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Purpose of Study

Overall, the purpose of this study is to address the legislative mandates pursuant to:

- **Public Act 14-217**, which called for an *assessment of the system of community-based services for children and youths who are under supervision*

- **Public Act 07-04**, which called for raising the maximum age of the juvenile court jurisdiction from 15 to 17 years old.

Youth included in study (n=3,986) were:

- Adjudicated delinquent (*excludes FWSN*)
- Supervised under juvenile probation (*for the first time*)
- Received community-based programs and services
- Never received out-of-home placement
Research Questions Addressed

1. What are commonly used community-based programs for youth under supervision?
2. What needs are the programs being implemented designed to meet?
3. How has attendance of those programs varied before, during, and after RtA?
4. What is the overlap between program eligibility and program selection?
5. How have program outcomes varied before, during, and after RtA?
Focus of Discussion

• Relevant Findings from Stage Agency Data (2005-2015)

• Relevant Findings from Focus Groups with Key Stakeholders (2017)
  • Juvenile Probation Officers and Supervisors
  • Programs and Services Staff responsible for contract oversight
  • Service Providers for programs serving youth on probation
  • Legal Advocates serving youth on probation

• Conclusion and Recommendations to JJPOC
Information/Data Reviewed:

• Most commonly used interventions for youth under supervision

• Characteristics about the youth

• Additional analyses of justice outcomes:
  • Length of supervision
  • Rearrests after 12 months

• Feedback from Practitioners working with youth
Most commonly used community-based interventions for youth under supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>JRRC</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>CYFSC</th>
<th>FSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Systemic Therapy</td>
<td>In-Home Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Strategic Family Therapy</td>
<td>In-Home Therapy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression Replacement Therapy/Treatment</td>
<td>Group Intervention within a Larger Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Affect Regulation: Guide for Education and Therapy</td>
<td>Group Intervention within a Larger Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive In-Home Child &amp; Adolescent Psychiatric Services</td>
<td>In-Home Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voices</td>
<td>Group Intervention within a Larger Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Enhancement Therapy &amp; Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy</td>
<td>Group Intervention within a Larger Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints (SPST)</td>
<td>Group Intervention within a Larger Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevant Findings from Data

- Most commonly youth under supervision who received services were:
  - 15 years old across all periods (pre, during, and post-RTA)

Relevant Findings from Data

• Most commonly youth under supervision who received services were:
  • White across all time periods (pre, during, and post-RTA)
  • However, the proportion of Hispanic youth went down and the proportion of Black youth went up.
Relevant Findings from Data

• Most commonly youth under supervision who received services were:
  • Male across all periods (pre, during, and post-RTA)
Relevant Findings from Data

• Most commonly youth under supervision who received services were:
  
  • Residing and offending in the same region (86.3%)
    • River Valley is highest for offense and residence for total time period
  
  • Receiving less than 160 days on probation (50%)
    • 18.3% received 91-92 days of probation
    • 27.3% received 181-184 days of probation
  
  • 1 year rearrests rates were highest pre RTA (14.2%) and lowest post-RTA (13.5%)
Relevant Findings from Data

• Program Attendance/Completion:
  • Top 8 Interventions:
    • 20% of youth received services from the top 8 interventions identified
    • 75% of youth are recorded as having completed services.
  • Group Interventions in the top 8:
    • 11.1% of youth received services from the group interventions identified
    • 83% of youth are recorded as having completed services.
  • Home interventions in the top 8:
    • 4.1% of youth received services from the home interventions identified
    • 64% of youth are recorded as having completed services.
Feedback from Practitioners

When asked about addressing youth’s needs, the following were brought up:

- Working with youths’ probation officers, service providers, and families
- The Juvenile Assessment Generic (JAG), Clinical assessments, Trauma screens, and School Records

When asked about the overlap between program eligibility and program selection, the following were brought up:

- Programs are selected based on their ability to address youths’ criminogenic needs
- Probation officers identify appropriate programs and services for their clients under supervision
Feedback from Practitioners

When asked about issues or concern, the following were brought up:

- Use of data collected and impact on services implemented
- Definitions for successful program completion
- Awareness of impact on youth post-service delivery period
- Wait list for services

When asked to provide advice, the following were brought up:

- Increased inter-agency data sharing
- Increased family involvement
- Increased use of flex funds
- Increased opportunities for cultural competency training
- Follow up information provided for youth served
Conclusions

• Justice outcomes post-RTA are the same or better than they were pre-RTA.

• The system of programs and services available to youth under supervision has changed substantially over the past decade.
  • Data collection about programs has improved and new data systems have been implemented.

• Evaluation is required to say that youth who receive a certain program have better outcomes than youth who did not.
  • This requires a program-specific approach and prospective planning for proper data collection and analysis to be possible.

• Retrospective data on programs that have already been modified and improved over time makes it difficult to offer additional recommendations.
Recommendations for JJPOC

• Two unaddressed research questions:
  6. What program features are associated with successful program outcomes?
  7. Are the fulfillment of program-specific outcomes associated with successful program outcomes?

• The model for programming has changed significantly over the past decade. In order to assess the role program features have on successful program outcomes, specific programs should be identified and data collection/analysis should proceed strategically.

  • Within each program, there are specific outcomes beyond completion and future system involvement. This data is most likely captured at the provider level and researchers should coordinate with service providers to conduct more evaluative studies.
Discussion