

111
Louisville/Jefferson County (Ky) -

111
~~JEFFERSON COUNTY (KY) -~~

111
M. S. S. D. (METROPOLITAN SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT) -

AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION

Interim Report/Jan. - Dec., 1972

Office of Research & Planning

G. B. Hearman, principal investigator

D. Conlin, assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION ONE - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	3
SECTION TWO - PHASE I OBSERVATIONS	21
APPENDIX I - METHODOLOGY FOR COMPUTATION OF SUCCESS/FAILURE PROJECTIONS	34
APPENDIX II - PHASE I DATA GATHERING INFORMATION	36

L I S T O F T A B L E S

TABLE	TITLE	Page
15	STATUS IN PROGRAM BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	15
16	NUMBER OF IN-TREATMENT OFFENSES BY SEX AND RACE BY INDIVIDUALS WHO COMPLETED THE PROGRAM	16
17	PHASE I IN-TREATMENT OFFENSES BY HOUSE AND RACE.	17
18	LENGTH OF STAY AT ORMSBY VILLAGE TREATMENT CENTER BY SEX AND RACE	18
19	OUTCOME BY RACE	20
20	PROJECTED OUTCOME BY RACE	20
SECTION TWO		
1	TIME IN PHASE I BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	22
2	TIME IN PHASE I BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION.	23
3	A.W.O.L. BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	24
4	A.W.O.L. BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	24
5	A.W.O.L. BY HOUSE BY AFTERCARE AND PRE-PROBATION	25
6	TRAINING PLAN BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	26
7	TRAINING PLAN BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	27
8	HOUSE BEHAVIOR BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	28

L I S T O F T A B L E S

TABLE	TITLE	Page
SECTION ONE		
1	AFTERCARE BY REASON REFERRED BY SEX AND RACE	3
2	PRE-PROBATION BY REASON REFERRED BY SEX AND RACE	4
3	REASON REFERRED (GROUPED) BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	6
4	REASON REFERRED (GROUPED) BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	6
5	TOTAL NUMBER OF PRIOR REFERRALS BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	7
6	TOTAL NUMBER OF PRIOR REFERRALS BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	8
7	AFTERCARE BY AGE BY SEX AND RACE	9
8	PRE-PROBATION BY AGE BY SEX AND RACE	10
9	AFTERCARE BY HOUSE BY SEX AND RACE	11
10	PRE-PROBATION BY HOUSE BY SEX AND RACE	12
11	AFTERCARE BY WORK STATUS BY SEX AND RACE	13
12	PRE-PROBATION BY WORK STATUS BY SEX AND RACE	13
13	PROGRAM STATUS AS OF 12/31/72 BY SEX AND RACE (AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION)	14
14	STATUS IN PROGRAM BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	15

L I S T O F T A B L E S

TABLE	TITLE	Page
9	HOUSE BEHAVIOR BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	28
10	REASON FOR RELEASE BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	29
11	REASON FOR RELEASE BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	30
12	PROGNOSIS BY SEX AND RACE - AFTERCARE	31
13	PROGNOSIS BY SEX AND RACE - PRE-PROBATION	31
14	COST ANALYSIS OF AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION PROJECT JANUARY 1, 1972 - DECEMBER 31, 1972	32

INTRODUCTION

The Aftercare/Pre-Probation Program of the Metropolitan Social Services Department (MSSD) of Jefferson County has been in operation for one year. This program, financed by a grant from the Kentucky Crime Commission under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, was designed to provide supportive services to two groups of youthful offenders:

- (1) Aftercare - those youths who were released from a delinquent institution;
- (2) Pre-Probation - those juveniles, referred directly by the Court, who did not require institutionalization but whose community environment was temporarily undesirable.

The Aftercare /Pre-Probation treatment program was comprised of two phases:

Phase I - During this phase the individual youth resided in one of six group homes scattered throughout Louisville and Jefferson County. Each home was operated in a family-like atmosphere by a houseparent and a social worker aide under the supervision of the house social worker. The maximum stay in any of these homes did not exceed two months, unless there were situations in the child's natural home which precluded his return. During the child's stay in Phase I, the social worker worked with the juvenile's family in preparation for his return to his natural home and also counseled the youth as he was faced with problems in the group home.

Phase II - Upon completion of his two month stay in the group home, the child was returned to his natural home whenever possible. The social worker continued to work with the youth and his family as well as supervised the youth's adjustment in the community, i.e., school, work and recreational activities. The maximum time that any child spent in Phase II usually did not exceed four months. At the end of that time, if the child was making a satisfactory adjustment to the community and satisfactory progress in school/job he was released from MSSD supervision.

The stated goals of the program were: (1) reducing recidivism, (2) shortening the length of institutional treatment, (3) decreasing institutional population, and (4) increasing the success rate in the treatment of social offenders. At this point in time, it is impossible to evaluate goals one and four since only 76 children have completed the program and just ten have more than three months of follow-up. More concrete information on these particular goals will be evaluated in a subsequent report.

The present report will concern itself with a description of the demographic characteristics of the juveniles served (Section I), and a variety of information on the Phase I (In-House) behavior of the juveniles (Section II).

Table 1. Aftercare by Reason Referred by Sex and Race

REASON REFERRED	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
Assault: Aggravated	0	-	0	-	2	5.9	0	-	2	2.9	0	-
Auto Tampering	1	2.9	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
Auto Theft	1	2.9	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
Unauthorized Use of Auto	2	5.7	0	-	2	5.9	0	-	4	5.8	0	-
Disorderly Conduct	4	11.4	5	16.1	4	11.8	0	-	8	11.6	5	11.9
Destruction of Property	0	-	0	-	1	2.9	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
Dwellinghouse Breaking	1	2.9	1	3.2	1	2.9	0	-	2	2.9	1	2.4
Grand Larceny	4	11.4	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	5.8	0	-
Loitering	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	9.1	0	-	1	2.4
Murder or Manslaughter	1	2.9	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
Petit Larceny	0	-	2	6.5	1	2.9	0	-	1	1.4	2	4.8
Robbery	0	-	0	-	3	8.8	0	-	3	4.4	0	-
Runaway: In County	1	2.9	4	12.9	1	2.9	2	18.2	2	2.9	6	14.3
School House Breaking	1	2.9	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
Sex Offenses	0	-	0	-	1	2.9	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
Shoplifting	1	2.9	0	-	1	2.9	1	9.1	2	2.9	1	2.4
Storehouse Breaking	1	2.9	0	-	5	14.8	0	-	6	8.7	0	-
Truancy	5	14.2	5	16.1	4	11.8	2	18.2	9	13.3	7	16.6
Ungovernable Behavior	5	14.2	13	41.9	5	14.8	5	45.5	10	14.5	18	42.9
Violation of Drug Laws	6	17.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	6	8.7	0	-
Other	1	2.9	1	3.2	1	2.9	0	-	2	2.9	1	2.4
Burglary	0	-	0	-	1	2.9	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
Possessing Burglary Tools	0	-	0	-	1	2.9	0	-	1	1.4	0	-
TOTAL	35	100.1	31	99.9	34	99.9	11	100.1	69	99.9	42	100.1

Table 2. Pre-Probation by Reason Referred by Sex and Race

REASON REFERRED	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
Assault:Aggravated	1	4.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Auto Theft	0	-	0	-	1	25.0	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Unauthorized Use of Auto	2	8.7	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	7.4	0	-
Disorderly Conduct	4	17.5	4	26.7	0	-	0	-	4	14.8	4	22.2
Grand Larceny	3	13.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	11.1	0	-
Robbery:Purse Snatching	0	-	0	-	1	25.0	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Robbery	0	-	0	-	1	25.0	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Runaway: In County	1	4.3	1	6.7	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	1	5.6
Runaway: Out of State	2	8.7	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	7.4	0	-
Runaway: AWOL	1	4.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Sex Offenses	1	4.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Shoplifting	1	4.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Truancy	2	8.7	1	6.7	0	-	2	66.7	2	7.4	3	16.7
Ungovernable Behavior	4	17.5	9	60.0	1	25.0	0	-	5	18.5	9	50.0
Weapons: Carrying, Poss.	1	4.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
Burglary	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	33.3	0	-	1	5.6
TOTAL	23	99.9	15	100.1	4	100.0	3	100.0	27	99.9	18	100.1

Females tended to be referred predominately for Truancy, Disorderly Conduct and Ungovernable Behavior, while males were referred for a wide variety of offenses. Both Aftercare and Pre-Probation referrals tended to be for the same type of offenses.

Tables 3 and 4 compare the types of offenders committed to the Aftercare/Pre-Probation Project. From this data, it would seem that the two populations, those coming from institutions (Aftercare) and those coming directly from the Court (Pre-Probation), are similar in terms of the nature of the offense that led to their admission to the program.

Females generally tended to be social offenders. Approximately three-fourths of all females admitted to Aftercare and Pre-Probation were social offenders. Aftercare males were more likely to be offenders against property than were Pre-Probation males; while slightly more Pre-Probation males were social offenders than Aftercare males.

Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the pre-history of the juveniles committed to the Aftercare/Pre-Probation Program. In general, males tended to have a more lengthy pre-history than females, and whites tended to have a more lengthy pre-history than blacks.

Those juveniles coming from institutions (Aftercare) tended to have a significantly longer pre-history than those youths coming directly from the Court (Pre-Probation). Over one-fourth of the Aftercare males had 10 or more prior referrals to the Court.

Table 3. Reason Referred (Grouped) by Sex and Race - Aftercare

G R O U P S	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
Major vs. Person	1	2.9	0	-	5	14.7	0	-	6	8.7	0	-
Major vs. Property	18	51.4	3	9.7	13	38.2	1	9.1	31	44.9	4	9.5
Minor	5	14.3	6	19.4	6	17.6	1	9.1	11	15.9	7	16.7
Social	11	31.4	22	71.0	10	29.4	9	81.8	21	30.4	31	73.8
TOTAL	35	100.0	31	100.1	34	99.9	11	100.0	69	99.9	42	100.0

Table 4. Reason Referred (Grouped) by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

G R O U P S	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
Major vs. Person	1	4.3	0	-	1	25.0	0	-	2	7.4	0	-
Major vs. Property	8	34.8	0	-	1	25.0	1	33.3	9	33.3	1	5.6
Minor	5	21.7	4	26.7	1	25.0	0	-	6	22.2	4	22.2
Social	9	39.1	11	73.3	1	25.0	2	66.7	10	37.0	13	72.2
TOTAL	23	99.9	15	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	27	99.9	18	100.0

Table 5. Total Number of Prior Referrals by Sex and Race - Aftercare

PRIOR REFERRALS	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
1	2	7.7	1	4.5	1	3.3	1	12.5	3	5.4	2	6.7
2	1	3.8	2	9.1	3	10.0	3	37.5	4	7.1	5	16.7
3	4	15.4	8	36.4	6	20.0	2	25.0	10	17.9	10	33.3
4	2	7.7	6	27.3	4	13.3	1	12.5	6	10.7	7	23.3
5	4	15.4	2	9.1	4	13.3	0	-	8	14.3	2	6.7
6	1	3.8	1	4.5	2	6.7	0	-	3	5.4	1	3.3
7	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	12.5	0	-	1	3.3
8	4	15.4	0	-	2	6.7	0	-	6	10.7	0	-
9	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
10+	8	30.8	2	9.1	8	26.7	0	-	16	28.6	2	6.7
TOTAL	26	100.0	22	100.0	30	100.0	8	100.0	56	100.1	30	100.0
\bar{X} Number of Referrals	6.8		4.3		5.8		3.0		6.3		3.9	

Table 6. Total Number of Prior Referrals by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

PRIOR REFERRALS	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
1	1	7.1	2	18.2	3	100.0	0	-	4	23.4	2	14.3
2	2	14.3	0	-	0	-	2	66.7	2	11.8	2	14.3
3	1	7.1	3	27.3	0	-	0	-	1	5.9	3	21.4
4	2	14.3	1	9.1	0	-	1	33.3	2	11.8	2	14.3
5	1	7.1	3	27.3	0	-	0	-	1	5.9	3	21.4
6	2	14.3	1	9.1	0	-	0	-	2	11.8	1	7.1
7	2	14.3	1	9.1	0	-	0	-	2	11.8	1	7.1
8	1	7.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.9	0	-
9	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
10+	2	14.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	11.8	0	-
TOTAL	14	99.9	11	100.1	3	100.0	3	100.0	17	100.1	14	99.9
X Number of Referrals	5.7		3.9		1.0		2.7		4.8		3.6	

Table 7. Aftercare by Age by Sex and Race

A G E	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
13	2	5.7	3	9.7	3	8.8	4	36.4	5	7.2	7	16.7
14	9	25.7	7	22.6	5	14.7	2	18.2	14	20.3	9	21.4
15	14	40.0	10	32.3	12	35.3	1	9.1	26	37.7	11	26.2
16	6	17.1	8	25.8	10	29.4	3	27.3	16	23.2	11	26.2
17	4	11.4	3	9.7	4	11.8	1	9.1	8	11.6	4	9.5
18	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
TOTAL	35	99.9	31	100.1	34	100.0	11	100.1	69	100.0	42	100.0
\bar{X} AGE	15.0		15.0		15.2		14.5		15.1		14.9	

Tables 7 and 8 represent the age distribution of those individuals referred to the Aftercare/Pre-Probation Program. In general, females tended to be slightly younger than males and Aftercare referrals tended to be younger than Pre-Probation referrals.

Table 8. Pre-Probation by Age by Sex and Race

A G E	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
13	1	4.3	2	13.3	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	2	11.1
14	3	13.1	1	6.7	0	-	0	-	3	11.1	1	5.6
15	9	39.1	4	26.7	2	50.0	3	100.0	11	40.7	7	38.9
16	6	26.1	6	40.0	1	25.0	0	-	7	25.9	6	33.3
17	3	13.1	2	13.3	1	25.0	0	-	4	14.8	2	11.1
18	1	4.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	3.7	0	-
TOTAL	23	100.0	15	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	27	99.9	18	100.0
\bar{X} AGE	15.4		15.3		15.8		15.0		15.5		15.3	

Table 9. Aftercare by House by Sex and Race

H O U S E	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL*			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
1	0	-	15	60.0	0	-	4	36.4	0	-	19	52.8
2	11	34.4	0	-	17	53.1	0	-	28	43.8	0	-
3	10	31.3	0	-	11	34.4	0	-	21	32.8	0	-
4	0	-	10	40.0	0	-	7	63.6	0	-	17	47.2
5	10	31.3	0	-	4	12.5	0	-	14	21.9	0	-
6	1	3.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.6	0	-
TOTAL	32	100.1	25	100.0	32	100.0	11	100.0	64	100.1	36	100.0

* A total of ten juveniles were admitted directly into Phase II and are not represented in Tables 9 or 10.

Table 9 and 10 illustrate the place of residence for the juveniles during the residential stage (Phase I) of the treatment program. A good racial distribution existed in all of the houses with the exception of House Number 2 where a disproportionally larger number of blacks were housed. The vast majority of the female Court referrals (Pre-Probation) resided at House Number 1.

Table 10. Pre-Probation by House by Sex and Race

HOUSE	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
1	0	-	12	75.0	0	-	3	100.0	0	-	15	78.9
2	8	34.8	0	-	4	100.0	0	-	12	44.4	0	-
3	10	43.5	0	-	0	-	0	-	10	37.0	0	-
4	0	-	4	25.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	21.1
5	3	13.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	11.1	0	-
6	2	8.7	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	7.4	0	-
TOTAL	23	100.0	16	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	27	99.9	19	100.0

Table 11. Aftercare by Work Status by Sex and Race

	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
EMPLOYED	13	37.1	7	22.6	23	67.6	2	18.2	36	52.2	9	21.4
UNEMPLOYED	22	62.9	24	77.4	11	32.4	9	81.8	33	47.8	33	78.6
TOTAL	35	100.0	31	100.0	34	100.0	11	100.0	69	100.0	42	100.0

Table 12. Pre-Probation by Work Status by Sex and Race

	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
EMPLOYED	10	43.5	3	20.0	1	25.0	1	33.3	11	40.7	4	22.2
UNEMPLOYED	13	56.5	12	80.0	3	75.0	2	66.7	16	59.3	14	77.8
TOTAL	23	100.0	15	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	27	100.0	18	100.0

Tables 11 and 12 represent the employment status of the youths during the treatment program. If the youth was working full-time or part-time, he was considered to be employed. Forty per cent of the juveniles in the program were employed at some time during the program. Males were more likely to be employed than females. Youths released from institutions (Aftercare) were more likely to be employed than were juveniles referred by the Court (Pre-Probation). Approximately two-thirds of the Aftercare black males were employed at some time during the program.

Table 13. Program Status as of 12/31/72 by Sex and Race - Aftercare/Pre-Probation

S T A T U S	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
PHASE I	14	24.1	8	17.4	4	10.5	3	21.4	18	18.8	11	18.3
PHASE II	19	32.8	15	32.6	13	34.2	4	28.6	32	33.3	19	31.7
COMPLETED	14	24.1	14	30.4	17	44.7	2	14.3	31	32.3	16	26.7
REMOVED	11	19.0	9	19.6	4	10.6	5	35.7	15	15.6	14	23.3
TOTAL	58	100.0	46	100.0	38	100.0	14	100.0	96	100.0	60	100.0

As of December 31, 1972, approximately one-half of the youths committed to the Aftercare/Pre-Probation program were still undergoing treatment. One-third of the males had successfully completed the program. Significantly more females than males had to be removed from the program and institutionalized. Over one-third of the black females had to be removed from the program.

Tables 14 and 15 reflect the status of the Aftercare juveniles and the Pre-Probation juveniles. Significantly more Aftercare whites (21.2 per cent) than Aftercare blacks (13.3 per cent) had to be removed from the program. White males tended to be removed from the program more often than any other sex/race category for the Aftercare population. Pre-Probation females were five times as likely to be removed from the program than were Pre-Probation males.

Table 14. Status in Program by Sex and Race - Aftercare

S T A T U S	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
PHASE I	3	8.6	4	12.9	2	5.9	3	27.3	5	7.2	7	16.7
PHASE II	14	40.0	10	32.3	11	32.4	4	36.4	25	36.2	14	33.3
COMPLETED	9	25.7	12	38.7	17	50.0	2	18.2	26	37.7	14	33.3
REMOVED	9	25.7	5	16.1	4	11.8	2	18.2	13	18.8	7	16.7
TOTAL	35	100.0	31	100.0	34	100.1	11	100.1	69	99.9	42	100.0

Table 15. Status in Program by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

S T A T U S	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
PHASE I	11	47.8	4	26.7	2	50.0	0	-	13	48.1	4	22.2
PHASE II	5	21.7	5	33.3	2	50.0	0	-	7	25.9	5	27.8
COMPLETED	5	21.7	2	13.3	0	-	0	-	5	18.5	2	11.1
REMOVED	2	8.7	4	26.7	0	-	3	100.0	2	7.4	7	38.9
TOTAL	23	99.9	15	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	27	99.9	18	100.0

Table 16. Number of In-Treatment Offenses by Sex and Race by Individuals Who Completed the Program

NO. OF OFFENSES	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
0	10	40.0	9	39.1	15	71.4	2	28.6	25	54.3	11	36.7
1	6	24.0	6	26.1	4	19.0	4	57.1	10	21.7	10	33.3
2	5	20.0	6	26.1	2	9.5	1	14.3	7	15.2	7	23.3
3	1	4.0	2	8.7	0	-	0	-	1	2.2	2	6.7
4+	3	12.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	6.5	0	-
TOTAL	25	100.0	23	100.0	21	99.9	7	100.0	46	99.9	30	100.0
\bar{X} Number of Offenses	1.3		1.0		0.4		0.9		0.9		1.0	

Females were more likely to commit an in-treatment offense than were males. Approximately three-fourths of the black males did not commit this type of offense while three-fourths of the white females did commit an offense during treatment. However, the mean number of in-treatment offenses was the same for both males and females. Blacks were less likely to commit an offense during treatment than were whites.

Table 17. Phase I In-Treatment Offenses by House and Race

NO. OF OFFENSES	HOUSE 1				HOUSE 2				HOUSE 3			
	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%
0	14	63.6	4	57.1	13	72.2	15	83.3	9	75.0	11	91.7
1	5	22.7	2	28.6	1	5.6	2	11.1	1	8.3	1	8.3
2	2	9.1	1	14.3	2	11.1	1	5.6	1	8.3	0	-
3	1	4.5	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	8.3	0	-
4+	0	-	0	-	2	11.1	0	-	0	-	0	-
TOTAL	22	99.9	7	100.0	18	100.0	18	100.0	12	99.9	12	100.0

Table 17 reflects the in-treatment offenses of the juveniles by their place of residence in Phase I. Houses 2 and 3 had a proportionally higher number of juveniles who did not commit an in-treatment offense.

NO. OF OFFENSES	HOUSE 4				HOUSE 5				TOTAL			
	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%
0	7	63.6	2	50.0	7	66.7	1	50.0	50	68.0	33	76.7
1	2	18.2	2	50.0	2	16.7	1	50.0	11	14.7	8	18.6
2	2	18.2	0	-	2	16.7	0	-	9	12.0	2	4.7
3	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	2.7	0	-
4+	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	2.7	0	-
TOTAL	11	100.0	4	100.0	11	100.1	2	100.0	74	100.1	43	100.0

Table 18. Length of Stay at Ormsby Village Treatment Center by Sex and Race

MONTHS	1971 (Jan. 1-Dec. 31)								1972 (July 1-Dec.31)							
	WHITE				BLACK				WHITE				BLACK			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
4 or Less	4	8.2	1	4.8	4	15.4	1	7.7	5	15.6	4	26.7	12	34.3	2	28.6
5	7	14.3	0	-	3	11.5	0	-	19	59.4	2	13.3	15	42.8	0	-
6	6	12.2	2	9.5	6	23.1	2	15.4	3	9.4	2	13.3	5	14.3	0	-
7	12	24.5	4	19.0	7	26.9	3	23.1	5	15.6	4	26.7	1	2.9	3	42.9
8	9	18.4	7	33.3	2	7.7	5	38.5	0	-	1	6.7	1	2.9	2	28.6
9	5	10.2	4	19.0	2	7.7	1	7.7	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
10+	6	12.2	3	14.3	2	7.7	1	7.7	0	-	2	13.3	1	2.9	0	-
TOTAL	49	100.0	21	99.9	26	100.0	13	100.1	32	100.0	15	100.0	35	100.1	7	100.1
\bar{X} STAY	7.1		7.9		6.5		7.4		5.3		6.4		5.1		6.4	

One of the avowed goals of the Aftercare/Pre-Probation program was to reduce the length of stay in juvenile institutions. As seen in Table 18, the length of stay at Ormsby Village Treatment Center (the chief source of Aftercare referrals) has been reduced by approximately one month since the initiation of the Aftercare/Pre-Probation program.

An attempt to determine the effectiveness of the Aftercare/Pre-Probation program in terms of recidivism was impossible to complete at this time due to an insufficient follow-up period. The vast majority of the juveniles are still undergoing treatment within the program and those who have been released from the program have at the most five months of follow-up. A follow-up period of this length would not yield conclusive data. For this reason, the second year evaluation will be more suitable for a thorough study of recidivism.

However, the Office of Research and Planning of MSSD does have sufficient base rate data from previous studies on which to make fairly accurate projections. In 1971, MSSD undertook a follow-up study of 346 male juveniles who received treatment. This study investigated the success of various treatment programs and variables that affect the success or failure of the juveniles after treatment. One of the significant findings of the report was that 66.7 per cent of the whites and 67.4 per cent of the blacks who committed an in-treatment offense ultimately became failures. Using this as a base, projections as to the ultimate success or failure rate of the program were computed.¹ Projections could only be made for males in the Aftercare/Pre-Probation programs since the original study dealt solely with males. As can be seen in Tables 19 and 20, it would seem that the Aftercare/Pre-Probation Programs will do as well as community-based treatment and significantly better than institutional treatment. However, it should be remembered that these are merely projections.

¹ For the specific methodology of computing the projections, see Appendix A.

Table 19. Outcome by Race

OUTCOME	*COMMUNITY TREATMENT						*INSTITUTIONS					
	White	%	Black	%	TOTAL	%	White	%	Black	%	TOTAL	%
SUCCESS	65	60.7	38	53.8	103	60.9	52	46.4	34	45.3	86	46.0
FAILURE	42	39.3	24	46.2	66	39.1	60	53.6	41	54.7	101	54.0
TOTAL	107	100.0	62	100.0	169	100.0	112	100.0	75	100.0	187	100.0

* Data taken from Treatment Analysis, Metropolitan Social Services Department, Office of Research & Planning, 1971.

Table 20. Projected Outcome by Race

PROJECTION	AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION					
	White	%	Black	%	TOTAL	%
SUCCESS	25	59.5	18	56.2	43	58.1
FAILURE	17	40.5	14	43.8	31	41.9
TOTAL	42	100.0	32	100.0	74	100.0

In an attempt to obtain some meaningful information on Phase I of the program, the house social worker was asked to complete a data form on each juvenile upon his or her release from Phase I. This form attempted to gather a variety of objective facts and some judgmental observations (See Appendix II). This information was compiled on the 117 juveniles who had completed Phase I of the program as of December 31, 1972 and is presented in the following tables.

Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the time that the juvenile spent in Phase I of the program. Females tended to stay longer in Phase I than males. Those juveniles referred by the Court (Pre-Probation) tended to remain in the group homes longer than those juveniles released from delinquent institutions (Aftercare). Pre-Probation females remained in the group home on an average of 7.5 weeks, while Aftercare females had an average stay of 6.9 weeks. White females tended to reside in the group homes longer than any other sex/race category.

Table 1. Time in Phase I by Sex and Race - Aftercare

W E E K S	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
1	2	7.7	0	-	0	-	1	12.5	2	3.6	1	3.3
2	0	-	1	4.5	1	3.3	0	-	1	1.8	1	3.3
3	0	-	0	-	2	6.7	0	-	2	3.6	0	-
4	4	15.4	2	9.1	3	10.0	0	-	7	12.5	2	6.7
5	4	15.4	0	-	4	13.3	2	25.0	8	14.3	2	6.7
6	6	23.1	6	27.3	8	26.7	1	12.5	14	25.0	7	23.3
7	6	23.1	6	27.3	8	26.7	1	12.5	14	25.0	7	23.3
8	3	11.5	2	9.1	1	3.3	2	25.0	4	7.1	4	13.3
9	0	-	1	4.5	1	3.3	0	-	1	1.8	1	3.3
10+	1	3.8	4	18.2	2	6.7	1	12.5	3	5.4	5	16.7
TOTAL	26	100.0	22	100.0	30	100.0	8	100.0	56	100.1	30	99.9
AVERAGE STAY/WEEKS	5.8		7.2		6.1		6.5		6.0		6.9	

Table 2. Time in Phase I by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

W E E K S	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
1	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
2	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	33.3	0	-	1	7.1
3	1	7.1	0	-	1	33.3	0	-	2	11.8	0	-
4	0	-	1	9.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	7.1
5	2	14.3	1	9.1	0	-	0	-	2	11.8	1	7.1
6	4	28.6	1	9.1	0	-	1	33.3	4	23.5	2	14.3
7	2	14.3	2	18.2	1	33.3	0	-	3	17.6	2	14.3
8	4	28.6	2	18.2	0	-	1	33.3	4	23.5	3	21.4
9	1	7.1	0	-	1	33.3	0	-	2	11.8	0	-
10+	0	-	4	36.4	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	28.6
TOTAL	14	100.0	11	100.1	3	99.9	3	99.9	17	100.0	14	99.9
AVERAGE STAY/WEEKS	6.6		8.1		6.3		5.3		6.5		7.5	

Table 3. A.W.O.L. by Sex and Race - Aftercare

A.W.O.L.	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
YES	6	23.1	14	63.6	2	6.7	2	25.0	8	14.3	16	53.3
NO	20	76.9	8	36.4	28	93.3	6	75.0	48	85.7	14	46.7
TOTAL	26	100.0	22	100.0	30	100.0	8	100.0	56	100.0	30	100.0

Table 4. A.W.O.L. by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

A.W.O.L.	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
YES	4	28.6	9	81.8	0	-	2	66.7	4	23.5	11	78.6
NO	10	71.4	2	18.2	3	100.0	1	33.3	13	76.5	3	21.4
TOTAL	14	100.0	11	100.0	3	100.0	3	100.0	17	100.0	14	100.0

One-third of the youths in the program went AWOL from the group home at some time during Phase I of the treatment. Females were more prone to go AWOL than were males and those youths coming directly from the Court (Pre-Probation) were almost twice as likely to go AWOL as those juveniles coming from institutions (Aftercare). Whites were more likely to go AWOL than were blacks.

Table 5. A.W.O.L. by House by Aftercare and Pre-Probation

A.W.O.L.	HOUSE 1				HOUSE 2				HOUSE 3			
	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%
YES	13	59.1	4	57.1	6	33.3	2	10.5	2	13.3	1	10.0
NO	9	40.9	3	42.9	12	66.7	17	89.5	13	86.7	9	90.0
TOTAL	22	100.0	7	100.0	18	100.0	19	100.0	15	100.0	10	100.0

Less than 20 per cent of the juveniles who resided at Houses 2, 3 and 5 went AWOL while over 60 per cent of the juveniles in Houses 1 and 4 went AWOL during Phase I treatment. These results reflect the females' tendency to go AWOL more often than males.

A.W.O.L.	HOUSE 4				HOUSE 5				TOTAL			
	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%	White	%	Black	%
YES	10	90.9	0	-	1	12.5	0	-	32	43.2	7	16.3
NO	1	9.1	4	100.0	7	87.5	3	100.0	42	56.8	36	83.7
TOTAL	11	100.0	4	100.0	8	100.0	3	100.0	74	100.0	43	100.0

Table 6. Training Plan by Sex and Race - Aftercare

TRAINING PLAN	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
All Day School (Academic)	15	57.7	10	45.5	15	50.0	3	37.5	30	53.6	13	43.3
All Day School (Vocational)	3	11.5	0	-	4	13.3	2	25.0	7	12.5	2	6.7
All Day Work	2	7.7	2	9.1	2	6.7	1	12.5	4	7.1	3	10.0
Part Time Work	3	11.5	2	9.1	6	20.0	0	-	9	16.1	2	6.7
*OTHER	3	11.5	8	36.4	3	10.0	2	25.0	6	10.7	10	33.3
TOTAL	26	99.9	22	100.1	30	100.0	8	100.0	56	100.0	30	100.0

*Other includes part-time school and part-time work, G.E.D., and AWOL.

The training plan for the individual youths are exhibited in Tables 6 and 7. Approximately one-half of the juveniles were enrolled in full-time school. Females from institutions were more likely to be enrolled in school full-time than were females admitted directly from Court. Males were more likely to be working than were females.

Table 7. Training Plan by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

TRAINING PLAN	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
All Day School (Academic)	8	57.1	3	27.3	2	66.7	1	33.3	10	58.8	4	28.6
All Day School (Vocational)	0	-	1	9.1	0	-	1	33.3	0	-	2	14.3
All Day Work	1	7.1	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.9	0	-
Part Time Work	1	7.1	3	27.3	0	-	0	-	1	5.9	3	21.4
*OTHER	4	28.6	4	36.4	1	33.3	1	33.3	5	29.4	5	35.7
TOTAL	14	99.9	11	100.1	3	100.0	3	99.9	17	100.0	14	100.0

*Other includes part-time school and part-time work, G.E.D., and AWOL.

Table 8. House Behavior by Sex and Race - Aftercare

HOUSE BEHAVIOR	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
POOR	3	11.5	8	36.4	5	16.7	2	25.0	8	14.3	10	33.3
AVERAGE	20	76.9	13	59.1	24	80.0	5	62.5	44	78.6	18	60.0
EXCELLENT	3	11.5	1	4.5	1	3.3	1	12.5	4	7.1	2	6.7
TOTAL	26	99.9	22	100.0	30	100.0	8	100.0	56	100.0	30	100.0

Tables 8 and 9 reflect the juveniles' behavior in the group home as judged by the house social worker. Females received a rating of poor more often than males and whites more often than blacks. Generally, the Pre-Probation population was less apt to have an average rating for house behavior; more received an excellent rating when compared with the Aftercare individuals.

Table 9. House Behavior by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

HOUSE BEHAVIOR	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
POOR	6	42.9	3	27.3	0	-	2	66.7	6	35.3	5	35.7
AVERAGE	5	35.7	6	54.5	1	33.3	1	33.3	6	35.3	7	50.0
EXCELLENT	3	21.4	2	18.2	2	66.7	0	-	5	29.4	2	14.3
TOTAL	14	100.0	11	100.0	3	100.0	3	100.0	17	100.0	14	100.0

Table 10. Reason for Release by Sex and Race - Aftercare

R E A S O N	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
SATISFACTORY ADJUSTMENT	18	69.2	10	45.5	26	86.7	4	50.0	44	78.6	14	46.7
NEW OFFENSE	6	23.1	2	9.1	2	6.7	0	-	8	14.3	2	6.7
A.W.O.L.	0	-	4	18.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	13.3
*OTHER	2	7.7	6	27.3	2	6.7	4	50.0	4	7.1	10	33.3
TOTAL	26	100.0	22	100.1	30	100.1	8	100.0	56	100.0	30	100.0

*Other includes change of residence, reached age 18, and joined the Armed Forces.

The reason for the juveniles' release from Phase I is demonstrated in Tables 10 and 11. The Aftercare population was more likely to be released because of a satisfactory adjustment and less likely to have committed a new offense or to be AWOL than the Pre-Probation group. Approximately twice as many females as males were released for being AWOL.

Table 11. Reason for Release by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

REASON	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
SATISFACTORY ADJUSTMENT	7	50.0	6	54.5	3	100.0	1	33.3	10	58.8	7	50.0
NEW OFFENSE	3	21.4	2	18.2	0	-	0	-	3	17.6	2	14.3
A.W.O.L.	2	14.3	2	18.2	0	-	1	33.3	2	11.8	3	21.4
*OTHER	2	14.3	1	9.1	0	-	1	33.3	2	11.8	2	14.3
TOTAL	14	100.0	11	100.0	3	100.0	3	99.9	17	100.0	14	100.0

*Other includes change of residence, reached age 18, and joined the Armed Forces.

Table 12. Prognosis by Sex and Race - Aftercare

PROGNOSIS	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
POOR	7	26.9	10	45.5	12	40.0	4	50.0	19	33.9	14	46.7
FAIR	8	30.8	9	40.9	16	53.3	4	50.0	24	42.9	13	43.3
GOOD	11	42.3	3	13.6	2	6.7	0	-	13	23.2	3	10.0
TOTAL	26	100.0	22	100.0	30	100.0	8	100.0	56	100.0	30	100.0

Table 13. Prognosis by Sex and Race - Pre-Probation

PROGNOSIS	WHITE				BLACK				TOTAL			
	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%	Male	%	Female	%
POOR	5	35.7	5	45.5	0	-	2	66.7	5	29.4	7	50.0
FAIR	4	28.6	5	45.5	2	66.7	0	-	6	35.3	5	35.7
GOOD	5	35.7	1	9.1	1	33.3	1	33.3	6	35.3	2	14.3
TOTAL	14	100.0	11	100.1	3	100.0	3	100.0	17	100.0	14	100.0

The house social worker was asked to make a prognosis as to the child's post-release adjustment as reflected in Tables 12 and 13. In the social worker's opinion, females were predicted to have a poorer post-release performance than were males and blacks poorer than whites.

Table 14. Cost Analysis of Aftercare/Pre-Probation Project - January 1, 1972 - December 31, 1972

AFTERCARE EXPENSES	TOTAL POPULATION	EXPENDITURES	COST PER CHILD	CHILD PER DAY
*Personal Services		\$ 123,235.04		\$ 6.51
**Non-Personal Services		38,254.10		2.03
TOTAL COST		\$ 161,489.14	\$ 1,035.19	\$ 8.54
<u>PHASE I COSTS</u>				
Personal Services		\$ 79,140.18		\$ 10.97
Non-Personal Services		34,853.06		4.83
TOTAL COST		\$ 113,993.24	\$ 730.73	\$ 15.80
<u>PHASE II COSTS</u>				
Personal Services		\$ 44,094.86		\$ 3.77
Non-Personal Services		3,401.04		.29
TOTAL COST		\$ 47,495.90	\$ 304.46	\$ 4.06
Total Number of Children	156			
Total Number of Child/Days	18,918			
PHASE I - Child/Days	7,213			
PHASE II - Child/Days	11,705			

*Personal Cost include salaries and fringe benefits.

**Non-Personal Costs include all other expenditures.

During the calendar year 1972, 156 juveniles spent 18,918 days in the Aftercare/Pre-Pro probation program. A total of 7,213 days in Phase I and 11,705 in Phase II.

Total expenditures were \$1,035.19 per case. The average daily expenditure per case was \$8.54. Phase I, the residential component of the program, cost approximately four times as much as Phase II (\$15.80 per child per day as compared to \$4.06 for Phase II non-residential care).

In reviewing a cost analysis of programs completed in 1971, the Aftercare/Pre-Pro probation program was more expensive than community based treatment, comparable to Southfields and less costly than Ormsby Village Treatment Center.

A P P E N D I X I

METHODOLOGY FOR COMPUTATION
OF SUCCESS - FAILURE PROJECTIONS

The Treatment Analysis, completed by the MSSD Office of Research and Planning in 1971, provided the necessary base rate data from which the projections were made. Using the data provided by this study a formula was developed for predicting the future success/failure rate of a program based on the In-Treatment offense rate. In mathematical terms, this formula can be stated as:

$$Fp = IoX + InoY$$

Where Fp = projected failures in the program,

Io = the number of In-Treatment offenders,

Ino = the number of Non In-Treatment offenders,

X = the rate of In-Treatment offenders in the general population who became failures, and

Y = the rate of Non In-Treatment offenders in the general population who became failures.

A significant finding of the Treatment Analysis was that race significantly affected the rate of both In-Treatment and Non In-Treatment offenders who eventually became failures. Therefore, the formula was adapted to adjust for a racial distinction. In symbolic terms:

$$Fpr = IorXr + InorYr$$

Where Fpr = projected failures for the program in the racial category,

Ior = the number of In-Treatment offenders in the racial category,

Xr = the rate of In-Treatment offenders in the general population for the racial category who became failures, and

Yr = the rate of Non In-Treatment offenders in the general population for the racial category who became failures.

Using this formula, a projection of the ultimate success/failure was computed (See Table 20, Section I).

A P P E N D I X II

PHASE I DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT

METROPOLITAN SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Aftercare Program Summary

PHASE ONE

Phase I Social Worker _____ / _____

Type (1-2) _____

Record Number (3-8) _____

Name: _____ / _____

Sex: 1) Male 2) Female (9) _____

Race: 1) White 2) Negro 3) Other (10) _____

Source of Referral: 1) Court 2) O.V.T.C.
3) Southfields 4) D.C.W.
5) Other _____ (11) _____

Original Reason for Commitment. (Code Charge) (12-13) _____

PRE-HISTORY

Age at first referral (14-15) _____

Number of formal appearances (to date) (16-17) _____

Number of informal referrals (to date) (18-19) _____

Number of prior institutionalizations (not including
the one leading to aftercare) (20) _____

Age at admission to Aftercare (21-22) _____

Admission Date (23-28) _____

Release Date (Phase One only) (29-34) _____

Time in Phase One (weeks) (35-36) _____

Reason for Release 1) satisfactory adjustment
2) New offense 3) AWOL
4) other _____ (37) _____

Went AWOL during Phase I 1) yes 2) no (38) _____

Mode of Release: 1) Aftercare Phase II
2) Foster Home 3) Court
4) AWOL 5) Other _____

(39) _____

House Number

(40) _____

REATMENT

Frequency of Individual Conferences

- 1) Not applicable
- 2) Daily 3) Every other day.
- 4) 3 times a week 5) weekly
- 5) Every other week.

(41) _____

Initial Response to Casework Services

- 1) Not applicable
- 2) Very Poor 3) Poor
- 4) Acceptable 5) Good
- 6) Very Good

(42) _____

Child's Peer Group Status in House

- 1) Not applicable
- 2) Leader 3) Follower
- 4) Member 5) Loner
- 6) Scapegoat

(43) _____

.....
Number of Visits by the Family

(44) _____

Total Number of Family Conferences

(45) _____

Family Reaction to Casework Services

- 1) Not applicable
- 2) Very Poor 3) Poor
- 4) Acceptable 5) Good
- 6) Very Good.

(46) _____

.....
Training Plan for Child

- 1) All day school (academic)
- 2) All day school (vocational)
- 3) All day work. 4) Part time work
- 5) 1 & 4 6) 2 & 4
- 7) Other _____

(47) _____

School Performance: 1) Not applicable (48) _____
2) Poor 3) Average
4) Excellent

Job Performance: 1) Not applicable
2) Poor 3) Average (49) _____
4) Excellent

House Performance/Behavior:
1) Poor 2) Average (50) _____
3) Excellent

PARENTS

Age of Father at Commitment (51-52) _____

Previously Married? 1)yes 2) no (53) _____

Age of Mother at Commitment (54-55) _____

Previously Married? 1)yes 2)no (56) _____

.....

Child's Prognosis on Release from Phase One
1) Poor
2) Fair
3) Good (57) _____

I.Q. (58-60) _____

I-Level (61-62) _____

(63-79) BLANK

Card Number (80) 1

COMMENTS:

END