

**EVALUATING THE WASHINGTON STATE INTENSIVE PAROLE
MODEL FOR HIGH RISK JUVENILE OFFENDERS**

Robert Barnoski

November 1999



*Washington State
Institute for
Public Policy*

**EVALUATING THE WASHINGTON STATE INTENSIVE PAROLE
MODEL FOR HIGH RISK JUVENILE OFFENDERS**

Robert Barnoski

November 1999

Washington State Institute for Public Policy

110 East Fifth Avenue, Suite 214

PO Box 40999

Olympia, WA 98504-0999

Phone: (360) 586-2677

Fax: (360) 586-2793

URL: <http://www.wa.gov/wsipp>

Document No. 99-11-1201

WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Mission

The Washington Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs the Institute, hires the director, and guides the development of all activities.

The Institute's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State. The Institute conducts research activities using its own policy analysts, academic specialists from universities, and consultants. New activities grow out of requests from the Washington legislature and executive branch agencies, often directed through legislation. Institute staff work closely with legislators, as well as legislative, executive, and state agency staff to define and conduct research on appropriate state public policy topics.

Current assignments include projects in welfare reform, criminal justice, education, youth violence, and social services.

Board of Directors

Senator Karen Fraser
Senator Jeanine Long
Senator Valoria Loveland
Senator James West
Representative Ida Ballasiotes
Representative Jeff Gombosky
Representative Helen Sommers
Representative Steve Van Luven

Lyle Quasim, Department of Social and Health Services
Marty Brown, Office of Financial Management
David Dauwalder, Central Washington University
Jane Jervis, The Evergreen State College
Marsha Landolt, University of Washington
Thomas L. "Les" Purce, Washington State University
Ken Conte, House Office of Program Research
Stan Pynch, Senate Committee Services

Staff

Roxanne Lieb, Director
Steve Aos, Associate Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Background.....	3
Report Structure	5
Section I: Initiating Intensive Parole	7
Section II: Description of Intensive Parole Model and JRA's Implementation.....	11
A. Information Management and Program Evaluation	12
B. Assessment and Selection Criteria.....	13
C. Individual Case Planning	14
D. A Mixture of Intensive Surveillance and Services.....	16
E. A Balance of Incentives and Graduated consequences.....	18
F. Community Resources and Social Networks.....	22
G. Transition Services	23
Section III: JRA's Summary of the Strengths of Intensive Parole Implementation.....	25
Section IV: Commentary.....	27
Appendix A: Self-Ratings by JRA Intensive Parole Teams	29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1997, the Washington State Legislature determined that the system for transitioning the highest-risk youth from state institutions to parole did not provide adequate rehabilitation and public safety.¹ The Legislature found that intensive supervision, as described in the intensive parole model of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)² is a promising strategy for reducing recidivism rates for these juvenile offenders. The Legislature funded intensive parole for up to 25 percent of the highest-risk youth committed to the state Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) custody.³

The program elements specified in the intensive parole legislation are:

- ✓ Information management and program evaluation;
- ✓ Assessment and selection criteria;
- ✓ Individual case planning;
- ✓ A mixture of intensive surveillance and services;
- ✓ A balance of incentives and graduated consequences;
- ✓ Service brokerage with community resources and linkage with social networks; and
- ✓ Transition services.

JRA contracted with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Institute) to evaluate the program's implementation, determine whether the program reduces recidivism, and analyze its costs and benefits to taxpayers and crime victims.

This first report describes the implementation of intensive parole to date. The next report, due in November 2000, will include an analysis of process data. The final report, including recidivism outcomes and a cost benefit analysis, is due in 2003.

This report finds that JRA is implementing the OJJDP intensive parole model specified in the 1997 legislation in a comprehensive and thorough manner. The strengths of JRA's implementation to date can be summarized as follows:

- ✓ Intensive parole is a priority for JRA management, and capable senior staff are leading the effort;
- ✓ The program relies upon a validated risk assessment to identify the highest-risk youth;
- ✓ Staff comprehensively assess the youth's strengths and weaknesses to guide competency development while on parole;
- ✓ JRA has established standards and is establishing measures of adherence to those standards;

¹ RCW 13.40.212.

² David Altschuler and Troy Armstrong, *Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model*, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, September 1994.

³ RCW 13.40.210

- ✓ JRA is trying to coordinate rehabilitation in the institutions with parole, including prerelease service planning; and
- ✓ Innovations include family services, day reporting, and incentive programs.

The intensive parole program became operational October 1, 1998, three months ahead of the legislatively-directed date. During the first year, 817 youth were placed in intensive parole.

BACKGROUND

In 1997, the Washington State Legislature determined that the system for transitioning the highest-risk youth from state institutions to parole did not provide adequate rehabilitation and public safety.⁴ The Legislature found that intensive supervision, as described in the intensive parole model of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)⁵ is a promising strategy for reducing recidivism rates for these juvenile offenders. In response, the Legislature funded intensive parole for up to 25 percent of the highest-risk youth released from JRA institutions.⁶

The intensive parole model employs a case management system to facilitate the transition of high-risk delinquents from secure confinement to community supervision. Case management starts when the juvenile first enters an institution, spans confinement, and extends through community supervision. This model is based on the work of David Altschuler and Troy Armstrong⁷ and was adopted in 1994 by OJJDP as a "promising strategy." Research findings on the program's effectiveness in reducing recidivism are pending; studies are underway in Colorado, Nevada, Virginia, and New Jersey. Washington is the only location where the program is statewide.

JRA contracted with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Institute) to evaluate the program's implementation, determine whether the program reduces recidivism, and analyze its costs and benefits to taxpayers and crime victims.

This first report describes the implementation of intensive parole to date. The next report, due in November 2000, will include an analysis of process data. The final report, including recidivism outcomes and a cost benefit analysis, is due in 2003.

The intensive parole program became operational on October 1, 1998, three months ahead of the legislatively-directed date. Each intensive parole counselor works with 12 paroled youth and 16 institutionalized youth. A community assistant supports two intensive parole caseloads. Standard parole was not funded during fiscal year 1999, but was reinstated in the next fiscal year with 20 youth per counselor.

Calendar of Events

During the program's implementation, the state policy on juvenile parole has undergone changes.

- 1997 Legislation:** Intensive parole authorized for 25 percent of the highest-risk JRA youth.
- July 1, 1998:** Funding for regular parole discontinued except for sex offenders.
- 1999 Legislation:** Funding for regular parole re-established.
- October 1, 1998:** Intensive parole started.
- July 1, 1999:** Regular parole started.

⁴ RCW 13.40.212.

⁵ David Altschuler and Troy Armstrong, *Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model*, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, September 1994.

⁶ RCW 13.40.210.

⁷ David M. Altschuler and Troy L. Armstrong, "Intensive Aftercare for the High-Risk Juvenile Parolee: Issues and Approaches in Reintegration and Community Supervision." In *Intensive Interventions with High-Risk Youths: Promising Approaches in Juvenile Probation and Parole*, Troy Armstrong (ed.), 1991, Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.

REPORT STRUCTURE

This report contains four sections.

Section I summarizes the program's implementation.

Section II describes each element specified in the intensive parole legislation and JRA's implementation actions to date.

Section III is JRA's summary of the strengths of their implementation of intensive parole.

Section IV summarizes the findings and comments regarding related research on intensive supervision.

SECTION I: INITIATING INTENSIVE PAROLE

The first section of this report summarizes JRA's overall implementation activities. Robert Salsbury, a JRA program administrator, was assigned to implement intensive parole statewide; he initiated a pilot project in 1996. During the first half of 1998, an intensive parole advisory committee reviewed program plans. The group was chaired by retired JRA Regional Administrator Marty Keeling and included agency representatives, juvenile court administrators, law enforcement officials, and representatives from the Institute, University of Washington, and the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee. Troy Armstrong, one of the model's developers, also advised the agency.

The first task completed by JRA was the development of a handbook for use by intensive parole staff. The handbook includes the standards developed by the advisory committee. At the same time, JRA established an internal website that includes the Intensive Parole Handbook, sample forms, and data entry capability. JRA is employing web technology to improve communication with its field staff. Table 1 presents the handbook's contents which documents how JRA expects intensive parole to work.

Table 1
Intensive Parole Handbook, Summary of Contents

Handbook Section	Contents of Section
Quick Reference Guide	Summarizes eligibility criteria, length of parole, revocation timelines, and accounting for time on parole (parole clock).
RCWs	Relevant RCWs: 13.40.210 and 13.40.212.
Standards	Detailed description of standards, including case reporting, residential responsibilities, community supervision, and parole revocation.
Family Services	Materials on working with families, including engaging, assessing, identifying barriers and services.
Case Reporting Forms	Transition Report, Response to Transition Report/Initial Service Plan: forms designed to facilitate communication concerning youth and their placement.
Supervision Assessment	The Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment and manual.
Structured Re-Entry	Guidelines for structured re-entry beginning 90 days before release and ending 90 days after release.
Day Reporting	Guidelines for day reporting programs that provide an option for youth not in other full-day programs.
Monitoring and Incentives	Principles and guidelines for monitoring and incentive programs, including samples.
Graduated Sanctions	Categorization of parole violations by seriousness and commensurate graduated sanctions.

After developing the handbook, JRA started training staff in preparation for program implementation. JRA contracted with family consultants to help JRA staff shift their focus to include the family and to train staff to conduct family needs assessments.

During this implementation process, Bob Salsbury conducted monthly reviews of progress within each region. The staff and management have been rating their adherence with the intensive parole standards. Ten areas are measured: residential case responsibilities, family services, community supervision program standards, community supervision contact standards, day reporting/community restitution work crews, monitoring/incentive programs, graduated sanctions, supervisory case reviews, pre-release service/supervision linkages, and release services/community networks. Several items are used to measure adherence in each area. JRA gave high ratings to their adherence with intensive parole standards. These self-reported measures are summarized in Appendix A.

JRA implemented intensive parole on October 1, 1998. Since that date, there have been 817 youth involved in the program. Table 2 summarizes the status of these youth as of October 1, 1999.

Table 2
Intensive Parole Population: October 1, 1999

Location of Intensive Parole Youth	Number of Youth
Institution	372
Parole Supervision	294
Discharged From Parole	151
Total Number of Youth	817

Because the program is being implementing statewide, Washington faces unique challenges. These include:

- *Geographic distances:* The national model assumes that community parole offices are located close enough to the state institutions to allow frequent contacts with residential staff. Some JRA community offices, however, are 300 miles from the main institutions, making contacts between residential and community staff more difficult.
- *Specialized residential units:* The model specifies that program youth are all located in the same institutional unit(s), thus facilitating specialized programming, training of staff, and logistics. To minimize disruptions to the institutions, Washington did not create housing units.
- *Transitional counselors:* To compensate for these situations, JRA assigned three counselors in the main institutions to serve as liaisons between residential and parole staff and to provide training. The counselors help prepare for placement of the youth on intensive parole.
- *Rural:* The OJJDP pilot programs excluded youth from rural jurisdictions. JRA, however, included youth from all jurisdictions according to the risk criteria. The agency has adapted the model to accommodate intensive supervision in rural areas.
- *Mental health:* Finally, the OJJDP model also excluded youth with mental health issues, whereas JRA includes all youth who meet the risk criteria.

Table 3 shows the chronology of JRA activities to implement intensive parole.

Table 3
Chronology of Intensive Parole Implementation

July 1, 1998	Regular parole ends
August 1998	Intensive Parole Handbook produced
August 1998	Intensive parole information placed on JRA website
August 1998	Community and residential program managers trained
September 1998	Community and residential staff participate in an intensive parole conference
September 1998	Community parole staff receive regional training
October 1, 1998	Intensive parole starts
November 1998	Intensive parole transition counselors start at Maple Lane School
December 1998	Regional monthly implementation reviews start
January 1999	Staff trained to use Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment
February 1, 1999	Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment starts
April 1, 1999	Parole Contact Reporting System starts
April 26, 1999	Intensive Parole Standards revised slightly
July 1, 1999	Regular parole reinstated
July 1, 1999	Intensive Parole Standards revised, residential case responsibilities changed to 30 days from admission rather than from commitment
July 1, 1999	Youth committed for murder are included in intensive parole only if high-risk
July 17, 1999	Revised Initial Security Classification Assessment implemented for intensive parole eligibility
September 1999	Intensive Parole Transition Counselors start at Green Hill Training School and Echo Glen

SECTION II: DESCRIPTION OF INTENSIVE PAROLE MODEL AND JRA'S IMPLEMENTATION

This section contains a brief description of each OJJDP model element ⁸ specified in the intensive parole legislation and JRA's implementation efforts for the element. The model elements described are:

- ✓ Information management and program evaluation;
- ✓ Assessment and selection criteria;
- ✓ Individual case planning;
- ✓ A mixture of intensive surveillance and services;
- ✓ A balance of incentives and graduated consequences;
- ✓ Community resources and social networks; and
- ✓ Transition services.

⁸ David Altschuler and Troy Armstrong, *Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model*, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, September 1994.

A. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

OJJDP Model Description

Information management and program evaluation help the organization maintain close oversight over implementation and quality control and determine the effectiveness of both the processes and outcomes of the program.

An ongoing management information system is required to ensure operational integrity. No test of the model is possible if implementation diverges from design principles and elements. The availability of timely information enables adjustments to be made before the program has veered substantially off course.

In addition to collecting basic information on who is served and in what ways, it is important to assess and document staffing patterns, job responsibilities, staff turnover, and job performance.

Assessing outcomes can be quite complex and should be assigned to well-qualified individuals.

JRA Implementation

- In July 1998, JRA started enhancing its management information system to collect data on day-to-day operations. Two new computer applications were added: the Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment in February 1999, and contact tracking in April 1999.
- The Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment software records risk and protective factors obtained from a structured interview with the youth when first placed on parole. The contact software collects information on the type, timing, and number of contacts JRA staff have with the youth, family, and service providers.
- JRA's current information system projects include automation of competency reports, violations, and interventions. The purpose of these computer programs is to allow for a more detailed tracking of day-to-day operations.
- JRA has contracted with the Institute to conduct the progress and outcome evaluation.⁹ As the process data becomes available from the new computer applications, the Institute will provide JRA with quantitative analysis describing operational adherence to the model's principles.

⁹ Robert Barnoski, *Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration Intensive Parole: Program Evaluation Design*, Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, March 1999.

B. ASSESSMENT AND SELECTION CRITERIA

OJJDP Model Description

The target population includes institutionalized juveniles who pose the highest risk of becoming repeat offenders after release. Objectively determining this group of juveniles requires a validated risk-screening device.

JRA Implementation

- The enabling legislation provided intensive parole funding for up to 25 percent of the highest-risk youth placed in the custody of JRA.
 - ✓ To identify high-risk youth for intensive parole, JRA is using a validated risk for re-offense instrument, the Initial Security Classification Assessment (ISCA).¹⁰ A score above 45 points on the ISCA identifies the 25 percent highest-risk youth. These youth are included in intensive parole.
 - ✓ JRA also uses the Sex Offender Screening Tool (SOST), a specialized risk assessment developed in Minnesota, to identify high-risk sex offenders. All sex offenders who are a Level III on the SOST assessment are included in intensive parole.
 - ✓ When intensive parole was first enacted by the state legislature, standard parole was not funded. To ensure that all youth convicted of murder would be supervised, JRA initially included all youth convicted of murder in intensive parole regardless of their ISCA score. Since standard parole was re-instated on July 1, 1999, high-risk murderers are placed on intensive parole; the remaining murderers are placed on standard parole. There are very few murder cases.
- The legislation authorizing JRA's Basic Training Camp (boot camp) program required that JRA employ a more intensive level of parole supervision, thus, this population is included in intensive parole.
- Beginning October 1, 1998, all youth are assessed immediately upon admission to a JRA facility. Youth who were already on parole as of October 1, 1998, were also assessed. Youth who meet the selection criteria are placed on intensive parole.
- The lengths of parole supervision vary as defined by state law:¹¹
 - ✓ 24 months for a juvenile sentenced for 1st or 2nd Degree Rape, 1st or 2nd Degree Rape of a Child, 1st Degree Child Molestation, or Indecent Liberties With Forcible Compulsion. Parole can be extended up to 36 months at the discretion of JRA.
 - ✓ All youth completing the state's Basic Training Camp program are placed on intensive parole for at least three months or until they serve their aggregate minimum sentence.
 - ✓ For all other youth placed on intensive parole, the length of parole is six months.

¹⁰ *Juvenile Rehabilitation Assessments: Validity Review and Recommendations*, Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, September 1998.

¹¹ RCW 13.40.210.

C. INDIVIDUAL CASE PLANNING

OJJDP Model Description

Individualized planning begins at admission to a secure correctional facility. Case planning involves both the institutional and community supervision staff determining:

- *How need-related risk factors will be addressed in the facility and then in the community after release;*
- *Youth's individual needs, particularly those linked to social network (family, close friends, peers in general) and community (schools, workplace, church, training programs, specialized treatment programs); and*
- *How the total set of risks, needs, and associated circumstances will be addressed during a phased transition from confinement to the community.*

To preserve the gains made while in confinement, supervision must connect the youth's activities during confinement to those in the community. Matching a youth with relevant programs requires an understanding of each program's intervention strategy (degree of change sought and attributes targeted) and organizing model (processes such as reinforcements and sanctions, limit-setting, and ratings of progress).

JRA Implementation

JRA has incorporated residential case management standards, intensive parole community supervision standards, a supervision assessment, competency reporting, and case review standards in their case planning process.

- The *Residential Case Management Standards* facilitate case planning among the parolee, family, and residential/community counselors.¹² Table 4 describes the responsibilities for both institutional and community counselors during the youth's residence in a JRA facility. JRA has guidelines to assist the community counselor in assessing family dynamics and skills.
- The *Intensive Parole Community Supervision Standards*, discussed in the next section, focus on monitoring, ensuring treatment, and supervising the youth's compliance with court parole conditions.
- JRA has established a *Competency Model*. JRA defines competencies as behavioral and cognitive measures of rehabilitation resulting in desired outcomes—lifelong behaviors as socially responsible citizens. All JRA staff are expected to teach competencies in their rehabilitative efforts. The competencies are to:
 - ✓ Provide staff with information about the effectiveness of interventions;
 - ✓ Provide clear and consistent expectations for youth;
 - ✓ Provide youth with information about their individual progress;
 - ✓ Enable service providers to produce evidence which supports interventions; and
 - ✓ Provide a baseline for quality assurance and program continuity.

¹² A community counselor works with youth while they are on parole in the community; a residential counselor works with youth while they are in a facility.

- JRA implemented an *Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment (IPSA)*¹³ to identify risk and protective factors in the following domains: aggression, work, education, life skills, relationships, criminal attitudes/behaviors, problem solving skills, family dynamics, substance abuse, mental health, sexual deviancy, and progress on supervision. The assessment is to:
 - ✓ Determine of the level of supervision;
 - ✓ Prioritize three competency areas for interventions;
 - ✓ Measure change in risk and protective factors; and
 - ✓ Determine intermediate outcomes.
- JRA instituted a *Supervisory Case Review* process to facilitate case planning during parole. Supervisory Case Review meetings are to be held to assess case progress, review the IPSA, and determine the competencies, interventions, and level of supervision for the upcoming 90 days. The meetings include the program manager, community counselor, parolee, family members, and others involved in the youth's supervision case plan.

Table 4
JRA Residential Phase Intensive Parole Standards

<p>These standards are to facilitate early and continued case planning among designated high-risk juvenile offenders, families, and residential/community counselors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 15 working days following admission to a JRA facility, the community counselor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Meets face-to-face with the youth, or, if that is not possible, calls the youth. ✓ Reviews the Diagnostic Report and the Juvenile Court Risk Assessment completed by the court to identify priority risk issues. • Within 30 days following admission to a JRA facility, the community counselor meets with the family in their home to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Provide an orientation to JRA. ✓ Review parole placement options for the youth. ✓ Solicit family support of the youth and participate in available community services. ✓ Gather family input. ✓ Review JRA's Competency Model. • Within 30 days following admission to a JRA facility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The community counselor contacts the assigned residential counselor to provide feedback from the family and discuss recommendations for residential case planning. ✓ The case plan is written by the residential counselor, signed by the youth, and reviewed by telephone with the family and community counselor. • Regularly scheduled communication (at least once every two months) occurs between the community counselor, residential counselor, and youth to review the progress of the youth's competency reports. The community counselor documents the communication. • The community counselor meets at least quarterly with the family to discuss progress. • The community counselor works with residential staff, family, relatives, and/or Children and Family Services in the development of a transition plan. • The community counselor visits applicable JRA institutions and camps at least annually.
--

¹³ The Institute worked with JRA to develop this assessment tool based on the assessment developed for the Washington State Association of Juvenile Court Administrators. The assessment was finalized in December 1998.

D. A MIXTURE OF INTENSIVE SURVEILLANCE AND SERVICES

OJJDP Model Description

Although close supervision is important, a strictly surveillance-oriented approach does not address the youth's individual needs and risks. Supervision is not merely a means to deter misconduct; it is to provide staff with the means to:

- *Recognize immediately when infractions, as well as achievements, have taken place;*
- *Know beforehand when circumstances may be prompting misconduct or leading to problems; and*
- *Respond accordingly with both reward and graduated sanctions.*

JRA Implementation

- JRA has adopted standards pertaining to surveillance (Table 6) and for services (Table 7).
- Surveillance primarily consists of contacting the youth and youth's family a specified number of times per week or month. The intensity of surveillance varies from the most intense surveillance in Phase 1 to the least intense in Phase 3. Youth move to less restrictive phases by complying with their conditions of parole.
- Services are defined by JRA as participation in school, work, community service, day reporting, treatment groups, curfews, electronic monitoring, weekly plans, and incentive/sanction programs. Consistent with the OJJDP model, these services are equivalent to the conditions of parole, and largely are surveillance oriented. Incentives and sanctions target compliance with the conditions of parole, and pro-social behavior.

Table 6

JRA Contact Standards for Intensive Parole Community Supervision

<p>The focus of community supervision is on monitoring, treatment, restitution to victims and the community, and other interventions intended to help accomplish the successful completion of these goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initial contact between the parolee and his or her community counselor occurs within three working days after release to parole and includes a review, and amendment if necessary, of the initial order of parole conditions. • All youth are initially placed in Phase I. Subsequent movement between phases is based upon the youth's progress in meeting program standards and conditions. 			
Community Counselor Contacts	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
Face-to-face with youth Phone call with youth Face-to-face with family/placement Phone call with family/placement Face-to-face with provider(s) Phone call with provider(s)	One per week None One per month Two per month One per month None	One per week None One per month None None One per two months	Two per month Two per month One per month None None One per two months
Community Assistant Contacts	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
Face-to-face for whereabouts Phone call with family/placement Phone call with service providers (e.g., school, treatment)	Eight per month One per month One per week	Six per month Two per month One per week	Two per month One per month Two per month

Table 7

JRA Program Standards for Intensive Parole Community Supervision

Program Standards	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
30 hours/week of school, work, community service, day reporting, treatment groups, and activities	Yes	Yes	Yes
Satisfactory participation in treatment/competency development program	Yes	Yes	Yes
Incentive programming and graduated sanctions	Yes	Yes	Yes
Curfew	Most restrictive	Medium restrictive	Least restrictive
Weekly Activity Plan	24 hours/seven days a week first two weeks	None	None
Electronic Surveillance	Mandatory: first 15 days	None	None

E. A BALANCE OF INCENTIVES AND GRADUATED CONSEQUENCES

OJJDP Model Description

Juvenile aftercare has often been burdened with unrealistic and unenforceable parole conditions and devoid of any positive reinforcement, rewards, or inducements. Restrictions and limitations generally imposed at the initiation of aftercare afford little room to impose proportionately more stringent sanctions short of revocation.

A number of approaches have been employed by programs to monitor progress, reinforce pro-social conduct, and guide advancement. These approaches range from relatively simple mechanisms involving frequent case reviews to elaborately structured token economies in which particular privileges or rewards are tied to the attainment of specific goals.

Because intensive parole is designed to intensify the number, duration, and nature of contacts with paroled youth, family, peers, school staff, employers, and service providers, it is inevitable that more infractions, technical violations, and instances of noncompliance will surface. With the absence of guidelines for consequences, aftercare workers may tend to do nothing—which undermines their authority—or to impose sanctions disproportionate to the violation.

Besides having a graduated system of sanctions, jurisdictions should review their juvenile revocation policy for possible revisions. These changes could include restricting re-incarceration only to youth with new offense convictions and establishing a special short-term residential backup facility for technical violators.

JRA Implementation

- Washington State statute defines the conditions of parole (RCW 13.40.210(3)). In addition to obeying all laws and not being allowed to possess a firearm or use a deadly weapon, the law indicates the following conditions may be required by the court or the agency:
 - ✓ Undergo available medical, psychiatric, drug and alcohol, sex offender, mental health, and other offense-related treatment services;
 - ✓ Report as directed to a parole officer and/or designee;
 - ✓ Pursue a course of study, vocational training, or employment;
 - ✓ Notify the parole officer of the current residential address;
 - ✓ Be present at a particular address during specified hours;
 - ✓ Remain within prescribed geographical boundaries;
 - ✓ Submit to electronic monitoring;
 - ✓ Refrain from using illegal drugs and alcohol, and submit to random urinalysis when requested by the assigned parole officer;
 - ✓ Refrain from contact with specific individuals or a specified class of individuals;

- ✓ Pay any court-ordered fines or restitution;
 - ✓ Perform community service (compulsory service without compensation, performed for the benefit of the community). Community service may be performed through public or private organizations or through work crews; and
 - ✓ Meet other conditions determined by the parole officer to further enhance the juvenile's reintegration into the community.
- In addition, Washington law lists the following conditions for youth on intensive parole:
 - ✓ Obey all laws and refrain from any conduct that threatens public safety;
 - ✓ Report at least once-a-week to an assigned community case manager;
 - ✓ Meet all other requirements imposed by the community case manager related to participating in the intensive supervision program; and
 - ✓ Intensive parole may require day reporting.
- JRA has established recommendations for incentive programs and guidelines for graduated consequences. JRA's incentive programs will be covered first, followed by the graduated consequences guidelines.
 - ✓ The monitoring and incentives section of the Intensive Parole Handbook outlines the use of positive reinforcement systems (incentives) to increase the frequency, intensity, and duration of pre-determined positive behaviors. Table 8 summarizes JRA's principles for the use of monitoring and incentive programs.
 - ✓ The Intensive Parole Handbook includes sanctions for misconduct. The Graduated Sanctions Section categorizes parole violations by seriousness and provides sanctions that are commensurate and graduated. JRA's goal is to standardize sanctioning decisions so they are consistent, immediate, and measured responses to parole violations. The community counselor continues to exercise discretion in sanctioning decisions.

Table 8
**JRA Intensive Parole Handbook:
Principles of Monitoring/Incentive Programs**

Principles

- ✓ Clear, well-defined expectations tied to daily behavior.
- ✓ Achievable behavioral expectations.
- ✓ Consistent monitoring of youth's performance and frequent verbal feedback.
- ✓ Consistent and predictable delivery of incentives.
- ✓ Close association in time between performance and incentives.
- ✓ Adequate supply and variety of material incentives to allow youth a choice.
- ✓ Pairing social incentives with material incentives.
- ✓ Fading material incentives and increasing social incentives over time.

Guidelines

- ✓ Operationally define all variables so it is clear what behaviors are to be reinforced.
- ✓ Use a point system, or equivalent, to provide objective standards for receiving incentives.
- ✓ Include other agents of change, e.g., schoolteachers, work supervisors, and treatment providers, in the process of reporting and rewarding behaviors.
- ✓ Develop and maintain an incentive "store" or supply of a wide variety of material incentives.
- ✓ Use incentive delivery schedules that are frequent and intense enough to motivate youth's behavior. Initial schedules that require waiting more than a week for an opportunity to receive an incentive are usually less effective.
- ✓ Use social incentives, e.g., praise, special activities, awards, and certificates, as much as possible, to reduce dependence on materials and to model reinforcing behavior.
- ✓ Create a reinforcement environment where three or four incentives are delivered for every sanction.
- ✓ Use a variety of incentive schedules ranging from rewards for behaviors measured on a daily/weekly basis, to rewards for achievement of specific time-framed competencies.
- ✓ Include parents/families in incentive programs to assist in monitoring behaviors and in delivering and receiving incentives.
- ✓ Award incentive points for the following types of activities: school, work, parole contacts, counseling sessions, recreational activities, urinalysis testing, and other pro-social activities. Points are added for compliance and subtracted for negative behavior or violations.
- ✓ Social incentives include praise, attention, and acknowledgment of positive behaviors. Material incentives include food, gift certificates, and enjoyable pro-social activities.

Table 9 shows, for each condition of parole, the increasing seriousness of the behavior that violates the condition.

Table 9
Seriousness of Violations

Parole Condition	Minor Violation	Moderate Violation	Serious Violation
Firearm/deadly weapon	N/A	N/A	Possession/use
New crime	N/A	Misdemeanor	Felony
Contact with minor child/victim	N/A	Unsupervised	Repeated/serious
School suspensions for behavior	N/A	Single incident	Repeated/chronic
Electronic monitoring	Minor/first time	Continued failure	Refusal
Required treatment	Missed appointment	Continued failure	Refusal
Parole contacts	Missed appointment	Continued failure	Refusal
School/vocational program/work	Minor/first time	Continued failure	Refusal
Address/hours requirements	Minor/first time	Continued failure	Chronic/excessive
Curfew violations	Minor/first time	Continued failure	Chronic/excessive
Community service	Minor/first time	Continued failure	Refusal
Treatment contract	Minor violation	Continued failure	Refusal/serious/excessive
Drug/alcohol use (U/As)	First time	Continued failure	Frequent/repetitive
Other program requirements	Minor/first time	Continued failure	Chronic/excessive

N/A = never considered minor or moderate violation.

Table 10 shows the penalty for each type of sanction according to the seriousness of the parole violation.

Table 10
Penalties for Parole Violations

	Type of Penalty	Minor Violation	Moderate Violation	Serious Violation
Serious	Revocation	N/A	N/A	Mandatory 30 day
	Return to institution	N/A	N/A	Rest of sentence
	Day reporting and electronic monitor	N/A	N/A	14 to 30 days
	Electronic monitor	Short term	Tighter schedule	House arrest
	Level of supervision	Increased	Higher phase	Higher phase
	Detention confinement	N/A	Up to 72 hours	Up to 30 days
Moderate	Day reporting	N/A	Up to 14 days	N/A
	Community service/work crew	N/A	Penalty hours	N/A
	Weekly activity schedule	N/A	24 hour/7 day week	N/A
	U/A frequency	N/A	Increased	N/A
	Curfew	Earlier	Increased	N/A
	Parole conditions	Increased	Case review	N/A
	Treatment services	Increased	Increased	N/A
Minor	Parole period	Increased	N/A	N/A
	Homework	Yes	N/A	N/A
	Verbal reprimand	Yes	N/A	N/A
	Behavioral contract	Yes	N/A	N/A
	Loss of privileges	Yes	N/A	N/A
	Written apology	Yes	N/A	N/A
	Youth propose sanction	Yes	N/A	N/A

N/A = never considered minor or moderate violation.

F. COMMUNITY RESOURCES AND SOCIAL NETWORKS

OJJDP Model Description

It is unrealistic to expect that comprehensive services coupled with close supervision and monitoring can be provided without the active involvement of a variety of community support systems. It is impractical to expect that the primary aftercare worker could spend the necessary time and have the capacity to provide the full range of needed services. Thus, referral and brokerage become crucial functions, which in turn means that program monitoring and quality control are paramount concerns.

As prior research on risk factors suggests, youth who have family problems, who associate with negative peer groups, and who are disruptive in school are at the highest risk of becoming repeat offenders. Accordingly, programming must focus on:

- ✓ *Improving the family situation;*
- ✓ *Intervening with the peer group; and*
- ✓ *Reversing the cycle of school failure to reduce the risk for re-offending.*

These goals require linkage with major social networks and require staff to actively work on reinforcing, or if necessary developing, a supportive network for each youth. It is also essential to devise a process to ensure coordination and continuity in work being done on a case and to monitor the extent and quality of the service provision.

JRA Implementation

- JRA's Intensive Parole Handbook partially addresses the issue of community resources and social networks in structured re-entry, which is discussed in the next section. JRA intensive parole teams regularly assess how well they perceive services are being implemented using a self-report review form. To date, these self-assessments indicate that linkage with community resources is a challenging task for JRA. Table 11 presents JRA's goals for release services and community networks.

Table 11

JRA Implementation Goals for Release Services and Community Networks

- Youth begins services during the first week of release
- Youth has involvement with pro-social community activities
- Youth has established community support systems
- Community counselors feel the community is ready for the youth's return
- Youth avoids drug/alcohol relapse

G. TRANSITION SERVICES

OJJDP Model Description

The model requires the active involvement of the aftercare counselor as soon as secure confinement begins. Aftercare providers must initiate some form of service before the youth is discharged from secure confinement. The lack of meaningful involvement on the part of the aftercare worker until the final phase of confinement, if then, is among the more serious problems that have confronted aftercare.

JRA Implementation

The 1997 intensive parole legislation states that transition services should transcend traditional agency boundaries and include courts, institutions, aftercare, education, social and mental health services, substance abuse treatment, and employment and vocational training. The OJJDP model concentrates on the transition of the youth from secure confinement to parole and does not address the issue of transcending professional and organizational boundaries.

- In accordance with the OJJDP model, JRA's transition standards include two segments: a residential segment that starts as soon as the youth is admitted to an institution, and a structured re-entry segment that begins 90 days prior to release and ends 90 days after release.
- The OJJDP model states that the transition from secure, highly-structured confinement to community living is a critical period for the youth. JRA intends that this period of adjustment be well planned and executed, thereby maximizing the chances of the youth's success in the community. JRA's guidelines for structured re-entry are shown in Table 12.
- JRA is using regional/local day reporting programs to facilitate structured re-entry. One day reporting model involves a half-day session of classroom-based experience followed by a half-day of community service-oriented work experience. Table 13 describes the classroom subjects JRA suggests for its day reporting programs.
- All but one day reporting center is state staffed and on-site at the regional office. The JRA Region 5 Office in Tacoma has established a day reporting program in partnership with the local juvenile detention center (Remann Hall). This day reporting program uses schoolteachers, security officers, and JRA staff and makes parole counselors available for regular contact with parolees.

Table 12
JRA Structured Re-entry Guidelines

Pre-Release Guidelines

- Youth completes the parole-readiness/transitional curriculum 60 to 90 days prior to release.
- Youth has necessary forms of identification at release.
- Placement is finalized pre-release.
- Program, service, and supervision linkages/appointments are established prior to release.
- Community counselor increases contacts with family within 90 days of release.
- Youth meets service providers prior to release.

Release Guidelines

- Focus on immediately including youth in the initial case plan.
- Use day reporting program to provide a higher level of structure and control for close observation and early intervention of youth's cognitive/behavior strengths and problems.
- Pay special attention to the risk of relapse into drug/alcohol use upon release. Close structuring of time, electronic monitoring, and whereabouts verification by trackers, in combination with immediate entry into chemical dependency counseling, may help to reduce the probability of relapse.

Table 13
Day Reporting Programming

Day reporting programs are intended to provide full-day programming options for youth who are not in other full-day programs. Areas of programming can include:

- *Life skills:* hygiene, home care, budgeting, cooking, conflict resolution, self-sufficiency.
- *Academic:* school readiness programming in math, reading, writing, and computers.
- *Pre-vocational:* jobs seeking, job readiness, job maintenance, and resume writing.

SECTION III: JRA'S SUMMARY OF THE STRENGTHS OF INTENSIVE PAROLE IMPLEMENTATION

The JRA program administrator responsible for intensive parole views the program as incorporating several strengths:

- *Incentive Programming:* JRA uses a structured, rigorous, and inclusive weekly behavior incentive programming across all dimensions of parole.
- *Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment:* JRA uses a comprehensive assessment of dynamic risk and protective factors to guide its rehabilitative efforts.
- *Pre-release service linkages:* JRA emphasizes establishing service linkages prior to the youth being released to community supervision, so the youth will have an initial service plan no later than 30 days prior to release, with appointments set for the first week on parole.
- *Programming:* JRA sets a high standard of at least 30 hours per week of structured programming, e.g., school and/or work.
- *Day Reporting:* JRA uses day reporting programs and community restoration work crews for youth who cannot participate in more traditional programming.
- *Family services:* JRA includes a treatment component for "Family Skills" in their competency model. During the first year of implementation, JRA contracted with family consultants to provide training and technical assistance to help staff shift their focus to include the family. Contracted family therapists are used to provide family therapy. Additionally, all intensive parole counselors have been trained and provided resources to conduct family needs assessments.

SECTION IV: COMMENTARY

Washington's intensive parole program will be a good test of whether a well-implemented intensive parole program can lower the recidivism rate of high-risk juvenile offenders in a cost-beneficial manner. As noted, the outcome evaluation of Washington's model will not be complete until 2003. The OJJDP sponsored intensive parole evaluations underway in three states should be completed before then. Thus, the effectiveness of the model is yet to be determined.

JRA has dedicated itself to a quality effort. As a cautionary note, however, the research literature shows that most previous intensive supervision efforts, whether for juvenile or adult offenders, have failed to reduce the recidivism rate of participants when compared to regular parole. That is, prior meta-analyses¹⁴ and research literature reviews¹⁵ do not inspire confidence regarding the likely effectiveness of intensive supervision—*by itself*—in reducing recidivism. The Institute's own cost-benefit analysis of previous juvenile and adult intensive parole or probation programs found few attractive investments.¹⁶ MacKenzie's recent commentary¹⁷ reiterates these findings.

MacKenzie notes that it is difficult to answer the question of whether intensive supervision will reduce recidivism given the amount of quality research. However, she goes on to state that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that effective programs must include rehabilitation and services to address the needs of individual juveniles.

Recent evidence on effective juvenile offender programming offers opportunities for JRA's intensive parole. The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence has identified a nucleus of programs that have been scientifically shown to reduce violence (Blueprints for Violence Prevention).¹⁸ Three Blueprint programs are compatible with the community supervision phase of intensive parole: Multisystemic Therapy, Functional Family Therapy, and Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care. Two of these programs are now being implemented by the juvenile courts in Washington. In addition, there are other programs, such as Aggression Replacement Training and Equip, that teach pro-social life skills and thinking strategies that may be worth pursuing.

JRA may wish to consider integrating these programs into intensive parole to strengthen the intervention services element of the program, and thus increase the likelihood of achieving the legislature's goals for this program.

¹⁴ Mark W. Lippy and David B. Wilson, *Effective Intervention for Serious Juvenile Offenders: A Synthesis of Research*, Paper prepared for OJJDP Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders, Washington D.C., April 1997.

¹⁵ Patrick Tolan and Nancy Guerra, *What Works in Reducing Adolescent Violence: An Empirical Review of the Field* Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, Center for the Study of the Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado, July 1994.

¹⁶ S. Aos, P. Phipps, R. Barnoski, and R. Lieb, *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime, A Review of National Research Findings With Implications for Washington State*, Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, May 1999.

¹⁷ Doris Layton MacKenzie, *Commentary: The Effectiveness of Aftercare Programs – Examining the Evidence*, Juvenile Justice Bulletin, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, July 1999.

¹⁸ Delbert S. Elliot, ed., *Blueprints for Violence Prevention*, Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado, 1998.

APPENDIX A: SELF-RATINGS BY JRA INTENSIVE PAROLE TEAMS ¹

How well has our team implemented intensive parole standards?

	Measure	Region						State Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	Residential Case Responsibilities							
1.1	Youth contacted by JRCC within 15 days of commitment	4	5	3	5	5	5	4.5
1.2	Family seen in home by JRCC within 30 days of commitment	3	5	1	5	2	5	3.5
1.3	JRRC contacted by JRCC within 30 days for case planning	4	5	4	5	4	N/A	4.4
1.4	JRRC contacted every two months for case planning/monitoring	4	4	4	5	4	4	4.2
1.5	Family contacted quarterly by JRCC for planning/support/monitoring	5	4	5	5	5	5	4.8
1.6	Transition Reports/Initial Service Plans completed within timelines	5	3	5	5	5	5	4.7
1.7	Staff understand overarching case management model	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
	Overall	4.3	4.4	3.9	5.0	4.3	4.8	4.4
2	Family Services							
2.1	Initial family contact involves strengths/needs assessment	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
2.2	Referrals for family services are made by the JRCC	5	5	5	5	5	4	4.8
2.3	Follow-up to monitor family referrals made	5	4	5	5	5	5	4.8
2.4	Family service providers are contracted or regularly involved in case staffing	4	5	1	1	4	5	3.3
2.5	Staff feels skilled or comfortable working directly with families	5	5	3	5	5	5	4.7
2.6	Family viewed as a resource; is involved in pre-release transitional planning	4	5	4	5	5	5	4.7
	Overall	4.7	4.8	3.8	4.3	4.8	4.8	4.6

¹ Rating Scale 1 = low adherence to 5 = high adherence
 JRRC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Residential Counselor
 JRCC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Counselor
 JRCA is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Assistant

How well has our team implemented intensive parole standards?

	Measure	Region						State Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
3	Community Supervision Programming							
3.1	Youth are involved in 30 hours/week of programming	3	5	5	3	5	4	4.2
3.2	Youth satisfactory participation in treatment/competency development	4	4	4	5	3	5	4.2
3.3	Youth are using or following weekly activity plans	1	2	4	N/A	5	5	3.4
3.4	Youth are involved in regular incentive programming	5	5	2	4	5	5	4.3
3.5	Youths receive graduated sanctions for violations	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
3.6	Youths receive mandatory curfews	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
3.7	Youth receive mandatory electronic monitoring	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
	Overall	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.9	4.5
4	Community Supervision Contacts							
4.1	Phase I JRCC contact standards are met	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
4.2	Phase II JRCC contact standards are met	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
4.3	Phase III JRCC contact standards met	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
4.4	Phase I JRCA contact standards are rarely, if ever, met	2	4	5	3	5	4	3.8
4.5	Phase II JRCA contact standards are met	5	5	5	3	5	4	4.5
4.6	Phase III JRCA contact standards are met	5	5	5	N/A	5	5	5.0
4.7	Staff willing and able to meet contact standards for phases	5	5		5	5	5	5.0
	Overall	4.6	4.9	5.0	4.3	5.0	4.7	4.7

¹ Rating Scale 1 = low adherence to 5 = high adherence
 JRRC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Residential Counselor
 JRCC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Counselor
 JRCA is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Assistant

How well has our team implemented intensive parole standards?

	Measure	Region						State Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
5	Day Reporting							
5.1	Youth have access to a day reporting program (classroom-based)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
5.2	Youth have access to a community restitution work crew	1	5	5	5	5	5	4.3
5.3	Youth in the day reporting/community restitution program receive competency-based instruction	5	3	5	5	5	5	4.7
5.4	Incentives are used in the day reporting program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
5.5	JRCCs refer eligible youth to the day reporting program and/or the community restitution work crew	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
	Overall	4.2	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
6	Monitoring and Incentives							
6.1	Incentive programs have clear expectations tied to daily behavior	5	5	5	N/A	5	5	5.0
6.2	Incentive programs have consistent and predictable delivery of incentives	5	5	5	4	5	5	4.8
6.3	Youth have any choice of incentives	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
6.4	Social incentives are used	5	5	3	5	5	4	4.5
6.5	Individual incentive programs are planned to step down/fade material incentives	4	3	1	4	1	2	2.5
6.6	Individual incentive programs are planned to reinforce youth competencies	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
	Overall	4.8	4.7	4.0	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.5

¹ Rating Scale 1 = low adherence to 5 = high adherence
 JRRC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Residential Counselor
 JRCC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Counselor
 JRCA is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Assistant

How well has our team implemented intensive parole standards?

	Measure	Region						State Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
7	Graduated Sanctions							
7.1	Sanctions are progressive in restrictiveness for parole violations	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
7.2	Parole violations assessed as to intensity, frequency, duration, interval, and impact	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
7.3	Sanctions are immediate and certain	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
7.4	Sanctions are matched to violations per the Graduated Sanctions Program	4	5	5	2	5	5	4.3
	Overall	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.3	5.0	5.0	4.8
8	Supervisory Case Reviews							
8.1	Supervisory case reviews are held within required timelines	3	5	5	5	4	5	4.5
8.2	Supervisory case reviews have family members present	2	4	1	3	3	4	2.8
8.3	Supervisory case reviews have providers present	1	3	1	1	1	2	1.5
8.4	Supervisory case reviews are held for phase changes to less restrictive phases	5	5	5	5	5	4	4.8
	Overall	3.9	4.7	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.2

¹ Rating Scale 1 = low adherence to 5 = high adherence
 JRRC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Residential Counselor
 JRCC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Counselor
 JRCA is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Assistant

How well has our team implemented intensive parole standards?

	Measure	Region						State Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
9	Pre-Release Services and Network							
9.1	Youth have completed parole-readiness/transitional curriculum	2	2	2	2	N/A	3	2.2
9.2	Youth have necessary forms of identification at release	1	4	2	2	2	2	2.2
9.3	Placements are finalized pre-release	5	5	4	5	5	5	4.8
9.4	Services are established prior to release (including appointments)	5	4	3	5	5	5	4.5
9.5	JRCCs increase contacts with families within 90 days of release	5	5	5	5	4	4	4.7
9.6	Youths have meet service providers prior to release	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.0
	Overall	3.2	3.5	2.8	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3
10	Release Services and Community Networks							
10.1	Youth begin services during the first week of release	5	5	4	5	5	1	4.2
10.2	Youth have involvement with pro-social community activities	2	5	3	4	5	4	3.8
10.3	Youth have established community support systems	2	3	3	4	5	1	3.0
10.4	JRCCs feel the community is ready for the youths' return	4	3	3	4	2	5	3.5
10.5	Youth avoid drug/alcohol relapse during the first 30 days of parole	1	4	3	3	4	4	3.2
	Overall	2.8	4.0	3.2	4.0	4.2	3.0	3.5

¹ Rating Scale 1 = low adherence to 5 = high adherence
 JRRC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Residential Counselor
 JRCC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Counselor
 JRCA is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Assistant

Average Rating for Each Section

	Measure	Region						State Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	Residential Case Responsibilities	4.3	4.4	3.9	5.0	4.3	4.8	4.4
2	Family Services	4.7	4.8	3.8	4.3	4.8	4.8	4.6
3	Community Supervision Programming	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.9	4.5
4	Community Supervision Contacts	4.6	4.9	5.0	4.3	5.0	4.7	4.7
5	Day Reporting	4.2	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
6	Monitoring and Incentives	4.8	4.7	4.0	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.5
7	Graduated Sanctions	3.9	4.7	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.2
8	Supervisory Case Reviews	3.9	4.7	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.2
9	Pre-release Services and Network	3.2	3.5	2.8	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3
10	Release Services and Community Networks	2.8	4.0	3.2	4.0	4.2	3.0	3.5

¹ Rating Scale 1 = low adherence to 5 = high adherence
 JRRC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Residential Counselor
 JRCC is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Counselor
 JRCA is a Juvenile Rehabilitation Community Assistant