

# WORKING P A P E R

---

## Los Angeles County Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act

Fiscal Year 2003-2004 Report

SUSAN TURNER, TERRY FAIN,  
AND AMBER SEHGAL  
RAND Corporation

in collaboration with  
JITAHADI IMARA, DAVIDA DAVIES,  
AND APRYL HARRIS  
Los Angeles County Probation Department

WR-218-LACPD

February 2005

This product is part of the RAND Infrastructure, Safety, and Environment working paper series. RAND working papers are intended to share researchers' latest findings and to solicit informal peer review. They have been approved for circulation by RAND Infrastructure, Safety, and Environment but have not been formally edited or peer reviewed. Unless otherwise indicated, working papers can be quoted and cited without permission of the author, provided the source is clearly referred to as a working paper. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors. RAND® is a registered trademark.



RAND INFRASTRUCTURE, SAFETY, AND ENVIRONMENT

## **PREFACE**

In 2000, the California Legislature passed the Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act, which authorized funding for county juvenile justice programs and designated the Board of Corrections (BOC) as the administrator of funding. A 2001 Senate Bill extended the funding and changed the program's name to the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA). This effort was designed to provide a stable funding source to counties for juvenile programs that have been proven effective in curbing crime among at-risk and young offenders.

The Board is required to submit annual reports to the California legislature measuring the success of JJCPA. The legislation identified six specific outcome measures ("the big six") to be included in annual reports from each of the individual JJCPA programs. These outcomes include successful completion of probation, arrests, probation violations, incarcerations, successful completion of restitution, and successful completion of community service. Each county can also supply supplemental outcomes to measure locally identified service needs. JJCPA programs were first implemented in summer and fall of 2001 and are now in their fourth year of funding.

The RAND Corporation was funded by the Los Angeles County Probation Department to conduct the evaluation of the County's JJCPA programs, including analyzing and reporting findings to the BOC. This report contains a summary of the fiscal year 2003-2004 (FY 03-04) findings reported to the BOC, as well as additional program information gathered by Los Angeles County Probation based on its oversight and monitoring of program implementation and outcomes. The report is a collaboration between RAND and the Los Angeles County Probation Department, whose mission is to promote and enhance public safety, ensure victims' rights, and facilitate the positive behavior change of adult and juvenile probationers.

This report should be of interest to researchers, policymakers, and practitioners interested in the effectiveness of intervention programs for at-risk youths and those involved in the juvenile justice system.

This research was conducted within RAND Infrastructure, Safety, and Environment (ISE), a division of the RAND Corporation. The mission of RAND ISE is to improve the development, operation, use, and protection of society's essential built and natural assets, and to enhance the related social assets of safety and security of individuals in transit and in their workplaces and communities. The ISE research

portfolio encompasses research and analysis on a broad range of policy areas including homeland security, criminal justice, public safety, occupational safety, the environment, energy, natural resources, climate, agriculture, economic development, transportation, information and telecommunications technologies, space exploration, and other aspects of science and technology policy. Inquiries regarding RAND Infrastructure, Safety, and Environment may be directed to:

Debra Knopman, Vice President and Director  
RAND Infrastructure, Safety, and Environment  
1200 South Hayes Street  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
703-413-1100  
Email: [ise@rand.org](mailto:ise@rand.org)  
<http://www.rand.org/ise>

## CONTENTS

Preface.....	iii
Tables.....	vii
Summary.....	ix
Evaluating JJCPA Programs.....	x
Programs in Initiative I: Mental Health Services.....	x
Outcomes for the Mental Health Initiative.....	x
Programs in Initiative II: Promoting School Success.....	xi
Outcomes for the School Success Initiative.....	xi
JJCPA Per Capita Costs.....	xii
Lessons Learned and Emerging Directions From the Perspective of the Los Angeles County Probation Department.....	xii
Perspectives and Conclusions per Evaluator's Observations.....	xiii
Evaluation Limitations.....	xiii
Conclusions.....	xiv
Chapter 1. Background.....	1
The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA).....	1
Implementing JJCPA in Los Angeles County.....	2
JJCPA in the Context of Los Angeles County Probation Programs.....	2
Evaluating JJCPA Programs.....	4
Chapter 2. JJCPA Programs and Outcome Measures.....	8
Youths Involved in JJCPA Programs.....	8
Programs and Outcomes in Initiative I: Mental Health Services.....	8
Mental Health Screening, Treatment, and Assessment (MH).....	9
Special Needs Court (SNC).....	10
Community Treatment Facilities (CTF).....	10
Multisystemic Therapy (MST).....	11
Summary of Outcomes for the Mental Health Initiative.....	12
Programs and Outcomes in Initiative II: Promoting School Success.....	12
School-Based Probation Supervision (SBMS and SBHS).....	13
Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT).....	15
Extended Day Community Supervision Program (JST).....	16
Gang Intervention Services (GIS).....	17
Youth Substance Abuse Intervention Program (YSA).....	18
Gender-Specific Services Programs.....	18
After School Enrichment and Supervision Program (PARKS).....	20
Housing-Based Day Supervision Program (HB).....	20
Law Enforcement Prevention Program (LEP).....	21
Intensive Transition Services Program (ITS-CCTP).....	21
Inside-Out Writing (IOW).....	22
Summary of Outcomes for the School Success Initiative.....	23

Additional Program Outcome Analyses .....	24
School-Based Program Youths by Gender.....	24
At-Risk, High-Risk, and Family-Based Programs .....	25
Results by Cluster.....	25
Selected Program and Comparison Group Outcome Rates.....	27
JJCPA Per Capita Costs .....	27
Chapter 3. Perspectives of the Los Angeles County Probation Department .....	29
Reported Satisfaction Among JJCPA Client and Families.....	29
Stakeholder Statements for Selected Programs.....	29
Survey of Parents in Selected Clusters.....	33
Lessons Learned and Emerging Directions From the Perspective of the Los Angeles County Probation Department .....	36
Chapter 4. Perspectives and Conclusions per Evaluator's Observations .....	45
Evaluation Limitations.....	48
Comparability of Comparison Groups to Program Youths.....	48
Data Quality .....	49
Conclusions.....	50
References.....	51
Appendix	
A. Description of Comparison Groups for JJCPA Programs .....	52
B. Probation’s Ranking of the “Big Six” Outcome Measures.....	56
C. Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) That Provided Services for JJCPA Programs in FY 03-04.....	57
D. BOC-Mandated and Supplemental Outcomes for Individual JJCPA Programs, FY 03-04 .....	59
I. Mental Health Initiative Programs .....	59
II. School Success Initiative Programs .....	63
E. Additional Statistics for Selected Programs.....	79
School-Based Youth Attendance, Completion of Probation, and School Attendance, by Gender .....	79
F. Selected Outcomes, by type of JJCPA Program.....	82
At-Risk Programs: Arrests Within Six Months Following Program Entry .....	82
High Risk Programs: Arrests and Incarcerations Within Six Months Following Program Entry .....	82
Family-Based Program: School Attendance, Suspensions and Expulsions .....	82
G. BOC-Mandated and Supplemental Outcomes, by Cluster, for Selected Programs .....	83

**TABLES**

2.1 - For Every 100 Program Youths Who..., How Many Comparison Group Youths...? .....27

2.2 - FY 03-04 Per Capital Costs, by JJCPA Program .....28

3.1 - Housing-Based Supervision Program--Results of Survey of Parents .....34

A.1 - Comparison Group and Reference Period for JJCPA Programs .....53

Program Outcomes:

    Mental Health Screening, Assessment, and Treatment (MH)--FY 03-04 .....59

    Special Needs Court (SNC)--FY 03-04 .....60

    Community Treatment Facilities (CTF)--FY 03-04 .....61

    Multisystemic Therapy (MST)--FY 03-04 .....62

    School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--Probationers--FY 03-04 ....63

    School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04 .....64

    School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--Probationers--FY 03-04 .....65

    School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04.....66

    Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT)--FY 03-04.....67

    Extended Day Community Supervision (JST)--FY 03-04 .....68

    Gang Intervention Services (GIS)--FY 03-04 .....69

    Youth Substance Abuse Intervention (YSA)--FY 03-04.....70

    Gender-Specific Services--Camps Program (GS-CAMP)--FY 03-04 .....71

    Gender-Specific Services--Juvenile Hall Program (GS-JH)--FY 03-04 .....72

    Gender-Specific Services--Community-Based (GS-COMM)--FY 03-04.....73

    After School Enrichment and Supervision (PARKS)--FY 03-04.....74

    Housing-Based Day Supervision (HB)--FY 03-04.....75

    Law Enforcement Prevention (LEP)--FY 03-04 .....76

    Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP)--FY 03-04.....77

    Inside-Out Writing (IOW)--FY 03-04 .....78

    School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--Probationers--FY 03-04 Arrests, Violations, and Attendance, by Gender .....79

School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04 Arrests and Attendance, by Gender.....	80
School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--Probationers--FY 03-04 Arrests, Violations, and Attendance, by Gender .....	80
School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04 Arrests and Attendance, by Gender .....	81
School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS) At-Risk; School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS) At-Risk; Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT); After School Enrichment (PARKS)--FY 03-04.....	82
Gang Intervention Services (GIS) and Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP)--FY 03-04 .....	82
Multisystemic Therapy (MST)--FY 03-04 .....	82
School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--Probationers--FY 03-04, by Cluster.....	83
School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04, by Cluster.....	84
School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--Probationers--FY 03-04, by Cluster.....	85
School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04, by Cluster.....	86
Gang Intervention Services (GIS)--FY 03-04, by Cluster.....	87
Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP)--FY 03-04, by Cluster .....	88

## SUMMARY

In 2000, the California Legislature passed the Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act, which authorized funding for county juvenile justice programs and designated the Board of Corrections (BOC) as the administrator of funding. A 2001 Senate Bill extended the funding and changed the program's name to the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA). This effort was designed to provide a stable funding source for juvenile programs that have been proven effective in curbing crime among at-risk and young offenders (California Board of Corrections 2004). Counties were asked to submit plans to the state for funding that identified programs that filled gaps in local services. These programs were to be based on empirical findings of effective program elements.

Administration of the JJCPA program is the responsibility of the BOC. The Board is required to submit annual reports to the California legislature measuring the success of JJCPA. The legislation identified six specific outcome measures ("the big six") to be included in annual reports from each of the individual JJCPA programs. These outcomes include successful completion of probation, arrests, probation violations, incarcerations, successful completion of restitution, and successful completion of community service.<sup>1</sup> Each county can also supply supplemental outcomes to measure locally identified service needs. JJCPA programs were first implemented in summer and fall of 2001 and are now in their fourth year of funding.

The Los Angeles County Probation Department documented that juvenile justice programs were weakest in the area of mental health assessments, treatment, and services, and programs targeting juvenile probationers and at-risk youths living and attending school in 85 high-risk school service areas. Two major initiatives were undertaken to address these weaknesses. The "mental health" initiative aimed to decrease mental health risk factors by increasing mental health services. The "school success" initiative's goal was to increase protective factors through promoting school success. Both initiatives provide a full continuum of care that includes prevention, early intervention, intermediate intervention, out of home intervention, reintegration, and suppression strategies, targeting neighborhoods of highest need across the county.

---

<sup>1</sup> For at-risk youths, only arrests and incarcerations are reported, since the other four measures relate to probationers.

## **EVALUATING JJCPA PROGRAMS**

Los Angeles County Probation Department submitted program evaluation designs, approved by the BOC, which used a quasi-experimental method. In this method, programs utilized a group of youths with characteristics similar to those of program youths where appropriate, and a pre/post measurement design in instances where no appropriate comparison group could be identified. Most comparison groups were selected by Probation. Given that no randomized designs were used and we were not able to verify the comparability of comparison groups for many of the programs, we caution that observed program effects may not be attributable to the programs themselves, but may be confounded with other factors we have not measured. Generally, outcomes are measured for a six-month period after program start, or after release into the community (for camp and juvenile hall programs). In addition to the “big six,” working with the BOC, the Los Angeles County Probation Department defined supplemental outcomes specific to each program, which are also reported to the BOC on an annual basis.

The Department contracted with the RAND Corporation to assist in the data analysis to determine program success after the research designs and outcome measures had been approved by the BOC. In addition, RAND also provides technical assistance, research expertise, and generation of scheduled and ad hoc reports as required by the Department and the BOC. The technical assistance is provided to JJCPA service providers to direct ways to improve service delivery and program results.

### **Programs in Initiative I: Mental Health Services**

Before JJCPA, the Department processed juvenile referrals in a manner similar to most probation departments in California, offering crisis intervention services only. There was no dedicated court to address youths with severe mental health issues, few if any placement options for crossover populations, and no cost-effective family-based community treatment service. These problems were addressed by initiating four programs within the mental health services initiative: Mental Health Screening, Treatment, and Assessment (MH); Special Needs Court (SNC); Community Treatment Facilities (CTF); and Multisystemic Therapy (MST).

### **Outcomes for the Mental Health Initiative**

Overall, JJCPA youths in the mental health initiative showed higher rates of completion of probation, restitution, and community service, and lower rates of arrests

and incarceration, than youths in the comparison groups. A larger percentage of youths in Community Treatment Facilities have successfully completed probation than comparison youths. The number of hospitalizations and the number of days hospitalized have decreased following program entry. Since its inception, Special Needs Court has provided screening and assessment for over 200 youths referred by other bench officers, and the psychosocial function of the participants has increased. On the other hand, probation violations were higher for program youths than for comparison youths in all four mental health initiative programs, possibly due to the increased scrutiny and closer supervision and monitoring afforded this population.

### **Programs in Initiative II: Promoting School Success**

Programs and services included in this initiative are: School-Based Probation Supervision for middle and high school probationers and at-risk youths (SBMS and SBHS); Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT); Extended Day Community Supervision (JST); Gang Intervention Services (GIS); Youth Substance Abuse (YSA); Gender-specific programs in camps (GS-CAMP), juvenile halls (GS-JH), and the community (GS-COMM); After School Enrichment (PARKS); Housing-Based Day Supervision (HB); Law Enforcement Program (LEP); Intensive Transition Services from camp to community (ITS-CCTP); and Inside-Out Writers (IOW).

### **Outcomes for the School Success Initiative**

Youths in the school success initiative were evaluated based on an appropriate comparison group, whenever possible. If no appropriate comparison group could be identified, youths were evaluated by comparing their outcomes in a reference period prior to enrollment in the program to their outcomes in a comparable reference period after joining the program.

Taken as a whole, youths in the school success initiative showed improvements in completion of probation, restitution, and community service, as well as improved school attendance. They also showed a decrease in arrests, incarcerations, school suspensions, and school expulsions. However, violations of probation were higher for program youths than for comparison youths for most programs in this initiative, and in those programs where a pre/post evaluation design was utilized, rates of probation violations were higher after entering the program than before. This high rate of violations may be due to the increased scrutiny and closer supervision and monitoring afforded this population.

### **JJCPA Per Capita Costs**

A total of 33,510 youths were served in JJCPA in fiscal year 2003-2004 (FY 03-04), at a total cost of \$36,398,881, or \$1,086 per participant. As one might expect, some programs had lower per capita costs than others. In general, the larger programs, such as Mental Health Screening, Assessment, and Treatment, had the lowest per capita costs, while the programs that offered more extensive services to a smaller population, such as Special Needs Court, had higher per capita costs. Overall, the cost per youth in the mental health initiative in FY 03-04 was \$682, while the school success initiative programs cost nearly twice as much, \$1,296 per youth.

### **LESSONS LEARNED AND EMERGING DIRECTIONS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

The Probation Department believes that success of JJCPA juvenile justice programs is the result of several committed partners that represent diverse sectors of the County: schools, service providers, Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), the Board of Supervisors, and the Probation Department. As part of this report, Probation staff gathered information from program staff and clients over the past year to document the successful, and unsuccessful, “lessons learned” during FY 03-04. These lessons are presented below; some of these lessons have already been incorporated with the programs for Year 4.

- Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs) in the School-Based Supervision Program have become an integral component of the educational process and campus life at School-Based sites.
- School-Based Program is an effective strategy and service delivery model for at-risk and high-risk probation youths.
- It is critical to maintain data and information sharing among JJCPA stakeholder agencies, community-based service providers, and program participants.
- In neighborhoods where gangs and violence are prevalent, there are consequences for youths residing in those neighborhoods.
- It is desirable to continue to promote strategies that hold youths and their parents responsible, accountable, and answerable.
- Increased mental health services for detained youths have resulted in earlier detection of problems and more immediate access to treatment.

- For youths entering juvenile hall, mental health treatment starts at the point of the screening process.
- It is desirable to continue to promote school success as a central strategy and intervention for probation and at-risk youths.
- It is desirable to continue to promote and provided early intervention and prevention services for at-risk youths.
- JJCPA services should support the family as a unit, rather than focus on the youths in isolation.
- Transportation services are essential to youths and their families having access and participating in JJCPA programs and services.

### **PERSPECTIVES AND CONCLUSIONS PER EVALUATOR'S OBSERVATIONS**

Researchers at RAND have served as the evaluators for JJCPA program outcomes since Year 1 of the program. While largely focusing on the analysis of outcome measures required by the Board of Corrections, RAND has also assisted the Probation Department in assessment of program implementation, development of case management activities, and modification/refinement of outcome measures for programs. Emerging directions include:

- Data collection has improved substantially and efforts to improve data quality and completeness should continue.
- Programs are evidence-based, but continued assessment of program fidelity is needed.
- Continued outcome evaluation has suggested ways to add/modify/drop programs.
- JJCPA programs are complex collaboratives and require constant care and feeding.
- JJCPA programs show success, but improvements in youths' behaviors are relatively modest.

### **Evaluation Limitations**

As with any evaluation, there are inherent limitations in our assessment of the Los Angeles County JJCPA. The current evaluation uses quasi-experimental designs to test the effectiveness of JJCPA programs. Quasi-experimental designs construct comparison groups using matching or other similar techniques, then compare the performance of the treatment population to that of the comparison group. Such comparison groups are

always open to the criticism that they are somehow not comparable to the program group, so that observed differences are not due to the program, but rather to differences between the groups.

Data for some programs were relatively complete--e.g., approximately 70% of youths in the School-Based programs had data related to school attendance, suspensions, and expulsions. In other programs, only a small fraction of program youths had data available for supplementary measures, calling into question the appropriateness of any findings based on such small sub-samples.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Implementation of JJCPA by the Los Angeles County Probation Department consists of two major initiatives, one to address mental health issues and the other aimed at school success issues. Both probationers and at-risk youths were targeted, with each initiative including several individual programs. In FY 03-04, JJCPA provided services to 11,450 youths in programs in the mental health initiative, and to 22,060 in programs in the school success initiative. Overall, youths in both initiatives showed reductions in rates of arrest and incarceration, as well as increases in the rate at which they successfully completed probation, restitution, and community service. School attendance improved, and school suspensions and expulsions decreased after entering the program.

Stakeholder statements suggest that the JJCPA programs are seen positively and perceived to contribute to improved performance and reduced juvenile delinquency. DPOs assigned to schools were praised for their efforts at improving both conduct and school performance. Probation's Cluster Managers, who oversee probation staff in each of Los Angeles County's five supervisor districts, have offered assessments of the progress made and the challenges that remain. Probation continues to monitor and improve the implementation of JJCPA programs.

## CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND

### THE JUVENILE JUSTICE CRIME PREVENTION ACT (JJCPA)

In 2000, the California Legislature passed the Schiff-Cardenas Crime Prevention Act, which authorized funding for county juvenile justice programs and designated the Board of Corrections (BOC) as the administrator of funding. A 2001 Senate Bill extended the funding and changed the program's name to the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA). This effort was designed to provide a stable funding source for juvenile programs that have been proven effective in curbing crime among at-risk and young offenders (California Board of Corrections 2004). Counties were asked to submit plans to the state for funding that identified programs that filled gaps in local services. These programs were to be based on empirical findings of effective program elements. The plans were required to include

- assessment of existing services targeting at-risk juveniles and their families
- identification and prioritization of neighborhoods, schools, and other areas of high juvenile crime
- a strategy to provide a continuum of graduated responses to juvenile crime

In addition, programs to be funded were required to be based on approaches demonstrated to be effective in reducing delinquency. They were also required to integrate law enforcement, probation, education, mental health, health, social services, drug and alcohol, and youth services resources in a collaborative manner, using information sharing to coordinate strategy and provide data for measuring program success (California State Assembly 2000).

Administration of the JJCPA program is the responsibility of the BOC. The Board is required to submit annual reports to the California legislature measuring the success of JJCPA. The legislation identified six specific outcome measures ("the big six") to be included in annual reports from each of the individual JJCPA programs. These outcomes include successful completion of probation, arrests, probation violations, incarcerations, successful completion of restitution, and successful completion of community service.<sup>2</sup> Each county can also supply supplemental outcomes to measure locally identified service needs (California Board of Corrections 2004).

---

<sup>2</sup> For at-risk youths, only arrests and incarcerations are reported, since the other four measures relate to conditions of probation.

JJCPA programs were first implemented in summer and fall of 2001 and are now in their fourth year of funding. In the second year of funding--the most recent year for which expenditure data are available--56 California counties spent over \$116 million to administer a total of 193 JJCPA programs to more than 110,000 youths. Nearly 70% of the programs met or exceeded their goal for arrest rate; approximately two thirds achieved their goal for incarceration rate, completion of probation, and completion of restitution; and over three-fourths of the programs met or exceeded their goals for completion of court-ordered community service (California Board of Corrections 2004).

### **Implementing JJCPA in Los Angeles County**

In preparing their Local Plan to implement JJCPA, the Los Angeles County Probation Department documented that juvenile justice programs were weakest in the area of mental health assessments, treatment, and services, and programs targeting juvenile probationers and at-risk youths living and attending school in 85 high-risk school service areas. Two major initiatives were undertaken to address these weaknesses. The "mental health" initiative aimed to decrease mental health risk factors by increasing mental health services. The "school success" initiative's goal was to increase protective factors through promoting school success. Both initiatives provide a full continuum of care that includes prevention, early intervention, and intermediate intervention, out of home intervention, reintegration, and suppression strategies, targeting neighborhoods of highest need across the county. The fundamental assumption behind the implementation of JJCPA is that increased protective factors through enhanced mental health care and school performance will lead to a reduction in delinquency and crime. The Los Angeles County Probation Department submitted its program plan to the BOC, along with the evidence base for the proposed programs. Probation's program plan was accepted by the BOC for implementation.

### **JJCPA in the Context of Los Angeles County Probation Programs**

JJCPA represents one of the major programs administered by the Probation Department, whose mission is to promote and enhance public safety, ensure victims' rights, and facilitate the positive behavior change of adult and juvenile probationers. In fiscal year 2003-2004, over \$32 million was allocated by the state to Los Angeles County. This represents roughly one-third of juvenile field expenditures; one-quarter of detention expenditures; and over one-third of camp expenditures; or almost 10 percent of all juvenile expenditures.

JJCPA programs were designed to complement and leverage other probation resources for at-risk and delinquent youths in the juvenile justice system. The leveraging of resources allows the DPO to shape a plan that builds on the strengths of each youth and is uniquely responsive to service needs. In collaboration with school officials, parents, and community partners, JJCPA DPOs are able to coordinate service plans that include various school and community-based resources.

This coordinated strategy allows JJCPA School-Based DPOs to closely supervise and support youths in the context of the school environment and the community, providing a continuum of care that extends beyond the normal school day and addresses educational, social, and recreational needs and strengths of the youths. These extended services aim to create a safe environment for youths normally unsupervised during after school hours, while also allowing the youths the opportunity to interact with prosocial peers and adults. These services include Operation Read, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Senate Bill 1095 funds (SB 1095), and L.A. Bridges.

**Operation Read.** Targeting probation, at-risk, and foster care youths, Operation Read is an after school literacy program that offers small group or one-on-one tutoring. The minors served read two or more grade levels below what is appropriate for their age. During fiscal year 2003-2004 (FY 03-04), 1,285 minors were tutored in the community by contracted Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and Probation Department employees. These services were provided, on average, at ten JJCPA sites per cluster for a total of approximately 50 schools, parks, and housing authorities. Four hundred ninety-two minors had both a pre- and a post-test. Of those with two assessments, the average reading improvement was 2.3 grade levels; the average beginning level was 4.3 and the average ending level was 6.6. Two hundred eighty-seven minors improved their reading scores by more than one grade level. The average per capita costs were \$149.21.

**Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).** TANF funding provides a continuum of family-focused, case-specific services in a community-based setting, to address the full spectrum of child and family needs. Among the services funded by TANF are counseling, monitoring and treatment; drug/alcohol education; educational advocacy; family crisis intervention; gang intervention; home detention; individual, family, and group counseling; and mental health assessment.

**Senate Bill 1095 (SB 1095).** SB 1095 provides a structured daily program of at least eight hours, including a minimum of five hours of academic instruction in Los Angeles County (no independent study). Participants receive a wide range of wraparound services based on a risk and needs assessment and probation case management plan.

**L.A. Bridges.** JJCPA has worked on a number of levels with L.A. Bridges in targeting gang- involved youths for prevention and intervention services. The Probation Department strategically located middle school DPOs at L.A. Bridges school sites. These sites included: Audubon, Horace Mann, Hollenbeck, Carver, John Muir, and Mc Clay. At these locations L.A. Bridges collaborated with the middle School-Based DPOs and the gang unit DPOs in providing preventive and early intervention services to gang-involved youths. Additionally, L.A. Bridges II worked with both the JJCPA gang intervention CBOs and the Department's gang unit in sharing information and in leveraging services. Bridges II CBOs worked with JJCPA gang intervention CBOs in identifying and working with gangs and gang members that were involved in violent disputes and incidents. Finally, JJCPA had quarterly meeting with L.A. Bridges in coordinating strategies and strategic events.

### **Evaluating JJCPA Programs**

As noted above, all counties that receive JJCPA funding are required to report annually on their program outcomes to the BOC. Each county uses a research design to gather information for program youths as well as a comparison group, which is used as a reference for measuring program success.

The most preferable research design is experimental, where participants are randomly assigned to either a treatment group or a comparison group. This allows the researcher to make strong statements about "cause and effect." In real world settings, however, such a design is often not practical for a variety of reasons, including ethical considerations, program capacity, and treatment groups that predate the evaluation. If an experimental design cannot be used, evaluations are often done on the basis of a quasi-experimental design, where a comparison group is chosen to match the characteristics of the treatment group as closely as possible.

Clearly, the more similar comparison groups are to their program groups, the better. In theory, one would want the comparison group to match the treatment group in all ways except for not receiving treatment. In practice, not all factors may be identified or measured. However, in criminal justice research, comparison groups are often matched to treatment groups on as many as possible of the following factors, which have been shown to be related to recidivism outcomes generally studied (Cottle, Lee, and Heilbrun 2001; Bureau of Justice Statistics 2000):

- demographic factors (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity)
- criminal history factors (degree of involvement in the criminal justice system)

- severity of instant offense

The assumption is that the more closely the comparison group matches the treatment group, the more confidently one can assert that differences between the two groups are due to the effects of treatment, rather than differences in characteristics between the two groups. There are several ways to construct comparison groups. Sometimes it is necessary to use a historical comparison group when no contemporaneous group is available. If neither contemporaneous nor historical comparison group can be identified, program youths themselves may comprise the comparison group, and their behavior after intervention compared to that before intervention--a weaker design than one that involves a separate group. The challenge with all quasi-experimental designs is to rule out alternative explanations for observed program effects.

Los Angeles County Probation Department submitted program evaluation designs, approved by the BOC, that used quasi-experimental methods. Programs utilized a group of youths with similar characteristics to those of program youths where appropriate, and a pre/post measurement design in instances where no appropriate comparison group can be identified. Generally, outcomes for program participants are measured for a six-month period after program start, or after release into the community (for camp and juvenile hall programs). In addition to the “big six”, working with the BOC, the Los Angeles County Probation Department defined supplemental outcomes specific to each program, which are also reported to the BOC on an annual basis.

During the first two years of JJCPA, program evaluation designs and comparison groups were ones contained in the original application to the BOC. During FY 03-04, RAND worked with Probation to modify supplemental outcomes in several programs to better reflect program goals and to identify more appropriate comparison groups for the Special Needs Court, Multisystemic Therapy, and School-Based Probationers (both high school and middle school) programs. The remainder of programs utilized the same comparison groups as in previous years. These comparison groups were determined by Probation, matching comparison youths to program youths on demographic characteristics--age, gender, and ethnicity. RAND was not able to verify the comparability of program and comparison groups on key background factors, with the exception of the two School-Based probationer programs. Data for all outcome measures were collected by Probation, extracted from the on-site database, and sent to RAND for analysis. Details of comparison groups may be found in Appendix A.

Given that no randomized designs were used and we were not able to verify the comparability of comparison groups for most of the programs, we caution that so that

observed differences between treatment and comparison groups may reflect pretreatment differences between the groups, rather than treatment effects for the programs.

We have applied standard statistical techniques (chi-square tests and difference of means tests) to assess whether the differences in outcomes between JJCPA youths and comparison group youths are statistically significant, i.e., that we can assert with a reasonable degree of certainty that the difference in outcomes between the two groups did not occur by chance, but result from real differences between group outcomes. Following customary social science research practice, we report statistical significance when the computed probability is less than 5% that the observed differences could have occurred by chance ( $p < .05$ ).

Some discussion of the “big six” is in order. The BOC does not rank the relative importance of these measures, nor is there any universally accepted relative importance of these measures of recidivism. For its planning purposes, Los Angeles County has ranked these in order, from most important to least important, in the view of the Department: successful completion of probation, arrests, probation violations, incarcerations, successful completion of restitution, and successful completion of community service. See Appendix B for an explanation of this rank-ordering.

An ideal outcome would be for no program youths to be arrested, incarcerated, or in violation of probation, and for all to complete probation, and (if applicable) community service and restitution. However, since for most JJCPA programs the “big six” outcomes are only measured for six months following entry into the program,<sup>3</sup> and because most youths’ term of probation runs 12 to 18 months, in practice a 100% completion of probation rate is not a realistic expectation. For all the “big six” measures, the most important metric is whether program youths performed significantly better than comparison youths, not the absolute value of any given outcome.

Some readers may also be interested in what percentage of youths improved their performance, did worse, or stayed the same in each outcome measure after entering the program. Such analyses potentially mask the overall trends, are applicable only to pre/post research designs, and are not generally used in criminal justice research. Therefore we have not included them in this report.

Outcomes required by the BOC focus on *programs*. Many of the JJCPA programs contract with CBOs. During FY 03-04, 26 lead CBOs, 6 County agencies, and 5 Los

---

<sup>3</sup> For programs based in camp or juvenile hall, the “big six” outcomes are measured for the six months after the youth returns to the community, rather than from program start.

Angeles City agencies participated in JJCPA.<sup>4</sup> CBOs provide specified services for the JJCPA programs--see Appendix C. CBOs are thus integral components of the programs, as are other County agency staff from Mental Health, Probation, Courts, and Law Enforcement. This report does not focus on the performance of individual CBOs or individual County agencies in providing services to JJCPA programs, but on the impact of the *programs as a whole* on youth outcomes. A strong study of the impact of different CBOs on youth outcomes would require adequate numbers of youths in the different programs, a better understanding of their background characteristics and the nature of the services provided to the youths by the CBO; these are not available with the current research design. The Department contracted with the RAND Corporation to assist in the data analysis to determine program success. In addition, RAND also provides technical assistance, research expertise, and generation of scheduled and ad hoc reports as required by the Department and the BOC. The technical assistance is provided to JJCPA service providers to direct ways to improve service delivery and program results.

This report summarizes the findings of the FY 03-04 (July 2003-June 2004) outcomes for all programs in the Los Angeles County JJCPA and represents the first comprehensive JJCPA report. It includes results of statistical analyses of empirical data, as required by the BOC, as well as more subjective information gathered from the Department's interviews with service providers and survey data on specific JJCPA programs.

In the next Chapter, we present a description of the programs and outcomes for the measures mandated by the BOC and the Department for the individual programs in the mental health and school success initiatives. Chapter 3 reports subjective feedback gathered by the Probation Department from community stakeholders, as well as the results of a survey of parents of youths taking part in the Housing-Based Supervision Program, and lists lessons learned and emerging directions from the perspective of the Probation Department. Chapter 4 gives perspectives and conclusions per the evaluator's perspective.

---

<sup>4</sup> Participating county agencies include the Department of Community and Senior Services (DCSS), the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD), the Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). County Housing, and County Parks and Recreation. Los Angeles City agencies were City Recreation and Parks, City Housing, Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Young Women At Risk (YWAR), and Los Angeles City Investment Board.

## **CHAPTER 2. JJCPA PROGRAMS AND OUTCOME MEASURES**

### **YOUTHS INVOLVED IN JJCPA PROGRAMS**

As noted in the previous chapter, legislation specified that JJCPA programs target at-risk juveniles, juvenile offenders, and their families (California State Assembly 2000). Although the BOC does not require details about the characteristics of JJCPA participants, many are fairly high risk, since the program specifically targeted youths who live or attend school in 85 high-risk areas of Los Angeles County. For example, 45 percent of the School-Based population had a court-ordered condition that indicates some type of gang involvement. Overall in FY 03-04, 33,510 youths received services, of whom 10,528 (31.4%) were at-risk and 22,982 (68.6%) were on probation.

### **PROGRAMS AND OUTCOMES IN INITIATIVE I: MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

Before JJCPA, the Department processed juvenile referrals in a manner similar to most probation departments in California, offering crisis intervention services only. There was no dedicated court to address youths with severe mental health issues, few if any placement options for crossover populations, and no cost-effective family-based community treatment service. These problems were addressed by initiating four programs within the mental health services initiative: Mental Health Screening, Treatment, and Assessment (MH), Special Needs Court (SNC), Community Treatment Facilities (CTF), and Multisystemic Therapy (MST).

Youths in the mental health initiative were evaluated based on an appropriate comparison group for each program. Detailed statistics for FY 03-04 outcomes are given in Appendix D, along with a description of the comparison group for each of the four programs.

We next give a brief description of each of the programs in the Mental Health Initiative, along with the reported outcomes for FY 03-04. Except where specifically noted, all of the outcome differences listed below were statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ), meaning that JJCPA youth outcomes were significantly different from comparison youth

outcomes.<sup>5</sup> Sample sizes indicated below are for the entire program and comparison groups. Because probation outcomes are not applicable to at-risk youths, and because only a subset of probationers are assigned restitution or community service, probation outcomes will be based on a subset of the entire group. Sample sizes for supplemental outcomes may be considerably smaller because school data were not available, strength and risk evaluation was not done on all program youths, etc. For details on the sample size of each outcome measure, see Appendix D.

### **Mental Health Screening, Treatment, and Assessment (MH)**

This program is designed to provide screening, assessment, and treatment services for newly detained youths entering juvenile hall. Program goals are to provide a therapeutic environment with intensive mental health and other ancillary services for juvenile hall minors. Additionally the program provides a multi-dimensional mental health screening protocol that is used to screen and assess all newly detained youths at the juvenile halls. The Department of Mental Health (DMH) provides staff to perform the screening, assessment, and intervention functions. Based on the initial screening, youths that require a more thorough review are referred for a more comprehensive assessment.

In addition to providing mental health treatment, the screening and assessment for mental health problems serves to funnel probationers and at-risk youths into the other three programs in the mental health initiative. The number of youths screened has grown steadily during the three years since the initiative was launched. Of the 13,497 youths whose juvenile hall stay lasted more than one day in FY 03-04, 11,193 (83%) were screened.

**Outcomes.** For outcome analyses, we examined 12,080 youths in the MH program and 30,656 comparison youths matched by age, gender, and ethnicity. Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) scores<sup>6</sup> declined significantly for program youths, from a mean of 53.7 to a mean of 50.1 in the three weeks following program entry. Program youths also had significantly fewer arrests in the six months following release from juvenile hall, 6.8%

---

<sup>5</sup> The chi-square test used to measure statistical significance for this evaluation requires that each cell of a 2 X 2 table contain at least five observations. Some programs, e.g., very small programs or those with very low arrest rates, did not meet this requirement, so that testing for statistical significance was not appropriate in some instances. In such instances, we report differences as “not statistically testable.”

<sup>6</sup> The BSI, developed by Leonard R. Derogatis (Derogatis and Melisaratos 1983), is designed to reflect the psychological distress and symptom patterns of psychiatric and medical patients, as well as community samples.

vs. 8.8%, and incarcerations, 6.4% vs. 7.2%, and completed restitution, 17.7% vs. 14.7%, and community service, 7.5% vs. 4.6%, at significantly higher rates than comparison youths. However, only 3.4% of comparison youths had probation violations, significantly fewer than the 17.2% for program youths. Differences in rates of completion of probation, 9.3% for program youths and 9.0% for comparison youths, were not statistically different between program and comparison youths.

### **Special Needs Court (SNC)**

The Juvenile Mental Health Court is a full-time court that has been specifically designated and staffed to supervise juvenile offenders who suffer from serious mental illness, organic brain impairment, or developmental disabilities. A specific objective of this program is to reduce the rearrest rate for juvenile offenders who are diagnosed with mental health problems and increase the number of juveniles who receive appropriate mental health treatment. This program initiates a comprehensive, judicially monitored program of individualized mental health treatment and rehabilitation services for juvenile offenders who suffer from diagnosed Axis I mental illness (serious mental illnesses), organic brain impairment, or developmental disabilities.

**Outcomes.** Outcome analyses compared 54 SNC youths to 44 comparison youths who were “near miss” rejects from SNC eligibility. Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) scores<sup>7</sup> increased significantly, from 43.6 to 47.7 for program youths in the six months following program entry. Consistent with program goals, SNC youths also had lower arrest and incarceration rates in the six months following program entry than did comparison youths in the six months following program rejection, 11.1% vs. 13.6% for both arrests and incarcerations, but differences were not statistically significant. Differences in probation violations between program and comparison youths, 25.9% for SNC youths and 18.2% for comparison youths, were not significant. Other outcomes were not statistically testable due to small sample size. For details, see Appendix D.

### **Community Treatment Facilities (CTF)**

This program provides supplemental funding to establish the Community Treatment Facility category of care for Severely Emotionally Disturbed (SED) children. This level of care is for minors who need a greater level of care than can be provided in a group home, but in a less restrictive and more community-based facility than a state or an acute care institution. The objectives of this program are to provide an appropriate and

---

<sup>7</sup> GAF scores are based on DSM-IV Axis V codes, which address sub-clinical problems in functioning (American Psychiatric Association 1994).

secure treatment setting in two mental health facilities (Vista del Mar and Starview). These facilities house juveniles with multiple, complex, and enduring mental health needs. CTF staff work to effectively treat mentally ill children in the most appropriate manner for their specific needs to prevent their behavior from escalating to the point of a crime.

**Outcomes.** For outcome analyses, we examined 25 CTF youths and 51 comparison youths who were Severely Emotionally Disturbed (SED) minors released from a level 14 care facility in calendar year 2000. Consistent with program goals, program youths had significantly fewer hospitalizations, a mean of 0.1 vs. 0.6, fewer days hospitalized, 0.6 vs. 9.9, and shorter hospital stays, 5.7 vs. 14.3, in the six months following program entry, compared to the six months prior to program entry. CTF youths performed somewhat better than comparison youths for all “big six” measures, but differences were not statistically testable due to small sample sizes. See Appendix D for details.

### **Multisystemic Therapy (MST)**

MST, copyrighted by MST Services, Inc., is designed to provide communities with affordable and effective treatment for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders. The goal of MST is to reduce criminal activity, substance abuse, and antisocial behavior through integrative, cost-effective, in-home, family-based treatment. MST aims to empower parents with the skills and resources needed to independently address the difficulties that arise in raising teenagers, and to empower youths to cope with family, peer, school, and neighborhood problems. The program uses a family-centered and strength-based service delivery approach and focuses on preserving the family.

**Outcomes.** Outcome analyses examined 67 MST youths and 51 comparison youths consisting of rejections from MST agreed upon by MST staff, Probation Department staff, and RAND staff. In the term after entering the program, 14.3% of MST youths were suspended from school, significantly fewer than the 37.1% in the term immediately prior to entering the program. In the term after entering the program, no program youths were expelled, whereas 5.9% had been expelled in the previous term. None of the differences between MST in the six months following program entry and comparison youths in the six months following program rejection in arrests, 14.9% vs. 19.6%; incarcerations, 10.4% vs. 19.6%; completion of probation, 9.5% vs. 10.6%; completion of restitution, 29.7% vs. 15.4%; and probation violations, 12.7% vs. 10.6%, were statistically significant. Differences in completion of community service between MST and comparison youths were not statistically testable due to small sample size.

Within MST, 74% of families improved their network of social supports, and 68% of parents improved their parenting skills. Self-report data indicated marked improvements in family relations, educational/vocational situation, and association with pro-social peers following program entry.

### **Summary of Outcomes for the Mental Health Initiative**

Overall, JJCPA youths in the mental health initiative showed higher rates of completion of probation, restitution, and community service, and lower rates of arrests and incarceration, than youths in the comparison groups. A larger percentage of youths in Community Treatment Facilities have successfully completed probation than comparison youths. The number of hospitalizations and the number of days hospitalized have decreased following program entry. Since its inception, Special Needs Court has provided screening and assessment for over 200 youths referred by other bench officers, and the psychosocial function of the participants has increased. Within the Multisystemic Therapy program, 74% of families improved their network of social supports, and 68% of parents improved their parenting skills. On the other hand, probation violations were higher for program youths than for comparison youths in all four mental health initiative programs, possibly due to the increased scrutiny and closer supervision and monitoring afforded this population.

### **PROGRAMS AND OUTCOMES IN INITIATIVE II: PROMOTING SCHOOL SUCCESS**

The School-Based program is the pulse of this initiative and has as its main objective the reduction of crime and delinquency in 85 high-risk neighborhoods by targeting School-Based probation supervision and services for the population of probationers and at-risk youths in the schools. A secondary goal is enhanced protective factors through improved school performance. The 85 targeted neighborhoods were identified as the most crime-impacted in Los Angeles County on the basis of:

- number of youths on probation at the schools
- rate of overall crime
- rate of juvenile crime
- rate of substance abuse
- rate of child abuse and neglect
- number of residents below the poverty level

Programs and services included in this initiative are: School-Based Probation Supervision for middle and high school probationers and at-risk youths (SBMS and

SBHS); Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT); Extended Day Community Supervision (JST); Gang Intervention Services (GIS); Youth Substance Abuse (YSA); Gender-specific programs in camps (GS-CAMP), juvenile halls (GS-JH), and the community (GS-COMM); After School Enrichment (PARKS); Housing-Based Day Supervision (HB); Law Enforcement Program (LEP); Intensive Transition Services from camp to community (ITS-CCTP); and Inside-Out Writers (IOW). A total of 22,060 youths received services from programs in the school success initiative during FY 03-04 of JJCPA.

Youths in the school success initiative were evaluated based on an appropriate comparison group, whenever possible. If no appropriate comparison group could be identified, youths were evaluated by comparing their outcomes in a reference period prior to enrollment in the program to their outcomes in a comparable reference period after joining the program. Details of the FY 03-04 outcomes, as well as brief descriptions of comparison groups, may be found in Appendix D.

We next turn to a brief description of each of the programs in the School Success Initiative, along with reported outcomes for FY 03-04. Except where specifically noted, all of the outcome differences listed below were statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ), meaning that JJCPA youths performed significantly different from comparison youths, or from their baseline measures.<sup>8</sup> Sample sizes indicated below are for the entire program and comparison groups. Because probation outcomes are not applicable to at-risk youths, and because only a subset of probationers are assigned restitution or community service, probation outcomes will be based on a subset of the entire group. Sample sizes for supplemental outcomes may be considerably smaller because school data were not available, strength and risk evaluation was not done on all program youths, etc. For details on the sample size of each outcome measure, see Appendix D.

### **School-Based Probation Supervision (SBMS and SBHS)**

The Probation Department's School-Based Supervision Program is designed to provide more effective supervision of probationers, increase school success for these youths, and to build on a partnership with schools and others to promote campus and community safety. DPOs are assigned and placed on school campuses with a focus on

---

<sup>8</sup> The chi-square test used to measure statistical significance for this evaluation requires that each cell of a 2 X 2 table contain at least five observations. Some programs, e.g., very small programs or those with very low arrest rates, did not meet this requirement, so that testing for statistical significance was not appropriate in some instances. In such instances, we report differences as "not statistically testable."

reducing recidivism by probationers by enforcing conditions of probation, daily monitoring of school issues (attendance, performance, and behavior), reducing first arrests by at-risk youths, holding youths and families accountable, and building resiliency with a priority on school success and positive redirection through mentoring. Programs target high schools and select feeder middle schools with a focused early intervention approach.

**School-Based High School Probationer Outcomes.** For outcome analyses, we examined 3,563 School-Based high school probationers and 3,374 comparison youths matched by age, gender, ethnicity, criminal history, severity of instant offense, and cluster. Consistent with program goals, program youths significantly increased the percent of school days attended from 57.9% to 65.0% and significantly decreased suspensions from 23.6% to 11.8% and expulsions from 2.6% to 1.2% in the term after entering the program, compared to the term immediately prior to entering the program. Program youths had also significantly higher rates of completing probation, 13.5% vs. 1.8%, and community service, 14.6% vs. 1.4%, than comparison youths. Their strength scores increased significantly from a mean of 8.3 to a mean of 10.2, and their risk scores decreased significantly from a mean of 5.1 to 0.7, six months after program entry compared to the time of program entry. However, program youths had higher rates of arrest, 8.5% vs. 7.2%; incarceration, 7.9% vs. 6.6%; and probation violation, 12.3% vs. 10.4%, than comparison youths. In the six months following program entry, 33.3% of program youths and 33.4% of comparison youths completed restitution, a difference that was not statistically significant.

**School-Based Middle School Probationer Outcomes.** For outcome analyses, we examined 410 School-Based middle school probationers and 1,477 comparison youths matched by age, gender, ethnicity, criminal history, severity of instant offense, and cluster. Consistent with program goals, program youths significantly increased school attendance from 58.8% to 71.7% and decreased suspensions from 47.4% to 20.5% and expulsions from 10.0% to 3.5% in the term after entering the program, compared to the term immediately prior to entering the program, and had significantly higher strength scores, 9.4 vs. 7.0, and significantly lower risk scores, 1.2 compared to 6.9, six months after program entry than at program entry. Youths in this program also completed probation, 10.7% vs. 1.3%, and community service, 11.0% vs. 1.1%, more often than comparison youths. Differences in completion of restitution, 30.7% for program youths and 29.7% for comparison youths, and violations of probation, 8.6% for program youths and 10.4% for comparison youths, were not statistically significant between the two groups.

**School-Based High School At-Risk Youth Outcomes.** For outcome analyses, we compared 1,083 School-Based high school youths with 119 comparison youths who participated in the Multi-Agency At-Risk Youth Committee (MAARY-C) program and were between 15 1/2 and 18 years old at program implementation. Consistent with program goals, School-Based high school at-risk youths had significantly fewer school suspensions, 16.4% of youths, in the term after entering the program than the 27.1% in the term immediately prior to entering the program. Program youths attended school 66.0% of the time in the term after program entry, not significantly more than the 64.6% in the previous term. Expulsion rates were identical for the two terms, at 1.1% of program youths. School-Based high school at-risk youths also had significantly lower arrest rates, 0.9% of program youths vs. 9.2% of comparison youths, and significantly lower incarceration rates, 0.9% of program youths vs. 8.4% of comparison youths. Probation outcomes were not applicable since the program serves only at-risk youths.

**School-Based Middle School At-Risk Youth Outcomes.** For outcome analyses, we examined 1,219 School-Based middle school youths with 67 comparison youths who participated in the Multi-Agency At-Risk Youth Committee (MAARY-C) program and were 15 1/2 years old or younger at program implementation. Consistent with program goals, program youths significantly increased school attendance, from 66.9% to 75.8%, and significantly decreased suspensions, from 35.8% to 21.6%, and expulsions, from 1.7% to 0.6%, in the term after entering the program, compared to the term immediately prior to entering the program. They also had lower arrest and incarceration rates than comparison youths, but differences were not statistically testable due to small sample size for the comparison group. For details, see Appendix D. In addition, program youths had significantly lower barrier scores, a mean of 0.2, six months after program entry than at program entry, when the mean score was 8.4. Differences in strength scores, 10.3 at six months following program entry and 9.6 at program entry, were not statistically significant. Probation outcomes were not applicable since the program serves only at-risk youths.

### **Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT)**

ACT is a program developed by the District Attorney's office that focuses on truancy problems in selected elementary schools. Program objectives are to ensure that youth who are at risk of truancy or excessive absences attend school, to improve school attendance through parent and child accountability, to address attendance problems at the earliest possible time before the child's behavior is ingrained and while the parent still exercises control over the child, and to impact long-term reduction of delinquency, adult

criminality and joblessness. The program targets truant students and their parents. The goal of the program is to return children to school and to hold the parent and child accountable when the child remains truant.

**Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we examined 2,377 ACT youths six months prior to, and six months following, program entry. Consistent with program goals, ACT youths had significantly fewer school absences, a mean of 9.2 days, in the term following program entry than in the term immediately preceding program entry, when the mean absence was 19.4 days. Participants in this program, all of whom were at-risk youths, had no arrests or incarcerations in the six months prior to program entry, and remained arrest-free during the six months following program entry. Probation outcomes were not applicable since the program serves only at-risk youths.

### **Extended Day Community Supervision Program (JST)**

This program is an extension of the School-Based DPO supervision program. Juvenile Support Teams (JST) comprising 15 DPOs are located countywide in the 85 school service areas. JST DPOs provide intensive case management and supervision for probationers experiencing difficulties complying with the conditions of their probation and at high risk of re-offending. This special needs population is referred to JST by the School-Based DPOs, based on family dysfunction, continued poor academic performance, excessive absenteeism, chronic truancy, and aggressive behavior. JST provides intensive case management and supervision during after school and evening hours, as well as during weekends.

**Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we compared the performance of 196 JST youths in the six months prior to program entry to their performance in the six months following program entry. Program youths had significantly fewer school suspensions in the term following program entry than in the term immediately preceding program entry, with 19.5% of youths suspended after program entry and 37.7% before. They also had significantly fewer arrests, 11.2% vs. 18.9%, and completed restitution more frequently, 23.4% vs. 6.5%, in the six months following program entry than in the six months prior to program entry. Differences in incarceration rates, 13.8% in the six months prior to program entry and 9.7% in the six months following program entry; school attendance, 62.8% in the term after program entry vs. 51.4% in the term prior to program entry; and expulsions, 5.2% in the six months before program entry vs. 7.1% in the six months after program entry, were not statistically significant between the two time periods, and differences in completion of probation and community service were not statistically testable due to the small number of youths who completed probation or community

service prior to program entry. For details, see Appendix D. Risk scores declined significantly after entering the program, from 6.3 to 0.5, but probation violations were higher than in the six months prior to entering the program, 10.6%, compared to the six months before program entry, 4.9%. Mean strength scores were 7.7 at program entry and 9.0 six months after program entry, a difference that was not statistically significant.

### **Gang Intervention Services (GIS)**

This program is a partnership developed between Probation and CBOs to implement a gang intervention strategy. Community workers are contracted through CBOs and work with school officials, public park staff, public housing authority staff, law enforcement agencies, faith-based organizations, and the Probation Department to provide a menu of gang intervention services. These services focused on involving identified gang youths in pro-social activity and behavior aimed at enhancing school readiness and school performance, and in reducing their involvement in gang activity.

**Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we compared the performance of 994 program youths in the six months prior to program entry to their performance in the six months following program entry. Significantly fewer youths in the gang intervention program were arrested in the six months following program entry, 10.6%, than the 18.5% arrested during the six months prior to program entry. Significantly fewer GIS youths were incarcerated in the six months following program entry, 9.9%, than in the six months prior to program entry, 15.6%. In addition, 14.6% of GIS youths completed probation in the six months following program entry, significantly more than the 0.7% who completed probation in the six months prior to program entry. Of GIS youths assigned restitution, 21.8% completed restitution in the six months following entry into the program, significantly more than the 12.9% in the six months before program entry. Of those assigned community service, 13.6% completed their requirement during the six months after program entry, whereas only 0.8% did so in the six months prior to program entry, too few to allow for significance testing. Consistent with program goals, GIS youths also had significantly fewer school suspensions in the term following program entry than in the term immediately preceding program entry, with 6.7% suspended after program entry compared to 25.3% before program entry. Probation violations were significantly higher in the six months following program entry, 12.8%, than in the six months prior to program entry, 8.3%. School attendance was higher, 56.8% vs. 41.4%, and expulsions were lower, 1.3% vs. 5.3%, in the term following program entry than in the term before program entry, but these differences were not statistically significant.

### **Youth Substance Abuse Intervention Program (YSA)**

Youths with substance abuse issues are referred by the School-Based DPO to a community-based provider for a comprehensive assessment. If the assessment indicates the need for treatment, the substance abuse provider employs intensive case management that will require contact with the youth and probation officer. Treatment through individual, family, and group counseling is provided. The treatment is holistic and focuses on roots of the problem and not just the substance abuse manifestation. Testing is utilized to verify abstinence and progress in the program. The treatment provider has access to inpatient services as needed.

**Outcomes.** Outcome measures were based on comparisons of the performance of 242 YSA youths in the six months before program entry to their performance in the six months following program entry. Significantly fewer youths who participated in this program were arrested in the six months following program entry, 8.3%, than in the six months prior to program entry, when 14.9% were arrested. Significantly more YSA youths completed probation in the six months following program entry than in the six months prior to program entry, 12.4% vs. 1.0%. Significantly more also completed restitution in the six months after entering the program, 30.1%, than in the six months before entering the program, 17.2%. Significantly more YSA youths had probation violations during the six months following program entry, 17.4%, than the 5.6% during the six months prior to program entry. Differences in completion of community service were not statistically testable, since no youths completed community service in the six months prior to program entry. Differences in supplemental measures--positive drug tests and scores on a drug and alcohol scale--were not statistically significant between the two periods. For more details, see Appendix D.

### **Gender-Specific Services Programs**

These programs provide gender-specific services for juvenile females on formal probation and at-risk girls in the 85 school service areas. Additionally, this program extends gender-specific services to approximately 210 juvenile females detained in camp and approximately 200 girls detained in juvenile hall. The program seeks to develop new services through CBOs to provide enhancements that will complement existing services in a variety of settings.

**Gender-Specific Services-Camps Program (GS-CAMP) Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we examined 465 GS-CAMP youths and 347 comparison youths, females who entered camp during 2000. Significantly fewer program youths were arrested in the six months following camp exit than comparison youths, with 6.2% of

program youths and 13.0% of comparison youths arrested. Differences in incarcerations were also significant, 5.8% of program youths vs. 13.0% of comparison youths. However, significantly fewer program youths completed probation, 7.8%, in the six months following program entry than did comparison youths, 18.4% of whom completed probation. Differences in completion of restitution, 18.8% of program youths and 13.0% of comparison youths, were not statistically significant, and too few comparison youths were assigned community service to meet the requirements for statistical testing. Mean self-efficacy scores for girls were 30.7 at program entry and 32.0 six months following program entry, a difference that was not statistically significant.

**Gender-Specific Services-Juvenile Hall Program (GS-JH) Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we examined 745 GS-JH youths and 4,452 comparison youths, consisting of females who entered juvenile hall in 2000, were detained and released back into the community. In the six months following release from juvenile hall, significantly more GS-JH youths were arrested, 10.1%, than the 6.6% of comparison youths who were arrested. Significantly more GS-JH youths also were incarcerated, 10.1%, than comparison youths, 5.2%. While only 2.3% of comparison youths had probation violations, significantly more, 31.0% of program youths, violated probation. Significantly more GS-JH youths completed community service, 4.2%, than comparison youths, only 1.6% of whom did so. Among GS-JH youths assigned restitution, 14.6% completed within six months of release from the hall, compared to 17.0% of comparison youths, a difference that was not statistically significant. Self-efficacy scores for girls increased significantly among program youths in the six months following program entry, to 31.3, compared to 30.0 at program entry.

**Gender-Specific Services-Community Program (GS-COMM) Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we compared 294 program youths in the six months before program entry to six months following program entry. In contrast to the other two gender-specific programs, the vast majority in this program were at-risk youths. Only a single youth, out of 294 in the program, was arrested in the six months prior to program entry, and only one was incarcerated. The same was true in the six months following program entry: only one youth was arrested, and only one incarcerated. Differences in mean self-efficacy scores for girls between program entry, 28.6, and six months following program entry, 29.8, were not statistically significant. Probation outcomes were not applicable since the program almost exclusively serves at-risk youths.

### **After School Enrichment and Supervision Program (PARKS)**

Los Angeles County and Los Angeles City Park and Recreational agencies, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles County Office of Education, other school districts, community-based service providers, and the Probation Department collaborate to provide after school enrichment programs and supervision for youths on formal probation in selected locations in the 85 school service areas. These after school enrichment programs are located at county and city parks, schools, and CBOs. School-Based DPOs refer probationers to after school programs. The after school services are offered at a time of the day when youths, especially probationers, are most likely to be without adult supervision, and are intended to reduce the risk of probationers re-offending.

**Outcomes.** To measure outcomes, we compared the performance of 478 PARKS youths in the six months prior to program entry to their performance in the six months following program entry. Targeted primarily toward at-risk youths, the goal of the after school enrichment program is to keep at-risk youths out of the juvenile justice system. In FY 03-04 of the JJCPA program, 474 of 478 youths in the after school enrichment program remained arrest-free in the six months after enrolling in the program. They also significantly increased school attendance in the school term after joining the program, as compared to the term before becoming a program participant, from 36.0% attendance in the term before program entry to 73.7% in the term immediately following program entry. Differences in other outcomes were not statistically testable due to the small number of youths on probation and the low number of after school arrests. For details, see Appendix D.

### **Housing-Based Day Supervision Program (HB)**

This program provides day, evening, and weekend supervision and services for probationers, at-risk youths, and their families. Selected public housing developments are used as hubs to provide day services and supervision for probationers. County and city housing authorities partner with CBOs, schools, the Probation Department and other county agencies to provide a menu of services specific to the probationers living in public housing developments. Additionally, this program assists the families of probationers in gaining access to resources and services that will aid these families in becoming self-sufficient and thereby reduce risk factors associated with juvenile delinquency and re-offending. Another program goal is to reduce crime rates for the housing units.

**Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we compared the performance of 224 HB youths in the six months prior to program entry to their performance in the six months

following program entry. Program youths significantly increased school attendance in the term after entering the program than in the term immediately prior to entering the program, to 62.8% from 51.8%. Differences in other outcomes were not statistically testable. Arrest and incarceration rates were low both before and after entering the program, e.g., only 4 of 224 youths were arrested in the six months following program entry. While performance on probation-related outcomes improved after entering the program, too few of the program participants were on probation to allow statistical significance testing. For details, see Appendix D.

Although crime rates are not considered school success indicators, a decrease in crime rates was found for the program. Consistent with program goals, the overall housing crime rates decreased from 957 per 10,000 residents in FY 01-02 to 885 per 10,000 residents in the current year.

### **Law Enforcement Prevention Program (LEP)**

The Law Enforcement Program is an early intervention gang program directed at deterring youths from gang association and involvement and other harmful behaviors that foster delinquency. The program serves youths ages 9 to 17 and their families. Youths are referred to LEP by parents and school and law enforcement officials. The program duration is one year. The parent or guardian is required to sign a one-year voluntary contract.

**Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we compared 185 LEP youths in the six months prior to program entry to the six months following program entry. Differences in arrest and incarceration rates were not significantly testable in the six months following program entry, compared to the six months prior to program entry. Rates were low both before and after program entry: 182 of 185 youths remained arrest-free in the six months after entering the program. Probation outcomes were not applicable since the program serves only at-risk youths.

### **Intensive Transition Services Program (ITS-CCTP)**

This program is a collaborative effort involving the Probation Department, schools, and community-based service providers. These agencies work to provide post residential services to juveniles returning to the community. In collaboration with the camp casework DPO, CBOs work with the family and probationer in working out a post-camp service plan which will place emphasis on academic improvement and achievement, school attendance, school citizenship, community service, personal and family responsibility, pro-social activities, assisting parents with transportation to camp if

necessary, and emancipation services when necessary to ensure that shelter and basic services are accessible for foster care youths returning home.

**Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we examined 515 program youths and 3,321 comparison youths, consisting of a contemporaneous group of youths released from similar camps who did not have intensive transition services during the community phase. This group was matched to program youths by age, gender, and ethnicity. Program youths had fewer arrests, 17.3%, in the six months following camp exit than comparison youths, 21.1% of whom were arrested. Program and comparison youths did not differ significantly in their rates of incarceration, 16.9% of program youths and 19.8% of comparison youths; completion of probation; 15.6% of program youths vs. 18.1% of comparison youths; completion of restitution, 17.9% of program youths vs. 19.6% of comparison youths; and completion of community service, 15.2% of program youths vs. 10.7% of comparison youths. Significantly more ITS-CCTP youths, 21.5%, had probation violations in the six months following camp exit than did comparison youths, 6.0% of whom violated probation. Consistent with program goals, program youths' school attendance improved significantly in the term following program entry when compared to the term immediately preceding program entry, to 69.6% from 14.3%. Differences in school suspensions, 4.7% in the term following program entry vs. 3.4% in the term before program entry, were not statistically significant, and differences in expulsions not statistically testable due to the low number of youths expelled in either term. Program youths had more returns to camp in the six months following re-entry into the community, with 16.2% returning to camp, than did comparison group youths, 8.8% of whom returned to camp within six months. Differences in returns to the California Youth Authority (CYA) were not statistically testable due to the low number of program youths who returned to CYA. No program youths were deemed unfit for juvenile court or waived to adult court in the six months following program entry. For details, see Appendix D.

### **Inside-Out Writing (IOW)**

This program is for youths 11 to 17 years old who have been found unfit to be tried as a juvenile and are subject to long-term detention--9 to 12 months--in juvenile hall while they await trial. The Inside-Out Writers program utilizes a writing program to develop interpersonal and communication skills for youths who volunteer for the program. The youths meet on a weekly basis, with sessions led by professional writers, to write and critique their writing work with others in the group. Youths are guided in

both their writing and in their discussion of their written work, providing experience in building a supportive community.

**Outcomes.** For outcome measures, we compared the performances of 554 IOW youths in the six months prior to juvenile hall entry to their performance in the six months following juvenile hall release. Youths in this program had significantly fewer arrests during the six months following release from juvenile hall, when 7.2% were arrested, compared to the six months prior to juvenile hall entry, when 20.4% were arrested. Significantly fewer youths were incarcerated during the six months following hall release, 6.9%, than in the six months prior to hall entry, 19.5%.<sup>9</sup> They completed restitution at a significantly higher rate during the six months after release from the hall, 12.6%, than in the six months prior to hall entry, when 6.9% completed restitution. During the six months after hall release, 9.4% completed probation and 8.1% completed community service, but because no IOW youths completed either probation or community service during the six months prior to hall entry, differences were not statistically testable. However, significantly more IOW youths had probation violations in the six months following release from juvenile hall, 15.8%, than during the six months prior to hall entry, when only 4.8% had a violation. Mean number of Special Incident Reports (SIRs) six months after program entry was not statistically significant from the mean number of SIRs in the first month of the program, the means being 0.29 in the first month and 0.27 six months later.

### **Summary of Outcomes for the School Success Initiative**

Taken as a whole, youths in the school success initiative showed improvements in the primary program goals of completion of probation, restitution, and community service, as well as improved school attendance. They also showed a decrease in arrests, incarcerations, school suspensions, and school expulsions. However, violations of probation were higher for program youths than for comparison youths for most programs in this initiative, and in those programs where a pre/post evaluation design was utilized, rates of probation violations were higher after entering the program than before. As stated earlier, this high rate of violations may be due to the increased scrutiny and closer supervision and monitoring afforded this population.

The School-Based programs were effective at keeping at-risk youths from entering the criminal justice system. In the six months after enrolling in the program, 99% of at-

---

<sup>9</sup> Only arrests or incarcerations that occurred at least two days before hall entry were included. The arrest that led directly to the hall stay during which the youth participated in the Inside-Out Writers program was thus excluded from this count.

risk high school participants were arrest-free, compared to 90% of comparison youths, and 99% of at-risk middle school participants remained arrest-free, versus 95% for comparison youths, differences that were statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). In addition:

- 730-of-824 eligible middle school JJCPA participants were promoted to high school
- 435-of-511 eligible high School-Based JJCPA participants graduated on time

### **ADDITIONAL PROGRAM OUTCOME ANALYSES**

In this section, we discuss additional analyses conducted to illuminate program outcomes by youth gender and risk level, as well as results observed in each of the five county clusters. We present below a summary of these analyses. Detailed results are contained in the appendices. Appendix E gives selected outcomes, separately for male and female participants in the School-Based programs. Appendix F presents selected results grouped by type of program: at-risk, high-risk, and family-based. In Appendix G, we present all BOC-mandated and supplemental outcomes for School-Based, gang intervention services, and intensive transition services programs, separately by cluster.

#### **School-Based Program Youths by Gender**

In order to assess the relative impact of programs by gender, we examined selected outcomes for the four School-Based programs separately for males and females. As noted above, School-Based high school probationers had higher arrest rates than comparison youths. This difference was primarily due to males, who were arrested more than twice as frequently as females. In fact, JJCPA females had lower arrest rates than comparison youths, while the opposite was true for males. Female school probationers also completed probation at a higher rate than their male counterparts. School attendance improved at virtually the same rate for both males and females.

A very similar pattern also held for middle school probationers, with JJCPA males arrested nearly twice as often as JJCPA females. Both males and females were arrested slightly less often than comparison males and females, respectively. Improvement in school attendance was practically identical for males and females.

At-risk high school and middle school male probationers were also arrested more often than their female counterparts, although both fared considerably better than comparison youths. While school attendance improved comparably for male and female at-risk middle school youths, at-risk high school males attended at virtually the same rate

before and after entering the program. At-risk high school females, on the other hand, showed a modest improvement in attendance after beginning the program.

### **At-Risk, High-Risk, and Family-Based Programs**

JJCPA programs targeted primarily toward at-risk youths include Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT), and After School Enrichment (PARKS), as well as the School-Based programs for high school and middle school. Youths in all of these programs had very low rates of arrest (see Appendix F). Overall, out of 5,157 youths in the four programs, only 32 (0.62%) were arrested in the six months following program entry.

Gang Intervention Services (GIS) and Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP) are the JJCPA programs aimed at high-risk youths. Both groups had relatively high arrest and incarceration rates in the six months following program entry. Youths in ITS-CCTP had the highest arrest and incarceration rates of any JJCPA program. Overall, just under 13% of all youths in the high-risk programs were arrested, and more than 12% incarcerated, in the six months after entering the program.

The primary JJCPA program that targets families is Multisystemic Therapy (MST). MST youths showed considerable improvement in school performance in the term following program entry, as compared with the preceding term. Attendance improved from less than half-time to more than two-thirds, suspensions dropped from more than 37% of MST youths to fewer than 15%, and not a single MST youth was expelled in the term following program entry.

In addition to the BOC-mandated and supplemental outcomes, MST staff rated participants and their families at program entry and six months following program entry in five areas: necessary parenting skills, family relations, network supports, success in educational or vocational settings, and involvement with pro-social peers. MST youths and their families showed marked improvement in all five areas. Differences were statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) in family relations, network supports, and success in educational or vocational settings. For parenting skills and pro-social peers, so few participants were rated positively at baseline that differences were not statically testable.

### **Results by Cluster**

To gauge the outcomes of JJCPA programs in different parts of the county, we examined BOC-mandated and supplemental outcomes in the six months following program entry, by cluster,<sup>10</sup> for the School-Based programs and the two high-risk

---

<sup>10</sup> “Cluster” is the term used by Probation to refer to a geographical area very closely aligned to a given Los Angeles County Supervisory District.

programs (GIS and ITS-CCTP). Unfortunately, we were not able to determine whether JJCPA results were better or worse than comparison youths for the “big six” outcomes because we did not have information on cluster for the latter. Thus our analyses compare results *across* clusters. Such comparisons cannot be used to make judgments about relative program effectiveness; differences between clusters may be due to differences in the characteristics of youths or the environments in which they live. For example, arrest rates are higher in some clusters than in others. In the case of supplemental outcomes, we do talk about relative differences for JJCPA and comparison youths *within* a cluster. Results of these analyses are presented in Appendix G.

High school probationers in Cluster 2 had the highest rates of arrests, incarcerations, and probation violations, as well as the lowest rates of successful completion of probation, restitution, and community service. Cluster 1 youths showed the lowest rates of arrests, as well as the largest improvement in school attendance. Youths in Cluster 5 were the only ones who attended less often after program entry than before.

At-risk high school youths in all clusters had very low rates of arrests and incarcerations, with Cluster 2 showing the highest rates and Cluster 4 the lowest. Youths in Cluster 1 again made the largest improvement in school attendance, while those in Clusters 2 and 4 attended less often than before enrolling in JJCPA.

Among middle school probationers, those in Cluster 4 had the highest rates of arrests, while those in Cluster 5 had the lowest. Youths in all clusters in this program improved school attendance, with the largest gain coming in Cluster 3.

As with high school at-risk youths, middle school at-risk youths overall had low arrest and incarceration rates. Clusters 4 and 2 youths had somewhat higher rates than those in the other clusters. Improvements in school attendance did not differ greatly from cluster to cluster, but youths in Clusters 2 and 4 showed dramatically lower rates of suspensions after entering JJCPA than before. Cluster 3 youths were suspended more in the term after entering JJCPA than in the term before.

Among Gang Intervention Services youths, those in Cluster 5 had the lowest rates of arrests, incarcerations, and probation violations, while those in Cluster 2 had the highest. Youths in Cluster 1 had the highest rates of completion of restitution, and those in Cluster 5 did best in successfully completing probation and community service. School performance data were available for only about 5% of the youths in this program, making it impossible to evaluate relative improvement by cluster.

Among Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP) youths, those in Cluster 4 showed the highest rates of arrests and incarcerations, but also the highest rates of

successful completion of probation, restitution, and community service. Youths in Cluster 1 had the fewest arrests, incarcerations, and probation violations. Improvement in school attendance was dramatic in every cluster, although suspensions and expulsions did not show improvement comparable to attendance. Youths in Cluster 2 had the highest rate of returns to camp, those in Cluster 3 the lowest.

**Selected Program and Comparison Group Outcome Rates**

For youths in the GIS, YSA, and ITS-CCTP programs, as well as for probationers in the two School-Based programs (SBHS and SBMS), we computed a ratio of rates between program and comparison youths in successfully completing probation, being arrested, and being incarcerated. This allows us to answer questions such as: For every 100 program youths who successfully complete probation, how many comparison youths do so? The resulting rates are shown in Table 2.1 below. If a higher percentage of program youths completed probation successfully than the percentage of comparison youths who did so, the corresponding entry in Table 2.1 will be below 100. For arrests and incarcerations, a number higher than 100 in Table 2.1 indicates that a higher percentage of comparison youths than program youths were arrested or incarcerated.

**Table 2.1**

**For Every 100 Program Youths Who..., How Many Comparison Group Youths...?**

<i>Program</i>	<i>Successfully complete probation</i>	<i>Are arrested</i>	<i>Are incarcerated</i>
SBHS	13	84	84
SBMS	13	102	104
GIS	5	175	158
YSA	8	180	167
ITS-CCTP	116	122	117

Note: SBHS, SBMS, and ITS-CCTP comparisons are to comparison group youths. For GIS and YSA, comparisons are pre/post.

**JJCPA Per Capita Costs**

A total of 33,510 youths were served in JJCPA in FY 03-04, at a total cost of \$36,398,881, or \$1,086 per participant. As one might expect, some programs had lower per capita costs than others. In general, the larger programs, such as Mental Health Screening, Assessment, and Treatment, had the lowest per capita costs, while the programs that offered more extensive services to a smaller population, such as Special

Needs Court, had higher per capita costs. Table 2.2 shows the total budget for each program, the number of youths served in FY 03-04, and the cost per program participant. Overall, the cost per youth in the mental health initiative in FY 03-04 was \$682, while the school success initiative programs cost nearly twice as much, \$1,296 per youth.

**Table 2.2**  
**FY 03-04 Per Capital Costs, by JJCPA Program**

<i>Program</i>	<i>Youths served</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>Per capita</i>
MH	11,193	\$5,310,243	\$474
SNC	84	\$1,347,769	\$16,045
CTF	78	\$757,594	\$9,713
MST	95	\$393,193	\$4,139
<b>Mental Health Initiative Total</b>	<b>11,450</b>	<b>\$7,808,799</b>	<b>\$682</b>
SBHS probationers	6,520	\$7,701,527	\$1,181
SBHS at-risk youths	1,533	\$1,691,226	\$1,103
SBMS probationers	731	\$727,974	\$996
SBMS at-risk youths	2,006	\$1,926,410	\$960
ACT	4,911	\$284,326	\$58
JST	345	\$1,373,537	\$3,981
GIS	943	\$4,002,848	\$4,245
YSA	347	\$2,030,917	\$5,853
GS-CAMP	847	\$335,139	\$396
GS-JH	1,190	\$251,576	\$211
GS-COMM	467	\$2,206,404	\$4,725
PARKS	1,027	\$1,644,275	\$1,601
HB	467	\$1,499,620	\$3,211
LEP	160	\$809,442	\$5,059
ITS-CCTP	422	\$1,901,470	\$4,506
IOW	144	\$203,391	\$1,412
<b>School Success Initiative Total</b>	<b>22,060</b>	<b>\$28,590,082</b>	<b>\$1,296</b>
<b>All programs</b>	<b>33,510</b>	<b>\$36,398,881</b>	<b>\$1,086</b>

### **CHAPTER 3. PERSPECTIVES OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

In this chapter we present the perspectives of the Los Angeles County Probation Department, based on their own analyses and experiences beyond the analyses done by RAND Corporation for the annual BOC report. In contrast to the official data used in the previous and following chapters, the material in this chapter is largely subjective and based on interviews and feedback from program staff, participating stakeholders, and parents.

#### **REPORTED SATISFACTION AMONG JJCPA CLIENT AND FAMILIES**

The Department obtained feedback from selected stakeholders in a few JJCPA programs. In addition, a survey was administered to parents of youths in the Housing-Based Day Supervision program in Clusters 1, 4, and 5.

#### **Stakeholder Statements for Selected Programs**

Stakeholders in all five clusters were offered the opportunity to comment on JJCPA programs in terms of implementation and effectiveness. Their feedback was generally very positive, supportive, and appreciative of the process and effects of JJCPA. Several JJCPA staff were singled out for their contributions. In this section we present a sample of the stakeholder comments, by cluster.

#### **Cluster 1**

Torch Middle School is one of those rare public schools that had been failing and is now beginning to succeed... Our partnership with the Probation Department has been a critical part of our success. You have provided and continue to provide a resident probation officer who has broken the back of gang influence on our campus.

Meta Nelson, School Administrator, Torch Middle School

First, I would like to say that DPO Mendiola has become an integral part of our efforts to improve student achievement here at South Gate M.S. Through her program, DPO Mendiola has taken many of our students and turned them away from the troublesome behaviors that would not allow them to be successful students. She does this by meeting with the students on a daily basis, thus monitoring students' at-risk behavior. She also provides the parents with outside referrals to counseling services and CBOs where they can obtain help for their particular situation. I genuinely appreciate DPO Mendiola's efforts in the area of gang intervention. Through her efforts,

many students have taken field trips to Juvenile Hall to see where their actions could send them. She also uses referrals to gang intervention programs to provide students with help they need to make wise choices when confronted with gang life options.

Michael Perez, Principal, South Gate Middle School

Attendance has improved for four consecutive years. The DPO works closely with all related personal maintaining a strong presence assuring safety.

Monica Oveido, Principal, Santa Fe High School

The collaboration efforts have helped our campus with behavioral problems. Arrests have gone down.

Dean T. Ortiz, Garfield High School

Having the DPO at the school has required mandatory reporting and accountability for each probationer. The DPO has assisted in ensuring student success on and off the campus.

Richard Wells, Assistant Principal, Garey High School

## **Cluster 2**

I am very appreciative of the support during the night football season and monitoring of difficult students. The DPO presence has improved the overall safety of the campus, and reduced the number of fights.

Issac Hammond, Principal, Crenshaw High School

The impact of the Probation Officer's presence has been significant, especially with school attendance of the minors on his caseload. Overall we have experienced minimal physical altercations because of the DPO's presence on campus.

Faye Banton, Principal, Edison Middle School

As a result of the support of the DPO provides, incidents have been reduced and safety of the environment has improved. We are thankful for the support of the Juvenile Support Team during black/brown agitations on campus.

Mary Kaufman, Principal, Los Angeles High School

The system of checking minors in and out and contacting parents when students are absent works well.

Franca Delpolio, Principal, Culver City High School

The Probation Officer makes sure probationers sign in and out as instructed and works with school administrators to improve the overall attendance of students. As a result of the DPO's presence, we have less fights and gang agitation on campus. She coordinates well with school police, law enforcement, and is always able to bring additional probation resources to campus in serious crisis situations.

Beverly Manuel, Dean of Students, Dorsey High School

### **Cluster 3**

Ms. Magana is always available, we know her schedule and she can be relied on. She is proactive and she knows what is going on here. She promotes school safety. She follows up on students with poor attendance and has a system set up for them to check in with her.

Keri Lew, Assistant Principal, Hollywood High School

The presence of the Probation Officer negates campus conflicts and there are less fights. She monitors the at-risk minors' attendance. More is the same is requested by the school official.

Viola Moten, Assistant Principal, Le Conte Middle School

The Probation Officer and Youth Service Specialist have contributed to the organized and positive school environment at Cleveland High School. The DPO has successfully turned around the lives of many students who came to the school with serious records states the Principal. The DPO has established a wonderful working relationship with the Dean's Office and security staff. This partnership has helped to keep the behavior and safety issues to a minimum. The impact of their presence here is priceless and irreplaceable.

Al Weiner, Principal, Cleveland High School

The DPO has become a very important and valued member of their campus. He is always ready to aid students, parents and staff, writes the assistant principal at of North Hollywood High School. His assistance to parents is quite evident in that they search him out for complex questions concerning their children. Through his efforts we have seen at-risk students improve their attendance and consequently their grades.

Diane L. Pokarney., Assistant Principal, North Hollywood High School

The Probation Officer (Mike Semain) has been an incredible asset. He monitors attendance, grades and behavior of students on his caseload. Our deans have felt extremely fortunate that they can glean very valuable information from Mr. Semain regarding students at risk. The counselors and administrators alike have been able to assist students in sometimes even small success thanks to their working hand in hand with Mike Semain.

Sharon Thomas, Principal, Taft High School

#### **Cluster 4**

The placement of camp returnees has become easier for my staff because the students are more closely monitored by the DPO. Camp returnees and students on probation have been less involved in campus problems.

Karen Thomas Hillburn, Director, LBUSD Student Placement Services

The presence of Probation Officer helps our students to remember that everyone has a right to come to school and feel safe from any threats from others.

Mr. Troy Bennett, Assistant Principal, Washington Middle School

Presence of PO has decreased relative crime on campus in the area of drug sales and truancies. PO facilitates after school reading program and has students sign-in daily to aid in improved attendance. In addition, weekly progress reports are required. Students whose grades are D and below are required to attend tutoring after school four days per week to improved their grades and reading ability. The DPO keeps parents informed of student progress.

Charles H. Fisher, Assistant Principal, San Pedro High School

Catherine is very effective in keeping up and following up with her students academic and school attendance. She is a key player in monitoring SARB attendance. The word gets around. Please don't cut this program, students will be lost if you do.

Gwen Baker, Assistant Principal, Paramount High School

All students are more secure because of her presence. Her probation students are now among the best-behaved students. Attendance for her students is 25% better than last year.

Thomas Drulias, Principal, Tracy High School

#### **Cluster 5**

Students are held responsible by the Probation Officer to check in daily to assure attendance is consistent. Grades are being monitored on a weekly basis; this assists the student and school with the primary goal of academic success.

Administrators, Hoover High School

Due to his (School-Based DPO) interventions, fights have not occurred, attendance has improved, and behavior has improved in specific students. Certainly, these things can equate with better academic performance, as well.

Kathy Lee, Principal, Piute Middle School

Our school has many identified gang members and associates. Having a probation officer to work hand-in-hand with our deans and assistant principals assists us in the ability to identify this type of threat in a much faster and more thorough fashion. Information is cataloged and shared with other law enforcement agencies as needed.

Dan Wyatt, Principal, Chatsworth High School

The two probation officers who have served Traweek (Middle School) have effectively recruited a substantial caseload of students who were at risk of behavioral, legal, or academic failure. They have done an excellent job of working with the families of these students in providing counsel, assistance and referrals to programs and services. The past 3 Most Improved Student awards have gone to students who are part of the program (School-Based supervision program).

Jeffery D. Wilson, Principal, Traweek Middle School

The School-Based program has given the probation officers the unique opportunity to engage at-risk and probation youths in a non-law enforcement environment, the school campus. This in turn seems to have allowed the youths to experience the probation officers as caring and concerned adults while also setting clear and reasonable boundaries and expectations for appropriate behavior.

Elizabeth Sesztak, Acting Asst. Principal, Alhambra High School

### **Survey of Parents in Selected Clusters**

Parents in Clusters 1, 4, and 5 were offered a short survey designed to elicit their responses to the JJCPA Housing-Based Supervision Program. The survey employed a five-answer Likert scale that ranged from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” A total of 48 parents responded to the survey. Table 3.1 shows the results of this survey. Of those responding, 81% approved of the responsiveness of JJCPA staff, and 88% reported that they found the program beneficial. Most parents reported that the program was helpful in keeping minors away from criminal behaviors (86%), using drugs (86%), and friends who were a bad influence (82%). They also said that the program helped youths improve at school (86%) and in family relations (81%). These positive findings are consistent with the housing based outcomes reported earlier, but many of the differences were not statistically significant due to small samples.

**Table 3.1**  
**Housing-Based Supervision Program--Results of Survey of Parents**

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>No comment</i>
<i>Cluster 1 (N=15)</i>						
Responsiveness of staff	0%	7%	0%	20%	73%	0%
Program helped minor stay away from:						
Committing crimes	0%	0%	0%	27%	67%	7%
Using drugs	0%	0%	7%	40%	47%	7%
Misbehaving friends/negative influences	0%	0%	7%	20%	73%	0%
School improvement	0%	0%	20%	33%	47%	0%
Family	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%
Overall benefit	0%	0%	7%	27%	67%	0%
No positive changes	27%	33%	0%	0%	13%	27%
<i>Cluster 4 (N=22)</i>						
Responsiveness of staff	0%	5%	18%	45%	32%	0%
Program helped minor stay away from:						
Committing crimes	0%	0%	5%	64%	27%	5%
Using drugs	0%	0%	5%	55%	41%	0%
Misbehaving friends/negative influences	0%	0%	9%	59%	27%	5%
School improvement	0%	0%	5%	68%	27%	0%
Family	0%	0%	14%	45%	36%	5%
Overall benefit	5%	0%	14%	50%	32%	0%
No positive changes	27%	59%	5%	9%	0%	0%

(cont'd on next page)

**Table 3.1 (cont'd)**  
**Housing-Based Supervision Program--Results of Survey of Parents (Cont'd)**

<i>Cluster 5 (N=11)</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>No comment</i>
Responsiveness of staff	9%	9%	9%	27%	45%	0%
Program helped minor stay away from:						
Committing crimes	18%	9%	9%	9%	55%	0%
Using drugs	18%	18%	0%	18%	45%	0%
Misbehaving friends/negative influences	9%	18%	18%	18%	36%	0%
School improvement	9%	9%	9%	27%	45%	0%
Family	9%	9%	27%	18%	36%	0%
Overall benefit	9%	0%	18%	36%	36%	0%
No positive changes	55%	27%	18%	0%	0%	0%

## **LESSONS LEARNED AND EMERGING DIRECTIONS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

Probation believes that the success of JJCPA juvenile justice programs is the result of several committed partners that represent diverse sectors of the County: schools, service providers, CBOs, the Board of Supervisors, and the Probation Department. As part of this report, Probation staff gathered information from program staff and clients over the past year to document the successful, and unsuccessful, “lessons learned” during FY 2003/2004. These lessons are outlined below; some of these lessons have already been incorporated into the programs for FY 2004/2005.

### **Lesson #1. DPOs in the School-Based Supervision Program have become an integral component of the educational process and campus life at School-Based sites.**

School-officials report that having DPOs on campus has been an important element in:

- maintaining campus safety
- deterring and suppressing gang activity
- improving school attendance
- reintegrating returning camp youths
- supporting parents
- being a resource for troubled or at-risk youths

Moreover, both school officials and students believe that the on-site presence of DPOs at schools contributes to the well-being of the students on campus.

Not only have School-Based DPOs been a safety and academic resource for at-risk and probation students, they have also been a resource for the parents of these students. School-Based DPOs give parents greater access to the school administration and keep parents better informed of their youths’ progress.

In dealing with troublesome youths, School-Based DPOs can intervene and offer an option for behavior modification that often makes suspension or expulsion unnecessary. These interventions by School-Based DPOs result in more students staying in school and fewer students experiencing unsupervised time while being suspended or expelled.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the forthcoming year, School-Based DPOs will continue to build on the lessons mentioned above. Also, they will focus on the following concerns:

- Interracial conflict on school campuses. School-Based DPOs will work closer with human relation commissions, faith- and CBOs, and law enforcement.
- Case management. The DPOs will also focus case planning efforts at developing post graduation and probation plans and strategies for probationers and at-risk youths.
- Parental involvement. School-Based DPOs will increase the involvement of parents in both the case planning.

**Lesson #2. School-Based Program is an effective strategy and service delivery model for at-risk and high-risk probation youths.**

The School-Based Program provides daily monitoring of probation and at-risk youths, which enables more of these youths to remain in, or re-enter, comprehensive middle or high schools.

Forty-five percent of the School-Based population has a court ordered condition that indicates some type of gang involvement. Additionally, a significant number of camp aftercare youths are enrolled in School-Based supervised schools. Prior to the implementation of the School-Based Supervision Program, almost all gang-involved and camp aftercare youths were administratively reassigned to alternative schools already burdened with marginal resources and delinquent or failing youths.

Since the School-Based Supervision Program has been implemented, school administrators are much more willing to enroll gang and camp affiliated youths into schools that have an assigned School-Based DPO. An increasing number of school administrators have seen that the behavior of troubled youths can be frequently mitigated to an acceptable degree by the interaction of an on-site DPO.

Consequently, substantially more gang-involved and camp returnee students are being transitioned to comprehensive schools that provide quality educational resources and maintain pro-social student bodies.

Arrest data further substantiates that the School-Based Supervision Program is an effective strategy and service delivery model for at-risk youths.

- Less than 1%, or 10 out of 1083, at-risk high school youths were arrested while in the School-Based Supervision Program.
- 1%, or 17 out of 1219, at-risk middle school youths were arrested while in the School-Based Supervision Program.

Inasmuch as the goal of servicing at-risk youths is to keep them out of the juvenile justice system, the School-Based Supervision Program demonstrated remarkable success in achieving this aim.

Evidence also indicates at-risk youths benefit academically from the School-Based Supervision Program:

- At-risk high school youths showed an improvement in attendance and a reduction in suspensions.
- The at-risk middle school youths showed an improvement in attendance and a reduction in both suspensions and expulsions.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, the School-Based Supervision Program will continue to facilitate school officials and parents in their efforts to reintegrate camp youths into comprehensive schools. The Probation Department will work with school districts in ensuring that enrollment barriers are removed that prevent camp youths from enrolling in their home school. Further, area office probation officers will be instructed to assist School-Based probation officers in enrolling returning gang and camp affiliated youths to comprehensive schools whenever possible.

Additionally, the Probation Department will work with other stakeholders to increase services for at-risk youths and their families.

At the middle schools, where youths start to become detached from school and drift toward delinquency and truancy, middle school DPOs will work with parents to provide more and better monitoring of these youths, and work with school officials to ensure that these youths have access to needed services.

### **Lesson #3: It is critical to maintain data and information sharing among JJCPA stakeholder agencies, community-based service providers, and program participants.**

Effective service delivery is dependent on the sharing of information. While there has been significant progress in information sharing among JJCPA participant agencies, there are areas that warrant attention.

JJCPA agencies have identified some crucial data and information sharing connections to focus on:

- Middle school DPOs and high school DPOs.
- CBOs and DPO case managers.
- Law enforcement, school officials, and School-Based DPOs.
- The Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Department of Health Services Alcohol and Drug Program Administration (ADAP) and the Probation Department.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, a dedicated effort will be made to ensure that strategies are put in place to minimize information barriers and foster information sharing. Some of these efforts have already begun. Some of the barriers are both legal (HIPPA) and structural (cross agency boundaries). Enhancing information sharing among JJCPA participants will result in not just better services, but better outcomes.

The increased sharing of case information will materially aid all service providers in addressing problems before they snowball into larger, more complex issues. A high level of information sharing will facilitate agency/CBO collaboration. To the credit of the participating agencies, there is widespread acknowledgement and agreement about the necessity of sharing data and information.

### **Lesson #4: In neighborhoods where gangs and violence are prevalent, there are consequences for youths residing in those neighborhoods.**

Gangs and gang violence has become a normative feature of everyday life in certain neighborhoods within the clusters. Cluster 2, for example, had a number of high profile gang killings. The gangs in this cluster and elsewhere are an intimidating force for youths and families who reside in those areas.

School-Based Supervision sites throughout the County have experienced gang fights and racial tension and campus disturbances driven by gang rivalries. The presence of gangs in and around schools is disruptive and discourages full youth participation in school and community activities, according to school officials and DPOs. Reportedly, parents have held students back from school for fear of violence. Similarly, students have voiced concerns about campus and school safety. In total, the impact of gangs in certain communities has affected school and community life.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, the following steps will be taken to address gang violence around school campuses:

- LAPD, LASD, and Long Beach Police will:
  - Provide “high visibility” patrolling in marked black and white police cars at designated school sites.
  - Be proactive and aggressive in enforcing the law around JJCPA school sites.
  - Leverage JJCPA funds with existing resources to conduct truancy and gang sweeps around JJCPA schools.
  - Provide safe passages at certain school locations.

- DPOs will work with school officials to continue to expand the school safety collaborative.
- JJCPA gang providers will work with the Department, School, LA Bridges, parents and other community stakeholders to develop strategies to make the areas around the school safer and free of gang intimidation.

**Lesson #5: Continue to promote strategies that hold youths and their parents responsible, accountable and answerable.**

The outcome results of the Multisystemic Therapy (MST) Program suggests that increased parental responsibility and enhanced parenting skills may encourage better outcomes for Probation youths. Participant parents in this program gained competency in monitoring, setting limits, enforcing consequences, and increasing involvement with the school and pro-social support networks.

Other programmatic efforts- Parents Anonymous and school/probation parent meetings have yielded similar benefits. Parents attending the Parents Anonymous program report that they have experienced a decrease in family stressors. They have also experienced an increased understanding relative parent support issues, parenting skills, discipline techniques, emotional control situations, and accessing community resources. Parents attending the School-Based meeting report that they are better informed about their child's school performance and school life.

**Emerging Direction**

Parents are the greatest source and lever of change in their children's lives. Consequently, they can effectively sustain JJCPA interventions. In the months ahead, the following JJCPA programs will incorporate a stronger focus on parental responsibility and accountability: School- and Housing-Based Supervision, Gender-Specific, Youth Substance Abuse, and High Risk/High Need.

And, similar to MST, these programs will focus on enhancing parental skills and increasing parental responsibility especially as it relates to monitoring the probationer's whereabouts, involving the probationer in pro-social activities, and increasing parental participation in school life. Case management and case plans will reflect an intensified focus on parental involvement in a minor's rehabilitation efforts.

**Lesson #6. Increased mental health services for detained youths have resulted in earlier detection of problems and more immediate access to treatment.**

Through the Mental Health Screening, Assessment and Treatment (SAT) Program and the Special Needs Court, detained youths are now being assessed and treated for mental health problems at a much earlier time. The SAT Program screened over 12,000

youths and the Special Needs Court screened and assessed over 200 youths who were referred by other bench officers. This allows for a more informed, accurate, and efficacious treatment and supervision plan in the juvenile halls and camps. In fact, through use of the SAT, it has surfaced that a significant number of detained youths show elevated scores or warning signs on the substance abuse component of the Massachusetts Adolescent Youth Screening Instruments (MAYSI). This issue is being addressed by Health Services Alcohol and Drug Program Administration, the Probation Department, and the Department of Mental Health (DMH).

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, there will be greater emphasis placed on coordination and information sharing across agencies. As information or data emerges from assessments or case management, the participating agencies will develop better methods of sharing this information or data. This effort has already started. In addition, ADPA will work with DMH and Probation in providing substance abuse evaluation and treatment interventions for detained youths identified with alcohol and other drug problems by DMH. This effort too has started.

### **Lesson #7. For youths entering juvenile hall, mental health treatment starts at the point of the screening process.**

The Department of Mental Health reports that their clinicians have observed that the mental health screening process administered in the juvenile halls has important value beyond screening for mental health issues. They have noted that the process is a therapeutic experience for the detained youths. The screening process provides short-term focus interventions for youths who surface mental health issues and the ones who do not. For many of these youths, the screening process is the first time they have talked with a mental health clinician about traumatic and negative life experiences. During the course of the screening, clinicians offer suggested strategies and plans for some of the youths. The process also offers detained youths an opportunity to discuss defining issues and events in their lives.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, DMH will look for ways to integrate the above lesson and recently gained insights in their assessment and treatment process. This lesson and observation will be useful to mental health clinicians and helpful to detained juveniles. DMH will also integrate the above lesson in their training.

**Lesson #8. Continue to promote school success as a central strategy and intervention for probation and at-risk youths.**

The outcomes of programs in the School Success Initiative reinforce one of the major assumptions in the JJCPA local action plan: the promotion of school success as an effective intervention and protective strategy for probation and at-risk youths.

School attendance improved, although not always significantly, in each of the eight programs that had attendance as an outcome measure (MST, School-Based Supervision, Extended Day Supervision, Gang Intervention, Youth Substance Abuse, Housing Day Supervision, and Intensive Transition Services).

As indicated in the School-Based stakeholders' comments and outcome data, probationers attended school more often and were better behaved. Correspondingly, program participants performed well when measured against the two key recidivism measures: (1) successful completion of probation and (2) arrest.

**Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, DPOs will work with school officials and parents to promote successful school performance for probationers and at-risk youths under their supervision. The DPO will work with parents in:

- Becoming more involved in their child's school process. For example requesting a weekly progress report and attending quarterly school conferences.
- Monitoring homework.
- Rewarding and reinforcing "Good" school performance. The DPOs will continue to work with school officials to ensure that probationers and at-risk youths have access to remedial and advanced educational services.

**Lesson #9. Continue to promote and provided early intervention and prevention services for at-risk youths.**

Keeping youths out of the juvenile justice system is one of the primary goals of prevention and early intervention programs. JJCPA Programs did very well in achieving this goal:

- In the School-Based Programs, less than 1% or 10 out of 1083 at-risk high school youths, were arrested, while more than 9% of comparison youths were arrested.
- 1%, or 17 out of 1219, at-risk youths in middle school were arrested, while more than 4% of comparison youths were arrested.

The results of these programs are a contribution to the County's larger effort at providing services and support to at-risk youths.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, JJCPA will work to increase and expand the resources and services for at-risk youths. Further JJCPA prevention and early intervention programs will focus their efforts on:

- Empowering parents to be the primary prevention agents of their children
- Empowering parents to be partners in the educational process
- Linking youths and families to appropriate resources and services

### **Lesson #10. JJCPA services should support the family as a unit, rather than focusing on the youths in isolation.**

Family life affects delinquency. Youths have a greater chance of success if risk factors in the family domain are reduced or eliminated. Most of the families receiving probation services reside in neighborhoods with high levels of crime and gang activity. Therefore, services to these families must focus on multiple domains and systems in which these families are nested and provide support for strong parental intervention strategies. Moreover, strengthening the families of high-risk offenders is critical to the treatment and supervision strategy of high-risk high-need probationers.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, JJCPA programmatic efforts and strategies will target intervention services at the family. These services will focus on: reducing isolation, promoting parent involvement in school success, and increasing the capacity of families to use the systemic strengths in their neighborhoods as levers for change and support.

### **Lesson #11. Transportation services are essential to youths and their families having access and participating in JJCPA programs and services.**

Gang boundaries, gang conflict, parent/caregiver employment demands and work schedules, and the distance of CBO agencies and Probation facilities present barriers for probationers and families in accessing and participating in after school, night and weekend services. The availability of transportation services in the clusters has minimized these obstacles to youth and parent involvement with JJCPA services. For example, the cluster transportation has enabled the Department to make inroads into the long-standing problem of gang-involved youths crossing gang boundaries to participate in court-ordered services. Similarly, cluster transportation facilitated the involvement of probation youths and their families in the services of the gender specific, housing, and park-based programs.

In addition, transportation services were provided to families of probationers housed in the Probation camps. However, these services fell far short of their intended aims. A review of the camp transportation services reveals that the service could have been used more efficiently, that more delivery points should have been established, and that camp staff should have used this service to:

- Support ongoing case management efforts
- Facilitate post camp planning
- Support family reunification efforts

Consequently because of this and other fiscal issues, camp transportation services for FY 04/05 were discontinued. It has been recommended by stakeholders that this service be reestablished.

### **Emerging Direction**

In the months ahead, the Department will look for more effective ways to provide increased access to transportation services for probationers and their families. Additionally, transportation for the camps will be re-established and managed more efficiently and will be used to:

- Enhance camp DPO case management – DPOs will leverage use the transportation service to engage parents in the in-camp case planning.
- Facilitate family unification – Being removed from home is a difficult process for both the probationer and parents. Assuring that parents have transportation to camp is a major starting point to begin the family unification process.
- Support and facilitate post-camp planning and services – Camps will coordinate transportation services with aftercare planning and services. Through the use of transportation, parents will be involved in planning and preparing for post-camp services. This should aid the aftercare transition process. The Department will establish a monitoring process to ensure that the aforementioned objectives are met.

## **CHAPTER 4. PERSPECTIVES AND CONCLUSIONS PER EVALUATOR'S OBSERVATIONS**

Researchers at RAND have served as the evaluators for JJCPA program outcomes since Year 1 of the program. While largely focusing on the analysis of outcome measures required by the Board of Corrections, RAND has also assisted the Probation Department on assessment of program implementation; development of case management activities; and modification/refinement of outcome measures for programs. The section below presents five major emerging directions from the viewpoint of the evaluators.

### **Emerging Direction #1. Data collection has improved substantially and should continue to improve.**

One of the most important aspects of the JJCPA initiative is the measurement of outcomes. Without this, counties would not be able to demonstrate the impact JJCPA funding has had. Los Angeles County has the largest number of programs and youths participating in the evaluation and the scope is enormous. Over 30,000 youths participate in the project each year, with outcomes recorded for many youths each month her or she is in the program. Over the past two years, data collection has been automated and streamlined. These efforts have resulted in more complete data being available to the evaluators in a more timely fashion in FY 03-04 than ever before. Continuing efforts by Probation staff in training, audits of data, and refinement of the automated system should help ensure that data quality continue to improve. In the coming year, more complete data on services provided by participating county and CBOs should also be available.

Gathering information on services received is important for several reasons. For one, it will provide the Probation Department better information on program implementation and whether youths are receiving the level of services as outlined in program descriptions. If not, program modifications can be made. In addition, it should be helpful in analyzing the relationship between services received and outcomes observed. We may find that combinations of programs and services provide more positive outcomes for certain types of youths.

### **Emerging Direction #2. Programs are evidence-based, but continued assessment of program fidelity is needed.**

As indicated earlier, the BOC required that the program plan submitted by Los Angeles County be based on strategies that have proven effective. However, constant monitoring and review of program fidelity is important. Program staff leave and new

staff are brought in to continue program activities; program “drift” can occur over time. As part of the effort to ensure that programs are true to theoretical models and operate according to best practices, RAND has adapted the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) developed by Gendreau and Andrews (1989) and used extensively by Ed Latessa for program assessment (e.g., Latessa, Jones, Fulton, Stichman, and Moon 1999). Programs are assessed according to best practices on program implementation and leadership, staff characteristics, client assessment, evaluation, organizational issues, program characteristics, and case management. Thus, not only the program model is evaluated based on best practices, but also program operations and staff qualifications. In this assessment, we focus on the programs as a whole –not just the individual CBOs or separate county departments. Meetings were held with program staff during FY 03-04 in which “scorecards” measuring adherence to CPAI principles were filled out; RAND staff are working with Probation staff to fill in gaps in program operations to bring them in line with best practices. It is hoped that this exercise, along with monitoring will help assure robust program models.

**Emerging Direction #3: Continued outcome evaluation has suggested ways to add/modify/drop programs.**

Not only have annual outcomes provided information to the Board of Corrections on how successful programs have been, outcomes have provided useful information to Probation for planning purposes. In fact, over the course of the past several years, programs have been eliminated or modified based on less-than-desired outcomes. The reality is that even though programs were developed based on strategies that have proven successful, it is important to test and monitor them in a local context to determine how successful they are in practice. Program impacts can be affected by the severity of the population, policy decisions, and availability of other programs and services in a jurisdiction

Adding and modifying programs to maintain a slate of prevention and intervention activities has its advantages. As suggested by the Washington State Institute on Public Policy (WSIPP), maintaining a portfolio approach may help to reduce the risk of any particular program being a poor investment. Based on a set of benefit-cost analyses of a large number of programs, WSIPP recommends a portfolio approach that achieves a “reasonable balance between near-term and long-term resources, and between research-proven strategies and those that are promising but in need of research and development” (Washington State Institute for Public Policy 2001).

**Emerging Direction #4: JJCPA programs are complex collaboratives and require constant care and feeding.**

As we have worked with programs to develop outcome measures and assist in program reviews, we have noticed that some partners tend to view programs primarily in terms of their own contributions. However, many of the programs are quite complex collaborations among county departments and CBOs. This tendency has resulted in a lack of communication of important case management activities and information from one agency to another, potentially reducing the effectiveness of the program. Probation has noted this as one of their lessons learned (see #3 above) and will be working in the future to improve communication flow. We also recommend that periodic meetings at which program partners attend together with the evaluators be continued. At these meetings, partners can be reminded of their interrelationships in producing outcomes designed to show the impacts of their programs.

**Emerging Direction #5: JJCPA programs show success, but improvements in youths' behaviors are relatively modest.**

Youths' outcomes are positive for many of the measures and programs in the JJCPA initiative. This includes measure of the "big six" as well as supplemental outcomes tailored to each program. But not all measures showed significant differences and some outcomes were counter-intuitive. In this final "emerging direction," we discuss some of the issues related to interpreting the outcomes.

First, without measures of implementation, we do not know which components or services were responsible for the observed program outcomes. We mentioned this earlier in terms of gathering additional program services information. It is crucial to an understanding of any program that such measures be collected and we cannot stress enough the importance of future efforts to gather this level of information.

The "big six" are the focus of attention, both at the state and county level. For Probation, the successful completion of probation and arrests are the two most important measures--providing indicators of the extent to which probation youths are fulfilling the terms of probation with the Department and refraining from criminal behavior. Supplemental outcomes may be perceived as secondary. However, we feel that these supplemental outcomes are very crucial for evaluating programs, as they measure the intervening and more immediate changes in youths' behaviors that we expect will ultimately impact the "big six." For example, School-Based programs focus on school performance in order to reduce truancy and poor performance, which are related to recidivism. It is vital to gather supplemental outcomes to measure intervening outcomes that should, in turn, affect delinquency. Over the past year we have been working on

refining supplemental program outcomes to capture such behaviors, and should continue to refine and modify these measures as program models are revised and improved.

In many programs, JJCPA youths showed higher rates of probation violations than comparison youths. This, on the surface, seems to indicate poorer performance for the JJCPA participants. However, this is not necessarily the case. We have observed this pattern before in programs that are more intensive than routine supervision--the more offenders are “watched” the more likely Probation is to uncover violations (see Petersilia and Turner 1993). Without a more thorough understanding of youth behavior and nature of the violations (whether the underlying cause of the violation is criminal behavior or an infraction of conditions), it is not possible to determine if such violations represent more misbehaviors by the youth, or simply the system identifying a higher percentage than for routine programming.

Many of the observed program outcomes show relatively modest changes in youths’ behavior. How do these compare with other program evaluations? Prior research generally shows fairly small effects, on the order of five percent differences. This was the average difference observed in a comprehensive meta-analysis of over 400 treatment studies conducted by Lipsey (1992). Thus, we should not expect large observed differences for programs; however, programs based on proven principles can expect to achieve more success. That is why it is important to continue to monitor and evaluate the implementation of JJCPA programs.

Finally, we would like to caution against using different programs’ outcomes as ways to evaluate whether some programs are “better” than others. Some of the programs included in the JJCPA portfolio are for at-risk youths--we would expect overall lower measures of recidivism as measured by arrest and reincarceration. Other programs target high risk youths--such as Intensive Transition Services--and we would expect among the highest recidivism rates for these. The test for each program is how the JJCPA program fares in contrast to its own comparison group.

## **EVALUATION LIMITATIONS**

### **Comparability of Comparison Groups to Program Youths**

As with any evaluation, there are inherent limitations in our assessment of the Los Angeles County JJCPA. As discussed in Chapter 1, the current evaluation uses quasi-experimental designs to test the effectiveness of JJCPA programs. Quasi-experimental designs construct comparison groups using matching or other similar techniques, then compare the performance of the treatment population to that of the comparison group.

Such comparison groups are always open to the criticism that they are somehow not comparable to the program group, so that observed differences are not due to the program, but rather to differences between the groups.

Comparison groups for Los Angeles County JJCPA were developed by Probation, in collaboration with the BOC, prior to program implementation and prior to selection of the evaluator. Similarly, the outcome measures to be utilized for comparison were either specified by the BOC or chosen in consultation between Probation and the BOC. All comparisons were developed based on groups with matching demographic characteristics. As noted in Chapter 1, no randomized designs were used and we were unable to verify the comparability of comparison groups for most of the programs, so that observed differences between treatment and comparison groups may reflect pretreatment differences between the groups, rather than treatment effects for the programs.

As noted earlier, in FY 03-04 RAND worked in consultation with Probation and program staff to modify comparison groups for four JJCPA programs--Special Needs Court, Multisystemic Therapy, School-Based High School Probationers, and School-Based Middle School Probationers--in an attempt to assure maximum comparability to their respective treatment groups. In addition, we modified supplemental outcomes in several programs to better reflect program goals. We will continue to monitor comparison groups for comparability and suggest changes as appropriate.

### **Data Quality**

Data used to compute outcome measures were extracted from databases maintained by Probation. These databases were originally designed for caseload tracking rather than report generation. Probation and RAND have worked together in an attempt to maximize the quality and quantity of data available. Data for the “big six” come from official records and are relatively easy to maintain and access. Data for supplemental outcomes are sometimes more problematic, as Probation’s data are only as good as the information obtained from CBO service providers, schools, and other county government departments (e.g., Mental Health).

Data for some programs were relatively complete--e.g., approximately 70% of youths in the School-Based programs had data related to school attendance, suspensions, and expulsions. In other programs, only a small fraction of program youths had data available for supplementary measures, calling into question the appropriateness of any findings based on such a small sub-sample. We will continue to work with Probation to increase the amount of data available for supplemental outcomes for all JJCPA programs.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Implementation of JJCPA by the Los Angeles County Probation Department consists of two major initiatives, one to address mental health issues and the other aimed at school success issues. Both probationers and at-risk youths were targeted, with each initiative including several individual programs. In FY 03-04, JJCPA provided services to 11,450 youths in programs in the mental health initiative, and to 22,060 in programs in the school success initiative. Overall, youths in both initiatives showed reductions in rates of arrest and incarceration, as well as increases in the rate at which they successfully completed probation, restitution, and community service. School attendance improved, and school suspensions and expulsions decreased after entering the program.

Stakeholder statements suggest that the JJCPA programs are seen positively and perceived to contribute to improved performance and reduced juvenile delinquency. Deputy probation officers assigned to schools were praised for their efforts at improving both conduct and school performance. Cluster Managers have offered assessments of the progress made and the challenges that remain. Probation continues to monitor and improve the implementation of JJCPA programs.

## REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Society, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition*, Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Society, 1994.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Correctional Populations in the United States, 1997*, Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000.
- California Board of Corrections, *Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, 2004 Annual Report*, Sacramento, CA: California Board of Corrections <http://www.bdcorr.ca.gov/JJCPA/FinalJJCPAreport2004.pdf> (as of December 29, 2004).
- California State Assembly, Assembly Bill 1913, 2000, [http://www.bdcorr.ca.gov/cppd/cpa\\_2000/october\\_27\\_00/legislation\\_1913.htm](http://www.bdcorr.ca.gov/cppd/cpa_2000/october_27_00/legislation_1913.htm) (as of December 29, 2004).
- Cottle, Cindy C., Ria J. Lee, and Kirk Heilbrun, "The Prediction of Criminal Recidivism in Juveniles," *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 28, No. 3, June 2001, pp. 367-394.
- Derogatis, L.R., and N. Melisaratos, "The Brief Symptom Inventory: An Introductory Report," *Psychological Medicine*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1983, pp. 595-605.
- Gendreau, Paul, and Donald Andrews, *The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (1st ed.)*, New Brunswick, NS: Saint John: University of New Brunswick, 1989.
- Latessa, Edward J., Dana Jones, Betsy Fulton, Amy Stichman, and Melissa M. Moon, *An Evaluation of Selected Juvenile Justice Programs in Ohio Using the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory*, Cincinnati, OH: Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, 1999.
- Lipsey, Mark, "The Effect of Treatment on Juvenile Delinquents: Results from Meta-Analysis," in Friedrich Losel, Doris Bender, and Thomas Bliesener (eds.), *Psychology and Law: International Perspectives*, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Petersilia, Joan, and Susan Turner, "Intensive Probation and Parole," *Crime and Justice*, Vol. 17, 1993, pp. 281-335.
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy, *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Cut Crime*, Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2001.

## Appendix

### A. DESCRIPTION OF COMPARISON GROUPS FOR JJCPA PROGRAMS

The quasi-experimental design adopted by for use in evaluating JJCPA programs provides for a comparison group for each program being evaluated. Comparison groups for all programs were initially selected by the Los Angeles County Probation Department, and approved by the California Board of Corrections (BOC), prior to program implementation and prior to the choice of RAND as JJCPA evaluator. Whenever it was possible to identify a comparison group of youths who were similar to program youths, the evaluation involved a comparison of the performance of program youths versus the performance of the comparison group. If an appropriate comparison group could not be identified, a pre-post design was employed, whereby the performance of program youths after entering the program was compared to the same youth's performance prior to program entry.<sup>11</sup>

In the first two years of JJCPA, comparison groups were selected by Probation, with the consultation and approval of the BOC. Data related to the criteria used in selecting these comparison groups were not available to RAND; thus we were not able to verify comparison group comparability. During FY 03-04, Probation and RAND collaborated to define new comparison groups for four of the JJCPA programs. For Special Needs Court and Multisystemic Therapy, we identified individuals who qualified for the program, but were not accepted due to program limitations, or else were "near misses" in terms of eligibility, as an appropriate comparison group. For the two School-Based Probationer programs, we used the statistical technique of propensity scoring to match program participants to youths on routine probation, based on six characteristics: age, gender, ethnicity, criminal history, offense severity, and cluster.

Table A.1 below describes the FY 03-04 comparison group for each JJCPA program and the reference period for comparative evaluation.

---

<sup>11</sup> Youths in the Inside-Out Writers program took part in the program while incarcerated in juvenile hall. Thus they were not at risk for re-arrest or re-incarceration until released from the hall. For this program, we compared their performance after exiting the hall to their performance before entering the hall.

**Table A.1**  
**Comparison Group and Reference Period for JJCPA Programs**

<i>Program</i>	<i>Comparison Group</i>	<i>Comparison Time</i>	<i>Follow-up Time</i>
Mental Health Screening, Assessment, and Treatment (MH)	Historical group of detained minors who entered juvenile hall in January 2000	6 months after release from juvenile hall	6 months after release from juvenile hall
Special Needs Court (SNC)	Youths eligible for SNC who could not participate because the program was at capacity, or youths who were “near misses” for eligibility	6 months after SNC rejection decision	6 months after program entry
Community Treatment Facilities (CTF)	Historical group of severely emotionally disturbed minors released from a level 14 care facility in calendar year 2000	6 months after release from level 14 facility	6 months after program exit
Multisystemic Therapy (MST)	Youths rejected by MST but identified as similar to MST participants	6 months after MST rejection	6 months after program entry
School-Based High School Probationers (SBHS-PROB)	Routine probationers matched to program youths by age, gender, ethnicity, criminal history, offense severity, and cluster	6 months after beginning probation	6 months after program entry
School-Based High School At-Risk Youths (SBHS-AT-RISK)	Historical group of Multi-Agency At-Risk Youth Committee (MAARY-C) minors older than 15 1/2 and less than 18 yrs. old at program implementation date	6 months after program implementation	6 months after program entry
School-Based Middle School Probationers (SBMS-PROB)	Routine probationers matched to program youths by age, gender, ethnicity, criminal history, offense severity, and cluster	6 months after beginning probation	6 months after program entry

(continued on next page)

**Table A.1 (cont'd)**  
**Comparison Group and Reference Period for JJCPA Programs**

<i>Program</i>	<i>Comparison Group</i>	<i>Comparison Time</i>	<i>Follow-up Time</i>
School-Based Middle School At-Risk Youths (SBMS AT-RISK)	Historical group of Multi-Agency At-Risk Youth Committee (MAARY-C) minors less than 15 1/2 yrs. old at program implementation date	6 months after program implementation	6 months after program entry
Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry
Extended Day Community Supervision (JST)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry
Gang Intervention Services (GIS)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry
Youth Substance Abuse Intervention (YSA)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry
Gender-Specific Camp Program (GS-CAMP)	Historical group of juvenile females who entered Camps Scott, Onizuka, and Kirby during calendar year 2000	6 months after camp exit	6 months after camp exit
Gender-Specific Juvenile Hall Program (GS-JH)	Historical group of juvenile females who entered juvenile hall in calendar year 2000, were detained and released	6 months after hall release	6 months after hall release
Gender-Specific Community Program (GS-COMM)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry
After School Enrichment and Supervision (PARKS)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry

(continued on next page)

**Table A.1 (cont'd)**  
**Comparison Group and Reference Period for JJCPA Programs**

<i>Program</i>	<i>Comparison Group</i>	<i>Comparison Time</i>	<i>Follow-up Time</i>
Housing-Based Day Supervision (HB)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry
Law Enforcement Program (LEP)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before program entry	6 months after program entry
Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP)	Historical group of juveniles released from camp between January 2000 and January 2001	6 months after camp exit	6 months after camp exit
Inside-Out Writers (IOW)	Program youths (pre/post design)	6 months before hall entry	6 months after hall exit

## **B. PROBATION'S RANKING OF THE "BIG SIX" OUTCOME MEASURES**

The Probation Department's rationale for the ranking of the "Big Six" BOC outcomes is as follows:

1. **Successful completion of probation.** Probation considers this the most definitive outcome measure. It captures the issues that brought the youth to the attention of Probation (risk, criminogenic needs, and presenting offense), and the concerns of the court, as articulated by the conditions of probation. Thus, one of the core purposes of the Probation Department is to facilitate the successful completion of probation for youths.
2. **Arrest.** While arrest is a valid and strong indicator of both recidivism and delinquency, not all arrests result in sustained petitions by the court. Therefore, Probation considers arrest as an important indicator with the caveat and qualifier mentioned above.
3. **Violation of probation.** Like arrests, violations are a key indicator of recidivism and delinquency. However, they represent subsequent sustained petitions only and do not necessarily prevent successful completion of probation.
4. **Incarceration.** Similar to arrest, incarceration is a valid indicator of delinquency and recidivism. However, incarceration may also be used as a sanction for case management purposes, and courts often impose incarceration as a sanction to get the attention of the youths.
5. **Successful completion of restitution.** This is an important measure, which gives value and attention to victims. Because restitution is often beyond the financial reach of the youths, the court may terminate probation even though restitution is still outstanding.
6. **Successful completion of community service.** Similar to restitution, this is a measure which gives value and attention to victims and the community. Although this is an important measure, it does not reflect recidivism.

**C. COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS) THAT PROVIDED SERVICES  
FOR JJCPA PROGRAMS IN FY 03-04**

<i>Cluster Served</i>	<i>Community-Based Organization (CBO)</i>	<i>JJCPA Program</i>
1	Art Share - Bell/South Gate	Gang Intervention Services
1	Art Share - Highland Park / East LA	Gang Intervention Services
1	Bienestar Human Services	School-Based Probation Supervision
1	Homeboy Industries	Intensive Transition Services
1	Project Leads - Pomona/San Gabriel	Gang Intervention Services
1	SPIRITT- Services for 9-12 and 13-15	Gender Specific Services
2	Asian American Drug Abuse - Crenshaw/West LA	Gang Intervention Services
2	Central Recovery & Development - Florence/Firestone	Gang Intervention Services
2	Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (YAL)	Law Enforcement Prevention
2	I-ADARP	Intensive Transition Services
2	Project Peacemakers - Services for 9-12 and 13-15	Gender Specific Services
2	Southern California Youth & Family Center	School-Based Probation Supervision
2	Starling Volleyball Clubs, USA	Gender Specific Services
2	Stop The Violence - Watts/Inglewood	Gang Intervention Services
3	Communities In Schools - Hollywood	Gang Intervention Services
3	Communities In Schools - San Fernando Valley	Gang Intervention Services
3	New Direction for Youth - Services for 9-12 and 13-15	Gender Specific Services
3	New Directions for Youth	School-Based Probation Supervision
3	Project Heavy West - Venice	Gang Intervention Services
3	Soledad Enrichment Action	Intensive Transition Services
4	Helpline Youth - Bellflower/Whittier	Gang Intervention Services
4	Helpline Youth - North Long Beach	Gang Intervention Services
4	Helpline Youth Counseling - Services for 9-12 and 13-15	Gender Specific Services
4	I-ADARP	Intensive Transition Services

(cont'd on next page)

<i>Cluster Served</i>	<i>Community-Based Organization (CBO)</i>	<i>JJCPA Program</i>
4	Long Beach Police Activity League (PAL)	Law Enforcement Prevention
4	Richstone Family - Long Beach/South Gate	Gang Intervention Services
4	Southern California Youth & Family Center	School-Based Probation Supervision
5	Asian Youth Center	School-Based Probation Supervision
5	Community Self Determination Institute - San Gabriel	Gang Intervention Services
5	Community Self Determination Institute - Santa Clarita/San Fernando	Gang Intervention Services
5	Spirit Awakening Foundation - Services for 9-12 and 13-15	Gender Specific Services
5	United Community Action Network	Intensive Transition Services
5	United Community Action Network - Antelope Valley	Gang Intervention Services
All	Alethos Foundation	Inside-Out Writing
All	Children's and Family Service	Community Treatment Facilities
All	Department of Mental Health	Mental Health Screening , Assessment, Treatment
All	Department of Mental Health	Multisystemic Therapy
All	Health Service Alcohol & Drug Program Administration	Youth Substance Abuse Intervention
All	Los Angeles City - YWAR	Gender Specific Services
All	Los Angeles City Housing Authority	Housing-Based Day Supervision
All	Los Angeles City Investment Board	Intensive Transition Services
All	Los Angeles City Police Department	Law Enforcement Prevention
All	Los Angeles City Recreation & Parks	After-School Enrichment & Supervision
All	Los Angeles Commission on Assaults Against Women (JH)	Gender Specific Services
All	Los Angeles County District Attorney	Abolish Chronic Truancy Expansion
All	Los Angeles County Housing Authority	Housing-Based Day Supervision
All	Los Angeles County Investment Board	Intensive Transition Services
All	Los Angeles County Parks & Recreation	After-School Enrichment & Supervision
All	Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (VIDA)	Law Enforcement Prevention
All	New Roads - Camp Gonzalez	Intensive Transition Services
All	Soledad Enrichment Action	Gender Specific Services
All	Superior Courts	Special Needs Court

**D. BOC-MANDATED AND SUPPLEMENTAL OUTCOMES FOR INDIVIDUAL JJCPA PROGRAMS, FY 03-04**

**I. MENTAL HEALTH INITIATIVE PROGRAMS**

**Mental Health Screening, Assessment, and Treatment (MH)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	817	6.76%*	12080	2713	8.85%	30656
Incarcerations	772	6.39%*	12080	2210	7.21%	30656
Completion of probation	1040	9.33%	11143	2445	9.01%	27138
Completion of restitution	1331	17.66%*	7538	3987	14.69%	27138
Completion of community service	395	7.46%*	5295	327	4.58%	7133
Probation violations	1920	17.23%	11143	923	3.40%*	27138
			<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>
<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
BSI score		53.70	311		50.14*	311

Note: Comparison group consists of all detained minors who entered juvenile hall in January 2000. This group was matched demographically to the program group based on age, gender, and ethnicity. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following release from juvenile hall. Supplemental outcome is measured at program entry and three weeks following program entry. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths.

\* Difference is statistically significant (p < .05).

**Special Needs Court (SNC)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	6	11.11%	54	6	13.64%	44
Incarcerations	6	11.11%	54	6	13.64%	44
Completion of probation	4	7.41%	54	4	9.09%	44
Completion of restitution	7	25.00%	28	4	13.33%	30
Completion of community service	3	12.00%	25	0	0.00%	15
Probation violations	14	25.93%	54	8	18.18%	44

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Mean GAF score	43.59	22	47.68*	22

Note: Comparison group consists of rejects from SNC identified in collaboration with SNC staff, Probation Department staff, and RAND staff. SNC screened to identify “near misses” for SNC eligibility. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following program entry (treatment group) and six months after rejection by SNC (comparison group). Supplemental outcome is measured at program entry and six months following program entry.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Community Treatment Facilities (CTF)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	1	4.00%	25	2	3.92%	51
Incarcerations	1	4.00%	25	2	3.92%	51
Completion of probation	2	33.33%	6	5	15.15%	33
Completion of restitution	2	66.67%	3	0	0.00%	9
Completion of community service	2	66.67%	3	0	0.00%	6
Probation violations	1	16.16%	6	0	0.00%	33

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Number of hospitalizations	0.56*	52	0.12	52
Days hospitalized	9.94*	52	0.65	52
Length of hospitalization	14.28*	17	5.67	6

Note: Comparison group consists of all Severely Emotionally Disturbed (SED) minors released from a level 14 care facility in calendar year 2000. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following program exit and six months following release from level 14 facility. Supplemental outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths; this program services both at-risk and probation juveniles.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Multisystemic Therapy (MST)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	10	14.93%	67	10	19.61%	51
Incarcerations	7	10.45%	67	10	19.61%	51
Completion of probation	6	9.52%	63	5	10.64%	47
Completion of restitution	8	15.38%	52	11	29.73%	37
Completion of community service	5	11.11%	45	1	3.57%	28
Probation violations	8	12.70%	63	5	10.64%	47

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance	49.63%	33	67.74%	33
School suspensions	37.14%*	35	14.29%*	35
School expulsions	5.88%	34	0.00%	34

Note: Comparison group consists of rejections from MST agreed upon by MST staff, Probation Department staff, and RAND staff. The MST team identified rejected cases. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following program entry (treatment group) and six months after MST rejection (comparison group). Supplemental outcomes are measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

## II. SCHOOL SUCCESS INITIATIVE PROGRAMS

### School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--Probationers--FY 03-04

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	302	8.48%	3563	241	7.15%*	3374
Incarcerations	281	7.89%	3563	223	6.60%*	3374
Completion of probation	452	13.54%*	3339	61	1.81%	3374
Completion of restitution	771	33.26%	2318	734	33.45%	2195
Completion of community service	297	14.62%*	2032	28	1.45%	1924
Probation violations	412	12.34%	3339	350	10.36%*	3374
<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance		57.93%	2745		65.03%*	2745
School suspensions		23.60%	3042		11.80%*	3042
School expulsions		2.60%	3037		1.25%*	3037
Strength score		8.32	517		10.22*	517
Risk score		5.05	516		0.70*	516

Note: Comparison group consists of regular supervision probationers matched to JJCPA youths based on age, ethnicity, gender, cluster, arrest history, and instant offense. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following program entry (treatment group) and six months after beginning of probation (comparison group). School-Based supplemental outcomes are measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. Strength and risk outcomes are measured at program entry and six months following program entry or at program exit, whichever comes first.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

**School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	10	0.92%*	1083	11	9.24%	119
Incarcerations	10	0.92%*	1083	10	8.40%	119
Completion of probation		N/A			N/A	
Completion of restitution		N/A			N/A	
Completion of community service		N/A			N/A	
Probation violations		N/A			N/A	

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance	64.63%	822	66.01%	822
School suspensions	27.06%	909	16.39% *	909
School expulsions	1.10%	906	1.10%	906

Note: Comparison group consists of Multi-Agency At-Risk Youth Committee (MAARY-C) minors older than 15 1/2 and less than 18 years old at program implementation date. This group was matched demographically to the program group based on age, gender, and ethnicity. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following program entry and six months following MAARY-C program entry. School-Based supplemental outcomes are measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. Additional supplemental outcomes (strength and barrier scores) are not included in this table because insufficient data were available to measure these outcomes. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths.

\* Difference is statistically significant (p < .05).

**School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--Probationers--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	37	9.02%	410	135	9.17%	1477
Incarcerations	33	8.05%	410	124	8.37%	1477
Completion of probation	42	10.66%*	394	20	1.34%	1477
Completion of restitution	84	30.66%	274	293	29.71%	987
Completion of community service	28	11.02%*	254	10	1.09%	915
Probation violations	34	8.63%	394	153	10.36%	1477

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance	58.81%	317	71.71%*	317
School suspensions	47.37%	342	20.47%*	342
School expulsions	10.00%	340	3.53%*	340
Strength score	6.98	59	9.44*	59
Risk score	6.92	59	1.17*	59

Note: Comparison group consists of regular supervision probationers matched to JJCPA youths based on age, ethnicity, gender, cluster, arrest history, and instant offense. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following program entry (treatment group) and six months after beginning of probation (comparison group). School-Based supplemental outcomes are measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. Strength and risk outcomes are measured at program entry and six months following program entry or at program exit, whichever comes first.

\* Difference is statistically significant (p < .05).

**School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	17	1.39%	1219	3	4.48%	67
Incarcerations	16	1.31%	1219	3	4.48%	67
Completion of probation		N/A			N/A	
Completion of restitution		N/A			N/A	
Completion of community service		N/A			N/A	
Probation violations		N/A			N/A	

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance	66.89%	1011	75.78%*	1011
School suspensions	35.82%	1044	21.65%*	1044
School expulsions	1.73%	1040	0.58%*	1040
Strength score	9.57	46	10.33	46
Barriers score	8.39	46	0.22*	46

Note: Comparison group consists of Multi-Agency At-Risk Youth Committee (MAARY-C) minors 15 1/2 or younger at program implementation date. This group was matched demographically to the program group based on age, gender, and ethnicity. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following program entry and six months following MAARY-C program entry. School-Based supplemental outcomes are measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. Strength and barriers outcomes are measured at program entry and six months following program entry or at program exit, whichever comes first. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is unreliable if *Number* is less than 5.

**Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	0	0.00%	2377	0	0.00%	2377
Incarcerations	0	0.00%	2377	0	0.00%	2377
Completion of probation		N/A			N/A	
Completion of restitution		N/A			N/A	
Completion of community service		N/A			N/A	
Probation violations		N/A			N/A	

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School absences	19.38	570	9.15*	570

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. Supplemental outcome is measured at 180 days prior to program entry and 180 days following program entry. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

**Extended Day Community Supervision (JST)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	37	18.88%	196	22	11.22%*	196
Incarcerations	27	13.78%	196	19	9.69%	196
Completion of probation	1	0.54%	185	31	16.40%	189
Completion of restitution	9	6.47%	139	33	23.40%*	141
Completion of community service	1	0.88%	114	19	16.81%	113
Probation violations	9	4.86%*	185	20	10.58%	189

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance	51.45%	139	62.85%	139
School suspensions	37.74%	159	19.50%*	159
School expulsions	5.16%	155	7.10%	155
Strength score	7.70	10	9.00	10
Risk score	6.30	10	0.50*	10

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. School-Based supplemental outcomes are measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. Strength and risk outcomes are measured at program entry and six months following program entry or at program exit, whichever comes first. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths; this program services both at-risk and probation juveniles.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Gang Intervention Services (GIS)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	184	18.51%	994	105	10.56%*	994
Incarcerations	155	15.59%	994	98	9.86%*	994
Completion of probation	6	0.67%	890	131	14.64%*	895
Completion of restitution	82	12.93%	634	137	21.75%*	630
Completion of community service	4	0.76%	527	71	13.60%	522
Probation violations	74	8.31%*	890	115	12.85%	895

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance	41.45%	46	56.84%	46
School suspensions	25.33%	75	6.67%*	75
School expulsions	5.33%	75	1.33%	75

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. School-Based supplemental outcomes are measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. Additional supplemental outcomes (strength scores, pro-gang attitudes, and pro-gang behaviors) are not included in this table because insufficient data were available to measure these outcomes. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths; this program services both at-risk and probation juveniles.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Youth Substance Abuse Intervention (YSA)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	36	14.88%	242	20	8.26%*	242
Incarcerations	30	12.40%	242	18	7.44%	242
Completion of probation	2	1.01%	198	25	12.44%	201
Completion of restitution	25	17.24%	145	44	30.14%*	146
Completion of community service	0	0.00%	120	12	10.00%	120
Probation violations	11	5.56%*	198	35	17.41%	201

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Percent positive tests	9	29.03%	31	21	36.84%	57
Percent who test positive	8	44.44%	18	10	35.71%	28

  

<i>Drug and alcohol scale score</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Drug and alcohol scale score	17.9	13	12.6	13

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. Test results are provided by a contracted vendor and, along with other supplemental outcomes, are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry, or at program exit, whichever comes first. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths; this program services both at-risk and probation juveniles.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Gender-Specific Services--Camps Program (GS-CAMP)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	29	6.24%*	465	45	12.97%	347
Incarcerations	27	5.81%*	465	45	12.97%	347
Completion of probation	33	7.82%*	422	63	18.42%	342
Completion of restitution	35	12.96%	270	25	18.80%	133
Completion of community service	13	7.30%	178	4	6.78%	59
Probation violations	82	19.43%*	422	18	5.26%	342
<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Self-efficacy for girls		30.7	74		32.0	74

Note: Comparison group consists of a representative sample of all juvenile females who entered Camps Scott, Onizuka, and Kirby during 2000. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following camp exit. The supplemental outcome is measured at program entry and six months following program entry or at program exit, whichever comes first.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Gender-Specific Services--Juvenile Hall Program (GS-JH)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	75	10.07%	745	295	6.63%*	4452
Incarcerations	75	10.07%	745	233	5.23%*	4452
Completion of probation	40	5.68%	704	343	9.05%*	3789
Completion of restitution	58	14.57%	398	276	17.00%	1624
Completion of community service	13	4.19%	310	13	1.63%*	797
Probation violations	218	30.97%	704	87	2.30%*	3789
	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Mean</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>		<i>Sample size</i>
Self-efficacy for girls	30.0		139	31.3*		139

Note: Comparison group consists of a representative sample of all juvenile females who entered juvenile hall during 2000, were detained, and released back to community. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months following release from juvenile hall. The supplemental outcome is measured at program entry and six months following program entry or at program exit, whichever comes first.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

**Gender-Specific Services--Community-Based (GS-COMM)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	1	0.34%	294	1	0.34%	294
Incarcerations	1	0.34%	294	1	0.34%	294
Completion of probation		N/A			N/A	
Completion of restitution		N/A			N/A	
Completion of community service		N/A			N/A	
Probation violations		N/A			N/A	

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Self-efficacy for girls	28.6	5	29.8	5

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. The supplemental outcome is measured at program entry and six months following program entry or at program exit, whichever comes first. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths.

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**After School Enrichment and Supervision (PARKS)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	5	1.05%	478	4	0.84%	478
Incarcerations	4	0.84%	478	3	0.63%	478
Completion of probation	0	0.00%	12	1	7.69%	13
Completion of restitution	1	12.50%	8	0	0.00%	9
Completion of community service	0	0.00%	6	1	14.29%	7
Probation violations	1	8.33%	12	1	7.69%	13

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School days attended		35.95%	67		73.74%*	67
After school arrests (3-6 pm)	2	0.42%	478	1	0.21%	478

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. School attendance is measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. After school arrests are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths; this program services both at-risk and probation juveniles.

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Housing-Based Day Supervision (HB)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	5	2.23%	224	4	1.79%	224
Incarcerations	3	1.34%	224	3	1.34%	224
Completion of probation	1	3.33%	30	2	6.90%	29
Completion of restitution	2	8.33%	24	8	34.78%	23
Completion of community service	1	4.76%	21	2	10.00%	20
Probation violations	1	3.33%	30	5	17.24%	29

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School days attended	51.80%	189	62.85%*	189

  

	<i>FY 01-02</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>FY 03-04</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Housing project crime rate	957	9149	885	7470

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. School attendance is measured at last complete academic period prior to program entry and first complete academic period following program entry. Housing project crime rate (per 10,000 population) is measured for the first year of the program and for the current year. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths; this program services both at-risk and probation juveniles.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Law Enforcement Prevention (LEP)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	2	1.08%	185	3	1.62%	185
Incarcerations	1	0.54%	185	3	1.62%	185
Completion of probation		N/A			N/A	
Completion of restitution		N/A			N/A	
Completion of community service		N/A			N/A	
Probation violations		N/A			N/A	

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to program entry and six months following program entry. An additional supplemental outcome (pro-gang attitudes) is not included in this table because insufficient data were available to measure this outcome. Probation outcomes do not include at-risk youths.

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	89	17.28%*	515	700	21.08%	3321
Incarcerations	87	16.89%	515	657	19.78%	3321
Completion of probation	79	15.58%	507	582	18.09%	3218
Completion of restitution	59	17.93%	329	361	19.63%	1839
Completion of community service	36	15.19%	237	93	10.74%	866
Probation violations	109	21.50%	507	194	6.03%*	3218

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
School attendance	14.34%	251	69.57%*	251
School suspensions	3.42%	322	4.66%	322
School expulsions	1.24%	322	1.86%	322

  

	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Returned to camp	83	16.21%	512	286	8.81%*	3246
Sent to CYA	2	0.39%	512	111	3.42%	3246
Deemed unfit for juvenile court	0	0.00%	512	0	0.00%	3246
Waived to adult court	0	0.00%	512	9	0.40%	2346

Note: Comparison group consists of a contemporaneous group of youths who are released out of similar camps but do not have intensive transition services during the community phase. This group was matched demographically to the program group based on age, gender, and ethnicity. Mandated outcomes are measured at six months after camp exit. School-Based supplemental outcomes are measured in the first month of the community phase and at six months following entry into community or at exit from the community phase, whichever comes first. Other supplemental outcomes are measured at six months following entry into the community.

\* Difference is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**Inside-Out Writing (IOW)--FY 03-04**

<i>BOC Mandated Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests	113	20.40%	554	40	7.22%*	554
Incarcerations	108	19.49%	554	38	6.86%*	554
Completion of probation	0	0.00%	434	42	9.38%	448
Completion of restitution	22	6.90%	319	38	12.62%*	301
Completion of community service	0	0.00%	236	17	8.13%	209
Probation violations	21	4.84%	434	71	15.85%*	448

  

<i>BOC Supplemental Outcomes</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
JH behavioral violations--SIRs	0.29	560	0.27	560

Note: Mandated outcomes are measured at six months prior to juvenile hall entry and six months after juvenile hall exit. The supplemental outcome is measured in the first month of the program and at six months after program entry or in the last month of the program, whichever comes first.

\* Difference is statistically significant (p < .05).

Statistical significance testing is invalid if *Number* is less than 5.

**E. ADDITIONAL STATISTICS FOR SELECTED PROGRAMS**

**SCHOOL-BASED YOUTH ATTENDANCE, COMPLETION OF PROBATION, AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, BY GENDER**

**School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--Probationers--FY 03-04  
Arrests, Violations, and Attendance, by Gender**

	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Arrests						
Male	269	9.58%	2809	203	7.60%	2676
Female	33	4.38%	754	38	5.50%	699
Total	302	8.48%	3563	241	7.15%	3374
Complete Probation						
Male	321	12.15%	2643	44	1.63%	2676
Female	131	18.82%	696	17	2.49%	699
Total	452	13.54%	3339	61	1.81%	3374
	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
Attendance		<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Male		58.26%	2141		64.80%	2141
Female		56.73%	604		65.84%	604
Total		57.93%	2745		65.03%	2745

Note: Sample sizes for comparison group are statistically computed effective sample sizes, based on propensity score matching. The sum of the sample sizes by gender may not exactly match the total effective sample size for the group as a whole.

**School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04  
Arrests and Attendance, by Gender**

	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
<b>Arrests</b>						
Male	8	1.22%	657	10	24.39%	41
Female	2	0.50%	402	1	11.11%	9
Unknown	0	0.0%	24	0	0.00%	69
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0.92%</b>	<b>1083</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9.24%</b>	<b>119</b>
	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
<b>Attendance</b>		<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Male		65.99%	507		65.41%	507
Female		62.00%	305		67.36%	305
Unknown		76.00%	10		55.25%	10
<b>Total</b>		<b>64.63%</b>	<b>822</b>		<b>66.01%</b>	<b>822</b>

**School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--Probationers--FY 03-04  
Arrests, Violations, and Attendance, by Gender**

	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
<b>Arrests</b>						
Male	33	9.68%	341	113	9.75%	1157
Female	4	5.80%	69	23	6.23%	366
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>9.02%</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>9.17%</b>	<b>1477</b>
<b>Complete probation</b>						
Male	29	8.79%	330	14	1.24%	1157
Female	13	20.31%	64	7	1.87%	366
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>10.66%</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1.34%</b>	<b>1477</b>
	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
<b>Attendance</b>		<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Male		58.21%	266		71.79%	266
Female		61.95%	51		71.29%	51
<b>Total</b>		<b>58.81%</b>	<b>317</b>		<b>71.71%</b>	<b>317</b>

Note: Sample sizes for comparison group are statistically computed effective sample sizes, based on propensity score matching. The sum of the sample sizes by gender may not exactly match the total effective sample size for the group as a whole.

**School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04  
Arrests and Attendance, by Gender**

<i>Arrests</i>	<i>Program</i>			<i>Comparison</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Male	15	2.84%	529	2	10.53%	19
Female	2	0.31%	645	1	50.00%	2
Unknown	0	0.00%	45	0	0.00%	46
Total	17	1.39%	1219	3	4.48%	67

  

<i>Attendance</i>	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>Follow-up</i>	
	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Male	67.79%	422	75.29%	422
Female	66.06%	563	76.34%	563
Unknown	70.36%	26	71.47%	26
Total	66.89%	1011	75.78%	1011

**F. SELECTED OUTCOMES, BY TYPE OF JJCPA PROGRAM**

**AT-RISK PROGRAMS: ARRESTS WITHIN SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING PROGRAM ENTRY**

**School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS) At-Risk; School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS) At-Risk; Abolish Chronic Truancy (ACT); After School Enrichment (PARKS)--FY 03-04**

<i>Program</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
SBHS At-risk	10	0.92%	1083
SBMS At-risk	17	1.39%	1219
ACT	0	0.00%	2377
PARKS	5	1.05%	478
Total	32	0.62%	5157

**HIGH RISK PROGRAMS: ARRESTS AND INCARCERATIONS WITHIN SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING PROGRAM ENTRY**

**Gang Intervention Services (GIS) and Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP)--FY 03-04**

<i>Program</i>	<i>Arrests</i>			<i>Incarcerations</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
GIS	105	10.56%	994	98	9.86%	994
ITS-CCTP	89	17.28%	515	87	16.89%	515
Total	194	12.85%	1509	185	12.26%	1509

**FAMILY-BASED PROGRAM: SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, SUSPENSIONS AND EXPULSIONS**

**Multisystemic Therapy (MST)--FY 03-04**

	<i>Baseline</i>			<i>Follow-up</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Attendance		49.63%	33		67.74%	33
Suspensions	13	37.14%	35	5	14.29%	35
Expulsions	2	5.88%	34	0	0.00%	34

**G. BOC-MANDATED AND SUPPLEMENTAL OUTCOMES, BY CLUSTER, FOR SELECTED PROGRAMS**

**School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--Probationers--FY 03-04, by Cluster**

<i>Cluster</i> <i>Outcome</i>	<i>Unknown</i>		<i>1</i>		<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>		<i>4</i>		<i>5</i>	
	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Arrest	17.19%	64	7.34%	804	9.37%	822	7.88%	495	9.37%	694	7.46%	684
Incarceration	17.19%	64	7.09%	804	9.25%	822	6.06%	495	8.93%	694	6.58%	684
Complete probation	18.97%	58	10.70%	757	9.59%	772	14.25%	463	13.30%	669	21.13%	620
Restitution	33.33%	42	28.92%	529	27.66%	499	42.11%	342	35.18%	469	35.93%	437
Community service	19.44%	36	11.84%	456	9.22%	423	16.23%	302	13.72%	430	23.12%	385
Violation	17.24%	58	11.10%	757	17.10%	772	12.53%	463	10.76%	669	9.03%	620
Baseline attendance	55.76%	58	50.21%	584	51.24%	556	50.80%	406	61.81%	580	73.96%	561
Follow-up attendance	71.33%	58	71.41%	584	56.47%	556	64.05%	406	66.09%	580	70.38%	561
Baseline suspensions	22.73%	66	18.47%	648	22.03%	640	17.36%	455	25.12%	613	33.55%	620
Follow-up suspensions	7.58%	66	9.10%	648	11.88%	640	9.67%	455	11.26%	613	17.10%	620
Baseline expulsions	1.52%	66	2.01%	647	3.44%	640	3.97%	453	2.30%	610	1.77%	621
Follow-up expulsions	3.03%	66	1.39%	647	0.78%	640	0.11%	453	1.15%	610	1.61%	621
Baseline strength	9.00	3	9.18	40	5.37	133	9.48	187	9.18	150	10.25	4
Follow-up strength	9.00	3	9.38	40	7.82	133	11.48	187	11.04	150	10.25	4
Baseline risk	8.33	3	5.35	40	5.14	133	4.92	186	4.99	150	5.00	4
Follow-up risk	0.00	3	0.00	40	1.05	133	0.74	186	0.55	150	0.00	4

Note: For all tables in this appendix, “N” refers to the sample size in each cluster, “%” to the percentage of youths in that cluster who were arrested, incarcerated, etc. For BOC-mandated “big six” outcomes, only program youths are included in these tables; comparison group data were not available by cluster. For supplemental outcomes, both baseline and follow-up data are included for program youths.

**School-Based Supervision, High School (SBHS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04, by Cluster**

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Unknown</i>		<i>1</i>		<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>		<i>4</i>		<i>5</i>	
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Arrest	2.33%	43	0.93%	216	1.26%	238	0.63%	160	0.00%	44	0.79%	382
Incarceration	2.33%	43	0.93%	216	1.26%	238	0.63%	160	0.00%	44	0.79%	382
Baseline attendance	70.36%	34	60.45%	143	59.73%	152	44.79%	122	71.17%	38	74.72%	333
Follow-up attendance	70.82%	34	71.41%	143	51.17%	152	58.10%	122	62.03%	38	73.32%	333
Baseline suspensions	17.14%	35	30.61%	147	21.43%	182	18.88%	143	35.00%	40	31.77%	362
Follow-up suspensions	8.57%	35	15.65%	147	7.14%	182	16.08%	143	12.50%	40	22.65%	362
Baseline expulsions	0.00%	35	1.39%	144	2.20%	182	1.40%	143	2.50%	40	0.28%	362
Follow-up expulsions	2.86%	35	0.69%	144	1.10%	182	0.70%	143	2.50%	40	1.10%	362
Baseline strength		0		0		0	3.00	1	6.00	1		0
Follow-up strength		0		0		0	3.00	1	6.00	1		0
Baseline barriers		0		0		0	11.00	1	12.00	1		0
Follow-up barriers		0		0		0	0.00	1	0.00	1		0

Note: For all tables in this appendix, “N” refers to the sample size in each cluster, “%” to the percentage of youths in that cluster who were arrested, incarcerated, etc. For BOC-mandated “big six” outcomes, only program youths are included in these tables; comparison group data were not available by cluster. For supplemental outcomes, both baseline and follow-up data are included for program youths.

**School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--Probationers--FY 03-04, by Cluster**

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Unknown</i>		<i>1</i>		<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>		<i>4</i>		<i>5</i>	
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Arrest	14.29%	7	7.69%	52	7.14%	70	8.00%	125	13.08%	107	6.12%	49
Incarceration	13.33%	15	7.69%	52	7.25%	69	4.13%	121	13.46%	104	6.12%	49
Complete probation	21.43%	14	15.69%	51	15.15%	66	11.86%	118	2.97%	101	9.09%	44
Restitution	20.00%	5	28.57%	35	25.00%	40	33.68%	95	35.21%	71	21.43%	28
Community service	27.27%	11	15.63%	32	19.35%	31	12.94%	85	2.94%	68	3.70%	27
Violation	7.14%	14	13.73%	51	12.12%	66	5.93%	118	9.90%	101	2.27%	44
Baseline attendance	43.36%	13	68.27%	38	58.84%	47	47.63%	100	68.69%	83	62.61%	36
Follow-up attendance	65.79%	13	80.67%	39	64.11%	47	72.80%	100	73.27%	83	67.70%	36
Baseline suspensions	40.00%	15	61.54%	39	49.02%	51	31.43%	105	57.61%	92	52.50%	40
Follow-up suspensions	20.00%	15	33.33%	39	7.84%	51	11.43%	105	30.43%	92	25.00%	40
Baseline expulsions	13.33%	15	10.26%	39	3.92%	51	10.58%	104	14.29%	91	5.00%	40
Follow-up expulsions	20.00%	15	0.00%	39	0.00%	51	2.88%	104	5.49%	91	2.50%	40
Baseline strength		0	9.33	3	4.59	17	7.29	28	9.27	11		0
Follow-up strength		0	9.33	3	7.12	17	11.11	28	10.64	11		0
Baseline risk		0	6.00	3	7.12	17	6.93	28	6.82	11		0
Follow-up risk		0	0.00	3	1.06	17	1.75	28	0.18	11		0

Note: For all tables in this appendix, “N” refers to the sample size in each cluster, “%” to the percentage of youths in that cluster who were arrested, incarcerated, etc. For BOC-mandated “big six” outcomes, only program youths are included in these tables; comparison group data were not available by cluster. For supplemental outcomes, both baseline and follow-up data are included for program youths.

**School-Based Supervision, Middle School (SBMS)--At-Risk--FY 03-04, by Cluster**

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Unknown</i>		<i>1</i>		<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>		<i>4</i>		<i>5</i>	
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Arrest	1.11%	90	0.00%	231	3.01%	133	1.64%	183	3.25%	246	0.30%	336
Incarceration	1.11%	90	0.00%	231	3.01%	133	1.09%	183	3.25%	246	0.30%	336
Baseline attendance	60.87%	69	68.43%	196	59.14%	81	69.43%	171	67.68%	207	67.40%	287
Follow-up attendance	73.50%	69	74.99%	196	69.64%	81	75.15%	171	78.57%	207	76.95%	287
Baseline suspensions	27.94%	68	46.08%	204	42.68%	82	22.73%	176	50.68%	219	25.42%	295
Follow-up suspensions	11.76%	68	32.35%	204	8.54%	82	23.86%	176	15.98%	219	23.05%	295
Baseline expulsions	0.00%	68	0.98%	204	0.00%	81	2.86%	175	4.13%	218	0.68%	294
Follow-up expulsions	0.00%	68	0.98%	204	0.00%	81	0.14%	175	0.92%	218	0.00%	294
Baseline strength		0	9.33	3	8.53	19	9.33	3	10.42	24		0
Follow-up strength		0	9.33	3	9.42	19	9.33	3	11.17	24		0
Baseline barriers		0	6.00	3	7.89	19	8.00	3	8.83	24		0
Follow-up barriers		0	0.00	3	0.37	19	0.00	3	0.13	24		0

Note: For all tables in this appendix, “N” refers to the sample size in each cluster, “%” to the percentage of youths in that cluster who were arrested, incarcerated, etc. For BOC-mandated “big six” outcomes, only program youths are included in these tables; comparison group data were not available by cluster. For supplemental outcomes, both baseline and follow-up data are included for program youths.

**Gang Intervention Services (GIS)--FY 03-04, by Cluster**

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Unknown</i>		<i>1</i>		<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>		<i>4</i>		<i>5</i>	
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Arrest	0.00%	17	7.48%	107	16.08%	255	10.71%	112	10.94%	257	6.50%	246
Incarceration	0.00%	17	7.48%	107	15.81%	255	8.04%	112	10.12%	257	6.10%	246
Complete probation	45.45%	11	14.58%	96	12.10%	248	11.00%	100	14.23%	239	18.41%	201
Restitution	16.67%	6	27.27%	66	24.12%	170	23.17%	82	20.22%	178	17.19%	128
Community service	66.67%	3	13.33%	60	9.33%	150	11.32%	53	11.11%	145	18.02%	111
Violation	0.00%	11	8.33%	96	20.16%	248	12.00%	100	12.13%	239	7.96%	201
Baseline attendance	37.12%	11		0	34.37%	22	60.74%	6	19.44%	4	100.00%	3
Follow-up attendance	52.08%	11		0	56.24%	22	58.93%	6	86.22%	4	35.40%	3
Baseline suspensions	13.64%	22	0.00%	2	37.93%	29	22.22%	9	50.00%	6	0.00%	7
Follow-up suspensions	0.00%	22	0.00%	2	17.24%	29	0.00%	9	0.00%	6	0.00%	7
Baseline expulsions	0.00%	22	0.00%	2	13.79%	29	0.00%	9	0.00%	6	0.00%	7
Follow-up expulsions	0.00%	22	0.00%	2	3.45%	29	0.00%	9	0.00%	6	0.00%	7

Note: For all tables in this appendix, “N” refers to the sample size in each cluster, “%” to the percentage of youths in that cluster who were arrested, incarcerated, etc. For BOC-mandated “big six” outcomes, only program youths are included in these tables; comparison group data were not available by cluster. For supplemental outcomes, both baseline and follow-up data are included for program youths.

**Intensive Transition Services (ITS-CCTP)--FY 03-04, by Cluster**

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Unknown</i>		<i>1</i>		<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>		<i>4</i>		<i>5</i>	
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Arrest	13.95%	43	15.65%	115	17.14%	140	18.03%	61	21.25%	80	17.11%	76
Incarceration	13.95%	43	14.78%	115	17.14%	140	16.39%	61	21.25%	80	17.11%	76
Complete probation	27.91%	43	16.67%	114	10.00%	140	15.00%	60	17.95%	78	15.28%	72
Restitution	16.13%	31	18.75%	80	15.07%	73	19.05%	42	21.43%	56	17.02%	47
Community service	25.00%	24	15.25%	59	9.26%	54	19.05%	42	20.00%	30	7.14%	28
Violation	13.95%	43	14.91%	114	25.71%	140	21.67%	60	23.08%	78	26.39%	72
Baseline attendance	18.06%	20	13.24%	50	13.98%	79	13.19%	31	17.52%	39	11.84%	32
Follow-up attendance	63.35%	20	68.02%	50	57.96%	79	74.86%	31	64.67%	39	67.45%	32
Baseline suspensions	3.45%	29	5.71%	70	3.06%	98	4.88%	41	2.27%	44	0.00%	40
Follow-up suspensions	0.00%	29	2.86%	70	3.06%	98	9.76%	41	2.27%	44	12.50%	40
Baseline expulsions	0.00%	29	2.86%	70	1.02%	98	2.44%	41	0.00%	44	0.00%	40
Follow-up expulsions	0.00%	29	2.86%	70	2.04%	98	2.44%	41	2.27%	44	0.00%	40
Return to camp	16.28%	43	20.00%	115	22.86%	140	4.92%	61	12.50%	80	10.96%	73
Return to CYA	2.33%	43	0.00%	115	0.71%	140	0.00%	61	0.00%	80	0.00%	73
Fit for adult trial	0.00%	43	0.00%	115	0.00%	140	0.00%	60	0.00%	80	0.00%	73
Unfit	0.00%	43	0.00%	115	0.00%	140	0.00%	61	0.00%	80	0.00%	73

Note: For all tables in this appendix, “N” refers to the sample size in each cluster, “%” to the percentage of youths in that cluster who were arrested, incarcerated, etc. For BOC-mandated “big six” outcomes, only program youths are included in these tables; comparison group data were not available by cluster. For supplemental outcomes, both baseline and follow-up data are included for program youths.