

DRUG CONTROL POLICY

Fax:517-373-2963

Dec 16 '02 16:04 P.04

214461

**Michigan Juvenile Intervention Initiative
Michigan State University
Fiscal Year 2001 Report on Project Activities**

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

**Submitted to:
Michigan Department of Community Health
Office of Drug Control Policy**

November 28, 2001

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
OFFICE OF DRUG CONTROL POLICY
BYRNE MEMORIAL FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM
FINAL PROGRAM REPORT

Michigan Dept. of Community Health
OFFICE OF DRUG CONTROL POLICY
DEC 11 2001

INSTRUCTIONS: The Quarterly Program Report is due in the Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP) **no later than 20 days following the end of the quarterly report period.** Failure to submit this report by the due date will cause ODCP to withhold the release of funds.

GRANTEE <i>Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice</i>		ODCP PROJECT NUMBER <i>83001-2500</i>
PROJECT TITLE <i>Michigan Juvenile Center/center Initiative</i>		
PROJECT START DATE <i>10/1/00</i>	PROJECT END DATE <i>10/1/01</i>	
Quarter <input type="checkbox"/> 1st <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> 4th <i>Year-end</i>		Report Period Ending <i>10/1/01</i>

REPORT NARRATIVE:

MICHIGAN JUVENILE INTERVENTION INITIATIVE

Use attached forms to provide a **complete** description of all project activities during this quarterly reporting period. Attach additional pages as necessary.

PROJECT DIRECTOR (NAME AND TITLE) <i>Timothy S. Byrum, Ph.D.</i>	TELEPHONE NUMBER <i>517-353-4515</i>
SIGNATURE <i>[Signature]</i>	DATE <i>12/7/01</i>

SUBMISSION: Attach all narrative information to the completed Quarterly Program Report form and mail to:

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
Office of Drug Control Policy
Lewis Cass Building, 2nd Floor
320 S. Walnut St.
Lansing, Michigan 48913
Telephone: 517-373-4300 Fax: 517-373-2963

By Authority of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988.
This report must be submitted in accordance with
grant contract terms and conditions.

[Signature]
DCH-007
REV 10/01

MICHIGAN JUVENILE INTERVENTION INITIATIVE

- I. Attach copies of all Quarterly Intake, Sanction, Progress, and Graduation reports from MJII Database.**
- II. Summarize goals, objectives, and quantifiable measures for FY 2000-2001.**
- III. Describe any project changes during the grant year.**

Introduction

The MSU team identified four primary goals to be accomplished during the 2000-2001 program year. The first goal was to provide comprehensive and regular technical assistance to the four project sites. Technical assistance was made available to the grantees through both large group meetings and individual site visits and phone contacts. Another important goal was the development of a case tracking system for each of the project sites. The project database allows project sites to collect information on each project participant. This information is then used to examine the attainment of project goals and to compare program outcomes across sites. The third goal of the project year was to develop outcome and assessment measures for each of the project sites. The MSU team developed a questionnaire to be administered to all youths in the project at different phases in the project period. The final goal of the project year was to establish a framework for delinquency prevention. A larger goal of the project in general is to develop programs that can be replicated in other sites in the state. During this project year, the MSU team conducted a number of ride alongs, interviews, and telephone contacts with the project staff to document the implementation of the project. The process evaluation will aid the MSU team in identifying factors associated with successful program implementation. The MSU team has made substantial progress toward achieving the goals set for the project year. Specific accomplishments for each goal are outlined below.

The overall project goal across the four sites was to direct attention at a previously ignored group of juvenile offenders: those who were 13 year old and younger but had been arrested for serious, non-violent offenses. Research from the sites indicated that this small group of offenders were at high risk for chronic and serious offending, as indicated by their arrest histories. This mirrored a body national research that indicates younger juvenile offenders, or those with "early onset" of delinquent behavior, are at higher risks for serious and chronic careers¹. Prior to the implementation phase, it was clear that none of the four sites concentrated on the identified target group. Our review of the four sites indicates that, with respect to drawing attention and resources to a previously ignored population, the first year has been successful. Under the grant programs, each site is maintaining small caseloads of high-risk juveniles between the ages of 10 and 13. The character of programming and interagency collaboration differs across sites, but each is appropriately focused on serious non-violent youthful offenders.

¹ Thornberry, T.P., Huizinga, D., and Locher, R. 1995. The prevention of serious delinquency and violence: Implications from the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency. In *Sourcebook on Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*, edited by J.C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J.D. Hawkins, and J.J. Wilson. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 213-237.

Meetings

During the grant year a number of meetings were held for all grantees involved in the Michigan Juvenile Intervention Initiative. The goal of the meetings was to provide the project sites with technical assistance in developing and implementing their grant program. In addition to the meetings listed below, the MSU team made numerous site visits to and telephone contacts with each of the sites during the grant year.

During the first quarter two meetings were held. On November 15, 2000 a meeting was held at the Kellogg Center at Michigan State University. The MSU team hosted a National teleconference presentation on Early Childhood Delinquency presented by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the American Society of Criminology. The teleconference included presentations by a panel of experts on juvenile delinquency. The national audience was also allowed to call in and ask the panelists questions. This meeting was very important to the project in that the research presented by the panelists reinforced the program models that had been developed by the MJII sites. The MSU team facilitated a discussion of the material presented during the teleconference.

On December 8, 2000 a quarterly site meeting was held at the Radisson Hotel. The goal of this meeting was to have each of the sites present the details of their program models. Each site was given thirty minutes to present the details of their program model. Following the presentation, sites were encouraged to ask questions of the presenters. This meeting was a great success. Site team members discussed at length their program models and sites provided suggestions on how to improve their models.

A group meeting was not held during the second quarter; however, the MSU team did make a presentation on the successes of the MJII program at the Annual Byrne Grantee Meeting on January 11, 2001. The goal of this meeting was to assist new grant applicants in understanding the elements necessary for a successful intervention program.

Two site meetings were held during the third quarter to help grantees in developing their application for the second phase of the project. The purpose of the first meeting, held on March 13, 2001, was to allow site staff to present the progress they had made over the year in implementing their program model and to prepare the teams to apply for the next program year. Each site made a presentation on the accomplishments of the program and other site team members were encouraged to ask questions of the presenters. During the second half of the meeting the MSU team presented information on the progress of the evaluation plan. The MSU team presented information on the project database that had been developed and discussed plans to interview all project participants. Members of the ODCP staff closed the meeting by presenting information on applications for the second project year.

In addition to the group meetings, individual meetings were held at each of the sites to discuss plans for the upcoming grant year. Each site was asked to bring all primary personnel and grant partners to the table to assess the successes of the first year and to develop plans to improve and expand the program during the second year. The individual site leaders made a presentation on the progress the site had made during the year and what changes were to be proposed for the next project year. The MSU team, along with the ODCP staff, was then able to highlight possible deficiencies and/or

problems with the grant projects. All participants then worked together to identify possible solutions to the problems.

In addition to the site-specific meetings a second group meeting was also held during this quarter. A meeting was held on May 15, 2001 for all grantees to present their final grant proposals. All grantees gave a 30-minute presentation on their program. The research team and ODCP then discussed the projects with the grantees. The MSU team was able to make advance plans with the grantees to help them implement any changes to their grant. This meeting also provided both the grantees and the evaluation staff an opportunity to ask any final questions before the final grants were submitted.

A training session was held for all project staff during the fourth quarter. On August 20, 2001 a meeting was held at MSU to instruct the site staff on how to use the database that had been developed for the project. During the first part of the meeting the MSU staff made a presentation on the database and how it could best be utilized by the project staff. The site project staff also brought with them case files from their site. The project staff used this information to begin working with the database. During the final part of the meeting, all grantees discussed any final questions or concerns that they had with the database. The grantees were then given the database on CD to take home to their jurisdictions.

Program Databases²

One important effort of the second grant year has been the standardization of data collection procedures. It is important that all sites are collecting the same material and coding the material in a similar format. Standardizing this process allows for better cross-site documentation and comparisons. The MSU technical assistance team developed a database that contains program information components relating to participant demographics, qualifying offense, mental health history, school performance history, characteristics of contacts with individuals, and participation in grant-funded program activities.

Gender Characteristics

Site	Female	Male	Total
Grand Rapids	6	33	39
<i>Row Total</i>	15%	85%	100%
Lansing	8	27	35
<i>Row Total</i>	23%	77%	100%
Saginaw	0	17	17
<i>Row Total</i>	0%	100%	100%
Total	14	77	91
<i>Row Total</i>	15%	85%	100%

Race/Ethnicity Characteristics

Site	African American	Biracial	Hispanic	White	Total
Grand Rapids	7	0	7	25	39
<i>Row Total</i>	18%	0%	18%	64%	100%
Lansing	18	3	4	10	35
<i>Row Total</i>	51%	9%	11%	29%	100%
Saginaw	15	0	1	1	17
<i>Row Total</i>	88%	0%	6%	6%	100%
Total	40	3	12	36	91
<i>Row Total</i>	44%	3%	13%	40%	100%

The first section of this analysis details demographic characteristics of the program participants. Review of the above program models indicates all sites proposed developing comprehensive intervention programs for first time (or near first time)

² No data from the Flint Police Department was included in this analysis because, to date, no data has been submitted.

juvenile offenders between the ages of 10-13 that were arrested for serious, non-violent offenses. Grand Rapids Police Department has included a total of 39 program participants during the first program year, the City of Lansing a total of 35 individuals and Saginaw 17 participants. There were, however, some minor differences in the target populations. Saginaw police department limited the program to males while Grand Rapids and Lansing have a limited number of female program participants. In all sites, the vast majority of program participants are males. African Americans comprise the largest racial group included in the program (44 percent) followed by Whites (40 percent) and Hispanics (13 percent).

The data indicate all sites were successful in limiting program participation to the age-related selection criteria. Of the 91 total program participants, 83 percent were between the ages of 10-13 when they were selected to participate in the program. Only 4 participants were younger than 10 and 9 were slightly older than 13. Data was missing for 3 participants. In many cases, these participants were within a few months of the age-related criteria. The largest deviation is for the City of Lansing who reported 26 percent of their participants as 14 upon entry into the program.

Age Characteristics

Site	9	10	11	12	13	14	Unknown	Total
Grand Rapids	0	4	6	11	18	0	0	39
<i>Row Total</i>	0%	10%	15%	28%	46%	0%	0%	100%
Lansing	1	2	5	9	8	9	1	35
<i>Row Total</i>	3%	6%	14%	26%	23%	26%	3%	100%
Saginaw	3	1	2	7	2	0	2	17
<i>Row Total</i>	18%	6%	12%	41%	12%	0%	12%	100%
Total	4	7	13	27	28	9	3	91
<i>Row Total</i>	4%	8%	14%	30%	31%	10%	3%	100%

The following table details the qualifying offense for program participants.³ The data indicate that the Cities of Grand Rapids and Lansing were largely successful in limiting participation to the qualifying offenses that were stipulated under the program guidelines. The criteria proposed that participation be limited to serious, non-violent offenses. The selection criteria, however, did allow sites to include individuals arrested for low-level assaults and criminal sexual conduct. Eventually, all sites were encouraged to summarily exclude future assault cases from their selection criteria. It should be noted the offense criteria refers to the most serious police charge for which an individual was arrested. The criteria are limited to the police charge and do not reflect the charge(s) filed by the prosecutor or eventual adjudication charge(s).

³ The City of Saginaw was also excluded because these data were not submitted.

Qualifying Offense by Location			
Qualifying Offense	Grand Rapids	Lansing	Total
Arson	1	1	2
Column Total	3%	3%	3%
Assault	7	8	15
Column Total	18%	23%	21%
Auto Theft	1	0	1
Column Total	3%	0%	1%
Breaking & Entering	9	13	22
Column Total	23%	37%	30%
Criminal Sexual Conduct	8	0	8
Column Total	21%	0%	11%
Curfew	1	0	1
Column Total	3%	0%	1%
Drug Possession	0	1	1
Column Total	0%	3%	1%
Furnishing False Information	0	1	1
Column Total	0%	3%	1%
Joyriding	0	1	1
Column Total	0%	3%	1%
Larceny	5	9	14
Column Total	13%	26%	19%
Malicious Dest. Property	1	0	1
Column Total	3%	0%	1%
Receiving and Concealing	3	0	3
Column Total	8%	0%	4%
Robbery	2	1	3
Column Total	5%	3%	4%
Unknown	1	0	1
Column Total	3%	0%	0%
Total	39	35	74
Column Total	100%	100%	100%

Both Grand Rapids (23 percent) and Lansing (37 percent) reported the largest qualifying offense category as breaking and entering, an offense classified as a serious, non-violent offense. Grand Rapids also included a sizable proportion of individuals arrested for criminal sexual conduct (21 percent) and Lansing for assault (8 percent). Grand Rapids did however, report one participant referred for what is considered a relatively minor offense, violation of curfew ordinance.

The intent of the program is to provide comprehensive and intensive services to program participants. One measure of "intensity" is the extent to which participants have contact with program staff. In this case, "contacts" are defined as purposeful interactions with program staff. Contacts may take the form of direct face-to-face contacts, phone contacts, or contacts made with the client by another officer. In a general sense, it reflects the extent to which participants are "monitored" in the community by program staff. The Cities of Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Saginaw all reported high numbers of contacts with individual program participants. Grand Rapids, for example, reported 1343 total contacts to date, Lansing 560 contacts and Saginaw 829 contacts. According to this analysis, Grand Rapids has reported contacts for 14 of 39⁴ individuals, Lansing 33 of 35 individuals, and Saginaw 17 of 17 individuals. The mean number of contacts per individual included in the analysis is 96 for Grand Rapids, 17 for Lansing, and 49 for

Summary of Contacts				
Site	Total Contacts	Mean Contacts Per Individual^a	Minimum Contacts Per Individual^a	Maximum Contacts Per Individual^a
Grand Rapids	1343	96	3	323
Lansing	560	17	1	47
Saginaw	829	49	15	97

^a Calculation is based on total number of individuals contacted not total number included in program.

Saginaw. The data indicate substantial amounts of variance in total number of contacts. In the City of Grand Rapids, for example, the number of contacts per individual ranges from 1 to 323. The variance is somewhat less in Lansing and Saginaw yet substantial gaps exist.

The final analysis details the types of contacts made by each program site. Each site was provided the ability to personalize "contact types" so that the program could be tailed to fit their own reporting needs. Although this strategy is effective in making the database user friendly to each location and work with internal paperwork processes, it does somewhat hinder the comparability of the data across sites. In some instances, the categories are not mutually exclusive or sufficiently descriptive. Grand Rapids, for example, created a category called "surveillance." The contact type details contacts made via the surveillance officers that were hired with grant funds. While it is useful to detail this information, the description does not indicate if the contacts were made in person, on the phone, or another method. Moreover, Saginaw created a category called "School." Although it is assumed this refers to personal contacts made with participants at school, this remains unclear. MSU staff will further review the information from the sites and create more appropriate contact categories.

⁴ Grand Rapids program staff indicated they are in the process of entering back contact data. Data have been entered for less than half of their program participants. Thus, these data under estimate the total number of contacts made to date.

The data indicate surveillance staff made the majority of contacts with program participants in Grand Rapids. Program staff reports a few instances of personal or phone contacts other than those made by surveillance staff. Lansing reported over 80 percent of their contacts were personal contacts. Personal contacts refer to situations where program staff, in this case probation and police department project staff, made personal visits to participants. These visits tend to occur at home or in school. Lansing Police Department also reported 54 phone contacts and 20 third person contacts. Third person contacts refer to field contacts made by other LPD officers. Saginaw reported 42 percent of their contacts were also personal contacts, 18 percent contacts with family members, and 13 percent as school contacts. They also reported 10 percent of their contacts as

Type of Contacts by Location

Contact Type	Grand Rapids	Lansing	Saginaw	Total
Family Contact	0	0	146	146
<i>Column Total</i>	0%	0%	18%	5%
Personal	55	460	348	863
<i>Column Total</i>	4%	82%	42%	32%
Phone	27	54	1	82
<i>Column Total</i>	2%	10%	0%	3%
School	0	0	106	106
<i>Column Total</i>	0%	0%	13%	4%
Surveillance	1261	0	0	1261
<i>Column Total</i>	94%	0%	0%	46%
Third Person	0	20	0	20
<i>Column Total</i>	0%	4%	0%	1%
Other Contact	0	0	79	79
<i>Column Total</i>	0%	0%	10%	3%
Other Officer	0	26	1	27
<i>Column Total</i>	0%	5%	0%	1%
Unable to Contact	0	0	148	148
<i>Column Total</i>	0%	0%	18%	5%
Total	1343	560	829	2732

“other contacts.”

Conclusion

The data detailed in this section indicate the sites have been largely successful in keeping to the selection criteria established at the onset of the program. Although each site indicated minor deviations during the early stages of the program, most have modified their criteria to limit the scope of the program to serious, non-violent offenders between ages 10-13. These data also indicate the overall program has been successful in achieving "intensive" efforts. Although the data only detail contacts, the three sites discussed have demonstrated a resource intensive commitment to surveillance.

Interview Component

The Michigan Justice Statistics Center has been involved in the evaluation of the Michigan Juvenile Intervention Initiative (MJII) since implementation began in 2000. This appraisal will encompass a detailed process and outcome evaluation considering several measures of effectiveness and/or success. One major aspect of this evaluation involves an interview of each program participant at three different stages (intake, 6 months, 12 months) to discern changes that occur during - and following - participation in the specific programming at each site. This section will detail some preliminary results from the first round of interviews at each site.

Interviews have been conducted at all sites for approximately seven months. Information was collected on offending patterns based on over two-dozen different offenses. Table 1 below displays descriptive details of what was uncovered in those interviews. As can be seen, there is wide variation in the types of offenses youth are engaged in. Moreover, the types and frequency of specific offenses seem to depend on the location. For example, while 46% of youth in Lansing had run away from home, only 8% of Saginaw youth and none of the juveniles in Flint reported running away from home. One third of the youth in Saginaw and Lansing indicate that they have carried a weapon; however, over two-thirds (67%) of youth in Flint and 45% of youth in Grand Rapids reported carrying a weapon. Of those who carried weapons, 43% carried a knife only, 30% carried a gun, 23% and carried both a knife and a gun. The most common type of gun carried was a BB gun, though various calibers of handguns were also reported. Youths in Lansing and Grand Rapids reported carrying knives more often, while those in Flint and Saginaw admitted to carrying guns most often. For example, all youths who carried weapons in Flint reported carrying guns, while only 36% of weapon carriers in Lansing reported it being a gun.

Other offenses were fairly consistent across sites. For example, 75% of the total sample has assaulted a peer (range 67%-86%). Approximately 1/3 of the total sample reported that they had cheated on a test at school. About half of the youth interviewed admitted to shoplifting at least once.

The frequency of participation in each delinquent activity in the previous 12 months also measures the extent to which youth are simply experimenting or involved on a more regular basis. For those in the sample who admitted to smoking marijuana, they used this drug an average of 78 times in the previous year. Also, while only 12% of the sample reported carrying a weapon within the past year, those who did carried it often (and average of 58 times).

While offense participation information is an important aspect of the evaluation, it is not the only information obtained from the interviews. Below are some other interesting findings:

- 69% agreed that it is ok to hit someone who hits you first
- 10% belong to a gang

- 99% expect to graduate from high school
- 94% expect to go to college
- 69% have heard guns being shot in their neighborhood
- 34% have seen someone get shot or stabbed

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for JII Sample, First Interview - Disaggregated by Site (as of 11/01/01)

Offense	Total (67)		Flint (9)		Grand Rapids (22)		Lansing (24)		Saginaw (12)	
	% Yes ¹	Mean ²	% Yes ¹	Mean ²	% Yes ¹	Mean ²	% Yes ¹	Mean ²	% Yes ¹	Mean ²
Cheated on school tests	33	3.85	22	1.50	50	3.10	25	3.20	25	9.00
Skipped School	54	14.63	44	7.25	68	11.07	50	27.09	42	3.80
Sent Home From School	76	8.08	67	8.17	82	4.65	71	9.18	83	12.00
Ran Away From Home	27	5.94	0	0.00	27	3.00	46	7.55	8	3.00
Damaged Property	42	2.39	44	2.25	41	2.56	42	2.40	42	2.00
Theft at Home	22	3.31	0	0.00	32	2.00	25	4.50	17	3.00
Trespassing	42	16.68	56	4.20	45	32.70	38	11.22	33	4.50
Theft from Auto	29	3.37	33	2.33	32	3.86	26	3.17	25	3.67
Shoplifting	51	14.80	44	6.25	45	8.29	63	22.43	42	9.40
Thrown Rocks at Others	46	8.76	56	2.80	45	15.11	42	8.78	50	4.17
Consumed Alcohol	48	10.59	56	4.60	68	3.47	38	28.56	25	2.33
Chewed Tobacco	4	2.33	11	1.00	0	0.00	4	5.00	8	1.00
Used Marijuana	45	78.20	44	4.00	50	19.55	46	164.18	33	77.25
Smoked Cigarettes	46	72.97	44	2.75	55	80.45	42	126.70	42	5.20
Sniffed Glue	3	1.00	0	0.00	9	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Assault Adult	34	3.36	44	1.50	36	6.00	38	1.89	17	4.50
Assault Peer	75	9.82	67	15.00	86	6.32	71	13.47	67	6.00
Graffiti	25	3.31	33	2.00	32	2.00	21	7.25	17	2.00
Disorderly Conduct	36	7.27	22	1.00	27	4.00	50	12.60	33	2.00
Arson/Attempted Arson	12	1.50	22	1.00	5	2.00	17	1.67	8	0.00
Carried a Weapon	43	58.03	67	63.00	45	44.80	38	94.22	33	2.25
Avoid Paying for Bus/Movie	27	8.00	44	3.00	27	2.67	29	2.29	8	100.00
Pick Pocket	4	2.67	0	0.00	14	2.67	0	0.00	0	0.00
Arrested	73	3.06	100	1.89	73	2.50	71	3.65	58	5.00

¹ Percent of youths reporting involvement in this activity

² Average number of times this act was committed in the last 12 months by those who engaged in it

Site Summaries

The Michigan Juvenile Intervention Initiative is intended to provide community-based intervention and treatment services for serious, non-violent juvenile offenders between ages 10-13. The direction of the program was based both on national program models and analysis of local police arrest records that indicated juveniles fitting this criterion are most likely to develop into serious and/or chronic offenders. For example, analysis of ten years (1989-1998) of police department arrest data indicated that juveniles with two arrests prior to age 14 were at an extremely high level of risk of future arrest: 65 percent had at least one future arrest and nearly 50 percent had three or more future arrests. These findings are highly consistent with other national findings (see Thornberry, Huizinga, and Loeber (1995). The importance of intervention programs for this target population was further amplified when focus groups with juvenile justice professionals from each site revealed that current policies generally provided few resources for this group of offenders.

Grand Rapids Police Department

Grand Rapids, Michigan has a population of slightly less than 200,000 and is the second largest city in the state. The police department employs 387 police officers and 100 civilian employees. It is the second largest police department in the state of Michigan.

Program Model: An Overview

The city of Grand Rapids has collaborated with several stakeholders to develop and implement an intense programming model to address the needs of youth involved in the early stages of delinquent activities. The Grand Rapids Intervention Program (GRIP) has four main components. First, the Community Policing and Probation project, which was piloted in the past, has been expanded to two other service areas in the city. This intensive probation program has provided both concentrated surveillance and the opportunity for pro-social encounters during non-traditional hours. Second, the Family court has completed risk assessment forms for all youth in the target age group. Third, when these youth are placed on formal probation, their probation order included attendance at either Youth Commonwealth or one of the Recreation Reaps Rewards programs (or other suitable program as determined by the court). Finally, an additional officer in the Serious Habitual Offender Team (SHOT) coordinates police activity with the Community Policing and Probation program and provides beat officers with updated information on juvenile offenders.

A specific target population was identified by MSU as a group of high-risk youth who may benefit from an intensive program such as the Grand Rapids model. This group consists of young second-time offenders (between the ages of 10-13) who are arrested for a serious, non-violent offense during the study period. They are identified by court officers who are aware of the initiative and fast-tracked into the program by being placed on the caseload of grant-funded probation officers.

GRIP personnel and partners: Observations and Interviews

During the summer of 2001 the MSU research team conducted in person and telephone interviews, as well as site visits that included observations of project personnel involved with the GRIP program on a daily basis. The research team made contact and interviewed a total of eleven people involved in the GRIP program ranging from the Supervisor of probation to administrative assistants in the prosecutors office. Below we discuss five aspects of the program that site personnel responded to including: The program model, actions taken to change youths, the most positive aspect of the program, the area where the program could be improved, and the change in interagency collaboration that occurred since the GRIP project started. Since some of those interviewed do not have a primary role in the project, and therefore have limited knowledge of the GRIP program, their responses will be omitted where necessary.

Program model:

- The program is aimed at getting kids involved in activities, keeping them busy and involved in meaningful activities

- Surveillance and recreation with some focus on specific programming such as mentoring and conflict resolution
- Sense of accountability from a variety of organizations including recreation. Also provide a set of positive role models
- Constant supervision – “kids complain that they are always being watched”
- Build a framework where kids can demonstrate that they are responsible individuals, especially through positive role models in recreation programs. Some specific case planning can also focus on individual needs.
- Focus on kids at an earlier age and “show them that somebody cares”
- Focus on kids 10-13 who are at risk and provide services for early intervention
- Assist youths in positive decision making and life skills
- Instilling positive attitudes and providing an environment for social interaction

Actions for changing youths (direct contact personnel only):

- Provide guidance and support to youth through the Youth Commonwealth center
- Varied activities including educational activities involving work in math and science, life skills training, recreational activities including team sports and field trips
- Coordination of sessions on decision making, life skills training, and how youths must take responsibility for actions and choices
- Make sure youths have contact with positive role models through recreation programs
- Distributing rewards *and* consequences to youths as needed
- Administer drug testing and maintain surveillance on youths

Most positive aspects of the program:

- Positive changes (non-specific) of the youths involved
- Comprehensive, holistic approach to intervention coupled with a strong support system for the youth

- Cooperative efforts of the police and the courts
- Alternative to detention for the youth and an opportunity to lead normal lives while receiving support from the program
- Surveillance officers provide a watcher and a mentor for youths by giving them the sense they are accountable and a model to emulate
- Intense supervision gives a sense of continuous surveillance
- Juveniles are kept involved in activities through recreation programs
- Accountability through surveillance
- Individual youths have made positive changes since the program "reinforces good decision making"
- Large community stake in the GRIP project

How could the program be improved?

- Increased interagency communication and cooperation
- Increase the target group size so more juveniles can benefit
- Increase services to youths including a victim/offender mediation session and parental substance abuse program
- Ensure the commitment of programs to deal with at risk kids
- More family counseling would be useful
- More concrete guidelines for what constitutes a sanctionable behavior and a schedule of sanctions for violations
- High use of detention as a sanction
- Anger management services necessary for the target group

Collaboration enhanced under the program

- Existing relationships, especially between the courts and police have been strengthened
- Geographically, organizations on the Westside of Grand Rapids have become more cohesive in delivering services to youths

- Community groups have made contacts with probation officers and provide information on youths
- Grand Rapids Police Department prepares information on repeat calls to addresses and contacts with parents of the target youths to the court as a "heads up" of possible parental problems
- The Prosecutor's office expedites GRIP cases for processing
- Weed and Seed has provided an outlet for restitution and community service

The impression of Program Model as suggested by on site personnel is a mixture of intense monitoring, involvement in pro-social recreation activities, and the reinforcement of positive decision-making within the target population. A summary of the actions that are taken to change how the youths behave includes constant surveillance, recreation, life skills training, and the introduction of positive role models in their lives. These actions that are reported are congruent with the formal program model that the GRIP project outlined as well as the program models suggested by the personnel interviewed.

In terms of positive effects of the program, accountability through monitoring for youthful offenders in the target group emerged as the primary positive outcome mentioned by project personnel. In addition, the program fosters involvement of youth in a program that was previously not available and provides an avenue for the development of better decision making skills. Improvements in the program seem to focus on two fronts: Sanctions and program content. In depth conversations with probation officers indicated that intermediate measures such as report writing and community service were available and used before detention would be considered for a violation. The uncertainty of how sanctions correspond to violations emerged as an issue and a "sanction schedule" does not exist for GRIP youths.

Collaboration between agencies is an important part of stimulating comprehensive change in how youths are dealt with in the juvenile justice system. The numbers of individuals and agencies involved in the GRIP program, from police, courts, recreation, probation, and prosecution indicates that the effort includes much interagency cooperation. The interviewees were asked about new relationships and strengthened relationships under the GRIP program. Collaboration was enhanced across all agencies but especially interesting is the impression that the community is being used as a resource for understanding and dealing with the target youths and that the Westside especially has become more cohesive in terms of service delivery. The preexisting relationship between the Kent County Juvenile Court and the Grand Rapids Police Department has been strengthened through regular meetings and discussions of the program. In addition, GRIP cases are expedited by the prosecutor's office and fast tracked into the program.

Lansing Police Department

The population of the City of Lansing is approximately 120,000. Thirty percent of the population is between 15 and 34 and the mean age is 31.4 years. The majority of residents are considered White (66 percent) and African Americans represent the largest minority group (22 percent). The Lansing Police Department (LPD) employed 261 officers in 2000, a number that has remained reasonably steady the last few years.

Program Model: An Overview

Lansing has continued to work with the target population as defined in the grant application. They will continue to target juvenile offenders between ages 10-13 first arrested for a serious non-violent crime. Due to potential problems with adequate sample size, Lansing relaxed these criteria slightly to allow for the arrest of interest to be the second arrest as long as there is no prior record of a serious violent offense. Both females and males are included for intervention programming efforts.

Lansing has partnered with the Ingham County 30th Judicial Circuit Court to provide comprehensive intervention services combined with intensive supervision to program participants. The comprehensive services include drug testing and treatment, psychological counseling that includes behavior modification and cognitive development efforts, and family counseling. The family counseling component addresses problems associated with family functioning and community, and substance abuse by family members. The program is also intended to provide mental health services to individuals experiencing one or more clinically diagnosed emotional problems. Finally, the program is intended to create positive change in the educational experiences by connecting students to tutoring and mentoring programs available in the Lansing School District. These services are delivered in a fashion that includes intensive supervision. Regular contact is made with each client, their families, and often school administrators and teachers. The intent of the intensive supervision is to constantly track the progress of individuals while keeping up to date on their behavior at home and in school.

Observations and Interviews

The MSU research team has been in contact with members of the LPD/30th Judicial Circuit Court during the past program year. Regular team meetings are held to discuss and rectify problems with the implementation of the program. The MSU team has also conducted personal interviews with three of the key project staff and five key project stakeholders. In addition, ride alongs were conducted with project personnel to determine the nature of their activities during a "typical" day. Below we discuss five aspects of the program that site personnel responded to including: The program model, actions taken to change youth, the most positive aspect of the program, the area where the program could be improved, and the change in interagency collaboration that occurred since the project started. The following detail important emergent issues from these interviews:

Program model:

- Create alternative consequences to detention for targeted youth

- Recognizing that offending among younger juveniles is serious and to get them into the system and services earlier to prevent future delinquency
- Developing comprehensive intervention strategies
- "Fix" problems that cause delinquency
- Create a positive environment for juveniles to get help
- The program identifies youthful offenders in their early stages of delinquency and intervenes in order to prevent further delinquency. The program looks at family and home issues along with early intervention to provide appropriate services to the youth
- The program identifies juvenile offenders and then provides better monitoring of the youth, more targeted support mechanisms and programs such as probation, counseling and tutoring
- Effectively "interrupt" the progression of the youth toward a life of crime

Actions for changing youth (direct contact personnel only):

- It is important to monitor and counsel youth. Also, to provide both consequences for negative behavior and rewards for positive behavior
- Assess the needs of each individual and connect them into the appropriate services including mental health, education, etc
- Make youth understand the importance of community service and other related activities

Most positive aspects of the program:

- The program has done a good job of delivering important services to program youth. Even for those youth that were moved from the program to residential placement, important services are being delivered that are expected to decrease future contact with the criminal justice system
- Getting juveniles help who would otherwise fall through the cracks of the system
- The program has given key project staff the ability to spend extensive time with program participants. Although problems have been encountered with spending too much time with certain individuals, the one-on-one approach has been effective
- The program has increased interagency communication and cooperation

- Prior to the implementation of the program, there was little to no communication between the various partners. The increased cooperation has resulted in safer schools and coordinated resources. For example, the police/court/school partnership has enhanced clearer communication between the three as to whom is on probation in various schools, the nature of probation requirements, and a direct contact should an incident occur with one of the program participants. In addition, it has increased the flow of information from the schools to the project staff about educational issues such as performance, attendance, and behavior
- Because of the increased communication, various partners have been able to "take risks" by trying strategies that had not been attempted in the past
- Juveniles involved in the program receive services much quicker than under traditional probation

How could the program be improved?

- There are still problems with internal administrative processes. The problems relate to documenting contacts with individuals, completion of necessary paperwork in a timely manner, and documentation of the services received by participants
- It would be beneficial to have more LPD officers involved in the program
- The program needs role clarification between key project personnel
- Alternative consequences for violations
- Service providers indicated more youth should be referred to their programs
- Flow of information between partners

The general impression was that the program was working. The Juvenile Intervention Initiative has been an important step in increasing the services delivered to youth and has been an important program to Ingham County's juvenile justice process. All personnel and stakeholders perceived the program to be important and necessary, and it has been particularly effective in establishing lines of communications between agencies that did not previously exist. These communication networks have been effective in delivering services to the participants and sharing important information with other concerned parties.

Flint Police Department

The City of Flint Police Department serves a community of 124,943 citizens. The police department employs 321 uniformed police officers and 53 full-time civilian employees.

Program Model: An Overview

The Flint Police Department has developed a strategy to deliver comprehensive intervention services to a defined group of high-risk first time juvenile offenders. The program target population includes all male juvenile offenders between the ages of 10-13 arrested for the first time for a serious non-violent offense. Juveniles are currently not formally charged and ordered to participate in the program; however, the Flint team is working with the court to develop a formal processing agreement. At this time, the grant funded officer is responsible for the identification and recruitment of program participants.

The program model is centered primarily on services provided through the Flint Police Activities League (PAL). Each program participant is expected to participate each day in the after-school programming offered at the PAL office. Three types of programming are provided within the Flint Program. General recreation (e.g. basketball) is provided by the PAL staff. The grant has also expanded the programming offered to the program participants to include counseling and life skills training. Group counseling sessions are provided two times a week and are facilitated by a psychologist. Life skill training is provided by a local community group. This group has developed a weekly program that addresses anger management, conflict resolution, and positive peer interaction. Computer skill training is also provided by an outside agency as part of the life skills training.

Flint personnel and partners: Observations and Interviews

During the summer of 2001 the MSU research team conducted in person and telephone interviews, as well as site visits that included observations of project personnel involved with the Flint program on a daily basis. The research team made contact and interviewed a total of four people involved in the Flint program. Below we discuss five aspects of the program that site personnel responded to including: The program model, actions taken to change youths, the most positive aspect of the program, the area where the program could be improved, and the change in interagency collaboration that occurred since the Flint project started. Since some of those interviewed do not have a primary role in the project, and therefore have limited knowledge of the Flint program, their responses will be omitted where necessary.

Program model:

- The program is aimed at changing the behavior of kids. The program includes taking a behavioral approach in working with anger management, communication skills, and conflict resolution.
- Another primary goal of the program is to provide program participants with a positive outlet in the community. This includes providing individuals with constructive programming for the after-school hours.

- The program also works to improve school attendance and performance through tutoring and surveillance of school attendance.

Actions for changing youths (direct contact personnel only):

- Provide structured after-school recreational programming to youth through the Police Activities Programming.
- Facilitate intense group and individual counseling sessions to aid participants in developing a positive self-image.
- Work with the families of the youth to keep them informed of their child's progress in the program.
- Facilitate programming for the entire family, when needed.
- Provide opportunities for youth to interact with positive peer and adult role models.

Most Positive Aspects of the Program:

- That there is some form of program where there was none before
- The opportunity for positive peer interaction among youth.
- The educational, recreational, and mentoring portions of the program.
- The program keeps kids busy and productive and keeps them out of trouble.
- The psychological counseling component of the program.
- Counseling opportunities provided to the youth including the one on one and group sessions are extremely beneficial for the youths in terms of changing their behavior.
- Eight kids have been able to successfully graduate from the program so far.

How could the program be improved?

- The program members feel that a substance abuse element could be included in the programming. This type of programming would include drug and alcohol counseling and periodic urinalysis screens.
- Increase the length of time that the individuals can participate in the program.

- Develop a supplemental fund for food so that the kids can have a snack after school.
- Hire the secretary that is designated in the grant.
- Reduce some of the roadblocks within the police department. Upward communication is the main problem in the department.
- Improved communication between project members. A monthly treatment team meeting would be good to review how the kids are doing, and what could be done better to help the kids.
- Improve the referral process so that more kids could take advantage of the program. The enrollment for the first year of the project was very low.
- Increase the number of professional volunteers involved in the program that work in various fields so that they can share their skills and provide mentoring.

Collaboration enhanced under the program

- The family court had little contact with the police department before this program. Now they work together on a regular basis. The police department feels that this partnership could be strengthened even further in the future.
- All of the service providers reported that they had no had prior contact with the police department prior to this program.

The general impression of the program was that it is an improvement over what had been done with juveniles in Flint in the past. Program team members were impressed with the range of services that have been provided to the youth. They were encouraged that the mix of recreational and cognitive and behavioral skills training would make a difference in the lives of the youth.

Despite the successes of the program, all of the individuals interviewed felt that the program could be improved. Specifically, they felt that the program could be expanded to include more individuals and more diverse programming. Program personnel also indicated that they had some difficulties in communicating with other program partners. This communication problem may be improved when juveniles are formally processed into the program. Formalization of the process could aid in clarifying the role to be played by program participants.

Saginaw Police Department

Saginaw, Michigan has a population of slightly more than 61,799 and the police department has 136 full time police officers. The full extent of the juvenile crime problem in Saginaw is difficult to describe since the record system used to record arrests did not capture the age of arrestees. Nevertheless hand searches of the portions of the data yielded a pattern of youth crime similar to that found in other Juvenile Intervention pilot sites. The focus of the intervention, therefore, was to be on youths between the ages of 10 and 13 with serious non-violent first arrests.

Program Model: An Overview

The Saginaw Police Department has developed a Juvenile Intervention Initiative (JII) strategy to deliver comprehensive intervention services to a defined group of high-risk, first time juvenile offenders. The program target population includes all male juvenile offenders between the ages of 10-13 arrested for the first time for a serious non-violent offense. Saginaw Police Department detectives are responsible for identification of possible candidates for the program. Individuals are then formally petitioned to court, adjudicated, and placed on probation. Participation in the program is a condition of probation for all identified youth. Intensive programming services are provided through the probation department. Intensive programming addresses the problems of substance abuse, negative peer association, and poor educational achievement.

JII personnel and partners: Observations and Interviews

During the summer of 2001 the MSU research team conducted several in person as well as site visits that included observations of project personnel involved with the JII program on a daily basis. The research team made contact and interviewed a total of five people involved in the JII program ranging from the Saginaw Court Administrator, probation officers, court intake personnel, and line officers working on the JII project for the Saginaw Police Department. Below we discuss five aspects of the program that site personnel responded to including: The program model, actions taken to change youths, the most positive aspect of the program, the area where the program could be improved, and the change in interagency collaboration that occurred since the JII project started. Since some of those interviewed do not have a primary role in the project, and therefore have limited knowledge of the JII program, their responses will be omitted where necessary.

Program model:

- JII officers establish a "big brother" role with the youths and link them and their families with counseling and other services
- Surveillance of target juveniles in a more intense fashion than previously possible in Saginaw. Probation department provides a treatment plan.

PROPERTY OF

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000