

**ELECTRONIC MONITORING AT THE  
YOUTH STUDY CENTER:  
AN EVALUATION**



Sidney J. Barthelemy  
Mayor

Alison C. Richards,  
Mayor's Assistant for  
Criminal Justice

Office of Criminal Justice Coordination  
Room 8E11, City Hall  
New Orleans, LA 70112  
(504) 565-7107

1-20-92  
MFI  
132165

ye,

ELECTRONIC MONITORING AT THE  
YOUTH STUDY CENTER:  
AN EVALUATION

Prepared by the  
OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATION

March, 1991

Linda Marye, Evaluator  
Alison C. Richards, Mayor's Assistant for Criminal Justice  
Sidney J. Barthelemy, Mayor

Office of Criminal Justice Coordination  
Room 8E11, City Hall  
New Orleans, LA 70112  
(504) 565-7100

132165

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been  
granted by

Office of Criminal Justice  
Coordination

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	2
METHODOLOGY	7
Research Methods	8
ANALYSIS	9
Participant Characteristics	9
Arrest Histories	11
Time in Program	16
Success Rates	17
Program Violations	20
Participants' Response	22
Trial Outcome	27
Predictors of EM Program Success	27
Arrests after Program	29
NET WIDENING	31
RECOMMENDATIONS	32
APPENDIX	35

## INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the City Charter Section 4-1102, the Youth Study Center under the Department of Welfare was established as the pretrial detention facility for juveniles in New Orleans. In 1985 the facility began experiencing overcrowding. At that time, because of fiscal cutbacks at the state level resulting in resource and staffing problems, the Louisiana Department of Corrections began to delay the acceptance of adjudicated delinquents. Since then the Youth Study Center, designed as a short term holding center for pretrial juveniles, has been used inappropriately as a place of confinement for sentenced juveniles. This use of the YSC clearly has strained the juvenile justice system in New Orleans. Pretrial youth who ordinarily would be detained have been released into the community to await their trials. Many experts believe that these non-confined pretrial youth are responsible for much of the increase in juvenile crime in New Orleans.

Two interim measures have been taken to protect the community. First, the Orleans Parish Criminal Sheriff's Office opened a facility with bedspace for 192 preadjudicated and adjudicated youth, thus relieving some of the overcrowding at the YSC. Second, the Youth Study Center has created an intensive home supervision program for pretrial youth.

The home supervision program has two components. Home Detention, an intensive supervision program, is an extension of the Community Attention Program (hereafter referred to as CAP) first tried in 1981 by the Youth Study Center. Electronic Monitoring (EM) adds computer generated calling and verification equipment to the CAP Home Detention program. The components were funded with separate JJDP grants. The \$90,000 CAP Home Detention grant provided three caseworkers and a supervisor for both programs and the

Electronic Monitoring grant provided \$50,000 for computer and telephone equipment.

Because participants from both programs use the same counselors who follow the same counseling schedule, descriptions of the two components are very similar. Where an activity is specific to the Electronic Monitoring program it will be noted in the program description to follow.

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Participation is voluntary and serves as an alternative to confinement. The following is a list of the admission criteria for the two home detention programs as approved in the grant application:

1. The juvenile must have committed offenses that would be crimes if committed by an adult; i.e., non-status offenders.
2. The juvenile has not committed a crime so serious that he or she poses a threat to the community or to self. Youths charged with homicide, aggravated battery, armed robbery, and rape are excluded from the program.
3. The juvenile has an appropriate home in which he or she can be placed.
4. The youth and parents/guardians must agree to the terms and conditions of the program as outlined in the court order, and in behavior contracts.
5. The youth must agree to daily school or job attendance.
6. The youth must agree to the daily contact/curfew schedule.
7. The judge must determine that detention is necessary before program acceptance.

For EM participants the following additional criteria apply:

8. The family must have a telephone and agree to maintain telephone service. The telephone must not have call forwarding.
9. The family and youth must agree in writing to take financial responsibility for the EM equipment.
10. The family must agree to support the terms and conditions of the program and report any violation to program staff.

Intake procedures are very similar for the two programs. Police officers arrest the youth and determine whether to release or detain him or her according to Article 34 of the Code of Juvenile Procedure. If the youth is to be detained, the YSC is contacted and the youth is transported to the Youth Study Center. At times a juvenile may go directly to the court from the juvenile holding cells in the police department. In those cases, program staff briefly interview the youth at court. A more detailed interview is carried out at the YSC after the detention hearing.

The youth's parents or guardians are notified that the juvenile is being held at the YSC and the following events take place:

1. YSC Central Control completes the usual admittance and preliminary screening forms.
2. Either that day or the following morning program counselors interview the youth at the YSC and make recommendations for secure detention.
3. The YSC Diagnostic Unit's social worker also makes recommendations regarding placement.
4. The juvenile's arrest record is obtained and, if possible, his or her probation officer, contacted.

5. The program staff call the youth's parents or guardians to explain the program. A preliminary judgment is made of their ability to control the youth.
6. Staff discuss the case and make final recommendations.

On the date of the detention hearing, the program worker, juvenile, and his parents or guardians appear in the court. After the judge determines that detention is necessary, the staff recommends home detention if appropriate. If the judge approves home detention, program staff explain legal rights and program expectations to the youth and his or her guardians. The judge, parents/guardians, juvenile, and program worker all sign the detention order.

The youth, parents/guardians, and program worker return to the Youth Study Center immediately after the hearing. They agree on a supervision plan and sign the behavior contract. Staff supply the juvenile and his parents/guardians with a card containing court, office, and home telephone numbers. For EM participants, written and oral instructions on operation of the monitoring equipment are given. A template of the participant's photographic image is made and stored in the computer. This stored image is later compared by the caseworker to the image provided by the participant during random computer calls. For EM participants, a home visit is scheduled within 48 hours of admission to install the equipment and further explain rules and procedures of the program.

After disposition of the case, the youth is released from the program. At the request of the judge, appropriate youth who are awaiting placement following disposition of the case may remain in the program until placement is made. The grant states that all EM placements will be limited to 60 days with

the possibility of one 30 day extension (90 days total) per offense. A 30 day extension would require written judicial approval.

Each counselor has an average of 15 CAP and 10 EM participants at a time. Both EM and CAP participants must keep daily face to face counseling appointments for the first week. After the first eight days the frequency of contact is adjusted to reflect the participant's need for supervision. At a minimum, CAP participants must make daily telephone contact with the program during curfew hours. For EM participants daily telephone contact is computer generated. After the first week, EM participants should receive the following:

- one telephone or personal contact daily from the counselor,
- one weekly contact at the juvenile's home to inspect the equipment,
- one biweekly contact with the juvenile's school or employer,
- one biweekly personal contact with the juvenile's family.

The program decided to use the Mitsubishi Luma Interactive Monitoring System (LIMS) after an extensive study was undertaken of all available options. The monitoring system consists of a computer base station (software, hardware and peripherals) and a Visitel visual telephone display. The base station is located at the YSC. The Visitel displays are connected to the residential telephone in the youth's home. The computer is programmed to call each participant at random or programmed times during the curfew hours set up at the detention hearing. The number of random calls and hours of curfew vary according to the previous juvenile justice history of the youth and his performance in the program. No youth receives fewer than four random calls a day between the hours of seven and midnight. Some are called more often and some have curfew hours that begin immediately after they return from school. If the line is busy or no one answers, the frequency of calls is automatically

increased by the computer. Program counselors may make personal calls at any time as well.

When the youth is called, a computer generated voice asks him or her to sit in front of the Visitel and, on command, push a button on the display. A picture of the individual is then transmitted by telephone to the base station and appears on the video monitor. This picture is then compared with the image stored in the computer's memory.

Several things can be done while the youth is on the telephone to verify that it is in fact a true, immediate image. He may be asked to make certain motions such as to hold up two fingers or touch his nose. He may be asked to speak, or if someone is actually monitoring the calls, the computer can be paused to allow a normal conversation.

Since most of the calls are made after closing hours, the counselors receive a printout of the previous day's calls and the participants' responses each morning. It is their duty to follow up on any problems as soon as possible. The counselor may also call the youth's home, school or employer to check on his activities.

Several problems appeared during program operation requiring a refinement of the process.

- Environmental factors in the participant's homes can interfere with the quality of the transmission. If the Visitel is placed in a dark corner, the image transmitted is not clear enough to verify the youth's presence during the call. Insects, other accidental contaminants, and damage to the cord through daily use can also jeopardize clear transmission.

- A stall time has been programmed into the calling system. At times the computer asked for the juvenile's picture too quickly to allow him or

her to come to the phone; the computer now pauses to allow the juvenile to come to the phone.

-An "operator intercept" message sometimes appears on the printouts indicating that the computer program did not complete its calling sequence.

-If telephone service to the main computer is lost, the whole system is inoperative.

-Participants have moved without informing the program. Not only is this a violation of the terms of their release but recovering the equipment is especially difficult under these circumstances.

#### METHODOLOGY

The original evaluation design called for using random assignment to an experimental and control group of those detained in the Youth Study Center for at least 24 hours to test the following propositions:

- Electronic Monitoring reduces the incidence of crimes committed by participants on in-house arrest.
- Electronic Monitoring reduces the incidence of behavior-related problems while on in-house arrest.
- Electronic Monitoring reduces the rate of no-shows for court appearances.

No true control group for the program was found to adequately measure these goals. As the following analysis shows, the Community Attention Program group was younger and less seriously involved in crime than the EM group. It is easy to understand the court and YSC's reluctance to randomly release juveniles, many of them multiple offenders, into the community with no

stronger supervision than daily counseling contacts. Because the closest program to EM is the CAP program, which is staffed by the same counselors and follows the same counseling schedule, the CAP group is included in most of the following analyses strictly as a comparison group.

#### Research Methods

Records were gathered on all participants of the two programs who entered and completed them between October 1, 1989, and January 31, 1991. Data was collected on dates of entry and exit, reasons for termination, date of birth, race, sex, grade level, previous criminal justice experience, current charge, trial outcome, number of face to face counseling contacts, no shows at court, runaways, and noncompliance with the program. Most of these measures were very straightforward and taken directly from the program face sheet and exit summary.

However, the measurement of noncompliance was not as simple. The program did not record noncompliance incidents routinely unless they resulted in the counselor's recommendation that the participant be terminated. In other words, there was no documentation in the folder of how many times a juvenile received a computer generated call and did not respond or failed to make his counseling appointments. In order to give some idea of the prevalence of these behaviors a count was made of whether or not the juveniles' folder contained either a letter sent to the parents stating that immediate contact needed to be made with the counselor pending termination, or a letter sent to the judge recommending termination, or if in the summary to the judge repeated acts of noncompliance were noted.

Certain anecdotal information was gathered through a sample of exit interviews and computer and counseling records on EM and CAP participants who completed the programs in December. A total of 28 exit interviews were done, twelve on EM participants and sixteen on CAP participants. An additional four EM and CAP participants, still active in December, had computer printouts and counseling records analyzed for evidence of noncompliance and computer malfunction.

Police department records from the Juvenile Division were retrieved to determine the number and most serious charges for arrests that occurred before, during, and after program exit. Seriousness was categorized in one of two ways. One way was to use the most severe sentence that could be given to an adult according to state law as an indication of seriousness. Offenses were grouped into Category I if an adult could be given a life sentence if convicted of them in state court; category II, if an adult could be given 30 years or more; Category III, if an adult could be given 20 to 29 years; Category IV, if an adult could be given 10 to 19 years; Category V, if an adult could be given one to nine years; Category VI for adult misdemeanors; and Category VII for status offenses. Another way was to simply group the charges as violent or property offenses.

In all cases if data was missing from one of the variables being studied the case was excluded from the analysis.

## ANALYSIS

### Participant Characteristics

A total of 127 juveniles completed the EM program and 145 completed the CAP program in the time period studied. As the following tables show the EM

participants were more likely to be male, black, and older than the CAP participants.

Table 1  
Racial Composition

	EM	CAP
Black	123 (98%)	133 (92%)
White	3 (2%)	9 (6%)
Asian	0	2 (1%)
<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1 (1%)</u>
Total	126	145
Unknown	1	0

Table 2  
Sexual Composition

Male	114 (90%)	126 (87%)
<u>Female</u>	<u>12 (10%)</u>	<u>19 (13%)</u>
Total	126	145
Unknown	1	0

Table 3  
Age in Years

	EM	CAP
11 years old	1	1
12 years old	2	6
13 years old	7	22
14 years old	29	25
15 years old	43	43
16 years old	45	45
<u>17 years old</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	127	144
Unknown	0	1

The average age of EM participants was 14.97 years and the CAP participants, was 14.71 years. While differences are slight, the CAP program had a larger proportion of its population 13 years of age and younger.

#### Arrest Histories

The above age differences would suggest that the EM program took more serious offenders. Tabulating the charges for arrests before program entry confirms this finding.

Table 4  
Number of Previous Arrests

	EM	CAP
Average total arrests	2.786	1.683
Median total arrests	2	1
Range for total arrests	0-14	0-13
Average violent previous arrests	0.607	0.222
Median violent previous arrests	0	0
Range for violent previous arrests	0-4	0-2
No previous arrests	20 (18%)	52 (41%)
Unknown previous arrests	15	19

EM participants exceeded CAP participants in both the total number of arrest incidents and the number of arrests for violent crimes before program entry. Over 40% of the CAP group had no previous arrests while this was true for only 18% of the EM group. The following table will look at the seriousness of these previous offenses.

Table 5  
Most Serious Previous Charge

	EM	CAP
Category I*	6 (5%)	3 (2%)
Murder**	3	1
Armed Robbery	2	2
Aggravated Rape	1	0
Category II	6 (5%)	3 (2%)
Aggravated Burglary	3	1
Distribution of Schedule II***	3	2
Category III	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
Aggravated Arson	2	1
Category IV	56 (50%)	49 (39%)
Simple Burglary	21	14
Aggravated Battery	12	7
Theft/Possession	23	26
Forgery	0	1
Carnal Knowledge	0	1
Category V	9 (8%)	6 (5%)
Simple Robbery	3	2
Possession of Schedule II	2	1
Simple Criminal Damage	1	0
Weapon Offenses	3	3
Category VI	10 (9%)	9 (7%)
Category VII	3 (3%)	3 (2%)
None	20 (18%)	52 (41%)
Total	112 (100%)	126 (100%)
Unknown	15	19

\* Category I=life sentences, Category II=30 years or more, Category III=20 to 29 years, Category IV=10 to 19 years, Category V=1 to 9 years, Category VI=misdemeanors, and Category VII=status offenses.

\*\* Usually attempted murder.

\*\*\* Schedule II Narcotics in these cases were almost invariably cocaine and crack.

For every category of offense, the EM group's arrest history was more serious. Another way of looking at seriousness of charge is to compare the

number of violent and property crimes for the two groups. By this measure, 29% of the EM group and 14% of the CAP group's most serious previous offense was violent. One half of the EM group and 42% of the CAP group's most serious previous offense was a property crime. By any measure, then, the EM group was more seriously involved in crime before program entry than the CAP group. The number of participants in each program with experience in other court ordered sanctions strengthens this conclusion.

Table 6

Experience with Other Sanctions\*

	EM	CAP
Louisiana Training Institute	5	2
Held at YSC for part of sentence	3	1
Supervised Probation	44	24
Special Programs	4	2
Non-secure detention	1	0

\*Some people may have experience with more than one of these sanctions.

When the seriousness of the current charge which resulted in their placement in one of these two programs is viewed alone, the differences in the EM and CAP participants are not as apparent.

Table 7  
Seriousness of Current Charge

	EM	CAP
Category I*	8 (6%)	5 (3%)
Murder**	2	1
Armed Robbery	3	4
Aggravated Rape	3	0
Category II	15 (12%)	13 (9%)
Aggravated Burglary	0	1
Distribution Schedule II	15	12
Category IV	66 (52%)	87 (60%)
Aggravated Crime Against Nature	1	0
Simple Burglary	13	26
Theft/Possession	42	47
Sexual Battery	1	0
Aggravated Battery	9	14
Category V	31 (24%)	35 (24%)
Simple Robbery	4	2
Simple Kidnapping	0	1
Possession Schedule II	13	8
Negligent Homicide	1	0
Weapons Offenses	13	21
Simple Criminal Damage	0	3
Category VI	7 (6%)	5 (3%)
Total	127 (100%)	145 (100%)
* See footnote Table 5.		
** Attempted		

Thus, while more EM participants had offenses which could have led to capital or life sentences, they also had more misdemeanors. Dividing the charges into violent versus property is a little more revealing. By this categorization, 24% of the EM group's charges were violent versus only 19% of the CAP group's. Nevertheless, looking at the current charge alone does not clearly delineate the groups.

It is important to note that accepted into both programs were three youths accused of attempted murder, seven accused of armed robbery, three

accused of aggravated rape, and 23 accused of aggravated battery. Thirteen percent of the participants were technically ineligible for either home detention program according to the selection criteria stated in the grant. These exceptions were made at the judges' request.

A number of factors interfere with a strict adherence to placement and termination criteria. One of the major factors is the amount of bedspace available. Rather than release a potentially more dangerous offender from detention, the judge may opt to place or keep a noncompliant participant in the program where they receive at least some supervision.

#### Time in Program

The EM participants spent slightly less time in the program than did the CAP participants.

Table 8

#### Time in Program

	EM	CAP
0 to 7 days	10	14
8 to 14 days	6	8
15 to 21 days	8	5
22 to 29 days	8	6
Less than 1 month	32 (27%)	33 (25%)
1 to 2 months	30 (25%)	38 (29%)
2 to 3 months	35 (29%)	27 (20%)
3 to 7 months	22 (18%)	35 (27%)
Unknown	8	12
Average length of stay	1.67 mos.	1.73 mos.

The major difference is in the juveniles held for 3 months and over. Twenty seven percent (27%) of the CAP participants were held for that long versus only 18% of the EM participants. Program guidelines in the grant stated that no EM participant was to be held longer than 90 days. Once again this lengthy stay was due to judicial discretion.

EM and CAP participants had very similar frequencies of contact with their counselors. For the EM program, the average frequency was 5.86 face to face visits over the program; for the CAP program, the average frequency was 6.19 face to face contacts.

#### Success Rates

Table 9 shows the number of successful versus unsuccessful participants for CAP and EM programs.

Table 9		
Exit Condition		
	EM	CAP
Successful	90 (75%)	114 (85%)
Unsuccessful	30 (25%)	20 (15%)
Unknown	7	11
Total	127	145

While 85% of the CAP participants successfully completed the program, only 75% of the EM participants did so. Because participants were not randomly assigned to the two groups, how much of this difference is due to programmatic factors cannot be determined.

Table 10

## Reason for Unsuccessful Termination

	EM	CAP
Rearrest	15 (50%)	10 (50%)
Noncompliance	8 (27%)	8 (40%)
Runaway	4 (13%)	1 (5%)
No show at court	0	1 (5%)
Phone disconnected	1 (3%)	0
Over one reason	2 (7%)	0
Unknown	7	11

Table 10 lists the reasons given for unsuccessfully terminating participants. In both programs, the most common reason given was being arrested while on the program. The proportions are identical, one half of those in both CAP and EM were terminated for this reason. The only reasons for termination in which the EM participants exceeded the CAP participants were running away before the trial, and the multiple reasons group.

Table 11

## Disposition for Unsuccessful Terminations

	EM	CAP
Detained locally	14 (74%)	10 (77%)
CAP program	3 (16%)	0
EM	0	1 (8%)
LTI	1 (5%)	0
Custody of parents	0	1 (8%)
Warrant	1 (5%)	1 (8%)
Unknown	11	7

In most cases, the folder did not show what happened after the participant was unsuccessfully terminated. When the judge makes this decision, program involvement ceases. Twenty six or 30% of the participants who successfully completed the program had a letter to the judge recommending termination, a letter to the parents warning of a possible termination, or a mention on the case summary that the juvenile had repeated incidents of noncompliance with program policies, but nothing was done to place the juvenile in a more secure environment.

### Program Violations

Over 30% of the EM participants were arrested while in the program. Twelve participants who successfully completed the program or 15% of the successful completions were arrested but not terminated from the program. Officers in the Juvenile Division reported that they had no way of knowing whether an arrested juvenile was in EM or not. Apparently program participants do not always carry the cards they are given at intake. If the person was released before being processed at the Youth Study Center, it would be possible for the program not to learn of the arrest. The number of arrest incidents while in the program is shown in the following table.

Table 12

#### During Program Arrest Incidents

	EM	CAP
None	86 (75%)	106 (82%)
One	21 (18%)	17 (13%)
Two	6 (5%)	3 (2%)
<u>Three through six</u>	<u>1 (1%)</u>	<u>2 (2%)</u>
Total	114 (100%)	128 (100%)
Unknown	13	17

In most cases, the charges for which the EM group were arrested were more serious than those of the CAP group. The next table lists the charges.

Table 13  
Seriousness of During Program Arrests

	EM	CAP
Category I*	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Armed Robbery	1	2
Category II	3 (3%)	1 (1%)
Distribution of Schedule II	3	1
Category IV	14 (12%)	11 (9%)
Simple Burglary	4	2
Theft/Possession	8	9
Aggravated Battery	2	0
Category V	4 (4%)	1 (1%)
Simple Robbery	1	0
Possession Schedule II	1	0
Weapon	2	0
Simple Criminal Damage	0	1
Category VI	5 (4%)	3 (2%)
Category VII	1 (1%)	3 (2%)
None	86 (75%)	106 (83%)
Total	114 (100%)	127 (100%)
Unknown	13	18

\* See footnote Table 5.

Seventy percent (70%) of the violent offenses and 57% of the property offenses were committed by EM participants.

Certain program violations were noted in the record. If the counselor stated that the juvenile failed to appear for a hearing (no show) or ran away from home, it was counted. Also counted were letters to guardians and the court. The following table gives a breakdown of the number of cases in which these problems occurred.

Table 14  
Program Violations

	EM	CAP
No show at court	3	2
Runaway	6	1
Other program violation	38	29

In general the EM participants violated the conditions of their program more often than did the CAP participants.

Participants' Response

Two exit interview questionnaires were administered to the parents of the participants. (Copies appear in the appendix.) Although the questions differed, both were rated on a five point scale with five being the most satisfactory response. Average scores are given in the table to follow.

Table 15  
Satisfaction with the Program

	EM	CAP
5-question Instrument	3.84 (N=5)	3.82 (N=6)
7-question Instrument	3.25 (N=7)	2.79 (N=10)

These findings are extremely tentative because of the small number of participants responding. Nevertheless, the scores indicate overall moderate satisfaction with the program.

It was difficult to reconstruct computerized calling records from the printout furnished by LIMS alone. If a participant responded vocally after

the Visitel failed to get an image, it may have been counted as noncompliant. Some computer malfunctions may have been recorded as noncompliant incidents as well. It is also impossible to know which of the participants' reasons for noncompliance were considered acceptable by the counselors.

With this in mind, the following results are displayed along with counseling notes and when available parents/guardians comments on the juveniles' participation as given in the exit interviews.

Table 16  
EM Computer Log

<u>Exit Status</u>	<u>No. of Calls</u>	<u>No. Noncompliant</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Successful	160	71 (44%)	On 5 noncompliant occasions the participant had counseling visits.
Successful	164	81 (49%)	No comments
Successful	124	50 (40%)	On 8 noncompliant occasions the participant had counseling visits.
Successful	24	2 (8%)	No comments
Successful	110	38 (35%)	The computer was malfunctional for 2 days. Parent stated that when the juvenile went to church the counselor would call to verify his activities.
Successful	106	50 (47%)	The computer was malfunctional for 7 days. Record shows a home visit was scheduled to verify juvenile's presence. Parent stated that juveniles left only when supervised

Successful 63 23 (37%)

by an adult and the juvenile informed the counselor of his whereabouts.

At least 7 of the non-compliant incidents were due to telephone problems. Participant was transferred to CAP.

Successful 132 66 (50%)

The computer was malfunctioning for 2 days. On 3 noncompliant occasions the participant had counseling visits. Noncompliance was noted in the record.

Successful 208 120 (58%)

Participant missed 3 counseling sessions. Moved to grandmother's after mother was hospitalized. Was on runaway status for a day. Parent stated that juvenile continually left during curfew. Felt the idea of telephone monitoring was ridiculous.

Successful 97 64 (66%)

Participant was on runaway status for 4 days and spent 6 days in the YSC because of rearrests. Counselor requested termination but the juvenile was transferred to CAP when his residential phone was disconnected.

The following participants were still active in the program when the data were gathered so are not a part of other analyses.

- 256 53 (21%)

Had excuses for most of noncompliant incidents. Was away from home with a parent.

-	450	128 (28%)	Had excuses for most of noncompliant incidents. Computer malfunctioned for 6 days.
-	285	84 (29%)	Had excuses for most of noncompliant incidents. On 5 occasions stated he was at girlfriend's house.

The fact that the excuses are recorded shows that the counselors did follow up on most noncompliant incidents. It is interesting to note, however, that for these 13 cases, four experienced computer malfunctions and one, telephone problems. This record shows in one case that the counselor scheduled a home visit after a particularly long series of computer problems. It is also interesting that in the cases of the participants most in violation of the program, there is evidence that the counselor either tried to detain the juvenile, made repeated attempts to contact them, or noted noncompliance in the record. Overall these participants failed to answer 38% of their calls.

The record of the CAP participants is very different. In the first place, they had fewer calls, and second, more of them were terminated from the program.

Table 17

CAP Counseling Log

<u>Exit Status</u>	<u>No. of Calls</u>	<u>No. Noncompliant</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Successful	11	1 (9%)	Late for one curfew. Record shows 1 during program arrest.
Successful	9	0	No comments.

Successful	13	0	Terminated from the program for noncompliance.
Successful	10	0	Admitted to New Orleans Adolescent Hospital.
Successful	13	0	No comments.
Successful	17	0	Twice rescheduled appointments.
Successful	10	0	No comments.
Successful	7	0	No comments.
Successful	6	0	No comments.
Unsuccessful	13	0	Terminated for rearrest.
Unsuccessful	14	0	Terminated for rearrest.
Unsuccessful	7	2 (29%)	Failed to call in on weekends. Terminated for rearrest.

The following were still in the program when data were collected and are excluded from other analyses.

-	4	0	No comments.
-	14	0	No comments.
-	13	0	No comments.
-	7	2 (29%)	Participant's phone was disconnected.

Two CAP participants were rearrested although no noncompliant incidents were noted. Because for EM participants the number of missed telephone calls increased when they were rearrested or ran away, electronic monitoring does seem to be a more reliable indicator of the participants' acceptance of the conditions of their release than counselor contact alone.

### Trial Outcome

Information about the outcome of the trial was not always available. It was rarely recorded when the participant was unsuccessfully terminated from the caseload, because in these cases, the counselors had no further contact with the juveniles. In both programs, for those participants for whom data is available, approximately three-fourths were found guilty. Of those found guilty 73% of the EM and 88% of the CAP participants received sentences of probation. Nine EM and two CAP participants were sentenced to LTI.

### Predictors of EM Program Success

An attempt was made to find predictors of success for EM participants. The factors most predictive of success seemed to be time in program, age, and previous arrests.

The most optimum time to spend in the program appears to be between 30 and 60 days. The following table indicates that most who fail the program do so in the first month. Another large group of program failures stayed between 60 and 90 days. There were so few participants who stayed longer that further analysis is impossible.

Table 18

	Time in Program by Exit Condition		
	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
Less than 1 month	22 (65%)	12 (35%)	34 (100%)
One to two months	24 (86%)	4 (14%)	28 (100%)
Two to three months	25 (71%)	10 (29%)	35 (100%)
Three to four months	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	13 (100%)
Four months and over	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	9 (100%)

Those 16 and over seem to be at higher risk of failing to complete the program. The following table shows the relationship between age and program success.

Table 19

Age by Exit Condition

	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
11 years old	1 (100%)	0 (-)	1 (100%)
12 years old	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
13 years old	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	6 (100%)
14 years old	23 (92%)	2 (8%)	25 (100%)
15 years old	33 (77%)	10 (23%)	43 (100%)
16 years old	27 (63%)	16 (37%)	43 (100%)

Thirty seven percent of the sixteen year-olds did not successfully complete the program.

The number of previous arrests also seemed predictive as the following table shows.

Table 20

## Number of Previous Offenses by Exit Condition

	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
None	16 (89%)	2 (11%)	18 (100%)
1 to 3 arrests	40 (80%)	10 (20%)	50 (100%)
4 to 6 arrests	17 (65%)	9 (35%)	26 (100%)
7 to 9 arrests	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	8 (100%)
10 and over	0 (-)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)

For the successful participants, 73% had three or fewer arrests. Only 44% of the unsuccessful participants did so. In fact twenty three percent of the unsuccessful participants had over seven arrests and an additional third of them had four to six arrests.

Arrests after the Program

Although reducing recidivism was not a goal of the program, arrests during the relatively brief period after participants completed the program were analyzed to see what effects the program might have had. Thirty eight percent (38%) of the EM participants and 29% of the CAP participants have been rearrested. The following table tabulates the seriousness of their crimes.

Table 21

## Seriousness of After Program Arrests

	EM	CAP
Category I*	10 (9%)	5 (4%)
Murder**	7	4
Armed Robbery	3	1
Category II	6 (5%)	4 (3%)
Distribution of Schedule II	6	4
Category IV	13 (12%)	16 (13%)
Extortion	0	1
Aggravated Crime against Nature	0	2
Simple Burglary	3	2
Aggravated Battery	2	4
Theft/Possession	8	7
Category V	4 (4%)	1 (1%)
Weapon	3	1
Simple Criminal Damage	1	0
Category VI	3 (3%)	7 (6%)
Category VII	7 (6%)	3 (2%)
No after offenses	69 (62%)	90 (71%)
Total	112 (100%)	126 (100%)
Unknown	15	19

\*See footnote Table 5

\*\*Usually attempted murder

## NET WIDENING

The issue of net widening is important to the facilities considering electronic monitoring. Is the program accepting juveniles who would not ordinarily be detained? The Youth Study Center introduced into their selection criteria the condition that the judge must first determine that detention is required before the decision is made to place a juvenile in the program. The following table shows that the secure detention population has not declined as a result of the EM program. In fact, the secure detention population almost doubled in 1990 and the CAP program expanded by 29%. The secure detention population is increasing so rapidly that no experimental first year program could hope to impact it substantially. Some of the factors that affect the secure detention population in New Orleans are: 1) juvenile crime, 2) judicial attitudes towards sentencing, 3) the availability of bedspace and staff, and 4) the number of adjudicated delinquents held locally.

Table 22

### Caseloads in Secure and Home Detention

	1989	1990	%Change
Secure Detention	418	823	+97%
CAP	377	485	+29%
<u>EM</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>106</u>	*
Total	803	1414	+76%

\*Program became operational in November, 1989.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the juvenile detention system in New Orleans is dependent upon the availability of bedspace, many of the recommendations to follow require the cooperation of the NOPD Juvenile Division, Juvenile Court, the Criminal Sheriff's Office and the Youth Study Center. Although this evaluation was designed to assess the effectiveness of EM for the entire state, local factors mentioned above undoubtedly affect many of the recommendations. Detention programs in other parts of the state will have to be tailored to their local conditions.

Solutions that might seem ideal under conditions of plentiful detention space may not be practical under the realities of constraint. For example, under ideal conditions the program would be able to immediately detain a participant if they were rearrested or otherwise failed to comply with program conditions. Realistically, detaining such a juvenile might mean releasing a potentially more dangerous offender. These realities have been taken into account in making these recommendations.

1. Greater cooperation between the program and the Juvenile Division must be initiated. The program needs to give the Juvenile Division a list of names and birthdates of those currently being supervised by CAP and EM. Likewise, if a program participant is arrested, the program needs to be notified before some other disposition is made. The planned SHOCAP (Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program), may be a good forum for this cooperative tracking.

2. At one time juveniles could be securely detained on the authority of the CAP counselors alone. When bedspace became limited, the procedure was changed. Now a warrant must be obtained from a judge to arrest the juvenile and bring him or her to the YSC. To issue such a warrant the judge needs to have clear documentation of noncompliance. To fulfill this requirement, the program must routinely document noncompliant incidents and their responses to them. Toward the end of the evaluation period, a system for doing this was being tested. The refined procedure should be shared with other jurisdictions contemplating electronic monitoring. (See appendix.)

3. Telephone, hardware, or software problems can interrupt the continuous monitoring of participants. Program staff need to be notified as soon as possible when the monitoring system breaks down so that extraordinary measures can be undertaken to contact their clients. These measures should be documented in the absence of the normal computer printout.

As the program now operates, no one regularly checks the LIMS outside regular working hours. An on-call rotation system needs to be devised in which staff members take turns coming in to check that the system is operational and that juveniles are remaining compliant with program guidelines, especially during holidays. Written procedures need to be developed for how the on-call staff member responds to system malfunctions or repeated lack of response to the monitor.

4. Electronic monitoring seems to be a more reliable form of tracking juveniles than counseling contacts alone. Noncompliance is more easily documented; activities are more closely supervised. However, if a youth is noncompliant and bedspace is not available, the program has no option but to continue monitoring the juvenile and hope for the best. Another option that could be added to the program for those juveniles who are noncompliant or who are too dangerous for telephone monitoring alone is an active system such as wristlets or anklets. These transmit a signal to a home unit connected to the program's main computer. When the juvenile leaves the transmission area, a signal is sent that contact has been broken. Immediate steps can be taken to find the youth. These devices have the additional deterrent effect of identifying the individual to the police as a program participant.
5. The section on netwidening pointed out an alarming increase in the number of juveniles being detained. While electronic monitoring alone cannot be responsible for this increase, a study needs to be undertaken to learn what factors are involved. The OCJC proposes to take a comprehensive look at the juvenile justice system to include the numbers of juveniles being arrested, the seriousness of their offenses, the range of options available to the judges, numbers of adjudicated delinquents being held locally, and the impact of increased bedspace. Only such a system-wide approach can lead to effective planning.

**APPENDIX**

CLIENT'S PERSONAL SOCIAL SATISFACTION WITH COUNSELING

DATE OF INTERVIEW \_\_\_\_\_

DATE ENTER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE EXIT \_\_\_\_\_

CLIENT CASENUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

Please read each of the following questions carefully and circle the response for each one that most neatly reflects your honest opinion.

1. How much help did you get with your concern?
  1. None
  2. A little
  3. Some
  4. Much
  5. All I needed
2. How satisfied are you with the relationship with your counselor?
  1. Not at all
  2. Slightly
  3. Some
  4. Pretty well
  5. Completely
3. How much help have you received with concerns other than your original reasons for entering counseling?
  1. None
  2. Little
  3. Some
  4. Much
  5. All I needed
4. How do you feel now compared to when you first came to counseling?
  1. Much worse
  2. A little worse
  3. The same
  4. Quite a bit
  5. Greatly
5. How much has counseling helped you in understanding yourself?
  1. None
  2. A little
  3. Moderately
  4. Quite a bit
  5. Greatly
6. How willing would you be to return to your counselor if you wanted help with another concern?
  1. Unwilling
  2. Reluctant
  3. Slightly
  4. Moderately
  5. Very willing
7. How willing would you be to recommend your counselor to one of your friends?
  1. Unwilling
  2. Reluctant
  3. Slightly
  4. Moderately
  5. Very willing

Exit Interview

For participants and family members. Changes for family members in parentheses.

ID# \_\_\_\_\_

Date Entered \_\_\_\_\_ Date Exited \_\_\_\_\_

1. Have you (Has your child) ever been arrested before? yes  
How many times? 1
2. If arrested, have you (has your child) ever been held in the Youth Study Center? NO  
How many times? N/A  
For how long? N/A
3. Were you (Was your child) ever in home detention before? NO  
How many times? N/A  
For how long? N/A
4. Were you (Was your child) ever put on probation before? NO  
How many times? N/A  
For how long? N/A
5. Were you (Was your child) ever incarcerated before? NO  
How many times? N/A  
For how long? N/A

6. How satisfied were you with the EM/CAP program? (Circle one.)

(5)

4

3

2

1

Very Satisfied   Satisfied   Neutral   Unsatisfied   Very Unsatisfied

7. How satisfied were you that your counselor (your child's) had your (his or her) best interest at heart?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Unsatisfied Very Unsatisfied

8. How satisfied were you with the telephone calls and visits to see if you were (your child was) at home?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Unsatisfied Very Unsatisfied

9. How satisfied are you that the program helped you (your child) get along better with your family?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Unsatisfied Very Unsatisfied

10. How satisfied are you that the program helped you (your child) do better in school?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Satisfied Satisfied Neutral Unsatisfied Very Unsatisfied

11. Please feel free to comment on any part of the program you particularly liked or disliked.

*appreciated the help.*

For EM participants only:

1. How often did you (your child) leave your home during curfew hours? *left only for school, CAP appts. or with parents.*

2. Did the program call for you (your child) while you were (he or she was) out? *sometimes when youth was at football practice*

DATE:

NAME:

TELEPHONE#:

=====CALLING INFORMATION=====

MONDAY

TIME

\*CALLS

=====

TUESDAY 10-16-90

INTAKE SESSION

WEDNESDAY 10-17-90

R-8 House Arrest  
All calls answered

Install Monitor

9:30 am - 10:30 pm.

THURSDAY 10-18-90

3 pm compl. / attending session ysc 2nd session

FRIDAY 10-19-90

4 pm compl. / attending session at ysc

SATURDAY 10-20-90

2 pm compl. / with Parents

SUNDAY 10-21-90

5 pm compl. / with Parents / church

TOTAL # OF CALLS:

40;

\*NON-COMPLIANCE:

14