



**JUVENILE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROBATION PILOT PROJECT**

**PHASE ONE STUDY**

**In Compliance With House Bill 91-1145**

**Prepared for the Colorado Judicial Department  
January 1993**

**Colorado Department of Public Safety**

**Division of Criminal Justice  
Office of Research and Statistics**

**141475**

141475

# JUVENILE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROBATION PILOT PROJECT

## PHASE ONE STUDY

JANUARY 1993

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

141475

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  
Colorado Department of Public  
Safety

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Bill Woodward, Director  
Division of Criminal Justice  
Colorado Department of Public Safety

Kim English, Research Director  
DCJ Office of Research and Statistics

*This research was funded by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. We would like to thank the Colorado Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council for its support of this project.*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This analyses indicates the goals of the Phase One implementation process for JISP are being met overall. The JISP youth appear more serious than the probation cases and more similar to the DOI placements. However, the analyses revealed a need for programs that target at least five particular types of delinquent groups, and these groups do not systematically fall within current programming options. This results derive from the grid which weights most heavily need factors, and these need factors tend describe nearly all youth in the juvenile justice system. From these Phase One findings, we recommend expanded JISP programming, and the further development of identification tools to objectively link placement decisions with appropriately designed interventions. The Phase Two study will focus on service delivery and will obtain case file data that may assist in the development of classification/programming tools.

This study describes nearly 400 juvenile cases processed in six Colorado judicial districts in late summer and early fall, 1992. The districts were pilot sites for juvenile intensive supervision probation (JISP) programs established in compliance with House Bill 91-1145. The purpose of this research was to describe the juveniles and the placement decision-making processes. In particular, we sought to (1) document the extent to which juveniles placed in the pilot programs met the Judicial Department's *JISP Program Guidelines*, and (2) describe differences among youth placed in JISP, regular probation and those receiving sentences to the Department of Institution placements.

## FINDINGS

***Who are youth receiving JISP placement recommendations? Do they resemble regular probation placements or DOI cases?***

- Youth placed in all three placement categories are similar across ethnicity, current offense classification, and DYS Grid Classification. Almost three-fourths of the nearly 400 cases studied had no history of prior felony or misdemeanor adjudication.
- JISP placements were significantly more likely to be on revocation status compared to DOI or probation.
- JISP and DOI cases were not significantly different on the following factors: current age, age at first arrest, prior criminal history, prior out-of-home placements, prior alcohol/drug problems, risk scores and needs scores. Probationers, in contrast, were considerably different on each of these characteristics compared to JISP and DOI.

- Over eighty juveniles met JISP referral criteria but were refused placement because the programs were at capacity. These "over-capacity" youth have slightly higher criminal history scores compared to regular probationers.

***Do JISP cases meet the Judicial Department's Program Guidelines criteria?***

- The process by which youth are referred to JISP followed the Program Guidelines.
- One of the placement criteria requires the use of the DYS classification grid and, as is detailed later in this report, the grid does not adequately discriminate among youth placed by juvenile courts. The vast majority of cases in our study (nearly nine out of 10) qualified for JISP placement by meeting the grid criterion, indicating the need for refinement or replacement of this tool as a placement guide.
- The referral criteria which divert the most cases from institutionalization to JISP are those regarding alternatives to revocation and detention center placement. JISP receives nearly half of these referrals. We recommend the referral criteria emphasize these cases for JISP placements.

***Does the judge follow the recommendations of the local JISP screening committee?***

- The judge followed the recommendation of the screening committees in 97.3% of the cases.
- 84 juveniles in this study were rejected for JISP placement by the screening committee because the program was full. The vast majority of these children (70 youth) were placed on probation, although the criminal history of these "overflow" cases tended to be more serious than the non-overflow probationers.

***Since the program is in its early stages, can we describe the juveniles in a meaningful way that might assist future program development?***

- Criminal history is the strongest predictor of case placement. This single focus, while consistent with the philosophical orientation of the juvenile justice system, may result in a lack of "matching" placement options with childrens' particular needs.
- Using a statistical procedure called factor analysis, we identified several categories of children that suggest the need for specific program development, regardless of adjudicated placement:
  1. Group One: High needs, runaway history, out-of-home placement history, no criminal history.
  2. Group Two: Nonviolent property offenders with no criminal history.

3. Group Three: Young age at first arrest, prior felony history
4. Group Four: On revocation status, prior misdemeanor adjudications, no prior felonies.
5. Group Five: Drug offenders, no or minor criminal history.

Although youth falling into Groups Three and Four are likely to receive JISP placements, the important finding is that these groups are not systematically receiving particular placements. Overall, however, these five categories of children are found throughout the placement options.

## INTRODUCTION

### Intensive Supervision Programs

Intensive supervision probation (ISP) programs have become widely used in the United States in the last decade. These programs are structured the way probation was originally conceived; that is, before caseloads of more than 100 or 200 offenders became commonplace. Intensive supervision programs usually limit caseloads to 25 offenders or less; require frequent face-to-face and telephone contacts between the supervising officer and the offender; include regular collateral communications between the officer and the employer, parents and other "significant contacts." These programs often require regular drug testing, electronic monitoring, and other special surveillance techniques, coupled with relevant treatment requirements such as drug/alcohol abuse education, personal counseling, life skills courses, hygiene education, vocational training, financial or marriage counseling, and so on.

These programs seem to be supported by a wide range of policy makers, for the surveillance emphasizes public safety and the treatment suggests the hope of rehabilitation. Both of these common justice system goals can be, in theory, achieved in residential or lock-down correctional settings, but ISP promises to address risk and rehabilitation with less costly measures. This is particularly important in the juvenile justice system where, compared to the adult system, the emphasis on rehabilitation and deinstitutionalization remains strong.

The study reported here focuses on a sample of Colorado youth who were recently adjudicated delinquent and for whom effective, fiscally conservative programs such as juvenile intensive supervision probation (JISP) are imperative. In Colorado, the annual cost of incarcerating a juvenile delinquent in the Department of Institutions ranges from \$35,000 to \$60,000 annually compared to approximately \$3,500 for placements in intensive probation supervision.

In a recent review of the literature of empirical studies of intensive supervision programs, Richard Wiebush<sup>1</sup> notes the popularity of ISP nationwide. Mirroring concerns in Colorado, Wiebush suggests that such favor stems from the potential cost savings associated

---

<sup>1</sup> Wiebush, Richard G., "Juvenile Intensive Supervision: The Impact on Felony Offenders Diverted From Institutional Placement," in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 39, No. 1, January 1993, pp. 68-89.

with the program,<sup>2</sup> plus the emphasis of control combined with the traditional juvenile justice concerns of rehabilitation.<sup>3</sup> His review of empirical findings concludes:

A series of studies from the 1970s and early 1980s has resulted in the widespread view that well-structured alternative programs for juveniles can produce recidivism results comparable to those obtained through incarceration, and do so at a much lower cost... (Wiebush, 1993:69).

## Context of the Present Research

The Colorado General Assembly passed House Bill 1145 in 1991, creating a pilot Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP) in several judicial districts. A budget/hiring freeze delayed implementation of the pilot projects for nearly one year. This report reflects the findings of an initial process evaluation of the pilot projects. Specifically, we explored whether JISP clients appear to have been diverted from institutional placement and the extent to which the referral criteria, defined in the legislation, were followed in the selection of program participants.

*The Colorado General Assembly passed House Bill 1145 in 1991, creating a pilot Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP) in several judicial districts. This report reflects the findings of an initial process evaluation of the pilot projects.*

This report is organized as follows: we first describe the context in which the JISP pilot projects were implemented, and briefly review relevant previous studies. Next, we present the research methods, and describe both Phase One and Phase Two of the study. We then report the research findings comparing, in particular, the characteristics of children participating in JISP programs with those placed in regular probation and the Department of Institutions (DOI).

## Background of the Study

According to a recent state Division of Youth Services report,<sup>4</sup> nearly 20% of Colorado youth between the ages of 12 and 17 (estimated by the state demographer's office

---

<sup>2</sup> Krisberg, Barry, et al, "Demonstration of Post-Adjudication Non-residential Intensive Supervision Programs: Assessment Report," National Council on Crime and Delinquency, San Francisco, 1989.

<sup>3</sup> See Edmund F. McGarrell's "Differential Effects of Juvenile Justice Reform on Incarceration Rates of the States," in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 37, No. 3, 1991 pp. 262-280; Armstrong, Troy, "National Survey of Juvenile Intensive Probation Supervision, Parts I and II," Criminal Justice Abstracts, Vol. 2, 1988, pp. 342-348, 497-523; Wiebush, Richard G. and Donna M. Hamparian, "Variations in 'Doing' Juvenile Intensive Supervision: Programmatic Issues in Four Ohio Jurisdictions," in Intensive Interventions with High-Risk Youth: Promising Approaches in Juvenile Probation and Parole, edited by T. Armstrong, Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, NY, 1991.

<sup>4</sup> Management Reference Manual: PH 1991-92, prepared by the Planning and Evaluation Unit, Division of Youth Services, Department of Institutions, October 1992, p. 5.

to be 274,075) incurred their first arrest in FY 1991-92 (54,626 arrests from a population of 274,075). Less than 5% of this "at-risk" population (i.e., the age group within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court) were filed-on in juvenile court, and approximately half of these received probation placements. Only .2% of the 274,075 (607 cases) received a court commitment to a juvenile institution.

While nearly one-fifth of Colorado youth experience an arrest, a considerably smaller proportion are actually processed through the juvenile justice system and placed under formal probation supervision or in residential settings. Nevertheless, youth in this small group are usually in need of a variety of surveillance and/or programming services, ranging from electronic monitoring to life skills and health education. These services and programs are provided at escalating costs to the taxpayers.

Researchers' best estimates of the number of children who will need such services in the future are hardly comforting. Projections of Colorado's juvenile detention and commitment populations, released last spring,<sup>5</sup> indicate that increases of more than 25% are expected over the next five years:

Table One  
Five-Year Projections of Colorado's  
Juvenile Detention and Commitment Average Daily Populations

Projection Year	Detention Average Daily Population	Commitment Average Daily Population	Total Average Daily Population
1993	377	681	1058
1994	405	719	1124
1995	435	758	1193
1996	467	797	1264
1997	501	838	1339

From: Mary Mande and Claus Tjaden, Projections Consultants, April 6, 1992 (See footnote 5 for full citation).

<sup>5</sup> Memorandum from Mary J. Mande Consulting Services and Claus Tjaden to Jerry Adamek (Director of Division of Youth Services), dated April 6, 1992.



Despite the fact that this startling growth (Table One) is a decrease over recent years,<sup>6</sup> concerns over managing this population is driven by at least three factors:

1. *Fiscal Restraint*: As with most states, funding for Colorado's juvenile justice system competes with funding for education, highways and other public concerns. Further, a recent tax limitation referendum, passed in the last general election, strictly restricts the growth of government. Accommodating the increased number of youth requiring justice services has become increasingly difficult.

2. *Youth Needs*: The Division of Youth Services is committed to providing "a statewide continuum of services and programs to assess, treat, and control youths placed in its care..." and "to recognize and address the needs of youths through effective programming."<sup>7</sup> Further, the Colorado Judicial Department, Office of the State Court Administrator, has supported local jurisdictions in pioneering youth programming, such as cognitive skills building programs.

3. *Appropriate Resource Allocation and Public Safety*: The General Assembly, in Senate Bill 91-94, declared that

...state funding for youth services is fragmented...and leads to a situation of cost unpredictability. The General Assembly finds that an especially volatile situation involves services and programs for troubled youth. The current system of funding such services and programs can discourage the use of the most appropriate placement and may encourage inappropriate placement of juveniles in the custody of the Department of Institutions. Moreover, there is a need to consider local options and early intervention as alternatives to expensive building and maintenance of facilities.

It was in this context that the General Assembly passed House Bill 1145 in 1991. This legislation authorized the Judicial Department to develop pilot JISP projects in up to seven jurisdictions. The two-year pilot programs were required to be located in communities where juvenile detention facilities were located.

To emphasize the issues of fiscal restraint and resource allocation the General Assembly, in HB 91-1145, transferred funds from the Department of Institutions for the purpose of providing youth treatment services and nonresidential program services.

---

<sup>6</sup> The expected increase reflected in Table One is significantly lower than the increases experienced by the Division of Youth Services between 1988 and 1991. The average daily population (ADP) of children in detention increased 67%, and the ADP of children committed to the Division increased by half (Mande and Tjaden, April, 1992).

<sup>7</sup> Management Reference Manual, FY 1991-92, Division of Youth Services, 1992, p.i.

## Purpose of JISP Project

### PILOT PROJECT

#### Goals and Objectives

The Juvenile ISP pilot project, administered by the state Judicial Department and implemented by local probation departments, was developed to "provide an additional sentencing option for adjudicated delinquent youth who present a high risk of future placement within correctional or residential facilities."<sup>8</sup>

*The ISP pilot project was developed to "provide an additional sentencing option for adjudicated delinquent youth who present a high risk of future placement within correctional or residential facilities."*

Specific objectives for the pilot project, described on pages 2 and 3 of the *JISP Program Guidelines* document produced by the Judicial Department, are outlined below. Emphasis has been added to factors that are particularly relevant to this report.

1. To improve the delivery of services to delinquent youth through the coordinated efforts of state and local agencies.
2. To develop and implement ***objective criteria which identify youth presenting a high risk of future incarceration*** within the Department of Institutions. Criteria will be developed cooperatively with the Division of Youth Services and the Division of Criminal Justice and will be subsequently validated.
3. To provide increased supervision and appropriate services to youth whose prior conduct and service needs would ***otherwise be considered for placement within a residential or correctional facility***, as determined by the approved criteria.
4. To provide comprehensive, standardized assessment of service needs, including drug and alcohol use; educational, employment and literacy skills; family and individual treatment needs.
5. To provide programming in seven judicial districts which ***reduces the utilization of juvenile detention centers*** for punitive sanctions. Specifically pilot sites

---

<sup>8</sup> Colorado Judicial Department, *Program Guidelines: Juvenile Intensive Supervision Pilot Program*, no date.

designating specific counties within that site, shall reduce the [maximum 45-day detention<sup>9</sup>] length of stay for sentenced youth. Baseline measures shall be established for each detention facility and designated counties.

6. ***To provide an alternative means of sanctioning probation violations.*** Pilot sites will reduce the admission and/or length of stay for youth held for violating conditions of probation. Each District shall specifically target reductions based on existing baseline measures.

### Procedures for Placement

Pilot programs were limited to 15 juveniles for each participating jurisdiction. For each adjudicated delinquent, pilot programs are required to complete a Presentence Investigation Worksheet and a JISP Selection Worksheet. Cases would be considered for JISP placement if the juvenile met one or more of the following criteria:

***Pilot programs were limited to 15 juveniles for each participating jurisdiction.***

1. To be recommended at presentence for commitment to DOI or for sentencing to a detention facility.
2. Pending revocation for probation violations, the officer is considering commitment, further detainment or placement within the Department of Social Services (DSS).
3. The case falls in one of the "secure placement" cells or an adjacent cell on the DYS "Commitment Classification Instrument" (the "risk-severity" grid).
4. Placement in a detention center on a probation violation, exceeding 72 hours.

Cases meeting at least one of the above criteria are then referred to a local screening board for referral to JISP placement. When the screening board rejects for JISP referral cases

---

<sup>9</sup> According to the state Judicial Department, the average length of stay of cases receiving this sanction is approximately 14 days.

that meet the program referral criteria, the screening board must document the rejection reason.

According to the *JISP Program Guidelines*, each screening board is chaired by the Chief Probation Officer or designee and may include representatives from other community agencies according to local needs. The screening board then makes case recommendations to the juvenile court judge, who is authorized to accept or reject the recommendation.

Descriptions of the JISP program are located elsewhere (in particular, the Judicial Department's *JISP Program Guidelines*). These will be of future research interest during the Phase Two JISP study and so will not be reported here.

## PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

### Phase One

The purpose of this study is to: (1) describe the youth placed in the five program options targeted in this study: probation, probation with other services (social service intervention, private out-of-home placement, and family programs), juvenile ISP and commitment to DOI; (2) describe, within the limits of the available data, the decision making process by which children are referred into programs; and (3) assess the extent to which the JISP program met the goal of reducing the use of detention facilities<sup>10</sup> by referring to the program youth who meet the criteria outlined above .

In general, the Phase-One study examines the "front end" of the JISP program implementation. The specific research questions addressed are:

1. Who are the youth receiving JISP placement recommendations? Do they resemble regular probation placements (which would be evidence of net-widening)? Do they resemble DOI cases (which would suggest diversion)?
2. Do these youth meet the *JISP Program Guidelines* criteria? Does a single criterion drive placements in JISP?
3. Does the judge follow the recommendations of the screening committees or are "overrides" common?
4. Since the program is in its early stages, can we describe the juveniles in meaningful ways that might assist future program development?

---

<sup>10</sup> The Phase-Two Study, to be completed between January 1 and September 30, 1993, will explore the extent to which the JISP program is providing increased supervision and appropriate services to high risk youth.

## Phase Two

Although the Phase Two segment of this study does not begin for several weeks, it is helpful to understand the focus of this component since Phase One leaves many process questions unanswered. While Phase One targets the referral process and the characteristics of juveniles in the five placement options, Phase Two will involve data collected on-site by Division of Criminal Justice researchers. Data will be gathered directly from the case management files of a sample of the cases studied in Phase One. The Phase Two study, which will be undertaken between January and September 1993, will explore the extent to which services, programming and monitoring occurs in each sample case, and this will be compared across placements. The focus will be the programming--frequency and type of contacts, in particular--reported in case files, drug testing, program violations and responses to the violations.

*Although the Phase Two segment of this study does not begin for several weeks, it will explore the extent to which services, programming and monitoring occurs in each sample case, and this will be compared across placements.*

A discussion of the research methods used to conduct the Phase One study and analysis follows.

## RESEARCH METHODS

### The Sample

Referral and placement data were collected by probation officers and forwarded to the Division of Criminal Justice for data entry and analysis (Appendix One contains the data collection forms). In particular, data from the Program Selection and Program Referral and Sentence Worksheets were necessary to meet the study objectives (discussed above).

Data for the 398 study cases, described in Table One by judicial district and demographic characteristics, were obtained by first collecting data on all youth adjudicated in the study districts between July and November, 1992. Because case data became available in three separate phases (juvenile characteristics including referral criteria, committee recommendations, and finally, court order), complete data are not available on all 398

*Because case data became available in three separate phases, complete data are not available on all 398 cases in the study sample at this writing.*

cases in the study sample at this writing.<sup>11</sup> Table Two reflects the number of cases in each study district.

**TABLE TWO**  
**Juvenile ISP Survey**  
**Demographics by Type of Placement**

	Type of Placement											
	ISP		DOI		Probation		Probation Plus		Jail			
<b>JUDICIAL DISTRICT</b>												
Jefferson	22.2%	16	17.6%	6	31.0%	76	25.0%	10	7.7%	1	27.0%	109
Denver	18.1%	13	47.1%	16	33.9%	83	47.5%	19	69.2%	9	34.7%	140
El Paso	26.4%	19	11.8%	4	15.9%	39	10.0%	4	.0%	0	16.3%	66
Adams	9.7%	7	5.9%	2	4.9%	12	7.5%	3	7.7%	1	6.2%	25
Arapahoe	22.2%	16	8.8%	3	5.7%	14	10.0%	4	15.4%	2	9.7%	39
Mesa	1.4%	1	8.8%	3	8.6%	21	.0%	0	.0%	0	6.2%	25
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	239	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	398

**\*Type of Placement:**

ISP is Intensive Supervision Probation.

DOI is Department of Institutions or other secure placement.

PROBATION is regular probation.

PROBATION PLUS is probation with special court ordered conditions, such as social services intervention, private out-of-home placement, family therapy, etc.

JAIL is a court sentence to the county jail or state prison for longer than two weeks.

The sampling objective was to obtain 15 JISP youth from each of the study sites. This objective was met in just half the sites. We will obtain complete case data from these sites within the next few months (see Footnote 11). Meanwhile, there are a total of 72 JISP cases with complete data from the study districts, and this number is sufficient for the present analysis. All placement cases are combined across judicial districts in the analyses presented later in this report. Table Three profiles the sample on demographic characteristics.

*It is important to note that these data are not analyzed by district. The demographic variation across the sites participating in this pilot study accounts for most of the differences.*

<sup>11</sup> There are two primary reasons for incomplete data on study cases: (1) cases have been initiated (screened, for example) but a court decision is pending, and (2) some cases were missing one or two of the three-phase data segments.

It is important to note that these data are not analyzed by district. The demographic variation across the sites participating in this pilot study accounts for most of the differences. Separating out district variation was beyond the scope of this project, but it is important to remember these differences when comparing specific programs.

**TABLE THREE**  
**Demographics by Type of Placement**

Characteristics	Type of Placement										Total Sample	
	ISP		DOI		Probation		Probation Plus		Jail			
<b>AGE</b>												
Mean	15.28		15.71		14.87		14.83		18.15		15.16	
Standard dev.	1.49		1.51		1.84		1.65		0.69		1.82	
Median	16.00		16.00		15.00		14.00		18.00		15.00	
<b>ACTUAL AGE</b>												
10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.8%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.5%	2
11	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.4%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.5%	6
12	2.8%	2	2.9%	1	6.9%	17	5.0%	2	0.0%	0	5.4%	22
13	6.9%	5	5.9%	2	11.0%	27	17.5%	7	0.0%	0	10.1%	41
14	15.3%	11	14.7%	5	24.9%	61	30.0%	12	0.0%	0	22.0%	89
15	22.2%	16	14.7%	5	14.3%	35	12.5%	5	0.0%	0	15.1%	61
16	20.8%	15	23.5%	8	19.2%	47	10.0%	4	0.0%	0	18.3%	74
17	27.8%	20	32.4%	11	12.7%	31	22.5%	9	7.7%	1	17.8%	72
18	2.8%	2	5.9%	2	6.9%	17	2.5%	1	76.9%	10	7.9%	32
19	1.4%	1	0.0%	0	.4%	1	0.0%	0	7.7%	1	.7%	3
20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.4%	1	0.0%	0	7.7%	1	.5%	2
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%		100.0%	404
<b>GENDER</b>												
Male	81.9%	59	100.0%	34	86.1%	211	87.5%	35	84.6%	11	86.6%	350
Female	18.1%	13	0.0%	0	13.9%	34	12.5%	5	15.4%	2	13.4%	54
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	404
<b>ETHNICITY</b>												
White	52.8%	38	38.2%	13	50.2%	120	47.5%	19	46.2%	6	49.2%	196
Black	16.7%	12	29.4%	10	16.7%	40	15.4%	8	15.4%	2	18.1%	72
Hispanic	23.5%	17	29.4%	10	26.4%	63	38.5%	10	38.5%	5	26.4%	105
Native American	2.8%	2	0.0%	0	.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.8%	3
Asian	1.4%	1	0.0%	0	1.3%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.0%	4
Other	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.8%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.5%	2
Multi-racial	2.8%	2	2.9%	1	4.2%	10	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	4.0%	16
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	404

## The Data Analysis

Five placement options were available for analysis: JISP, DOI, Probation, "Probation Plus," which includes social services or other types of court ordered intervention, and "other," which we found included only juveniles placed in jail or prison. However, the focus of this study is differences among youth placed in JISP, DOI and regular probation, and this information is provided in the findings section below. Thus, the detailed descriptions of youth receiving the five placements is available in Appendix Two.

*The focus of this study is differences among youth placed in JISP, DOI and regular probation.*

To address the specific research questions outlined above, descriptive statistics were obtained to profile the characteristics of youth referred to each placement and to examine the basic relationships between the referral criteria and program placement. Bivariate analyses, such as chi-square tests and correlations, were used to examine differences in nominal- and ordinal-level variables; ordinal-level variables, such as age and risk score<sup>12</sup>, were examined using analysis of variance techniques. Based on findings obtained from the correlation coefficients, factor analysis was used to explain underlying constructs or "factors" that explain the correlations among the sample characteristics. That is, observed correlations--for example, between placement and case characteristics, are the result of shared characteristics that reflect underlying attributes.

*Descriptive statistics were obtained to profile the characteristics of youth referred to each placement.*

## FINDINGS

### Research Questions:

1. *Who are the youth receiving JISP placement recommendations? Do they resemble regular probation placements (which would be evidence of net-widening)? Do they resemble DOI cases (which would suggest diversion)?*

---

<sup>12</sup> Appendix Three contains the risk and needs classification instruments.



**Summary:** Overall, youth in all three placement categories are similar across ethnicity, Offense Severity Factor Scores (from the DYS grid) and current offense classification<sup>13</sup>.

Furthermore, JISP and DOI placements are similar on several factors important to placement decisions (indicated by bullets in Figure One), while probationers are statistically significantly different from both the JISP and DOI groups. Importantly, JISP placements were significantly more likely to be on revocation status compared to DOI or probation (this issue is discussed further under Research Question 3).

*JISP placements were significantly more likely to be on revocation status compared to DOI or probation.*

### *Risk, Needs and Criminal History*

JISP youth had, on average, risk, needs and criminal history scores which fell above the average for the delinquent population overall, and which fell between DOI and Probation placements. JISP scores were significantly higher than probation and significantly lower than DOI

for these two scores. Youth placed in JISP have criminal history records which are significantly higher than probationers, but there is no difference between JISP and DOI placements on this factor. Table Four presents this information.

*Youth placed in JISP have criminal history records which are significantly higher than probationers, but there is no difference between JISP and DOI placements on this factor.*

<sup>13</sup> Although there were no statistical differences (i.e., differences not found by chance alone) in current offense seriousness across all placement types studied, there were proportional differences that describe placement differences. Importantly, a slightly larger proportion of JISP placements had a current serious offense compared to DOI placements (30.6% and 23.5%, respectively). Additionally, 29.2% of JISP cases had a serious property instant offense compared to 20.6% of DOI.

FIGURE ONE

Group Profile Descriptions

PLACEMENT FACTORS	DOI	JISP	PROBATION
Current Age	•	•	younger
Ethnicity	•	•	•
Gender	more boys	•	•
Age at First Arrest	•	•	•
Current Offense	•	•	•
Grid Severity	•	•	•
Prior Misdemeanors	•	•	least
Prior Felonies	most		least
Runaway/Out-of-home Placement	•	•	least
Recidivism Factor	•	•	lowest
Prior Alcohol/Drug Referral	•	•	lowest
Risk Score	•	•	lowest
Needs Score	•	•	lowest
Revocation		most	least

NOTE: • indicates NO statistical differences across programs.

TABLE FOUR

Comparison of Risk, Needs and Criminal History  
Across Placement Categories

Scores	DOI	JISP	Probation	Total Juvenile Population
Average Risk Score	19.88	17.00	12.32	14.52
Average Needs Score	25.06	21.61	16.21	18.84
Average Criminal History Score*	1.38	.71	.12	.43

\*An index to describe criminal history was created by multiplying the number of prior felony adjudications by a factor of one (x 1.5) and the number of prior misdemeanors by .5 (x .5).

Regarding criminal history, almost three-fourths of the juvenile population did not have any history of prior misdemeanors or felonies. Nearly half of the JISP placements have a criminal history compared to two-thirds of DOI youth and 11 % of probation placements.

*Almost three-fourths of the juvenile population did not have any history of prior misdemeanors or felonies.*

The difference between ISP and Probation is statistically significant; the difference between JISP and DOI is not. This indicates that juveniles receiving JISP and DOI placements had similar proportions of first time offenders, and that JISP and DOI have a smaller proportion of first-time offenders compared to probationers. Specific criminal history information is presented in Table Five.

TABLE FIVE

Criminal History Across Placement Categories

Criminal History	DOI	ISP	Probation	Total Juvenile Population
Percent with NO Criminal History	35.3%	48.6%	88.6%	72.0%
Mean number of Prior Misdemeanors	.21	.23	.06	.11
Mean Number of Prior Felonies	1.38	.71	.12	.43

*Social Needs History*

The availability of data pertaining to social needs was limited in this phase of the study to (1) prior out of home placements, (2) runaway history, and (3) drug or alcohol referrals. In this data set, one-fourth of both JISP and DOI have no history of social needs, compared with nearly half of the probationers (see Table Six). JISP children had more runaways than any other placement group and is significantly higher than DOI. JISP clients recorded fewer out-of-home placements than DOI. Finally, ISP and DOI placement categories have equal proportions of people with prior drug or alcohol referrals.

TABLE SIX

## Social Needs Characteristics Across Placement Categories

Social Needs History Variables	DOI	ISP	Probation	Total Juvenile Population
Percent with Prior Drug/Alcohol Referrals	44.1%	40.3%	14.3%	23.5%
Runaway History	47.1%	61.1%	33.1%	44.1%
Prior Out-Of-Home Placement	55.9%	44.4%	25.7%	37.1%
Percent with NONE of the Above Characteristics	26.5	25.0	49.0	38.4

*Current Offense and Status*

No statistical differences were found across placement types and the type of offense based on person, property or drug crimes. It is possible that a new set of categories are needed to provide insight into placement criteria. For example, the new criteria might isolate the most common juvenile offenses (such as auto theft) and also distinguish the type of person crime, such as a sex crime versus assault. Exploring these issues should be the subject of future research.

*JISP Overflow Cases*

Over eighty juveniles met JISP referral criteria but were refused placement because the programs were at capacity. These juveniles had higher criminal history scores<sup>14</sup> (average CH score: .34) than those rejected and placed in regular probation (average CH score: .11) and lower scores than those rejected because their risk score was too high (average CH score: 1.45). Also, findings indicate that overflow youth were more likely than probationers to have at least one prior felony adjudication (48.6% had priors) compared to 11.4% of probationers.

**2. Do these youth meet the JISP Program Guidelines criteria? Does a single criterion drive placements in JISP?**

<sup>14</sup> An index to describe criminal history was created by multiplying the number of prior felony adjudications by a factor of one (x 1) and the number of prior misdemeanors by .5 (x .5). Only one case had a petty offense history, so this item was not included in the CH score index.

**Summary:** Overall, the process by which children are referred to JISP follows the *Program Guidelines*. The referral criteria which appear to divert the most cases to JISP are those pending revocation and detention center placement. ISP receives nearly half of these referrals (40% of pending revocations and 46.1% of potential detention center placements). However, these two referral types rarely occur. Only 13 youth were in detention centers and 45 had pending revocations.

Figure Two reviews the eligibility criteria and the extent to which these criteria are met when recommending youth for JISP.

The single criterion that drives ISP placement based on current program guidelines is the grid: of the 72 juveniles in ISP, 43.1% were placed only because they met the grid criterion. Specifically, 86.5% of the study group met the JISP grid referral criteria, indicating that nearly 9 out of 10 children will be qualified for JISP according to the grid.

The use of the *DYS grid*, in which the vertical axis is the Offense Severity Score and the horizontal axis is the Recidivism Factor Score (see Figure Two), reflects a classification method that is heavily weighted on need factors rather than current offense or criminal history. The offense severity score, which is the vertical axis, is the same, on average, for all juvenile placements (5.0). This leaves the recidivism factor score to determine grid placement. But the recidivism factor score is weighted heavily on need characteristics (see Appendix Three).

FIGURE TWO

ELIGIBILITY CRITERION	FINDINGS
A. To be recommended at presentence for commitment to DOI or for sentencing to a detention facility.	Yes. 18.6% were recommended for commitment to DOI (this is significantly higher than the proportion of juveniles placed on regular probation -- 10.6%). 97.1% of JISP placements were recommended for JISP at presentence.
B. Pending revocation for probation violations, the officer is considering commitment, further detainment, or placement within the Department of Social Services (DSS).	Yes. 30.5% of JISP cases were pending revocation compared to 6.7% of probation cases and 16.7% of DOI cases.
C. The case falls in one of the "secure placement" cells or an adjacent cell on the DYS "Commitment Classification Instrument" (the "risk-severity" grid).	Yes. 82.6% of the total sample fell into the grid eligibility cells: 76.3% of the JISP cases were referred primarily because of grid eligibility.
D. Placement in a detention center on a probation violation, exceeding 72 hours.	Yes. 46.1% of JISP cases were referred to JISP because of this criterion compared to 7.7% of DOI commitments and 23.1% of probation placements.

The research literature (see Elliott, *Multiple Problem Youth*, 1989) indicates that children who are clients of the juvenile justice system are exceptionally needy. The recidivism factor scores in this sample (which is mostly a *needs* score based on runaway history, out-of-home placement and drug/alcohol history) confirms this because the average score for JISP and DOI are the same as for the entire sample. Probation cases score, on average, slightly lower and the difference is not statistically significant.

*The research literature (see Elliott, Multiple Problem Youth, 1989) indicates that children who are clients of the juvenile justice system are exceptionally needy.*

Therefore, the grid does not discriminate among the children in this sample because it is heavily weighted on need characteristics, and all the children in the sample receive similar scores. That is, the children in this study are similar to each other in terms of social needs.

*The grid does not discriminate among the children in this sample because it is heavily weighted on need characteristics, and the children in this study are similar to each other in terms of social needs.*

FIGURE THREE: DYS GRID

Offense Severity Factor	8 or more	16	17	18	19	20
	3-7	11	12	13	14	15
	1-2	6	7	8	9	10
	0	1	2	3	4	5
		1-3	4-7	8-10	11-12	13-14
		Recidivism Factor				

Shade = ISP Qualified

In sum, our data indicate that the *DYS grid* may not be a useful tool for differentiating among youth for placement decisions because:

- 86.5% of the total sample--and 97.1% of the JISP group--fell within the qualifying cells of the grid. This means that the grid may not be refined enough to identify specific youth who might benefit most from JISP.
- The offense severity factor is the same, on average, for children receiving all five placement types.
- The recidivism factor score is the only dimension to determine eligibility for JISP. This score has little variation among placement types because the score is weighted heavily on needs, and the research literature indicates all juveniles delinquents are needy.

**3. *Does the judge follow the recommendations of the screening committees or are "overrides" common?***

The judge followed the recommendation of the screening committees 97.3% of the time. Although qualified for JISP placement, 84 juveniles in this study were rejected for ISP placement because the program was full. The question, then, is where were the ISP overcapacity cases placed? A vast majority of these children were placed on regular probation (83.4%, or 70 youth); 9.5% (8 cases) were ordered to DOI and one case (1.2%) was placed in jail. Five children (5.9%) of the overflow group received probation plus specific court orders for additional interventions.

**4. *Since the program is in its early stages, can we describe the juveniles in meaningful ways that might assist future program development?***

#### *Factor Analyses*

Factor analysis was used to identify underlying dimensions that divide the juvenile sample into six groups or categories. Five categories described by the factor analysis were

found to "group" statistically. Figure Four reflects preliminary findings describing five distinct groups of youthful offenders.

**FIGURE FOUR**

**Groups of Juveniles with Common Characteristics  
Determined Statistically with Factor Analysis**

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
High need score	Property offenders	Young age at 1st arrest	Revocation status	Drug offenders
High risk score	Not violent	Prior felony history	Prior misdemeanor history	Minor/no criminal history
Runaway history	NO criminal History		NO prior felonies	
Out-of-home placement history				
NO criminal History				

This preliminary classification model, developed to further describe the youth in the JISP study, accounted for over 75% of the variance in the groupings, meaning that 25% of the cases could not be classified because they did not resemble any of the five categories. This "unclassified group" represented 106 juveniles. The cases in this group, while not similar enough to each other to become a statistically valid category, tended to have no criminal history, but, more than 30% had a violent instant offense. For purposes of further investigation, we called these cases "group six" and placed them in Table Seven below.



TABLE SEVEN

## Factor Groupings by Type of Placement

SIX FACTOR GROUPINGS							
PLACEMENT TYPE	NO CRIMINAL HISTORY			PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY			NUMBER OF YOUTH
	Group 1: High Needs	Group 2: Property Offenders	Group 6: Statistically Unclassified	Group 3: Prior Felony History	Group 4: Prior Misd. History	Group 5: Drug Offenders	
ISP	19.5%	6.7%	12.3%	30.6%	42.9%	14.3%	69
PROBATION	53.2	86.2	76.4	20.5	42.9	71.4	234
PROBATION AND COURT ORDERS	10.2	1.1	5.7	17.9	9.5	7.1	38
DOI	6.5	3.4	2.8	25.6	4.8	7.1	33
JAIL	2.6	2.2	2.8	5.1	0.0	0.0	11
TOTAL YOUTH	77	89	106	78	21	14	385
TOTAL PERCENT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table Seven describes where the six groups of youth were actually placed. Since criminal history is the strongest predictor of case placement (and current offense does not guide placement), the table is organized to depict--in the first three columns of data--the groups without criminal history. The next three data columns reflect the factor groups controlling for criminal history.

Important distinctions in placement decisions and offender profiles can be seen in Table Seven, but it is important to note that, because regular probation does not have a finite number of beds or slots (and can expand), the majority of nearly all the factor groupings are placed on probation. Of particular interest, however, is that more than half (53.2%) of "Group 1: High Needs" were placed on probation. Almost nine of 10 (86.5%) of the property offenders also received probation placements.

Almost one-third (30.8%) of the prior felony group were placed in JISP and, combined, more than one-third were either sentenced to probation or probation plus additional court orders. One-fourth were placed in DOI, indicating that some of the DOI children are likely being diverted to ISP, but program staff should attempt to increase this process.

The majority of "Group 4: Prior Misdemeanor" were placed in either JISP or Probation. For this group, JISP more resembles a severe probation placement, and not enough a DOI diversion placement.

### *Discriminant Analyses*

The following items, ranked according to importance, appear to drive juvenile placement decisions in this study:

1. Number of prior felony adjudications
2. Risk score (which weights heavily social needs items)
3. Runaway history
4. Current revocation status
5. Prior alcohol or drug treatment referral
6. Serious violent current offense
7. Prior out-of-home placement

Specifically, the following characteristics, obtained from discriminant analyses, appear to drive the three placement decisions:

FIGURE FIVE

Factors Found to be Statistically Significant in  
Predicting Placement

PROBATION	JISP	DOI
Serious current offense	Serious current offense	Serious current offense
Mean Criminal History Score*: .12	Mean Criminal History Score: .71	Mean Criminal History Score: 1.4
not likely to have been placed outside the home or prior runaway status	Likely to be on revocation status	Likely to be on revocation status

\* See footnote 13 for description of criminal history score.

We suggest further research that assists in the integration of placement decisions with the youth "grouping," as described above. This would maximize resource allocation and the potential for positive client outcomes.

## **SUMMARY**

This analyses indicates that the goals of the Phase One implementation process for JISP are being met overall. The JISP youth appear more serious than the probation cases and more similar to the DOI placements. However, the analyses revealed a need for programs that target at least five particular types of delinquent groups, and these groups do not systematically fall within current programming options. This results from heavy reliance on the grid which weights most heavily need factors, and these need factors tend describe nearly all youth in the juvenile justice system. From these Phase One findings, we recommend expanded JISP programming, and the further development of identification tools to objectively link placement decisions with appropriately designed interventions. The Phase Two study will focus on service delivery and will obtain case file data that may assist in the development of classification/programming tools.

## **Appendix One**

### **Referral and Placement Data Form**



# COLORADO JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT JUVENILE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROBATION PROGRAM SELECTION WORKSHEET

**2. OFFENSE SEVERITY FACTOR (Vertical Axis):** Determine the classification of the most serious charge of conviction and the associated weight by utilizing the tables provided in the PROGRAM SELECTION WORKSHEET INSTRUCTIONS. Identify the appropriate vertical cell. Enter the score in the appropriate space below the grid.

**3. GRID CELL PLACEMENT:** Plot the intersection of Item #1 and Item #2. Complete the grid cell information in the appropriate space below the grid.

Offense Severity Factor	8 or more	16	17	18	19	20
	3-7	11	12	13	14	15
	1-2	6	7	8	9	10
	0	1	2	3	4	5
		1-3	4-7	8-10	11-12	13-14
		Recidivism Factor				

Recidivism Factor \_\_\_\_\_ Offense Severity Factor \_\_\_\_\_ Cell Number \_\_\_\_\_

**4. REFERRAL FOR J.I.S.P. REVIEW:** According to the selection criteria established by the Judicial Department Juvenile Intensive Supervision Guidelines, Section IV (C), the following criteria for referral must be utilized. Complete the referral worksheet and process according to local district procedures.

Please indicate all categories which apply to this case.

- ☐ a. Any juvenile to be recommended at presentence phase for commitment to the Department of Institutions or for sentencing to a juvenile detention center.
- ☐ b. Any juvenile pending revocation for probation violations, in which the officer is considering commitment, further detainment or placement within the Department of Social Services.
- ☐ c. Any juvenile whose placement in the selection worksheet, falls in the secure placement region or cells adjacent to the separating line.
- ☐ d. Any juvenile placed in a detention center on a probation violation exceeding 72 hours.
- ☐ e. None of the above, case not referred for I.S.P. Screening.

**COLORADO JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT  
JUVENILE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROBATION  
PROGRAM REFERRAL AND SENTENCE WORKSHEET**

**PART I. DEMOGRAPHICS**

Judicial District \_\_\_\_\_ Case # \_\_\_\_\_ P.O. Initials \_\_\_\_\_

Juvenile's Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Last, First M.I.

Referral Type: \_\_\_\_\_ a. Presentence/ in Custody c. Revocation/ in Custody  
b. Presentence/ not in Custody d. Revocation/ not in Custody

**PART II. BOARD REVIEW:**

1. Review Decision: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Rejection Reason: \_\_\_\_\_

- a. Accepted
- b. Rejected (complete #2)
- c. Accepted with conditions (see comments)

- a. Low risk factor, regular probation
- b. High risk factor, recommend D.Y.S.
- c. Recommend Dept. of Social Services
- d. Other (see comments)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Review Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**PART III. ACTUAL SENTENCE**

This section shall be completed on all cases actually referred and screened for J.I.S.P. Please check all appropriate items.

\_\_\_ 1. Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation

- \_\_\_ a. Home Detention \_\_\_\_\_ (Days Ordered)
- \_\_\_ b. Electronic Home Monitoring \_\_\_\_\_ (Days Ordered)
- \_\_\_ c. Detention Sentence \_\_\_\_\_ (Days Ordered)
- \_\_\_ d. Drug Testing
- \_\_\_ e. Individual mental health evaluation or treatment
- \_\_\_ f. Family services
- \_\_\_ g. Drug/Alcohol Treatment/Education
- \_\_\_ h. Employment/Education/Literacy
- \_\_\_ i. Life Skills
- \_\_\_ j. Parenting/Health
- \_\_\_ k. Community Service
- \_\_\_ l. Restitution \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (Amount)
- \_\_\_ m. Work Program
- \_\_\_ n. Other \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ 2. Regular Probation

\_\_\_ 3. Probation and Placement with \_\_\_ a. Social Services b. Private Placement  
c. Other Family Member d. Other

\_\_\_ 4. Commitment to Dept. of Institutions \_\_\_\_\_ Months (if specified)

## **Appendix Two**

### **Sample Profile by Program Placement**



### Criminal History by Type of Placement

CRIMINAL HISTORY	Type of Placement										Total Sample
	ISP		DOI		Probation		Probation Plus		Jail		
<b>PRIOR FELONY ADJUDICATIONS</b>											
Mean	.4000		.8529		.0656		.5676		.4545		.2500
Standard Dev.	.5490		.8214		.2480		.8347		.6876		.5378
<b>ACTUAL NUMBER</b>											
0	62.9%	44	38.2%	13	93.4%	228	59.5%	22	63.6%	7	79.3% 314
1	34.3%	24	41.2%	14	6.6%	16	29.7%	11	27.3%	3	17.2% 68
2	2.9%	2	17.6%	6	0.0%	0	5.4%	2	9.1%	1	2.8% 11
3	0.0%	0	2.9%	1	0.0%	0	5.4%	2	0.0%	0	.8% 3
Column Total	100.0%	70	100.0%	34	100.0%	244	100.0%	37	100.0%	11	100.0% 396
<b>PRIOR MISDEMEANOR ADJUDICATIONS</b>											
Mean	.2286		.2059		.0620		.1351		.1667		.1139
Standard Dev.	.4867		.4104		.2886		.3466		.3892		.3558
<b>ACTUAL NUMBER</b>											
0	80.0%	56	79.4%	27	95.0%	230	86.5%	32	83.3%	10	89.9% 355
1	17.1%	12	20.6%	7	3.7%	9	13.5%	5	16.7%	2	8.9% 35
2	2.9%	2	0.0%	0	1.2%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.3% 5
Column Total	100.0%	70	100.0%	34	100.0%	242	100.0%	37	100.0%	12	100.0% 395
<b>PRIOR PETTY ADJUDICATIONS</b>											
Mean	.0000		.0294		.0000		.0000		.0000		.0025
Standard Dev.	.0000		.1715		.0000		.0000		.0000		.0503
<b>ACTUAL NUMBER</b>											
0	100.0%	70	97.1%	33	100.0%	243	100.0%	37	100.0%	12	99.7% 395
1	0.0%	0	2.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.3% 1
Column Total	100.0%	70	100.0%	34	100.0%	243	100.0%	37	100.0%	12	100.0% 396
<b>AGE AT FIRST ADJUDICATION</b>											
Mean	14.89		14.97		14.58		14.23		16.92		14.71
Standard Dev.	1.54		1.71		1.78		1.67		1.75		1.77
<b>ACTUAL AGE</b>											
10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.8%	2	2.5%	1	0.0%	0	.7% 3
11	1.4%	1	2.9%	1	3.7%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.7% 11
12	1.4%	1	2.9%	1	7.8%	19	10.0%	4	7.7%	1	6.5% 26
13	18.3%	13	14.7%	5	12.7%	31	22.5%	9	0.0%	0	14.4% 58
14	21.1%	15	23.5%	8	28.6%	70	25.0%	10	0.0%	0	25.6% 103
15	21.1%	15	11.8%	4	13.5%	33	17.5%	7	7.7%	1	14.9% 60
16	21.1%	15	20.6%	7	16.7%	41	12.5%	5	7.7%	1	17.1% 69
17	12.7%	9	20.6%	7	11.8%	29	7.5%	3	23.1%	3	12.7% 51
18	1.4%	1	2.9%	1	4.5%	11	2.5%	1	53.8%	7	5.2% 21
19	1.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	.2% 1
Column Total	100.0%	71	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0% 403
<b>FIRST TIME ADJUDICATION</b>											
YES, first time adjudication	48.6%	35	35.3%	12	88.6%	217	50.0%	20	53.8%	7	72.0% 291
NO, first time adjudication	51.4%	37	64.7%	22	11.4%	28	50.0%	20	46.2%	6	28.0% 113
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0% 404

\*An index to describe Criminal history was created by multiplying the number of prior felony adjudications by a factor of 1.5 and the numbers of prior misdemeanors by .5.

### Current Offense by Type of Placement

CURRENT OFFENSE	Type of Placement										Total Sample
	ISP		DOI		Probation		Probation Plus		Jail		
<b>OFFENSE CLASSIFICATION</b>											
SP - Serious Person	30.6%	22	23.5%	8	21.6%	53	22.5%	9	15.4%	2	23.3% 94
LP - Lesser Person	19.4%	14	20.6%	7	18.8%	46	15.0%	6	30.8%	4	19.1% 77
MJP - Major property	29.2%	210	20.6%	7	26.1%	64	32.5%	13	7.7%	1	26.2% 106
MIP - Minor Property	13.9%	3	17.6%	6	20.8%	51	10.0%	4	30.8%	4	18.6% 75
OP - Other Property	4.2%	2	14.7%	5	8.6%	21	17.5%	7	7.7%	1	9.2% 37
O - Other	2.8%		2.9%	1	4.1%	10	2.5%	1	7.7%	1	3.7% 15
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0% 404

### Alcohol / Drug Referrals by Type of Placement

ALCOHOL/DRUG REFERRALS	Type of Placement										Total Sample	
	ISP		DOI		Probation		Probation Plus		Jail			
<u>PRIOR ALCOHOL/DRUG REFERRAL</u>												
YES	40.3%	29	44.1%	15	14.3%	35	27.5%	11	38.5%	5	23.5%	95
NO	59.7%	43	55.9%	19	85.7%	210	72.5%	29	61.5%	8	76.5%	309
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	404

### Program Referral by Type of Placement

PROGRAM REFERRALS	Type of Placement										Total Sample	
	ISP		DOI		Probation		Probation Plus		Jail			
<b>GRID CELL PLACEMENT</b>												
ISP Qualified	90.3%	65	88.2%	30	84.5%	207	97.5%	39	69.2%	9	86.6%	350
NCT Qualified for ISP	9.7%	7	11.8%	4	15.5%	38	2.5%	1	30.8%	4	13.4%	54
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	404
<b>REFERRAL FOR JISP REVIEW</b>												
a) Recommend to DOI												
YES	18.6%	11	80.0%	24	10.6%	22	10.0%	3	28.6%	2	18.6%	62
NO	81.4%	48	20.0%	6	89.4%	186	90.0%	27	71.4%	5	81.4	272
Column Total	100.0%	59	100.0%	30	100.0%	208	100.0%	30	100.0%	7	100.0%	334
<b>REFERRAL FOR JISP REVIEW</b>												
b) Pending Revocation Of Probation												
YES	30.5%	18	16.7%	5	6.7%	14	26.7%	8	0.0%	0	13.5%	45
NO	69.5%	41	83.3%	25	93.3%	194	73.3%	22	100.0%	7	86.5%	289
Column Total	100.0%	59	100.0%	30	100.0%	208	100.0%	30	100.0%	7	100.0%	334
<b>REFERRAL FOR JISP REVIEW</b>												
c) Referred by Grid												
YES	76.3%	45	70.0%	21	85.1%	177	90.0%	27	85.7%	6	82.6%	276
NO	23.7%	14	30.0%	9	14.9%	31	10.0%	3	14.3%	1	17.4%	58
Column Total	100.0%	59	100.0%	30	100.0%	208	100.0%	30	100.0%	7	100.0%	334
<b>REFERRAL FOR JISP REVIEW</b>												
d) Detention Center or Probation Violation over 72 Hours												
YES	10.2%	6	3.3%	1	1.4%	3	6.7%	2	14.3%	1	3.9%	13
NO	89.8%	53	96.7%	29	98.6%	205	93.3%	28	85.7%	6	96.1%	321
Column Total	100.0%	59	100.0%	30	100.0%	208	100.0%	30	100.0%	7	100.0%	334

### Review Decisions by Type of Placement

REVIEW DECISIONS	TYPE OF PLACEMENT										Total Sample	
	ISP		DOI		PROBATION		PROBATION PLUS		JAIL			
REVIEW DECISION BY SCREENING BOARD												
Accepted for ISP	85.7%	60	.0%	0	3.8%	9	2.5%	1	7.7%	1	17.9%	71
Rejected for ISP	2.9%	2	100.0%	34	95.8%	230	92.5%	37	92.3%	12	79.3%	315
Accepted with conditions	11.4%	8	.0%	0	.4%	1	5.0%	2	.0%	0	2.8%	11
Column Total	100.0%	70	100.0%	34	100.0%	240	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	397
REJECTION REASON												
Program Full	.0%	0	26.7%	8	32.9%	70	13.5%	5	8.3%	1	28.5%	84
Low risk - regular probation	.0%	0	.0%	0	43.7%	93	2.7%	1	.0%	0	31.9%	94
High risk- DYS	.0%	0	40.0%	12	1.9%	4	5.4%	2	8.3%	1	6.4%	19
Social Services	33.3%	1	6.7%	2	3.8%	8	59.5%	22	.0%	0	11.2%	33
Other rejection	66.7%	2	23.3%	7	16.4%	35	18.9%	7	33.3%	4	18.6%	55
Jail recommended	.0%	0	3.3%	1	.5%	1	.0%	0	41.7%	5	2.4%	7
Not age appropriate	.0%	0	.0%	0	.9%	2	.0%	0	8.3%	1	1.0%	3
Column Total	100.0%	3	100.0%	30	100.0%	213	100.0%	37	100.0%	12	100.0%	295

### Risk and Need Factors by Type of Placement

RISK AND NEEDS FACTORS	TYPE OF PLACEMENT										Total Sample	
	ISP		DOI		PROBATION		PROBATION PLUS		JAIL			
RISK SCORE												
Mean	17.00		19.88		12.32		18.45		17.64		14.55	
Std. Dev.	4.96		6.87		5.20		5.38		7.97		6.12	
Median	17.00		21.00		12.00		19.00		18.00		14.00	
Range	5 - 29		5 - 31		1 - 29		5 - 30		3 - 35		1 - 35	
N	69		33		235		38		11		386	
NEEDS SCORE												
Mean	21.61		25.06		16.21		22.66		25.55		18.84	
Std. Dev.	6.93		8.55		7.84		8.51		12.37		8.63	
Median	22.00		26.00		16.00		22.00		27.00		19.00	
Range	0 - 20		0 - 10		0 - 14		0 - 20		1 - 15		0 - 51	
N	69		33		234		38		11		385	
RECIDIVISM FACTOR												
Mean	7.06		7.62		5.99		8.73		5.92		6.59	
Std. Dev.	3.32		3.50		2.69		2.86		3.66		3.05	
Median	7.00		7.50		6.00		9.00		5.00		6.00	
Range	0 - 20		0 - 10		0 - 14		0 - 20		1 - 15		1 - 14	
N	72		34		245		40		13		404	
OFFENSE SEVERITY FACTOR												
Mean	5.45		4.88		4.87		4.60		5.08		4.95	
Std. Dev.	3.75		3.69		3.29		2.85		3.82		3.38	
Median	5.00		4.50		5.00		5.00		5.00		5.00	
Range	0 - 20		0 - 10		0 - 14		0 - 20		1 - 15		0 - 20	
N	71		40		34		244		13		416	
PRIOR OUT OF HOME PLACEMENT												
Yes	44.4%	32	55.9%	19	25.7%	63	77.5%	31	38.5%	5	37.1%	150
No	55.6%	40	44.1%	15	74.3%	182	22.5%	9	61.5%	8	62.9%	254
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	404
RUNAWAY HISTORY												
Yes	61.1%	44	47.1%	16	33.1%	81	82.5%	33	30.8%	4	44.1%	178
No	38.9%	28	52.9%	18	66.9%	164	17.5%	7	69.2%	9	55.9%	226
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	34	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%	404
Yes	61.1%	44	47.1%	16	33.1%	81	82.5%	33	30.8%	4	44.1%	178

### Revocation Status by Type of Placement

REVOCATION STATUS	TYPE OF PLACEMENT										Total Sample	
	ISP		PROBATION		PROBATION PLUS		DOI		JAIL			
REVOCATION												
Yes (1)	33.3%	24	7.3%	18	20.0%	8	11.8%	4	23.1%	3	14.1%	57
No (0)	66.7%	48	92.7%	227	80.0%	32	88.2%	30	76.9%	10	85.9%	347
Column Total	100.0%	72	100.0%	245	100.0%	40	100.0%	34	100.0%	13	100.0%	404

## **Appendix Three**

### **Risk and Needs Instruments**

# JUVENILE ASSESSMENT OF RISK

Client Name	Last	First	Middle	Case Number	Judicial District
Date of Assessment	Officer Last Name, First Name				

Select the highest point total applicable for each category.

			RISK SCORE
1. AGE AT FIRST ADJUDICATION .....	0	16 or older	
	3	14 or 15	
	5	13 or younger	_____
2. PRIOR CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR .....	0	No prior police contacts	
	2	Prior arrest record, with sanctions imposed.	
	3	Prior delinquency petition sustained; adjudication entered, no offenses classified as serious felony	
	5	Prior delinquency petition sustained; adjudication entered, at least one serious felony offense filed	_____
3. INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENTS OR PLACEMENTS .....	0	None	
	2	One	
	4	Two or more	_____
4. DRUG/CHEMICAL USE .....	0	No use	
	2	THC, once a week or less	
	5	Controlled substance or toxic vapor use, or THC more than once a week	_____
5. ALCOHOL USE .....	0	No known use	
	2	Known alcohol use	
	5	Physical symptoms/behavior changes (passing out, blackouts, shakes, personality changes)	_____
6. PARENTAL CONTROL .....	0	Parents generally consistent and effective in setting and enforcing limits	
(include foster or group home experience)	2	Inconsistent and/or ineffective in setting and enforcing limits <input type="checkbox"/> limits set but not enforced by parent	
	4	<input type="checkbox"/> limits set but occasionally violated by juvenile <input type="checkbox"/> Parents fail to set limits <input type="checkbox"/> Child totally defiant of limits	_____
7. EDUCATION .....	0	Attending, High School diploma, GED, Vocational Certificate, or no court expectations	
	1	Problems handled within the school setting	
	3	Suspended from school during a semester	
	5	Not attending school, expelled or truancy petition pending	_____
8. PEER RELATIONS .....	0	Positive support and influence	
	2	Positive and negative influences	
	4	Negative influence (known offenders, gang or cult involvement)	_____

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_

Client Name	Last	First	Middle	Case Number	Judicial District
Date of Assessment					

Clients are assigned to the highest level of supervision indicated on following scale.

RISK	LEVEL OF SUPERVISION	NEEDS
17 and above	1. Maximum	26 and above
10 to 16	2. Medium	19 to 25
9 and below	3. Minimum	18 and below

RISK  
SCORENEEDS  
SCORE

Risk SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

LEVEL \_\_\_\_\_

Need SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

Supervision over-ride: If the officer or supervisor feels the level of supervision should be higher or lower, indicate applicable reason(s).  
Supervisory approval is required.

Classification over-ride \_\_\_\_\_Assigned Level of Supervision \_\_\_\_\_

1. P.O. over-ride
2. Supervisor over-ride
3. Due to court order
4. Risk Factors
5. Need Factors
6. Assaultive behavior

1. Maximum
2. Medium
3. Minimum
4. Administrative
5. Transfer-out
6. Interstate out

COMMENTS

Supervisor Signature  
(if over-ride used)

Amount of Restitution Ordered: \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_



# JUVENILE REASSESSMENT OF RISK

Client Name	Last	First	Middle	Case Number	Judicial District
Date of Reassessment	Officer Last Name, First Name				

Select the highest point total applicable for each category.

RISK  
SCORE

1. AGE AT FIRST ADJUDICATION .....	0	16 or older	
	2	14 or 15	
	3	13 or younger	_____
2. PRIOR CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR .....	0	No prior police contacts	
	2	Prior arrest record, with sanctions imposed	
	3	Prior delinquency petition sustained; adjudication entered, no offenses classified as serious felony	
	5	Prior delinquency petition sustained; adjudication entered, at least one serious felony offense filed	_____
3. INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENTS OR PLACEMENTS .....	0	None	
	1	One	
	3	Two or more	_____
RATE THE FOLLOWING BASED ON PERIOD SINCE LAST CLASSIFICATION:			
4. DRUG/CHEMICAL USE .....	0	No use	
	2	THC, once a week or less	
	5	Controlled substance or toxic vapor use, or THC more than once a week	_____
5. ALCOHOL USE .....	0	No known use	
	1	Known alcohol use	
	3	Physical symptoms/behavior changes (passing out, blackouts, shakes, personality changes)	_____
6. PARENTAL CONTROL (Check appropriate boxes) .....	0	Parents generally consistent and effective in setting and enforcing limits	
(include foster or group home experience)	2	Inconsistent and/or ineffective in setting and enforcing limits <input type="checkbox"/> limits set, but not enforced by parent <input type="checkbox"/> limits set, but occasionally violated by juvenile	
	4	<input type="checkbox"/> Parents fail to set limits <input type="checkbox"/> Child totally defiant of limits	_____
7. EDUCATION .....	0	Attending, High School diploma, GED, Vocational Certificate, or no court expectations	
	1	Problems handled within the school setting	
	3	Suspended from school during a semester	
	5	Not attending school, expelled or truancy petition pending	_____
8. RESPONSE TO SUPERVISION REQUIREMENT .....	0	No problems of consequence	
	2	Moderate compliance problems (e.g., missed appointments, some resistance to authority)	
	5	Major compliance problems, totally uncooperative	_____
9. USE OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES/TREATMENT PROGRAMS ....	0	Not needed	
	0	Productively utilized	
	2	Needed but not available	
	3	Utilized but not beneficial	
	5	Available but rejected	_____

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_

# **JUVENILE NEEDS REASSESSMENT**

Client Name	Last	First	Middle	Case Number	Judicial District
Date of Reassessment	Officer Last Name, First Name				

For each item below, select the single appropriate answer and enter the associated number in the adjacent blank.

**NEEDS  
SCORE**

**1. DRUG/CHEMICAL USE**

0 No interference  
with functioning

4 Occasional use,  
some disruption of functioning,  
unwilling to participate in treat-  
ment program

6 Frequent use,  
serious disruption needs  
immediate treatment

**2. ALCOHOL USE**

0 No known use

4 Occasional use, some disruption  
of functioning, unwilling to  
participate in treatment program

6 Frequent use, serious disruption,  
needs immediate treatment

**3. PRIMARY FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS**

0 Relatively stable relationships or  
not applicable

3 Some disorganization or stress  
but potential for improvement

5 Major disorganization or stress

**4. ALTERNATIVE FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS**

0 Relatively stable relationships or  
not applicable

3 Some disorganization or stress  
but potential for improvement

5 Major disorganization or stress,  
unwilling to comply with family  
rules

**5. EMOTIONAL STABILITY**

0 Appropriate adolescent responses

3 Exaggerated periodic or sporadic  
responses e.g., aggressive acting  
out or depressive withdrawal

6 Excessive responses; prohibits or  
limits adequate functioning

**6. MENTAL ABILITY**

0 Able to function independently

3 Some need for assistance, poten-  
tial for adequate adjustment

5 Deficiencies severely limit  
independent functioning

**7. LEARNING DISABILITY**

0 None

3 Mild disability, able to function in  
classroom

5 Serious disability, interferes with  
social functioning

**8. EMPLOYMENT**

0 Not needed or currently employed

3 Currently employed but poor  
work habits

4 Needs employment

**9. VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL SKILLS**

0 Currently developing marketable  
skill or in school

3 Needs to develop marketable skill

Enter the value 1 for each characteristic which applies to this case

**10. EDUCATIONAL ADJUSTMENT**

Not working to potential

Poor attendance record

Refusal to participate in any education program

Program not appropriate for needs, age and/or ability

Disruptive school behavior

**TOTAL**

**11. PEER RELATIONSHIPS**

Socially inept

Loner behavior

Receives basically negative influence from peers

Dependent upon others

Exploits and/or manipulates others

**TOTAL**

**12. HEALTH AND HYGIENE**

Medical or Dental referral needed

Needs health or hygiene education

Handicap or illness limits functioning

**TOTAL**

**13. SEXUAL ADJUSTMENT**

Lacks knowledge (sex education)

Avoidance of the opposite sex

Promiscuity (not prostitution)

Sexual deviant (not prostitution)

Unwed parent

Prostitution

**TOTAL**

**TOTAL**

Client Name	Last	First	Middle	Case Number	Judicial District
Date of Reassessment	Officer Last Name, First Name				

RISK  
SCORE

NEEDS  
SCORE

Clients are assigned to the highest level of supervision indicated on following scale.

**RISK**

17 and above  
10 to 16  
9 and below

**LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

1. Maximum  
2. Medium  
3. Minimum

**NEEDS**

26 and above  
19 to 25  
18 and below

Risk SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

LEVEL \_\_\_\_\_

Need SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

Supervision over-ride: If the officer or supervisor feels the level of supervision should be higher or lower, indicate applicable reason(s).  
Supervisory approval is required.

**Classification over-ride**

1. P.O. over-ride
2. Supervision over-ride
3. Due to court order
4. Risk Factors
5. Need Factors
6. Assaultive behavior

**Assigned Level of Supervision**

1. Maximum
2. Medium
3. Minimum
4. Administrative
5. Transfer-out
6. Interstate out

**COMMENTS**

Supervisor Signature  
(if over-ride used)

Restitution ordered: \_\_\_\_\_

**TERMINATION**

The following information is to be completed upon termination of case.

Date Terminated \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Supervision Status: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Maximum
2. Medium
3. Minimum
4. Administrative
5. Transfer-out
6. Interstate-out

Termination Status: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Terminated
2. Terminated - returned to sending district or change of venue
3. Revoked - Technical
4. Revoked - new offense - felony
5. Revoked - new offense - misdemeanor
6. Absconded - warrant outstanding

TOTAL

Restitution Amount Paid \_\_\_\_\_