National Center for Juvenile Justice



1999

JUVENILE AFTERCARE SERVICES

compiled by patrick griffin

Aftercare is the name given to programs, services, and strategies intended to assure a juvenile's successful transition from residential placement to life in the community. The term may include parole-style supervision, monitoring and testing as well as counseling and treatment services, training and mentoring, and other forms of post-institutional help.

Little more than a decade ago, aftercare was considered to be the juvenile justice system's weakest and most neglected link. Often, in fact, the link was nonexistent: juveniles in residential placements, having "done their time," were simply released to the streets from which they had come, with little or nothing in the way of preparation, follow-up, monitoring, or services. Institutional treatment ended, institutional structure was withdrawn, and nothing took their place. Rehabilitative progress evaporated quickly. Old habits and associations reasserted themselves. Not surprisingly, rates of failure and recidivism among formerly incarcerated delinquents were unacceptably high.

The juvenile justice system's response, in a broad sense, has been to attempt to build better bridges between the institutional and community environments. Approaches have varied. But any well-designed aftercare strategy will include a handful of basic features. It will impose concrete, enforceable expectations on all juveniles, with a reliable method of verifying compliance and a coherent structure of incentives and sanctions for noncompliance. It will offer some level of intensified surveillance, enhanced services, or both, to those at serious risk of failure/recidivism, and will use formal risk/eligibility assessments to target those interventions carefully. (Not only because special efforts would be wasted on others—intrusive surveillance can actually heighten the chances that low-risk offenders will reoffend.) And it will rely as much as possible on partner-ships with community resources and support systems to do the work of reintegration.

The most ambitious effort to design a flexible, research-based approach to aftercare has been the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency



"Aftercare is ... intended to assure a juvenile's successful transition from residential placement to life in the community."

INSIDE SUMMARIES

Intensive Aftercare Progam (IAP) Products and Related Materials p. 2

> Other Juvenile Aftercare Materials p. 3

Aftercare Program
Evaluations
p. 5

Aftercare Program
Descriptions
p. 7

Prevention's Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Programs initiative, a long-term research, development, training, and demonstration program that was launched in 1988 and is still ongoing. The Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) model that has emerged from this process consists of pre-release planning, structured reentry, and long-term reintegrative monitoring and services. IAP is intended, in the words of its originators, to reduce recidivism and failure by: 1) "[p]reparing juveniles for progressively increased responsibility and freedom in the community"; 2) "[f]acilitating interaction and involvement between juveniles and the community": 3) "[w]orking with offenders and targeted community support systems (families, peers, schools, employers) on the qualities needed for constructive interactions that advance the juveniles' reintegration into the community"; 4) "[d]eveloping new resources and supports as needed"; and 5) "[m]onitoring and testing juveniles and the community on their capacity to deal with each other productively." The IAP model has been adopted for demonstration purposes at pilot sites in Colorado (the Lookout Mountain Youth Services Center, which serves a catchment area including greater metropolitan Denver); Nevada (the Caliente Youth Center in Clark County, which serves Las Vegas); and Virginia (the Beaumont Juvenile Correctional Center, serving Norfolk County). (In addition, an IAP pilot site was originally established at the New Jersey Training School for Boys in Jamesburg, serving Camden and Essex Counties, including Newark; however, early in 1998, New Jersey stopped enrolling juveniles for participation in the program.) Many of the materials summarized below were directly or indirectly generated by the IAP project.

Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) Products and Related Materials

· Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model

Altschuler, David M., and Troy L. Armstrong. 1994. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 20 pages.

The IAP model is the product of an effort to identify and combine the most effective and promising strategies for helping high-risk juvenile parolees make the transition from confinement to freedom. This is the handiest available account of the theory, design, and objectives of the IAP initiative, summarizing the major findings of the project's assessment of pre-IAP aftercare efforts and describing the proposed framework for field-testing the IAP model.

To order a copy, call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at (800) 851-3420 and ask for NCJ 147575.

 Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: Policies and Procedures

Altschuler, David M., and Troy L. Armstrong. 1994. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 28 pages.

This is a somewhat more detailed overview of the IAP model and its theoretical framework, intended to convey a sense of how IAP program components are structured and expected to function, and to serve as a guide to programming options in the

areas of case management and case planning, risk/ needs assessment and classification, monitoring techniques, service delivery, service brokerage, incentives and sanctions, management information and program evaluation.

To order a copy, call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at (800) 851-3420 and ask for NCJ 147712.

· Aftercare Not Afterthought: Testing the IAP Model

Altschuler, David M., and Troy L. Armstrong. 1996. <u>Juvenile Justice</u> 3.1 (1996): 15-22.

This is good, short, readable introduction to the IAP initiative, the thinking behind it, and the way this approach to juvenile aftercare is being implemented and tested, with brief descriptions of each of the IAP pilot programs.

Issues of <u>Juvenile Justice</u> can be requested from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse by phone at 800-638-8736; by e-mail at puborder@ncjrs.org; or by mail at P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000.

· Aftercare in the Juvenile Justice System: New Trends and Programs

Altschuler, David, and Troy Armstrong. <u>Perspectives</u> (1995): 24-35.

Besides offering a quick history of the OJJDPfunded Intensive Juvenile Aftercare Programming Initiative and more detail on the workings of the IAP pilot sites, this article outlines possible reasons for increasing recidivism rates among youth released from correctional facilities and discusses the need for more specialized responses to the problem. Available from the American Probation and Parole Association, c/o The Council of State Governments, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, KY 40578-1910. To order reprints, call (606) 244-8205.

 Reintegrating Juvenile Offenders Into the Community: OJJDP's Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Demonstration Program.

National Institute of Justice. 1998. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. 2 pages.

This summary of a presentation by Dr. David Altschuler of the Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies, besides containing another account of the development and ongoing implementation of the IAP model, presents a brief statistical profile of youth targeted by the demonstration project, an outline of project objectives and methods, and some preliminary findings of an ongoing independent evaluation.

To order a copy, call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at (800) 851-3420 and ask for FS 00234.

Other Juvenile Aftercare Materials

• Reintegration, Supervised Release, and Intensive Aftercare

Altschuler, David, Troy Armstrong, and Doris Layton MacKenzie. 1999. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 23 pages.

This Juvenile Justice Bulletin from OJJDP brings together two separate articles on aftercare. "Reintegrative Confinement and Intensive Aftercare," by Altschuler and Armstrong, examines the methods and results of five recent juvenile aftercare initiatives in light of the theoretical rationale for the IAP model and the research that supports it. MacKenzie's accompanying "Commentary: The Effectiveness of Aftercare Programs—Examining the Evidence" takes a broader look at what is currently known about the recidivism-reducing effectiveness of intensive juvenile aftercare programs of the type proposed by Altschuler and Armstrong, based on a previous congressionally mandated evaluation of state and local crime prevention programs entitled Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising, which MacKenzie co-authored. The "Commentary," after summarizing eight studies of community supervision/aftercare programs and their impact on recidivism, concludes that, due to a combination of flawed program implementation and inadequate or incomplete evaluation methods, there has been as yet no quality research that convincingly demonstrates a strong link between intensive aftercare and reductions in recidivism; however, the article concedes that there is good evidence for the practical effectiveness of some treatment and rehabilitation methods that form part of the IAP model, even if it is "unclear whether the increased surveillance of the juveniles in the community adds anything to the impact of treatment and rehabilitation."

To order a copy, call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at (800) 851-3420 and ask for NCJ 175715.

 Intensive Interventions With High-Risk Youths: Promising Approaches in Juvenile Probation and Parole Armstrong, Troy L., editor. 1991. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press, a division of Willow Tree Press, Inc. 447 pages.

This collection of articles on intensive interventions with delinquents who are at high risk of reoffending contains several that focus on aftercare issues. The editor's own "Intensive Aftercare for the High-Risk Juvenile Parolee: Issues and Approaches in Reintegration and Community Supervision" discusses community-based parole supervision and services for high-risk juvenile offenders released from secure correctional confinement. J. Fred Springer's "Selective Aftercare for Juvenile Parolees: Administrative Environment and Placement Decisions" treats the influence of the administrative environment on decisions to place juvenile offenders in community-based aftercare programs, discusses approaches to developing valid placement instruments to determine youths' service needs and risk levels, and presents a case study of Arizona Department of Corrections' juvenile aftercare placement decisions.

Available from Willow Tree Press, Inc., P.O. Box 249, Monsey, NY 10952.

 Managing Delinquency: Programs That Work

American Correctional Association. 1995. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association. 34 pages (excerpt).

One chapter of this book, "Managing Aftercare Services for Delinquents," by Troy Armstrong and David Altschuler, offers guidelines for the initiation, management and operation of juvenile aftercare. The chapter discusses the organizational structure and administrative functions of such a program; eligibility of juveniles according to risk and jurisdictional boundaries; the structure of the juvenile aftercare program; the prospects and impediments

involved in confinement, prerelease and transition; advocacy and service delivery capacity-building in the community; service brokerage and referral; staffing; and management information and evaluation.

Available from the American Correctional Association, 8025 Laurel Lakes Court, Laurel, MD 20707-5075.

Aftercare Program Evaluations

• Treatment and Reintegration of Violent Juvenile Offenders: Experimental Results

Fagan, Jeffrey A. Justice Quarterly 7.2 (1990): 233-56.

This scholarly article gives an account of the Violent Juvenile Offender (VJO) Program funded by OJJDP in the 1980's, under which four program sites (Newark, Detroit, Boston, and Memphis) tested an intervention model that included a phased program of reentry from secure facilities to intensive supervision in the community. Recidivism and social outcomes of participants were compared with those of youths randomly assigned to mainstream juvenile corrections programs. Implementation of the experimental intervention varied by site; however, in two sites with strong implementation, failure rates and arrest rates by time at risk for VJO youths were lower than those for control youths. The author concludes that, rather than lengthy confinement followed by minimal supervision, reintegration and transition strategies should be the focus of correctional policy.

Available from <u>Justice Quarterly</u>, Eastern Kentucky University, 458 Stratton Building, Richmond, KY 40475, or call the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences at (800) 757-ACJS. Alternative Placements for Juvenile
 Offenders: Results From the Evaluation of
 the Nokomis Challenge Program

Deschenes, Elizabeth Piper, and Peter W. Greenwood. <u>Journal of Research in Crime and</u> Delinquency 35.3 (1998): 267-94.

The Nokomis Challenge Program was a correctional program launched by the Michigan Department of Social Services (DSS) in 1989, combining three months of residence and outdoor challenge programming in a remote wilderness camp with nine months of intensive community-based aftercare. It was designed for low and medium risk juveniles convicted of a felony offense who would otherwise have been placed in a residential facility for 14-16 months. The aftercare component featured community surveillance, treatment, and extensive family services. However, evaluators who followed the progress of the Nokomis group and a comparison group for two years found no significant differences between the two in terms of the overall proportion with a new felony arrest. Also, failure rates during the Nokomis Program's aftercare phase were so high (60% were either transferred to or placed in custodial settings in the first year of aftercare) that the program did not save as much money as had been expected.

Available from SAGE Publications, Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320, (805) 499-0721.

 An Evaluation of Juvenile Intensive Aftercare Probation: Aftercare Versus System Response Effects

Sontheimer, Henry, and Lynne Goodstein. Justice Quarterly 10.2 (1993): 197-227.

This paper succinctly presents the results of a study

of the effects of the Philadelphia Intensive Aftercare Probation Program. The authors compared a group of juveniles subjected to intensive aftercare probation with a similar group given only standard aftercare, and found that the intensive program had a dramatic impact on the frequency, but not the incidence, of recidivism. On the basis of these findings, they argue that the value of intensive probation lies not in rehabilitation but in risk control: the intensive aftercare approach improves the system's response to juvenile reoffending without affecting juveniles' underlying propensity to reoffend.

Available from <u>Justice Quarterly</u>, Eastern Kentucky University, 458 Stratton Building, Richmond, KY 40475, or call the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences at (800) 757-ACJS.

· Philadelphia Intensive Aftercare Probation Evaluation Project

Sontheimer, Henry, Lynne Goodstein and Michael Kovacevic. 1990. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. 195 pages.

This evaluation report on the Philadelphia Intensive Aftercare Probation Program describes in more detail the research work that formed the basis for the above <u>Justice Quarterly</u> article, including more complete descriptions of the researchers' data collection procedures, instruments, and findings.

Available from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, P.O. Box 3222, Harrisburg, PA 17015-3222, (800) 692-7292.

· Chronic Juvenile Offenders: Final Results From The Skillman Aftercare Experiment

Greenwood, Peter W., Elizabeth Piper Deschenes, and John Adams. 1994. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. 73 pages.

This is the final report of a four-year evaluation of the Skillman Intensive Aftercare Program Initiative, which consisted of two experimental intensive aftercare programs that were designed to help delinquent youth from Detroit and Pittsburgh return to their homes following residential placements. For purposes of the evaluation, juveniles set for release were randomly placed in either the experimental Skillman program or a pre-existing one, and their subsequent progress was compared. However, the authors found that differences in programs had little or no effect on final outcomes: despite some reported positive impacts on youths' personal goals, sense of efficacy and coping skills, there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups in terms of rearrest, selfreported offenses or drug use.

Available from the RAND Corporation, 1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138, (310) 451-7002.

 Juvenile Aftercare in Florida: How Aftercare Programs Are Defined, Designed and Funded

Juvenile Justice Advisory Board. Tallahassee, FL: Juvenile Justice Advisory Board, Florida Legislature. 106 pages.

This is an extremely thorough and detailed look at the theory and practice of aftercare in a single state. It includes information about Florida's current

aftercare service continuum—maximum supervision, intensive day treatment, intensive community supervision, re-entry programs, and community supervision—as well as detailed results from earlier evaluations of aftercare programs in the state. There are sections on the historical development and funding of aftercare in Florida. Appendices contain a supervision risk classification instrument, sample aftercare contracts, aftercare cost tables, and a current listing of all of the state's aftercare programs, with their 1996-97 budgets.

Available from the Juvenile Justice Advisory Board, Florida Legislature, Suite 308, Holland Building, Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300, (850) 922-4377

Aftercare Program Descriptions

 Aftercare and Specialized Aftercare Services

Clouser, Megan. <u>Pennsylvania Progress</u> 3.4 (1996). 6 pages.

This issue of the newsletter of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency follows more than 20 years of aftercare programming in Pennsylvania, from the original demonstration project established in 1974, through the expansion of aftercare services to 30 counties, to the evolution of specialized aftercare models such as Intensive Aftercare and Drug and Alcohol Intensive Aftercare.

Available from the National Center for Juvenile Justice, 710 Fifth Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15219-3000, (412) 227-6950.

· "Intensive Aftercare" in Juvenile Corrections - The Colorado Experience

Bennett, David B. <u>Focal Point</u> (Spring 1997): 25-28.

This article describes the workings of the Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) pilot site established by Colorado's Division of Youth Corrections.

Available from Portland State University, Research & Training Center, Regional Research Institute for Human Services, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751, (503) 725-4175, http://www.pdx.rtc.edu.

· The Virginia Intensive Parole Program

Boykin, Valerie. Focal Point (1997): 32-34.

Like the previous article, this one is an account of the operation of an IAP pilot site: the Virginia Intensive Parole Program in Norfolk. The author describes the four phases of the program, which include an orientation phase, a "freedom" phase, an outreach and tracking phase and a regular parole supervision phase.

Available from Portland State University, Research & Training Center, Regional Research Institute for Human Services, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751, (503) 725-4175, http://www.pdx.rtc.edu.

· Preventative Aftercare, Inc.: Keeping Families Together

George Junior Republic. 1996. Grove City, PA: George Junior Republic. 16 pages.

This document describes the Community-Based Preventative/Aftercare Program operated by the George Junior Republic in Grove City, PA, setting out the program's goals and objectives, its treatment regimen, costs, and the services and supervision it provides.

Available from George Junior Republic, P.O. Box 1058, Grove City, PA 16127.

This summary is a product of the National Center for Juvenile Justice, the research division of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Summaries provide information on topics relevant to the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG) Program administered by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. For more information about this and other summaries contact us at:

National Center for Juvenile Justice 710 Fifth Avenue, 3rd Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219-3000 (412) 227-6950 or www.ncjj.org

For information about the JAIBG program, contact: Development Services Group, Inc. at 1-877-GO-JAIBG (465-2424) or www.dsgonline.com

This summary was supported by funds under grant #98-JB-VX-0102 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent any official position, policy, or view of the U.S. Department of Justice.