

Evaluation of CSSD's New Haven Pilot Program for
16 and 17 Year Old Probationers

FINAL REPORT

Stephen M. Cox, Ph.D.
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Aileen Keays, M.S.
Institute for Municipal & Regional Policy

Andrew Clark
Institute for Municipal & Regional Policy

Central Connecticut State University
June 2010

This project was funded in part through a contract from the Connecticut Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division. Neither the Connecticut Judicial Branch nor any of its components are responsible for, or necessarily endorse, the views expressed in this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2006 the Connecticut General Assembly began what has become an extended and intense debate as to the efficacy of raising the legal age of adult offenders from 16 to 18 years old. Shortly thereafter, the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division piloted a unique probation program targeting the needs of 16 and 17 year old New Haven probationers. This program, the Youth Probation Officer (YPO) program, was based on the premise that 16 and 17 year old probationers have different needs than older adult probationers and should be supervised in a different manner. In its inception, the YPO program had two major components. The first involved the creation of youth probation officers – specially trained probation officers who would only supervise 16 and 17 year old probationers. The second component focused on the enhancement of contracted services available specifically for program participants. These consisted of substance abuse and mental health assessments, in-patient substance abuse treatment, employment services, in-house psychiatric treatment, and an array of risk reduction services (e.g., anger management, moral reasoning, social skills, intra- and inter-personal safety, relapse prevention, impulse control, etc.).

As the CSSD pilot YPO program commenced, two Youth Probation Officers began supervising probationers in November of 2006. The program was later expanded to three YPOs in February of 2008. In July 2007, Central Connecticut State University was contracted to evaluate the YPO program. The evaluation had three overarching goals. The first goal was to determine how well the program was implemented. The second goal was to determine the effectiveness of the program in reducing arrests and technical violations of probation. The third goal was to identify programmatic and systemic barriers that may have decreased the effectiveness of the program and make recommendations for programming and supervision of 16 and 17 year old probationers.

Program Implementation Findings

The initial piloting of the YPO program appeared to be implemented according to the planned model. That is, as per best practice youth justice-involved supervision models, the focus of Youth Probation Officers was on engaging probationers and an emphasis was placed on informal field contacts. This philosophy appeared to change more toward traditional adult probation practices after the program was expanded in February of 2008. As resources became more limited, the general practice of Youth Probation Officers seemed to focus more on tracking and monitoring probationers' progress than building rapport and engagement.

All of the contracted services were available for most of the first three years of the YPO program (fall 2006 to spring 2009) and probationers were commonly referred to them. The Youth Probation Officers appeared to have positive working relationships with most program staff. There were two issues we observed across the contracted services. First, there appeared to be a limited need for mental health treatment and in-patient substance abuse treatment. Second, we were concerned by the low program participation and completion rates for several of the contracted services. Almost all of the programs had completion rates under 50%.

Program Outcomes

To evaluate the effectiveness of the YPO program, we compared the arrest and technical violation rates across four study groups after one year of supervision by Youth Probation Officers or adult probation officers. The study groups consisted of probationers attending the initial YPO program, probationers supervised by Youth Probation Officers after the program was expanded, a similar group of probationers supervised by adult probation officers prior to the implementation of the YPO program, and a similar group of probationers who were not selected to participate in the YPO program. The recidivism analysis initially found that YPO probationers were not more or less successful than a similar group of probationers being supervised by adult probation officers. However, an analysis of recidivism rates of the five Youth Probation Officers uncovered that one of them had significantly higher arrest and technical violation rates than the other four. Removing this Youth Probation Officer from the recidivism analysis led us to conclude that the YPO program did produce statistically significant positive effects. In fact, 16 and 17 year old probationers supervised by adult probation officers were twice as likely to be arrested.

The gap analysis revealed disconnects between probationer needs and the services that were provided to them. Despite differences in identified needs, most of the contracted services were being utilized at the same rates. In other words, probationer needs did not appear to heavily influence the services probationers received. During our interviews with Youth Probation Officers we were surprised to hear that adult probation officers do not have access to juvenile probation officer records, even if they supervise the same probationers. We believe this policy limits effective supervision of probationers.

Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

This evaluation found that the YPO program can be effective in reducing the recidivism of 16 and 17 year old probationers. The common themes throughout the evaluation were that positive engagement, education/employment, and positive leisure activities with these youth led to more successful outcomes. The average 16 and 17 year old probationer in the YPO program was lower risk and did not have significant mental health or substance abuse problems. They typically had difficulties in school or were unemployed, a lack of positive leisure activities, and a negative peer group.

We believe this program could have had a much higher rate of success and offer the following recommendations for supervising 16 and 17 year old offenders:

- The Judicial Branch should consider revising the policy that does not allow adult probation officers access to juvenile probation officers' records;
- CSSD should develop training and supervision practices aimed at increasing positive interactions and engagement with youth;
- Youth Probation Officers should be better trained on how to properly assess risks/needs of youth and make more appropriate service referrals;
- More programming should be aimed at education/employment and positive leisure activities;
- CSSD should closely track and examine the completion rates of contracted services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2

INTRODUCTION 5

 “Raise the Age Initiative” 5

DESCRIPTION OF THE YPO PILOT PROGRAM..... 6

 Probation Officers 6

 Service Providers..... 7

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY 8

 Research Design and Data..... 8

 Creation of the Study Groups..... 9

 Study Group Description and Comparison 10

EVALUATION FINDINGS..... 13

 Program Participation and Integrity 13

 Youth Probation Officers 13

 Risk Reduction Services..... 17

 Court-Based Assessments 23

 Educational and Vocational Support Services 24

 Mental Health Services..... 26

 In-Patient Substance Abuse Treatment 29

 Alternative to Incarceration Programs (AICs) 31

 Evaluative Summary of the YPO Program Implementation and Contracted Services ... 32

 Recidivism Analysis..... 34

 Comparison of YPO Recidivists and Non-Recidivists..... 36

 Program Effects on Recidivism..... 38

 Gap Analysis 41

 YPO Probationer Needs 42

 Summary of Gap Analysis..... 46

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 47

 Conclusions 47

 Program Implementation 47

 Program Outcomes 48

 Programmatic and Systemic Barriers 49

 Overall Conclusions 50

 Recommendations 51

INTRODUCTION

In November of 2006, the Court Support Services Division of the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch began implementing a specialized probation program for 16 and 17 year old offenders in New Haven. This program created specialized caseloads for probation officers (called Youth Probation Officers (YPOs)) and provided an array of services for participants. The Institute for Municipal & Regional Policy (IMRP) at Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) was contracted to evaluate this program beginning in July of 2007. The initial contract was to last for two years and called for CCSU to assess: (1) the referral and selection process; (2) the services provided by the YPO program; (3) the differences between youth probation officers and adult probation officers (prior to this program, 16 and 17 year old probationers were assigned adult probation officers); and (4) the outcomes of YPO probationers compared to two other groups of similar probationers.

The initial YPO program had two youth probation officers so not all 16 and 17 year old youth on probation in New Haven were selected for this program. However, this program was later expanded in February of 2008 to include all 16 and 17 year old probationers in its host city. Due to this expansion, the evaluation was extended one more year so that follow-up data could be collected and analyzed on probationers entering this program after the expansion. This report is the final product of this three-year evaluation. The report provides an overview of the program's model, a discussion of the contracted service programs, and the evaluation findings regarding program integrity, recidivism rates, a gap analysis. The final part of the report presents our conclusions and recommendations for future programming.

“RAISE THE AGE INITIATIVE”

While the State of Connecticut General Assembly passed legislation raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18 years old, full implementation of this law has been delayed. Public Act 07-4 permits offenses involving 16 and 17 year olds whom are not deemed serious or violent offenders, to be handled in juvenile court beginning January 1, 2010. Prior, juvenile cases involving serious felonies were automatically transferred to adult court and prosecutors were able to request juvenile court judges to transfer other, less serious cases involving a juvenile defendant to adult court.

Section 88 of Public Act 07-4 established the Juvenile Jurisdiction Policy and Operations Coordinating Council (JJPOCC) to monitor the implementation of the Raise the Age initiative. The JJPOCC was also mandated to resolve issues concerning changes required in the juvenile justice system to expand jurisdiction to include 16 and 17 year olds. During the Council's 16-months of service, its members tackled many issues relating to raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18 years old. Its members had to find compromise on some of the more contested issues, such as: motor vehicle infractions and offenses and whether 16 and 17 year olds would be treated as adults or juveniles;

statements made to police by 16 and 17 year olds and whether parental consent would be mandated; the detention and supervision of 16 and 17 year olds; and, the release of a detained 16 or 17 year old and whether the release could only be made to a guardian. Despite strong feelings on both sides of the above-mentioned issues, Council members were able to come to a compromise and a joint final report was issued on March 21, 2009 (see the full version of the report at <http://www.housedems.ct.gov/jjpooc/index.asp>).

In addition to the negotiation of the legal concerns mentioned above, budgetary issues were also raised. With Connecticut, and the country as whole, struggling through a financial depression, such a large-scale change in infrastructure seemed too costly for some and a lot of resistance to the implementation ensued. Concerns were raised over: adequate housing for detained 16 and 17 year olds; an increase in costs for servicing this population in the juvenile system as opposed to the adult system; the length of time it would take for police to process 16 and 17 year olds as juveniles during arrest as opposed to adults; and, the amount of time and money it would take to treat motor vehicle offenses committed by 16 and 17 year olds as juvenile offenses as opposed to adult. These concerns were also negotiated with technical and language resolutions determined, and a staggered implementation of the increased juvenile jurisdiction agreed upon. Sixteen year olds were the first to change their jurisdiction to juvenile in January 2010. The following year, 17 year olds will fall under juvenile jurisdiction. This compromise allowed for the legislation to successfully be implemented and the staggered approach permits a gradual increase in cost as the changes are implemented.

DESCRIPTION OF THE YPO PILOT PROGRAM

The rationale behind the YPO program was that 16 and 17 year old probationers have different needs than adult probationers and should be supervised accordingly. To identify and address these needs, the YPO program was designed on two major components. First, YPOs would have reduced caseloads of 35 clients and receive additional specialized training. Second, services would be made available for YPO participants consisting of mental health assessments, in-patient substance abuse treatment, employment services, in-house psychiatric treatment, and risk reduction services.

Probation Officers

Caseload

One of the most important facets of the YPO Program was the reduced caseloads for YPOs. Each YPO would supervise no more than thirty-five 16 and 17 year old probationers at any one time.

Philosophy

The vision for this newly designed probation service model was that the 16 and 17 year olds on reduced caseloads would receive a different level of probation supervision, and may be referred for services based upon their individually identified needs.

Training

Each officer would receive additional, specialized training designed to prepare them to effectively identify and address the specific needs of 16 and 17 year olds. Training was to be provided upon assignment as a YPO as well as offered periodically for continuing education purposes and on an as-needed basis.

Service Providers

As Connecticut was planning for the increase in the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18, it looked toward research to guide its programming and service implementation. However, the state found a lack of significant research relating to community-based services for 16 and 17 year olds, likely due to the majority of states already having a combined juvenile justice system. Therefore, the Connecticut Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division (CSSD) implemented a pilot program model that offered an array of services to 16 and 17 year old probationers based on information gathered from local stakeholders and court officials; existing adult and juvenile program models; and evidence-based literature. The five services available to probationers in the YPO program model included: mental health assessments which were conducted by Campagna Associates; in-patient substance abuse treatment provided by The Apt Foundation's Transitions program; employment services offered by Marrakech; in-house psychiatric treatment through Yale University's Intensive In-Home Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Services (IICAPS); and, risk reduction services (i.e., a center where youth could attend groups to learn new skills such as anger management, moral reasoning, social skills, intra- and inter-personal safety, relapse prevention, and impulse control) from Forensic Health Services' Youth Risk Reduction Center (YRRC).

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of the Youth Probation Officer pilot program had three overarching goals. The first goal was to determine how well the program was implemented. The second goal was to determine the effectiveness of the YPO program in reducing arrests and technical violations of probation. The third goal was to identify programmatic and systemic barriers that may have decreased the effectiveness of the YPO program and make recommendations for programming and supervision of 16 and 17 year old probationers. The following section describes the research methods and data used to achieve these goals. The latter part of this section provides a detailed description of the 16 and 17 year old probationers included in this evaluation.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA

The YPO evaluation incorporated qualitative and quantitative methods within the research design. The qualitative methods were used to assess program implementation and consisted of face-to-face interviews, focus groups with the youth probation officers and contracted service providers, and attending meetings between YPOs and service providers. YPOs were interviewed in the fall of 2008 and again in the spring of 2010. These interviews focused on training and preparation for working with 16 and 17 year olds, supervision practices of YPOs (e.g., how YPO supervision was different than non-YPO supervision), the positive and negative aspects of working primarily with 16 and 17 year olds, working relationships with service providers, and recommendations for program improvement. We also conducted focus groups with service providers. We met with YRRC staff in the fall of 2008 and the spring of 2010, Transitions staff in the fall of 2008, Marrakech staff in the fall of 2008, Campania Associates in the fall of 2008, and Yale University's IICAPS staff in the spring of 2010. The focus groups centered on questions of program implementation, working relationships with the YPOs, perceived need of YPO clients, and barriers that may have hindered effectiveness.

The quantitative component of the evaluation utilized a secondary analysis of existing data for the purposes of measuring program utilization, client backgrounds and needs, and probation outcomes. Specifically, data were collected from four sources: (1) the Court Support Services Division's Case Management Information System (CMIS); (2) the Department of Public Safety's Connecticut Criminal History database; (3) CSSD's Contractor Data Collection System (CDCS); and (4) from service providers.

The first step in the data collection process consisted of receiving CMIS probation records of all 16 and 17 year old probationers in the New Haven probation office who began probation supervision between January 1, 2005 and March 1, 2009. The CMIS data contained the following information:

- Probation start and end dates
- Demographic information (age, gender, race/ethnicity, education level obtained, employment)

- Date of probation violation (if one occurred)
- Nature and disposition of probation violation
- Criminal history (prior arrests and convictions, age at first arrest)
- Current offense (offense type, number and types of charges, number and types of convictions)
- Level of Service Inventory Revised (LSI-R) risk and needs assessment scores

The second step in the data collection process consisted of collecting criminal history data from the Department of Public Safety's Connecticut Criminal History database (CCH). These data were used to compare recidivism rates (primarily new arrests) between YPO participants and probationers in our other study groups. This step was accomplished by matching probationers in our study (from step one) to the CCH using their CSSD assigned client number. The information from the CCH consisted of:

- Arrest date
- Arrest charge
- Court disposition (e.g., guilty, not guilty, nolle, dismissed)
- Court sentence and sentence length

Following this step, we matched study participants to CSSD's CDCS database using their CSSD assigned client number. The CDCS database houses all program attendance information for the CSSD contracted service providers. By collecting these data, we were able to assess which probationers were referred to various services, along with the amount of programming received. The CDCS database provided information pertaining to:

- Dates of services
- Service provider
- Service types (e.g., case management, substance abuse, urinalysis, etc.)
- Service participation (e.g., number of times program was attended)

The final step in the data collection process was to receive lists of program participants from the service providers contracted through the YPO program. This step was necessary because the YRRC was the only program to enter service data in the CDCS database.

CREATION OF THE STUDY GROUPS

Four separate study groups were created following the data collection on all 16 and 17 year old New Haven probationers who started probation between January 1, 2005 and March 1, 2009. These groups were comprised of probationers who: (1) were supervised by YPOs during the first part of the YPO pilot (from November 2006 to January 2008); (2) were supervised by YPOs after the expansion of the YPO program (from February of 2008 through February of 2009); (3) were on probation in New Haven prior to the YPO program (January 2005 through October of 2006); and, (4) were on probation in New

Haven after the implementation of the YPO program but were not supervised by YPOs (November 2006 through February 2009).

The first group, the YPO study group, represents the initial piloting of the YPO program. These probationers were supervised by the original YPOs, who received a significant amount of training at the onset of the YPO program and were involved in the development of the YPO model. There were 45 probationers in the YPO group. The second study group, the YPO Expansion, was comprised of probationers selected to participate in the program after it was expanded in February of 2008. This group received the same services as the original YPO group but was supervised by different YPOs. There were 146 probationers in this group.

The third study group, the Pre-YPO group, consisted of 16 and 17 year old New Haven probationers prior to the implementation of the YPO program. This historical comparison group was created as a baseline for the YPO program. That is, to assess what happened to youth prior to the inception of the YPO program and to compare their outcomes to youth on YPO caseloads. These youth were placed on probation between January 2005 and October 2006. A total of 360 16 and 17 year olds were on general probation caseload during this time. After this group was selected, propensity score matching was used to select out those youth who were not similar to youth in the YPO group. This step would assure that the historical comparison and the YPO groups were similar. The two groups were matched based on race, gender, age at probation start, LSI-R risk scores, and assigned probation supervision level. This group was similar to the YPO study group but did not receive any of the benefits of the YPO program (they were in a larger adult probation officer caseload and did not receive specialized services). There were 213 youth in the Pre-YPO study group.

The fourth study group, the Non-YPO group, was created from 16 and 17 year old New Haven probationers who were not selected to be supervised by YPOs. Since the YPO caseloads were limited to 35 youth per probation officer, not all eligible youth were placed in the YPO program. These were youth not receiving the full benefits of YPO probationers (they were part of a larger adult probation officer caseload and may or may not have received the same services as YPO probationers). This group initially consisted of 156 probationers. Similar to the Pre-YPO group, propensity score matching was used to select Non-YPO youth similar to YPO probationers to have evenly matched groups. The groups were matched based on race, gender, age at probation start, LSI-R risk scores, and assigned probation supervision level. There were 70 youth in the Non-YPO study group.

STUDY GROUP DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON

Table 1 compares the four study groups across demographic variables (gender, race/ethnicity, age, and education/employment level at the start of probation). The majority of probationers were male (83%) and African-American (74%) in all four study groups. The study groups consisted mostly of 17 year old probationers with the average

age being 16.5 years old. There were some 18 year olds in the YPO study groups, but all of them were on probation prior to turning 18. All four groups had a fairly high percentage of probationers who were unemployed and not enrolled in school (close to 40%) but also had a similar percentage of probationers who were employed full-time or in school (also close to 40%).

Table 1. Demographic Summary of Study Groups*

	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)
Males	80%	82%	83%	89%
Race/Ethnicity				
African-American	82%	72%	72%	75%
Caucasian	7%	15%	12%	9%
Hispanic	11%	13%	16%	16%
Age				
16	44%	39%	45%	40%
17	49%	51%	55%	60%
18	7%	10%	0%	0%
Average Age (years)	16.64	16.71	16.55	16.60
Education/Employment				
Unemployed/No School	33%	39%	38%	49%
Part-time Student/Employ.	29%	20%	17%	19%
Full-time Student/Employ.	38%	40%	45%	33%

*There were no statistically significant differences across the groups at $p < .05$.

The assigned probation supervision levels based on the LSI-R total risk scores are presented in Table 2. The average LSI-R total risk score was approximately 22, with the highest percentage of probationers in the YPO, YPO Expansion, and Non-YPO study groups being assigned as medium risk (the Pre-YPO group had a slightly higher percentage of probationers in the high risk group).

Table 2. LSI-R Supervision Risk Level Across Study Groups*

LSI-R Risk Level	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)
Administrative	16%	15%	15%	17%
Medium	47%	55%	42%	47%
High	37%	30%	43%	36%
Average LSI-R Total Risk Score	21.20	22.46	22.74	22.54

*There were no statistically significant differences across the groups at $p < .05$.

There were also no statistically significant differences across the four groups for LSI-R Primary Needs (Table 3). Over 30% of probationers in all four study groups had Companions as their primary need followed by attitude/orientation, family, alcohol/drug, and emotional/personal. The one exception was the YPO study group. The second highest primary need for this group was family, followed by attitude/orientation.

Table 3. LSI-R Primary Need Across Study Groups*

LSI-R Primary Need	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)
Companions	36%	34%	30%	36%
Attitude/Orientation	16%	23%	24%	27%
Family	29%	16%	18%	16%
Alcohol/Drug	9%	13%	13%	11%
Emotional/Personal	11%	11%	12%	7%
Criminal History	0	1%	4%	3%

*There were no statistically significant differences across the groups at $p < .05$.

The comparison of the four study groups found no statistically significant differences in terms of demographics or LSI-R risk scores. The similarity of these groups allowed for directly testing the effectiveness of the YPO program for the original piloting of the YPO model (the YPO study group) compared to the change in YPOs (YPO Expansion). The outcomes of these two groups will be compared to 16 and 17 year olds on adult probation prior to the YPO program (Pre-YPO) and those who were not selected for YPO supervision (Non-YPO).

EVALUATION FINDINGS

The evaluation of the Youth Probation Officer program focused on four major research questions. These were: (1) was the program implemented in a way to maximize its potential for successful outcomes; (2) were there differences in the arrest and technical violation rates of YPO probationers and probationers not receiving YPO supervision or services; (3) were there specific probationer characteristics related to success; and, (4) what were the effects of the contracted services on arrest and technical violation rates. The following section presents the findings to these questions. The first part of this section summarizes the implementation and utilization of the YPO components. This section is followed by the comparison of recidivism rates (arrests and technical violations) of the four study groups along with analyses exploring which programs and characteristics had the most effect on recidivism. The final part of our analyses presents the gap analysis, which identified gaps between probationer needs and services delivered.

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AND INTEGRITY

The following section addresses the first major research question. That is, was the YPO program implemented in a way to maximize its potential for successful outcomes? In this section, we summarize the various components of the YPO program, their utilization, and our assessment of their implementation. The information presented here was based upon interviews and focus groups, data from the CDCS database, and data reported to CSSD from service providers.

Youth Probation Officers

The centerpiece of the YPO program was the Youth Probation Officers. They were given reduced caseloads so they could have increased positive contacts with their probationers. The increased contacts would, theoretically, lead to better rapport with probationers, a better understanding of probationer needs, mentor-type relationships between YPOs and probationers, and a high level of follow-up with service providers. YPOs were believed to be able to make positive changes in probationers' lives, which would result in fewer arrests and technical violations of probation.

Staffing

The YPO program initially had two probation officers assigned to it. They were involved in the initial planning of the program, were offered a variety of training opportunities, and supervised the first group of 16 and 17 year olds picked to participate in the YPO program. One of the original YPOs began supervising YPO probationers from November of 2006 until he was promoted to a supervisor in January of 2008. The other original YPO also began supervising YPO probationers in November of 2006 and continued in the program until September of 2007. She was replaced by another female probation officer who began supervising YPO probationers from October of 2007 to the writing of

this report (May, 2010). In February of 2008, two other YPOs were added to the program and began supervising 16 and 17 year old probationers (one male and one female). They were still supervising YPO probationers at the time of this report (May, 2010). In addition, there was a change in supervisors in January of 2008. The initial supervisor was involved in the development of the YPO program and supervised the YPOs from November of 2006 through December of 2007. One of the original YPOs was promoted to this position starting in January of 2008.

Caseloads

The YPO program began taking clients in November of 2006. The initial group of YPO probationers was created by moving eligible 16 and 17 year old probationers from regular adult probation caseloads to the caseloads of YPOs. After the implementation of the YPO program, 16 and 17 year olds starting their probation supervision were assigned to YPOs or probation officers with adult caseloads.

The caseload size was initially set at no more than 35 YPO probationers per officer. CSSD raised this limit to 50 in October of 2009. While we do not know the effects of this increase, YPOs expressed concerns that it likely decreased their ability to have positive interactions with probationers. For example, with lower caseloads, YPOs were able to go to the probationers' homes frequently and talk to education staff in the youths' schools on a regular basis. With laptops, cellular phones, and routine access to state vehicles, YPOs believed they had more freedom to work off-site and had more interaction with probationers. With the increase in caseloads, coupled with the removal of cellular phones and laptops, and the lack of availability of state vehicles, YPOs reported being more office-bound. YPOs stated that they were able to leave the office for home or school visits once or twice per month. YPOs felt this hindered their ability to engage their probationers in the most meaningful and effective manner.

In order to avoid exceeding their caseload capacities but still receive new probationers, YPOs believed they were under pressure to transfer probationers to either the Judicial Administrative Monitoring System (JAMS) or other adult probation officers. These decisions were made using youths' Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) scores and information received from service providers. YPOs felt that in order to provide the level of service that 16 and 17 year old probationers required, their caseloads should be no more than 20 or 25 probationers. YPOs felt that caseloads of 35 were even a little high when trying to achieve the greatest possible outcomes for the youths.

Most probationers on YPO caseloads were at the medium risk level, however YPOs maintained mixed caseloads of low, medium and high-risk clients as determined by each youths' LSI-R score. At the time of this report, the YPOs were planning on using the Multimedia Adolescent Suicide Interview (MASI) as an additional assessment tool in determining symptoms of major depression, severity of suicidal ideation, severity of suicide attempts and exposure to suicide. The assessment instruments available to YPOs were LSI-R, the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument (MAYSI), Adult Substance Use Survey-Revised (ASUS-R), and the Domestic Violence Screening Instrument

(DVSI). These instruments were in addition to other court-based assessment services provided by Campagna Associates.

Training

During the planning and initial implementation of the YPO program, probation officers received specialized training relevant to working with 16 and 17 year olds. Some of the initial trainings were on Cultural Competency, Parent and Teen Mediation, Street Smarts Venture Training, Adolescent Development, Juvenile Probation Officer Motivational Interviewing, Strengths Based Training, and Frameworks of Effective Interventions. They were followed by a series of trainings including those also received by the contracted service providers on the particular intervention strategies available to 16 and 17 year old probationers on their caseloads. This thorough understanding of each service intervention, along with the knowledge of clients' needs, allowed YPOs to make informed referrals to the services that best addressed clients' individualized needs. YPOs found these trainings to be extremely beneficial in preparing them to work affectively with 16 and 17 year old probationers. However, new YPOs did not receive the same amount of training. One of the new YPOs was provided only with Child and Adolescent Development training. This YPO also took Interviewing Children and Engaging Youth and Their Families but had to take on his own. The 2009 *Evaluation of the Court Support Services Division's New Haven Pilot Program Process Evaluation Report* cited several trainings that YPOs believed would be beneficial for new YPOs as part of a standardized training program. YPOs felt as though the need for specific training for incoming YPOs was conveyed to CSSD administrative personnel but the request was not fulfilled. The new YPOs were appreciative of the mentoring given to them by the original YPOs, but stated that the extensive training given to the initial YPOs would have been helpful to them as well.

In addition to the trainings previously mentioned, YPOs felt that instruction on effective techniques to deal with resistant clients and how to motivate reluctant youth to want to improve their lives would be beneficial. They felt they needed something more than Motivational Interviewing (MI); they wanted techniques more specific to working with youth. The YPOs did find adolescent development to be very helpful, as well as the training on dealing with familial issues, loss and bereavement. They also pointed out that trainings on the programs that service providers offered were useful.

Intake and Supervision

Within the first week of receiving a new probationer, the YPO assigned to that probationer was required to visit the client's house, meet the youth's family to see how the family was living, and go to the client's school. At times, clients had been released from a residential or correctional institution and did not know what school they were supposed to attend. In these instances, YPOs needed to determine the school the youth should attend, assure they were registered for that school, and began attending school. YPOs believed this was a very important task, even though it often was extremely time-consuming.

During the initial stages of the YPO pilot program, YPOs had difficulty acquiring educational information to assess probationers' level of school involvement. This improved significantly when they began working with New Haven Board of Education staff from Department of Social Development and Truancy. These staff served as liaisons between YPOs and the schools. There are 17 high schools in New Haven which, prior to YPOs working with social development and truancy staff, required YPOs to visit each school on a weekly basis to obtain information on their probationers' truancy, behavior, grades, and participation in extra-curricular activities. Since this relationship was established, YPOs were able to provide probationer names to social development and truancy staff who, in turn, provided YPOs with the school information they needed to assess probationers' school performance and behavior.

YPO Concerns with Discontinuing Two of the Contracted Services

Five contracted service providers were available to YPOs at the onset of the YPO program (mental health assessments; in-patient substance abuse treatment; employment services; in-house psychiatric treatment; and, risk reduction services). By the conclusion of the second contract year (June 30, 2009), two of the services had been discontinued: in-patient substance abuse treatment and employment services through the Work/Learn Model. While the YPOs knew the Work/Learn program was going to be discontinued, they would have preferred to have been part of the decision-making process as they viewed these services as filling a specific need. YPOs also expressed concerns about the lack of replacement programming. CSSD did attempt to establish other substance abuse treatment services and had the YRRC provide employment services. However, replacement programming had not been secured at the time of this report.

Information Sharing Amongst Probation Officers

During our interviews with YPOs we were surprised to hear that juvenile probation officers were not allowed to share supervision and assessment information with adult probation officers. That is, adult probation officers do not have access to juvenile probation officer records, even if they have the same probationers. Due to an unquestioned need to guard the privacy of juvenile offenders, allowing them the opportunity to "start over" upon adulthood, juvenile records are strictly protected. However, this strict adherence to privacy has resulted in the inability for probation officers to share administrative and supervisory information about juvenile probationers with each other. This policy appears to have potentially detrimental supervision ramifications in instances where youths are either being supervised by a juvenile probation officer (JPO) and YPO/ adult probation officer (APO) simultaneously for two separate criminal charges, or when a youth was formerly under the supervision of a JPO, to then later be supervised by a YPO/APO for new charges. Undoubtedly, there are some records that should remain confidential and inaccessible to others, however some information should be considered for sharing in order to equip probation officers with the information needed to best meet the needs of probationers while preventing the duplication of services.

Records to consider for sharing should be information pertaining to former service recommendations, previous assessment outcomes, the successful/unsuccessful completion of programs, family history relevant to effective case management and important information regarding supervision requirements (for example, if a female youth should not be supervised by a male probation officer due to a history of false sexual harassment claims).

The lack of communication between juvenile probation officers and adult probation officers can create significant barriers for probationers and also waste valuable resources by duplicating the services. For instance, it is not uncommon for one probationer to be simultaneously supervised by a juvenile probation officer and an adult probation officer. In this situation, the probationer has to follow separate sets of probation conditions, meet with two different probation officers, complete different assessments for each probation officer, and may be required to attend two different programs for the same type of treatment. One youth who was required to complete anger management treatment for both probation officers, yet the certificate for completion of anger management at one facility did not meet the requirement for the other probation officer, thereby requiring the youth to successfully complete two different anger management treatment programs.

Risk Reduction Services

The major service component of the YPO program was risk reduction services provided by The Forensic Health Services' Youth Risk Reduction Center (YRRC). The YRRC was based on the concept that multi-faceted, intense and individually tailored treatment would be more effective than singularly focused programs. Here, youth were offered a variety of services intended to target their specific criminogenic needs, as identified by the YPOs. The programs available were curriculum-driven and evidence-based models. Youth identified as medium risk, and some higher risk youth if preapproved by the supervisor, were placed in one or more of the services as deemed appropriate by their YPO. Theoretically, YPOs would be aware of the available services and match probationers to YRRC programs. Once referred, YRRC staff would be able to also assess the youths and recommend which services best fit their needs.

Program Description

The Forensic Health Services' Youth Risk Reduction Center (YRRC) offered a variety of services intended to target medium risk youth (YRRC services were offered to low and high risk youth with an override from the YPO supervisor). The YRRC was meant to be a center where youth could attend groups that would help them learn new skills. The YRRC had the capacity to serve 50 youth at a time and, depending upon their identified needs, placed them into programming intended to address those specific needs. The programs provided by the YRRC were:

- Aggression Replacement Training (ART)
- Motivational Enhancement Therapy (MET), Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), and Family Service Network (FSN)

- Voices
- Save Our Streets (SOS)
- Trauma-Adaptive Recovery Group Education and Therapy (TARGET)
- Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT)
- Case management (Goals and Progress)
- Flex funds
- Viewpoints
- Family Violence Education (FVEP)

Aggression Replacement Training (ART). ART was a 30-hour program that met three times a week for 10 weeks and was for males only. Participants addressed moral reasoning, anger management, impulse control and social skill development.

Motivational Enhancement Therapy (MET), Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), and Family Service Network (FSN). MET/CBT/FSN offered males and females a three-pronged approach to clinical treatment. Participants received two MET sessions and ten CBT sessions that focused on building drug and alcohol refusal skills, problem solving, anger management, communication skills, relapse prevention and techniques for dealing with anxiety and depression. FSN involved six parent education sessions as well as four home visits.

Voices. Voices was a strengths-based and relational program that helped females develop healthier self-images by learning to explore their feelings and identify their self-concept and needs.

Save Our Streets. The “Save Our Streets” curriculum was used to provide a gun violence prevention program. This program was a 16-session, two-hour per session program that used a dual-pronged approach of law-related education with conflict resolution. The law-related educational portion offered participants an understanding of law and the legal process, particularly gun-related legislation. The conflict resolution training instructed youth on effective communication, problem-solving, decision-making and negotiation skills.

Trauma-Adaptive Recovery Group Education and Therapy (TARGET). TARGET taught male and female trauma and extreme-stress survivors practical skills for managing stressful experiences through a strengths-based, present-centered and biopsychosocial approach. The overall goal of TARGET was to move youths’ primary focus from past trauma to gaining a sense of control and meaning in life through understanding their reactions to traumatic stress.

Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT). BSFT was a home-based, family-focused program with a strong cultural component. Because of the strong cultural undertone, it was shown to be effective with minority populations. Each therapist visited clients in their home, provided approximately 15 hours of counseling over a three month period,

and served approximately 12-17 cases at a time. Considering the program was short-term, the therapist targeted minor issues such as communication problems.

Case Management (Goals and Progress). Through case management, youth were linked with area resources that provided on-going community support once their supervision period ended. Additionally, previously existing and contracted community-based services were included in the program plans to prevent Judicial funds from duplicating services.

Flex Funds. The YRRC had discretionary funds available to promote pro-social community activities. Flex funds could be used for such things as athletics, club memberships, paying for drivers education courses and Emergency Medical Training (EMT).

Viewpoints. Viewpoints focused on making positive decisions and engaging in positive behaviors. It encouraged participants to think about consequences and how to engage in positive decision-making. At the time of this writing, the YRRC was participating in an evaluation with Yale University to determine its effectiveness.

Family Violence Education (FVEP). This program consisted of nine weekly classes that centered on decreasing violence occurring within family and dating relationships. The curriculum was gender specific and used skills training, Motivational Interviewing, cognitive-behavioral approaches, and a solution focused approach to hold participants accountable for their behavior.

Program Utilization

YRRC began accepting referrals in June of 2007 and provided several different types of services to youth. The few times that YPO and YRRC staff felt a certain type of service intervention was needed that was not offered by the YRRC, they worked together to try to create that programming.

Since January of 2010, YRRC began receiving referrals for 18 year olds; if the probationer was still in youthful offender status he/she could participate in YRRC programming, even if they were 18 years old.

YRRC offered its services primarily to medium risk youthful offenders but did have some low and high risk youth. YRRC served low and high risk probationers if the YPO supervisor and YRRC director agreed these probationers would likely benefit from the programs offered at YRRC and if the YPO supervisor overrode the risk-level requirement. In terms of capacity, YRRC staff reported that the program's 50 caseload slots remained at or near capacity since early in its inception.

Youth were referred to the YRRC by the YPOs. Once referred, YRRC staff determined which services were appropriate based upon their own assessments, when groups were starting soon, and what other youth were in the current groups. Table 4 presents the number of services received by probationers in the four study groups. While the YRRC was not available for Pre-YPO youth, Non-YPO youth could have been referred for

services. Fourteen of the 45 YPO probationers (31%) received at least one service from the YRRC; 57 of the 146 YPO Expansion probationers (53%) attended the YRRC, and 6 of the 70 Non-YPO probationers (9%) attended the YRRC. Overall, the majority of youth referred to the YRRC received multiple services (81% of all YRRC participants received more than one program).

Table 4. Number of YRRC Programs Participated in by Study Group Probationers

	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)	Total
Zero	31	69	212	64	376
One	4	14	0	1	19
Two	5	22	0	4	32
Three	3	22	0	0	25
Four	2	16	0	1	19
Five	0	2	0	0	2
Seven	0	1	0	0	1

Table 5 presents the number of YPO probationers who participated in each YRRC program, the average number of sessions that participants attended, and the number of youth who completed each program. The most widely used programs were case management services (68 YPO participants), MET-CBT-FSN (36 youth), and TARGET (34 youth) while the least used programs were FVEP (6 youth), Viewpoints (15 youth), and ART (19 youth).

In the CDCS database, YRRC staff entered the number of treatment sessions required and the number of treatment sessions attended. From these two CDCS data fields, we calculated the number of youth completing all of the sessions for each program (Table 5). The services with the highest attendance rates were FVEP (5 out of 6 participants attended all sessions, 83%), MET-CBT-FSN (19 out of 36, 53%), and TARGET (18 out of 34, 53%). The least provided services were BSFT (1 out of 18, 6%), SOS (6 out of 22, 27%), and Voices (5 out of 17, 29%). Case Management services were not included in this assessment because these were ongoing services and did not have any specific attendance requirements.

Table 5. YRRC Program Participation and Number Completing Programs by YPO Group

	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)
ART		
Number of Youth Participated	1 (2%)	18 (12%)
Average Sessions Attended	29	22
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions	0	9
MET-CBT-FSN		
Number of Youth Participated	7 (16%)	29 (20%)
Average Sessions Attended	8	11
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions	0	19
Voices		
Number of Youth Participated	4 (9%)	13 (9%)
Average Sessions Attended	16	5
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions	3	2
TARGET		
Number of Youth Participated	9 (20%)	25 (17%)
Average Sessions Attended	7	8
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions	2	16
BSFT		
Number of Youth Participated	2 (4%)	16 (11%)
Average Sessions Provided	5	9
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions	0	1
Case Management: Goals and Progress		
Number of Youth Participated	4 (9%)	64 (44%)
Average Sessions Attended	15	8
Viewpoints		
Number of Youth Participated	0	15 (10%)
Average Sessions Attended		6
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions		8
SOS		
Number of Youth Participated	4 (9%)	18 (12%)
Average Sessions Attended	8	11
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions	0	6
FVEP		
Number of Youth Participated	0	6 (4%)
Average Sessions Attended		8
Number of Youth Completing All Sessions		5

Assessment of Program Implementation

We believe the YRRC maintained its fidelity to the model of service delivery. A key factor was the variety of programs offered by the YRRC and the close working relationship they established with the YPOs. YRRC staff and the YPOs began meeting monthly to discuss challenges and successes they had experienced, and to review the

progress of YPO probationers attending the YRRC. Decisions on client need and service recommendations were made jointly at these meetings. In addition, discrepancies between information provided by the probationer to the YPO versus the YRRC staff were shared and realized. Intervention was jointly considered and agreed upon resulting in both workers (the YPO and YRRC staff member working with the client) addressing the youth in the same manner. Each probationer was theoretically surrounded by people working with them toward a shared goal but within the different contexts of each worker. Another benefit of the monthly meetings occurred when a worker was out-of-the-office. If a particular probationer's YRRC worker was unavailable during a crisis, every YPO and YRRC staff member was aware of each youth's status and needs, therefore, another worker would be able to assist the youth until his/her worker was able to speak with him/her. YRRC staff found these meetings to be so helpful that they established ongoing meetings with their new referral sources.

In addition, YRRC staff worked with the YPOs to provide programming that addressed the specific, newly-identified needs of their clientele as the YPO program progressed. At times, during the monthly meetings discussed above, the YPOs and YRRC staff realized a particular need shared by several clients that may not have been getting fully addressed through YRRC's existing programming. Therefore, the YPOs and YRRC staff decided to create a new service with the intent of better serving their clients. For instance, when the contract for employment services expired in June of 2009, YRRC recognized the need for life skills as well as educational and employment services. YRRC staff and YPOs agreed that the primary motivation for 16 and 17 year olds was their desire for employment. Therefore, the YRRC assigned one of its case managers to address the educational and employment needs of YRRC's clients. This case manager assessed each client's educational status and when necessary, enrolled the client in school. For employment, the case manager collected job applications and searched online regularly for local job openings that they would post in the YRRC office. The case manager assisted clients in filling out job applications, writing cover letters and resumes, and escorted them to potential employers to drop-off the applications. To prepare youth for interviews, the case manager would conduct mock interviews and, when needed, used flex funds to provide youth with proper interview attire (e.g., ties, shoes, shirts, etc.).

Discretionary funds provided the opportunity for YRRC staff to meet the non-programmatic individual needs of YPO probationers. As mentioned above, funds were used to purchase clothing for job interviews, grooming and hygiene products, and winter coats. These funds were also used to pay for transportation, acquire state identification and/or driver's licenses, register clients for driving school, pay for child care, purchase baby items for a client who was stealing merchandise for their baby, and, gym memberships to build self-esteem. YRRC staff believed flex funds were crucial in allowing the staff to attend to the unexpected, non-programmatic needs of YPO participants.

One service that YRRC staff felt was needed but not provided were parenting classes. YRRC was surprised to discover that many of their 16 and 17 year old clients were ill-equipped parents who, due to their own upbringing, did not have positive parenting skills.

YRRC conducted research on parenting programs and expressed interest in providing such services.

Court-Based Assessments

CSSD originally contracted with Campagna Associates LLP to provide psychological, psychiatric, psychosocial, psychosexual, and substance abuse assessments of juveniles referred by the Juvenile Court. Most of these evaluations were provided prior to adjudication. YPOs referred their clients for the same schedule of evaluations. The rationale for allowing YPOs access to Court-Based Assessments (CBAs) was that the assessments would help better identify client risk factors and formulate more effective supervision and treatment plans. Campagna Associates was contracted to conduct assessments for 65 New Haven youth per year.

Program Description

Youth were referred for additional assessments when:

- LSI-R risk scores indicated possible drug and/or alcohol problems;
- the YPO or parent(s) indicated a potential psychiatric or drug and/or alcohol problem;
- the YPO was struggling to make an appropriate recommendation due to the complexity of the youth's problems and clinical guidance was warranted.

A CBA was scheduled within ten business days and the written report was sent to the YPO within five business days after the assessment was completed. The report:

- summarized the referral question and relevant history;
- described evaluation procedures;
- analyzed results of the procedures;
- presented a case formulation;
- proposed additional evaluations (if indicated) and appropriate treatment interventions.

Program Utilization

From November 2006 through April 2009 there were 211 YPO probationers referred for a CBA. Of these, 117 youth were assessed and 94 did not show up to the appointment (a 45% no-show rate). During the first contract year, there was a high no-show rate amongst youth referred for assessment. The YPOs and CBA staff discussed the issue and worked together to reduce the high no-show rate. The following describes the YPO scheduling procedure (which is essentially the same procedure utilized statewide):

- YPOs telephoned the Court-Based Assessment (CBAs) referral coordinator Monday through Friday, 8:30-4:30 pm. Many evaluations were arranged while the probationer was sitting in the office with the YPO.
- When the YPO referred the probationer for evaluation and the probationer was not present, the CBAs referral coordinator contacted the client to schedule the

evaluation, sent the probationer an appointment letter and e-mailed a copy of the letter to the YPO.

- The referral coordinator provided printed directions to the evaluation site, which was on a major bus route and less than five miles from the probation office.
- When factors such as transportation difficulties or a probationer's attitude toward the evaluation would likely result in a probationer's failure to appear for the evaluation, YPOs would escort the probationer to their appointment. This practice grew out of a high failure rate for initial appointments and was successful in reducing that rate.
- Three kinds of events yielded a "failure to appear" (FTA):
 - Client or family canceled the appointment with less than 24 hours notice
 - Client arrived more than 30 minutes later than the scheduled appointment
 - Client failed to appear at all.
- When a scheduled appointment resulted in a FTA, the referral coordinator notified the YPO. Depending on the nature of the FTA, the referral coordinator may have rescheduled with the client directly or the YPO could have chosen to intervene with the client and/or family before another appointment was scheduled.

Assessment of Program Implementation

Campagna Associates provided the assessment services according to their contractual obligations. They received over 65 referrals per year and attempted to assess all of these YPO probationers. YPOs reported that Campagna Associates conducted the assessments in a timely manner and provided written reports as expected. There were a few occasions where the YPOs were required to make service referrals before receiving Campagna Associates' written reports. This problem was no fault of Campagna Associates. We were concerned about the high no-show rate and although corrective actions were taken to alleviate this problem, CSSD still had to pay Campagna Associates \$28,952 for missed appointments.

Educational and Vocational Support Services

CSSD believed that 16 and 17 year old probationers should be prepared for productive engagement and sustainable employment to be successful adults. This belief led to the inclusion of education and vocational support services in the YPO program. To facilitate the implementation of these services at the onset of the YPO program, CSSD entered into a "Memorandum of Understanding" with the State of Connecticut Department of Children and Families (DCF) to "buy" 20 program slots in a DCF contracted program operated by Marrakech, Inc.

Program Description

Marrakech, Inc. was contracted to provide medium-to-low risk YPO probationers with educational and vocational support services. The YPO youth referred to Marrakech, Inc. were to have at least 12 months of their probationary term remaining to allow for effective intervention. YPO youth attended the program with youth committed to DCF

who were abused, neglected, in foster care, or were participating in voluntary DCF services.

Marrakech, Inc. followed a Work/Learn model, which was a strengths-based approach that offered vocational and educationally-related services such as: skills and interests evaluation, academic assessment and testing, high school or GED acquisition assistance, certificate program planning, placement and retention, post-secondary educational planning, employment assistance, and tutoring. In addition, Marrakech, Inc. offered more comprehensive services targeting needs outside of educational and vocational preparation including life skills training, financial management, community engagement and recreational activities, referrals for counseling (for the individual and/or family), referrals for housing assistance, and healthcare referrals.

Program Utilization

As discussed in the 2009 *Evaluation of the Court Support Services Division's New Haven Pilot Program Process Evaluation Report*, the Work/Learn model of programming was highly regarded by YPOs and appeared to be popular amongst YPO probationers. Attendance was high with some former clients continuing to visit the facility, friends and staff. YPOs quickly filled the 20 CSSD program slots and continually requested more slots. A total of 53 YPO youth were referred to Marrakech, Inc. and 43 of these youth attended. Youth spent an average of 300 days in the program (from intake to discharge). Unlike the YRRC, we were unable to track how often youth attended Marrakech, Inc. or what specific services were received. Marrakech, Inc. staff was required to maintain logs to track program utilization; however, these logs were not made available to CSSD.

Assessment of Program Implementation

Despite the initial popularity of the program, CSSD did not renew the employment and vocational services contract after June 30, 2009. This contract was not renewed primarily over concerns regarding the type of programming delivered by Marrakech, Inc. CSSD contracted with Marrakech, Inc. for the sole purpose of providing educational and vocational skills and to be more proactive in helping YPO participants find employment. Marrakech, Inc. staff stated that they were not specifically a job placement program but a program that helped youth in a variety of ways and, in some cases, arranged employment internships that often ended with youth receiving jobs. In addition, CSSD contract monitors were concerned that Marrakech, Inc. was not providing a significant amount of organized and structured programming. These concerns were exacerbated by Marrakech, Inc.'s lack of providing outcome reporting and quality improvement data.

CSSD intended the Work/Learn model of programming to provide educational and vocational support services with the intention of preparing youth for employment and assisting in their hire with local employers, as well as to assist with the youths' educational needs and successes. Marrakech, Inc. staff admitted that the focus of programming swayed away from employment and toward improving the youths' self-esteem, functioning in the community, positive peer interaction, creating a sense of hope,

encouraging youth to think about the future and plan realistically on how to accomplish the goals they have established for themselves, life skills, and the ultimate goal of helping the youth out of poverty.

Marrakech, Inc. staff pointed out that one reason they did not fully follow the Work/Learn model was due to the amount of time YPO youth were in the program. YPO youth referred for services were to have at least 12 months left on their probation sentence so that they could fully participate in the Work/Learn model. Due to the nature of probation sentences, this was not always possible and some YPO youth were referred for services with only three months remaining in their probationary term. Marrakech, Inc. staff felt this severely limited the program's ability to positively affect participants. In this limited time, Marrakech, Inc. staff believed that this could be accomplished through role modeling, pro-social activities, providing the youth with a positive atmosphere to be after school, demonstrating how to resolve conflict effectively when tensions arose at the facility, instructing youth on how to speak properly with adults and potential employers, how to dress and present oneself respectfully, and how to be accountable for behavior. Although these interventions are inarguably beneficial, CSSD's purpose for contracting for this sphere of YPO programming was to secure employment for 16 and 17 year old probationers; a service that Marrakech, Inc. was unable to provide.

Mental Health Services

Research on youthful offenders has found that 15% to 20% have serious mental health disturbances that can have extreme detrimental effects on their everyday functioning, which increases their likelihood of recidivating. To address this need among YPO probationers, CSSD contracted with the Yale University Child Study Center to provide Intensive In-Home Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Services (IICAPS).

Program Description

IICAPS utilized a strengths-based model relying on the engagement of the youth and their family to identify and build upon the youth's and family's strengths and address the problems which place the youth in danger of placement outside of his/her home and community. The program was intended to target children in acute psychiatric crisis, children being discharged from a psychiatric hospital and children with needs that would not be sufficiently met with traditional outpatient services.

The services provided through IICAPS consisted of mental health assessments; family and individual psychotherapy; 24 hours a day and 7 day a week crisis response; school observation and consultation; parent guidance and training in behavioral management techniques, and case management services. The IICAPS model was implemented by a two-person team consisting of a licensed or license eligible clinician and a B.A. level mental health counselor. This two-person team provided treatment in the familial home and worked in partnership with families to create implementable treatment plans. They also collaborated with school staff and probation officers to assure the youths' safety in

their homes and communities. CSSD funded one IICAPS team in New Haven that was contracted to serve 9 youths at a time or 18 youths per year.

Program Utilization

According to CSSD staff, IICAPS was a difficult service to fill with a population of 16-17 year old CSSD adolescents for two primary reasons. The first reason was that YPOs had difficulty identifying individuals with serious mental health issues. The other was that IICAPS was a home-based family model that required at least one care-giving adult to be highly involved in the child's progress. Although many of the 16 and 17 year olds on probation did not have stable housing and often stayed with family members, extended family, friends and others, IICAPS was willing to work with any care-giver who made a commitment to the adolescent. YPOs were not able to identify many youth with serious mental health issues who met these criteria and subsequently enrollment often fell below capacity.

IICAPS staff worked with YPOs to introduce them to the program and help them to make use of it. Establishing relationships with the YPOs increased their interest in the program and increased enrollments. The program was described by YPOs as a really good program with great success and no violations of youth that had participated. During the meeting with the YPOs, they remarked that with one client, IICAPS extended its service beyond six months because the client was very much engaged in the therapeutic work and still had issues that needed to be resolved.

IICAPS was committed to working collaboratively with CSSD and assisting YPOs to identify 16-17 year olds in the juvenile justice system who meet the referral criteria for service. The difficulties in identifying this group of adolescents and engaging them and their caregivers in treatment were understood and continually addressed by both the YPOs and IICAPS.

Table 6 provides a summary of YPO probationers who were referred to IICAPS. A total of 20 YPO youth were referred to IICAPS and 10 participated in the program (8 YPO youth refused to participate in the program, 1 moved during the program, and 1 was not admitted because he needed a higher level of treatment). Of the 10 YPO youth that participated, 7 completed the treatment and the other 3 received probation violations and were removed. IICAPS completers averaged 104 face-to-face contact hours with staff.

Table 6. Outcomes of IICAPS' Participants

Client	Face-to-Face Sessions	Face-to-Face Contact Hours	Discharge Reason
1	135	156.75	Completed Treatment
2	8	2.00	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
3	24	23.00	Revoked to Juvenile Justice Facility due to probation violation
4	51	47.25	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
5	68	65.00	Revoked to Juvenile Justice Facility due to probation violation
6	10	5.75	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
7	95	81.17	Completed Treatment
8	87	62.75	Child's condition requires higher level of care: Inpatient or Residential Treatment
9	182	175.25	Completed Treatment
10	68	67.00	Completed Treatment
11	44	43.25	Completed Treatment
12	2	1.00	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
13	129	126.75	Completed Treatment
14	20	17.75	Revoked to Juvenile Justice Facility due to probation
15	87	76.25	Completed Treatment
16	19	12.25	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
17	61	45.00	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
18	14	9.25	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
19	18	12.00	Child/Family Did Not Participate in Treatment
20	26	23.75	Family Moved

Assessment of Program Implementation

IICAPS appears to have been implemented in a manner consistent with its model. The YPOs had a positive working relationship with IICAPS staff and youth who completed IICAPS had a high number of face-to-face contacts with IICAPS staff. The primary drawback of this program was the perceived lack of need among YPO probationers. YPOs stated there were few youth who had serious mental health issues to warrant referrals to IICAPS. Also, IICAPS adjusted the admittance criteria so more YPO youth could be considered for treatment. However, it is unclear if there was actually a low number of youth with serious mental health problems or that YPOs were not able to adequately screen and detect mental health problems. We were also concerned about the low percentage of referrals that resulted in program participation. Only 10 out of 20 referrals resulted in treatment. We concur with the YPOs observations that this age group (16 and 17 year olds) posed a particularly difficult challenge for a home-based model that required parental involvement, given that many of the 16 and 17 year olds on probation did not have stable housing or any type of relationships with their parents.

In-Patient Substance Abuse Treatment

A commonly identified problem for 16 and 17 year old offenders was substance abuse. It is believed that substance abuse is a major risk factor for violence, delinquency, and various psychological disorders. Because of these concerns, in-patient substance abuse treatment was available for YPO probationers. CSSD contracted with the APT Foundation to reserve four slots in its Transitions program for YPO probationers. Prior to the YPO program, CSSD had already contracted 25 beds for referrals across the state.

Program Description

Transitions' mission was to provide residential treatment to youth with substance abuse problems, as well as legal, educational, housing and/or familial issues. Transitions' treatment philosophy was to help clients accept responsibility for their substance abuse and criminal justice problems, receive necessary interventions and demonstrate the motivation and skills necessary to change these and other behaviors. The average length of stay for a participant was intended to be four to six months, with an average number of youth served annually of 8 to 12.

Program Utilization

YPOs referred youth to Transitions primarily based on the recommendation of the Court Based Assessment. However, there seemed to be a low-need for intense substance abuse treatment; although, there was a strong need for in-patient behavioral modification programming. Transitions modified its service curriculum to include a behavioral modification focus. This change permitted youth who were in need of behavioral modification with substance abuse issues to be admitted.

The outcomes of Transitions participants are presented in Table 7. A total of 30 YPO youth were referred to the program and 29 were admitted (one YPO youth was not accepted due to other non-substance abuse related problems). Of the 29 youth admitted, 11 were removed by CSSD before completing the program, 9 successfully completed the program, 3 absconded, 1 was rearrested in the program, and 5 were unsuccessfully discharged for not complying with program requirements. Program completers averaged 94 days in the program.

Table 7. Outcomes of Transitions' Participants

Client	Placement Outcome	Days in Program
4	Absconded	2
5	Absconded	2
12	Absconded	10
10	Inappropriate for Program	
2	Removed by CSSD	
11	Removed by CSSD	
13	Removed by CSSD	
16	Removed by CSSD	
17	Removed by CSSD	
21	Removed by CSSD	
23	Removed by CSSD	
25	Removed by CSSD	
26	Removed by CSSD	
27	Removed by CSSD	
29	Removed by CSSD	
6	Re-Arrested	
8	Successful Discharge	76
9	Successful Discharge	108
14	Successful Discharge	91
18	Successful Discharge	134
19	Successful Discharge	115
20	Successful Discharge	181
22	Successful Discharge	134
24	Successful Discharge	60
28	Successful Discharge	58
1	Unsuccessful Discharge	106
3	Unsuccessful Discharge	57
7	Unsuccessful Discharge	37
15	Unsuccessful Discharge	148
30	Unsuccessful Discharge	14

Assessment of Program Implementation

During the first contract year, the Transitions program had problems in working with YPO participants. First, the program was located in Bridgeport which made it difficult for New Haven youth to attend and for their families to visit. Second, Transitions had internal problems that resulted in the revision of their curriculum and a nearly 100% staff turnover. These problems appeared to be amplified by poor communication with YPOs and an underestimation of the needs of 16 and 17 year olds. Despite several meetings with CSSD staff and attempts to adjust its programming and staffing to better meet clients' needs, many problems persisted and CSSD did not renew this contract. Serious concerns over client safety led to CSSD removing all in-patient clients from the facility.

Alternative to Incarceration Programs (AICs)

In addition to the YPO specific programs previously discussed, YPOs could refer probationers to an Alternative to Incarceration (AIC) program. CSSD contracted with AICs to provide an array of services for adult probationers and pre-trial clients. Without the YPO contracted programs, 16 and 17 year old probationers would have likely been referred to an AIC program. Although AIC programs were not part of this evaluation, we included this discussion because a significant number of probationers in our four study groups received services from AICs.

Table 8 provides the number of AIC services received by probationers in each study group. This information was obtained from the CDCS database. It is important to point out that it likely under measures the number of Pre-YPO probationers attending AIC programs since the Pre-YPO study group was created before the CDCS database began collecting program information. The majority of YPO probationers (in both the YPO and YPO Expansion study groups) were not referred to an AIC. This result was expected given the services available through the YPO program. For all four study groups, probationers going to AICs received multiple services.

Table 8. Number of AIC Programs Attended by Study Group

	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)	Total
Zero	33 (73%)	94 (64%)	175 (82%)	39 (56%)	341
One	4	11	10	8	33
Two	2	17	13	5	37
Three	5	16	11	15	47
Four	1	7	1	2	11
Five	0	1	3	1	5

As mentioned above, AICs provided an array of services for adult probationers. The most commonly used service was urinalysis to test for drug use (Table 9). The highest number of probationers attending an AIC in each study group received this testing. The other commonly used services were case management, TAD (a psycho-educational program for clients with mild to moderate substance use problems), and Reasoning and Rehabilitation (a program designed to improve offenders' decision-making through cognitive behavioral techniques).

Table 9. Type of AIC Program Attended by Study Group

	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)
Case Management	5	29	17	17
Employment Services	3	4	10	5
Moving On	0	1	0	1
Reasoning and Rehabilitation	6	17	17	9
TAD (Substance Abuse)	3	28	17	17
Transitional Housing	1	1	2	0
Urinalysis	8	44	22	26
Breathalyzer	1	2	1	1

Out of the 191 YPO participants, 64 attended AIC programs (34%). The majority of these youth went to an AIC for urinalysis (52) followed by case management (34) and substance abuse treatment (31)(Table 9). Of the 64, 42 YPO youth were sent to an AIC program in addition to another program (66%)(Table 10). It appears that YPO participants were sent to AICs primary for urinalysis (as a required court-assigned condition of probation), and subsequently, received substance abuse treatment (with TAD) and case management services. A small percentage of YPO participants (22 out of 191, 12%) were sent to an AIC and no other programs.

Table 10. Dual Referrals and Type of AIC Programming Received

	Dual Referrals* (n=64)	Urinalysis	TAD	Case Management	Reasoning & Rehabilitation
YRRC	33	29	16	16	10
Marrakech, Inc.	14	11	4	8	7
Transitions	6	5	4	3	2
IICAPS	3	3	0	2	2
No Other Referrals	22	17	12	14	9

*Total referrals are more than 64 because probationers were referred to more than one program.

Evaluative Summary of the YPO Program Implementation and Contracted Services

Youth Probation Officers

The Youth Probation Officer program consisted of two or three adult probation officers who only supervised 16 and 17 year old probationers (the pilot YPO program consisted of two probation officers which was later expanded to three). YPOs were initially given reduced caseloads (no more than 35 probationers), cell phones, access to state vehicles, and specialized training so they could have increased positive contacts with probationers and service providers. The initial piloting of the YPO program appeared to be implemented according to the planned model. That is, the focus of YPOs was on

engaging probationers and an emphasis was placed on informal field contacts. The general approach was more holistic, because YPOs spent a significant amount of time talking to parents, service providers, and school personnel. A common theme throughout our interviews with YPOs was developing and utilizing techniques to establish rapport and engaging youth in a positive manner to decrease their criminal behavior.

This philosophy appeared to change more toward traditional adult probation practices after the program was expanded in February of 2008. As resources became more limited, YPOs had their caseloads increased to a maximum of 50 probationers, did not have cell phones, had limited access to state vehicles, and did not participate in the same specialized training opportunities. While YPOs were still able to talk with service providers by telephone and meet with probationers in the probation office, there was much less emphasis on informal field contacts. In fact, the YPOs stated that they rarely had out-of-office contacts with YPO probationers. The general practice of YPOs seemed to focus more on tracking and monitoring probationers' progress than building rapport and engagement.

Service Providers

The original YPO program provided contracted services for risk reduction (Forensic Health Services' Youth Risk Reduction Center), clinical substance abuse and mental health assessment (Campagna Associates), education and vocation (Marrakech, Inc.), mental health treatment (Yale University Child Study Center's Intensive In-Home Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Services), and in-patient substance abuse treatment (APT Foundations' Transitions program). YPOs could also refer probationers to CSSD contracted Alternative to Incarceration programs (AICs). Two of these programs, educational/vocational services and the in-patient substance abuse treatment program were discontinued in June of 2009.

All of the contracted services were available for most of the first three years of the YPO program (fall 2006 to spring 2009) and the YPOs commonly referred probationers to them. The YPOs appeared to have very positive working relationships with program staff and communication regarding probationers' progress was frequent and ongoing. We were particularly impressed by the content and quality of the monthly meetings between YPOs and YRRC staff. With the exception of Transitions and Marrakech, Inc., service providers were open to input and attempted to address concerns raised by YPOs.

There were two issues we observed across the contracted services. First, there was limited need for mental health treatment and in-patient substance abuse treatment among the YPO probationers. YPOs stated that they had difficulty making appropriate referrals to these programs and the programs also amended their admittance or program criteria to accommodate these limited needs. Given that the majority of YPO probationers (over 60%) had low or medium LSI-R total risk scores, we were not surprised that a limited number of them had serious substance abuse or mental health needs. Second, we were concerned by the low program participation and completion rates for several of the contracted services. For instance, 45% of referrals to Court-Based Assessments did not

show up for assessments, 50% of referrals to mental health services did not participate, 31% of probationers attending the in-patient substance abuse treatment completed the treatment, and 47% of YRRC participants completed their programs. It was beyond the scope of this project to conduct rigorous individual evaluations of each contracted service so we cannot offer substantiated explanations for the low participation and completion rates.

RECIDIVISM ANALYSIS

The second goal of this evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of the YPO program in reducing recidivism. The recidivism analysis compared arrest and technical violation rates across the four study groups one year after starting probation or YPO supervision. The purpose of using four study groups was to assess the two phases of the implementation of the YPO program and compare the outcomes of YPO probationers to two similar groups of probationers who did not participate in the YPO program. The following section presents the outcome results of the YPO evaluation. We first present the recidivism rates of the four study groups. Second, we explored differences between YPO probationers who were arrested or technically violated to those probationers who were not.

The four study groups were created following the data collection on all 16 and 17 year old New Haven probationers who started probation between January 1, 2005 and March 1, 2009. These groups were comprised of probationers who: (1) were supervised by YPOs during the first part of the YPO pilot (from November 2006 to January 2008)(this group was called YPO); (2) were supervised by YPOs after the expansion of the YPO program (from February of 2008 through February of 2009)(YPO Expansion); (3) were on probation in New Haven prior to the YPO program (January 2005 through October of 2006)(Pre-YPO); and, (4) were on probation in New Haven after the implementation of the YPO program but were not supervised by YPOs (November 2006 through February 2009)(Non-YPO).

One Year Recidivism Rates

Table 11 presents the one year rates of arrests and technical violations for the four study groups. While there were some differences between the four groups, especially between the YPO and Pre-YPO groups in overall recidivism (51% of the YPO group was arrested or violated compared 66% of the Pre-YPO study group), these differences were not statistically significant. The lack of differences can be attributed to the technical violation rates. All four groups had a violation rate close to 10%.

Table 11. Arrests and Technical Violations with All YPOs*

	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=146)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)
New Arrests	20 (44%)	64 (44%)	121 (57%)	37 (53%)
Technical Violations	3 (7%)	18 (12%)	20 (9%)	5 (7%)
Totals	23 (51%)	82 (56%)	141 (66%)	42 (60%)

*There were no statistically significant differences at $p < .05$

We further explored this lack of recidivism differences across the four study groups by looking at the arrest and technical violation rates for each Youth Probation Officer (Table 12). There were few differences across the YPOs except for YPO C. This YPO had the highest percentage of probationers who were arrested (53%) and also technically violated (18%). This YPO's overall recidivism rate was much higher than the other four YPOs (71% of YPO C's probationers were arrested or technically violated within one year of beginning the YPO program). After uncovering these recidivism differences with YPO C, we tested the possibility that this YPO's probationers were higher risk or had different needs than the other YPOs' probationers. These additional analyses did not find any statistically significant differences across the YPOs' probationers in terms of age, gender, education, LSI-R need scale scores, or LSI-R primary needs.

Table 12. YPO Recidivism Rates by Youth Probation Officers

YPO	Total Clients	New Arrest	Technical Violation	Total Recidivism
A	18	7 (39%)	1 (6%)	8 (45%)
B	27	13 (48%)	2 (7%)	15 (55%)
C	49	26 (53%)	9 (18%)	35 (71%)
D	54	23 (43%)	4 (7%)	27 (50%)
E	43	15 (35%)	5 (12%)	20 (47%)

Because of the large recidivism differences between YPO C and the other YPOs, we removed YPO C's probationers from the recidivism analysis and again compared the arrest and violation rates across the four study groups (Table 13). Without YPO C, there were statistically significant differences in the recidivism rates for the two YPO study groups compared to the two non-YPO study groups. The differences were found in both the percentages of new arrests and technical violations. For arrests, the YPO Expansion study group had the lowest percentage (39%). However, for technical violations, the YPO Expansion group was slightly higher (9%) than the YPO (7%) and Non-YPO (7%) study groups and the same as the Pre-YPO group (9%).

Table 13. Arrests and Technical Violations without YPO C

	YPO (n=45)	YPO Expansion (n=97)	Pre-YPO (n=213)	Non-YPO (n=70)
New Arrests*	20 (44%)	38 (39%)	121 (57%)	37 (53%)
Technical Violations	3 (7%)	9 (9%)	20 (9%)	5 (7%)
Totals	23 (51%)	47 (48%)	141 (66%)	42 (60%)

*Arrest differences were statistically significant at p.<.05

Since one year recidivism differences were found between YPO probationers and the probationers not involved in the YPO program, we next calculated the actual effects of YPO participation. Multinomial logistic regression was used to determine these effects without YPO C’s probationers (Table 14). The overall results mirror Table 13, in that, the YPO program had significant effects for arrests but not technical violations. An odds ratio was used in this analysis for determining the actual effects of the YPO program. For new arrests, the odds ratio of 0.510 indicates that YPO probationers were 1.96 times less likely to be arrested than those 16 and 17 year olds not supervised by YPOs. The effects were not statistically significant for technical violations.

Table 14. YPO Program Effects on New Arrests and Technical Violations

		B	Std. Error	Sig.	Odds Ratio
New Arrests	Intercept	.457	.128	.000	
	YPO Probationers	-.674	.218	.002	.510
Technical Violations	Intercept	-1.38	.224	.000	
	YPO Probationers	-.405	.384	.291	.667

Chi-Square=9.689, df=2, p.<.05

Comparison of YPO Recidivists and Non-Recidivists

The next part of the recidivism analysis was comprised of identifying differences between YPO participants who were arrested or technically violated one year after starting the YPO program. Table 15 shows these percentages for gender, race/ethnicity, age, and employment/education. The only statistically significant differences were found in employment/education. YPO probationers who had a full-time job or were enrolled full-time in school had a much lower arrest rate (26%) than those who were not in school and unemployed (57%), or were part-time students or had part-time jobs (55%). Youth not in school and unemployed had the highest arrest and technical violation rates (57% and 13% respectively).

Table 15. Demographic Differences between YPO Recidivists and Non-Recidivists

	New Arrest	Technical Violation
Gender		
Males (n=155)	45%	12%
Females (n=36)	39%	6%
Race/Ethnicity		
Caucasian (n=25)	32%	4%
African-American (n=140)	46%	11%
Hispanic (n=23)	48%	22%
Age at YPO Start		
16 (n=77)	48%	12%
17 (n=97)	42%	10%
18 (n=16)	38%	13%
Employment/Education*		
Unemployed/No School (n=72)	57%	13%
Part-time Employment/Student (n=42)	55%	5%
Full-time Student/Employment (n=76)	26%	13%

*Differences were statistically significant at $p < .05$

Table 16 presents the differences between YPO recidivists and non-recidivists in LSI-R scores. There were no statistically significant differences between the three recidivism outcomes (no recidivism, new arrests, and technical violations). There were, however, differences between probationers who were arrested compared to those who did not recidivate, and differences between those receiving a technical violation and those who did not recidivate. YPO probationers who were arrested had higher criminal history, education/employment, financial, companions, attitude/orientation, and total LSI-R risk scores than probationers who were not arrested or technically violated. Additionally, YPO probationers receiving technical violations had higher risk scores for education/employment, leisure, alcohol/drug, and total LSI-R risk scores.

Table 16. LSI-R Differences between YPO Recidivists and Non-Recidivists

	Number of Items	None	New Arrest	Technical Violation
Criminal History	10	1.6	2.6*	2.3
Education/Employment	10	5.8	7.0*	6.8*
Financial	2	0.7	1.2*	0.9
Family	4	1.8	2.0	1.8
Accommodations	3	0.7	1.0	1.0
Leisure	2	1.4	1.6	1.8*
Companions	5	2.6	3.1*	3.0
Alcohol/Drug	9	2.4	3.3*	3.9*
Attitude/Orientation	4	1.2	1.7*	1.3
Emotional/Personal	5	1.4	1.0	0.9
Total LSI-R Risk Score	54	19.6	24.4*	23.7*

*Statistically different than "None" at $p < .05$

The results of this analysis suggested the profiles of YPO probationers who were arrested were slightly different than those who were technically violated. For instance, arrested probationers already had been arrested, were likely not enrolled in school or did not have a job, associated with a negative peer group, used drugs and/or alcohol, had a poor attitude, and financial needs. The group of probationers technically violated was also likely to not be enrolled in school or have a full-time job, used drugs and/or alcohol, but also had a lack of positive leisure activities.

Program Effects on Recidivism

An additional multinomial regression analysis predicted arrests and technical violations using program participation in the contracted YPO programs. It is important to point out that we did not conduct scientific evaluations on the overall effectiveness of each program. The below analysis simply looked at the effects each program had on arrests and technical violations. It would be inappropriate to conclude that one program was better than another based on this analysis because the levels of risk differed among clients sent to the different programs. For example, Transitions and IICAPS were intensive programs for higher risk clients with serious substance abuse and mental health problems while Marrakech was designed for lower risk clients with educational or employment needs.

This analysis only used YPO probationers. For arrests, the only statistically significant factors were participation in Marrakech and an AIC (Table 17). YPO probationers who attended Marrakech were less likely to be arrested. The odds ratio of .291 can be interpreted as Marrakech participants were nearly 3.5 times less likely to be arrested than YPO probationers who did not attend this program. The AIC effects were the opposite, in that AIC participants were 1.4 times more likely to be arrested than those who did not go to an AIC.

The results for technical violations were similar to arrests. YPO probationers attending Marrakech were much less likely to be violated (almost nine times less likely) than those not attending. Probationers going to AICs were nearly twice as likely to receive a technical violation. None of the other programs produced statistically significant effects on arrests or technical violations.

The multinomial regression analysis for programs produced limited findings. We were not surprised that AIC participants had higher arrest and technical violations because they were higher risk probationers being tested for using illegal substances. Frequent drug testing often leads to positive tests, which results in technical violations. The lower arrest and technical violation rates for Marrakech, Inc. participants were also likely due to the types of probationers being referred to this program. Low and medium risk probationers were referred to the program, and in some cases, YPOs used this program as a reward for good behavior. During our first interviews with YPOs, they stated that many youth were not referred to the educational and vocational services program until they had completed other programs, were doing well in school, and/or were successfully completing their probation conditions.

Table 17. Multinomial Regression Analysis For New Arrests and Technical Violations with Contracted Program Participation

		B	Std. Error	Wald	Sig.	Odds Ratio
Arrest	Intercept	-.011	.225	.002	.962	
	AIC	.321	.140	5.258	.022	1.378
	IICAPS	.009	.017	.254	.614	1.009
	YRRC	-.012	.106	.013	.911	.988
	Transitions	-.822	.680	1.464	.226	.439
	Marrakech	-1.154	.475	5.918	.015	.315
Technical Violation	Intercept	-1.370	.363	14.223	.000	
	AIC	.630	.191	10.839	.001	1.878
	IICAPS	-.032	.069	.211	.646	.969
	YRRC	-.289	.208	1.923	.166	.749
	Transitions	-.980	1.165	.708	.400	.375
	Marrakech	-2.153	1.105	3.795	.050	.116

Cox and Snell $R^2=0.12$, Nagelkerke $R^2=0.14$

Predictors of Recidivism

The final aspect of the recidivism analysis consisted of exploring causal factors related to being arrested or technically violated. For this analysis, we looked at the probationers in all four study groups using multinomial regression analysis. This type of regression analysis statistically identifies those factors that significantly affect whether probationers in the four study groups were arrested or technically violated and the importance of each (Table 18).

Probationers across all four study groups arrested one year after their probation or YPO start date were 16 years old and had high LSI-R criminal history risk scores. Probationers most likely to be violated had high LSI-R criminal history risk scores and high LSI-R leisure risk scores. None of the other LSI-R risk scores were statistically significant.

This analysis shows the differences between which probationers were arrested or technically violated. Arrests of these probationers were the most difficult to predict, with age and criminal history being the only significant predictors. That is, 16 year olds with prior arrests were most likely to be arrested, regardless of their needs. For technical violations, probationers with prior arrests and lack of positive leisure activities were most likely to be violated.

Table 18. Multinomial Regression Analysis For New Arrests and Technical Violations

		B	Std. Error	Wald	Sig.	Odds Ratio
Arrest	Intercept	6.780	3.277	4.281	.039	
	Age	-.555	.192	8.366	.004	.574
	Gender	.495	.283	3.053	.081	1.641
	LSI Criminal History	.308	.070	19.139	.000	1.361
	LSI Education/Employment	.035	.052	.447	.504	1.035
	LSI Financial	.126	.149	.719	.396	1.135
	LSI Family	-.006	.104	.003	.953	.994
	LSI Accommodations	.136	.144	.895	.344	1.146
	LSI Leisure	.109	.162	.451	.502	1.115
	LSI Companions	.098	.096	1.038	.308	1.103
	LSI Alcohol/Drug	.054	.044	1.492	.222	1.056
	LSI Attitude/Orientation	.165	.093	3.192	.074	1.180
	LSI Emotional/Personal	-.096	.080	1.459	.227	.908
Technical Violation	Intercept	-1.877	5.316	.125	.724	
	Age	-.221	.305	.524	.469	.802
	Gender	.933	.577	2.609	.106	2.542
	LSI Criminal History	.287	.104	7.557	.006	1.333
	LSI Education/Employment	.023	.089	.066	.798	1.023
	LSI Financial	-.213	.248	.733	.392	.808
	LSI Family	-.138	.166	.694	.405	.871
	LSI Accommodations	.162	.237	.465	.495	1.175
	LSI Leisure	.778	.341	5.192	.023	2.176
	LSI Companions	.193	.163	1.407	.236	1.213
	LSI Alcohol/Drug	.097	.070	1.888	.169	1.102
	LSI Attitude/Orientation	.044	.153	.081	.776	1.045
	LSI Emotional/Personal	-.165	.143	1.325	.250	.848

Cox and Snell $R^2=0.17$, Nagelkerke $R^2=0.20$

Summary of the Recidivism Analysis

The recidivism analysis compared the arrest and technical violation rates across the four study groups after one year of supervision by YPOs or adult probation officers. This analysis initially found no statistically significant differences across the four groups for arrests or violations, which meant that YPO probationers were not more or less successful than a similar group of probationers being supervised by adult probation officers. However, an analysis of recidivism rates of the five YPOs uncovered that one of the YPOs had significantly higher arrest and technical violation rates than the other four. Removing this YPO from the recidivism analysis led us to conclude that the YPO program did produce statistically significant positive effects. In fact, 16 and 17 year old probationers supervised by adult probation officers were twice as likely to be arrested as those supervised by YPOs.

This analysis also looked at differences between YPO probationers who were arrested and technically violated and those who were not. The only difference in demographic characteristics was that YPO probationers who were enrolled full-time in school or had a

full-time job had the lowest arrest and technical violation rates compared to probationers who were unemployed/not in school or had part-time employment/schooling. A similar analysis of LSI-R risk scores revealed that profiles of YPO probationers who were arrested were slightly different than those who were technically violated. For instance, arrested probationers already had been arrested, were likely not enrolled in school or did not have a job, associated with a negative peer group, used drugs and/or alcohol, had a poor attitude, and financial needs. The group of probationers technically violated was also likely to not be enrolled in school or have a full-time job, used drugs and/or alcohol, but also had a lack of positive leisure activities.

We next assessed the overall effects of the contracted services (Marrakech, Transitions, IICAPS, YRRC, and AICs) on arrests and technical violations. Those YPO probationers who attended Marrakech were the least likely to be arrested, while those attending an AIC were the most likely. None of the other programs were associated with lower arrests. The analysis of technical violations again found that Marrakech participants were less likely to be violated while AIC attendees were more likely to be violated than those who did not. It is important to repeat that this was not an evaluative study of the overall effectiveness of each contracted program because it did not take into account risks and needs differences in probationers sent to each program. Further, the results concerning AIC and Marrakech, Inc. participants appear to be more of a function of the type of probationers sent to each program (high risk for AICs and low risk for Marrakech) rather than a result of the programming received.

The final analysis explored those factors having the most influence on arrests or technical violations. Using all of the 16 and 17 year old probationers across the four study groups, we found that 16 year old probationers with prior arrests had the most influence on whether probationers were rearrested. For technical violations, probationers with prior arrests and lack of positive leisure activities were most likely to be violated.

GAP ANALYSIS

The purpose of the gap analysis was to identify deficiencies in the YPO program that may have decreased its effectiveness. That is, were there gaps between the needs of YPO probationers and the services utilized by the YPOs? Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. was contracted by CSSD to study the needs of 16 and 17 year old youth in the adult courts. In their 2007 report, they estimated that 84 percent of these youth needed educational and/or employment services, 64 percent likely had some significant clinical needs (e.g., emotional, family, alcohol/drugs, and attitude), and 28 percent needed some accommodation services (only 3 percent had serious housing needs). Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. also stressed that programs focusing on leisure and positive peer relationships must be included in comprehensive services. Our gap analysis follows the method employed by Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc., to identify YPO probationer needs and follows with the assessment of whether these needs were met through contracted services.

YPO Probationer Needs

To assess probationer needs, LSI-R subscale scores were categorized by No Need (probationers who did not respond to any of the individual items in the subscale), Some Need (probationers who responded to one-half or less of the individual items), and Higher Need (probationers responding to more than one-half of the individual subscale items). Table 19 presents the number and percentage of YPO probationers with higher needs and no needs across the ten LSI-R subscales.

The majority of YPO probationers had higher education/employment needs (66%) and leisure needs (65%) while 48% had high risk scores for companions. The subscales with the most probationers not having these needs were: emotional/personal (41%), accommodations (36%), alcohol/drug (31%), attitude/orientation (31%), and financial (28%). These results were similar to Hornby Zeller Associates' finding that the most prevalent need of 16 and 17 years old in the adult courts was education and/or employment services with accommodations being one of the lowest needs.

Table 19. YPO Probationer Needs Using LSI-R Scale Scores

LSI-R Risk Scale	Probationers with Higher Needs	Probationers with No Needs
Educational/Employment	126 (66%)	0
Leisure	125 (65%)	31 (16%)
Companions	92 (48%)	7 (4%)
Family	64 (34%)	18 (9%)
Financial	62 (33%)	53 (28%)
Alcohol/Drug	38 (20%)	60 (31%)
Attitude/Orientation	37 (19%)	60 (31%)
Emotional/Personal	18 (9%)	79 (41%)
Criminal History	11 (6%)	28 (15%)
Accommodations	5 (3%)	69 (36%)

Next, we determined the number of higher needs of each YPO probationer (Table 20). Eighteen probationers (9%) had no LSI-R identified service needs while 15% only had one high LSI-R needs score. The majority of probationers had three or more (20% had three higher needs, 21% had four, and 19% had five or more).

Table 20. YPO Probationers with Higher Needs

Number of Higher Needs	Number	Percentage
Zero	18	9%
One	28	15%
Two	30	16%
Three	38	20%
Four	41	21%
Five or More	36	19%

Program Utilization and Needs Scores

The second aspect of the Gap Analysis linked YPO probationers' needs to program participation. Table 21 shows the proportion of program attendees by their LSI-R supervision level. For AIC participants, 16% were low risk (administrative), 42% were medium risk, and 42% were high risk. Across the contracted programs, Marrakech participants had the lowest average LSI-R total risk score (18.5) with IICAPS (25.3) and AICs (24.0) having the highest. Transitions and IICAPS had the highest proportion of high risk probationers (55% of Transitions' attendees were high risk and 50% of IICAPS participants were high risk). Marrakech attendees appeared to be the lowest risk (based on LSI-R total risk score along with the proportion of administrative, medium, and high risk attendees), followed by YRRC clients. IICAPS and Transitions appeared to have the highest risk clients. For those probationers who were not referred to any programs, 40% were under administrative supervision, 30% were medium, and 30% were high risk.

Table 21. LSI-R Supervision Risk Levels of YPO Probationers by Program

	Administrative	Medium	High	Average LSI-R Total Risk
AIC	16%	42%	42%	24.0
YRRC	12%	61%	27%	21.6
Marrakech	17%	66%	17%	18.5
IICAPS	13%	38%	50%	25.3
Transitions	9%	36%	55%	22.3
No Programs	40%	30%	30%	21.1

Note: All percentages are row percents.

While the previous table shows that higher risk probationers tended to be referred to different programs than lower risk probationers, we also related specific LSI-R identified needs to program attendance. This step would allow for observing if probationer needs were being matched to specific programming. Table 22 shows little differences in program attendance by high needs (the percentages total over 100% for each program because YPO probationers could have been referred to multiple programs). For instance, approximately 45% to 50% of YPO probationers were sent to the YRRC, approximately 15% were sent to Marrakech, close to 6% were sent to Transitions, less than 5% were

sent to IICAPS, approximately 40% to 45% were sent to an AIC, and around 30% were not referred to any contracted programs. These percentages were similar across most of the LSI-R needs.

Table 22. YPO Probationer Program Utilization by LSI-R Identified Needs

	Total	YRRC	Marrakech	Transitions	IICAPS	AIC	None
Education/Employ	126	60 (48%)	12 (10%)	7 (6%)	6 (5%)	49 (39%)	36 (29%)
Leisure	125	62 (50%)	17 (14%)	8 (6%)	5 (4%)	47 (38%)	34 (27%)
Companions	92	42 (46%)	12 (13%)	6 (7%)	4 (4%)	43 (47%)	24 (26%)
Family	64	28 (44%)	10 (16%)	2 (3%)	4 (6%)	23 (36%)	20 (31%)
Financial	62	23 (43%)	5 (9%)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	22 (42%)	17 (32%)
Alcohol/Drug	38	16 (42%)	4 (11%)	6 (16%)	2 (5%)	18 (47%)	11 (29%)
Attitude/Orientation	37	19 (51%)	5 (14%)	0	3 (8%)	16 (43%)	8 (22%)
Emotional/Personal	18	5 (28%)	0	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	1 (6%)	10 (56%)
Criminal History	11	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	0	0	7 (64%)	3 (27%)
Accommodations	5	1 (20%)	0	0	0	3 (60%)	2 (40%)

Comparing LSI-R Needs Scores to YRRC and AIC Program Participation

Two of the contracted programs, YRRC and AICs, offered an array of programs that were to be tailored around specific client needs. While Table 22 did not show many differences between the needs and programs, we expected attendance in the individualized YRRC and AIC programs to be closely related to a need. For instance, YRRC clients with high family needs should have higher participation in programs addressing these specific needs (e.g., Family Violence Education and Brief Strategic Family Therapy).

Similar to our previous analysis, we did not observe distinct patterns between needs and YRRC programs (Table 23). A similar percentage of probationers participated in the YRRC programs regardless of LSI-R needs. A majority of YRRC clients participated in Goals and Progress (which was expected because this program provided case management services). However, the second most utilized program was MET-CBT, followed by TARGET, SOS, ART, BSFT, Voices, Viewpoints, and FVEP. For our earlier example of probationers with high family needs, 21% of these probationers did participate in BSFT, but 46% participated in TARGET, 32% in MET-CBT, 32% in Voices, 29% in SOS, 21% in ART, and 14% in Viewpoints.

Table 23. LSI-R Identified Needs by YRRC Program Participation

	Total	ART	BSFT	FVEP	Goals and Progress	MET-CBT
Education/Employ	60	23%	13%	8%	82%	35%
Leisure	62	19%	19%	7%	73%	36%
Companions	42	21%	21%	5%	81%	45%
Family	28	21%	21%	7%	71%	32%
Financial	23	17%	17%	0	78%	48%
Alcohol/Drug	16	6%	19%	6%	81%	38%
Attitude/Orientation	19	21%	11%	5%	68%	21%
Emotional/Personal	5	0	40%	0	100%	20%
Criminal History	1	0	0	0	100%	0
Accommodations	1	0	0	0	100%	100%

Table 23 Continued.

	Total	SOS	TARGET	Viewpoints	Voices
Education/Employ	60	23%	35%	18%	22%
Leisure	62	19%	39%	15%	18%
Companions	42	24%	33%	14%	14%
Family	28	29%	46%	14%	32%
Financial	23	13%	26%	22%	22%
Alcohol/Drug	16	0	50%	13%	31%
Attitude/Orientation	19	16%	42%	11%	32%
Emotional/Personal	5	0	20%	0	60%
Criminal History	1	0	0	0	100%
Accommodations	1	0	0	0	0

An analysis of AIC program participation by higher LSI-R needs also found no distinct patterns of program participation across needs (Table 24). This analysis included only those AIC programs that had more than ten YPO probationers participate and found that a large majority of all YPO probationers were sent to AICs for urinalysis tests (approximately 80%), followed by case management (over 50%) and TAD - a psycho-educational program for clients with mild to moderate substance use problems (nearly 50%). Even though 18 YPO probationers had high alcohol/drug need scores, only 44% participated in TAD and 72% for urinalysis. Similarly, of the 49 youth with high education/employment needs, only 12% were involved in an AIC employment program.

Table 24. LSI-R Identified Needs by AIC Program Participation

	Total	Case Management	Employment	TAD	Urinalysis
Education/Employ	49	55%	12%	53%	80%
Leisure	47	51%	11%	47%	81%
Companions	43	54%	9%	54%	81%
Family	23	57%	13%	39%	78%
Financial	22	55%	18%	50%	81%
Alcohol/Drug	18	44%	6%	44%	72%
Attitude/Orientation	16	50%	6%	44%	81%
Emotional/Personal	1	100%	0	100%	100%
Criminal History	7	57%	29%	29%	43%
Accommodations	3	67%	0	67%	67%

Summary of Gap Analysis

The purpose of the gap analysis was to identify deficiencies in the YPO program that may have decreased its effectiveness. This analysis was comprised of three sections: (1) identifying YPO probationer needs, (2) comparing probationer needs to their participation on contracted programs, and (3) comparing probationer needs to the specific programs offered by the YRRC and AICs.

This first part of the gap analysis found that the top three needs for YPO probationers were education/employment (66% of YPO probationers had high needs), leisure (65%), and companions (48%) while the lowest needs were emotional/personal (41% had no emotional/personal needs) and accommodations (36% had none). The second and third parts looked at whether identified needs were being treated through the contracted programs (the second part looked at this across all contracted programs and the third part focused on individual programs offered by the YRRC and AICs). We found that most of the programs were being utilized at the same rates, regardless of probationer needs. In other words, probationer needs did not appear to heavily influence the services probationers received.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As the Connecticut General Assembly was debating whether to raise the legal age of adult offenders from 16 years old to 18 years old, the Court Support Services Division piloted a unique program targeting the needs of 16 and 17 year old probationers. This program, the Youth Probation Officer (YPO) program was based on the premise that 16 and 17 year old probationers have different needs than older adult probationers and should be supervised in a different manner. The YPO program had two major components. The first component consisted of creating youth probation officers who would only supervise 16 and 17 year old probationers. The second component greatly enhanced contracted services available for YPO probationers. These consisted of substance abuse and mental health assessments, in-patient substance abuse treatment, employment services, in-house psychiatric treatment, and an array of risk reduction services. Two Youth Probation Officers began supervising probationers in November of 2006. The program was later expanded to three YPOs in February of 2008.

Central Connecticut State University was contracted to evaluate the YPO program. The evaluation of the Youth Probation Officer program had three overarching goals. The first goal was to determine how well the program was implemented. The second goal was to determine the effectiveness of the YPO program in reducing arrests and technical violations of probation. The third goal was to identify programmatic and systemic barriers that may have decreased the effectiveness of the YPO program and make recommendations for programming and supervision of 16 and 17 year old probationers.

CONCLUSIONS

Program Implementation

Youth Probation Officers

YPOs were initially given reduced caseloads (no more than 35 probationers), cell phones, access to state vehicles, and specialized training so they could have increased positive contacts with probationers and service providers. The initial piloting of the YPO program appeared to be implemented according to the planned model. That is, the focus of YPOs was on increasing the number of positive interactions with probationers and an emphasis was placed on informal field contacts. The general approach was more holistic, because YPOs spent a significant amount of time talking to parents, service providers, and school personnel. A common theme throughout our interviews with YPOs was developing and utilizing techniques to establish rapport and engaging youth in a positive manner to decrease their criminal behavior.

This philosophy appeared to change more toward traditional adult probation practices after the program was expanded in February of 2008. As resources became more limited, YPOs had their caseloads increased to a maximum of 50 probationers, did not have cell

phones, had limited access to state vehicles, and were not given the same specialized training opportunities. While YPOs still were able to talk with service providers by telephone and meet with probationers in the probation office, there was much less emphasis on informal field contacts. In fact, the YPOs stated that they rarely had out-of-office contacts with YPO probationers. The general practice of YPOs seemed to focus more on tracking and monitoring probationers' progress than building rapport and engagement.

Service Providers

The original YPO program provided contracted services for risk reduction (Forensic Health Services' Youth Risk Reduction Center), clinical substance abuse and mental health assessment (Campagna Associates, LLC), education and vocation (Marrakech, Inc.), mental health treatment (Yale University Child Study Center's Intensive In-Home Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Services), and in-patient substance abuse treatment (APT Foundations' Transitions program). YPOs could also refer probationers to CSSD contracted Alternative to Incarceration programs (AICs). Two of these programs, educational/vocational services and the in-patient substance abuse treatment program, were discontinued in June of 2009.

All of the contracted services were available for most of the first three years of the YPO program (fall 2006 to spring 2009) and the YPOs commonly referred probationers to them. The YPOs appeared to have positive working relationships with most program staff and communication regarding probationers' progress tended to be frequent and ongoing. Most of the service providers were open to input and attempted to address concerns raised by YPOs.

There were two issues we observed across the contracted services. First, there was a perceived limited need for mental health treatment and in-patient substance abuse treatment among the YPO probationers. Given that the majority of YPO probationers (over 60%) had low or medium LSI-R total risk scores, we were not surprised that a limited number of them had serious substance abuse or mental health needs. Second, we were concerned by the low program participation and completion rates for several of the contracted services. For instance, 45% of referrals to Court-Based Assessments did not show up for assessments, 50% of referrals to mental health services did not participate, 31% of probationers attending the in-patient substance abuse treatment completed the treatment, and 47% of the risk reduction participants completed their programs. It was beyond the scope of this project to conduct rigorous individual evaluations of each contracted service so we could not offer substantiated explanations for the low participation and completion rates.

Program Outcomes

To evaluate the effectiveness of the YPO program, we compared the arrest and technical violation rates across four study groups after one year of supervision by YPOs or adult probation officers. The study groups consisted of probationers attending the initial YPO

program, probationers supervised by YPOs after the program was expanded, a similar group of probationers who were supervised by adult probation officers prior to the implementation of the YPO program, and a similar group of probationers who were not selected to participate in the YPO program.

The recidivism analysis found no statistically significant differences between probationers attending the YPO program and the two comparison groups in arrests or violations, which meant that YPO probationers were not more or less successful than a similar group of probationers being supervised by adult probation officers. However, an analysis of recidivism rates of the five YPOs uncovered that one of the YPOs had significantly higher arrest and technical violation rates than the other four YPOs. Removing this YPO from the recidivism analysis led us to conclude that the YPO program did produce statistically significant positive effects. In fact, 16 and 17 year old probationers supervised by adult probation officers were twice as likely to be arrested.

We also explored those risk factors related to recidivism. First, in looking only at YPO probationers, we found that high education/employment needs and alcohol/drug use were common among those probationers who were arrested and technically violated. For those arrested, we also found that they had high risk scores for companions (associated with a negative peer groups) and financial needs. The group of probationers technically violated had high leisure risk scores (a lack of positive leisure activities). Second, in assessing program effects of the contracted services (Marrakech, Transitions, IICAPS, YRRC, and AICs), we found that YPO probationers who attended Marrakech were the least likely to be arrested, while those attending an AIC were the most likely. None of the other programs were associated with lower arrests. The analysis of technical violations again found that Marrakech participants were less likely to be violated while AIC attendees were more likely to be violated than those who did not. We believe these findings were likely associated with probationers' risk levels (high for AICs and low for Marrakech, Inc.) more than specifically programming. It is important to repeat that this was not an evaluative study of the overall effectiveness of each contracted program because it did not take into account risks and needs differences in probationers sent to each program.

Third, the final analysis used all of the 16 and 17 year olds in our study to determine which risk scores had the most influence on arrests and technical violations. Arrests of these probationers were the most difficult to predict, with age and criminal history being the only significant predictors. That is, 16 year olds with prior arrests were most likely to be arrested, regardless of their needs. For technical violations, probationers with prior arrests and lack of positive leisure activities were most likely to be violated.

Programmatic and Systemic Barriers

Throughout the evaluation period we observed several barriers that likely limited the effectiveness of the YPO program. These barriers were found with the YPOs and contracted services. We also identified a major systemic barrier. Prior to the implementation of the YPO program in November of 2006, YPOs were given a detailed orientation on the rationale and purpose of the program and received a significant amount

of training centered on the specific needs of 16 and 17 year olds. In addition, they were given access to CSSD personnel who could give advice on how to best use the assessments (e.g., LSI-R) to make treatment referrals. However, YPOs who replaced the original YPOs or were added during the February 2008 expansion did not receive similar orientation, training, or assessment consultation. We believe that as a result of this, the newer YPOs did not closely follow the prescribed YPO model.

The gap analysis revealed disconnects between probationer needs and the services that were provided to them. Despite differences in identified needs, most of the contracted services were being utilized at the same rates. In other words, probationer needs did not appear to heavily influence the services probationers received. One cause of this was CSSD policy requiring service referrals to be made within a specific amount of time following a probationer's start of supervision. For example, YPOs pointed out that they would send a youth for a court based assessment but the assessment would not be completed in time to make the proper service referral. Regardless of the reason, the disconnect between probationer needs and services was likely related to the low service program completion rates.

During our interviews with YPOs we were surprised to hear that juvenile probation officers were not allowed to share supervision and assessment information with adult probation officers. That is, adult probation officers do not have access to juvenile probation officer records, even if they supervised the same probationers. For instance, if a child is being supervised by a juvenile probation officer (JPO), commits a new offense, and is placed under the supervision of a YPO (or any other adult probation officer), the YPO cannot access any of the JPOs supervision notes, risk/needs assessments, or formally discuss the case with the JPO. We fully understand the Judicial Branch's concern to guard the privacy of juvenile offenders' court records, but we raise concerns whether this is a sound policy, given that both JPOs and adult probation officers work for the same agency (CSSD) that already has a very strict confidentiality policy protecting court and probation records. We believe this policy limits effective supervision of probationers and can lead to duplication of services.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Overall, this evaluation found that the YPO program can be effective in reducing the recidivism of 16 and 17 year old probationers. The common themes throughout the evaluation were that positive engagement, education/employment, and positive leisure activities with these youth led to more successful outcomes.

As one YPO stated, "overall, the most important things seem to be that the youth have a positive, welcoming place to go during free time, and that the probation officers continue to have a small caseload. A youth that has already been in trouble is highly susceptible to returning to negative behavior. Keeping that youth busy, in a positive and supportive environment is the best chance anyone has of helping them make the right choices to

become a positive member of society. In order to guide the youth in a positive direction, it is essential for probation officers to have a small caseload to offer youth the personalized attention and services they need to change their thought-processes and alter their behavior.”

Our findings supported this statement. The average 16 and 17 year old probationer in the YPO program was lower risk and did not have significant mental health or substance abuse problems. They typically had difficulties in school or were unemployed, a lack of positive leisure activities, and a negative peer group. Those youth most likely to be arrested were younger (16 years old) and already had criminal records.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While the YPO program model did lead to positive outcomes, we believe this program could have had a much higher rate of success and offer the following recommendations for supervising 16 and 17 year old offenders.

1. The Judicial Branch should consider revising the policy that does not allow adult probation officers to access information on their probationers who were supervised by juvenile probation officers. Again, we do not discount the privacy concerns regarding juvenile court records, but believe this policy decreases supervision effectiveness and resource utilization.
2. CSSD should develop training and supervision practices aimed at increasing positive interactions and engagement with youth. A similar recommendation was made by Hornby Zeller Associates that CSSD should “explore other approaches to address the needs of 16 and 17 year old population, including motivational interviewing and mentoring”. To start, more emphasis could be placed on increasing out of office contacts such as in school, at programs, or extracurricular activities.
3. YPOs should be better trained on how to properly assess risks/needs of youth and make more appropriate service referrals. Hornby Zeller Associates made two recommendations regarding assessments and services: (1) the “State should move to integrated service system for youth which links risk assessment, needs assessment, service planning and delivery, reassessment and outcomes.” And, (2) “CSSD should expand and enhance its effort to track services and outcomes and should commit to making decisions about which services to offer based on the data from the tracking.”
4. More programming should be aimed at education/employment and positive leisure activities. These were the two highest needs of these youth with the least amount of programming associated with them. We are not discounting the need for mental health and substance abuse programs, but this population did not appear to have substantial needs in these areas. As Hornby Zeller Associates also

recommended, “The state should develop services which focus on education and employment and work with other groups such as educators, employers, and service organizations.”

5. CSSD should closely track and examine the completion rates of contracted services. In this study, all of the service providers had fairly low completion rates. We recommend that CSSD further study these to determine whether: (a) the disconnect between assessments and treatment recommendations is causing inappropriate program referrals; (b) probation officers are placing additional burdens on probationers by making too many program referrals; (c) service providers are not adequately engaging clients; or (d) probationers do not have a clear understanding of why they are being referred to services and do not understand that failing to participate in services jeopardizes their probation status.