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Executive Summary
In 2008, Yolo County probation undertook a series of changes to better align its departments with emerging Evidence Based Practices around the use of risk based supervision and detention, as well as needs based referrals to treatment and therapy.

Evidence Based Practices is defined as
“the use of scientific principles to assess the available evidence on program effectiveness and develop principles for best practice in any particular field. In delinquency prevention or intervention this includes: assessment of community and individual client needs; review and assessment of programs that could meet those needs; development and/or implementation of new programs; assignment of youth to particular programs; and monitoring of program fidelity and outcomes.”

These system changes included a number of programs as well as practices modeled on national evidence on how justice system involved youth were supervised, as well as case managed with a policy goal decreasing costly out of home placements as well as improving outcomes for youth and public safety. Yolo county juvenile arrest rate declined, along with use of the Yolo County Juvenile hall over the period of July 2008 to June 2013, which coincides with a national and California-wide downward trend in crime and youth incarceration. The goals of this report are to summarize trends in the Yolo county juvenile justice system over the last 5 years and progress made on implementation and structure for building quality control for assessment systems during the JABG grant. The goal of the original project was to build up the capacity, both in management and information systems, to create robust and important evaluative research as California counties implement practices and policies that are seen as evidence-based in juvenile justice.

Yolo County made changes to its detention, supervision, and treatment referral practices to align itself with a model that focuses resources only those most likely to reoffend based on ideas from national research evidence that supervision intensity as well as dosage should be proportional to risk. This is supported by evidence that putting lower risk youth with higher amounts of services leads to worse outcomes for these low risk youth.

Yolo County became one of the first counties in California to adopt Functional Family Probation (FFP herein) in 2008 as its case management approach. The FFP model was a central part of

---

3 See appendix for initial project layout and project plan
the county plan to limit out of home placements of system involved youth in a way that managed youth based on their risk to re-offend, and targeted interventions based on their most critical needs. Further, the FFP model employs a somewhat new approach to clearer systematic collaboration between probation officers, and treatment providers which is currently only used in Los Angeles County in California. The FFP model is a juvenile case management approach modeled on Functional Family Therapy (FFT) to reduce risk factors and enhance protective factors, and early evidence from studies in other states has been shown to reduce re-offense rates, when coupled with effective community treatment interventions. The FFP model uses a structured method for probation officers to interact with youth that provides clearer steps and intervention strategies, and refer them to Yolo County’s primary service provider, Communicare. This approach to supervision, along with name brand interventions like Functional Family Therapy, cognitive programming like Thinking for a Change, and Aggression Replacement Therapy, has been shown to reduce recidivism in youth.

The EBP grant funded the following activities:

- Report on general themes and work of the department based on the information gathered from automated data
- Development of information technology to support evidence based systems and the use of that information.
- Create a frame work for probation staff to assess the quality of service providers
- Develop a quality control framework to assess quality of implementation of supervision
- Assess the validity of the primary risk assessment tool
- Create documents to help Yolo County manage and implement a monitoring system, such as a data dictionary.

The implementation of the evaluation systems project underscores the challenge in aligning numerous systems, people, and agencies into not just adopting evidence based practices or programs, but sustaining and monitoring them. One of the fundamentals of monitoring fidelity and outcomes is the ability to access offender level data in an automated way, at numerous intervention and contact points. The development of systems data was a key component of the initial project plan, but this focus in some ways distracts from the work being done in the department by officers and staff since QA can also be done without complex data reports, but through case file review and samples. The choice to build and develop Yolo’s own case

---

6 http://www.blueprintsprograms.com/resources/logic_model/FFT.pdf
7 http://www.communicarehc.org/View_webpage.asp?Title=Home
8 http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/54
management system with county resources, or buy from a vendor, became crucial implementation questions that impacted the grant, as did potential changes in the assessment tools used by the department. General observations from the implementation of the grant showed progress and a groundwork for future efforts along with some challenges:

- Changeover in top management early in the grant led to uncertainty regarding key system choices around case management systems, assessment tools, and policy direction. The limbo around systems choices meant development of management reports, and query functionality, was halting. There was substantial work product developed, but little was put in place and will largely be used as a starting point for future effort in the county.
- The 3-year grant term provided implementation flexibility, but at times an unclear marker of “completion” since it was a combination of multiple interwoven services, vendors, processes, and deliverables such that project management was overly complex. Further, the mix of grant funded tasks, Yolo staff work made implementation difficult when local capacity for data analysis, and logic model development was not identified.
- The lack of emphasis on qualitative factors meant an inconsistent view from the field of those implementing the processes. In hindsight, survey research or qualitative methods done early on could have helped management in assessing employee attitudes and knowledge of EBP principles.
- The quality assurance portion of the plans were not implemented due to changes in the assessment vendor, and general lack of certainty regarding the risk assessment tools. However, the capacity and knowledge exists in the department both in terms of implementing QA, as well as the capacity to use data-driven decision making to assist in QA.
- The method for assessing local programming was completed and a group of Yolo County probation officers trained in how to assess and review the effectiveness of a program provider using the Correctional Planning Checklist.

This system ambiguity did not preclude analysis or data availability to the credit of officers as well as administrative staff, it just slowed the development of automated approaches to monitoring quality and longer-term investments in making the data useful to numerous stakeholders. This grant also provided an important case study in how to align county information technology resources with evidence based systems development. Evaluation Planning documents such as data dictionaries and logic models created a refined list and roadmap for what was important to measure, but they largely lived outside of the data systems and were never fully implemented.
Report Outline
Section 1 will lay out the process and results of some of policies put in place in 2008. Section 2 gives an overview of some of the implementation issues around the grant. Section 3 looks at efforts at quality control and quality assurance. Section 4 discusses the predictive validity of the risk assessment tool used by Yolo County to differentiate juveniles for supervision dosage and treatment. Section 5 looks at the development of the Correctional Planning Checklist (CPC) implemented to give probation staff the ability to address the quality and fidelity of programs and interventions in the community. Section 6 includes an appendix with a statistical archive, projects planning documents, specifications for internal management dashboards, and technical code for data transformations written for the assessment tool.

Evaluation and Research Design
A full program evaluation of all programs, interventions, and supervision processes were outside the scope of this project, but over the course of developing reporting and information systems, several questions are fundamental for understanding the quality of the implementation, as well as areas for future evaluation and a more robust research design. Evaluation and Research are used somewhat interchangeably in the report as social research, as well as the term “research design”. Evaluation design is usually part of a larger framework of planning and implementation, and as such, its methods tend to be seen as more applied to certain issues or contexts. Social research design can be more theoretical and concerned with developing, exploring, and testing ideas. However, the methods and concepts are complimentary in an applying these concepts in a county juvenile justice system.

The type of design ideally used is one that identifies a group of participants in a program, and compares them to a group of similarly situated non-participants. The different in impact can then be derived by comparing the relative levels of change toward the designed outcome between those receiving the intervention, and those who did not. The key is to be able to differentiate people on important common variables. This is especially applicable to treatment programs and certain types of strategies of intervention, but the use of a control group isn’t always possible and as such in applied setting, there are several approaches. These approaches can be classified in three ways:

- **Experimental or Randomized:** By gathering a group of similar people, the use of a control group to differentiates who receives a treatment dosage or intervention based on a random assignment to a program. This is the most robust type of design, but difficult and impractical in most applied settings.
- **Quasi-experimental:** By statistically gathering a group of similar people, this approach matches populations to then determine the effect of the program. This can be done
before a study begins or after and can be drawn from existing data sources, but this may
effect reliability.

• Non-experimental: This approach uses statistical techniques to control for differences
between participants and non-participants and use existing data sources, but is more
complex to implement with high quality and can introduce significant selection bias (the
extent to which subgroups or target populations participate differently in the program)

Since there was no initial research cohort to provide a comparison group, and data systems
came online for both automated case management and risk assessment tools around the time
of the policy changes, the report cannot isolate certain aspects of treatment or case
management as causal factors in effecting juvenile outcomes. There is also a gap in
understanding around Yolo’s EBP model fidelity, such that the outcomes of the implementation
could have been attributed to chance or randomness. The complexities of the systems change
create a number of inter-related activities such that isolating a single intervention or
component of the approach was not feasible in the current grant arrangement. However, the
detailed data coming from Yolo County systems allow for substantial analysis of inter-group
differences and further research could more adequately plan and design a study with the data
on hand. Despite some of these limitations on research design, the report describes some of
the results of the risk assessment tools used to make detention and supervision choices, as well
as some of the aggregate treatment needs.

Future studies by Yolo County could develop small treatment/comparison groups to see if a
different group not given a certain intervention to enhanced services fared different.
Randomized studies could have been done to modify system approaches, but these were
beyond the scope of the project and not defined when the changes went into effect. An
evaluation of treatment providers was outside the scope of the project, but the use of the
Correctional Planning Checklist gave Yolo County useful information about how to address and
further refine its work with Communicare and Yolo County Juvenile Detention Facility.

Although recidivism is a key outcome of any juvenile justice intervention, the decline in crime
and juvenile crime rates needs to be viewed in the larger context of nationwide falling crime
rates, as well as declining juvenile arrest rates. In Yolo County, multiple reform efforts and
system level interactions with outside organizations were in place to help in understanding
system exposure of youth involved in both the juvenile justice. The county has had a long
running Disproportionate Minority Contact (recently renamed Reducing Racial and Ethnic
Disparities, or RED) 9 grant that looks at many of the decision points and practices that lead to
youth incarceration, with a number of the recommendations having a far-reaching impact on

9 http://www.bsc.ca.gov/s_reducingracialandethnicdisparities(r.e.d.)subcommittee.php
the outcomes of Yolo County’s youth. Yolo County’s involvement in Positive Youth Justice Initiative was a major initiative targeting improved coordination between corrections administrators and Child Welfare. Part of this approach is looking at more than just recidivism in assessing the success of treatment, case management and programming. Both of these effort were approaches taken at the system level, even though their lens was focused on subpopulations.

All of these changes, both internal to the department as well as outside entities, lead to a complex web of approaches and interventions, such that the actions by one group to limit system exposure could also have changed procedures for all youth involved in the system. These multiple efforts make it challenging to control for or isolate the effects of probation business model and policy changes. That being, said, all these programs had similar goals around reserving terms of incarceration and out-of-home placement for those youth unable to be case managed, unresponsive to treatment, but more broadly to increase protective factors and reduce future recidivism.

---

1. Summary of Yolo’s EBP strategy

Developing a set of evaluation plans requires a policy and set of procedures to gauge adherence to standards. In 2006, 2008, and 2009, Yolo County implemented several inter-related reforms that employed guidelines for detention, pre-assessment, full assessment, case planning, and re-assessment. These reforms implemented an approach to case management adhering to Functional Family Probation, which is an integrative supervision and case management model for engaging, motivating, assessing and working successfully with high-risk youth and families. This case management strategy follows a court and case management process outlined in Figures 2 and 3, and largely adopted from national evidence on risk-needs responsivity that assess risk using a validated risk tool, make supervision decision based on the assessment, and then assess needs and develop case plans for service matching.

Figure 1: Model for Service delivery using a Risk-Need Responsive Model

11 Underlying data was adapted for analysis and exploration using a data visualization tool. This approach was intended to model good data handling and exploration techniques and serve as “mockups” for future integration in Yolo County’s main IT systems. This project data consultant wrote queries from the main databases and creating extracts, such data was not real time, but with some work could be adapted to real time (or low latency) for use in a management context.

12 Elizabeth Seigle, Nastassia Walsh, and Josh Weber, Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System (New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2014)
Juvenile Justice Model in Yolo County

This process begins with an offense, which can be dealt with in a range of ways, depending on the seriousness of the crime, risk assessment of the youth, and home environment. The process illustrates the ways youth can move from lower levels of interventions, to interventions that are more intensive. Delineation between intervention intensity levels is the point when a petition is filed with the Court, differentiating diversionary policies that avoid the juvenile being involved in the court process and those that involve more parts of the criminal justice system.

Figure 2: Yolo County Juvenile Probation Process, Pt 1

A booking into juvenile hall can lead to a secure confinement, release to an alternative program, or outright release. These booking choices are made using a risk assessment tool, which will be discussed later. If a petition is filed and sustained, the youth can be put on a form of informal supervision that includes a court disposition, but does not make the youth a ward of the court. The next level in seriousness is formal supervision, which includes formal supervision by probation. This can be for a defined period or a longer period to be decided by the court. Youth at this level of supervision are at risk for removal from the home such that these youth are then supervised more intensively by probation and referred to programs based on the youths treatment needs. Once a youth reaches this level of general supervision, the youth is then case managed according to risk assessment level, with moderate, moderate-high, and high-risk youth using Functional Family Probation. FFP combines the efforts of probation staff and family therapists to address underlying family issues, as well as other treatment modalities such as substance abuse, behavioral therapy, and other treatments.
Once the youth is at risk for removal from the home, the youth may be placed in placement prevention programs such as WRAP along with higher levels of supervision services\(^\text{13}\), which involves more members of the treatment and service community to avoid the youth being put in an Out of Home placement. When a youth is put in an out of home place, they are sent a group home. The last level is an institutional commitment for long-term custody, which may be in the Yolo County juvenile hall or the California Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ).

---

**Figure 3: Yolo County Juvenile Probation Process, Pt 2**

In Yolo County, this continuum sought to divert youth from the criminal justice or court proceedings, and then gradually increase supervision and system involvement as risk level increased. This section outlines the standardized decision-making approaches Yolo County put in place in 2006 and a process evaluation of how these different policies played out as assessment tools such as the DRAI and PACT were added to the general flow of probation services. Each of these steps involves a set of business processes based in the tenants of risk assessment and addressing dynamic needs of the youth.

\(^\text{13}\) A continuum of social services provided to the most at-risk youth in the justice system, tailored towards building strengths, promoting success, safety, and permanency in home, school, and the community.
Detention Assessment

Every juvenile booked into the Juvenile Detention Facility receives a Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (DRAI) to provide placement recommendations throughout the court process, either to a parent or guardian, or through an alternative to detention such as Electronic monitoring, Home Supervision, or GPS. The DRAI helps officers in assessing each juveniles risk to the community, themselves, and the likelihood of each juvenile returning to court for a detention hearing or jurisdictional hearing before their court hearing. The DRAI computes a score based on a battery of social and criminal history, as well as certain attributes that create a “mandatory hold”. These mandatory hold elements override the scoring of the DRAI. Mandatory holds made up 30% of all DRAI assessment in 2008 and 45% in 2013.

Table 1: Mandatory Hold Reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Hold Reasons</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolo Warrant</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707 Crime</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County Warrant</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring Failure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm Usage</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Customs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Hold</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscond</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This increase is partially because there were fewer DRAI’s being administered to youth “new” to the system as the total number of DRAI’s administered fell from near 400 to 250 in 2013. Table 1 shows that most mandatory holds are for Warrants or new crimes that required detention until court hearings. 409 youth from 2008 to 2013 were detained because of a mandatory hold making meaning 40% of the youth screened had a mandatory hold in the 5-year period. Mandatory hold rates have stayed fairly constant(Figure 4), except for the warrants, which have fluctuated, and accounted for some of the decrease in detentions is related to

![Figure 4: Multiyear Mandatory Hold Reasons](image-url)
changes in warrant policies brought about during work under a grant to come up with strategies around Disproportionate Minority Contact. The proportion of risk assessments haven’t varied significantly over time, which implies changes in detention and juvenile hall ADP are related to the number of referrals, not make up or risk profile.

The quantitative scores translate into 3 levels, with scores of 7 or below immediately being released, and scores above between 8 screened using the PACT Pre-Screen Assessment.

![Yolo County Detention Decisions, by year](image)

Detention decisions between 2009 and 2012 show a downward trend. There are three options for bookings: an outright release, a release to a detention alternative such as GPS, electronic monitoring, or a contract for home detention, and a secure detention in the juvenile hall. In looking at the processes, the combination of a using a detention screening tool (DRAI) as well as a PACT Pre-Screen Tool together give officers a fuller sense of the risk the youth pose. It also gives information about the best placement options for youth while he/she continues through the juvenile court system using risk to reoffend as a key indicator for release, in conjunction with the DRAI score.

The DRAI, as a detention screener, looks more flight at risk or risks of new crimes, while the pre-PACT looks at a range of factors. A PACT pre-screen is done to determine each minor’s level of risk to reoffend, and in the case of detention screening, to determine the need for further mental health and substance abuse assessment. The PACT Pre-Screen assessment is completed on every minor who is referred to the Yolo County Probation Department for a non-traffic offense with associated confinement time, unless they are being booking for a violation of probation or transferred in. However, minors with no prior referral, low-level crimes, no pending cases, or not already been sent to the DA’s truancy program, may be closed without a screening. The PACT Pre-screen gives more information to the probation staff and is risk based. It measure criminal history, social history, mental health, and attitudes and behavior.

---

14 [http://www.bsc.ca.gov/s_reducingracialandethnicdisparities%28r.e.d.%29subsectioncommittee.php](http://www.bsc.ca.gov/s_reducingracialandethnicdisparities%28r.e.d.%29subsectioncommittee.php)
These guidelines drive the custody decisions and as such, more research needs to be done into their use and implementation in the department. Over a 5-year period, 43% of youth screened were low risk on the DRAI, 33% moderate, and 24% high risk during the initial screen. However, youth can still be a lower risk on the DRAI, but due to mandatory holds be detained. When mandatory holds are removed, 55% are low risk, 30% medium risk, and 14% high risk.

Table 2: Comparison of DRAI-PACT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACT/DRAI Score</th>
<th>DRAI</th>
<th>PACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing the DRAI and PACT results (Table 2), more youth are coded as low risk for purposes of a detention screen, but these same youth are consider high risk for re-offense. This is mainly because the PACT takes into account more aspects in determining risk, and as such, much of this can be managed in the community outside of detention.

As an example of how this plays out, 245 juveniles were booked into the Yolo County juvenile hall (Figure 8). Of those, 136 juveniles were detained in 2012, of them 86 were held for mandatory reasons such as warrants and the nature of the crime. Using the structured decision-making tools, detention decisions can be made using multiple sources of information to then better inform case planning, as well as assess treatment needs around mental health or substance abuse.

**Figure 5: JDF Booking Outcomes for 2012**

*Trends in Juvenile Hall population*
Since 2009, the long-term trend has been down for total number of juveniles being booked into the Yolo juvenile hall. The flowchart shows the process probation follows after a juvenile is referred. Those scoring high or medium (8 or above) on the Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (DRAI)\(^{15}\) are given additional screening using the Positive Achievement Change Tool (pre-PACT)\(^{16}\) to make the final assess of detention versus other alternatives, or release. The juveniles having mandatory holds (type of offense, warrants, or history of absconds) and rating high on both risk assessments will be recommended for detentions, leaving room for overrides but only under specific situations.

Figure 2 shows the four-year decline in detention risk assessments given to every booking into the juvenile hall, with a decline of 2.3% every quarter. This assessment is where the probation department determines whether to admit the youth into the facility after the referral for booking by law enforcement. The decline in bookings has translated into fewer youths being assessed.

Since 2010, the reduction in the average daily population of the juvenile has gone from 65 during 2010, to 30 in 2012. This multiyear decline shown in figure 9 comes from two groups taking up fewer JDF beds: contract, or bed rentals, and those brought in through Yolo county law enforcement and receiving Yolo County Services. These populations are managed differently, and for the purpose of this analysis, only those brought in for Yolo County are being Bed rentals or contract beds are taken up by juveniles from jurisdictions that do not have the capacity in their local juvenile halls.

Although managed by the Yolo County juvenile facility, they are not a result of local decisions, be it law enforcement or Yolo County probation.

There has also been a decline in bed rentals over the same period, as this has made up a large portion of the juvenile hall population, usually around 50%. The decline in bed rentals can be attributed to other counties adding capacity as well as similar changes in the use of risk based

---

\(^{15}\) https://www.assessments.com/purchase/detail.asp?SKU=5229

\(^{16}\) https://www.assessments.com/purchase/detail.asp?SKU=5198
decision tools\textsuperscript{17}, as the ADP in the state for juvenile halls and camps has dropped by 30% between 2009 and the beginning of 2012. The ADP for those receiving Yolo Services went from 25 in 2010 to 14 in 2012. This group is the focus of structured decision-making around confinement and supervision. As the decline in juvenile detention ADP has progressed over the years, it is important to understand the basis for this decline in the tools probation uses to make evidence and risk based choices.

The considerations made to incarcerate youth is a complicated decision that takes into account the risk to the community of the juvenile, legal issues, as well as what is an evidence based response to reduce recidivism for the juvenile. In the last 5 years, Yolo County Juvenile probation underwent a large-scale change in how it assesses juveniles for risk to the community, with a focus on only holding those that pose the highest risk to community, mandatorily held by law, or risk of not appearing in court. During this same time, the total number of referrals to probation has fallen. The change in decision making as well as change in the county crime rate has led to a steep decline in the daily population of the juvenile hall. In addition, only juveniles deemed moderate-high risks are case managed by probation field services during the evaluation period. This targeted intervention strategy prioritizes supervision and treatment resources for higher risk youth. National evidence shows that this

\textsuperscript{17} http://www.bscca.ca.gov/programs-and-services/fso/resources/juvenile-detention-profile
approach will drive down recidivism, and result in better outcomes for youth.

This analysis will show that the reduction in referrals to probation, as well as implementing evidence based protocols has led to fewer people under juvenile supervision and securely detained. Yolo County is also part of a longer term, national downward trends in youth crime and incarceration.\(^{18}\)

Bookings are largely controlled by law enforcement agencies such that the flow of referrals is usually for new law violations. There has been a 30% decline in total referrals, with a 25% decline in referrals for new law crimes. This reduction means fewer juveniles encountering the juvenile justice system, resulting in fewer beds being taken up in the juvenile hall (Figure 10).

Fresh Arrest have historically made up the majority of bookings (Figure 11), followed by Violations of Probation, Warrants, and Court Ordered Detention.

Discretionary bookings grew in 2013, after hitting a low in 2012. The length of stay for discretionary reasons declined during the evaluation period, but rebounded in 2013. Of the 450 bookings in 2013, 140 were for youth being booked for VOPs, warrants, and court ordered detention with 45 of the youth being booking multiple times in calendar year 2013. As a proportion of discretionary bookings, VOPs returned to their 2010 levels of 90, to around 40% of all juvenile hall admissions. (Figure 12)

![Figure 9: JDF Booking Proportion](image)

Minors who score High, Moderately High, or Moderate risk to reoffend are given a Full PACT. These results may then be for determining the appropriate services, levels of supervision, and

---


incorporated into the FFP case management approach. These strengths and risks are used for the following goals:

I. Identify dynamic factors that place the minor at risk to re-offend;
II. Identify the areas of strength specific to the minor and family;
III. Develop a case plan targeting the areas of need;
IV. Make targeted, cost-effective service referrals that minimize the minor’s exposure to new or existing risk factors;
V. Monitor the minor’s success; and
VI. Assist the court at disposition.

Minors are re-assessed for Risks and needs every 6 months or when there is a significant change in their situation. Of the 2,500 PACTs, 567 were for initial assessment and 1800 were for re-assessment. Similar to the downward trend in 2012 and 2013 in youth being booked into the juvenile hall, there was also a downturn in the number of initial and re-assessment indicating fewer new youth were coming into contact with probation. There was also a large scale decline in reassessments which may be in part due to fewer youth coming through the system, as reassessments can come from a range of circumstances, as well as turning 18 years old.

The assessment instrument measures a youth’s risk and protective factors in the following domains: Criminal History, School, Use of Free Time, Employment, Relationships, Family, Living Arrangements, Alcohol and Drugs, Mental Health, Attitudes/Behaviors, Aggression, and Skills. These are included in the disposition report to the court, Deferred Entry of Judgment (DEJ) reports, 654.2 behavioral reports, or others that could affect the minors

---

20 A significant change may include, but is not limited to, arrest, a custody episode of 30 days or more, substance abuse, death of a loved one, divorce in the family, behavior change, habitual truancy, change in mental health, return from placement, special program completion, disruption in living arrangement and/or school issues, re-admissions to school district, completion of counseling service, obtaining employment, high school graduation or GED certification, etc.
disposition by the court. Further, minors in out of home placement, participating in intensive community treatment, or at risk of out of home placement also received PACT assessments.

The PACT scores the minor’s dynamic risk and dynamic protective factors. These are called dynamic because they are changeable, in comparison to static risk which is based on past events. These factors combined can summarize the progression a youth is making in a number of areas of intervention. Using the PACT’s survey scoring algorithm, each youth assessed is given a protective and risk factors generate sub scores.

Table 3: Dynamic Risk scores of Initial Assessment, by Static Risk Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static Risk</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Protective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each youth brings a mix of strengths and risks these are instructive to the progress of supervision as well as the criminogenic needs being addressed during supervision and treatment. Using each youth’s initial PACT assessment gives a profile of the population, as shown in table 3. Ideally, a youth’s protective factor score will increase and risk factors decline as the youth is re-assessed. Static risk is also re-assessed, and generally changes when there is a new interaction with law enforcement. As expected, youth with higher dynamic protective factors have lower dynamic risk factors, as well as lower static risk assessment. The scores above are derived from the survey questions in structure interview process, and as such are helpful in determining a trajectory of change, or relative factors.

Table 4: Age at First Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at First Arrest</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 and Under</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 14</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-16 show descriptions of survey responses from initial assessment of those most likely to be case managed at the outset, those with high, moderate-high, and moderate risk levels. Disaggregated from the risk scores in table 3, these question responses are processed using propriety algorithm within the PACT’s automated assessment scoring to come up with a score, both over-all and within domains. The list below is a sampling and works as a demography of Yolo juvenile supervision at the point of initial assessment. These can also be used to form comparison groups in subsequent research, or expand cross tabulation between questions.

Table 5: History of Referrals for Misdemeanors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misdemeanor Referrals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or one</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or four</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: History of Referrals for Felonies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Felony Referrals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: School History: School Attendance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance in the most Recent School Term</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No unexcused absences</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good attendance; few excused absences</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some partial-day unexcused absences</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some full-day unexcused absences</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual truant</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: School History: Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance in the most recent School term</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honor student (mostly A’s)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 3.0 (mostly A’s and B’s)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 to 3.0 (mostly B’s and C’s, no F’s)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Based on Yolo’s protocols there may be low risk supervised though an override, but in general low risk youth do not receive the same treatment or supervision dosage as higher risk levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 to 2.0 (mostly C's and D's, some F's)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1.0 (some D's and mostly F's)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Peers: History of Anti-Social Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Anti-Social peers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had pro-social friends</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had anti-social friends</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been a gang member/associate</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never had consistent friends or companions</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: History of Court Ordered Out of Home Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out of home placements</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No out-of-home placements exceeding 30 days</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 out-of-home placement</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 out-of-home placements</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more out-of-home placements</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: History of Running Away for being kick out of a home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Running away from home or Being Kicked Out</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No history of running away or being kicked out</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 instance of running away/kicked out</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 instances of running away/kicked out</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 instances of running away/kicked out</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 instances of running away/kicked out</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12: History of Interaction with incarcerated adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Jail or Prison for those involved in the household</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never anyone in jail or prison involved in the house for more than 3 months</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one currently involved who has been to jail or prison</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13: Problem History of Parents currently involved in the household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem history of parents who are currently involved in the household</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No current problems</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mental health 9%
Physical health 9%
Employment 18%

Table 14: History of Physical Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Physical Abuse</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a victim of physical abuse</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized by family member</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized by someone outside the family</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized at home</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized in a foster/group home</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacked with a weapon</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: History of Drug and Alcohol Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Drug and Alcohol Use</th>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some use</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrupted education</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused family conflict</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfered with keeping pro-social friends</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused health problems</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to criminal behavior</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed increasing amounts to achieve same level of intoxication or high</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor experienced withdrawal problems</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Mental Health History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Health History</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No history of mental health problem(s)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosed with mental health problem(s)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mental health medication(s) prescribed</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mental health treatment prescribed</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health treatment and medication(s) prescribed</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results were consistent over the study period and as such represent a demographic portrait at initial assessment. How youth change is important as many of the above tables are historical, such that the case management approach would target current issues for treatment and services. However, the model consistently re-assesses youth at an interval of 6 months, and after any positive or negative event. This makes discerning progress in certain factors more difficult as there tends to be negative relationship between number of re-assessments and protective factors (Youth’s with more re-assessments have lower protective factors scores) as
well as positive relationship with risk factors (youth with more re-assessments have higher risk factor scores). Since there is not a clear identifier in the re-assessment data for the reason for re-assessment, it makes quantifying progress difficult since each youth is on a different trajectory and each re-assessment may mean different things.

Summary of Recidivism Using New Referrals
A 2-year follow-up year recidivism study of 908 youth risk assessed for their first offense between the July 2008 and June 2010, showed 27% had a subsequent referral or new arrest, with 6% being referred for a new subsequent felony. Compared to national juvenile recidivism rates, this is 5 percentage points below similarly defined juvenile recidivism rates. Most national studies site a 33% re-offense rate for juvenile offenders. 22 When controlling for the risk of the minor, low risk youth had new referrals 20% of the time, with 4% for a new felony.

The majority of re-offense happened within the first 200 days of assessment, with 80% being referred to probation within 400 days.

Of the 222 youth with subsequent referrals, 74% were for misdemeanor referrals. Table 17 shows the percent of offenses that 48% of the new referrals were crimes against people, with 20% of them being at the felony level.

Table 17: Re-Offense by level and Type of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-offense Type</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Sex Crimes</th>
<th>Drug and Alcohol</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 222 youth with a new referral, 41% were only referred once, 67% twice, and 33% 3 times or more. Since the majority of the new referrals were for misdemeanors, further study is needs to understand the crime patters underlying the recidivism data.

A relatively small number of crimes made up the bulk of new crimes by penal code section, with the top 10 crime codes making up 60% of the first referred crimes.

### Table 18: Most serious Re-Offense, by percent of all Re-Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pc 242 : Battery-With-Serious-Bodily-Injury</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc 459 : Burglary</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs 11357(B) : Possess-Marijuana0-Under-1-Oz</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc 490.5(A) : Petty-Theft-Retail-Merchandise/Etc</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc 484(A) &amp; 490.5(A) : Petty Theft Of Retail Merchandise</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vc 12500(A) : Drive-W/O-License</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc 647(F) : Disorderly-Conduct</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc 415.5(A)(1) : Fight-College/University</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs 11357(E) : Possession Of Marijuana</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc 594(A)(B)(2)(A) : Misdemeanor Vandalism</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since this analysis was formed from the goal of informing the validity of the pre-PACT, a different cohort may yield more generalized results, applicable to a larger section of the population. 23 Although every youth involved in the system would have had an initial crime and an assessment, the dynamic nature of assessment means measuring from multiple places and decision points gives the fullest view. Since this recidivism review only summarizes those “new” to probation and follows them for two years, a subsequent study design could use a longer follow-up period. Focusing on different types of recidivism, while controlling for other factors gives the fullest picture of how youth are faring on supervision.

---

23 The results of the recidivism results were then put into data visualization for Yolo staff to interactively query to see subpopulations and trends. The screenshots of this feature are in the appendix.
2. Implementation and Technology Management

The project was designed to develop evaluation practices, automated systems, and quality control procedures. By increasing the capacity to monitor the tools used to make decisions, the project sought to provide better information to make case management or county system choices. This mix of policy, practices, and information systems provided a challenging set of operational and choices to project manage. Since the project's focus was more on administrative and operational questions, it did not necessarily focus on doing an evaluation of a particular process or practice. This “evaluation of evaluation services” created challenges of creating attainable milestones and deliverables since the goal of the project was to create a system of best practices, documents, and approaches to support an evolving use of research and data in decision-making. Ideally, this would drive down the cost, time, and complexity of delivering relevant program information based on a substantial and high-quality database of juveniles.

There were unforeseeable challenges around technology systems soon after the project plan was implemented, not so much from the systems themselves, but a state of limbo emerged as to whether proposed changes in assessment and CMS systems in 2012 reduced the value of developing reports or system improvements for the project. Most of the quantitative work focused on extraction of data using standard SQL tools and merging for a single report or purpose, instead of the original goal of a more integrated case and risk/needs assessment system with evidence-based reports. New investments of time and resources were suspended in 2012 and the agreement with the external vendor of assessment software was discontinued in December 2012. Internal data collection was complicated by parallel data collection efforts around FFP implementation supported by an outside training institute[^24] that caused staff to enter data into spreadsheets outside of their normal workflow, which would have otherwise been integrated into the case management system. Gaps in information sharing between care providers as well as use of administrative data for measuring some of probation interactions resulted in a substantial amount of staff time devoted to cleaning up case files, and removing erroneous data.

The external project team was loosely affiliated and created a challenging project management task for the Probation Program Manager in terms of deadline, scope, and quality. There were several roles envisioned in the grant:

- Yolo Probation Manager

• External contract-funded research and data analyst
• External evaluator of assessment tool and programming
• External vendor for training and booster of risk assessment and motivational interviewing
• External vendor for training on assessment of community programs

The complexity of initiatives and contracting led to multiple efforts and subprojects, on top of a rather ambitious effort in data extraction to support the other work efforts. The components of the project are all key pieces in a high performing quality assurance process such that pieces of all these were developed, but challenges arose in integrating them into Yolo County’s workflow, policies, and processes.

A major barrier to evaluation, as well as efficient use of probation data for answering questions of efficacy and policy is the expense of developing programming scripts, which is typical of a process called “ETL”, or Extract, Transform, and Load. This data warehousing process creates routines to take data from a system of databases, merge or change the structure based on the need, and then load the transformed data into a location for further analysis. Because so much project time was spent on ETL, there was limited project time for analysis. A peripheral goal of the JABG project was to share data extracts and analysis scripts where possible, to aid other counties in the extraction of information. The appendix of this report contains some of the extraction code.

The ability to access assessment history as well as event history have given Yolo County a rich set of information to design reporting and evaluation functionality. However, the initial mapping was not followed up by the information technology resources or long term systems investment in queries and reporting logic, given new systems and assessment tools were being considered. The Assessments.com \(^{25}\) “DataMart” is an MS Access database shell over a SQL server database which contains results from youth assessed using the DRAI (Detention Risk Assessment Instrument) upon booking into the juvenile hall and the PACT (Positive Achievement Change Tool) as a short proxy tool and the longer full-PACT to determine supervision plans.

The Yolo County probation department uses the probation module of Lawsuite, a SQL server web based case management system developed by the Yolo County Information Technology Department. In place since 2009, the case management system has modules for juvenile court, detention, supervision, and referrals. The probation module is linked to the District Attorney’s to allow for integration of court actions within the same database. The unique person ID also

\(^{25}\) https://www.assessments.com/default.asp
translates into the Adult probation module such that a complete Yolo County criminal history is available.

The management of the analysis lacked centralization due to the focus of the data extraction and report building by an off-site research and data consultant. The project initially envisioned training and handing off analysis and evaluation functions done under the grant by the research and data consultant, but Yolo County staff was never identified and role confusion ensued around other competing projects. Further, having the contract research and data consultant being embedded in the department may have caused a lack of objectivity in assessing or advising due to experience with confounding factors inside the department, as well as exposure to internal management discussions. The project also funded the participation of an external evaluator to complete a more evaluation of the project progress, as well as the impact. The external evaluator participated in some of the initial work, but there was never substantial progress on an evaluation framework. It was decided in 2013 to forgo a formal external evaluation and focus on a descriptive report.
3. Developing Quality Assurance

Quality assurance is the maintenance of a desired level of quality to adherence to the Functional Family Probation model, especially attention to every stage of the process as laid out by the model program. Since FFP follows a staged model, the ability of Yolo County probation officers to engage youth at each level is key to the success of the model. Setting minimum standards and benchmarks that are linked to the department’s policies and procedures ensures officers and managers are working toward the same end. Using common definitions and measures, Yolo County attempted to track progress toward shared short-term goals, with the assumption that FFP, as an evidence-based program, would reduce recidivism in the long term.

Yolo County Probation, consistent with the research, is routinely using risk assessment tools to determine level of recidivism risk and inform case planning, and is implementing several evidence-based corrections and mental health programs. In addition to FFP, individuals on probation (and their families) may need interventions focused in the following areas:

- Stable and safe housing
- Completing education or obtaining employment
- Treating mental health disorders
- Treating substance use disorders
- Treating physical health conditions
- Improving family or interpersonal relationships

Agencies that effectively utilize evaluation and quality assurance can ensure fidelity to EBPs. Through their use of quality assurance and evaluation, these agencies can also encourage the development of new EBPs and encourage employee development.

Agencies would also be able to understand:

- If their practices are effective in achieving the desired outcomes;
- If their practices result in unexpected outcomes;
- If practices are being implemented as intended; and
- If their clients and stakeholders are satisfied.

Quality assurance gives insight into the departments evidence-based work, how well it is doing it, and if it is leading to the desired outcomes. Additionally, an active quality assurance plan can connect the dots between what happens on a day-to-day basis and the achievement of desired outcomes. Additionally, quality assurance allows employees ongoing opportunities for skill development and leadership.

Initially, a quality assurance group called the “CQAC” or the Continuous Quality Assurance Committee was formed in Yolo to plan quality assurance activities as well as be a working group around making improvements. This group met to plan the logic model and data dictionary early in 2011, but was never fully operationalized due to uncertainty with future risk assessment approaches as well as the vendor of QA technical assistance not being available to deliver the services.
Going forward, Yolo County Probation should focus on the following areas to either measure or create quality standards and assurance:

1. **Create a group to oversee quality standards that ensure the interventions.** Yolo supports are targeted to youth at medium or higher risk of future system involvement, and develop ways of ensure program fidelity of those services. There is growing research on the negative effects of implementing evidence-based programs poorly, such that outcomes may not match model results. Yolo County already maintains a written protocol for a number of incremental steps around assessment and case planning.

2. **Assess validity and reliability of new risk/needs tool on the local population.** Although the county may be moving to a new risk/needs assessment package, this does not change the need to use a validated risk tool to direct services and treatment. The assessment stage needs to be normalized to the general populations as well as accurate based on gender and race. The new tools will also require new training on their operation and use, such that this provides an opportunity to re-train staff on risk theory as well as the practical role of risk assessment in juvenile case management.

3. **Match services based on Case Plans and Assessment.** Using a validated tool to develop cases gives clearer guidance about the dynamic factors of the youth under supervision. Yolo Probation should provide service agencies with population needs data, and then ensure providers have the appropriate treatment programs and delivery to address the needs of Yolo County youth. By continuing to track service referral data, Yolo probation can begin to see how service referrals are doing. This data should be separated from case notes and clearly delineated in the case management system for easy categorization. This should ensure dosage hours of supervision, programming, or confinement are related to a case plan.

4. **Assess Quality Assurance for various points in the system.** The experience of Yolo County with efforts like Positive Youth Justice Initiative and RED(Racial and Ethnic Disparities) through the Burns Institute has made use of an approach of quality assurance that looks at various system decision points using aggregate data to then inquire and modify system choices. Although focused on the experiences of crossover youth and racial disparities respectively, this approach can be used internal in probation to look at various points in the system and better ensure quality processes and fidelity by using standard reports and sharing them widely.

5. **Increase the role of the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) to communicate about program implementation.** The training in CPC gives Yolo County a group of officers trained in a rigorous approach to internally assessing programs in their community. The “train the trainers” model also mean this could be expanded to other officers(with oversight by the provider, University of Cincinnati) and continue to provide feedback and review of programs, as well as re-assessing the organization done under JABG grant(Communicare and the Yolo Juvenile Hall)

6. **Continue to choose programs and approaches that, based on the best research, are proven to work.** In recent years, there have been a number of efforts to develop “clearinghouses” of effective interventions (and other areas of social policy) based on rigorous research work. These clearinghouses use approaches such as meta-analysis to aggregate multiple studies of programming to compute an “effect size” that can approximate the scale of change the program
has, as well as the chance that it will have a positive result if implemented with fidelity. Not all programs will be included in these clearinghouse, but attempts to match program attributes to a larger database of effective programs can help in choosing from local programs, as well as advocating for the use of brand name programs shown to work.²⁶

7. **Expand the use of system data to inform system choices.** Work with Yolo IT to develop standard reports from case management as well as assessment systems to show outputs and summary reports, as well as be able to create datasets for more analytic needs of power users and external researchers. Building capacity for this can be done by developing and training appropriate staff in basic aspects of software like Microsoft Excel. Modern database software has become customizable and capable of delivering on-demand data to users and some of this should be explored using the existing SQL server reporting features. Yolo County possesses high quality data and should expand its utility.

Although Yolo was not able to implement a quality assurance program, it still has significant resources to do its work in conjunction with a quality control plan. Yolo County has implemented a number of ingredients consistent with a quality assurance program, but tying these all together will require management, line staff, IT staff, and analytic capacity. Yolo County has a rich collection of juvenile data that has been well maintained and developed, but the lack of access to the correct type of data at times gave the perception Yolo County did not have the required data to do various types of analysis. The lack of data availability was more an issue of planning and resources, as the raw data is available to create a robust quality assurance program, based in a data driven process but linked to an engaged team of managers and line staff.

²⁶ Websites such as [crimesolutions.org](http://crimesolutions.org), [WSIPP](http://wsipp.org), [What Works Clearinghouse](http://www2.ed.gov/whatworks), and [Pew’s Results-First Evidence Gateway](http://www.pecg.org) have developed large databases of a range of programs for juvenile justice populations.
4. Risk Assessment Validation and Evaluating System Outcomes

A key component of the Yolo County business model for case managing youth is the use of the Positive Achievement in Change Tool (PACT) in making choices in supervision levels. The PACT and its shorter proxy version is used in 29 California counties27 for assessing both risk of re-offense for youth, as well as needs for services. Research has shown that a comprehensive evidence-based approach—assessing risk, matching supervision and treatment to an offender’s risk level and targeting criminogenic risk factors with proven programs—reduces recidivism through the concept of risk needs responsivity.

Although not able to fully assess the validity of the PACT in the context of Yolo County, the project looks at the amount and nature of re-offense after a youth’s first referral to law enforcement, using youth referred for their first offense between July 30, 2008 to June 30, 2010. The approach uses the first assessment by Yolo probation with the pre-PACT to assess each youth for static risk based on the offense. An initial assessment showed higher risk level was correlated with higher re-offense, such that youth shown to be low risk at first assessment reoffended at lower rates than those rated as moderate, moderate-high, or high.

The Yolo County Probation Department has implemented a policy to institutionalize the use of the PACT in 2008. The Yolo County Probation Department started a policy in 2008 that requires all DPOs in Juvenile services to assess and reassess minors assigned to their caseloads at defined intervals as part of a plan to enhance case management services.

In 2008, staff began completing the PACT assessment utilizing an automated system. Additionally, the Yolo County Probation Department was in the process of developing an automated case plan that will build on the PACT assessment instrument as part of an enhanced case management process. The case management process would provide a more consistent and objective foundation for determining appropriate services based upon the needs of the minor. Youth with higher risk scores are then assessed for dynamic needs based on the interventions that probation can use to reduce recidivism in the future. These higher risk youth were then placed in the FFP supervision/treatment model.

One constraint of the validation method is the assessments could not be broken out to the numerical score, such that cutoffs could not be assessed, limiting the analysis to only categorical risk variables. During the PACT assessment process, the survey tool generates and weights risk using a series of questions on static risk that are then quantified and an algorithm applied. This quantification is done inside the assessment database, and the algorithm is not publically available. Ideally, a more robust validation would have included the ability to assess

27 http://public.tableausoftware.com/views/ProbationSystemsList/Introduction#1
individual questions, as well as relative scores in different modules of the PACT. That being said, descriptive statistics can determine if the categories were correctly predicting future offense and point the way toward a more robust validation analysis.

Table 19: Demographics of Validity Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>% of Sample Assessment</th>
<th>% of All Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~High</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Mod-High</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Moderate</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Low</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Male</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Female</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Under 12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~13-14</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~15</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Over 16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Hispanic</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~White</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Black</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Asian/PI</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Native American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To develop a sample of similarly situated youth, all youth having an assessment between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010 were queried and using questions within the PACT survey, only those being assessed for their first arrest or first assessment/interaction with probation. This approach to developing a cohort may contain some room for error based on incorrect responses to whether the youth had previous misdemeanor or felony referrals. However, probation practice is to check multiple sources and criminal history files, which mitigates the risk of false attribution. This method analyzes youth who are similarly situated with this being their first interaction with probation services. The validity of a risk assessment tool to properly predict youth with no previous criminal history is important since case management choices and services are based on these initial classifications.

Using this method, the 908 youth were largely similar demographically to the larger population screen during the same time. However, they were risk assessed at a lower level than the general population. An explanation may be that these were first time offenders, where the larger population contains youth who would have had previous referrals and a higher risk profile. The other demographic difference was the group in the study sample skewed slightly older, as well as more females.
Table 20 below shows the percentage of the population assessed at different PACT risk scores by gender and further subdivided by race. For example, of the 240 females assessed, 35% were white. Of the white females, 86% were low risk. The nested table shows the percentage in terms of gender and race, instead of a percentage of the whole population. This analysis shows certain subpopulations are distributed very different in basic demography. For example, African American boys and girls both make up a smaller proportion of low risk assessments than other races, and within African Americans, girls have higher risk assessment scores.

Table 20: Multivariate Assessment Population: Race, Gender, and Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Female (n=240)</th>
<th>Male (n=668)</th>
<th>Grand Total (n=908)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White (n=300)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic or Latino (n=436)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African American (n=91)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian/PI (n=28)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native American/Alaskan (n=18)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (n=36)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Assessment Validity

Yolo juvenile probation case manages Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-risk youth using Functional Family Probation. Using this practice, 222 of the 908 would have been actively case managed based on their initial assessment score. Since this validity approach is aimed at identifying the ability of the PACT to correctly sort youth at the point of first interaction with the justice system, it doesn’t take into account other dynamic factors that may change as time passes after the youth’s assessment, both in terms of risk factors, as well as protective factors. A new offense was defined as a new referral to probation for either a felony or misdemeanor, which excludes youth referred for technical violations, infractions, or status offenses. Further research into recidivism would take into account more factors to control for a wider range of factors. However, for the purpose of this report, the priority was to determine the ability of the PACT to correctly categorize low risk youth from youth who would be case managed and required more statistical analysis, as well as access to data in a format different than available during the project.

Ideally, higher risk score categories would correlate with higher re-offense rate. The re-offense rate showed the risk assessment correctly differentiated low risk offenders from high risk offenders, but was less accurate with moderate risk youth. One theory for the discontinuity in higher risk youth recidivism rates is moderate and moderate-high risk assessment levels receive lower levels of service and treatment dosage at the onset than those with the high initial risk level. Since Yolo’s service delivery model focused treatment and service dosage on higher risk youth, referrals to programs like Functional Family Therapy(FFT), which have high effect sizes28 in generating reducing recidivism in youth on probation29, may have had an impact on this results. However, the quality assurance aspect of the project was not fully implemented and the sample of high risk youth may not be large enough to clearly show how much of the effect can be attributed to Yolo probation’s programming or referral protocol.

---

28 Effect size is a quantitative measure of the strength of a phenomenon. Effect-sizes always compare two variables, but can do so in different ways and in the context of program outcomes and defining evidence based programs, are used in meta-analysis to combine the results of various studies. This results can then be applied in different jurisdictions, assuming similar levels of implementation, to get an expected recidivism reduction, or range of results. The Washington State Institute of Public Policy uses this approach in then develop cost benefits models for the recidivism for program likes FFT and others. http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/32
Table 21: Risk Level by % reoffending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>No Re-offense</th>
<th>Re-offense</th>
<th>Total(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk(n)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square= 21.9087  Pr= 0.000

The initial results from the study showed 27% of the 908 youth had a subsequent referral for a non-status offense during the 2-year follow-up period. The chi-square results show a highly significant difference between the categories of risk and re-offense rates, such that we can be confident that these differences are not random. Without continuous data on how the actual scores were distributed, we are limited to categorical data analysis, for which chi-square tests of significance are a common tool. The instrument failed to differentiate moderate, moderate-high, and high risk youth, such that the distribution of re-offense for moderate youth is higher than high risk youth. From a case management point of view, this difference may not effect who received services or treatment in general, but it does indicate a need for further research or quality assurance into the cutoffs for determining higher risk levels, or norming of the PACT to Yolo County’s population. The difference can come from Yolo’s population as compared to the population the PACT compares results, but it can also be drawn from how the survey was carried out. The reliability of the tool, when scored by different people, can be managed through a robust quality assurance plan that supports officers in their skills at assessing juveniles, as well as providing ongoing training in the risk assessment tool.

Further work in risk tool validation would norm the tool to be accurate for a number of sub populations. Most typically, the norming of the tool would tailor the scores to Yolo’s juvenile population and demographics. Using the initial risk assessment scores across race and gender,
subpopulations emerge as useful scales to explore the validity of the tool across demographics features. That being said, none of these is criminogenic, but in norming risk assessments to a population, there needs to be some adaptation to local population characteristics.

**Univariate Analysis of Re-offense Factors**

The work of norming the population starts with univariate analysis, but quickly needs to move to multivariate analysis as people have multiple characteristics and many of these can interact. Figures 13-15 show the source of some of the inconstancy in the risk assessment as low risk youth are generally correctly identified, with the exception of African American youth, who appear to be mis-categorized such that low risk African Americans provided substantial “false negatives” such that low risk youth were re-offending more often than expected.

![Figure 13: Percent Arrested During Follow-Up, by Gender and Risk](image1)

![Figure 14: Percent Arrested During Follow-Up, by Race and Risk Assessment](image2)
Multivariate Analysis: Controlling for Youth Background Characteristics

Using a multivariate analysis, such as logistic regression, gives a more accurate picture in determining which variables, when looked at individually and as a group of variables, are explanatory for whether the youth reoffended. Ideally, the PACT would show re-offense rising with the level of risk assessment such that a low Risk youth is recidivating at a lower rate than a high-risk youth.

This assumes everyone in the population is similarly situated and variance between the expected results are driven by the tool itself, or something endogenous (outside) of what the tool uses to assess for risk and protective factors. The prior focus on the univariate relationship between the PACT and re-offense is a step toward then controlling for variation caused across variables identified in a youth’s background, or things that are not crimogenically dynamic. This analysis provides additional factors that may influence the validity of how well the PACT predicts recidivism. These factors include age at assessment, gender, race/ethnicity, whether the youth would have been case managed, and the amount of dosage hours under FFP. Table 22 presents the results from a logistic regression analysis of the total sample. We see that, even controlling for other factors that might be related to recidivism, a low risk assessment is still significantly related to low levels of re-offense. Other factors are also related to re-offense: age (not being in the youngest or oldest age group\textsuperscript{31}), being male (as opposed to being female), being African American (as opposed to being white), and being under probation supervision at the outset of the follow-up period. The overall measure of the model yielded a F-test of p>0.000 meaning the regression was valid, and an r-squared of .32 meaning there was some explanatory power in its construction. The r-square implies the items in the regression explains some amount of the variation in

\textsuperscript{31} The square of age at assessment is used as a factor to control for the non-linear relationship between age and re-offense, the likelihood of offense is low when someone is youngest, increases for a few years, then in general declines over time.
the population, around 32%, such that other factors need to be assessed to better understand the variance in population. Since the individual risk scores were ineffective at distinguishing those not low risk, a proxy was used for all those case managed since this was Yolo’s County’s practice.

The factors statistically correlated with re-offense are age, and whether the person was case managed using FFP. This analysis show that youth who were supervised by probation had a statistically significant difference in re-offense as those not low risk recidivated at a rate 12% higher than those not supervised, i.e. low risk. When controlling for multiple factors like race, age, and gender it points to a positive validity of the assessment tool in sorting youth at first assessment. However, a study that is more rigorous would be needed to determine the proper adjustments to risk cutoff levels as well as a complete validation of the risk assessment, coupled with inter-rater reliability testing.

Table 22: Logistic Regression Results for Re-Offense during Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number of obs = 908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>76.4552496</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9221785</td>
<td>F( 7, 901) = 60.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>162.54475</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>.180404828</td>
<td>R-squared = 0.3199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>.263215859</td>
<td>Root MSE = .42474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| re-offense | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|------|---------------------|
| Age        | .0956798 | .0106168 | 9.01 | 0.000 | .0748433 to .1165163 |
| Age^2      | -.0049809 | .0006194 | -8.04 | 0.000 | -.0061966 to -.0037652 |
| Male       | .028671 | .0321474 | 0.89 | 0.373 | -.0344215 to .0917635 |
| Black      | -.0088057 | .0487966 | -.18 | 0.857 | -.1045738 to .0869625 |
| White      | -.0587767 | .0319972 | -1.84 | 0.067 | -.1215744 to .004021 |
| Other      | -.0998712 | .0509285 | -1.96 | 0.050 | -.1998234 to .000081 |
| Supervised | .1236744 | .033408 | 3.70 | 0.000 | .0581079 to .1892409 |
5. Correctional Planning Checklist (CPC)

During the grant phase, the implementation of the Correctional Planning checklist gave Yolo County a framework to engage with agencies and community service providers around how services were being delivered in adherence with models of “what works” in corrections. The CPC was a tool developed by the University Of Cincinnati (UC) as a way to uniformly review services and materials. In 2012, 2 UC staff trained a cohort of 8 Yolo County probation officers and staff in the “train the trainers” model such that Yolo county probation could expand the scope and use of the CPC in the community to other providers and institutions. During the grant period, Yolo County reviewed the work of Communicare, a community behavioral health provider, and the Yolo County Juvenile Hall, overseen by the Yolo County Probation Department.

The CPC is a tool developed to assess correctional intervention programs, and is used to ascertain how closely correctional programs meet known principles of effective intervention. Several recent studies conducted by the University of Cincinnati on both adult and juvenile programs were used to develop and validate the indicators on the CPC. These studies found strong correlations with outcome between overall scores, domain areas and individual items.

Programs that adhere to the principles of effective intervention are more likely to impact criminal reoffending. Specifically, correctional research suggests that cognitive behavioral and social learning models of treatment for offenders are associated with considerable reductions in recidivism.

The CPC is divided into two basic areas: capacity and content. The capacity area is designed to measure whether a correctional program has the capability to deliver evidence-based interventions and services for offenders. There are three domains in the capacity area including: (1) Leadership and Development; (2) Staff; and (3) Quality Assurance. The content area focuses on the substantive domains of: (1) Offender Assessment; and (2) Treatment Characteristics. This area evaluates the extent to which the program meets the principles of risk, need, responsivity, and treatment.

32 The CPC is modeled after the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory developed by Gendreau and Andrews; however, the CPC includes a number of items not contained in the CPAI. In addition, items that were not found to be positively correlated with recidivism were deleted.

33 These studies involved over 40,000 offenders (both adult and juvenile), and over 400 correctional programs, ranging from institutional to community based. All of the studies are available at www.uc.edu/criminaljustice. A large part of this research involved the identification of program characteristics that were correlated with outcome.
This process is meant to collaborative and iterative, such that CPC results are generated to begin a dialogue about to improve services delivery. The assessed agency is given an initial report for review, as well as a correction sheet I which the agency can correct an errors or omissions.

There are several limitations to the CPC that should be noted. First, the instrument is based upon an “ideal” program. The criteria have been developed from a large body of research and knowledge that combines the best practices from the empirical literature on “what works” in reducing recidivism. Second, as with all applied research, objectivity and reliability are an issue. Although steps are taken to ensure that the information gathered is accurate and reliable, given the nature of the process, decisions about the information and data gathered are invariably made by the assessor(s). Third, the process is time specific. That is, the assessment is based on the program at the time of the assessment. Though changes or modifications may be under development, only those activities and processes that are present at the time of the review are considered for scoring. Fourth, the process does not take into account all “system” issues that can affect the integrity of the program.

Yolo County Probation and Community Treatment Provider CommuniCare Health Centers have a close relationship, with the majority of juvenile referrals for services going to Communicare for various cognitive and behavioral health needs.

Table 23: Case File Sample of Dosage and Treatment Offerings at Communicare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Dosage Hours</th>
<th>Number of Juveniles</th>
<th>Average Dosage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Council Group</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Circle Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression Replacement Therapy (ART)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis Youth (CYT) Group</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Substance Abuse Group (CBI-SA)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral/ Family Hours (Not FFT)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy (FFT)</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing Parenting Program (NPP)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillstreaming Group</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Group</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Therapy</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake/Assessment</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Life Choices (PLC) Group</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking for a Change (T4C) Group</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communicare provides a range of interventions for juveniles and based on a case file review of 229 youth at first assessment, 104 youth between 2010 and 2012 received 4,000 dosage hours of treatment (See table 23). Levels of engagement varied as did referral programs such that further case file review and study design would be needed to fully assess the fidelity of name brand models offered by Communicare, as well as determine relative effectiveness.

Yolo County probation wanted to know if the programs they referred their juvenile probationers to adhering to certain principles of effective interventions. The principles of effective interventions include concepts like leadership, staffing quality assurance from administrative point of view, as well as a focus on substantive areas such as offender assessment and treatment characteristics. After completing the CPC, the results were shared with Communicare, which gave Communicare the opportunity to respond to the results.

The report is designed to give both parties a framework for continually assessing and improving service delivery in the following areas:

**Capacity**

1. Program Leadership and Development

The first CPC domain examines the program director’s qualifications and previous experience, as well as his/her current involvement with the staff and the program participants. This section of the CPC assesses the degree of support received by the program from both the at-large and criminal justice communities. Lastly, this domain considers the stability of the program, including the adequacy of funding to provide rehabilitative services.

2. Staffing

This section of the CPC pertains to the staffing of the program, and includes staff qualification, experience, stability, training, supervision, and involvement in decisions. Staff considered in this section include, all full-time and part-time internal and external providers who conduct groups or deliver direct service/treatment to the participants. Excluded from this group is support staff, as well as the program director that was evaluated in the previous section.

---

34 For the purposes of better understanding the impact of treatment dosage on the validity of the risk assessment, the project team used the same group of youth who would have been managed under FFP to initiate a case file review. Communicare staff worked diligently to provide cases as well as supporting documentation. Their work on providing total dosage hours by youth and service type, although not able to inform overall effectiveness due to study design limitation, was much appreciated and lays the ground work for future work and quality assurance work.
3. Quality Assurance

This CPC domain centers on the quality assurance and evaluation processes used to monitor how well the program is functioning. Specifically, this section examines the type of feedback, assessments, and evaluations used to monitor the program.

Content

4. Offender Assessment

The purpose of this domain is to determine if offenders are appropriate for the services being provided. Additionally, it reviews if the program utilizes validated assessments tools to determine risk, need, and responsivity (RNR) factors; and if the program considers said factors to provide services and treatment. The assessment tool(s) should assist the program with the selection of offenders, the assessment of risk, need, and personal characteristics of the offender. Finally, this domain examines the manner in which these characteristics are assessed.

5. Treatment Characteristics

This domain of the CPC examines whether or not the program targets criminogenic behavior, the types of treatment used to target these behaviors, specific treatment procedures, the use of positive reinforcement and punishment, the methods used to train offenders in new pro-social skills, and the provision and quality of aftercare services. Other important elements of effective intervention include matching the offender’s risk, needs, and personal characteristics with appropriate treatment programs, treatment intensity, and staff. Finally, the use of relapse prevention strategies designed to assist the offender in anticipating and coping with problem situations is considered.
6. Technical Appendix and Knowledge Transfer
A major goal of the project was to use this project to expand the knowledge of available tools, approaches, and technology. By attempting to develop tools of the trade as part of the system evaluation, this project also worked to document the approaches taken. What follows is a brief description of the items developed with primary documents in the appendix:

1. Statistical Appendix- The statistical appendix summarizes context data on Yolo County, the juvenile population, and crime and arrest data.
2. Project Plan- A summary of some of the initial planning documents and project plan tasks
3. Data Extraction and Dashboard Reports- Technical SQL code for generating data extracts from the ADC DataMart, as well as the local case management system. Sample Dashboards reports show some of the visual approaches taken to interact with data.
Statistical Appendix

Demographic Context

Yolo County’s population has grown at an annualized rate of 2% since 2000, with a 2010 population of 200,849 people. Of these, 22% were youth under 18 years old, or 44,416\(^{35}\). By 2020, Yolo County is forecast to have 229,000 people and by 2060 305,000 people or a 50% growth over the next 50 years\(^{36}\). Based on population estimates the 0-17 population in Yolo County will be 48,000 people by 2020, reflecting growth of 8%\(^{37}\).

Table 24 shows the population of Yolo county’s major cities in 2010.

Table 24: 2010 Yolo County Populations by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>65,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>48,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters</td>
<td>6,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>55,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Rest of County</td>
<td>24,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yolo County has 4 major population centers that make up 88% of the population, with the county seat in Woodland and location of the most services and administrative functions. Zipcode level population also show the clustering of county population along Highway 113, Interstate 5, and Interstate 80. Yolo County planning documents show growth will continue in these areas as Yolo becomes increasingly urban.

Figure 16: Map of Yolo County Cities and Towns

---

\(^{35}\) http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tablesservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DP_DPDP1

\(^{36}\) http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/projections/P-1/

Figure 17: Yolo County Youth Poverty by Racial/Ethnic Group

Figure 18: Yolo County Youth Poverty as % of total Population

Figure 19: Yolo County Youth, by age Group
In light of Yolo County probation reforms, it’s important to understand where those changes fit into the county context of understanding the impact of Yolo County changes in juvenile supervision practices. In the context of probation, crimes by juveniles can either generate initial referrals to probation, or indicate re-offense. However, these general metrics of crime and arrest are not the only factors when deciding how a youth is case managed in Yolo County. Crime and arrest are offered as context for both Yolo County probation’s reforms in 2009, and the underlying trends in Yolo County communities.

California has seen a long term drop in crime rates for the last 30 years. Annual crimes reported to the Uniform Crime report by Yolo County law enforcement agencies like local police and Sherriff over a ten-year period showed crime declining, with property and violent crime showing slightly different timing of decline, but similar large-scale declines. The increase in property crime in 2012 has been attributed by some to Criminal justice realignment with correlates of increases in crime for some categories like motor vehicle thefts and certain property crimes.

Yolo County has a crime rate in lower quartile of California when using a rate per 100,000 people, with the 14th lowest overall crime rate when combining property and violent crimes.

---

38 http://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/images/cjsc/recent-stat-cc2.jpg
However, Yolo’s major cities have varied crime rates with Woodland historically having higher levels of property crime than its neighbors do.

When separated out by adult and juvenile crime, youth and adult arrests vary on the types of crimes being arrested. Although these crime types vary considerably, they give some context to the larger crime and arrest dynamics in the county. Comparing arrest rates for juveniles to adults give an indication of the types of crimes youth in Yolo County are being arrested for, as well as their composition of total arrests in the county. Data from the 2012 Uniform crime report show adults tended to have higher rates per 100,000 people in all arrest areas except for felony property crimes, which 20% more minors arrested on a per youth basis. This distribution is not uncommon, as juveniles tend to commit more crimes of opportunity. There was a 20% decline in police officers in Yolo County after 2007, from 302 to 260 in 2012\(^\text{40}\). This decline might have led to fewer arrests being made, alongside the decline in crime reporting due to a lack of detection or resources for crimes to be cleared.

![2012 Yolo County Arrest Rate per 100,000, by Crime Type and Severity](image1)

**Figure 22: 2012 Arrest Rate by crime type and Adult/Juvenile Status**

Status offenses are crime that are only applicable to certain class or type of person and where the motive is not a consideration. In the case of youth, these offenses center on violations like possession.

![Yolo County Status Offense Arrests per 100,000 people age 10-17](image2)

**Figure 23: 10-year trend of status offenses**
of alcohol, truancy, curfew, running away from home.

These types of arrests showed a decline for a number of years, except for 2009, with sharp rise in 2012 to the highest rate per 100,000 youth in 10 years, when controlling for youth population. The source of these status offenses is usually arrests by city police, but can be initiated by a number of entities including schools. Status offenses are dealt with in various ways and if they make it to the courts, they are usually filed as infractions. However, the district attorney has created and maintained a diversion program that diverts most of these youth away from probation dealt with informally, unless seriousness or repeat offense leads to a referral to the juvenile courts. This reserves Yolo County probation to work with offenses that are more serious.

The distribution of juvenile arrests in Yolo County show higher rates of drug and alcohol offenses, as well as “other offenses” than the state average when looking across arrest types. Other offenses are crimes not included in UCR Part 1 or Part 2, such as trespassing.41

![2012 Yolo County Juvenile Arrest Percentage, by type](image)

**Figure 24: Distribution of Arrests compared to California State Average**

According to research on crime trends, most juvenile criminality is of a less serious nature than adult and the overall contribution of youth crime has to be looked at in a more specific context of juvenile arrests.

In preventing future delinquent acts, it is important to differentiate prevention and treatment. One of the strongest predictors of future criminality is the age of first arrests, as well as the juvenile record in terms of seriousness and length. Research on long-term criminal records show a pattern of escalation in crime and such the interruption of that pattern plays a key role.

Once a youth has committed a violent crime, they are more at risk than others to commit another violent crime, when compared to a youth who has no criminal record. This differentiation forms the basis for looking beyond crime and arrest, and the use of risk-needs assessment to determine the level of intervention to both treat needs and prevent future crimes.

**Initial Project Plan**

When the project was envisioned in early 2011, it was designed to develop specific tools and approaches for Yolo County to use some of the best thinking about “what works” in juvenile corrections. As this report has outlined, implementing so many administrative practices in the face of a changing landscape of technology and management made certain aspects hard to sustain. In an effort to build on other department activities, the original intent was to integrate activities around evaluation, technology, reporting, and QA. Some of the activities would be funded through the grant, with others coming from internal department sources that would implemented together. The initial project plan description and project management plan outlines some of the high-level activities during the project and differentiates whether it is grant funded.

**Data Reporting Tools**

*Data extraction and transformation scripts*

Yolo County uses the Assessments.com Datamart (ADC-datamart) to access and query assessment records from the Detention Risk Assessment Instrument, as well as Pre-PACT, and Full-PACT. The MS-Access shell on the SQL server application give this system real-time monitoring of cases and systems level information. However, this functionality isn’t matched by reports or easy access to the underlying data. The case management database has a similar challenge, as it takes SQL programming to run extractions and then export into a tool like MS Excel for further analysis. Once the queries are written and the report on installed, they are scalable and easy to reproduce population snapshots as well as ongoing report over time. The scripts included are from the ADC DataMart; with the thinking that other counties may have the DataMart, but not have the technical resources to do the initial query writing. These queries are offered as is, and likely easy to adapt to a local environment so data can extracted and used in other areas for analysis.

*Dashboard Screen Shots*

With the data systems available, the project developed several rounds of test dashboards and reports to augment information currently available for analysis. The process followed what is known as “best practices” in dashboard design by using planning documents like data dictionaries to source information, then focus in on key on-going information users may want to see to support decision or better inform ongoing understanding of their system.
Data Dictionary

In the fall of 2011, Yolo County Juvenile probation developed a comprehensive mapping of important data variables, and their location in the Yolo County information technology systems. These variables ranged from juvenile characteristics and demography to events like referrals and bookings into juvenile hall to Risk and needs assessments. The scope of information required to properly assess and monitor approaches is large in size, but once automated and reported on systemically, become less of an effort. This early effort helped to prioritize the development of database extraction queries from Yolo County’s case management system, Lawsuite, as well as queries from the Assessment.com “DataMart” query tool to use results of the DRAI, pre-PACT, and Full PACT.
Yolo County has aggressively sought to implement “what works” in corrections. Yolo County has implemented a range of Evidence Based Practices in recent years to reduce recidivism and improve program outcomes for juvenile offenders, as well as department wide. These practices require monitoring and evaluation to assure inter-rater reliability of risk and needs assessments as well as maintain high levels of program fidelity to techniques and trainings. This requires data systems that are integrated and clearly defined, a model of program elements related to departmental goals, and a feedback and reporting systems that gives staff at all levels of the organization access to operational data, as well as department wide targets.

The project focuses on three main areas: Quality Assurance training around Yolo’s Risk Assessment tool, Integration of Yolo’s Risk information into the case management system, and the implementation of the Correctional Programming Checklist to ensure program fidelity (CPC). These primary interventions will be supplemented by other evaluation activities in the department such as logic modeling and local validation of the Yolo’s Risk Tool. This summary highlights the grant supported work, as well as concurrent activities to improve the quality of Yolo’s programs, as well as reduce recidivism.

Grant Funding Activities

Intervention 1: Quality Assurance system for Evidence Based Practices

- **Description**
  - The project will develop a QA and QCI plan in the department to establish training and quality control systems to ensure program fidelity, maintenance of EBP practitioner’s skills, and system for supervisor oversight. As Yolo EBP practitioners have begun using assessment tools, motivational interviewing, and case planning, there needs to be a process to continuously improve the quality of implementation. The development of liaison program will enhance trainings by creating a group of internal trainers and mentors. This work will begin in January 2012 and operational by August 31, 2012.

- **Benefits**
  - Having a practitioner-centered QA plan will allow Yolo to link the work of probation officers with offenders to larger interventions in the department. This change gives supervisors, liaisons, and practitioners a fact based way to discuss program outcomes, as well as model fidelity.

- **Process Documentation**
  - The project will keep logs of people trained, the number of training hours completed, and the documentation provided at trainings for liaisons and other practitioners. There will also be logs of inter-rater reliability scores and taped
interviews to track skill progress.

- **Outcome Measures**
  - The project will collect pre- and post-surveys from training participants, prepare a report showing perception of effectiveness and accuracy of the QA tools, as well as data gathered from the tools put in place.

- **Evaluation Method**
  - The project will use a pre-post research method where officers will receive a survey capturing their skills and attitudes at the onset of the training, then follow-ups throughout the grant. The project will also include interviews of training participants to link the qualitative parts of the implementation to data gathered from the QA tools.

**Intervention 2: Correctional Programming Checklist**

- **Description**
  - The project will implement and train 6-8 staff on the Corrections Programming Checklist to assure program fidelity. The CPC assesses correctional intervention programs, and is used to ascertain how closely correctional programs meet known principles of effective intervention. This intervention will be completed by August 2012.

- **Benefits**
  - Stakeholders across the county need to understand the referral process, as well as which programs are available in their communities that are proven to work in reducing recidivism. The CPC training helps in insuring program fidelity which in turn increases favorable outcomes for individuals on probation.

- **Process Documentation**
  - There will be program documents from the CPC trainers and the results of the initial program evaluation using the CPC.

- **Outcome Measures**
  - Results of the CPC, feedback from trainees

- **Evaluation Method**
  - The project will include the results of the CPC as well as a database of evaluation results and interventions.

**Intervention 3: Data Integration, Dictionary Development, and Reporting Tools**

- **Description**
  - The project will identify relevant outcome indicators and measures, building upon those currently available in Assessments.com (ADC) and Law Suite, and
adding new measures/indicators. This will integrate ADC and the Lawsuite case management system to facilitate better analysis and evaluation specification. This will allow the project to develop analysis protocols and reporting formats/templates for all of the project activities. Following this, the project will provide training and support to Probation Department staff to replicate (and expand) analyses and reporting, associated with each level of evaluation. This process will be complete by May 2012, with modifications made throughout the project based on feedback to reports.

- **Benefits**
  - The integration of ADC’s EBP tools with Yolo County’s criminal justice case management system, Lawsuite, will allow for a unified set of system variables and a single ID to link systems together. This dataset will provide dynamic and static reports to all levels of Yolo County Probation through the development of reports and dashboards.

- **Process Documentation**
  - The process will result in a Data Dictionary of primary database variables, project outcomes, and data mapping. The Data schema linking ADC and Lawsuite will provide a roadmap for sourcing variables. A Drilldown map will allow for analysis that moves between high level system variables and case level data. Training materials for using data reports for decision making, will be coupled with trainings to improve internal capacity for data analysis.

- **Outcome Measures**
  - The project will develop Data quality metrics which will feed Quality Control reports for high value data to identify missing values, repeated cases, or timely reassessment.

- **Evaluation Method**
  - The project will expect to see improvements in data quality and completion throughout the project, as well as increased usage of reports, and increased user satisfaction surveys with the reports.

**Concurrent Activities**

**Logic Model Development**

- **Description**
  - The project will prepare a logic model that describes how department resources (inputs) are to be configured into the department’s activities and aligned to meet the needs of juveniles on probation (outputs) in order to achieve short and long term corrections outcomes. A logic model is the basis for planning and understanding the efforts Yolo County will undertake in improving its QA
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processes, as well as developing data driven practices at all levels of the department, as well as in county collaboration. A finished logic model will allow the county to organize its resources and better understand and explain to stakeholders how the inputs are linked to outputs, and linked to program outcomes as well as departmental goals. The logic modeling will be complete by Dec 31, 2011.

- **Benefits**
  - By the end of the project, Yolo County will have a logic model of charting progress toward interim and long-term outcomes. Yolo will also have a stronger basis for planning interventions in the future, as well as understanding outcomes in framework of the logic model.

- **Process Documentation**
  - The logic modeling process will take place over 2 months and involve a range of department staff. The process will keep track of participants, intermediate versions and comments, and a final model linking EBP activities to program outcomes, and data measures.

**Local Risk Assessment Instrument Validation**

- **Description**
  - The project will locally validate the Risk/Needs tools to ensure it predictively classifies probationers based on their risk level. The implementation of a static risk assessment with local validation ensures correct grouping of offenders based on risk of recidivism. This will be completed by XXXX, 2012.

- **Benefits**
  - A risk assessment will assure resources are properly allocated toward the probationers with the highest risk of recidivism, and highest needs. Although Yolo already uses a validated Risk Assessment, the local validation will ensure the proper targeting of resources in Yolo.

- **Process Documentation**
  - Local Validation testing results.

- **Outcome Measures**
  - Recidivism rates for various risk populations.

- **Evaluation Method**
  - The project will conduct an investigation of the arrest rates of adults and youth identified at low and moderate recidivism risk levels. This will be used to determine the impact of “banking” low and moderate risk individuals, and assist in developing any adjustments in the approach to these populations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Id</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Required by JABG Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quality Assurance systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop QA and QCI plan</td>
<td>11/1/2011</td>
<td>8/31/2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implement QC reports and training plan</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B       | Yes    | Correctional Planning Checklist         |             |              |                        |
|         | 3      | CPC implementation                      | 2/1/2012    | 8/31/2012    |                        |
|         | 4      | Complete initial assessment of Communicare/JDF | 4/30/2012 | 8/31/2012 | Yes                    |
|         | 5      | Implement checklist in other programs   | 6/30/2012   | 12/31/2012   | No                     |
|         | 6      | Report on program quality               | 1/1/2013    | 3/30/2013    | No                     |

| C       | Yes    | Data Dictionary and Logic Model         |             |              |                        |
|         | 7      | Facilitate a group to choose key elements | 11/1/2011   | 11/15/2011   | Yes                    |
|         | 8      | Create a draft data dictionary         | 11/16/2011  | 12/31/2011   | Yes                    |
|         | 9      | Map data elements in Lawusite and ADC to dictionary | 1/1/2012 | 12/31/2012 | Yes                    |
|         | 10     | Internal Review data dictionary and mappings | 1/1/2012 | 12/31/2012 | Yes                    |
|         | 11     | Build program logic model              | 1/1/2013    | 3/30/2013    | No                     |

| C       | Yes    | Validate Pre-Pact                       |             |              |                        |
|         | 12     | Define parameters for study period      | 5/30/2012   | 12/31/2012   | No                     |
|         | 13     | Build queries for base assessment data from ADC | 6/1/2012 | 10/1/2012 | No                     |
|         | 14     | Build queries for base assessment data from Lawusite | 6/1/2012 | 10/1/2012 | No                     |
|         | 15     | Create programming code for merging across datasets | 10/1/2012 | 11/1/2012 | No                     |
|         | 16     | Deliver merged dataset of assessment and recidivism for review and finalization | 11/1/2012 | 12/1/2012 | No                     |
|         | 17     | Publish and disseminate recidivism study | 4/1/2013    | 4/30/2013    | No                     |

| C       | Yes    | Reporting and Quality Control           |             |              |                        |
|         | 18     | Build standard reports and dashboard from data dictionary and database | 7/1/2012 | 8/31/2012 | No                     |
|         | 19     | Deliver draft data reports              | 9/1/2012    | 12/31/2012   | Yes                    |
|         | 20     | Finalize Data reports                   | 1/1/2013    | 3/30/2013    | Yes                    |
|         | 21     | Dashboard reports and plan proposal     | 1/1/2013    | 3/30/2013    | No                     |

| End of Project Report | Yes    |                           |             |              |                        |
| End of Project Report | 1/1/2014 |                            | 9/30/2014   |              |                        |

| 22     | Draft Outline Report                   | 1/1/2014    | 1/30/2014    | Yes                    |
| 23     | Develop 1st Draft                     | 2/1/2014    | 6/30/2014    | Yes                    |
| 24     | Develop final report                  | 7/1/2014    | 9/30/2014    | Yes                    |
--basic demography query
SELECT
A.PERSON_ID, A.PROB_PERSON_ID, B.Last_name, B.First_name, B.Sex, B.Race, B.DOB,
a.PROB_STATUS, A.RISK_LEVEL, a.FILE_STATUS, a.SUPERVISION_LEVEL,
A.JUVENILE_FLAG
FROM PROB.PERSON AS A
JOIN PERSON.PERSON AS B
  ON A.PERSON_ID = B.PERSON_ID
Order by A.PERSON_ID

--referral query for all events
SELECT
A.PERSON_ID, D.REFERRAL_ID, C.Ref_Date, D.ACTION_ID, D.ACTION, D.DISPOSITION, D.EFF_DATE, A.JUVENILE_FLAG
FROM PROB.PERSON AS A
JOIN PERSON.PERSON AS B
  ON A.PERSON_ID = B.PERSON_ID
JOIN PROB.REFERRAL AS C
  ON A.PROB_PERSON_ID = C.PROB_PERSON_ID
JOIN PROB.ACTION AS D
  ON C.REFERRAL_ID = D.REFERRAL_ID
Order by A.PERSON_ID, D.REFERRAL_ID, D.EFF_DATE

--all charge information connected to a referral
SELECT
A.PERSON_ID, c.REFERRAL_ID, C.Ref_Date, e.CHARGE_ID, E.OFF_DATE, F.Crime_Type, e.CHARGE_LEVEL, F.Charge_Code, F.Charge_Section, F.Charge_Code_Desc
FROM PROB.PERSON AS A
JOIN PERSON.PERSON AS B
  ON A.PERSON_ID = B.PERSON_ID
JOIN PROB.REFERRAL AS C
  ON A.PROB_PERSON_ID = C.PROB_PERSON_ID
JOIN PROB.OFFENSE AS E
  ON C.REFERRAL_ID = E.REFERRAL_ID
join LU.CHARGE_CODES as F
  ON F.Charge_Code_Id = E.CHARGE_CODE_ID
Order by A.PERSON_ID, c.REFERRAL_ID, C.Ref_Date
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Assessments.com PACT Extraction Code (SQL)

Question Lookup
SELECT dbo_DIM_DOMAIN_QUESTION.assessment_name_txt,
dbo_DIM_DOMAIN_QUESTION.domain_question_cd, dbo_DIM_DOMAIN_QUESTION.domain_name_short_txt,
dbo_DIM_DOMAIN_QUESTION.question_txt
FROM dbo_DIM_DOMAIN_QUESTION;

Active Assessments by Age Group
SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.age_group_txt, Sum(dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_cnt) AS SumOfsubject_cnt
FROM dbo_DIM_SUBJECT
WHERE (((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt)="No"))
GROUP BY dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.age_group_txt;

Active Assessments by Gender+
SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.gender_cd, Sum(dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_cnt) AS SumOfsubject_cnt
FROM dbo_DIM_SUBJECT
WHERE (((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt)="No"))
GROUP BY dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.gender_cd;

Active Assessment by Race
SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt, Sum(dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_cnt) AS SumOfsubject_cnt
FROM dbo_DIM_SUBJECT
WHERE (((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt)="No"))
GROUP BY dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt;

Assessments by Month
SELECT dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_name_txt, dbo_DIM_DATE.month_name,
Sum(dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.subject_assessment_cnt) AS SumOfsubject_assessment_cnt,
dbo_DIM_DATE.year_num
FROM dbo_DIM_DATE INNER JOIN (dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT INNER JOIN
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT ON dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_key =
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.assessment_key) ON dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key =
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.completed_date_key
GROUP BY dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_name_txt, dbo_DIM_DATE.month_name,
dbo_DIM_DATE.year_num;

Ontime performance overview
SELECT dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER.full_name_txt,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.pre_assessment_name_txt,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.pre_datetime,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.post_assessment_name_txt,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.post_datetime,
SELECT dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.days_between_num, dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.target_dttm, dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.late_flag FROM (dbo_DIM_SUBJECT INNER JOIN dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS ON dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key = dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.subject_key) INNER JOIN dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER ON dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.completed_by_user_key = dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER.user_key ORDER BY dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.pre_datetime DESC;

Overall Risk to Reoffend
SELECT dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_name_txt, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.label_txt, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.risk_level_txt, Sum(dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.subject_assessment_cnt) AS SumOfsubject_assessment_cnt, dbo_DIM_DATE.year_num FROM dbo_DIM_DATE INNER JOIN (dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT INNER JOIN dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT ON dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_key = dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.assessment_key) ON dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key = dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.completed_date_key WHERE (((dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_code_num)=5219) AND ((dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.status_txt)="Complete") OR (((dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_code_num)=5220) AND ((dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.status_txt)="Complete")) GROUP BY dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_name_txt, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.label_txt, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.risk_level_txt, dbo_DIM_DATE.year_num ORDER BY dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT.assessment_name_txt;
### Juvenile Demographics

```sql
SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key, dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.Person_Id, 
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.last_name_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.first_name_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.birth_dttm, 
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.gender_cd, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt, 
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.address_1_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.city_txt, 
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN dbo_DIM_SUBJECT ON 
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.adc_system_id_num = dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.adc_system_id_num 
WHERE (((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key)<>-1));
```

### DRAI Recomendations

```sql
SELECT dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.subject_key, 
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.Person_Id, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.last_name_txt, 
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.first_name_txt, dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.screener_txt, 
dbo_DIM_DATE.calendar_date, 
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN ((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT INNER JOIN 
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE ON dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key = 
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.subject_key) LEFT JOIN dbo_DIM_DATE ON 
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.screening_date_key = dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key) ON 
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.adc_system_id_num = dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.adc_system_id_num 
ORDER BY dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.screening_date_key;
```

### DRAI/PACT CrossTabulation

```sql
SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key, dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.Person_Id, 
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN 
WHERE (((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key)<>-1));
```

```sql
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN ((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT INNER JOIN 
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE ON dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key = 
) LEFT JOIN dbo_DIM_DATE ON 
) ON 
ORDER BY dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.screening_date_key;
```

### DRAI/PACT CrossTabulation

```sql
SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key, dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.Person_Id, 
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt, dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.drai_detention_recomendation_txt, 
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.total_score_num, 
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN 
WHERE (((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key)<>-1));
```

```sql
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN 
) LEFT JOIN dbo_DIM_DATE ON 
ORDER BY dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.screening_date_key;
```
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.use_firearm_txt,
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.immigration_customs_enforcement_hold_txt,
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.citable_warrant_txt,
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.court_remand_txt,
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.other_txt,
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.misc_txt,
dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.out_of_county_warrant_county_txt
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN (dbo_DIM_DATE INNER JOIN
(dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE INNER JOIN (dbo_DIM_SUBJECT INNER JOIN
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT ON dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key =
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.subject_key) ON
(dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.screening_date_key =
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.completed_date_key) AND
(dbo_FCT_DETENTION_RISK_RESPONSE_SCORE.subject_key = dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key)) ON
dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key = dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.completed_date_key) ON
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.adc_system_id_num = dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.adc_system_id_num;

Pact-Pre Query
SELECT dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.subject_key,
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.Person_Id, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt,
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.status_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.chronological_placement_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.label_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.gender_cd,
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.risk_level_txt,
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.completed_dttm, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.zip_code_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q1_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q2_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q3_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q4_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q5_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q6_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q7_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q8_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q9_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q10_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q11_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q12_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q1_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q2_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q3_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q4_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q5_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q6_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q7_txt, dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q8_txt,

PACT Domain Scores
SELECT dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.subject_assessment_key,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.subject_key,
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.Person_Id, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt,
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.status_txt, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.label_txt,
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.gender_cd, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.age_group_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt,
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.city_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.zip_code_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.county_txt,
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.risk_level_txt, dbo_DIM_DATE.calendar_date,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.criminal_history_static_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.school_history_static_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.school_history_static_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.current_school_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.current_school_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.free_time_history_static_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.free_time_current_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.free_time_current_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.employment_history_static_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.employment_history_static_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.employment_curr_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.employment_curr_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.relationship_history_static_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.relationship_history_static_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.relationship_current_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.relationship_current_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.family_history_static_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.family_history_static_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.living_arrangements_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.living_arrangements_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.alcohol_drug_history_static_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.alcohol_drug_history_static_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.alcohol_drug_current_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.alcohol_drug_current_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.mental_health_history_static_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.mental_health_history_static_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.mental_health_current_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.mental_health_current_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.attitudes_behaviors_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.attitudes_behaviors_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.aggression_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.aggression_dynamic_protective_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.skills_dynamic_risk_amt,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.skills_dynamic_protective_amt
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID INNER JOIN
((dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES INNER JOIN dbo_DIM_DATE ON
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.completed_date_key = dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key) INNER JOIN
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT ON dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DOMAIN_SCORES.subject_key =
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key) INNER JOIN dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT ON
(dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key = dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.subject_key) AND
(dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key = dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.completed_date_key)) ON
dbo_DIM ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.adc_system_id_num = dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.adc_system_id_num;

Change in Dynamic Risk Performance
SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.label_txt,
SELECT dbo_DIM_DATE.calendar_date,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DYNAMIC_SCORES_COMBINED.dynamic_risk_average,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DYNAMIC_SCORES_COMBINED.dynamic_protective_average,
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.risk_level_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt
FROM dbo_DIM_SUBJECT INNER JOIN (dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DYNAMIC_SCORES_COMBINED INNER
JOIN (dbo_DIM_DATE INNER JOIN dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT ON dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key =
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.completed_date_key) ON
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DYNAMIC_SCORES_COMBINED.adc_system_user_assessment_num =
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.adc_system_user_assessment_num) ON dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key =
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.subject_key
GROUP BY dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key, dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.label_txt,
dbo_DIM_DATE.calendar_date,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DYNAMIC_SCORES_COMBINED.dynamic_risk_average,
dbo_FCT_CPACT_FULL_DYNAMIC_SCORES_COMBINED.dynamic_protective_average,
dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.risk_level_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt
ORDER BY dbo_FCT_SUBJECT_ASSESSMENT.label_txt;

Ontime Assessment and Reassessment

SELECT dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER.full_name_txt,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.pre_assessment_name_txt,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.pre_datetime,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.post_assessment_name_txt,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.post_datetime,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.days_between_num,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.target_dttm,
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.late_flag
FROM (dbo_DIM_SUBJECT INNER JOIN dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS ON
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key = dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.subject_key) INNER
JOIN dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER ON
dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.completed_by_user_key =
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER.user_key
ORDER BY dbo_FCT_ONTIME_PERFORMANCE_ASSESSMENTS.pre_datetime DESC;

Full Pact Question Pull

SELECT dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key, dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.Person_Id,
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt, dbo_DIM_DATE.calendar_date,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.chronological_placement_txt,
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.archived_record_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.city_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.zip_code_txt,
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.county_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.birth_dttm, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.gender_cd,
dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.age_group_txt, dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.race_description_1_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d3a_q2_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d7b_q2_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d7b_q2_o30_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d7b_q2_o31_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d7b_q6_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d7b_q12_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o1_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o2_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o3_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o4_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o5_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o6_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o7_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o8_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q1_o9_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o1_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o2_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o3_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o4_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o5_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o6_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o7_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o8_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q2_o9_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q3_txt,
dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.d8a_q4_txt
FROM dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID RIGHT JOIN ((dbo_DIM_SUBJECT INNER JOIN
(dbo_DIM_DATE INNER JOIN dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8 ON
dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key = dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.completed_date_key)
ON dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key = dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_1_TO_8.subject_key)
INNER JOIN dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_9_TO_12 ON (dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.subject_key
= dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_9_TO_12.subject_key) AND (dbo_DIM_DATE.date_key
= dbo_FCT_PACT_FULL_ASSESSMENT_DOMAINS_9_TO_12.completed_date_key)) ON
dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER_PERSON_ID.adc_system_id_num = dbo_DIM_SUBJECT.adc_system_id_num;
### Overall Recidivism Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK_LEVEL</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>56.82%</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>76.97%</td>
<td>23.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reoffense by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>RISK_LEVEL</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61.82%</td>
<td>38.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>48.39%</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74.85%</td>
<td>25.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>85.29%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>80.87%</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reoffense By zip Code

![Reoffense By zip Code Map](image)

### Reoffense by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>RISK_LEVEL</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78.39%</td>
<td>21.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>76.39%</td>
<td>23.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1. Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Field name</th>
<th>Datatype</th>
<th>Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationer Last Name</td>
<td>person.person, dim_subject_name</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>Lawsuite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationer First Name</td>
<td>person.person, dim_subject_name</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>Lawsuite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation ID Number</td>
<td>person.person_ID, dim_subjectID</td>
<td>uniqueID</td>
<td>Lawsuite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>Person.DOB,dim. Subject.DOB</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>Lawsuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender_txt</td>
<td>category</td>
<td>ADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Race_txt</td>
<td>category</td>
<td>ADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipcode/address</td>
<td>ZIP_CODE_txt</td>
<td>category</td>
<td>ADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness Classification (611 Form)</td>
<td>dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d2_q11_txt</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at First Arrest</td>
<td>dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q1_txt</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>ADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender</td>
<td>dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q8_txt</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>ADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dbo_FCT_PACT_PRE_ASSESSMENT.d1_q7_txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Risk/Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Field name</td>
<td>Datatype</td>
<td>Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Date: DRAI</td>
<td>Completion_date</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer ID Number</td>
<td>screener.txt</td>
<td>uniqueID</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: DRAI</td>
<td>total_score_num</td>
<td>numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Decision</td>
<td>drai_detention_recommendation_txt</td>
<td>category</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Date: PACT Pre-Screen Level of Risk</td>
<td>Completion_date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer ID number</td>
<td>dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER</td>
<td>uniqueID</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT Pre-Screen Level of Risk</td>
<td>risk_level_txt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Date: Full PACT</td>
<td>Completion_date</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer ID number</td>
<td>dbo_DIM_ASSESSMENT_USER</td>
<td>uniqueID</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 1 Record of Referrals</td>
<td>criminal_history_static_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 3a: School History</td>
<td>school_history_static_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 3b: Current School Status</td>
<td>current_school_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 4a: Historic Use of Free Time</td>
<td>free_time_history_static_protective_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 4b: Current Use of Free Time</td>
<td>free_time_current_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 5a: Employment History</td>
<td>employment_history_static_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv. PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 5b: Current Employment</td>
<td>employment_curr_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 6a: History of Relationships</td>
<td>relationship_history_static_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 6b: Current Relationships</td>
<td>relationship_current_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship_current_dynamic_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 7a: Family History</td>
<td>family_history_static_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family_history_static_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 7b: Current Living Arrangements</td>
<td>living_arrangements_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>living_arrangements_dynamic_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 8a: Alcohol and Drug History</td>
<td>alcohol_drug_history_static_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alcohol_drug_history_static_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 8b: Current Alcohol and Drugs</td>
<td>alcohol_drug_current_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alcohol_drug_current_dynamic_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 9a: Mental Health History</td>
<td>mental_health_history_static_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mental_health_history_static_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 9b: Current Mental Health</td>
<td>mental_health_current_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mental_health_current_dynamic_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 10: Attitudes/Behaviors</td>
<td>attitudes_behaviors_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attitudes_behaviors_dynamic_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 11: Aggression</td>
<td>aggression_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aggression_dynamic_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: PACT domain 12: Skills</td>
<td>skills_dynamic_risk_amt</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>ADC.juv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skills_dynamic_protective_amt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Probation Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms and Conditions</th>
<th>Types/combinations--overload-- of certain terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End date</td>
<td>MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Status</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation Supervision</th>
<th>Category of Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) Banked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Low Risk Caseload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) CCCM w/ Drug Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) CCCM w/out Drug Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) FFP w/Drug Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) FFP w/out Drug Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) offender link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention type</th>
<th>Category of interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) FFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Trauma Focus CBT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) TBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) YFR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) T4C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Outpatient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Residential treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) DRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) WRAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer ID number</th>
<th>Unique ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End date</td>
<td>MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Status</td>
<td>Successful completion/terminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Contacts with Probationer</th>
<th>FFP/Casenotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFP Stage of intervention</td>
<td>FFP/Casenotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Contact</td>
<td>FFP/Casenotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of Collateral/Family Contacts</td>
<td>FFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Type</th>
<th>FFP/Casenotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral Service</td>
<td>Category/LU table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Date</td>
<td>MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Agency</td>
<td>Category/LU table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Start Date</td>
<td>MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service End Date</td>
<td>MM/DD/YYYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Status</td>
<td>Category/LU table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violation type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrest related referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penal Code of highest new charge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category of highest new offense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of new referral/arrest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count of new charges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time between events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referring Agency</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in protective/Risk factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net change since last Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in subdomains</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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