

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS
OFFICE OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

Program Accountability Measures
2003 PAM Report
A Two-Year Analysis

May 2003

A Research Report Submitted to the:
Louisiana Department of Public Safety
and Corrections
M.J. "Mike" Foster, Jr., Governor
Richard L. Stalder, Secretary

Presented by:
The Justice Research Center
443 East College Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32301



Final Report

May 22, 2003

Produced by

Justice Research Center, Inc.
443 East College Avenue
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Kristin Winokur, Ph.D.
Gregory Hand
Julia Blankenship, M.S.W.
Elizabeth Cass, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Data and Methodology	4
Data Sources.....	4
Recidivism Pool Selection	5
Calculating the PAM Score.....	6
Program Effectiveness Measure.....	6
Program Cost Measure	9
The PAM Score: Combining Cost and Effectiveness Measures.....	9
Limitations	9
Findings.....	9
Program Effectiveness Categories	10
Cost Categories	10
Non-Residential Programs:	10
Residential Programs:	11
PAM Scores by Residential and Non-Residential Status.....	11
PAM Scores by Program Effectiveness Categories	13
PAM Scores by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories	14
Conclusion.....	17
Appendix A1 - Excluded Programs	19
Appendix A2 - Definitions of Terms	20
Appendix A3 - Non-Residential Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Non-Residential Programs.....	22
Appendix A4 - Residential Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Residential Programs.....	23
Acknowledgements	24

Introduction

In the current age of increased accountability, government funded programs must demonstrate cost effectiveness in order to maintain support. This report represents the first Louisiana Program Accountability Measure (PAM) study, the result of a collaborative effort between the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Office of Youth Development (DP&C/OYD) and the Justice Research Center (JRC) to develop a program accountability model for juvenile justice programs.

The methodology is based on the program accountability model used by the JRC to evaluate programs operated under the direction of the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.¹ The analytic techniques used in the PAM Report have been recognized by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) as a best practice in the use of juvenile justice data.

A desired outcome of juvenile justice programs is to reduce the likelihood of future offending in a cost effective manner. Programs serve youth with widely varying risk factors which impact the likelihood that youth will recidivate. A comparison of programs on the basis of recidivism alone does not account for these variations. For example, programs serving all males are likely to have higher recidivism rates than programs serving females. The PAM model estimates the probability of program youth recidivating given underlying risk factors. It is therefore possible to calculate how well a program is expected to do based on the risk for re-offending attributed to each youth released by the program (expected recidivism) and to compare this to how well the program's youth actually performed (observed recidivism) after release. With this approach, programs serving youth with higher risk factors are not held to inequitable standards due to the increased likelihood of re-offending among the youth they serve, and a realistic measure of effectiveness for programs serving less challenging youth is provided.

In evaluating juvenile justice programs, a PAM score is calculated for each program to provide a rank based on its recidivism outcome effectiveness and operating cost relative to other juvenile justice programs. To attain adequate sample sizes, two years of release and cost data are used for each program. The PAM score is derived from a formula based on: (1) effectiveness which is measured as the difference between observed recidivism and expected recidivism, and (2) operating cost which is measured as the program's cost relative to the statewide average cost per completion.

This report covers juvenile programs operated by, or contracted with, the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Office of Youth Development (DP&C/OYD) during fiscal years (FY) 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. Non-residential and residential juvenile justice programs are assessed and ranked based on client outcomes and program costs. Given the diversity in juvenile justice program types, PAM scores are calculated separately for non-residential and residential programs.

¹ Justice Research Center (2002). *The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice's Program Accountability Measures: The 2003 Pam Report, A Two-Year Analysis*. Tallahassee, FL.

Data and Methodology

Data Sources

Data were compiled from multiple sources. Five data extracts obtained from DP&C/OYD were used to conduct the analyses reported here. They include:

1. Juvenile Information Records Management System's (JIRMS) Demographic File that contains data for each youth who has been in state custody;
2. JIRMS Transfer File that contains placements to and transfers among the DP&C/OYD facilities;
3. JIRMS Petition and Offense History File that contains all offenses that have resulted in an adjudication in juvenile court for youth with DP&C/OYD placements;
4. JIRMS Risk and Needs Assessment File that contains assessment scores for 15 risk factors demonstrated in the research literature to be associated with delinquency; and
5. Corrections Adult Justice Uniform Network (CAJUN) that contains adult convictions resulting in adult placement (prison or probation).²

These data sources were used to identify 1,171 youth who completed non-residential programs and 4,437 youth who completed residential programs during the two-year period between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001. Demographic and offense history data for these youths were obtained from JIRMS. Youth who subsequently re-offended were identified through both juvenile offense records in JIRMS and adult records in CAJUN. For purposes of this report, recidivism is defined as a subsequent juvenile adjudication, adult conviction, status offense,³ or revocation⁴ within one year of a youth's release to the community or to parole services.

Program results are presented here for the 14 non-residential and 32 residential programs that released at least 15 youth during the two-year period. Analysis of a program with fewer than 15 releases would yield potentially unreliable results. In addition, a few programs were excluded as a result of having no program cost data. For a list of programs excluded due to having too few releases and/or missing costs, see Appendix A1.

² A protocol developed for use with Florida's data was used to match adult data to the recidivism pool.

³ This would include, but is not limited to, revocation due to truancy, ungovernability, a FINS case, and offenses that apply only to juveniles.

⁴ Revocation includes any youth who had a "pending" secure or non-secure residential placement within one year of release, but did not have any related delinquent or criminal offense.

Recidivism Pool Selection

The inclusion of youth in the recidivism pool was generally based upon the following criteria:

1. Completion of a non-residential or residential juvenile justice program between FY 1999-2000 and 2000-2001, and
2. Release to the community or to a parole services non-residential program.

Typically, recidivism pool identification is based upon a release reason and/or subsequent placement. Since release reasons were missing from the DP&C/OYD data for secure residential placements, the determination of whether the youth met the criteria for inclusion in the recidivism pool was based solely on subsequent placements.⁵

Youth released from non-consecutive commitments (approximately 8% of the recidivism pool) to more than one program during the two-year period were counted separately for each release. In other cases, youth served consecutive placements with no release from the system. It was necessary in these instances to determine the program to which outcome measures would be attributed. Different criteria were used for non-residential and residential programs. For non-residential programs, it was determined that outcome measures would be attributed to the program from which the youth was released last. For residential facilities, DP&C/OYD requested that the determination be based on length of stay, so that the outcome measures would be attributed to the program in which the youth had the longest stay.⁶

Residential programs are classified in Louisiana into 3 categories:

1. regular secure,
2. short-term secure, or
3. non-secure.

Regular secure programs are essentially correctional centers for youth and include: JCCY, BCCY, SCCY, SCCY-M I, SCCY-M II, and JJJC.⁷ Non-secure programs include facilities such as group treatment homes, halfway houses, independent living homes, foster homes, staff secure homes and other contracted residential facilities.

⁵ Youth with subsequent placements to "client exit," "parents," or "foster family," who do not have a "pending secure or non-secure placement" as their next assigned location, were selected for inclusion in the pool.

⁶ For a more specific delineation of program code classifications and placements, see the Justice Research Center's 2002 report: *Methodology for Calculating Program Recidivism Rates and Identifying Individual Characteristics Related to Recidivism for Juveniles Released From the Custody of the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections*, submitted to the DP&C/OYD.

⁷ Youth who were placed in these components (JJCY-JRDC, JRDC-SID, JRDC-Absent Offender, and JRDC-Treatment Unit) of the secure programs without having been placed in the main secure facility were not examined for recidivism analysis.

Calculating the PAM Score

Program Effectiveness Measure

Program effectiveness is defined as the difference between an estimation of the program's success and its actual success. An estimate of expected success (converse of expected recidivism) is calculated for each program based on the risk factors of the youth released, plus or minus a margin of error (99% confidence interval).⁸ This interval, referred to here as the expected success range, is then compared to how well the program actually performed, or the observed success rate (converse of expected recidivism). The difference between a program's expected success range and its actual success rate provides a measure of the crime reduction effect the program achieved.⁹

Logistic regression analyses were used to identify the factors that significantly predict recidivism among the youth in the two-year Louisiana pool. A number of variables were examined to determine whether they were related to recidivism initially at the bivariate level, and then subsequently at the multivariate level. These variables include demographic characteristics, risk and needs indicators, and prior history factors. The following variables were examined at the bivariate level for both the non-residential and residential releases:

- Gender
- Race
- Age
- Length of stay
- Adjudication index¹⁰
- Average prior offense seriousness¹¹
- Total number of prior adjudications
- Total number of adjudicated offenses during supervision
- Most serious prior offense¹²
- Family stability
- Drug use
- Alcohol use

⁸ A 99% confidence interval is defined as the range of values that, 99 times out of 100, can be expected to contain the number being estimated (expected success/recidivism).

⁹ The size of a confidence interval is related to the number of youth released by a program. Smaller programs have larger confidence intervals and larger programs have smaller intervals.

¹⁰ An adjudication index score (AIS) is calculated for each youth based on the number and seriousness of prior adjudicated offenses. Each prior adjudication is given a score as follows: 8 points for violent felony or other person felony; 5 points for property felony or other felony; 3 points for offenses categorized as either felony or misdemeanor; 2 points for misdemeanor; and 1 point for status offense. An AIS score is obtained by summing the scores of all prior adjudications.

¹¹ This is the AIS divided by the total number of prior adjudicated offenses.

¹² This variable was further broken down into dichotomies representing whether the worst prior offense was a: violent offense, violent or person offense, felony property offense, felony or misdemeanor offense, or status offense.

- Emotional stability
- School discipline
- Educational/vocational performance
- Negative peer relationships
- Employment
- Economic status
- Sexual problems
- Health problems
- Prior offenses (as measured on risk/needs assessment forms)
- Court ordered commitments
- Parental control
- Number of family moves

Variables found to be significant at the bivariate level were subsequently used in logistic regression analyses to determine the specific variables predictive of recidivism (holding other significant factors constant).¹³ The following risk factors were identified as statistically significant predictors of whether youth released from non-residential and residential programs in Louisiana would likely re-offend:

Risk Factors Identified by the Predictive Model for Non-Residential Programs
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Length of Stay 2. Number of Prior Adjudications 3. Gender 4. Age at Release 5. Occasional or Chronic Drug Use 6. Status Offense was Most Serious Prior Offense

¹³ Given the assumption that variables in the model should not be highly correlated with one another, certain significant variables were not included as they conceptually overlapped another variable (e.g., average prior offense seriousness and adjudication index). In these instances, the more significant variable of the two was used.

Risk Factors Identified by the Predictive Model for Residential Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Number of Prior Adjudications 8. Race 9. Gender 10. Age at Release 11. Severe Truancy or School Behavior Problem 12. Felony Property was Most Serious Prior Offense 13. Status Offense was Most Serious Prior Offense

Gender was the most powerful single predictor of the likelihood that a youth would recidivate for both the non-residential and residential releases. The odds of re-offending increased by a factor of 3.3 if the youth was male. For youths released from non-residential programs, those classified on risk/needs assessments as either occasional or chronic drug users, were more likely than non-drug users to recidivate. In addition, youths who were older at the time of release and who had fewer prior adjudicated offenses, were significantly less likely to recidivate than younger youth and those with a greater number of prior adjudications. Juveniles whose most serious prior was a status offense, were also much less likely than those with more serious prior offenses to recidivate. Length of stay significantly predicts the likelihood of recidivism among youths released from non-residential programs, but does not have the same effect for youth released from residential programs. In general, the longer youths stay in non-residential programs, the less likely they are to re-offend following release.

For youth released from residential programs, being male, black, and younger at release significantly increased the odds of recidivating. Similar to non-residential youth, the more prior adjudications a youth had, the more likely they were to re-offend. Youths whose most serious prior offense was a status offense, were much less likely than youths with more serious prior adjudications to recidivate. Conversely, the odds of re-offending were increased by a factor of 1.3 when a youth's most serious prior was a felony property offense. Among the youth released from residential programs, those with severe truancy or behavioral problems in school were much more likely than juveniles with no identified school problems to recidivate.

The final step in the analyses involved using Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) to calculate the probability of success (no subsequent adjudications or convictions) for the 14 non-residential and 32 residential programs that released 15 or more youth during FY 1999-2000 and FY 2000-2001. HLM is the appropriate statistical technique for predicting recidivism at the program level while controlling for the individual characteristics of the youth in each program.

The expected success range provides a comparison between expected and observed success rates taking into account an estimate of random error in the measure of expected success. Subtracting a program's observed success rate from the upper or lower limits of the

confidence interval for expected success allows an assessment of the effectiveness of each program in reducing re-offending. For definitions of all terms used in the analyses, see Appendix A2. In addition, for a breakdown of the risk factors of youth released for each program, see Appendices A3 and A4.

Program Cost Measure

Program cost per completion is calculated by dividing the costs expended by a program by the number of youth completing the program during the two-year period. Total expenditures equal each program's combined costs for FY 1999-2000 and FY 2000-2001. In calculating the PAM score, each program's cost per completion is compared to the average cost per completion of \$6,823 for non-residential programs and \$35,443 for residential programs.

The PAM Score: Combining Cost and Effectiveness Measures

The program accountability measures score combines the cost and effectiveness measures, as defined above. These measures are standardized separately for non-residential and residential programs. The PAM score is the sum of the program effectiveness measure, weighted by a factor of two-thirds and the program cost measure, weighted by a factor of one-third. By standardizing the scores on a scale from 1 to 100, the PAM scores are comparable to academic grades. The scores presented in this report range from 40 to 96 for residential programs and from 51 to 91 for non-residential programs.

Limitations

The expected success measure used here explains only a portion of the variation in recidivism for both non-residential and residential programs. The remainder of the difference between observed success and expected success is due to program effects and to the effects of unmeasured variables. Expected success measures are designed to assist in evaluating past program performance and not for predicting the future behavior of individuals. They explain only a portion of the variation in recidivism rates among individuals and should only be used to evaluate overall program expected and observed outcomes.

Findings

The Program Accountability Measures scores for the 14 non-residential and 32 residential programs are presented in three ways:

1. By residential status and security type in descending order of PAM score;
2. By residential status and security type in descending order of program effectiveness; and
3. By program effectiveness categories in ascending order of cost (with separate tables for non-residential and residential programs).

Program Effectiveness Categories

Residential and non-residential programs are divided into five categories based on the standardized difference between their expected success range and their observed success rates as follows:

- **Highly Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are greater than the upper limit of the expected success range by more than one standard deviation. Sixteen percent (n=5) of the residential programs and seven percent (n=1) of the non-residential programs fall into this category.
- **Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that exceed the upper limit of the expected success range by up to one standard deviation. Thirty-one percent (n=10) of the residential programs and 29% (n=4) of the non-residential programs fall into this category.
- **Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having actual observed success rates that are within the expected success range. Thirty-one percent (n=10) of the residential programs and 7% (n=1) of the non-residential programs fall into this category.
- **Below Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are up to one standard deviation below the lower limit of the expected success range. Six percent (n=2) of the residential programs and 50% (n=7) of the non-residential programs fall into this category.
- **Least Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are more than one standard deviation below the lower limit of the expected success range. Sixteen percent (n=5) of the residential programs and 7 (n=1) of the non-residential programs fall into this category.

Cost Categories

Two cost categories were computed separately for the non-residential and residential programs. Each program's cost per youth completion is compared to the average cost per completion for all programs of \$6,823 for non-residential and \$35,443 for residential programs. Programs are therefore divided into the following cost categories:

Non-Residential Programs:

- **Below Average Cost Programs:** One-half (n=7) of programs' costs were less than the overall average program cost per youth. The cost per completion for these non-residential programs was \$6,823 or less.

- Above Average Cost Programs: One-half (n=7) of programs had costs above the overall average. The cost per completion for these non-residential programs was greater than \$6,823.

Residential Programs:

- Below Average Cost Programs: Fifty-nine percent (n=19) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per completion for these residential programs was \$35,443 or less.
- Above Average Cost Programs: Forty-one percent (n=13) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per completion for these residential programs was greater than \$35,443.

PAM Scores by Residential and Non-Residential Status

Tables 1 and 2 provide a breakdown of the non-residential and residential programs ranked by PAM score. The rank allows a comparison of the overall recidivism and cost effectiveness between programs. In addition, security types are provided for the residential juvenile justice facilities.

Table 1. Non-Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Zion Human Services	25	10%	\$8,806	91
Educational and Treatment Council, Inc.	42	3%	\$3,069	83
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	73	1%	\$3,975	78
American Resource Technicians	249	-2%	\$1,629	75
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	109	2%	\$11,974	74
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Intensive Home	102	-3%	\$5,361	70
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Lafayette District)	154	-5%	\$2,782	69
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Day Program	99	-2%	\$10,157	68
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Hammond District)	66	-6%	\$1,835	68
Volunteers of America - Non-Residential Services	41	1%	\$19,595	66
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	49	0%	\$18,576	65
Boys & Girls Village - Day Program (Lake Charles)	25	-5%	\$10,665	63
Medical Management Options - Northshore	69	-4%	\$18,302	58
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Thibodaux District)	37	-15%	\$2,251	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 2. Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Security Type	Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Non-Secure	Harmony Center Inc - Supervised Apartments	16	8%	\$21,944	96
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Group Home Female	17	8%	\$27,487	94
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Female	22	3%	\$27,461	81
Non-Secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	31	1%	\$27,578	76
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Male	67	1%	\$32,709	75
Non-Secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	30	0%	\$25,071	74
Non-Secure	Youth House of Ouachita II - Female	20	0%	\$25,492	74
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Female	49	3%	\$51,817	74
Regular/Short Term Secure	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth	669	-1%	\$20,492	73
Non-Secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport	50	0%	\$30,074	73
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Female	22	0%	\$33,204	72
Regular Secure	Jena Juvenile Correction Center	247	-1%	\$25,816	72
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Male	16	0%	\$37,027	71
Non-Secure	Challenge & Development Center of Clinton	18	-2%	\$19,664	71
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Male	31	0%	\$37,614	71
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Hadley Group Home	20	0%	\$37,787	71
Non-Secure	Tyche - Christian Acres	164	-1%	\$29,604	70
Non-Secure	Tyche - Briar Hill	35	-2%	\$23,301	70
Regular/Short Term Secure	Swanson Correctional Center Madison (Contracted/State Funded)	950	-1%	\$33,507	69
Non-Secure	Father Flanagans Girls and Boys Town	17	-1%	\$35,919	69
Non-Secure	Community Receiving Home	27	0%	\$44,925	69
Non-Secure	Larry Reynolds Institute Of Youth Guidance	78	0%	\$45,600	68
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	16	4%	\$92,062	68
Non-Secure	La Methodist Childrens Home - Female	18	0%	\$47,795	68
Non-Secure	Johnny Robinsons Boys Home	65	-4%	\$19,023	66
Regular Secure	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	1,033	-2%	\$39,697	65
Non-Secure	Joy Home for Boys	51	-4%	\$23,907	64
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Shirleys Den	17	-3%	\$32,975	64
Regular Secure	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe	462	-1%	\$59,658	62
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate	25	-6%	\$34,330	56
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive	19	-6%	\$44,071	53
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Male	19	-9%	\$62,887	40

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

PAM Scores by Program Effectiveness Categories

Tables 3 and 4 present PAM scores for the non-residential and residential programs by the five recidivism effectiveness categories identified earlier in the report. For each program, the tables provide the observed success rate, expected success range, percent above or below expected success rate, two-year program costs, program cost per completion, and the PAM score for each program. This presentation allows a comparison of program success rates by program type (non-residential and residential; and security type within residential program listings).

Table 3. Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Zion Human Services	25	88%	75% - 78%	10%	\$220,156	\$8,806	91
Effective Programs							
Educational and Treatment Council, Inc.	42	81%	75% - 78%	3%	\$128,884	\$3,069	83
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	109	80%	77% - 78%	2%	\$1,305,183	\$11,974	74
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	73	78%	76% - 77%	1%	\$290,152	\$3,975	78
Volunteers of America - Non-Residential Services	41	78%	75% - 77%	1%	\$803,381	\$19,595	66
Average Programs							
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	49	76%	75% - 77%	0%	\$910,228	\$18,576	65
Below Average Programs							
American Resource Technicians	249	73%	75% - 76%	-2%	\$405,683	\$1,629	75
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Day Program	99	73%	75% - 76%	-2%	\$1,005,582	\$10,157	68
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Intensive Home	102	71%	74% - 75%	-3%	\$546,824	\$5,361	70
Medical Management Options - Northshore	69	70%	73% - 75%	-4%	\$1,262,834	\$18,302	58
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Lafayette District)	154	67%	72% - 73%	-5%	\$428,440	\$2,782	69
Boys & Girls Village - Day Program (Lake Charles)	25	68%	73% - 76%	-5%	\$266,613	\$10,665	63
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Hammond District)	66	67%	73% - 74%	-6%	\$121,094	\$1,835	68
Least Effective Programs							
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Thibodaux District)	37	57%	71% - 74%	-15%	\$83,284	\$2,251	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 4. Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Security Type	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs								
Non-Secure	Harmony Center Inc - Supervised Apartments	16	94%	77% - 86%	8%	\$351,112	\$21,944	96
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Group Home Female	17	94%	78% - 86%	8%	\$467,279	\$27,487	94
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	16	88%	75% - 84%	4%	\$1,472,992	\$92,062	68
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Female	22	86%	77% - 84%	3%	\$604,135	\$27,461	81
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Female	49	88%	82% - 85%	3%	\$2,539,051	\$51,817	74
Effective Programs								
Non-Secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	31	84%	77% - 82%	1%	\$854,923	\$27,578	76
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Male	67	84%	80% - 83%	1%	\$2,191,481	\$32,709	75
Average Programs								
Non-Secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	30	70%	69% - 75%	0%	\$752,122	\$25,071	74
Non-Secure	Youth House of Ouachita II - Female	20	80%	73% - 81%	0%	\$509,842	\$25,492	74
Non-Secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport	50	68%	68% - 73%	0%	\$1,503,686	\$30,074	73
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Female	22	77%	72% - 79%	0%	\$730,494	\$33,204	72
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Male	16	69%	67% - 77%	0%	\$592,428	\$37,027	71
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Male	31	68%	68% - 74%	0%	\$1,166,048	\$37,614	71
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Hadley Group Home	20	80%	73% - 81%	0%	\$755,746	\$37,787	71
Non-Secure	Community Receiving Home	27	78%	74% - 81%	0%	\$1,212,978	\$44,925	69
Non-Secure	Larry Reynolds Institute Of Youth Guidance	78	76%	75% - 78%	0%	\$3,556,763	\$45,600	68
Non-Secure	La Methodist Childrens Home - Female	18	78%	71% - 80%	0%	\$860,302	\$47,795	68
Below Average Programs								
Regular Secure	Jena Juvenile Correction Center	247	64%	65% - 66%	-1%	\$6,376,461	\$25,816	72
Regular Secure	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe	462	75%	76% - 77%	-1%	\$27,561,919	\$59,658	62
Regular/Short Term Secure	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth	669	59%	60% - 61%	-1%	\$13,708,941	\$20,492	73
Regular/Short Term Secure	Swanson Correctional Center Madison (Contracted/State Funded)	950	67%	68% - 68%	-1%	\$31,831,337	\$33,507	69
Non-Secure	Tyche - Christian Acres	164	66%	67% - 69%	-1%	\$4,854,991	\$29,604	70
Non-Secure	Father Flanagans Girls and Boys Town	17	65%	66% - 76%	-1%	\$610,624	\$35,919	69
Regular Secure	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	1,033	75%	77% - 77%	-2%	\$41,006,861	\$39,697	65
Non-Secure	Challenge & Development Center of Clinton	18	61%	63% - 74%	-2%	\$353,947	\$19,664	71
Non-Secure	Tyche - Briar Hill	35	63%	65% - 71%	-2%	\$815,540	\$23,301	70
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Shirleys Den	17	59%	62% - 73%	-3%	\$560,578	\$32,975	64
Least Effective Programs								
Non-Secure	Johnny Robinsons Boys Home	65	52%	56% - 60%	-4%	\$1,236,523	\$19,023	66
Non-Secure	Joy Home for Boys	51	53%	57% - 61%	-4%	\$1,219,272	\$23,907	64
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate	25	52%	58% - 66%	-6%	\$858,245	\$34,330	56
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive	19	53%	59% - 69%	-6%	\$837,352	\$44,071	53
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Male	19	47%	56% - 67%	-9%	\$1,194,848	\$62,887	40

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

PAM Scores by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Tables 5 and 6 compare program PAM scores and effectiveness groupings by the two cost categories. This allows an examination of program recidivism rates relative to cost effectiveness.

Table 5. Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Security Type	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Above Average Cost								
NR	Zion Human Services	25	88%	75% - 78%	10%	\$220,156	\$8,806	91
EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
NR	Educational and Treatment Council, Inc.	42	81%	75% - 78%	3%	\$128,884	\$3,069	83
NR	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	73	78%	76% - 77%	1%	\$290,152	\$3,975	78
Above Average Cost								
NR	Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	109	80%	77% - 78%	2%	\$1,305,183	\$11,974	74
NR	Volunteers of America - Non-Residential Services	41	78%	75% - 77%	1%	\$803,381	\$19,595	66
AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Above Average Cost								
NR	Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	49	76%	75% - 77%	0%	\$910,228	\$18,576	65
BELOW AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
NR	American Resource Technicians	249	73%	75% - 76%	-2%	\$405,683	\$1,629	75
NR	Childrens Comprehensive Services - Intensive Home	102	71%	74% - 75%	-3%	\$546,824	\$5,361	70
NR	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Lafayette District)	154	67%	72% - 73%	-5%	\$428,440	\$2,782	69
NR	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Hammond District)	66	67%	73% - 74%	-6%	\$121,094	\$1,835	68
Above Average Cost								
NR	Childrens Comprehensive Services - Day Program	99	73%	75% - 76%	-2%	\$1,005,582	\$10,157	68
NR	Boys & Girls Village - Day Program (Lake Charles)	25	68%	73% - 76%	-5%	\$266,613	\$10,665	63
NR	Medical Management Options - Northshore	69	70%	73% - 75%	-4%	\$1,262,834	\$18,302	58
LEAST EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
NR	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Thibodaux District)	37	57%	71% - 74%	-15%	\$83,284	\$2,251	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 6. Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Security Type	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
Non-Secure	Harmony Center Inc - Supervised Apartments	16	94%	77% - 86%	8%	\$351,112	\$21,944	96
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Group Home Female	17	94%	78% - 86%	8%	\$467,279	\$27,487	94
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Female	22	86%	77% - 84%	3%	\$604,135	\$27,461	81
Above Average Cost								
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Female	49	88%	82% - 85%	3%	\$2,539,051	\$51,817	74
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	16	88%	75% - 84%	4%	\$1,472,992	\$92,062	68
EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
Non-Secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	31	84%	77% - 82%	1%	\$854,923	\$27,578	76
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Male	67	84%	80% - 83%	1%	\$2,191,481	\$32,709	75
AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
Non-Secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	30	70%	69% - 75%	0%	\$752,122	\$25,071	74
Non-Secure	Youth House of Ouachita II - Female	20	80%	73% - 81%	0%	\$509,842	\$25,492	74
Non-Secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport	50	68%	68% - 73%	0%	\$1,503,686	\$30,074	73
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Female	22	77%	72% - 79%	0%	\$730,494	\$33,204	72
Above Average Cost								
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Male	16	69%	67% - 77%	0%	\$592,428	\$37,027	71
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Male	31	68%	68% - 74%	0%	\$1,166,048	\$37,614	71
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Hadley Group Home	20	80%	73% - 81%	0%	\$755,746	\$37,787	71
Non-Secure	Community Receiving Home	27	78%	74% - 81%	0%	\$1,212,978	\$44,925	69
Non-Secure	Larry Reynolds Institute Of Youth Guidance	78	76%	75% - 78%	0%	\$3,556,763	\$45,600	68
Non-Secure	La Methodist Childrens Home - Female	18	78%	71% - 80%	0%	\$860,302	\$47,795	68
BELOW AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
Regular Secure	Jena Juvenile Correction Center	247	64%	65% - 66%	-1%	\$6,376,461	\$25,816	72
Regular/Short Term Secure	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth	669	59%	60% - 61%	-1%	\$13,708,941	\$20,492	73
Regular/Short Term Secure	Swanson Correctional Center Madison (Contracted/State Funded)	950	67%	68% - 68%	-1%	\$31,831,337	\$33,507	69

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**Table 6. Residential Programs Ranked by
Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories (continued)**

Security Type	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
BELOW AVERAGE PROGRAMS (continued)								
Below Average Cost (continued)								
Non-Secure	Challenge & Development Center of Clinton	18	61%	63% - 74%	-2%	\$353,947	\$19,664	71
Non-Secure	Tyche - Christian Acres	164	66%	67% - 69%	-1%	\$4,854,991	\$29,604	70
Non-Secure	Tyche - Briar Hill	35	63%	65% - 71%	-2%	\$815,540	\$23,301	70
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Shirleys Den	17	59%	62% - 73%	-3%	\$560,578	\$32,975	64
Above Average Cost								
Regular Secure	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	1,033	75%	77% - 77%	-2%	\$41,006,861	\$39,697	65
Regular Secure	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe	462	75%	76% - 77%	-1%	\$27,561,919	\$59,658	62
Non-Secure	Father Flanagans Girls and Boys Town	17	65%	66% - 76%	-1%	\$610,624	\$35,919	69
LEAST EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Below Average Cost								
Non-Secure	Johnny Robinsons Boys Home	65	52%	56% - 60%	-4%	\$1,236,523	\$19,023	66
Non-Secure	Joy Home for Boys	51	53%	57% - 61%	-4%	\$1,219,272	\$23,907	64
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate	25	52%	58% - 66%	-6%	\$858,245	\$34,330	56
Above Average Cost								
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive	19	53%	59% - 69%	-6%	\$837,352	\$44,071	53
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Male	19	47%	56% - 67%	-9%	\$1,194,848	\$62,887	40

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Conclusion

Employing a method to compare program effectiveness and cost is an important part of ensuring that government funds are wisely allocated. The results of the Louisiana PAM analysis indicate that there are both excellent programs that are successfully reducing recidivism in a cost effective manner, as well as programs that are failing to achieve these goals.

This evaluation examined youth released between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001 from DP&C/OYD programs. Observed recidivism rates ranged from 12% to 43% for non-residential programs and from 6% to 53% for residential programs. Cost per successful completion ranged from \$1,629 to \$19,595 for non-residential programs, and from \$19,023 to \$92,062 for residential programs.

When the percent above or below the expected success range is examined, wide variation is observed. The most effective non-residential program (Zion Human Services) exceeded

their expected success rate by 10%, while the least effective program (Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services) had an observed success rate that was 15% less than would be expected given the youth they served.

Similar variation was observed among residential programs. The most effective residential programs (Harmony Center Inc and Boys and Girls Village Group Home for Girls) exceeded their expected success rate by 8%, while the least effective program (Hope Haven for Boys) had an observed success rate that was 9% less than would be expected given the youth they served.

Finally, the PAM scores ranged from 51 to 91 for non-residential programs and 40 to 96 for residential programs. The non-residential program with the lowest cost per successful completion was Zion Human Services, while the residential program with the lowest cost per successful completion was Johnny Robinson's Boys Home.

While outcome studies are a crucial part of providing effective juvenile justice programming, another important step in creating a system for continual improvement is to build an understanding of the relationships between program components and outcomes. More than 40 years of research on correctional programs has led to the identification of principles of effective intervention to guide the development and operation of juvenile justice programs. This body of literature, generally referred to as What Works¹⁴ has resulted in the identification of characteristics of effective programs and risk factors associated with delinquent behavior. The What Works approach involves treatment designed to target predictors of crime and identify youths' risk levels in order to deliver effective juvenile justice programming. Assessment instruments, such as the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory,¹⁵ which is designed to correlate with recidivism rates, can be used as a tool to identify program characteristics associated with successful outcomes. Replication of effective programs and modification or elimination of ineffective components is then possible. The Louisiana Program Accountability Measures Report represents an important step and a critical component in the on-going process of implementing sound juvenile justice programming in a cost effective manner.

¹⁴ Sherman et al. (1997). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising: A Report to the United States Congress. Prepared for the National Institute of Justice.

¹⁵ Gendreau, P. and D. Andrews (1989). The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (1sted.). Saint John: University of New Brunswick.

Appendix A1 - Excluded Programs

Security Type	Program Code	Name of Program	1999-2000 Releases	2000-2001 Releases	Total Releases	Reason Excluded from PAM Calculations
Non-secure	0852	Ware Youth Center Girls	0	4	4	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0803	Cane River Childrens Services	5	2	7	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0804	Boys and Girls Villages (Girls)	5	2	7	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	2108	Harmony Center - A.B. Horne	3	5	8	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0832	Youth House of Ouachita I	6	4	10	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0842	The Methodist Home for Children	6	5	11	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0850	BHC Meadow Wood HSP DBA Quality Psych.	5	6	11	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0848	Harmony Center - HCI Focus	5	7	12	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0702, 0704, 0705	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services	7	6	13	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0847	North American Family Institute	14	0	14	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	1405	Harmony III	9	5	14	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0306	Orleans Marine Institute	16	0	16	No program cost. Contract expired 6/30/99 before study period
Non-secure	0811	Health Access	1	0	1	No program cost and released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	1419	Boys and Girls Foundation	1	0	0	No program cost and released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	1904	McAdoo Hotel	0	2	2	No program cost and released less than 15 youth
NR	0408	Family Counseling Ag	1	0	1	No program cost and released less than 15 youth
NR	2001	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Service- New Orleans District	0	1	1	No program cost and released less than 15 youth
NR	0312	Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles	0	6	6	Released less than 15 youth
NR	0307	Zion Day Program	7	0	7	Released less than 15 youth

Appendix A2 - Definitions of Terms

Cost minimization index: The value of the standardized measure for cost per completion, inverted (multiplied by -1) to allow lower costs to contribute positively in the PAM score. Cost is standardized by dividing the program cost per completion by the standard deviation of program cost per completion among all programs included in the report.

Expected success range: The expected success rate plus or minus the margin of error (the 99% confidence interval for the measure of expected success). If the observed success rate falls below the lower limit or exceeds the upper limit of the expected success range, the probability that the difference is due to random error is less than 1%.

Expected success rate: The average probability of success for youth released from a program, based on the risk factors for recidivism. Separate predictive models for residential and non-residential programs were developed. For non-residential programs the risk factors identified in available data as significant predictors of recidivism include age at release, gender, the length of stay, number of prior adjudications, whether a youth's most serious offense was a status offense, and whether youth is an occasional or serious drug user. For residential programs the risk factors identified in available data as significant predictors of recidivism include the include age at release, gender, race, number of prior adjudications, whether a youth's most serious offense was a status or property offense, and whether the youth is classified as a severe truant.

Included programs: Residential and non-residential programs with at least 15 youth released between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001.

Percentage above expected success range: The difference between the observed success rate for a program and the upper limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percentage below expected success range: The difference between the observed success rate for a program and the lower limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percent difference: The percent above or below the expected success range.

Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score: The PAM score is calculated by summing the program cost measure (weighted by a factor of one-third) and the program effectiveness measure (weighted by a factor of two-thirds). The combined measure is then standardized and transformed into a PAM score similar to the typical grading scale where 70 is considered average.

Program completions: Youth who were released from a program directly to the community or to parole.

Program cost per completion: Total expenditures for each program divided by the number of program completions for the two-year period between FY 1999-2000 and FY 2000-2001 (see definition of program completions above and total expenditures below).

Recidivism: a subsequent juvenile adjudication, adult conviction, status offense, or revocation within one year of a youth's release to the community or to parole services.

Recidivism pool: A pool of 4,437 youth released from residential programs and 1,171 youth released from non-residential programs to the community or parole services between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001. Recidivism is tracked for one year after each youth's release. Therefore, a youth released on June 29, 2001 is tracked till June 28, 2002

Program effectiveness index: The difference between the observed success rate and the upper limit (for positive differences) or lower limit (for negative differences) of the expected success range.

Standardization: Conversion of the two accountability measures to a uniform scale in order to combine them into a single measure; a process similar to converting academic grades to a scale of 100. Cost and effectiveness measures are standardized by dividing each program's value on each of the two measures by the standard deviation for the distribution of values for all included programs.

Success rate: The percentage of youth released from a program that do not recidivate (as defined above) within one year after release.

Total Expenditures (Two-Year Expenditures): DP&C/OYD expenditures for FYs 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

Appendix A3 - Non-Residential Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Non-Residential Programs

Non-Residential Programs	Risk Factors								
	Recidivism Pool	Average Length of Stay (days)	Average # of Prior Adjudicated Charges	Percent of Youths With Most Serious Prior a Status Offense	% Male	Average Age at Release	Percent of Youths with Occasional or Serious Drug Use	Expected Success Range	Success Rate
American Resource Technicians	249	86.5	2.0	12%	81%	16.3	59%	75% - 76%	73%
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	109	178.0	1.3	9%	85%	16.1	63%	77% - 78%	80%
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	49	159.6	1.5	39%	78%	15.9	59%	75% - 77%	76%
Boys & Girls Village - Day Program (Lake Charles)	25	141.3	3.2	8%	76%	16.0	88%	73% - 76%	68%
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Day Program	99	113.8	1.8	17%	75%	16.1	49%	75% - 76%	73%
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Intensive Home	102	56.0	1.7	25%	63%	15.8	58%	74% - 75%	71%
Educational and Treatment Council, Inc.	42	44.5	2.4	14%	67%	15.4	52%	75% - 78%	81%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Hammond District)	66	90.1	2.2	9%	89%	16.5	68%	73% - 74%	67%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Lafayette District)	154	102.9	2.7	8%	90%	16.1	62%	72% - 73%	67%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Thibodaux District)	37	86.8	3.1	0%	95%	16.1	81%	71% - 74%	57%
Medical Management Options - Northshore	69	131.5	2.6	3%	72%	16.1	55%	73% - 75%	70%
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	73	42.5	1.7	12%	63%	15.6	40%	76% - 77%	78%
Volunteers of America - Non-Residential Services	41	197.4	1.9	24%	78%	15.6	39%	75% - 77%	78%
Zion Human Services	25	157.1	1.9	20%	68%	16.7	88%	75% - 78%	88%

Appendix A4 - Residential Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Residential Programs

Security Type	Residential Programs	Recidivism Pool	Risk Factors								Expected Success Range	Success Rate
			Average # of Prior Adjudicated Offenses Before Release	% Black	% Male	Average Age at Release	Percent of Youths Who Were Severe Truants	Percent of Youths With Status Offense as Most Serious Prior	Percent of Youths With Felony Property Offense as Most Serious Prior			
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Group Home Female	17	3.1	29%	0%	17.2	29%	47%	6%	78% - 86%	94%	
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Male	31	3.8	58%	100%	16.1	52%	10%	61%	68% - 74%	68%	
Regular/Short Term Secure	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth	669	2.9	69%	100%	16.1	41%	0%	43%	60% - 61%	59%	
Non-Secure	Challenge & Development Center of Clinton	18	1.6	67%	100%	15.3	44%	78%	11%	63% - 74%	61%	
Non-Secure	Community Receiving Home	27	1.9	70%	63%	16.1	15%	48%	15%	74% - 81%	78%	
Non-Secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport	50	2.3	92%	100%	16.3	54%	18%	48%	68% - 73%	68%	
Non-Secure	Father Flanagans Girls and Boys Town	17	2.1	76%	65%	15.9	41%	41%	18%	66% - 76%	65%	
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Hadley Group Home	20	2.1	70%	100%	15.7	35%	30%	35%	73% - 81%	80%	
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - Shirleys Den	17	3.0	76%	100%	15.9	53%	12%	29%	62% - 73%	59%	
Non-Secure	Harmony Center Inc - Supervised Apartments	16	2.6	88%	100%	19.2	44%	0%	13%	77% - 86%	94%	
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Female	49	1.7	55%	0%	15.8	53%	49%	6%	82% - 85%	88%	
Non-Secure	Hope Haven - Male	19	2.1	53%	100%	15.2	58%	21%	11%	56% - 67%	47%	
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive	19	2.1	68%	100%	15.2	84%	32%	42%	59% - 69%	53%	
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate	25	2.5	48%	100%	14.9	56%	16%	48%	58% - 66%	52%	
Regular Secure	Jena Juvenile Correction Center	247	3.4	81%	100%	17.7	35%	0%	35%	65% - 66%	64%	
Regular Secure	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	1,033	3.2	78%	63%	17.1	42%	0%	33%	77% - 77%	75%	
Non-Secure	Johnny Robinsons Boys Home	65	2.5	60%	100%	15.6	54%	18%	40%	56% - 60%	52%	
Non-Secure	Joy Home for Boys	51	2.6	73%	100%	14.0	78%	20%	25%	57% - 61%	53%	
Non-Secure	La Methodist Childrens Home - Female	18	1.9	50%	0%	16.1	44%	39%	11%	71% - 80%	78%	
Non-Secure	Larry Reynolds Institute Of Youth Guidance	78	2.2	64%	100%	16.5	36%	15%	32%	75% - 78%	76%	
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Female	22	1.9	64%	0%	16.3	64%	50%	14%	72% - 79%	77%	
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Male	67	1.8	67%	100%	16.8	57%	16%	30%	80% - 83%	84%	
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Female	22	2.1	77%	0%	15.8	41%	45%	9%	77% - 84%	86%	
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Male	16	2.1	63%	100%	15.6	69%	25%	31%	67% - 77%	69%	
Regular Secure	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe	462	3.1	81%	100%	17.8	39%	0%	39%	76% - 77%	75%	
Regular/Short Term Secure	Swanson Correctional Center Madison (Contracted/State Funded)	950	3.1	76%	100%	16.9	43%	0%	46%	68% - 68%	67%	
Non-Secure	Tyche - Briar Hill	35	4.2	63%	100%	15.8	57%	6%	54%	65% - 71%	63%	
Non-Secure	Tyche - Christian Acres	164	2.2	61%	100%	15.9	51%	20%	38%	67% - 69%	66%	
Non-Secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	31	2.0	45%	0%	15.9	48%	58%	13%	77% - 82%	84%	
Non-Secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	30	2.4	43%	0%	15.6	43%	60%	7%	69% - 75%	70%	
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	16	3.3	81%	100%	17.0	50%	6%	44%	75% - 84%	88%	
Non-Secure	Youth House of Ouachita II - Female	20	1.8	75%	0%	15.5	50%	55%	10%	73% - 81%	80%	

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the consultation and assistance of the staff at the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Office of Youth Development. In particular, we would like to thank George White, James Bueche, Ruth Goodman, Melba Oubre, and Amy Primes for their support and commitment to outcome evaluation in the aim of providing effective programming to delinquent youths.