

Program Accountability Measures
**2005 Louisiana
PAM Report**

June 2005

A Research Report Submitted to the



Louisiana Office of Youth Development
Kathleen B. Blanco, Governor
Simon G. Gonsoulin, Deputy Secretary

Produced by the



Justice Research Center, Inc.
2898 Mahan Drive, Suite 4
Tallahassee, FL 32308

Final Report

June 2005

Produced by

The Justice Research Center, Inc.
2898 Mahan Drive, Suite 4
Tallahassee, Florida 32308
(850) 521-9900
www.thejrc.com

Kristin Parsons Winokur, Ph.D.
Julia L. Blankenship, MSW
Gregory A. Hand, B.S.

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
The PAM Model.....	8
Goals of Program Accountability.....	9
Data and Methodology	10
Data Sources.....	10
Recidivism Pool Selection	11
Calculating the PAM Score.....	12
Program Effectiveness Measure.....	12
Program Cost Measure	15
The PAM Score: Combining Cost and Effectiveness Measures.....	15
Limitations	15
Non-Residential and Residential Demographic, Cost and Recidivism Figures.....	15
PAM Analysis Findings	28
Program Effectiveness Categories	28
Cost Categories	29
Non-Residential Programs:	29
Residential Programs:	29
PAM Scores by Residential and Non-Residential Status.....	29
PAM Scores by Program Effectiveness Categories	32
PAM Scores by Cost Categories and Program Effectiveness	36
Conclusion.....	40
Appendix A1 - Common Definitions Report	43
Appendix A2 - Programs Excluded from PAM Calculations	62
Appendix A3 - Definitions of Terms	65
Appendix A4 - Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Recidivism Range for Non-Residential Programs.....	67
Appendix A5 - Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Recidivism Range for Residential Programs.....	68
Appendix A6 – Risk Factors, Recidivism and Cost Effectiveness, and PAM Scores for Non-Residential and Residential Programs, 2003-2005	70
Acknowledgements	77

Introduction

The 2005 Louisiana Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Report presents a comprehensive outcome evaluation of juvenile justice programs serving youth in the state of Louisiana. The study is the result of an ongoing collaborative effort between the Louisiana Office of Youth Development (OYD) and the Justice Research Center (JRC) to develop a program accountability model for programs serving delinquent youth.

The PAM Report details the annual assessment and ranking of Louisiana's residential and non-residential juvenile justice programs in terms of program costs and recidivism. The methodology is based upon the program accountability model used by the JRC to evaluate programs operated under the direction of the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.¹ The methodology employed in the PAM model has been recognized by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) as a best practice in the use of juvenile justice data. In 2005, the Florida PAM model was selected as a semi-finalist in Harvard University's prestigious Innovations in American Government Awards program. Often referred to as the "Oscars" of government prizes, selection of the Florida PAM model as a semi-finalist in the awards program placed it in the top five percent of all programs nominated across the country. The PAM model was recognized by Harvard University as one of the most creative, forward thinking, results-driven government programs in the nation. A comprehensive description of the background and methodology employed in the PAM model was published in the peer-reviewed journal, *Federal Probation*. The article entitled, *What Works in Juvenile Justice Outcome Measurement—A Comparison of Predicted to Observed Performance*, was published in 2002.²

The Louisiana Office of Youth Development in collaboration with the Justice Research Center, replicated the PAM model with Louisiana's juvenile justice programs beginning in 2003 and has since continued this important outcome evaluation annually. Now with three years of data, it is possible to examine trends in cost and recidivism effectiveness among Louisiana's programs. The PAM analysis represents an important step in the process of ensuring effective programming for youth committed to juvenile justice facilities. It should not be used in isolation however as it provides the means by which to rank the relative cost and recidivism effectiveness of programs, but is not intended to identify specific programming factors resulting in facilities being evaluated as effective or ineffective. Instead, the PAM model should be an initial step in the outcome evaluation and effective program implementation process. Program rankings and outcomes should then be used to further explore program characteristics and determine why some facilities

¹ The Justice Research Center has been under contract with the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (FDJJ) since 2001, to produce its annual PAM Report and ranking of all residential juvenile justice facilities serving youth in the state of Florida. Prior to 2001, JRC staff members worked as employees of the FDJJ and were responsible for preparing annual outcome evaluation reports including the PAM assessment. A copy of the most recent annual Florida Program Accountability Measures Report can be found at the following link: <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/statsnresearch/mr/2005reports.html#mr0501>. Justice Research Center (2005). *The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice's Program Accountability Measures: The 2005 PAM Report, A Two-Year Analysis*. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice: Tallahassee, FL.

² Winokur, K., Tollett, T., and Jackson, S. (2002). "What Works in Juvenile Justice Outcome Measurement: A Comparison of Predicted Success to Observed Performance." *Federal Probation* 66(2): 50-56.

score Below Average while others are consistently ranked as Above Average. Using additional program evaluation tools such as the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI)³ to identify effective and ineffective programming elements, assists programs and administrators in improving services and outcomes. When coupled with such an approach, the PAM model becomes a vital component to effective, evidenced-based service delivery throughout the juvenile justice system.

The PAM Model

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. An outcome evaluation of programs on the basis of recidivism alone does not account for these variations. For example, programs serving all males or chronic offenders are likely to have higher recidivism rates than those serving females or youth without extensive prior records. The PAM model estimates the probability of program youth recidivating given the youths' 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 compare this to how well the program's youth actually performed (observed recidivism) after release. With this approach, programs serving youth with greater 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 based upon recidivism effectiveness and operating costs is calculated for each program to provide a relative ranking of all the juvenile justice programs serving youths under the direction of the OYD. 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 which incorporates: (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 OYD during fiscal years (FY) 2001-02 and 2002-03. Given the diversity in juvenile justice program types, PAM scores were calculated separately for non-residential and residential programs.⁴

³ Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D.A., (1990). "Tertiary Prevention: What the Meta-analysis of the Offender Treatment Literature Tells us About 'What Works.'" *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32, 173-184.

⁴ Louisiana operates both secure and non-secure residential juvenile justice programs. These programs may serve diverse populations with different underlying risk factors. While separate models were developed for residential secure and residential non-secure programs, there were only three secure programs, making it methodologically unfeasible to calculate reliable standardized rankings. As such, residential secure programs were combined and evaluated with residential non-secure programs.

Goals of Program Accountability

Implementing an innovative policy initiative like the PAM model requires creative mechanisms for evaluating successes and outcomes. The model was developed with three goals in mind: 1) developing an effective method of evaluating program outcomes accepted by government and providers alike; 2) developing a useful, easily interpretable evaluation tool; and 3) developing an equitable evaluation model.

The most significant undertaking is the first goal of developing an effective method of evaluating juvenile justice programs that is supported by government stakeholders, policymakers, OYD personnel and program providers. Historical evaluation methods often rely only on comparisons of program recidivism rates and ignore offender characteristics and program cost-effectiveness. Recidivism rates alone fail to account for variations in the seriousness of offenders served by programs and fail to measure program cost-effectiveness. The PAM model addresses these shortcomings by incorporating measures of programs' average seriousness of offenders, average prior adjudications, average number of youth successfully completing the program, percent who recidivate, and cost per successful completion. The model incorporates rigorous statistical methods, including logistic regression analyses to identify significant risk factors associated with recidivism and Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) to control for program influences and effects as well as the seriousness of youth served by the various programs. The consensus of providers, stakeholders, and departmental personnel established that recidivism effectiveness be weighted by a factor of two-thirds, while program cost-effectiveness indicators be weighted by a factor of one-third in the model.

The second and third goals of program accountability are as integral as the first goal. To be effective, any accountability initiative needs to be equitable and easily interpretable. Models based solely on recidivism create an inequitable 'apples to oranges' comparison whereby programs serving more serious offenders with greater risks for re-offending are treated the same as programs serving considerably less serious offenders. As such, the PAM model incorporates a standardized measure of expected versus observed recidivism for each program, controlling for underlying risk factors of youth served. Program expenditure comparisons include the standardized difference between program cost per completion and the statewide average program cost. These measures even the playing field and establish an equitable model supported by government and providers alike.

In the early years of the development of the PAM model in Florida, the report provided summative indices and z-score statistics for readers to interpret, and as such, the reports accomplished little in effectuating provider buy-in, understanding, and service improvement. The current report in Louisiana now presents standardized program PAM scores using an easily-interpretable scale similar to academic scoring, ranging from 1 to 100. In addition, the report includes detailed appendices documenting exact formulas used in calculating program effectiveness (expected recidivism compared to observed recidivism) and cost effectiveness (program cost per completion compared to the statewide average). A comprehensive Common Definitions report is also presented in Appendix A1

and further outlines all conceptual and operational definitions as determined by the Louisiana OYD.

Data and Methodology

Data Sources

Data were compiled from multiple sources. Five data extracts obtained from 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 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 OYD placements;
4. JIRMS Risk and Needs Assessment File that contains assessment scores for 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).

These data sources were used to identify 1,222 youth who completed non-residential programs and 4,062 youth who completed residential programs during the two-year period between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2003. Program completion is defined as a release from a program directly to the community or to parole. For residential secure programs, program completions include youth deemed to have successfully completed the program as well as those who have not successfully completed the program and been released against the recommendation of the OYD (examples include release by court order and release as a result of youth reaching the jurisdictional age limit of the juvenile court; for further explanation and examples, see the Common Definitions Report presented in Appendix A1).

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,⁵ or revocation⁶ within one year of a youth's release to the community or to parole services.

Program results are presented here for the 20 non-residential and 27 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. For a list of programs excluded, see Appendix A2.

⁵ This would include, but is not limited to, revocation due to truancy, ungovernability, a family in need of services (FINS) case, and offenses that apply only to juveniles.

⁶ 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 2001-02 and FY 2002-03, and
2. Release to the community or to a parole services non-residential program.

Typically, recidivism pool identification was based upon a release reason and/or subsequent placement. However, since release reasons were missing from the 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.⁷

Youth released from non-consecutive placements (approximately 12% 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. Based upon Common Definitions rules, different criteria were used for non-residential and residential programs (see Common Definitions Report at Appendix A1). 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, 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.⁸

Residential programs in Louisiana are classified into three 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 JJCC.⁹ 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.

⁷ Youth with subsequent placements to "client exit," "parents," or "foster family," who did not have a "pending secure or non-secure placement" as their next assigned location, were selected for inclusion in the pool.

⁸ 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 OYD.

⁹ Youth who were placed in these components (JCCY-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 expected recidivism and its actual recidivism. An estimate 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).¹⁰ This interval, referred to here as the expected recidivism range, is then compared to how well the program actually performed, or the observed recidivism rate. The difference between a program's expected recidivism range and its actual recidivism rate provides a measure of the crime reduction effect the program achieved.¹¹

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 index¹²
- Average prior offense seriousness¹³
- Total number of prior adjudications
- Total number of adjudicated offenses during supervision
- Most serious prior offense¹⁴
- Family stability
- Drug use
- Alcohol use
- Emotional stability
- School discipline

¹⁰ 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 recidivism).

¹¹ 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 confidence intervals.

¹² 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.

¹³ This is the AIS divided by the total number of prior adjudicated offenses.

¹⁴ 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.

- Educational/vocational performance
- Negative peer relationships
- Employment
- Economic status
- Sexual problems
- Health problems
- Prior offenses (as measured on risk/needs assessment forms)
- Abuse victimization
- Whether youth is a parent
- Whether youth is a chronic offender (four or more prior adjudications)
- 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).¹⁵ 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. Gender 2. Race 3. Age at Release 4. Number of Prior Adjudications 5. Major Economic Difficulty 6. Family Instability

Risk Factors Identified by the Predictive Model for Residential Programs
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gender 2. Chronic Offender (4 or more prior adjudications) 3. Race 4. Negative or Delinquent Peers 5. Chronic Drug and/or Alcohol Use 6. Age at Release 7. Failing in School or Vocational Setting 8. Placed in Non-Secure Facility

¹⁵ 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.

Gender was the most powerful single predictor of the likelihood that a youth would recidivate for both the non-residential and residential releases. For youths released from residential programs, the odds of re-offending increased by a factor of 1.8 if the youth was male. Those classified on risk/needs assessments as chronic drug and/or alcohol users, were more likely than non-drug/alcohol users to recidivate among residential releases. Notably, youths released from non-secure residential programs were significantly less likely than their counterparts released from secure facilities to recidivate within the one-year follow-up period. In addition, youths who were younger at the time of release were much more likely to recidivate than older youth, a finding often reported in the research literature.

Prior offending was measured at the bivariate level both in terms of youths' total number of prior adjudicated offenses and in terms of the percentage of program youth classified as a chronic offender, i.e., with four or more prior adjudications. At the multivariate level, for youths released from non-residential programs, the odds of recidivating increased by a factor of 1.2 with each one point increase in the total number of prior adjudications. Similarly, residential youths classified as chronic offenders were significantly more likely to re-offend within one year of release than were youths with less serious delinquency records.

For youth released from both residential and non-residential programs, being male, minority, and younger at release significantly increased the odds of recidivating. Youths released from residential programs who associated with negative peers or were failing/performing poorly in school or a vocational setting, were significantly more likely to recidivate than those who did not associate with negative peers or were performing well academically. For non-residential youth, the odds of re-offending were increased by a factor of 1.5 when a youth's family was assessed to have some/major economic difficulty, and a factor of 1.4 when a youth's family was deemed on the risk assessment instrument to have major instability or stress. An even greater impact, however, was gender, as the odds of re-offending for youth released from non-residential programs increased by a factor of 3.0 if the youth was male.

Once the significant risk factors were identified, 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 20 non-residential and 27 residential programs that released 15 or more youth during FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03. 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 recidivism range provides a comparison between expected and observed recidivism rates taking into account an estimate of random error in the measure of expected recidivism. Subtracting a program's observed recidivism rate from the upper or lower limits of the confidence interval for expected recidivism allows an assessment of the effectiveness of each program in reducing re-offending. For definitions of all terms used in the analyses, see Appendix A3 and the Common Definitions Report provided in

Appendix A1. For a breakdown of the risk factors of youth released from each program, see Appendices A4 and A5. In addition, Appendix A6 provides the significant risk factors and PAM rankings for each non-residential and residential program over the last three years.

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 2001-02 and FY 2002-03. In calculating the PAM score, each program's cost per completion is compared to the average cost per completion of \$8,621 (up from \$7,619 in the 2004 report) for non-residential programs and \$40,619 (up only slightly from \$40,490 in the 2004 report) 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 34 to 86 for residential programs and from 51 to 86 for non-residential programs.

Limitations

The expected recidivism 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 recidivism and expected recidivism is due to program effects and to the effects of unmeasured variables. Expected recidivism 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.

Non-Residential and Residential Demographic, Cost and Recidivism Figures

A total of 37 residential and 30 non-residential programs served and released youth in Louisiana during fiscal years 2001-02 and 2002-03. Not all programs however were included in the PAM model analyses, as some had been closed or did not have at least 15 or more releases during this time period. However, basic demographic, cost and recidivism figures are presented for each of these programs, as they nonetheless served delinquent youth. The tables that follow provide a breakdown of the residential and non-residential juvenile justice programs presented separately by gender.

**Table 1. Female Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Demographic and Expenditure Information**

Program Area	Program Name	Total 2 Year Expenditure	Cost Per Completion	Number of Completions	Race			Avg. Age at Release
					White	Black	Other	
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Female	\$599,037	\$27,229	22	55%	45%	0%	16.1
Non-Secure	Cane River Children's Services - Female	\$704,390	\$64,035	11	64%	36%	0%	16.7
Non-Secure	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - Magazine Home - Female	\$151,911	\$50,637	3	33%	67%	0%	16.2
Non-Secure	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Female	\$129,855	\$21,643	6	67%	33%	0%	14.9
Non-Secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	\$2,815,105	\$48,536	58	31%	67%	2%	15.7
Secure (Regular)	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	\$16,443,159	\$43,848	375	30%	68%	1%	16.5
Non-Secure	Methodist Home for Children - Female	\$1,145,935	\$45,837	25	44%	52%	0%	16.2
Non-Secure	Renaissance - Female	\$714,621	\$39,701	18	56%	44%	0%	15.8
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Female	\$782,563	\$37,265	21	38%	62%	0%	16.3
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Female	\$620,500	\$24,820	25	40%	60%	0%	16.0
Non-Secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	\$827,542	\$25,077	33	61%	39%	0%	16.0
Non-Secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	\$684,846	\$23,615	29	28%	69%	3%	15.5
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Female	\$1,425,049	\$61,959	23	43%	57%	0%	15.5
Non-Secure	Youth House of Ouachita - Female	\$858,931	\$28,631	30	30%	70%	0%	15.9
Total		\$27,903,444	\$41,095	679	36%	63%	1%	16.2

**Table 2. Male Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Demographic and Expenditure Information**

Program Area	Program Name	Total 2 Year Expenditure	Cost Per Completion	Number of Completions	Race			Avg. Age at Release
					White	Black	Other	
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Male	\$751,591	\$53,685	14	29%	71%	0%	16.3
Secure (Short-Term)	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	\$16,527,039	\$21,890	755	30%	69%	1%	16.0
Non-Secure	Challenge and Development Center of Clinton - Male	\$386,750	\$27,625	14	43%	57%	0%	15.1
Non-Secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	\$1,488,551	\$38,168	39	15%	85%	0%	16.3
Non-Secure	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - All Districts - Male	\$143,293	\$28,659	5	20%	80%	0%	16.0
Non-Secure	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Male	\$151,497	\$21,642	7	43%	57%	0%	15.3
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	\$3,357,022	\$56,899	59	24%	76%	0%	17.1
Non-Secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts - Male	\$1,310,480	\$48,536	27	41%	59%	0%	14.8
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	\$763,524	\$36,358	21	38%	62%	0%	14.9
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	\$724,242	\$24,974	29	41%	59%	0%	15.2
Non-Secure	Jena Juvenile Correction Center - Closed - Male	NA	NA	13	0%	100%	0%	18.5
Secure (Regular)	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	\$29,071,505	\$43,848	663	21%	77%	3%	17.4
Non-Secure	Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	\$1,169,175	\$22,925	51	41%	55%	4%	15.4
Non-Secure	Joy Home for Boys - Male	\$1,187,615	\$31,253	38	29%	66%	5%	13.7
Non-Secure	Larry Reynolds Institue Of Youth Guidance - Male	\$1,378,356	\$43,074	32	53%	47%	0%	15.7
Non-Secure	Renaissance - Male	\$516,116	\$39,701	13	15%	85%	0%	16.8
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Male	\$1,937,774	\$37,265	52	29%	69%	0%	16.4
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Male	\$498,665	\$62,333	8	25%	75%	0%	15.9
Secure (Short-Term)	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	\$34,880,775	\$44,605	782	22%	77%	1%	17.0
Secure (Regular)	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	\$33,478,859	\$60,650	552	18%	80%	1%	17.6
Non-Secure	Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	\$734,421	\$30,601	24	33%	67%	0%	16.2
Non-Secure	Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	\$4,702,264	\$29,389	160	24%	73%	3%	15.9
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	\$1,548,966	\$61,959	25	52%	44%	4%	16.8
Total		\$136,708,480	\$40,410	3,383	25%	74%	1%	16.8

**Table 3. Female Non-Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Demographic and Expenditure Information**

Program Area	Program Name	Total 2 Year Expenditure	Cost Per Completion	Number of Completions	Race			Avg. Age at Release
					White	Black	Other	
Day & Trackers	American Resource Technicians - Female	\$162,503	\$4,063	40	0%	100%	0%	15.9
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	\$1,172,025	\$18,313	64	23%	77%	0%	15.6
Intensive In-Home	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Female	NA	NA	1	0%	100%	0%	16.7
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	\$183,326	\$2,321	79	34%	63%	1%	16.0
Day Program	Medical Management Options - Northshore - Female	\$256,822	\$21,402	12	75%	25%	0%	16.2
Trackers	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Female	\$9,651	\$4,826	2	50%	50%	0%	16.7
Day Program	Renaissance Day Program - Female	\$30,634	\$15,317	2	0%	100%	0%	15.9
Intensive In-Home	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	\$59,138	\$3,113	19	74%	21%	5%	15.9
Day & Trackers	Volunteers of America - Female	\$332,104	\$17,479	19	37%	63%	0%	15.9
Trackers	Zion Human Services Trackers - Female	\$75,755	\$15,151	5	40%	60%	0%	17.2
Total		\$2,281,958	\$9,391	243	31%	68%	1%	15.9

**Table 4. Male Non-Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Demographic and Expenditure Information**

Program Area	Program Name	Total 2 Year Expenditure	Cost Per Completion	Number of Completions	Race			Avg. Age at Release
					White	Black	Other	
Day Program	American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	\$637,243	\$31,862	20	5%	90%	5%	16.3
Trackers	American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	\$358,097	\$1,809	198	1%	98%	1%	16.1
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	\$1,109,101	\$13,864	80	19%	81%	0%	16.0
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	\$852,085	\$20,783	41	37%	61%	2%	15.9
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	\$661,426	\$24,497	27	26%	74%	0%	16.2
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	\$748,144	\$18,704	40	43%	50%	8%	16.1
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	\$837,047	\$18,197	46	24%	74%	2%	15.7
Intensive In-Home	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Male	NA	NA	3	0%	100%	0%	16.3
Intensive In-Home	Going Home - Lafayette - Male	NA	NA	1	100%	0%	0%	18.5
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	\$131,510	\$1,686	78	55%	44%	1%	16.6
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	\$115,254	\$2,175	53	36%	58%	6%	16.9
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	\$378,238	\$2,505	151	29%	70%	1%	16.0
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	\$102,008	\$3,188	32	78%	22%	0%	15.4
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	\$65,464	\$2,112	31	32%	68%	0%	16.3
Day Program	Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	\$1,155,701	\$21,402	54	65%	33%	2%	16.1
Trackers	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Male	\$57,903	\$4,825	12	8%	92%	0%	15.5
Day Program	Renaissance Day Program - Male	\$168,487	\$15,317	11	27%	73%	0%	15.9
Intensive In-Home	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	\$146,290	\$3,113	47	70%	28%	2%	15.6
Day Program	Volunteers of America - Male	\$845,864	\$17,997	47	40%	57%	2%	15.5
Trackers	Zion Human Services Trackers - Male	\$44,190	\$6,313	7	14%	86%	0%	17.7
Total		\$8,414,052	\$8,595	979	31%	68%	2%	16.1

**Table 5. Female Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Prior Adjudication Information by Program**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Average Prior Adjudications	Worst Prior Adjudication Type					Average Prior Seriousness Index ¹
				Felony Person	Felony Property	Other Felony	Misd.	Status	
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Female	22	2.5	0%	9%	5%	32%	54%	3.6
Non-Secure	Cane River Children's Services - Female	11	1.7	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	2.7
Non-Secure	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - Magazine Home - Female	3	1.3	0%	33%	0%	0%	67%	2.7
Non-Secure	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Female	6	2.7	17%	17%	0%	17%	50%	7.0
Non-Secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	58	1.7	10%	3%	15%	14%	58%	3.7
Secure (Regular)	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	375	2.8	25%	22%	17%	36%	0%	8.5
Non-Secure	Methodist Home for Children - Female	25	2.2	16%	12%	12%	24%	36%	5.1
Non-Secure	Renaissance - Female	18	1.7	0%	11%	6%	17%	66%	3.0
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Female	21	1.7	14%	0%	29%	29%	28%	4.1
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Female	25	1.6	8%	8%	0%	28%	56%	3.1
Non-Secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	33	2.0	3%	12%	0%	33%	52%	3.6
Non-Secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	29	2.1	0%	7%	10%	21%	62%	3.3
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Female	23	1.7	9%	22%	4%	13%	52%	3.8
Non-Secure	Youth House of Ouachita - Female	30	1.9	0%	7%	16%	17%	60%	3.0
Total		679	2.4	17%	16%	14%	29%	24%	6.3

¹ The seriousness index is comprised of the sum of all scores for adjudicated charges. The following point values are assigned: 8 for a violent felony, 5 for a property or other felony, 2 for a misdemeanor, and 1 for any other charge.

**Table 6. Male Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Prior Adjudication Information by Program**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Average Prior Adjudications	Worst Prior Adjudication Type					Average Prior Seriousness Index ¹
				Felony Person	Felony Property	Other Felony	Misd.	Status	
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Male	14	2.9	14%	21%	8%	29%	28%	8.2
Secure (Short-Term)	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	755	2.7	22%	42%	17%	19%	0%	9.9
Non-Secure	Challenge and Development Center of Clinton - Male	14	1.3	0%	7%	0%	21%	72%	1.9
Non-Secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	39	2.4	31%	36%	2%	18%	13%	9.1
Non-Secure	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - All Districts - Male	5	2.8	20%	20%	20%	0%	40%	7.6
Non-Secure	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Male	7	1.7	0%	14%	0%	43%	43%	2.9
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	59	2.4	58%	17%	6%	5%	14%	10.8
Non-Secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts - Male	27	2.0	15%	22%	7%	26%	30%	5.8
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	21	2.2	24%	33%	0%	19%	24%	6.9
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	29	2.0	17%	34%	8%	28%	13%	6.2
Non-Secure	Jena Juvenile Correction Center - Closed - Male	13	2.9	62%	23%	15%	0%	0%	14.0
Secure (Regular)	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	663	3.7	32%	38%	17%	13%	0%	13.7
Non-Secure	Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	51	2.2	14%	31%	6%	16%	33%	6.8
Non-Secure	Joy Home for Boys - Male	38	1.9	16%	34%	8%	16%	26%	6.1
Non-Secure	Larry Reynolds Institue Of Youth Guidance - Male	32	2.6	44%	19%	3%	13%	21%	8.5
Non-Secure	Renaissance - Male	13	1.8	15%	15%	1%	15%	54%	3.9
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Male	52	2.1	35%	40%	4%	15%	6%	8.5
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Male	8	2.4	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%	7.5
Secure (Short-Term)	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	782	3.2	27%	45%	13%	15%	0%	11.7
Secure (Regular)	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	552	3.2	37%	43%	8%	12%	0%	12.7
Non-Secure	Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	24	4.5	13%	50%	8%	25%	4%	12.0
Non-Secure	Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	160	2.1	18%	34%	8%	15%	25%	6.5
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	25	2.0	28%	20%	16%	12%	24%	7.2
Total		3,383	3.0	28%	40%	13%	15%	4%	11.1

¹ The seriousness index is comprised of the sum of all scores for adjudicated charges. The following point values are assigned: 8 for a violent felony, 5 for a property or other felony, 2 for a misdemeanor, and 1 for any other charge.

**Table 7. Female Non-Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Prior Adjudication Information by Program**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Average Prior Adjudications	Worst Prior Adjudication Type					Average Prior Seriousness Index ¹
				Felony Person	Felony Property	Other Felony	Misd.	Status	
Day & Trackers	American Resource Technicians - Female	40	1.7	25%	13%	17%	25%	20%	5.6
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	64	1.6	2%	8%	24%	41%	25%	3.4
Intensive In-Home	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Female	1	3.0	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	6.0
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	79	1.8	10%	18%	11%	33%	28%	4.9
Day Program	Medical Management Options - Northshore - Female	12	2.0	17%	8%	25%	33%	17%	5.5
Trackers	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Female	2	0.5	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2.5
Day Program	Renaissance Day Program - Female	2	1.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1.0
Intensive In-Home	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	19	2.0	32%	11%	4%	26%	27%	6.1
Day & Trackers	Volunteers of America - Female	19	1.5	11%	16%	0%	32%	42%	3.6
Trackers	Zion Human Services Trackers - Female	5	2.6	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	6.0
Total		243	1.7	12%	13%	16%	33%	26%	4.6

¹ The seriousness index is comprised of the sum of all scores for adjudicated charges. The following point values are assigned: 8 for a violent felony, 5 for a property or other felony, 2 for a misdemeanor, and 1 for any other charge.

**Table 8. Male Non-Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Prior Adjudication Information by Program**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Average Prior Adjudications	Worst Prior Adjudication Type					Average Prior Seriousness Index ¹
				Felony Person	Felony Property	Other Felony	Misd.	Status	
Day Program	American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	20	2.3	20%	25%	35%	5%	15%	8.3
Trackers	American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	198	2.2	20%	44%	21%	7%	8%	8.8
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	80	1.3	16%	35%	14%	24%	11%	5.1
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	41	2.0	7%	20%	10%	27%	36%	4.7
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	27	1.7	22%	26%	15%	19%	18%	6.2
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	40	2.7	18%	43%	21%	13%	5%	9.4
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	46	1.4	13%	15%	7%	43%	22%	4.0
Intensive In-Home	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Male	3	1.7	0%	33%	0%	0%	67%	4.3
Intensive In-Home	Going Home - Lafayette - Male	1	2.0	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16.0
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	78	2.2	19%	41%	17%	22%	1%	8.0
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	53	2.8	34%	32%	15%	9%	10%	11.5
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	151	2.9	16%	42%	15%	19%	8%	9.5
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	32	3.8	19%	56%	3%	19%	3%	12.8
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	31	2.7	39%	45%	16%	0%	0%	11.6
Day Program	Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	54	1.5	11%	35%	15%	26%	13%	5.4
Trackers	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Male	12	1.6	8%	67%	0%	25%	0%	6.2
Day Program	Renaissance Day Program - Male	11	1.2	0%	18%	9%	36%	37%	3.0
Intensive In-Home	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	47	2.1	26%	40%	13%	19%	2%	7.9
Day Program	Volunteers of America - Male	47	1.6	9%	28%	6%	36%	21%	4.6
Trackers	Zion Human Services Trackers - Male	7	1.9	14%	57%	15%	0%	14%	7.0
Total		979	2.2	18%	38%	15%	18%	11%	7.9

¹ The seriousness index is comprised of the sum of all scores for adjudicated charges. The following point values are assigned: 8 for a violent felony, 5 for a property or other felony, 2 for a misdemeanor, and 1 for any other charge.

**Table 9. Female Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Subsequent Delinquent or Criminal Activity**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Percent of Completions with Subsequent				Overall Recidivism Rate ¹
			Delinquent Adjudication	Adjudicated Status Offense	Revocation	Adult Conviction	
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Female	22	14%	0%	0%	0%	14%
Non-Secure	Cane River Children's Services - Female	11	0%	0%	0%	9%	9%
Non-Secure	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - Magazine Home - Female	3	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Non-Secure	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Female	6	17%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Non-Secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	58	7%	2%	7%	0%	16%
Secure (Regular)	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	375	10%	2%	6%	2%	19%
Non-Secure	Methodist Home for Children - Female	25	16%	4%	8%	8%	32%
Non-Secure	Renaissance - Female	18	0%	0%	6%	0%	6%
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Female	21	14%	0%	0%	0%	14%
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Female	25	8%	0%	4%	0%	12%
Non-Secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	33	6%	3%	12%	0%	21%
Non-Secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	29	7%	10%	7%	3%	21%
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Female	23	17%	0%	22%	4%	43%
Non-Secure	Youth House of Ouachita - Female	30	10%	3%	13%	0%	23%
Total		679	10%	2%	7%	2%	20%

¹ The subsequent percentages are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although each of the measures presented are an indication of recidivism, adding percentages will not necessarily result in the overall recidivism rate.

**Table 10. Male Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Subsequent Delinquent or Criminal Activity**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Percent of Completions with Subsequent				Overall Recidivism Rate ¹
			Delinquent Adjudication	Adjudicated Status Offense	Revocation	Adult Conviction	
Non-Secure	Boys & Girls Village - Male	14	21%	0%	7%	7%	36%
Secure (Short-Term)	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	755	22%	1%	10%	6%	39%
Non-Secure	Challenge and Development Center of Clinton - Male	14	14%	0%	7%	0%	21%
Non-Secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	39	13%	3%	10%	3%	26%
Non-Secure	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - All Districts - Male	5	20%	0%	0%	0%	20%
Non-Secure	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Male	7	14%	14%	0%	0%	29%
Non-Secure	Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	59	7%	0%	5%	5%	17%
Non-Secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts - Male	27	19%	0%	7%	0%	26%
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	21	29%	0%	10%	0%	38%
Non-Secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	29	17%	0%	0%	10%	28%
Non-Secure	Jena Juvenile Correction Center - Closed - Male	13	0%	0%	0%	38%	38%
Secure (Regular)	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	663	10%	0%	3%	19%	31%
Non-Secure	Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	51	20%	2%	6%	4%	29%
Non-Secure	Joy Home for Boys - Male	38	13%	8%	8%	0%	26%
Non-Secure	Larry Reynolds Institute Of Youth Guidance - Male	32	16%	0%	6%	3%	25%
Non-Secure	Renaissance - Male	13	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Non-Secure	Rutherford House - Male	52	10%	0%	4%	10%	23%
Non-Secure	Sanctuary - Male	8	38%	0%	0%	13%	50%
Secure (Short-Term)	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	782	14%	0%	5%	13%	33%
Secure (Regular)	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	552	10%	1%	1%	14%	27%
Non-Secure	Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	24	13%	0%	8%	4%	25%
Non-Secure	Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	160	15%	1%	6%	6%	26%
Non-Secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	25	0%	0%	4%	12%	16%
Total		3,383	15%	1%	5%	12%	31%

¹ The subsequent percentages are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although each of the measures presented are an indication of recidivism, adding percentages will not necessarily result in the overall recidivism rate.

**Table 11. Female Non-Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Subsequent Delinquent or Criminal Activity**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Percent of Completions with Subsequent				Overall Recidivism Rate ¹
			Delinquent Adjudication	Adjudicated Status Offense	Revocation	Adult Conviction	
Day & Trackers	American Resource Technicians - Female	40	10%	0%	0%	3%	13%
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	64	11%	5%	6%	0%	20%
Intensive In-Home	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Female	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	79	4%	0%	1%	0%	5%
Day Program	Medical Management Options - Northshore - Female	12	17%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Trackers	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Female	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Day Program	Renaissance Day Program - Female	2	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
Intensive In-Home	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	19	16%	0%	0%	0%	16%
Day & Trackers	Volunteers of America - Female	19	5%	11%	0%	0%	16%
Trackers	Zion Human Services Trackers - Female	5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total		243	8%	2%	2%	0%	13%

¹The subsequent percentages are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although each of the measures presented are an indication of recidivism, adding percentages will not necessarily result in the overall recidivism rate.

**Table 12. Male Non-Residential Program Completions FY 2001-2003
Subsequent Delinquent or Criminal Activity**

Program Area	Program Name	Number of Completions	Percent of Completions with Subsequent				Overall Recidivism Rate ¹
			Delinquent Adjudication	Adjudicated Status Offense	Revocation	Adult Conviction	
Day Program	American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	20	5%	0%	0%	15%	20%
Trackers	American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	198	23%	1%	6%	7%	35%
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	80	13%	0%	3%	5%	20%
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	41	27%	5%	2%	2%	34%
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	27	11%	0%	7%	7%	26%
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	40	18%	0%	8%	3%	28%
Day Program	Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	46	13%	0%	2%	7%	20%
Intensive In-Home	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Male	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Intensive In-Home	Going Home - Lafayette - Male	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	78	6%	0%	8%	8%	22%
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	53	9%	0%	15%	11%	36%
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	151	20%	1%	9%	6%	35%
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	32	9%	3%	3%	3%	19%
Trackers	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	31	10%	3%	0%	6%	19%
Day Program	Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	54	7%	0%	9%	7%	24%
Trackers	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Male	12	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Day Program	Renaissance Day Program - Male	11	0%	0%	9%	0%	9%
Intensive In-Home	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	47	17%	0%	6%	4%	28%
Day Program	Volunteers of America - Male	47	26%	2%	9%	2%	38%
Trackers	Zion Human Services Trackers - Male	7	0%	0%	14%	29%	43%
Total		979	16%	1%	6%	6%	29%

¹The subsequent percentages are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although each of the measures presented are an indication of recidivism, adding percentages will not necessarily result in the overall recidivism rate.

PAM Analysis Findings

The Program Accountability Measures scores for the non-residential and residential programs with at least 15 releases during fiscal years 2001-02 and 2002-03 are presented in three ways:

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

Program Effectiveness Categories

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

- **Above Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed recidivism rates that are greater than the upper limit of the expected recidivism range. Thirty-five percent (n=7) of the non-residential programs and 22% (n=6) of the residential programs fall into this category.
- **Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having actual observed recidivism rates that are within the expected recidivism range. Twenty-five percent (n=5) of the non-residential programs and 30% (n=8) of the residential programs fall into this category.
- **Below Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed recidivism rates below the lower limit of the expected recidivism range. Forty percent (n=8) of the non-residential programs and 48% (n=13) of the 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 \$8,621 for non-residential and \$40,619 for residential programs. Programs are therefore divided into the following cost categories:

Non-Residential Programs:

- **Below Average Cost Programs:** One-half (n=10) of programs had costs at or below the overall average program cost per youth. The cost per completion for these non-residential programs was \$8,621 or less.
- **Above Average Cost Programs:** One-half (n=10) of programs had costs above the overall average. The cost per completion for these non-residential programs was greater than \$8,621.

Residential Programs:

- **Below Average Cost Programs:** Fifty-nine percent (n=16) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per completion for these residential programs was \$40,619 or less.
- **Above Average Cost Programs:** Forty-one percent (n=11) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per completion for these residential programs was greater than \$40,619.

PAM Scores by Residential and Non-Residential Status

Tables 13 through 16 provide a breakdown of the non-residential and residential programs (with separate tables for male and female 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 13. Female Non-Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	79	-3.35%	\$2,321	86
American Resource Technicians - Female	40	0.00%	\$4,063	75
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	19	1.89%	\$3,113	69
Volunteers of America - Female	19	1.82%	\$17,479	63
Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	64	5.13%	\$18,313	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range.

Table 14. Male Non-Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	32	-3.04%	\$3,188	85
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	31	-2.88%	\$2,112	85
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	78	-0.76%	\$1,686	78
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	46	-2.66%	\$18,197	77
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	80	-1.72%	\$13,864	76
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	47	0.00%	\$3,113	75
American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	20	-2.31%	\$31,862	70
American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	198	2.08%	\$1,809	69
Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	40	0.00%	\$18,704	68
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	151	2.36%	\$2,505	68
Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	54	0.00%	\$21,402	67
Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	27	0.00%	\$24,497	65
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	53	3.63%	\$2,175	64
Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	41	2.74%	\$20,783	58
Volunteers of America - Male	47	5.15%	\$17,997	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range.

Table 15. Female Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Type	Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Non-secure	Renaissance - Female	18	-8.46%	\$39,701	86
Non-secure	Sanctuary - Female	25	-2.78%	\$24,820	82
Non-secure	Boys & Girls Village - Female	22	-1.30%	\$27,229	79
Non-secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	29	1.74%	\$23,615	75
Non-secure	Rutherford House - Female	21	-0.68%	\$37,265	74
Non-secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	33	2.19%	\$25,077	73
Secure/Regular	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	375	0.20%	\$43,848	70
Non-secure	Youth House of Ouachita - Female	30	3.97%	\$28,631	69
Non-secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	58	0.00%	\$48,536	69
Non-secure	Methodist Home for Children - Female	25	11.23%	\$45,837	51
Non-secure	Ware Youth Center - Female	23	21.00%	\$61,959	34

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range.

Table 16. Male Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Type	Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Secure/Short-term	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	755	1.76%	\$21,890	75
Non-secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	29	1.22%	\$24,974	75
Non-secure	Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	24	0.00%	\$30,601	75
Non-secure	Joy Home for Boys - Male	38	0.26%	\$31,253	74
Non-secure	Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	160	0.97%	\$29,389	74
Non-secure	Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	51	2.84%	\$22,925	73
Non-secure	Rutherford House - Male	52	0.00%	\$37,265	73
Non-secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	39	0.00%	\$38,168	72
Non-secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	25	-4.93%	\$61,959	72
Non-secure	Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	59	-3.18%	\$56,899	71
Non-secure	Larry Reynolds Institute of Youth Guidance - Male	32	0.00%	\$43,074	71
Non-secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts - Male	27	0.00%	\$48,536	69
Secure/Regular	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	663	1.09%	\$43,848	68
Secure/Short-term	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	782	1.28%	\$44,605	68
Secure/Regular	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	552	0.78%	\$60,650	63
Non-secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	21	9.63%	\$36,358	57

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percent).

PAM Scores by Program Effectiveness Categories

Tables 17 through 20 present PAM scores for the non-residential and residential programs by the three recidivism effectiveness categories identified earlier in the report (with separate tables for male and female programs). For each program, the tables provide the observed recidivism rate, expected recidivism range, percent above or below expected recidivism rate (percent difference), two-year program costs, program cost per completion, and the PAM score for each program. This presentation allows a comparison of program recidivism rates by program type (non-residential and residential; and security type within residential program listings).

Table 17. Female Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Above Average Programs							
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	79	5%	8% - 10%	-3.35%	\$183,326	\$2,321	86
Average Programs							
American Resource Technicians - Female	40	13%	10% - 13%	0.00%	\$162,503	\$4,063	75
Below Average Programs							
Volunteers of America - Female	19	16%	10% - 14%	1.82%	\$332,104	\$17,479	63
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	19	16%	10% - 14%	1.89%	\$59,138	\$3,113	69
Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	64	20%	13% - 15%	5.13%	\$1,172,025	\$18,313	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range.

Table 18. Male Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Above Average Programs							
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	32	19%	22% - 26%	-3.04%	\$102,008	\$3,188	85
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	31	19%	22% - 26%	-2.88%	\$65,464	\$2,112	85
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	46	20%	22% - 25%	-2.66%	\$837,047	\$18,197	77
American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	20	20%	22% - 28%	-2.31%	\$637,243	\$31,862	70
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	80	20%	22% - 24%	-1.72%	\$1,109,101	\$13,864	76
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	78	22%	23% - 25%	-0.76%	\$131,510	\$1,686	78
Average Programs							
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	47	28%	25% - 29%	0.00%	\$146,290	\$3,113	75
Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	27	26%	24% - 29%	0.00%	\$661,426	\$24,497	65
Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	40	28%	25% - 29%	0.00%	\$748,144	\$18,704	68
Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	54	24%	24% - 27%	0.00%	\$1,155,701	\$21,402	67
Below Average Programs							
American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	198	35%	32% - 33%	2.08%	\$358,097	\$1,809	69
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	151	35%	31% - 33%	2.36%	\$378,238	\$2,505	68
Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	41	34%	28% - 31%	2.74%	\$852,085	\$20,783	58
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	53	36%	29% - 32%	3.63%	\$115,254	\$2,175	64
Volunteers of America - Male	47	38%	30% - 33%	5.15%	\$845,864	\$17,997	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range.

Table 19. Female Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Type	Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Above Average Programs								
Non-secure	Renaissance - Female	18	6%	14% - 18%	-8.46%	\$714,621	\$39,701	86
Non-secure	Sanctuary - Female	25	12%	15% - 18%	-2.78%	\$620,500	\$24,820	82
Non-secure	Boys & Girls Village - Female	22	14%	15% - 18%	-1.30%	\$599,037	\$27,229	79
Non-secure	Rutherford House - Female	21	14%	15% - 18%	-0.68%	\$782,563	\$37,265	74
Average Programs								
Non-secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	58	16%	15% - 17%	0.00%	\$2,815,105	\$48,536	69
Secure/Regular	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	375	19%	19% - 19%	0.20%	\$16,443,159	\$43,848	70
Below Average Programs								
Non-secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	29	21%	16% - 19%	1.74%	\$684,846	\$23,615	75
Non-secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	33	21%	16% - 19%	2.19%	\$827,542	\$25,077	73
Non-secure	Youth House of Ouachita - Female	30	23%	16% - 19%	3.97%	\$858,931	\$28,631	69
Non-secure	Methodist Home for Children - Female	25	32%	17% - 21%	11.23%	\$1,145,935	\$45,837	51
Non-secure	Ware Youth Center - Female	23	43%	19% - 22%	21.00%	\$1,425,049	\$61,959	34

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range.

Table 20. Male Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Type	Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Above Average Programs								
Non-secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	25	16%	21% - 25%	-4.93%	\$1,548,966	\$61,959	72
Non-secure	Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	59	17%	20% - 22%	-3.18%	\$3,357,022	\$56,899	71
Average Programs								
Non-secure	Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	24	25%	22% - 26%	0.00%	\$734,421	\$30,601	75
Non-secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts - Male	27	26%	22% - 26%	0.00%	\$1,310,480	\$48,536	69
Non-secure	Larry Reynolds Institute of Youth Guidance - Male	32	25%	22% - 26%	0.00%	\$1,378,356	\$43,074	71
Non-secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	39	26%	23% - 26%	0.00%	\$1,488,551	\$38,168	72
Non-secure	Rutherford House - Male	52	23%	22% - 25%	0.00%	\$1,937,774	\$37,265	73
Non-secure	Joy Home for Boys - Male	38	26%	23% - 26%	0.26%	\$1,187,615	\$31,253	74
Below Average Programs								
Secure/Regular	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	552	27%	25% - 26%	0.78%	\$33,478,859	\$60,650	63
Non-secure	Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	160	26%	24% - 25%	0.97%	\$4,702,264	\$29,389	74
Secure/Regular	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	663	31%	30% - 30%	1.09%	\$29,071,505	\$43,848	68
Non-secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	29	28%	23% - 26%	1.22%	\$724,242	\$24,974	75
Secure/Short-term	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	782	33%	31% - 31%	1.28%	\$34,880,775	\$44,605	68
Secure/Short-term	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	755	39%	37% - 37%	1.76%	\$16,527,039	\$21,890	75
Non-secure	Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	51	29%	24% - 27%	2.84%	\$1,169,175	\$22,925	73
Non-secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	21	38%	24% - 28%	9.63%	\$763,524	\$36,358	57

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percent).

PAM Scores by Cost Categories and Program Effectiveness

Tables 21 through 24 compare program PAM scores and effectiveness groupings by the two cost categories (with separate tables for male and female programs). This allows for an examination of program recidivism relative to cost effectiveness.

Table 21. Female Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Cost and Program Effectiveness Categories

Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
BELOW AVERAGE COST**							
Above Average Programs							
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	79	5%	8% - 10%	-3.35%	\$183,326	\$2,321	86
Average Programs							
American Resource Technicians - Female	40	13%	10% - 13%	0.00%	\$162,503	\$4,063	75
Below Average Programs							
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	19	16%	10% - 14%	1.89%	\$59,138	\$3,113	69
ABOVE AVERAGE COST**							
Below Average Programs							
Volunteers of America - Female	19	16%	10% - 14%	1.82%	\$332,104	\$17,479	63
Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	64	20%	13% - 15%	5.13%	\$1,172,025	\$18,313	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percent).

**Average cost = \$8,621.

Table 22. Male Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Cost and Program Effectiveness Categories

Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
BELOW AVERAGE COST**							
Above Average Programs							
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	32	19%	22% - 26%	-3.04%	\$102,008	\$3,188	85
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	31	19%	22% - 26%	-2.88%	\$65,464	\$2,112	85
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	78	22%	23% - 25%	-0.76%	\$131,510	\$1,686	78
Average Programs							
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	47	28%	25% - 29%	0.00%	\$146,290	\$3,113	75
Below Average Programs							
American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	198	35%	32% - 33%	2.08%	\$358,097	\$1,809	69
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	151	35%	31% - 33%	2.36%	\$378,238	\$2,505	68
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	53	36%	29% - 32%	3.63%	\$115,254	\$2,175	64
ABOVE AVERAGE COST**							
Above Average Programs							
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	46	20%	22% - 25%	-2.66%	\$837,047	\$18,197	77
American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	20	20%	22% - 28%	-2.31%	\$637,243	\$31,862	70
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	80	20%	22% - 24%	-1.72%	\$1,109,101	\$13,864	76
Average Programs							
Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	40	28%	25% - 29%	0.00%	\$748,144	\$18,704	68
Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	54	24%	24% - 27%	0.00%	\$1,155,701	\$21,402	67
Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	27	26%	24% - 29%	0.00%	\$661,426	\$24,497	65
Below Average Programs							
Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	41	34%	28% - 31%	2.74%	\$852,085	\$20,783	58
Volunteers of America - Male	47	38%	30% - 33%	5.15%	\$845,864	\$17,997	51

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percent).

**Average cost = \$8,621.

Table 23. Female Residential Programs Ranked by Cost and Program Effectiveness Categories

Program Type	Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
BELOW AVERAGE COST**								
Above Average Programs								
Non-secure	Renaissance - Female	18	6%	14% - 18%	-8.46%	\$714,621	\$39,701	86
Non-secure	Sanctuary - Female	25	12%	15% - 18%	-2.78%	\$620,500	\$24,820	82
Non-secure	Boys & Girls Village - Female	22	14%	15% - 18%	-1.30%	\$599,037	\$27,229	79
Non-secure	Rutherford House - Female	21	14%	15% - 18%	-0.68%	\$782,563	\$37,265	74
Below Average Programs								
Non-secure	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	29	21%	16% - 19%	1.74%	\$684,846	\$23,615	75
Non-secure	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	33	21%	16% - 19%	2.19%	\$827,542	\$25,077	73
Non-secure	Youth House of Ouachita - Female	30	23%	16% - 19%	3.97%	\$858,931	\$28,631	69
ABOVE AVERAGE COST**								
Average Programs								
Non-secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	58	16%	15% - 17%	0.00%	\$2,815,105	\$48,536	69
Secure/Regular	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	375	19%	19% - 19%	0.20%	\$16,443,159	\$43,848	70
Below Average Programs								
Non-secure	Methodist Home for Children - Female	25	32%	17% - 21%	11.23%	\$1,145,935	\$45,837	51
Non-secure	Ware Youth Center - Female	23	43%	19% - 22%	21.00%	\$1,425,049	\$61,959	34

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percent).

**Average cost = \$40,619.

Table 24. Male Residential Programs Ranked by Cost and Program Effectiveness Categories

Program Type	Program Name	N	Observed Recidivism Rate	Expected Recidivism Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
BELOW AVERAGE COST**								
Average Programs								
Non-secure	Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	24	25%	22% - 26%	0.00%	\$734,421	\$30,601	75
Non-secure	Rutherford House - Male	52	23%	22% - 25%	0.00%	\$1,937,774	\$37,265	73
Non-secure	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	39	26%	23% - 26%	0.00%	\$1,488,551	\$38,168	72
Non-secure	Joy Home for Boys - Male	38	26%	23% - 26%	0.26%	\$1,187,615	\$31,253	74
Below Average Programs								
Non-secure	Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	160	26%	24% - 25%	0.97%	\$4,702,264	\$29,389	74
Non-secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	29	28%	23% - 26%	1.22%	\$724,242	\$24,974	75
Secure/Short-term	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	755	39%	37% - 37%	1.76%	\$16,527,039	\$21,890	75
Non-secure	Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	51	29%	24% - 27%	2.84%	\$1,169,175	\$22,925	73
Non-secure	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	21	38%	24% - 28%	9.63%	\$763,524	\$36,358	57
ABOVE AVERAGE COST**								
Above Average Programs								
Non-secure	Ware Youth Center - Male	25	16%	21% - 25%	-4.93%	\$1,548,966	\$61,959	72
Non-secure	Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	59	17%	20% - 22%	-3.18%	\$3,357,022	\$56,899	71
Average Programs								
Non-secure	Larry Reynolds Institute of Youth Guidance - Male	32	25%	22% - 26%	0.00%	\$1,378,356	\$43,074	71
Non-secure	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts - Male	27	26%	22% - 26%	0.00%	\$1,310,480	\$48,536	69
Below Average Programs								
Secure/Regular	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	552	27%	25% - 26%	0.78%	\$33,478,859	\$60,650	63
Secure/Regular	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	663	31%	30% - 30%	1.09%	\$29,071,505	\$43,848	68
Secure/Short-term	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	782	33%	31% - 31%	1.28%	\$34,880,775	\$44,605	68

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected recidivism range (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percent).

**Average cost = \$40,619.

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 2005 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, 2001 and June 30, 2003 from OYD programs. Observed recidivism rates ranged from 5% to 38% for non-residential programs, compared to recidivism rates reported in the 2004 PAM Report (17% to 44%) and in the 2003 PAM Report (12% to 43%). Among the residential programs, recidivism rates ranged from a low of 6% to a high of 43%. This is in contrast to 13% - 48% in 2004 and 6% - 53% in 2003. In general, average program costs increased for both non-residential and residential programs compared to the 2004 PAM Report. The cost per successful completion ranged from \$1,686 to \$31,862 for non-residential programs, and from \$21,890 to \$61,959 for residential programs.

When the percent above or below the expected recidivism range is examined, wide variation is observed. The most effective non-residential program (Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female) had an observed recidivism rate that was 3.35% lower than expected, while the least effective program (Volunteers of America - Male) had an observed recidivism rate that was 5.15% higher than would be expected given the youth they served.

Similar variation was observed among residential programs. The most effective residential program (Renaissance - Female) had an observed recidivism rate that was 8.46% lower than expected, while the least effective program (Ware Youth Center - Female) had an observed recidivism rate that was 21% higher than would be expected given the youth they served.

Finally, the PAM scores ranged from 51 to 86 for non-residential programs and 34 to 86 for residential programs. The non-residential program with the lowest cost per successful completion was Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers – Hammond - Male, while the residential program with the lowest cost per successful completion was Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male. Four non-residential programs were classified as *both* above average in effectiveness relative to recidivism and below average in program costs: Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers (All Districts – Female, Thibodaux - Male, Lake Charles – Male, and Hammond - Male). Four residential programs were classified as *both* above average in effectiveness relative to recidivism and below average in program costs: Renaissance – Female, Sanctuary – Female, Boys & Girls Village – Female, and Rutherford House – Female.

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 Works*¹⁶ 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,¹⁷ 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 2005 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.

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ Gendreau, P. and D. Andrews (1989). *The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (1st Ed.)*. Saint John: University of New Brunswick.

Appendix A1 - Common Definitions Report

Common Definitions and Methodology for the 2005 Louisiana Program Accountability Measures Report

June 2005

A Report Submitted to the:
Louisiana Office of Youth Development
Kathleen B. Blanco, Governor
Simon G. Gonsoulin, Deputy Secretary

Presented by:
The Justice Research Center
2898 Mahan Drive, Suite 4
Tallahassee, Florida 32308

Introduction

Stakeholders in the juvenile justice system have recognized the usefulness of developing a uniform definition and common understanding of key terms used in outcome evaluations. Beginning in 2002, the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Office of Youth Development (DP&C/OYD), in collaboration with the Justice Research Center (JRC), set out to determine the feasibility of conducting a program evaluation study similar to that currently performed annually in Florida. It was determined that such a model was feasible and at that time a Common Definitions report was issued outlining the methods used to initiate this evaluation tool in Louisiana. Since May 2003, following guidelines established by the DP&C/OYD, the Justice Research Center has produced the comprehensive Louisiana Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Report which compares programs serving juvenile justice offenders in terms of recidivism outcomes and cost effectiveness.

This document outlines the definitions and methodology established by the DP&C/OYD for use by the JRC in producing the 2005 PAM report.

Definitions and Methods

The PAM report is based upon a two-year sample of all youths released from programs operated or administered by the DP&C/OYD. The PAM model estimates the probability of program youth recidivating given their underlying risk factors. The model examines 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 compares this to how well the program's youth actually performed (observed recidivism) after release. In addition, program costs are compared to the overall statewide average cost per youth released. The resulting factor is then combined with the recidivism outcome measure to produce a PAM score for each program.

In performing these analyses a number of mythological inquiries must be resolved from the outset. Included in these are the basic fundamental questions:

1. Who is to be examined, or more specifically, which programs and which youth that were served by those programs will be in the follow-up pool;
2. What data are available for determining underlying risk and which of those data are both empirically and significantly related to recidivism, and
3. What is the definition of recidivism; including not only the subsequent criminal activity but also the follow-up time period?

The following document was designed as a reference to the methods used by the Justice Research Center, in collaboration with DP&C/OYD staff and stakeholders, in answering the aforementioned questions. These methods are based on the data available in the DP&C/OYD JIRMS database. Because the method for collecting the program and offense data has not changed, some examples may not be specific to this year's report, however,

they still provide a relevant example to the methods used for the past year's and recent PAM report.

GENERAL POOL SELECTION RULES

A youth was considered eligible for inclusion in the pool, if he/she met the following criteria:

1. Completion from either a residential secure or non-secure or a non-residential program within the two-year period between fiscal year 2001-2002 and 2002-2003, and
2. Released to the community.

Identifying Program Types

In categorizing the program effectiveness in terms of recidivism outcomes and costs, facilities were classified into one of the following program types:

1. Residential Secure
 - a. First 2 digits of the assigned location are '02'
 - b. Includes: JCCY, BCCY, SCCY, SCCY-M I, SCCY-M II, and JJJC
 - c. These are further divided into short-term and long-term program types
2. Residential Non-Secure
 - a. First 2 digits of the assigned location are '07', '08', '14', '19', '21', or '22'
 - b. Includes: group treatment homes, halfway houses, independent living homes, foster homes, staff secure homes and other contracted residential facilities
3. Non-residential
 - a. First 2 digits of the assigned location are '03', '04' or '20'
 - b. Includes: day programs, trackers, intensive in-home and other contracted non-residential programs
4. Other program types
 - a. Includes: parish jails, detention, parents, foster families, runaway, etc.

Youth that were released from program types 1, 2, and 3 were used as the base pool of youth to be examined for subsequent recidivism rates. However, because the definition of the recidivism pool includes only youth that “completed” the program services and were then subsequently placed back into the community, further determinations of these releases were necessary. The first of these determinations, because youth could have multiple consecutive placements of the same type, is to resolve which specific program of the same type of programs the recidivism rate should be associated. Therefore, the program identified as the one to which the recidivism credit would be associated with, also receives the credit as having completed the youth. The second of these determinations is to resolve

which of these youth actually were released back into the community based on the available data in JIRMS.

Identifying Recidivism Rates with Associated Programs

Consecutive Secure and Non-Secure Residential Placements

There are several youth with multiple consecutive secure placements (see example) and multiple non-secure residential placements. In addition to the possible ambiguous determination of which program should receive the recidivism and completion credit, the length of stays for these program types could potentially be truncated if the programs are not aggregated. For the purposes of this report, the DP&C/OYD determined that all secure placements would be combined into one stay assigning the recidivism and completion credit to the program in which the youth stayed the longest.

Consecutive Secure Placement – Example

YTHID: 073227

<i>Trns ID</i>	<i>Ass Code</i>	<i>Assigned location</i>	<i>Phy Code</i>	<i>Physical Location</i>	<i>Prg Type</i>	<i>In Date</i>	<i>Out Date</i>	<i>DEPLC</i>
001	0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0004	GUARDIAN	GUARDIAN	2/6/2002	5/1/2002	
002	0851	WARE GRP HM/BOYS	0851	WARE GRP HM/BOYS	GROUP_HOME	5/1/2002	7/16/2002	10
003	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	7/16/2002	7/18/2002	
004	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	7/18/2002	7/30/2002	
005	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	7/30/2002	8/19/2002	
006	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	8/19/2002	9/16/2002	
007	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	9/16/2002	11/20/2002	
008	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	11/20/2002	12/18/2002	
009	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	12/18/2002	4/14/2003	
010	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0207	JCCY	SECURE	4/14/2003	3/24/2004	
011	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	3/24/2004	4/1/2004	
012	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	4/1/2004	5/6/2004	
013	0206	BCCY	0206	BCCY	SECURE	5/6/2004	9/13/2004	
014	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/13/2004	9/21/2004	
015	2009	GULF COAST TRAC-JEFF	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/21/2004	12/9/2004	07A
016	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	12/9/2004	1/12/2005	
017	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	DETENTION	1/12/2005	2/10/2005	
018	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	2/10/2005		

In the above example, the youth was in four consecutive and distinct secure residential placements: 0201, 0207, 0220, and back to 0207 from 8/19/2002 through 4/14/2003 at which point he was released into the status of “Client Exit”. Because the youth spent the majority of his time in JCCY (0207) his recidivism credit and completion credit will be associated with that program. In addition, his length of stay in the program becomes the sum total of the days spent in all four placements.

Consecutive Non-Secure Residential Placement - Example

YTHID: 050614

<i>Trns ID</i>	<i>Ass Code</i>	<i>Assigned location</i>	<i>Phy Code</i>	<i>Physical Location</i>	<i>Prg Type</i>	<i>In Date</i>	<i>Out Date</i>	<i>DEPLC</i>
001	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/19/1997	9/19/1997	
002	2003	VOA TRACKERS-LAF	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/19/1997	10/9/1997	07A
003	0009	PARENTS	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	10/9/1997	10/21/1997	
004	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	10/21/1997	12/4/1997	
005	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	12/4/1997	12/19/1997	
006	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	12/19/1997	3/17/1998	
007	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	3/17/1998	3/19/1998	
008	2003	VOA TRACKERS-LAF	0009	PARENTS	HOME	3/19/1998	4/9/1998	01
009	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/9/1998	4/21/1998	
010	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/21/1998	12/14/1999	
011	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	12/14/1999	2/16/2000	
012	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	2/16/2000	3/2/2000	
013	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	3/2/2000	7/17/2002	
014	1405	HARMONY C III	1405	HARMONY C III	RESIDENTIAL	7/17/2002	9/11/2002	05
015	1901	HARMONY SUPV APT	1901	HARMONY SUPV APT	INDEPEN_LIVING	9/11/2002	5/2/2003	01
016	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	5/2/2003	5/5/2003	
017	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	5/5/2003		

In the above example, the youth was in two consecutive and distinct non-secure residential placements: 1405 and 1901 from 7/17/2002 through 5/2/2003 at which at point he was released to location of “Parents”. Because the youth spent the majority of his time in Harmony Supervised Apartments (1901) his recidivism credit and completion credit will be associated with that program. In addition, his length of stay in the program becomes the sum total of the days spent in both placements.

Consecutive Non-Residential Placements

There are several youth with multiple non-residential placements (see example). Length of stays for these program types could potentially be truncated if the programs are not aggregated. The DP&C/OYD determined that all non-residential placements would be combined into one stay assigning the recidivism and completion credit to the last non-residential program in which the youth was released. Most of these are the same program. However, when they are different programs, it is usually due to a program closing and transferring youth to the newly assigned program.

Consecutive Non-Residential Placement – Example

YTHID: 054935

<i>Trns ID</i>	<i>Ass Code</i>	<i>Assigned location</i>	<i>Phy Code</i>	<i>Physical Location</i>	<i>Prg Type</i>	<i>In Date</i>	<i>Out Date</i>	<i>DEPLC</i>
001	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	DETENTION	6/15/1998	7/2/1998	
002	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	7/2/1998	7/28/1998	
003	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	7/28/1998	12/30/1998	
004	0225	JJC	0225	JJC	SECURE	12/30/1998	5/16/2000	
005	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	5/16/2000	9/19/2001	
006	2008	AMER RESOURCE TEC-NO	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/19/2001	9/20/2001	05
007	2009	GULF COAST TRAC-JEFF	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/20/2001	12/20/2001	01
008	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/20/2001	7/8/2002	
009	0009	PARENTS	0011	RUNAWAY	RUNAWAY	7/8/2002	12/17/2003	
010	1236	ORLEANS PJ	1236	ORLEANS PJ	PARISH_JAIL	12/17/2003	12/22/2003	
011	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	12/22/2003	1/8/2004	
012	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	1/8/2004		

In the above example, the youth was in two consecutive and distinct non-residential placements: 2008 and 2009 from 9/19/2001 through 12/20/2001 at which at point he was released to the location of “Parents”. Because the youth’s last non-residential placement

was from Gulf Coast Trackers (2009) his recidivism credit and completion credit will be associated with that program. In addition, his length of stay in the program becomes the sum total of the days spent in both placements.

Identifying the Recidivism Pool

There were several issues that needed to be addressed in order to determine whether or not a youth completed a program and then subsequently released to the community. Among these issues included

1. Instances where a release reason was not provided,
2. Instances where youth were released to a transitional placement;
3. Instances where youth were released with only partial success; and
4. Instances where youth should always be excluded from the pool;

The DP&C/OYD solutions to these issues are addressed in detail in the next four subsections.

Issues Regarding Secure Residential Releases

For secure residential programs, because JIRMS does not have an outcome code related to the placement, only subsequent placement information could be used to determine their completion status. Based on the availability of data, DP&C/OYD decided that any youth that was released from a secure residential program with a subsequent placement of “Client Exit” would be included in the recidivism pool (an example is provided below).

Example of Secure Placement Release to “Client Exit”

YTHID: 010920

<i>Trns ID</i>	<i>Ass Code</i>	<i>Assigned location</i>	<i>Phy Code</i>	<i>Physical Location</i>	<i>Prg Type</i>	<i>In Date</i>	<i>Out Date</i>	<i>DEPLC</i>
001	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/12/1989	11/13/1990	
002	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/13/1990	4/3/1995	
003	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	DETENTION	4/3/1995	4/20/1995	
004	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	4/20/1995	5/4/1995	
005	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	5/4/1995	10/3/1995	
006	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	DETENTION	10/3/1995	10/4/1995	
007	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	PEND_SECURE_PLA	10/4/1995	1/23/1996	
008	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	DETENTION	1/23/1996	3/7/1996	
009	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	3/7/1996	3/13/1996	
010	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	3/13/1996	4/3/1996	
011	0208	SCCY	0208	SCCY	SECURE	4/3/1996	10/4/1996	
012	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	10/4/1996	8/28/1997	
013	2599	JUV TO ADULT	2599	JUV TO ADULT	ADULT_SERVICES	8/28/1997	8/29/1997	
014	2588	JUV EXIT ADULT	2588	JUV EXIT ADULT	OTHER	8/29/1997	8/29/1997	
015	0514	FOTI CONCHETTA	0514	FOTI CONCHETTA	DETENTION	8/29/1997	9/26/1997	
016	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	9/26/1997	10/1/1997	
017	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	10/1/1997	10/8/1997	
018	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	10/8/1997	5/15/1998	
019	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	5/15/1998	5/27/1998	
020	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	5/27/1998	1/12/2000	
021	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	1/12/2000	1/26/2000	
022	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	1/26/2000	4/3/2000	
023	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	4/3/2000	4/12/2000	
024	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	4/12/2000	10/20/2000	
025	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	10/20/2000	12/19/2000	
026	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	12/19/2000	12/29/2000	
027	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	12/29/2000	5/23/2001	
028	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	5/23/2001	6/29/2001	
029	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	6/29/2001	7/9/2001	
030	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	7/9/2001		

In addition, they determined that all youth with a subsequent placement of “Parent,” “Guardian,” or “Foster Family” without a “Pending Secure” or “Pending Non-Secure” assigned location would also be included in the recidivism pool (an example is provided below).

Example of Secure Placement Release to “Parent,” “Guardian,” or “Foster Family” Without a Pending Secure or Pending Non-Secure in the Assigned Location

YTHID: 035024

Trns ID	Ass Code	Assigned location	Phy Code	Physical Location	Prg Type	In Date	Out Date	DEPLC
001	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/21/1994	2/29/1996	
002	0405	CHILD COMP SER IN-HO	0304	CHILD COMP SER DAY P	DAY_PROGRAM	2/29/1996	5/7/1996	01
003	0304	CHILD COMP SER DAY P	0009	PARENTS	HOME	5/7/1996	6/12/1996	01
004	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	6/12/1996	7/8/1996	
005	0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	7/8/1996	7/23/1996	
006	1406	HOPE HAVEN/REG/BOYS	1406	HOPE HAVEN/REG/BOYS	RESIDENTIAL	7/23/1996	8/27/1997	01
007	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/27/1997	11/16/1997	
008	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/16/1997	1/12/1998	
009	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	1/12/1998	7/16/1998	
010	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	7/16/1998	9/22/1998	
011	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	DETENTION	9/22/1998	10/15/1998	
012	0306	ORLEANS MARINE INSTI	0009	PARENTS	HOME	10/15/1998	12/28/1998	10
013	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/28/1998	1/12/1999	
014	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	1/12/1999	2/24/1999	
015	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	2/24/1999	3/25/1999	
016	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	3/25/1999	6/23/1999	
017	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	6/23/1999	8/7/1999	
018	0009	PARENTS	0011	RUNAWAY	RUNAWAY	8/7/1999	11/4/1999	
019	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/4/1999	1/20/2000	
020	0009	PARENTS	0011	RUNAWAY	RUNAWAY	1/20/2000	6/25/2000	
021	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	6/25/2000	7/7/2000	
022	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0510	SHERIFF FOTI S FAC	DETENTION	7/7/2000	8/31/2000	
023	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	8/31/2000	9/7/2000	
024	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	9/7/2000	12/8/2000	
025	0221	SCCY-M-II	0221	SCCY-M-II	SECURE	12/8/2000	1/4/2001	
026	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	1/4/2001	5/9/2002	
027	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	5/9/2002	6/26/2002	
028	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	6/26/2002		

Another issue that needed to be addressed was that some youth were released to a transitional placement prior to completion. This includes other program facilities such as detention, hospitalization, psychiatric care, jails, etc. (determined as program type 4). DP&C/OYD decided that youth that stayed 60 days or less in one of these transitional programs and then were released to “Client Exit” or were released to “Parent,” “Guardian,” or “Foster Family” without a “Pending Secure” or “Pending Non-Secure” assigned location, were included in the recidivism (see examples below).

Example of Secure Placement Release to a Transitional Program and Then to “Client Exit” (stayed 60 days or less in transition)

YTHID: 040406

Trns ID	Ass Code	Assigned location	Phy Code	Physical Location	Prg Type	In Date	Out Date	DEPLC
001	0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/27/1995	1/9/1996	
002	1416	HOPE HAVEN/INT/GIRLS	1416	HOPE HAVEN/INT/GIRLS	RESIDENTIAL	1/9/1996	8/8/1996	01
003	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/8/1996	9/12/1996	
004	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/12/1996	8/14/1997	
005	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	8/14/1997	8/21/1997	
006	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	8/21/1997	9/15/1998	
007	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0207	JCCY	SECURE	9/15/1998	1/18/2001	
008	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	1/18/2001	2/8/2001	
009	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	2/8/2001	12/8/2001	
010	0203	JRDC-ABSENT OFFENDER	0203	JRDC-ABSENT OFFENDER	OTHER	12/8/2001	3/13/2002	
011	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	3/13/2002	3/20/2002	
012	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	PEND_SECURE_PLA	3/20/2002		

Example of Secure Placement Release to a Transitional Program and Then to “Home” Without a “Pending Secure/Non-Secure” Assigned Location (stayed 60 days or less in transition)

YTHID: 054840

Trns ID	Ass Code	Assigned location	Phy Code	Physical Location	Prg Type	In Date	Out Date	DEPPLC
001	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	6/2/1998	1/31/1999	
002	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	1/31/1999	3/23/2000	
003	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	3/23/2000	8/31/2000	
004	0405	CHILD COMP SER IN-HO	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/31/2000	9/9/2000	09
005	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/9/2000	2/21/2001	
006	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	2/21/2001	3/22/2001	
007	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	3/22/2001	9/27/2001	
008	0009	PARENTS	0011	RUNAWAY	RUNAWAY	9/27/2001	8/8/2002	
009	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	8/8/2002	11/12/2002	
010	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	11/12/2002	11/21/2002	
011	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	11/21/2002	12/9/2002	
012	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	12/9/2002	12/30/2002	
013	0206	BCCY	0206	BCCY	SECURE	12/30/2002	3/27/2003	
014	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	3/27/2003	4/1/2003	
015	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/1/2003	4/23/2003	
016	0313	JUVENILE EDU & TRAIN	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/23/2003	4/30/2003	10
017	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/30/2003	5/1/2003	
018	0009	PARENTS	0011	RUNAWAY	RUNAWAY	5/1/2003	8/7/2003	
019	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0511	YOUTH STUDY CTR-ORL	DETENTION	8/7/2003	8/21/2003	
020	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	8/21/2003	10/1/2003	
021	0208	SCCY	0208	SCCY	SECURE	10/1/2003	3/18/2004	
022	0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	3/18/2004	8/1/2004	
023	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0207	JCCY	SECURE	8/1/2004		

Issues Regarding Non-Secure Residential and Non-Residential Releases

Non-Secure residential programs and non-residential placements *did* have a placement outcome code. However, determining which of the outcome codes indicated a completion was the challenge. DP&C/OYD decided that only youth with a placement outcome code of “successful completion” (01’s & 02) would be included in the recidivism pool. In addition, in order to meet the second criteria of the general rule that the youth needed to be released to the community, and DP&C/OYD decided that only youth with a subsequent placement of “Client Exit” or to “Parent,” “Guardian,” or “Foster Family” without a “Pending Secure” assigned location, would be included in the recidivism pool (several examples are provided below and on the next page).

Example of a Non-Residential Placement Release to “Client Exit” and the Outcome Code is 100% Successful Completion

YTHID: 039634

Trns ID	Ass Code	Assigned location	Phy Code	Physical Location	Prg Type	In Date	Out Date	DEPPLC
001	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	10/5/1995	1/4/1997	
002	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	1/4/1997	8/13/1998	
003	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/13/1998	8/13/1999	
004	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/13/1999	9/6/2001	
005	0009	PARENTS	0506	LAFAYETTE DET	DETENTION	9/6/2001	9/21/2001	
006	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/21/2001	1/10/2002	
007	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0506	LAFAYETTE DET	DETENTION	1/10/2002	1/15/2002	
008	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	1/15/2002	1/30/2002	
009	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	1/30/2002	4/30/2002	
010	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/30/2002	5/13/2002	
011	2007	GULF COAST TRACK-LAF	0009	PARENTS	HOME	5/13/2002	6/23/2002	01
012	0003	CLIENT EXIT	2007	GULF COAST TRACK-LAF	TRACKERS	6/23/2002		

Example of a Non-Secure Residential Placement Release to "Client Exit" after a <60 day transition in Independent Living

YTHID: 061698

Trns ID	Ass Code	Assigned location	Phy Code	Physical Location	Prg Type	In Date	Out Date	DEPLC
001	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	10/8/1999	11/15/1999	
002	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	11/15/1999	11/24/1999	
003	1621	THE SPRING OF RECVRY	1621	THE SPRING OF RECVRY	SUBSTANCE_ABUSE	11/24/1999	1/5/2000	10
004	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	1/5/2000	2/8/2000	
005	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	2/8/2000	2/14/2000	
006	0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	2/14/2000	3/30/2000	
007	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	3/30/2000	6/26/2000	
008	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	6/26/2000	7/27/2000	
009	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	7/27/2000	8/16/2000	
010	0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	8/16/2000	8/21/2000	
011	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/21/2000	8/22/2000	
012	0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	8/22/2000	11/9/2000	
013	1411	REYNOLDS INSTITUTE	1411	REYNOLDS INSTITUTE	RESIDENTIAL	11/9/2000	6/20/2002	01D
014	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	6/20/2002	6/29/2002	
015	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0513	ST JAMES DETENTION	DETENTION	6/29/2002		

Example of a Non-Secure Residential Placement Released Pending Non-Secure and the Outcome Code is 100% Successful Completion

YTHID: 067764

Trns ID	Ass Code	Assigned location	Phy Code	Physical Location	Prg Type	In Date	Out Date	DEPLC
001	0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	1/18/2001	4/5/2001	
002	1416	HOPE HAVEN/INT/GIRLS	1416	HOPE HAVEN/INT/GIRLS	RESIDENTIAL	4/5/2001	9/10/2001	01
003	0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/10/2001	9/11/2001	
004	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/11/2001	9/28/2001	
005	0314	BAYOU LAFOURCHE M/I	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/28/2001	4/2/2002	10
006	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/2/2002	5/30/2002	
007	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	5/30/2002		

Example of a Non-Residential Placement Release to Detention; stayed <60 days in Detention and Went Home

YTHID: 064534

Trns ID	Ass Code	Assigned location	Phy Code	Physical Location	Prg Type	In Date	Out Date	DEPLC
001	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/19/2000	4/19/2001	
002	0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/19/2001	10/4/2001	
003	0009	PARENTS	0518	FLORIDA PARISH DET	DETENTION	10/4/2001	11/3/2001	
004	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/3/2001	12/13/2001	
005	0309	NORTHSHORE OPTIONS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/13/2001	1/28/2003	01
006	0009	PARENTS	0518	FLORIDA PARISH DET	DETENTION	1/28/2003	2/27/2003	
007	0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	2/27/2003	4/29/2003	
008	0012	PEND SECURE PLACE	0518	FLORIDA PARISH DET	DETENTION	4/29/2003	5/5/2003	
009	0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	5/5/2003	5/29/2003	
010	0206	BCCY	0206	BCCY	SECURE	5/29/2003	8/29/2003	
011	2302		0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/29/2003	1/26/2004	10
012	0003	CLIENT EXIT	2302		ELEC_MONITORING	1/26/2004		

Overall Pool Exclusions

There are instances where youth would never be included in the recidivism pool. Provided below are the reasons determined by DP&C/OYD:

- Youth with a direct subsequent residential placement.
- Youth with a “runaway” subsequent placement.
- Youth that went to a transitional program and stayed more than 60 days.
- Youth that went to a transitional program and then went to another transitional program.
- Where the youth’s physical location is “runaway”
- Where the youth’s physical location is “detention”
- Where the youth’s physical location is either a medical, psychiatric, substance abuse or emergency facility

Multiple Completions within the Same Time Period

There were instances where one youth completed two or more programs during the two year period. When this occurs, the DP&C/OYD determined that each of the releases should be examined for separate recidivism results. This creates multiple pools. Each release is assigned to a separate pool (referred to as “X,” “Y,” and “Z” pools) in order to track re-offending for one year from each completion date (examples are provided below)

Example 1 of Multiple Completions Divided Into Separate Pools for Recidivism Follow-Up

054698



2/15/1985 M WH

Placement History

0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	6/2/1998	11/10/1998
0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/10/1998	12/7/1998
0820	SANCTUARY-BOYS	0820	SANCTUARY-BOYS	GROUP_HOME	12/7/1998	7/29/1999 08
0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	7/29/1999	8/5/1999
0820	SANCTUARY-BOYS	0820	SANCTUARY-BOYS	GROUP_HOME	8/5/1999	11/19/1999 01
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/19/1999	2/17/2000
0012	PEND SECURE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	2/17/2000	4/27/2000
0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	4/27/2000	6/1/2000
0206	BCCY	0206	BCCY	SECURE	6/1/2000	9/21/2000
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/21/2000	9/28/2000
2007	GULF COAST TRACK-	0009	PARENTS	HOME	9/28/2000	12/28/2000 01
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/28/2000	1/31/2001
0009	PARENTS	0525	ST MARTIN JUV TR CTR	DETENTION	1/31/2001	2/26/2001
0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	2/26/2001	

Example 2 of Multiple Completions Divided Into Separate Pools for Recidivism Follow-Up

057671

3/14/1983 M WH

Placement History						
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/16/1998	3/17/1999
0012	PEND SECURE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	3/17/1999	3/18/1999
0012	PEND SECURE	0515	ST BERNARD DET	DETENTION	3/18/1999	3/25/1999
0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	3/25/1999	4/21/1999
0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	4/21/1999	7/21/1999
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	7/21/1999	7/28/1999
0004	GULF COAST TRACK-	0009	PARENTS	HOME	7/28/1999	8/12/1999 01B
0309	NORTHSHORE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/12/1999	1/10/2000 01A
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	1/10/2000	1/11/2000
0004	GULF COAST TRACK-	0009	PARENTS	HOME	1/11/2000	4/11/2000 01B
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	4/11/2000	4/19/2000
0012	PEND SECURE	0515	ST BERNARD DET	DETENTION	4/19/2000	6/1/2000
0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	6/1/2000	7/27/2000
0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	7/27/2000	10/18/2000
0220	SCCY-M	0220	SCCY-M	SECURE	10/18/2000	11/15/2000
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	11/15/2000	12/23/2000
0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/23/2000	

Example 3 of Multiple Completions Divided Into Separate Pools for Recidivism Follow-Up

057438

7/21/1984 M WH

Placement History						
0008	PEND NON-SEC PLACE	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/3/1998	12/9/1998
2201	BRIAR HILL/TYCHE	2201	BRIAR HILL/TYCHE	STAFF_SECURE	12/9/1998	8/6/1999 01
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/6/1999	8/11/1999
0304	CHILD COMP SER	0009	PARENTS	HOME	8/11/1999	9/23/1999 01
0003	CLIENT EXIT	0304	CHILD COMP SER DAY P	DAY_PROGRAM	9/23/1999	11/10/1999
0012	PEND SECURE	0509	RIVARDE DET-JEFF	DETENTION	11/10/1999	12/2/1999
0201	JCCY-JRDC	0201	JCCY-JRDC	SECURE	12/2/1999	12/10/1999
0207	JCCY	0207	JCCY	SECURE	12/10/1999	12/20/2000
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/20/2000	12/27/2000
0405	CHILD COMP SER IN-	0009	PARENTS	HOME	12/27/2000	2/3/2001 01
0009	PARENTS	0009	PARENTS	HOME	2/3/2001	4/6/2001
0003	CLIENT EXIT	0009	PARENTSHOME	4/6/2001		

DEFINING SPECIFIC VARIABLES*Prior Adjudications and Prior Adjudication Index Score*

The JIRMS Petition and Offense History files contain only offenses associated with state custody. This presents a potential bias in the measurement of prior offending and could suppress the relationship between prior delinquency and recidivism. Based on the available data, the number of prior adjudications and a prior adjudication index score (AIS) were calculated. The AIS is based on both the number of prior adjudicated offenses and the seriousness of each offense. For the DP&C/OYD data, each offense type was grouped into eight categories and a score was assigned to each category as follows:

Offense Types	Assigned Points
Violent Felonies	8
Other Person Felonies	8
Property Felonies	5
Other Felonies	5
Either misdemeanor or felony charges	3
Misdemeanors	2
Status offenses	1

Prior offense scores are summed to produce a prior adjudication index score for each youth. At the program level these summed scores are then averaged to produce an average prior adjudication index score for each facility.

Risk and Needs Assessment Variables

Multiple risk and/or needs assessments could have been conducted prior to program admission. Within each domain the youth is assigned an ordinal value, so that higher degrees of risk or need result in higher scores on the assessment. For the purposes of this analysis, all risk and needs assessments administered prior to the placement were aggregated together in order to retain the maximum value for each domain. This approach was taken based on the assumption that if the youth had ever been identified as having a problem in a specific domain prior to placement, that information should be retained.

One of the most problematic issues regarding the risk and need data pertains to the number of different assessments that DP&C/OYD has used over the years. Presented in the table below is the list of assessment forms that DP&C/OYD has used since 1990. As is presented, there have been 15 forms created all together. For many of the forms, the same type of risk/ need data is collected, although collected with different choices and for different purposes. This is problematic, in that, some youth may have the same risk/ need data type as another youth, but in a different format from a different form.

Form #	Form Title	Record type	Initial or Re-class	Number of Questions	Implementation and Phase Out Dates	Observed First Date
Custody Classification Forms						
Form 14	Initial Custody Classification	22	I	7	Through 10/98	7/31/1991
Form 15	Custody Reclassification Scale	22	R	8	Through 10/98	8/18/1993
Form 5	Revised Initial Custody Classification	24	I	8	10/98 through 11/03	10/8/1998
Form 4	Revised Custody Reclassification Scale	24	R	6	10/98 through 11/03	10/22/1988
Form 7	2003 Initial Custody Classification	24	I	8	Started 11/03	11/5/2003
Form 8	2003 Custody Reclassification	24	R	8	Started 11/03	11/3/2003
Custody Need Forms						
Form 3	Custody Need Assessment	23	I&R	27	Through 11/03	7/31/1991
Form 9	2003 Custody Need Assessment	23		18	Started 11/03	12/24/2003
Risk Assessment/ Reassessment Forms						
Form 11	Risk Assessment	21	A	9	Through 2/02	11/15/1989
Form 12	Risk Reassessment	21	R	11	Through 2/02	5/24/1990
Form 2	Risk/Needs Assessment (Risks)	21	A&R	5	2/02 through 12/02	10/30/2002
Form 6	Risk Screening Document	35	A	9	12/02 - 11/03	1/13/2002
Form 10	2003 Risk Screening Document	35	A	9	Started 11/03	11/10/2003
Placement Need Forms						
Form 13	Needs Assessment/ Reassessment	20	A&R	11	Through 12/02	11/15/1989
Form 1	Placement Needs Form	35	N	11	Started 12/02	3/6/2002

In order to address this issue of having the same risk/ need data type in different forms and in different formats, JRC went through the process of mapping each of the form's data points and cross-referenced those to the other forms. The table below presents the final cross-walk of the data points that were found in multiple forms.

Variable	Forms Where the Same Variable Was Found							
Age at First Adjudication	Form 11	Form 12	Form 2	Form 6	Form 10			
Age at First Adjudication - Custody	Form 14	Form 5						
Number of Prior Offenses	Form 11	Form 12	Form 2					
Court Ordered Commitments	Form 11	Form 12	Form 2					
Substance Abuse (Alcohol and Drugs)	Form 11	Form 12	Form 13	Form 3	Form 9			
Parental Control	Form 11	Form 12	Form 9					
School Discipline Problems	Form 11	Form 12	Form 13	Form 9				
Peer Relationships	Form 11	Form 12	Form 13	Form 9				
Number of Moves	Form 11	Form 12	Form 2					
Emotional Stability	Form 13	Form 3	Form 14	Form 5				
Employment	Form 13	Form 3	Form 9					
Severity of Present Adjudication	Form 6	Form 10	Form 14	Form 15	Form 5	Form 7	Form 8	
Most Serious Prior Adjudication	Form 6	Form 10	Form 14	Form 15	Form 5	Form 7	Form 8	
Number of Prior Adjudication	Form 6	Form 10	Form 14	Form 15	Form 5	Form 7		
History of Probation	Form 6	Form 10						
Number of Out-of-Home Placements	Form 6	Form 10						
Prior Escapes or Runaways	Form 6	Form 10	Form 14	Form 15	Form 5	Form 4	Form 7	Form 8
Prior Assaultive Behavior	Form 14	Form 5	Form 7	Form 8				
Number of Major Disciplinary Reports	Form 15	Form 4	Form 8					
Most Serious Disciplinary Report	Form 15	Form 4	Form 8					
Program Participation/Adjustment	Form 15	Form 8						
Furlough Experience	Form 15	Form 4						
Victim of Abuse	Form 5	Form 4	Form 9					
Number of Minor Disciplinary Reports	Form 4	Form 8						

Therefore, given that each of the forms with the same risk/ need data needed to be integrated, JRC created new variables that took the common data elements of each of the variables in the different forms. For example, the variable "age at first adjudication." This

variable, or data type, was found in five different forms. Each of the variables from the five forms was recoded into two data values: “14 or older” or “13 or younger” as is presented in the following table. As can be seen, these were the only common data values available.

Variable	Form #	Original Code	Original Label	New Code	New Label
Age at First Adjudication	Form 11	0	16 or older	0	14 or older
		3	14 or 15	0	14 or older
		5	13 or younger	1	13 or younger
	Form 12	0	16 or older	0	14 or older
		3	14 or 15	0	14 or older
		5	13 or younger	1	13 or younger
	Form 2	0	16 or older	0	14 or older
		3	14 or 15	0	14 or older
		5	13 or younger	1	13 or younger
	Form 6	2	Age 15 or older	0	14 or older
		5	Age 14	0	14 or older
		7	Age 13	1	13 or younger
		10	Age 12 or younger	1	13 or younger
	Form 10	1	Age 15 or older	0	14 or older
		3	Age 14	0	14 or older
		5	Age 13	1	13 or younger
		10	Age 12 or younger	1	13 or younger

Once each of the data types from the different forms were recoded into a single variable for the specific data element, the rule of retaining the maximum value for each variable was applied. The table below presents an example. The highlighted forms were all administered prior to the youth’s placement into the secure BCCY program. The maximum values for each of the data points in those forms was retained and used as the youth’s risk/ need assessment data.

Youth: 062152 entered BCCY 5/2/2002

Assessment Date	Forms Administered	
11/10/1999	Form 11 Risk Assessment	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
12/30/1999	Form 11 Risk Assessment	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
6/1/2000	Form 12 Risk Reassessment	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
12/22/2000	Form 12 Risk Reassessment	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
6/19/2001	Form 12 Risk Reassessment	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
8/23/2001	Form 12 Risk Reassessment	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
2/28/2002	Form 2 Risk/Needs Assessment (Risks)	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
5/2/2002	Form 5 Revised Initial Custody Classification	
10/28/2002	Form 2 Risk/Needs Assessment (Risks)	Form 13 Needs Assessment/ Reassessment
1/31/2003	Form 6 Risk Screening Document	

Recidivism

Definitions of recidivism vary widely among states and in academia. They range from calculating re-arrest rates within a brief follow-up period to calculating re-incarceration rates for an indefinite period. These differences revolve around three issues:

1. how long should the programs be responsible for the services rendered;
2. what data are available to determine re-offending; and
3. which of those data points most accurately define re-offending behavior?

Based on last year's Common Definitions, the JRC and DP&C/OYD determined that youth who were found to have a petition or adult arrest which resulted in an adjudication or conviction within a one-year follow-up from their release would be identified as a recidivist. In addition, any youth found to have a revocation during the same follow-up period would be determined a recidivist as well.

Costs and Program Groupings

Each year, program costs are provided to JRC by DP&C/OYD for the two-year period of the study. Because, some of the costs are grouped by contract, it is necessary for JRC to group specific programs. In addition, in order to meet the minimum allowable completion of 15 youth during the two-year period, other programs are grouped to obtain a higher number of completions so that a PAM score can be applied.

For this year, PAM tables were created for males and females separately. Because some of the programs serve both males and females, the costs associated with those programs needed to be divided by the number of males to female ratio. For example, Jetson Correctional Center for Youth (JCCY) completed 663 males and 375 females. They received a total cost for the two-year period of \$45,514,664. The ratio of males to females was 64% males to 36% females. The cost, therefore, was split using the same ratio, so that JCCY for males received 64% of the \$45,514,664 or \$29,071,505 and JCCY for females received 36% of the \$45,514,664 or \$16,443,159. The following tables show the final cost and program grouping for each of the programs in the 2005 PAM report. Programs shaded in red were not given PAM scores because they either closed or completed less than 15 youth.

Male Residential Program Costs and Groupings

Assigned Location Codes	Program Label(s)	Completions	Two-Year Cost	% of Two-Year Cost Based on Ratio M:F	Final Two-Year Cost for New Program Code
0206	Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth	755	\$16,527,039	100.0%	\$16,527,039
0207	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	663	\$45,514,664	63.9%	\$29,071,505
0208	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe	552	\$32,292,175	100.0%	\$32,292,175
	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison	782	\$36,067,459	100.0%	\$36,067,459
0220	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth-Madison	581			
0221	Swanson Correctional Center for Youth-Madison (Contracted)	201			
0225	Jena Juvenile Correction Center	13			
1403	David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport	39	\$1,488,551	100.0%	\$1,488,551
	Harmony Center - All Districts	59	\$3,357,022	100.0%	\$3,357,022
2108	Harmony Center - A.B. Home	10	\$401,881	100.0%	
0837	Harmony Center - Hadley Group Home	15	\$623,665	100.0%	
0848	Harmony Center - HCI Focus	12	\$775,982	100.0%	
0849	Harmony Center - Shirley's Den	7	\$451,564	100.0%	
1901	Harmony Center Inc - Supervised Apts	4	\$401,563	100.0%	
1405	Harmony III	11	\$702,367	100.0%	
	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts	27	\$4,125,585	31.8%	\$1,310,480
1414	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities -Intensive Boys	23	\$4,125,585	31.8%	
1406	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities -Regular Boys	4	inc in 1414	0.0%	
1418	Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive	21	\$763,524	100.0%	\$763,524
1421	Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate	29	\$724,242	100.0%	\$724,242
0806	Johnny Robinson's Boys Home	51	\$1,169,175	100.0%	\$1,169,175
1407	Joy Home for Boys	38	\$1,187,615	100.0%	\$1,187,615
1411	Larry Reynolds Institue Of Youth Guidance	32	\$1,378,356	100.0%	\$1,378,356
0815	Rutherford House	52	\$2,720,337	71.2%	\$1,937,774
2201	Tyche - Briar Hill	24	\$734,421	100.0%	\$734,421
1402	Tyche - Christian Acres	160	\$4,702,264	100.0%	\$4,702,264
0851	Ware Youth Center	25	\$2,974,015	52.1%	\$1,548,966
1401	Boys & Girls Village	14	\$751,591	100.0%	\$751,591
1417	Challenge and Development Center of Clinton	14	\$386,750	100.0%	\$386,750
0814	Community Receiving Home	13	\$1,230,737	41.9%	\$516,116
	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts	7	\$281,352	53.8%	\$151,497
0704	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services-Lafayette	5	inc in 0703	0.0%	
0705	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services-New Orleans	1	inc in 0703	0.0%	
0703	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services-Thibodaux	1	\$281,352	53.8%	
	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - All Districts	5	\$143,293	100.0%	\$143,293
0828	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - Bienville Home	3	\$78,970	100.0%	
0829	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - City Park Home	2	\$64,323	100.0%	
0820	Sanctuary - Residential Males	8	\$498,665	100.0%	\$498,665

Female Residential Program Costs and Groupings

Assigned Location Codes	Program Label	Completions	Two-Year Cost	% of Two-Year Cost Based on Ratio M:F	Final Two-Year Cost for New Program Code
0207	Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	375	\$45,514,664	36.1%	\$16,443,159
	Boys & Girls Village - Residential Female	22	\$599,037	100.0%	\$599,037
0844	<i>Boys & Girls Village-Group Home Female</i>	19	<i>inc in 0804</i>	0.0%	
0804	<i>Boys and Girls Villages (Girls)</i>	3	\$599,037	100.0%	
0814	Community Receiving Home	18	\$1,230,737	58.1%	\$714,621
	Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities	58	\$4,125,585	68.2%	\$2,815,105
1416	<i>Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities -Intensive Girls</i>	51	<i>\$4,125,585</i>	<i>68.2%</i>	
1412	<i>Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities -Regular Girls</i>	7	<i>inc in 1412</i>	0.0%	
	Methodist Home for Children	25	\$1,145,935	100.0%	\$1,145,935
0842	<i>Methodist Home for Children - Group Home</i>	11	<i>\$304,245</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	
1410	<i>Methodist Home for Children - Residential Female</i>	14	<i>\$841,690</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	
0816	Rutherford House - Residential Females	21	\$2,720,337	28.8%	\$782,563
0821	Sanctuary - Residential Females	25	\$620,500	100.0%	\$620,500
1404	Tyche - Evangeline Oaks	33	\$827,542	100.0%	\$827,542
2202	Tyche - Magnolia Ridge	29	\$684,846	100.0%	\$684,846
0852	Ware Youth Center (Girls)	23	\$2,974,015	47.9%	\$1,425,049
	Youth House of Ouachita	30	\$858,931	100.0%	\$858,931
0832	Youth House of Ouachita I	12	\$383,474	100.0%	
0833	Youth House of Ouachita II	18	\$475,457	100.0%	
0803	Cane River Children's Services	11	\$704,390	100.0%	\$704,390
0831	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - Magazine Home	3	\$151,911	100.0%	\$151,911
	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts	6	\$281,352	46.2%	\$129,855
0704	<i>Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services-Lafayette</i>	4	<i>inc in 0703</i>	0.0%	
0705	<i>Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services-New Orleans</i>	1	<i>inc in 0703</i>	0.0%	
0703	<i>Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services-Thibodaux</i>	1	<i>\$281,352</i>	<i>46.2%</i>	

Male Non-Residential Program Costs and Groupings

Assigned Location Codes	Program Label	Completions	Two-Year Cost	% of Two-Year Cost Based on Ratio M:F	Final Two-Year Cost for New Program Code
0313	American Resource Technicians Day Program	20	\$732,829	87.0%	\$637,243
2008	American Resource Technicians Trackers	198	\$425,014	84.3%	\$358,097
0301	Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	80	\$1,372,512	80.8%	\$1,109,101
0314	Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche	41	\$1,101,476	77.4%	\$852,085
0315	Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands	27	\$881,901	75.0%	\$661,426
0312	Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles	40	\$822,958	90.9%	\$748,144
0311	Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	46	\$1,200,981	69.7%	\$837,047
2004	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond	78	\$153,428	85.7%	\$131,510
	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson	53	\$160,920	71.6%	\$115,254
2009	<i>Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson</i>	51	\$160,920	71.6%	
2001	<i>Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - New Orleans</i>	2	<i>inc in 2009</i>	0.0%	
2007	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette	151	\$475,929	79.5%	\$378,238
2010	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles	32	\$117,947	86.5%	\$102,008
2006	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux	31	\$67,576	96.9%	\$65,464
0309	Medical Management Options - Northshore	54	\$1,412,523	81.8%	\$1,155,701
2012	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita	12	\$67,554	85.7%	\$57,903
0316	Renaissance Day Program	11	\$199,121	84.6%	\$168,487
0401	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	47	\$205,428	71.2%	\$146,290
	Volunteers of America	47	\$1,177,968	71.8%	\$845,864
0308	<i>Volunteers of America Day Program - Lafayette</i>	39	\$1,089,937	72.2%	\$787,177
2011	<i>Volunteers of America Trackers - Shreveport</i>	8	\$88,031	66.7%	\$58,687
0410	Going Home - Lafayette	1	Missing	100.0%	Missing
0409	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson	3	Missing	75.0%	Missing
2005	Zion Human Services Trackers	7	\$75,755	58.3%	\$44,190

Female Non-Residential Program Costs and Groupings

Assigned Location Codes	Program Label	Completions	Two-Year Cost	% of Two-Year Cost Based on Ratio M:F	Final Two-Year Cost for New Program Code
	American Resource Technicians	40	\$1,157,843	14.0%	\$162,503
2008	American Resource Technicians Trackers	37	\$425,014	15.7%	\$66,917
0313	American Resource Technicians Day Program	3	\$732,829	13.0%	\$95,586
	Associated Marine Institute - All Districts	64	\$5,379,828	21.8%	\$1,172,025
0301	Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	19	\$1,372,512	19.2%	\$263,411
0314	Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche	12	\$1,101,476	22.6%	\$249,391
0315	Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands	9	\$881,901	25.0%	\$220,475
0312	Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles	4	\$822,958	9.1%	\$74,814
0311	Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	20	\$1,200,981	30.3%	\$363,934
	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts	79	\$975,800	18.8%	\$183,326
2004	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond	13	\$153,428	14.3%	\$21,918
2009	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson	21	\$160,920	28.4%	\$45,666
2007	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette	39	\$475,929	20.5%	\$97,691
2010	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles	5	\$117,947	13.5%	\$15,939
2006	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux	1	\$67,576	3.1%	\$2,112
0401	Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	19	\$205,428	28.8%	\$59,138
	Volunteers of America	19	\$1,177,968	28.2%	\$332,104
0308	Volunteers of America Day Program - Lafayette	15	\$1,089,937	27.8%	\$302,760
2011	Volunteers of America Trackers - Shreveport	4	\$88,031	33.3%	\$29,344
0409	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson	1	Missing	25.0%	Missing
0309	Medical Management Options - Northshore	12	\$1,412,523	18.2%	\$256,822
2012	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita	2	\$67,554	14.3%	\$9,651
0316	Renaissance Day Program	2	\$199,121	15.4%	\$30,634
2005	Zion Human Services Trackers	5	\$75,755	100.0%	\$75,755

Appendix A2 - Programs Excluded from PAM Calculations

The following tables present the programs that have been excluded from the PAM analyses for the past 3 years (in descending order).

2005 Program Exclusions

Security Type	Program Code	Program Name	FY 01-02 Releases	FY 02-03 Releases	Total Releases	Reason for Exclusion
Non-Secure	1401	Boys & Girls Village - Male	4	10	14	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0803	Cane River Children's Services - Female	7	4	11	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	1417	Challenge and Development Center of Clinton - Male	5	9	14	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0828, 0829	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - All Districts - Male	4	1	5	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0831	Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town - Magazine Home - Female	2	1	3	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0409	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Female	0	1	1	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0409	FLY Intensive Day Program - Jefferson - Male	0	3	3	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0410	Going Home - Lafayette - Male	0	1	1	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0704, 0705, 0703	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Female	5	1	6	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0704, 0705, 0703	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - All Districts - Male	4	3	7	Released less than 15 youth
Secure	0225	Jena Juvenile Correction Center - Closed - Male	12	1	13	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0309	Medical Management Options - Northshore - Female	5	7	12	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	2012	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Female	0	2	2	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	2012	One Step Further Trackers - Ouachita - Male	0	12	12	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0814	Renaissance - Male	5	8	13	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0316	Renaissance Day Program - Female	0	2	2	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0316	Renaissance Day Program - Male	0	11	11	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0820	Sanctuary - Male	4	4	8	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	2005	Zion Human Services Trackers - Female	5	0	5	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	2005	Zion Human Services Trackers - Male	6	1	7	Released less than 15 youth

Appendix A2 - Programs Excluded from PAM Calculations (continued)

2004 Program Exclusions

Security Type	Program Code	Program Name	FY 00-01 Releases	FY 01-02 Releases	Total Releases	Reason for Exclusion
Non-Residential	0313	ART Day Program	0	5	5	No program costs in FY 2000-01 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0314	Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche	0	11	11	No program costs in FY 2000-01 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0315	Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands	0	5	5	No program costs in FY 2000-01 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0850	BHC Meadow Wood HSP DBA Quality Psych.	6	0	6	No program costs or releases in FY 2001-02.
Non-Secure	0803	Cane River Children's Services	2	7	9	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	1417	Challenge & Development Center of Clinton	7	5	12	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0405	Childrens Comprehensive Services - Intensive Home	74	0	74	No program costs in FY 2001-02 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0304	Childrens Comprehensive Services - Day Program	64	0	64	No program costs in FY 2001-02 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0406	Educational and Treatment Council, Inc.	25	0	25	No program costs in FY 2001-02 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	2010	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services (Lake Charles Dist)	0	11	11	No program costs in FY 2000-01 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	2001	Gulf Coast Track - NO	1	1	2	No program Cost and released less than 15 youth
Secure	0225	JJJC	76	12	88	Program Closed.
Non-secure	1904	McAdoo Hotel	2	0	2	No program costs in FY 2001-02 and released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	1422	Medical Management Options - New Directions	1	0	1	No program costs or releases in FY 2001-02.
Non-Secure	0842	The Methodist Home for Children	5	6	11	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Secure	0832	Youth House of Ouachita I	4	7	11	Released less than 15 youth

Appendix A2 - Programs Excluded from PAM Calculations (continued)

2003 Program Exclusions

Security Type	Program Code	Program Name	FY 99-00 Releases	FY 00-01 Releases	Total Releases	Reason for Exclusion
Non-Residential	0312	Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles	0	6	6	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	1419	Boys and Girls Foundation	1	0	0	No program Cost and released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0804	Boys and Girls Villages (Girls)	5	2	7	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0803	Cane River Childrens Services	5	2	7	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0408	Family Counseling Ag	1	0	1	No program Cost and released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	2001	Gulf Coast Teaching Family Service- New Orleans District	0	1	1	No program Cost and 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	2108	Harmony Center - A.B. Horne	3	5	8	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0848	Harmony Center - HCI Focus	5	7	12	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	1405	Harmony III	9	5	14	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0811	Health Access	1	0	1	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
Non-secure	0847	North American Family Institute	14	0	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	0842	The Methodist Home for Children	6	5	11	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0852	Ware Youth Center Girls	0	4	4	Released less than 15 youth
Non-secure	0832	Youth House of Ouachita I	6	4	10	Released less than 15 youth
Non-Residential	0307	Zion Day Program	7	0	7	Released less than 15 youth

Appendix A3 - 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 recidivism range: The expected recidivism rate plus or minus the margin of error (the 99% confidence interval for the measure of expected recidivism). If the observed recidivism rate falls below the lower limit or exceeds the upper limit of the expected recidivism range, the probability that the difference is due to random error is less than one percent.

Expected recidivism rate: The average probability of recidivism 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, race, gender, family stability, economic status, and number of prior adjudications. For residential programs the risk factors identified in available data as significant predictors of recidivism include age at release, gender, race, chronic offending (four or more prior adjudications), whether the youth associates with negative/delinquent peers, whether the youth is failing in school or a vocational setting, whether the youth is a chronic drug and/or alcohol user, and whether the youth was placed/released from a non-secure residential facility (as opposed to regular or short-term security status).

Included programs: Residential and non-residential programs with at least 15 youth released between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2003.

Non-residential programs: Non-residential programs are defined as those programs serving youth in a non-residential setting and are identified in the JIRMS system as having one of the following two digits in the assigned location field: 03, 04, or 20. These programs include day programs, trackers, intensive in-home, and other contracted non-residential programs.

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

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

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

Appendix A3 - Definitions of Terms (continued)

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. Note, for residential secure programs, program completions include youth deemed to have successfully completed the program as well as those who have not successfully completed the program and been released against the recommendation of the Office of Youth Development (examples include release by court order and release as a result of youth reaching the jurisdictional age limit of the juvenile court).

Program cost per completion: Total expenditures for each program divided by the number of program completions for the two-year period between FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 (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 (N): A pool of 4,062 youth released from residential programs and 1,222 youth released from non-residential programs to the community or parole services between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2003. Recidivism is tracked for one year after each youth's release. Therefore, a youth released on June 29, 2002 is tracked until June 29, 2003.

Residential programs: Residential programs are defined as those programs serving youth in either a secure or non-secure residential setting and are identified in the JIRMS system as having one of the following two digits in the assigned location field: 02, 07, 08, 14, 19, 21, or 22. These programs include JCCY, BCCY, SCCY, SCCY-M I, SCCY-M II, JJJC, group treatment homes, halfway houses, independent living homes, foster homes, staff secure homes and other contracted residential facilities.

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 (converted into z-scores). 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.

Recidivism 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): OYD expenditures for fiscal years 2001-02 and 2002-03.

Appendix A4 - Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Recidivism Range for Non-Residential Programs (presented in alphabetical order)

Non-Residential Programs	Risk Factors								
	Number Released	Average Number of Prior Adjudicated Charges	Percent Minority	Percent Male	Average Age at Release	Percent With Family Instability	Percent With Economic Difficulty	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate
American Resource Technicians - Female	40	1.68	100%	0%	15.9	86%	43%	10% - 13%	13%
American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	20	2.25	95%	100%	16.3	52%	47%	22% - 28%	20%
American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	198	2.15	99%	100%	16.1	62%	35%	32% - 33%	35%
Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	64	1.56	77%	0%	15.6	84%	28%	13% - 15%	20%
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	80	1.31	81%	100%	16.0	81%	53%	22% - 24%	20%
Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	41	2.00	63%	100%	15.9	89%	30%	28% - 31%	34%
Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	27	1.67	74%	100%	16.2	65%	35%	24% - 29%	26%
Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	40	2.70	57%	100%	16.1	65%	53%	25% - 29%	28%
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	46	1.39	76%	100%	15.7	95%	12%	22% - 25%	20%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	79	1.82	65%	0%	16.0	82%	39%	8% - 10%	5%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	78	2.24	45%	100%	16.6	63%	22%	23% - 25%	22%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	53	2.83	64%	100%	16.9	100%	37%	29% - 32%	36%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	151	2.87	71%	100%	16.0	69%	35%	31% - 33%	35%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	32	3.84	22%	100%	15.4	77%	27%	22% - 26%	19%
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	31	2.68	68%	100%	16.3	96%	42%	22% - 26%	19%
Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	54	1.54	35%	100%	16.1	64%	30%	24% - 27%	24%
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	19	1.95	26%	0%	15.9	87%	5%	10% - 14%	16%
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	47	2.13	30%	100%	15.6	83%	12%	25% - 29%	28%
Volunteers of America - Female	19	1.47	63%	0%	15.9	79%	26%	10% - 14%	16%
Volunteers of America - Male	47	1.60	60%	100%	15.5	74%	26%	30% - 33%	38%

Appendix A5 - Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Recidivism Range for Residential Programs (presented in alphabetical order)

Risk Factors

Residential Programs	Number Released	Chronic Offender - Percent With Four or More Prior Adjudicated Offenses	Percent Minority	Percent Male	Security Type	Average Age at Release	Percent Negative/Delinquent Peers	Percent Performing Poorly or Failing in Educ/Voc Setting	Percent Chronically Using Drugs and/or Alcohol	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate
Boys & Girls Village - Female	22	41%	45%	0%	Non-secure	16.1	100%	91%	9%	15% - 18%	14%
Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	755	43%	70%	100%	Reg/Short-term	16.0	89%	84%	30%	37% - 37%	39%
David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	39	26%	85%	100%	Non-secure	16.3	90%	90%	13%	23% - 26%	26%
Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	59	32%	76%	100%	Non-secure	17.1	86%	78%	25%	20% - 22%	17%
Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - All Districts - Male	27	19%	59%	100%	Non-secure	14.8	78%	78%	7%	22% - 26%	26%
Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	58	21%	69%	0%	Non-secure	15.7	84%	88%	5%	15% - 17%	16%
Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	21	33%	62%	100%	Non-secure	14.9	86%	90%	5%	24% - 28%	38%
Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	29	24%	59%	100%	Non-secure	15.2	86%	72%	14%	23% - 26%	28%
Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	375	46%	70%	0%	Regular	16.5	91%	85%	25%	19% - 19%	19%
Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	663	62%	79%	100%	Regular	17.4	93%	90%	46%	30% - 30%	31%
Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	51	24%	59%	100%	Non-secure	15.4	76%	86%	14%	24% - 27%	29%
Joy Home for Boys - Male	38	24%	71%	100%	Non-secure	13.7	97%	89%	8%	23% - 26%	26%
Larry Reynolds Institute Of Youth Guidance - Male	32	44%	47%	100%	Non-secure	15.7	88%	78%	6%	22% - 26%	25%
Methodist Home for Children - Female	25	20%	52%	0%	Non-secure	16.2	88%	76%	28%	17% - 21%	32%
Renaissance - Female	18	11%	44%	0%	Non-secure	15.8	89%	50%	6%	14% - 18%	6%
Rutherford House - Female	21	24%	62%	0%	Non-secure	16.3	86%	90%	19%	15% - 18%	14%
Rutherford House - Male	52	27%	71%	100%	Non-secure	16.4	94%	85%	29%	22% - 25%	23%
Sanctuary - Female	25	16%	60%	0%	Non-secure	16.0	88%	84%	0%	15% - 18%	12%
Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	782	54%	78%	100%	Reg/Short-term	17.0	93%	87%	40%	31% - 31%	33%
Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	552	52%	82%	100%	Regular	17.6	96%	87%	41%	25% - 26%	27%
Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	24	67%	67%	100%	Non-secure	16.2	100%	92%	21%	22% - 26%	25%

Appendix A5 - Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Recidivism Range for Residential Programs (presented in alphabetical order) (Cont'd)

Risk Factors

Residential Programs	Number Released	Chronic Offender - Percent With Four or More Prior Adjudicated Offenses	Percent Minority	Percent Male	Security Type	Average Age at Release	Percent With Negative/Delinquent Peers	Percent Performing Poorly or Failing in Educ/Voc Setting	Percent Chronically Using Drugs and/or Alcohol	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate
Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	160	24%	76%	100%	Non-secure	15.9	87%	86%	19%	24% - 25%	26%
Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	33	21%	39%	0%	Non-secure	16.0	94%	91%	6%	16% - 19%	21%
Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	29	28%	72%	0%	Non-secure	15.5	100%	90%	0%	16% - 19%	21%
Ware Youth Center - Female	23	13%	57%	0%	Non-secure	15.5	91%	91%	22%	19% - 22%	43%
Ware Youth Center - Male	25	32%	48%	100%	Non-secure	16.8	92%	92%	36%	21% - 25%	16%
Youth House of Ouachita - Female	30	27%	70%	0%	Non-secure	15.9	100%	93%	7%	16% - 19%	23%

Appendix A6 – Risk Factors, Recidivism and Cost Effectiveness, and PAM Scores for Non-Residential and Residential Programs, 2003-2005
(presented in alphabetical order)

The following tables presented in Appendix A6 provide risk factors, recidivism and cost effectiveness values and categories, and PAM scores for non-residential and residential programs for the past three years. It is important to note, however, that PAM scores represent relative rankings of programs each year. As such, it is not possible to compare a program's PAM score from one year to its PAM score from another, given that different populations of youth were analyzed. It is possible to look at individual program averages on the risk factors for the youths served by each program for a given year. However, given changes in the youth population and in risk assessment variables, the significant predictors of recidivism are not always the same from year to year. It is also possible to compare standardized measurements like the programs' recidivism effectiveness and cost effectiveness indices. For ease of interpretation, these indices are categorized into recidivism effectiveness (above average, average, and below average) and cost effectiveness groupings (below average and above average costs). These groupings can be compared from year-to-year in a relative sense, but it is important to remember that since the PAM analyses ranks programs annually, a program could perform similarly to the way it did the year before and still go down in their PAM score if a significant number of other programs did particularly well that year. As such, these better performing programs would have the effect of lowering the other program's PAM score, due to the ranking methodology used in the analyses.

Appendix 6

2005 Non-Residential Programs PAM Summary

Non-Residential Programs	2005 Risk Factors						Recidivism & Cost			Categories and PAM Score			
	N	Percent Minority	Average # of Prior Adjudicated Charges	Percent With Economic Difficulty	% Male	Average Age at Release	Percent With Family Instability	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate	Cost Per Completion	Effective Category	Cost Category	PAM Score
American Resource Technicians - Female	40	100%	1.68	43%	0%	15.9	86%	10% - 13%	13%	\$4,062.58	Average	Below Average	75
American Resource Technicians Day Program - Male	20	95%	2.25	47%	100%	16.3	52%	22% - 28%	20%	\$31,862.15	Above Average	Above Average	70
American Resource Technicians Trackers - Male	198	99%	2.15	35%	100%	16.1	62%	32% - 33%	35%	\$1,808.57	Below Average	Below Average	69
Associated Marine Institute - All Districts - Female	64	77%	1.56	28%	0%	15.6	84%	13% - 15%	20%	\$18,312.89	Below Average	Above Average	51
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge - Male	80	81%	1.31	53%	100%	16.0	81%	22% - 24%	20%	\$13,863.76	Above Average	Above Average	76
Associated Marine Institute - Bayou Lafourche - Male	41	63%	2.00	30%	100%	15.9	89%	28% - 31%	34%	\$20,782.56	Below Average	Above Average	58
Associated Marine Institute - Jefferson Wetlands - Male	27	74%	1.67	35%	100%	16.2	65%	24% - 29%	26%	\$24,497.26	Average	Above Average	65
Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles - Male	40	57%	2.70	53%	100%	16.1	65%	25% - 29%	28%	\$18,703.60	Average	Above Average	68
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport - Male	46	76%	1.39	12%	100%	15.7	95%	22% - 25%	20%	\$18,196.67	Above Average	Above Average	77
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - All Districts - Female	79	65%	1.82	39%	0%	16.0	82%	8% - 10%	5%	\$2,320.58	Above Average	Below Average	86
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Hammond - Male	78	45%	2.24	22%	100%	16.6	63%	23% - 25%	22%	\$1,686.03	Above Average	Below Average	78
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Jefferson - Male	53	64%	2.83	37%	100%	16.9	100%	29% - 32%	36%	\$2,174.60	Below Average	Below Average	64
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lafayette - Male	151	71%	2.87	35%	100%	16.0	69%	31% - 33%	35%	\$2,504.89	Below Average	Below Average	68
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Lake Charles - Male	32	22%	3.84	27%	100%	15.4	77%	22% - 26%	19%	\$3,187.75	Above Average	Below Average	85
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services Trackers - Thibodaux - Male	31	68%	2.68	42%	100%	16.3	96%	22% - 26%	19%	\$2,111.74	Above Average	Below Average	85
Medical Management Options - Northshore - Male	54	35%	1.54	30%	100%	16.1	64%	24% - 27%	24%	\$21,401.87	Average	Above Average	67
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Female	19	26%	1.95	5%	0%	15.9	87%	10% - 14%	16%	\$3,112.53	Below Average	Below Average	69
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau - Male	47	30%	2.13	12%	100%	15.6	83%	25% - 29%	28%	\$3,112.55	Average	Below Average	75
Volunteers of America - Female	19	63%	1.47	26%	0%	15.9	79%	10% - 14%	16%	\$17,479.16	Below Average	Above Average	63
Volunteers of America - Male	47	60%	1.60	26%	100%	15.5	74%	30% - 33%	38%	\$17,997.11	Below Average	Above Average	51
Average for All Programs*	58	64%	2.08	32%	75%	16.0	78%	8% - 33%	24%	\$8,600.00	--	--	70

* The average for all programs is defined as the HLM level-2 program average. Additionally, it is important to note that the values within the expected recidivism range columns represent the minimum and maximum expected recidivism values among the programs for that year.

Appendix 6 - Continued

2004 Non-Residential Programs PAM Summary

Non-Residential Programs	N	2004 Risk Factors					Recidivism & Cost			Categories and PAM Score		
		Average # of Prior Adjudicated Charges	% Black	% Male	Average Age at Release	Percent With No Parental Control/ Supervision	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate	Cost Per Completion	Effective Category	Cost Category	PAM Score
American Resource Technicians	230	2.11	90%	82%	16.1	21%	25% - 26%	30%	\$1,719.77	Below Average	Below Average	71
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	107	1.35	77%	87%	15.9	14%	22% - 23%	21%	\$12,421.68	Above Average	Above Average	74
Associated Marine Institute - Lake Charles	24	3.50	46%	75%	16.2	29%	22% - 25%	25%	\$31,185.42	Average	Above Average	64
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	63	1.43	78%	74%	15.9	28%	24% - 25%	29%	\$17,348.54	Below Average	Above Average	63
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - Jefferson	29	2.67	74%	74%	16.3	26%	24% - 27%	44%	\$2,820.97	Below Average	Below Average	48
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - Hammond	67	2.22	28%	89%	16.5	13%	22% - 23%	19%	\$1,931.99	Above Average	Below Average	82
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - Lafayette	148	2.50	71%	86%	16.0	27%	25% - 26%	29%	\$3,015.71	Below Average	Below Average	70
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - Thibodaux	30	3.23	53%	100%	16.2	37%	22% - 25%	20%	\$1,855.63	Above Average	Below Average	81
Medical Management Options - Northshore	56	2.14	25%	77%	16.1	4%	23% - 25%	25%	\$23,753.63	Average	Above Average	67
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	72	1.97	22%	71%	15.5	9%	21% - 22%	17%	\$2,917.39	Above Average	Below Average	83
Volunteers of America - Non-Residential Services	54	1.57	61%	72%	15.3	15%	23% - 25%	30%	\$16,332.56	Below Average	Above Average	63
Zion Human Services	26	1.96	72%	60%	16.8	36%	22% - 25%	24%	\$7,744.92	Average	Above Average	75
Average for All Programs*	76	1.69	58%	79%	16.1	21%	21% - 27%	26%	\$7,600.00	--	--	70

* The average for all programs is defined as the HLM level-2 program average. Additionally, it is important to note that the values within the expected recidivism range columns represent the minimum and maximum expected recidivism values among the programs for that year.

Appendix 6 - Continued

2003 Non-Residential Programs PAM Summary

Non-Residential Programs	N	2003 Risk Factors					Recidivism & Cost			Categories and PAM Score			
		Average Length of Stay (days)	Average # of Prior Adjudicated Charges	% of Youths With Most Serious Prior a Status Offense	% Male	Average Age at Release	% Using Drugs	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate	Cost Per Completion	Effective Category	Cost Category	PAM Score
American Resource Technicians	249	86.5	2.04	12%	81%	16.3	59%	24% - 25%	27%	\$1,629.25	Below Average	Below Average	75
Associated Marine Institute - Baton Rouge	109	178.0	1.32	9%	85%	16.1	63%	22% - 23%	20%	\$11,974.15	Above Average	Above Average	74
Associated Marine Institute - Shreveport	49	159.6	1.51	39%	78%	15.9	59%	23% - 25%	24%	\$18,576.08	Average	Above Average	65
Boys & Girls Village - Day Program (Lake Charles)	25	141.3	3.24	8%	76%	16.0	88%	24% - 27%	32%	\$10,664.53	Below Average	Above Average	63
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Day Program	99	113.8	1.76	17%	75%	16.1	49%	24% - 25%	27%	\$10,157.39	Below Average	Above Average	68
Childrens Comprehensive Services - Intensive Home	102	56.0	1.69	25%	63%	15.8	58%	25% - 26%	29%	\$5,361.02	Below Average	Below Average	70
Educational and Treatment Council, Inc.	42	44.5	2.36	14%	67%	15.4	52%	22% - 25%	19%	\$3,068.67	Above Average	Below Average	83
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - Hammond	66	90.1	2.20	9%	89%	16.5	68%	26% - 27%	33%	\$1,834.76	Below Average	Below Average	68
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - Lafayette	154	102.9	2.68	8%	90%	16.1	62%	27% - 28%	33%	\$2,782.08	Below Average	Below Average	69
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services - Thibodaux	37	86.8	3.11	0%	95%	16.1	81%	26% - 29%	43%	\$2,250.92	Below Average	Below Average	51
Medical Management Options - Northshore	69	131.5	2.58	3%	72%	16.1	55%	25% - 27%	30%	\$18,301.94	Below Average	Above Average	58
Tangipahoa Youth Service Bureau	73	42.5	1.74	12%	63%	15.6	40%	23% - 24%	22%	\$3,974.68	Above Average	Below Average	78
Volunteers of America - Non-Residential Services	41	197.4	1.85	24%	78%	15.6	39%	23% - 25%	22%	\$19,594.65	Above Average	Above Average	66
Zion Human Services	25	157.1	1.92	20%	68%	16.7	88%	22% - 25%	12%	\$8,806.24	Above Average	Above Average	91
Average for All Programs*	81	113.4	2.14	14%	77%	16.0	62%	22% - 29%	27%	\$6,800.00	--	--	70

* The average for all programs is defined as the HLM level-2 program average. Additionally, it is important to note that the values within the expected recidivism range columns represent the minimum and maximum expected recidivism values among the programs for that year.

Appendix 6 - Continued

2005 Residential Programs PAM Summary

Residential Programs	2005 Risk Factors								Recidivism & Cost			Categories and PAM Score		
	Number Released	Chronic Offender - % With Four or More Prior Adjudicated Offenses	Percent Minority	Percent Male	Average Age at Release	Percent With Negative/Delinquent Peers	Percent Using Drugs and/or Alcohol	% Performing Poorly or Failing in Educ/Voc Setting	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate	Cost Per Completion	Effective Category	Cost Category	PAM Score
Boys & Girls Village - Female	22	41%	45%	0%	16.1	100%	9%	91%	15% - 18%	14%	\$27,228.95	Above Average	Below Average	79
Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth - Male	755	43%	70%	100%	16.0	89%	30%	84%	37% - 37%	39%	\$21,890.12	Below Average	Below Average	75
David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport - Male	39	26%	85%	100%	16.3	90%	13%	90%	23% - 26%	26%	\$38,167.97	Average	Below Average	72
Harmony Center - All Districts - Male	59	32%	76%	100%	17.1	86%	25%	78%	20% - 22%	17%	\$56,898.68	Above Average	Above Average	71
Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Male	27	19%	59%	100%	14.8	78%	7%	78%	22% - 26%	26%	\$48,536.30	Average	Above Average	69
Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities - Female	58	21%	69%	0%	15.7	84%	5%	88%	15% - 17%	16%	\$48,536.29	Average	Above Average	69
Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive - Male	21	33%	62%	100%	14.9	86%	5%	90%	24% - 28%	38%	\$36,358.29	Below Average	Below Average	57
Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate - Male	29	24%	59%	100%	15.2	86%	14%	72%	23% - 26%	28%	\$24,973.86	Below Average	Below Average	75
Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Female	375	46%	70%	0%	16.5	91%	25%	85%	19% - 19%	19%	\$43,848.42	Average	Above Average	70
Jetson Correctional Center for Youth - Male	663	62%	79%	100%	17.4	93%	46%	90%	30% - 30%	31%	\$43,848.42	Below Average	Above Average	68
Johnny Robinson's Boys Home - Male	51	24%	59%	100%	15.4	76%	14%	86%	24% - 27%	29%	\$22,925.00	Below Average	Below Average	73
Joy Home for Boys - Male	38	24%	71%	100%	13.7	97%	8%	89%	23% - 26%	26%	\$31,253.03	Average	Below Average	74
Larry Reynolds Institute of Youth Guidance - Male	32	44%	47%	100%	15.7	88%	6%	78%	22% - 26%	25%	\$43,073.63	Average	Above Average	71
Methodist Home for Children - Female	25	20%	52%	0%	16.2	88%	28%	76%	17% - 21%	32%	\$45,837.40	Below Average	Above Average	51
Renaissance - Female	18	11%	44%	0%	15.8	89%	6%	50%	14% - 18%	6%	\$39,701.17	Above Average	Below Average	86
Rutherford House - Female	21	24%	62%	0%	16.3	86%	19%	90%	15% - 18%	14%	\$37,264.90	Above Average	Below Average	74
Rutherford House - Male	52	27%	71%	100%	16.4	94%	29%	85%	22% - 25%	23%	\$37,264.88	Average	Below Average	73
Sanctuary - Female	25	16%	60%	0%	16.0	88%	0%	84%	15% - 18%	12%	\$24,820.00	Above Average	Below Average	82
Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison - Male	782	54%	78%	100%	17.0	93%	40%	87%	31% - 31%	33%	\$44,604.57	Below Average	Above Average	68
Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe - Male	552	52%	82%	100%	17.6	96%	41%	87%	25% - 26%	27%	\$60,650.11	Below Average	Above Average	63
Tyche - Briar Hill - Male	24	67%	67%	100%	16.2	100%	21%	92%	22% - 26%	25%	\$30,600.88	Average	Below Average	75
Tyche - Christian Acres - Male	160	24%	76%	100%	15.9	87%	19%	86%	24% - 25%	26%	\$29,389.15	Below Average	Below Average	74
Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	33	21%	39%	0%	16.0	94%	6%	91%	16% - 19%	21%	\$25,077.03	Below Average	Below Average	73
Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	29	28%	72%	0%	15.5	100%	0%	90%	16% - 19%	21%	\$23,615.38	Below Average	Below Average	75
Ware Youth Center - Female	23	13%	57%	0%	15.5	91%	22%	91%	19% - 22%	43%	\$61,958.65	Below Average	Above Average	34
Ware Youth Center - Male	25	32%	48%	100%	16.8	92%	36%	92%	21% - 25%	16%	\$61,958.64	Above Average	Above Average	72
Youth House of Ouachita - Female	30	27%	70%	0%	15.9	100%	7%	93%	16% - 19%	23%	\$28,631.03	Below Average	Below Average	69
Average for All Programs*	147	0.3	64%	59%	16.0	90%	18%	85%	14% - 37%	24%	\$40,000.00	--	--	70

* The average for all programs is defined as the HLM level-2 program average. Additionally, it is important to note that the values within the expected recidivism range columns represent the minimum and maximum expected recidivism values among the programs for that year.

Appendix 6 - Continued

2004 Residential Programs PAM Summary

Residential Programs	N	2004 Risk Factors							Recidivism & Cost			Categories and PAM Score		
		Chronic Offender - % With Four or More Prior Adjudicated Offenses	% Black	% Male	Average Age at Release	% of Youth Who Are Parents	% Using Drugs	% With Felony Property Offense as Most Serious Prior	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate	Cost Per Completion	Effective Category	Cost Category	PAM Score
Boys and Girls Villages	46	39%	48%	48%	16.4	0%	63%	28%	20% - 23%	20%	\$30,183.74	Above Average	Below Average	74
Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth	688	29%	71%	100%	16.0	1%	67%	45%	37% - 38%	39%	\$21,993.78	Below Average	Below Average	72
David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport	45	16%	91%	100%	16.2	2%	69%	42%	25% - 29%	29%	\$33,410.20	Average	Below Average	71
Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town	19	11%	79%	63%	15.9	0%	37%	11%	23% - 30%	32%	\$28,405.68	Below Average	Below Average	70
Gulf Coast Teaching Family Services	15	7%	60%	47%	15.0	0%	40%	13%	18% - 26%	13%	\$20,655.47	Above Average	Below Average	92
Harmony Center Programs Combined	79	25%	75%	100%	16.9	1%	61%	22%	19% - 21%	18%	\$41,197.51	Above Average	Above Average	72
Hope Haven Boys & Girls Catholic Charities	82	6%	62%	26%	15.2	0%	50%	7%	18% - 20%	17%	\$50,348.67	Above Average	Above Average	68
Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive	18	11%	67%	100%	15.2	0%	56%	28%	25% - 33%	39%	\$45,797.89	Below Average	Above Average	50
Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate	34	15%	50%	100%	15.2	0%	47%	44%	26% - 30%	32%	\$22,927.62	Below Average	Below Average	70
Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	988	37%	77%	64%	17.0	5%	72%	33%	24% - 24%	26%	\$44,549.78	Below Average	Above Average	63
Johnny Robinson's Boys Home	67	10%	57%	100%	15.5	0%	52%	33%	28% - 31%	33%	\$18,318.12	Below Average	Below Average	70
Joy Home for Boys	42	17%	74%	100%	13.7	0%	29%	26%	34% - 38%	48%	\$29,085.02	Below Average	Below Average	46
La Methodist Childrens' Home - Female	18	17%	50%	0%	16.2	0%	61%	17%	24% - 31%	33%	\$47,877.22	Below Average	Above Average	61
Larry Reynolds Institute of Youth Guidance	69	19%	58%	100%	16.2	0%	52%	26%	24% - 26%	26%	\$40,928.45	Average	Above Average	70
Renaissance	29	7%	55%	55%	16.3	0%	52%	21%	18% - 23%	14%	\$42,755.28	Above Average	Above Average	83
Rutherford House	80	10%	71%	74%	16.4	1%	75%	23%	19% - 21%	19%	\$36,524.68	Above Average	Below Average	73
Sanctuary - Male and Female	40	18%	68%	30%	15.9	3%	48%	8%	19% - 23%	18%	\$28,470.50	Above Average	Below Average	80
Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Madison	830	33%	77%	100%	17.0	1%	74%	49%	32% - 32%	33%	\$42,878.28	Below Average	Above Average	65
Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe	491	38%	81%	100%	17.7	2%	77%	41%	23% - 24%	25%	\$64,721.11	Below Average	Above Average	58
Tyche - Briar Hill	27	44%	67%	100%	16.2	4%	74%	59%	23% - 28%	26%	\$28,503.96	Average	Below Average	74
Tyche - Christian Acres	146	10%	64%	100%	15.8	1%	60%	36%	27% - 28%	29%	\$32,920.15	Below Average	Below Average	69
Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	32	19%	50%	0%	16.0	6%	59%	19%	20% - 25%	19%	\$26,803.56	Above Average	Below Average	79
Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	34	12%	59%	0%	15.6	6%	59%	9%	24% - 29%	29%	\$22,641.21	Average	Below Average	75
Ware Youth Center	39	23%	54%	56%	16.3	3%	67%	31%	24% - 28%	28%	\$67,384.62	Average	Above Average	61
Youth House of Ouachita II - Female	18	6%	61%	0%	15.8	11%	78%	6%	19% - 26%	17%	\$26,624.78	Above Average	Below Average	83
Average for All Programs*	159	19%	65%	67%	16.0	1%	59%	27%	18% - 38%	26%	\$40,000.00	--	--	70

* The average for all programs is defined as the HLM level-2 program average. Additionally, it is important to note that the values within the expected recidivism range columns represent the minimum and maximum expected recidivism values among the programs for that year.

Appendix 6 – Continued

2003 Residential Programs PAM Summary

Residential Programs	N	2003 Risk Factors						Recidivism & Cost				Categories and PAM Score		
		Average # of Prior Adjudicated Offenses Before Release	% Black	% Male	Average Age at Release	% Who Were Severe Truants	% With Status Offense as Most Serious Prior	% With Felony Property Offense as Most Serious Prior	Expected Recidivism Range	Recidivism Rate	Cost Per Completion	Effective Category	Cost Category	PAM Score
Boys & Girls Village - Group Home Female	17	3.1	29%	0%	17.2	29%	47%	6%	14% - 22%	6%	\$27,487.00	Above Average	Below Average	94
Boys & Girls Village - Male	31	3.8	58%	100%	16.1	52%	10%	61%	26% - 32%	32%	\$37,614.46	Average	Above Average	71
Bridge City Correctional Center for Youth	669	2.9	69%	100%	16.1	41%	0%	43%	39% - 40%	41%	\$20,491.69	Below Average	Below Average	73
Challenge & Development Center of Clinton	18	1.6	67%	100%	15.3	44%	78%	11%	26% - 37%	39%	\$19,663.74	Below Average	Below Average	71
Community Receiving Home (Renaissance)	27	1.9	70%	63%	16.1	15%	48%	15%	19% - 26%	22%	\$44,925.10	Average	Above Average	69
David Joe Williams - Cool Springs of Logansport	50	2.3	92%	100%	16.3	54%	18%	48%	27% - 32%	32%	\$30,073.72	Average	Below Average	73
Father Flanagans Girls and Boys Town	17	2.1	76%	65%	15.9	41%	41%	18%	24% - 34%	35%	\$35,919.06	Below Average	Above Average	69
Harmony Center - Hadley Group Home	20	2.1	70%	100%	15.7	35%	30%	35%	19% - 27%	20%	\$37,787.30	Average	Above Average	71
Harmony Center - Shirleys Den	17	3.0	76%	100%	15.9	53%	12%	29%	27% - 38%	41%	\$32,975.18	Below Average	Below Average	64
Harmony Center Inc - Supervised Apartments	16	2.6	88%	100%	19.2	44%	0%	13%	14% - 23%	6%	\$21,944.47	Above Average	Below Average	96
Hope Haven - Female	49	1.7	55%	0%	15.8	53%	49%	6%	15% - 18%	12%	\$51,817.37	Above Average	Above Average	74
Hope Haven - Male	19	2.1	53%	100%	15.2	58%	21%	11%	33% - 44%	53%	\$62,886.72	Below Average	Above Average	40
Hope Youth Ranch - Intensive	19	2.1	68%	100%	15.2	84%	32%	42%	31% - 41%	47%	\$44,071.13	Below Average	Above Average	53
Hope Youth Ranch - Moderate	25	2.5	48%	100%	14.9	56%	16%	48%	34% - 42%	48%	\$34,329.78	Below Average	Below Average	56
Jena Juvenile Correction Center	247	3.4	81%	100%	17.7	35%	0%	35%	34% - 35%	36%	\$25,815.63	Below Average	Below Average	72
Jetson Correctional Center for Youth	1,033	3.2	78%	63%	17.1	42%	0%	33%	23% - 23%	25%	\$39,696.86	Below Average	Above Average	65
Johnny Robinsons Boys Home	65	2.5	60%	100%	15.6	54%	18%	40%	40% - 44%	48%	\$19,023.43	Below Average	Below Average	66
Joy Home for Boys	51	2.6	73%	100%	14.0	78%	20%	25%	39% - 43%	47%	\$23,907.29	Below Average	Below Average	64
La Methodist Childrens Home - Female	18	1.9	50%	0%	16.1	44%	39%	11%	20% - 29%	22%	\$47,794.54	Average	Above Average	68
Larry Reynolds Institute Of Youth Guidance	78	2.2	64%	100%	16.5	36%	15%	32%	22% - 25%	24%	\$45,599.53	Average	Above Average	68
Rutherford House - Female	22	1.9	64%	0%	16.3	64%	50%	14%	21% - 28%	23%	\$33,204.25	Average	Below Average	72
Rutherford House - Male	67	1.8	67%	100%	16.8	57%	16%	30%	17% - 20%	16%	\$32,708.67	Above Average	Below Average	75
Sanctuary - Female	22	2.1	77%	0%	15.8	41%	45%	9%	16% - 23%	14%	\$27,460.70	Above Average	Below Average	81
Sanctuary - Male	16	2.1	63%	100%	15.6	69%	25%	31%	23% - 33%	31%	\$37,026.77	Average	Above Average	71
Swanson Correctional Center for Youth - Monroe	462	3.1	81%	100%	17.8	39%	0%	39%	23% - 24%	25%	\$59,657.83	Below Average	Above Average	62
Swanson Correctional Center Madison	950	3.1	76%	100%	16.9	43%	0%	46%	32% - 32%	33%	\$33,506.67	Below Average	Below Average	69
Tyche - Briar Hill	35	4.2	63%	100%	15.8	57%	6%	54%	29% - 35%	37%	\$23,301.14	Below Average	Below Average	70
Tyche - Christian Acres	164	2.2	61%	100%	15.9	51%	20%	38%	31% - 33%	34%	\$29,603.60	Below Average	Below Average	70
Tyche - Evangeline Oaks - Female	31	2.0	45%	0%	15.9	48%	58%	13%	18% - 23%	16%	\$27,578.16	Above Average	Below Average	76
Tyche - Magnolia Ridge - Female	30	2.4	43%	0%	15.6	43%	60%	7%	25% - 31%	30%	\$25,070.73	Average	Below Average	74
Ware Youth Center - Male	16	3.3	81%	100%	17.0	50%	6%	44%	16% - 25%	13%	\$92,062.00	Above Average	Above Average	68
Youth House of Ouachita II - Female	20	1.8	75%	0%	15.5	50%	55%	10%	19% - 27%	20%	\$25,492.08	Average	Below Average	74
Average for All Programs*	135	2.5	66%	72%	16.2	49%	26%	28%	14% - 44%	29%	\$35,000.00	--	--	70

* The average for all programs is defined as the HLM level-2 program average. Additionally, it is important to note that the values within the expected recidivism range columns represent the minimum and maximum expected recidivism values among the programs for that year.

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the dedication, consultation and assistance of the staff at the Louisiana Office of Youth Development. In particular, we would like to thank Beth Meng, George White, Ruth Goodman, Melba Oubre, and Amy Primes for their work in preparing the data on which this report is based. Their commitment to program evaluation is a critical part of an ongoing nationwide effort to continuously improve the effectiveness of services for delinquent youths. Finally and most importantly, we would like to thank Deputy Secretary Simon Gonsoulin for his support and commitment to outcome evaluation, effective performance measurement, and cost accountability.