

# **JARPP**

## **Preliminary Findings**

### **on Youth Recidivism Outcomes**

Joint Meeting on Adolescent Treatment Effectiveness  
Baltimore, MD  
December 14, 2010

Douglas Young, University of Maryland, College Park  
Jill Farrell, University of Maryland, Baltimore  
Faye Taxman, George Mason University

# JARPP Youth Outcomes: Baseline & Two Youth Follow-Up Cohorts

- Tracked youth in the 12 study offices assigned to probation or aftercare during the sampling periods

Table 1. Study Cohorts

Group	Sampling Period	Sample Size
Baseline	4 month period, > 6 months before 3-day training	773 (range: 239-287)
Follow-Up Cohort 1	5-6 months after 3-day training	789 (range: 222-320)
Follow-Up Cohort 2	7-12 months after 3-day training	719 (range: 206-260)

We studied 3 groups of youth: 1 baseline pre-training cohort and 2 follow-up post-training cohorts.

# JARPP Youth Outcomes: Recidivism Measures and Benchmarks

- Measures of delinquency from DJS (no adult data)
  - Referrals to DJS (any referral; felony referral)
  - Detained pre-adjudication
  - Adjudicated and found delinquent
- Types of placements
  - Service-oriented (e.g., tx programs, shelter, group homes)
  - Surveillance-oriented (e.g., hardware and staff secure facilities)
- Follow-up benchmarks
  - At 6 and 12 months following date assigned to supervision
  - Also assessed time-to-referral within follow-up periods

# Recidivism Outcomes and Analyses

- The big picture
  - Re-referral rates very similar across cohorts: 27.9%-29.7% at 6 months & 42.2%-42.8% at 12 months
  - But much variation across sites, from <10% to >60%
  - Logistic regressions test effects of JARPP training on...
    - Re-referrals @ 6 & 12 months, felonies @ 12 months
    - Detentions @ 6 & 12 months
    - Adjudicated delinquent @ 12 months
    - Placement types @ 6 & 12 months
  - Survival analyses on re-referrals & and adjudications

# Model Covariates & Recidivism Predictors

- All models include demographics, delinquency history, type of current offense (felony, misdemeanor) and supervision (probation or aftercare)
- Significant predictors of recidivism at 2 follow-up points
  - Gender (males higher recidivism in 11 of 20 models;  $p < .05$ )
  - Age (younger youth higher in 19 of 20 models)
  - History (more prior referrals higher in 20 of 20 models)
  - Currently on probation (compared to aftercare, probation youth higher on 14 of 20 models)

# JARPP Recidivism Findings: Referral, Detention, & Adjudication

- Baseline cohort differences (compared to Control offices)
  - ET offices lower on 6 month re-referrals (Log OR=.62, p=.02)\*
  - ST offices higher on 1 yr felony referrals (Log OR=1.83, p=.02)
- Follow-up cohort 1 differences
  - ET offices lower on 1 yr adjudications (Log OR=.62, p=.05)\*
- Follow-up cohort 2 differences
  - ET offices lower on 1 yr re-referrals (Log OR=.59, p=.01)\*
  - ET offices lower on 1 yr felony referrals (Cox OR=.77, p=.08)
  - ET offices lower on 1 yr detentions (Log OR=.67, p=.07)

\* Same group effect found in survival model, p<.05)

# Recidivism Findings: Placement Types

- Baseline cohort differences
  - ST offices lower on 6 month surveillance-oriented placements (OR=.626, p=.04)
- Follow-up cohort 1 differences
  - ST offices higher on 6 month service-oriented placements (OR = 1.72, <.01)
  - ET offices lower on 1 yr surveillance plcmnts (OR=.702, p=.08)
- Follow-up cohort 2 differences
  - ST offices higher on 1 yr service plcmnts (OR=1.84, p<.01)
  - ET offices lower on 1 yr surveillance plcmnts (OR=.554, p<.01)

# Conclusions & Next Steps

- Favorable impacts of JARPP training are evident on multiple recidivism measures and placement outcomes
- Effects are most evident in the Enhanced Training condition and at the later, second follow up
- As in most controlled studies, impacts as reflected in reduced recidivism figures are small  $\Rightarrow$  where significant, ET-Control group differences range 5.6% to 10.5%
- Future analyses will assess effects of...
  - reported practices, agency integration with youth outcomes
  - organizational functioning results with youth outcomes