


HU7.2/R26/1999

C.1

Only 1
copy
available

COLORADO STATE PUBLICATIONS LIBRARY
HU7.2/R26/1999 local
Dieterich, William/Colorado Regimented J



3 1799 00029 5279

COLORADO REGIMENTED JUVENILE TRAINING PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT



Submitted to the Colorado General Assembly

November 1999

*William Dieterich
University of Denver
Graduate School of Social Work*

*Cecilia E. Boyles
Colorado Department of Human Services
Division of Youth Corrections*

*Susan Colling
Colorado Judicial Department
Office of Probation Services*

Return to
State Publications Library
201 East Colfax Avenue, Room # 314
Denver, CO 80203

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A special legislative session held in Colorado in the summer of 1993 focused on issues of youth violence and resulted in legislation that imposed harsher sentences for certain juvenile crimes, produced a revision to the Colorado Children's Code, and created the Colorado Regimented Juvenile Training Program (RJTP), a military model boot camp for juvenile offenders (Senate Bill 93S-1005). The bill called for an evaluation of the RJTP and declared 1997 as a sunset year for the program. Following the 1996 RJTP evaluation, Senate Bill 97-050 was passed calling for selection guidelines for juveniles sentenced to the boot camp that exclude lower risk youth who would otherwise be sentenced exclusively to probation. Such guidelines were to take into account the offense for which the juvenile is sentenced, the juvenile's criminal history, and previous efforts to intervene with the youth. The bill also called for a new evaluation of the boot camp including a review of the profiles of youth served, and identified the year 2000 as a sunset year for this program.

The Colorado RJTP consists of two phases: 1) a military-style residential phase administered by the Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Youth Corrections, and 2) an aftercare phase administered by the Colorado Judicial Department, Office of Probation Services. A description of Phase I program components and a schedule of daily activities, as well as services provided during Phase II, are included in the full report

Based on several performance measures, outcomes of youth served in the Colorado Regimented Training Program are generally positive:

- 96% of youth entering the program graduated from Phase I
- 69% of graduates were employed and/or in school at six months following graduation
- 77% of graduates had no new misdemeanor or felony offenses within six months following graduation resulting in a filing in district court
- 64% of graduates had no new misdemeanor or felony offenses within one year of graduation resulting in a filing in district court
- 77% of graduates had no commitments to DYC within one year of graduation (44% of the new commitments were due to technical violations of probation)
- 53% of graduates had no new offenses or commitments within one year of graduation
- 41% of graduates had no new offenses, commitments or probation revocations within one year of graduation

- 19% of graduates committed a new felony offense within one year of graduation resulting in a filing in district court
- 23% of graduates are committed to NYC within one year of graduation

While these outcomes are encouraging, issues concerning the development of guidelines on the appropriate profile of youth to refer to the boot camp program continue to surface. An extensive review of boot camp literature reveals mixed findings related to characteristics of youth served in these programs, stated goals and purposes of the program, structure of the residential and aftercare phases, and reported outcomes. The literature on boot camps for juvenile offenders points to the following conclusions:

1. There is weak theoretical support for the core components of the boot camp model.
2. There is little research evidence that indicates the boot camp model can reduce recidivism or adequately address the social problems that correlate with recidivism.
3. There are constraints in the juvenile justice system, including smaller incarcerated populations and shorter terms of confinement, which limit the population reduction and cost-saving potential of boot camp. Judicial discretion represents an additional type of system constraint.
4. There is apparent confusion over the purposes and goals of the boot camp for juveniles. This relates partly to system constraints and partly to limitations in program theory and program design.
5. These factors influence decision makers' expectations of the model and affect the process of youth selection for boot camp.

Confusion around the purpose of boot camp programs and their role in a range of sentencing options has led to inconsistent use and expectations of these programs. An RJTP Advisory Board established to monitor the intent of the legislation around the juvenile boot camp in Colorado and review issues concerning profiles of youth served, management concerns and performance of youth in the program experienced many of the same frustrations found in the literature. Specifically, the Board struggled with the development of guidelines for identification of appropriate clients to be served in this program. Profile descriptions of youth served in the boot camp illustrate the diversity in sentencing practices and the weaknesses in past methods employed to establish consistent guidelines for use of the RJTP program. Recommendations posed as a result of these findings are offered to promote more consistency and standardization in a system that embraces the concept of proportionality and graduated sanctions, and specifically to foster the development of appropriate selection guidelines for the boot camp sentencing option.

The profile sample includes all youth who entered the RJTP between April 1997 and May 1999, and graduated from the residential phase of the program. Evaluation of the characteristics of 950 youth for whom profile data was collected points to the following conclusions:

1. There is wide diversity in the types of offenders sentenced to the Colorado RJTP, ranging from misdemeanants and minor offenders with no prior record, to violent and serious offenders with multiple prior felony adjudications.
2. There is wide diversity in terms of offender needs in the areas of education, mental health, family disruption, and substance abuse.
3. Inconsistent sentencing patterns stem from the problems identified in the literature.

The wide diversity in the profiles of youth served in the Colorado RJTP illustrates the inconsistency of use of this sentencing option and points to the confusion encountered in attempts to develop appropriate guidelines. The original OJJDP model of the juvenile boot camp described “a tough intermediate punishment less severe than long-term institutionalization, but more severe than immediate supervised release”. However, stated goals for the boot camp vary from better treatment outcomes, to less use of longer-term incarceration and cost-efficiency. While various stakeholders may perceive boot camps and other intermediate sanctions in different ways, they have a clearly defined function within a system of graduated sanctions and treatment. The OJJDP Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders provides a framework for understanding the location of the boot camp program among an array of intermediate sanctions. A core component of the Comprehensive Strategy is a system of graduated sanctions that includes immediate non-residential interventions for first-time, nonviolent offenders; intermediate sanctions (non-residential or community-based residential) for first-time serious or violent offenders and less serious repeat offenders; and secure placements (community-based or training school) for the most serious, violent, or chronic offenders. Graduated sanctions combine incrementally intrusive sanctions with increasingly intensive rehabilitative services following a continuum of care model. At a basic level, the aim is to direct the most cost intensive and intrusive sanctions to the most serious and chronic offenders. The goal is the efficient and equitable allocation of resources, including both sanctions and treatment, in pursuit of societal interest in offender accountability and public safety.

The achievement of the objectives of the Comprehensive Strategy depends heavily on valid and reliable means of assessing and classifying juvenile offenders. The methods, procedures, and goals of risk assessment and classification as employed in a system of graduated sanctions seem highly pertinent to a discussion of youth selection for boot camp. The unanswered questions surrounding the population reduction potential of juvenile boot camps and limited knowledge concerning the effect of boot camp or the kinds of offenders who do well in boot camp, indicate a need for alternative placement criteria. Reformulating the problems of youth selection from the perspective of graduated sanctions may be a way to overcome some of the obstacles previously reviewed. From that perspective, intermediate sanctions such as the boot camp are components that fulfill specific purposes along a continuum of interventions where the selection of confinement-bound youth may be secondary to the primary concern for consistency, fairness, and efficiency. The selection of youth for boot camp could be formulated as a problem of defining the boot camp as an intermediate sanction and locating it in terms of severity, intrusiveness, etc., relative to other available intermediate sanctions. This approach assumes the existence of a continuum of intermediate

sanctions, use of valid and reliable risk assessment and classification instruments, and the support of key decision makers, including judges and probation officers. It must be emphasized that the process of developing selection guidelines appropriate for a system of graduated sanctions must address the role of treatment separately from the role of sanction, and clearly identify how sentencing decisions are made relative to proportionality and treatment needs.

The literature on risk assessment, placement classification, and graduated sanctions point to the following conclusions:

1. Viewing the RJTP from the perspective of graduated sanctions may be a way to overcome some of the limitations of the model, constraints in the system, and confusion over purpose and goals.
2. The RJTP may have an important role as an intermediate sanction independent of cost saving or recidivism reduction goals.
3. From the perspective of graduated sanctions, the goals of consistency, equity, and efficiency would take the place of the less viable goals of population reduction or recidivism reduction.
4. Methods and procedures for youth selection should be developed that are clearly aligned with viable and achievable goals.
5. Youth selection criteria should be coherent with the limitations of the model and constraints in the system. Offense seriousness and prior record are examples of criteria that meet this requirement.
6. Given the limitations of the model, treatment needs may not be appropriate selection criteria. At the same time, the treatment needs of youth sentenced to the RJTP must be addressed by some adjunct intervention, i.e., integrated aftercare services.
7. The development of youth selection methods and procedures is a consensus process requiring the support of key decision makers, including judges and probation officers.

A few states have developed classification models used as guidelines within a system of graduated sanctions. Some of these models are included in the full report. An overlay of the youth served in the Colorado RJTP against any of these models further illustrates the disparity in the use of this sentencing option and the lack of meaningful selection guidelines. It is critical that 1) any model proposed in the state have the support of key decision makers including judges and probation officers to be effective, and 2) programs that coincide with each sanction along the continuum of graduated sanctions are available to the courts.

The results of this evaluation point to the following recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION: The boot camp sentence represents an 'intermediate sanction' within a system of graduated sanctions in Colorado. Development of selection guidelines for the juvenile boot camp must be developed in relation to the goals associated with this sanction and in the overall context of the broad range of sanctions available in Colorado. The Judicial Department and the Department of Human Services should continue to work on youth selection guidelines for the boot camp based on the role this program serves within the broad continuum of sentencing options in Colorado as well as treatment considerations related to the boot camp regimen.

Development of referral guidelines promotes consistency in the characteristics served in the program. Once this consistency is achieved, outcomes of juveniles served in the program can be evaluated and compared with alternative programs for similar youth, and will allow evaluation of impacts on youth outcomes as changes to the programs are implemented.

Background

A special legislative session held in Colorado in the summer of 1993 focused on issues of youth violence and resulted in legislation that imposed harsher sentences for certain juvenile crimes, produced a revision to the Colorado Children's Code, and created the Colorado Regimented Juvenile Training Program (RJTP), a military model boot camp for juvenile offenders (Senate Bill 93S-1005). The bill called for an evaluation of the RJTP and declared 1997 as a sunset year for the program.

The first evaluation of the RJTP was submitted to the Colorado General Assembly in November 1996. Based on the findings of this study, the authors concluded that the RJTP option would appear to be a viable sentencing option if one or both of the following conditions exist:

- 1) A high proportion of juveniles who would otherwise receive a commitment sentence are sentenced to the RJTP, and/or
- 2) The outcomes of juveniles served in the boot camp are better than that of similar youth receiving alternative, less costly, sentences (e.g., probation, probation with a short-term detention sentence, etc.).

In this study, youth whose profiles most closely matched that of youth who are placed on probation had more favorable outcomes when given a probation sentence than when given a boot camp sentence. This finding led to revisions to the recommended criteria for entry into the boot camp. Specifically, the boot camp option is suggested to be more appropriate for youth with prior adjudications and failed attempts to treat the youth than for youth with little or no prior involvement in the juvenile justice system. These changes to the original legislation were included in Senate Bill 97-050. The bill also

called for a new evaluation of the profiles and outcomes of youth served in the RJTP subsequent to the passage of SB97-050. The current report presents the findings of this new evaluation of the Colorado RJTP. The report builds on the following major areas:

Description of the Colorado RJTP residential and aftercare phases
Review of Boot Camp Literature (relevance to the current evaluation
Section I: RJTP Profile Data
Section II: RJTP Youth Selection (overview and issues)
Section III: RJTP Aftercare Services
Section IV: Outcomes of RJTP Graduates (six months and one year)
Conclusions and Recommendations

COLORADO RJTP PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The RJTP consists of two phases:

- 1) A military-style residential phase administered by the Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Youth Corrections
- 2) An aftercare phase administered by the Colorado Judicial Department, Office of Probation Services

Phase I – Residential Phase

The residential phase of the RJTP incorporates the elements of military basic and provides education, computer training and life skills classes in a structured setting. Leadership training is an integral part of the program geared toward development of pro-social behaviors. There are nine basic components to the program aimed at effecting positive changes in the youth's attitude and behavior:

- 1) The first component involves early screening and assessment of the youth's physical abilities and mental health status as they pertain to the demands of a boot camp regimen.

- 2) The second component consists of assessment and orientation. Educational assessment is done to develop an appropriate academic course of study for each youth, particularly geared toward students identified with special needs. Orientation is designed to provide youth with an understanding of the expectations of his participation and conduct in the military regimen setting. During this time, students learn their rights to medical, emergency dental care, in house psychological services, respect and personal dignity, confidentiality, privacy, and grievance and/or appeal procedures.
- 3) The third component utilizes intensive military-style training designed to improve individual and group behavior. The goal is to establish an immediate positive, short term, and high impact change in personal goals felt to be more achievable through a structured and energized environment.
- 4) The fourth component involves team building. An extensive Challenge by Choice Course (Ropes Course) is provided to enhance team experiences as well as moral and ethical development among the team members. The emphasis is on teaching the individual members to promote group success for the betterment of the team.
- 5) The fifth component addresses physical conditioning of the body and mind. The goal is to educate the youth on how to take care of their bodies with physical exercise and good nutrition. Emphasis is placed on the benefit of a healthy and physically active life-style once the youth leaves the program.
- 6) The sixth component involves appearance and cleanliness. Youth are educated on personal hygiene. Areas covered include cleaning and maintaining their uniforms in the military fashion and maintaining clean living quarters ready for daily inspections.

This part of the program helps the youth develop a sense of pride and personal achievement.

- 7) The seventh component is the Life Skills Classes. Each of these classes coincide with the Leadership and Drug and Alcohol awareness classes. The first half of the course teaches the youth Personal and Social Responsibilities that enables them to deal with interpersonal relationship skills. The second half of the class deals with teaching employment skills such as resume writing, interviewing techniques and filling out applications for employment, loans, secured credit cards, drivers license and other skills used in daily adult living.
- 8) The eighth component is the computer Training Course. This component teaches the youth basic computer literacy from knowledge of how to turn on a computer to using various programs to create, save and print documents.
- 9) The final component is the Individual Transition Plan specifically designed for each recruit. It outlines the long term and short term goals for the youth. Transition groups are also conducted individual goals and methods of achieving those goals are discussed. A transition coordinator also does follow-up telephone calls to each youth beginning two weeks after graduation, and schedules visits to the youth either at their home or their school.

While a major emphasis of the RJTP is intensive leadership and physical training, academic education is also a priority. Each youth is assessed upon admission as to abilities, needs, academic functioning levels and vocational interests. Based on these assessments, individual academic programs are designed. Besides teaching academic subjects including Language Arts, Reading, Science and Math, teachers also provide

instruction on appropriate classroom behavior and listening skills and communication skills.

Youthtrack Academy provides a minimum of six hours of education contact time for each recruit five days per week. Education contact time includes a minimum of three hours per day in the academic classroom with certified teachers, one hour daily of Life Skills and Computer Training. It also includes one hour of Leadership Training some days, and Alcohol and Drug Awareness classes on other days. A minimum of one hour of nightly supervised academic study hall is also provided.

Each recruit participates in a work program. They perform housekeeping, grounds keeping, kitchen and laundry duties, and minor repair and maintenance assignments on a daily basis.

Family involvement is incorporated into the RJTP schedule for each youth. Midway through the 60-day program, parents are invited to attend a staffing which will include probation officer(s), case managers (if applicable), and any aftercare person who will be directly involved with the juvenile upon completion of boot camp. At this staffing, the youth's first 30 days progress is discussed as well as what will be expected for the rest of the program. An aftercare recommendation is drafted, and it becomes the responsibility of the probation officer to enforce the recommended plan once the youth leaves Youthtrack Academy. A Family Get Together Night is included on the Friday of staffing week from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. This consists of the families coming together with their recruit to share a dinner that Youthtrack Academy provides. Family issues are discussed at this time.

Routine daily training schedules of activities exists for each platoon. Daily schedules for summer weekdays, winter weekdays, Saturday summer days and winter days, and for Sundays and holidays are shown in Appendix A.

In July 1998, administration of the residential phase was transferred from Rebound!Colorado to Youthtrack Services, Inc. through a Request for Proposal process. It is important to note that the majority of youth for whom information was collected and is reported in this document were admitted to the RJTP prior to the change in administration. Limited follow-up information on youth served under the new Youthtrack administration is reported. The majority of the original RJTP staff was maintained under the new administration, and much of the structure and programming remained intact. Some changes implemented by Youthtrack included additional education staff and the hiring of a Transition Coordinator.

The aftercare phase of the RJTP is administered by the Office of Probation Services. Monitoring and treatment services provided to boot camp graduates vary by judicial district. Section III contains information on services provided during aftercare and Appendix E provides breakdowns by judicial district.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following literature review establishes a context in which to ground the current evaluation of the Regimented Juvenile Training Program (RJTP) and important policy implications of the findings. Several factors are pertinent to understanding the relevance of boot camps for juvenile offenders. Program goals, program design, youth selection, aftercare design, and management issues must be taken into account when assessing the utility or effectiveness of the boot camp model for juveniles (Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Caliber Associates, 1997). A review of these issues follows a description of the generic boot camp model and summary of the history of juvenile boot camps.

Generic Model

The generic boot camp model is fashioned after the highly structured and disciplined environment of military basic training. Common distinguishing features include a military atmosphere, strict rules, and discipline (MacKenzie, 1990). A military boot camp culture is replicated through the introduction of military-style regimentation, drill, physical training, courtesy, dress, and terminology. Intense confrontation, summary punishment, and group punishment are the principal disciplinary techniques applied to enforce a strict code of conduct. These fundamental military-like ingredients exist in varying degrees within most boot camps for juvenile offenders.

A recent survey of juvenile boot camps ($n = 35$) found that 70% used military titles and uniforms; 89% grouped inmates by platoon; 91% employed military drill; 51% used group punishment; and 34% used summary punishment (MacKenzie & Rosay, 1996). Of the boot camps surveyed, 97% incorporated some type of physical training and

71% required inmates to perform physical labor. All programs surveyed contained education and drug and alcohol components. There was considerable variance across programs in terms of the proportion of program time devoted to physical training, drill, work, education, and counseling. On average, the programs surveyed invested approximately four hours (range: 1 – 10 hrs.) of the program day in physical training, military drill, and/or physical labor and seven hours (range: 3.5 – 12 hrs.) in education and/or counseling. Programs also varied in terms of length of stay, ranging from 28 days to 240 days, and length and type of aftercare services provided.

Colorado's Regimented Juvenile Training Program consists of a 60-day residential phase followed by an aftercare phase administered by probation officers within each youth's home judicial district. The residential phase resembles military basic training and incorporates military titles, drill, ceremony, courtesy, dress, physical training, work, and regimentation. Summary punishment and group punishment and group reward are used for purposes of discipline, motivation, and team building. The program day is 16 hours long with approximately six hours each weekday devoted to education, life skills, leadership, drug and alcohol, and computer classes.

History

Alabama, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Texas were the first states to open boot camps for juveniles during the late 1980s (Bottcher, Isorena, & Belnas, 1996; MacKenzie & Rosay, 1996). Some of these early attempts, such as the About Face program in Tennessee, have since been abandoned, but others, such as the Challenge program in Texas, have evolved into permanent alternative programs (MacKenzie & Rosay, 1996). Initially, the idea of boot camps for juvenile offenders was slow to take hold, and by 1992

only eight juvenile boot camp programs were in operation in seven states (Toby, Pearson, Felker, Bourque, Cronin, & Armor, 1992). This trend changed dramatically starting in 1993, following an initiative by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to promote the boot camp model as an alternative sanction. The OJJDP initiative was a response to states' concerns over rising youth corrections populations and growing interest in intermediate sentencing options. The spread of boot camps for juveniles was also encouraged by political trends that emphasized a "get tough" attitude toward a perceived escalation in juvenile crime. Colorado's Regimented Juvenile Training Program (boot camp) emerged out of a special legislative session that was convened in response to several highly publicized murders committed by juveniles during the 1993 "summer of violence". As a result of the convergence of these factors, and others, including the endorsement of the juvenile boot camp model by the American Correctional Association (Taylor, 1992), the number of boot camps across the country increased to 37 by 1995 and to over 50 by 1998 (MacKenzie, 1996; MacKenzie personal communication, 1999). This trend continues despite the lack of an adequate research base supporting the effectiveness of the boot camp model or a substantive theoretical rationale for such a model (Correia, 1987; MacKenzie & Rosay, 1996; Morash & Rucker, 1995; Zhang, 1998).

Boot Camp Program Design

Underlying Rationale

Discussing the underlying rationale of three prototype juvenile boot camps, Bourque and colleagues (1996) stated that, "Embedded in boot camp theory are the twin themes of discipline and development. The implicit hypothesis is that external discipline

fosters the self-discipline needed to engage in, and benefit from, program treatment and development components" (p. 9). Myers (1996) provided a similar rationale for the paramilitary structure of the Abraxas boot camp in Pennsylvania: "Most cadets will be very uncomfortable with the regimentation and military terminology, which creates a tension conducive to engaging the cadet in an experiential and cognitive treatment process" (Myers, 1996, p. 139).

Along a related line, Polsky and Fast (1993) presented a conceptual model based on data from a qualitative study of juvenile recruits that depicts the boot camp experience as a form of culture shock. According to that model, the sudden immersion into the boot camp culture generates high levels of stress and anxiety in participants. Culture shock facilitates the acculturation process, leading to conformity, adaptation, and internalization of new values and worldview. Polsky and Fast found that recruits' quick adjustment to the boot camp culture mitigates the anxiety-effect. They recommended that "recruits be re-challenged soon after their primary adaptation to boot camp norms by stirring up a second round of anxiety . . . [to] gradually alter the present adjustment curve in the boot camp into a series of shocks and recoveries" (p. 413). Similar curvilinear relationships between the initial shock of incarceration, anxiety levels, and motivation to change have been found in traditional prison settings as well (Zamble & Porporino cited in McCorkle, 1995).

McCorkle presented a slightly different view of the relationship between stress and motivation to change in a recent adult boot camp study. He found no group main effects in a quasi-experimental study that compared adult offenders in a 150-day boot camp to adult offenders in a 120-day presentencing evaluation and treatment program

(1995). Offenders in both programs demonstrated increased positive attitudes in several domains of the Jessness Inventory (self, others, and future). McCorkle speculated that the two programs produced similar results because both had high levels of “therapeutic integrity” (Gendreau & Ross, cited in McCorkle, 1995), each provided similar treatment components, and each took advantage of the “misery that immediately follows incarceration to make inmates full participants in the effort at rehabilitation” (p. 373). Those results suggest that “military training does not appear to be either a necessary or sufficient element in rehabilitation” (p. 373).

Critics of the boot camp model argue that military components are irrelevant and possibly conducive to increased levels of aggression in both inmates and staff (Morash & Rucker, 1995). Proponents of boot camps for juvenile offenders counter that the challenge of boot camp fosters a sense of accomplishment that increases self-competence and self-esteem (MacKenzie & Souryal, 1995). The physical and psychological challenges of boot camp, it is argued, may have positive impacts on a wide range of relevant behavior, from drug use to work habits. Proponents also defend the relevancy of military components. For example, the military courtesy of referring to one’s self in the third person (Sir! This recruit requests permission to use the latrine. Sir!) is defended as a means to alter impulsivity in young offenders. Similarly, the cadence of military drill is said to enhance learning. Or, forms of military appearance such as the shaved head are believed to help change negative self-concept (Clark, Moscicki, & Perry, 1996).

Research in the adult system generally supports the notion that inmates may derive a sense of accomplishment from the challenge of boot camp. MacKenzie and Souryal (1995) found that adult boot camp inmates developed more positive program

attitudes than did comparison groups of inmates incarcerated in prison. The results of their exploratory study “suggest that something in the boot camp atmosphere produces more positive attitudes toward the program and the staff than does the traditional prison” (p. 350). There is also limited evidence that juvenile offenders respond positively to the military aspects of boot camp and gain a sense of accomplishment and self-discipline from the experience (Cronin, 1994). But, the link between attitude change and future criminal behavior is not very solid or well understood. This is also the case for the connection between intensive boot camp physical training and future criminality (Correia, 1997).

A Relevant Model for Adolescents

Participants at a roundtable convened by the OJJDP to address the topic of juvenile boot camps “largely agreed that a confrontational model is counter-productive to changing juvenile behavior” (Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Caliber Associates, 1997). The roundtable raised several concerns about the design of boot camps for juveniles, including the difficulty of monitoring staff-inmate interactions and the potential for abuse within a confrontational model. In addition, the roundtable questioned the compatibility of the military atmosphere with the developmental needs of adolescents and the suitability of the confrontational model for therapeutic interventions. Unlike Henggeler and Schoenwald, who argued that “responsible policy makers should ‘just say no’ to boot camps as a solution to the problem of serious, chronic, and violent juvenile offending” (1994, p. 246), the roundtable participants recommended only a shift towards less confrontational models tailored to the developmental needs and strengths of adolescents.

Some recent versions of the juvenile boot camp have moved away from the confrontational model to more developmentally congruent models. MacKenzie mentions two boot camps that focus more on treatment and less on military-style confrontation (1996). These newer versions of the model are referred to as 2nd generation boot camps (Gransky, Castellano, & Cowles, 1995). More sophisticated designs and ambitious rehabilitative goals generally require longer program durations and higher costs. As an example, the Youth Leadership Academy Boot Camp in New York consists of a "highly normed entry-level program" lasting 30 days, followed by 5 months of day programming in the community (Cornick, 1996, pg. 122).

Program Goals and Youth Selection

Population Reduction

The boot camp model was extended to juvenile offenders for the same reason it was first applied in the adult system. There was an expectation that the use of the boot camp as an alternative to longer-terms of confinement would relieve the strain of rising incarceration rates (Bourque et al., 1996). Parent found that to achieve such goals boot camps need to be large scale programs that target a confinement bound population, significantly reduce the term of confinement, and minimize program failures (1996). Parent also determined that, "Few boot camps meet these conditions. Many limit eligibility to nonviolent first offenders, select offenders who otherwise would receive probation, and intensively supervise graduates, thus increasing return-to-prison rates for technical violations. In most jurisdictions, boot camps appear more likely to increase correctional populations and costs rather than reduce them" (1996, p. 263).

Impediments to Population Reduction

According to Parent (1996) judicial discretion in sentencing is largely responsible for the failure of adult boot camps to reduce costs, despite the fact that in most jurisdictions correctional officials select participants from those offenders already sentenced. One reason for this cited by Parent is that judges may "alter their sentencing practices and imprison selected offenders so that they may be selected for boot camps" (1996, p. 270). Judicial discretion may be more of a problem in the juvenile system because in most states the juvenile court has control over the selection process. Based on what is known about the decision process in juvenile courts, the boot camp sentence will be applied too broadly, thus diminishing cost savings potential and encouraging net widening.

Morris and Tonry (1990) contend that judicial discretion is a more serious problem when the only sentencing options are probation or incarceration. In the absence of intermediate punishments there will be inappropriate sentences to both probation and incarceration. When an intermediate punishment is made available, both offenders who previously would have received probation and those who would have been incarcerated will be sentenced instead to the intermediate punishment. "The question becomes not 'Is this program being applied only to people who would otherwise have been imprisoned?' but 'Is this program being applied for persons of the sort for whom it was intended?'" (Morris & Tonry, 1990, p. 228). From that standpoint net widening is a problem only when it results from "undeserved" punishment defined in terms of desert, equity, proportionality, and parsimony.

Shift to Rehabilitative Goals

In the case of juveniles, there is growing recognition that cost saving through population reduction is not an achievable goal due to relatively smaller incarcerated populations and shorter sentences. There is also increasing consensus that rehabilitation “may be the only viable goal in opening a juvenile correctional boot camp (Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Caliber Associates, 1997, p. 5). This shift in expectations is reflected in a recent survey of administrators of boot camps for juvenile offenders that ranked rehabilitation and recidivism reduction as the most important program goals and punishment as the least important (MacKenzie & Rosay, 1996). Population reduction, cost savings, public safety, and deterrence received only mixed ratings.

Treatment versus Punishment

The shift to rehabilitation goals does not overcome the problems of population reduction, youth selection, or net widening. In many ways the appeal to rehabilitative goals creates more confusion regarding the appropriate use of boot camps. It introduces an added dimension to the conflict of interpretations over the goals of boot camp – the tension between punishment and treatment. This tension is readily apparent in the conflict between policymakers who find the boot camp appealing as a “get tough” approach to juvenile crime and practitioners who find the model attractive as a vehicle for delivering therapeutic services (MacKenzie & Rosay, 1996).

MacKenzie and Parent (1992) noted, “To some extent, shock incarceration programs [boot camps] may be a marketing ploy designed to sell today’s policymakers treatment, when what they really want to buy is retribution” (p. 115). Similarly, the boot camp has been described as a convenient way to overcome the public’s disillusionment

with the rehabilitative model: "Boot camps, in contrast to many other alternatives, offer a particularly attractive package - the chance to pursue rehabilitative goals in an environment that does not appear to coddle delinquents" (Bourque, Cronin, Pearson, Felker, Han, & Hill, 1996, p. 3). The multiple meanings of the boot camp suggest that legislators, judges, district attorneys, probation officers, and social workers may hold varying expectations for this alternative sanction. These expectations affect the decision making processes related to how this sentencing option is used, which has serious implications for youth selection and outcomes.

Rehabilitative Goals and Youth Selection

Eventually research in juvenile boot camps may provide understanding as to "what type of boot camp is (or is not) effective for specific types of offenders (MacKenzie & Rosay, 1996, p. 102), in which case, youth selection would be key to achieving individual outcomes. Research is presently far behind these kinds of youth selection questions, but there is already some evidence of a link between youth selection and individual outcomes. The OJJDP pilot study found that youth at the Cleveland site with prior commitments, as well as those with less serious criminal histories, were most likely to recidivate. Those results "suggest that the eligibility pool for boot camp may be too broad at both ends of the offense history spectrum" (Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Caliber Associates, 1997, p. 22). The previous RJTP study conducted by the Colorado Division of Youth Corrections Research Unit in 1996 arrived at a similar conclusion. Results suggested that "sentencing lower risk youth to the RJTP may result in worse outcomes for the youth and higher cost placements to the state" (Boyles, Bokenkamp, & Madura, 1996, p. 35). As Parent (1996) and others have noted, intensive supervision

following release from boot camp may increase the failure rate of less serious offenders. In addition, failure following a tough intermediate sanction may accelerate penetration into the deep end of the system (i.e., commitment).

Achieving Rehabilitative Goals

National Studies. If rehabilitation is the more viable goal of juvenile boot camps, individual outcomes such as recidivism reduction take on greater significance. But, thus far no study has demonstrated that juvenile boot camps can reduce recidivism. To date, the only published study to examine the effectiveness of a boot camp model for juvenile offenders was conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Caliber Associates, 1997). That study tested a pilot model using an experimental design at demonstration sites in Cleveland, Ohio; Denver, Colorado; and Mobile, Alabama. The programs were similar in terms of length of stay (90 days) and basic paramilitary structure, although they differed significantly in terms of youth selection (youth at the Cleveland site had more serious offense histories) and residential program design (Denver placed more emphasis on military/punitive aspects and less on treatment). At the Cleveland site, youth in the experimental group (boot camp) had significantly higher rates of recidivism compared to youth in the control group (72% vs. 50%). At the Denver and Mobile sites, no significant differences in recidivism were observed between the experimental and control groups (39% vs. 36% and 28% vs. 31%, respectively). Recidivism was defined as a new adjudicated offense committed during a survival window extending from the point of release into the community up to 32 months. A survival analysis indicated that reoffending youth in the experimental

groups at all three sites committed new offenses more quickly compared to the reoffending youth in the control groups.

Evaluations in Colorado. Results from juvenile boot camp evaluations conducted by state and county agencies across the country indicate similarly unimpressive results in terms of recidivism. An earlier evaluation of the RJTP conducted by the Colorado Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) compared outcomes for a random sample of boot camp graduates with youth sentenced to probation, probation plus detention, or commitment (Boyles, Bokenkamp, & Madura, 1996). New charges within six months and commitment within one year from the point of release into the community were the variables of interest. Compared with the probation-only group and the probation-plus-detention group, the boot camp group had a higher rate of new charges within six months (42% vs. 27% and 30%, respectively) and a higher rate of commitment within one year (22% vs. 6% and 13%, respectively).

Evaluations in Florida. The first boot camp for juvenile offenders opened in Florida in 1993. By 1997, six boot camps were being operated by the Department of Juvenile Justice through county sheriff's offices across the state. Preliminary findings from four evaluations conducted by the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice are presented. These include evaluations for boot camps in Martin County, Polk County, Bay County, and Manatee County (Florida Department of Juvenile Justice). The Florida program components include physical training, physical labor, academics, and rational emotive therapy (cognitive) within a paramilitary structure. The basic program design includes four months of boot camp followed by several months of aftercare services. The Polk County program incorporates a residential transition phase between boot camp and

aftercare in the community. The programs run four concurrent platoons of approximately 15 recruits (capacity of about 65). Average length of stay ranged from 132 days at the Martin County site to 237 days at the Polk County site (residential phase included). The programs appear to target juvenile offenders with more serious profiles. For example, the average number of prior delinquency referrals ranged from 7.7 for youth at the Martin County boot camp to 14.5 at the Manatee County site. Recidivism, defined as an arrest for a new offense within one year of graduation, ranged from 63% in Polk County to 74% in Manatee County. The rate of new arrests resulting in an adjudication or conviction ranged from 49% in Bay County to 60% in Manatee County. Recidivism rates for boot camp graduates were not significantly different than those observed in matched comparison groups.

Evaluations in California. California's LEAD program, implemented in 1992, is an intensive boot camp program for juvenile offenders committed (new commitments or parole violators) to the California Youth Authority. The LEAD (leadership, esteem, ability, discipline) program includes a 4 month residential phase with counseling, social skills training, substance abuse, and physical exercise components within a paramilitary structure combined with a 6-month parole/aftercare phase emphasizing relapse management and enhanced supervision. The main program goals are recidivism reduction and provision of a cost-effective treatment option. Preliminary results of the LEAD evaluation indicate no statistically significant differences in recidivism between LEAD graduates and their counterparts in a control group (Bottcher, Isorena, & Belnas, 1996). Recidivism was defined as any arrest, technical or criminal violation resulting in detention, or citation during a 12-month follow-up period. Examining only arrests for

property or person offenses (excludes technical, minor, and alcohol or drug offenses) preliminary results indicated no statistically significant differences between the LEAD group and the control group (29% vs. 30.7%) during a 12-month follow-up. Subsequent analyses by the California Youth Authority determined that the LEAD program was no more effective than regular commitment and parole. Based on those results, the LEAD program was recently discontinued (CYA, personal communication, 1999).

Graduated Sanctions and Youth Selection

The original OJJDP model of the juvenile boot camp was conceived of as a tough intermediate "punishment less severe than long-term institutionalization, but more severe than immediate supervised release" (qtd. in Toby, Pearson, Felker, Bourque, Cronin, & Armor, 1992). Intermediate sanctions "offer an alternative to the 'either/or' sentencing policy found in many states, that is, *either* prison *or* probation" (Petersilia, Lurigio, & Byrne, 1992, p. ix). Intermediate sanctions are used as alternatives to long-term incarceration and they are also used as enhancements to probation and aftercare (Altschuler, 1998). In addition to boot camp, intermediate sanctions include juvenile intensive supervision probation (JISP), weekend detention, alcohol and other drug treatment, electronic home monitoring, challenge/wilderness programs, and intensive aftercare. Intermediate sanctions appear to be an attractive sentencing option for a range of stakeholders in the juvenile delinquency arena. "Their enormous appeal to both the public and the criminal justice community may stem from the fact that intermediate sanctions can be argued to serve a variety of purposes - retribution or just deserts, deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation, and restitution" (Office of Justice Programs, cited in Toby et al., 1992, p. 8).

While various stakeholders may perceive boot camps and other intermediate sanctions in different ways, they have a clearly defined function within a system of graduated sanctions and treatment. The OJJDP Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders (Wilson & Howell, 1993) provides a framework for understanding the location of the boot camp program among an array of intermediate sanctions. A core component of the Comprehensive Strategy is a system of graduated sanctions that includes immediate non-residential interventions for first-time, nonviolent offenders; intermediate sanctions (non-residential or community-based residential) for first-time serious or violent offenders and less serious repeat offenders; and secure placements (community-based or training school) for the most serious, violent, or chronic offenders. Graduated sanctions combine incrementally intrusive sanctions with increasingly intensive rehabilitative services following a continuum of care model. Wiebush, Baird, Krisberg, & Onok (1995) provided a rationale for that model:

Juvenile justice must have the capacity to directly link the nature of the intervention with the offender's need for control, supervision, and services. Only by moving beyond the traditional choice between probation and incarceration can systems hope to maximize the efficiency, effectiveness, and proportionality of their responses (1995, p. 172).

The Comprehensive Strategy is a response to research that documents the critical issues of overcrowding, inappropriate placements, and related resource allocation problems. At a basic level, the aim is to direct the most cost intensive and intrusive sanctions to the most serious and chronic offenders. The goal is the efficient and

equitable allocation of resources, including both sanctions and treatment, in pursuit of societal interest in offender accountability and public safety.

The achievement of the objectives of the Comprehensive Strategy depends heavily on valid and reliable means of assessing and classifying juvenile offenders (Wiebush, Baird, Krisberg, & Onek, 1995). The methods, procedures, and goals of risk assessment and classification as employed in a system of graduated sanctions seem highly pertinent to a discussion of youth selection for boot camp. Issues reviewed in the previous sections make clear the need for a fairly systematic approach to the selection process. The unanswered questions surrounding the population reduction potential of juvenile boot camps and limited knowledge concerning the effect of boot camp or the kinds of offenders who do well in boot camp, indicate a need for alternative placement criteria.

Reformulating the problems of youth selection from the perspective of graduated sanctions may be a way to overcome some of the obstacles previously reviewed. From that perspective, intermediate sanctions such as the boot camp are components that fulfill specific purposes along a continuum of interventions where the selection of confinement-bound youth may be secondary to the primary concern for consistency, fairness, and efficiency (Morris & Tonry, 1990). The selection of youth for boot camp could be formulated as a problem of defining the boot camp as an intermediate sanction and locating it in terms of severity, intrusiveness, etc., relative to other available intermediate sanctions. This approach assumes the existence of a continuum of intermediate sanctions, use of valid and reliable risk assessment and classification instruments, and the support of key decision makers, including judges and probation officers (Wiebush, Baird,

Krisberg, & Onek, 1995). These issues will be taken up in more detail in the profile data analysis section of this report.

SECTION I: PROFILE DATA

Introduction

The RJTP Advisory Board repeatedly addressed the SB97-50 requirement that the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) and the Judicial Department establish and implement selection guidelines for juveniles sentenced to the RJTP “which exclude lower-risk juveniles who would otherwise be sentenced exclusively to probation”. This section builds on youth selection issues discussed in the literature review. Profile data results for the youth sentenced to the RJTP are integrated with a more specific discussion of the problems related to youth selection. While the profile data results indicate only moderate success in terms of affecting the composition of the RJTP population through attempts to establish or implement selection criteria, the study has yielded a better understanding of these issues that leads to meaningful recommendations.

Method

Sample

The profile sample includes all youth who entered the RJTP between April 1997 and May 1999. There were 961 intakes during this period representing 36 platoons or graduating classes. Of the 961 intakes, approximately 4% ($n=35$) terminated before completing the RJTP sentence. The reasons for not completing the sentence included medical problems ($n=17$), behavioral problems ($n=12$), escape or escape attempts ($n=3$), mental health problems ($n=2$), and court order ($n=1$). Seven non-completers (6 medical & 1 behavioral) were recycled, and six of these (5 medical & 1 behavioral) subsequently

completed the boot camp sentence. There were four additional recycled cases, including three that completed the program twice and one that completed the first time but failed to complete the second time. In all, 11 of the 961 intakes represent cases (youth) that were recycled. To maintain uniformity in analyses duplicate intakes were deleted. If the first intake was a failure (did not complete) then the second intake was selected, but if the first intake was a success (completed) then that intake was selected. This method of dealing with duplicate cases does not meaningfully affect the profile data, except in terms of calculating the percentage of non-completers, which we have already dealt with separately. This method does, however, minimally affect the interpretation of outcome data. The deletion of duplicate intakes reduced the profile sample to 950 unique cases (individual youth).

Data Collection

Profile data were collected on all youth entering the RJTP using referral forms and a DYC intake data collection instrument. The referral form (Appendix B) contains several demographic and legal variables, including age, ethnicity, special education status, and current detention status. The DYC intake data form (Appendix C) was used to collect information on sentencing offense, prior adjudications, age at first adjudication, number of prior placements, and living situation. The DYC intake data form also contains information on level of alcohol and other drug use and current psychotropic medication use, as well as scores on the most recent administration of the Colorado Young Offender Level of Services Inventory (CYO-LSI) prior to entry into the RJTP. The CYO-LSI is a risk/need assessment instrument used by the Department of Probation Services to determine appropriate levels of supervision and services for probationers.

Referral forms and DYC intake data forms were completed by probation officers on all youth entering the RJTP. The data forms were collected by boot camp staff and sent to the Division of Youth Corrections Research and Evaluation Unit at the time of graduation, along with recruit rosters, mittimuses, discharge information and pre- and post-test scores in reading, math, leadership/life skills, and physical fitness.

Information from the DYC Client Data System and the Judicial Department's Integrated Colorado Online Network (ICON) was used as a supplement and reliability check for data collected using the methods described above. Detention admissions retrieved from the DYC Client Data System were used to estimate the extent of probation violations prior to boot camp. Court records in ICON were used to check the reliability of information collected from probation officers, particularly the number of prior adjudications.

Social Indicators

Demographics

The sample exhibits significant demographic diversity. The average age at intake was 16.25 years and ranged from 12.67 years to 18.65 years. Fifty-six percent of the sample was Anglo, 31% Latino, 10% African-American, 2% American Indian, and 1% Asian. At the time of referral to the RJTP, 22% of the youth were living at home with both parents, 23% with a biological parent and stepparent, 36% with one parent, and 1% with adoptive parents. Ten percent of the sample was residing in out-of-home placement with social services, 7% with friends or relatives, and 1% in an institution. Twelve percent of the youth were residing in highly or mostly rural counties at the time of referral, but most (75%) came from highly or mostly urbanized counties. Thirty-six

percent of the sample came from counties that rank high in the percentage of children living below the poverty line (upper 50%).

Academic Indicators

The sample is characterized by a high degree of educational diversity as well, including a considerable range of academic strengths and deficits. The educational level for youth in the sample ranged from 6th through 12th grade with the average level being ninth grade ($M = 9.5$). Only 56% of the youth in the sample reported being enrolled in an academic program at the time of referral. A small percentage of youth had attained a GED or high school diploma. Based on pre-test scores of the McGinnity Reading Test a substantial proportion of the sample was behind in reading and language skills. On average youth in the sample had grade equivalent reading scores 1.9 years below reported grade levels. On the other hand, a significant proportion of the sample (33%) had grade equivalent scores at or above their reported grade levels. Twenty-one percent of the youth were classified as special education students.

Substance Abuse, Mental Health, and Family Disruption Indicators

Twenty-eight percent of the youth in the sample had an alcohol or other drug problem that was ranked as severe by probation officers. Approximately 30% of the youth in the sample had a prior psychological intervention and 13% were prescribed psychotropic medication (typically, antidepressants or psychostimulants). A high percentage of youth reported that they had problems in family relationships (60%), had a family member with a criminal history (52%), or had been the victim of physical abuse (25%). Thirty percent of the youth in the sample had a social services caseworker at the time of referral to the RJTP.

Sentencing Offense, Offense History, and Prior Interventions

Following the language of SB97-50, the seriousness of the sentencing offense, prior record, and previous interventions should form the basis of any RJTP selection guidelines. Six variables collected during the study provide a descriptive classification of offenses and offenders: Age at first adjudication, number of prior adjudications, prior detention admissions, prior out-of-home placements, sentencing offense seriousness, and sentencing offense type (i.e., probation violation or new adjudicated offense).

Sentencing Offense

Youth can be directly sentenced to the RJTP as a condition of probation for a new delinquent offense or as a result of a violation of the terms of probation for a previous offense. Fifty-two percent of the RJTP sentences were a result of a new delinquent offense. For youth sentenced for a new delinquent offense, the distribution of offenses shows property felonies with the highest relative frequency at 46% (Table 1.1, column 1). Property misdemeanors have the next highest relative frequency, followed by person misdemeanors, person felonies, weapons charges, public order misdemeanors, and drug offenses. For youth sentenced as a result of a technical probation violation, the distribution of the most serious original probation offenses underlying technical violations (Table 1.1, column 2) is almost identical to that of new offenses, with the exception that drug offenses have a higher relative frequency. In the same way, the relative frequency of all felony offenses remains at or near 60% across the different offense distributions.

Table 1.1 Offense Category by Sentence Type

Offense ^a Category	Sentence Type		
	New Offense	Technical Violation	Total
person felony	47	43	90
	9.8%	9.2%	9.5%
person misdemeanor	50	60	110
	10.4%	12.8%	11.6%
property felony	222	217	439
	46.1%	46.4%	46.2%
property misdemeanor	86	59	145
	17.8%	12.6%	15.3%
drug felony	6	19	25
	1.2%	4.1%	2.6%
drug misdemeanor	6	10	16
	1.2%	2.1%	1.7%
weapons felony	8	6	14
	1.7%	1.3%	1.5%
weapons misdemeanor	24	26	50
	5.0%	5.6%	5.3%
public order felony	1	6	7
	.2%	1.3%	.7%
public order misdemeanor	21	17	38
	4.4%	3.6%	4.0%
petty offense	11	5	16
	2.3%	1.1%	1.7%
Total	482	468	950
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

^a. If sentenced for a technical probation violation, category is most serious offense for which the youth was currently on probation.

Table 1.2 shows a distribution of sentencing offenses collapsed into the categories *violent* (person felonies), *serious* (non-person felonies and all weapons offenses), *less serious* (person, drug, and property misdemeanors), and *minor* (public order misdemeanors & petty offenses). Approximately 56% of the youth in the sample were either sentenced for a new serious offense or a technical violation of a probation sentence

stemming from a serious offense. Approximately 34% of the RJTP sentences stem, either directly or indirectly, from less serious and minor offenses. Approximately 10% of the RJTP sentences stem from violent offenses. Again, there is no significant difference between the distributions for new offenders or technical violators. These similarities between new delinquent offenses and offenses underlying technical violations should not obscure the fact that nearly half of all RJTP sentences were the result of a violation of probation.

Table 1.2 Sentencing Offense Seriousness by Sentence Type

			Sentence Type		
			New Offense	Technical Violation	Total
Sentencing Offense Seriousness ^a	Violent	Count	47	43	90
		% within Sentence Type	9.8%	9.2%	9.5%
	Serious	Count	261	274	535
		% within Sentence Type	54.1%	58.5%	56.3%
	Less Serious	Count	142	129	271
		% within Sentence Type	29.5%	27.6%	28.5%
	Minor	Count	32	22	54
		% within Sentence Type	6.6%	4.7%	5.7%
Total	Count	482	468	950	
	% within Sentence Type	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

^a. If sentenced for a technical probation violation, sentencing offense is most serious offense for which the youth was currently on probation.

Prior Adjudications

There is often confusion concerning the definition of “prior adjudications,” especially as one considers deferred adjudications and revocations due to technical violations of probation, versus adjudications resulting from new delinquent offenses. For the purposes of the current study, if a youth is sentenced to the RJTP as a result of a technical violation of probation, the delinquent offense for which the youth was

originally adjudicated and placed on probation is considered the “current offense” and not a prior adjudication. Using this definition, 46% of the sample had no prior adjudications at the time of sentencing to the RJTP, 32% had one prior, 16% had two priors, and 6% had three or more priors. Of those youth with prior adjudications, 58% had at least one prior felony adjudication.

To get a clearer picture of the combination of legal factors that currently drive the RJTP sentence, it is helpful to look at the relationship between sentencing offense type (new offense or technical violation) and prior adjudications in a cross tabulation (Table 1.3). Of the youth sentenced for a technical violation ($n=468$), 68% had no prior adjudications, 22% had one prior, and 10% had two or more prior adjudications. For youth sentenced as a result of misdemeanor offenses ($n=198$), 18% had no prior adjudications, 44% had one prior, and 38% had two or more prior adjudications. For those youth sentenced on a felony offense ($n=284$), 31% had no prior adjudications, 42% had one prior, and 27% had two or more prior adjudications.

Table 1.3 Prior Adjudications by Sentence Type

		Sentence Type ^a			Total
		Misd.	Felony	Technical violation	
Prior Adjudications Range	No prior adjudications	35 17.7%	87 30.6%	320 68.4%	442 46.5%
	One prior adjudication	87 43.9%	120 42.3%	100 21.4%	307 32.3%
	Two prior adjudications	56 28.3%	55 19.4%	36 7.7%	147 15.5%
	Three or more prior adjudications	20 10.1%	22 7.7%	12 2.6%	54 5.7%
Total		198 100.0%	284 100.0%	468 100.0%	950 100.0%

^a. Chi-square (6, 950) = 192.20, p < .001

From the cross-tabulations it appears that prior record is given relatively less consideration for most youth sentenced for a technical violation. On the other hand, for those youth sentenced for new misdemeanor or felony offenses, prior record seems to have played a more significant role in the sentencing decision. This association is only partly explained by the fact that a new offense may automatically create a prior adjudication. This is true only for youth that were on probation for one offense and then committed a new offense. In fact, 41% of the sample sentenced for an actual offense ($n = 482$) were not on probation at the time of the offense but were directly sentenced to the RJTP as a condition of probation. In addition, significant differences are most pronounced in terms of the absence of an offense history (68% sentenced for technical have no prior adjudications) and there is no necessary condition of technical violators to account for this.

Prior Detention Admissions

Obviously, factors in addition to the number of prior adjudications and offense seriousness influence the RJTP sentencing decision. Detention admissions prior to the RJTP sentence provide an indication of other matters taken into account at the time of sentencing. Detention records dating back three years from the RJTP intake date were obtained from the DYC Client Data System for each youth in the sample. Four categories of detention admissions were explored. These include detention stays for preadjudicated delinquent offenses ($n = 1500$), preadjudicated probation violations ($n = 509$), probation sentences ($n = 279$), and other delinquent offense sentences ($n = 53$).

The *preadjudicated offense* category includes arrests and holds for mandatory felonies and weapons offenses (49%); arrests for failure to appear (FTA) in court (21%); arrests for bond revocation (5%); and post-detention hearing holds awaiting adjudication or disposition (25%). The *preadjudicated probation violation* category includes arrests and holds on probation violations (80%) and probation warrants (20%). The *probation sentence* category includes detention sentences imposed by the court as a condition of probation and sentences stemming from sustained petitions for probation violations. The *other delinquent offense sentence* category includes sentences imposed by the court for adjudicated felony and weapons offenses (13%); sentences resulting from contempt charges (42%); prior sentences to the RJTP (19%); sentences not imposed as a condition of probation (15%); and sentences for other offenses (11%). Prior detention stays stemming from traffic, game and fish, municipal and park, CHINS, runaways, courtesy holds, commitment related stays and interrupted admissions (e.g., returned from court) are excluded from the analysis.

Table 1.4 compares detention admissions for cases sentenced to the RJTP for a new felony or misdemeanor offense with cases sentenced for a technical probation violation. Note that the table includes detention admissions, if any, related to the RJTP sentence. In addition, figures within a category indicate the percentage of cases with one or more admissions within that category and some cases fall into more than one category. Overall, the table shows that a substantial percentage of the total sample experienced at least one detention stay. Seventy-one percent of the youth in the sample had at least one prior preadjudicated detention admission related to a mandatory felony, FTA warrant, or stay while awaiting adjudication or disposition. Approximately 15% of the sample had no prior detention admissions of any type.

Table 1.4 Prior Detention Admissions by Sentencing Offense Type

Type of Sentencing Offense		% w/ detention category	Type of Detention Stay			
			Preadj. Offenses (not prob. violations)	Preadj. Probation Violation	Probation Sentence	Sentence for Other Delinq. Offense
Misdmnr.			130	49	56	13
			66.6%	25.2%	28.7%	6.7%
	Felony	% w/ detention category	218	62	47	17
			76.2%	21.6%	16.4%	5.9%
Technical Violation		% w/ detention category	326	212	109	22
			69.5%	45.2%	23.3%	4.7%
Total Sample ^a		% w/ detention category	674	323	212	52
			70.9%	34.0%	22.3%	5.5%

a. Percentages do not sum to 100 due to cases that fall into more than one category of detention stay.

Compared to youth sentenced for new offenses, a higher percentage of youth sentenced for technical violations had at least one prior detention stay stemming from a

preadjudicated probation violation. This relationship was explored in more detail using data on the number of admissions (data not shown) obtained from the DYC Client Data System. One-way analysis of variance indicated that the mean number of admissions for preadjudicated probation violations was significantly different between the groups sentenced for a technical violation, misdemeanor, or felony offense ($F(2, 945)=27.10, p < .001$). Post hoc test results (Scheffe) indicated that youth sentenced to the RJTP for a technical violation had a significantly ($p < .01$) higher mean number of prior detention admissions ($M = .67$) for preadjudicated probation violations compared to youth sentenced for misdemeanor ($M = .32$) or felony offenses ($M = .27$).

While youth sentenced to the RJTP for technical violations, as a group, have significantly fewer prior adjudications, they have significantly higher rates of detention admissions for probation violations. As in the case of the relationship between a new offense and prior adjudications, youth sentenced for a technical violation, by definition, may have more detention stays for probation violations compared to youth sentenced for a new offense. But, again, there is no necessary condition of youth sentenced for a new offense that prevents them from having a history of detention stays for probation violations. A more extensive history of noncompliance, estimated by the number of prior detention stays, may explain, in part, RJTP sentencing decisions for youth with no prior adjudications.

Age-At-First Adjudication

Age at first adjudication is another important aspect of the legal involvement of offenders sentenced to the RJTP. By itself, age at first adjudication provides information regarding risk of future offending. But, when related to a youth's age at the time of

sentencing to the RJTP, age at first adjudication also provides an indication of the length of a youth's official delinquent career. Taken together, age at first adjudication and number of prior adjudications provide an estimate of delinquent trajectory. Youth with prior adjudications who were first adjudicated before age 14 have predicted trajectories of more extensive delinquency. Career length (age at intake minus age at first adjudication) provides an estimate of the current location along that trajectory.

Table 1.5 shows a cross tabulation of delinquent career by age-at-first adjudication for the youth in the profile sample. Forty-five percent of the sample was arrested and adjudicated before age 15 ($n=426$). Forty-seven percent of the sample had a delinquent career of two years or more ($n = 446$). Twenty-nine percent of the sample had both an early age at first adjudication and a career length of two years or more ($n = 273$). This latter group was more likely to have one or more prior adjudications (76%) compared to those with first adjudication at age 15 or older and careers of one year or less (33% ($n = 351$)). On the other hand, 25% of the sample was adjudicated at age 15 or older, had careers of one year or less and no prior adjudications ($n = 237$). There were significant correlations between age-at-first adjudication and number of prior adjudications ($r = -.31, p < .01$) and between career length and number of prior adjudications ($r = .43, p < .01$). There were no significant differences between technical violators and new offenders in terms of age-at-first adjudication or career length.

Table 1.5 Delinquent Career by Age-at-First Adjudication

		Age-at-First Adjudication			
			14 y/o or younger	15 y/o or older	Total
Delinquent Career Range	one year or less	Count	153	351	504
		% of Total	16.1%	36.9%	53.1%
	two years or more	Count	273	173	446
		% of Total	28.7%	18.2%	46.9%
Total		Count	426	524	950
		% of Total	44.8%	55.2%	100.0%

Prior Out-of-Home Placements

Approximately 39% of the profile sample had a prior out-of-home placement. Of those youth with a prior out-of-home placement, only 62% were residing with at least one biological parent at the time of RJTP intake, compared to 93% of those youth with no prior placements. Of those with at least one prior out-of-home placement 53% had a social services caseworker and 27% were residing in a social services placement at the time of intake. There were small but significant correlations between prior out-of-home placements and prior adjudications ($r = .12, p < .001$), age-at-first adjudication ($r = -.11, p < .001$), and career length ($r = .12, p < .001$). There was a small/moderate correlation between prior placements and prior total detention admissions ($r = .27, p < .001$). There were no significant differences between new offenders and probation violators in terms of the number of prior out-of-home placements.

Summary

Discussion

Six dimensions of delinquent involvement pertinent to the RJTP sentencing decision have been examined: Seriousness of the presenting offense, type of sentencing offense (new offense or probation violation), record of prior adjudications, record of prior probation violations, age-at-first adjudication, and prior out-of-home placements. When classified along these dimensions several important patterns emerge that shed light on the RJTP sentencing decision.

The RJTP sentence is just as likely to result from a probation violation, as it is a new offense. The distributions for violent, serious, less serious, and minor offenses are very similar between technical violators and new offenders, but there are important distinctions between these groups. Technical violators were less likely to have a prior adjudication, but more likely to have prior detention admissions for probation violations. Across all other dimensions investigated, there were no significant differences between technical violators and new offenders that might mitigate the observed disparity in their records of prior adjudication. Technical violators did not differ from new offenders in offense seriousness, age-at-first adjudication, official career length, or prior out-of-home placements. Nor could technical violators be distinguished from new offenders based on any of the demographic, academic, mental health, substance abuse, or family problem indicators.

These results point to two important considerations in the development of RJTP sentencing criteria. First, the RJTP appears to function both as a direct sanction for delinquent offenses and as a probation sanction for technical violations. Because

disparate factors are typically relied upon when making decisions for different purposes, it is highly probable that inconsistent sentencing patterns will result. As evident in the data, the disparity between the factors taken into account when sentencing new offenders as opposed to technical violators is not necessarily balanced out by other aggravating or mitigating factors. Second, youth selection methods and procedures for the RJTP should be cognizant of these different purposes and incorporate some indicator of probation non-compliance. Equivalency between technical violators and new offenders may not be practical or prudent, but criteria that include a dimension of probation failure would make the sentencing of probation violators more consistent.

There is additional evidence of inconsistent use of the RJTP that is not directly related to the type of sentence (new offense or technical). While most sentences were the direct or indirect result of a serious offense, a substantial percentage of sentences involved misdemeanants and minor offenders with no prior record of adjudications. At the other extreme, a significant proportion of RJTP sentences involved violent and serious offenders with prior felony adjudications. Wide diversity is also evident at the intersection of age-at-first adjudication, career length, and prior adjudications. Twenty-two percent of the youth in the sample were adjudicated before age 15, had careers longer than two years and at least one prior adjudication. On the other hand, 25% of the youth in the sample were age 15 or older when first adjudicated, had careers of one year or less and no prior adjudications.

Limitations

Two major problems with the profile data limit what can be said about RJTP sentencing patterns. First, the sample includes only those cases that were actually

sentenced to the RJTP; therefore, it is impossible to assess the influence of factors that lead to an RJTP sentence as opposed to some other sentence. The data provide a description of the youth sentenced to the RJTP and comparisons between subgroups of that population only. Second, the range of measured variables that might influence the RJTP sentencing decision is incomplete.

Data on prior interventions and sanctions are restricted to prior out-of-home placements and prior detention stays. It is impossible to determine from the data the type of prior out of home placement – group home, foster care, shelter care, RCCF, or RTC. While certain interventions such as in-patient drug treatment or foster care are captured by the broad category of out-of-home placements, a wide range of interventions that don't entail out-of-home placement are unmeasured and unknown. Additionally, data were not collected on the number or type of interventions or sanctions imposed or the successful completion rate of such programs.

The use of prior detention admissions as a proxy for probation noncompliance similarly has limitations. The lack of a detention history may not indicate an absence of a history of noncompliance. Instances of prior probation violations that were responded to with alternatives to detention are unknown. It should also be noted that prior detention served a specific methodological purpose for the description of the RJTP profiles and it would be inadvisable to use it as a proxy measure or otherwise in any sentencing criteria.

Finally, an absence of prior adjudications does not necessarily equate with a less serious profile. Youth with no prior adjudications may have been sentenced to the RJTP for multiple concurrent cases, multiple consolidated cases, or single cases with multiple counts. Some youth may have a new offense that is treated as a probation violation or a

deferred adjudication that is not counted as a prior adjudication. Some prior deferred adjudications may subsequently be revoked and become prior adjudications.

Despite limitations in the data, there is wide diversity among the offenders sentenced to the RJTP that provides a fairly strong indication of inconsistent sentencing patterns. The major intent of this section was not to find evidence of inconsistent sentencing decisions, but to identify some of the factors that should be included as RJTP selection criteria.

SECTION 2: RJTP YOUTH SELECTION

Overview

The RJTP Advisory Board has been struggling with the problem of youth selection since it first emerged in the previous study. In setting policy for the RJTP, the Division of Youth Corrections and Office of Probation Services originally decided upon the JISP risk assessment matrix as a guide for selecting boot camp candidates. The JISP risk assessment matrix is the same instrument as the Division of Youth Corrections Commitment Classification Instrument, developed and validated for DYC in 1990 by the Center for Action Research of the University of Colorado, Boulder. The instrument was originally designed to assist DYC in making placement decisions for newly committed youth, and is still used for this purpose.

Initially, it was recommended that youth sentenced to the RJTP should have a matrix score of at least five. Based on results of the RJTP study conducted in 1996, it was determined that a score of eight or above would be more appropriate, since it was more likely to target commitment-bound youth. In that study, a discriminant function

model was developed to distinguish between youth who were commitment-bound or probation-bound based on a comparison of probation youth and commitment youth characteristics. The profile score derived from that analysis is a composite of the following weighted variables: number of prior adjudications, ethnicity, current probation felony offense, prior living situation, age at first adjudication, and number of prior out-of-home placements. These weighted variables were found to significantly discriminate between probationers and committed youth. The actual profile score was deemed unsuitable as a screening tool because the weighted ethnicity and living situation variables, while predictive of subsequent commitment, are inappropriate screening criteria for sentencing guidelines.

The profile score was used throughout the current study to estimate the proportion of youth sentenced to the RJTP who would otherwise be committed. It became evident early on that a high percentage of the youth being sentenced to the RJTP would not have otherwise been committed. This trend persisted throughout the study despite adjusted recommendations regarding the matrix cut-off scores. Several factors appear responsible for these selection problems. First, a significant proportion of the youth sentenced to the RJTP had Matrix scores less than eight. This key factor highlights the fact that judicial discretion and probation officer decisions have a significant influence on the selection process, independent of the recommended selection criteria. Second, the matrix cut-off score of eight did not always discriminate between probation and committed youth. In FY 1998-99, 14% of youth committed to DYCS had matrix scores below 8. Third, the Colorado Office of Probation Services had implemented the newly validated Colorado Young Offender Level of Supervision Inventory (CYO-LSI). This risk/needs instrument

replaced the JISP risk assessment that was previously used by probation officers to obtain the juveniles' matrix scores. For this reason, the CYO-LSI was examined and it was estimated that a cut-off score of at least 38 on the CYO-LSI would be required to capture predominantly commitment-bound youth. Concern was raised that this would severely restrict the pool of youth eligible for the boot camp and miss some youth who score below 38 but who would otherwise be committed.

The resolution of these problems was eventually achieved through a process of comparing the relationships between the profile, matrix, and CYO-LSI measures, assessing the differential effect of these measures on the composition of the boot camp population over time, and analyzing additional profile variables. Importantly, the direction of our investigation was strongly influenced by the literature on risk assessment and classification as applied with graduated sanctions. Recall that this topic was introduced in the literature review and proposed as the basis for the consistent, equitable, and efficient use of the boot camp. Of the issues discussed by Wiebush and colleagues (1995), two that are most pertinent to the current study concern the differences between risk assessment and placement classification instruments and the validity of their use at different decision points.

Placement Classification versus Risk Assessment

Risk Assessment

Risk assessment instruments are typically composed of variables that predict recidivism or probation failure. Risk assessment instruments classify youth in terms of the need for control, supervision, and treatment. The Colorado Young Offender Level of Services Inventory (CYO-LSI) used by the Office of Probation Services is an example of

a risk/needs assessment instrument. It was constructed using a wide range of risk and needs indicators selected on a consensus basis. It has also undergone empirical testing and the total score appears to have some predictive validity in terms of recidivism and probation failure (Mattson et al., 1997).

Placement Classification

Placement classification instruments on the other hand typically combine predictors of recidivism with level of offense seriousness. These two dimensions reflect the placement authority's interest in arriving at a placement decision (sentence) that matches an offender's need for control or treatment while being proportional to the seriousness of the presenting offense. The relative weight assigned to risk factors or proportionality dimensions varies depending on the purpose of the classification and type of placement involved (Gottfredson, 1987). The Matrix used by NYC for placement decisions is an example of a type of classification instrument. It uses a risk score derived from validated risk indicators and a separate offense seriousness score based on weights assigned on a consensus basis.

Profile Scores

Technically, the profile score is neither a risk assessment or classification instrument. It is composed of profile variables that are weighted in such a manner that they predict the risk of commitment, but not the risk of reoffending. Using the profile score, it is possible to discriminate between committed youth and probation only youth, but solely in terms of their risk of commitment. The profile score does not assign much weight to offense severity (felony probation offense is assigned a weight of 17) and was not designed for the purpose of placement classification. The use of the profile score as a

benchmark to gauge the utility of the CYO-LSI and matrix score for selecting youth for boot camp had limited validity.

Comparison of Instruments in Use

The profile, CYO-LSI, and matrix measures each tap different dimensions of risk and/or offense severity, and therefore, will yield varying results when applied to the profile sample. We can illustrate, somewhat, the unique characteristics of each measure using the profile sample. In order to maintain consistency we will restrict this part of the analysis only to all consecutive intakes between September 1997 and November 1998 ($n=535$), because that segment of the sample has the most complete data for all three measures (98% of profile scores, 92% of CYO-LSI scores, and 96% of matrix scores).

The profile measure indicates that only 28% of the RJTP recruits score high on a set of factors that have been found to discriminate between committed youth as a group and probation only youth as a group. On the other hand, the CYO-LSI indicates that 54% of the youth have total scores above the level determined by probation as high risk. A comparison of the CYO-LSI with the profile score using a cross tabulation shows that 37% of the total sample have CYO-LSI scores above the high-risk cut-off (> 30) but low profile scores (Table 2.1). A statistical measure of agreement for categorical variables indicates low concordance between the CYO-LSI and profile score ($Kappa = .08$). Even if it were possible to manipulate the CYO-LSI cut-off scores in order to discriminate offender groups similarly to the profile score, this would achieve little in terms of validity. Most importantly, neither instrument has a satisfactory proportionality dimension and neither measure was designed as a placement classification tool.

Table 2.1 Comparison of Profile Score and CYO-LSI

		CYO-LSI Hi/Lo ^a			
			0 thru 30	31 thru highest	Total
Profile Score Hi/Lo	0 thru 64	Count	171	181	352
		% of Total	34.8%	36.8%	71.5%
	65 thru highest	Count	53	87	140
		% of Total	10.8%	17.7%	28.5%
Total ^b		Count	224	268	492
		% of Total	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%

a. Kappa = .08, p < .05.

b. Intakes 09/16/97 thru 11/10/98. Missing cases = 37 (7%).

Evaluating the sample with the matrix score indicates that 79% of the youth sentenced to the RJTP are classified into cells 8 and above. A cross tabulation of the matrix score and profile score reveals that 53% of the sample have matrix scores above 8 but low profile scores (Table 2.2). Similarly, there is low concordance between the matrix and profile scores (Kappa = .10). Again, these measures were developed for unique purposes, and the manipulation of cut-off scores is not a valid way to overcome their differences.

Table 2.2 Comparison of Profile Score and Matrix Score

		Matrix Score Hi/Lo ^a			
		0 thru 7	8 thru highest	Total	
Profile Score Hi/Lo	0 thru 64	Count	93	271	364
		% of Total	18.2%	53.1%	71.4%
	65 thru highest	Count	15	131	146
		% of Total	2.9%	25.7%	28.6%
Total ^b	Count	108	402	510	
	% of Total	21.2%	78.8%	100.0%	

^a. Kappa = .10, $p < .001$.

^b. Intakes 09/16/97 thru 11/10/98. Missing Cases = 19 (3.6%).

Notice that neither the profile score nor the CYO-LSI score can tell us much about the seriousness of the RJTP sentencing offense. The proportionality of the boot camp sentence to offense seriousness should be an essential feature of the placement decision and therefore indicators of offense severity are critical to evaluating the composition of the RJTP, as well as sentencing patterns. In hindsight, among the three instruments investigated during the study, the matrix comes closest to being an appropriate classification instrument for boot camp. The matrix is a type of classification instrument that possesses some of the characteristics recommended for placement classification, including separate risk and offense severity dimensions. But the matrix has properties that are not very well understood, and its suitability to the task of RJTP youth selection is uncertain.

The matrix incorporates offense seriousness into both the risk dimension and proportionality dimension. Minor property offenses are assigned less weight in the offense seriousness dimension, but they are also assigned more weight in the risk dimension. The matrix also assigns disproportionate weight to particular offenses

relative to other offenses that most experts define as serious. For example, misdemeanor contraband is assigned more weight than felony auto theft, and misdemeanor sexual assault is assigned the same weight as felony burglary. These properties may reflect its use for commitment placements where particular offenses may be seen as predictive of control problems or dangerousness while in the institution (see, Brennan, 1987a). In addition the matrix contains a large number of cells (20) but provides little direction as to which cells might be appropriate for boot camp.

Developing Selection Criteria for the RJTP

Rationale

As discussed previously, the unanswered questions surrounding the population reduction potential of juvenile boot camps and limited knowledge concerning the effect of boot camp or the kinds of offenders who do well in boot camp, indicate a need for alternative placement criteria. Reformulating the problems of youth selection from the perspective of graduated sanctions may be a way to overcome some of the obstacles previously reviewed. From that perspective, intermediate sanctions such as the boot camp are components that fulfill specific purposes along a continuum of interventions where recidivism reduction and cost savings may be secondary to the primary concern for consistency, fairness, and efficiency (Morris & Tonry, 1990). If the RJTP is to play a viable role as an intermediate sanction between probation and commitment, methods and procedures for controlling the allocation of this resource are imperative. This view is supported by the profile data results that suggest inconsistent use of the boot camp. As Tonry noted, "Probably the most important lesson learned from recent experience with

intermediate sanctions is that they are seldom likely to achieve their goals unless means can be found to set and enforce policies governing their use” (1998, p. 685).

Examples

There are several types of classification instruments suitable to the task of youth selection for the RJTP. The matrix has been discussed as one of the more promising designs because it integrates separate risk and proportionality measures and provides multiple and more precise classifications (Wiebush et al., 1995). The matrix design is presented here because it is one of the few examples in the limited literature on placement classification instruments for youth offenders. The use of a matrix type classification instrument as a sentencing guideline is only one example of several possible combinations of youth selection tools and strategies. Additionally, there are numerous complex methodological issues involved in the actual development and implementation of classification instruments (Brennan, 1987b). The matrix examples discussed below are not validated instruments; they serve a strictly heuristic purpose.

Table 2.3 shows an example of a matrix design adopted from a juvenile corrections placement classification instrument that was favorably reviewed by Wiebush and colleagues (1995). Notice that this example and the others that follow are applied using the profile data from the current evaluation. The risk dimension in this example is based simply on an additive score using age-at-first adjudication, prior adjudications, and prior out-of-home placements. This particular risk score and all other elements of the matrices discussed in this section have strictly illustrative functions. The shaded portion of the matrix identifies a range of cells that calls for an intermediate sentence. The shaded range of cells corresponds to a range of intermediate sentences, from lesser

sanctions like electronic home monitoring, through more serious sanctions like JISP, to the most serious intermediate sanctions such as boot camp.

Table 2.3 Example A: RJTP Sentencing Matrix^a

		RISK RANGE			Total
		High	Medium	Low	
Sentencing Offense Seriousness ^b	Violent	18	24	48	90
		1.9%	2.5%	5.1%	9.5%
	Serious	129	178	225	532
		13.6%	18.8%	23.8%	56.2%
	Less Serious	82	100	89	271
		8.7%	10.6%	9.4%	28.6%
	Minor	14	23	17	54
		1.5%	2.4%	1.8%	5.7%
Total ^c		243	325	379	947
		25.7%	34.3%	40.0%	100.0%

^a Adopted from Indiana Juvenile Corrections placement classification cited in Wiebush et al., 1995.

^b Technical probation violations are replaced with most serious original probation offense.

^c Intakes 04/22/97 thru 05/18/99. Missing Data: 3 cases.

Table 2.4 shows an example adopted from juvenile court guidelines that were reviewed and recommended by Morris and Tonry (1990). In this example the sentencing decision is guided by the seriousness of the instant offense and prior record. Although prior record generally correlates with future offending, a pure risk dimension is not included in the model. In the original model described by Morris & Tonry (1990) the sentencing offense and offense history dimensions included more categories than those shown in the example. The shading has been added to designate a range of cells that might qualify for an intermediate sanction. Again, the upper range of shaded cells would call for more intense intermediate punishments like the RJTP. In the original model each cell corresponded to several sanctions that could be combined to obtain roughly

equivalent sentencing options for that cell. The model was designed as a presumptive, but flexible, sentencing guideline. It's focus on offense seriousness and prior record reflects an interest in constraining judicial discretion. A movement is implicit away from individualized sentences based on risk factors that are typical of juvenile courts to more determinate sentences directed toward proportionality and equity that are typical of adult courts (see von Hirsch, 1998).

Table 2.4 Example B: RJTP Sentencing Matrix

		Offense History (prior adjudications)					Total
		2 or more w/ felony	2 or more w/ misd.	1 w/ felony	1 w/ misd.	no priors	
Sentencing Offense Seriousness ^b	Violent	12 1.3%	3 .3%	12 1.3%	12 1.3%	51 5.4%	90 9.5%
	Serious	77 8.1%	26 2.7%	102 10.7%	77 8.1%	253 26.6%	535 56.3%
	Less Serious	46 4.8%	22 2.3%	33 3.5%	55 5.8%	115 12.1%	271 28.5%
	Minor	7 .7%	8 .8%	4 .4%	12 1.3%	23 2.4%	54 5.7%
Total ^c		142 14.9%	59 6.2%	151 15.9%	156 16.4%	442 46.5%	950 100.0%

a. Adopted from Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice juvenile court guidelines cited in Morris & Tonry, 1990.

b. Technical violations replaced with most serious original probation offense.

c. Intakes 04/22/97 thru 05/18/99.

Table 2.5 shows an example that incorporates prior probation violations into the offense history dimension. Recall that nearly half of the RJTP sentences resulted from a technical violation of probation and that a high percentage of these cases had no prior adjudications. Findings based on the profile data suggest a differential use of the RJTP for new offenders and probation violators. It is recommended that RJTP selection criteria include a measure of prior probation violations. In this example prior detention admissions are used as a proxy measure of prior technical probation violations. The

limitations of this estimation method were addressed earlier. In actual practice a measure of prior probation violations should be based on documented instances of prior probation failure.

Table 2.5 Example C: RJTP Sentencing Matrix

		Prior Record (adjudications & probation violations)				Total
		Extensive Record	Significant Record	Minor Record	No Record	
Sentencing Offense Seriousness ^a	Violent	13 1.4%	19 2.0%	28 2.9%	30 3.2%	90 9.5%
	Serious	93 9.8%	142 14.9%	178 18.7%	122 12.8%	535 56.3%
	Less Serious	62 6.5%	51 5.4%	104 10.9%	54 5.7%	271 28.5%
	Minor	13 1.4%	15 1.6%	17 1.8%	9 .9%	54 5.7%
Total ^b		181 19.1%	227 23.9%	327 34.4%	215 22.6%	950 100.0%

a. Technical violations replaced with most serious original probation offense.

b. Intakes 04/22/97 thru 05/18/99.

Discussion

Several complex issues are involved in both the development and implementation of youth selection methods and procedures; consensus decisions come to bear on most of them. Decisions must be made about the purpose of the methods and procedures, their basic design elements, and what factors they will include. Each one of these preliminary decisions will entail considerable debate. For example, should the RJTP sentence be guided mostly by offense seriousness and prior record, or should predictive (risk) variables be considered, and, if so, which ones and how much weight should they be assigned? Should presumptive guidelines be imposed that restrict judicial discretion? Or, should guidelines be limited to sentencing recommendations that may be loosely

followed? The answers to these and other critical questions will depend on the perspectives that make up the debate (see Tonry, 1987 for a discussion of the philosophical arguments surrounding the inclusion of predictive variables in sentencing guidelines).

The juvenile justice system is complex; change contemplated in one part of the system will affect and be affected by other parts of the system. Even the fairly straightforward objective of excluding youth who would otherwise receive probation only is constrained by prevailing conditions in the overall system of sanctions. Consider, for example, that in the absence of intermediate punishments like the RJTP there will be inappropriate sentences to both probation and commitment. When an intermediate punishment is made available, both offenders who previously would have received probation and those who would have been committed will be sentenced instead to the intermediate punishment (Morris & Tonry, 1990). "The question becomes not 'Is this program being applied only to people who would otherwise have been imprisoned?' but 'Is this program being applied for persons of the sort for whom it was intended?'" (Morris & Tonry, 1990, p. 228). Thus, objectives based on conditions in other parts of the system (e.g., probation or commitment profiles) may be misaligned with the intended purpose of the RJTP.

It is difficult to seriously consider a placement classification for the RJTP in isolation from the wide array of other sentences handed down in the juvenile court. RJTP selection methods and procedures will have less relevance and overall impact in the absence of a continuum of similarly guided intermediate sanctions. In addition to the development of RJTP selection criteria, methods and procedures must be developed to

classify the other sanctions currently in use. Boot camps, inpatient drug treatment, group homes, intensive supervision probation, intensive aftercare, detention, intensive family therapy, electronic home monitoring, wilderness work camp, community service, and fines/restitution can all be used alone or in combinations to develop a continuum of intermediate punishments that correspond to classes of offenders and offenses.

The approach presented assumes the existence of a continuum of intermediate sanctions, use of valid and reliable risk assessment and classification instruments, and the support of key decision makers, including judges, district attorneys, and probation officers (Wiebush, Baird, Krisberg, & Onek, 1995). Additional key stakeholders include an assortment of SB94 alternative programs and community evaluation teams (CETs). These entities play an extremely important and influential role in the allocation of juvenile justice resources. The compatibility of the assessment and classification instruments used by these other programs should be assessed and the feasibility of integrating them with the RJTP selection methods and procedures should be explored.

Thus far little attention has been paid to the effect of placement classification on outcomes in terms other than consistency, fairness, and efficiency. The impact of placement classifications on individual outcomes such as recidivism should also be considered. For example, Le Blanc (1998), in discussing the limitations of the matrix design, questioned whether the treatment programs of the corresponding cells produce good outcomes for the youth assigned to them. These are valid concerns that may have to wait until there is both a classification of intermediate sanctions and a valid classification instrument in use. Progress towards the goal of identifying good boot camp responders can be accomplished in stages. The classification of sanctions and offenses

should result in a more even distribution of offenders sentenced to the RJTP.

Methodologically it will be much simpler to determine what kinds of serious offenders do well in boot camp, as opposed to determining which kinds of all kinds of offenders do well in boot camp. Eventually, a point may be reached where it becomes possible to determine the types of offenders, among those intended offenders, that do well in boot camp. For the time being, problems with consistency, equity, and efficiency seem more immediate.

Finally, the profile data indicate that a large percentage of the youth sentenced to the RJTP have problems in the areas of mental health, family disruption, and substance abuse. As yet, there is no substantive reason or research evidence that seems to warrant an expectation that the boot camp model can effectively address many of the social problems that correlate with delinquency. If this premise is accepted, then it follows that the boot camp sentence should not be based on treatment needs. On the other hand, a limited focus on proportionality appears to ignore the social problems that most delinquent youth experience. Some have suggested that the boot camp sentence be used for the purpose of punishment and that aftercare be used to address treatment needs (Osler, 1991). Again, these are very complex issues that need to be taken up during the development of youth selection methods and procedures.

SECTION III: AFTERCARE SERVICES

The following section is a description of the Aftercare Program, or Phase II of the Regimented Juvenile Training Program. Juveniles who graduate from Phase I of the RJTP enter the aftercare program as a means of reintegration into the community. This is accomplished by offering services to youth to allow them to transition back into the community and to develop skills to succeed. Services vary across the state but focus on areas such as education, job training, and individual and family counseling. Additionally, since the majority of the graduates who participate in the aftercare program are on probation, they also receive supervision and monitoring through drug testing and electronic monitoring. The Aftercare Program is administered by the Judicial Department and funds are allocated directly to the judicial districts for implementation of these aftercare services.

Method

Data Collection

The Regimented Juvenile Training Program (RJTP) Aftercare Survey Form (Appendix D) was used to collect data on juveniles who graduated from the RJTP and were admitted into the aftercare program. The data collected targeted the types of services that youth received, along with their supervision status during and after termination from the aftercare program. In addition, the amount of time that youth were active in the program was collected and whether or not they successfully terminated from the program.

Sample

The aftercare sample includes all youth who graduated from the RJTP between January 1997 and April 1998. Notice that this time frame differs from the profile and follow-up samples. It was broadened to increase the number of intakes included in the sample and to compensate for a high percentage of missing aftercare data. There were 627 intakes during this time period representing 23 platoons. After deleting duplicate intakes following the method described in the profile data section, the sample was reduced to 615 unique cases. Aftercare data is missing for approximately 18% of the cases in the sample. The extended sample also allowed time for youth to complete the aftercare program, successfully or unsuccessfully, thereby enhancing the amount and quality of data collected.

Probation officers in each judicial district completed the aftercare survey on these youth, regardless of whether or not they successfully terminated the aftercare program. A total of 503 aftercare forms were collected from the 21 judicial districts that utilize the bootcamp and the aftercare program. Of these, 56 juveniles did not receive aftercare services and were eliminated from the final analysis. These youth did not receive services because they immediately committed a new offense (3), had a technical violation (6), absconded from probation (3), moved out of state (23), terminated from probation supervision (2), enlisted in the military (1), did not receive services (13), moved within the state (2), were placed directly into a commitment facility (2) or the reason was unknown (1). Therefore, the analysis focused on the 447 juveniles who received aftercare services during the study period. Due to additional missing data, the analysis in Appendix E, a comparison of each judicial district to the state, contains 441 cases.

Findings

Aftercare Attrition

As illustrated in Table 3.1, juveniles in the aftercare program successfully terminated at a higher percentage than those individuals who failed to complete the program. In fact, 63.8% terminated from the aftercare component successfully, meaning they completed all required programming, compared to 36.2% of juveniles who were unable to complete the program.

TABLE 3.1 Successful and Unsuccessful Terminations

	Yes	No	Total Terminations
Successful Termination	63.8% (n=285)	36.2% (n=162)	100.0% (n=447)

The most common reasons for failure included the commitment of a new offense, commitment of a technical violation, or absconsion from the program. Of those who failed, 58.7% unsuccessfully terminated from the aftercare program due to a technical violation, 25.9% committed a new offense, and 15.4% absconded from the program (see Table 3.2).

TABLE 3.2 Failure to Complete Aftercare Program Reason

Reason	Number	Percentage
New Offense	42	25.9%
Technical Violation/Non Compliance	95	58.7%
Absconsion	25	15.4%
Total	162	100.0%

Aftercare Attrition by Judicial District

Table 3.3 displays the number and percentage of successful and unsuccessful terminations by judicial district. Fourteen (66.7%) of the 21 participating judicial districts had more than 50% of their admissions successfully terminate the aftercare program. Conversely, only seven (33.3%) judicial districts had less than 50% of their admissions successfully terminate. It should be noted that due to the small number of cases in some districts, it is difficult to draw sound conclusions based on the number of successful cases.

TABLE 3.3 Aftercare Outcome by Judicial District

Judicial District	# of Successful Terminations % of Total Admissions	# of Unsuccessful Terminations % of Total Admissions	Total # of Admissions Total District Percentage
1	18 69.2%	8 30.8%	26 100.0%
2	7 53.8%	6 46.2%	13 100.0%
3	0 0	0 0	0 100.0%
4	77 72.0%	30 28.0%	107 100.0%
5	12 70.6%	5 29.4%	17 100.0%
6	4 44.4%	5 55.6%	9 100.0%
7	7 77.8%	2 22.2%	9 100.0%
8	13 76.5%	4 23.5%	17 100.0%
9	7 53.8%	6 46.2%	13 100.0%
10	31 64.6%	17 35.4%	48 100.0%
11	12 75.0%	4 25.0%	16 100.0%
12	6 66.7%	3 33.3%	9 100.0%
13	11 55.0%	9 45.0%	20 100.0%
14	6 37.5%	10 62.5%	16 100.0%
15	6 100.0%	0 0	6 100.0%
16	2 40.0%	3 60.0%	5 100.0%
17	2 22.2%	7 77.8%	9 100.0%
18	22 51.2%	21 48.8%	43 100.0%
19	4 40.0%	6 60.0%	10 100.0%
20	3 42.9%	4 57.1%	7 100.0%
21	35 76.1%	11 23.9%	46 100.0%
22	0 0	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
Total	285 36.2%	162 63.8%	447 100.0%

Length of Aftercare Phase

There were distinct differences in the amount of time that a juvenile spent in the aftercare program. The data were collapsed into six categories, ranging from 1 day to 181 days (6+ months). Of those juveniles who successfully terminated, the highest percentage, 40.0%, were in the program for 90 days or 3 months. The second highest percentage of successful juveniles occurred after they participated in the program for 60 days (21.8%). On the other hand, 56.6% of those who failed, did so in the first 60 days of receiving aftercare services. This may indicate that if a juvenile is going to fail, they are more than likely to fail early on in the program.

TABLE 3.4 Amount of Time Spent in the Aftercare Program by Termination

Number of Days in the Program	Successful Terminations	Unsuccessful Terminations
1Day – 29 days number percent	18 6.3%	17 10.7%
31 days – 60 days number percent	62 21.8%	73 45.9%
61 days – 90 days number percent	114 40.0%	13 8.2%
91 days – 120 days number percent	30 10.5%	6 3.8%
121 days – 180 days number percent	7 2.5%	4 2.5%
181+ days number percent	54 18.9%	46 28.9%
Total N %	285 100.0%	159* 100.0%

* The amount of time spent in the program was missing in 3 cases and not included in the final number.

Types of Services

The following section describes the types of services that juveniles received while participating in the aftercare program. Table 3.5 lists how frequently a particular service is used across the state from the most frequently used service to the service that was least likely to be utilized. The use of urinalysis/breathalyzer was the most commonly applied service, followed by EHM, curfew or other restrictions, 81.2% and 80.1% respectively. The least common services that districts used as a part of their aftercare program was the utilization of services through Social Services (9.8%) and day treatment services (7.9%).

TABLE 3.5 Types of Aftercare Services and Frequency of Use

<u>Type of Service Received</u>	<u>Frequency of Use (%)</u>
Urinalysis/ Breathalyzer	81.2%
Restriction – EHM, Curfew	80.1%
Day Reporting/ Tracking	68.7%
Educational Services	66.2%
Employment	54.4%
Restitution Monitoring	50.8%
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	49.7%
Skill Building	37.2%
Family Counseling	30.2%
Community Service	27.0%
Mental Health Counseling	24.5%
Out of Home Placement	14.4%
Vocational Training	13.5%
Non-Residential Through Social Services	9.8%
Day Treatment	7.9%

Overall, regardless of the amount of time spent in the aftercare program, in many cases youth who successfully terminated were more likely to receive a service than those youth who did not complete the aftercare program. The services offered to bootcamp graduates vary and youth are not limited in the number of services in which they may

participate. The data in Table 3.6 indicate that when comparing the youth who were successful in the program to those who were unsuccessful, the successful youth were more likely to receive services that focused on enhanced and developing life skills. On the other hand, those youth who were unsuccessful were more likely to have services aimed at addressing personal issues, such as mental health counseling and family treatment. This may suggest that the type of services that youth are receiving relative to their needs may have an impact on their type of termination.

TABLE 3.6 Types of Services Received by Aftercare Outcome

Type of Service Received	Successful Terminations	Unsuccessful Terminations
Urinalysis/Breathalyzer	232 82.0%	126 79.7%
Restriction – EHM, Curfew	222 79.6%	128 81.0%
Day Reporting/ Tracking	197 69.6%	106 67.1%
Educational Services	193 68.2%	99 62.7%
Employment	170 60.1%	70 44.3%
Restitution Monitoring	148 53.0%	74 46.8%
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	130 45.9%	89 56.3%
Skill Building	103 36.4%	61 38.6%
Family Counseling	79 27.9%	54 34.2%
Community Service	79 27.9%	40 25.3%
Mental Health Counseling	63 22.3%	45 28.5%
Out of Home Placement	38 13.5%	25 15.8%
Vocational Training	42 15.1%	17 10.8%
Non-Residential Through Social Services	20 8.1%	138 12.7%
Day Treatment	20 7.1%	15 9.5%

Type of Aftercare Service by Region

The use of aftercare services that are part of the RJTP Phase II program across the state vary in their use by region. Some differences in the frequency of use may depend on the availability of that service in a particular region. For example, as illustrated in Table 3.7, drug/ alcohol counseling in the Denver region was used in 66.7% of the cases, while the Southern region only utilized this service 40.5% of the time. This variation may indicate that counseling services were not as readily available or accessible in the southern region as they were in the Denver region. Another possible reason for the variation in service use may be that if a juvenile is receiving a service internally, and not referred to an external source, we would not know this from the current data. Hence, a probation officer reporting on their client involved in the aftercare program who was involved in a skill building group that was provided in house may not record this activity as a service received as it pertains to this study. Therefore, differences in recording practice may account for some variation in the proportion of youth receiving specific types of services.

TABLE 3.7 Type of Aftercare Service and Frequency of Use By Region

Type of Service Received	Frequency of Use by Region (%)					
	Denver Region	Central Region	Southern Region	Northeast Region	Western Region	State wide
Urinalysis/Breathalyzer	73.3	89.1	77.9	83.0	80.2	81.2
Restriction – EHM, Curfew	53.3	62.6	90.0	73.6	85.2	80.1
Day Reporting/ Tracking	33.3	51.1	92.1	35.8	62.6	68.7
Educational Services	53.3	75.0	68.9	60.4	57.1	66.2
Employment	46.7	55.4	70.5	24.5	38.5	54.4
Restitution Monitoring	66.7	39.6	53.7	56.6	50.0	50.8
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	66.7	51.1	40.5	58.5	59.3	49.7
Skill Building	20.0	50.0	23.2	56.6	45.1	37.2
Family Counseling	40.0	33.7	24.7	49.1	25.3	30.2
Community Service	20.0	17.4	25.8	26.4	40.7	27.0
Mental Health Counseling	20.0	34.8	16.8	26.4	29.7	24.5
Out of Home Placement	26.7	16.3	10.5	7.5	22.5	14.4
Vocational Training	6.7	14.3	15.3	7.5	13.6	13.5
Non-Residential Through Social Services	20.0	8.7	8.4	3.8	15.4	9.8
Day Treatment	26.7	16.3	3.2	11.3	4.4	7.9

Supervision Status

Table 3.8 illustrates that while participating in the aftercare program, 64.1% of RJTP graduates were on regular probation and 35.9% were on JISP. These percentages decreased following termination from the aftercare phase of the program (see Table 2.9). Forty- eight percent of juveniles continued to be supervised on regular probation and 18.7% were still involved under the supervision of the JISP program after termination. However, nearly one- fourth (22.2%) of the juveniles supervised by regular probation or JISP following the aftercare program were revoked, and an additional 2.5% had a

revocation pending. Of the total number of juveniles who terminated the aftercare program, 8.6% were successfully discharged from their probation sentence.

TABLE 3.8 Status of Youth During the Aftercare Program

STATUS	NUMBER	PERCENT
Regular Probation	284	64.1%
JISP	159	35.9%
Total	444*	100.0%

*There were 4 cases that did not indicate the status of the juvenile during the aftercare program.

TABLE 3.9 Status of Youth After Completion of the Aftercare Program

STATUS	NUMBER	PERCENT
Regular Probation	212	47.4%
JISP	83	18.6%
Successful Completion of Probation	38	8.5%
Revoked	98	21.9%
Revocation Pending	11	2.8%
Total	442*	100.0%

*There were 5 cases that did not indicate the status of the juvenile after completion of the aftercare program.

Placement at Time of Aftercare Termination

Upon completion of the aftercare program, the highest percentage of youth, 64.7%, were living at home. The remainder of juveniles included in the sample were in out of home placement (10.2%), were placed with the Division of Youth Corrections either in a commitment facility (7.7%) or in detention (6.1%), or were living under other

circumstances (11.3%). Table 3.10 shows the placement breakdown of juveniles after completing aftercare programming.

TABLE 3.10 – Placement of Youth Upon Completion of the Aftercare Program

PLACEMENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Home	285	64.7%
Out of Home	45	10.2%
Commitment	34	7.7%
Detention	27	6.1%
Runaway/ Warrant Status	16	3.6%
County Jail	14	3.2%
Residing With A Relative	8	1.8%
Other**	12	2.7%
Total	441*	100.0%

*There were 6 cases that did not indicate the placement of the juvenile after completion of the aftercare program.

** Other includes a juvenile placed in independent living, living with a relative out of state, is homeless or has been placed in community corrections.

Services by Judicial District

Appendix E contains a list of tables that illustrate the use of services by the individual districts compared with their frequency of use statewide. Note that because some districts have a small number of cases, it is difficult to make strong comparisons between individual districts and the state as a whole.

SECTION 4: SIX-MONTH AND ONE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP DATA

Method

Sample

The follow-up sample includes all youth who entered the RJTP between April 1997 and April 1998. There were 485 intakes during this period representing 18 platoons. The follow-up sample is a segment of consecutive intakes from the profile sample and is affected by the method of dealing with duplicate cases discussed in the profile data section. Of the 485 intakes, 3% ($n=13$) terminated before completing the RJTP sentence. The reasons for not completing the sentence included medical problems ($n = 7$), behavioral problems ($n = 5$), and escape ($n = 1$). Three non-completers (all medical problems) were recycled and all of these subsequently completed the RJTP sentence. Two recycled cases completed within the one-year follow-up window and their subsequent intakes are included in the sample. One recycled case completed outside the follow-up window and is not included in the sample. The deletion of duplicate intakes reduced the follow-up sample to 482 unique cases, including 10 that terminated before completing the RJTP sentence. The follow-up segment did not differ significantly from the total profile sample on any of the social or legal variables described in the profile data results.

Data Collection

Three separate methods were involved in the collection of follow-up data: a survey of probation officers, a visual search of district court and probation records, and a computer assisted search of the DYC Client Data System. Follow-up surveys were mailed to the probation officers of each youth six months following release from the

RJTP. The follow-up survey was used to collect information on placement, school, employment, and probation status at six months, as well as the occurrence of any new charges during the first six months following release from the RJTP. One-year recidivism data were collected through a search of district court records in the Office of Probation Services using ICON. The probation record of each youth was also searched in ICON to collect information on probation status at one year. The DYC Client Data System was searched to track new commitments within one year of release from the RJTP.

Recidivism Definition

Recidivism was defined as a new misdemeanor or felony offense committed within one year of release from the RJTP and filed in district court. The offense date, not the court filing date, was the determining time-factor. All municipal court filings and district court filings for petty offenses are excluded using this definition of recidivism. In this section of the report, the terms *new offense*, *reoffend*, and *reoffender* refer to the study definition of recidivism.

Data Reliability

Multiple data collection methods give a broader picture of success or failure following release from the RJTP. Multiple sources of information also make it possible to compare results across the different methods as a check on the reliability of the data being collected. Cross-referenced data sources did not provide a complete reliability check for all cases, but did give a strong indication that our methods were yielding accurate results overall. An initial comparison of probation officers' reports of new offenses during the first six months with results obtained from the ICON search indicated

89% agreement (Kappa = .70). A re-examination of court records revealed that errors in the survey data (probation officer report) explained 94% of the discordant observations. In most cases survey data errors were related to petty offenses, municipal offenses, and offense dates or court filing dates outside the six-month follow-up window. A similar process of comparing results, identifying discordant observations, and tracing the source of errors was carried out with the commitment data. This data screening method improved the quality of data overall and yielded results that indicated the data obtained from searches of court records had good reliability.

Results

School and Employment at Six Months

Table 4.1 shows a breakdown of academic and employment activity six months after release from the RJTP. Approximately 39% of the sample was reported as enrolled in school at six months. Another 17% of the sample was participating in a GED program at six months. A small percentage of youth who had attained their high school or GED diplomas are included in these groups. Seventy-eight percent of the youth in the sample were under the age of 18 at the time of the six-month follow-up, and this group was more likely to be enrolled in school. Forty-five percent of school-age youth were enrolled in school at the six-month follow-up (Table 4.2). Twenty-six percent of the school aged youth who were enrolled at intake were not enrolled at the six-month follow-up. Twelve percent of those not enrolled at intake were enrolled at six months. Note that the data on school enrollment at intake were based on youth self-report and the six-month follow-up data were based on probation officer report. Note also that the inclusion of GED classes would substantially alter the distribution depicted in Table 4.2.

Employment is another indicator of positive adjustment following release from the RJTP. As shown in Table 4.1, 41% of the sample was employed at six months. Eighty percent of the youth in the sample were age 16 or older when they were followed up at six months, and this group was more likely to be employed. Twenty-nine percent of the youth in the sample were not engaged in any academic or employment activity.

Table 4.1 School and Employment at Six Months

	Frequency	Percent
School only	109	23.7
Employed only	67	14.6
GED only	31	6.7
School & employed	72	15.7
GED & employed	47	10.2
Idle	134	29.1
Total ^a	460	100.0

a. Missing Data: 22 cases (4.6%).

Table 4.2 School @ Six-Month Follow-up by School @ Intake

		Enrolled in School @ Intake			
		No	Yes	Total	
Enrolled in School @ 6-Month Follow-up	No	Count	96	87	183
		% of Total	28.7%	26.0%	54.6%
	Yes	Count	40	112	152
		% of Total	11.9%	33.4%	45.4%
Total ^a		Count	136	199	335
		% of Total	40.6%	59.4%	100.0%

a. Includes only youth who were less than 18 years old at the time of the six-month follow-up. Missing Data: 41 cases (11%).

Placement at Six Months

Table 4.3 shows a cross-tabulation of placement six months after graduation by placement at the time of intake. Six months following release from the RJTP, 61% of the sample was residing at home. Significant proportions of the sample moved between parental custody and state custody from the time of intake to six-month follow-up. Placement situations deteriorated for 30% of the youth who were living at home at the time of intake, changing to either out-of-home placement or incarceration at the six-month follow-up. Placement situations appear to have improved for 37% of the youth who were in an out-of-home placement at the time of intake, changing to living at home six months after release from the RJTP.

Table 4.3 Placement at Six Months by Placement at Intake

		Placement at Intake			Total
		Home	Friends or Relatives	Social Services or Other Placement	
Placement at Six Months	Home	251	15	22	288
		65.0%	50.0%	37.3%	60.6%
	Relatives, friends, Indep. living	13	1	1	15
		3.4%	3.3%	1.7%	3.2%
	College, job corps, military school	4			4
		1.0%			.8%
	OOH Placement	25	2	17	44
		6.5%	6.7%	28.8%	9.3%
Detention, county jail, work release	33	3	4	40	
	8.5%	10.0%	6.8%	8.4%	
DYC Commitment, YOS	50	8	12	70	
	13.0%	26.7%	20.3%	14.7%	
Runaway, absconded	10	1	3	14	
	2.6%	3.3%	5.1%	2.9%	
Total ^a	386	30	59	475	
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

a. Intakes 04/22/97 thru 04/18/98. Missing Data: 7 cases (1.5%).

New Offenses

Thirty-six percent of the youth in the sample had a new misdemeanor or felony offense that was committed within one year of release from the RJTP and filed in district court. Table 4.4 shows a breakdown of the categories of offense for those youth who reoffended during the follow-up period. The distribution of new offenses is very similar to the distribution of RJTP sentencing offenses presented in the profile section. Table 4.5 shows a comparison of sentencing offenses and new offenses for those youth who reoffended during the one-year follow-up. Offenses are collapsed into the categories *violent* (person felonies), *serious* (property felonies, drug felonies, all weapons offenses),

less serious (person misdemeanors, property misdemeanors, and drug misdemeanors), and *minor* (misdemeanor public order and petty offenses). Among the group that reoffended, a higher proportion of youth with nonviolent serious RJTP sentencing offenses had new nonviolent serious offenses, compared to those originally sentenced for violent, less serious, or minor offenses.

Table 4.4 New Offense Category

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Person Felony	13	7.4
Person Misdemeanor	18	10.3
Property Felony	63	36.0
Property Misdemeanor	40	22.9
Drug Felony	9	5.1
Weapons Felony	3	1.7
Weapons Misdemeanor	6	3.4
Other Felony	5	2.9
Other Misdemeanor	18	10.3
Total ^a	175	100.0

^a. Includes only cases that had a new misdemeanor or felony offense committed within 1 yr. of RJTP release and filed in district court.

Table 4.5 RJTP Sentencing Offense by New Offense w/ One Year

		RJTP Sentencing Offense ^a				Total
		Violent	Serious	Less Serious	Minor	
New Offense Following RJTP	Violent	1 6.7%	6 6.3%	4 7.4%	2 20.0%	13 7.4%
	Serious	7 46.7%	58 60.4%	18 33.3%	3 30.0%	86 49.1%
	Less Serious	3 20.0%	28 29.2%	22 40.7%	5 50.0%	58 33.1%
	Minor	4 26.7%	4 4.2%	10 18.5%		18 10.3%
	Total ^b	15 100.0%	96 100.0%	54 100.0%	10 100.0%	175 100.0%

a. If sentenced to RJTP for technical violation, offense is most serious original probation offense.

b. Includes only cases that had a new misdemeanor or felony offense committed within 1 yr. of RJTP release and filed in district court.

For those youth who reoffended, the mean survival time from release to offense date was 156 days. Fifty percent of all new offenses were committed within 138 days of release from the RJTP. Based on data obtained from the ICON search, 23% of the follow-up sample had a new misdemeanor or felony offense within six months. In the previous RJTP study conducted by DYC in 1996, 42% of the RJTP graduates had new offenses within six months of release. The current six-month outcomes compare favorably with those earlier results, but differences in sample composition, recidivism definition, and/or data collection methods may, at least partially, account for this.

The mean age at the time of the new offense was 16.7 years and ranged from 13.45 years to 18.67 years. Seventy-five percent of new offenses were committed by youth younger than 17.6 years old. Thirteen percent of new offenses were filed as adult criminal cases ($n = 23$) and the remainder as juvenile cases ($n = 152$). Of those youth with new offenses filed in adult court, 35% were under age 18 at the time of the offense.

The juveniles with offenses filed in adult court were arrested for person felonies ($n = 1$), property felonies ($n = 5$), and weapons felonies ($n = 2$). Seventy-five percent of the juveniles with adult filings were minority youth. Of those juveniles with new offenses filed in adult court, five were sentenced to the Youth Offender System (YOS), and two were sentenced to the Department of Corrections. The one remaining case was still pending at the end of the study.

Case dispositions were tracked beyond the one-year follow-up window for the 175 youth with new offenses. By the end of the study, 82% of the youth with new offenses were found guilty, 12% had their cases dismissed, and 6% were awaiting disposition.

DYC Commitments

Twenty-three percent of the youth in the sample were committed to the Department of Youth Corrections within one year of release from the RJTP ($n = 113$). For those youth who were committed, the mean survival time from the point of RJTP release to commitment date was 181 days. Fifty percent of all commitments occurred within 165 days of release from the RJTP. Table 4.6 shows a cross-tabulation of new commitments by new offenses during the one-year follow-up period. As shown, 13% of the youth in the sample had both a new offense and commitment within one year of release from the RJTP ($n = 63$). Approximately 10% of the youth in the sample had a commitment and no new offense ($n = 50$). Commitments depicted in the table that do not appear to stem directly from a new offense typically resulted from technical probation violations, but, in some cases, they are associated with stayed or suspended sentences imposed prior to the RJTP or delinquent offenses that occurred before the RJTP. For

eight of the youth with a new commitment and new offense, the new offense occurred after the commitment. From the data in Table 4.6, it can be seen that 47% of the youth in the sample had either a new offense, a commitment and no new offense, or a new offense and commitment ($n = 225$). Fifty-three percent of the youth in the sample survived for one year after release from the RJTP without reoffending or being committed to NYC ($n = 257$).

Table 4.6 Commitment by New Offense

		Offense w/ 1yr. of RJTP Release			
		No	Yes	Total	
Committed w/ 1 yr. of RJTP Release	No	Count	257	112	369
		% of Total	53.3%	23.2%	76.6%
	Yes	Count	50	63	113
		% of Total	10.4%	13.1%	23.4%
Total ^a		Count	307	175	482
		% of Total	63.7%	36.3%	100.0%

^a. Intakes 04/22/97 thru 04/18/98.

The descriptive comparison in Table 4.6 calls attention to the fact that rates of reoffending alone provide an incomplete picture of recidivism. Not all new offenses result in a commitment and not all commitments result from a new offense. When commitments are considered along with reoffending, four types of outcome associated with recidivism emerge: (1) no offense or commitment, (2) offense but no commitment, (3) commitment but no offense, and (4) offense and commitment. We can refer to these categories as types of recidivism, each of which, in turn, may be qualified by additional kinds of outcomes, such as probation status.

Probation Status

Table 4.7 shows the one-year probation status for youth in the sample across the four categories of recidivism described above. Focusing on the first two categories (columns) of the table, two important considerations seem apparent. First, not all youth who survived for one year without a new offense or commitment (category 1) had positive probation outcomes at one year. At one year from RJTP release, approximately 14% of the youth in category 1 had been revoked and an additional 9% had probation revocations or warrants pending. Second, not all youth that reoffended and survived commitment (category 2) had negative probation outcomes at one year.

Table 4.7 Probation Status @ One Year by Recidivism Type

		Recidivism Type				Total
		No offense or commitment	Offense no commitment	Commitment no offense	Offense and commitment	
Probation Status @ 1 yr.	Successful termination	74 28.8%	7 6.3%			81 16.8%
	Active or other supervision ^a	122 47.5%	72 64.3%		1 ^b 1.6%	195 40.5%
	Revocation pending or warrant status	24 9.3%	8 7.1%			32 6.6%
	Revoked technical or unsuccessful completion	37 14.4%	13 11.6%	46 92.0%	15 ^c 23.8%	111 23.0%
	Revoked new offense		12 10.7%	4 ^d 8.0%	47 74.6%	63 13.1%
Total		257 100.0%	112 100.0%	50 100.0%	63 100.0%	482 100.0%

a. Other supervision includes interstate compact, private, and adult probation (6 cases).

b. Short commitment sentence and probation continued.

c. Offense dismissed or treated as technical probation violation, probation revoked prior to new offense, or committed prior to new offense.

d. Petty offenses not captured by definition of recidivism used in the study.

At one year from RJTP release, only 22% of the youth in category 2 had been revoked and an additional 7% had probation revocations or warrants pending. Although the critical occurrence of a new offense distinguishes category-1 youth from category-2 youth, the two groups are very similar in terms of other outcomes, in addition to probation status. For instance, at six months, similar proportions of category 1 and category 2 youth were in a restrictive placement (22% vs. 24%) and similar proportions were not engaged in employment or school (22% vs. 23%). Looking at recidivism in these terms changes the overall picture of RJTP outcomes and demonstrates the limitations of measuring success solely in terms of rates of reoffending.

Recidivism Within Judicial Districts

A description of the rates of reoffending within judicial districts is presented in Table 4.8. The reader should pay attention to two important caveats regarding the rates that are depicted. First, small and unequal cell frequencies restrict even simple tests of independence. Second, and, most importantly, any apparent differences in rates across judicial districts may be explained by differences in youth profiles or aftercare services received, or other factors not accounted for in the table. Table 4.9 shows a similar description for rates of commitment within judicial districts, and the same restrictions and caveats apply. Future analyses may compare the rates of reoffending, commitment, probation revocation, and detention admissions across the larger judicial districts while controlling for profile variables and aftercare services. But, these more complex analyses exceed the scope of the current evaluation.

Table 4.8 Rates of Reoffending Within Judicial Districts

Judicial District		New Offense w/ 1 yr. of RJTP Release		Total
		No	Yes	
1	Count	21	3	24
	% within Judicial District	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
2	Count	12	5	17
	% within Judicial District	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
3	Count	2		2
	% within Judicial District	100.0%		100.0%
4	Count	65	45	110
	% within Judicial District	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
5	Count	9	4	13
	% within Judicial District	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
6	Count	10	7	17
	% within Judicial District	58.8%	41.2%	100.0%
7	Count	9	3	12
	% within Judicial District	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
8	Count	11	7	18
	% within Judicial District	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%
9	Count	3	5	8
	% within Judicial District	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
10	Count	30	20	50
	% within Judicial District	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
11	Count	7	3	10
	% within Judicial District	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
12	Count	5	3	8
	% within Judicial District	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
13	Count	17	4	21
	% within Judicial District	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
14	Count	10	7	17
	% within Judicial District	58.8%	41.2%	100.0%
15	Count	3	4	7
	% within Judicial District	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
16	Count	2	4	6
	% within Judicial District	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
17	Count	7	5	12
	% within Judicial District	58.3%	41.7%	100.0%
18	Count	36	19	55
	% within Judicial District	65.5%	34.5%	100.0%
19	Count	4	4	8
	% within Judicial District	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
20	Count	21	11	32
	% within Judicial District	65.6%	34.4%	100.0%
21	Count	23	12	35
	% within Judicial District	65.7%	34.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	307	175	482
	% within Judicial District	63.7%	36.3%	100.0%

Table 4.9 Commitments Within Judicial Districts

Judicial District		Committed w/ 1 yr. of RJTP Release		Total
		NO	Yes	
1	Count	17	7	24
	% within Judicial District	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
2	Count	13	4	17
	% within Judicial District	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%
3	Count	2		2
	% within Judicial District	100.0%		100.0%
4	Count	72	38	110
	% within Judicial District	65.5%	34.5%	100.0%
5	Count	10	3	13
	% within Judicial District	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%
6	Count	10	7	17
	% within Judicial District	58.8%	41.2%	100.0%
7	Count	12		12
	% within Judicial District	100.0%		100.0%
8	Count	14	4	18
	% within Judicial District	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
9	Count	3	5	8
	% within Judicial District	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
10	Count	42	8	50
	% within Judicial District	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
11	Count	8	2	10
	% within Judicial District	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
12	Count	8		8
	% within Judicial District	100.0%		100.0%
13	Count	20	1	21
	% within Judicial District	95.2%	4.8%	100.0%
14	Count	16	1	17
	% within Judicial District	94.1%	5.9%	100.0%
15	Count	6	1	7
	% within Judicial District	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
16	Count	4	2	6
	% within Judicial District	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
17	Count	9	3	12
	% within Judicial District	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
18	Count	47	8	55
	% within Judicial District	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%
19	Count	5	3	8
	% within Judicial District	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
20	Count	26	6	32
	% within Judicial District	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%
21	Count	25	10	35
	% within Judicial District	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	369	113	482
	% within Judicial District	76.6%	23.4%	100.0%

Discussion

The design of the current evaluation limits what can be said about the outcomes described in this section. Without a comparison or control group it is impossible to estimate a treatment effect for the RJTP. Without an estimate of treatment effect, causal statements about the effectiveness of the program cannot be made. Although these methodological issues restrict interpretation, they do not prevent a discussion of results.

There are several aspects of the results that warrant discussion. First, there are positive indications in the outcomes for school, employment, and placement at six months. Approximately 70% of the follow-up sample was engaged in some type of school or employment activity at the six-month follow-up. Similarly, 61% of the sample was residing at home at the six-month follow-up. While placement situations appeared to deteriorate for some youth following release from the RJTP, there were indications that placement situations improved for others, especially for those youth who were in out-of-home placement at intake. Looking at six-month outcomes overall, 57% of the sample was living at home and also working and/or participating in an academic program. These results seem positive given their inherent social value, even though their prophylactic effect for recidivism was not analyzed and their causal relationship to the RJTP was not determined.

The second prominent issue in the data results is the significance of recidivism as an indicator of success. The results seem to be in agreement with numerous citations in the delinquency literature that describe the limitations of measuring success solely in terms of reoffending. The occurrence of a new offense is obviously a critical event, but the addition of information on commitments and revocations provides a more complete

picture of recidivism. When the follow-up sample is evaluated in these terms the following breakdown is obtained: 41% had no new offense, commitment, or revocation; 15% had no new offense or commitment, but were revoked; 19% had a new offense, but no commitment or revocation; 10% had no new offense, but were committed; 13% had a new offense and commitment; and 1% had a new offense and sentence to DOC/YOS. When they are evaluated in these terms, not all youth who didn't reoffend look like successes, and not all youth who did reoffend look like failures.

Finally, the results should be judged in the context of the broader issue of youth selection, which has been the focus of this report. Data results from the profile section suggested inconsistent youth selection patterns. Notably, there was evidence of considerable variance in the kinds of offenders being sentenced to the RJTP. Therefore, outcomes are conditioned by the variability in the profile data, and they should be weighed with this in mind.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on several performance measures, outcomes of youth served in the Colorado Regimented Training Program are generally positive:

- 96% of youth entering the program graduated from Phase I
- 69% of graduates were employed and/or in school at six months following graduation
- 77% of graduates had no new misdemeanor or felony offenses within six months following graduation resulting in a filing in district court
- 64% of graduates had no new misdemeanor or felony offenses within one year of graduation resulting in a filing in district court

- 77% of graduates had no commitments to NYC within one year of graduation (44% of the new commitments were due to technical violations of probation)
- 53% of graduates had no new offenses or commitments within one year of graduation
- 41% of graduates had no new offenses, commitments or probation revocations within one year of graduation
- 19% of graduates committed a new felony offense within one year of graduation resulting in a filing in district court
- 23% of graduates were committed to NYC within one year of graduation (44% of the commitments were due to technical violations of probation)

While these outcomes are encouraging, efforts to develop criteria or selection guidelines on the appropriate profile of youth to refer to the boot camp have been unsuccessful. This is evidenced by the wide variety in offense and background characteristics of youth served in boot camp. A review of juvenile boot camp literature suggests that many states have encountered similar difficulties in this area. Confusion around the purposes and goals of the boot camp sentencing option have led some programs to close and others to redefine the targeted population and expected outcomes.

Efforts to evaluate the Colorado RJTP have been ongoing since 1996. The RJTP Advisory Board has met regularly to address administrative issues and to monitor the use of the boot camp sentencing option in terms of characteristics of youth served and performance during both the residential and aftercare phases of the program. Research staff from the Division of Youth Corrections, in cooperation with staff from the Colorado Judicial Department, Office of Probation Services, made repeated attempts to respond to requests for guidelines around profiles of youth who are appropriate for a boot camp program. As discussed in the body of the report, each effort met with difficulties and

current guidelines for selection criteria are still relatively vague with the exception of exclusion of youth with serious physical or mental disabilities. The literature review conducted for this report provides insight to the reasons for these problems, which include differing perceptions on whether the boot camp is primarily developed to improve outcomes, to reduce commitments, or to sanction youth in proportion to their criminal behavior. Selection criteria differ depending on whether the goal is to produce the best performance of youth served, to reduce the more costly longer-term incarceration sentence, or to provide a sanction that combines an intermediate sanction with rehabilitative efforts. Clearly, low risk youth will do better than high risk youth in almost any program. Thus, outcomes alone cannot drive the decisions around program selection. Similarly, while the boot camp program is a short term, less costly option than commitment, most communities would not accept a 60-day residential program for a youth who committed a serious violent crime. Efforts to develop selection criteria related to sentencing options result in widely defined criteria due to issues related to judicial discretion and an inability to capture all of the variables that impact case by case decisions. Based on overriding issues identified through the literature and on evidence of similar issues identified in the current study, the following primary recommendation is offered:

RECOMMENDATION: The boot camp sentence represents an ‘intermediate sanction’ within a system of graduated sanctions in Colorado. Development of selection guidelines for the juvenile boot camp must be developed in relation to the goals associated with this sanction and in the overall context of the broad range of sanctions available in Colorado. The Judicial Department and the Department of Human Services should continue to work on youth selection guidelines for the boot camp based on the role this program serves within the broad continuum of sentencing options in Colorado and treatment considerations related to the boot camp regimen.

Development of referral guidelines promotes consistency in the characteristics served in the program. Once this consistency is achieved, outcomes of juveniles served in the program can be evaluated and compared with alternative programs for similar youth, and will allow evaluation of impacts on youth outcomes as changes to the programs are implemented.

References

- Altschuler, D. M. (1998). Intermediate sanctions and community treatment for serious and violent juvenile offenders. In R. L. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 367 – 385). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bottcher, J., Isorena, T., & Belnas, M. (1996). LEAD: A boot camp and intensive parole program - An impact evaluation: Second year findings. Sacramento: California Youth Authority.
- Bourque, B. B., Cronin, R. C., Pearson, F. R., Felker, D. B., Han, M., & Hill, S. M. (1996). Boot camps for juvenile offenders: An implementation evaluation of three demonstration programs. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Boyles, C. E., Bokenkamp, E., & Madura, W. (1996). Evaluation of the Colorado Juvenile Regimented Training Program. Denver: Department of Human Services, Division of Youth Corrections.
- Brennan, T. (1987a). Classification for control in jails and prisons. In D. M. Gottfredson and M. Tonry (Eds.), Crime and justice: An annual review: Vol. 9. Prediction and Classification: Criminal justice decision making (pp. 323 – 366). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brennan, T. (1987b). Classification: An overview of selected methodological issues. In D. M. Gottfredson and M. Tonry (Eds.), Crime and justice: An annual review: Vol. 9. Prediction and Classification: Criminal justice decision making (pp. 201 – 248). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Byrne, J. M., Lurigio, A. J., & Petersilia, J. (1992). Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Clark, C. L., Moscicki, R., & Perry, J. (1996). To march or not to march: Is that the question? In American Correctional Association, Juvenile and adult boot camps (pp. 151 – 184). Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Colledge, D., & Gerber, J. (1998). Rethinking the assumptions about boot camps. Federal Probation, 62(2), 54 – 61.
- Cornick, T. H. (1996). The Youth Leadership Academy Boot Camp: An examination of the military model. In American Correctional Association, Juvenile and adult boot camps (pp. 119 - 132). Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Correia, M. (1997). Boot camps, exercise, and delinquency: An analytical critique of the use of physical exercise to facilitate decreases in delinquent behavior. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 13, 94 – 113.
- Cronin, R. C. (1994). Boot camps for adult and juvenile offenders: Overview and update. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. (1996). Manatee County Sheriff's Boot Camp: A follow-up study of the first four platoons. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Data.
- Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. (1997). Bay County Sheriff's Office Juvenile Boot Camp: A follow-up study of the first seven platoons. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Data.

- Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. (1997). Martin County Sheriff's Office Boot Camp: A follow-up study of the first four platoons. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Data.
- Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. (1997). Polk County Juvenile Boot Camp: A follow-up study of the first four platoons. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Data.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R. (1979). Effective correctional treatment: A bibliotherapy for cynics. Crime & Delinquency, *25*, 463 – 489.
- Gottfredson, D. M. (1987). Prediction and classification in criminal justice decision making. In D. M. Gottfredson and M. Tonry (Eds.), Crime and justice: An annual review: Vol. 9. Prediction and Classification: Criminal justice decision making (pp. 1 – 20). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gransky, L., Castellano, T. C., & Cowles, E. L. (1995). Is there a 'next generation' of shock incarceration facilities? The evolving nature of goals, program components and drug treatment services. In J. Smykla & W. Selke (Eds.), Intermediate sanctions: Sentencing in the 1990s (pp. 89 – 111). Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Henggeler, S. W., & Schoenwald, S. K. (1994). Boot camps for juvenile offenders: Just say no. Journal of Child and Family Studies, *3*(3), 243-248.
- Le Blanc, M. (1998). Screening of serious and violent juvenile offenders: Identification, classification, and prediction. In R. L. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 167 – 193). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1998). Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders. In R. L. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 313 – 345). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lutze, F. E., & Brody, D. C. Mental abuse as cruel and unusual punishment: Do boot camp prisons violate the Eighth Amendment? Crime & Delinquency, 45(2), 242-255.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (1990). Boot camp prisons: Components, evaluations, and empirical issues. Federal Probation, 54(3), 44-52.
- MacKenzie, D. L., & Parent, D. G. (1992). Boot camp prisons for young offenders. In J. M. Byrne, A. J. Lurigio, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions (pp. 103 – 119). London: Sage Publications.
- MacKenzie, D. L., & Rosay, A. B. (1996). Correctional boot camps for juveniles. In American Correctional Association, Juvenile and adult boot camps (pp. 93 - 117). Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- MacKenzie, D. L., & Souryal, C. (1995). Inmates' attitude change during incarceration: A comparison of boot camp with traditional prison. Justice Quarterly, 12(2), 325 – 354).
- MacKenzie, D. L., Gover, & A. R., Styve. (1998). National evaluation of juvenile correctional facilities. College Park, MD: Evaluation Research Group, University of Maryland.

- Mathlas, R., & Mathews, J. (1991). The boot camp program for offenders: Does the shoe fit? International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 35, 322 – 327.
- Mattson, B. A., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N., & Pampel, F. (1997). Reliability and validity analysis of the Colorado Young Offender-Level of Service Inventory (CYO-LSI). Denver: Author.
- McCorkle, R. C. (1995). Correctional boot camps and change in attitude: Is all this shouting necessary? A research note. Justice Quarterly, 12(2), 365 – 375.
- Morash, M., & Rucker, L. (1990). A critical look at the idea of boot camp as a correctional reform. Crime & Delinquency, 36(2), 204-222.
- Morris, N., & Tonry, M. (1990). Between prison and probation: Intermediate punishments in a rational sentencing system. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers, C. A. (1996). Juvenile boot camp: the Abraxas model. In American Correctional Association, Juvenile and adult boot camps (pp. 133 – 150). Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Osler, M. W. (1991). Shock incarceration: Hard realities and real possibilities. Federal Probation, 55, 24 – 42.
- Parent, D. G. (1996). Boot camps and prison crowding. In D. L. MacKenzie and E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: A tough intermediate sanction (pp. 263 – 274). Washington DC: National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

- Petersilia, J., Lurigio, A. J., & Byrne, J. M. (1992). Introduction: The emergence of intermediate sanctions. In J. M. Byrne, A. J. Lurigio, and J. Petersilia (Eds.), Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions (pp. ix-xv). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications
- Peters, M., Thomas, D., Zamberlan, C., & Caliber Associates. (1997). Boot camps for juvenile offenders. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Polsky, H., & Fast, J. (1993). Boot camps, juvenile offenders, and culture shock. Child and Youth Care Forum, 22(6), 403 – 415.
- Sechrest, D. K. (1989). Prison “boot camps” do not measure up. Federal Probation, 53(3), 15-20.
- Simon, J. (1995). They die with their boots on: The boot camp and the limits of modern penalty. Social Justice, 22(2), 25-48.
- Taylor, W. J. (1992). Tailoring boot camps to juveniles. Corrections Today, 54 (July), 122+.
- Toby, J., Pearson, F. R., Felker, D. B., Bourque, B. B., & Cronin, R. C. (1992). Boot camps for juvenile offenders: Constructive intervention and early support - Implementation evaluation final report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Tonry, M. (1987). Prediction and classification: Legal and ethical issues. In D. M. Gottfredson and M. Tonry (Eds.), Crime and justice: An annual review: Vol. 9. Prediction and Classification: Criminal justice decision making (pp. 367 – 413). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Tonry, M. (1998). Crime and punishment in America. In M. Tonry (Ed.), The handbook of crime and punishment (pp. 3 – 27). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Von Hirsch, A. (1998). Penal theories. In M. Tonry (Ed.), The handbook of crime and punishment (pp. 659 – 682). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Welch, M. (1997). A critical interpretation of correctional bootcamps as normalizing institutions. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 13(2), 184-205.
- Wiebush, R. G., Baird, C., Krisberg, B., & Onek, D. (1995). Risk assessment and classification for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders. In J. C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J. D. Hawkins, & J. J. Wilson (Eds.), Serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders: A sourcebook (pp. 171 – 212). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wilson, J. J., & Howell, J. C. (1993). Comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Zamble, E., & Porporino, F. (1988). Coping, behavior, and adaptation in prison inmates. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Zhang, S. X. (1998). In search of hopeful glimpses: A critique of research strategies in current boot camp evaluations. Crime & Delinquency, 44 (2), 314-334.

TRAINING SCHEDULE
PHASE I
Monday thru Friday T-1 thru T-30
CURRENT AS OF: July 8, 1999

COMPANY	1st & 2nd SQUADS	3rd & 4th SQUADS
0530	Reveille (Company Accountability)	Reveille (Company Accountability)
0530-0545	Wake-up Procedures	Wake-up Procedures
0545-0700	Physical Training / P.T. Recovery	Physical Training / P.T. Recovery
0700-0815	Breakfast / Platoon Leaders Time	Breakfast / Platoon Leaders Time
0815	COMPANY FORMATION POST COLORS	COMPANY FORMATION POST COLORS
0830-1130	ClassRoom/Academics	CMDRS TIME (Lifeskills/D&C/Comp. Lab/Ropes)
1130-1230	Lunch / Platoon Leaders Time	Lunch / Platoon Leaders Time
1230-1530	CMDRS TIME (Lifeskills/D&C/Comp. Lab/Ropes)	ClassRoom/Academics
1545-1650	Drug & Alcohol Class (M-W-F) Leadership Classes (Tues,Thur,Sat)	Drug & Alcohol Class (M-W-F) Leadership Classes (Tues,Thur,Sat)
1650-1700	COMPANY FORMATION RETREAT COLORS	COMPANY FORMATION RETREAT COLORS
1700-1900	Dinner / Platoon Leaders Time	Dinner / Platoon Leaders Time
1900	Homework/Study Time/Letters in classrooms	Homework/Study Time/Letters in classrooms
1930	ISSUE SNACKS	ISSUE SNACKS
2000	Personal Hygiene/Hygiene Inspection	Personal Hygiene/Hygiene Inspection
2030	Clean Up/Secure platoon area & Equipment	Clean Up/Secure platoon area & Equipment
2100	Final prep for next days training	Final prep for next days training
2130	TAPS	TAPS

COMMANDERS TIME

PLATOON LEADERS TIME

TIME	SENIOR	MIDDLE	JUNIOR	
0830-0930	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	D & C	1. D & C , PRACTICE / TEST
0930-1030	D&C/ ROPES	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	2. REVIEW / EXAMS
1030-1130	COMPUTER LAB	D&C/ ROPES	LIFESKILLS	3. TRANSITION GROUP (PHASE II)
				4. UNIFORM- UP KEEP
1230-1330	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	D & C	5. COUNSELING
1330-1430	D&C/ ROPES	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	6. MAKE-UP TRAINING
1430-1545	COMPUTER LAB	D&C/ ROPES	LIFESKILLS	

WEEKDAY MEAL SCHEDULE

MEAL HOURS: BRKFST LUNCH DINNER

SENIOR: 0700 1130 1700

MIDDLE: 0720 1150 1720

JUNIOR: 0720 1150 1720

NOTE: The Drill Instructor/Recruit Ratio is 1/10 for Security/Safety reasons. All staff members will insure that this standard is maintained.

TRAINING SCHEDULE
PHASE II
Monday thru Friday T-30 thru T-60
CURRENT AS OF: July 8, 1999

COMPANY	3rd & 4th SQUADS	1st & 2nd SQUADS
0530	Reveille (Company Accountability)	Reveille (Company Accountability)
0530-0545	Wake-up Procedures	Wake-up Procedures
0545-0700	Physical Training / P.T. Recovery	Physical Training / P.T. Recovery
0700-0815	Breakfast / Platoon Leaders Time	Breakfast / Platoon Leaders Time
0815	COMPANY FORMATION POST COLORS	COMPANY FORMATION POST COLORS
0830-1130	ClassRoom/Academics	CMDRS TIME (Lifeskills/D&C/Comp. Lab/Ropes)
1130-1230	Lunch / Platoon Leaders Time	Lunch / Platoon Leaders Time
1230-1530	CMDRS TIME (Lifeskills/D&C/Comp. Lab/Ropes)	ClassRoom/Academics
1545-1650	Drug & Alcohol Class (M-W-F) Leadership Classes (Tues,Thur,Sat)	Drug & Alcohol Class (M-W-F) Leadership Classes (Tues,Thur,Sat)
1650-1700	COMPANY FORMATION RETREAT COLORS	COMPANY FORMATION RETREAT COLORS
1700-1900	Dinner / Platoon Leaders Time	Dinner / Platoon Leaders Time
1900	Homework/Study Time/Letters in classrooms	Homework/Study Time/Letters in classrooms
1930	ISSUE SNACKS	ISSUE SNACKS
2000	Personal Hygiene/Hygiene Inspection	Personal Hygiene/Hygiene Inspection
2030	Clean Up / Secure platoon area & Equipment	Clean Up / Secure platoon area & Equipment
2100	Final prep for next days training	Final prep for next days training
2130	TAPS	TAPS

COMMANDERS TIME

PLATOON LEADERS TIME

TIME	SENIOR	MIDDLE	JUNIOR	
0830-0930	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	D & C	1. D & C , PRACTICE / TEST
0930-1030	D&C/ ROPES	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	2. REVIEW / EXAMS
1030-1130	COMPUTER LAB	D&C/ROPES	LIFESKILLS	3. TRANSITION GROUP (PHASE II)
				4. UNIFORM- UP KEEP
1230-1330	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	D & C	5. COUNSELING
1330-1430	D&C/ ROPES	LIFESKILLS	COMPUTER LAB	6. MAKE-UP TRAINING
1430-1545	COMPUTER LAB	D&C/ROPES	LIFESKILLS	

WEEKDAY MEAL SCHEDULE

MEAL HOURS:	BRKFST	LUNCH	DINNER
SENIOR:	0700	1130	1700
MIDDLE:	0720	1150	1720
JUNIOR:	0720	1150	1720

NOTE: The Drill Instructor/Recruit Ratio is 1/10 for Security/Safety reasons. All staff members will insure that this standard is maintained. Effective 10 May 99 Life Skills post tests will be scheduled for all recruits in Senior Platoon at 1330 on Monday of graduation week.

SATURDAY TRAINING SCHEDULE

T-1 thru T-60

CURRENT AS OF: July 8, 1999

COMPANY	1st & 2nd SQUADS	3rd & 4th SQUADS
0530	Reveille (Accountability)	Reveille (Accountability)
0530-0600	Wake-up Procedures	Wake-up Procedures
0600-0700	Physical Training / P.T. Recovery	Physical Training / P.T. Recovery
0700-0815	Breakfast / Platoon Leaders Time	Breakfast / Platoon Leaders Time
0815	COMPANY FORMATION POST COLORS	COMPANY FORMATION POST COLORS
0830-	Area Beautification (Grounds Maintenance)	Area Beautification (Grounds Maintenance)
0900	** Community Service (0900-1130- selected recruits)	** Community Service (0900-1130- selected recruits)
1000-1100	(Grass cutting, trimming, weeding - Sweeping- rake sand - all	yard maintenance in general)
1130-1230	Lunch / Platoon Leaders Time	Lunch / Platoon Leaders Time
1230-1530	PLATOON LEADERS TIME	PLATOON LEADERS TIME
1545-1645	Leadership Class	Leadership Class
1700	COMPANY FORMATION - RETREAT COLORS	COMPANY FORMATION - RETREAT COLORS
1700-1900	Dinner / Platoon Leaders Time	Dinner / Platoon Leaders Time
1900	Homework/Study Time/Letters in classrooms	Homework/Study Time/Letters in classrooms
1930	ISSUE SNACKS	ISSUE SNACKS
2000	Personal Hygiene/Hygiene Inspection	Personal Hygiene/Hygiene Inspection
2030	Clean Up/Secure platoon area & Equipment	Clean Up/Secure platoon area & Equipment
2100	Final prep for next days training	Final prep for next days training
2130	TAPS	TAPS

PLATOON LEADERS TIME

1. D & C , PRACTICE / TEST
2. REVIEW / EXAMS
3. TRANSITION GROUP (PHASE II)
4. UNIFORM- UP KEEP
5. COUNSELING
6. MAKE-UP TRAINING

MEAL SCHEDULE

MEAL HOURS: BRKFST LUNCH DINNER

SENIOR: 0700 1130 1700

MIDDLE: 0720 1150 1720

JUNIOR: 0720 1150 1720

NOTE: The Drill Instructor/Recruit Ratio is 1/15 for Security/Safety reasons. All staff members will insure that this standard is maintained.

****COMMUNITY SERVICE:** The duty officer is required to submit recruit names & hours per task to SFC Roque NLT 0900 hrs. on the Monday following their weekend shift.



Youthtrack Academy Referral Information

Referring Probation Officer: _____
 Probation District/County: _____
 Phone Number: _____ Fax Number: _____
 DSS Caseworker Name: _____ Phone Number: _____

Youth Name: _____ Age: _____
 D.O.B.: _____ Ethnic Background: _____ Home Number: _____
 Parents: _____ Work Number: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____
 Height: _____ Weight: _____ Shoe Size: _____ Shirt Size _____
 Adjudication(s)/Offense: _____
 Adj. Date: _____ Date of Sentence to Boot Camp: _____
Reason referred:
 Probation revocation _____
 Alternative 45 Day detention _____
 Alternative to NYC _____

Significant information on case(s): _____

 _____ **Dangerous Y/N** _____

Currently taking medications?: _____ For: _____

*****If Yes, he will need a doctor's note and 60 days worth of medication in order to come to boot camp.**

Prior Medical Injuries/Surgeries: _____

Last School Attended: _____ Grade: _____

Is youth classified as Special Ed? Y/N _____ ***If Yes, forward a current copy of the IEP with referral.**

Is juvenile's language English? Y/N _____ If not what level of English does he speak _____

Issues to be addressed at Boot Camp: (Please mark in numerical order)

Discipline _____ Decision Making _____ Gangs _____ Drug/Alcohol _____ School _____ Job _____

Vocation _____ Other(s) _____

Transition/Aftercare will be: EHM _____ 30-60-90 Day Community Placement _____ SB94 _____

Anger _____ Family Preservation _____ Day Tx _____ Violence Tx _____ Drug/Alcohol _____ Education _____

Vocation _____

Is the Youth currently being detained in a NYC detention facility? Y/N _____ If yes, which facility?

Will he in there until he comes to boot camp? Y/N _____

*****Transportation: Will youth be at the following sites for pick-up in the parking lots:**

Platte 6:00 a.m. _____ Adams 8:00 a.m. _____ Gilliam 9:00 a.m. _____ Mt. View 10:00 a.m. _____

Foote 11:00 a.m. _____ Spring Creek 12:30 p.m. _____ NYC 01:30 p.m. _____

Other(authorized personnel) _____ or be delivered by Parents _____

Youthtrack Academy Use:

Tentative Intake Date: _____

Medical Screening Results: **PASS** _____ **DATE** _____ **FAIL** _____ **DATE** _____

Psych. Screening Results: **PASS** _____ **DATE** _____ **FAIL** _____ **DATE** _____

COLORADO RJTP (BOOT CAMP) INTAKE DATA REQUIRED BY DYC

YOUTH'S NAME: _____

1. **Original Probation Offense:** _____ Felony Misd.
(most serious adjudicated offense resulting in youth's current probation)

2. **What was the RJTP Sentencing Offense?**

Technical Probation Violation Only New Delinquent Offense Plead to Probation

Violation

New Delinquent Offense and Adjudication and Sentence to RJTP.
List Offense: _____ Felony Misd.

Direct Sentence to RJTP as Condition of Probation.
List Offense: _____ Felony Misd.

3. **YOUTH'S LIVING SITUATION PRIOR TO RJTP SENTENCE:**

- Home/both biological parents
- Home/parent/stepparent
- Home/adoptive parents
- Home/one parent
- Other (explain) _____
(Do not include detention)
- Friends/Relatives
- Social Services Placement
- Other Institution (mental health treatment prog., etc.)

4. **NUMBER OF PRIOR OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS** _____ *(Do not include detention).*
(e.g., Social Services placement, institution, other treatment program)

5. **TOTAL NUMBER OF ADJUDICATIONS** _____.

6. **NUMBER OF PRIOR ADJUDICATIONS** _____. *(Do not count sentencing offense as a prior)*

7. **AGE AT FIRST ADJUDICATION** _____ YRS.

8. **MOST SERIOUS PRIOR ADJUDICATED OFFENSE** _____ Felony Misd.
(Do not count sentencing offense as a prior)

9. **Level of Drug/Alcohol Involvement:** LOW MODERATE SEVERE

10. **ISP MATRIX CELL #** _____ **REQUIRED EVEN IF YOUTH IS NOT ISP.**
If Matrix Cell number is not in range of 8 - 16, explain: _____

11. **Currently on Psychotropic Medications:** YES NO

12. **CYOLSI SUBSCALE SCORES*** **DATE OF CYOLSI** _____

_____ Criminal History	_____ Family Problems	_____ Miscellaneous
_____ Substance Abuse	_____ Peer Relations	
_____ Accomodation	_____ Education/Employment	

**OFFICE OF PROBATION SERVICES
AFTERCARE SURVEY**

To be Completed upon Termination of Aftercare Services

Last Name _____ First Name _____ DOB _____ ML # _____
 P.O. Name _____ Judicial District _____
 Date of Bootcamp Graduation _____ Date Aftercare Program Began _____
 Aftercare Program Ended _____ Total Days _____ Successful Aftercare Termination? Yes or No
 If No, give reasons _____

Aftercare Services Received (circle most appropriate level for each service)	None	<1 hr/wk	1-3 hrs/wk	4-6 hrs/wk	>6 hrs/wk	Duration (# of weeks)
Day Reporting/Tracking Services	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Non-Residential Services through Social Services	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Employment Services	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Drug/Alcohol Counseling	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Mental Health Counseling	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Family Counseling	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Skill Building (Cognitive, Anger Management)	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Education (School, GED)	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Community Service	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Day Treatment	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Urinalysis/Breathalyzer Tests (1 test = 1 hour)	N	1	2	3	4	_____
Other _____		1	2	3	4	_____
_____		1	2	3	4	_____

	Completed?	Duration
Out-of-Home Residential Placement	Y or N	Y or N _____
Restriction (EHM, Curfew)	Y or N	Y or N _____
Restitution Monitoring	Y or N	Y or N _____
Vocational Training/Job Corp	Y or N	Y or N _____

During Aftercare Programming: (circle one)

Was youth supervised in _____ Regular Probation or JISP
 If Regular Probation, this was due to _____ Camp Falcon Recommended No JISP Program Appropriate to Risk Level
 JISP Caseloads at Max Other _____

Upon Completion of Aftercare Programming: (circle one)

Probation Status: _____ JISP Regular Probation Successful Sentence Completion Revoked
 Placement: _____ Home Out-of-Home Detention Commitment Other _____

JISP Intake, or most recent, CYO-LSI Subtotals: Assessment Date _____ Criminal History _____
 Substance Abuse _____ Education/Employment _____ Family _____ Peer Relationship _____ Accommodation _____
 Miscellaneous _____ Total Score _____ Rater Box Count _____ Next Scheduled Reassessment _____

Please attach copy of CYO-LSI Score Sheet

Completed by _____ **Date** _____

1st JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=25)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	15 60.0	10 40.0	25 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	0 0	25 100.0	25 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	15 60.0	10 40.0	25 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	18 72.0	7 28.0	25 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	4 16.0	21 84.0	25 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	1 4.0	24 96.0	25 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	18 72.0	7 28.0	25 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Education Services	19 76.0	6 24.0	25 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	4 16.0	21 84.0	25 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	13 52.0	12 48.0	25 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	22 88.0	3 12.0	25 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	1 4.0	24 96.0	25 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	5 20.8	19 79.2	25 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	3 12.5	21 87.5	25 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	3 12.5	21 87.5	25 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

2nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=13)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	5 38.5	8 61.5	13 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	3 23.1	10 76.9	13 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	6 46.2	7 53.8	13 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	10 76.9	3 23.1	13 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	3 23.1	10 76.9	13 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	6 46.2	7 53.8	13 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	3 23.1	10 76.9	13 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	8 61.5	5 38.5	13 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	3 23.1	10 76.9	13 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	4 30.8	9 69.2	13 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	9 69.2	4 30.8	13 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	4 30.8	9 69.2	13 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	8 61.5	5 38.5	13 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	9 69.2	4 30.8	13 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	1 7.7	12 92.3	13 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

4th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=106)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	104 98.1	2 1.9	106 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	5 4.7	101 95.3	106 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	79 74.5	27 25.5	106 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	37 34.9	69 65.1	106 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	7 6.6	99 93.4	106 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	16 15.1	90 84.9	106 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	20 18.9	86 81.1	106 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	58 54.7	48 45.3	106 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	14 13.2	92 86.8	106 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 .9	105 99.1	106 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	78 73.6	28 26.4	106 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	9 8.5	97 91.5	106 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	102 96.2	4 3.8	106 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	84 79.2	22 20.8	106 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	20 18.9	86 81.1	106 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

5th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=17)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	6 35.3	11 64.7	17 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	3 17.6	14 82.4	17 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	5 29.4	12 70.6	17 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	7 41.2	10 58.8	17 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	6 35.3	11 64.7	17 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	5 29.4	12 70.6	17 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	6 35.3	11 64.7	17 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	14 82.4	3 17.6	17 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	7 41.2	10 58.8	17 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	0 0	17 100.0	17 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	15 88.2	2 11.8	17 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	2 11.8	15 88.2	17 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	16 94.1	1 5.9	17 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	12 70.6	5 29.4	17 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	6 35.3	11 64.7	17 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

6th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=9)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	1 11.1	8 88.9	9 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	3 33.3	6 66.7	9 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	9 100.0	0 0	9 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	2 22.2	7 77.8	9 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	3 33.3	6 66.7	9 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	1 11.1	8 88.9	9 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	9 100.0	0 0	9 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	8 88.9	1 11.1	9 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	9 100.0	0 0	9 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	3 33.3	6 66.7	9 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	8 88.9	1 11.1	9 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	5 55.6	4 44.4	9 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

7th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=8)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	2 25.0	6 75.0	8 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	4 50.0	4 50.0	8 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	3 37.5	5 62.5	8 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	6 75.0	2 25.0	8 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	5 62.5	3 37.5	8 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	4 50.0	4 50.0	8 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	4 50.0	4 50.0	8 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	7 87.5	1 12.5	8 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	3 37.5	5 62.5	8 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	0 0	8 100.0	8 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	8 100.0	0 0	8 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	2 28.6	5 71.4	7 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	4 66.7	2 33.3	6 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	5 83.3	1 16.7	6 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

8th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=16)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	2 12.5	14 87.5	16 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	0 0	16 100.0	16 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	3 18.8	13 81.2	16 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	11 68.7	5 31.3	16 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	3 18.8	13 81.2	16 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	5 31.3	11 68.7	16 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	10 62.5	6 37.5	16 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	8 50.0	8 50.0	16 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	4 25.0	12 75.0	16 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	3 18.8	13 81.2	16 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	11 68.7	5 31.3	16 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	0 0	16 100.0	16 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	10 62.5	6 37.5	16 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	8 50.0	8 50.0	16 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	3 18.8	13 81.2	16 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

9th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=13)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	11 84.6	2 15.4	13 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	2 15.4	11 84.6	13 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	1 7.7	12 92.3	13 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	11 84.6	2 15.4	13 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	3 23.1	10 76.9	13 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	4 30.8	9 69.2	13 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	8 61.5	5 38.5	13 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	11 84.6	2 15.4	13 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	0 0	13 100.0	13 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 7.7	12 92.3	13 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	11 84.6	2 15.4	13 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	1 7.7	12 92.3	13 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	12 92.3	1 7.7	13 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	2 15.4	11 84.6	13 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	1 7.7	12 92.3	13 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

10th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=48)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	48 100.0	0 0	48 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	6 12.5	42 87.5	48 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	39 81.3	9 18.7	48 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	21 43.8	27 56.2	48 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	13 27.1	35 72.9	48 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	19 39.6	29 60.4	48 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	18 37.5	30 62.5	48 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	44 91.7	4 8.3	48 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	25 52.1	23 47.9	48 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	2 4.2	46 95.8	48 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	48 100.0	0 0	48 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	4 8.3	44 91.7	48 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	48 100.0	0 0	48 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	0 0	48 100.0	48 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	3 6.3	45 93.2	48 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

11th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=16)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	6 37.5	10 62.5	16 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	4 25.0	12 75.0	16 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	9 56.2	7 43.8	16 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	10 62.5	6 37.5	16 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	7 43.8	9 56.2	16 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	5 31.3	11 68.7	16 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	3 18.8	13 81.2	16 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	12 75.0	4 25.0	16 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	3 18.8	13 81.2	16 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 6.3	15 93.7	16 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	10 62.5	6 37.5	16 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	6 37.5	10 62.5	16 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	10 62.5	6 37.5	16 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	6 37.5	10 62.5	16 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	4 25.0	12 75.0	16 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

12th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=9)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	8 88.9	1 11.1	9 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	2 22.2	7 77.8	9 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	6 66.7	3 33.3	9 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	4 44.4	5 55.6	9 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	4 44.4	5 55.6	9 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	8 88.9	1 11.1	9 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	1 11.1	8 88.9	9 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 11.1	8 88.9	9 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	8 88.9	1 11.1	9 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	5 55.6	4 44.4	9 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	5 55.6	4 44.4	9 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

13th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=20)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	11 55.0	9 45.0	20 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services -- Nonresidential	1 5.0	19 95.0	20 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	7 35.0	13 65.0	20 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	15 75.0	5 25.0	20 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	7 35.0	13 65.0	20 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	8 40.0	12 60.0	20 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	11 55.0	9 45.0	20 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	15 75.0	5 25.0	20 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	10 50.0	10 50.0	20 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 5.0	19 95.0	20 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	18 90.0	2 10.0	20 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	1 5.0	19 95.0	20 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	17 85.0	3 15.0	20 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	13 65.0	7 35.0	20 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	0 0	20 100.0	20 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

14th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=16)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	6 37.5	10 62.5	16 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	5 31.3	11 68.7	16 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	8 50.0	8 50.0	16 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	12 75.0	4 25.0	16 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	11 68.7	5 31.3	16 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	7 43.8	9 56.2	16 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	3 18.8	13 81.2	16 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	9 56.2	7 43.8	16 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	10 62.5	6 37.5	16 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 6.3	15 93.7	16 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	10 62.5	6 37.5	16 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	2 13.3	13 86.7	15 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	10 66.7	5 33.3	15 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	4 40.0	6 60.0	15 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	1 6.7	14 93.3	15 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

15th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=6)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	6 100.0	0 0	6 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	4 66.7	2 33.3	6 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	2 33.3	4 66.7	6 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	5 83.3	1 16.7	6 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	2 33.3	4 66.7	6 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	5 83.3	1 16.7	6 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	4 66.7	2 33.3	6 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	1 16.7	5 83.3	6 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

16th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=5)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	3 60.0	2 40.0	5 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	0 0	5 100.0	5 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	1 20.0	4 80.0	5 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	2 40.0	3 60.0	5 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	0 0	5 100.0	5 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	1 20.0	4 80.0	5 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	2 40.0	3 60.0	5 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	4 80.0	1 20.0	5 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	4 80.0	1 20.0	5 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	0 0	5 100.0	5 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	3 60.0	2 40.0	5 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	0 0	5 100.0	5 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	1 20.0	4 80.0	5 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	3 60.0	2 40.0	5 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	1 20.0	4 80.0	5 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

17th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=9)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	3 33.3	6 66.7	9 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	1 11.1	8 88.9	9 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	3 33.3	6 66.7	9 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	1 11.1	8 88.9	9 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	5 55.6	4 44.4	9 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	1 11.1	8 88.9	9 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	3 33.3	6 66.7	9 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	2 22.2	7 77.8	9 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	8 88.9	1 11.1	9 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	2 22.2	7 77.8	9 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	7 77.8	2 22.2	9 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	6 66.7	3 33.3	9 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	0 0	9 100.0	9 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

18th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=43)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	29 67.4	14 32.6	43 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	3 7.0	40 93.0	43 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	29 67.4	14 32.6	43 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	19 44.2	24 55.8	43 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	20 46.5	23 53.5	43 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	20 46.5	23 53.5	43 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	14 32.6	29 67.4	43 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	30 69.8	13 30.2	43 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	4 9.3	39 90.7	43 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 2.3	42 97.7	43 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	38 88.4	5 11.6	43 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	10 23.3	33 76.7	43 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	31 72.1	12 27.9	43 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	21 48.8	22 51.2	43 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	2 4.7	41 95.3	43 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

19th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=10)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	3 30.0	7 70.0	10 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	1 10.0	9 90.0	10 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	4 40.0	6 60.0	10 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	2 20.0	8 80.0	10 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	3 30.0	7 70.0	10 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	9 90.0	1 10.0	10 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	9 90.0	1 10.0	10 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	7 70.0	3 30.0	10 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	0 0	10 100.0	10 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	0 0	10 100.0	10 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	9 90.0	1 10.0	10 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	1 10.0	9 90.0	10 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	5 50.0	5 50.0	10 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	3 30.0	7 70.0	10 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	1 10.0	9 90.0	10 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

20th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=7)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	2 28.6	5 71.4	7 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	2 28.6	5 71.4	7 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	1 14.3	6 85.7	7 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	3 42.9	4 57.1	7 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	2 28.6	5 71.4	7 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	4 57.1	3 42.9	7 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	7 100.0	0 0	7 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	5 71.4	2 28.6	7 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	1 14.3	6 85.7	7 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	1 14.3	6 85.7	7 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	7 100.0	0 0	7 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	2 28.6	5 71.4	7 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	5 71.4	2 28.6	7 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	1 14.3	6 85.7	7 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	2 28.6	5 71.4	7 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

21st JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=44)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	37 84.1	7 15.9	44 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	3 6.8	41 93.2	44 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	20 45.5	24 54.5	44 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	15 34.1	29 65.9	44 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	6 13.6	38 86.4	44 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	5 11.4	39 88.6	44 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	24 54.5	20 45.5	44 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	15 34.1	29 65.9	44 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	16 36.4	28 63.6	44 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	2 4.5	42 95.5	44 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	34 77.3	10 22.7	44 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	12 27.3	32 72.7	44 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	40 90.9	4 9.1	44 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	26 59.1	18 40.9	44 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	9 20.5	35 79.5	44 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

22nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TYPE OF SERVICE	JUDICIAL DISTRICT			STATEWIDE		
	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=1)	YES	NO	TOTAL (n=441)
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Tracking/ Day Reporting	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	303 68.7	138 31.3	441 100.0
Dept. Social Services – Nonresidential	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	43 9.8	398 90.2	441 100.0
Employment	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	240 54.4	201 45.6	441 100.0
Drug/ Alcohol Counseling	1 100.0	0 0	1 100.0	219 49.7	222 50.3	441 100.0
Mental Health Counseling	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	108 24.5	333 75.5	441 100.0
Family Counseling	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	133 30.2	308 69.8	441 100.0
Skill Building	1 100.0	0 0	1 100.0	164 37.2	277 62.8	441 100.0
Educational Services	1 100.0	0 0	1 100.0	292 66.2	149 33.8	441 100.0
Community Service	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	119 27.0	322 73.0	441 100.0
Day Treatment	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	35 7.9	406 92.1	441 100.0
Urinalysis	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	358 81.2	83 18.8	441 100.0
Out Of Home Placement	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	63 14.4	376 85.6	441 100.0
Restriction - EHM, Curfew	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	350 80.1	87 19.9	441 100.0
Restitution Monitoring	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	222 50.8	215 49.2	441 100.0
Vocational Training	0 0	1 100.0	1 100.0	59 13.5	378 86.5	441 100.0

**DYC OFFICE OF RESEARCH
AND EVALUATION
CAMP FALCON BOOT CAMP
EVALUATION
SIX MONTH FOLLOW-UP**

Last name: «LAST» First name: «FIRST»
 DOB: «DOB» Judicial District: «DISTRICT»
 Boot Camp Graduation Date: «RELDA»
 Aftercare End Date: «ACEND»
 Probation Officer: «POFIRST» «OFFICER»

Services* continued beyond aftercare end date (leave blank if AC has not ended):

- Day Treatment
- Family Counseling
- Mental Health Services
- DSS Non-Residential Services
- Community Service
- EHM
- Day Reporting
- Educational Services
- Employment Services
- Alcohol/Drug Treatment
- Individual Counseling
- Other _____

(*check all services that apply)

Youth's Placement as of «FUDATE» :

- Home Begin: _____ End: _____
- OOH Placement Begin: _____ End: _____
- Detention Begin: _____ End: _____
- DYC Institution Begin: _____ End: _____
- Other Institution Begin: _____ End: _____
- Independent Living Date: _____
- Commitment Date: _____
- Other _____

Youth's Activity as of «FUDATE»:

(if incarcerated, indicate activity & school status at time of arrest)

- GED Classes Employed Job Corps
- Vocational Recreation Other _____

Current or Most Recent School Status: Enrolled/Attending

- Enrolled/Poor Attendance Truant Expelled Dropped Out
- High School Graduate or GED Attained

Youth's Supervision Status as of «FUDATE» (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) :

- JISP Probation Revoked Revoked & Reinstated Since Bootcamp Graduation
- Revocation Pending Successful Probation Completion Unsuccessful Probation Termination

If youth is revoked, revoked reinstated, or pending revocation as of «FUDATE», Please Check Reason:

- Technical Violations New Delinquent Charge

New charges during six-month follow-up period from «RELDA» thru «FUDATE» ?

- Yes No

If Yes, list charge, status, and disposition:

- Charge: _____ Felony Misdemeanor
- Filing/status: Charges Filed No Filing/Pending CASE #, IF KNOWN _____ JD _____
- Disposition: adjudicated convicted deferred adjudication plea bargain _____
- Committed dismissed pending other _____
- Charge: _____ Felony Misdemeanor
- Filing/Status: Charges Filed No Filing/Pending CASE #, IF KNOWN _____ JD _____
- Disposition: adjudicated convicted deferred adjudication plea bargain _____
- Committed dismissed pending other _____

