



OJJDP

Working for Youth Justice and Safety

JUVENILE JUSTICE BULLETIN

October 2012

Melodee Hanes, Acting Administrator

Underage Drinking

Underage drinking is a widespread offense that can have serious physical, neurological, and legal consequences. Problematically, it has become quite commonplace. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) works to eliminate underage consumption of alcohol and provide guidance for communities developing prevention and treatment programs.

OJJDP created the underage drinking bulletin series to educate practitioners and policymakers about the problems youth face when they abuse alcohol and to provide evidence-based guidelines. The series presents findings from a study on preventing underage drinking in the Air Force as well as a literature review of the effects and consequences of underage drinking, best practices for community supervision of underage drinkers and legal issues surrounding underage drinking, and practice guidelines for working with underage drinkers.

The series highlights the dangers of underage drinking. Hopefully, the information it provides will support communities in their efforts to reduce alcohol use by minors through the use of evidence-based strategies and practices.

Community Supervision of Underage Drinkers

Highlights

In this bulletin, the authors provide a theoretical overview upon which to base policies, procedures, and practices that will help professionals—and their corresponding agencies—effectively supervise underage drinkers in the community. They also discuss the legal issues that professionals may encounter when working with these youth.

Some of the authors' recommendations include the following:

- An effective community supervision program should emphasize four goals: community protection, youth accountability, competency development, and individual assessment.
- Conditions of community supervision must be clearly stated to the youth, must be constitutional and fair, and must help rehabilitate the youth.
- Community corrections and diversion professionals must acknowledge the diverse cultural backgrounds of youth and tailor interventions and services accordingly.
- Justice system professionals must remember that youth under supervision maintain certain basic constitutional rights. Violation of these rights, intentional misconduct, or negligence can result in legal liability.





October 2012

Community Supervision of Underage Drinkers

Underage youth¹ who drink face a variety of personal and legal consequences. Current strategies to reduce underage drinking focus on community-based initiatives such as decreasing the availability of alcohol to underage youth, reducing occasions and opportunities for underage drinking, and diminishing youth's demand for alcohol (Bonnie and O'Connell, 2004). Communities can create healthier environments that help prevent underage drinking. They can make sure that prevention efforts reach the whole community and that treatment is available for all youth who need it. Youth who have been arrested or adjudicated for underage drinking require a special focus.

This bulletin describes the current goals and principles most communities use to guide their approach to underage drinking. These goals and principles are partly guided by the Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) Model, which the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) developed in an effort to help offenders take responsibility for their actions and learn skills to contribute to their community and to increase community safety. The bulletin also describes the legal issues underage drinkers and the justice officials who work with them may encounter. The authors examine current

laws within the United States, the rights that underage drinkers have, and the liability issues that justice professionals may face in supervising underage drinkers following adjudication.

Goals for Community Supervision Programs

BARJ has been accepted as a guiding strategy for the past couple of decades (Maloney, Romig, and Armstrong, 1988). It places equal emphasis on three primary goals: community protection, accountability, and competency development. In addition, individualized assessments of youth and young adults help supervisors develop case plans that combine these goals in practice. For more information about BARJ, see the sidebar, "The Balanced and Restorative Justice Model."

Community Protection

Community protection refers to safeguarding all residents in every community, including criminals and victims. The effects of underage drinking are far reaching and have negative effects on youth and young adults, their

THE BALANCED AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE MODEL

The three-pronged, balanced approach holds an individual accountable for his or her actions, develops individual competence and skills as a result of the youth entering the justice system, and upholds public safety within the community. The approach is based on the judicial philosophy of restorative justice, which focuses on repairing harm between victims, offenders, and community members

when crimes occur. To be successful, this model requires stakeholders, including members of the community and justice professionals, to collaborate in the work of juvenile.

For more information, see OJJDP's *Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model* at www.ojjdp.gov/PUBS/implementing/balanced.html.

families, victims of vehicle crashes and crimes, and the entire community. Community protection efforts target communities, community groups, and youth and attempt to prevent crime through vigilance and monitoring by community members.

Strategies to reduce underage drinking have focused on eliminating opportunities for youth to obtain alcohol and have emphasized alternative activities that do not involve alcohol use. Supervision and sanctions can be used to help youth comply with behavioral expectations. A safe and secure community is considered a public right.

Accountability

Accountability refers to measures taken to ensure that youth take responsibility for the damage, injury, or loss their actions have caused. Accountability clearly communicates that certain consequences follow harmful actions and that the offender is responsible for repairing the damage caused to victims and the community. These measures help youth develop greater awareness of the harmful consequences of their actions. Measures may include paying restitution, making written or public apologies to victims, performing community service, and repairing damaged property.

Competency Development

Youth and young adults should leave the justice system as more capable and productive members of society than when they entered. Youth can take classes, learn how to have positive interactions with adults, find employment, and perform community service (Bazemore and Umbreit, 1994).

Individualized Assessment

Youth who enter the justice system should be given individual assessments that help them develop a plan of action. These plans should provide a combination of supervision, accountability measures, competency development opportunities, and treatment. An individualized assessment can help identify the most beneficial sanctions, supervision approaches, and treatment methods for each youth and may be used to group youth with similar needs during supervision. Each youth's assessment and case plan should evaluate the reasons youth participate in underage drinking, highlight his or her strengths and resources, assess his or her needs, and determine the strategies that may change his or her attitudes and behaviors.

Principles for Addressing Underage Drinking

The primary goals of intervention described above provide a purpose and direction for practitioners working with underage drinking offenders. Additionally, the authors define six important principles that provide a foundation for the diversion and probation programs youth attend. These principles are described below.

Principle 1: Implement a Comprehensive Approach

Effectively addressing underage drinking requires a comprehensive approach to diminish the supply of alcohol available to underage youth and control and change their attitudes and behaviors to decrease their alcohol consumption.

Communities should implement a well-rounded strategy to reduce underage drinking. Past strategies have targeted communities, the alcohol industry, policymakers, and general adult and youth populations. These strategies include (Bonnie and O'Connell, 2004):

- Increasing the minimum drinking age to limit youth's access to alcohol.
- Strengthening prohibitions against providing alcohol to those who are underage.
- Raising taxes on alcohol products to reduce youth's consumption.
- Decreasing advertisements and media that portray alcohol consumption as an attractive and acceptable activity for youth and young adults.
- Developing strategic partnerships to enhance prevention efforts.
- Providing educational services to youth on preventing alcohol use.

These approaches are often referred to as universal strategies because they are directed toward all youth and all communities. Although these strategies can be very effective in preventing underage drinking and related problems, further work is needed to identify youth who have already begun using alcohol and may be at risk for substance abuse or may have already exhibited signs of dependence. At-risk youth should be directed to intervention programs because they already have attitudes and behaviors consistent with a greater demand for alcohol.



Principle 2: Provide a Balanced Response

The entire justice system and community supervision agencies should create balanced responses to youth that are tailored to the specific characteristics and situation of each youth and should collaborate to establish written criteria for system responses to ensure fair access to and use of services.

A wide range of youth may engage in underage drinking. Some of these youth may be at low risk of reoffending. For others, the offense is just the beginning of increasingly serious alcohol problems (Dick et al., 2011).

In response to these problems, the justice system must send a clear message that underage drinking is not acceptable, while not overreacting by imposing intensive interventions or services for youth who have little risk of reoffending. To determine what level of intervention is appropriate for a youth, justice staff should conduct a careful assessment.

Juvenile justice practice promotes the use of the least restrictive sanctions that will produce the desired outcomes for the individual youth or young adult (Maxwell, 2003). For example, diversionary programs are often used to prevent youth from going through the formal court process. Additionally, when possible, youth may be supervised in the community and placed on probation rather than sent to a custodial program. In fact, although it has yet to be enacted into law, the proposed Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2009 (U.S. Senate, 2009) encourages states to provide juveniles with alternatives to detention if they are status or first-time minor offenders.

Justice professionals, treatment providers, and other policymakers should collaborate to establish criteria that refer youth to intervention based on their risk level. These criteria will ensure the most equitable, effective, and economical use of community resources.

Principle 3: Use Evidence-Based Practices

Assessment, intervention, response to, and supervision of underage drinking offenders should be based, when possible, on practices that research has proven effective.

Drug and alcohol treatment can be effective in deterring youth from future drug abuse and criminal offending. Research has found that the length and intensity level of treatment is strongly correlated with its effectiveness (see National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2007). In fact, research has found reductions in drug and alcohol use, crime, risky health behaviors, and mental health problems among individuals who have engaged in drug and alcohol programs (see Johnson et al., 2002). Using sanctions can also help motivate individuals to participate in treatment programs and succeed (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 2005).

Research on the most appropriate interventions for underage drinkers is not as robust as some of the substance abuse treatment literature. This area of scientific investigation must grow before the field can verify the best possible strategies for fostering public safety, offender accountability, competency development, and positive treatment outcomes for this subset of individuals. To progress, local community corrections agencies must develop effective program evaluations. Programs should gather data on their practices and outcomes and seek the help of researchers in pinpointing the most useful strategies.

Principle 4: Develop Culturally Appropriate Responses

Responses to underage drinking must be sensitive to the cultural background of the youth.

Community corrections and diversion professionals must strive to understand the cultural traditions of the youth and young adults with whom they work. To achieve this understanding, professionals need to have ongoing dialogue with key persons from different races, ethnicities, religions, sexual orientations, and cultural groups. Such dialogue will help cultural groups understand the interventions and services the community provides and enhance services and make them more culturally appropriate.

The considerable diversity among youth and young adults entering the justice system requires responses that take into account the needs of each person. Responses should be sensitive to the fact that law enforcement and courts have discriminated against many minorities in the past, so minorities may fear the justice system.

Nonetheless, underage drinking offenders should be held accountable for their behavior, regardless of their cultural backgrounds and special needs. Professionals should not

allow youth to use their culture as an excuse or justification for drinking. Professionals must choose their methods carefully so that they enhance public safety and help youth become healthy, law-abiding individuals.

If youth receiving diversion or probation services are not proficient in English, interpreters should be provided to ensure that they receive appropriate and satisfactory services. Whenever possible, interpreters should not be family members or friends of the youth or young adults.

Principle 5: Increase Practitioners' Knowledge and Understanding

Community corrections agencies and practitioners should engage in ongoing training and collect data for program evaluation and research to increase their individual and collective knowledge of underage drinking and the responses to it.

Community corrections and diversion professionals must have a solid understanding of the dynamics of underage drinking, the goals of supervision, the strategies for monitoring underage drinkers, and the skills required to intervene effectively. Agencies train staff on how to deal with underage drinking. Beyond agency-based training, professionals should read professional literature, consult with local experts, and attend training programs to enhance their own knowledge and skills.

Once interventions are put into practice, community corrections managers should collect data to measure their effectiveness. For instance, if the desired outcome of an alcohol awareness class is to increase participants' knowledge of risks associated with underage drinking, a simple preclass/postclass test can provide the necessary data. If the data show no increase in knowledge for a reasonable number of participants, then the manager knows that the program should be enhanced. Alternately, a program evaluation may show that an intervention is working, which can support managers' requests for funding or grants, prove the need for additional staff positions, or generate community support for their program.

Principle 6: Collaborate With Other Organizations and Agencies

Community corrections agencies and professionals should collaborate with community-based and justice system strategies and programs to reduce underage drinking.

Underage drinking presents social, health, and justice system problems that a single person or agency cannot resolve. Effective intervention requires cooperation and collaboration between professionals in a variety of fields and services.

All jurisdictions and agencies must build alliances to foster public safety, offender accountability, skill learning, and treatment. Collaboration involves sharing knowledge, information, resources, power, and decisionmaking. Individuals and organizations work together to provide a more consistent response to underage drinking and have a positive impact on their communities.

There are several key reasons for collaboration when providing community supervision for underage drinking offenders:

- A variety of participants will bring different viewpoints about underage drinking to the decisionmaking process. If these perspectives and ideas are processed effectively, they can be honed into a final plan that best meets the needs of the supervising agency and the community.
- Collaboration means that agencies and stakeholders are more likely to identify all of the issues associated with underage drinking in the community. If agencies and stakeholders recognize issues from the outset, they can save time in the planning process.
- Stakeholders who provide input from the beginning of the process may invest long-term in the project. Those who have not had an opportunity to share their ideas and hear other viewpoints are more likely to find fault in the program or even sabotage it during its implementation.
- Involved stakeholders may be good ambassadors for the strategies that the group puts forth. A well-chosen group of stakeholders can promote the program and come to its defense if the program encounters any problems.

The group must view each collaborator as an equal member who can work independently and with others and respect others' suggestions. Collaborations should involve people with differing opinions and should include parties that:

- Will be affected by the underage drinking supervision strategies.
- Have essential background knowledge.
- May strongly support or reject the implementation of the approach.

If collaborators disagree, they should understand that knowing the objections to a particular course of action may help planners create stronger, more acceptable strategies. With compromise and understanding, persons opposed to a change will often modify their opinions.



Legal Issues

Lawmakers in all 50 states and the District of Columbia have passed legislation controlling alcohol purchase, possession, and/or consumption by persons younger than 21. Given the extent that persons younger than 21 use alcohol, juvenile justice staff may encounter many clients who have been arrested for alcohol use or for whom alcohol use has contributed to their pattern of illegal behavior. This section describes laws related to alcohol use and the rights of underage drinkers.

Age and Legal Status

The legal system specifies the age at which one becomes an adult for different purposes. Youth can marry without parental consent at age 18; can purchase tobacco products at age 18; and can obtain a driver's license, depending on the state, between ages 16 and 18. Youth cannot legally purchase alcohol if they are younger than 21.

States and U.S. territories differ regarding how they classify underage alcohol offenses and which courts have jurisdiction over offenders. In some states, youth younger than age 18 who are charged with an alcohol offense will be under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. In other states, youth ages 16 and older who are charged with an alcohol offense will be under the jurisdiction of an adult court. Sanctions and remedies that are available to the juvenile and adult courts vary widely as well. By law, some states treat underage alcohol offenses as a civil matter and those charged are diverted out of the court's jurisdiction. Other states have minimum and mandatory fines as well as rigorous conditions and limitations on expunging the record of the underage drinker. Each system has differences in process, procedure, and sanctions.

Underage Drinking Laws

All 50 states and Washington, DC, have legislation that controls alcohol purchase, possession, and/or consumption by persons younger than 21. The National Minimum

Drinking Age Act of 1984 (23 U.S.C. 158) provided federal highway funds only if states adopted a minimum drinking age of 21. Shortly thereafter, all states enacted laws to conform to this federal requirement. State laws vary considerably, but those related to the behavior of minors include the following (Hafemeister and Jackson, 2004):

- Fifty states and the District of Columbia bar the purchase of alcohol by persons younger than 21.
- Forty-six states and the District of Columbia make the possession of alcohol by persons younger than 21 illegal.
- Forty states forbid the use of false identification to purchase alcohol.
- Thirty-eight states and the District of Columbia penalize youth younger than 21 who attempt to purchase alcohol.
- Thirty-four states and the District of Columbia prohibit youth younger than 21 from consuming alcohol.

Despite these laws, states make frequent exceptions when regulating alcohol-related activities among youth. For example, some states allow underage individuals to possess and consume alcohol on private property. About one-half of the states allow some lesser restrictions on alcohol use when parents of those younger than 21 are present or give consent. Some laws allow youth to enter businesses that serve alcohol when accompanied by a parent. Some state laws prohibit those younger than 21 from serving alcohol, but others allow it when it is a job requirement. Some states may exempt youth and young adults from strict adherence to the prohibitions against alcohol use due to religious practices or medical purposes (Hafemeister and Jackson, 2004).

Besides federal and state underage drinking laws, localities may enact ordinances. Some may restrict activities in which underage drinking is likely to occur or restrict alcohol use in public places that youth often frequent (Hafemeister and Jackson, 2004).

Sanctions for noncompliance with underage drinking laws vary by state and locality. Penalties are established for adults

“The considerable diversity among youth entering the justice system requires responses that take into account the needs of each person.”

who illegally sell or provide alcohol to minors. Those set by law for minors who purchase or consume alcohol range from fines as low as \$50 to incarceration, depending on the age and legal status of the youth. Intermediate sanctions may include community service, alcohol assessment and treatment, and driver’s license suspension or revocation (Hafemeister and Jackson, 2004).

Justice system personnel must know the laws and the exceptions to them and should understand how they can be implemented. Justice system professionals should consult local counsel if they have questions about specific laws or ordinances in their jurisdictions or if they do not understand the appropriate response to an underage drinking incident.

Rights and Privileges of Underage Drinkers

Youth found guilty of certain offenses may lose some of their rights and freedoms. However, certain constitutional rights cannot be diminished because of age or legal status, including the right to freedom of speech and religion, the right to due process, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses, the right to equal protection under the law, and the right against self-incrimination (Del Carmen and Sorensen, 1988).

Therefore, justice system personnel must carefully consider their responses to underage drinking offenders to ensure that youth receive fair treatment. When constructing conditions of community supervision, professionals must ensure that they meet the following criteria (Del Carmen and Sorensen, 1988):

- Supervision conditions must be constitutional and cannot violate any of the individual’s constitutional rights.
- Conditions must be clearly stated and understandable to the youth.
- Conditions must be reasonable, meaning that they are fair and that youth can achieve them.
- Conditions must help protect society and/or rehabilitate the individual.

Legal counsel should scrutinize policies and procedures developed for community supervision of underage drinking

offenders before they are implemented. This will avoid the risk of later challenges based on violations of youth’s rights.

Confidentiality

Two sets of federal confidentiality laws and regulations can be applied to individuals who experience addiction or other results of alcohol use, one for service programs and the other for health care agencies and providers. States also may have specific confidentiality policies regarding addiction, alcohol treatment, or justice system involvement. Justice system professionals must know federal, state, and local confidentiality requirements to safeguard their own practices. They should also know the requirements of other treatment programs and services that may work with the same youth.

Federal regulations for service programs. The privacy of persons receiving alcohol-related services is protected under 42 U.S.C. 290dd-3 and ee-3 (*U.S. Code*, 2007). This federal confidentiality law applies to all programs receiving federal assistance that provide alcohol or drug abuse diagnosis, treatment, or referral. It prevents the disclosure of information that would identify a person who is receiving alcohol or drug treatment.

Programs must protect patient records in a secure room in a locked file cabinet or similar place, and written procedures should detail exactly who has access to those records. Likewise, programs must establish appropriate policies and procedures to protect the electronic information maintained on clients. Programs must provide clients a written summary of confidentiality requirements (Crowe and Reeves, 1994).

Programs may release information about an individual receiving alcohol treatment services if he or she² signs a consent form. In this case, programs must also include a written notice that federal law protects the information and that the recipient cannot further disclose the material. When a parent or guardian signs for a minor, the minor has a right to revoke such consent later.

For underage drinkers involved in the justice system, consent forms cannot be revoked until a youth’s legal status changes.

“Youth should leave the justice system as more capable and productive members of society than when they entered.”

Alcohol and drug treatment programs may advise criminal justice agencies without obtaining an individual’s consent, if the person referred for treatment fails to apply for or receive services from the program (Crowe and Reeves, 1994).

Federal regulations for health care agencies and providers. The federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information (Privacy Rule) (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2002, 2003) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) parallel, in many ways, the substance abuse confidentiality rules just discussed. The Privacy Rule establishes a foundation for federal protection of the privacy of health information. HIPAA regulations apply to health plans, health care clearinghouses, and health care providers who conduct certain health care transactions electronically.

HIPAA regulations limit the number of people who have access to protected health information. Programs must take reasonable steps to limit the use or disclosure of that information. Similar to the confidentiality requirements for substance abuse programs, individuals may sign an authorization to release health information in appropriate circumstances. These regulations require (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2002, 2003):

- Notifying patients about their privacy rights and how their information can be used.
- Adopting and implementing privacy procedures for health care providers and health plans.
- Training employees to understand the privacy procedures.
- Designating an individual in charge of seeing that the privacy procedures are adopted and followed.
- Securing patient records containing identifiable health information so they are not readily available to those who do not need them.

Justice system agencies and personnel are not classified as health care or treatment providers and may not be subject to all of these confidentiality requirements. These agencies must decide which confidentiality procedures they will follow. Besides the two types of federal confidentiality

requirements just discussed, justice system agencies may also be subject to state and local confidentiality provisions.

Discrimination and Access to Services

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, as amended (2008) ensures equal access to employment, goods, and services for disabled individuals. Those who are diagnosed with substance abuse disorders are protected under this law (Crowe and Reeves, 1994).

ADA prohibits discrimination in employment practices and requires all employers with 15 or more employees to implement the law. Job applications, hiring, firing, advancement, compensation, training, and other aspects of employment are covered under the act. Anyone who meets the skill, experience, education, or other requirements of a job must be considered qualified, even if reasonable accommodations are required for him or her to perform the job.

Thus, employers cannot ask a recovering substance abuser to reveal his or her chemical dependency in applications or interviews. However, employers can test for illegal drug use. They can use the results of drug tests to make employment decisions—persons who currently engage in the use of illicit drugs are not protected (Crowe and Reeves, 1994).

Treatment programs and justice system agencies also may have to modify facilities or activities to accommodate physically disabled individuals. This is true even if programs do not receive any federal funding (Crowe and Reeves, 1994).

Searches

Justice system personnel may need to search their property or ask youth to take an alcohol or drug test to verify youth’s compliance with supervision conditions. For example, if a youth is not allowed to possess alcohol, justice system professionals may need to search his or her residence, vehicle, and other places the youth might keep personal property to verify compliance. Courts have consistently upheld the practice of warrantless searches of probationers’ properties. Local legal counsel should review the need for search warrants because state laws may differ



from federal laws. Agencies should establish appropriate officer safety policies for searches, and personnel should abide by all safety procedures.

Legal Liability Issues

Justice system professionals are responsible for their conduct. They must abide by the same criminal laws as any other citizen and may face lawsuits related to their job or professional performance. The following types of actions by justice professionals could result in liability (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2002):

- Intentional misconduct.
- Negligence.
- Abuse of authority resulting in a violation of a youth's protected rights.
- Oppressive conduct resulting in the deprivation of a youth's civil rights.

If a justice system professional is accused of wrongdoing, he or she may raise defenses such as self-defense or consent. Additionally, because community corrections professionals are government officials, they may be able to protect themselves against lawsuits using an official immunity defense. Three types of official immunity might apply (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2002):

- **Absolute immunity.** Protects practitioners—such as judges, prosecutors, and legislators—from lawsuits when they are acting in an official capacity.
- **Quasi-judicial immunity.** Protects justice system professionals performing judicial functions or operating under the direction of a judge (e.g., a probation officer acting pursuant to a court order) against liability claims.
- **Qualified immunity.** Provides protection against lawsuits when an officer acts in good faith. In other words, the justice system professional must act with the honest belief that he or she is performing his or her duties lawfully and without malice.

If a justice system professional's actions unknowingly infringe on a youth's rights, good faith may also be used as

a defense in civil rights cases (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2002). If a justice professional has been asked to take improper actions, he or she may avoid liability by notifying superiors of the problem in writing and refraining from further actions that violate another person's rights (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2002).

The "public duty doctrine" states that public officials are not liable for negligent conduct if a youth under their supervision causes harm to someone. For example, a probation officer's duty to protect applies only to specific individuals, not the general public. Unless the officer had a duty to a specific individual and breached that duty, he or she would not be held liable. However, if an officer knows that a youth might cause harm to a person or group of people, he or she must try to prevent the act and/or warn possible victims (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2002).

Justice system professionals can avoid exposure to lawsuits by (Crowe, 1999):

- Following established department policies and procedures on how to respond to alcohol-involved youth.
- Documenting activities taken to address alcohol problems.
- Staying informed about treatment and confidentiality laws regarding substance abusers.
- Getting signed releases of information from youth.
- Consulting with supervisors and/or obtaining court approval when in doubt about an issue.

Conclusion

Supervising underage drinkers can be complicated because youth become subject to the adult legal system before they are allowed to drink. Therefore, justice professionals must understand the legal issues that may confront them before they begin to supervise youth, particularly underage drinkers.

To best inform professionals, future research must work toward a better understanding of the most effective treatment and supervision approaches that enable underage drinkers to succeed. Furthermore, Congress must pass legislation like the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2009 to provide professionals with the resources they need to do their jobs effectively. In the end, implementing research and policy may lead to more effective practice guidelines to combat underage drinking.

For More Information

This bulletin was adapted from *Underage Drinking: Intervention Principles and Practice Guidelines for Community Corrections* (Crowe et al., 2011). The bulletin is the third in an OJJDP series on underage drinking. The goal of the series is to better inform practitioners, policymakers, and judges on the negative effects of underage drinking in the hope that this information will support the development of more effective policy and practice guidelines to combat the problem.

In this bulletin, the authors have highlighted common goals and principles communities should consider when creating supervision programs for underage drinkers. They also have outlined legal issues practitioners may encounter within a community supervision program.

Other bulletins in the series describe the effects and consequences of underage drinking, provide practical guidelines for supervising underage drinkers in the community, and present the findings of an evaluation of OJJDP's Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws initiative implemented at five communities with local Air Force bases.

The bulletins can be accessed from OJJDP's Web site, ojjdp.gov. *Underage Drinking: Intervention Principles and Practice Guidelines for Community Corrections* is available online at www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/appa/pubs/UDIPPGCC.pdf.

Endnotes

1. In this bulletin, the term “youth” refers to adolescents and young adults younger than age 21.
2. If the individual is a minor, his or her parent or legal guardian must also sign the form.

References

- Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended. 2008. Public Law 101–336, 101st Cong., 2d Sess., *U.S. Statutes at Large* 104:327, as amended by Public Law 110–325, 110th Cong., 2d Sess., *U.S. Statutes at Large* 122:3553–3559.
- Bazemore, G., and Umbreit, M.S. 1994. *Balanced and Restorative Justice*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Bonnie, R.J., and O’Connell, M.E., eds. 2004. *Reducing Underage Drinking: A Collective Responsibility*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. 2005. *Substance Abuse Treatment for Adults in the Criminal Justice System*. DHHS Publication No. SMA 05–4056. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
- Crowe, A.H. 1999. *Working With Substance Abusing Youths: Knowledge and Skills for Juvenile Probation and Parole Professionals*. Lexington, KY: American Probation and Parole Association.
- Crowe, A.H., Mullins, T.G., Cobb, K.A., and Lowe, N.C. 2011. *Underage Drinking: Intervention Principles and Practice Guidelines for Community Corrections*. Lexington, KY: American Probation and Parole Association.

“The justice system must send a clear message that underage drinking is not acceptable, while not overreacting by imposing intensive interventions for youth who have little risk of reoffending.”

Crowe, A.H., and Reeves, R. 1994. *Treatment for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse: Opportunities for Coordination*. DHHS Publication No. SMA 94-2075. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment.

Del Carmen, R.V., and Sorensen, J.R. 1988. Legal issues in drug testing probationers and parolees. *Federal Probation* 52:19-27.

Dick, D.M., Aliev, F., Viken, R., Kaprio, J., and Rose, R.J. 2011. Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index scores at age 18 predict alcohol dependence diagnoses 7 years later. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 35(5):1011-1014.

Hafemeister, T.L., and Jackson, S.L. 2004. Effectiveness of sanctions and law enforcement practices targeted at underage drinking not involving operation of a motor vehicle. In *Reducing Underage Drinking: A Collective Responsibility*, edited by R.J. Bonnie and M.E. O'Connell. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, pp. 490-540.

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996. 1996. Public Law 104-191, 104th Cong., 2d Sess., *U.S. Statutes at Large* 110:1936-2103.

Johnson, J., Ahmed, A., Plemons, B., Powell, W., Carington, H., Graham, J., Schwartz, R.P., and Brooner, R.K. 2002. Steps to Success: Baltimore Drug and Alcohol Treatment Outcomes Study. Report submitted to Baltimore Substance Abuse Systems, Inc. Retrieved April 9, 2010, from www.soros.org/initiatives/baltimore/articles_publications/publications/steps/steps.pdf.

Maloney, D., Romig, D., and Armstrong, T. 1988. The balanced approach to juvenile probation. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* 39(3):1-4.

Maxwell, G. 2003. Achieving effective outcomes in youth justice: Implications of new research for principles, policy and practice. Paper presented at the Australian Institute of Criminology conference "Juvenile Justice: From Lessons of the Past to a Road for the Future," Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.

National Center for Juvenile Justice. 2002. *Desktop Guide to Good Juvenile Probation Practice*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

National Institute on Drug Abuse. 2007. *Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations: A Research-Based Guide*. NIH Publication No. 06-5316. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Human and Health Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Drug Abuse.


National Minimum Drinking Age Act of 1984. 1984 (July 17) [2007]. Public Law 98-363, Section 6(a), 98th Cong., 2d Sess., *U.S. Statutes at Large* 98:437, codified at *U.S. Code*, Title 23, Section 158.

U.S. Code. 2007. Title 42, Sections 290dd-3 and ee-3.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2002 (August 14). Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information—Final Rule. 45 CFR Parts 160 and 164. *Federal Register* 67(157):53,182-53,273.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2003. Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Available online: www.hhs.gov/ocr/privacy/hipaa/understanding/coveredentities/introduction.html.

U.S. Senate. 2009. *Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2009*. S. 678, 111th Cong., 1st Sess., Congressional Record 155, No. 50 (March 24): S3662-3669.



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business

Penalty for Private Use \$300



PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/OJJDP
PERMIT NO. G-91

Acknowledgments

This bulletin was adapted from *Underage Drinking: Intervention Principles and Practice Guidelines for Community Corrections*, authored by Ann H. Crowe with Tracy G. Mullins, Kimberly A. Cobb, and Nathan C. Lowe. Ann Crowe, M.S.S.W., Ed.D., was a project director and senior research associate at the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) before her retirement in December 2006. Tracy Mullins is a deputy director of the APPA in Lexington, KY. Kimberly Cobb is a research associate with the APPA. Nathan Lowe is a research associate with the APPA. The authors would like to acknowledge the Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center at the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) in Calverton, MD, and the American Probation and Parole Association in Lexington, KY. The authors would also like to thank Kathryn Stewart, M.S., director of the Dissemination and Diffusion of Science-Based Prevention Component of the Prevention Research Center Grant at PIRE and founding partner of Safety and Policy Analysis, International.

Share With Your Colleagues

Unless otherwise noted, OJJDP publications are not copyright protected. We encourage you to reproduce this document, share it with your colleagues, and reprint it in your newsletter or journal. However, if you reprint, please cite OJJDP and the authors of this bulletin. We are also interested in your feedback, such as how you received a copy, how you intend to use the information, and how OJJDP materials meet your individual or agency needs.

Please direct comments
and/or questions to:

National Criminal Justice
Reference Service
P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

800-851-3420

301-519-5600 (fax)

Web: tellncjrs.ncjrs.gov

This bulletin was prepared under grant number 2007-AH-FX-K003 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of OJJDP or the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance; the Bureau of Justice Statistics; the National Institute of Justice; the Office for Victims of Crime; and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking.