31402
SUP

M.S.S.D.
AFTERCARE / PRE-PROBATION
A REVIEW

LOUISVILLE / JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY.

METROPOLITAN SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

AFTERCARE / PRE-PROBATION

A REVIEW

WINTER, 1975

Prepared by:

MSSD Office of Research & Planning
G. B. Haarman, Director

V. L. Allen
D. G. Conlin
T. A. Hildenbrand
K. S. McDaniel
J. E. Metzler
S. A. Mimms
M. F. Seibold
A. M. Stastny
H. K. Williams

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES
(Con't.)

INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the Aftercare/Pre-Probation Program up to the end of the Federal Grant period of June 30, 1975. The program was financed by a grant from the Kentucky Crime Commission under the auspices of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. Beginning in 1972, the program was centered on two populations: Aftercare for those released from institutions and Pre-Probation referrals directly from court for those juveniles whose home environment was unsuitable but were not in need of institutionalization.

The first part of this report deals with the demographic and adjudication parameters of the population through June of 1975. The second section deals with a further follow-up of the 1972 and 1973 populations.

For a more in-depth report on the program, please refer to the MSSD Aftercare/Pre-Probation Final Evaluation published by this office in 1974. This present report is an update of that original study.

The data in this report was not computer generated and thus is not as detailed as in other studies. Certain comparisons are not available because of this fact.

The program is divided into two phases; Phase One in a group home and Phase Two in community supervision.

SECTION ONE

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

During the time span in which the program was federally funded, a total of 523 youths resided in the Aftercare/Pre-Probation Program. Two changes have occurred in the population of the program in the three and one-half years studied in this report. When the program began, there were more males than females and over two-thirds were white. However, the program has become increasingly female oriented with over fifty per cent of the population being females. Also, the rate of blacks in the program has increased from less than 35 per cent to over forty per cent of the population in the last half-year of the study. (Table 1)

For all of the juveniles in the program, the living arrangement of "mother only" was the greatest. Almost fifty per cent of the blacks had a mother only arrangement and close to one-third of the whites. Whites tended to have a both parent living arrangement more often than blacks. (Tables 2 and 3)

The families of males were more likely to be receiving public assistance than females and blacks were more likely than whites to be receiving assistance. (Table 4) Almost ninety per cent of the youths referred to the Aftercare/Pre-Probation program were attending school. (Table 5)

There was a one-year difference in the mean age at time of admission between males and females with the latter being older. Over two-thirds of the females were referred for social offenses while less than a third of the males were adjudicated for these offenses. Males were referred, in the great part, for property offenses.

TABLE 1.

REFERRALS TO AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION BY YEAR

	TOTAL						WHITE						BLACK					
	TOTAL		Male		Female		Male		Female		Sub T.		Male		Female		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1972	157	100.0	97	61.8	60	38.2	58	36.9	45	28.7	103	65.6	39	24.9	15	9.5	54	34.4
1973	170	100.0	106	62.4	64	37.6	68	40.0	44	25.9	112	65.9	38	22.4	20	11.7	58	34.1
1974	142	100.0	69	48.6	73	51.4	39	27.5	45	31.7	84	59.2	30	21.1	28	19.7	58	40.8
Jan.-June 1975	54	100.0	22	40.7	32	59.3	15	27.8	17	31.5	32	59.3	7	12.9	15	27.8	22	40.7
T O T A L	523	100.0	294	56.2	229	43.8	180	34.4	151	28.9	331	63.3	114	21.8	78	14.9	192	36.7

TABLE 2.

AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION BY LIVING ARRANGEMENT

	TOTAL		TOTAL				WHITE				BLACK			
			Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mother & Stepfa.	57	10.9	22	7.5	35	15.3	16	8.9	33	21.9	6	5.3	2	2.6
Mother Only	207	39.6	124	42.2	83	36.2	65	36.1	45	29.8	59	51.8	38	48.7
Relative	37	7.1	15	5.1	22	9.6	7	3.9	10	6.6	8	7.0	12	15.4
Institution	44	8.4	24	8.2	20	8.7	21	11.7	12	7.9	3	2.6	8	10.3
Both Parents	121	23.1	73	24.8	48	21.0	52	28.9	36	23.8	21	18.4	12	15.4
Father & Stepmo.	13	2.5	6	2.0	7	3.1	4	2.2	4	2.6	2	1.8	3	3.8
Father Only	23	4.4	20	6.8	3	1.3	9	5.0	2	1.3	11	9.6	1	1.3
Foster Family	16	3.1	6	2.0	10	4.4	3	1.7	8	5.3	3	2.6	2	2.6
Independent	5	1.0	4	1.4	1	0.4	3	1.7	1	0.7	1	0.9	0	-
T O T A L S	523	100.1	294	100.0	229	100.0	180	100.1	151	99.9	114	100.0	78	100.1

TABLE 3.

GROUPED LIVING ARRANGEMENT

	TOTAL		TOTAL				WHITE				BLACK			
			Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Both Parents	121	23.1	73	24.8	48	21.0	52	28.9	36	23.8	21	18.4	12	15.4
Parent & Step.	70	13.4	28	9.5	42	18.3	20	11.1	37	24.5	8	7.0	5	6.4
Single Parent	230	44.0	144	49.0	86	37.6	74	41.1	47	31.1	70	61.4	39	50.0
Other	102	19.5	49	16.7	53	23.1	34	18.9	31	20.5	15	13.2	22	28.2
T O T A L S	523	100.0	294	100.0	229	100.0	180	100.0	151	99.9	114	100.0	78	100.0

TABLE 4.

RECEIPT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

RECEIPT OF P.A.	T O T A L		TOTAL				WHITE				BLACK			
			Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
YES	366	70.0	199	67.7	167	72.9	136	75.6	121	80.1	63	55.3	46	59.0
NO	157	30.0	95	32.3	62	27.1	44	24.4	30	19.9	51	44.7	32	41.0
T O T A L S	523	100.0	294	100.0	229	100.0	180	100.0	151	100.0	114	100.0	78	100.0

TABLE 5.

SCHOOL STATUS

SCHOOL STATUS	T O T A L		TOTAL				WHITE				BLACK			
			Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Attending	468	89.5	258	87.8	210	91.7	154	85.6	141	93.4	104	91.2	69	88.5
Withdrawn	54	10.3	36	12.2	18	7.9	26	14.4	9	6.0	10	8.8	9	11.5
Completed	1	0.2	0	-	1	0.4	0	-	1	0.7	0	-	0	-
T O T A L S	523	100.0	294	100.0	229	100.0	180	100.0	151	100.1	114	100.0	78	100.0

TABLE 6.

AGE AT ADMISSION TO AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION

	TOTAL		TOTAL				WHITE				BLACK			
			Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
9 & Under	10	1.9	10	3.4	0	-	5	2.7	0	-	5	4.4	0	-
10	23	4.4	21	7.1	2	0.9	12	6.7	1	0.7	9	7.9	1	1.3
11	26	5.0	22	7.5	4	1.7	10	5.6	2	1.3	12	10.5	2	2.6
12	54	10.3	38	12.9	16	7.0	21	11.7	9	6.0	17	14.9	7	9.0
13	100	19.1	51	17.3	49	21.4	31	17.2	35	23.2	20	17.5	14	17.9
14	125	23.9	67	22.8	58	25.3	51	28.3	38	25.2	16	14.0	20	25.6
15	98	18.7	45	15.3	53	23.1	28	15.6	36	23.8	17	14.9	17	21.8
16	65	12.4	30	10.2	35	15.3	21	11.7	23	15.2	9	7.9	12	15.4
17	22	4.2	10	3.4	12	5.2	1	0.6	7	4.6	9	7.9	5	6.4
TOTAL	523	99.9	294	99.9	229	99.9	180	100.1	151	100.0	114	99.9	78	100.0
Mean	13.7		13.3		14.3		13.4		14.3		13.2		14.2	

TABLE 7.

GROUPED REASONS REFERRED TO AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION

	TOTAL		TOTAL				WHITE						BLACK					
			Male		Female		Male		Female		Sub T.		Male		Female		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Major vs. Person	29	5.5	25	8.5	4	1.7	9	5.0	0	-	9	2.7	16	14.0	4	5.1	20	10.4
Major vs. Property	129	24.7	119	40.5	10	4.4	76	42.2	9	6.0	85	25.7	43	37.7	1	1.3	44	22.9
Minor	124	23.7	61	20.7	63	27.5	39	21.7	40	26.5	79	23.9	22	19.3	23	29.5	45	23.4
Social	230	44.0	83	28.2	147	64.2	50	27.8	98	64.9	148	44.7	33	28.9	49	62.8	82	42.7
Dependency	11	2.1	6	2.0	5	2.2	6	3.3	4	2.6	10	3.0	0	-	1	1.3	1	0.5
T O T A L	523	100.0	294	99.9	229	100.0	180	100.0	151	100.0	331	100.0	114	99.9	78	100.0	192	99.9

SECTION TWO

THE FOLLOW-UP PERIOD

A. Methodology

This section deals with the outcome of the Aftercare/Pre-Probation populations of 1972 and 1973. Unlike other studies by this office, this study is less detailed and more limited in scope. Information in this report was hand tabulated and thus certain cross references are not included due to the fact of the time involved in manual operations. Also, only Juvenile Court records were used because of problems concerning access to police records and the lengthy time involved in collecting data. Recidivism rates are based on the juvenile system only.

Recidivism was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. The score used to test recidivism reflects both the seriousness of the offense and if a further commitment occurred as a result of that offense.

Master Score-1 (Success) - No Offenses
Master Score-2 (Moderate Success) - Minor Offenses
Master Score-3 (Minimal Success) - Major Offenses
Master Score-4 (Failure) - Offenses resulting in institutionalization

A Master Score of Zero was assigned to those juveniles who either turned 18, died, joined the military or left the state. Master Score-Zero was not included in the analysis but does appear in the data presented.

B. Follow-Up

Males referred directly by the court (Pre-Probation) were slightly more successful than males returning from institutions (Aftercare); however, females were more successful than males in both modes. White females had a higher rate of success and lower rate of failure compared to black females. White females were particularly successful in Aftercare. (Tables 8 and 9) When sex is combined, however, the differences between races was minimal. Pre-Probation was slightly more successful than Aftercare. Blacks in Aftercare had the highest failure rate. (Table 10)

In MSSD Aftercare/Pre-Probation Final Evaluation, 1974, the 1972 population of the program was examined to determine recidivism. The length of follow-up in the original study varies from six to twelve months. In this study, the same 1972 population was re-examined to determine any further changes in the recidivism rate. At this point in time, an additional 12 months of follow-up was available.

The original recidivism rates that were established using a six to 12 month follow-up are depicted in Table 11, and the subsequent recidivism rates based on an 18 to 24 month follow-up can be seen in Table 12.

It is worth noting that the subsequent follow-up had very little effect on the overall failure rates. Again, this is consistent with previous findings which indicates that the first six months after release from a program is the critical period in determining whether a child will be institutionalized or referred to the Grand Jury.

A slight downward filtering is noticeable in the male population, with those males who had previously been categorized as successes becoming marginal and more moderate successes. However, this trend was not noticeable for females. The base recidivism rates for females did not seem to be affected by an additional longer follow-up period. The recidivism rates for females can be established with a minimum of follow-up, and these rates vary little with the passage of time.

The preliminary recidivism rates for the 1973 population, based on a six to 12 month follow-up, are illustrated in Table 13. In comparison to the preliminary rates that were established for the 1972 population, it would appear that the failure rate is fairly consistent. However, there would appear to be some deterioriation of the success rates within the male population of the program. This deterioriation was not found in the female population.

For those with a higher Interpersonal Maturity Level, the chances of success increased. Over two-thirds of the I_2's were failures compared to slightly over one-third of those at the I_4 level. The higher the Interpersonal Maturity Level, the greater chance of a favorable outcome. (Table 14)

Tables 13 through 16 show the length of stay in Phase I and Phase II of the Aftercare and Pre-Probation programs. The stay for those youths referred directly by the court was approximately four weeks longer than those youths returning from institutions. White females had the longest mean stay in Phase One. In general, females had a longer stay than males and whites a longer stay than blacks for Phase One.

In Phase Two, those in Aftercare had a considerably longer period of supervision than juveniles from Pre-Probation, almost seven weeks longer. White females were under supervision the longest for both programs.

TABLE 8.

1972 and 1973 AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION BY MASTER SCORE, RACE AND SEX

MALE

MASTER SCORE	TOTAL						AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION					
	TOTAL		White		Black		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	28		21		7		11		5		16		10		2		12	
1	23	13.1	11	10.5	12	17.1	3	4.9	10	16.7	13	10.7	8	18.2	2	20.0	10	18.5
2	21	12.0	18	17.1	3	4.3	13	21.3	1	1.7	14	11.6	5	11.4	2	20.0	7	13.0
3	34	19.4	21	20.0	13	18.6	13	21.3	11	18.3	24	19.8	8	18.2	2	20.0	10	18.5
4	97	55.4	55	52.4	42	60.0	32	52.5	38	63.3	70	57.9	23	52.3	4	40.0	27	50.0
TOTALS*	175	99.9	105	100.0	70	100.0	61	100.0	60	100.0	121	100.0	44	100.1	10	100.0	54	100.0

FEMALE

MASTER SCORE	TOTAL						AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION					
	TOTAL		White		Black		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	15		9		6		3		5		8		6		1		7	
1	51	46.8	40	50.0	11	37.9	22	55.0	7	43.8	29	51.8	18	45.0	4	30.8	22	41.5
2	13	11.9	13	16.3	0	-	7	17.5	0	-	7	12.5	6	15.0	0	-	6	11.3
3	3	2.8	1	1.3	2	6.9	1	2.5	0	-	1	1.8	0	-	2	15.4	2	3.8
4	42	38.5	26	32.5	16	55.2	10	25.0	9	56.3	19	33.9	16	40.0	7	53.8	23	43.4
TOTALS*	109	100.0	80	100.1	29	100.0	40	100.0	16	100.1	56	100.0	40	100.0	13	100.0	53	100.0

*Totals and percentages exclude Master Score-0.

TABLE 9.

1972 MASTER SCORE BY RACE AND SEX*

M A L E

MASTER SCORE	AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION						T O T A L					
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	8		4		12		5		1		6		13		5		18	
1	6	21.4	11	33.3	17	27.9	6	35.3	0	-	6	33.3	12	26.7	11	32.4	23	29.1
2	2	7.1	0	-	2	3.3	1	5.9	0	-	1	5.6	3	6.7	0	-	3	3.8
3	6	21.4	4	12.1	10	16.4	2	11.8	0	-	2	11.1	8	17.8	4	11.8	12	15.2
4	14	50.0	18	54.5	32	52.5	8	47.1	1	100.0	9	50.0	22	48.9	19	55.9	41	51.9
TOTALS**	28	99.9	33	99.9	61	100.1	17	100.1	1	100.0	18	100.0	45	100.1	34	100.1	79	100.0

F E M A L E

MASTER SCORE	AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION						T O T A L					
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	3		1		4		2		1		3		5		2		7	
1	13	59.1	5	50.0	18	56.3	9	50.0	0	-	9	42.9	22	55.0	5	38.5	27	50.9
2	3	13.6	1	10.0	4	12.5	1	5.6	0	-	1	4.8	4	10.0	1	7.7	5	9.4
3	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
4	6	27.3	4	40.0	10	31.3	8	44.4	3	100.0	11	52.4	14	35.0	7	53.8	21	39.6
TOTALS**	22	100.0	10	100.0	32	100.1	18	100.0	3	100.0	21	100.1	40	100.0	13	100.0	53	99.9

*Aftercare/Pre-Probation, Final Evaluation, 1974, MSSD Office of Research and Planning
**Totals and percentages exclude Master Score-0.

TABLE 10.

1972 AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION REFERRALS (SUBSEQUENT FOLLOW-UP) BY SOURCE OF ENTRY, MASTER SCORE, RACE AND SEX

M A L E

MASTER SCORE	AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION						T O T A L					
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	6		4		10		4		1		5		10		5		15	
1	1	3.3	9	27.3	10	15.9	4	22.2	0	-	4	21.1	5	10.4	9	26.5	14	17.1
2	4	13.3	0	-	4	6.3	1	5.6	0	-	1	5.3	5	10.4	0	-	5	6.1
3	9	30.0	5	15.2	14	22.2	4	22.2	0	-	4	21.1	13	27.1	5	14.7	18	22.0
4	16	53.3	19	57.6	35	55.6	9	50.0	1	100.0	10	52.6	25	52.1	20	58.8	45	54.9
TOTALS*	30	99.9	33	100.1	63	100.0	18	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.1	48	100.0	34	100.0	82	100.1

F E M A L E

MASTER SCORE	AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION						T O T A L					
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	2		1		3		2		1		3		4		2		6	
1	13	56.5	5	50.0	18	54.5	8	44.4	0	-	8	38.1	21	51.2	5	38.5	26	48.1
2	4	17.4	0	-	4	12.1	2	11.1	0	-	2	9.5	6	14.6	0	-	6	11.1
3	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
4	6	26.1	5	50.0	11	33.3	8	44.4	3	100.0	11	52.4	14	34.1	8	61.5	22	40.7
TOTALS *	23	100.0	10	100.0	33	99.9	18	99.9	3	100.0	21	100.0	41	99.9	13	100.0	54	99.9

*Totals and Percentages exclude Master Score-0.

TABLE 11.

AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION REFERRALS BY SOURCE OF ENTRY, MASTER SCORE, RACE AND SEX

M A L E

MASTER SCORE	AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION						TOTAL					
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	5		1		6		6		1		7		11		2		13	
1	2	6.5	1	3.7	3	5.2	4	15.4	2	22.2	6	17.1	6	10.5	3	8.3	9	9.7
2	9	29.0	1	3.7	10	17.2	4	15.4	2	22.2	6	17.1	13	22.8	3	8.3	16	17.2
3	4	12.9	6	22.2	10	17.2	4	15.4	2	22.2	6	17.1	8	14.0	8	22.2	16	17.2
4	16	51.6	19	70.4	35	60.3	14	53.8	3	33.3	17	48.6	30	52.6	22	61.1	52	55.9
TOTAL*	31	100.0	27	100.0	58	99.9	26	100.0	9	99.9	35	99.9	57	99.9	36	99.9	93	100.0

F E M A L E

MASTER SCORE	AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION						TOTAL					
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	1		4		5		4		0		4		5		4		9	
1	9	52.9	2	33.3	11	47.8	10	45.5	4	40.0	14	43.8	19	48.7	6	37.5	25	45.5
2	3	17.6	0	-	3	13.0	4	18.2	0	-	4	12.5	7	17.9	0	-	7	12.7
3	1	5.9	0	-	1	4.3	0	-	2	20.0	2	6.3	1	2.6	2	12.5	3	5.5
4	4	23.5	4	66.7	8	34.8	8	36.4	4	40.0	12	37.5	12	30.8	8	50.0	20	36.4
TOTALS*	17	99.9	6	100.0	23	99.9	22	100.1	10	100.0	32	100.1	39	100.0	16	100.0	55	100.1

*Totals and Percentages exclude Master Score-0.

TABLE 12.

1972 AND 1973 AFTERCARE/PRE-PROBATION BY MASTER SCORE AND RACE

SCORE	TOTAL						AFTERCARE						PRE-PROBATION					
	TOTAL		White		Black		White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	43		30		13		14		10		24		16		3		19	
1	74	26.1	51	27.6	23	23.2	25	24.8	17	22.4	42	23.7	26	31.0	6	26.1	32	29.9
2	34	12.0	31	16.8	3	3.0	20	19.8	1	1.3	21	11.9	11	13.1	2	8.7	13	12.1
3	37	13.0	22	11.9	15	15.2	14	13.9	11	14.5	25	14.1	8	9.5	4	17.4	12	11.2
4	139	48.9	81	43.8	58	58.6	42	41.6	47	61.8	89	50.3	39	46.4	11	47.8	50	46.7
TOTALS	284	100.0	185	100.1	99	100.0	101	100.1	76	100.0	177	100.0	84	100.0	23	100.0	107	99.9

TABLE 13.

AFTERCARE PHASE I BY WEEKS, RACE AND SEX

WEEKS	TOTAL						WHITE						BLACK					
	TOTAL		Male		Female		Male		Female		Sub T.		Male		Female		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0- 1	6	3.2	4	3.1	2	3.4	3	4.5	0	-	3	2.9	1	1.7	2	8.3	3	3.6
2- 4	22	11.8	19	15.0	3	5.1	10	14.9	2	5.7	12	11.8	9	15.0	1	4.2	10	11.9
5- 7	66	35.5	45	35.4	21	35.6	21	31.3	14	40.0	35	34.3	24	40.0	7	29.2	31	36.9
8-10	50	26.9	33	26.0	17	28.8	18	26.9	10	28.6	28	27.5	15	25.0	7	29.2	22	26.2
11-13	20	10.8	15	11.8	5	8.5	8	11.9	2	5.7	10	9.8	7	11.7	3	12.5	10	11.9
14-16	15	8.1	7	5.5	8	13.6	5	7.5	5	14.3	10	9.8	2	3.3	3	12.5	5	6.0
17-19	4	2.2	3	2.4	1	1.7	2	3.0	1	2.9	3	2.9	1	1.7	0	-	1	1.2
20-22	2	1.1	0	-	2	3.4	0	-	1	2.9	1	1.0	0	-	1	4.2	1	1.2
23-25	1	.5	1	.8	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	1.7	0	-	1	1.2
26-28	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
29+	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
TOTALS	186	100.1	127	100.0	59	100.1	67	100.0	35	100.1	102	100.0	60	100.1	24	100.1	84	100.1
MEAN	8.2		7.8		9.0		7.9		9.1		8.3		7.7		8.8		8.0	

TABLE 14.

PRE-PROBATION PHASE I BY WEEKS, RACE AND SEX

WEEKS	TOTAL						White						Black					
	TOTAL		Male		Female		Male		Female		Sub T.		Male		Female		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0- 1	1	.5	0	-	1	0.9	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	3.0	1	1.7
2- 4	18	8.4	8	7.9	10	8.8	6	7.9	4	4.9	10	6.4	2	8.0	6	18.2	8	13.8
5- 7	38	17.7	21	20.8	17	14.9	17	22.4	13	16.0	30	19.1	4	16.0	4	12.1	8	13.8
8-10	36	16.7	24	23.8	12	10.5	18	23.7	9	11.1	27	17.2	6	24.0	3	9.1	9	15.5
11-13	35	16.3	13	12.9	22	19.3	7	9.2	16	19.8	23	14.6	6	24.0	6	18.2	12	20.7
14-16	32	14.9	18	17.8	14	12.3	14	18.4	13	16.0	27	17.2	4	16.0	1	3.0	5	8.6
17-19	24	11.2	9	8.9	15	13.2	6	7.9	8	9.9	14	8.9	3	12.0	7	21.2	10	17.2
20-22	14	6.5	5	5.0	9	7.9	5	6.6	8	9.9	13	8.3	0	-	1	3.0	1	1.7
23-25	7	3.2	1	1.0	6	5.3	1	1.3	3	3.7	4	2.5	0	-	3	9.1	3	5.2
26-28	4	1.9	0	-	4	3.5	0	-	4	4.9	4	2.5	0	-	0	-	0	-
29+	6	2.8	2	2.0	4	3.5	2	2.6	3	3.7	5	3.2	0	-	1	3.0	1	1.7
TOTALS	215	100.1	101	100.1	114	100.1	76	100.0	81	99.9	157	99.9	25	100.0	33	99.9	58	99.9
MEAN	12.5		11.3		13.5		11.5		14.0		12.8		10.8		12.3		11.6	

TABLE 15.

AFTERCARE PHASE II BY WEEKS, RACE AND SEX

WEEKS	TOTAL						White						Black					
	TOTAL		Male		Female		Male		Female		Sub T.		Male		Female		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0- 1	5	2.6	5	3.9	0	-	4	6.0	0	-	4	3.7	1	1.6	0	-	1	1.2
2- 4	6	3.1	3	2.3	3	4.7	2	3.0	1	2.4	3	2.8	1	1.6	2	8.7	3	3.6
5- 8	13	6.8	8	6.3	4	7.8	6	9.0	3	7.3	9	8.3	2	3.3	2	8.7	4	4.8
9-12	21	10.9	14	10.9	7	10.9	10	14.9	5	12.2	15	13.9	4	6.6	2	8.7	6	7.1
13-16	28	14.6	19	14.8	9	14.1	9	13.4	6	14.6	15	13.9	10	16.4	3	13.0	13	15.5
17-20	29	15.1	21	16.4	8	12.5	7	10.4	5	12.2	12	11.1	14	23.0	3	13.0	17	20.2
21-24	29	15.1	24	18.8	5	7.8	12	17.9	2	4.9	14	13.0	12	19.7	3	13.0	15	17.9
25-28	14	7.3	8	6.3	6	9.4	3	4.5	4	9.8	7	6.5	5	8.2	2	8.7	7	8.3
29-32	19	9.9	9	7.0	10	15.6	4	6.0	8	19.5	12	11.1	5	8.2	2	8.7	7	8.3
33-36	8	4.2	4	3.1	4	6.3	2	3.0	2	4.9	4	3.7	2	3.3	2	8.7	4	4.8
37-40	5	2.6	3	2.3	2	3.1	1	1.5	2	4.9	3	2.8	2	3.3	0	-	2	2.4
41-44	9	4.7	7	5.5	2	3.1	5	7.5	1	2.4	6	5.6	2	3.3	1	4.4	3	3.6
45-48	3	1.6	1	0.8	2	3.1	0	-	1	2.4	1	0.9	1	1.6	1	4.4	2	2.4
49-52	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
53+	3	1.6	2	1.6	1	1.6	2	3.0	1	2.4	3	2.8	0	-	0	-	0	-
TOTALS	192	100.1	128	100.0	64	100.0	67	100.1	41	99.9	108	100.1	61	100.1	23	100.0	84	100.1
MEAN	21.0		20.4		22.1		19.6		22.9		20.8		21.2		20.8		21.1	

TABLE 16.

PRE-PROBATION PHASE II BY WEEKS, RACE AND SEX

WEEKS	TOTAL						White						Black					
	TOTAL		Male		Female		Male		Female		Sub T.		Male		Female		Sub T.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0- 1	9	7.8	7	11.5	2	3.6	5	11.1	2	4.9	7	8.1	2	12.5	0	-	2	6.7
2- 4	7	6.0	3	4.9	4	7.3	3	6.6	2	4.9	5	5.8	0	-	2	14.3	2	6.7
5- 8	13	11.2	9	14.8	4	7.3	7	15.6	1	2.4	8	9.3	2	12.5	3	21.4	5	16.7
9-12	26	22.4	15	24.6	11	20.0	9	20.0	11	26.8	20	23.3	6	37.5	0	-	6	20.0
13-16	17	14.7	10	16.4	7	12.7	7	15.6	4	9.8	11	12.8	3	18.7	3	21.4	6	20.0
17-20	17	14.7	8	13.1	9	16.4	7	15.6	6	14.6	13	15.1	1	6.3	3	21.4	4	13.3
21-24	13	11.2	8	13.1	5	9.1	7	15.6	4	9.8	11	12.8	1	6.3	1	7.1	2	6.7
25-28	8	6.9	0	-	8	14.5	0	-	6	14.6	6	7.0	0	-	2	14.3	2	6.7
29-32	2	1.7	1	1.6	1	1.8	0	-	1	2.4	1	1.2	1	6.3	0	-	1	3.3
33-36	3	2.6	0	-	3	5.5	0	-	3	7.3	3	3.5	0	-	0	-	0	-
37-40	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
41-44	1	.9	0	-	1	1.8	0	-	1	2.4	1	1.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
45-48	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
49-42	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
53+	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
TOTALS	116	100.1	61	100.0	55	100.0	45	100.1	41	99.9	86	100.1	16	100.1	14	99.9	30	100.1
MEAN	14.3		12.1		16.8		12.1		17.7		14.7		12.1		14.3		13.1	

TABLE 17.

MASTER SCORE BY INTERPERSONAL MATURITY LEVEL (I-Level)

	I-2		I-3		I-4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Success	5	21.7	7	26.9	14	32.6
Moderate Success	1	4.3	3	11.5	9	20.9
Minimal Success	2	8.7	3	11.5	5	11.6
Failure	15	65.2	13	50.0	15	34.9
T O T A L S	23	99.9	26	99.9	43	100.0

SECTION THREE

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

This report is an addendum to the Aftercare/Pre-Probation Final Evaluation published by this office in the Fall of 1974, and examines the program population up to the termination of federal funding. The original report concluded that certain of the stated goals were met and others were not. The program did not appear to affect recidivism, or reduce the size of institutional populations. However, it did meet the goals of reducing the cost and length of institutional care and partially met the goal of reducing the status offender population in Ormsby Village.

For males (based on 1971 Treatment Analysis), *there was little difference in the recidivism rates for those with and those without Aftercare.* However, if the males placed in Pre-Probation would have normally been institutionalized, *the Pre-Probation aspect of the program certainly had a positive effect on treatment outcome.*

Female post treatment performance was enhanced by Aftercare (based on Female Delinquency in Jefferson County) and the Pre-Probation success rates were comparable to probation in the female study. *Thus, the Aftercare-Pre-Probation Program, to a small degree, has been a limited success in terms of recidivism.*

Many of those involved in treatment evaluation believe that a small decrease in recidivism is encouraging given the method in which programs are attached to the juvenile justice system. Rather than

an overall re-planning of treatment strategies, programs are created idealistically and must adjust to the system when implemented. Thus, the programs rarely function on the model of which they were based.

For example, Aftercare/Pre-Probation was conceived as a program drawing on all institutions to which delinquents from this county were placed. In actuality, the programs ended up drawing primarily from one institution. Also, treatment strategems conceived in unreality must operate in day to day reality.

Therefore, the slight reduction of recidivism by this program has achieved one of the stated goals.

The goal of reducing cost has been met. The actual cost per day is approximately five dollars less per day (based on 1973 data) than institutions and the length of stay is much shorter than institutions and thus the total cost per case is less. *The Aftercare Program also met the goal of reducing the length of institutional stay.*

The final goal of reducing the population of juvenile institutions was perhaps unrealistic. As long as the space is there, the juveniles will be placed if the need arises. As the number of juvenile referrals increase, the institutions will continue to remain a treatment option and programs such as Aftercare/Pre-Probation will have little effect on population size.

A larger problem is discernable if one examines the processes involved in developing large-scale programs of this nature. Although the Aftercare/Pre-Probation program has been a qualified success and met some of its goals, was it the best possible way to have gone about the problem?

As it is, the juvenile justice system deals, for the most part, with the poor and culturally deprived individual, yet the system is not necessarily geared to the client it serves. There appears to be no overall strategem for treatment of delinquents. Some juveniles end up in programs in which they do not belong which may in fact aggravate the problem. Some juveniles are treated as delinquents when in fact thay are not.

Is it better to implement new programs or to introduce changes within the juvenile justice system as the needs arise? Subtle alterations or redefinition of existing programs to fit the clients' needs would possibly be more useful and certainly less costly than large-scale expensive programs.

END

7 illustrations