013): 425–431. Giedd, J.N., Blumenthal, J., Jeffries, N.O., Castellanos, F.X., Liu, H., Zijdenbos, A., Paus, T., Evans A.C., and Rapoport, J.L. (1999). "Brain Development During Childhood and Adolescence: A Longitudinal MRI Study." *Nature Neuroscience* 2: 861-863; Berlin, G., Furstenberg, F. F., and Waters, M.C. (Eds.) (Spring 2010). "Transition to Adulthood." Special Issue. *The Future of Children* 20(1).
- ¹⁰ NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, REFORMING JUVENILE JUSTICE: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH (2013); BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, DRUG USE AND DEPENDENCE, STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONERS, 2004 7 (2006).
- ¹¹ Emerging adults aged 18-20 experience violent victimization at more than twice the rate of the general population, and those with a history of foster care are 10 times more likely to report being arrested when they were 18 or 19. See, Velazquez, T. (May 2013). "Young Adult Justice: A New Frontier Worth Exploring." *The Chronicle of Social Change*, available at <http://chronicleofsocialchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Young-Adult-Justice-FINAL-revised.pdf>.
- ¹² Wolff, N., J. Huening, J. Shi and B.C. Frueh (Oct. 2013). *Screening for and Treating PTSD and Substance Use Disorders Among Incarcerated Men*. Policy Brief. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Behavioral Health Services and Criminal Justice Research; Birn, R., B. Roeber, S. Pollak (May 2017). "Early Childhood Stress Exposure, Reward Pathways, and Adult Decision Making." Proceedings of the National Academies of Sciences of the United States of America: 1-6.
- ¹³ NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, REFORMING JUVENILE JUSTICE: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH (2013); BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, DRUG USE AND DEPENDENCE, STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONERS, 2004 7 (2006).
- ¹⁴ U.S. DEP'T OF LABOR, *Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey* (accessed April 9, 2016), <http://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/cpseea10.htm> (showing unemployment rates for emerging adults far exceeding those of older age groups).
- ¹⁵ COUNCIL FOR STATE GOVERNMENTS, REDUCING RECIDIVISM AND IMPROVING OTHER OUTCOMES FOR EMERGING ADULTS IN THE JUVENILE AND ADULT CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS (Nov. 2015)
- ¹⁶ Pam Fessler, *Report: Foster Kids Face Tough Times After Age 18*, NPR (Apr. 7, 2010), <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=125594259>.
- ¹⁷ COUNCIL FOR STATE GOVERNMENTS, REDUCING RECIDIVISM AND IMPROVING OTHER OUTCOMES FOR EMERGING ADULTS IN THE JUVENILE AND ADULT CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS 4 (Nov. 2015).
- ¹⁸ Schiraldi, V., Western, B., and Bradner, K. (2015). "Community-Based Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults." *New Thinking in Community Corrections Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 248900.
- ¹⁹ Council for State Governments, "Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Young Adults in the Juvenile and Adult Criminal

Justice Systems.” *Supra* note 24 at 5; for example, the Douglas County, Nebraska young adult court has been operating since 2004, and one study attempted to undertake a close analysis of its effectiveness in 2012. However, because the sample size of its participants from 2007–11 was so small (31 at the most general level of analysis), the study could not draw many conclusions. *See generally* University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, Evaluation of Nebraska’s Problem-Solving Courts (2012), <http://ppc.unl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/drug-court-report-final-report.pdf>.

¹⁹ Hayek, Connie. “Environmental Scan of Developmentally Appropriate Criminal Justice Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults,” National Institute of Justice (2016): 5, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/249902.pdf>.

²⁰ National Institute of Corrections. “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections,” second edition. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections (2009): 11, <https://nicic.gov/implementing-evidence-based-policy-and-practice-community-corrections-second-edition>.

²¹ Hayek, Connie. “Environmental Scan of Developmentally Appropriate Criminal Justice Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults,” National Institute of Justice (2016): 1.

²² National Institute of Corrections. “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections,” *supra* note 75 at 12-13.

²³ Kelly, W.R., et al. *From Retribution to Public Safety*, *supra* note 54 at 146-147.

²⁴ National Institute of Corrections. “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections,” *supra* note 75 at 12-13; *see also*: *see also*: D. A. Andrews and James Bonta, “Rehabilitating Criminal Justice Policy and Practice,” *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 16, no. 1 (2010): 39, https://www.utcourts.gov/courts/juv/ebp/docs/Rehabilitating_criminal_justice_policy_and_practice.pdf, showing that programs that adhere to the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model have been shown to reduce recidivism by up to 35% among justice system-involved adults.

²⁵ National Institute of Corrections. “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections,” *supra* note 75 at 12-13.

²⁶ *Ibid*, 13.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 13.

²⁸ Council for State Governments, “Dos and Don’ts for Reducing Recidivism Among Young Adults in the Justice System.” (Sept. 2017): 1, <https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Dos-and-Donts-for-Reducing-Recidivism-among-Young-Adults-in-the-Justice-System.pdf>.

²⁹ *Ibid*, 139.

³⁰ *Ibid*, 140.

³¹ *Ibid*, 138, citing Sedere and Sharfstein, “Fixing the Troubled Mental Health System.” *Huffington Post* (Dec. 6, 2017), https://www.huffingtonpost.com/lloyd-i-sederer-md/fixing-the-broken-mental-_b_5973106.html.

³² *Ibid*, 135-136.

³³ *Ibid*, 136.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 15.

³⁵ *Ibid*, 15.

³⁶ Sered, Danielle. “Accounting for Violence: How to Increase Safety and Break Our Failed Reliance on Mass Incarceration.” New York: Vera Institute of Justice (2017): 28, <https://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/commonjustice/pages/82/attachments/original/1506608259/accounting-for-violence.pdf?1506608259>.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 16.

³⁸ Sered, Danielle. “Fostering Accountability Among Young Adults: Restorative Justice as a Developmentally Targeted Intervention.” Harvard Kennedy School Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy (2018), <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/centers/wiener/programs/criminaljustice/research-publications/young-adult-justice/fostering-accountability-among-young-adults>.

³⁹ *Ibid*.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*.

⁴¹ *Ibid*.

⁴² National Institute of Corrections. “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections,” *supra* note 75 at 15-16.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 16.

⁴⁴ Sered, Danielle. “Fostering Accountability Among Young Adults.” *Supra* note 90.

⁴⁵ Kelly, W.R., et al. *From Retribution to Public Safety*, *supra* note 54 at 148.