

AN EVALUATION OF IOWA'S
YOUTHFUL OFFENDER PROGRAMS

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
DIVISION OF CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE PLANNING
AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER

DECEMBER, 1997

AN EVALUATION OF IOWA'S YOUTHFUL OFFENDER PROGRAMS

Richard G. Moore, Administrator

Principle Researchers and Authors:

David Huff, Justice Systems Analyst

Terry Hudik, Justice Systems Analyst

Technical Assistance:

Bonnie S. Wilson, Statistical Research Analyst

Greg Pieper, Program Planner II

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Statistical Analysis Center (CJJP), conducted this research at the request of the Iowa Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse (GASA). GASA provided a great deal of the background data and documents that served as the foundation for this research. GASA also provided the funding which made this research possible. CJJP acknowledges, and extends its thanks to GASA for all that they have contributed to this project. Without those contributions, this research would not have been possible.

As part of this research, CJJP staff traveled to each of the five Youthful Offender Program (YOP) offices, and met with the YOP staff at each location. In order to obtain the data that was being sought, each YOP staff willingly cooperated by, among other tasks, identifying offenders whose YOP participation dates fell within the date range being examined, pulling the offender files so that the data could be collected, answering a myriad of questions from CJJP staff and re-filing all the files from which data were collected. CJJP wishes to acknowledge and thank all the YOP personnel who took time from their busy schedules to assist our staff, for without all their assistance, this research could not have been completed.

As will be detailed in this report, CJJP found that the five YOPs do not operate with total reliance on the YOP staff to provide input and services to the offenders. A number of other individuals and organizations work closely with the YOPs. These individuals and organizations include, but are not limited to, the Judicial Districts' Department of Correctional Services, the County Attorney and his/her staff, various substance abuse service providers, and other private service providers. In each YOP, the individuals who participated in YOP in some form made themselves available to CJJP staff, and readily provided time information and data that CJJP requested. CJJP wishes to acknowledge these YOP team players, and thank them for the assistance they provided.

INTRODUCTION

Background

Community Based Corrections (CBC) programs are correctional services provided in a community setting. Included are pretrial and pre-sentence services provided to the courts. Traditionally, the core services provided by CBC include probation, parole, community service sentencing, residential treatment, work release, and OWI treatment. In the past five years, CBC officials and other relevant key players have begun focusing on efforts to enhance CBC's intermediate criminal sanctions which are methods of supervising offenders in the community with the intent of providing more services and offender control than regular probation and parole. An intermediate criminal sanction that meets this definition and has received a good deal of attention is the Youthful Offenders Program (YOP). This program was designed specifically for offenders between the ages of 16 and 21 as an alternative to incarceration or in response to non-compliant probationer behaviors.

YOP History and Development

In the Fall of 1992, the Youthful Offenders Program (YOP) was established in Iowa's 5th judicial district to provide a sentencing alternative for offenders between the ages of 16 and 21 who committed first time felony or aggravated misdemeanor offenses. Offenders who were 16 and 17 years of age had to have been waived to the adult court to be eligible for admittance to the YOP. Over the past five years, the YOP has expanded from the 5th judicial district to four other judicial districts, the 1st, 4th, 6th, and 8th. In each of the five judicial districts, the YOP operates as part of a partnership with numerous agencies (the county attorneys, the District Departments of Correctional Services (DCS), and a variety of different treatment agencies), to provide a holistic approach in the rehabilitation of youthful offenders.

The Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse (GASA) currently provides funds to all of the YOPs except for the one operating in the 5th judicial district. The reason for this is that the 5th judicial district has already used its 4 years of eligibility for these funds. The federal funds that GASA allocates to each YOP comes from the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) which is under the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs. One of the requirements in receiving the BJA funds is that the districts provide a minimum match of 25%. The matching funds typically come out of each judicial districts' budget, however in the 4th judicial district a portion of the matching funds comes from the Department of Human Services' decategorization project¹. In addition to the federal funds and the state match, each YOP is allowed to budget for other project funds that may come from the Department of Correction's district appropriations or locally generated income.

¹ Iowa's decategorization initiative is being designed and implemented throughout the state to allow local communities to redesign their child welfare and juvenile service systems through increased funding flexibility.

YOP Evaluation and Project Focus

GASA contracted with CJJP to conduct an evaluation study of all five of Iowa's youthful offender programs. The evaluation was undertaken to enhance GASA's grant administration process as well as to provide a more complete picture of the clients, resources, interventions, program goals, and program impact. It was anticipated that such information would also be useful to the YOP directors and their staffs, the Department of Corrections (DOC), the District Departments of Correctional Services (DCS) and others (e.g., legislators, judicial court judges, county attorneys).

The project focus and work plan were developed through a participatory process involving CJJP, GASA, DOC, DCS, and YOP directors and their staffs. Through this cooperative approach a number of project activities were identified (e.g., interviewing program directors and their staffs, observing staffing and other programming components, reviewing program-specific documents, and examining client-specific information) to provide GASA and the involved departments of correctional services with information describing:

- the goals, resources, policies and practices which comprise each of the five youthful offender programs;
- the offender populations receiving YOP services; and,
- offender-specific program outcomes such as program completion rates and recidivism.

THE YOP STUDY SAMPLE

The study sample includes the total population of cases from program inception through December 31, 1996 for four of the five YOPs. The earliest program admission dates for the 1st, 4th, 6th and 8th judicial districts are: the 1st - 12/27/94, the 4th - 7/28/95, the 6th - 10/31/94, the 8th - 1/31/95. Because of the number of cases and the length of existence of the program in the 5th judicial district, CJJP staff decided to only sample a percentage of its cases. Approximately, thirty-three percent of the cases for the 3rd and 4th years of operation were studied. The reason for selecting these two years is twofold: (1) the level of information available for cases completed during the first two years was greatly limited compared to the information available for years 3 and 4; and, (2) the 3rd and 4th years of information covered a similar period of time as the other four programs. The total number of cases obtained for each judicial district are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1: THE YOP STUDY SAMPLE

JUDICIAL DISTRICT	n	%
1	27	12.8
4	8	3.8
5	74	35.2
6	67	31.9
8	34	16.2
TOTAL	210	100.0

Program Completion Defined

Program completion was one of the major study variables examined in this evaluation. Offenders were considered to have successfully completed YOP according to officials' decisions that program requirements had been met. Unsuccessful completions include those cases in which offenders were terminated by program officials for non-compliance with program rules, criminal behavior or other reasons.

Recidivism Defined

For the purposes of this study, recidivism was defined as any new arrest in which the offender was convicted of an offense or in which the case was still pending before the court. Probation revocations were also included in this definition, however, arrests in which the offender was acquitted were not included. The period of time in which an offender could have recidivated was calculated from the time the client completed YOP or was terminated and the end of the data collection period which was June 30, 1997.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

In general, there were some commonalities in the way that each of the 5 YOPs operated as well as in the types of services that were available to their clients. All of the YOPs shared the same basic principles that guided the development of the first YOP in the 5th judicial district. The first principle that all of the programs shared, was that they were all designed to provide a sentencing alternative or intermediate criminal sanction for offenders between the ages of 16 and 21. Typically the offenders were those who committed first time felony or aggravated misdemeanor offenses. The second principle that they all shared was to provide a more intensive level of case management and supervision than regular probation. The third and final basic principle that they all shared was that each program was created to provide a holistic level of treatment not available through other Community Based Corrections (CBC) services. In addition to these three basic principles, there were three primary goals that each of the programs shared in regards to the offenders who participated in the YOPs. First, that the offenders complied with the program rules and societal regulations. Second, that the offenders reduced or eliminated their frequency of criminal behavior. Third, that the offenders improved their life, career, and social skills.

There seemed to be a common order of events that occurred at each of the programs. Offenders were referred to the program and then screened for appropriateness. Upon entry to the programs, offenders were required to attend orientation sessions where they typically learned what the requirements were in order to successfully complete the program. Typically the requirements included the completion of a High School Degree or GED, non-academic courses (e.g., Street Law, Cognitive Restructuring, Career Skills), community service, victim offender reconciliation program, substance abuse assessments and treatment if deemed necessary.

Most offenders received a curfew upon entry into the program and were required to make a specific number of contacts with the probation officer every week that they were in the program. There appeared to be a common order in which the non-academic courses were offered by the programs and subsequently taken by the clients. A cognitive restructuring course was the first one taught at each of the programs where it was available. The next courses in their typical order included: street law, career skills and then other specialty programs (e.g., parenting skills, anger management).

The completion of some type of community service was mandatory at all of the programs and could have been completed at any point during an offender's treatment. Mentoring was also used throughout an offender's involvement, but was utilized more on an individual basis in situations where it was deemed to be most appropriate. Victim offender reconciliation mediation and the payment of restitution typically occurred toward the end of an offender's involvement with a YOP. For those offenders that chose not to comply with the program rules, there were sanctions applied such as jail time, electronic monitoring, house arrest, and ultimately program termination.

Referral, Selection and Intake

One of the fundamental distinctions among the programs was in whether the program was pre-trial (1st and 5th), post-trial (4th and 6th), or a combination of both (8th). The differences between the programs seemed to be most pronounced in the screening and referral process. On the pre-trial side it was the county attorney who ultimately made the decision of who was eligible for YOP. However, it appeared that there was dialogue between the county attorneys office and the program staff prior to the client's placement in the YOP. The County Attorney's Office, often in conjunction with the YOP staff, conducted an initial screening during the Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) while an offender is still in jail. On the post-trial side the decision to accept or decline an offender was made by the YOP director. In these cases, the offender was sentenced to probation and then the YOP director examined the case to see if it met criteria established for the program.

Despite the fundamental difference in regards to the screening and referral process, a common core of service areas that all 5 YOPs shared was identified. These common core services included: educational programming, substance abuse evaluation, education & treatment, case management and supervision, community service, victim-offender reconciliation, restitution, mentoring, and the use of prison tours².

Educational Programming

Each of the 5 YOPs had GED preparatory courses available to the offenders. These courses were available either at the program offices or through a local high school or community college. In addition, all of the programs allowed some offenders to attend an alternative high school or a regular public school.

All five of the programs had at least one non-academic course designed to restructure an offender's cognitive thinking. Four of the programs (1st, 5th, 6th, 8th) offered a number of other courses aimed at improving or developing life and social skills, anger management, and gang awareness. A course focused on teaching offenders about common legal problems and issues was also offered at these 4 programs.

Academic Education:

Educational screening was provided at all of the YOPs to determine an offender's level of academic ability and what type of educational programming was appropriate. One of the programs (1st) systematically used standardized assessments of academic level. All of the programs, except for the 4th judicial district, required the completion of a high school degree or a GED in order to successfully complete the YOP. It should be noted that every program indicated some exceptions to the educational requirement. For example, this requirement may have been waived if an offender was too low-functioning, or a when a client, who successfully completed all other program components, was having trouble completing his or her educational

² Please note that mentoring was just being developed in the 6th judicial district during the study period. It should also be noted that although it was available, none of the 8 offenders studied in the 4th judicial district had received this component.

component but had a full-time job.

Non-Academic Education:

The non-academic category refers to a group of courses that were meant to provide information regarding life, social and career skills to the offenders. The specific name of courses varied from program to program. This was particularly the case for courses that focused on the restructuring of an offender's cognitive thinking. For example, the 5th judicial district referred to it as "breaking barriers," while the 6th called it "positive solutions." The format of these courses along with the teaching methods varied somewhat among the programs, however, the subject matter was determined to be very similar. For purposes of uniformity in this evaluation report, courses that were similar in course content but varied in their specific name among the programs were given generic names which indicated the type of course material covered as opposed to the specific course name.

A number of non-academic courses were identified as a core group of such courses available at most of the programs. Whether a course was considered a mandatory requirement in order for an offender to successfully complete a program varied among the YOPs. In addition to the core group of non-academic courses that was identified, there were also a number of other courses (e.g., cultural awareness, parenting skills) that were unique to specific programs.

In the sections of this report that describe individual programs, there is a discussion of the non-academic courses available in each judicial district, including a description of those courses unique to each program. The following definitions are intended to provide a description of the generic categories of non-academic courses that are found at most of the programs.

- Street Law - This course was taught by Assistant County Attorneys and volunteer private attorneys. It focused on essential legal principals utilized in everyday living as well as some basic procedures in the criminal justice system.
- Cognitive Restructuring - This course was taught by YOP staff. The activities focused on restructuring the manner in which YOP participants perceived situations and problems, the manner in which they reacted to certain types of situations and the manner in which they resolved issues and problems which they may have encountered in everyday living.
- Gang Awareness - This course was taught by YOP staff. The activities of gangs in today's society, why individuals join gangs and the detrimental effects of gang membership were among the subjects discussed.
- Career Skills - In this course the YOP staff taught the participants the essentials of job seeking skills such as how to prepare resumes, proper interviewing techniques, and personal appearance. Activities used included one or more of the following: pre-employment training, job shadowing, intensive follow-ups and problem solving. There was often job placement assistance offered.

Substance Abuse Evaluation, Education, and Treatment

All of the programs required a substance abuse evaluation for each offender participating in their program. Each of the 5 programs utilized local hospitals or substance abuse agencies to conduct the evaluations. The evaluations typically included information about an offender's life history and involvement with substances. Most evaluations included a recommendation of what treatment modality would be most appropriate for an offender.

There were basically three different types of substance abuse services available: in-patient treatment, out-patient treatment, and prevention education courses. Those offenders determined to have the most severe problems were referred to in-patient treatment. Those offenders determined to possess slightly lower levels of problems were referred to out-patient treatment. In some of the programs, substance abuse prevention education was provided to the remainder of the offenders regardless of whether the offenders disclosed any personal use. For those offenders that were deemed to have a substance abuse problem and were receiving either in-patient or out-patient treatment, there were aftercare or relapse prevention services available.

At each of the programs, the YOP staff worked closely with the substance abuse agency staff in developing a treatment plan and in monitoring progress. Typically, the YOPs were accessing local agencies to provide in-patient treatment, but occasionally a program did utilize state programs such as the one at Mount Pleasant.

Mental Health Evaluation and Treatment

Unlike the substance abuse evaluations that were required for all offenders, the mental health evaluations were provided more on an individual-need basis. The levels of treatment included in-patient and out-patient (counseling) services. The services were offered at either a local or state agency.

Case Management And Supervision

Case management and supervision referred to a number of different activities aimed at tracking an offender's progress and monitoring their compliance with program requirements and rules. Upon entry to the program, each offender was assigned a probation officer who was responsible for supervising the offenders during their involvement with YOP. Except in the 4th district, where YOP completion typically resulted in probation completion, offenders received a different probation officer once they successfully completed the program and were put back on regular probation. It can also be noted that unlike the other districts, the 5th district designated a particular probation officer to supervise all offenders completing YOP. This officer was considered an important feature of this district's YOP program. Procedures used to manage and supervise YOP participants included staffing meetings, substance abuse monitoring, and participant monitoring.

Staffing Meetings:

Staffing meetings referred to periodic meetings (usually every week or two) among the various staff members who represented the various component parts of the YOPs. Typically these

meetings were run by the probation officer(s) and included the YOP director, substance abuse staff, employment coordinators, VORP coordinators and other appropriate individuals. The format of these meetings was similar across all of the programs. A probation officer would present each of the staffing meeting attendees with a list of offenders on their current caseload and then begin going through the list of offenders and discussing relevant issues (e.g., curfew violations, educational progress, substance abuse monitoring, and other pertinent topics). Recommendations regarding changes in curfew, program termination, and warrants for non-compliance with program rules were often made to the probation officer during these meetings.

Substance Abuse Monitoring:

The most common form of substance abuse testing was urine analysis; however, breath tests were administered by probation officers during home visits on occasion. The tests were usually performed by the YOP staff or a representative from a local substance abuse agency. The specific drugs tested for varied somewhat by program but, for the most part, included marijuana, alcohol, cocaine, methamphetamines, amphetamines, PCP, morphine, and benzedrine.

Typically, clients were tested between once and several times a month. Most of the programs used a color code system that indicated when an offender was supposed to be tested. Offenders were expected to phone the YOP offices and find out whether their color code matched the code for the week; if it did, they were required to be tested within a given period of time. Occasionally spot checks were conducted while an offender was participating in one of the program components.

Positive urinalysis results often resulted in arrest warrants being issued for the offenders. Upon arrest, the offender often received a short-term incarceration in the county jail. Other times, positive urinalysis tests resulted in a referral to a higher level of substance abuse treatment. In situations where an offender could not produce a specimen within a reasonable period of time, they were often considered to be positive.

Participant Activity Monitoring:

Participant activity monitoring refers to those activities designed to track the progress of an offender as they proceeded through the program. The monitoring primarily included offender and collateral contacts, curfew checks, the maintenance and logging of offender information in case files and the monitoring of progress in required components. The offenders were required to check in with a probation officer at certain times of the week; usually this included one or two face-to-face visits a week and telephone calls as necessary. In addition, there were nightly curfew checks, most of which occurred over the telephone. All of the programs, except for the one in the 5th judicial district made regular home visits. The YOP director in the 5th judicial district indicated that the probation/officers working in this district had caseloads two to three times those of the YOP staff in the other districts and therefore did not have time to make such visits. The collateral contacts were made periodically by all of the programs and included contacts with such individuals as employers, parents, friends, spouses, school officials and others.

Community Service

All of the programs had some type of community service requirement, although the actual number of hours required and the type of activities available to complete the hours varied across the programs. Most of the YOPs allowed both individual and group projects. Some of the programs required special weekend projects that may have included challenge courses or group community service projects. All of the programs reduced or increased community service hours depending upon compliance with program rules and components. Some of the offenders elected to pay off their community service through additional fees they paid to the court.

Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program (VORP)

This refers to mediation between the victim and the offender and was conducted by a specialized, trained mediator that coordinated the meetings. VORP sessions typically took place in a neutral setting and did not occur in the YOP offices, the victims home or the offenders home. This component was provided through either the county attorneys office or a mediation center. VORPs were designed to allow the victim to confront the offender and convey information about the impact of the crime to the offender. The program is geared toward allowing the offenders to recognize the consequences of their criminal activity.

Not all offenders completed a VORP for a variety of different reasons. The various reasons included when the offender was determined to be uncooperative, when the offender was terminated from the program prior to completing this program component or when a victim or all of the victims refused to meet with the offender. VORPs were usually scheduled towards the completion of an offender's program, after they have completed most of the other components.

Victim Restitution

Victim restitution for the pre-trial programs was coordinated by the county attorney's office while the offenders were in YOP. If an offender had not paid all victim restitution and other fees as warranted upon completion of YOP, their case was forwarded to the Clerk of Court Office for the collection and scheduling of payments while the offender completed probation. Those offenders who participated in the post-trial programs were required to schedule their payments with either the CBC restitution clerk or the local Clerk of Court Office.

Mentoring

Mentoring was a program designed to match offenders with individuals in the community. The mentors were volunteers who were usually accessed through local churches and civic-minded organizations. Mentoring was provided in each of the programs on an individual basis. If an offender was matched with a mentor, the offender typically was encouraged to have at least one in-person contact and one telephone contact with the mentor each week while participating in the program.

Prison Tours

Many offenders were required to take a tour of one of Iowa's prisons to get a first-hand look at what awaited them if they continued their criminal behavior or continued having problems with program compliance issues. The prison tours often included mock strip searches and other aspects of prison life meant to provide the offenders with a realistic view of prison life. To provide further information to the offenders, panels of inmates were often asked to talk with the YOP offenders.

Post YOP Probation

Those offenders who participated in the pre-trial programs went to court after completion of YOP. Typically they received a deferred or reduced sentence with the stipulation that they completed a given period of probation. The probationary period for the pre-trial offenders was typically 1 to 2 years.

The offenders who participated in the post-trial programs were typically sentenced to 2 or 3 years of probation, with YOP taking up part of that time. An exception to this rule, was found in the 4th judicial district which was a terminal program -- meaning that once an offender successfully completed the requirements for YOP, they also completed probation.

The probationary period was usually less intensive than the YOPs in regards to supervision and requirements. The number of contacts probation officers had with offenders was close to 2 per month compared to multiple contacts (2 or 3) in a given week during YOP participation. Offenders were usually required to complete community service, payment of victim restitution and other court fees, VORP, and other requirements not completed during YOP. Program staff in most of the YOPs indicated that some offenders completed their GEDs while on probation. As was pointed out earlier, the 5th judicial district, unlike the other districts, assigned a special probation officer to supervise all offenders who had completed YOP.

FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT'S YOP (DETOUR)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Physical Facilities

The first judicial district's YOP, which was referred to as the Delivery of Education, Treatment/Training, Opportunities for Understanding Responsibility Program (DETOUR) was actually located in two locations. The main facility was located in downtown Waterloo, Iowa, and was comprised of the DETOUR probation officer's office, one large and one small multi-purpose office, with an additional office being dedicated to administrative functions. The large office was utilized for the educational evaluations, GED instruction, non-academic class sessions, staffing meetings, and other purposes. The second location was the First Judicial District's Probation/Parole Office, which was located on the northern edge of downtown Waterloo. This was where the offenders reported once they had completed the DETOUR program or otherwise were placed on probation.

DETOUR Staff

The primary DETOUR staff consisted of two full-time individuals whose work was dedicated exclusively to the program. One was a Probation/Parole Officer 3 (PPO) who had the primary responsibility for overseeing the activities of the offenders who were participating in the program (the case load was approximately 30 offenders), and the other was an educational specialist who oversaw the educational components of the program as well as conducted a number of the academic and non-academic classes that the program offered. One secretarial position was also devoted full-time to the program. In addition to the full-time personnel, there were additional personnel who devoted a portion of their time to the program. Included in this category was a Probation/Parole Supervisor 3 who oversaw the work of the PPO and at times assisted the PPO in his work. Also included was the DETOUR director who was also responsible for managing the broader field services program in the 1st judicial district.

Other individuals who provided staff to the DETOUR program included the Black Hawk County Attorney's office (the County Attorney, the VORP coordinator, and the victim/witness coordinator). A staff member with the Treatment Alternatives To Street Crimes Program (TASC), which is housed within the Northeast Council on Substance Abuse, conducted the substance abuse assessments and served as a liaison between DETOUR and the substance abuse treatment component of the program. Other agencies and their staff members were utilized on an as needed basis such as the Kheperan Black Men Excellence Project. This project was accessed on an as-needed basis to provide cultural diversity training, education, and mentoring when necessary.

DETOUR Population

The Detour population studied includes 27 offenders between the ages of 17 and 18. The majority of the DETOUR participants were male, Caucasian/Non-Hispanic and 18 years of age or older (see Tables 2-4).

TABLE 2: SEX

SEX	n	%
Male	24	88.9
Female	3	11.1
TOTAL	27	100.0

TABLE 3: AGE

AGE AT ADMISSION TO YOP	n	%
17	2	7.4
18	8	29.6
19	12	44.5
20	5	18.5
TOTAL	27	100.0

TABLE 4: RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND

RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND	n	%
African-American	5	18.5
Caucasian/Non-Hispanic	22	81.5
Hispanic	0	0.0
Native American	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0
TOTAL	27	100.0

An analysis of the most serious offenses for which each offender was referred to YOP indicated that none of these offenses were committed against a person (see Table 5). Two offenses were Class C Felony Drug Charges, twenty offenses were Class D Felonies, the most prevalent of which was Burglary 3rd Degree (15 cases, or 75% of the Class D Felonies) and five offenses were Aggravated Misdemeanor Offenses. Of the 27 participants, 14 were referred to YOP for one offense, 4 were referred for two offenses, 6 were referred for three offenses and 3 were referred for four offenses. Of the two offenders under age 18 who participated in the program, one was waived to the jurisdiction of the adult court by direct action of the juvenile court. The second offender was exempt from juvenile court pursuant to Iowa Code Chapter 232.8 and handled directly in adult court.

TABLE 5: YOP REFERRAL OFFENSE CLASSES

OFFENSE CLASS	AGAINST PERSON		NOT AGAINST PERSON	
	n	%	n	%
Class B Felony	0	0.0	0	0.0
Class C Felony	0	0.0	2	7.4
Class D Felony	0	0.0	20	74.1
Aggravated Misdemeanor	0	0.0	5	18.5
Serious Misdemeanor	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTALS	0	0.0	27	100.0

All of the offenders who were participating in DETOUR were living in the same county (Black Hawk County) where the program was located. Clients were allowed to live outside of Black Hawk County, but the intensity of the program, in regards to contacts with program staff, attendance at both academic and non-academic classes and monitoring activities (e.g., substance abuse testing, curfew checks), may have led to the acceptance of clients by the program who lived within a reasonable distance to the program. One of the major problems mentioned by the probation officers was in regards to transportation of offenders between their homes and all of the different program components (e.g., community service, prison tours, classes, meetings with probation officers). It was apparent from CJJP’s observations that the offenders moved residences and changed roommates fairly often.

Referral, Selection and Intake

DETOUR was a pre-trial diversion program wherein the offenders were placed in the YOP prior to going to trial on their charges. The Black Hawk County Attorney’s office reviewed new arrest incidents and selected those offenders whom they believed would be appropriate for YOP intervention. The primary selection criteria were that the candidate was between the ages of 16 and 21 and the offense(s) committed met certain standards set by the program (normally, first-time aggravated misdemeanor or felony offense, no forcible felonies, etc.). None of the offenders were intended to be admitted to this program if the offenses charged were the result of an assaultive act causing serious injury or use of a dangerous weapon. The Detour Program was designed for first-time offenders in adult court, but a prior minor criminal record in adult court or a prior adjudication in juvenile court did not disqualify an offender from admission if he or she was otherwise considered appropriate.

Screening of the offenders for the DETOUR Program was ultimately the responsibility of the Black Hawk County Attorney’s Office. However, the YOP staff was usually involved in the preliminary selection process. If an offender was determined initially eligible, a “pre-charge risk assessment” was made using criminal history, pre-trial release data and other available information. If the assessment indicated that the offender did not pose serious risk to commit future violent offenses, admission to the program was offered. Those offenders who were determined to be appropriate candidates for the program, and who agreed to participate in DETOUR, had to sign a contract and agree to abide by the program’s terms and conditions, after which they were admitted to the program.

In their review of the cases, the County Attorney's office identified a "target charge", to which the offender was allowed to plead guilty to after successful completion of YOP. In most cases, successful completion of YOP resulted in a felony charge being reduced to a misdemeanor charge, or in the case of an aggravated misdemeanor charge, being reduced to a serious misdemeanor charge. Upon successful completion of YOP, the offender pled guilty to the "target" charge. The County Attorney normally recommended that any term of incarceration be suspended, and that a term of regular probation be imposed. In some cases, the County Attorney recommended a deferred judgment be ordered by the court so that if the offender successfully completed their normal probation, the charges could be dismissed by the court. Those individuals who did not successfully complete YOP were normally brought to trial on the charges filed at the time of arrest, which were normally higher (more serious) than the reduced charges that the offender would have been allowed to plead guilty to had they successfully completed YOP.

A few offenders voluntarily participated in the program, with the approval of the program staff, even after the County Attorney had concluded that they should not be offered the formal opportunity to enroll in DETOUR. The program staff indicated that these offenders participated in the program hoping that the County Attorney would change his decision and permit a reduction in charges after successful YOP conclusion. It should also be noted that any sentencing recommendations made by the Black Hawk County Attorney were in fact simply recommendations; with the court making the final determination of which sanctions would or would not be imposed on the offender.

Educational Programming

Academic Education:

Each offender was required to complete an educational intake assessment, sign an education plan and follow through with the plan recommended by the educational instructor. When they entered the program, the academic level of the 27 offenders who were participating in DETOUR ranged from having completing the 9th grade to having earned a high school diploma or GED certificate (see Table 6). The findings in Table 6 show that 62.9 percent of the YOP offenders had not obtained a GED or high school degree prior to admission to the program, while 37.1 percent had.

TABLE 6: EDUCATIONAL LEVEL UPON ENTRY TO YOP

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
8th Grade	0	-----
9th Grade	2	7.4
10th Grade	4	14.8
11th Grade	11	40.7
12th Grade/GED	10	37.1
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>100.0</i>

The educational programs available included GED preparatory courses, high school, community college and other approved educational programming. If the offenders entered DETOUR without a GED or high school degree they were required to obtain one in order to successfully complete the program. However, this was not exactly what the findings showed. Of the 17 offenders who entered the program without a GED or high school degree, 8 earned their GED while enrolled in the program and 2 earned their high school diploma. It would have been possible for some of the offenders who did not obtain a GED or a high school degree to have completed their education while on probation or in an institution after YOP.

Non-Academic Education:

As with all YOPs, DETOUR had a non-academic educational curriculum designed to upgrade an offender’s “life skills” and assist them in becoming a contributing member of society. As was indicated earlier, generic names were given to those “core courses” that covered similar subject matter at each of the 5 YOPs. The generic courses available at DETOUR included Street Law, Cognitive Restructuring, Gang Awareness, and Career Skills.

The Cognitive Restructuring and Street Law classes were considered to be mandatory requirements for all of the offenders in order to complete the program. In addition, each offender was expected to complete a Career Skills Course and a Parenting Responsibility Course as directed by program staff. The 11 offenders who successfully completed the DETOUR program completed each of the following non-academic courses: Street Law, Cognitive Restructuring, Gang Awareness, and Career Skills. Four of these offenders also completed a course in anger management. It was found that three offenders who were eventually terminated from the program, completed Cognitive Restructuring and Career Skills prior to their termination. Two of these three offenders also completed Street Law and Anger management prior to termination from the program.

Substance Abuse Evaluation, Education and Treatment

All program offenders who participated in the program were required to undergo a substance abuse assessment, which was conducted by a TASC liaison. All 27 of the offenders studied received a substance abuse assessment. Based upon the results of that assessment, additional substance abuse services were prescribed by the program as part of the required activities. The

possible services included substance abuse prevention classes, treatment in a residential treatment or in-patient facility, a treatment half-way house, intensive or normal outpatient treatment, aftercare or relapse prevention therapy, and “drunk driver’s school”. Nineteen offenders were required to participate in substance abuse prevention education, 1 offender was referred to in-patient/residential treatment, 6 offenders were referred to out-patient treatment, and 1 offender received aftercare/relapse prevention (see Table 7). All eleven of the offenders who eventually completed the program and 2 offenders who were later terminated from the program, completed the prevention education course.

TABLE 7: SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT	NUMBER AND PERCENT WHO COMPLETED THE ACTIVITY	
	n	%	n	%
Prevention Education	19	70.4	13	68.4
In-Patient/Residential Treatment	1	3.7	1	100.0
Out-Patient/Halfway House	6	22.2	2	33.3
Aftercare/Relapse Prevention	1	3.7	0	0.0

These services were administered by a combination of state and local substance abuse treatment providers. If the offenders were found to have been using drugs or alcohol while enrolled in the program, and if they were allowed to continue with DETOUR, they were required to have received a second assessment and complete additional treatment including but not limited to inpatient treatment or halfway house placement.

Mental Health Evaluation and Treatment

In addition to receiving the substance abuse evaluation, education and/or treatment, all program offenders were informally screened by a TASC staff member for possible mental health problems. When indicated, offenders may have been required to submit to a formal mental health evaluation conducted by a DCS psychologist. Five of the offenders studied were subjected to a mental health evaluation. Based on the results of the evaluation, the offenders may have been required to receive counseling from the DCS psychologist or treatment from the Black Hawk Mental Health Center. Of the five offenders who were subjected to a mental health evaluation, 2 were referred to in-patient treatment and 1 was referred to out-patient treatment.

Case Management/Supervision

Staffing Meetings:

Normally, a weekly staffing meeting was held at the DETOUR offices. These meetings were typically attended by the DETOUR staff, a representative of the County Attorney’s Office, a representative from the Treatment Alternative to Street Crimes (TASC) program, a representative from the Victim-Offender Reconciliation Project (VORP), various supervisory

personnel whose responsibilities include some segment of YOP activities and other personnel, such as interns, who were working with the project staff.

At each staffing meeting, the progress of each DETOUR offender was discussed. If an offender was under consideration for the imposition of a sanction, the client normally attended the meeting to give his/her explanation of the actions that prompted the consideration of sanction imposition. After that explanation, the offender was excused and the group reached a consensus as to what YOP sanctions would be imposed, or to recommend to the court that it impose a particular sanction. Compliance with program rules was rewarded at these staffing meetings with extended curfew hours, travel permits, and reduced community service hours.

Substance Abuse Monitoring:

Substance abuse monitoring was structured and administered by the DETOUR staff. Upon enrollment into YOP, each offender was assigned a “color code”. Each week, one or more colors were selected by the YOP staff, and the colors were made known to the offenders. If an offender’s color code matched the weekly code, they were then required to submit a urine sample for testing before the end of the calendar week. All testing was done in compliance with the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act (CLIA) which is a federal law setting laboratory standards for testing. The majority of the offenders who participated in the DETOUR program were found to have either not tested positive or tested positive only once (see Table 8).

TABLE 8: POSITIVE DRUG TESTS

NUMBER OF POSITIVE DRUG TESTS	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
0	16	59.3
1	5	18.5
2 to 3	4	14.8
More than 3	2	7.4
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Participant Activity Monitoring:

Each of the offenders was required to submit to the supervision by the First Judicial District Department of Corrections and comply with conditions set by DETOUR, including but not limited to the following:

- Observe any curfew hours established;
- Refrain from possessing, injecting or otherwise using any non-prescribed drugs or alcohol;
- Submit to breathalyzer, urinalysis or other authorized test for drugs or intoxicants immediately upon the request of DETOUR staff or designee;
- Submit to visits at their residence at the discretion of the DETOUR staff;

- Sign in and out of the DETOUR office upon every visit; and
- Meet with DETOUR staff as required.

Most offenders were required to appear at the program office on a daily basis Monday through Friday to report on their progress in meeting the program's required activities. A curfew time was established for each offender, which could be extended or reduced based upon the overall compliance with the program rules. Curfew checks were conducted via phone or in person by program staff. Violations of curfew were handled through such sanctions as earlier curfew, electronic monitoring, or short-term jail incarceration. None of the offenders who participated in the DETOUR program were subjected to electronic monitoring, house arrest, and violators program. One of the offenders was placed in a residential facility, and 10 were sent to jail.

Any additional criminal activity by the offenders who participated in the program was also closely monitored. During the course of program participation, some of the offenders were arrested for a form of criminal activity other than violation of program rules. The evaluation findings show that 13 of the YOP offenders were arrested during their involvement with program. Upon arrest for a new offense, the program or court imposed one or more of a number of sanctions. Those sanctions included, but were not limited to, an earlier curfew, house arrest, electronic monitoring, assignment to a residential facility, assignment to the state's Violator's Program, short term incarceration or termination from YOP. The same sanctions were utilized when the participant violated program rules to the degree that the imposition of a sanction was thought necessary by the program staff.

Community Service

Each offender entering DETOUR agreed to perform a total of 150 hours of community service through a combination of group and individual projects, normally performed for a non-profit organization operating within the community. Each offender was given the opportunity to reduce the 150 hour requirement by a maximum of 50 hours for completing a GED, maintaining regular attendance at DETOUR educational programs, and not missing curfew checks.

The evaluation findings show that 10 of the offenders completed their community service prior to successful completion of the program. One offender was allowed to successfully complete the program prior to completion of community service. It was very possible that the offender completed their community service while on probation. It was also possible that some or all of those offenders who were terminated from the program and sentenced to some other CBC sanction completed community service after their involvement in YOP.

Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program (VORP)

The VORPs were run by a coordinator within the Black Hawk County Attorney's office. This was a process that gave the victim a chance to confront an offender and describe the personal and economic impact of their crime(s). The VORP coordinator contacted each victim and requested that they complete a victim impact statement. The VORP coordinator also determined whether the victim(s) were willing to meet with the offender. Both the offenders

and the victims were screened for appropriateness for the VORP services. If the victim agreed to participate in the program and was deemed to have been appropriate, a mediation session was scheduled at a neutral site to both the victim and offender. Each offender was required to participate in a VORP, provided the victim chose to participate in the program. The evaluation findings indicate that all of the offenders who eventually completed the program successfully, completed VORP.

Restitution

The amount of restitution the offender owed was typically discussed and agreed upon at the VORP meetings. In the event the victim refused to participate in a VORP, the economic impact statement submitted by the victim was utilized as a suggested victim restitution amount. All agreed-upon or suggested restitution amounts were reviewed by the Black Hawk County Attorney's Office, and then presented to the court. The court then reviewed the amount proposed and entered an order fixing the amount of victim restitution that each offender was required to pay. In the event that the victim did not submit an impact statement, normally no victim restitution was ordered. The study findings indicate that 4 of the 11 offenders who successfully completed the program had paid off all of the victim restitution they owed. It was indicated by the VORP coordinator and program staff that many of the offenders paid their victim restitution after leaving the DETOUR program.

In addition to victim restitution, additional offender payments were often ordered by the court. These included, but were not limited to, court appointed attorney's fees, and the various court costs (e.g., filing fees, court reporter fees) associated with the offender's case.

Mentoring

Mentoring was a DETOUR component set up, on an individual basis, to pair offenders with individuals in the community who were thought to have displayed some degree of leadership in their lives through volunteer work. It was found that 3 of the offenders participating in YOP had participated in and completed this component. It was hoped that the mentor and the offender would establish a good personal relationship that positively influenced the offenders' lives. Often the community volunteers were accessed through local churches and civic-minded organizations.

Prison Tours

Many offenders were required to take a tour of one of Iowa's prisons to get a first hand look at what awaited them if they continued a life of a crime. The use of such tours appeared to be used especially when clients were not complying with program rules. This activity was not implemented at the onset of the program, but shortly thereafter. The evaluation study found that 4 offenders had completed this component.

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT'S YOP

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In reviewing the narrative and data that follow, it should be noted that this YOP was the newest program in the state, having accepted their first program participant in August, 1995. Given a total program time of 12 to 18 months for successful completion as indicated by program staff, only a minimal number of clients had successfully completed YOP for evaluation purposes. This fact may tend to skew some of the data, especially successful and unsuccessful completion rates. It should also be noted that this YOP was still developing many of its components at the time this evaluation was conducted.

Physical Facilities

The fourth judicial district's YOP offices were located in a storefront which was attached to a hardware store. This YOP was located in what could be considered downtown Council Bluffs, Iowa. There were four offices, three of which were utilized by the Probation/Parole Officers assigned to YOP and the Intensive Supervision Project (ISP). The fourth office was used for administrative purposes, housing a secretarial area, and a smaller area which could be termed a general purpose area.

YOP Staff

The primary staff consisted of two full-time Probation/Parole Officers 3s (PPOs) whose work was dedicated exclusively to YOP. At the time of data collection for this project, the second PPO had just joined YOP, and the caseload of the two officers combined was approximately 17 offenders. The officers' caseload has increased to about twice as many cases since the data collection was completed for this study. As previously indicated, also present in the facility were PPOs assigned to ISP. All PPOs were CBC employees, and although assigned to different programs, they worked closely together, assisting each other on an as-needed basis. In addition to the PPOs there was a secretary who provided support to both groups of PPOs in performing their duties.

In addition to the full-time personnel, there were additional personnel who devoted a portion of their time to the program. Included in this category was a Probation/Parole Supervisor who oversaw the work of the YOP and ISP PPOs and, at times, assisted them in their duties. There was a TASC liaison staff member who was responsible for conducting the substance abuse assessments. Other staff and agencies were utilized as needed (e.g., Job Corps in Denison, Iowa).

YOP Population

The majority of YOP clients were male, Caucasian/Non-Hispanic and 18 years of age or older (see Tables 9-11). All 8 of the offenders who participated in the YOP resided in the same county (Pottawattamie County) where the program was located. However, it was apparent from

CJJP’s observations that the clients moved residences and changed roommates fairly often. Such mobility was considered to be somewhat problematic in regards to tracking and monitoring, especially when the offenders failed to notify the YOP staff of their address changes.

TABLE 9: SEX

SEX	n	%
Male	7	87.5
Female	1	12.5
TOTAL	8	100.0

TABLE 10: AGE

AGE AT ADMISSION TO YOP	n	%
17	2	25.0
18	3	37.5
19	2	25.0
20	1	12.5
TOTAL	8	100.0

TABLE 11: RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND

RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND	n	%
African-American	1	12.5
Caucasian/Non-Hispanic	7	87.5
Hispanic	0	0.0
Native American	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0
TOTAL	8	0.0

The 4th judicial district’s YOP was a post-, rather than pre-trial program. In order to maintain parity with the pre-trial programs in the course of this analysis, the automated CBC database and the computerized criminal history records maintained by the Iowa Department of Public Safety were examined to determine the offenses for which these offenders were originally arrested, as opposed to the offenses of which they were eventually convicted. An analysis of the most serious offenses for which each offender was arrested and subsequently referred to YOP indicated that most of the offenses were not committed against a person (see Table 12).

Of the two juveniles (under age 18) participating in the program, it appears that one was waived to the jurisdiction of the adult court by direct action of the juvenile court, and the second was exempt from juvenile court pursuant to Iowa Code Chapter 232.8 and handled directly by adult court.

TABLE 12: YOP REFERRAL OFFENSE CLASSES

OFFENSE CLASS	AGAINST PERSON		NOT AGAINST PERSON	
	n	%	n	%
Class B Felony	1	100.0	0	0.0
Class C Felony	1	50.0	1	50.0
Class D Felony	0	0.0	4	100.0
Aggravated Misdemeanor	0	0.0	0	0.0
Serious Misdemeanor	1	100.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	3	37.5	5	62.5

Referral, Selection and Intake

The fourth judicial district YOP is a post-trial program. Operating under a blanket judicial order from the Chief Judge of the district which allows CBC to select the program participants, the YOP staff reviews the cases of offenders who had been convicted of one or more offenses and subsequently placed on a period of formal probation. Staff then selected those individuals whom they believed would be most appropriate for YOP intervention. The primary selection criteria were that the candidate be between the ages of 16 and 21 (juveniles must have been waived to the jurisdiction of the adult court), and the offense(s) committed must have met certain standards set by the program (normally, first-time aggravated misdemeanor or felony offense, currently on formal probation or parole, etc.).

This YOP has indicated that they actively seek the most “difficult cases” based upon risk assessment scores, and also accepted those offenders who had violated the terms of their probation. It was also indicated that one of the primary concerns in selecting YOP clients was that of safety to the public. The individuals selected by the YOP staff were interviewed, and the program requirements were explained. Those who were still thought to be appropriate candidates after the intake interview, and who agreed to participate in YOP, then signed a contract agreeing to abide by the program’s terms and conditions, after which they were admitted to the program.

The fourth judicial district differed from other post-trial programs in that it was a terminal probation program. In other post-trial YOP programs, successful YOP completion was normally followed by a period of formal “regular” probation, upon successful completion of which the offender was discharged from the criminal justice system. In this YOP, successful completion of YOP was normally accompanied by a recommendation to the court that the period of formal probation be ended; a recommendation with which the court usually concurred.

Educational Programming**Academic Education:**

Like other YOPs, the 4th judicial district required that all participants who had not obtained a high school diploma or a GED certificate had to have been enrolled in a course of study in a secondary school, or been working toward their GED. The GED program was administered by

a local community college, which worked with YOP clients so as to arrange instruction and testing to meet the client’s work schedule.

Upon admittance to the program, the 8 offenders studied ranged from having completed the 9th grade to having earned a high school diploma or GED certificate (see Table 13). The average educational level was 10.50 years, and 1 of the 8 (12.5%) offenders had completed high school or earned their GED prior to admission to the program. Of the 7 offenders who entered the YOP without a high school degree or GED, 2 were able to obtain a GED during their involvement with the program.

TABLE 13: EDUCATIONAL LEVEL UPON ENTRY TO YOP

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
8th Grade	0	0.0
9th Grade	1	12.5
10th Grade	3	37.5
11th Grade	3	37.5
12th Grade/GED	1	12.5
<i>TOTAL</i>	8	<i>100.0</i>

Non-Academic Education:

As with all YOPs, this program has a non-academic educational curriculum designed to upgrade the offender’s “life skills” and assist them in becoming a contributing member of society. At the time of the on-site visit, this YOP, which was the latest one to become operational, was still in the process of developing the majority of the non-academic curriculum, including a complete life skills course. The cognitive restructuring course had been developed and was being administered to the offender’s participating in the program. Three out of the four offenders who successfully completed the program, completed Cognitive Restructuring.

Substance Abuse Evaluation, Education and Treatment

All 8 of the YOP offenders were subjected to a substance abuse assessment, which was conducted through a contractual arrangement with the TASC program. Based upon the results of that assessment, additional substance abuse services may have been prescribed by the program as part of the required activities (see Table 14). The possible services included substance abuse prevention classes, treatment in a residential treatment or in-patient facility, a treatment half-way house, intensive or normal outpatient treatment, aftercare or relapse prevention therapy. These services were administered by a combination of state and local substance abuse treatment providers. The evaluation findings indicate that 2 of the offenders were referred to substance abuse prevention education, one of these offenders also received outpatient treatment and the other was upgraded to in-patient treatment. A total of three offenders received in-patient treatment and 5 received outpatient treatment. Aftercare/relapse prevention was also provided to those offenders who received in-patient residential treatment.

TABLE 14: SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT	NUMBER AND PERCENT WHO COMPLETED THE ACTIVITY	
	n	%	n	%
Prevention Education	2	25.0	1	50.0
In-Patient/Residential Treatment	3	37.5	2	66.6
Out-Patient/Halfway House	5	62.5	2	40.0
Aftercare/Relapse Prevention	1	12.8	0	0.0

It should be noted that in the area of substance abuse education, as well as in other areas, this YOP did not require participation if it did not appear warranted. For example, if an offender's substance abuse assessment and initial testing indicated no history of substance abuse, the client was not required to participate in further substance abuse activities such as education. This was in contrast to most other programs which required substance abuse education/prevention participation regardless of the assessment and initial testing results.

Mental Health Evaluation and Treatment

In addition to the substance abuse evaluation, education and treatment, all of the offenders were informally screened for possible mental health problems. When indicated, an offender may have been required to undergo a formal mental health evaluation conducted by a local mental health service provider. The evaluation findings indicate that 3 of the offenders received a mental health evaluation. Based on the results of the evaluation, the offender might have been required to undergo mental health treatment. The treatment alternatives would have included in-patient or out-patient mental health services, which could have been provided by either state or local mental health agencies. However, none of the 8 offenders studied were referred for any post-evaluation mental health services.

Case Management/Supervision

Staffing Meetings:

Given the small size of the program at the time this report's information was collected, staffing meetings were normally held at the YOP offices on an as-needed basis. These meetings were typically attended by the YOP staff and the supervisory PPO, with representatives of local agencies providing services to YOP clients attending when possible. At each staffing meeting, the progress of each YOP client was discussed and assessed. Sanctions utilized for non-compliance and curfew violations included such things as more restrictive curfews, electronic monitoring, jail or other such sanctions as deemed appropriate. Compliance with program rules was rewarded at these staffing meetings with extended curfew hours, travel permits and reduced community service.

Substance Abuse Monitoring:

Substance abuse monitoring was administered by the YOP staff, and was conducted on a stratified, random basis. While the offenders who were tested were randomly selected, they appeared to have been selected from two distinct groups; those with a history of substance abuse, and those without such a history. Offenders with substance abuse histories or current substance abuse problems appeared to be tested more often than those without such conditions. All testing was done in compliance with the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act (CLIA) which is a federal law setting lab standards for testing. The evaluation findings presented in Table 15 shows that 62.5 percent of the offenders had tested positive for a substance on more than 3 occasions.

TABLE 15: POSITIVE DRUG TESTS

NUMBER OF POSITIVE DRUG TESTS	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
0	2	25.0
1	1	12.5
2 to 3	0	0.0
More than 3	5	62.5
<i>TOTAL</i>	8	<i>100.0</i>

Participant Activity Monitoring:

Certain aspects of the offenders' activities were monitored by program staff. This monitoring took the form of almost daily contacts between the PPOS and the offenders. Some contacts were made by phone, with face-to-face contacts being made between 2 and 5 days per week. Collateral visits were also conducted at educational facilities, places of employment, and various other places. A curfew time was established for each participant, which was extended or reduced depending upon the offenders' overall compliance with the program rules. Curfew checks were conducted via phone or in person by program staff. Violations of curfew or other program rules were handled through the imposition of variety of different sanctions. Of the offenders studied, 5 received electronic monitoring, 4 were assigned to a residential facility, 3 were sent to jail for short-term incarceration, and 1 was placed on house arrest.

Any additional criminal activity by the offenders was also closely monitored. During the course of program participation, some offenders were arrested for a form of criminal activity other than violation of program rules. Five of the offenders studied were arrested for a new offense during their involvement with YOP. When this occurred, the program or the court imposed one or more of a number of different sanctions. Those sanctions included, but were not limited to, an earlier curfew, house arrest, electronic monitoring, assignment to a residential facility, assignment to the violator's program, short-term jail incarceration or termination from YOP. The same sanctions were utilized when the participant violated program rules to the degree that the imposition of a sanction was thought necessary by the program staff.

Community Service

Upon program admission, each offender who entered YOP agreed to perform up to 100 hours of community service through a combination of group and individual projects, normally performed for a non-profit organization operating within the community. Each offender was given the opportunity to reduce the 100 hour requirement, if the requirement had not been ordered by the court, by completing a GED, maintaining regular attendance at YOP educational programs, not missing curfew checks, and other acts indicating compliance with YOP's rules and goals. The evaluation findings indicate that 1 of the 4 offenders who successfully completed YOP had not completed their community service at time of their discharge from the program.

Victim-Offender Reconciliation Project (VORP)

The fourth judicial district YOP did not operate a formal VORP, although the implementation of such a program was under consideration when the information for this report was collected.

Restitution

The amount of restitution the offender owed was typically set on the basis of an economic impact statement submitted by the victim, reviewed by the County Attorney's Office, and then presented to the court. The court then reviews the amount proposed, and enters an order fixing the amount of victim restitution that each offender would be required to pay. Payments were made to the restitution clerk with the Department of Correctional Services, which disbursed the funds to the victim(s). In the event that the victim did not submit an impact statement, normally no victim restitution was ordered. The study findings indicate that 7 of the 8 offenders had victim restitution to pay and all but one of these offenders completed this component of the program.

In addition to victim restitution, additional forms of offender payments were often ordered by the court. These included, but were not limited to, court appointed attorney's fees, and various court costs (filing fees, court reporter fees, etc.) associated with the offender's case.

Mentoring

Mentoring was a YOP component set up to pair offenders with individuals in the community who were thought to have displayed some degree of leadership in their lives through volunteer work or other civic minded activities. It was hoped that the mentor and the offender would establish a good personal relationship, and that the mentor could exert a positive influence in changing the undesirable behaviors of the offender. The mentors in the fourth judicial district came from two primary sources; MAD DADS and volunteer members of the general public, who once accepted as mentors, underwent training at a local school. Mentoring was provided at this program on an as-needed basis. However, none of the 8 offenders who were studied had been involved in this component of the program.

Prison Tours

Some of the offenders participating in the program were required to take a tour of one of Iowa's or Nebraska's prisons to get a first-hand look at what awaited them if they continued their criminal behavior. This activity was implemented shortly after the program began its operations. Of the offenders examined, only 3 of them completed a prison tour. Two of these offenders successfully completed the program and the other was terminated from the program.

FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT'S YOP

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Physical Facilities

The YOP was located in the same building as the other CBC services on the north side of Des Moines. During the time of this evaluation, the YOP program changed offices within the same building. The new offices allowed the staff to be in one secured area rather than spread out across an entire floor. The new location included 4 staff offices (2 for the probation/parole officers, 1 for a substance abuse counselor, and 1 for the director), a rest room and small side room for substance abuse screening, a small multipurpose room which contained the YOP case files, and a conference room where staffing meetings and other group activities took place. There was a larger room at the end of the hall which housed the educational programming unit. This was where the educational screening occurred, GED programming, and other non-academic courses were taught.

Substance abuse treatment, biofeedback and other components that were deemed appropriate were provided to the offenders at other locations within Polk County. The victim offender reconciliation program was coordinated out of the Polk County Court House. Community service activities took place in various locations around Polk County and in some instances they occurred at the YOP offices.

Staff

The program staff included two probation/parole officers who were responsible for the supervision and monitoring of the YOP participants. One of the probation officers supervised the offenders while they participated in the formal YOP components. The other officer supervised those offenders who successfully completed YOP and were subsequently sentenced to "regular" probation. There was also a YOP director who was responsible for the administration of the program (along with other CBC duties) and often assisted the officers with their caseloads. An educational coordinator (provided to the program by the Des Moines Area Community College) was responsible for screening each of the offenders as to their education needs. This person coordinated the GED programming and served as a liaison between the program and local school districts for those offenders attending a public or alternative school. The program had no permanent clerical or staff support; when available they relied on interns.

Three major differences were found in regards to the probation/parole officers in this district as compared to each of the other 4 programs. First, this was the only location where a specific officer was assigned to provide post-YOP supervision to offenders who successfully completed the YOP components. The two officers (YOP and post-YOP) were housed in the same location and worked as a team. Second, both of the probation/parole officers were classified as PPO 2s rather than as PPO 3s. Third, both probation/parole officers (PPOS) had case loads 2 and 3 times the size of those in the other YOPs.

The other agencies that provided services or staff support to the program included the Polk County Attorneys Office (assistant county attorneys and the VORP coordinator), the Employees and Family Resources program who provided both pre-employment and substance abuse assessments and the prevention education component, the Biofeedback Training Clinic, and other community service agencies as warranted. In addition to these various services, a surveillance and warrant team developed between the 5th Judicial District and the Des Moines Police Department to provide immediate sanctions to probation and parole violations through arrests and short-term jail sentences was sometimes used for YOP violators. However, in some situations when the warrant team was not available to act immediately, the YOP PPOS would obtain warrants and conduct their own arrests.

Population

The offenders participating in the program were primarily white, male, and ranged in age from 16 to 20 (see Tables 16-18).

TABLE 16: SEX

SEX	n	%
Male	64	86.5
Female	10	13.5
TOTAL	74	100.0

TABLE 17: AGE

AGE	n	%
16	4	5.4
17	19	25.7
18	31	41.9
19	18	24.3
20	2	2.7
21	0	0.0
TOTAL	74	100.0

TABLE 18: RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND

RACE	n	%
Caucasian, Non-Hispanics	53	71.6
African Americans	16	21.6
Hispanics	2	2.7
Native Americans	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	4.1
TOTAL	74	100.0

An analysis of the most serious offenses for which each offender was referred to YOP indicated that approximately 74.3 percent of them had been referred for non-person offenses (see Table

19). It was found that one of the offenders studied in this district had been admitted to the program for a serious misdemeanor offense. Of the 23 offenders under the age of 18, six were exempt from juvenile court pursuant to Iowa Code Chapter 232.8 and handled directly by adult court, while 17 were referred to juvenile court, but then waived to adult court.

TABLE 19: YOP REFERRAL OFFENSE CLASSES

OFFENSE CLASS	AGAINST PERSON		NOT AGAINST PERSON	
	n	%	n	%
Class B Felony	6	85.7	1	14.2
Class C Felony	9	52.9	8	47.1
Class D Felony	2	4.8	40	95.2
Aggravated Misdemeanor	2	28.6	5	71.4
Serious Misdemeanor	0	0.0	1	100.0
TOTAL	19	25.7	55	74.3

The majority of the offenders (71 out of 74) who participated in the program lived in Polk County at the time of their admission to the program. The remaining 3 offenders lived in counties that immediately surrounded Polk County. The number of contacts with the program and the number of activities that offenders were required to complete, made it necessary for the offenders to live within a reasonable distance from the YOP.

Referral, Selection and Intake

Prior to adjudication, the Polk County Attorney’s Office screened the offenders for appropriateness to the program. The basic criteria were: (1) that the offender was between 16 and 21 years of age, and (2) that the referral offense was a felony or an aggravated misdemeanor. While these criteria were usually followed, there appeared to be some experimentation with who to accept into this program. For example, as just noted in the section above, at least one of the offenders was referred for a serious misdemeanor offense. Program staff indicated that in some situations, offenders who had committed a forcible felony (e.g., robbery) were also accepted.

Upon placement at YOP, an orientation session was held for all new offenders. The rules of the program and the schedule of components were explained to the offenders and a plea agreement identifying the requirements was signed by the offenders. If an offender successfully completed the program, probation for the period of 1 to 2 years was often recommended instead of a prison sentence, and the original charges were usually reduced to a lower offense or expunged from the offender’s record.

Educational Programming

Academic Education:

The education component of this YOP was delivered through a contract with the Des Moines Area Community College. The contract provided an education coordinator who was responsible for education assessments, literacy, GED and social development courses. The coordinator was

also responsible for tracking the progress of those offenders who were allowed to continue attending one of the local schools. The GED preparatory courses and most of the non-academic courses were held at the YOP offices.

Over 61 percent of the offenders participating in the program entered the YOP without having completed a high school degree or having obtained a GED (see Table 20). According to the findings, 8 of the offenders who entered the YOP without a high school degree or GED were able to complete a high school degree or GED during their involvement with the program.

TABLE 20: EDUCATIONAL LEVEL UPON ENTRY INTO YOP

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	n	%
8th Grade	1	1.3
9th Grade	9	12.2
10th Grade	15	20.3
11th Grade	20	27.0
12th Grade/GED	29	39.2
TOTAL	74	100.0

Non-Academic Education:

As with all YOPs, this YOP had a non-academic educational curriculum designed to upgrade the participant’s “life skills” and assist them in becoming a contributing member of society. As was indicated earlier, while the specific name of the courses varied among the programs, many of the courses covered the same subject matter. The generic courses comprising the “core subjects” for this program included cognitive restructuring, street law, career skills, and substance abuse prevention education. The cognitive restructuring component in this district was referred to as Breaking Barriers. Breaking Barriers was a video-taped course with a complimentary workbook in which the offenders had to watch and complete assignments. Some of the assignments were individual and some were small group projects aimed at enhancing one’s ability to make positive decisions. This class was moderated by the program director and the educational coordinator and met for one week for five evenings sessions.

There was also a street law class that met twice each week for 5 weeks and was 2 hours in length. This course was taught by prosecutors from the Polk County Attorney’s Office. Street law was a course in practical law that provided information and problem-solving opportunities to enable the offenders to analyze, evaluate and in some situations, resolve legal disputes. The Employees and Family Resources program provided a Pre-Employment Training Program (PEP) which was an intensive job skills training component that included 8 weeks of classes and was held twice a week for 2 hours per class. Other non-academic courses (e.g., Young Parents Class, Life Enhancement, Youth at Risk) were incorporated into an offender’s programming when it was determined to have been appropriate.

The evaluation findings indicate that 58 of the offenders completed Breaking Barriers, 53 completed Street Law, and 46 had completed Career Skills. In addition to these core course, 6 offenders completed the Young Parents Class, 1 had completed the Life Enhancement Course and 1 had completed the Youth at Risk program.

Substance Abuse Evaluation, Education and Treatment

All of the offenders received a substance abuse assessment and, upon completion of the assessment, were placed into one of three treatment modalities (education, inpatient or outpatient treatment). The assessments and prevention education were provided by Employees and Family Resources, while the substance abuse treatment component was provided through Children and Families of Iowa's Cornerstone Recovery Program. The majority of the offenders received either out-patient or prevention education services (see Table 21).

TABLE 21: SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT	NUMBER AND PERCENT WHO COMPLETED THE ACTIVITY	
	n	%	n	%
Prevention Education	38	51.4	30	78.9
In-Patient/Residential Treatment	11	14.9	6	54.5
Out-patient/Halfway House	40	54.1	29	72.5
Aftercare/Relapse Prevention	0	0.0	0	0.0

Mental Health Evaluation and Treatment

Offenders were informally screened for mental health problems and when appropriate they were given mental health evaluations. Seven of the offenders studied were subjected to a mental health evaluation. Of these 7 offenders, 1 received in-patient treatment and 4 received out-patient.

Biofeedback Training

The Biofeedback Training Clinic was an agency located in Des Moines, Iowa designed to provide a number of different services aimed at identifying and eliminating stress and tension in one's life. This particular service was provided to the offenders participating in YOP on an individualized basis primarily for anger control issues. Techniques used included the use of biofeedback, autogenic visualization, progressive relaxation training, transpersonal counseling, and a stress, nutrition and activity profile. None of the offenders studied had received Biofeedback Training. This component had only just begun accepting YOP offenders a few months prior to the completion cut-off date of December 31, 1996 for this study.

Case Management/Supervision

Staffing Meetings:

The staffing meetings in this district were held weekly in which over 100 clients typically were reviewed as to their treatment progress and treatment needs. The attendees are typically the 2

PPOS, the YOP educational instructor, the director of the biofeedback training clinic, the YOP director, the substance abuse counselor, an assistant county attorney, and the VORP coordinator. Other individuals, including offenders, were present for these meetings when staff deemed it necessary.

Substance Abuse Monitoring:

In this district, the offender participating in the program had to phone the YOP on a certain day to find out what the color for the week was; if it matched their color then they had to come in and be tested within a certain period of time. This was done within a CLIA approved manner. Urinalysis were sometimes conducted as spot-checks when offenders came into the offices or were participating in a program component such as Street Law or Breaking Barriers. The findings presented in Table 22 show that a majority of the offenders studied had 1 or no positive drug tests.

TABLE 22: POSITIVE DRUG TESTS

NUMBER OF POSITIVE DRUG TESTS	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
0	43	59.2
1	15	18.5
2 to 3	13	17.6
More than 3	3	4.1
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Participant Activity Monitoring:

The PPOS monitor certain aspects of an offenders activities including employment, education, and compliance with program rules. The monitoring included phone calls and face-to-face visits with the offenders. Collateral contacts with employers, schools, parents and others were also made on a regular basis. A variety of different sanctions were used when offenders violated the rules ranging from changes in curfew to jail. The findings regarding the sanctions imposed on the offenders in the program show that none of them were put on house arrest, 1 had received electronic monitoring, 1 was sent to the violators program, 6 were placed in a residential facility, and 37 were sent to jail for short-term incarceration.

This district has developed a surveillance and warrant team to monitor the activities of all offenders on probation and parole. The surveillance and warrant team worked with the Des Moines Police Department and the judicial system to provide immediate sanctions for program violations through arrests and short-term jail sentences. While YOP staff referred cases to this special unit, they also reported the need to respond quicker than the workload and procedures of the surveillance and warrant team would allow. Therefore, the YOP PPOS began obtaining warrants and arresting offenders on their own.

Any additional criminal activity by the offenders who participated in the program was also closely monitored. During the course of program participation, some of the offenders were arrested for a form of criminal activity other than violation of program rules. The evaluation

findings show that 22 of the offenders studied had been arrested for such offense(s) during their involvement with the program.

Community Service

All of the offenders were required to perform 100 hours of community service. The community service activities in this district were primarily individual activities. However, there was a group weekend community service project available. The number of community service hours an offender received could have been reduced for special projects or unusually good performance. The number of community service hours could also have been increased as a penalty for program violations that did not warrant removal from the program. It was found that 64.9 percent of the offenders had completed all of their community service hours by the time they completed the program. It was very possible that those who were placed on probation after YOP may have completed their community service at that time.

Victim Offender Reconciliation Program (VORP)

The victim offender reconciliation program was designed to allow victims a chance to confront an offender and describe the personal and economic impact of their crimes. VORP was run by a coordinator with the Polk County Attorney's Office. The process was begun by the VORP coordinator contacting the victim and having them fill out an impact statement and indicating whether they were willing to meet with the offenders. If the victim agreed to participate in the program, a meeting was scheduled at a neutral site to both the victim and offender and then a mediation session occurred. All offenders were required to have a VORP except in special circumstances (e.g., the offender was not deemed to be appropriate or victim refused to participate). The evaluation findings indicate that 36 of the offenders who successfully completed the program had completed at least one VORP at the time they completed the program. Since the study period, changes in VORP requirements have reportedly been made to reduce the number of YOP completions that do not include VORP.

Restitution

The amount of restitution the offender owed was typically discussed and agreed upon at VORP meetings. In the event the victim refused to participate in a VORP, the economic impact statement submitted by the victim was utilized as a suggested victim restitution amount. All agreed-upon or suggested restitution amounts were reviewed by the Polk County Attorney's Office and then presented to the court. The court would then review the amount proposed and enter an order fixing the amount of victim restitution that each offender would be required to pay. The payments were arranged and paid to the Polk County Attorney's office while the offenders were in YOP. Upon completion, the offender's case was transferred to the Clerk of Court Office. In the event that the victim did not submit an impact statement, normally no victim restitution was ordered. The study findings indicate that 21 of the offenders were required to pay victim restitution and 5 had paid their restitution off by the time they completed the program.

In addition to victim restitution, additional forms of offender payments were often ordered by the court. These included, but were not limited to payment for court appointed attorney's fees,

and the various court costs (filling fees, court reporter fees) associated with the offender's case.

Mentoring

Mentoring was a program where an offender was matched with an individual in the community who was thought to have displayed some degree of leadership in their life through volunteer work or other civic activities. It was hoped that through this pairing of offender and mentor, a good personal relationship would develop and exert a positive influence in changing the undesirable behaviors of the offender. Often, the community volunteers were accessed through local churches and civic minded organizations. This component was used on an individual-need basis. It was found through the evaluation study that 47 of the offenders had at least one mentor. The offenders who were selected to be involved with a mentor were required to make at least one in-person contact and one telephone contact per week.

Prison Tours

The offenders were taken to one of Iowa's prisons for a chance to see first hand what prison life was like. It was found that 26 out of the 74 offenders studied had completed a prison tour. The PPOS stated that they thought that the prison tours were very useful and reported that they often saw changes in the offenders' attitudes because of these visits.

SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT'S YOP

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Physical Facilities

The building housing the YOP office was located in the southwest corner of Cedar Rapids in the same complex housing many other CBC services. It was pointed out by the director of the YOP that two new wings had been added to the building in the last two years. The building is one story high and most of the offices had windows facing outside, there were also several conference rooms which were utilized as YOP classrooms. The non-academic courses, substance abuse and mental health assessments, the substance abuse prevention education course and weekly meetings between offenders and their probation officers were held in this building. Both high school and GED programming were held in a separate building next door. Most of the other services (e.g., substance abuse community-based treatment, and community service) took place in other facilities located in Cedar Rapids.

Staff

The primary YOP staff consisted of 2 Probation/Parole Officers 3s (PPOS) and 1 Secretary. There was also a program director who was responsible for the administration of the program and the screening or selection process. A staff psychologist was responsible for teaching the substance abuse prevention education course and conducting the substance abuse and mental health assessments.

The other agencies that provided services and staff to these offenders included the Human Resource Center (educational services), Metro (an Alternative High School), Alternative Services (employment classes and job tracking), the victim offender mediation program, and the TASC liaison (substance abuse). Additional agencies that were accessed to provide staff and services included the Cedar Rapids Schools, Kirkwood Community College, the Linn County Attorneys Office, the public defenders offices, and the Young Parent's Network. Each of the youthful offenders participating in the program were sent to a treatment unit within the DCS where they received a life skills assessment designed to assess the individualized needs of each of the offenders. The life skills assessments were used to develop the offenders' program plan and to determine treatment needs.

The YOP Population

The YOP population included 67 offenders between the ages of 17 and 21. The offenders in this district were mainly male, 18 and 19 years of age, and white (see Tables 23-25). All of the clients were listed as living in Linn county at the time of their placement into the program.

TABLE 23: CLIENT'S SEX

SEX:	n	%
MALE	61	91.0
FEMALE	6	9.0
TOTAL	67	100.0

TABLE 24: CLIENT'S AGE

AGE AT ADMISSION TO YOP	n	%
17	3	4.5
18	24	35.8
19	24	35.8
20	11	16.4
21	5	7.3
TOTAL	67	100.0

TABLE 25: CLIENT'S RACE

RACE	n	%
Caucasian, Non-Hispanic	11	16.4
African American	54	80.6
Hispanic	1	1.5
Native American	1	1.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0
TOTAL	67	100.0

In order to maintain parity with the pre-trial programs in the course of this analysis, the automated CBC database and the computerized criminal history records maintained by the Iowa Department of Public Safety were examined to determine the offenses for which these offenders were originally arrested, as opposed to the offenses of which they were eventually convicted. An analysis of the most serious offenses for which each offender was referred to YOP indicated that 4 of the offenses were against a person, while the majority were not (see Table 26). It should also be pointed out that 2 offenders were accepted into the YOP with serious misdemeanors. The 3 juvenile offenders participating in the program were waived to the jurisdiction of the adult court by direct action of the juvenile court.

TABLE 26: YOP REFERRAL OFFENSE CLASSES

OFFENSE CLASS	AGAINST PERSON		NOT AGAINST PERSON	
	n	%	n	%
Class B Felony	0	0.0	0	0.0
Class C Felony	0	0.0	8	10.4
Class D Felony	3	4.5	44	65.7
Aggravated Misdemeanor	0	0.0	10	14.9
Serious Misdemeanor	1	1.5	1	3.0
TOTAL	4	6.0	63	94.0

Referral, Selection and Intake

The County Attorney’s office and CBC’s Pre-Sentence Investigators screened offenders according to selected criteria (including assessments) and made recommendations to the judge for program placement at sentencing. The criteria used in the screening process were similar in each of the other 4 YOPs including that the offenders were between 16 and 21 and had been referred on either a first time felony or aggravated misdemeanor. However, there were at least 2 exceptions to this rule as indicated in Table 26.

Once sentenced to probation, the YOP Director screened offenders for appropriateness for YOP and typically relied on information contained in an offender’s pre-sentence report. Employment and education seemed to be two primary considerations in making decisions regarding the acceptance of offenders to the program. For example, if an offender was maintaining regular employment and, regardless of educational status, did not have any major problems, they were often placed on traditional probation or ISP. If an offender did have employment problems and had no high school degree or GED they were more likely to be considered for placement into YOP.

Upon acceptance to the program, the offenders were required to attend and complete a number of components (high school degree or GED, career skills education, cognitive restructuring, substance abuse education or treatment, life skills weekly meetings, a prison tour, street law, victim/offender reconciliation meetings, community service, and a high adventure challenge course). Based on individual need, some offenders may have been able to participate in three components at a time while others may only have been able to be involved with one component. The program staff indicated that they tried, when possible, to accommodate offenders in regard to their other responsibilities such as parenting or employment secured before the program. Those offenders who successfully completed the program may have received a recommendation for a deferred sentence or for early discharge from probation.

Educational Programming

Academic Education:

As with the other programs, all offenders were required to obtain a high school diploma or GED. Each offender was required to complete an educational assessment which was used in the

development of an education plan. If an offender was assessed as being able to achieve a diploma or GED, they were expected to do so prior to program completion. The Human Resource Center located next to the YOP was responsible for providing both high school and GED services. However, in some instances the local public school system was accessed to accommodate offenders already enrolled in public schools. If the offenders were showing positive progress and maintaining regular attendance, they were allowed to stay in the public school. The YOP staff also provided assistance to those who had completed a diploma or GED and wanted to continue their education at a local community college or other placement.

The average educational attainment at admission was 10.7 and the majority of the offenders had not obtained a high school degree or a GED prior to admission to the program (see Table 27). It was also found that 17 of the offenders studied who had entered the program without a high school degree or GED were able to obtain one during their involvement with the program. Of these 17 offenders 10 successfully completed the program and 7 did not.

TABLE 27: EDUCATIONAL LEVEL UPON ENTRY TO YOP

YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED AT ADMISSION	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
8th Grade	3	4.5
9th Grade	10	14.9
10th Grade	10	14.9
11th Grade	27	40.3
12th Grade/GED	17	25.3
TOTAL	67	100.0

Non-Academic Education:

As with each of the other YOPs, this program had a non-academic educational curriculum designed to enhance the offenders’ “life skills” and assist them in becoming contributing members of society. For the purposes of uniformity across programs, CJP staff decided to use generic names in describing the core non-academic courses. The generic courses comprising the “core subjects” for the 6th judicial district include Street Law, Cognitive Restructuring, Career Skills and Anger Management. As in the other districts the Street Law class was taught by local attorneys representing the County Attorney’s Office, the Public Defender’s Office, Legal Services Corporation, and the private sector. The street law class consisted of six sessions that lasted approximately 2 hours each. The study findings show that only 29 of the total 74 offenders completed this course during their involvement with YOP.

The Cognitive Restructuring course was referred to as Positive Solutions. This class met once per week for an hour and a half and was aimed at improving an offender’s problem solving ability. One of the rules of completing the program included the completion of this course; if an offender missed one of the cognitive restructuring class sessions in the first six weeks, they were made to start over. It was found that 57 of the 74 offenders studied had taken this course. All of those offenders who successfully completed the program had completed this component.

The career skills course was referred to as Employment For Youth and was taught by Alternative Services. This was a 30 hour course that lasted four weeks. The evaluation findings indicate that 34 of the offenders studied had completed this course by the time they completed YOP. The focus of this course was upon teaching the fundamentals of securing and maintaining employment. The activities used in this course included pre-employment training, job shadowing, intensive follow-up, and problem solving. Upon completion of the course, clients received assistance in job placement and were monitored regarding job progress for a minimum of six months.

In addition to the core courses, there were other courses and non-academic services available including a life-skills weekly meeting, a High Adventure Challenge Course, Parenting Skills and Multicultural Programming. The life skills weekly meetings were mandatory for all of the offenders participating in the 6th judicial district's YOP. These meetings allowed the probation officers to address issues that arose and provide the offenders with feedback of how they were doing. The University of Iowa Recreation Services conducted the High Adventure Challenge Course and it was found that 29 of the offenders did complete this particular component. The fundamental philosophy of this program was "challenge by choice" which allowed the participants to challenge their limitations and build self-esteem. It consisted of games, trust exercises, and a ropes course that allowed for individual challenge. This was a one-day event.

Offenders with children under age three were referred to the Young Parents Network to gain information on child development and to strengthen parenting skills; however, none of the offenders studied were identified as completing this component. Multicultural programming was available through the "Black Manhood Development" program on an individual basis -- it was found that 2 of the offenders received this service. In addition to these courses and non-academic components, it was found that 2 of the offenders studied were involved in Batterer's Education, and 7 took a course entitled Design for Living.

Substance Abuse Evaluation, Education and Treatment

An individualized substance abuse assessment was completed on each client deemed appropriate, and the offenders were required to follow the recommendations as part of their program. The study findings indicate that approximately 60 percent of the offenders studied were subjected to a substance abuse assessment.

The TASC Liaison, in consultation with the staff psychologist, determined appropriateness for substance abuse education. The substance abuse education course met twice weekly for four weeks and was taught by the staff psychologist. Offenders with little or no history of alcohol or drug use were required to attend this course. Offenders who were assessed to have histories of alcohol or drug use were subjected to a more complete substance abuse evaluation. Upon reviewing the evaluation findings, the TASC Liaison met with the offenders and made recommendations to some level of treatment, which may have included regular out-patient treatment, intensive out-patient treatment, residential treatment, and/or inpatient treatment. Over half of the offenders studied completed the prevention education course (see Table 28).

TABLE 28: SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT	NUMBER AND PERCENT WHO COMPLETED THE ACTIVITY	
			n	%
Prevention Education	40	59.7	23	57.5
In-Patient/Residential Treatment	18	26.9	8	44.4
Out-Patient/Halfway House	6	9.0	0	0.0
Aftercare/Relapse Prevention	0	0.0	0	0.0

Mental Health Evaluation and Treatment

The staff psychologist conducted a mental health evaluation on offenders when it was deemed appropriate. Six out of the 67 offenders studied were found to have received such an evaluation. Upon completion of the assessment and when deemed appropriate, the staff psychologist referred the offenders to appropriate mental health services. It was found that only 1 of the offenders was referred to out-patient treatment and none were referred for in-patient treatment.

Case Management/Supervision**Staffing Meetings:**

Staffing meetings were typically held between 1.5 and 2 weeks apart. It was stated by the YOP director, that weekly meetings were originally held, but it was felt that it was not necessary to meet that often. The staff who typically attended these meetings included educational staff, alternative service staff, the two probation officers, the VORP coordinator, a TASC staff person, 1 staff psychologist, 1 clerical staff, and the director of the YOP.

Similar to the other districts, the probation officers were the ones who actually ran the meetings. They began the meetings by reviewing each offender who was participating in the program and assessing their progress. In this particular district, curfew violations and other non-compliant behavior was dealt with as it arose by the probation officers and the director, and was presented in the meetings to update the other staff.

Substance Abuse Monitoring:

The TASC liaison was the one who provided substance abuse assessments and often assisted the PPOS in the urinalysis testing. The offenders were required to call the TASC liaison twice a week with testing occurring once a week. If an offender had completed treatment or the prevention education course, the PPOS conducted random tests. All such testing was conducted in compliance with the Clinical Laboratory Act. Table 29 shows that over 50 percent of the offenders had no positive drug tests, with a only a relatively small percent having more than 2.

TABLE 29: POSITIVE DRUG TESTS

NUMBER OF POSITIVE DRUG TESTS	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
0	39	58.2
1	17	25.4
2 to 3	5	7.4
More than 3	6	8.9
<i>TOTAL</i>	67	100.0

Participant Activity Monitoring:

In addition to substance abuse, a number of other aspects of the offenders’ behavior were monitored while they were involved with the program including compliance with curfew, program components, educational requirements, community service, and other such activities. This monitoring took the form of phone, personal, and collateral contacts between the PPOS and the offenders. Offenders were required to meet with their probation officer in the office once every week during their participation in the program. There were up to 4 additional contacts with each offender in a typical week that took place in other settings.

Immediately upon assignment to probation, offenders were placed on a curfew from 10:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M., which was adjusted according to their compliance with curfew and other program components. The program staff indicated that offenders typically received 4 to 5 curfew checks each week. The PPOS also indicated that they tried to conduct at least one on-site visit contact a week, usually on Saturdays.

The offenders criminal activity was also closely monitored while they were in the program. When an offender was arrested for a criminal offense the program staff recommended and imposed one or more sanctions. Those sanctions included, but were not limited to house arrest, electronic monitoring, assignment to a residential facility, short-term jail incarceration and termination from YOP. The study findings show that 6 were put on electronic monitoring, 2 were put on house arrest, 1 was sent to the violator’s program, 4 were placed in a residential facility, and 9 were placed in jail. An increased number of contacts with their PPO was also often utilized as a sanction for noncompliance. The same sanctions were utilized when an offender violated program rules to the degree that the imposition of a sanction was thought necessary by the program staff.

During the course of program participation, some of the offenders were arrested for a form of criminal activity other than violation of program rules. Twenty-three out of the 74 offenders studied were arrested during their involvement with the program.

Community Service

The 6th judicial district required a somewhat lower rate of community service than did the other YOPs. The 6th required approximately 50 hours of community service which could have been completed as either a group or individual project. The program staff indicated that reductions were sometimes offered to those offenders who completed program components or special

projects. Additions to community service hours were sometimes made when an offender violated one or more of the program rules. The findings show that 54.8 percent of the total offenders who were studied in this district had completed their community service hours by the time they had completed or were terminated from the program.

Victim Offender Reconciliation

In the 6th this was referred to as the Victim Offender Mediation Program (VOMP). This component was conducted by a specialized, trained mediator who was responsible for contacting the victims and coordinating the mediation meetings between the victims and the offenders. The VOMP coordinator, in conjunction with the PPO, determined which cases were appropriate for mediation. The primary goal of the VOMPS was for the victims to confront the offenders and express their feelings regarding the impact that the crime(s) had on their lives. Restitution amounts were set at time of sentencing by the court. According to the study findings only 1 offender had completed a VORP by the time that they completed the program.

Restitution

The amount of restitution the offender owed was typically set on the basis of an economic impact statement submitted by the victim, usually as part of the pre-sentence investigation, reviewed by the Linn County Attorney. The court then reviewed the amount proposed, and entered an order that fixed the amount of victim restitution that each offender was required to pay. The total amount of victim restitution ordered was \$48,908.19 and the total amount paid during YOP involvement was \$9,718.60. Almost 39 percent of those offenders who successfully completed YOP had paid their victim restitution prior to completion of the program as compared to 2% of the offenders who were terminated from the program.

In addition to victim restitution, additional forms of offender payments were often ordered by the court. These included, but were not limited to court appointed attorney's fees, and the various court costs (e.g., filing fees, court reporter fees, etc.) associated with the offender's case.

Mentoring

This component was under development and was not being used with any of the offenders reviewed for this report.

Prison Tours

Offenders were required to attend a tour of a correctional facility in Iowa (e.g., Iowa State Men's reformatory in Anamosa). This was done to give the offenders a first hand opportunity to see what prison life was like and dispel any myths that they had about it. It was found that 20 of the total offenders studied in this district had completed this component.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT'S YOP

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Physical Facilities

The eighth judicial district's YOP facility was located north of downtown Ottumwa, Iowa in an office building next door to the local CBC offices. The facility was shared by YOP and the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP). There were a total of six offices in the facility, two of which were utilized by the Probation/Parole Officers (PPOS) assigned to YOP. One office was used for general administrative purposes, one was used by the Domestic Violence Victim Coordinator, and two areas could have been termed general purpose areas, which were used for meetings and classes conducted by both YOP and DAIP.

YOP Staff

The primary staff consisted of two full-time PPO 3's whose work was dedicated exclusively to YOP. They oversaw an average of 15 to 25 offenders at any given time. Secretarial assistance and support was purchased from Manpower, a temporary service agency. In addition to the full-time personnel, there were additional personnel who devoted a portion of their time to the program. Included in this category was a treatment director, who oversaw the work of the YOP and DAIP.

Other agencies that provided staff and assistance to the YOP and the offenders who participated in the program included: Family Recovery - a local hospital based treatment facility, Iowa Residential Treatment Center in Mount Pleasant, local high schools, Indian Hills Community College, the Southern Prairie Area Educational Agency (AEA), local law enforcement agencies, Aegis a local mental health provider, a pre-employment coordinator, and the Ottumwa Rotary Club. In addition, County Attorneys and District Court Judges supported the YOP through program referrals.

YOP Population

The majority of YOP clients were male, Caucasian/Non-Hispanic and 18 years of age or older (see Tables 30-32).

TABLE 30: SEX

SEX:	n	%
Male	29	85.3
Female	5	14.7
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100.0</i>

TABLE 31: AGE

AGE AT ADMISSION TO YOP:	n	%
17	1	2.9
18	15	44.2
19	17	50.0
20	1	2.9
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100.0</i>

TABLE 32: RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND

RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND:	n	%
African-American	0	0.0
Caucasian/Non-Hispanic	34	100
Hispanic	0	0.0
Native American	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100.0</i>

In order to maintain parity with the pre-trial programs in the course of this analysis, the automated CBC database and the computerized criminal history records maintained by the Iowa Department of Public Safety were examined to determine the offenses for which these offenders were originally arrested, as opposed to the offenses of which they were eventually convicted.

An analysis of the most serious offenses for which each offender was arrested and subsequently referred to YOP for indicated that 5 (14.7%) of these offenses were committed against a person, with the remaining 29 (85.3%) offenses not committed against a person (see Table 33). Of the offenses committed against a person, 3 were Class B felony charges (Burglary 1st degree), and 2 were aggravated misdemeanor assault charges. Of the offenses not committed against a person, 6 were Class C felony charges, 18 were Class D felony charges, 3 were aggravated misdemeanor charges and 2 were serious misdemeanor charges. Of the 34 participants, 26 were referred to YOP for one offense, 7 were referred for two offenses and 1 was referred for three offenses. The one juvenile offender participating in the program was waived to the jurisdiction of the adult court by direct action of the juvenile court.

TABLE 33: YOP REFERRAL OFFENSE CLASSES

OFFENSE CLASS	AGAINST PERSON		NOT AGAINST PERSON	
	n	%	n	%
Class B Felony	0	0.0	0	0.0
Class C Felony	0	0.0	6	17.6
Class D Felony	0	0.0	17	50.0
Aggravated Misdemeanor	4	11.8	5	14.7
Serious Misdemeanor	0	0.0	2	5.9
TOTAL	4	11.8	30	88.2

Twenty-two out of the 34 clients studied resided in Wapello County where the YOP offices were located. Of the remaining 11 offenders, 10 were from the counties immediately surrounding Wapello County. One of the offenders participating in the program apparently moved to Wapello County after committing the offense for which they were referred. Clients drawn from outlying counties in the judicial district did experience some problems caused by the intensity of the program with regards to contacts with probation officers, attendance at both academic and non-academic classes and monitoring (e.g., substance abuse testing, curfew checks, etc.). One of the major problems mentioned by the PPOS was the transportation of offenders between their homes and all of the different program components (e.g., community service, prison tours, classes, meetings with probation officers). A number of absences at YOP functions were caused by a lack of reliable transportation. The distance between the YOP offices and the residences of those clients living outside the county also caused problems for the PPOS in that they had to spend considerable time in traveling to these residences to conduct curfew checks and make personal contacts.

Referral, Selection and Intake

At the time of this evaluation, the 8th judicial district's YOP was primarily receiving offenders referred to the program by District Court Judges at the time of sentencing, although two individuals were experimentally admitted to the program on a pre-trial basis. This experiment was considered successful by the YOP staff and has led to a significant increase in the numbers of pre-trial referrals since the time of the evaluation.

Upon referral, the cases were reviewed by the program staff to determine if offenders met the primary eligibility requirements for YOP. The potential client had to be between the ages of 16 and 21, and was required to have been charged or convicted of a first time felony or aggravated misdemeanor. The YOP staff indicated that those offenders who had been charged with a forcible felony (e.g., murder or robbery) were not accepted by the program. In some instances, upon the specific recommendation of the county attorney, individuals who were charged or convicted of an aggravated misdemeanor were considered for YOP.

Educational Programming

Academic Education:

The 8th judicial district required that an educational assessment be completed on all of the offenders who participated in the program to determine the appropriate level of educational programming that was warranted. Like other YOPs, this program required that all of the offenders who had not obtained a high school diploma or a GED certificate had to be enrolled in a course of study in a local high school or be working toward their GED at Indian Hills Community College.

Upon entry to the program, the educational level of the 34 offenders ranged from having completing the 9th grade to having completed one year of college level courses. The educational achievements of two of the offenders at the time of admission to YOP was not recorded. The average educational level was 11.06 years, and 15 of the 32 (46.9%) participants whose educational level was known had completed high school or earned their GED prior to entering YOP (see Table 34). Ten of the 17 offenders who entered the program without a GED or high school degree were able to obtain one by the time they completed the program. Seven of these 10 eventually completed the program successfully, while 3 did not.

TABLE 34: EDUCATIONAL LEVEL UPON ENTRY INTO YOP

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	n	%
8th Grade	0	0.0
9th Grade	4	11.8
10th Grade	7	20.6
11th Grade	6	17.6
12th Grade/GED	15	44.1
Unknown	2	5.9
TOTAL	34	100.0

Non-Academic Education:

As with the other 4 YOPs, this program has a non-academic educational curriculum designed to enhance the participant's "life skills" and assist them in becoming a contributing member of society. The courses available at this program included Street Law, Cognitive Restructuring, and Career Skills. Nineteen of the 34 offenders had completed Street Law, 19 had completed Cognitive Restructuring, 10 had completed Career Skills during their involvement with the YOP.

There was also a weekly life skills enhancement meeting held each week-- it was found that 27 of the 34 offenders had completed this particular component. These meetings were designed to focus on the offenders' overall identity and teach accountability. In addition to these courses, it was found that 6 of the offenders completed a cultural diversity course, 14 had completed a non-violent alternatives program, 3 had completed a course called Project Reality, 7 had completed a parenting skills course, and 5 had completed 2 other non-academic courses. It was also found

that 1 of the offenders had been referred to and completed BEP.

Substance Abuse Evaluation, Education and Treatment

All YOP participants were subjected to a substance abuse assessment conducted by Family Recovery, a local hospital-based treatment facility. Regardless of the assessment results, all of the offenders in the program were to be required to attend substance abuse education classes provided through this agency. The findings in Table 35 show that not all of the offenders participated in prevention education and that only 61 percent of the 18 who did, actually completed this component. It should also be noted that 5 of the offenders who completed the program successfully did not complete this component.

Out-patient and aftercare treatment services were also provided through Family Recovery. In-patient treatment was provided by the Iowa Residential Treatment Center in Mount Pleasant, Iowa.

TABLE 35: SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT	NUMBER AND PERCENT WHO COMPLETED THE ACTIVITY	
			n	%
Prevention Education	18	52.9	11	61.1
In-Patient/Residential Treatment	11	32.4	7	63.6
Out-Patient/Halfway House	12	35.3	8	66.7
Aftercare/Relapse Prevention	0	0.0	0	0.0

Mental Health Evaluation and Treatment

The offenders were screened for possible mental health problems on an individual basis. When an offender was determined to have needed a more complete evaluation or assessment of their mental health, a referral was made to a licensed clinical psychology agency called Aegis³. This agency provided assessments, individualized counseling, and referrals to in-patient treatment. Seventeen of the offenders studied received an evaluation, 1 received in-patient care and 2 received out-patient treatment.

Case Management/Supervision

Staffing Meetings:

The staffing meetings held in this district were very similar to those held in the other 4 districts. The staffing meetings were held to assess the progress of the offenders in regards to their specific requirements and served to update each of the participating staff as to the offenders’ overall compliance with the program. These meetings were typically held every other week,

³ Aegis is a word in the English Language that means support or protection.

and consisted of program staff, a staff member from Family Recovery, the coordinator of the victim/offender reconciliation program, and the pre-employment coordinator.

Substance Abuse Monitoring:

Substance abuse monitoring was administered by the YOP staff, and was conducted on what might be termed a stratified basis. Most clients initially were tested at least twice a month. After a period of time, the testing frequency was either increased or decreased depending upon the clients progress in regards to substance abuse treatment and perceived probability of drug use. All of the substance abuse testing was conducted in compliance with the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act. The majority of the offenders studied had no positive drug tests (see Table 36).

TABLE 36: POSITIVE DRUG TESTS

NUMBER OF POSITIVE DRUG TESTS	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER DISTRICT
0	25	73.5
1	6	17.6
2 to 3	2	5.9
More than 3	1	2.9
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Participant Activity Monitoring:

The program staff monitored certain aspects of the offenders’ activities such as their compliance with program requirements and their employment and educational progress. The monitoring in this district took similar forms as those in each of the other YOPs including phone, personal, and collateral contacts between the PPOS and the offenders. Personal or face-to-face contacts were usually made at least twice per week.

All offenders received a curfew of 10:30 P.M. to 6:00 A.M., which was adjusted according to their compliance with curfew and other program components. The PPOS tried to accommodate those individuals who worked beyond their normal curfew by giving them extended curfews for those nights. Curfew checks were conducted either over the phone or in person by program staff. The PPOS indicated that their surveillance activities typically increased on the weekends.

The offender’s criminal activity was also closely monitored while they were in the program. When an offender was arrested for a criminal offense, the program staff recommended and imposed one or more sanctions. Those sanctions included, but were not limited to, house arrest, electronic monitoring, assignment to a treatment residential facility, short term incarceration and termination from YOP. The same sanctions were utilized when the participant violated program rules to the degree that the imposition of a sanction was thought necessary by the program staff. If an offender’s sanction was residential placement other than for treatment issues, they were automatically terminated from YOP.

The evaluation findings indicate that 6 of the offenders were put on electronic monitoring, 6

were put on house arrest, 14 were placed in a residential facility and 13 were placed in jail. It was also found that 7 of the 34 offenders were arrested for a new offense during their involvement with YOP.

Community Service

Each of the offenders entering YOP were required to perform 100 hours of community service through a combination of YOP group (50 hours) and individual projects (50 hours). Both types of projects were normally performed for any one of a number of non-profit and/or public service organizations operating within the community. Some of the group community service projects have included activities with local nursing homes, the Kaiwanas Club and others. Some of the individual projects have involved such activities as setting up and assisting with events held through the local YMCA. It was found that 14 of the offenders studied had completed their community service requirement by the time they completed the program. Only 2 of the offenders who successfully completed the program were found to have not completed their community service requirement by the time they completed the program.

Victim-Offender Reconciliation Project (VORP)

Similar to the other YOPs, a VORP coordinator served as a liaison between the victims, courts, and offenders. The first step was to assess the impact of the victimization and identify the amount of damages incurred. Contact with the victim usually began at the pre-sentence stage and increased throughout the offender's participation in the program. A number of individual interviews were held with the victim and offender leading up to a reconciliation meeting. According to the program staff, the victim was usually ready for the VORP before the offender. It was also stated by program staff that the reconciliation meetings are set up to be convenient to the victims schedule. The evaluation findings indicate that 12 of the offenders studied had completed this requirement. This means that 4 of those who successfully completed the program had not completed this particular component for a number of possible reasons (e.g., the victim refused, the offender or victim was deemed inappropriate, etc.).

These reconciliation or mediation sessions typically began with a statement by the mediator as to what his/her role was along with an explanation as to the objectives of the mediation session. The mediators role during these meetings was to guide the process and serve as an objective third party. The goals of these sessions for the victims is to get a chance to confront their offenders and describe the emotional and economic impact of the offense. It was hoped that this process would help sensitize the offender as to the impact of his crime and force them to be accountable for the consequences. Restitution and payment schedules were almost always discussed during these meetings.

Restitution

The amount of restitution the offender owed was typically set on the basis of an economic impact statement submitted by the victim, usually as part of the pre-sentence investigation, reviewed by the County Attorney's Office, and then presented to the court. The court then reviewed the amount proposed and entered an order fixing the amount of victim restitution that each offender would be required to pay. For those offenders that were admitted to the program

after going to trial, payments were made to the Clerk of Court Office, which disbursed the funds to the victim(s). The two offenders from this district that were admitted prior to their trial made payments through the Wapello County Attorney's office until they were placed on probation and then their payments went through the Clerk of Court Office. No restitution was typically ordered in those cases where the victim did not submit an impact statement. It was found that 6 of the offenders studied had paid off their restitution prior to successfully completing the program.

In addition to victim restitution, additional forms of offender payments were often ordered by the court. These included, but were not limited to, court appointed attorney's fees, and the various court costs (e.g., filing fees, court reporter fees, etc.) associated with the offender's case.

Mentoring

Offenders were matched with individuals in the community who were thought to have displayed some degree of leadership in their lives through volunteer work and other such activities. It was hoped that such relationships would provide a positive influence in offender's lives that was otherwise deemed to have been missing. It was found that 18 of the 34 offenders studied had at least one mentor during their involvement with YOP. Two of these 18 offenders were later terminated from the program.

The mentors in the eighth judicial district originally came from the local Rotary Club. However, program staff has indicated that the organization's interest in continuing to be involved with the mentoring program has subsided. Since it appeared to project staff that this component was having a positive impact on the clients, staff was currently seeking other sources of mentors.

Prison Tours

As part of this YOP, offenders were required to tour a prison operated by DOC to see first hand where continuing their criminal behavior might lead. However, it was found that only 7 of the offenders studied had actually attended one of these tours. Program staff indicated that during the course of these tours, on more than one occasion, offenders participating in the program were threatened with physical harm and suffered other negative consequences of the tours. As a result, the actual tour of the prisons was suspended and replaced with a meeting with a panel of inmates in an environment that was more controlled and safer for the offenders participating in the YOP.

OUTCOMES

Multi-District Program Characteristics and Program Completion

One of the project activities that was identified through a participatory process involving CJJP, GASA, DOC, DCS, and YOP was to describe offender-specific program outcomes. Two primary outcomes were identified for the purposes of this study -- program completion and recidivism as determined by YOP staff. Program completion was defined as either successful or unsuccessful completion of YOP. Typically those offenders who were considered to have successfully completed YOP, completed core requirements (e.g., education, non-academic education, substance abuse treatment) and complied with the program rules to an acceptable extent.

Offenders could have been unsuccessfully terminated from the individual YOP programs for any number of reasons (e.g., new arrest, non-compliance, positive drug tests). It appeared that new arrests were more likely than non-compliance or drug tests to result in termination for the first occurrence. For non-compliance issues, there were normally one or more sanctions imposed prior to termination such as electronic monitoring, more restrictive curfews, house arrests, and jail time. Positive drug tests usually resulted in more intensive treatment, jail time or some other sanction prior to termination.

A number of different variables (e.g., demographic, educational level at admission, drug tests, risk assessment scores) were collected and analyzed to allow a description of those items that might be related to completion rates. The overall completion rate for all five of the programs studied was 54.3 percent (see Table 37). The post-trial programs had very similar completion rates, while the pre-trial programs varied from 66.2 percent in the 5th judicial district to 40.7 percent in the 1st judicial district (see Table 38). It should also be noted that the two pre-trial cases in the 8th judicial district were both terminated unsuccessfully from the program.

TABLE 37: JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND COMPLETION RATES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT	TOTAL CASES	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
1 st	27	11	40.7%
4 th	8	4	50.0%
5 th	74	49	66.2%
6 th	67	34	50.7%
8 th	34	16	47.1%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>54.3%</i>

TABLE 38: PROGRAM TYPE (PRE-TRIAL AND POST-TRIAL) AND COMPLETION RATES

PROGRAM TYPE BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT	TOTAL CASES	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
<i>PRE-TRIAL</i>			
1 st	27	11	40.7%
5 th	74	49	66.2%
8 th	2	0	0.0%
TOTAL	103	60	58.3%
<i>POST-TRIAL</i>			
4 th	8	4	50.0%
6 th	67	34	50.7%
8 th	32	16	50.0%
TOTAL	107	54	50.5%

Program Length and Completion Rates

A substantial number of factors impact on the amount of time required to successfully complete YOP. As was shown in the program description section, the number of required elements in the individual YOPs vary, and the larger the number of required elements, the longer it might take to complete all the elements. Also, during the course of YOP, a number of offenders received sanctions (jail, residential facility placement, etc.) which precluded the offender from active YOP participation for a period of time. Such a period of non-participation would also lengthen the amount of time required to successfully complete YOP. Other factors such as the amount of time an offender had available after work to attend YOP-required classes, to complete required community service work, etc.; the availability of the victim(s) to complete a VORP; and the length of time required to complete high school are other examples of factors affecting the amount of time required to successfully complete YOP.

The amount of time after which an offender was terminated from YOP, and thereby completes the program unsuccessfully, appears to depend upon two factors. The first was the ability of the offender to comply with the program requirements (no new offenses, abstinence from drugs and alcohol, observed curfew and travel restrictions, etc.). The second factor was amount of tolerance that the individual YOPs have for violation of program requirements as there appeared to be no set rules as to the number of arrests for new offenses, positive drug tests, or other deviant behavior that will result in YOP termination.

Table 39 displays the average times for both successful and unsuccessful completion of YOP by individual judicial district. In each of the YOPs, the amount of time to successfully complete YOP exceeded the amount of time after which the average offender was unsuccessfully terminated from the program, except in the 4th judicial district where the opposite was true. One possible explanation for this fact, in that particular program, is that the offender was normally released from formal probation upon completion of YOP, and as such, the program

may have accepted more deviations from the rules in an attempt to secure offender compliance.

TABLE 39: AVERAGE LENGTH OF YOP PARTICIPATION BY COMPLETION TYPE AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

COMPLETION TYPE AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	AVERAGE LENGTH OF PARTICIPATION
<i>SUCCESSFUL</i>	
1 st	10.30 Months
4 th	8.72 Months
5 th	5.87 Months
6 th	5.21 Months
8 th	10.55 Months
<i>SUCCESSFUL AVERAGE</i>	<i>6.88 Months</i>
<i>UNSUCCESSFUL</i>	
1 st	6.38 Months
4 th	9.29 Months
5 th	4.23 Months
6 th	3.95 Months
8 th	5.00 Months
<i>UNSUCCESSFUL AVERAGE</i>	<i>4.85 Months</i>

Gender and Completion Rates

Over 88 percent of all offenders who participated in the 5 YOPs were male. The completion rates of the males were slightly higher than that for the females, except in the 5th judicial district where females had slightly higher rates of completion (see Table 40).

TABLE 40: GENDER BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND COMPLETION RATES

GENDER AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	TOTAL CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
<i>MALE</i>				
1 st	24	88.9	11	45.8%
4 th	7	87.5	4	57.1%
5 th	64	86.5	42	65.6%
6 th	61	91.0	32	52.5%
8 th	29	85.3	14	48.3%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>185</i>	<i>88.1</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>55.7%</i>
<i>FEMALE</i>				
1 st	3	11.1	0	0.0%
4 th	1	12.5	0	0.0%
5 th	10	13.5	7	70.0%
6 th	6	9.0	2	33.3%
8 th	5	14.7	2	40.0%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>11.9</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>44.0%</i>

Age and Completion Rates

The ages of the offenders ranged from 16 to 21 years of age, with the majority of the offenders under 18 years of age having been waived to adult court. Table 41 shows that those offenders in the 18-19 year old age group had lower rates of successfully completing YOP than those offenders in each of the other two groups.

TABLE 41: AGE BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND COMPLETION RATES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND AGE GROUP	TOTAL CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
16 – 17				
1 st	2	7.4	0	0.0%
4 th	2	25.0	2	100%
5 th	23	31.1	16	69.6%
6 th	3	4.5	1	33.3%
8 th	1	2.9	1	100%
TOTAL	31	14.8	20	64.5%
18 – 19				
1 st	20	74.0	9	45.0%
4 th	5	62.5	1	20.0%
5 th	49	66.2	31	69.6%
6 th	48	71.6	22	45.8%
8 th	32	94.1	15	46.9%
TOTAL	154	73.3	78	50.7%
20 – 21				
1 st	5	18.5	2	40.0%
4 th	1	12.5	1	100%
5 th	2	2.7	2	100%
6 th	16	23.8	11	68.8%
8 th	1	2.9	0	0.0%
TOTAL	25	11.9	16	64.0%

Race/Ethnicity and Completion Rates

Approximately 81 percent of the all of the offenders who participated in the YOPs were Caucasian, non-Hispanic, 16 percent African-American, and 3 percent other (see Table 42). During data collection, 5 race/ethnic categories were tracked including African-American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Native-American, and Asian/Pacific Islander. Since there were only 7 offenders who were Hispanic, Native-American, or Asian/Pacific Islander, it was decided to combine these three groups for statistical analysis purposes. The Caucasians had higher rates of successful program completion than each of the other two groups. Since the numbers of African-Americans and others was relatively small, caution is warranted in attaching too much

significance to any differences found among the judicial districts for these two groups.

TABLE 42: RACE/ETHNICITY BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND COMPLETION RATES

RACE AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	TOTAL CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
<i>AFRICAN-AMERICAN</i>				
1 st	5	18.5	1	20.0%
4 th	1	12.5	1	100%
5 th	16	21.6	9	56.3%
6 th	11	16.4	4	36.4%
8 th	0	0.0	0	-----
TOTAL	33	15.7	15	45.5%
<i>CAUCASIAN (NON-HISPANIC)</i>				
1 st	22	81.5	10	45.5%
4 th	7	87.5	3	42.9%
5 th	53	71.6	37	69.8%
6 th	54	80.6	30	55.6%
8 th	34	100	16	47.1%
TOTAL	170	81.0	96	56.5%
<i>OTHER</i>				
1 st	0	0.0	0	-----
4 th	0	0.0	0	-----
5 th	5	6.8	3	60.0%
6 th	2	3.0	0	0.0%
8 th	0	0.0	0	-----
TOTAL	7	3.3	3	42.9%

Referral Offenses and Completion Rates

Table 43 and the following discussion describe the criminal offenses for which the offenders were referred to YOP. Presenting these data posed something of a dilemma in that the referral offenses for the pre-trial and post-trial programs were inherently different in character. In the pre-trial programs, the referral offenses were most often those offenses for which the offender was arrested. Any reduction of charges, through a plea agreement for example, would take place after the offender successfully completed YOP and before the trial had taken place. In the post-trial programs, any reduction in charges had already taken place, and in a number of cases, the offender was allowed to plead guilty to a charge less serious than they had originally been arrested for. In order to assure a valid comparison of the referral charges, for those offenders entering a YOP post-trial program, the ICBC and CCH databases were queried, and the most serious original arrest or court charge was recorded as the referral offense. By doing this, the most serious original arrest or court charge was utilized for analyses for both the pre-trial and post-trial groups.

The offenses for which the offenders were referred to the programs ranged from class B felonies (e.g., robbery-first degree, burglary-first degree, arson-first degree) to serious misdemeanors (e.g., assault without intent causing injury, theft-fourth degree, criminal mischief-fourth degree). None of the offenders who participated in YOP were referred for class A felonies (e.g., kidnapping-first degree, murder-first degree) or simple misdemeanors (e.g., simple assault, theft-fifth degree). Over 63 percent of all offenders who participated in YOPs were referred for class D felonies (e.g., burglary-third degree, criminal mischief-second degree), 25 percent were referred for class C felonies (e.g., burglary-second degree, theft-second degree, arson-second degree), 10 percent were referred for aggravated misdemeanor offenses (e.g., arson-third degree, criminal mischief-third degree, theft-third degree), 5 percent were referred for class B felonies, and 2 percent were referred for serious misdemeanors.

Although all of the programs were originally designed for those offenders who had committed a first time felony or aggravated misdemeanor offense, there were a few offenders in the 5th judicial district who had been admitted for a forcible felony. There were also a few offenders who had been admitted to YOP for a serious misdemeanor. Table 43 shows that the group of offenders with the lowest completion rate was those who had been admitted with a serious misdemeanor. One possible reason for this finding is that offenders admitted with serious misdemeanor offenses may have had less to lose than those admitted for more serious offenses. In other words, it may be that those offenders who had been admitted with higher offenses were more concerned with the possibility of a harsher sanction if they had been terminated from the program.

**TABLE 43 : REFERRAL OFFENSE BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT
AND COMPLETION RATES**

LEVEL OF MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
<i>B FELONY</i>				
1 st	0	0.0	0	0.0%
4 th	1	12.5	1	100%
5 th	7	9.4	5	71.4%
6 th	1	1.5	0	0.0%
8 th	2	5.9	1	50.0%
TOTAL	11	5.2	7	63.6%
<i>C FELONY</i>				
1 st	2	7.4	1	50.0%
4 th	2	25.0	0	0.0%
5 th	17	23.0	10	58.8%
6 th	25	37.3	2	8.0%
8 th	6	17.6	3	50.0%
TOTAL	52	24.8	16	30.8%
<i>D FELONY</i>				
1 st	20	74.1	9	45.0%
4 th	3	37.5	1	33.3%
5 th	42	56.8	29	69.0%
6 th	51	76.1	28	54.9%
8 th	17	50.0	8	47.0%
TOTAL	133	63.3	75	56.4%
<i>AGGREGATED MISDEMEANOR</i>				
1 st	5	18.5	1	20.0%
4 th	1	12.5	1	100%
5 th	7	9.5	5	71.4%
6 th	4	3.0	2	50.0%
8 th	4	11.8	4	100%
TOTAL	21	10.0	13	61.9%
<i>SERIOUS MISDEMEANOR</i>				
1 st	0	----	0	----
4 th	1	12.5	1	100%
5 th	1	1.4	0	0.0%
6 th	2	3.0	0	0.0%
8 th	1	3.0	0	0.0%
TOTAL	5	2.4	1	20.0%

Offender Risk and Completion Rates

All offenders assigned to CBC in the state of Iowa are supposed to be assessed in terms of their risk of recidivism. A 13-point instrument which included a number of risk indicators (e.g., age at classification, age at first adult conviction/juvenile adjudication, prior probation/parole supervisions) was used (see Appendix A). Each of the risk items received an individual score which were then added together for a total risk score. The possible risk scores ranged from -5 to 25 and were used to identify an offender's appropriate level of supervision. There were 4 different levels of supervision (administrative, minimum, normal, and intensive) identified on the assessment instrument. To obtain the three risk levels presented in Table 44, the lowest two groupings were combined to form the low group, those in the normal group were considered to be at medium risk, and those in the intensive group were considered to be at high risk of recidivism. The reason that Table 44 is presented by pre-trial/post-trial groupings is that there was a fundamental difference in when the assessment tool was employed. In the pre-trial programs the risk assessment was calculated after the offender completed YOP and was placed on probation. In the post-trial programs the offender was assessed prior to their admission to YOP.

As a whole, there was a lower percent of offenders who participated in the pre-trial programs who were classified as high risk than those offenders who participated in the post-trial programs (see Table 44). And, conversely the pre-trial programs had higher rates of offenders who were classified as low risk than the post-trial programs. The most common risk level for both the pre-trial and post-trial programs was the medium risk level. Table 44 shows that offenders, regardless of type of program, who had higher levels of risk had lower rates of completing YOP than those who were classified with lower levels of risk.

**TABLE 44: RISK ASSESSMENT LEVELS BY PROGRAM TYPE
AND COMPLETION RATES**

RISK SCORES AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	TOTAL CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
< 7 (LOW RISK)				
PRE-TRIAL				
1st	1	3.7	0	0.0
5th	16	21.6	15	93.8
8th	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	17	16.5	15	88.2
POST-TRIAL				
4th	0	0.0	0	0.0
6th	5	7.5	4	80.0
8th	2	6.3	2	100
TOTAL	7	6.5	6	85.7
8-14 (MEDIUM RISK)				
PRE-TRIAL				
1st	13	48.1	8	61.5
5th	33	44.6	25	75.8
8th	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	46	44.7	33	71.7
POST-TRIAL				
4th	3	37.5	2	66.7
6th	34	50.7	21	61.8
8th	11	34.4	9	81.8
TOTAL	48	44.9	32	66.7
15-31 (HIGH RISK)				
PRE-TRIAL				
1st	13	48.1	3	23.0
5th	14	18.9	6	42.8
8th	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	27	26.2	9	33.3
POST-TRIAL				
4th	5	62.5	2	40.0
6th	28	41.8	9	32.1
8th	12	37.5	4	33.3
TOTAL	45	42.1	15	33.3

Arrests and Completion Rates

Arrests during YOP, as displayed in Table 45, were those instances where the offender was arrested for a new public offense while participating in YOP. These data did not include any arrests made for violation of probation which may have resulted from violating program rules. It should be noted that some of the arrests shown were made by YOP probation/parole officers as a result of their surveillance of, and contacts with, the YOP offenders.

Overall, approximately one-third of the YOP offenders were arrested while participating in YOP. Only in the 4th judicial district did the number of those arrested during YOP exceed the number of those not arrested during YOP. (In reviewing this fact, it should be remembered that the number of YOP offenders in that district is very small, and that the difference is probably not significant.) As might be expected, the successful completion rate for those offenders not arrested during YOP (65.5%) far exceeded the successful completion rate of those who were arrested during YOP (30.9%). What appears noteworthy is that almost one-third of those offenders arrested during YOP did go on to successfully complete YOP.

TABLE 45: ARRESTS DURING YOP BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND COMPLETION RATES

ARRESTED DURING YOP AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
<i>NOT ARRESTED DURING YOP</i>				
1 st	14	51.9	6	42.9%
4 th	3	37.5	2	66.7%
5 th	54	73.0	44	81.5%
6 th	44	65.7	29	65.9%
8 th	27	79.4	12	44.4%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>67.6</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>65.5%</i>
<i>ARRESTED DURING YOP</i>				
1 st	13	48.1	5	38.5%
4 th	5	62.5	2	40.0%
5 th	20	27.0	5	25.0%
6 th	23	34.3	5	21.7%
8 th	7	20.6	4	57.1%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>32.4</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>30.9%</i>

YOP Sanctions and Completion Rates

Based on the information provided by each of the YOPs, it was found that there were a number of sanctions utilized for program rule violations and/or new arrests during YOP. Most of those sanctions, and their documented usage by each of the judicial districts, is shown in Table 46. One other sanction, the imposition of an earlier curfew time, was utilized by all of the YOPs, but due to inconsistent recording of this sanction in the case files, its usage was not included in this table. It should also be noted that the sanctions portrayed in this table are not mutually exclusive. Offenders could be, and in several instances were, subjected to a combination of different sanctions prior to their completion of YOP. Some offenders were also subjected to the same sanction on more than one occasion.

House arrest was utilized as a sanction in only three of the five YOPs, and only a total of nine times. The usage of this sanction was so low that about the only conclusion that can be drawn is that it was the least used of the sanctions. The next least used sanction was that of electronic monitoring which was used in four of the five YOPs and a total of 18 times. Again, the low frequency of use precludes a meaningful discussion of this sanction's usage and possible affect on offenders. Assignment to a residential facility was used as a sanction in all the YOPs, but it was only used on a total of 29 offenders. Of those offenders sanctioned by the assignment to a residential facility, approximately one-third did successfully complete YOP. Finally, the use of short term jail incarceration was the most frequently utilized sanction, having been utilized on almost one-third of all YOP offenders. Of those offenders receiving a jail term as a sanction, almost one-half continued on and successfully completed YOP. It might therefore be indicated that the use of short term jail incarceration appeared to be an effective sanction in terms of bringing an offender's behavior into compliance with the program rules approximately 50% of the time. Determining whether the impact of short term jail incarceration was significantly different than the use of other sanctions was not possible due to the low frequency with which the other sanctions were used.

TABLE 46: PROGRAM SANCTIONS IMPOSED BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND COMPLETION RATES

PROGRAM SANCTION AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
<i>ELECTRONIC MONITORING</i>				
1 st	0	-----	0	0.0%
4 th	5	62.5	2	40.0%
5 th	1	1.4	1	100%
6 th	6	9.0	1	16.7%
8 th	6	17.6	2	33.3%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>33.3%</i>
<i>ASSIGNED TO RESIDENTIAL FACILITY</i>				
1 st	1	3.7	1	100%
4 th	4	50.0	4	100%
5 th	6	8.1	2	33.3%
6 th	4	6.0	0	0.0%
8 th	14	41.2	2	14.3%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>13.8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>31.0%</i>
<i>JAIL</i>				
1 st	10	37.0	4	40.0%
4 th	3	37.5	1	33.3%
5 th	37	50.0	23	62.2%
6 th	9	13.4	2	22.2%
8 th	13	38.2	5	38.5%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>34.3</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>48.6%</i>
<i>HOUSE ARREST</i>				
1 st	0	-----	0	-----
4 th	1	12.5	0	0.0%
5 th	0	-----	0	-----
6 th	2	3.0	0	0.0%
8 th	6	17.6	3	50.0%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>4.3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>33.3%</i>

Note: Two YOP clients were assigned to the CBC Violator's Program, one from the 5th Judicial District and one from the 6th Judicial District. Both successfully completed YOP.

Drug Tests and Completion Rates

Each of the judicial districts had some form of systematic drug testing as a component of YOP. Each YOP offender was required to submit urine samples for drug screening on a periodic basis. In addition to the drug screenings, in some of the YOPs, the probation/parole officers, during the course of their field contacts, would sometimes administer breath tests to determine if the offender had consumed any alcohol, which was normally prohibited by program rules. Both positive drug and alcohol tests are recorded in the table below.

Table 47 displays data regarding the number of positive drugs tests by judicial district as well as the corresponding successful completion data. In each of the judicial districts, with the exception of the 4th, the majority of the offenders did not test positive for any drugs or alcohol. (The reader is again reminded of the extremely low number of cases in the 4th judicial district.) Statewide, approximately 60 percent of the YOP offenders did not test positive for drugs during their YOP participation. Conversely, approximately 40% of the YOP offenders did test positive for drugs at least once, a fact that apparently underscores the need for the substance abuse education and treatment component of YOP. Of those offenders who did not test positive for drugs, approximately 60 percent successfully completed YOP.

Approximately 20 percent of the YOP offenders tested positive for drugs on one occasion. The single positive drug test did not appear to reduce the percentage of offenders successfully completing YOP in that the successful YOP completion rate of those testing positive once was slightly higher than for those offenders who did not test positive at all.

YOP offenders who tested positive for drugs on more than one occasion constituted approximately 20 percent of the total YOP population. This group successfully completed YOP at a rate much lower than those who tested positive only once, or not at all, approximately 35 percent compared to approximately 60 percent. The data indicates little difference in the successful completion rates of those testing positive twice and those testing positive three or more times.

Given that substance abuse assessment and the initial stages of treatment/education took place early in YOP, it might be concluded that those who tested positive for drugs two or more times were individuals who had serious drug problems, and continued to engage in this behavior in spite of the efforts of YOP to provide help in overcoming this problem. This established pattern of behavior might also have manifested in other ways, which would further place the offender in non-compliance with the program rules. It could be expected that individuals who continued to be in non-compliance with program rules would be terminated from the program, thus the lower successful completion rate for these individuals would be expected to result, which the data indicate did happen.

TABLE 47: NUMBER OF POSITIVE DRUG TESTS BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND COMPLETION RATES

NUMBER OF POSITIVE TESTS AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF CASES	PERCENT OF TOTAL CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION RATE
<i>POSITIVE = 0</i>				
1 st	16	59.3	7	43.8%
4 th	2	25.0	0	0.0%
5 th	43	58.1	30	69.8%
6 th	39	58.2	23	59.0%
8 th	25	73.5	13	52.0%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>59.5</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>58.4%</i>
<i>POSITIVE = 1</i>				
1 st	5	18.5	3	60.0%
4 th	1	12.5	1	100%
5 th	15	20.3	10	66.7%
6 th	17	25.4	9	52.9%
8 th	6	17.6	3	50.0%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>21.0</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>59.1%</i>
<i>POSITIVE = 2 - 3</i>				
1 st	4	14.8	1	25.0%
4 th	0	-----	0	-----
5 th	13	17.6	7	53.8%
6 th	5	7.5	1	20.0%
8 th	2	5.9	0	0.0%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>11.4</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>37.5%</i>
<i>POSITIVE > 3</i>				
1 st	2	7.4	0	0.0%
4 th	5	62.5	3	60.0%
5 th	3	4.1	2	66.7%
6 th	6	9.0	1	16.7%
8 th	1	2.9	0	0.0%
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>8.1</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>35.3%</i>

Results of Unsuccessful YOP Completions

One final aspect of YOP completion appears noteworthy. The foregoing tables and discussions have focused on those individuals who successfully completed YOP. That focus raises the question of what outcomes were experienced by those YOP offenders who did not successfully complete YOP, having been terminated from the program. Table 48 displays, to the extent possible, those sanctions received as a result of unsuccessfully completing YOP. The data displayed was extracted from the ICBC and CCH databases. Those databases, however, did not contain the sanctions imposed for 18 of the 96 individuals who did not successfully complete YOP. In addition, the ACDS database was queried, and in each case it was found that the offender had not been sent to prison as the sanction. Therefore, the sanction for those 18 individuals is shown as unknown, but not prison.

Overall, the most often imposed sanction for unsuccessful YOP completion was assignment to a residential facility, with that sanction being imposed on 26.0 percent of those not successfully completing YOP. The sanctions of jail and prison were each used in approximately 20.0% of the cases, and the sanction of probation was used in approximately 15.6 percent of the cases. The sanctions imposed on the remaining cases was unknown. Of the known sanctions, approximately 50.0% involved some form of incarceration, while the remaining 50.0% involved some form of continued CBC involvement.

In the 8th judicial district, there appears to be a heavy reliance on incarceration as the sanction of choice. In that district, 77.8% of those unsuccessfully completing YOP were incarcerated, with 61.1% of those unsuccessfully completing being sentenced to prison and the remaining 16.7% receiving jail sentences. It should also be noted that while 15.6% of all those unsuccessfully completing YOP received probation as a sanction, no one received that sanction in the 8th judicial district.

Recalling that the number of YOP offenders studied in the 4th judicial district was extremely small (8), the same apparent reliance on incarceration as a sanction may be found in the 4th judicial district as in the 8th judicial district. In the 4th judicial district, 75.0% of those offenders unsuccessfully completing YOP were incarcerated as a sanction, with the sanction for the remain 25.0% being unknown.

TABLE 48: SANCTIONS IMPOSED FOR UNSUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF YOP BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT

SANCTION IMPOSED AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS RECEIVING SANCTION	PERCENT OF CASES PER JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF UNSUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS	PERCENTAGE OF UNSUCCESSFUL COMPLETIONS
<i>Probation</i>				
1st	6	22.2	16	37.5
4th	0	0.0	4	-----
5th	6	8.1	25	24.0
6th	3	4.5	33	9.1
8th	0	0.0	18	-----
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>7.1</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>15.6</i>
<i>Residential Facility</i>				
1st	3	11.1	16	18.8
4th	0	0.0	4	-----
5th	8	10.8	25	32.0
6th	11	16.4	33	33.3
8th	3	8.8	18	16.7
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>11.9</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>26.0</i>
<i>Jail</i>				
1st	1	3.7	16	6.3
4th	1	12.5	4	25.0
5th	1	1.4	25	4.0
6th	12	17.9	12	36.4
8th	3	8.8	18	16.7
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>18.8</i>
<i>Prison</i>				
1st	1	3.7	16	6.3
4th	2	25.0	4	50.0
5th	2	2.7	25	8.0
6th	3	4.4	33	9.1
8th	11	5.2	18	61.1
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>9.0</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>19.8</i>
<i>Unknown, Not Prison</i>				
1st	5	18.5	16	31.3
4th	0	0.0	4	-----
5th	8	10.8	25	32.0
6th	4	6.0	33	12.1
8th	1	2.9	18	5.6
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>18.8</i>

Multi-District Program Characteristics and Recidivism

The tables and discussion in this section are meant to help assess the effectiveness of YOP in preventing criminal recidivism by YOP offenders through an examination of how successful completion of YOP, as well as other variables, impact upon recidivism. It should be noted that because of resource limitations, it was not possible to compare the recidivism rate of YOP offenders with the recidivism rate of a control group of individuals who did not participate in YOP. Such a comparison would be strongly recommended as the next step in the continuation of this research and/or an ongoing evaluation of the YOP programs across the state. Given the data collected from the YOPs, it was possible to identify two groups of offenders for whom a comparison of recidivism information might lend itself to the examination of YOP effectiveness. The two groups of people for whom recidivism is estimated and examined in this report are the offenders who participated in YOP and successfully completed the program and the offenders who participated in YOP but were terminated from the program and did not successfully complete it.

In the following analyses, recidivism was defined as being arrested or otherwise being brought before a court for the commission of a public offense, including violation of probation, after completing YOP, either successfully or unsuccessfully; and having been convicted of an offense as a result of those charges, or having the charges still pending before the court. Individuals who were arrested and subsequently found not guilty, or had the charges dismissed were excluded from the recidivist population.

In order to determine if a YOP offender had in fact committed a recidivist act, three databases were searched. They were the computerized criminal history records maintained by the Iowa Department of Public Safety, the Iowa Community Based Corrections database maintained by the Iowa Department of Corrections and the driver's license records maintained by the Iowa Department of Transportation. With regard to the driver's license records, minor traffic offenses (simple misdemeanors) such as stop sign violations were not considered a recidivist act, but more serious offenses (serious misdemeanors and above) such as driving while barred were considered a recidivist act.

Recidivism Period and Recidivism Rates

In order to put the recidivism and other data that follows into perspective as relates to time, Table 49 displays the amount of time YOP offenders had in which to recidivate between their completion of YOP and June 30, 1997, the end of the study period. That date was chosen to insure that all YOP offenders had a minimum of six months following completion of YOP in which to recidivate. Analysis of the data indicates that more than two-thirds of all offenders (69.5%) had 12 or more months following YOP completion during which to recidivate. Further analysis indicates that more than 4 of 10 offenders (41.9%) had 18 or more months following YOP completion during which to recidivate. The average time between completion of YOP and June 30, 1997 for all offenders was 17.19 months. It would thus appear that each YOP offender studied had a substantial period of time following completion of YOP within which to recidivate.

It should be noted that not all YOP offenders had the total amount of time available as indicated by Table 49 within which to recidivate. As a result of one or more recidivist acts, 19 YOP offenders were sentenced to prison terms of one year or more, and another 18 YOP offenders were sentenced to jail terms of up to one year after their participation in YOP. These sentences, however, did not totally preclude the opportunity for recidivism. In some instances, YOP offenders sentenced to prison were released on shock probation or parole after serving as few as 6 months of incarceration. They were then returned to society, where they again had the opportunity to recidivate. No available database contains data regarding the amount of incarceration actually served by those individuals sentenced to jail, thus it was not possible to quantify the exact amount of time available for recidivism for that group of YOP offenders. Consequently, it was not possible to quantify the exact amount time available for recidivism by the entire YOP population.

TABLE 49: TYPE OF YOP COMPLETION BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND TIME BETWEEN COMPLETION OF YOP AND JUNE 30, 1997

TIME IN MONTHS FROM YOP COMPLETION TO JUNE 30, 1997										
TYPE OF COMPLETION AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	6.00 TO 11.99 MONTHS		12.00 TO 17.99 MONTHS		18.00 TO 23.99 MONTHS		24.00 TO 29.99 MONTHS		30.00 MONTHS AND OVER	
	CASES	%	CASES	%	CASES	%	CASES	%	CASES	%
SUCCESSFUL										
1st	7	6.1	4	3.5	0	-----	0	-----	0	-----
4th	3	2.6	1	0.9	0	-----	0	-----	0	-----
5th	11	9.6	9	7.9	11	9.6	13	11.4	5	4.4
6th	6	5.3	8	7.0	8	7.0	12	10.5	0	-----
8th	8	7.0	6	5.3	2	1.8	0	-----	0	-----
TOTAL	35	30.7	28	24.6	21	18.4	25	21.9	5	4.4
UNSUCCESSFUL										
1st	8	8.3	4	4.2	4	4.2	0	-----	0	-----
4th	3	3.1	0	-----	1	1.0	0	-----	0	-----
5th	5	5.2	8	8.3	8	8.3	3	3.1	1	1.0
6th	8	8.3	13	13.8	5	5.2	7	7.3	0	-----
8th	5	5.2	5	5.2	3	3.1	5	5.2	0	-----
TOTAL	29	30.2	30	31.3	21	21.9	15	15.6	1	1.0
YOP TOTALS	64	30.5	58	27.6	42	20.0	40	19.0	6	2.9

Notes: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

“Totals are those for the completion types, successful and unsuccessful.

Average time between completion of YOP and June 30, 1997 was 17.19 months.

Overall Non-Recidivism Rate

Analyses of the data shown in Table 50 indicate that 114 out of the 210 offenders studied (54.3%) successfully completed YOP. Further, 73 of the 114 (64.0%) who successfully completed YOP did not commit a recidivist act between their completion of YOP and June 30, 1997. In terms of the total YOP population, 73 of the 210 offenders (34.8%) both successfully completed the program and did not recidivate after completion. If successful completion of YOP and non-recidivism were considered two primary goals of the program, the data indicate

that more than one of every three offenders entering YOP achieved both these goals.

TABLE 50: OVERALL YOP COMPLETION AND NON- RECIDIVISM RATE

TOTAL NUMBER OF YOP OFFENDERS	NUMBER SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED YOP	NUMBER SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED YOP WITHOUT RECIDIVISM	SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION WITHOUT RECIDIVISM RATE
210	114	73	34.8%

Table 51 below indicates the overall level of recidivism for all of the YOP offenders studied. It indicates that 94 of the 210 offenders, or 44.8 percent, did not recidivate. The total number of recidivist acts (offenses) was 191, or approximately 1.65 recidivist acts per recidivist offender.

While only 34.8 percent of the YOP participants successfully completed the program and did not recidivate, 44.8 percent of all YOP participants did not recidivate. As might be expected for a number of reasons, some offenders who failed to successfully complete YOP were not found to recidivate, just as some offenders who succeeded at YOP were found to recidivate.

TABLE 51: OVERALL YOP NON-RECIDIVISM RATE

NUMBER OF YOP OFFENDERS	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NUMBER OF RECIDIVIST INCIDENTS	NON - RECIDIVISM RATE
210	94	191	44.8%

Program Type and Recidivism Rates

In order to gain a more complete picture of recidivism within the different types of YOPs (Pre-Trial and Post-Trial), the individual YOP programs and the different types of YOP completion, successful and unsuccessful, Tables 52 and 53 indicate recidivism by those variables. As was previously noted in the program description section of this report, while there are many similarities between the individual YOP programs, there are also a substantial number of differences. *Because of the types and number of differences among the individual programs, the reader is cautioned that a direct comparison of data between the individual programs may not be appropriate or valid.*

The data in these two tables tend to indicate two apparently significant differences in recidivism rates. First, it appears that in both types of programs, pre-trial and post-trial, **those who successfully completed YOP recidivated at a lower rate than those who did not successfully complete YOP.** Table 53 shows the total YOP offender population by judicial district and it indicates that of those successfully completing YOP, 64 percent did not recidivate. Of those who did not successfully complete YOP, only 21.9 percent did not recidivate.

It also appears that **offenders in the pre-trial programs are less likely to recidivate than**

offenders in the post-trial programs; both those offenders who successfully completed YOP and those who did not. One possible explanation for this difference may be consistent with one of the basic concepts behind the pre-trial YOP approach: the outcome of an offender's charges in pre-trial YOPs is still in doubt and dependent to a large degree upon the offender's actions during YOP. Successful completion of YOP in a pre-trial environment might lead to a deferred judgment, which allows the offender the opportunity to successfully complete the remaining period of probation and then have the case dismissed by the court and expunged from their criminal record. In other pre-trial cases, successful completion of YOP might allow the offender the opportunity to plead guilty to a reduced charge, with a county attorney's recommendation, which is normally accepted by the court, that any period of incarceration be suspended pending successful completion of the remaining period of probation. This is in contrast to the post-trial programs where any plea negotiations have already taken place, any reduction of charges has taken place, and judgment and sentence have been entered on the record. In this type of program, it appears that the primary motivating factor for successful completion of YOP by the offender would be that any period of incarceration imposed as part of the sentence and suspended by the court will remain suspended if the offender successfully completes YOP and any ensuing period of probation.

It could be argued that in a pre-trial program, the offender has more control over the eventual outcome of the criminal case, and thus more motivation to successfully complete YOP. While the findings of this study do not prove this argument conclusively, they do suggest that pre-trial offenders successfully complete YOP at a higher rate than their counterparts in the post-trial group and that they are less likely to recidivate following successful completion.

TABLE 52: PROGRAM TYPE BY TYPE OF COMPLETION AND NON-RECIDIVISM RATES

PROGRAM TYPE	SUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION			UNSUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION		
	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON-RECIDIVISM RATE	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON-RECIDIVISM RATE
Pre-Trial	60	43	71.7%	43	14	32.6%
Post-Trial	54	30	55.6%	53	7	13.2%

TABLE 53: JUDICIAL DISTRICT BY TYPE OF PROGRAM COMPLETION AND NON-RECIDIVISM RATES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION			UNSUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION		
	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATED	NON RECIDIVISM RATE	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE
1st	11	10	90.9%	16	6	37.5%
4th	4	3	75.0%	4	1	25.0%
5th	49	33	67.3%	25	8	32.0%
6th	34	14	41.2%	33	4	12.1%
8th	16	13	81.3%	18	2	11.1%
TOTAL	114	73	64.0%	96	21	21.9%

Gender And Recidivism Rates

Table 54 indicates the YOP completion and recidivism data by the gender of the YOP offender. The number of female offenders represented 12 percent of the total YOP population. This compares with females accounting for 21 percent of the persons arrested in 1995 where the gender of the arrest was known, according to the 1995 Iowa Uniform Crime Report. It can again be seen that those offenders successful completing YOP had a much higher non-recidivism rate when controlling for the variable of gender. It can be observed that none of the female offenders who successfully completed YOP recidivated between their completion of YOP and the end of the study period. For those females who did not successfully complete YOP, their rate of non-recidivism was higher than that of their male counterparts who did not successfully complete YOP. With the caveat that the number of female YOP offenders could be considered low, it could be concluded from the data that female YOP offenders recidivate at a much lower rate than male YOP offenders, regardless of whether they successfully or unsuccessfully complete YOP.

TABLE 54: GENDER BY YOP COMPLETION TYPE, JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND NON-RECIDIVISM RATES

GENDER & JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION			UNSUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION		
	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATED	NON RECIDIVISM RATE	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE
MALE						
1st	11	10	90.1%	13	4	30.8%
4th	4	3	75.0%	3	0	0.0%
5th	42	26	61.9%	22	7	31.9%
6th	32	12	37.5%	29	3	10.3%
8th	14	11	78.6%	15	2	13.3%
TOTAL	103	62	60.2%	82	16	19.5%
FEMALE						
1st	0	0	-----	3	2	66.7%
4th	0	0	-----	1	1	100%
5th	7	7	100%	3	1	33.3%
6th	2	2	100%	4	1	25.0%
8th	2	2	100%	3	0	0.0%
TOTAL	11	11	100%	14	5	35.7%

Age and Recidivism Rates

Table 56 portrays recidivism by judicial district, completion type and age groupings of YOP offenders. The correlation between successful YOP completion and non-recidivism is again demonstrated across all age groups. It can also be observed from this table that the age group with the highest successful YOP completion rate, and the highest non-recidivism rate for those who successfully complete YOP, is the 16-17 age group, the juveniles. The data appear to indicate that the younger the offender, the higher the YOP completion rate, and the lower the recidivism rate after successful YOP completion.

TABLE 56: ADMISSION AGE GROUP BY YOP COMPLETION TYPE, JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND NON-RECIDIVISM RATES

ADMISSION AGE AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION			UNSUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION		
	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE
16 - 17						
1st	0	0	-----	2	0	0.0%
4th	2	2	100%	0	0	-----
5th	16	11	68.8%	7	1	14.3%
6th	1	1	100%	2	0	0.0%
8th	1	0	0.0%	0	0	-----
TOTAL	20	14	70.0%	11	1	9.1%
18 - 19						
1st	9	8	88.9%	11	6	54.5%
4th	1	1	100%	4	1	25.0%
5th	31	20	64.5%	18	7	38.9%
6th	22	9	40.9%	26	3	11.5%
8th	15	13	86.7%	17	2	11.8%
TOTAL	78	51	65.4%	76	19	25.0%
20 - 21						
1st	2	2	100%	3	0	0.0%
4th	1	0	0.0%	0	0	-----
5th	2	2	100%	0	0	-----
6th	11	4	36.4%	5	1	20.0%
8th	0	0	-----	1	0	0.0%
TOTAL	16	8	50.0%	9	1	11.1%

Race And Recidivism Rates

Table 55 depicts the recidivism data for the various YOP programs by type of program completion and the race of the offenders. The data again indicate that those who successfully completed YOP recidivated at a lower rate than those who did not successfully complete YOP, regardless of the offender's race. Further analysis indicates that Caucasian - Non Hispanic offenders did not recidivate at a higher rate than all other ethnic groups, whether or not they completed YOP successfully. In some categories, the difference in recidivism rates between the ethnic groups could be considered substantial. These data could be construed as raising the question of whether YOP and its component parts could be not as germane or relevant to other

ethnic groups as they are to Caucasian non-Hispanics. The data could also be viewed as suggesting a review of the component parts of YOP to insure that they are equally applicable to all ethnic groups.

TABLE 55: RACE BY YOP COMPLETION TYPE, JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND NON-RECIDIVISM RATES

RACE AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION			UNSUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION		
	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE
AFRICAN - AMERICAN						
1st	1	0	0.0%	4	1	25.0%
4th	1	1	100%	0	0	-----
5th	9	5	55.6%	7	1	14.3%
6th	4	1	25.0%	7	1	14.3%
8th	0	0	-----	0	0	-----
TOTAL	15	7	46.7%	18	3	16.7%
CAUCASIAN NON-HISPANIC						
1st	10	10	100%	12	5	41.7%
4th	3	2	66.7%	4	1	25.0%
5th	37	27	73.0%	16	7	43.8%
6th	30	13	43.3%	24	3	12.5%
8th	16	13	81.3%	18	2	11.1%
TOTAL	96	65	67.7%	74	18	24.3%
OTHER						
1st	0	0	-----	0	0	-----
4th	0	0	-----	0	0	-----
5th	3	1	33.3%	3	0	0.0%
6th	0	0	-----	1	0	0.0%
8th	0	0	-----	0	0	-----
TOTAL	3	1	33.3%	4	0	0.0%

Note: Other includes Hispanic, Native American and Asian/Pacific Islanders.

Education and Recidivism Rates

Tables 57 and 58 depict recidivism in relationship to two educational variables, the level of academic education upon entry to YOP and the level of academic educational change achieved while participating in YOP. In controlling for these two variables, it again appears that those individuals who successfully complete YOP recidivate at a lower rate, regardless of the offender's educational level upon entry to YOP, or the educational change they achieve while in YOP.

Further analyses indicate that those individuals who enter YOP with the equivalent of a 12th grade education appear to not recidivate at a higher rate, regardless of whether or not they successfully complete YOP. It can also be observed that those who earn their high school diploma or GED while participating in YOP do not recidivate at a higher rate than those who do not, regardless of whether they successfully complete YOP or not.

TABLE 57: EDUCATION LEVEL UPON ENTRY TO YOP BY YOP COMPLETION TYPE, JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND NON-RECIDIVISM RATES

EDUCATION LEVEL AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION			UNSUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION		
	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE	TOTAL COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE
LESS THAN 12th GRADE						
1st	6	5	83.3%	11	4	36.4%
4th	4	3	75.0%	3	1	33.3%
5th	30	19	63.3%	15	6	40.0%
6th	22	10	45.5%	28	4	14.3%
8th	8	6	75.0%	11	2	18.2%
TOTAL	70	43	61.4%	68	17	25.0%
12th GRADE OR HIGHER						
1st	5	5	100%	5	2	40.0%
4th	0	0	-----	1	0	0.0%
5th	19	14	73.7%	10	2	20.0%
6th	12	4	33.3%	5	0	0.0%
8th	8	7	87.5%	7	0	0.0%
TOTAL	44	30	68.2%	28	4	14.3%

TABLE 58: NO DIPLOMA OR GED UPON ENTRY TO YOP BY EDUCATIONAL CHANGE DURING YOP, COMPLETION TYPE, JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND NON-RECIDIVISM RATE

EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT AND JUDICIAL DISTRICT	SUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION			UNSUCCESSFUL YOP COMPLETION		
	NUMBER COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE	NUMBER COMPLETED	NUMBER NOT RECIDIVATING	NON RECIDIVISM RATE
EARNED GED OR DIPLOMA						
1st	6	5	83.3%	4	1	25.0%
4th	2	1	50.0%	0	0	-----
5th	8	5	62.5%	0	0	-----
6th	10	6	60.0%	7	2	28.6%
8th	7	6	85.7%	3	1	33.3%
TOTAL	33	23	69.7%	14	4	28.6%
NO GED OR DIPLOMA EARNED						
1st	0	0	-----	7	3	42.9%
4th	2	2	100%	3	1	33.3%
5th	22	14	63.6%	15	6	40.0%
6th	12	4	33.3%	21	2	9.5%
8th	1	0	0.0%	8	1	12.5%
TOTAL	37	20	54.1%	54	13	24.1%

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

Overall Similarities And Differences

Programs:

Through this evaluation study it was found that there are some commonalities in the way that each of the 5 YOPs operated as well as in the types of services that were available to their clients. It was found that all of the YOPs were designed to provide a sentencing alternative or intermediate criminal sanction, all of the YOPs provided a more intensive level of case management and supervision than regular probation, and all of the YOPs provided a holistic level of treatment not available through other Community Based Corrections (CBC) services.

There appeared to be a common order of events that occurred at each of the programs. First, offenders were referred to the programs and then screened for appropriateness. Upon entry to the programs, clients were required to attend orientation sessions where they typically learned what the requirements were in order to successfully complete the programs. Typically the requirements included the completion of a high school degree or GED, non-academic courses (e.g., Street Law, Cognitive Restructuring, and Career Skills), community service, victim offender reconciliation program, substance abuse and mental health assessments and treatment if deemed necessary.

Most of the offenders received a curfew upon entry to the program and were required to make a specific number of contacts with the probation officers every week that they were in the program. There appeared to be a common order in which the non-academic courses were offered by the programs and subsequently taken by the offenders. A cognitive restructuring course was the first one taught at each of the programs where it was available. The next courses in their typical order included street law, career skills, and then other specialty programs (e.g., parenting skills, anger management).

The completion of some type of community service was mandatory at all of the programs and could have been completed at any point during an offender's treatment. Mentoring was also used throughout an offender's involvement, but was utilized more on an individualized basis in situations where it was deemed to be most appropriate. Victim offender reconciliation/mediation and the payment of restitution typically occurred toward the end of an offender's involvement with YOP.

All 5 of the programs utilized similar activities and procedures for supervising the offenders' activities. All of the programs held staffing meetings, required periodic meetings with the

offender and the probation officer, and required substance abuse testing. For those offenders who chose to not comply with the program rules, there were sanctions applied such as jail time, electronic monitoring, house arrest, and ultimately program termination.

One of the fundamental distinctions among the programs was found in the type of program -- whether it was a pre-trial program, a post-trial program or a combination of both. The differences between the programs were most pronounced in the screening and referral process, but were evident in other aspects of the program as well; such as: the use of risk assessments, when offenders go to court on referral offense and the use of deferred and reduced sentences. Another fundamental difference was found in the length of existence of each of the YOPs. The YOP in the 5th judicial district began operation in 1992, the YOPs in the 1st and 6th judicial districts began in 1994, and the YOPs in the 4th and 8th judicial districts began in 1995.

Clients:

The majority of the offenders at each of the programs were Male, Caucasian, non-Hispanic, and did not have a high school degree or GED. The pre-trial programs included offenders with slightly lower risk levels compared to the post-trial programs that included slightly higher risk offenders. Although all of the programs studied indicated that they only took offenders who had committed a first time felony or aggravated misdemeanor offense, the study findings showed that all of the programs except the one in the 1st judicial district had at least one offender who had a serious misdemeanor listed as their referral offense. It was also found that at least one of the programs accepted some forcible felons.

The sample of clients studied included the total population of offenders who had either completed or been terminated from the program prior to December 31, 1996 for each of the YOPs, except the one operating in the 5th judicial district where a sample of cases from 1994 and 1995 was obtained. In order to get some sense of what the case loads were for each of the YOPs since the end of the data collection period, a survey of each of the programs was conducted and the results are presented in Table 63. Due to resource and time limitations two questions were included in this survey: (1) how many offenders were enrolled in YOP on September 30, 1997? and (2) do you anticipate that your YOP case load will increase, decrease or remain the same over the next 12 months?

The YOP staff in the 1st judicial district indicated that they expected their case loads to grow from 20 to about 35 over the next 12 months. The YOP staff in the 4th judicial district stated that the case load will probably stay about the same or increase just slightly over the next 12 months. The YOP staff in the 5th judicial district indicated that they expect the case loads to remain about the same over the next 12 months. The YOP staff in the 6th judicial district said that their cap is 25 per probation officer, but that they will continue to be slightly over that in the next 12 months. The YOP staff in the 8th judicial district expected that their case load will increase to about 30 in the next 12 months.

**TABLE 63: STUDY SAMPLE AND CASES ENROLLED ON
SEPTEMBER 30, 1997**

JUDICIAL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF CASES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY SAMPLE	NUMBER OF CASES ENROLLED ON SEPTEMBER 30, 1997
1	27	20
4	8	33
5	74	75
6	67	51
8	34	17
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>196</i>

Program Completion

Overall, more than one-half of the offenders entering YOP successfully completed the program. When examining the YOP completion rate and controlling for certain program and offender characteristics, it was found that not all types of offenders or program approaches experienced the same completion rate:

- ◆ Pre-Trial YOP programs experienced somewhat higher completion rates than post-trial programs.
- ◆ Females successfully completed YOP at a rate lower than that of the males.
- ◆ Offenders in the 18-19 age group successfully completed YOP at a rate lower than those of all other age groups.
- ◆ Non-Hispanic, Caucasian offenders successfully completed YOP at a rate higher than all other ethnic groups.
- ◆ As the offenders' risk of recidivism increased, their successful completion rate decreased.
- ◆ Program sanctions other than extended curfew and jail, were infrequently used for technical violations.
- ◆ Approximately one-half of those offenders sanctioned for technical violations by jail went on to successfully complete the program.
- ◆ Almost one-third of those offenders who were arrested for a new offense during YOP

participation went on to successfully complete YOP.

- ◆ Offenders testing positive for drugs/alcohol two or more times successfully completed YOP at a rate substantially lower than those testing positive once or not at all. Over 40% of the YOP offenders tested positive for drugs/alcohol at least once.
- ◆ Offenders in pre-trial YOPs were more likely to receive a CBC-based sanction following unsuccessful completion of YOP, whereas offenders in post-trial YOPs were more likely to receive incarceration as a sanction when terminated unsuccessfully from YOP.

Recidivism

It could be reasonably assumed that one of the primary goals of YOP was to prevent future recidivism. The data indicated that overall, almost 45% of the offenders who entered YOP did not recidivate after completing YOP, either successfully or unsuccessfully during the period examined. Analysis of the data did indicate that those offenders successfully completing YOP recidivated at what appeared to be a substantially lower rate than those offenders who did not successfully complete YOP.

Again assuming that the prevention of future recidivism was one of the primary goals of YOP, it is important to note that not all types of offenders or program approaches experienced the same difference in recidivism rates of those who successfully completed YOP and those who did not:

- ◆ Thirty-five percent of all offenders entering YOP successfully completed YOP and did not recidivate.
- ◆ Offenders who successfully completed YOP did not recidivate at a rate substantially higher (64.0% v. 21.9%) than those offenders who did not successfully complete YOP.
- ◆ Pre-trial YOP programs had a higher non-recidivism rate than the post-trial YOP programs.
- ◆ Females experienced a higher non-recidivism rate than males, both for those successfully completing YOP and those not successfully completing YOP.
- ◆ Caucasian, Non-Hispanics had a higher non-recidivism rate than all other races.
- ◆ Juveniles, age 16-17, had the highest successful YOP completion rate, and of those successfully completing YOP, the highest non-recidivism rate.
- ◆ Offenders with a 12th grade or higher educational level had a higher rate of non-recidivism than those with a lower educational level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- This research indicated that females and non-Caucasians did not complete YOP as often as Caucasians, non-Hispanic males. It is recommended that the individual YOPs examine their program content and delivery methods to find ways to improve the program's relevance to, and impact on, females and non-Caucasians.
- Though this research it was found that YOP offenders under the age of 18 had slightly higher successful program completion rates than those offenders over 18 years of age. It was also found, for those offenders who successfully completed the program, that those offenders under the age of 18 had higher non-recidivism rates than those offenders over 18 years of age. In response to these findings, it is recommended that:
 - Individual YOPs examine their program content and delivery methods to find ways to improve the program's relevance to and impact on, offenders over the age of 18.
 - Caution be used in any plans to expand the use of this program for offenders who might otherwise remain in the juvenile court. Although this research indicated that such offenders were the most likely to complete YOP and not recidivate, no research-based information is available that compares this level of success with the outcomes of a wide variety of juvenile court sanctions and services – some of which are new and considered by many to be quite innovative and promising (e.g., day treatment, tracking and monitoring, etc.). It is recommended that a study of offenders with similar backgrounds (e.g., risk scores, demographic factors, offense types and levels) receiving various juvenile court sanctions and services be conducted to compare program completion rates, recidivism rates, and cost-effectiveness with offenders participating in the YOP programs.
- Through this research, it was found that pre-trial YOPs had higher rates of successful YOP completion and non-recidivism than the post-trial YOPs. Based on that finding, it is recommended that the appropriate policy makers examine the specific benefits of the post-trial YOPs to determine if these benefits outweigh the apparent higher levels of success in pre-trial YOPs in terms of preventing recidivism.
- Offenders in all of the programs except for those offenders participating in the YOP operating in the 4th judicial district received some type of post-YOP supervision or service. Further it was found that the YOP operating in the 5th judicial district was the only one where the YOP probation officer and a special “post-YOP probation officer” were housed in the same location and functioned as a team. It is recommended that the different types of post-YOP supervision and services receive further study to determine their impact or effectiveness in regards to various outcome measures. Although the findings could not discern clearly that one approach was better than another, it is recommended that the relative benefits of post-supervision be further considered.

- Transportation issues were identified in almost every one of the districts as a problem that the YOP staff had to deal with. It seems that this will become an even larger issue as current programs expand their services and if other YOP sites are established. The development and implementation of a plan to deal with transportation issues is recommended as a part of any expansion planning process.
- The findings indicated a wide variance among the YOPs in the number and types of community agencies providing key YOP components to the offenders. Based on this finding, an examination of the actual costs and funding sources of the many and varied services provided to YOP participants may be warranted. Such an analysis might provide useful information with which to compare YOP to other sanctions, to assess its cost-effectiveness and to help plan and guide YOP planning and other community collaborations involving community-based corrections.
- The findings from the unsuccessful completion cases appear to suggest that authorities in the post-trial YOP sites rely more heavily upon incarceration as a sanction for unsuccessful YOP completion, as compared to authorities in pre-trial YOP sites, which appear to rely more heavily on CBC based sanctions. That the likelihood of incarceration following the unsuccessful completion of pre-trial YOPs is less than that in post-trial YOPs may not be surprising for a number of reasons, including the role of the judge in post-trial cases or the fact that post-trial YOP offenders have already been given the chance of probation through their YOP involvement. On the other hand, if one of the primary offender-motivators in pre-trial YOPs is thought to be the threat of incarceration, the finding that the majority of pre-trial YOP participants who fail YOP do not go on to prison (or jail) should be considered carefully by those planning the future of this program.
- The findings indicated that the use of prison tours was inconsistent in regards to participation of offenders who went through it. In the 8th judicial district it was discovered that the use of such tours had lead to threats and verbal attacks against the YOP participants. Providing an exposure to the prison experience, because of its potential deterrent effect, has been used for youthful offenders for many years. While many YOP staff indicated a positive effect on the offenders, it is not known what, if any long term positive effect results from such an experience. Studies and the experiences of various system officials have shown that the practice has sometimes had unintended and negative effects. Concerns over such effects, as well as the time and resources the practice entails, would seem to warrant caution if the practice continues.
- The findings showed that the frequency in which mentoring was used was quite low in most of the programs. The YOP operating in the 6th judicial district was still in the developmental stages of this component, while the other four programs used mentoring to varying degrees. It seems that there was difficulty in recruiting and retaining mentors among these four programs. YOP staff should either seek to strengthen this component or avoid promoting YOP as a sanction that routinely includes mentoring for participants who can benefit from it.

- It was found through this study that there was a wide variance in the extent to which stated requirements needed to be met in order to successfully complete a program. Some of the requirements stated to be mandatory were seldom completed. Educational requirements, community service and other supposedly mandatory requirements were sometimes waived at the discretion of YOP staff. If it is desired to continue the perhaps desirable practice of determining YOP completion on a case-by-case basis, it is recommended that program officials avoid promoting YOP as a sanction through which offenders complete such a wide variety of requirements.

- It was found that short-term jail time was used as a sanction for program non-compliance in about a third of all YOP cases. In these cases, the offender went on to successfully complete YOP about 50 percent of the time. Other alternative sanctions were either used infrequently or the extent to which they were used was not clear. To assess the relative effectiveness of the short-term jail sanction, it is recommended that the use of sanctions other than short-term jail time be increased, and that the use of all sanctions be maintained to assess their impact on YOP completion rates.

- Based on the findings of this research, YOP appears to be a promising approach within the districts' range of intermediate sanctions. It is recommended that GASA, the judicial districts' departments of correctional services and the individual YOPs continue the evaluation of YOPs on an ongoing basis. More specifically, ongoing and future research should include:
 - ❑ Continued tracking of completion rates and recidivism rates by the individual YOPs as two possible measures of YOP program outcomes (this could be accomplished with minimal resources).
 - ❑ Comparison of the recidivism rate of YOP offenders and the recidivism rate of offenders who did not participate in YOP.
 - ❑ Comparison of the recidivism rate of YOP offenders and the recidivism rate of offenders who participated in other CBC directed supervision programs.
 - ❑ Further statistical analyses of a number of variables included in this study (e.g., education, substance abuse services, community service, etc.) is recommended using a greater number of a cases to identify the degree and significance of such variables' impact upon completion and recidivism rates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	4
Background	4
YOP History and Development	4
YOP Evaluation and Project Focus	5
<i>THE YOP STUDY SAMPLE</i>	5
<i>PROGRAM OVERVIEW</i>	7
<i>FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT’S YOP (DETOUR) PROGRAM DESCRIPTION</i>	14
<i>FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT’S YOP PROGRAM DESCRIPTION</i>	23
<i>FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT’S YOP PROGRAM DESCRIPTION</i>	31
<i>SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT’S YOP PROGRAM DESCRIPTION</i>	39
<i>EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT’S YOP PROGRAM DESCRIPTION</i>	47
<i>OUTCOMES</i>	55
Multi-District Program Characteristics and Program Completion	55
Multi-District Program Characteristics and Recidivism	72
<i>SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS</i>	80
Overall Similarities And Differences	80
Program Completion	82
Recidivism	83
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS</i>	84