

ARROWHEAD REGIONAL CORRECTIONS

ARROWHEAD JUVENILE CENTER

2016 INTERIM

TREATMENT PROGRAM

OUTCOME REPORT

Prepared By Toni Poupore-Haats, ARC Research Analyst

September 2016

INTRODUCTION:

A full Arrowhead Juvenile Center (AJC) Treatment Program Outcome/Recidivism Report will be completed in 2017. This report is a condensed version with selected elements of the full report.

DATA COLLECTION PROCESS/RECIDIVISM DEFINED:

Data Sources:

- JAIMS (Juvenile/Adult Information Management System) for resident information
- CSTS (Court Services Tracking System) for recidivism information
- Cognitive Skills Pre- and Post-Test Surveys
- Resident Satisfaction Surveys
- Parent/Guardian Satisfaction Surveys

Sample:

Recidivism Sample: 116 juveniles discharged from the following Arrowhead Juvenile Center Treatment programs in 2013 and 2014:

- Hillside Female Program
- Kenwood Male Program
- Lakeside Sex Offender Treatment Program

It does not include youth who were assigned to the following services in 2013 and 2014:

- Short-term Female Program
- Short-term Consequence/Kitchen Program
- Residents on furlough
- Detention Unit

Cognitive Skills Program Sample: 102 juveniles who completed the pre- and post-test after completing the Cognitive Skills curriculum in 2013 or 2014

Resident Satisfaction Survey Sample: 115 juveniles who filled out the "Client Satisfaction Survey" before their discharge in 2013 or 2014

Parent/Guardian Satisfaction Survey: 40 parents or guardians who filled out the "Parent Satisfaction Survey" before their child was discharged in 2013 or 2014

Recidivism Definition:

Recidivism, for the purpose of this report, is defined as conviction for a new felony, gross misdemeanor or misdemeanor offense within one year of discharge from Arrowhead Juvenile Center. Petty misdemeanor offenses were not included.

Note: the report only includes *convictions*, not arrests, because a person could be arrested, but not convicted/adjudicated of an offense. No data on “violation of probation” rates were collected for this report.

Recidivism Comparison Data:

The recidivism results of this interim report were compared to AJC Treatment Program recidivism reports completed in 2011 and 2014. This interim report only includes recidivism results; it does not include resident demographics, risk/need assessment levels, length of stay or any program-specific data.

RECIDIVISM RESULTS:

Overall, 66 (57%) of the 116 AJC treatment residents were not convicted/adjudicated of a new offense within one year of discharge. Fifty (43%) of the 116 youth in the treatment programs were convicted/adjudicated of a new offense within one year of discharge.

Residents discharged from the Kenwood Male Offenders Program continue to have the highest recidivism rate, followed by Hillside Female Offender Program residents. The Lakeside Sex Offender Program continues to have the lowest recidivism rate.

RECIDIVISM BY TREATMENT PROGRAM:

Treatment Program	Total participants	Number convicted/ adjudicated of a new offense	Percent convicted/ adjudicated of a new offense	Compared to Past Recidivism Reports	
				2014 Interim Report	2011 Full Report
Hillside (Female Offenders) Program	14	5	36%	44%	48%
Kenwood (Male Offenders Program)	83	40	48%	57%	66%
Lakeside Sex Offender Treatment Program	19	5	26%	12.5%	6%
Total	116	50	43%	50%	50%

RECIDIVISM BY OFFENSE LEVEL:

Of the 50 residents who were convicted of a new offense, nearly twice as many committed a new misdemeanor offense as committed a new felony-level offense.

Offense Level	Number
Misdemeanor	29
Gross Misdemeanor	6
Felony	15
TOTAL	50

The most common felony offenses were assault (4), burglary (3) and theft of a motor vehicle or firearm (3). The most common gross misdemeanor offenses were giving a false name to a police officer (2) and criminal sexual conduct (2). The most common misdemeanor offenses were theft (5), underage consumption (4) and disorderly conduct (4).

RECIDIVISM BY TYPE OF OFFENSE:

Overall, the most common offenses were theft and assault.

OFFENSE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Theft *	11	22%
Assault	6	12%
Disorderly Conduct	4	8%
False Name to Police Officer	4	8%
Underage Consumption	4	8%
Burglary	3	6%
Criminal Sexual Conduct	3	6%
Fleeing a Police Officer	3	6%
Aggravated Robbery	2	4%
Aiding an Offender	1	2%
Domestic Assault	1	2%
DWI	1	2%
Escape from Custody	1	2%
False Fire Alarm/Tamper with Fire Alarm System	1	2%
Obstruction of Legal Process	1	2%
Possession of Synthetic Cannabinoid	1	2%
Receiving Stolen Property	1	2%
Tampering with a Motor Vehicle	1	2%
Trespassing	1	2%
TOTAL	50	100%

*Theft includes general theft (6), shoplifting (2), theft of motor vehicle (2) and theft of firearm (1)

COGNITIVE SKILLS PROGRAMMING RESULTS:

102 juveniles who participated in the Cognitive Skills curriculum (Thinking for a Change or T4C) in 2013 or 2014 completed pre- and post-tests. 66% showed a similar or improved test score after completing the Cognitive Skills group.

Areas with the biggest score gains were in “being objective”, “defining feelings” and using the “Stop and Think” skill more often.

Participants also answered open-ended questions regarding aspects of the program that they liked the best, the least and suggestions for improving the program. Most common responses for each question included:

1. What did you like best?

- Learning new ways of thinking – especially stopping to think before acting/reacting
- Learning new, positive problem solving skills
- Learning new ways to deal with situations
- Learning how to interact with people
- Learning new social skills

2. What didn't you like?

- The homework
- Group was too long
- Role-plays
- It was boring
- Program is repetitive

3. How could the program be improved?

- Shorter lessons/groups
- More role-playing
- Less homework, or at least a choice about whether to do homework
- More interactive/interesting/less boring curriculum
- More realistic, up-to-date examples – better/more interesting materials with topics that relate to situations residents have faced

RESIDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS

115 youth filled out a thirteen question “Client Satisfaction Survey” shortly before their discharge. The average scores were all in the “strongly agree” to “agree” scale.

Clients answered the questions based on a scale of 1 to 5, specifically:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

The average score for each question is listed below (strongly agree/agree responses are highlighted in red font):

1. My basic care needs were met: **1.7**
2. I felt safe: **1.7**
3. I felt listened to: 2.1
4. Staff was helpful, supportive and understood my problems: 2.0
5. My sexual identity was respected: **1.7**
6. I understood what was expected of me: **1.7**
7. Disciplinary actions were fair and consistent: 2.3
8. I received medical and dental care when needed: 2.0
9. I received mental health care when needed: 2.0
10. The teachers helped me with my educational goals: 2.0
11. I learned new ideas in groups that will help me manage my life better: **1.7**
12. I enjoyed the recreational activities: **1.9**
13. Community people who came to AJC met my religious, cultural and treatment needs: **1.9**

Overall, residents rated their stay as “Good” (2.2 on a scale of 1=very good, 2=good, 3=fair and 4=poor).

Residents also answered open-ended questions regarding aspects of their stay that they liked the best, the least and suggestions for improving the program. Most common responses for each question included:

1. What was most helpful?
 - Staff
 - T4C groups
 - Chemical Dependency Treatment
 - Community people/organizations (including Community Coaches)
 - Cultural activities
2. What didn't you like at AJC?
 - Food (breakfast was mentioned most often)
 - Some of the staff
 - Being locked up/confined to a locked facility/lockdown
 - Peers
 - Bedtimes and rules

3. Comments or Suggestions for Improvement:

- Improve the food (e.g. more food, especially at breakfast)
- Staff behavior, including: knowing rules and enforcing them equally, respecting privacy, fair treatment and following through
- Same rules/equal treatment for male and female residents
- More opportunities to make phone calls
- More responsive nursing staff
- Less lockdown

PARENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS:

Forty parents or guardians filled out a 28 question “Parent Satisfaction Survey” shortly before their child’s discharge. The average scores were all in the “strongly agree” to “agree” scale.

Parents/Guardians answered the questions based on a scale of 1 to 5, specifically:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

The average score for each question is listed below (strongly agree to agree responses are highlighted in red font):

1. My child’s basic care needs were met: **1.5**
2. My child’s treatment plan was accurate and helpful: 2.1
3. I was involved in decision-making about my child: 2.0
4. I felt my child was safe: **1.4**
5. I felt my child was listened to: 2.0
6. Staff was helpful, supportive and respectful: 1.8
7. My child understood was expected: **1.5**
8. The relationship my child had with staff was helpful: **1.9**
9. Staff were easy to reach: **1.7**
10. I was regularly informed of my child’s progress: 2.2
11. I was informed of visiting hours, phone calls and other family rules: **1.7**
12. Disciplinary measures were fair and consistent: 2.0
13. Teachers helped my child with educational goals: **1.6**
14. My child received medical and dental care: 2.0
15. My child received mental health care: 2.0
16. My child learned new ideas to help manage life: 2.1
17. My child enjoyed recreational activities: 2.0
18. Community people met my child’s religious, cultural and treatment needs: 2.2
19. My child is ready to return to the community: **1.6**

The survey also asked about parental involvement during their child's stay. 60% said they were involved, either with regular visits and/or contact with staff. Those who weren't involved said they didn't have transportation to get to AJC, they were never contacted, they were ignored, their child was at AJC for a relatively short period of time, they were a more distant relative, or they never asked to be involved. Only two parents/guardians participated in the AJC/Human Development Center Parent Group, one rated it as "very poor" and the other one did not rate it.

Overall, parents/guardians rated AJC services for families as good (1.9 on a scale of 1=very good, 2=good, 3=fair and 4=poor).

They rated their child's stay as good (1.8 on a scale of 1=very good, 2=good, 3=fair and 4=poor).

Parents/guardians also answered open-ended questions regarding (1) ways AJC could help their child succeed, (2) what was most helpful at AJC (3) what they didn't like about AJC and (4) comments or suggestions for improving the program. The most common responses for each question included:

1. How can AJC help you help your child to succeed?

- Continue to teach my child to be better person and make better choices
- Continued support from staff for my child and me
- Send information on the structure at AJC so we could try to incorporate it upon returning home
- By keeping him safe and well-cared for while he was at AJC

2. What was most helpful at AJC?

- Helpful staff and Community Coaches who answered questions, found information, were supportive in meetings and visits, and communicated clearly
- AJC kept my child safe and away from trouble while he was there
- Structure
- Staff support to help residents' succeed

3. What didn't you like about AJC?

- Restrictions on visitors/visits, such as siblings, gay partner, lack of privacy during visits
- Certain staff and their lack of communication (i.e. not returning phone calls)
- The long drive to AJC
- Not enough family counseling

4. Comments or suggestions?

- Disappointed there wasn't one-on-one therapy for the offender and more family interaction
- Need more staff who genuinely care about kids
- An parent information sheet re: rules, visiting procedures, what items are allowed, phone call rules would be helpful

- A weekly scheduled progress meeting to touch base with staff in person or over the phone
- More information about the AJC/HDC parents group
- Change visitation procedures to visit in larger rooms with more activities and not overlapping with meal times
- Help in accessing HDC information

REFERRING AGENCY SATISFACTION SURVEY:

In 2017, ARC's Research Analyst will work with MN DOC Juvenile Facilities staff to revise the Referring Agency Satisfaction Survey.