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Abstract

The complexity of high-risk offenders is difficult in itself and then adding in re-entry, the job becomes one of the most challenging aspects of the justice system. Collaboration is critical with these youth so there piles on another level of complication and we finalize it with finding individualized services among hundreds available and this is to deal with the multitude of concerns with this one individual. No wonder Martinson’s work concluded there is no effect to services we give in corrections and the outside media coined that “Nothing Works” (Martinson, R., 1974). This is wrong and there are many things that work but there is much confusion among all the components in dealing with high-risk youth and reentry.

Instead of designing another program to deal with the monstrosity of issues it is critical to take a look at ourselves in designing a program to sharpen our tools in becoming more effective with what we have. Understanding the youth better in not just looking at one or two components but taking a look at all their parts will help in making lasting decision. The Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project (CHARP) is designed to sharpen our tools within the justice system by establishing a clear collaborative defining of high-risk, communicate this to families and other agencies, and simplify finding appropriate services for these youth. The complication of the task if approved will only deal with the OJJDP FY 2007 High-Risk Youth Offender Reentry grant portion even though a foundation of this is bringing family involvement is critical it is not the focus of CHARP.

One of the unique aspects of this project is early intervention, this will be done in Maricopa County Juvenile Detention and deal with youth that are first involved with the justice system as well as some that continue to re-offend and end up in the corrections system. The more a youth offends the more complex and habitual they become so to define high risk early and help at the core is to divert a life of crime and community victimization. CHARP is based on an intensive assessments and interventions while detained and a focus on services and supervision when reentry happens. The final product of this project will be a system sustained reentry model with a clear “one view” defining of a youths risk, a collaborative communication mechanism (portfolio and dashboard), with a streamlined view of
services and support (resource database) to help justice systems make data driven decisions on dealing with high risk youth on re-entry.

Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project (CHARP)

1.0 Program Narrative

1.1 Statement of the Problem/Program Narrative

Maricopa County Juvenile Probation (MCJP) has two detention centers that serve youth ages 8 to 18. In 2005 there were a total of 8,721 youth detained with a daily population of 435. Over sixty percent (60%) stayed in detention longer than three days, and of that sixty percent; 65% were released home, 13% were released to placements, and 8% were released to the department of juvenile corrections. Traditionally, re-entry of high-risk youth has been a problem in the juvenile justice system. MCJP specifically has problems in this area because 1) there is no clear collaborative definition of risk, 2) there is a confusing, convoluted system of communicating this risk to youth, families, and other providers, and 3) it is difficult to maneuver through the massive number of resource providers available. These are not unique only to MCJP but to the justice system as a whole.

In a review of numerous federal programs over the last 30 years, it is apparent that defining the term “high-risk” is complex. The term itself has been convoluted and not clearly conceptualized. High-risk has been defined by dropout or truancy, homeless or parentless, unemployment, involved with multiple system, gang involved, substance abuse, and poor families. For some, simply the fact that a youth is locked up denotes they are high risk. It can also be a combination of any of these factors. Taking a snapshot on 5/31/07 of the risk scores with those in Maricopa County Detention it was found that approximately 21% of the youth score in the top 10% and could be considered “high-risk” this is 68 youth. The number of “high risk” youth varies,
but in 1999 experts indicated that there were five million youth between the age of 14 and 24 that fit the above definition. This number is expected to increase by 22 percent by 2015 (Serving high risk youth, 2002). The term high-risk needs to be clearly defined when a youth is first involved in the justice system to optimize service and divert further compounding risk factors over time. For example, youth may get frustrated in school because they can not read at an early age. If they do not get help this often turns into behavior problems. These behavior problems turn into delinquency and possibly a high risk juvenile that is truant, aggressive, and defiant. The simple answer is to teach them to read, but it is not that simple because now the youth has many complex factors involved, and this complexity will only increase over the years if all the risk factors are not addressed. All agency personnel should know the reading levels of youth when they get involved in the justice system, since low reading levels is a long standing major “risk factor” that leads to continued delinquency (VanderStaay, 2006). “While poor academic performance does not directly cause delinquent behavior, rates of reoffending and recidivism are highly correlated with low levels of academic achievement” (Malmgren & Leone, 2000). A clear collaborative view of those at highest risk will truly help best decision making. The justice worker should have a clear understanding of justice risks, academic and vocational risk, and mental health risks to understand the complexity of high risk. But they also need to see strength based projective positive things to help the youth go forward, a “one view” of the youth is needed.

High risk youth are involved with multiple systems including juvenile justice, education, and mental health. Each of these systems has their own perception of what will enable the youth to be successful upon re-entry, and often each adds their own plan, creating confusion for the systems and families. Historically, programs either hire a transition specialist or place the juvenile in community based programs and expect him/her to deal with the multitude of diverse needs and the
facets of re-entry with little focus except stopping delinquent behaviors. For example, the Arizona Detention Transition Project (ADTP) was a four-year model demonstration grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). It was specific to transitioning high risk youth (defined as being in special education) from short term facilities. It was a four year intense program and designed promising practices for re-entry, but when the funding was over the transition officers were let go and the intense promising practices were not maintained. This is not a new issue but an overall system problem in sustaining re-entry services after funding stops. Separate agencies work on one high risk component but not all risk components due to funding stipulations. One of the promising practices with ADTP was a transition portfolio that was based on assessments, youth engagement, and increased communication with community agencies. The youth worked with a transition officer in detention. They combined main transition components into a portfolio (see appendix B and figure 1) and upon release assisted in getting the youth engaged in school or work. This was a great idea and very helpful in communication to the youth and family, community/schools, and the justice staff. An expansion of the portfolio that encompasses all risk would allow a look at all the components needed for a successful re-entry plan. Communication is critical upon re-entry to continue engagement and foster collaboration. This proposal takes the portfolio concept one step further by designing a computer dashboard (see appendix B and figure 2) that will allow the justice system to have a “one view” to make data driven decisions, track all the functions going on, and communicate effectively with other agencies.

Collaboration needs to be embedded in a system of seeing all risks. Justice risks are in one place, mental health risks are in another, and academic/vocational risks are in another place. There are numerous files defining these high risk youth, but no one place to see all risk. There is an
emphasis on strength based systems, but little to no collection of strength based data when there is a clear view of all risks and a direction the youth wants to go this should be communicated to the youth so he/she can do a self evaluation. It should also be communicated to the family to support re-entry goals, and to involved agencies to employ a wraparound continuum of services and direction. This would help have a clear view of the youth, but there is also the multitude of services to choose from.

Figure 1: Example of a Portfolio
When justice workers look for services for youth when planning re-entry there are a myriad of options. For example, Maricopa County has 395 different contracted programs from 58 different contracted providers (see appendix C). This does not include community agencies as they are not specifically contracted for pay. There are also lists of programs that are emailed to all justice staff a few times a month to keep everyone updated with new programs. If a justice staff has a specific service need for a high risk youth and they do not know where to go they ask around. When staff moves positions they have to learn a new set of programs and what is available in that area. The complexity of our system of determining aftercare service is difficult because it depends
on what type of service it is, where the youth lives, what costs are entailed, unique specialties, etc. For staff to find appropriate programs it is not an easy task, and time consuming. When Altschuler and colleagues (Altschuler, Armstrong, & MacKenzie, 1999) examined aftercare programs they could not conclude any examined were effective in reducing recidivism based on the limited research conducted. Many programs were not implemented as designed, therefore attempting to untangle effects to specifically define success was difficult (Altschuler, Armstrong, & MacKenzie, 1999). As previously stated, there are many aftercare programs, but determining which one is right for a high-risk individual is difficult. Services also come and go so to keep up with the changes is very intricate. Additionally, given the number of services available, it is difficult for juvenile justice workers to be aware of all program requirements, components, and advantages. To increase awareness of providers, programs, and services it would be helpful to define existing programs by the Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) Model. This model should be used as a standard within a created a database of services.

Defining high risk youth, collaborative communication, and understanding aftercare programs is a system problem that needs to be addressed to reduce recidivism and provide critical services. Designing another reentry program will only add to the complexity of an already convoluted menu of options. Rather, the multiple options that are available y should be combined into a single view, “one view”, of high risk in an understandable database. This innovative program will change the way re-entry, case management, and providers deal with the complexity of the youth and services. The Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project (CHARP) will start with a Transition Probation Officer (TPO) and end with an embedded self sustainable system with “one view” of the youth when re-entry occurs by collaboratively defining high risk,
increasing communication (through a portfolio and dashboard) and organizing a comprehensive database of service to reduce recidivism among high risk youth in Maricopa County.

1.2 Impact/Outcomes and Evaluation

Reentry planning starts when a youth is arrested. The youth is taken into the Juvenile Detention Assessment Center (JDAC) were assessment includes both self report (JDAC- justice risk factors and strength based questions, self harm, medical, ect) and nationally accepted assessments (MAYSI, academic, vocational, etc). Currently this is as far as transition does as a combined agency. This data is collected but not used much. In CHARP it will be different and look like this. While detained, the youth will see their assessment results and an educated plan of action will be drafted. This plan, along with the release terms, will guide the youth and communicate to all parties their desires and direction.

The implementation of this project upon release will have a significant impact on youth engagement and support on reentry as they would transition with a portfolio in hand of where they are academically, vocationally, and goals they set while detained. This will increase engagement in their re-entry as they are more awareness of where they are based on their assessments, and will have a direction in the main parts of their life. Their parent, guardian, placement, or wherever they go will also have a copy of their re-entry portfolio. This will help family or services engagement in working with the plan since it gives a “one view” of the youth. They know what the plan is and where they need to give support. In addition, those involved with the youth in the juvenile system will have a “one view” dashboard that will improve a continuum of services with a collaborative framework of dealing with the entire individual. The dashboard will also help make data driven decisions with the risk factors present and compliance data for tracking how they are doing. Currently there is a standard supervision level system that can intensify or reduce supervision of a
youth based on their behaviors and situation (see appendix D). This supports a multistage decompression process for best results.

Additionally this project will bring all 395 contracted services as well as hundreds of community, faith based, and grass root programs involved with our justice system together to build a unique database for understanding and using intense programs for high-risk youth. It will also allow for a phase down of intense programs when the youth is being successful and intensifying if additional services are needed. This can help long term reentry activities and using graduated sanctions of the service available.

2.0 Goals and Objectives

This proposal seeks to design an embedded, automated system to address the complexity of juvenile justice services in two parts. The way re-entry, case management, and resource are seen needs to sharpen and change to address the complexity of the youth and the collaborative partners. CHARP will first embed a sustainable system with “one view” of the youth. This view encompasses all components of the youth including justice risks, academic & vocational information, and a strength based direction. This will increase data driven decision making as a justice worker can see all risk component at once. When a youth is detained, transition will start and will include intensive assessments, individualized youth decision making, and a specific re-entry plan. When re-entry occurs, this will include an individualized (ADTP type) portfolio for the youth and family and dashboard for Probation and involved agencies to make better informed decisions for risk and services.

The second part of the proposal will restructure the existing system of resources to ensure more efficient application to and utilization of partner services for those most at risk. It will include contract providers, community-bases and faith-based, as well as others in a catalog in
defining services they can render. This is a great opportunity to expose programs that are not well known yet have unique strengths. Probation will know what the service is all about (intensities, prerequisites, etc) along with a guide as to if they use best practice models, follow IAP guidelines, service high-risk youth, etc. The two components of the database include: 1) an online portion where approved services can keep their information up to date and, 2) a space where probation can define best practices (note Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) model) and allow for comments on how justice workers have used the service. The final product of CHARP will be an embedded tool that will pioneer how risk is defined, communicated (“one view”), and services defined. The following goals and objectives will be targeted in this project. The performance measures for each of these objectives are listed in Table 1.

**Goal 1** - Collaborate to define high risk and start TPO where ADTP left off but working with youth of high risk.

**Objective 1.1** - Define high risk factors across agencies and start re-entry

*Objective 1.1.1* – Develop advisory board to direct the project

*Objective 1.1.2* – Specify appropriate assessments for determining high risk

*Objective 1.1.3* – Collect data on recidivism and reentry

**Objective 1.2** – Hire 2 Transition Probation Officers (TPO) to gather information, collaborate with partners in the community, organize resources, create re-entry interviews to start transition of youth, report to board on process.

**Goal 2** – Communicate risk to juvenile, family, collaborative agencies and set a re-entry plan 1 week, 1 month, and 3 months.

**Objective 2.1** - Design a “one view” portfolio for youth and family for transition and communication. Automate system in iCIS

**Objective 2.2** - Design a “one view” dashboard for PO and involved agencies for transition and communication. Automated system in iCIS

**Goal 3** – Organize, specifically define, and automate services database
Objective 3.1 – Specifically define criteria or reporting of resource by type, intensity level, demographics, etc. Use of IAP model

Objective 3.2 - Design electronic resource database

Objective 3.2.1 – Develop iCIS justice database of easy access to find services information

Objective 3.2.2 – Develop online provider sign-in for up to date information

Objective 3.2.3 – Design and juvenile justice define service level (best practice, serve high risk or high needs, funding to community resource, etc)

Goal 4 – Reduce recidivism and give appropriate services for high-risk youth within a self sustaining automated system

Objective 4.1 – Train staff in use of portfolio, dashboard, transition plans, and resource database

Objective 4.2 – Train service providers on use of resource database

Objective 4.3 – Phase out TPO into automated detention assessment, portfolio, dashboard, and resource database for probation officer to make data driven decisions of risk and services. 

Objective 4.4 – Evaluate data on recidivism and reentry

Table 1: Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Data Grantee Provides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.1 - Define high risk factors across agencies and start re-entry</td>
<td>Universal definition of “high risk” by advisory board and most important 10-15 components to collect and follow.</td>
<td>Collect data on number of youth with only juvenile justice high risk factors and compare to those with the more descriptive universal definition of high risk. Collect number of youth with a new offense, comparing number across and between high risk definitions and those defined as not at high risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.2 – Hire 2 Transition Probation Officers (TPO)</td>
<td>Track 10-15 highest risk youth at each facility to be in the program, collaborate with partners in probation and the community, organize resources, and</td>
<td>Number of program youth who successfully complete a pre-release risk or needs assessment, participate in all assigned pre-release services, and obtain a transition plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 2.1** - Design a “one view” portfolio for youth and family for transition and communication. Automate system in iCIS

- Increase of program youth who successfully complete the pre-release program with portfolio in hand and their specific plan: 1 week, 1 month, and 3 month goals
- Number of youth in program released with portfolio and successful completion of goals

**Objective 2.2** - Design a “one view” dashboard for PO and involved agencies for transition and communication. Automated system in iCIS

- Increase collaboration with agencies on working with youth in program in dealing with highest risk factors to give appropriate services and working towards their release goals
- Number of program youth who are in services on release with contract and community agencies.

**Objective 3.1** – Specifically define criteria or reporting of resource by type, intensity level, demographics, etc. Use of IAP model

- Collaborative inclusive criteria to fully understand services available and who they specialize in serving. Specific to program youth and re-entry
- Number of programs that follow IAP model.
- Report areas of highest need for program youth and if service matches need

**Objective 3.2** - Design electronic resource database

- Increased number of pre-release services being provided and available to program youth in the following categories:
  - Cognitive behavioral therapy or other counseling
  - Life skills
  - Employment
  - Education
  - Substance abuse
  - Mental health
  - Overall health
  - Family strengthening
- Number of providers at origination and % increase or decrease of services available over term of project.
| Objective 4.1 – Train staff in use of portfolio, dashboard, transition plans, and resource database | Training evaluations and suggestions of change with the electronic systems. | Number of staff trained and evaluated success.  
Number of youth in program released with portfolio and successful completion of goals |
|---|---|---|
| Objective 4.2 – Train service providers on use of resource database | Training evaluations and suggestions of change with the electronic systems. | Number of staff trained and evaluated success.  
Number of service use increases across contract providers and community providers with program youth and overall. |
| Objective 4.3 – Phase out TPO into automated detention assessment, portfolio, dashboard, and resource database for probation officer to make data driven decisions of risk and services. | At 2 years and 6months of project the TPO will no longer have a case of youth in the program but these youth will be established through the system and | Number of program youth receiving pre-release services while incarcerated, following plans on release, category of service by providers and providing overall and category- level data |
| Objective 4.4 –Evaluate data on recidivism and reentry | Recidivism or High Risk youth | Projected to decrease youth in program by 30% compared to recidivism before program was fully implemented. |

### 3.0 Program Objectives

The overall objective is to increase understanding what a high risk youth is with all their complexities and strengths. Transition with a “one view” will increase communication among youth and all those involved, as it will create and follow a plan they set for their release guided by their assessments they took. This leads to a positive reentry and one plan on release and can decrease recidivism with these youth. The database is a unique opportunity to establish a robust
link with community organizations of all kinds. Staff will have an ideal source where they can enter in risks or look for distinctive programs to give specific dynamic opportunities. For example, if the youth has a family as a core to their success a community service provider that provides family-centered approaches to treatment and diversion would be ideal. If a youth has a love for animals they can search for that type of service. The decisive program objectives is to decrease recidivism of high risk youth after reentry by understanding what the specific risk is and understanding all service available through a unique collaborative tool.

4.0 Performance Measures

4.1 Project/Program Design and Implementation

In 2002 Arizona State University, in collaboration with the National Center on Education Disability and Juvenile Justice, the Arizona Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts, Maricopa County Regional School District, and Maricopa County Juvenile Detention designed the Arizona Detention Transition Project (ADTP) based on the promising transition practices for short-term jails and detention centers. The ADTP was a four-year model demonstration grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. The purpose of the ADTP was to develop a sustainable model transition program that would reduce the number of students who recidivate and were sentenced to state juvenile and adult corrections and increase the number of students who were successfully and continuously engaged in school, work, and community activities through implementation of promising transition practices. The ADTP funded a Transition Specialist at each of the two Maricopa County Juvenile Detention Centers (Southeast and Durango) to implement the following promising transition practices: 1) development of individualized transition plans for all youth with disabilities, 2) development of Transition Portfolios for all youth with disabilities, 3) establishment of a seamless and immediate transfer of
educational records across sending and receiving agencies, 4) increased interagency linkages and communication, and 5) establishment of a youth tracking system to monitor the engagement and recidivism of all youth with disabilities upon release from detention.

After the first two years the implementation of the ADTP processes, it was determined that more concrete youth-centered transition variables needed to be evaluated. Therefore, the Transition Portfolio became the vehicle for these youth-centered variables. The Transition Portfolio contains twelve educational items (see appendix E) that are shared with parents, Probation Officers, related service providers, employers, public schools, and others to facilitate successful engagement after the youth is released from detention.

Beginning in the third year of the project, all youth with disabilities within the detention center were randomly assigned to either a treatment or a non-treatment group. Youth in the treatment group were provided with all components of the Transition Portfolio while youth within the non-treatment group were provided with some components of the Transition Portfolio. Some youth were released prior to reception of services or identification as special education; these youth comprised the control group. The Transition Specialists also maintained a youth tracking system for determining measures of engagement and recidivism at 30, 60, 90, and 120 days post-release.

The final evaluation report from this project is not yet available, however preliminary data suggests that youth within the treatment group were more successful returning to school and were less likely to be re-detained than those youth in the non-treatment group. These preliminary results are exciting and significant for all correctional educators, but many questions still remain. One of the problems with many grants is that when the funding is over the transition officers are discontinued and services are not kept at the level unless the agency can takeover the duties. That was the case with ADTP. Even though there was great success and improvement within the
detention educational area the youth with special needs are currently not getting the intensity of service they received when the program was intact. With the CHARP project it is a change in focus to high risk youth but the foundation and implementation are designed to become automated and sustainable through easier data analysis of risk, expanding the portfolio to a dashboard for better collaboration among agencies.

4.2 IAP Intensive Aftercare Program Structure

The underlying principals that govern IAP are theoretically based and a guide for successful integration during reentry. The foundation of CHARP follows all the principles of the IAP model as well as sets up a structure within it to define services used by Maricopa County. This will allow services to be better understood by justice workers if they have met the standards of IAP there will be a notation of “IAP standards”. The first principle is “Preparing youth for progressively increased responsibility and freedom in the community” this is accomplished through the normal structure of probation (see appendix D) but with the advisory committee it should be decided that youth coming out of detention be put on level 1 so they may step down from supervision slowly and show their success with the release portfolio. The second principle is to “facilitating youth-community interaction and involvement” this is increased with CHARP by increasing providers within detention to start services through vocational programs as well as certain contract providers. Increased community involvement will also occur as the database will make it easier to find specific, unique services quicker and easier. With the portfolio it allows easier understanding of a youth and increases communication among youth, families, and community support which leads to the third principle, “Working with both the offender and targeted community support systems (e.g., families, peers, schools, employers) on qualities needed for constructive interaction and the youths’ successful community adjustment”. The fourth
principle of IAP is “Developing new resources and supports where needed” with the database it will show all services and where more services are needed as well as The fifth and final principle is “Monitoring and testing the youth and community on their ability to deal with each other productively”, this is accomplished through the detention assessments and the structured database for justice workers to comment on the programs and how they fair. These principles lead to a continuum of services and set a good base for successful reentry. CHARP addresses the main components in a modern way by designing a system solution to serve those most at risk for re-offending.

Transition services that address multiple risk factors are more likely to be successful in preventing delinquency among youth with intense needs. When looking at services a clear understanding of what high risk the youth has and how to connect to the appropriate service is critical (Catalano, Loeber, & McKinney, 1999). Typically, when a youth goes through re-entry they receive their release terms, a set of goals (terms of release) to follow from the judge, and are to report to a service. The youth is told what they are doing wrong and how to fix it but seldom are they given a look at their assessment and asked to be part of the solution. Policy on how reentry occurs needs to change to address the many facets involved, making sure youth are functioning developmentally and age appropriate (Altschuler & Brash, 2004). Despite early skepticism regarding intervention programs, literature reviews and meta-analyses demonstrate that intervention programs can effectively reduce delinquency (Lipsey, 2000; Lipsey, 1992; Andrews et al., 1990). Sherman and colleagues report that the "important issue is not whether something works but what works for whom" (Sherman, Gottfredson, MacKenzie, Eck, Reuter, & Bushway, 1997) the CHARP model will increase knowledge to better do this.
Research with what some call most at risk, the serious and violent juveniles (SVJ) emphasizes early intervention to address the multiple problems that occur simultaneously in schools and home through community specific services that draw on positive effects and behaviors (Loeber & Farrington. 1997). This project will be done in short term detention facilities when first signs of risk show up and continue for some until they are sentenced to juvenile corrections. Research at this level is critical for establishing the need for early intervention and identifying specific risks and how to stop them.

4.3 Design Elements

1. Develop an advisory group that includes individuals from juvenile corrections, juvenile probation and parole, community corrections, local law enforcement; faith-based and community based organizations, other intermediaries involved in the project, and other pre-release and community-based service and treatment providers. With the EDJJ project there was an advisory board that met quarterly to discuss projects being done nationally and within the state. It was an excellent collaborative opportunity to share ideas and services. This board was together for 4 years and was changed last year to the ASCEC Arizona Secure Care Educational Consortium. Their mission is to advocate for and educate individuals within secure care to successfully reintegrate into all communities through academic and workforce transition. Many from this group will be invited to attend as they do have a major focus on transition, aftercare, and appropriate services. There will also be a push to get those in the justice area more involved and community agencies that give services to all kids.

2. Develop individualized transition plans for high risk youth before re-entry - The Transition Probation Officer in each site, in coordination with detention intake and school personnel, will gather the comprehensive screening assessments of 10 of those youth designated as highest
risk within the first three day after detainment. A Transition Interview will be conducted for all youth so designated. The transition interview is the first step in the transition planning process; all subsequent transition programming will be based on the youth’s goals as identified in the transition interview and the youth’s educational and vocational needs, abilities, interests, and preferences. This will start out with in the first 6 months as a hard copy portfolio but will transition it the electronic for that can be printed out on release.

3. Develop and Implement a Transition Portfolio – Each site will create a portfolio assessment and development process for 10 designated youth with the highest risk to recidivate. Each Transition Probation Officer will collect twelve relevant documents that make up the Transition Portfolio (see appendix B). This Transition Portfolio will follow the student as he/she is released from the detention site and moves along the continuum of appropriate transition services to school, work, and community involvement. The Transition Portfolio will be available in hard copy and will be given to the youth and family (or designated party) on release but will over time become electronic format.

4. Increase Interagency Linkages and Communication – The Transition Probation Officer in each site will coordinate with public and alternative schools, the detention centers, and community and employment agencies to ensure a seamless continuum of services. The Transition Probation Officer will develop and maintain interagency linkages and communication with public and alternative schools, community agencies, and job and employment services. While some of these linkages will be made among agencies at the administrative or program services level, Transition Probation Officer will set up linkages and communication with the line staff of these schools and agencies on an individual basis. Because the transition process from the juvenile detention centers must be initiated immediately due to the relatively short period of
time that youth's are detained (e.g., 17 days on average in Arizona), the Transition Probation Officer must establish predictable and reliable contacts.

5. Design a dashboard and resource database for a continuum of services in sustaining a wraparound system. The dashboard is an electronic tool used to visually ascertain the status (or "health") of a youth in the justice system. It showed their specific risk, strengths, compliance, goals, and well as other components deemed as critical to have a “one view” of the youth. A dashboard allows for better data driven solutions and understanding by seeing the whole picture. The resource database is a way to organize a complex system of services justice workers have to sift through in deciding how to help the youth. If this is made easier there is more time for contacts and direct service to the youth. Designing a way to narrow down resources by the needs of the youth will open staff to new services opportunities that may not have found. By allowing approved providers access to enter their own basic data it allows for quicker up to date and accurate information. With the justice side also ranking and rating the providers it will help set a standard for what best practice, promising practices, upcoming proactices, and those providers with no standards. These improvements will help to bring us into the next generation of easier access to information in better utilization of time and energy in making best decisions.

6. Establish Youth Tracking System –This will include several assessment JDAC- justice risk factors, self harm, medical, as well as and nationally accepted MAYSI- mental health index, academic- New Century, vocational aptitude- AzCIS. All except the academic and vocational assessments have been going on over the last year. In order to determine the impact of the project on recidivism, follow-up data will only be collected on youth who are released “home” or a placement. Therefore, follow-up data on recidivism will not be collected for youth who
are adjudicated and sentenced to lengthy stays in juvenile or adult correctional facilities and youth who are released to long-term residential secure treatment centers, since engagement and recidivism status after release from these programs would not be a measure of this project.

7. Maricopa Superior Court Integrated Court Information System (iCIS) is the next generation of JOLTS (Juvenile Online Tracking System). JOLTS is a statewide juvenile probation and dependency management system developed by Maricopa County Juvenile Court in 1979. It was on the cutting edge then and was used nationally as well as expanded into all of Arizona courts and detention centers. It is currently the operating system in both Maricopa County detention center and is set to fully be in Maricopa County courts and juvenile probation by September 2007.

JOLTS provides the following functionality: Probation Caseload Management, Detention Management, Billing & Financial, Tracking Court Calendaring, Petition Generation, Victim Notification Dependency, Severance, Adoption Risk Needs Assessment, Treatment Services Tracking, Diversion Program Tracking, Tracking Juveniles who go to Adult Court, Statewide Youth Index, Statewide Database, Statewide Data Warehouse

JOLTS users number approximately 2,600 statewide and include the following collaborating agencies: Juvenile Court Centers, Juvenile Probation Departments, School Probation Officers, County Attorneys, Public Defenders, Attorney Generals Office, Victim Rights Advocates, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) Foster Care Review Board (FCRB) Department of Economic Security Regional Behavior Health Entity Department of Juvenile Corrections, Law Enforcement through the Arizona Criminal Justice Information System, Clerk of the Court, Court Administration, and Adult Probation Departments.
The foundation and history show that this system is sound and on the cutting edge. Adding in the CHARP components will help deal with those youth of high risk in re-entry and allow for greater service to the youth in a true wraparound model. Some assessment components are already in iCIS (JDAC and MAYS1). The data is only used to show overall percentages but with CHARP a change to an individual portfolio and dashboard will allow for greater decisions on appropriate individualized services.

4.4 Evaluation

Both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used to provide information for summative and formative evaluations. Formative evaluation will be used for ongoing review and project modification to enhance the effectiveness of the program development, management, and implementation strategies in each site. Summative evaluation will provide data on the overall effectiveness of the project. The combination of formative and summative evaluation will allow the project personnel to monitor the effectiveness of project implementation strategies in each site, measure youth performance outcomes, ensure that the methodology used is appropriate, thorough, and feasible for each goal, and will generate replicable results. Project implementation, goals, objectives, and performance measures will also be monitored according to the Timelines for Evaluation Plan with Milestones (see appendix F).

Common descriptive analyses will be utilized to support findings for research questions one through four. Consequently, hierarchical linear models (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992) will be employed to support such analysis. Specifically, longitudinal modeling techniques will be employed. In this context individuals are nested within time periods (here 30 days, 60 days, 120 days, etc.) at the first level of the model. Analysis can then determine what variables account for variability in student engagement (and recidivism) over time.
In sum, these multilevel models will be employed in the context of Generalized Linear Models. This modeling paradigm provides the following analytic affordances:

- Students will not need to be measured at the same time points;
- The model allows for missing data;
- The models can deal with dichotomous or continuous outcome measures.

These affordances are critical as experience shows that there will be missing data and that the timing of data collection will vary by site. Fortunately, recent advances in statistical methodologies (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) allow compensation for the realities of practice without negative consequences for the proposed analyses.

5.0 Capacity and Adequacy of Resources

The proposed Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project will draw upon an extensive array of resources from both within and outside Arizona State University. Arizona State University is the largest university in the nation with over 60,000 students enrolled. The ASU main campus, organized into 11 colleges offering more than 250 bachelors, masters, and doctoral degree programs, provides the work facilities, technical support, and the necessary experience and expertise to provide technical assistance and direction to this model demonstration project. In addition, the Office of Sponsored Projects has the appropriate accounting, property, and other internal management systems necessary to be responsible for the fiscal administration of grants. ASU, as a Research 1 University, has a solid record of contract compliance.

The ASU College of Education provides a variety of comprehensive and exemplary degree programs in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Psychology in Education, and Curriculum and Instruction. The COE is ranked 21st in the U.S. News and World Report ranking of Schools and
Colleges of Education where faculty and staff have been awarded over $15,000,000 in external funding in the 2005-2006 academic year. The COE has the capacity and commitment to support the proposed Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project.

The Division of Curriculum and Instruction oversees a broad spectrum of undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degree programs. The Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Degree Program in C&I has 9 Ph.D. concentrations with faculty and students from across the Division and the University. The Special Education Program within the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program until recently had 5 full-time doctoral students in the EDJJ Project whose research focus is transition of youth with disabilities in the juvenile justice system. Over the past 12 years, 10 doctoral dissertations and 15 masters theses on transition and juvenile corrections (Baltodano, Mathur, & Rutherford, 2005) have been completed by students mentored by Dr. Mathur.

The Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department is an agency of more than 900 employees working together to achieve its mission – To provide access to evidence-based early intervention, supervision, treatment and secure care for youth and families so that youth learn accountability and responsibility, and community safety is enhanced – through the Balanced Approach and Restorative Justice Principles. There are two main Court Center locations in Phoenix and Mesa, and three community offices in south Phoenix, Sunnyslope, and west Phoenix. Each year we receive 35,000 juvenile complaints and citations from police agencies, schools and parents in Maricopa County.

On any given day approximately 170 probation officers (PO's) in our Probation Services Divisions supervise about 4,400 juveniles on Standard Probation and 290 juveniles pending a disposition hearing. This includes an average of 200 juveniles in Home Detention, 60 in an electronic monitoring program, and 50 Drug Court probationers. On Intensive Probation
there are 25 teams of two officers, each supervising about 25 probationers contact them several times a week at any time during the day or night. Each year the Victim Services Unit contacts over 15,000 victims of juvenile crime, helping many of them to receive restitution.

There are two detention centers, one in Phoenix (229 BEDS) and one in Mesa (128 beds). Each center has a team of POs that screens every juvenile brought to detention and decides whether or not he should be kept in detention. If a juvenile does not need to be detained, the screening team returns them to his parent or some other adult who is responsible for him.

The research planning and administration have approximately 80 staff in these two divisions. They operate and program the computers, produce statistical and management reports, hire new employees, produce an annual budget, make sure we all get paid, purchase equipment and supplies, secure grant funds, and do many other things to support the staff who work directly with juveniles and their families. Collaborative grants we have had with ASU include the ADTP, AARIN project (substance abuse) and are currently involved in other grants with community partners like safe school, youth parent training, and well as a day report center in community serves.

Previous Projects and Experience Related to Juvenile Justice

Dr. Mathur co-directed the ASU transition component of the National Center on Education, Disability, and Juvenile (EDJJ). EDJJ is a national center funded by the U.S. Departments of Justice (OJJDP) and Education (OSEP). This consortium includes faculty and staff from the University of Maryland, Arizona State University, University of Kentucky, the American Institutes for Research, and the Pacer Parent Advocacy Center. EDJJ is a collaborative research, training, technical assistance, and dissemination program designed to develop more effective
responses to the needs of youth in the juvenile justice system or those at-risk for involvement with the juvenile justice system.

Dr. Mathur also served as the co-principal investigators of the Arizona Detention Transition Project (ADTP), a U.S. Department of Education (OSEP) Model Demonstration Project that provides comprehensive transition services for youth detained in the Maricopa Regional Detention Centers.

Dr. Griller Clark is the ADTP Project Director and supervises two Transition Specialists in the two largest detention centers the Greater Phoenix Metropolitan Area. The ADTP project has developed, implemented, and evaluated the promising transition practices: individualized transition plans for detained youth with disabilities; transition portfolios, seamless transfer of educational records; interagency linkages and communication; and youth tracking system.

Derrick Platt, MA is a Juvenile Probation Officer for over 16 years and a current JPO IV in charge of the intake assessment area at the southeast facility. He was a research assistance with EDJJ and a consultant on the ADTP. He has been involved in many projects over his tenure with the courts most recently helping design system change in implementing the Juvenile Detention Assessment Center (JDAC) in changing the way youth enter the facility and an increasing of assessment.

End of submitted Grant
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Budget Narrative

Personnel Year 1-4

The Principal Investigator Sarup Mathur will oversee all aspects of the project, directing the study as well as managing the administration of the grant. The salary requested for the PI is based on an academic year salary of $66,207. We are requesting salary for .10 FTE during the nine months of the academic year.

The Co-Investigator Heather Griller-Clark will be responsible for carrying out the tasks necessary for completion of the project, directing the study as well as managing the administration of the grant. The salary requested for the Co-Investigator is based on an academic year salary of $52,240. We are requesting salary for .12 FTE during the nine months of the academic year.

The Research Assistants requested are support for four masters level graduate research assistant to assist with maintenance, research, and transitional support to the project as described in appendix, to assist TPO’s, programmer, and consultants. We are requesting a .25 of salary in the amount of $6,343, for the nine month academic year.

Fringe Benefits

Fringe Benefits are requested for ASU personnel salaries and are preset amounts with the principal investigators it is at 25%. Graduate assistants have ERE which is 7.3% and tuition remission rate of 33.7%.

General Supplies

The supplies used for this project will consist of mostly paper having to do with the portfolios for youth and training materials for staff. The design of the portfolio is that the youth take with them as a hard copies on release. The first year the portfolio will be all hard copy and the following year it will move to being automated but still printed out with less paper. (Estimated $650 1st year and $520 2-4 years).

Consultants/ Contracts

Independent Evaluator- An evaluation consultant will be competitively selected to work with project staff to provide ongoing assessment support and project monitoring. The selected consultant will refine the evaluation plan, maintain a solid foundation of best practice, collect and analyze evaluation data, and prepare the yearly final evaluation report. It is estimated that the consultant will work nine days a quarter at a rate of $470 per day. Yearly cost: $16,925 (4 x $4,230).

iCIS consultant ($1,000 1st year) - Support is required to enable the design and implementation of the computer system to insure it is appropriate and usable. The business analysis aspect of the program is critical to build system change, increase information sharing, and practical application. This is only needed the first year of the grant and will most likely be paid out with 4 visits at $250 each.

Maricopa Juvenile Probation Budget Year 1-4

The Transition Probation Officer will be responsible for carrying out the day to day transition of the high risk youth, community collaboration, as well as tasks necessary for completion of the project. Two Transition Probation Officer positions are being requested based on the two different facilities and the amount of youth Maricopa County serve. The salary requested for the Transition Probation Officer is based on a fiscal year salary of $59,176. We are requesting salary full time through out the year.
The iCIS programmer will be responsible for iCIS programmer, to attend meeting in the development of the computer system (portfolio, dashboard, and resource database) and design the computer interface and foundation involved to the final product. The salary requested for the iCIS programmer is based on a fiscal year salary of $60,715. We are requesting a .20 salary throughout the year.

**Fringe Benefits**

Fringe Benefits are requested for Maricopa County also based on salaries for the Transition Probation Officers it is 16.9% with a fixed benefit of $7,095 for CORP (Correctional Officers Retirement Program) contribution. With the iCIS programmer it is set at 17.25 with no fixed fringe benefit.
Appendix A: References

Reference


Malmsen, Kimber W., Leone, Peter E..(2000). Effects of a Short-Term Auxiliary Reading Program on the Reading Skills of Incarcerated Youth. Education & Treatment of Children, 23: 3, p239-248


Appendix B Defining a portfolio and dashboard

Portfolio

- Academic Assessment (Reading and Math grade levels)
- High school Credits Earner or GED (number of credits over 21 to show how close they are to full graduation credits).
- Vocational Assessment (Aptitude to certain career paths, top 2 reported)
- Resource Packet (AzCIS on how to access online)
- Vital Records they have ad need
  - Social Security Card
  - Birth certificate
  - Immunization records
- Resume
- Future goal and engagement within the first week
- Future goal and engagement within the first month
- Future goal and engagement within the first 3 months
- Term of release

Dashboard

- Academic Assessment (Reading and Math grade levels)
- High school Credits Earner or GED (number of credits over 21 to show how close they are to full graduation credits).
- Vocational Assessment (Aptitude to certain career paths, top 2 reported)
- Resource Packet (AzCIS on how to access online)
- Vital Records they have ad need
  - Social Security Card
  - Birth certificate
  - Immunization records
- Resume
- Future goal and engagement within the first week
- Future goal and engagement within the first month
- Future goal and engagement within the first 3 months
- Term of release and compliance data
- DSMIV Diagnoses
- Supervision level and compliance data
- Resource information


A digital dashboard, also known as an enterprise dashboard or executive dashboard, is a business management tool used to visually ascertain the status (or "health") of a business enterprise via key business indicators. Digital dashboards use visual, at-a-glance displays of data pulled from disparate business systems to provide warnings, action notices, next steps, and summaries of business conditions.
Types of dashboards

Dashboard of Sustainability screen shot illustrating example dashboard layout

Based on the metaphor of the instrument panel in a car, the computer, or "digital" version of a dashboard provides a business manager with the input necessary to "drive" the business. Devices such as red/green/yellow lights, alerts, drill-downs, summaries, graphics such as bar charts, pie charts, bullet graphs, sparklines and gauges are usually set in a portal-like environment that is often role-driven and customizable.

Digital dashboards may be laid out to track the flows inherent in the business processes that they monitor. Graphically, users may see the high-level processes and then drill down into low level data. This level of detail is often buried deep within the corporate enterprise and otherwise unavailable to the senior executives.

Specialized dashboards may track all corporate functions. Examples include human resources, recruiting, sales, operations, security, information technology, project management, customer relationship management and many more departmental dashboards. For a collection of over 800 enterprise dashboard screenshots see The Dashboard Spy, a blog dedicated to monitoring digital dashboards.

Digital dashboard projects involve business units as the driver and the information technology department as the enabler. The success of digital dashboard projects often rely on the correct selection of metrics to monitor. Key performance indicators, balanced scorecards, sales performance figures — these are just some of the content appropriate on business dashboards.

Benefits of digital dashboards

Most organizations have various departments all contributing to its overall success and thus it is important to be able to assess the progress of each department. Digital dashboards, which are a type of executive information system, allow managers to do just that. To gauge exactly how well an organization is performing overall, digital dashboards allow you to capture and report specific data points from each department within the organization, thus providing a "snapshot" of performance.

Some benefits to using digital dashboards include:
• Visual presentation of performance measures
• Elimination of duplicate data entry.
• Ability to identify and correct negative trends.
• Measure efficiencies/inefficiencies.
• Ability to generate detailed reports showing new trends.
• Increase overall revenues.
• Ability to make more informed decisions based on collected BI (business intelligence)
• Align strategies and organizational goals.
Appendix C: Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Provider list  
(This is only a small example as the list is very large)

**SERVICE CODE: 135 (General Mental Health - Individual-Masters)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCIES/SERVICES</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Baptist Children's Services (SPOC)(508S)</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Children's Association (SPOC)(751S)</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Interfaith Counseling (AOC)(721)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Youth Assoc. dba General Health Corporation (502S)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara D. McArthur (AOC)(720)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayless, Michael B. &amp; Associates, P.C.(SPOC)(715S)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I., Inc. (SPOC)(6296S)</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Svc. Of Central and Northern AZ, Inc.(504S)</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Against Sexual Abuse (SPOC)(723S)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc.(SPOC)(559S)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy L. Tatum (AOC)(581)</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corazon Behavioral Health Services (SPOC)(13566S)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux Foundation, The (SPOC)(556S)</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Preservationists: Counseling Associates (AOC)(11816)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service Agency (SPOC)(548S)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Crittenton Services of Arizona, Inc.(SPOC)(506S)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly House, Inc.(SPOC)(647S)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossman &amp; Grossman (AOC)(890)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin, Oscar &amp; Associates (AOC)(661)</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedberg, Ben, M.c., C.P.C.(AOC)(10582)</td>
<td>51.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Resource Builders, Inc.(AOC)(747)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Family &amp; Children's Service (SPOC)(544S)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutz, Mark W.(AOC)(729)</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Livingston, M.S., Ed.(AOC)(5566)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley Counseling Center (AOC)(749)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Anonymous of Arizona, Inc.(SPOC)(550S)</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Rios (AOC)(696)</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREHAB of Arizona, Inc.(SPOC)(509S)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Salado Behavioral Health Systems, Inc.(SPOC)(692S)</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Behavioral Health Services (SPOC)(641S)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spellman, Shannon (AOC)(663)</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Prevention Center, Inc.(SPOC)(648S)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Mountain Mental Health Center, Inc.(773S)</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terros, Inc.(SPOC)(726S)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Foundation (SPOC)(510S)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchstone Behavioral Health Services (SPOC)(505S)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Assessment Screening Center, Inc.(SPOC)(536S)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbleweed Center for Youth Development (AOC)(604)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valle del Sol, Inc.(SPOC)(701S)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development Institute (SPOC)(5670S)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Evaluation and Treatment Centers (SPOC)(511S)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Levels

E. Post-Disposition Contact Standards and the Standard Field Supervision Level System

The Maricopa County Probation Department utilizes a level system to provide supervision to those youth placed on standard probation. The level system is designed to help probation officers provide the most effective case management for the youth who are on probation.

All youth placed on probation will meet with their assigned probation officer within ten business days of the disposition hearing in order to review the terms of probation. An individualized case plan will be completed within 45 days of being placed on probation. The probation officer will continue to monitor probationers’ need for services and sanctions as well as their risk to the community.

The assigned probation officer will meet with his/her supervisor to discuss the cases assigned to them and determine movement between the levels. The supervisor has the discretion to change the level of a youth based on their discussion with the probation officer.

1. Level System contact standards

a) Level One Supervision Contacts: (ICIS color: Red)

Youth are placed on the highest level of supervision immediately after being placed on probation. The probationer should remain on level one if the following conditions exist: the juvenile has just been released from an RTC or a group home, family instability; new complaints or non-compliance with his/her terms of probation; if a violation of probation must be filed or until a new petition is resolved. The supervisor and probation PO have discretion to retain the high level of supervision based on the needs of the probationer.

- Youth: Two personal contacts each month.
- Parent: One telephone or personal contact each month.
- One home visit within 45 days of being placed on probation.
- One home visit every three months.
- Contact with the juvenile’s school will occur every three months during the school year. Contacts are defined as personal or telephone contact with school personnel or an assigned school probation officer. Contacts may include copies of attendance or discipline records.
- Verification of employment via a pay check stub, speaking with an employer or viewing a youth at their job.
- One personal visit each week for detained youth.

b) Level Two Supervision Contacts: (ICIS color: Yellow)

Youth who are on level two supervision are demonstrating compliance with his/her terms of probation. The family situation is stable and/or the living environment where youth is residing is providing 24 hour supervision (i.e. a CPS ward in a group home, shelter or RTC). The youth is attending and participating in services that are being provided such as counseling and drug testing.

- Youth: One personal contact each month.
- Parent: One telephone or personal contact each month.
- One home visit within 45 days of being placed on probation.
- One home visit every three months.
- Contact with the juvenile’s school will occur every three months during the school year. Contacts are defined as a personal or telephone contact with school personal or assigned school probation officer. Contacts include copies of attendance or discipline records.
- Verification of their employment via a pay check stub, speaking with an employer or viewing a youth at their job.
- Youth who are detained, one personal visit each week.

c) Level Three Supervision Contacts: (ICIS color: Green) Youth who are on level three supervision are highly stable and demonstrating compliance with his/her terms. A youth who is on level three
supervision is in full compliance with their probation terms and is considered to be a very low risk for re-offending. They have demonstrated that they are consistently attending school or work. They are attending or have successfully completed any Court ordered treatment programs and/or have completed all of the programs that were ordered. A youth may be placed on this level of supervision because they owe significant amounts of restitution and cannot be released from probation until the money is paid. They are making the required payments as well and they may not need personal contacts from the probation officer. Level three youth are likely to be released early but mitigating circumstances dictate they remain on probation for one full year.

- Youth/Parent: One telephone contact per month with either the youth or the parent.

2. Administrative Level Supervision: (ICIS color: White) Youth are placed on administrative supervision when they are not physically available for personal contacts. A youth who is residing in another Arizona County, or out of state, a youth incarcerated in the County jail or hospitalized are examples of Administrative supervision level.

- Youth/Parent: One telephone contact per month with either the youth or parent.

3. Summary Probation (ICIS color: Black) Generally, Youth placed on Summary Probation are those who are considered a low risk to the community. The Court has usually assigned a special term for the youth to complete such as community restitution and or fine. Once the special terms have been completed, the youth is usually released from probation without any further probation/court intervention.

- One personal contact with youth within 10 days to sign terms of probation and other necessary forms. This is to be done prior to sending the case to the probation officer dealing exclusively with summary probationers.
- One telephone contact per month with either the youth or the parent.
Appendix E: Twelve components of ADTP portfolio

Twelve Components of ADTP portfolio

1. Academic Assessment
2. Vocational Assessment
3. Transition Interview
4. Resource Packet
5. Vital Records
   a. Social Security Card
   b. Birth certificate
   c. Immunization records
6. Resume
7. Special Education Rights
8. Special Education Records
   a. Copy of IEP
   b. Copy of Psychoed
9. Transcripts
10. Credit Analysis
11. Certificate, diploma, GED
12. Work sample
### Appendix F: Timelines for the Evaluation Plan with Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Project Goal</th>
<th>Related Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Collaborate to define high risk and start TPO where ADTP left off but working with youth of high risk.</td>
<td>Objective 1.1 - Define high risk factors across agencies and start re-entry</td>
<td>Objective 1.1.1 – Develop advisory board to direct the project. Initially, PI’s will facilitate the meetings. However, a chair may be designated among the board if the group decides to do so. Quarterly meetings will be held to direct the work. Subcommittees and virtual meetings will be used.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Investigators, Sarup Mathur, Heather Griller-Clark, and Derrick Platt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 1.2 – Hire 2 Transition Probation Officers (TPO) to gather information, collaborate with partners in the community, organize resources, create re-entry interviews to start transition of youth, and report to board on process.</td>
<td>Maricopa County Human Resources will recruit and/or transfer 2 full-time experienced Juvenile Probation Officers</td>
<td>End of month 2</td>
<td>Principle Investigator, Derrick Platt through Maricopa County Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 1.1 - Define high risk factors across agencies and start re-entry</td>
<td>Objective 1.1.2 Specify assessments and collaborative definition for determining high risk.</td>
<td>End of month 6</td>
<td>Advisory board with the involvement of all PIs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Vita & Resumes Not included but in the application

Appendix H: Roles and Responsibilities of project staff

Roles and Responsibilities of Project Staff

Principal Investigator, Dr. Sarup Mathur, Arizona State University (.10) – Sarup R. Mathur, Ph.D. has also been a leader in special education and juvenile justice for the past two decades. Dr. Mathur is the President of the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders and is currently the Chair of the Special Education Program at Arizona State University. She is the Associate Director of the National Center on Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice and the Co-PI of the ADTP Project, as well as the Co-PI of the ASU-UA Dual University Program to Prepare Professors in Emotional and Behavioral Disorders Project. Dr. Mathur has published widely in the areas of social skills, correctional special education, and professional development of teachers in special education, corrections, and juvenile detention. Dr. Mathur, together with Dr. Griller Clark and Derrick Platt, will provide overall leadership of the Project. Their primary responsibilities will include project management, training, technical assistance, dissemination, and internal evaluation.

Principal Investigator, Dr. Heather Griller Clark, Arizona State University (.12) – Heather Griller Clark, Ph.D. has been the transition coordinator for the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections, a correctional special education teacher, a consultant for both OJJDP and OSEP, and is the Project Director for both the Arizona Detention Transition Project and the Learner Outcomes for Merging Two Worlds Corrections Project. She was the recipient of an OSEP Student-Initiated Research Grant entitled Analysis of gender and resiliency in youth with disabilities transitioning from the juvenile justice system. Dr. Griller Clark has published
numerous articles and chapters and presented widely on the topic of transition of youth with disabilities in detention and corrections. Her primary responsibilities will include developing student education passports, individualized transition plans, seamless systems for transferring records, establishing community linkages, and tracking youth progress. She will work closely with the Transition Specialists to ensure that they are able to carry out the assigned project activities and collect and compile on-going data on project effectiveness.

Principal Investigator, Derrick Platt, Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Officer – Derrick Platt, MA has worked in detention for over fourteen years in designing and overseeing programs within the justice system. Some of the main programs include restructuring of detention intake to the Juvenile Detention Assessment Center (JDAC) in changing the way youth enter the facility and an increasing of assessment. Derrick has been a detention manager for 9 years and supervised many staff and is the main liaison with the detention school (Maricopa Regional School District). He is a well known collaborative partner in the state between juvenile justice, education, and mental health. As a graduate Arizona State University student, Derrick was research assistance with EDJJ and a consultant on the ADTP project. Derrick will be the main onsite manager to over see the day to day operation. Maricopa County is very dedicated to the project and will support Derrick as a co- Principal Investigator.

Transition Probation Officers (2 TBD at 1.00) - The primary responsibilities of the Transition Probation Officer (TPO) will be to implement individualized transition plans for high risk youth, establish interagency linkages, create individualized transition portfolios, and work towards an embedded data driven system for probation. The Transition Probation Officer will be current probation officers interviewed to be part of the grant in designing this project. It is critical to use probation officers as they are the natural transition within the justice system and to have meet all the needs in designing this project this authority is needed to increase collaboration.
and training as an insider and one who knows the justice system. They will collect and report the research data that result from the implementation in their respective sites.

iCIS programmer (1 TBA) (.20)- The primary responsibility for the iCIS programmer is to attend meeting in the development of the computer system (portfolio, dashboard, and resource database) and design the computer interface and foundation involved to the final product. Their main focus will be in defining high risk and reentry support through computer application in assisting justice workers in collaboration. They will be hired for the entire 4 years to facilitate problems that may arise in implementing program ideas. They will also help training and implementing with all staff.

Research Assistants (4 TBD) (.25 each) - The primary responsibilities of the Research Assistants will be to take part in developing data collecting systems, assist the Transition Probation Officer in collecting baseline and on-going data, assist iCIS programmer and iCIS consultant in design and usability of computer system, and assist the Principle Investigators, Independent Evaluator and iCIS Consultant in analyzing the project data. RA 1 and 2 will be responsible for working with the Transition Probation Officers; RA 3 will be responsible for working with the iCIS programmer and iCIS consultant; and RA 4 will work closely with the Independent Evaluator, iCIS Consultant and the Principle Investigators to compile the project data into a single project data monitoring report.

Independent Evaluator (4 x $4,500) - An independent evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluator who takes the lead in designing and implementing the evaluation. They will do at least four evaluations a year in helping to define the project for maximum success. It is important to have a solid foundation in all aspects of the underlying research and data analysis. They will report to the board of their findings and give suggestions for best results of the project individually with the youth but as a whole with the systems.
iCIS consultant ($1,000 1st year) - Support is requested to enable the design and implementation of the computer system to insure it is appropriate and usable. The business analysis aspect of the program is critical to build system change, increase information sharing, and practical application. This is only needed the first year of the grant and will most likely be 4 visits.
Appendix I: Geographic information

High-Risk Youth Offender Reentry and Family Strengthening Initiatives (CFDA 16.548)
Derrick Platt 602-506-2686

Durango Facility
3125 W. Durango Street
Phoenix, AZ 85009
(602) 506-4011

This is one of the Juvenile Court Centers. There is a Court Building, a 229-bed detention facility, Executive Offices, and offices for field and diversion probation officers. The Human Resource, Financial, Information Technology, and Research staffs are also located here.

Southeast Facility
1810 S. Lewis
Mesa, AZ 85210
(602) 506-2619
June 6, 2007

Heather Griller Clark
Sarup Mathur
Mary Lou Fulton College of Education
Division of Curriculum & Instruction
PO Box 871011
Tempe, AZ 85287-0111

Dear Ms. Clark and Ms. Mathur,

The purpose of this letter is to express support for the Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project (CHARP) that will create a sustainable system to encompass all components that impact juvenile reentry including needs, risks, academic & vocational information, and a strength based plan.

The Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department supports student and family resiliency through a variety of different services and is committed to providing opportunities for youth to successfully transition back into the community after spending time our detention facilities. By collaborating with ASU and other youth-serving organizations, our hope is to strengthen existing partnerships for the benefit of justice-involved youth throughout Maricopa County.

Sincerely,

Carol L. Boone
Chief Juvenile Probation Officer
June 7, 2008

Derrick Platt, Grant Writer
Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department

Dr. Sarup Mathur, Principal Investigator
Arizona State University

Dr. Heather Griller-Clark, Principal Investigator
Arizona State University

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing in support of your grant application to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice. The Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project (CHARP) proposed by Arizona State University and the Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department will make a significant contribution to the challenging process of providing quality transition and aftercare services to support the reintegration of high risk youth based on data driven decision making with appropriate support for each individual. This proposal supports innovations and enhancements of juvenile justice related practice as prescribed and authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002.

The Arizona Supreme Court Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has long recognized the need to be proactive in researching and supporting development of programs and services that hold promise for reducing recidivism, as evidenced by the educational and probation programs conducted by the Juvenile Justice Services Division of the AOC. It is my understanding that the CHARP is a systems change model that addresses the complexity of services needed and received by court involved youth. It proposes to change the way re-entry, case management and resources are viewed and allocated, and will create a sustainable system with “one view” of the youth encompassing all components that impact reentry including needs, risks, academics and vocational information and a strength-based re-entry plan. In addition, the project proposes to restructure the existing system of resources to ensure more efficient application to and utilization of partner services for those most at risk.

The Juvenile Justice Services Division of the AOC provides fiscal and administrative coordination for detention education programs throughout Arizona to ensure compliance with federal and state statutes, guidelines and best practice standards. Statewide data reporting for detention indicates that a large number of youth are detained throughout the state and are in need of specialized transition services. I understand that CHARP proposes to implement the project in the two largest detention centers in Arizona located in Maricopa County that will include best practices for addressing many of the critical needs surrounding the transition of youth from detention facilities. Successful implementation of your planned program in the two largest detention facilities in the state should provide a replicable model that can be implemented across the country.

I commend your efforts to bring additional resources to address a critical need for our detained youth, and I am pleased to recommend that CHARP receive serious consideration for funding as a comprehensive coordinated system for facilitating successful reintegration and aftercare support for detained youth and their families back into their communities. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Wodzinska,
Director of Federal Education Grants Programs

1501 W. Washington Street, Ste. 337 • Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231 • (602) 452-3373
June 7, 2007

Heather Griller Clark
Sarup Mathur
Mary Lou Fulton College of Education
Division of Curriculum & Instruction
PO Box 871011
Tempe, AZ 85287-0111

Dear Ms. Clark and Ms. Mathur:

The purpose of this letter is to express support for the **Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project (CHARP)**. We understand that creating a sustainable system that encompasses all components impacting juvenile reentry back into their communities is greatly needed.

Maricopa County Regional School District supports any opportunity for students to successfully transition back into the community after spending time in detention schools. By collaborating with ASU and other youth-serving organizations, our hope is to strengthen existing partnerships for the benefit of justice-involved youth throughout Maricopa County.

Sincerely,

Michael B. Hopper
Principal
Durango & Mesa Detention Center Schools
Mr. Derrick Platt  
Dr. Heather Griller-Clark  
Dr. Sarup Mather

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to lend my support and collaboration for your grant proposal entitled, “Collaborating High-Risk Automated Re-entry Project” (CHARP). The final outcome of this will assist all secure care facilities in providing a successful reentry for court involved youth. This project will increase communication with other secure care agencies by giving us a view of the youth’s overall risk/need, and help juvenile justice systems make informed, data driven decisions for services for these youth.

As Director of Special Education for the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections, I would be pleased to be apart of the collaborative effort with Arizona State University and OJJDP in supporting your grant proposal to provide a successful transition program for all of our adjudicated youth.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gail Jacobs  
Director of Special Education  
Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections