

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1989

An evaluation methodology using probation classification instruments in the selection of a nonequivalent control group

Wesley Allen Krause

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Krause, Wesley Allen, "An evaluation methodology using probation classification instruments in the selection of a nonequivalent control group" (1989). *Theses Digitization Project*. 436.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/436>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

AN EVALUATION METHODOLOGY USING PROBATION
CLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENTS IN THE SELECTION OF A
NONEQUIVALENT CONTROL GROUP

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Criminal Justice

by
Wesley Allen Krause
May 1989

AN EVALUATION METHODOLOGY USING PROBATION
CLASSIFICATION INSTRUMENTS IN THE SELECTION OF A
NONEQUIVALENT CONTROL GROUP

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Wesley Allen Krause

May 1989

Approved by:



David Shichor Ph.D., Chair, Criminal Justice

7/11/89
Date



Donald B. Lindsey Ph.D., Criminal Justice



Frank P. Williams III Ph.D., Criminal Justice

ABSTRACT

Corrections has long suffered from a lack of methodologically sound program evaluation. Recently, legislative mandates for evaluation and other catalysts have improved the environment for evaluation. However, objections to experimentation and random assignment remain problematic.

The research problem of this thesis was to apply a predictive classification instrument in such a manner as to develop matched comparison groups that were equivalent on the basis of all the variables contained in that instrument. This was demonstrated and the equivalence of the groups allowed for differences in some outcome measures to be attributed to program effect.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The development of the research methodology for this thesis and the application of that methodology in the evaluation of the Regional Youth Education Facility was completed under the direct supervision of Norman Skonovd, Ph.D. a Research Program Specialist with the California Youth Authority Program Research and Review Division. His constant support and guidance was greatly appreciated and contributed significantly to the author's appreciation of the many complexities involved in evaluation research.

Special thanks also to Cathy Majors for her careful collection and coding of the data and to Carman Jacobs for giving of her own time to complete the data entry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	10
CHAPTER 3	METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION.....	22
CHAPTER 4	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	35
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSIONS.....	68
APPENDIX A	Original RISK/NEED Instrument Used by San Bernardino County	73
APPENDIX B	Revised RISK/NEED Instrument and Operational Definitions of the Variables.	76
REFERENCES	99

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 Reliability of RISK Variables..... 38

TABLE 2 Reliability of NEED Variables..... 39

TABLE 3 Comparability of RISK Variables..... 43

TABLE 4 Comparability of NEED Variables..... 46

TABLE 5 Age of Program Completions..... 50

TABLE 6 Race of Program Completions..... 50

TABLE 7 Number of Prior Offenses of Program Completions. 51

TABLE 8 Nature of Prior Offenses of Program Completions. 52

TABLE 9 Nature of Commitment
Offenses of Program Completions..... 53

TABLE 10 Recidivism At Six Months After Release..... 61

TABLE 11 Recidivism At One Year After Release..... 61

INTRODUCTION

Historical Overview

"Nothing works" is the often misquoted conclusion of sociologist Robert Martinson's 1974 survey of evaluations of correctional programs published between 1945 and 1967. What was actually stated was that "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on rehabilitation" (Lipton, Martinson & Wilks: 1975). More important, Martinson found that the correctional community had failed to develop any systematic process of evaluation. Few evaluations were found to be acceptable by rigorous scientific standards. He lamented, "It is just possible that some of our treatment programs are working to some extent, but that our research is so bad that it is incapable of telling" (Martinson, 1974: 14). His words echoed the thoughts of Kirby (1954) who had twenty years earlier observed that "most treatment programs are based on hope and perhaps informed speculation rather than on verified information". In view of the discouraging findings of those programs that have been evaluated, it is understandable that the corrections community has not been eager to open itself to scrutiny. The risk that publication of findings would

threaten the existence of valued programs and the underlying rationale of rehabilitation is very real (Walker, 1985: 169).

In many instances, the underlying theoretical rationale of rehabilitation has been lost or forgotten. Many programs and activities have become institutionalized and are employed without clear reference to any particular theoretical paradigm (Elliot, 1980: 238). The processes employed in many programs exist because they have a tradition. As Elliot observes, "they have become proper and accepted things to do for youth in trouble, because they are relatively easy to implement and because people are trained to provide this service or treatment." Many practitioners have little interest in evaluation of their programs and cling strongly to the status quo. They consider the theoretical concepts of rehabilitation to be the realm of academicians. Weiss observed that while evaluation research can contribute to the development of theory, it is primarily a management tool for agency planning, program development, refinement and for policy decision making (Weiss, 1972: 39). Without evaluation research, policy decisions are left to administrative philosophy, intuition, tradition and to political expediency. Recently the National Institute of Justice called for the use of experiments in shaping new policies and reviewing traditional ones (Garner & Visher, 1988: 2-8). To these ends corrections needs credible evaluation

methodologies that are relatively unobtrusive to program administration. Certainly there is a need to create an environment where evaluation can perform its most valuable functions. However, to create an environment where evaluation is systematically introduced, a catalyst is required.

In recent years, economic constraints imposed upon government have focused on the cost benefit of correctional programs. In a few cases, legislatures have imposed requirements for program evaluation as a contingency for funding. Overpopulation of state prison and youth correctional institutions has focused attention upon local corrections. Recent studies by the Rand Corporation focused on felony probation and the issue of prison vs. probation (Petersillia, 1985; 1986). Both studies respond to the changing profile of adult offenders that are being maintained in the community on probation.

A decade ago, the majority of probationers were placed on probation by the Municipal Courts following misdemeanor convictions. Today in California, as many as two thirds of the adult probationers are Superior Court felony convictions (San Bernardino County Probation 1987 Annual Report). Similarly, the elimination of the status offender from secure juvenile institutions and the expansion of diversion programs to keep minors out of the formal system, has had

the effect of increasing the number of serious juvenile offenders in probation caseloads and institutions. This effect has been magnified by the diminishing resources amongst community corrections programs. Without the resources to meet a growing population, community corrections has been forced to eliminate programs for all but the most serious offenders. With the concern for public safety a key political issue, it seems reasonable that legislators will see a need for demonstrating the effectiveness as well as the efficiency of community corrections and local institutional programs.

Privatization may prove to be another catalyst for the development of systematic program evaluation. The increasing interest of private enterprise in correctional programs introduces a threat to traditional public programs and creates a need for government regulation of private programs to assure efficiency and effectiveness.

Statement of the Research Problem

Two legislative mandates, one in Wisconsin and the other in California, have created an opportunity to explore a research methodology that may have wide application to those correctional programs traditionally under the jurisdiction of probation departments.

In 1973, the Wisconsin Bureau of Probation and Parole requested 37 new positions to reduce client/agent ratios. In the state's 1973 budget, the positions were granted but the legislature also mandated that the bureau implement a workload inventory system and specialized caseloads. This resulted in the "Case Classification/Staff Deployment Project" which received federal funding under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The system was implemented in 1975 and was composed of four components (Baird et al, 1979):

- 1) A risk assessment scale
- 2) A needs assessment scale
- 3) A workload budgeting and deployment system
- 4) A management information system

The Wisconsin model was viewed by the National Institute of Corrections to be a well researched and adaptable

system. In 1981, the Wisconsin system was adopted as a model probation system by the National Institute of Corrections. The model utilizes predictive classification systems to differentiate between offender groups as to likelihood of recidivism. These are of great value to the probation administrator faced with limited resources and a desire to concentrate those resources in the most efficient and effective manner. As a result, offender classification has gained widespread acceptance amongst chief probation officers. Today, the vast majority of probation agencies have some form of formal, "paper driven", classification system (Clear and Gallagher, 1985: 424). In California, most county probation departments have adopted a classification system for their adult caseloads and are moving towards the adoption of classification for juvenile caseloads. The Chief Probation Officers of California have also initiated a project to standardize the classification variables (Burton, 1984). As the utilization and standardization of risk classification spreads, there will develop in California a substantial data base composed of these classification variables along with traditional offender variables such as sex, age, race, offense history and court dispositions.

In 1980 the San Bernardino County Probation Department implemented case classification including risk and need assessment in both its adult and juvenile operations. In 1985

San Bernardino County Probation applied for funding of a Regional Youth Education Facility (R.Y.E.F.). Legislation passed in 1984 authorized this experimental program to provide a sentencing alternative to the juvenile courts. The program targeted 16 - 17 year old males who were wards of the juvenile court under section 602 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code (designating the courts jurisdiction over youth who violate criminal statute.) Wards eligible for placement were awaiting out of home placement in juvenile halls, and were not eligible for commitment to the California Youth Authority. The facility was a short term intensive educational experience including programs such as competency-based educational services, visual perceptual screening, remedial individual education plans for diagnosed learning disabilities, electronic and computer education, physical education, vocational training, work experience, character education, and restitution. Following promotion from the placement, the wards received intensive supervision by a probation officer for a minimum of 120 days (Skonovd, 1989).

The enabling legislation required that an evaluation be conducted by the Program Research and Review Division of the California Youth Authority. The program proposal that was accepted by the Youth Authority called for an experimental design with random assignment to experimental and control

groups. However, subsequent to the grant of program funding to San Bernardino County, an administrative decision was made to drop the experimental design. This decision was based upon anticipated resistance from the courts and attorneys. It was expected that attorneys would oppose assignment of their clients to alternative facilities if that assignment occurred as the result of randomization. It was expected that the court would frequently overrule the random assignment. A conflict also arose from an ethical issue with the department administrator who was concerned about denial of the program to eligible wards. Because of this restriction on methodology, the initial evaluation of the program submitted to the California legislature in December 1986 contained only data on the delivery of the program elements. No recidivism study was conducted. The legislature extended the program in 1986 but required that a recidivism study be conducted and a report be made to the legislature in January 1989. This required program administrators and the Department of the Youth Authority to agree upon a research methodology. The methodology would have to be acceptable to both the administration of the program and the research division of the Youth Authority. This situation presented an opportunity to develop a research methodology that could both meet the legislative mandate for this specific program and suggest a format for the evaluation of various other probation programs.

The research problem, then, is to apply a predictive classification instrument in such a manner as to develop matched comparison groups that are equivalent on the basis of all the variables contained in that instrument. The equivalence of the groups will allow for differences in outcome measures to be attributed to program effect. Further, the design will open the door to a more valid experimental design using classification as an antecedent to random assignment.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Daniel Glaser observed that while experimental designs are generally considered the ideal way to test causal theories and treatment technologies, administrative inertia, legal or ethical barriers generally make such experiments impossible to conduct. He also observed that true experiments are frequently feasible only under such unusual conditions or restraints that their conclusions would not be generalizable to more typical circumstances (Glaser, 1987: 281).

Inasmuch as an experimental research design was not an option for the study of this program, (due to the administrative decision against a randomized design) a search for an alternative design was conducted. The quasi-experimental design offered the greatest prospect of being accepted by both the administration of the program and the research group responsible for the evaluation. Campbell and Stanley set the basic criteria for judging a quasi-experimental design as the degree to which it protects against the effects of extraneous variables on the outcome measures (1963: 171-246). Reviewing this criteria, Carol Weiss remarked that quasi-experimental designs generally leave some threats to internal validity unprotected;

however, when conducted with the same rigor as the experimental design, they offer a practical alternative to program evaluation.

Glaser stressed the requirement of comparison in the design of evaluation methodology. "No knowledge on the effectiveness of people-changing effort is acquired only by learning the subsequent rates of behavior of those subjected to the effort. Instead, effectiveness is assessed by comparing these rates with some standard, preferably the rates that evidence would suggest would have characterized the group studied had they not been the subjects of the people-changing endeavor" (Glaser, 1976: 74). Comparison in single group designs looks only at before and after effects of the same individuals. These designs suffer greatly from the effects of history, maturation and other threats to internal validity. A Nonequivalent Control Group Design controls well for history and maturation (Campbell and Stanley, 1963: 47).

In 1975 the United States Department of Justice produced a "Practical Guide" to evaluative research in corrections. The manual was a direct response to Martinson's review of evaluation literature. The main emphasis of the guide was twofold. First, "the correctional administrator has several responsibilities to fulfill if he is to benefit

from research." Second, "the researcher must command a variety of techniques if he is to meet the descriptive and analytic needs of his agency" (Adams, 1975: iii). In essence the Department of Justice called for flexibility and cooperation from both administrator and researcher. The organization must support the evaluation and accommodate the research design. The researcher must find procedures that produce a successful evaluation within the constraints of the program administration. In a review of quasi-experimental designs, Adams found that they presented several practical advantages to the true experiment. These included: convenience, flexibility, speed of application, and immunity to the "denial of treatment" charge. Adams cited the importance of giving equal care to the implementation of quasi-experimental designs as that given to the true experiment.

A Nonequivalent Control Group design might well serve both administrator and researcher in the evaluation of correctional programs, but the design chosen must observe certain guidelines to assure the validity of the results. Riecken and Boruch (1974) in their review of comparison group designs cautioned that while it is natural to seek a comparison group that is as similar as possible to the experimental on as many factors as possible, it is necessary to do so in a way that avoids regression artifacts due to

selection. Weiss observed that matching as a substitute for randomization can create pseudoeffects that can produce misleading results. This occurs because all measures (such as test or attitude scores) contain some type of error. On a given testing or assessment, some individuals will score artificially high and others, artificially low. A subsequent test or assessment would likely place them closer to the mean. If participants are chosen on the basis of their extreme scores, they are likely to regress towards the mean with or without the program (Weiss, 1972: 70). It is recommended that a comparison group be chosen on general grounds but not on the basis of pretest scores.

Fitz-Gibbon and Morris (1978: 28-29) concur in the concept that the experimental and comparison groups should be as similar as possible. They recommend three guidelines in developing the nonequivalent control group in a quasi-experimental design. First, if the experimental group is selected by means of a particular procedure, then the control group should be selected by a procedure which is as nearly the same as possible. Second, the nonequivalent control group should be given all the major tests that the experimental group was given. Third, all similarities and differences between the control and the experimental groups should be carefully documented.

These authors also make recommendations as to the nature of the program that the control group should receive. The "best solution" is one which provides the most useful information for decisions that have to be made. Ideally the program received by the control group should be the closest competitor to the experimental program (Fitz-Gibbon & Morris, 1978: 30).

In reviewing the nonequivalent control group design for its ability to reduce equivocality in the interpretation of outcomes Campbell and Stanley (1963: 48) observe that:

"The more similar the experimental and control groups are in their recruitment, and the more this similarity is confirmed by the scores on pretest, the more effective this control becomes. Assuming that these desiderata are approximated for purposes of internal validity, we can regard the design as controlling for the main effects of history, maturation, testing and instrumentation, in that the difference for the experimental group between pretest and posttest (if greater than that for the control group) cannot be explained by the main effects of these variables such as would be found affecting both the experimental and control group."

They caution that the pretest means of the groups may not differ substantially or the process of matching will introduce unwanted regression effects.

Classification instruments in common use in corrections present a method for comparing experimental and control groups. Most of these instruments are predictive in nature, thus allowing the corrections administrator to differentiate between offenders who are more or less likely to fail. Early work in the development of prediction instruments was completed by Burgess (1928) and E. and S. Glueck (1930). In 1955 Mannheim and Wilkins produced an instrument (containing seven variables) for predicting the probability that an offender committed to a British borstal would be reconvicted within three years of discharge (Mannheim & Wilkins, 1955). In 1959 Benson applied the instrument to a population of young prisoners, finding a good fit between observed and predicted outcomes. Further, he found little difference in the rate of success between the two populations (Benson, 1959). These works suggested the feasibility of developing instruments which could predict high or low probability of success in parole populations.

Statistical prediction devices have generally fared better than clinical judgment in accuracy of prediction (Gottfredson, 1967: 185). Based on this evidence, in the early 1970's the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, recommended the BE61A (Developed for parole populations by the California Department of Corrections) for use by all federal probation officers (Hemple, Webb and

Reynolds, 1976: 33). This scale, along with other instruments, was evaluated by the Federal Judicial Center in 1982 resulting in the recommendation for adoption of another statistical device, the U.S.D.C. 75 as the principal method for classifying probationers in all ninety-five districts of the Federal probation system (Eaglin & Lombard, 1982: 67).

A parallel trend has occurred in local corrections following the development of the Wisconsin Case Classification/Staff Deployment Project and its subsequent adoption by the National Institute of Corrections as a model system. Currently thirty-eight of the fifty-nine California county probation departments employ actuarial classification devices as the primary means of differentiating service levels in their client populations.

Using classification instruments as an alternative to randomization was suggested in the late 1950's by Leslie T. Wilkins. He used "base expectancy" tables of factors that could be known before subjects were exposed to the program to be assessed. The "base expectancy" refers to the frequency of an outcome criterion in a population. From this benchmark, subpopulations can be identified that have higher or lower frequencies of the outcome criterion. Analysis of variables suggest the "salient factors" that predict outcome. That is, those variables that are strongly correlated

to the outcome and together explain the greatest possible amount of variance.

The base expectancy tables were used to classify individuals into preprogram risk groups. Two methods were suggested for the evaluation. First, the expected outcome rates are calculated for a large population from which the experimental population would be taken. The outcome rates of the experimental group can then be measured against the base expectancy to see if the outcomes are better or worse than predicted. A second use of the base expectancy was to compare program effects for different risk groups; that is, to compare the difference between expected and actual outcomes for high versus low risk groups (Glaser, 1987: 282).

A similar method was used by Robertson and Blackburn (1984) to evaluate the effectiveness of probation supervision on groups of probationers with different classifications of risk and correspondingly different levels of supervision and treatment. They compared outcomes of offenders who had similar risk classifications but differing levels of supervision. For each level of risk, maximum, medium and minimum outcomes were measured for a group assigned to an enhanced level of supervision. As a comparison, risk assessments were made on recently closed cases and outcomes were measured. The study revealed that there was a positive

effect from treatment for all levels of risk classification. All individuals included in the study were classified by the four most prominent risk prediction instruments devised in recent years: the Salient Factor, Revised Oregon, California BE61A and the U.S.D.C. 75.

This review of theory and research options suggested two methodologies as prospects for the evaluation of the Regional Youth Education Facility. The first would compare outcomes with another program which accepted a similar clientele. With this type of methodology it would be necessary to find a second program which was very similar in terms of acceptance criteria. If the general populations of the two programs were not very similar, the differences between the populations might account for differences in outcomes from the two programs. That is, one or more critical variables could be overlooked. These variables might explain the differences in post-program delinquency. In the alternative, subpopulations of one or both programs might be selected for their similarity on a specific set of variables. However, if the scores on these variables are at the extreme ends of the possible scores a regression effect could be introduced.

Due to the threats to internal validity left uncorrected in this design, an alternative methodology was

developed. This called for a screening criteria based upon a set of objective variables and required the experimental program to accept only those individuals that satisfied the criteria. Selection by this process was on the basis of a general score on a set of variables rather than a score on each variable in a set. This screening criteria was then applied to a large population in order to locate individuals not referred to the experimental program who met the acceptance criteria. These comparison group minors were referred to various alternative programs.

The success of this methodology required that certain conditions be met. First, the administration of the program had to be willing to accept the limitations of the screening process. Conversely, the researcher had to design a screening instrument that sufficiently complemented the programs needs for a specific client type. If the administrators could rely on the instrument to guarantee appropriate clients it was less likely that the program staff would misuse or override the instrument. Second, to assure a pool of eligibles for the control group, there had to be a process in existence that would assure that some individuals who would have been appropriate for the program bypass the screening process be assigned to alternative programs. Discretion on the part of the probation officer assigned to a case to select other programs over the experimental one

formed an acceptable process for creating a pool of eligibles. Further, there occasionally existed a lengthy waiting list for the experimental program. The wait discouraged some referrals which were then referred to other programs.

The classification instrument that formed an essential component of the N.I.C. model probation system as implemented in San Bernardino County offered a natural foundation for a screening and selection device. The purpose of the risk and need instrument was to assign a level of supervision based upon the risk of individuals to the community and the needs of the clients for services. Provided that the risk instrument was capable of differentiating between low and high risk groups of offenders, it allowed administrators to efficiently distribute department resources. Those offenders who were a minimal risk to the community were assigned to minimal supervision caseloads. Similarly, the high risk offenders received maximum supervision and services.

In this county, all probationers were classified by the instrument; therefore, a database existed from which to select potential program eligibles. Further, if the instrument were validated, that is, variables in instrument were correlated with the probability of further criminal conduct,

it was likely that these variables would capture the salient factors that influence criminality. As continued criminality following treatment was the primary outcome measure, then the risk prediction instrument contained a logical and related variable set.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

Instrumentation

San Bernardino County Probation had classified cases with a risk/need instrument since 1980 (Appendix A). However, the instrument used had never been validated. Further, the same instrument was used for both juvenile and adult caseloads. There was a need to develop a validated juvenile Risk/Need instrument. Rather than selecting a set of new variables to construct a new instrument, it was decided that the variables in the existing instrument would be accepted and tested for correlation with some outcome criterion. In a national survey of juvenile risk assessment instruments, Baird (1985) found that certain variables had validity for most jurisdictions. The existing instrument was compared to another validated juvenile instrument from a neighboring jurisdiction and was found to contain 90 percent of the same or very similar variables. No significant variables appeared to be missing. Weighting of the variables and correct distribution into either the risk or need area were the primary concerns. Only variables that were related to recidivism should remain on the risk side of the instrument. Those that might suggest other casework needs should be delegated to the need side of the instrument.

The validation was accomplished by collecting 300 classifications from files closed during a six-month period in 1985. Success on probation was used as the outcome criterion and the relationship of all variables to this criterion was measured. Both new arrests and technical probation rule violations were recorded and used in the statistical analysis. Variables that showed a relationship to one of the outcome variables were retained in the "risk" area of the instrument. For the initial selection, a Chi-Square analysis was employed. Each variable was put into a cross-tabulation with the dependent variable (failure on probation). If the Chi-Square analysis of the cross-tabulation indicated a probability of chance of less than .10, the variable was retained. The second analysis and adjustment employed a simple correlation coefficient. Each variable was weighted to correspond to the strength of its relationship to the outcome criterion. That is, a variable that explained twice as much of the variance as another would receive twice the point score. Variables which did not appear to be associated with recidivism but were indicative of casework needs or provided significant demographic information were retained in the "need" side of the instrument. Additionally, some variables were added to the need side of the instrument to enhance demographic information. These included information of the minor's parents including:

1) which parent the minor resided with; 2) the family income; 3) psychological or physical illness of a parent; 4) other delinquency in the family; 5) the number of family address changes in the past year.

Before the instrument was introduced to the department, a manual containing the operational definitions of each variable and each level of score was completed and distributed (Appendix B). Unfortunately, it was not possible to provide training sessions on the use of the new instrument. Such training would have enhanced reliability. However, the operational definitions did provide for the resolution of conflicts over the proper scoring of a case when it was reviewed by a supervisor or a program screening committee.

To convert the classification instrument to a program screening instrument, it had to be fitted to the desired program population. The Regional Youth Education Facility program had been operational for approximately one year prior to implementation of the evaluation. This allowed for an analysis of the first year's population which had been selected by the existing screening process. Risk and need assessments were available for eighty-five of these first year's placements. From this sample, the mean risk score of the population was determined. Statistical analysis sug-

gested that 95% of the population fell within nine points on the risk assessment instrument (13 - 21 points).

The program administration was then allowed to identify additional variables which by themselves would exclude a minor from the program. Seven variables were identified. They were: 1) two or more sustained felony petitions; 2) alcohol or drug dependency; 3) an emotional disorder requiring professional treatment; 4) a confirmed homosexual life style; 5) a tested I.Q. of below 80 points; 6) a serious handicap or chronic illness; 7) the minor stated or his record indicated a resistance to all efforts to modify his behavior. These variables were added to the instrument where they had not previously existed. The combination of the nine point spread on the risk assessment instrument and the exclusionary variables formed the criteria for acceptance to the experimental program.

Application of the instrument

Beginning on January 1st, 1987 all clients for the Regional Youth Education Facility were selected on the basis of the risk/need screening instrument. Only those individuals who scored between 13 and 21 points on the risk instrument and failed to score in the exclusionary range on

the discrete variables were accepted to the program. The risk/need instrument was originally prepared by the referring probation officer. It was required to have been completed within six months of the placement referral or immediately following the adjudication of the offense that resulted in the referral to the program whichever was the shorter time frame.

The screening committee was allowed to review the scores on each variable of the risk/need instrument. A screening committee score for each variable was recorded and the minor was accepted or rejected on the basis of the committee scoring. However, both scores were retained in a data base so that either scoring (probation officer or screening committee) could be used to select the experimental group to be evaluated. The screening committee was also allowed to override the scores to either accept or reject a minor for placement. However, it was agreed that this process would be kept to no more than five percent of the screened cases. None of the overrides would be used in the study. These overrides were necessary both to accommodate the occasional situation where the court would order a minor into placement and to allow for other special circumstances.

Data Collection

All minors ordered into out-of-home placement by the juvenile court are referred to a specialized unit in the probation department which is responsible for selecting and then initiating the placement. All cases referred to this placement unit of the probation department were required to have a recently completed risk/need instrument. From January 1st, 1987 to December 31st, 1987 all files of cases assigned to this unit were captured and referral data was collected. All risk/need variables along with prior record data, court dispositional data and demographic data were coded and keyed into a computerized data base.

During the course of the year, data from 724 cases was collected. These cases included all minors selected for the Regional Youth Education Facility along with those minors who were screened and rejected for the program. It also included all minors referred to other placements and not screened through the experimental program.

Selection of the Experimental and Comparison Groups

Both the scores of the probation officer and of the screening committee were retained in the data base. This provided an opportunity to evaluate the reliability of the variables by comparing the scores of the probation officers with those of the screening committee. In selecting the experimental group to be evaluated, it was decided that only those minors who scored as acceptable by the probation officer would be retained in the study. In doing so, both the comparison and experimental groups were subjected to the same scoring process. Scoring errors and other reliability problems should be equally applied to both groups. This selection process eliminated approximately one half of the minors who entered the program during the time frame of the study. The final experimental group was reduced to 41 minors.

From the total of 724 cases, those minors for whom a complete record did not exist were removed. This reduced the number of available cases to 708. All cases screened for the experimental program were next removed. This reduced the available cases to 564. To these 564 cases the criteria for program acceptance were applied. These criteria included age (16 - 17.9 years), sex (males only), risk score (13 - 21 points) and all exclusionary variables.

The process produced a list of 53 names of minors who, had they been screened, would have been acceptable, on the basis of the probation officer's score, for the Regional Youth Education Facility. Of these, two had been previously placed at R.Y.E.F.. One was placed at R.Y.E.F. following an initial placement failure and one case was transferred out of the jurisdiction during placement. All of these cases were removed from the study leaving the final count for the comparison group at 48.

For each case which qualified on the basis of the probation officer's risk and need scores for either the experimental or the comparison group movement between placements was recorded. This movement may have resulted from a placement removal for failure to adjust or from an escape. Time in each placement also was recorded as was the daily cost of each placement.

For each of the minors in the experimental and comparison groups who successfully completed a placement, outcome measures of recidivism were obtained. These data were collected during the first week of May 1989. To improve accuracy and completeness multiple sources were used. Cross checks were made between sources to assure agreement on the data. These sources included Probation Department files, the Juvenile Justice Information System (an automated

Juvenile Court database) the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Central Name Index (the primary automated law enforcement system) and the Automated Court Information System which serves the municipal and superior courts. These systems revealed data concerning arrests, custody, convictions and subsequent juvenile or adult court dispositions.

An attempt was also made to collect data concerning outcome measures other than recidivism. For each R.Y.E.F. ward, a record was made by the probation officer supervising the case. This record included information on employment and educational efforts following promotion from the program. Additionally, community work service and restitution payment records were kept. It was hoped that a similar record might be created for the comparison group. After the comparison group had been identified, each probation officer assigned to a case in the group was contacted. The officers were asked to complete the same form that had been completed by the experimental group's officers. However, on many occasions the cases had passed through more than one officer in the time since release from placement. Officer familiarity with the case was limited. Notes kept by previous officers were incomplete or unreliable. Many cases had been dismissed due to the minor's age or the minors had absconded and their whereabouts were unknown.

These additional outcome measures would have been valuable in measuring program effect. Had the measures been planned in the development of the study, it might have been possible to expand the data collection of these outcomes to all minors exiting placements. This would have assured more reliable and complete records.

Limitations

Although the experimental program is only six months in duration, some wards in the comparison group, especially those in privately operated facilities, spent substantially longer periods in placement. Even eighteen months after the last minor entered the placement unit the number of minors out of placement for at least one year was smaller than was desirable. While it was possible to look at a longer period of outcome for a subset of both groups the validity of outcome measures might be affected by this selection process. This process would select for those minors who completed placement in a relatively short time. Those individuals retained for longer periods in placement would be excluded from the sample. It is possible that minors who spend additional time in placement have different outcomes from the rest of the population. Further, the comparison group would be reduced to a very small number and the two groups would

differ substantially in size. It would be difficult to conduct an analysis that would have any statistically significant value. A six month period of follow-up should be sufficient as it was determined during the validation of the risk instrument that half of all violations occur in the first six months following the court disposition.

This entire project was significantly dependent upon the accuracy of official records. Both the independent variables of the risk/need instrument and the various measures of recidivism were affected by errors and biases introduced into the official records. It was important that the risk/need instruments be completed within a short period before placement. This was necessary in order to capture a profile of the minors at the time of placement. Unfortunately not all officers referring minors to placement followed the policy of completing a risk/need assessment at the time of referral.

Reliability of the risk/need variables is dependent both upon the understanding of the operational definitions of the variables and on the concern of the officer for accurately recording the variables. To many staff, the risk/need instruments are only an additional piece of paperwork to be completed. Further, while the reporting of some information such as prior record data is relatively unaf-

ected by officer's attitudes, many of the risk/need variables are highly subjective and easily manipulated. Reliability of each variable was measured and must be reported.

Reports of delinquent behavior both as variables in the risk instrument and as measures of recidivism are highly subject to biases introduced by agency policy and procedure. No attempt is being made to measure criminal activity except by official records of arrests and the subsequent responses to arrests. As not all criminal behavior will be discovered by law enforcement or correctional agencies, the measure of recidivism will probably be less than what has actually occurred. There is no assurance that differential enforcement of the law or conditions of probation will be evenly distributed between the experimental and comparison groups however in the absence evidence to the contrary it is reasonable to assume that it will (Glaser, 1973). The observed recidivism may depend not only upon the behavior of the persons who are the subject of this study but upon the behavior of police, prosecutors, judges, or probation officials. Probation violations may depend on both the probationers behavior and the response of the probation officer (Gottfredson & Tonry, 1987: 14) Any bias introduced as a result of differential enforcement of the law or conditions of probation can not be controlled nor its effect

measured. Further, with the small sample size available for this study, the poor reliability of recidivism measures will significantly reduce the value of this criterion as a measure of program success. Violations of probation may be especially affected. As the experimental program personnel were aware of the study and as the study outcomes were tied to continued funding, it is likely that they attempted to keep violations to a minimum. This could be done by exerting influence on the probation officers who supervise the minors subsequent to release from the program. Due to the potential for this manipulation, any conclusions based upon violations of conditions of probation are highly suspect.

As much as possible, the selection process for the experimental program was protected from external and internal manipulation. Frequent contact with program staff helped to resolve problems with the screening process and improved the staff's commitment to the evaluation.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Analysis of the Independent Variables

The first analysis of the independent variables involved an examination of the inter-rater reliability of the instrument. The screening committee was allowed to make changes in the weighting of the variables after the instrument had been scored and submitted by the probation officer. The frequency of these changes and the specific variables affected could damage the integrity of the process. To assess reliability of the variables in the screening process, 130 screenings were collected and analyzed. Due to incomplete data on some screenings, two were dropped from the analysis of the need data and one was dropped from the analysis of the risk data. The frequency of agreement is shown in tables 1 and 2.

The frequency of agreement between probation officer and screening committee varied from a low of 50% (on the attitude variable) to a high of 93.8% (on the health variable). For the most part, the degree of reliability was well correlated with the subjectivity of the variable. Those relating to "hard" data such as "prior record", did better than those relating to subjective evaluation such as

"attitude". One exception to this was a poor rating on the variable "probation history" this occurred as a result of confusion generated in the operational definition of the variable. Nature of offense, while appearing to be a clear variable proved to be problematic due to confusion over some offenses that could be considered crimes against both a person and property.

Age at first offense and the number of prior arrests have been found to be the best variables in predicting recidivism (Baird, 1985: 36 and Ashford & LeCroy, 1988: 145). As data existed (in the data set on all eligibles for the program) to test the probation officer's measure of this variable against the actual recorded prior offense record, reliability for both variables was measured. For both variables agreement between scoring of the variable and recorded prior offense history was 82%. On the age at first offense variable the majority of errors (14 of the 15 errors) were in towards a higher score on the variable. However on the number of prior offenses variable, the error was in favor of a lower score.

The average agreement between probation officer and screening committee on the variables was 80%. However, the frequency at which the probation officer and committee agreed on the total score was only 24.8% on the need instru-

ment and 15.6% on the risk instrument. When adjustment in made for the 9 point spread in the range of acceptability to the program 70% of those minors scoring an acceptable risk score by the probation officer were accepted by the screening committee.

The exclusionary variables present another concern. Alcohol use, emotional stability, opposite sex peer, learning disability (need), health and assaultive history all score in excess of 80% reliability. However, the variables of illegal drug use and attitude scored 76.7% and 50% respectively. The attitude variable had been expected to be poorly reliable and should have been dropped from the instrument. However, despite problems of reliability, this variable had scored high in predicting recidivism. Further, the program administration was insistent that the variable be retained.

In the final analysis, the combined effects of reliability deficiencies was to reduce the agreement between the probation officer and screening committee by 44%. Of the 75 minors screened and accepted for the program, only 41 were acceptable by both the probation officer and screening committee's scoring. This reduction was much higher than had been hoped and may have affected comparability between the experimental and control groups.

TABLE 1
Reliability of RISK Variables

Percentage of Agreement
Between
Probation Officer and Screening Committee

n = 128

Number of prior offenses	84.4%
Nature of offenses	74.2%
Assaultive history	82.0%
Age at first offense	88.3%
Probation history	68.0%
Revocation history	74.2%
Placement history	88.3%
Emotional stability	70.3%
Attitude	50.0%
School attendance	89.8%
Academic achievement	89.1%
Learning disability	91.4%
Peer influence	80.5%
Agreement on exact RISK score	15.6%

TABLE 2

Reliability of NEED Variables

Percentage of Agreement
Between
Probation Officer and Screening Committee

n = 128

Employment	79.1%
Alcohol use	76.7%
Drug use	81.4%
Family relations	58.1%
School problems	76.0%
Academic achievement	89.8%
Emotional stability	86.8%
Primary parent	86.0%
Parent drug abuse	89.1%
Parental illness	83.7%
Family criminal history	83.7%
Family income	77.5%
Family address changes	82.2%
Opposite sex peer	89.1%
Recreation or hobby	84.5%
Learning disability	82.2%
Health	93.8%
Agreement on exact NEED score	24.8%

Intra-rater reliability was also measured. Three variables, school attendance, academic achievement and learning disabilities, on the risk instrument are repeated on need instrument. The variable, emotional stability, is also repeated but with greater difference in the operational definition. A comparison of the similar variables on each instrument from the same rater indicated the consistency of scoring. For these variables the rater consistency was better than 90%.

From the risk/need data, prior record information and age data, the two groups were compared for similarity. Analysis of the prior record information did not lend itself well to statistical analysis due to the discrete nature of the data. However, numbers of prior arrests could be compared in cross-tabulation and allowed for a valid Chi-Square test if significance. Race also allowed for cross-tabulation and a Chi-Square test of significance.

As all the risk variables are weighted according to their ability to predict recidivism, cross-tabulation and a Chi-Square test of significance was deemed appropriate to reveal differences between the groups. Although the weighting of the need variables is not related to the primary outcome variable (recidivism), cross-tabulation of these weighted variables with a Chi-Square test also offered in-

formation about the comparability of the two groups.

There was a significant reduction of the experimental and comparison groups due to program failure. This reduction in group size was disproportionate, as 52.7% (25) of the comparison group failed to complete the first assigned placement and 22.5% (9) of the experimental group failed to complete placement at R.Y.E.F. Eight of the comparison group were placed in other facilities and eventually completed a program. Three minors in the comparison group had not completed placement within six months of the outcome data measurement and were therefore excluded from the study. The significance of this differential rate of failure and placement duration will be discussed in the analysis of the dependent variables.

If the goal was to measure the success of the experimental program in reducing recidivism, it seemed appropriate that only those who had received the full benefit of the program should be included in the outcome measures. This should also then hold true for the comparison group. When only program completions are counted the groups are reduced to 32 experimentals and 28 comparisons.

Crosstabulation of the risk/need data of the original groups of all eligibles (minor's qualified for the program

on the basis of the screening criteria) was compared with cross-tabulation of the same variables for the final groups of program completions (minor's who completed R.Y.E.F. or an alternative program). The results of that analysis are contained in tables 3 and 4. The tables indicate differences between the experimental and comparison groups on the basis of the frequency of each level of each variable before and after elimination of program failures. Also indicated where statistically significant is the Chi-Square probability that the differences between the comparison and experimental groups could have resulted from chance. Where possible, the data was recoded to raise the expected cell frequency to 5 or greater (Alreck & Settle, 1985: 309). Even with the recoding, the expected cell frequency was below 5 in one third of the variables. Although the the problem of small marginals could not be overcome, it was felt that the statistical analysis was useful in interpreting the data (Babbie, 1986: 425).

TABLE 3
Comparability of RISK Variables

	All Eligibles		Program Completions	
	RYEF n=41	Comp. n=48	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
Number of prior offenses				
none.....	2.4%	8.3%	3.1%	0.0%
one.....	24.4%	31.3%	31.3%	35.7%
two or more..	73.2%	60.4%	65.6%	64.3%
Nature of offenses				
property.....	63.4%	60.4%	59.4%	60.7%
persons.....	14.6%	16.7%	18.8%	14.3%
both.....	22.0%	22.9%	21.9%	25.0%
Assaultive history				
none.....	70.7%	62.5%	68.8%	60.7%
yes.....	29.3%	37.5%	31.3%	39.3%
Age at first offense				
16-17.....	22.0%	29.2%	21.9%	35.7%
under 15.....	78.0%	70.8%	78.1%	64.3%
Probation history				
none.....	17.1%	31.3%	18.8%	32.1%
one.....	36.6%	52.1%	40.6%	50.0%
two +.....	46.3%	16.7% *	40.6%	17.9%

* p ≤ .05

TABLE 3 cont.

Comparability of RISK Variables

by

	All Eligibles		Program Completions	
	RYEF n=41	Comp. n=48	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
<hr/>				
Revocation history				
none.....	22.0%	29.2%	21.9%	35.7%
one.....	36.6%	37.5%	40.6%	35.7%
two +.....	41.5%	33.3%	37.5%	28.6%
<hr/>				
Placement history				
no.....	75.6%	77.1%	81.3%	82.1%
yes.....	24.4%	22.9%	18.8%	17.9%
<hr/>				
Emotional stability				
stable.....	4.9%	8.3%	6.3%	10.7%
unpredictable	87.8%	75.0%	84.4%	75.0%
unstable.....	7.3%	16.7%	9.4%	14.3%
<hr/>				
Attitude				
motivated....	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	3.6%
dependent....	48.8%	37.5%	43.8%	39.3%
rationalizes.	51.2%	58.3%	56.3%	57.1%
<hr/>				
School attendance				
regular.....	19.5%	10.4%	21.9%	10.7%
truancy.....	80.5%	89.6%	78.1%	89.3%
<hr/>				

TABLE 3 cont.

Comparability of RISK Variables

by

	All Eligibles		Program Completions	
	RYEF n=41	Comp. n=48	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
<hr/>				
Academic achievement				
at grade.....	12.2%	16.7%	9.4%	10.7%
below grade..	87.8%	83.3%	90.6%	89.3%
<hr/>				
Learning disability				
none.....	92.7%	91.7%	90.6%	85.7%
yes.....	7.3%	8.3%	9.4%	14.3%
<hr/>				
Peer influence				
positive.....	2.4%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%
negative.....	90.2%	85.4%	90.6%	82.1%
gang.....	7.3%	14.6%	6.3%	17.9%
<hr/>				
Risk score				
13-15.....	24.4%	29.2%	25.0%	28.6%
16-18.....	39.0%	47.9%	43.8%	53.6%
19-21.....	36.6%	22.9%	31.3%	17.9%
<hr/>				
Mean Risk Score:	17.29	16.65	17.16	16.57
<hr/>				

TABLE 4
Comparability of NEED Variables
by

	All Eligibles		Program Completions	
	RYEF n=41	Comp. n=48	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
Employment				
employed n/a.	12.2%	41.7%	15.6%	53.6%
needs empl...	87.8%	58.3% *	84.4%	46.4% *
Alcohol use				
none.....	31.7%	41.7%	31.3%	39.3%
occasional...	68.3%	58.3%	68.7%	60.7%
Drug use				
none.....	14.6%	22.9%	15.6%	21.4%
occasional...	85.4%	77.1%	84.4%	78.6%
Family relations				
supportive...	2.4%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%
stable.....	7.3%	4.2%	6.3%	3.6%
disorganized.	46.3%	35.4%	46.9%	39.3%
major stress.	43.9%	56.3%	43.8%	50.0%
abuse.....	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	7.1%
School problems				
attending....	2.4%	4.2%	0.0%	7.1%
problems.....	22.0%	8.3%	25.0%	7.1%
truant.....	22.0%	27.1%	25.0%	21.4%
expelled.....	53.7%	60.4%	50.0%	64.3%

* $p \leq .05$

TABLE 4 cont.

Comparability of NEED Variables

by

	All Eligibles		Program Completions	
	RYEF n=41	Comp. n=48	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
<hr/>				
Academic achievement				
at grade.....	19.5%	14.6%	18.8%	7.1%
below grade..	80.5%	85.4%	81.3%	92.9%
<hr/>				
Emotional stability				
appropriate..	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	10.7%
exaggerated..	100.0%	93.8%	100.0%	89.3%
<hr/>				
Primary parent				
both.....	7.3%	20.8%	9.4%	21.4%
one + step...	34.1%	29.2%	31.3%	35.7%
single.....	58.5%	50.0%	59.4%	42.9%
<hr/>				
Parent drug abuse				
none.....	53.7%	70.8%	59.4%	75.0%
yes.....	46.3%	29.2%	40.6%	25.0%
<hr/>				
Parental illness				
none.....	92.7%	89.6%	96.9%	89.3%
physical.....	7.3%	6.3%	3.1%	7.1%
psychological	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	3.6%
<hr/>				

TABLE 4 cont.

Comparability of NEED Variables

by

	All Eligibles		Program Completions	
	RYEF n=41	Comp. n=48	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
<hr/>				
Family criminal history				
none.....	56.1%	47.9%	50.0%	53.6%
priors.....	43.9%	52.1%	50.0%	46.4%
<hr/>				
Family income				
above ave....	2.4%	12.5%	0.0%	10.7%
adequate.....	56.1%	35.4%	59.4%	35.7%
subsistence..	41.5%	52.1%	40.6%	53.6%
<hr/>				
Family address changes				
none.....	65.9%	62.5%	65.6%	60.7%
one.....	19.5%	22.9%	18.8%	25.0%
two.....	9.8%	12.5%	9.4%	10.7%
three.....	4.9%	2.1%	6.3%	3.6%
<hr/>				
Opposite sex peer				
appropriate..	95.1%	89.6%	93.8%	92.9%
inappropriate	4.9%	10.4%	6.3%	7.1%
<hr/>				

TABLE 4 cont.

Comparability of NEED Variables

by

	All Eligibles		Program Completions	
	RYEF n=41	Comp. n=48	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
<hr/>				
Recreation or hobby				
active.....	12.2%	22.9%	12.5%	14.3%
none.....	87.8%	77.1%	87.5%	85.7%
<hr/>				
Learning disability				
none.....	85.4%	89.6%	84.4%	85.7%
yes.....	14.6%	10.4%	15.6%	14.3%
<hr/>				
Health				
good.....	97.6%	89.6%	100.0%	92.9%
problems.....	2.4%	10.4%	0.0%	7.1%
<hr/>				
Mean Need Score:	17.29	16.66	17.16	16.57
<hr/>				

TABLE 5

Age of Program Completions

by

	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
Age at first offense	14.20	14.69
Mean age at entry	17.33	16.71
Mean age at exit	17.83	17.54

TABLE 6

Race of Program Completions

by

	RYEF n=32	Comp. n=28
Caucasian	54.8%	57.1%
Black	19.4%	21.4%
Hispanic	25.8%	17.9%
Other	0.0%	3.6%

TABLE 7

Number of Prior Offenses
of Program Completions

by

	RYEF n=32		Comp. n=28	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
One	(7)	21.9%	(9)	32.1%
Two	(5)	15.6%	(11)	39.3%
Three	(11)	34.4%	(4)	14.3%
Four	(3)	9.4%	(4)	14.3%
Five	(3)	9.4%	(0)	0.0%
Six	(3)	9.4%	(0)	0.0%
Total number	100		59	
Ave. No. of priors:	3.125		2.107	

p = 0.059

TABLE 8

Nature of Prior Offenses
of Program Completions

by

	RYEF n=32		Comp. n=28	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
Assault	(16)	16.0%	(3)	5.1%
Robbery	(1)	1.0%	(1)	1.7%
Burglary	(23)	23.0%	(12)	20.3%
Theft	(23)	23.0%	(22)	37.3%
Sex Violation	(0)	0.0%	(1)	1.7%
Drugs	(16)	16.0%	(7)	11.9%
Misc. Felony	(7)	7.0%	(1)	1.7%
Misc. Misd.	(9)	9.0%	(9)	15.3%
Incorrigible	(2)	2.0%	(0)	0.0%
Escape	(0)	0.0%	(2)	3.4%
VCO*	(3)	3.0%	(1)	1.7%

* VCO = Violation of Court Order

TABLE 9

Nature of Commitment Offenses
of Program Completions

by

	RYEF n=32		Comp. n=28	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
Robbery	(1)	3.1%	(1)	3.1%
Assault	(3)	9.4%	(1)	3.6%
Burglary	(11)	34.4%	(5)	17.9%
Theft	(4)	12.5%	(5)	17.9%
Sex Viol.	(0)	0.0%	(2)	7.1%
Drugs	(2)	6.3%	(2)	7.1%
Misc. Fel.	(2)	6.3%	(2)	7.1%
Misc. Misd.	(2)	6.3%	(3)	10.7%
Escape	(1)	3.1%	(1)	3.6%
VCO	(6)	18.8%	(6)	21.4%

Tables 5 through 9 contain data from the final groups (program completions) for comparison on age, race, number of prior offenses, nature of prior offenses and the nature of the offense that resulted in placement. A Chi-Square computation of probability of chance is included where appropriate.

When the distributions of the levels of each of the risk/need variables are examined, differences between the control and experimental groups are apparent. However, with the statistical analysis that was employed, these differences are not significant except in two cases. The first is probation history from the risk instrument. This variable is significant at the .05 level in the risk/need data of the original groups of all eligible minors. It is not significant in the groups that completed placement. As previously noted, this variable suffered greatly from problems of reliability. Second is the employment variable in the need instrument. This variable shows a Chi-Square probability of chance less than .05. This level of significance is found in both the groups of all eligibles and the final groups of program completions. It should be noted that in the construction of the risk/need instrument, this variable was found to have no value in predicting failure on either the criteria of probation violations or subsequent arrests. Further, the probation officer's scoring of this variable

might have been strongly influenced by the emphasis on employment in the experimental program. That is, the scoring of this variable may have been biased by the probation officer's expectation that the screening committee was looking for minors who would benefit from employment.

Another variable found to be statistically significant was the number of prior offenses. While this variable is not significant on the risk instrument analysis, when the actual count of prior offenses was computed from the official records, the significance became apparent. Expected cell frequency was acceptable on both measures of the variable. In the development of the instruments, prior record was found to be significant in predicting subsequent offenses or probation violations and this conclusion has been replicated by other research (Baird, 1985: 34). This variable was significant at near the .05 level in both the original groups of all eligibles and in the final groups of program successes.

The distribution of the total score from the risk instrument is an important variable as it suggests the possibility of regression effects if either of the groups scores were strongly grouped in the highest range. This did not occur. While there are differences between the groups in the distribution of scores, neither group has a

disproportionate number of high risk scores. It should be noted however, that the experimental group does have a larger portion of the high risk offenders. This must be considered in interpreting recidivism data.

There were no variables that showed dramatic change between the groups of all eligibles and the program successes. In the analysis that was employed, no variable or group of variables explained the failure of some minors to adjust to the initial placement. Further, no variable or group of variables appeared to explain the significant difference in the rate of program failures between the experimental and comparison groups.

The difference in number of prior offenses between the recorded values on the risk/need instrument and the actual measured values from court records suggests the impact of poor reliability on the analysis of these variables and ultimately on the finding that the experimental and comparison groups were similar. It further suggests that a closer look at other variables is warranted to locate other possible differences between the groups that could have been significant had the reliability of variables been greater.

Shichor and Bartollas, in their review of differences between minors sent to public versus private placements, ex-

amined the full data set from which these experimental and control groups were derived. Their analysis revealed differences based on the risk/need variables between minors sent to public versus private placements in San Bernardino County. They found that on the variables of health, emotional stability, drug use, family problems, family criminal history, family income, parents' health and learning disabilities there were statistically significant differences. On all but the drug use variable, those minors sent to public placement were less problem oriented. Further, they found that "the delinquent background of minors placed in public facilities had more delinquent 'qualities' in terms of involvement at an earlier age, having more prior records and having more involvement with drugs and alcohol." On the other hand, minors sent to private placements, were "somewhat more assaultive and gang related" while also possessing a larger degree of psychological problems (Shichor & Bartollas, 1989: 12).

The selection process for the comparison group appears to have controlled these differences on most variables. However, for the variables of age at first offense, probation history, family problems, school problems, employment, family income, parents' health and recreation there remains at least a 10% difference in the distribution of the levels of these variables between the experimental and comparison

groups. As previously discussed, there was also an important difference between the groups on the basis of the measured number of prior offenses. Examination of the data in table 5 further confirms some differences in the nature of offenses between the groups.

The differences which are observed on all the variables mentioned have the same direction of problem orientation as observed by Shichor and Bartollas. That is, the experimental minors scored higher on traditional measures of delinquency (number of prior offenses and age at first offense) while comparison minors showed more family, emotional and school problems. It should also be noted that these differences persist despite the fact that ten of the comparison group eligibles were from other public placements. Eight of the final comparison group program successes were from public placements. The influence of these public placement minors should have reduced differences on the variables. The possible impact on outcome measures of the comparison group of such variables as family problems, income and emotional problems cannot be discounted. On the other hand, it could be argued that on the basis of strongly predictive variables such as age at first offense and number of prior offenses, any disadvantage to the comparison group is canceled.

In summary, on the basis of the risk/need variables which were used in the selection of both the experimental and comparison groups, there are no statistically significant differences between the groups other than need for employment. On the basis of these variables with the statistical measures employed, the methodology was successful in generating experimental and comparison groups that are very similar. Despite a very different rate of program failure between the experimental and control groups, the only significant difference that can be found in the final groups of minors who completed an assigned placement was need for employment. This variable has been previously evaluated and found not to be predictive of outcome when the outcome criterion is defined as either failure to comply with probation terms or a subsequent offense.

However, reliability of the variables may mask real differences between the groups. This was demonstrated on one important variable: number of prior offenses. Further, when the variables are examined for differences between the experimental and comparison groups, there appear to remain artifacts of differences that are significant between public and private placement minors in the larger sample from which these groups were drawn. These factors must be considered in the analysis of outcome measures.

Analysis of the Dependent Variables

The legislative mandate which prompted this study specified that recidivism would be an outcome measure. The legislation, however, did not operationally define recidivism. As Glaser (1973) and many others have demonstrated, recidivism has a multitude of possible definitions and, as an outcome measure, is influenced as much by policy, procedure and the discretion inherent in the criminal justice system as it is by the behavior of the offender.

For the purpose of this study, several measures of recidivism were tracked. These included infractions of the conditions of probation, subsequent arrests, subsequent convictions (or true findings in a Juvenile court) and dispositions. Only subsequent probation rule violations and subsequent arrests proved to have occurred in sufficient quantity to have meaningful statistical value. The results of a six-month and a one-year follow-up are presented in tables 10 and 11.

Table 10
 Recidivism At Six Months After Release
 by

	Experimental Group	Comparison Group
None	24 (75%)	20 (71%)
Probation Infraction	3 (09%)	3 (11%)
New Law Viol.	5 (16%)	5 (18%)
Total	32	28

Table 11
 Recidivism at One Year After Release
 by

	Experimental Group	Comparison Group
None	14 (54%)	7 (47%)
Probation Infraction	8 (31%)	4 (27%)
New Law Viol.	4 (14%)	4 (27%)
Total	26	15

The recidivism data at six months shows no significant difference between the experimental and control groups. At one year the groups are no longer approximately equal in size but there is again no significant difference in recidivism. However, the higher rate of new law violations in the comparison group is noteworthy. The data does point to differences in the length of placement. Only 15 of the 28 comparison group wards had been out of placement for one year when the data was collected on 05/01/89. This resulted from the longer placement time of private facilities.

This finding suggests other measures of outcome. Glaser (1973) suggested that measures of program value should step beyond recidivism. The relative cost of programs is a significant measure of success. Benefit-cost analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis have come to the forefront in the evaluation of federally-funded programs (Peterson, 1986: 29). Another measure suggested by the data in this study is length of placement required for a comparable level of recidivism. While a longer period of placement may have benefits to society from the aspect of incapacitation, that benefit is lost when the offenders frequently escape and have the opportunity to commit further offenses before being apprehended. Retention of the minor in placement is therefore an outcome measure. In addition

to opportunities to commit further offenses, it can be demonstrated that if minors have to be frequently removed from placement and re-placed or they escape, have to be apprehended, and re-placed, there is an additional cost to the juvenile justice system. As cost models are developed for the juvenile justice system, the analysis of these costs will be possible and they will become a significant measure of program value.

These additional measures of outcome are discernible from the data collected in this study. Further, they are probably the most valid indicators of the impact of the experimental program. The various problems discussed in the analysis of the independent variables suggest serious weaknesses in the methodology. However, even if these weaknesses could be remedied the validity of the recidivism data would be questionable.

The study suffered from experimental mortality (placement failure). Further the rate at which placement failure occurred was substantially different between the groups. It is reasonable to assume that the characteristics of these placement failures will be different from placement successes (Bloom, 1984: 226 & Leibrich, 1986: 32). As recidivism rates were measured only for those who completed a placement, an advantage is given to the group that has the

greatest rate of failure. That is, those facilities unable to retain minors in placement are evaluated only on the basis of the minors who remain and succeed in completing the program. A facility that is able to retain a higher portion of its assigned residents, (perhaps as a result of facility security and restrictions on the freedom of the residents), must bear the burden on the recidivism outcomes for those who had greater difficulty adjusting to the program. If the delinquency proneness in the comparison group is lowered with the removal of placement failures (that is, minors likely to reoffend drop out of the group) then a finding of "no difference" in the recidivism outcomes would actually mean that the experimental group has a greater impact on subsequent delinquency. The program is able to maintain an equal level of recidivism with the control group even though the minors that remain in program have a greater delinquency proneness. When a longer period of follow-up is possible, it would be important to measure the recidivism of the placement failures. It could be argued that a program should be held partially accountable for subsequent behavior of minors who fail in placement. At least, the subsequent behavior of these minors should be applied to the outcomes of program successes in such a manner as to reduce the total measure of program effect.

The failure rate is, in itself, a significant measure

of program value. The experimental program was successful in retaining 78% of the minors originally selected for that placement. In contrast, 48% of the minors who were assigned to other placements escaped or were removed and were placed in a second facility. Ten percent were placed in a third facility. Crosstabulation of the groups by second placement provided a Chi-Square of $p = 0.018$ for this differential failure to retain minors in placement. Similar findings were made in a previous evaluation of another county program (Verdemont Boys Ranch) which looked at data from 1980-82 (Cal. Poly., Pomona, 1985). What can not be discounted, due to the lack of random assignment in both studies is that some selection process is occurring which places minors who are more prone to fail into the comparison group. However, analysis of the risk/need variables in cross-tabulation with second placement revealed only two relationships that were significant at the .05 level. These variables were prior probation revocation and prior placement. On both these variables, the experimental group was more problematic (table 41). On this basis, minors placed at the R.Y.E.F. should have had the greater rate of failure.

Length of time in placement was significantly different between the groups. For those minors who completed the R.Y.E.F. program, the average length of stay was 182 days. In contrast, for those minors in the comparison group who

eventually completed a placement, the average length of stay was 302 days.

The cost of placement was determined from the daily rate of the placement. The length of stay was multiplied by the daily rate to determine the actual cost of placement for each minor. For the experimental program, the average cost of placement was \$15,217.00. For the comparison group, the average cost of placement was \$19,196.00. When private placements are separated out from the comparison group it is found that their average length of stay and cost are greater than public placement. The average length of stay for minors in private placement (n=20) was 326 days. The average cost for these minors was \$22,116.00.

Assuming that no difference in recidivism existed between the experimental and comparison groups, the cost of placement for the same level of recidivism is significantly different. However, caution must be taken in declaring these cost findings as evidence of the value of the experimental program. The lack of random assignment leaves a question about the effectiveness of the methodology in controlling for threats to internal validity.

If random assignment had occurred, it would not only have greatly improved confidence in the cost findings but

would have allowed for adjustments in the recidivism data to reveal differences in outcome. This could have been accomplished by measuring the recidivism of all persons assigned to either group regardless of program completion. The estimated average program effect per participant could then be computed by adding a weighted average of zero to placement failures to the average effect per program completion (Bloom, 1984: 227). While this procedure would underestimate the program effect for participants, it would clearly establish any significant differences between programs.

CONCLUSIONS

Daniel Glaser (1965) has labeled evaluative research in corrections as "an elusive paradiss." Although it has been promoted and initiated by leading criminologists it has never been securely established. Clearly, a catalyst is needed to routinize evaluation in corrections. It is possible that concerns for the responsible use of scarce public resources and pressures from the private sector to intrude more deeply into the traditionally public domain of corrections will provide this catalyst. However, acceptance of experimental designs in evaluation may be resisted by the courts and by corrections officials. Many will argue that "random" assignment to treatment programs is a violation of constitutional requirements for rational differentiation or classification of similar individuals (Baunach, 1980). However, in numerous court decision on this issue, random assignment when conducted under the auspices of a well-controlled experiment is constitutional (Erez, 1986). Further, it may be the most fair method of assigning individuals to programs and the only methodology that will reasonably assure the measures of outcome desired by legislators and administrators.

Ironically, the fact that a comparison group was avail-

able provides evidence that random assignment was not only necessary to measure the desired outcome but would have provided a fair method for assignment of juveniles to treatment programs. The experimental program could receive only eighty cases per year. The forty-eight juveniles in the comparison group should have been given the opportunity of being screened for the experimental program but were denied it due to the discretion inherent in the probation department's placement process. These minors were committed to other placements where their stability of adjustment was poor and their average length of confinement was significantly greater.

An attempt has been made here to demonstrate a quasi-experimental design that could provide an alternative to random assignment. As has been evidenced, many threats to internal validity cannot be controlled in such a design. In the final analysis, any differential recidivism between the experimental program and alternative programs could not be clearly established. As this was the primary outcome measure defined in the legislation, the methodology failed to accomplish this goal.

While the focus of this thesis has been a demonstration of methodology, the importance of selecting appropriate outcome criterion has also been evidenced. Recidivism, the

most popular outcome measure in criminal justice program evaluation, is a poor criterion regardless of which of the many operational definitions are employed. The problem of reliability in recidivism measures is amplified by the small sample sizes of this and many other program evaluations. Further, even if a randomized experimental design had been allowed for the evaluation of the Regional Youth Education Facility, recidivism would not have sufficed as an outcome measure. Differences in other program measures such as retention of assigned wards and length of placement confounded recidivism measures. Combined with the small sample size, these factors substantially reduce the value of conclusions drawn from this data. The need for a variety of reliable outcome measures is clearly demonstrated.

Despite the methodology's inability to differentiate between the recidivism outcomes of the experimental and control groups, other outcome data was demonstrated with a higher degree of confidence. These outcome measures support the conclusion that the experimental program was (in the absence of differential recidivism) more efficient in the delivery of services to the program participants and to the community. Length of stay was shorter, the placement was more effective in retaining minors accepted by the program and the cost was substantially less than that of the alternative programs.

The methodology also demonstrated the usefulness of probation risk/need instruments in the process of screening delinquent minors for out-of-home placement. The process made the screening decisions highly defensible in juvenile court when the committee declined to accept a minor for the experimental program. The court viewed the process as objective, thereby assuring the legal rights of minors to equal opportunity in dispositional alternatives.

Had a process of random assignment occurred following classification, a methodology would have been created that would have effectively controlled for threats to internal validity (Campbell and Stanley, 1963: 49). Random assignment combined with improved reliability of the risk/need variables would have allowed for further analysis of recidivism and of the possible relationships between the variables and success or failure following treatment. That is, certain variables or combinations of variables may predict that certain offenders will receive a positive treatment effect from a specific program. Such an analysis would not only allow administrators to evaluate the overall effectiveness of programs but to determine which programs are most effective for minors with specific risk/need profiles. This would, in turn, allow for a better match of client and program which might significantly improve the outcome of

correctional programs. To the correctional administrator this would mean increasing the professionalism of the field while demonstrating the effectiveness and efficiency of correctional programs to those who control the distribution of resources and the determination of criminal justice policy.

Appendix A

Original RISK/NEED Instrument

Used by

San Bernardino County

Juvenile Division
(Rev. 5-80)

**County of San Bernardino
PROBATION DEPARTMENT
JUVENILE
ASSESSMENT OF CLIENT NEEDS**

Client Name _____ Last _____ First _____ Middle Initial _____ DOB _____ Court Number _____

Probation Officer _____ Phone Number _____

Date of Evaluation _____ Month _____ Day _____ Year _____
Select the appropriate answer and enter the associated weight in the score column. Total all scores to arrive at the needs assessment score.

		Score	Reclassification
Employment	0 Part-time, full-time, not relative 1 Needs employment	_____	_____
Alcohol Use	0 None 1 Prior use 2 Current use 3 Chronic use	_____	_____
Illegal Drug Use	0 None 1 Prior use 2 Current use 3 Chronic use	_____	_____
Family Relationships	0 No conflict 1 Sibling conflict 2 Parent(s), guardian conflict or parent/parent conflict 3 Sibling and parent(s), guardian conflict	_____	_____
School	0 Attending, graduated, G.E.D., equivalence 1 Problems handled at school level 2 Severe truancy or behavioral problems 3 Not attending/expelled	_____	_____
Academic Achievement	0 At or above grade level 1 Below grade level	_____	_____
Emotional Instability	0 No symptoms of instability 1 Limited symptoms but do not prohibit adequate functioning 2 Symptoms prohibit adequate functioning	_____	_____
Family Finances	0 No current difficulties 1 Minor difficulties 2 Severe difficulties	_____	_____
Peers	0 Good support and influence 1 Negative association influence or loner	_____	_____
Opposite Sex Peer	0 Has appropriate sex peer relationship or not relevant (age) 1 General disinterest or no opposite sex peer 2 Inappropriate sex peer	_____	_____
Recreation/Hobby	If no constructive leisure time activities or hobbies or no regular physical exercise, enter 1	_____	_____
Organization	If juvenile does not belong to any positive extracurricular clubs (i.e., church, school, social, athletics), enter 1	_____	_____
Learning Disability	0 No/unknown 1 Yes	_____	_____
Health (Physical appearance)	0 Sound physical health 1 Handicap or illness interferes with functioning 2 Serious handicap or chronic illness	_____	_____
TOTAL		_____	_____

Adult and Juvenile
(Rev. 5-80)

**County of San Bernardino
PROBATION DEPARTMENT
ASSESSMENT OF CLIENT RISK**

Client Name _____
Last First Middle Initial

Date of Evaluation _____
Month Day Year

		Score	Reclassification
Alcohol abuse (Prior to current matter)	0 None 2 Yes — Adult 3 Yes — Juvenile	_____	_____
Substance abuse (includes marijuana and sniffing) (Prior to current matter)	0 None 1 Marijuana only 2 Yes — Adult 3 Yes — Juvenile	_____	_____
Number of prior felony convictions (or juvenile true findings or SOC'd)	0 None 1 One 2 Two or more	_____	_____
Convictions, or juvenile true findings or SOC's including present offense (add for each count, not to exceed a total of 10 points)	1 Crimes against property or victimless crimes 2 Crimes against persons	_____	_____
Convictions, juvenile true finding or SOC'd for assaultive offense (if any offense involves the use of a weapon, physical force, the threat of force or a sex offense against a child)	0 None 5 Yes	_____	_____
Prior conviction or involuntary commitments (Not cumulative)	0 None 1 Juvenile Hall, Ricardo M., weekends, residential placements, County Jail 2 CYA, Prison, CRC, State Hospital	_____	_____
Number of prior grants of Formal Probation/Parole (Adult or juvenile)	0 None 1 One 2 More than one	_____	_____
Number of prior probation/parole revocations (Adult or juvenile)	0 None 1 One 2 More than one	_____	_____
Emotional stability	0 Stable 1 Unpredictable personality 2 Unstable	_____	_____
Attitude	0 Motivated to change 1 Dependent or unwilling to accept responsibility 2 Rationalizes behavior, not motivated to change	_____	_____
Age at first conviction, juvenile true finding or SOC'd with signed admission (Including present matter)	0 24 or older 1 20-23 2 16-19 3 15 or younger	_____	_____
Number of address changes in last 12 months	0 None 1 One 2 Two or more	_____	_____

Family criminal record — if sibling(s) or parent(s) have a criminal record, enter (1)

Current "gang" involvement enter (5) (adult or juvenile)

Victim of child abuse (sexual, physical or psychological)

0 None
2 Yes
Specify _____

Classification = Risk + Needs			Reclassification = Risk + Needs		
Adult		Juvenile	Adult		Juvenile
0-13	minimum	0-14	0-11	minimum	0-10
14-28	regular	15-30	12-22	regular	11-21
29+	maximum	31+	23+	maximum	22+

RISK TOTAL _____

NEEDS TOTAL _____

Add or subtract up to 5 points based on subjective opinion of interviewer.
Explain:

TOTAL _____

Appendix B

Revised RISK/NEED Instrument
and
Operational Definitions
of the Variables

**County of San Bernardino
PROBATION DEPARTMENT
ASSESSMENT OF CLIENT NEED: JUVENILE**

Client's Name: _____ Initial Classification Date: _____ P.O.: _____

Date of Birth: _____ Minor's Court Number (J#): _____

		Initial Score	Reclassi- fication	Reclassi- fication
1. Employment:	Part-time, full-time, not relative	0		
	Needs employment/job training	1		
2. Alcohol Use:	No known/infrequent/no impairment	0		
	Occasional/frequent/excessive use	2		
	Dependency	3		
3. Illegal Drug Use:	No known/infrequent/no impairment	0		
	Occasional/frequent/excessive use	2		
	Dependency	3		
4. Family Relationships:	Relationships and support strong	0		
	Relatively stable relationships or not applicable	1		
	Some disorganization or stress, potential for improvement	2		
	Major disorganization or stress	3		
	Abuse or Neglect	4		
5. School:	Attending, graduated, G.E.D., equivalence	0		
	Problems handled at school level	1		
	Severe truancy or behavioral problems	2		
	Not attending/expelled	4		
6. Academic Achievement:	At or above grade level	0		
	Below grade level	2		
7. Emotional Stability:	Appropriate adolescent responses	0		
	Exaggerated or self-defeating responses to stress, counseling would be beneficial	2		
	Emotional disorder. Professional treatment required	3		
8. Primary/Alternate Parent Problems:	Both natural parents	0		
	Natural parent (+) stepparent	1		
	Single parent home/relative	2		
9.	Parental alcohol/drug abuse	2		
10.	Parent physical illness	1		
	Parent psychological illness	2		
11.	Family criminal history	1		
12.	Above average income	0		
	Adequate family income	1		
	AFDC or subsistence income	2		
13.	Family address changes past year (one point for each).			
14. Opposite sex peer:	Appropriate relationships	0		
	Inappropriate relationships	1		
	Confirmed homosexual life-style	2		
15. Recreation/Hobby:	If no constructive leisure time activities or no regular physical exercise, enter	2		
16. Learning Disability:	Yes	1		
	Full scale I.Q. tested below 80 points	2		
17. Health (physical appearance):	Sound physical health	0		
	Handicap or illness interferes with functioning	1		
	Serious handicap or chronic illness	2		
CMC Classification: <input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>		TOTAL	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Initial Assessment of Juvenile Risk

To answer items one (1) through thirteen (13), select the most appropriate answer from the available options for that item and record the item's numerical value on the line immediately following the variable in the "Initial Score" column. You must select one of the printed scores based upon information available to you at the time of the assessment.

1) Number of Prior Offenses. Score one of the following:

1) Number of prior offenses: S.O.C. with admission or	None	0
sustained. (Does not include instant offense).	Yes	1
	Two or More	2

- (0) The minor has no known record of arrests or probation referrals pertaining to WIC 602 matters in this or any other jurisdiction. Excludes arrest(s) and/or referral(s) which resulted in minor's present Wardship.
- (1) The minor has a record of one Application for Petition to which he/she admitted the allegation(s) or for which he/she appeared in Court and the allegation(s) were sustained. Excludes arrest(s) and/or referral(s) which resulted in minor's present Wardship.
- (2) Excluding the sustained Petition(s) resulting in the minor's current Wardship, the minor has at least two prior Applications for Petition to which the allegations were admitted or at least two sustained Petitions or a combination of an Application with an admission and a sustained Petition on separate matters.

2) Nature of Offenses

) Nature of offenses: Drug sales scores two(2).	Crimes against property 1	
	Crimes against persons 2	
	Both persons and property 3	

- (1) Includes any Application for Petition alleging crime(s) against property to which the minor admits or any sustained Petition for crime(s) against property including the present offense.
- (2) Includes any Application for Petition alleging crime(s) against person(s) to which the minor admitted or any sustained Petition for crime(s) against person(s) including the present offense.
- (3) Includes any Application for Petition alleging crime(s) against person(s) or property(s) (arising from separate offenses) or any sustained Petition for crime(s) against person(s) (arising from separate offenses).

3) Assaultive Offense History

?) Assaultive offense history:	Offense history includes use of a weapon, physical force, threat of force or sex offense against a child	1
	Two or more sustained felony assaultive offenses	2

- (0) The minor's known record includes no Application(s) for Petition with an admission and/or no sustained Petition(s) for offenses involving the use or threat to use a weapon, physical force or threat to use physical force and/or sex offenses against a child. Includes present offense.
- (1) Includes the present sustained Petition(s), any previous sustained Petition(s) or an Application for Petition to which the minor admits involvement in the use or threat to use a weapon, physical force or threat to use physical force and/or a sex offense against a child.
- (2) The minor's known record includes two or more sustained Petitions for felony assaultive offenses as described above.

4) Age at First Offense

Age at first offense: (Use current age for reassessment.)	16-19 0	_____
	15 or younger 3	_____

- (0) At the time of the initial offense if the minor had attained the age of sixteen (16) years, utilize the score in this category.
- (3) If the minor, at the time of the initial offense, was still fifteen (15) years of age or younger, utilize the score in this category.

(5) Probation History

5) Probation history: Includes prior 654 agreements and/or grants.	None 0	_____
	One 2	_____
	More than one 3	_____

- (0) The minor has never been placed on Informal Probation (WIC 654) and has no known record of formal probation in this or any other jurisdiction.
- (2) The minor has a prior Informal Probation Agreement (WIC 654) or formal grant of probation.
- (3) The minor has two (2) or more Informal or formal probations or a combination of either.

6) Revocation History

6) Revocation history: Minor returned to Court. (For reassessment use only if revoked after reclassified).	None 0	_____
	One 1	_____
	More than one 2	_____

- (0) The minor has never been on probation or has been on Informal Probation or formal probation and successfully abided by terms and conditions without further Court appearances during the probation period.
- (1) Minor violated terms and conditions of Informal or formal probation and was returned to Court for further proceedings resultant from the violation or a subsequent offense was settled out of Court with admission.

- (2) Minor on two (2) or more occasions was returned to Court for violation of Informal or formal terms and conditions of probation or any combination thereof or subsequent offenses were settled out of Court with admissions.

7) Placement History

7) Placement history: Include custody orders of 60 days or more in Juvenile Hall. (For reassessment use only if placed after initial classification.)

	None	0	
	Yes	2	

(0) Excluding the current pending disposition, the minor has never received a Court ordered institutional commitment in any jurisdiction of sixty (60) days or greater. Neither has the minor been placed in a foster home, group home, private institution or psychiatric hospital under a Court order for placement.

(2) The minor has been ordered to serve at least one institutional commitment of sixty (60) days or greater or has at some time, been placed in a foster home, group home, private institution or psychiatric hospital under a Court order for placement.

8) Emotional Stability

8) Emotional stability:

	Stable	0	
	Unpredictable personality	1	
	Unstable	2	

(0) Based upon the information available to the Probation Officer, the minor has demonstrated no aberrant behavior in his social or authoritative relationships.

(1) Minor's past behavior reflects impulsiveness, unpredictability and occasional explosiveness, generally demonstrated in verbal outbursts or avoidance (includes present offense).

(2) Minor's past behavior is consistently antisocial and frequently demonstrates physical aggression or violence. Minor is a potential threat to self and others (includes present offense). Responses to stress and frustration are consistently inappropriate, impulsive and/or aggressive.

9) Attitude/Response to Supervision

9. Attitude/reponse to supervision:	Motivated to change	0
	Dependent or unwilling to accept responsibility	1
	Rationalizes behavior, not motivated to change	3
	Resists all efforts to modify behavior	4

- (0) Minor accepts responsibility for his behavior and demonstrates a desire to change his/her behavior.
- (1) Minor is dependent upon parents, peers and/or significant others in determining his willingness to face responsibilities. Allows others to speak for him regarding behavior and culpability.
- (3) Offense was not the minor's fault as demonstrated through the manipulation of circumstances and his/her intended behavior, victim's ignorance, other influences, etc., which involved him/her. Behavior and subsequent attitude toward the offense(s) is representative of asocial value system and/or rationalization.
- (4) Behavior and subsequent attitude toward the offense(s) is representative of asocial value system and/or rationalization. The minor strongly opposes all efforts to modify his behavior. This may be expressed aggressively or passively (i.e., by adamant refusal to cooperate with programs or habitual runaway incidents).

10) School Attendance

10. School attendance:	Regular attendance or graduated and/ or problems handled at school level	0
	Severe truancy or behavior problems or expelled	2

- (0) Minor is attending school full time, in training or works full time or a combination of school/training or work approved by the school district. Minor has completed school requirements by completing GED or Proficiency Test as required in California. Lesser violations of school rules, behavior problems and/or absences were handled in the school setting without referral to law enforcement or probation.

- (2) School records indicate a "severe" truancy problem not resolved through the resources of the school. Minor's campus/classroom behavior is/has been disruptive, intimidating, combative, assaultive and/or involved him/her in illegal activities, e.g., weapons or drugs, on school grounds. Minor's behavior has resulted in suspension(s), expelling or exemption from school.

11) Academic Achievement

11) Academic achievement:	At or above grade level 0		_____
	Below grade level 2		_____

- (0) Performing at or above grade level and maintaining at least a "C" average.
- (2) Functioning below grade level or academic performance is less than a "C" average.

12) Learning Disability

12) Learning disability: Based upon school district, medical or psychological records.	No/unknown 0		_____
	Yes 2		_____

- (0) Based upon school district medical and/or psychiatric/psychological testing, the minor has demonstrated no learning disability. (Probation Officer should pursue other medical or psychological records of the family physician, psychologist, counselor and/or probation records which provide information on any potential disability.)
- (2) Minor has diagnosed learning disability and is assigned to Educationally Handicapped or other special classes.

13) Peer Influence

13) Peer influence:	Generally positive associations 0		_____
	Primarily delinquent associations 1		_____
	Member of gang or crime ring 2		_____

- (0) The minor generally associates with nondelinquent peers. He/she does not appear to be strongly influenced by negative or delinquent associates in his/her attitudes and demonstrated past behavior(s).

- (1) Minor primarily associates with other minors involved in delinquent or criminal activities and/or substance abuse.
- (2) Minor is a recognized member of a street gang and/or a cohesive group whose primary purpose is involvement in criminal activity.

Initial Classification by Score

Add all scores in the "Initial Score" column and total at bottom. Transfer the Need Score Total to the appropriate area on the "Risk Scale." Determine the highest supervision level by comparing the Risk Score Total and Need Score Total as indicated in the Juvenile Matrix Chart. Circle MX (maximum), RG (regular), or MN (minimum).

Override

Following "Classification." Indicate the classification which "overrides" the raw score on Risk or Need Scales, then indicate why this is appropriate in the "Reason for Override," by writing "P" for policy or "C" for casework. A supervisor's signature is required on overrides.

Risk Totals _____	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Need Totals _____	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Classification (Circle one) _____	Mx Rg	Mx Rg	Mx Rg
_____	Mn	Mn	Mn
Override (Enter New Classification: Mx, Rg, Mn, Ld) _____	_____	_____	_____
Reason For Override (State: Policy or Casework) _____	_____	_____	_____
Supervisor Initial (Overrides Only) _____	_____	_____	_____

VI. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF JUVENILE PLACEMENT RECLASSIFICATION

Prior to screening for a County institution or transfer to a placement unit, the Probation Officer will complete an assessment of risk and an assessment of need. If the case is coming from investigation on a new Petition (rather than a continuing wardship), the initial classification is used for placement screening. If the minor is a continuing ward, having violated probation, the placement reclassification column will be used.

The following instructions apply to the placement reclassification format. With the exceptions of Risk Assessment items 1, 5, and 6, the instructions for completing the initial classification apply to the placement reclassification format.

Number of Prior Offenses

Include any prior offenses sustained or settled out of Court with admission that occurs prior to the current sustained allegation. If the current sustained allegation is a violation of Court order (not including a new offense), the last sustained (or settled out of Court) offense is the bench mark from which the prior record is measured.

Example:

Minor has one sustained PC 459, no other offenses settled out of Court or sustained and is being placed on the basis of a violation of Court order, number of prior offenses = 0.

Probation History

If the minor has been supervised on probation prior to placement screening (including detention at home pending placement, trial basis with terms), the minor has at least one prior grant of probation.

Revocation History

Includes any violation of informal or formal probation terms resulting in filing on a violation of Court order; filing or settled out of Court with admission on a new offense, including the current matter.

Note:

When completing item Risk 4, Age at First Offense, for placement assessment, use instructions for initial classification. That is, score this item on basis of minor's age at first offense, not current age.

V. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE ASSESSMENT
AND REASSESSMENT OF JUVENILE NEEDS FORM

The needs instrument utilized in both the assessment and reassessment is the same and is to be completed by the assigned Probation Officer in conjunction with completion of the initial risk assessment or reassessment of juvenile risk instruments. The same chronological sequence (scheduled case assessments) apply and case factors which might result in a change of supervision level other than that which is indicated by the scoring of this instrument also can be handled on an individual basis via the override process.

In assessing each case, the Probation Officer will consider and utilize all available information including but not limited to Court reports, intake documents, interview information, police reports and record checks.

To answer items one (1) through twelve (12), select the most appropriate answer and enter the corresponding score on the line immediately following that variable to the right hand margin under the subheading "Initial Score." You must select one of the printed scores based upon all the information available to you at the time of the assessment.

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

ASSESSMENT OF CLIENT NEED: JUVENILE

Client's Name: _____ Initial Classification Date: _____ P.O.: _____

Date of Birth: _____ Minor's Court Number (J#): _____

1) Employment

1) Employment: Part-time, full-time, not relative 0
Needs employment/job training 1 | _____

(0) Currently employed or the minor is attending school and/or job training full time. Not applicable because of age.

(1) Minor is not employed or in training program and is not attending school. Due to age and need for adult living skills, he is in need of job skills and employment.

2) Alcohol Abuse

2) Alcohol Use: No known/infrequent/no impairment 0
Occasional/frequent/excessive use 2
Dependency 3 | _____

This variable measures the degree to which the use of alcohol is a dominant feature in the minor's life and its effect on the minor's health and adolescent development and/or represents a threat to the community safety.

This variable should consider the frequency of use as well as motivation, circumstances and effect.

These cases can be aggravated by youthfulness of the minor or by denial of alcohol abuse on the part of the parents and the minor or may be mitigated by the minor's honesty in admitting the problem, insight into causes and willingness to participate in treatment. Evidence for this variable need not be first hand; reliable third party (e.g., police, parents, school authorities, etc.) information is deemed sufficient.

(0) No known use; occasional use; no interference with functioning.

Minor has never used or tried.
Experimentation in the past, no current use.
Occasional use without becoming intoxicated or otherwise impaired.

- (2) Occasional excessive use - no immediate threat to health and safety.

Occasional use to excess.
 No instance of destructive violent, irrational behavior while intoxicated.
 No regularity of use. Able to go long periods without use.
 No use during the day, at school, etc.
 Any suspicion of use of alcohol when dependent on the use of other drugs or controlled substances.
 Drunk driving with no indication of prior excess use.

- (3) Dependency - contributes to delinquent behavior.

Regular use with periods of intoxication.
 Excessive periodic use creating dangerous situations or promoting irrational behavior or preventing proper judgment.
 Drinking during the day, at school, on the job, etc. Drinking alone, after school, etc.

3) Illegal Drug Use

3) Illegal Drug Use:	No known/infrequent/no impairment 0		
	Occasional/frequent/excessive use 2		
	Dependency 3		

This variable should consider the frequency of use as well as motivation, circumstances and effect.

These cases can be aggravated by youthfulness of the minor or by the denial of abuse on the part of the parents and minor or may be mitigated by the minor's honesty in admitting the problem, insights into causes and willingness to participate in treatment.

Evidence for this variable need not be first hand; reliable third party (e.g., parents, police, school authorities, etc.) information is deemed sufficient.

- (0) No known use; occasional use - no interference with functioning.

Minor has never used or tried.
Experimentation in the past, no current use.
Occasional use without becoming intoxicated or otherwise impaired.

- (2) Occasional excessive use - no immediate threat to health and safety.

Occasional use to excess.
No instance of destructive violent, irrational behavior while intoxicated.
No regularity of use. Able to go long period without use.
Any suspicion of use of drugs or controlled substance when dependent on alcohol.
Drunk driving on drugs with no indication of prior excess of use.

- (3) Dependency or addiction contributes to criminal behavior.

Daily use with periods of intoxication.
Regular excessive use creating dangerous situations or promoting irrational behavior or preventing proper judgment.
Using drugs or controlled substances during the day, after school or on the job, etc.
Using the same substances alone, after school, etc.
In possession of a large quantity of drugs for sale or to sustain the minor for a considerable period of time.
Involved in drug sales to sustain own habit.
Use of heroin or crossover use of different types of intoxicants; no particular drug of choice - object: to get "high."
Drunk driving on drugs with indication of prior excessive use.

4) Family Relationships

Family Relationships:	Relationships and support strong	0
	Relatively stable relationships or not applicable	1
	Some disorganization or stress, potential for improvement	2
	Major disorganization or stress	3
	Abuse or neglect	4

This variable measures the extent to which the family can be counted on to provide emotional and material support consistently enough for the proper adolescent development of the minor. The focus of this variable is any family situation that may be causing stress, anxiety or hostility in the minor. Areas to consider are the ability of the family to solve problems, the strength of relationships, extent of shared values, etc. Aggravating the situation would be the length of time the problems have persisted. A mitigating factor would be the ability of the minor to successfully cope with the family situation. A "primary" family is headed by the natural parent(s) or stepparent(s) of the minor. "Alternate" families are headed by the minor's grandparent(s), aunt(s)/uncle(s) or guardian(s).

- (0) Relationships and support exceptionally strong.

Shared value system, "proactive" problem solvers, open communication and trust, caring relationships.

- (1) Relatively stable relationships or not applicable.

None of the problems cited below; however, some communication difficulties, "reactive" to minor's violational behavior.

- (2) Some disorganization or stress, potential for improvement.

Single parent in association with financial or control problems.

Major family trauma, strong relationships but parents currently preoccupied.

Conflict between parents and minor over behavior standards, value systems.

Significant periods of no supervision ("latch key" child).

Parents willing to work with minor in probation/placement program.

(3) Major disorganization or stress.

Separation or recent divorce, minor changing residences to live with both. Criminal family member; negative role models.

Severe, persistent conflict between parents (e.g., involving physical abuse, repeated verbal abuse).

Minor's basic needs not being provided for.

Significant, long-standing family problems (financial, illness, etc.) - minor not coping well.

Minor not wanted in home.

Parents refuse to work with minor in probation/placement program.

(4) Abuse or neglect of the minor physically, psychologically or sexually (state which). Home environment dangerous to minor.

5) School

5) School:	Attending, graduated, G.E.D., equivalence 0	
	Problems handled at school level 1	
	Severe truancy or behavioral problems 2	
	Not attending/expelled 4	

(0) Attending school training and/or working (full time or acceptable).

Minor is engaged in full-time activities at school, training and/or work and is not experiencing the attendance/behavior problems cited below.

(1) School attendance or behavior problems.

Repeated class cuts.

More than one unexcused absence.

Reports from school authorities of less than satisfactory school behavior (repeatedly missing assignments, poor participation, classroom disruptions, some incidents of "mutual combat").

- (2) Truancy or illegal behavior in academic setting.

Several full days of unexcused absences or class period equivalents.
 WIC 602 school related violations (assault with injury, vandalism, theft).
 Repeated "predatory" behavior (peer confrontation, intimidation) and/or disruptive behavior.
 Stealing, assaultive or other illegal behavior resulting in school expulsion.

- (3) Not attending school or training.

The minor has been dropped from school enrollment and/or at least ten (10) straight days have elapsed since last attendance. The minor has not completed GED and the minor is not actively participating in vocational training.

6) Academic Achievement

6) Academic Achievement:	At or above grade level 0	_____	_____	_____
	Below grade level 2	_____	_____	_____

- (0) Performing at or above grade level, average or better grades.
 (2) Functioning below grade level, performance is less than "C" average.

7) Emotional Stability

7) Emotional Stability:	Appropriate adolescent responses 0	_____	_____	_____
	Exaggerated or self-defeating responses to stress, counseling would be beneficial 2	_____	_____	_____
	Emotional disorder. Professional treatment required 3	_____	_____	_____

- (0) Appropriate adolescent responses.

Emotional responses appropriate to situation, counseling not indicated.

- (2) Exaggerated or self-defeating responses to stress. Counseling would be beneficial.

Withdrawn, some communication problems. Excessive anxiety or anger related to identifiable problems. Poor self-image, inability to relate to peers.

- (3) Diagnosed emotional disorder; irrational or bizarre behavior. Professional treatment required.

Clinical diagnosis of emotional/personality disorder. Bizarre or irrational behavior exhibited. Any behavior, which in the opinion of the Probation Officer requires immediate professional treatment (severe depression, suicide risk, etc.).

Primary/Alternate Parent Problems

(Record appropriate scores from each category:)

8)	Primary/Alternate Parent Problems:	Both natural parents	0			
		Natural parent (+) stepparent	1			
		Single parent home/relative	2			
9)		Parental alcohol/drug abuse	2			
10)		Parent physical illness	1			
		Parent psychological illness	2			
11)		Family criminal history	1			
12)		Above average income	0			
		Adequate family income	1			
		AFDC or subsistence income	2			
13)	Family address changes past year (one point for each).					

8) Physical Custody

- (0) Minor resides in the home of both natural parents.
- (1) Minor resides in the home of one natural parent plus a stepparent.
- (2) Minor resides in a single parent home or in the home of an immediate family relative.

- 9) Parental Drug/Alcohol Use
- (0) No apparent problems with alcohol or drugs.
 - (2) Minor resides in a home where one or both parents exhibit or report alcohol or drug abuse (include stepparent or relative).
- 10) Parental Physical/Psychological Health
- (0)
 - (1) One or both parents parents suffer from an observed/reported physical illness or hardship which reduces ability to supervise the minor.
 - (2) One or both parents suffer from from an observed/reported mental illness or disorder which reduces ability to supervise the minor.
- 11) Family Criminal History
- (0) No family Criminal/Delinquent History discovered or reported.
 - (1) One or more members of the immediate family have a past or present arrest and adjudication for a Criminal/Delinquent offense.
- 12) Family Income
- (0) Above average income.
 - (1) Adequate income to meet the family's needs.
 - (2) Inadequate resources, AFDC/Subsistence Income.
- 13) Residence Stability
- (0) No known residence changes.
 - () Total the number of family address changes in the past year and multiply by one (1). Enter the total score.

17) Health

0) Health (physical appearance):	Sound physical health 0
	Handicap or illness interferes with functioning 1
	Serious handicap or chronic illness 2

(0) Sound physical health.

No serious or chronic problems, appearance reveals no evidence of severe dietary deficiencies, compulsive eating habits, etc.

(1) Handicap or illness interferes with functioning.

Handicap or illness not requiring recurring hospitalization or costly treatments. Excessively overweight or underweight. Low stamina level.

(2) Serious handicap or chronic illness.

Problem(s) causing major disruption of minor's life.

Minor is not stabilized on medication to control effects of illness of handicap (i.e., epileptic seizures).

REFERENCES

- Adams, S. (1975). Evaluation Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Alreck, P.L. & Settle, R.B. (1985). The Survey Research Handbook. Chicago, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Ashford, J. and LeCroy, C. (1988). Predicting Recidivism: An evaluation of the Wisconsin Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Risk Instrument, Criminal Justice and Behavior. 15:2, June 1988, pp 141-149.
- Baird, S. C., Heinz, R. C. & Bemus, B. J. (1979). Case Classification/ Staff Deployment Project: A Two Year Follow-up Report. Wisconsin: Department of Health and Social Services/Division of Corrections/Bureau of Community Corrections.
- Baird, S. C. (1985). Classifying Juveniles: Making the Most of an Important Management Tool, Corrections Today. 47:1 February 1985, pp. 32-38.
- Babbie, E. (1986). The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Baunach, P. J. (1980). Random Assignment in Criminal Justice Research, Criminology. 17:435-44.
- Benson, Sir George (1959). Prediction Methods and Young Prisoners, British Journal of Delinquency. 9:3.
- Bloom, H. S. (1984). Accounting for No-Shows in Experimental Evaluation Designs, Evaluation Review. 8:2 April 1984 pp. 225-246.
- Burgess, E. W. (1928). In Bruce, Burgess & Harno, The Working of the Indeterminate Sentence in Illinois. Springfield: Illinois: State Board of Parole.
- Burton, A. (1984). An Action Plan for the Statewide Implementation of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Model Probation Client Classification and Management System Shasta, Calif.: Chief Probation Officers of California

- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Department of Architecture Institute for Environmental Design (1985). Report to the San Bernardino County Administrative Office: An Analysis of the Juvenile Propulation at the Verdemont Boys Ranch and Alternative Dispositional Facilities. Cal. Poly. Pomona, July 11, 1985.
- Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally & Co.
- Campbell, D. C. & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and Quasi-experimental Design for Research on Teaching, in Gage N. L., Handbook on Teaching. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally & Co.
- Clear, T.R. & Gallagher, K.W. (1985). Probation and Parole Supervision: A Review of Current Classification Practices, Crime and Delinquency. 31:423-443
- Eaglin, J. B. & Lombard, P. A. (1982). A Validation and Comparative Evaluation of Four Predictive Devices for Classifying Federal Probation Caseloads. Washington D.C.: Federal Judicial Center.
- Elliott, D. S. (1980). Recurring Issues in the Evaluation of Delinquency Prevention and Treatment Programs, in Shichor & Kelly, Critical Issues in Juvenile Delinquency. Massachusetts: Lexington.
- Erez, E. (1986). Randomization Experiments in Correctional Context: Legal, Ethical, and Practical Concerns, Journal of Criminal Justice. 14:389-400.
- Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. & Morris, L. L. (1978). How to Design a Program Evaluation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Univ. of Calif./ Sage.
- Garner, J. & Visher, C. (1988). Policy Experiments Come of Age, NIJ Reports. No. 211, Sept./Oct. 1988, pp. 2-8.
- Glaser, D. (1965). Correctional Research: An Elusive Paradise, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 2:1, January 1965 pp.1-11.
- Glaser, D. (1973). Routinizing Evaluation: Getting Feedback on Effectiveness of Crime and Delinquency Programs. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Rockville, Maryland.

- Glaser, D. (1987). Classification for Risk, in Gottfredson & Tonry, Prediction and Classification. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. T. (1930). 500 Criminal Careers. New York: Knopf.
- Gottfredson, D. (1967). Assessment and Prediction Methods in Crime and Delinquency. Washington D.C.: Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.
- Gottfredson, D. M. & Tonry, M. (1987). Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Leibrich, J. (1986). Pitfalls in Criminal Justice Evaluation Research: Sampling, Measurement, and Design Problems, Federal Probation. 50:3 September, 1986 pp. 31-35.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies. Praeger.
- Mannheim, H. & Wilkins, L. T. (1955). Predicting Methods in Relation to Borstal Training. London, Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform, The Public Interest. 35, Spring, 1974 pp. 22-35.
- Petersilia, J., Turner, S., Kahan, J. & Peterson, J. (1985). Granting Felons Probation: Public Risks and Alternatives (report No. R-3186-NIJ). Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation.
- Petersilia, J., Turner S. (1986). Prison versus Probation in California: Implications for Crime and Offender Recidivism (report No. R3323-NIJ). Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation.
- Peterson, R. D. (1986). The Anatomy of Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, Evaluation Review. 10:1 February 1986 pp. 29-44.
- Riecken, H.W. & Boruch (1974). Social Experimentation. New York: Academic Press.

- Robertson, J. & Blackburn, J., (1984). An Assessment of Treatment Effectiveness by Case Classification. Federal Probation 48:4, December 1984, pp. 34-38.
- Shichor, D. & Bartollas, C. (1989). Comparison of Private and Public Placements: An Exploratory Study. An unpublished manuscript.
- Skonovd, N. (1989). Regional Youth Education Facility: The Second Evaluation of a Short Term Intensive Program for Juvenile Court Wards from Riverside and San Bernardino County Probation Departments. Sacramento, Calif. Department of the Youth Authority.
- Walker, S. (1985). Sense and Nonsense about Crime: A Policy Guide. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Weiss, C. (1972). Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Wilkins, L. T. & Mac Naughtin-Smith, P. (1954). New Prediction and Classification Methods in Criminology, The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1:19-32.