

The Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice Recidivism Report: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure

Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges' Commission

April 2013

www.jcjc.state.pa.us



The Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice Recidivism Report:
Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure

Supported in part by:
Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency
Subgrant #2009-JG-06-22159
and
The Stoneleigh Foundation
Emerging Leader Fellowship Program

Prepared By:

Justine Fowler.....	Program Analyst
Rebecca Anderson.....	Information Technology Technician
Linda Bender.....	Director of Juvenile Justice Information and Technology
Tom Green.....	Director of Administration and Grant Programs

Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
601 Commonwealth Ave, Suite 9100
P.O. Box 62425
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2425
717.787.6910
www.jcjc.state.pa.us

April 2013

Acknowledgements

The Juvenile Court Judges' Commission is sincerely grateful to the many individuals and organizations who contributed to the completion of this project. Without their assistance, this report would not have been possible.

Our deepest appreciation is extended to the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC), which provided all the criminal court data that was used in this study. Ralph Hunsicker, Assistant Director of Judicial Automation, Barbara Holmes, Enterprise Application and Design Architect, Andrew Sickler, Database Administrator, and John Skocik, Database Administrator, were especially instrumental in the collection of this information.

We would also like to share our sincerest gratitude to the Stoneleigh Foundation, which provided partial funding for this project through a Fellowship position. In addition, the preparation of this report was also supported in part by Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) Subgrant #2009-JG-06-22159.

Finally, a heartfelt appreciation is extended to the many members of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers who offered feedback throughout the entire process of this project. Their insight, interest, inquisitiveness, and attention to detail contributed greatly to the success of this report.

Executive Summary

- One in five juveniles (20%) recidivated within two years of their 2007 case closure (page 19).
- Recidivism rates ranged from 0% (in Clinton and Sullivan Counties) to 45% (in Clarion County) (page 19).
- The average length of time to recidivism was 11.5 months from case closure (page 24).
- Recidivists were more likely than non-recidivists to have been adjudicated delinquent at some point in their juvenile offending career prior to their 2007 case closure date (page 26).
- Juveniles with only one written allegation in their juvenile offending history (i.e., first time offenders) re-offended at a rate of 13%. Conversely, juveniles with four or more previous written allegations (i.e., chronic offenders) re-offended at a rate of 37% (page 27).
- The younger a juvenile was at the time of his or her **first written allegation**, the more likely he or she was to recidivate. Conversely, the older the juvenile was at the time of his or her **first written allegation**, the less likely he or she was to recidivate (page 29).
- The older the juvenile was at the time of **case closure**, the more likely he or she was to recidivate. Conversely, the younger the juvenile was at **case closure**, the less likely he or she was to recidivate (page 32).
- 90% of recidivists were males (page 34).
- Males were almost three times more likely to recidivate than females (page 35).
- One in four Black offenders re-offended, while one in six White offenders recidivated. Only one in 12 Asian offenders were recidivists (page 37).
- 80% of recidivists were from “disrupted” family situations (e.g., biological parents deceased, biological parents never married, or biological parents separated/divorced). Only 20% of recidivists were from family situations in which their biological parents were married (page 40).
- 44% of juveniles with both biological parents deceased recidivated. Only 15% of juveniles whose biological parents were married recidivated (page 41).
- Drug offenders and Property offenders were most likely to commit the same types of crimes when they re-offended. Person offenders and Other offenders were less likely to commit the same types of crimes when they re-offended (page 45).
- 70% of juveniles committed a misdemeanor offense when they recidivated (page 48).
- Juveniles who had more formal dispositions on their 2007 case that closed (e.g., *placement* and *formal probation*) recidivated at higher rates than juveniles who had less formal dispositions on their 2007 case (e.g., *informal adjustment*, *consent decree*, and *warned, counseled, case closed*) (page 50).

Executive Summary (Continued)

- Juveniles who had been under supervision for the commission of a sex offense re-offended at a rate of 14%. Only 2% of sex offenders committed another sex offense within two years of their case closure (page 52).
- Juveniles who committed an indecent exposure recidivated at higher rates than any other sex offenders (page 52).
- Recidivists were 1.5 times more likely to have an out-of-home experience (e.g., detention/shelter or placement) than non-recidivists (52% vs. 32%, respectively) (page 63).
- Only 15% of juveniles who had NO out-of-home experience recidivated, while 30% of juveniles who at least one out-of-home experience recidivated (page 63).
- The average recidivism rate for juveniles who had a placement experience at a private sector placement facility was 34% (page 65).
- The average recidivism rate for juveniles who had a placement experience at a Youth Development Center/Youth Forestry Camp operated by the Department of Public Welfare was 40% (page 69).
- Philadelphia County (Class 1) had the highest recidivism rate: 29% (page 71), followed by Class 7 counties, with an average recidivism rate of 26% (page 75). Class 8 counties had the lowest recidivism rate: 15% (page 75).
- One in five juveniles with a 2007 case closure were either a serious offender, a violent offender, OR a chronic offender, as defined by the study (page 78).
- 6% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were serious offenders, and 34% of violent offenders recidivated (page 79).
- 6% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were violent offenders, and 31% of violent offenders recidivated (page 84).
- 14% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were chronic offenders, and 37% of chronic offenders recidivated (page 89).
- Only 0.4% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were serious, violent, AND chronic (SVC) offenders, though 48% of SVC offenders recidivated (page 95).
- 2% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were child offenders, and 29% of child offenders recidivated (page 98).
- 45% of child offenders were either a serious offender, a violent offender, or a chronic offender (page 103).

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature	3
Methodology	15
Findings	18
Section 1: Baseline Figures.....	18
Baseline Recidivism Rate	19
Proportion of Recidivists to Non-Recidivists	23
Court of First Recidivating Case.....	23
Length of Time to Recidivism	24
Span of Time between First Written Allegation and 2007 Case Closure	26
Rate of Delinquency Adjudication.....	26
Written Allegation History	27
Number of Written Allegations and Recidivism Rates.....	27
Section 2: Demographic Variables	28
Age at First Written Allegation.....	29
Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency	30
Age at 2007 Case Closure.....	31
Recidivism Rate by Age at 2007 Case Closure	32
Age at Time of Recidivism.....	33
Gender.....	34
Race	36
Ethnicity.....	38
Family Status	40
Section 3: Offense and Disposition Variables	42
Recidivism Rate by Offense Type	43
Offense Type Specialization	45
Recidivism Rate by Grade of Offense	46
Change in Offense Severity	48
Recidivism Rate by Disposition.....	50
Sex Offender Analysis	52
Section 4: Program and Out-of-Home Service Variables	62
Rate of Receiving Out-of-Home Services	63
Recidivism Rate by Out-of-Home Service Type	64
Length of Time Spent Receiving Out-of-Home Services	65
Recidivism Rates by Placement Facility.....	65
Recidivism Rates by Youth Development Center/Youth Forestry Camp.....	69
Section 5: County Class Size	70

Table of Contents (Continued)

Section 6: Serious, Violent, Chronic (SVC), and Child Offenders	76
Definitions	77
Prevalence of Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders	78
Serious Offenders	79
Prevalence of Serious Offenders	79
Gender	79
Race	80
Ethnicity	82
Written Allegations	83
Age at First Written Allegation	83
Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency.....	83
Span of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System.....	83
Violent Offenders	84
Prevalence of Violent Offenders	84
Gender	82
Race	86
Ethnicity	87
Written Allegations	88
Age at First Written Allegation	88
Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency.....	88
Span of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System.....	88
Chronic Offenders	89
Prevalence of Chronic Offenders	89
Gender	89
Race	90
Ethnicity	92
Written Allegations	93
Age at First Written Allegation	93
Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency.....	93
Span of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System.....	93
Combination Offenders	94
Serious and Chronic Offenders	94
Violent and Chronic Offenders	94
Serious and Violent Offenders	95
Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders	95

Table of Contents (Continued)

Child Offenders.....	98
Prevalence of Child Offenders.....	98
Gender.....	99
Race	100
Ethnicity.....	101
Written Allegations.....	102
Age at First Written Allegation	102
Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency	102
Span of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System	103
Child Offenders Who Developed Serious, Violent, and Chronic Careers	103
Comparison of SVC Findings to Other States	105
Limitations of Study	108
Implications for Future Research.....	109
References.....	110
Appendix.....	121
Appendix A: List of Pennsylvania Counties by Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory Implementation Phases	
Appendix B: County and Statewide Recidivism Rates Using an Alternative Definition of Recidivism	
Appendix C: Private Provider Placement Facilities’ Recidivism Rates: Facilities with Less than Ten Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Appendix D: Youth Development Centers’/Youth Forestry Camps’ Recidivism Rates: Facilities with Less than Ten Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Appendix E: Detention and Shelter Facilities’ Recidivism Rates	
Appendix F: Definitions of Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders	

Introduction

The Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (JCJC) provides leadership, advice, training, and support to enable Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system to achieve its balanced and restorative justice mission. The Commission is legislatively empowered to advise juvenile court judges in all matters pertaining to the proper care and maintenance of delinquent and dependent children, employing evidence-based practices whenever possible, and to compile and publish such statistical data as needed for efficient administration of the juvenile courts.

In November 2010, the JCJC unanimously endorsed a comprehensive strategy, known as the Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy (JJSES), to enhance the capacity of Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system to achieve its mission of balanced and restorative justice. The following is the statement purpose of the JJSES:



We dedicate ourselves to working in partnership to enhance the capacity of Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system to achieve its balanced and restorative justice mission by:

- Employing evidence-based practices, with fidelity, at every stage of the juvenile justice process;
- Collecting and analyzing the data necessary to measure the results of these efforts; and, with this knowledge,
- Striving to continuously improve the quality of our decisions, services and programs.¹

Key stakeholders concluded that one of the most appropriate ways to evaluate the effectiveness of the JJSES was to examine the recidivism rates of juveniles who have been involved in Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system. After all, "recidivism is the key statistic in determining whether or not criminal justice interventions, from diversion through incarceration, are making a difference in keeping offenders from committing more crimes" (Virginia Department of Justice, 2005). At the initiation of the JJSES, however, there was no systematic mechanism available to track the statewide recidivism rates of juvenile offenders in Pennsylvania within both the criminal and juvenile justice systems once their case closed.²

Consequently, the JCJC undertook the current project and developed the methodology and capacity to monitor the statewide recidivism rates of juvenile offenders. The Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research (CJJT&R), a division of the JCJC, currently collects and maintains delinquency data related to approximately 100,000 juvenile court dispositional records each year through the Pennsylvania Juvenile Case Management System (PaJCMS), and has been doing so for over three decades. The JCJC worked closely with the Administrative Office of

¹ For more information on Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy, please visit: <http://www.jcjc.state.pa.us>.

² The Juvenile Court Judges' Commission collects data related to juveniles who re-offend while under supervision. Between the years 2005 and 2010, the annual rate has been 12%-16%.

Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC), who collects court data at both the criminal and magisterial district justice levels, for the project.

The current study had two overarching goals. Since the core premise of the JJSES is that recidivism rates can be reduced through the implementation of evidence-based practices, the first goal was to establish a recidivism benchmark against which the JJSES could be measured. The second goal was to examine differences between recidivists and non-recidivists in terms of demographics and other key variables to identify factors related to recidivism in the Pennsylvania juvenile justice system.

After discussions with Temple University Criminal Justice Professor Phil Harris, JCJC staff, and representatives from the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers, the following definition of recidivism was adopted:

Recidivism:

A subsequent delinquency adjudication or conviction in criminal court for either a misdemeanor or felony offense within two years of case closure.

The two-year tracking period was selected because there was a consensus that recidivism beyond two years from case closure would be less likely to be related to the services and interventions provided during the period of juvenile court supervision. Additionally, only subsequent adjudications of delinquency and findings of guilt in criminal proceedings³ were included in the definition of recidivism since these case outcomes require judicial determinations.

The benchmark was developed with cases closed in 2007 to provide an accurate measure of pre-JJSES recidivism because the JJSES was not implemented in any jurisdiction until 2010. While full implementation of the JJSES may take years, the data obtained from this report will provide an appropriate baseline to gauge the successfulness of the strategy.

After a brief review of related literature and description of the methodology employed, the remainder of this report will describe the results of the study. First, the calculated baseline recidivism rate at both the statewide and the individual county level will be provided. Next, descriptive statistics of juvenile recidivists and non-recidivists will be detailed. Finally, the report will conclude with a summary, project limitations, and suggestions for future research.

³ Findings of guilt included: a *guilty* verdict, a *guilty plea*, and a *nolo contendere* plea.

Review of Related Literature

Juvenile crime is a serious problem in the United States. Not only does it affect the quality of life for our communities' citizens, it also produces a financial burden for society (Tennyson, 2009). In addition, and perhaps unsurprisingly, evidence has demonstrated that a strong relationship exists between juvenile delinquency and adult criminality (Paternoster, Brame, & Farrington, 2001). That is, many adult offenders begin their criminal careers as juveniles (Farrington, 1992). Cohen (1998) estimated that one repeat offender could cost taxpayers as much as 1.3 to 1.5 million dollars. Given such knowledge, it is important to identify which characteristics of the juvenile justice system and the individual juvenile offender affect recidivism in order to prevent future offending and costs to society. Fortunately, previous research has illustrated that recidivism is not a random event, but can actually be predicted (Klein & Caggiano, 1986).

It is generally observed that delinquent behavior and subsequent re-offending are the result of complex interactions between *risk factors*, *protective factors*, and *promotive factors* (van der Put, 2011). According to van der Put (2011), "risk factors are those factors that increase the chances of delinquent behavior" (p. 157). Risk factors are associated with individual, family, school, peer, and community/neighborhood domains. While "most professionals agree that no single risk factor leads to [...] delinquency, [the likelihood of juvenile offending] increases as the number of risk factors and risk factor domains increases" (Wasserman et al., 2003, pp. 2-3). Protective factors are factors that moderate or reduce the effects of risk factors on problem behavior (van der Laan, Veenstra, Bogaerts, Verhulst, & Ormel, 2010). Examples of protective factors include having a high IQ or possessing strong coping skills. Promotive factors, on the other hand, decrease problem behavior directly, regardless of risk. These factors enhance pro-social behavior and healthy development and are associated with better outcomes under all conditions (van der Laan et al., 2010). Many scholars view promotive factors as the "reverse side of the risk coin" or, on a linear spectrum, the "opposing end" of risk factors. For example, a risk factor for a child is weak bonding to conventional parents, while a promotive factor is strong bonding to conventional parents

The following is a summary of the empirical literature on potential factors related to offending and reoffending, broken down by five categories (individual, family, school, peer, and community). In addition, variables related to offense history and involvement with the juvenile justice system, as well as information regarding serious, violent, and chronic offenders are detailed.⁴

⁴ While all of the preceding variables are somehow *associated* with recidivism, the literature has consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated that the following eight domains have the *strongest* relationship to re-occurring delinquent and criminal behavior and should be targeted by interventions in order to most effectively reduce recidivism: prior and current offenses, family circumstances/parenting, education/employment, peer relations, substance abuse, leisure/recreation, personality/behavior, and attitudes/orientation.

Individual Factors

Age

Empirical data has revealed that age plays a key role in juvenile recidivism. First, the younger the juvenile is at the commission of his or her first offense, the more likely he or she is to re-offend (Duncan, Kennedy, & Patrick, 1995; Miner, 2002). For example, Katsiyannis and Archwamety (1997) concluded from their comparison study of recidivists and non-recidivists that what separated the former from the latter is age of first offense and age of first commitment. Second, the younger the offender is at the time of his or her case closure, the greater the likelihood of subsequent re-offending (Harrison, Maupin, & Mays, 2001; Harms, 2003; Puzanchera, 2003). Indeed, Pond, Watkins, Jenkins, Tjaden, and Engle (2004) concluded that “the younger the offender is at the time of release the more likely they will be to recidivate, within a shorter period of time” (p. 6).

Gender

Existing research has consistently and overwhelmingly shown that males are not only more likely than females to commit crimes, but they are also more likely to recidivate (Strom, 2000; Harms, 2003; Mbuba, 2004). To illustrate, McElfresh, Yan, and Janku (2009) concluded that males had a higher risk of recidivating than females in their sample of juvenile offenders. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (2010) discovered that female juvenile offenders re-offended at a lower rate than male juvenile offenders. The Colorado Department of Human Services (2010) reported that 41% of males in their FY 2006-07 release cohort from the Division of Youth Corrections recidivated, while only 17% of females did. In FY 2007-08, 42% of males recidivated, while only 22% of females did. Ponds, Watkins, Jenkins, Tjaden, and Engle (2004) discovered from their analysis of juvenile re-offenders in Georgia that 30% of females recidivated, while 51% of males did. DeComo (1998) found this trend to be true across all races.

Race/Ethnicity

It is widely observed that both race and ethnicity of an offender are associated with both offending and subsequent re-offending (Yan, 2009). In general, non-White individuals offend at disproportionate rates compared to White individuals. In addition, Black offenders, on average, recidivate at the highest rate compared to all other races/ethnicities. The evidence is mixed, however, as to whether Hispanic offenders are more or less likely to recidivate than White offenders (see for example California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2010; Colorado Department of Human Services, 2010; Langan & Levin, 2002; McElfresh, Yan, & Janku, 2009; Michigan Department of Human Services, 2005; Washington Sentencing Guidelines Commission, 2005). It appears that, generally, all other races/ethnicities (e.g., Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaska Native) re-offend at lower rates than Black individuals, White individuals, and Hispanic individuals.

Drug/Alcohol Abuse

The relationship between drugs/substance abuse and juvenile delinquent behavior dominates the scholarly literature. Several studies have found a link between drug and alcohol abuse and

juvenile offending (Hawkins, Jenson, & Catalano, 1988; Huizinga, Loeber, & Thornberry, 1995). While it is not clear whether drugs and alcohol *cause* delinquent behavior, evidence clearly demonstrates that substance abusers are disproportionately more likely to engage in criminal activity. Hawkins, Jenson, and Catalano (1988) observed that “frequent use and abuse of drugs is more common among youths who engage in chronic delinquent behavior than among other adolescents” (p. 258). Several studies have also discovered a relationship between drug and alcohol abuse and juvenile re-offending (Grenier & Roundtree, 1987; Howell, 1995). Mbuba (2004) stated, “recent studies [have] found an important association between use of drugs/substance abuse, including alcohol, and re-offending [and have thus concluded] that use of drugs/substance abuse increases the likelihood of recidivating for young offenders” (p. 29). Federal and statewide reports have drawn similar conclusions. For example, the United States Sentencing Commission (2004) concluded that offenders in their sample who had used illicit drugs within the prior year to their instant offense had a recidivism rate almost double those who had not used illicit drugs (31% and 17%, respectively). The Alaska Judicial Council (2007) discovered that those offenders in their sample with alcohol and drug problems recidivated at a higher rate than those who did not. McElfresh, Yan, and Janku’s (2009) analysis of juvenile recidivists in Missouri revealed that youth with moderate or severe substance abuse problems had a greater risk of recidivating than those youth who did not have substance abuse problems.

Mental Health Issues

Mental health disorders continue to be a major issue for juvenile justice systems. According to Bilchik (1998), “research suggests that [mental health] problems are significantly greater for juvenile delinquents than for other youth” (p. 1). Coccozza (1992) estimated that of the youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system each year, approximately 150,000 meet the diagnostic criteria for at least one mental health disorder. Skowyra and Coccozza (2007) stated that up to 70% of youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system have a diagnosable mental health disorder, with 20% of those youth having a disorder so severe that their ability to function is impaired. Mayeda (2010) reported that 90% of juveniles committed to the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility between 2005 and 2007 had a mental health diagnosis. In addition, many youth in the juvenile justice system who have a mental health disorder also have a co-occurring substance abuse disorder. In fact, according to the results of Shufelt and Coccozza’s (2006) comprehensive mental health prevalence study, among those youth with a mental health diagnosis, 61% also met the criteria for a substance abuse disorder.

In addition, since juveniles with mental health issues generally lack protective factors and are “experiencing serious problems that interfere with their functioning” (Coccozza & Skowyra, 2000, p. 6), they are also at a greater risk to re-offend. Several studies have confirmed this. For example, Mayeda (2010) concluded that 72% of youth committed to the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility who had a mental health history recidivated as a juvenile, while 73% recidivated as an adult. Cottle, Lee, and Heilbrun’s (2001) meta-analysis of twenty-three recidivism studies revealed that mental health issues were a significant predictor of re-offending. Sullivan et al. (2007) determined that having a significant mental health issue was a statistically significant predictor of recidivism. Finally, the Alaska Judicial Council (2007) discovered that felons with a mental health history were at a greater risk of re-offending than those felons that did not have a mental health history.

Lastly, evidence indicates that simply having a mental health disorder is not a risk factor for re-offending. Rather, it is a responsibility issue that must be addressed before proper, targeted interventions can be effective for a juvenile.

Cognitive and Behavioral Characteristics

Several cognitive and behavioral characteristics have been linked to offending and re-offending in juveniles. For example, Wasserman et al. (2003) reported that poor cognitive development and low intelligence influenced the likelihood that a juvenile would take part in antisocial and delinquent behavior. Furthermore, in their summary of predictors of youth violence, Hawkins et al. (2000) concluded that the following individual factors also affected the likelihood that a juvenile would take part in delinquent activity: 1.) hyperactivity, concentration problems, restlessness, and risk-taking personalities, 2.) aggressiveness, 3.) other forms of antisocial behavior (e.g., smoking, early sexual intercourse), and 4.) beliefs and attitudes favorable to deviant or antisocial behavior (e.g., dishonesty, hostility toward police). Additional empirical literature supports these claims. To illustrate, Klinteberg, Andersson, Magnusson, and Stattin (1993) discovered that boys with restlessness and concentration problems were five times more likely to be arrested for violence than boys without these characteristics. Stattin and Magnusson (1989) linked early childhood aggression to later violent behavior, particularly in males. Haapasalo and Tremblay (1994) found that physical aggression in kindergarten was the best predictor of later involvement in property crimes. Farrington (1989) discovered that those juveniles who smoked and engaged in early sexual intercourse were at a greater risk for committing criminal offenses than those who did not. Haapasalo and Tremblay (1994) concluded that pro-social behaviors (e.g., helping, sharing, and cooperation) acted as protective factors, particularly for those who had risk factors for committing violent and property crimes.

Leisure/Recreational Activities

Research has shown that juveniles who are involved in pro-social, organized leisure/recreation activities are less likely to be involved in delinquent activity than those who are not involved with such (Agnew & Petersen, 1989). Additionally, it appears that the more structured the activity is, the more effective it will be in preventing antisocial behavior (Stattin & Mahoney, 2000). Social control and social bond theories help to explain why such pro-social involvement influences delinquency. According to control theorists, “the reason that most of us conform to societal norms is that we are bonded to society in such a way that does not allow us to deviate from the norm, or we have internalized those norms to the extent that our conscience will not allow us to be so engaged” (Sims, 2006, p. 85). Furthermore, Hirschi’s social bond theory states that the more bonded juveniles are to social institutions, such as pro-social school-, recreation-, and family- related activities, “the more likely they are to believe strongly in the value systems being posited by these social institutions and will become committed to conforming behaviors” (Sims, 2006, p. 85). In addition, Hirschi (1969) argued that active juveniles are “simply too busy doing conventional things to find time to engage in deviant behavior” (p. 22). These theories and their tenets have received considerable empirical support, demonstrating that structured activities indeed lower levels of antisocial behavior (see for example: Eccles & Barber, 1999; Mahoney, 2000; Mahoney & Stattin, 2000; Wong, 2005).

Employment Status

It appears that employment status is correlated with criminal activity and recidivism in that those individuals who have employment opportunities are, in general, less likely to offend and re-offend than those who do not (Uggen, 2000; Hetz-Burrell & English, 2006; Calhoun et al., 2008). According to the Colorado Department of Human Services (2010), “gainful employment [is] an indication of ‘buying into’ a pro-social lifestyle; therefore, it is assumed that youth who [are] employed at the time of discharge [will have] lower rates of recidivism than youth [not] employed” (p. 40). The Colorado Department of Human Services (2010) discovered that those juveniles employed at the time of discharge were less likely to recidivate than those not employed, though this difference was not statistically significant. Mbuba (2004) reported, however, that the “effect of employment is age-related and is most felt among older releases than among the more youthful adolescents” (p. 32).

Family Factors

Parental Factors and Circumstances

Mbuba (2004) noted that “family [...] is the single most important factor in ensuring that a child is properly assimilated in the main stream of society” (p. 28). Because parental influence has the capability of providing a barrier to delinquent behavior and associations with delinquent peers (Warr, 1993), thus acting as a promotive factor, those juveniles with quality family relationships are less likely to commit criminal acts (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987). Fendrich (1991) concurred, reporting that youth who have strong family ties/bonds are less likely to offend and re-offend than those who do not have supportive family relationships. Furthermore, Cottle, Lee, and Heilbrun (2001) concluded from their meta-analysis of twenty-three published recidivism studies that the presence of family problems was a strong predictor of re-offending.

There has been considerable debate in the literature as to whether *family structure* affects delinquency. For example, several studies have indicated that children from single-parent or divorced households were at a greater risk of taking part in anti-social behavior than were those children who came from intact households (Farrington & Loeber, 1999; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985). On the other hand, however, other scholars have argued that additional factors, such as parenting style, parental supervision, proper discipline, and affection can act as protective factors and thus mediate the influence of a “broken” family structure (Yan, 2009).

In addition to these issues, Farrington (2010) reported that the following family factors also influence delinquency: 1.) large family size, 2.) inadequate child rearing/management methods (e.g., poor supervision, inconsistent discipline, parental coldness and rejection, low parental involvement with the child), and 3.) other parental features, such as young age of parents and parental substance abuse, stress, or depression. Derzon (2010) detailed similar findings from his meta-analysis, stating that the following were the strongest predictors of criminal or violent behavior: 1.) poor parental education, 2.) poor parental supervision, 3.) poor child rearing skills, 4.) parental conflict, and 5.) large family size. Finally, Hawkins et al. (2000) added that family conflict increases the likelihood of later youth violence. Indeed, evidence exists to demonstrate that exposure to high levels of marital and family conflict and domestic violence increase the risk for later violence (See for example: Elliott, 1994; Farrington, 1989).

Parental and Sibling History of Criminal Involvement

Research indicates that juveniles whose parents have a history of criminal involvement are more likely to be involved in criminal activity and subsequent re-offending themselves (Wallace, 2006). Since “arguably the most influential aspect of a child’s life revolves around the family [and] the primary responsibility of parents is to oversee the socialization of their children” (Wallace, 2006, p. 569), it is not surprising that juveniles who are exposed to the criminality of their parents are more likely to engage in criminal acts themselves. Several studies have linked the criminal history of parents to both juvenile and adult offending (see for example Leschied et al., 2006), including Farrington’s (1989) analysis that determined that boys who had a parent arrested before they reached 10 were 2.2 times more likely to commit violent crimes than those with noncriminal parents.

Empirical evidence also demonstrates that parental criminal histories influence the likelihood of juvenile recidivism. For example, in a statewide recidivism study of juveniles who had been placed in the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility, Mayeda (2010) concluded that those individuals whose parents had been incarcerated were at an increased risk of re-offending upon release. For example, 92% of youth whose mother had an incarceration history re-offended as a juvenile, while 72% re-offended as an adult. Similarly, three-fourths (75%) of youths whose father had an incarceration history re-offended as a juvenile, while 74% re-offended as an adult. The Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (2008) concluded that almost 40% of juveniles who had a history of family criminal involvement re-offended, while only 22% of youth who had no family history of criminal involvement did. Grumwald, Lockwood, Harris, and Mennis (2010) also concluded from their analysis of juvenile offenders in Philadelphia that parental criminal history was significantly related to juvenile re-offending.

Other studies have also discovered a link between having a delinquent sibling and juvenile delinquency. For example, Farrington (1995) concluded that having an antisocial sibling increased a juvenile’s likelihood of antisocial behavior. In addition, Farrington (1989) discovered that having a delinquent sibling by age 10 predicted later convictions for violence for juveniles.

Childhood Maltreatment

Individuals who are abused or neglected as children are at an increased risk to commit delinquent acts compared to children who are not maltreated (Ryan & Testa, 2005). For example, Scudder, Blount, Heide, and Silverman (1993) concluded from a randomly selected group of cohort children who attended schools in West Central Florida that a significant relationship existed between abuse and delinquency. Ryan and Testa (2005) discovered that substantiated victims of maltreatment averaged 47% higher delinquency rates compared to children who had not been victims of abuse or neglect. In addition, approximately 16% of children placed into substitute care experienced at least one delinquency petition compared to 7% of all abuse/neglect victims who were not removed from their family. Mersky and Reynolds (2007), using data from the Chicago Longitudinal Study (CLS), concluded that maltreatment, both abuse and neglect, were significantly related to violent delinquency. English, Widom, and Brandford (2004) concluded from their sample of abused and neglected children that maltreated youth were 11 times more

likely to be arrested for a violent crime as a juvenile, 2.7 times more likely to be arrested for a violent crime as an adult, and 3.1 times more likely to be arrested for any violent crime (juvenile or adult) compared to the matched control group of non-maltreated youth.

The scholarly literature also demonstrates that maltreated youth are at a greater risk to re-offend. To illustrate, Mulder, Brand, Bullens, and van Marle (2011) concluded that a history of physical and emotional abuse was a significant risk factor for recidivating. In a statewide recidivism study of juveniles who had been placed in the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility, Mayeda (2010) found that those individuals who had a history of maltreatment were more likely to re-offend as both a juvenile and an adult. For example, 72% of youth who had a history of being in a foster home re-offended as a juvenile, while 64% re-offended as an adult. In addition, 84% of youths who had been the victim of physical abuse re-offended as a juvenile, while 70% re-offended as an adult. Furthermore, 81% of youth who had been the victim of sexual abuse re-offended as a juvenile, while 82% re-offended as an adult.

School Factors

Educational Commitment, Attachment, and Success

A youth's dedication to and success in the educational setting affects the likelihood that he or she will engage in delinquent behavior. In general, youth who are committed to the educational process are less prone to delinquency (Wallace, 2006). In addition, Thornberry (1987) reported that having a high level of commitment to the educational process decreased a juvenile's chances of associating with antisocial peers. Henry and Slater (2007) wrote that school attachment/bonding has been consistently identified as a promotive factor against antisocial behavior. Dornbusch, Erikson, Larid, and Wong (2001) concurred, concluding that attachment to school predicted lower levels of initiation of deviant behavior, suggesting that school commitment acts as a promotive factor.

It is also apparent that educational success affects delinquency. For instance, Yan and Janku (2009) found that those juveniles who had below average or failing academic statuses were more likely to recidivate than those who were succeeding in school. Bartollas (2003) reported similar findings, stating that delinquency was related to school performance for both males and females.

Truancy and Educational Attainment

In addition to educational commitment, attachment, and success, school attendance and achievement affect the likelihood that a juvenile will take part in antisocial or criminal behavior. For example, Farrington (1989) found that youth with high truancy rates at ages 12-14 were more likely to engage in violence as adolescents and adults. Farrington (1989) also reported that leaving school before age 15 predicted later violence. Bynum and Thompson (2005) stated that adolescents who dropped out of school were more susceptible to delinquent behavior than those who graduated. Archwamety and Katsiyannis (2000) found that graduates were 3.5 times less likely to be arrested than dropouts. The United States Sentencing Commission (2004) reported that, in general, the more education an offender has, the less likely he or she is to recidivate. Since dropouts, in general, have a hard time finding substantial employment, and girls who drop out are more likely to become pregnant compared to those who stay in school (Cantelon &

LeBouf, 1997), “contemporaneous circumstances have a high affinity to delinquent and repeat delinquent behavior” (Mbuba, 2004, p. 31).

Peer Factors

Delinquent Peers

Seydlitz and Jenkins (1998) argued that peer influence on antisocial behavior is perhaps the most widely studied aspect of juvenile delinquency. In short, research indicates that youth who associate with antisocial peers are more likely to commit delinquent acts (Elliot, Huizinga, & Ageton, 1985; Messner & Krohn, 1990; Patterson & Dishion, 1985). Furthermore, the relationship between delinquent peers and delinquent behavior appears to be reciprocal; that is, antisocial peer association fosters delinquency and delinquency increases the likelihood of associating with antisocial peers (Matsueda & Anderson, 1998). Mbuba (2004) wrote that “a large body of research has successfully and steadily linked peer influence to patterned delinquent behavior, with peer pressure forming a central explanation of not only the first involvement in delinquency, but also the repetitive pattern that typifies recidivism” (p. 30). Furthermore, Cottle, Lee, and Heilbrun (2001) concluded in their meta-analysis that association with delinquent peers was a strong predictor of re-offending.

Gang Involvement

Since the mid-20th century, gang violence in the United States has become widespread, with all 50 states and the District of Columbia reporting gang problems. According to the National Longitudinal Study of Youth, 8% of the juveniles surveyed had belonged to a gang at some point between the ages of 12 and 17 (Snyder and Sickmund, 2006). Data suggests that individuals involved in gangs are not only at a higher risk for committing criminal offenses compared to individuals not involved in gangs, but they are also at a higher risk for recidivating. For example, Hindeland, Hirschi, and Weis (1981) concluded from the Seattle Youth Study data that gang members were almost 3.5 times more likely to be re-arrested for a new crime than non-gang members. Olson, Dooley, and Kane (2004) discovered that gang members were about 20% more likely to be re-arrested for a new crime than non-gang members. Benda and Tollet (1999) discovered from their study of approximately 250 juveniles aged 10-17 years old released from the Arkansas Division of Youth Services that gang members were twice as likely to be reincarcerated within a year than non-gang members. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency and Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections Research and Development (2002) tracked more than 3, 600 juveniles released from the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections and determined that juveniles involved in gangs were more likely to be returned to prison. The Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (2008) reported that 47% of juveniles with a gang affiliation recidivated. Finally, Katsiyannis and Archwamety (1997) concluded that gang involvement was one factor that distinguished recidivists from non-recidivists in a sample of delinquent youth placed in a state correctional facility.

Geographic/Neighborhood Factors

According to Yan (2009), “the unequal geographic distribution of crime and delinquency has led to increasing research attention on the relationship between characteristics of different communities and human development in the emergence of antisocial and criminal behavior” (p.

29). More specifically, evidence has shown that serious youth crime is concentrated in urban cities and counties, and particular neighborhoods within those areas (Sickmund, Snyder, & Poe-Yamagata, 1997). There are many explanations for this trend. For example, juveniles in inner-city neighborhoods are exposed to high levels of community violence versus youth living in suburban or rural areas. This exposure, in turn, leads to increased aggression and antisocial behavior of those juveniles (Yan, 2009). It also leads to an increase in gang membership as a form of protection (and as previously mentioned, gang involvement is a major correlate of delinquent behavior). In addition, these particular areas tend to have higher poverty rates, which also affect the likelihood of youth committing crime (Hawkins, 1999). Urban areas also have higher concentrations of drugs and firearms, which in turn lead to violent behaviors (Maguin et al., 1995). Furthermore, juveniles who reside in urban areas are exposed to community disorganization at greater rates. Disorganized neighborhoods have weak social control networks which allow criminal activity to go unnoticed and unmonitored (a tenet of Shaw and McKay's (1942) social disorganization theory) (Sampson & Lauritsen, 1994). Additionally, juveniles residing in inner-city neighborhoods are often exposed to and socialized to accept norms favorable to crime (Wasserman et al., 2003). Finally, Yan (2009) observed that the following typify urban areas: 1.) greater population density, 2.) greater proportions of unmarried men, 3.) pervasive single-parent households, 3.) a high proportion of unemployed males, 4.) a lack of professional role models, 5.) community instability, 6.) low neighborhood attachment, 7.) community disorganization, and 8.) the accessibility of drugs and firearms. Youth from these areas are also more prone to recidivism, which is logical. When supervision is terminated and juveniles return to the same neighborhoods and environments which caused their initial antisocial behavior, it should not be surprising that juveniles persist with delinquent actions.

Offense-Related Variables

Prior Offense History

Prior criminal involvement is perhaps the best indicator of future criminal involvement. Indeed, extensive evidence has demonstrated that recidivism rates are higher for those that have extensive criminal histories (Nagin & Paternoster, 1991; Corrado, Cohen, Glackman, & Odgers, 2003). Recidivism studies in Alaska, Colorado, Georgia, Missouri, New York City, and North Carolina have confirmed this (Alaska Judicial Council, 2007; Colorado Department of Human Services, 2010; Ponds, Watkins, Jenkins, Tjaden, and Engle, 2004; McElfresh, & Janku, 2009; Gewirtz et al., 2007; Calhoun et al., 2008, respectively).

Offense Type

When examining correlations between the type of offense for which an individual was released from placement or supervision and subsequent re-offending, the literature is mixed. Bondeson (2002) reported that juveniles who committed violent offenses were more likely to re-offend than juveniles who committed minor or property offenses. A statewide recidivism report conducted in Iowa by Moore et al. (2001) discovered that violent young offenders had the highest re-offense rate of any group studied. Moore and colleagues also concluded that sex offenders had the lowest rate of recidivism. Similarly, McElfresh, Yan, and Janku (2009) and the Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (2008) also concluded that sex offenders recidivated at the lowest rate.

In contrast, however, Langan and Levin (2002) reported that individuals released for property offenses had the highest rates of recidivism in comparison to violent, drug, and public transgression offenders. The authors also concluded that violent offenders had the lowest recidivism rates. Similarly, Kohl, Hoover, McDonald, and Solomon (2008) discovered that nonviolent offenders reoffended at higher rates than violent offenders. Finally, Calhoun and colleagues (2009) concluded that violent juvenile offenders were least likely to recidivate (39.8%), followed by serious (57.5%) and minor offense (56.9%) juvenile offenders.

Involvement with Juvenile Justice System

Length of Stay in Placement

The evidence is mixed in regards to the effect of length of stay in placement on recidivism. On one hand, some scholars have concluded that the longer a juvenile is in placement, the more likely he or she is to re-offend. For example, Katsiyannis and Archwamety (1997) found in their examination of re-offense patterns for juveniles who had been placed in a state correctional facility that length of stay was a significant factor that differentiated recidivists from non-recidivists. Others, such as Langan and Levin (2002) and Miner (2002), have also discovered that the time spent in a correctional facility was a positive factor related to the likelihood of return to a correctional facility.

Conversely, however, Winokur, Smith, Bontrager, and Blakenship (2008) found no consistent relationship between length of confinement and recidivism. Frederick (1999) also discovered that, after controlling for significant risk factors, there were no consistent differences between recidivists and non-recidivists in terms of residential length of stay. Finally, Langan, Schmitt, and Durose (2003) found a higher re-arrest rate among sex offenders who had served the shortest amount of time in comparison to other sex offenders who had served longer periods.

History of Placement/Detention

In general, the literature supports the notion that juveniles should be placed in detention or placement as a measure of last resort, with preference going first to diversionary efforts. Many advocates of diversion point to the evidence of both labeling theories and differential association theories to support their arguments. According to Marsh and Patrick (2006), labeling theory “hypothesizes that the delinquent behavior (primary deviance) and the act of being negatively labeled by powerful authority figures in society will strongly influence juveniles to believe themselves to be deviant and create secondary deviance” (p. 477). Similarly, differential association theories suggest that “through association with deviant groups, individuals are more likely to become deviant themselves. Juveniles incarcerated with other juvenile offenders will interact with and are more likely to join deviant groups” (Marsh & Patrick, 2006, p. 476). Furthermore, differential association theories posit that through interaction with deviant others, individuals actually learn the values, attitudes, techniques, and motives for criminal behavior.

In addition, detaining or confining youth also widens the gulf between the juvenile and positive influences such as family and school (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2005). Empirical data supports these claims. For example, in Sullivan, Veysey, Hamilton, and Grillo’s (2007) evaluation of the Mental Health Juvenile Justice Diversion Project, the authors

found that history of prior placement was a statistically significant predictor of recidivism. McElfresh, Yan, and Janku (2009) concluded that those juveniles with a history of out-of-home placement were more likely to recidivate than those who had no history of out-of-home placement. The Colorado Department of Human Services (2010) reported that 40% of juveniles who had been detained three or more times recidivated in their analysis of FY 2006-07 discharges from the Division of Youth Corrections. Finally, several studies have demonstrated that as many as 50–70% of previously confined youth are rearrested within one or two years after release (See for example: Fagan, 1996; Krisberg, 1997; Wiebush, Wagner, McNulty, Wang, & Lee, 2005; Winner, Lanza-Kaduce, Bishop, & Frazier, 1997).

Program Type

Extensive research has focused on which types of program are most effective in treating juvenile offenders. Shepard (1995) concluded that the most successful programs focus on improving self-control, interpersonal skills, and academic achievement. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) wrote that effective programs, in general, emphasize healthy social, physical, and mental development. Altschuler (1998) argued that the best programs provide structure, emphasize social skills, and provide individual counseling that addresses the juveniles' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors.

Lipsey (2009) concluded from his meta-analysis of interventions for juveniles that the following components characterized the most effective programs for youth offenders: 1.) a therapeutic philosophy (versus a control or deterrence philosophy), 2.) servicing high-risk offenders, and 3.) proper implementation and maintenance of the program. Furthermore, Lipsey and Chapman (2011) reported that skill building programs, counseling programs, and multiple service programs provided the greatest reduction in recidivism for juvenile offenders, while discipline and deterrence programs actually increased the likelihood of recidivism. The most effective counseling approaches included mentoring and group counseling, while the most effective skill building programs involved behavioral and cognitive behavioral approaches.

Lipsey (2009) also suggested targeting high risk youth for services and programs. In doing so, there will be more substantial changes in recidivism rates for high risk offenders than low risk offenders (allowing for the “best bang for the buck”). Additionally, evidence demonstrated that over-servicing low risk youth may actually *increase* their likelihood of re-offending. According to Pealer (n.d.), over-supervising and over-treating low-risk youth disrupts the very things that make them low risk (e.g., bonds to pro-social conventions, such as school, family, church, and other activities). In addition, exposing low-risk youth to high-risk youth allows for contagion of antisocial tendencies.

Serious, Violent, and Chronic (SVC) Offenders

Evidence continues to mount that a small proportion of offenders commit a substantial amount of juvenile offending, including the most serious and violent crimes (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1995). According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), *violent* offenders are those that commit homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, arson of an unoccupied dwelling, or kidnapping. *Serious* offenders are those that commit other person offenses, burglary, motor vehicle theft, theft over \$100, arson, drug

trafficking, or extortion (Foote, 1997). Chronic juvenile offenders are those individuals that have been arrested four or more times.

In perhaps the most comprehensive analysis of serious, violent, and chronic offenders conducted involving over 151,000 juvenile delinquents in Maricopa County, Arizona, Snyder (1998) shed some light on the extent of the serious, violent, and chronic (SVC) problem. First, nearly two-thirds (64%) of juvenile delinquents in the study were non-serious, non-violent, and non-chronic offenders. Second, approximately one-third (34%) of juvenile offenders were serious offenders, 15% were chronic offenders, and 8% were violent offenders. Finally, 4% of juveniles fit the operationalization of a serious, violent, and chronic offender.

Other studies have found similar results. For example, in a 2001 analysis of court risk assessments and dispositions in juvenile court in North Carolina, it was discovered that nearly 60% of juvenile offenders were neither a serious, violent, nor chronic offender. However, 27% were serious offenders, 10% were chronic offenders, and 2% were violent offenders (Kelly, 2011). Three longitudinal studies conducted in Colorado, New York, and Pennsylvania concluded that approximately 15% of the juvenile population account for the vast majority of all violent offenses (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1995).

The OJJDP (2001) reported that approximately 8% of the juvenile offender population becomes chronic offenders and are responsible for 55% of repeat cases. Loeber and Farrington (2001) reported that between one-fourth and one-third of disruptive children are at risk of becoming child delinquents (those that begin offending before age nine), and approximately one-third of all child delinquents eventually become serious, violent, and chronic offenders. In addition, a large proportion of those who are involved in violent behavior beginning at an early age, usually by nine, eventually become chronic offenders. In general, the literature suggests that the younger a juvenile starts offending, the more likely he or she is to become a serious, violent, and/or chronic offender (Wilson & Howell, 1993).

Methodology

As previously mentioned, the current study had two overarching goals. The first was to establish a recidivism benchmark against which various components of the Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy (JJSES) could be measured. The second goal was to examine differences between recidivists and non-recidivists in terms of demographics and other key variables. In order to meet these goals, staff members from the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission's (JCJC) Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research (CJJT&R) began the data collection process by querying the Pennsylvania Juvenile Case Management System (PaJCMS) to identify juveniles from counties that were involved with the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI; hereafter referred to as YLS)⁵ Phase 1 implementation group⁶ who had a case closed in 2007. Juveniles were included in the sample if their case had a valid disposition prior to the 2007 closure date. Valid dispositions for the purposes of this project were as follows: *informal adjustment, consent decree, probation, placement, probation with day treatment, deferred adjudication, deferred placement, courtesy supervision, other, and warned, counseled, case closed.*⁷ The CJJT&R staff then created a base data file that included the juvenile's name, date of birth, State Identification Number (SID), the final (most recent) valid disposition, the date of that disposition, and the date of the 2007 case closure. These juveniles formed the base sample for the study.

The CJJT&R staff members then provided this base data file to the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC). The AOPC in turn queried their case management systems (Common Pleas Case Management System [CPCMS], the Legacy system, and the Re-Write system) against the list of juveniles provided by the CJJT&R to determine if the individuals re-offended as adults after their 2007 case closure. A juvenile was matched by: 1.) his or her SID alone, or 2.) two of the following: his or her last name, his or her date of birth, his or her social security number. The AOPC then provided to the staff at the CJJT&R **all** cases subsequent to the 2007 case closure date recorded for the listed juveniles, regardless of the length of time that had elapsed. For each case that was provided, the most serious alleged offense and the disposition for that alleged offense ("offense disposition") were also supplied. Finally, the disposition for the overall case ("case disposition") was provided.

While the AOPC queried their systems to determine if any of the listed juveniles from the base data files had recidivated in the criminal system, staff members from the CJJT&R did the same in the PaJCMS to determine if any of the youth re-offended as juveniles. If the individual recidivated (i.e., had a subsequent delinquency adjudication) in juvenile court after their 2007 case closure, the disposition for the **first** recidivating case was recorded, regardless of length of

⁵ The Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) was developed by Dr. Robert Hoge, Dr. D.A. Andrews, and Dr. Alan Leschied. The YLS/CMI represents the youth version of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R), which was developed by Dr. D.A. Andrews and Dr. James Bonta.

⁶ To make the data collection process manageable, data was pulled in stages, determined by the phases in which the YLS was implemented in Pennsylvania. There were a total of four phases of implementation that involved 65 counties. The remaining two counties that are currently not using the YLS, Elk and Monroe, were included in the fourth stage. For more information on the YLS and a list of counties that comprise each phase, please see Appendix A.

⁷ Inquiries have been made about how Pennsylvania's recidivism rates would be affected if juveniles who had a disposition of *dismissed, not substantiated* were included in the base sample, and if *consent decrees* and *accelerated rehabilitative dispositions (ARDs)* were counted as recidivating events (these dispositions do not require a judicial adjudication or determination of guilt). To see recidivism rates using this alternative definition of recidivism, please refer to Appendix B.

time that elapsed from the 2007 case closure date. The date of that delinquency adjudication and the offense disposition were also documented.

The AOPC then returned to the CJJT&R a data file that included the aforementioned information (i.e., all subsequent cases recorded for the juveniles, the most serious alleged offense, the disposition of that alleged offense, and the disposition of the entire case). Next, staff members from the CJJT&R incorporated this data into the base data file. Since some juveniles had multiple subsequent cases in the criminal court system, staff members from the CJJT&R selected the **first** recidivating incident that occurred, a process similar to the cases retrieved from the PaJCMS. **All re-offense data utilized in this study was drawn from the first recidivating case. That is, if a juvenile has multiple recidivating cases, only statistics related to the first re-offense was captured in this report.** The most serious alleged offense and its subsequent disposition were also included in the file. Following this, staff members from the CJJT&R incorporated into the base data file the recidivism data that had been extracted from the PaJCMS.

Next, this base data file was reviewed by staff members from the JCJC to identify recidivists and non-recidivists. All juveniles with a case closed in 2007 who had a subsequent delinquency adjudication or finding of guilt⁸ in criminal court for either a felony or misdemeanor offense within two years of their case closure were placed in the “recidivist” sample. The length of time to recidivism was calculated from the date of the 2007 case closure to the date of the delinquency adjudication or finding of guilt in criminal court for the recidivating case (where applicable), except in the instance of juveniles who turned twenty-one in 2007. In Pennsylvania, juvenile court jurisdiction ends at age twenty-one, and as such, these juveniles were tracked two years beyond their twenty-first birthday.

Furthermore, all juveniles who did not recidivate or recidivated but not by the aforementioned definition (e.g., those juveniles who recidivated more than two years after their 2007 case closure⁹ or those juveniles who recidivated only with a summary offense) were placed in the “non-recidivist” sample.

Since the AOPC provided information related to only the most serious **alleged** offense (versus the most serious **substantiated** offense), all cases with an offense disposition of *withdrawn*, *dismissed*, or *nolle prossed*, but overall case disposition of *guilty plea*, were queried in the Common Pleas Court Docket Sheets system, available to the public through the AOPC’s website. The most serious substantiated offenses were then recorded on the case. If it was discovered through the public docketing system that the most serious **substantiated** offense was a summary offense, that particular case was discarded from the sample. The AOPC returned file was then reviewed to determine if the juvenile was involved in another case that fit the current study’s definition of recidivism. If the juvenile did commit another offense, this new case was included within the sample. If there were no more offenses committed by the juvenile within two years of case closing, or the most serious substantiated offense for all subsequent recidivating event(s) was a summary offense, the juvenile was placed in the “non-recidivist”

⁸ Findings of guilt included: a *guilty* verdict, a *guilty plea*, and a *nolo contendere* plea.

⁹ While including individuals known to have recidivated more than two years after case closure in re-offense figures would undoubtedly increase Pennsylvania’s recidivism rate, doing so would ultimately decrease the ability to link the return to delinquent or criminal behavior to treatment and services received while under juvenile court supervision.

group. These individuals were only removed if they did not recidivate in the juvenile system by the current study's definition.

In addition, in some instances, an individual's first recidivating case was as an adult for a summary offense. Before placing that individual in the "non-recidivist" sample, staff members from the JCJC searched the AOPC returned file to determine if he or she had another case that fit the current study's definition of recidivism. If that individual did, that subsequent case replaced the first case in which he or she had recidivated, and the individual was placed in the "recidivist" sample. If there were no more cases that fit the current study's definition of recidivism, or if the subsequent case occurred more than two years after the juvenile's 2007 case closure, that individual was then placed in the "non-recidivist" sample.

This entire process was then repeated for YLS Phase 2, 3, and 4 counties. Cameron, Chester, Delaware, and Philadelphia Counties were not using the PaJCMS in 2007, so each of these counties provided the necessary data to the CJJT&R for analysis. In addition, only limited data is available for Cameron County, and thus their figures are omitted from several of the proceeding analyses, noted where applicable.

Executive Summary: Baseline Figures

- One in five juveniles (20%) with a 2007 case closure recidivated (page 19).
- Recidivism rates ranged from 0% (in Clinton and Sullivan Counties) to 45% (in Clarion County) (page 19).
- Slightly more than half (54%) of recidivists re-offended first in criminal court (page 23).
- The average length of time to recidivism was 11.5 months from case closure. The median length of time to recidivism was 11 months from case closure (page 24).
- Recidivists were involved with the juvenile justice system 9 months longer, on average, than non-recidivists (page 26).
- Recidivists were more likely than non-recidivists to have been adjudicated delinquent at some point in their juvenile offending career prior to their 2007 case closure date (page 26).
- Recidivists averaged 3 written allegations each in their juvenile offending history. Non-recidivists averaged 2 written allegations (page 27).
- Juveniles with only one written allegation in their juvenile offending history (i.e., first time offenders) re-offended at a rate of 13%. Conversely, juveniles with four or more previous written allegations (i.e., chronic offenders) re-offended at a rate of 37% (page 27).

Baseline Figures

Cautionary Note Regarding Expunged Cases

It is critically important to note that expunged cases create a significant limitation to this study. In Pennsylvania, when a case is expunged, all of a juvenile’s identifying information pertaining to that case is “erased” and is therefore not available for analysis. Consequently, juveniles with a 2007 case expungement were omitted from the study’s sample, unless they had a separate case closed in 2007 that was not expunged.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine how a particular county’s recidivism rate was affected by the number of expungements for a variety of reasons, including that the unit of measurement for the recidivism study was a *juvenile*, while the unit of measurement for an expungement was a *case* (one juvenile may have had several cases from 2007 expunged).

Arguably, juveniles whose cases are expunged are presumed to be individuals who are considered to be at lower risk to recidivate (i.e., first-time, relatively minor offenders). However, since no risk assessment instruments (e.g., the Youth Level of Service) were being utilized in Pennsylvania prior to 2009, there is no way to determine the actual risk levels of juveniles with a 2007 case closure. In general, counties that expunged significant numbers of cases had higher recidivism rates than their counterparts. A possible explanation for this result is that a significant number of lower risk youth were removed from the research sample in these jurisdictions.

Moreover, these recidivism rates do not take into account the specific treatment and services that were provided to juveniles while under supervision. Readers are cautioned, therefore, to make no comparisons between counties due to varying juvenile court policies and practices, including those relating to expungement. Rather, it is our goal to measure whether recidivism rates within each county decline as evidence-based practices are implemented.

Table 1: County and Statewide Recidivism Rates for Juveniles with 2007 Case Closures				
County	Recidivism Rate ^x	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists	Number of Expunged Cases ^{xx}
Adams	23%	254	58	26
Allegheny	16%	1,603	257	181
Armstrong	14%	49	7	0
Beaver	17%	301	52	0
Bedford	14%	70	10	0
Berks	21%	769	160	158
Blair	9%	149	14	60
Bradford	19%	67	13	0
Bucks	20%	852	167	154
Butler	19%	173	33	97
Cambria	16%	408	64	20
Cameron	20%	10	2	0
Carbon	8%	111	9	0

**Table 1: County and Statewide Recidivism Rates for Juveniles
with 2007 Case Closures (Continued)**

County	Recidivism Rate^x	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists	Number of Expunged Cases^{xx}
Centre	11%	55	6	11
Chester	19%	623	117	38
Clarion	45%	29	13	36
Clearfield	25%	72	18	0
Clinton	0%	7	0	0
Columbia	17%	70	12	4
Crawford	17%	125	21	0
Cumberland	29%	89	26	894
Dauphin	22%	850	184	13
Delaware	22%	298	67	N/A**
Elk	22%	37	8	4
Erie	21%	708	147	6
Fayette	13%	280	37	1
Forest	33%	3	1	4
Franklin	24%	348	84	4
Fulton	6%	17	1	0
Greene	8%	37	3	88
Huntingdon	23%	52	12	0
Indiana	13%	78	10	1
Jefferson	25%	73	18	98
Juniata	33%	6	2	12
Lackawanna	25%	265	67	102
Lancaster	28%	398	112	7
Lawrence	17%	202	35	1
Lebanon	30%	301	91	0
Lehigh	10%	899	86	36
Luzerne	21%	390	81	318
Lycoming	29%	297	86	74
McKean	27%	52	14	91
Mercer	19%	163	31	0
Mifflin	36%	53	19	19
Monroe	9%	245	22	0
Montgomery	21%	1,042	223	117
Montour	19%	26	5	2
Northampton	16%	566	92	13

Table 1: County and Statewide Recidivism Rates for Juveniles with 2007 Case Closures (Continued)

County	Recidivism Rate ^x	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists	Number of Expunged Cases ^{xx}
Northumberland	22%	184	40	53
Perry	21%	63	13	3
Philadelphia	29%	2,098	598	306
Pike	12%	86	10	0
Potter	15%	27	4	0
Schuylkill	13%	301	39	2
Snyder	27%	63	17	2
Somerset	9%	143	13	5
Sullivan	0%	6	0	0
Susquehanna	23%	57	13	0
Tioga	24%	66	16	8
Union	29%	38	11	10
Venango	9%	47	4	18
Warren	15%	73	11	1
Washington	25%	351	87	4
Wayne	20%	74	15	2
Westmoreland	13%	553	74	88
Wyoming	28%	68	19	1
York	24%	1,012	246	57
Total:	20%	18,882	3,827	3,250

^x Recidivism is defined as: A subsequent adjudication of delinquency or conviction in criminal court for a misdemeanor or felony offense within two years of case closure. Expunged cases are not included in these figures.

^{xx} This figure represents cases closed in 2007 and subsequently expunged. One juvenile may have had multiple cases expunged.


N/A**: The number of expunged cases in Delaware County is unavailable.

Baseline Recidivism Rates

During the year 2007 in Pennsylvania, 18,882 youth who had been under the supervision of a county juvenile probation department had their case closed. Ultimately, within two years of that case closure, 3,827 youth were subsequently adjudicated delinquent or convicted in criminal court for a new misdemeanor or felony offense. This equates to a 20% statewide recidivism rate. In the current study, these juveniles are referred to as *recidivists*. Conversely, 80% (N= 15,055) of juveniles whose case closed in 2007 did not re-offend by the study's definition. These youth are referred to as *non-recidivists*. Locally, recidivism rates ranged anywhere from 0% (in Sullivan and Clinton Counties) to 45% (Clarion County). Table 1 above presents each of Pennsylvania's sixty-seven counties' recidivism rates, along with the number of cases closed in 2007 in the respective jurisdiction, the number of recidivists by the study's definition, and the number of expunged cases in each county.


Proportion of Recidivists to Non-Recidivists

The figure below (Figure 1) depicts the proportion of recidivists (20%) to non-recidivists (80%).




Court of First Recidivating Case

Slightly more than half (54%; N= 2,058) of recidivists re-offended first in criminal court. The remaining 46% (N= 1,769) re-offended first in juvenile court (See Figure 2).




Length of Time to Recidivism¹⁰

The average length of time to recidivism was 11.5 months, while the median length of time to recidivism was 11 months. As illustrated by Figure 3, 27% (N= 1,037) of recidivists re-offended within the first six months, 29% (N= 1,117) re-offended between months seven and twelve, an additional 25% (N= 949) recidivated within thirteen to eighteen months, and the remaining 19% (N= 724) re-offended between months nineteen and twenty-three.



¹⁰ Length of time to recidivism was calculated from the 2007 close date to the date of the delinquency adjudication or finding of guilt in criminal court for the recidivating case.

Figure 4 presents the data in a slightly different format. As shown below, approximately 25% (N= 1,037) of recidivists re-offended within 6 months of their case closure. In addition, 50% (N= 2,154) of juveniles recidivated within 12 months of their case closure, and 75% (N= 3,103) recidivated within 18 months of their case closure.



Span of Time¹¹ between First Written Allegation and 2007 Case Closure¹²

For all youth with a 2007 case closure, the average span of time between the juveniles' first written allegations and their 2007 case closure (i.e., span of involvement with the juvenile justice system), calculated from the date of the juveniles' first written allegations in their juvenile offending histories to the date of the juveniles' 2007 case closures, was 24 months. The median span of time was 16 months.

As shown in Table 2, recidivists had been involved with the juvenile justice system for longer periods of time than non-recidivists. In fact, recidivists were involved with the juvenile justice system, on average, nine months longer than non-recidivists. In addition, the median span of involvement for recidivists was almost double that of non-recidivists (25 months versus 14 months, respectively).

Table 2: Span of Time Involved with the Juvenile Justice System*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure		
	Average Span of Time (in months)	Median Span of Time (in months)
Recidivists	32	25
Non-Recidivists	23	14

*The span of time involved with the juvenile justice system was unknown for 685 juveniles with a 2007 case closure.

Rate of Delinquency Adjudication

Among the entire population of juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 8,678 juveniles (46%) had at least one delinquency adjudication in their juvenile offending history prior to their 2007 case closure. Conversely, 10,194 juveniles with a 2007 case closure were never adjudicated delinquent. As illustrated in Table 3, recidivists had a significantly higher rate of adjudication than non-recidivists (59% vs. 43%).

Table 3: Rate of Delinquency Adjudication: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Total Number of Juveniles with a History of Adjudication	Total Number of Juveniles with 2007 Case Closure	Adjudication Rate
Recidivists	2,238	3,825	59%
Non-Recidivists	6,440	15,047	43%
Total	8,678	18,872	46%

¹¹ Span of involvement with the juvenile justice system is calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation in his or her juvenile offending history to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure. Periods of time in which the youth was NOT active with the juvenile justice system between those two dates are included in these figures as well.

¹² Except where noted, the preceding figures do not include Cameron County (N= 10).

Written Allegation History¹³

The 18,872 juveniles who had a case closure in 2007 had a combined total of 38,352 written allegations in the history of their juvenile offending careers. This equates to an average of 2 written allegations per juvenile. The number of previous written allegations for the entire sample of juveniles with a 2007 case closure ranged from 1 to 21.

As illustrated by Table 4, recidivists had more written allegations in the history of their offending careers, on average, than did non-recidivists (3 versus 2, respectively). The number of previous written allegations for recidivists and non-recidivists, however, ranged from 1 to 21 for both groups.

Table 4: Written Allegation History for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
	Total Number of Juveniles	Total Number of Written Allegations	Average Number of Written Allegations per Juvenile	Range
Recidivists	3,825	10,418	3	1 - 21
Non-Recidivists	15,047	27,934	2	1 - 21

Number of Written Allegations and Recidivism Rates

Of the 18,872 juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 10,389 had only one written allegation (for their 2007 case closed) in the history of their juvenile offending careers. Only 13% of these first time offenders re-offended. A total of 3,987 juveniles had two written allegations in the history of their juvenile offending careers; one in four (N= 3,048) of these offenders recidivated. Furthermore, 526 of the 1,888 juveniles (28%) who had three written allegations in their juvenile offending history recidivated. Finally, those juveniles who had four or more written allegations (N= 964) re-offended at a rate of 37%. Please refer to Table 5.

Table 5: Number of Written Allegations and Recidivism Rates				
	One Written Allegation	Two Written Allegations	Three Written Allegations	Four or More Written Allegations
Recidivists	1,396	939	526	964
Non-Recidivists	8,993	3,048	1,362	1,644
Total	10,389	3,987	1,888	2,608
Recidivism Rate	13%	24%	28%	37%

¹³ The figures presented include all written allegations that occurred in the juveniles' offending histories up to the date of the 2007 case closure.

Executive Summary: Demographic Variables

- Recidivists were, on average, one year younger than non-recidivists at the time of their first written allegation (14 years vs. 15 years, respectively) (page 29).
- The younger a juvenile was at the time of his or her **first written allegation**, the more likely he or she was to recidivate. Conversely, the older the juvenile was at the time of his or her **first written allegation**, the less likely he or she was to recidivate (page 29).
- Recidivists were, on average, one year younger than non-recidivists at the time of their first adjudication of delinquency (15 years vs. 16 years) (page 30).
- The average and median age at the time of case closure was 17 years for both recidivists and non-recidivists (page 31).
- The older the juvenile was at the time of **case closure**, the more likely he or she was to recidivate. Conversely, the younger the juvenile was at **case closure**, the less likely he or she was to recidivate (page 32).
- The average and median age of recidivists at the time of re-offense was 18 years (page 33).
- 90% of recidivists were males (page 34).
- Males were almost three times more likely than females to recidivate (page 35).
- Over 99% of recidivists were either Black or White (page 36).
- One in four Black offenders re-offended, while one in six White offenders recidivated. Only one in 12 Asian offenders were recidivists (page 37).
- 90% of recidivists were non-Hispanic. Only 10% of recidivists were Hispanic (page 38).
- Hispanic juveniles and non-Hispanic juveniles recidivated at similar rates (21% and 20%, respectively) (page 39).
- 80% of recidivists were from “disrupted” family situations (e.g., biological parents deceased, biological parents never married, or biological parents separated/divorced). Only 20% of recidivists’ biological parents were married (page 40).
- 44% of juveniles with both biological parents deceased recidivated. Only 15% of juveniles whose biological parents were married recidivated (page 41).

Demographic Variables

Age¹⁴ at First Written Allegation

Among all juveniles with a 2007 case closure, the average and median age at the time of their first written allegation was 15 years. As shown in Table 6, recidivists were slightly younger than non-recidivists at the time of their first written allegation (14 years versus 15 years).

Table 6: Age at First Written Allegation by Population* for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure		
	Average Age at First Written Allegation (in years)	Median Age at First Written Allegation (in years)
Recidivists	14	14
Non-Recidivists	15	15


*The age at first written allegation was unknown for 48 juveniles with a 2007 case closure.

In addition, the data illustrated that the younger the juvenile was at his/her first written allegation, the more likely he or she was to recidivate. For example, juveniles who were aged seven at the time of their first written allegation recidivated at a rate of 44%, those aged eight re-offended at a 26% rate, those aged nine re-offended at a 35% rate, and those aged ten recidivated at 30%. Conversely, juveniles aged sixteen at the time of their first written allegation recidivated at a rate of only 17%, juveniles aged seventeen recidivated at a rate of only 13%, and juveniles aged eighteen recidivated at a rate of only 15%. Please refer to Table 7 and Figure 5.

Table 7: Recidivism Rate by Age at First Written Allegation* for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
Age at First Written Allegation	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Seven	4	5	9	44%
Eight	6	17	23	26%
Nine	14	26	40	35%
Ten	123	288	411	30%
Eleven	206	547	753	27%
Twelve	381	1,068	1,449	26%
Thirteen	596	1,801	2,397	25%
Fourteen	727	2,606	3,333	22%
Fifteen	706	2,763	3,469	20%
Sixteen	561	2,770	3,331	17%
Seventeen	434	2,817	3,251	13%
Eighteen	52	306	358	15%

*The age at the first written allegation was unknown for 48 juveniles with a 2007 case closure.

¹⁴ The age at first written allegation was calculated from the juvenile's date of birth to the date of his/her first written allegations recorded in the PaJCMS.



Age¹⁵ at First Adjudication of Delinquency


For all juveniles with a 2007 case closure, the average and median age at the first adjudication of delinquency for youth who had been adjudicated at some point in their juvenile offending history was 16 years. The average and median age of recidivists at the time of their first adjudication of delinquency was 15 years, and the average and median age of non-recidivists was slightly older: 16 years (See Table 8).

Table 8: Age at First Adjudication for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure		
	Average Age at First Adjudication (in years)	Median Age at First Adjudication (in years)
Recidivists	15	15
Non-Recidivists	16	16


¹⁵ Age at first adjudication was calculated from the juvenile's date of birth to the date of his or her first adjudication recorded in the PaJCMS.

Age¹⁶ at 2007 Case Closure¹⁷

The average and median age of *recidivists* at the time of their 2007 case closure was 17 years. Approximately two-thirds (N= 2,693) were between the ages of 15 and 18 (See Figure 6).



Similarly, the average and median age of *non-recidivists* at the time of their 2007 case closure was 17 years. More than 75% (N= 11,177) were between the ages of 15 and 18 (See Figure 7).



¹⁶ Age at case closure was calculated from the juvenile's date of birth to his or her 2007 case closure date.


¹⁷ Data from Cameron County (N= 10) is included in these figures.

Recidivism Rate by Age¹⁸ at 2007 Case Closure

As illustrated by Table 9 and Figure 8, though juveniles who were aged nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one at the time of their 2007 case closure comprise a relatively small proportion of the overall recidivist population, juveniles in these age categories actually recidivated at the highest rate (26%, 24%, and 32%, respectively). Sixteen year-olds re-offended at a rate of 21%. Thirteen, fourteen, fifteen and eighteen year-olds recidivated at the next highest rate: 20% each. Seventeen year-olds re-offended at 18%, while twelve year-olds recidivated at a 15% rate. Ten and eleven year-olds recidivated at the lowest rate (6% and 7%, respectively).

Table 9: Recidivism Rate by Age at 2007 Case Closure


Age	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Recidivists	2	10	48	149	280	420	613	716	944	383	120	142
Non-Recidivists	33	129	264	600	1,087	1,717	2,327	3,277	3,853	1,090	372	306
Total	35	139	312	749	1,367	2,137	2,940	3,993	4,797	1,473	492	448
Recidivism Rate	6%	7%	15%	20%	20%	20%	21%	18%	20%	26%	24%	32%



¹⁸ Data from Cameron County (N= 10) is included in these figures.

Age¹⁹ at Time of Recidivism²⁰

The average and median age at the time of re-offense for juveniles with a 2007 case closure was eighteen years. More than half of recidivists (N= 2, 215) were between the ages of seventeen and nineteen when they re-offended. Only 2 juveniles were age eleven when they re-offended, 13 were age twelve, and 49 were age thirteen. In addition, 139 juveniles were age fourteen, 279 juveniles were age fifteen, and 435 were age sixteen when they recidivated. Finally, 416 youth were aged twenty at the time of recidivism, 192 youth were twenty-one, 86 were twenty-two, and one was twenty-three (See Figure 9).





¹⁹ Age at recidivism was calculated from the juvenile's date of birth to the date of the adjudication of delinquency or finding of guilt in criminal court for the recidivating case.

²⁰ Data from Cameron County (N= 10) is included in these figures.

Gender

The below figure (Figure 10) portrays the breakdown of the gender of recidivists only. As illustrated, males comprised 89% (N= 3,396) of the recidivist population, while females comprised a mere 11% of the recidivist population (N= 427).

Figure 11 presents the average breakdown by gender of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007.²¹ As illustrated, males comprised 76% of all dispositions in this time period, while females comprised 24% of all dispositions. This indicates that males accounted for a higher proportion of the recidivist population than would be expected given the total percentage of dispositions that occurred. Similarly, females accounted for a smaller proportion of the recidivist population than would be expected given the total percentage of dispositions that occurred.




* The gender of 2 recidivists was not reported in the PaJCMS.

²¹ Dispositional averages were drawn from years 2005, 2006, and 2007 because these were the years in which the majority of juveniles' cases from the study's sample were initiated.

The table and figure below (Table 10 and Figure 12) present the recidivism rates of males versus females for all juveniles with a 2007 case closure. As illustrated, males recidivated at a higher rate (almost three times more) than females.

Table 10: Recidivism Rate by Gender*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Male	Female	Total
Recidivists	3,396	427	3,823
Non-Recidivists	10,765	4,261	15,026
Total	14,161	4,688	18,849
Recidivism Rate	24%	9%	



*The gender of 2 recidivists and 21 non-recidivists was not reported in the PaJCMS.



Race

As shown in Figure 13, White juvenile offenders accounted for 61% (N= 2,302) of the recidivist population, while Black juveniles comprised 39% (N= 1,494) of the recidivist population. Juveniles who identified their race as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or Other accounted for less than 1% (N= 13) of the recidivist population.

Figure 14 presents the average breakdown by race of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007. On average, White juveniles accounted for 58% of all dispositions in this time period, Black juveniles accounted for 41% of all dispositions, Asian juveniles accounted for 1% of all dispositions, and juveniles who were Other races (including Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaska Native) accounted for less than 1% of all dispositions. Both White and Black offenders comprised the recidivist population at rates slightly higher than would be expected given the total percentage of dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007. Conversely, Asian offenders and Other offenders accounted for less of the recidivist population than would be expected.




* The race of 16 recidivists was not reported in the PaJCMS.

When examining the recidivism rates within each race category, however, the figures were slightly different. As shown in Table 11 and Figure 15, juveniles who identified themselves as an Other race re-offended at the highest rate (50%). In addition, one in four (25%; N= 1,494) Black offenders, 22% (N= 2) of Native American or Pacific Islander juveniles, and 18% (N= 2,302) of White juveniles re-offended. American Indian or Alaska Native and Asian juveniles recidivated at the lowest rates, 14% and 8%, respectively. The sample size of American Indian or Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and Other juveniles was very small, so their rates should be reviewed with such in mind.

Table 11: Recidivism Rate by Race*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure

	Other	Black	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	White	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Total
Recidivists	3	1,494	2	2,302	2	6	3,809
Non-Recidivists	3	4,548	7	10,243	12	77	14,890
Total	6	6,042	9	12,545	14	83	18,699
Recidivism Rate	50%	25%	22%	18%	14%	8%	



* The race of 173 juveniles was not reported in the PaJCMS.



Ethnicity

The majority of the recidivist population for juveniles with a 2007 case closure was Non-Hispanic (90%). Only one in ten recidivists was Hispanic (See Figure 16).

Figure 17 presents the average breakdown by ethnicity of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007. Non-Hispanic youth accounted for 90% of all dispositions within that period, while Hispanic youth accounted for 10%. This is the same exact breakdown of the recidivist population, indicating that non-Hispanic youth and Hispanic youth recidivated at rates that would be expected.




*The ethnicity of 45 recidivists was not reported in the PaJCMS.

In addition, the recidivism rates of Hispanics and Non-Hispanics were almost identical. Of the 1,757 Hispanic juveniles in the sample, 21% (N= 372) re-offended. Of the 16,517 non-Hispanics in the sample, 20% (N= 3,383) re-offended (See Table 12 and Figure 18).

Table 12: Recidivism Rate by Ethnicity*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Total
Recidivists	373	3,407	3,780
Non-Recidivists	1,401	13,368	14,769
Total	1,774	16,775	18,549
Recidivism Rate	21%	20%	

*The ethnicity of 323 juveniles was not reported in the PaJCMS.





Family Status

Below is an analysis of the relationship between juveniles' family statuses and recidivism. Family status captured the "status" of the *biological* parents of the juvenile. The following statistics were collected at the initiation of the case that ultimately closed in 2007, not at the time of the recidivating offense.

It was discovered that two out of five recidivists (N= 1,411) were from a family situation in which their parents were never married. In addition, 21% (N= 741) of juvenile recidivists' parents were divorced, while 20% (N= 688) of recidivists' parents were married. Seven percent (N= 228) of recidivists were from Other family situations, while 6% (N= 203) of recidivists' parents were separated, and 5% (N= 192) of recidivists had one parent was deceased. Only 1% (N= 19) of recidivists were from family situations in which both parents were deceased (See Figure 19).

Figure 20 presents the average breakdown by family status of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007. In general, the breakdown of the recidivist population was what would be expected given the total number of dispositions by family status for those years.




*The family status of 343 recidivists was not reported in the PaJCMS.

The recidivism rates for each family status, however, were much more glaring. For example, almost half (44%) of the juveniles with a 2007 case closure with both parents deceased recidivated within two years. Juveniles with one parent deceased, those with the family status of “other,” and those whose parents never married recidivated at a rate of 23% each. Juveniles with parents who were divorced or separated re-offended at a rate 20% and 18%, respectively. Perhaps unsurprisingly, juveniles with parents who were married recidivated at the lowest rate: 15% (See Table 13 and Figure 21).

Table 13: Recidivism Rate by Family Status*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure

	Both Parents Deceased	One Parent Deceased	Other	Parents Never Married	Divorced	Separated	Married	Total
Recidivists	19	192	228	1,411	741	203	688	3,482
Non-Recidivists	24	632	781	4,689	3,051	900	3,757	13,834
Total	43	824	1,009	6,100	3,792	1,103	4,445	17,316
Recidivism Rate	44%	23%	23%	23%	20%	18%	15%	

* The family status of 1,556 juveniles was not reported in the PaJCMS.



Executive Summary: Offense and Disposition Variables


- 32% of recidivists had committed Other offenses on their 2007 case that closed, 28% had committed Property offenses, 22% had committed Person offenses, and 18% had committed Drug offenses (page 43).
- Juveniles who had committed a Drug offense on their 2007 case that closed recidivated at a rate of 22%, Property offenders recidivated at a rate of 21%, 20% of Other offenders recidivated, and 19% of Person offenders recidivated (page 44).
- Drug offenders and Property offenders were most likely to commit the same types of crimes when they re-offended. Person offenders and Other offenders were less likely to commit the same types of crimes when they re-offended (page 45).
- 55% of recidivists had committed a misdemeanor offense on their 2007 case that closed. Approximately 26% of recidivists had committed a felony offense, and 19% had committed an ungraded or summary offense (page 46).
- 23% of juveniles who had committed a felony offense on their 2007 case that closed recidivated, 19% of juveniles who had committed a misdemeanor offense recidivated, and 19% of juveniles who had committed an ungraded or summary offense re-offended (page 47).
- The majority (70%) of juveniles committed a misdemeanor offense when they recidivated (page 48).
- Juveniles who had more formal dispositions on their 2007 case that closed (e.g., *placement* and *formal probation*) recidivated at higher rates than juveniles who had less formal dispositions on their 2007 case (e.g., *informal adjustment*, *consent decree*, and *warned, counseled, case closed*) (page 50).
- Juveniles who had been under supervision for the commission of a sex offense re-offended at a rate of 14%. Only 2% of sex offenders committed another sex offense within two years of their case closure (page 52).
- Juveniles who committed an indecent exposure recidivated at higher rates than any other sex offenders (page 52).

Offense²² and Disposition Variables

Recidivism Rates by Offense Type and Offense Grade of 2007 Case Closed

Offense Type of the 2007 Case Closed

As illustrated in Figure 22, for 32% (N= 1,242) of recidivists, the most serious substantiated offense of the 2007 case closed was an Other²³ type of offense. In addition, 28% (N= 1,052) of recidivists had committed Property offenses, while 24% (N= 848) had committed Person offenses. Only 18% of recidivists (N= 682) had committed Drug offenses.



* The type of offense committed was unknown for 2 recidivists.


²² Data in the following sections was based on the most serious *substantiated* offense, not the most serious *alleged* offense.

²³ The category of Other includes such offenses as nonpayment of fines, criminal coercion, indecent exposure, perjury, providing false statements to an officer, possession of a firearm by a minor, and city or local ordinance violations.

Recidivism rates within each type of offender category did not vary significantly. Drug offenders re-offended at a rate of 22% (N= 681), Property offenders recidivated at 21% (N= 1,052), Other offenders recidivated at 20% (N= 1,242), and Person offenders re-offended at 19% (N= 848) (See Table 14 and Figure 23).

Table 14: Recidivism Rate by Type of Offense Committed on 2007 Case Closed*				
	Drug	Property	Other	Person
Recidivists	681	1,052	1,242	848
Non-Recidivists	2,473	3,993	4,951	3,597
Total	3,154	5,045	6,193	4,445
Recidivism Rate	22%	21%	20%	19%

*The type of offense committed was unknown for 35 juveniles with a 2007 case closure.



Offense Type Specialization

The following analysis examined the degree of offense specialization that existed for juveniles with a 2007 case closure who recidivated. That is, the propensity for juveniles to commit the same type of offense (i.e., Person, Property, Drug, or Other) when they recidivated was analyzed.

The results indicated that some degree of specialization existed among juveniles with a 2007 case closure (Refer to Table 15). More specifically, Property offenders and Drug offenders appeared likely to return to the same type of crimes when they re-offended. To illustrate, 35% (N= 239) of Drug offenders committed another Drug offense when they re-offended, while 27% (N= 183) of Drug offenders committed Property offenses, 22% (N= 150) committed Person offenses, and 16% (N= 106) committed Other offenses. Furthermore, 31% (N= 323) of Property offenders committed another Property offense when they recidivated, though 33% (N= 348) committed Drug offenses. Twenty-one percent of Property offenders (N= 220) committed a Person offense when they recidivated, and 15% (N= 161) committed an Other offense.


It does not appear that those juveniles who committed Person or Other offenses had the propensity to commit the same type of offense when they recidivated. For example, as illustrated in Table 15, 34% (N= 284) of Person offenders committed a Drug offense when they recidivated, 27% (N= 232) committed a Property offense, and 14% (N= 117) committed an Other offense. Only 25% (N= 214) of Person offenders committed another Person offense. In addition, 31% (N= 389) of Other offenders committed a Property offense when they recidivated, 30% (N= 368) committed a Drug offense, and 23% (N= 283) committed a Person offense. Only 16% (N= 201) of Other offenders committed another Other offense when they re-offended.

Table 15: Recidivism Rates by Offense Type Specialization *				
Offense Type Committed on 2007 Case Closed	Offense Type of First Recidivating Case			
	Person	Property	Drug	Other
Person	25% (N= 214)	27% (N= 232)	34% (N= 284)	14% (N= 117)
Property	21% (N= 220)	31% (N= 323)	33% (N= 348)	15% (N= 161)
Drug	22% (N= 150)	27% (N= 183)	35% (N= 239)	16% (N= 106)
Other	23% (N= 283)	31% (N= 389)	30% (N= 368)	16% (N= 201)

*The offense type committed on either the 2007 case closed or the first recidivating case was unknown for 7 recidivists.

Grading of the 2007 Case Closed

As illustrated by Figure 24, the most serious substantiated offense committed on the 2007 case closed by the majority of recidivists was a misdemeanor (55%; N= 2,088). In addition, 26% (N= 989) of recidivists had committed a felony offense, while 19% (N= 702) had committed summary or ungraded offenses²⁴.




*The grade of the most serious substantiated offense of 46 recidivists was not reported in the PaJCMS.

²⁴ Ungraded and summary offenses include: failure to pay fines and costs, violations of probation, violations of a court order, and dependency referrals.

Juveniles who committed a felony offense, however, had the highest recidivism rate (23%; N= 989), while juveniles who committed a misdemeanor offense recidivated at a rate of 19% (N= 2, 088). Ungraded and summary offenders also recidivated at a rate of 19% (N= 702). Refer to Table 16 and Figure 25.

Table 16: Recidivism Rate by Grading of 2007 Case Closed*			
	Felony	Misdemeanor	Ungraded/Summary
Recidivists	989	2,088	702
Non-Recidivists	3,261	8,750	2,937
Total	4,250	10,838	3,639
Recidivism Rate	23%	19%	19%


* The grade of the most serious substantiated offense of 145 juveniles was not reported in the PaJCMS.





Change in Offense Severity

An analysis was also conducted to determine the change in offense severity from the grading of the most serious substantiated offense of the 2007 case closed (ungraded/summary, misdemeanor, and felony) to the most serious substantiated offense of the recidivating case (misdemeanor or felony).

In summary, it was discovered that regardless of the grading of the offense of the case that was closed in 2007, the majority (about 70%) of recidivists committed misdemeanor offenses when they re-offended. To illustrate, approximately 7 out of 10 (N= 487) recidivists who committed an ungraded or summary offense recidivated with a misdemeanor offense, while only 31% (N= 215) recidivated with a felony offense (See Figure 26).



In addition, 71% (N= 1,473) of misdemeanor offenders re-offended with a misdemeanor offense (remained the same in offense severity) and 29% (N= 611) re-offended with a felony offense (increased in offense severity) (See Figure 27). Finally, as illustrated by Figure 28, 68% (N= 672) of felony offenders recidivated with a misdemeanor offense (decreased in offense severity), while only 32% (N= 312) committed another felony offense (remained the same in offense severity). The change in offense severity was unknown for 55 recidivists.



Recidivism Rate by Final (Most Recent) Disposition on 2007 Case²⁵

As illustrated by Table 17, juveniles who had a final disposition of *placement* had the highest recidivism rates (31%). In addition, one in four youth who had a final disposition of either *deferred adjudication* or *other* recidivated. Twenty-two percent of youth with a final disposition of *probation* re-offended, followed by 21% of youth with a final disposition of *protective supervision, dependent*. Twenty percent of juveniles with a final disposition of *finest and costs ordered* recidivated, while 19% of juveniles with a final disposition of *referred to another agency, individual* re-offended. Furthermore, youth with a final disposition of *warned, counseled, case closed* had an 18% recidivism rate. Finally, juveniles with final dispositions of *consent decree* and *informal adjustment* recidivated at the lowest rate of 16% each.

Table 17: Recidivism Rate by Final (Most Recent) Disposition on 2007 Case*				
Disposition**	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Placement	604	1,375	1,979	31%
Deferred Adjudication	229	638	867	26%
Other	96	309	405	24%
Probation	1,039	3,743	4,782	22%
Protective Supervision, Dependent	22	84	106	21%
Fines and Costs Ordered	308	1,226	1,534	20%
Referred to Another Agency, Individual	34	142	176	19%
Warned, Counseled, Case Closed	171	770	941	18%
Consent Decree	725	3,681	4,406	16%
Informal Adjustment	585	3,055	3,640	16%

* Due to data migration, the final (most recent) disposition was unknown for 14 recidivists and 32 non-recidivists.

²⁵ Data from Cameron County (N= 10) is included in these figures.

**Note: When examining the variable of most recent disposition, the last disposition before the 2007 case closure was used. In some instances, the most recent disposition before the 2007 case closure was listed as *change of placement* or *continuation of placement*. These dispositions were changed to *placement*. In the instances when the most recent disposition before the 2007 case closure was listed as *continuance of previous disposition*, the PaJCMS was queried to determine what the previous valid disposition was, and that valid disposition was used in the study. Due to data migration, however, some of the previous dispositions were unknown.

In addition, in some counties when a juvenile was in placement and subsequently received aftercare services from a probation department, a disposition of *probation* was entered in the PaJCMS following the *placement* disposition. Since the final disposition in the PaJCMS was *probation*, this was the disposition used in the study, not *placement*. A total of 697 non-recidivists and 403 recidivists had a disposition of *placement* on their 2007 case, though the final disposition listed in the PaJCMS for these juveniles was *probation*. If these 1,100 juveniles were included in the *placement* disposition category, *placement* recidivism rates would increase from 31% to 33%.

Sex Offender Recidivism Analysis

Overall Recidivism Rate of Sex Offenders


In 2007, 451 juveniles under supervision for committing a sex offense²⁶ had their case closed from a juvenile probation department in Pennsylvania. Ultimately, 62 of those juveniles re-offended within two years of that case closing. This equates to a 14% recidivism rate. Depending on the type of sex offense committed, however, recidivism rates ranged from 0% (statutory sexual assault) to 30% (indecent exposure) (See Table 18 and Figure 29). Only 7 juveniles, or 2% of all sex offenders with a 2007 case closure, committed another sex offense within two years of release.²⁷

Table 18: Recidivism Rate by Sex Offense Type Committed on 2007 Case Closed			
Sex Offense	Number of Recidivists	Number of Sex Offenders with Case Closed in 2007	Recidivism Rate
Indecent Exposure	11	37	30%
Sexual Assault	3	14	21%
Rape	10	59	17%
Indecent Assault	26	217	12%
IDSi	9	87	10%
Aggravated Indecent Assault	3	31	10%
Statutory Sexual Assault	0	6	0%
Total	62	451	14%

²⁶ Sex offenses include the following: rape, statutory sexual assault, involuntary deviate sexual intercourse (IDSi), sexual assault, aggravated indecent assault, indecent assault, and indecent exposure.

²⁷ Only the **first** recidivating case was included in this analysis. For example, if a sex offender committed a burglary 6 months after his 2007 case closure, then committed a rape one year later, the burglary was used in the study as it was the first recidivating case. The first recidivating case of 7 sex offenders involved a subsequent sex offense. An additional 2 juveniles committed a sex offense **after** their first recidivating case, bringing the total number of sex offenders who committed a subsequent sex offense within two years of case closure to 9. The recidivism rate for committing subsequent sex offenses with these two additional juveniles included is still 2%.

**Figure 29: Recidivism Rate by Sex Offense* Type
Committed on 2007 Case Closed**



*See Table 18 for Ns of each sex offense group.

Recidivism Rates and Re-Offending Charge by Sex Offense Type

The following is an analysis of recidivism rates by each sex offense type: rape, statutory sexual assault, IDSI, sexual assault, aggravated indecent assault, indecent assault, and indecent exposure. Additionally, the most serious substantiated offense of the recidivating case is presented. Offenses in bold type and with an asterisk (*) denote subsequent sex offenses.

Rape

A total of 59 juveniles with a 2007 case closure had committed rape. Ten of these juveniles committed another offense (See Table 19).

Table 19: Rape Recidivism Rate for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Recidivists	10
Non-Recidivists	49
Total	59
Recidivism Rate	17%

As illustrated by Table 20, of the ten recidivists, one committed another sex offense.

Table 20: Most Serious Substantiated Offense of Recidivating Case for Juveniles who had Committed Rape on 2007 Case Closed	
Offense	Number of Recidivists
Corruption of Minors	1
Criminal Trespass	1
Disorderly Conduct	1
Involuntary Deviate Sexual Intercourse (IDSI)*	1
Possession with Intent to Deliver	1
Simple Assault	3
Theft	2
Total	10

Statutory Sexual Assault

As shown in Table 21 below, 6 juveniles who had been charged with a statutory sexual assault had a case closed in 2007. None of these juveniles re-offended.

Table 21: Statutory Sexual Assault Recidivism Rate for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Recidivists	0
Non-Recidivists	6
Total	6
Recidivism Rate	0%

Involuntary Deviate Sexual Intercourse (IDSI)

In 2007, there were 87 juveniles with a case closure that had committed an involuntary deviate sexual intercourse (IDSI). Nine of these juveniles (10%) committed another offense within two years of their case closure (see Table 22).

Table 22: IDSI Recidivism Rate for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Recidivists	9
Non-Recidivists	78
Total	87
Recidivism Rate	10%

Of these nine recidivists, one committed another sex offense (See Table 23).

Table 23: Most Serious Substantiated Offense of Recidivating Case for Juveniles who had Committed IDSI on 2007 Case Closed	
Offense	Number of Recidivists
Aggravated Indecent Assault*	1
Burglary	1
Possession of a Controlled Substance	1
Criminal Trespass	1
Forgery	1
Possession of Marijuana	1
Simple Assault	2
Theft	1
Total	9

Sexual Assault

As illustrated by Table 24, 14 juveniles who had committed a sexual assault had their case closed in 2007.

Table 24: Sexual Assault Recidivism Rate for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Recidivists	3
Non-Recidivists	11
Total	14
Recidivism Rate	21%

Only three (21%) of those individuals recidivated. None of those juveniles, however, committed another sex offense (See Table 25).

Table 25: Most Serious Substantiated Offense of Recidivating Case for Juveniles who had Committed a Sexual Assault on 2007 Case Closed	
Offense	Number of Recidivists
Disorderly Conduct	1
Firearms without License	1
Possession of a Controlled Substance	1
Total	3

Aggravated Indecent Assault

Of the 31 juveniles with a 2007 case closure that committed an aggravated indecent assault, only 3 (10%) re-offended (Refer to Table 26).

Table 26: Aggravated Indecent Assault Recidivism Rate for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Recidivists	3
Non-Recidivists	28
Total	31
Recidivism Rate	10%

One of those three recidivists, however, committed another sex offense (See Table 27).

Table 27: Most Serious Substantiated Offense of Recidivating Case for Juveniles who had Committed an Aggravated Indecent Assault on 2007 Case Closed	
Offense	Number of Recidivists
Accidents Involving Damage	1
Rape of Child*	1
Use or Possession of Drug Paraphernalia	1
Total	3

Indecent Assault

A total of 217 juveniles with a 2007 case closure had committed an indecent assault. As illustrated in Table 28, 26 (12%) of those juveniles recidivated.

Table 28: Indecent Assault Recidivism Rate for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Recidivists	26
Non-Recidivists	191
Total	217
Recidivism Rate	12%

None of those juveniles, however, committed another sex offense (See Table 29).

Table 29: Most Serious Substantiated Offense of Recidivating Case for Juveniles who had Committed an Indecent Assault on 2007 Case Closed	
Offense	Number of Recidivists
Aggravated Assault	1
Driving Under the Influence (DUI)	1
Endangering the Welfare Of Children	1
Escape	1
Firearms Carried without a License	1
Harassment	1
Possession of a Controlled Substance	2
Possession of Drug Paraphernalia	1
Possession of Marijuana	1
Possession with Intent to Deliver	1
Receiving Stolen Property	1
Robbery	1
Simple Assault	3
Terroristic Threats	1
Theft	4
Threat to Use Weapons of Mass Destruction	1
Unauthorized Use of a Motor Vehicle	1
Unknown	2
Unsworn Falsification To Authorities	1
Total	26

Indecent Exposure²⁸

The last sex offense analyzed was indecent exposure. Ironically, not only did this category of sex offenders recidivate at the highest rate (30%), this category also had the highest proportion of recidivists commit another sex offense (please refer to Tables 30 and 31).

Table 30: Indecent Exposure Recidivism Rate for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure	
Recidivists	11
Non-Recidivists	26
Total	37
Recidivism Rate	30%

Table 31: Most Serious Substantiated Offense of Recidivating Case for Juveniles who had Committed an Indecent Exposure on 2007 Case Closed	
Offense	Number of Recidivists
Burglary	1
Driving Under the Influence (DUI)	1
Indecent Assault*	2
Indecent Exposure*	1
Robbery	1
Simple Assault	1
Statutory Sexual Assault*	1
Theft	2
Use or Possession of Drug Paraphernalia	1
Total	11


²⁸ Of the 37 juveniles whose most serious, **substantiated** offense was Indecent Exposure, the most serious **alleged** offense for 31 of these juveniles was also Indecent Exposure. The most serious alleged offense for the remaining 6 juveniles was as follows: IDSI (two juveniles), Aggravated Indecent Assault, Indecent Assault, Escape, and Possession of Obscene Materials. All six of these juveniles were non-recidivists.

Sex Offenders who Committed a Subsequent Sex Offense

The following table (Table 32) depicts the proportion of all juvenile sex offenders (categorized by the most serious substantiated sex offense of the 2007 case closure) who committed another sex offense within two years of their case closure. As previously mentioned, only 7 juveniles, or 2% of all sex offenders with a 2007 case closure (N= 451), committed another sex offense upon release. As illustrated, those juveniles who had a charge of indecent exposure were most likely to commit another sex offense, while juveniles who had committed a statutory sexual assault, sexual assault, or indecent assault did not commit another sex offense (See also Figure 30).

Table 32: Subsequent Sex Offenders by Sex Offense Type on 2007 Case Closed			
Sex Offense Type	Number of Juveniles Who Committed Sex Offense on 2007 Case	Number of Juveniles Who Committed a Subsequent Sex Offense	Recidivism Rate
Indecent Exposure	37	4	11%
Aggravated Indecent Assault	31	1	3%
Rape	59	1	2%
IDSI	87	1	1%
Indecent Assault	217	0	0%
Sexual Assault	14	0	0%
Statutory Assault	6	0	0%
Total	451	7	2%

Figure 30: Subsequent Sex Offenders* by Sex Offense Type on 2007 Case Closed



*See Table 32 for Ns of subsequent sex offender groups.

Executive Summary: Program and Out-of-Home Service Variables

- Recidivists were more than 1.5 times likely to have an out-of-home experience (e.g., detention/shelter, placement) than non-recidivists (52% vs. 32%, respectively) (page 63).
- Only 15% of juveniles who had NO out-of-home experience recidivated, while 30% of juveniles who at least one out-of-home experience recidivated (page 63).
- 26% of youth who ever had an experience at a detention/shelter facility ONLY recidivated, while 28% of juveniles who ever had an experience at a placement facility ONLY re-offended. Those youth who had experiences at detention/shelter facilities AND placement facilities recidivated at a rate of 34% (page 64).
- Both recidivists and non-recidivists averaged three out-of-home episodes each (page 64).
- Among those juveniles who had at least one out-of-home episode, 59% had experienced only one service type (e.g., detention/shelter only, placement only) in their juvenile offending career. The remaining 41% had experienced a detention/shelter experience AND a placement experience (page 64).
- On average, juveniles spent 73 days receiving out-of-home services. Recidivists and non-recidivists did not differ significantly in the length of time spent receiving such services (76 days vs. 72 days, respectively) (page 65).
- The average recidivism rate for juveniles who had a placement experience at a private sector placement facility was 34% (page 65).
- The average recidivism rate for juveniles who had a placement experience at a Youth Development Center/Youth Forestry Camp operated by the Department of Public Welfare was 40% (page 69).

Program and Out-of-Home Service Variables

Below is an analysis of juveniles with a 2007 case closure who ever received an out-of-home service (detention/shelter or placement²⁹) at any point in their history of involvement with the Pennsylvania juvenile justice system. To complete this analysis, the case histories of all juveniles with a 2007 case closure in the study's sample were examined to determine if any records of *ever* receiving an out-of-home service existed. All out-of-home service episodes were included in the analysis, regardless of the year(s) the episode occurred. For example, if John was released from Glen Mills in 2005, but his case did not close until 2007, he was tracked from 2007 until 2009 (not 2005 to 2007) to determine if he re-offended. **This means that the juveniles were tracked two years beyond their 2007 case closure to determine if they were a recidivist, NOT two years beyond their service end date.** In addition, if a juvenile received multiple out-of-home services over the history of his/her involvement with the juvenile justice system leading up to the 2007 case closure, all out-of-home services were included in the analysis. For example, if Carl received out-of-home services from George Junior in 2002 and Abraxas in 2004, and Carl recidivated within two years of his 2007 case closure, he was counted as a recidivist for **both** George Junior and Abraxas.

Overall Rate of Receiving Out-of-Home Services

As shown in Table 33, 36% (N= 6,744) of all juveniles with a 2007 case closure had at least one out-of-home experience. Furthermore, approximately 52% (N= 2,004) of recidivists experienced at least one out-of-home service episode, while only 32% (N= 4,740) of non-recidivists had such an experience.

In addition, of the 6,744 juveniles who did experience at least one out-of-home episode, 30% (N= 2,004) re-offended within two years of their 2007 case closure, twice the rate of juveniles who had no out-of-home service experience (15%).

Table 33: Overall Rate of Receiving Out-of-Home Services for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure

	No Out-of-Home Service	Out-of-Home Service	Total	Rate of Receiving Services
Recidivists	1,821	2,004	3,825	52%
Non-Recidivists	10,307	4,740	15,047	32%
Total	12,128	6,744	18,872	36%
Recidivism Rates	15%	30%		

²⁹ Out-of-home experiences are categorized into one of two groups: 1.) detention/shelter and 2.) placement. The former group indicates experiences at temporary holding facilities, while the latter indicates experiences at programs utilized as a juvenile court disposition.

Overall Recidivism Rate by Out-of-Home Service Type

As displayed in Table 34, only 15% (N= 1,821) of juveniles who had no out-of-home service episodes recidivated. Youth who had an experience in a detention or shelter facility only recidivated at a rate of 26% (N= 760), while juveniles who had an experience in a placement facility only re-offended at a rate of 28% (N= 305). Juveniles who had an experience at a detention/shelter facility AND a placement facility recidivated at the highest rate: 34%.

Table 34: Recidivism Rates by Out-of-Home Service Type For Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
	No Out-of-Home Service	Detention/Shelter Only	Placement Only	Detention/Shelter + Placement
Recidivists	1,821	760	305	939
Non- Recidivists	10,307	2,177	770	1,793
Total	12,128	2,937	1,075	2,732
Recidivism Rate	15%	26%	28%	34%

Average Number of Out-of-Home Service Episodes

Among the 6,744 juveniles with a 2007 case closure who had at least one out-of-home experience, the average number of out-of-home episodes was 3. The number of out-of-home episodes per juvenile ranged from 0 episodes to 48 episodes. Recidivists averaged 3 out-of-home episodes each, ranging anywhere between 0 and 42 episodes each, while non-recidivists also averaged 3 out-of-home episodes each, ranging anywhere between 0 and 48 episodes each.

Combination of Out-of-Home Service Experiences

Among the 6,744 juveniles with an out-of-home episode, 4,012 (59%) had experienced only one service type (e.g., detention/shelter only, placement only) in their juvenile offending career. An additional 41% (N= 2,732) had experienced a detention/shelter experience AND a placement experience.

Average Length of Time (in days) Spent Receiving Out-of-Home Services

The results indicated that length of time spent receiving out-of-home services did not significantly impact recidivism rates. On average, all juveniles with a 2007 case closure who had at least one out-of-home service episode spent 73 days out of the home. Recidivists spent, on average, 76 days receiving out-of-home services, while non-recidivists spent, on average, 72 days. Please refer to Table 35.

In addition, when examining the length of time spent receiving out-of-home services by service type (i.e., detention/shelter, placement), only minor differences were detected (see Table 35). To illustrate, recidivists spent an average of 19 days in detention/shelter facilities, while non-recidivists spent, on average, 15 days in detention/shelter facilities. Conversely, non-recidivists spent slightly more time than recidivists at placement facilities (182 days vs. 178 days, respectively).

Table 35: Average Length of Time (in days) Spent Receiving Out-of-Home Services for Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure*

Service Type	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Both Populations
Detention/Shelter	19	15	16
Placement	178	182	181
Overall Average	76	72	73

*The average length of time spent receiving out-of-home services was unknown for 233 juveniles. This is the result of either the service start date or the service end date for the out-of-home episode being missing from the PaJCMS.

Recidivism Rate by Placement Facility

The following table (Table 36) presents the recidivism rate for each placement facility included in the analysis. The average recidivism rate for juveniles who had ever been placed at a private placement facility was 34%. As was mentioned previously, a juvenile was counted as a recidivist/non-recidivist for every facility that he or she had a placement experience, regardless of when the placement occurred. Because of the effects of small sample sizes, rates for facilities that had less than 10 juveniles from the sample of cases closed in 2007 placed there are grouped together in the Other category. A total of 141 facilities in the analysis had less than 10 juveniles placed there and are combined in this category. To review the rates of these 141 facilities, please refer to Appendix C.

Recidivism rates for publicly-run placement facilities (i.e., Youth Development Centers and Youth Forestry Camps) are provided in the next section.

To view the individual recidivism rates of the different detention/shelter facilities included in the analysis, please refer to Appendix E.

Cautionary Note Regarding Placement Facility Recidivism Rates

The reader is cautioned to not rely solely on recidivism rates to evaluate the quality of the services provided by the agencies or programs listed. There are a variety of factors that contribute to recidivism both during placement and during post-placement supervision. In addition, there were no risk assessment instruments being utilized in Pennsylvania prior to 2009 to determine the risk levels of youth who were placed at each facility. Finally, as detailed previously (please see page 19), juveniles with a 2007 case expungement were not included in these figures.

**Table 36: Private Provider Placement Facilities' Recidivism Rates:
Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure**

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Abraxas Foundation	188	285	473	40%
Act I	12	25	37	32%
Act II	25	26	51	49%
Adelphoi Village	48	121	169	28%
Allegheny CISP	46	127	173	27%
Allegheny Day/Evening Treatment Program	92	256	348	26%
Alternative Rehabilitation Communities	42	67	109	39%
Appalachian Youth Services	0	13	13	0%
Auberle Home (Boys)	23	36	59	39%
Beacon Light Behavioral System	5	11	16	31%
Bethany Children's Home (Reed Cottage)	3	7	10	30%
Bethesda Children's Home	8	16	24	33%
Bowling Brook	27	25	52	52%
Bradley Center	1	11	12	8%
Children's Aid Society	6	9	15	40%
Children's Home Of Reading	5	15	20	25%
CICTP (Perseus House Program-Erie)	27	46	73	37%
Circle C Group Home	3	9	12	25%
Clearbrook Lodge	25	48	73	34%
Clearvision Female Residential Program	4	13	17	24%
Community Service Foundation	38	79	117	32%
Concern	25	32	57	44%
Concern Treatment Unit For Boys	4	6	10	40%
Deveraux Foundation	6	19	25	24%
Diakon	5	13	18	28%
Diversified Treatment Alternative	7	8	15	47%
DPW	11	20	31	35%
Family Care Service, Inc.	2	9	11	18%
Gannondale	1	26	27	4%

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Gateway Rehab Center	11	23	34	32%
Gaudenzia House (Chambers Hill)	7	6	13	54%
George Jr. Republic	100	161	261	38%
Glen Mills Schools	115	166	281	41%
Harborcreek School For Boys	29	57	86	34%
Hermitage House	9	25	34	26%
Hoffman Home For Youth	2	8	10	20%
Impact Project	8	14	22	36%
Issachar House	3	10	13	23%
Kendu Aftercare	8	11	19	42%
Keystone Adolescent	19	26	45	42%
Kid's Peace	3	26	29	10%
Laurel Youth Services	9	24	33	27%
Lourdesmont Good Sheppard Adolescent Services	1	9	10	10%
Luzerne County Residential Child Care- Secure	6	14	20	30%
Madalyn at Lady Of The Lakes – Chester County	2	11	13	15%
Manos	32	39	71	45%
Mars Home For Youth	1	18	19	5%
Mid-Atlantic Youth Services/West PA Child Care	3	13	16	19%
Middle Earth Inc.	2	9	11	18%
New Life Youth Services	17	17	34	50%
Northampton County Juvenile Justice Center	9	29	38	24%
Northwestern	147	205	352	42%
Other**	123	274	397	31%
Outside/In Program	21	19	40	53%
Paradise School	11	16	27	41%
Pathways Adolescent Center	9	11	20	45%
Pennsylvania Clinical Schools	6	9	15	40%
Perseus House	14	30	44	32%
Pressley Ridge School	10	29	39	26%
Priorities Responsibility Enhancement Program	21	31	52	40%
Pyramid Healthcare	16	33	49	33%
Pyramid Ridgeview Treatment Center	6	8	14	43%
Renewal Centers	3	9	12	25%

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Safeguards Foster Care Program	2	8	10	20%
Specialized Treatment Services	8	5	13	62%
St. Gabriel's Hall System	20	31	51	39%
St. Michael's School For Boys	10	21	31	32%
Still Meadow School	5	5	10	50%
Strive	5	8	13	38%
Summit Academy	58	105	163	36%
SummitQuest	6	4	10	60%
Susquehanna House	15	10	25	60%
The Bridge	3	10	13	23%
There's Room At The Inn	7	7	14	50%
Today, Inc.	36	53	89	40%
Tressler Lutheran Services Associates, Inc.	21	46	67	31%
Vision Quest, Inc.	172	330	502	34%
White Deer Run	8	11	19	42%
Youth Services, Inc.	134	289	423	32%

**To view each of the 141 placement facilities with less than 10 juveniles placed there, please refer to Appendix C.

Recidivism Rates of Youth Development Center (YDCs) / Youth Forestry Camps (YFCs)

Separate analyses were conducted to examine the outcomes of youth whose cases were closed in 2007 and who had ever been placed at a publically-run Youth Development Center (YDC) or Youth Forestry Camp (YFC) in Pennsylvania.

Again, like in the previous section, a juvenile was counted as a recidivist/non-recidivist for every YDC/YFC facility that he or she had a placement experience, regardless of when the placement occurred. Because of the effects of small sample sizes, rates for facilities that had less than 10 juveniles from the sample of cases closed in 2007 placed there are grouped together in the Other category. A total of 5 facilities in the analysis had less than juveniles 10 juveniles placed there and are combined in this category. To review the rates of these 5 facilities, please refer to Appendix D.

In all, 467 juveniles with a 2007 case closure had at least one experience at a YDC or YFC. Of those juveniles, 188 recidivated, equating in a 40% recidivism rate. The individual YDC and YFC facilities and their respective recidivism rates are provided below (Table 37).

****Please refer to page 66 for a cautionary note regarding placement facility recidivism rates****

Table 37: Youth Development Center/Youth Forestry Camp (YDC/YFC) Placement Facilities' Recidivism Rates: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Cresson Secure	15	17	32	47%
Danville Center For Adolescent Females	2	9	11	18%
New Castle	17	26	43	40%
North Central Secure At Danville	11	27	38	29%
Other**	11	7	18	61%
South Mountain Secure Treatment Unit	6	12	18	33%
Torrance	7	6	13	54%
YDC Loysville	56	62	118	47%
YDC New Castle	24	36	60	40%
YFC #2 (Hickory Run)	36	50	86	42%
YFC #3 (Trough Creek)	39	57	96	41%
Total³⁰	224	309	533	42%

**To view each of the 5 placement facilities with less than 10 juveniles placed there, please refer to Appendix D.

³⁰ Some juveniles are counted multiple times in these figures if they had placement experiences at more than one YDC/YFC.

Executive Summary: County Class Size

- Class 1 county (Philadelphia County) had the highest recidivism rate: 29% (page 71), followed by Class 7 counties, with an average recidivism rate of 26% (page 75).
- Class 8 counties had the lowest recidivism rate: 15% (page 75).

County Class Size

Recidivism Rate by County Class Size

Cautionary Note Regarding Expunged Cases

It is critically important to note that expunged cases create a significant limitation to this study. In Pennsylvania, when a case is expunged, all of a juvenile’s identifying information pertaining to that case is “erased” and is therefore not available for analysis. Consequently, juveniles with a 2007 case expungement were omitted from the study’s sample, unless they had a separate case closed in 2007 that was not expunged.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine how a particular county’s recidivism rate was affected by the number of expungements for a variety of reasons, including that the unit of measurement for the recidivism study was a *juvenile*, while the unit of measurement for an expungement was a *case* (one juvenile may have had several cases from 2007 expunged).

Arguably, juveniles whose cases are expunged are presumed to be individuals who are considered to be at lower risk to recidivate (i.e., first-time, relatively minor offenders). However, since no risk assessment instruments (e.g., the Youth Level of Service) were being utilized in Pennsylvania prior to 2009, there is no way to determine the actual risk levels of juveniles with a 2007 case closure. In general, counties that expunged significant numbers of cases had higher recidivism rates than their counterparts. A possible explanation for this result is that a significant number of lower risk youth were removed from the research sample in these jurisdictions.

Moreover, these recidivism rates do not take into account the specific treatment and services that were provided to juveniles while under supervision. Readers are cautioned, therefore, to make no comparisons between counties due to varying juvenile court policies and practices, including those relating to expungement. Rather, it is our goal to measure whether recidivism rates within each county decline as evidence-based practices are implemented.

In this section, Pennsylvania’s 67 counties were broken down by class size in order to 1.) analyze the recidivism rates of similar sized counties, and 2.) determine if recidivism rates varied between class sizes. Pennsylvania’s 67 counties are broken down into 9 different classes (1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) based on population sizes, with Class 1 (i.e., Philadelphia County) being the largest class and Class 8 being the smallest class.

Philadelphia County is the only county in Class 1. Philadelphia’s recidivism rate for juveniles with a 2007 case closure was 29%, the highest rate of any class size (Refer to Table 38).

County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Philadelphia	29%	2,098	598	306
Total	29%	2,098	598	306

Similar to Philadelphia County, Allegheny County is the only county in Class 2. As shown in Table 39, Allegheny County's recidivism rate was 16%.

Table 39: Class 2 County				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Allegheny	16%	1,603	257	181
Total	16%	1,603	257	181

Table 40 presents the recidivism rates of Class 2A counties. The average recidivism rate for Class 2A counties was 21%.

Table 40: Class 2A Counties				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Bucks	20%	852	167	154
Delaware	22%	298	67	N/A**
Montgomery	21%	1,042	223	117
Total	21%	2,192	457	271

The recidivism rates of Class 3 counties are provided in Table 41 below. The average recidivism rate for Class 3 counties was 20%.

Table 41: Class 3 Counties				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Berks	21%	769	160	158
Chester	19%	623	117	38
Cumberland	29%	89	26	894
Dauphin	22%	850	184	13
Erie	21%	708	147	6
Lackawanna	25%	265	67	102
Lancaster	28%	398	112	7
Lehigh	10%	899	86	36
Luzerne	21%	390	81	318
Northampton	16%	566	92	13
Westmoreland	13%	553	74	88
York	24%	1,012	246	57
Total	20%	7,122	1,392	1,730

Class 4 counties' recidivism rates are presented below, and the average recidivism rate of this class size was 16% (see Table 42).

Table 42: Class 4 Counties				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Beaver	17%	301	52	0
Butler	19%	173	33	97
Cambria	16%	408	64	20
Fayette	13%	280	37	1
Monroe	9%	245	22	0
Schuylkill	13%	301	39	2
Washington	25%	351	87	4
Total	16%	2,059	334	124

Table 43 presents the recidivism rates of Class 5 counties. The average recidivism rate for Class 5 counties was 23%.

Table 43: Class 5 Counties				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Adams	23%	254	58	26
Blair	9%	149	14	60
Centre	11%	55	6	11
Franklin	24%	348	84	4
Lawrence	17%	202	35	1
Lebanon	30%	301	91	0
Lycoming	29%	297	86	74
Mercer	19%	163	31	0
Northumberland	22%	184	40	53
Total	23%	1,953	445	229

Class 6 counties' recidivism rates are presented below, and the average recidivism rate of this class size was 18% (see Table 44).

Table 44: Class 6 Counties				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Armstrong	14%	49	7	0
Bedford	14%	70	10	0
Bradford	19%	67	13	0
Carbon	8%	111	9	0
Clarion	45%	29	13	36
Clearfield	25%	72	18	0
Clinton	0%	7	0	0
Columbia	17%	70	12	4
Crawford	17%	125	21	0
Elk	22%	37	8	4
Greene	8%	37	3	88
Huntingdon	23%	52	12	0
Indiana	13%	78	10	1
Jefferson	25%	73	18	98
McKean	27%	52	14	91
Mifflin	36%	53	19	19
Pike	12%	86	10	0
Somerset	9%	143	13	5
Susquehanna	23%	57	13	0
Tioga	24%	66	16	8
Venango	9%	47	4	18
Warren	15%	73	11	1
Wayne	20%	74	15	2
Total	18%	1,528	269	375

The recidivism rates of Class 7 counties are provided in Table 45 below. The average recidivism rate for Class 7 counties was 26%. Behind Philadelphia County (Class 1), Class 7 counties had the second highest recidivism rate.

Table 45: Class 7 Counties				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Juniata	33%	6	2	12
Perry	21%	63	13	3
Snyder	27%	63	17	2
Union	29%	38	11	10
Wyoming	28%	68	19	1
Total	26%	238	62	28

Class 8 counties' recidivism rates are presented below (See Table 46). The average recidivism rate for Class 8 counties was 15%, the lowest rate among the nine classes.

Table 46: Class 8 Counties				
County	Recidivism Rate	Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Definition	Number of Expunged Cases
Cameron	20%	10	2	0
Forest	33%	3	1	4
Fulton	6%	17	1	0
Montour	19%	26	5	2
Potter	15%	27	4	0
Sullivan	0%	6	0	0
Total	15%	89	13	6

Executive Summary: Serious, Violent, and Chronic (SVC) and Child Offender Analysis

- One in five (21%) juveniles with a 2007 case closure were either a serious offender, a violent offender, OR a chronic offender (page 78).
- 6% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were serious offenders, and 34% of serious offenders recidivated (page 79).
- 6% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were violent offenders, and 31% of violent offenders recidivated (page 84).
- 11% of Black offenders were violent offenders. Only 3% of White offenders were violent offenders (page 86).
- 14% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were chronic offenders, and 37% of chronic offenders recidivated (page 89).
- Only 0.4% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were serious, violent, AND chronic offenders, though 48% of serious, violent, and chronic offenders recidivated (page 95).
- 2% of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were child offenders, though 29% of child offenders recidivated (page 98).
- 45% of child offenders were either a serious, violent, or chronic offender (page 103).
- 15% of child offenders were serious offenders (page 103).
- 17% of child offenders were violent offenders (page 104).
- 31% of child offenders were chronic offenders (page 104).

Serious, Violent, Chronic (SVC) and Child Offender Analysis

In an effort to better understand Pennsylvania's delinquent population, an examination was undertaken to: 1.) calculate the proportion of juveniles with cases closed in 2007 who were classifiable as serious, violent, and/or chronic (SVC) offenders, 2.) determine if those juveniles who were classifiable as serious, violent, and/or chronic offenders were ultimately recidivists/non-recidivists by the current study's definition, and 3.) analyze certain demographics and other variables related to the SVC offender populations. Similar analyses were also conducted to examine child offenders within the population of 2007 case closures.

The definitions of serious offenders, violent offenders, chronic offenders, and child offenders are as follows:³¹

Serious offender: a juvenile who has been adjudicated delinquent at any point in his or her juvenile offending history for one of the following offenses: burglary, theft (felonies only), arson, drug trafficking (manufacture/deliver/possession with intent to deliver), and extortion (theft by extortion).

Violent offender: a juvenile who has been adjudicated delinquent at any point in his or her juvenile offending history for one of the following offenses: homicide or non-negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, kidnapping, and select firearms/weapons offenses.

Chronic offender: a juvenile who has four or more previous written allegations for separate incidents that occurred prior to the date of the 2007 case closure.

Child offender: a juvenile who was under the age of 13 as of the date of his or her first adjudication of delinquency.

³¹ To view the exact crimes codes utilized to define serious and violent offenses, please refer to Appendix F.

Prevalence of Serious, Violent, and/or Chronic Offenders

Among the 18,872 juveniles with a case closure in 2007, 3,393 juveniles were either a serious offender, a violent offender, or a chronic offender. This means that 21% of the entire 2007 case closure sample had either a serious, violent, or chronic offense history. Likewise, 14,879 juveniles, or 79%, with a 2007 case closure did NOT have such an offense history.

As illustrated by Table 47, 36% of the recidivist population were either a serious offender, a violent offender, or a chronic offender, while only 17% of the non-recidivist population were one of these types of offenders. Likewise, 64% of the recidivist population did NOT meet the definition of either a serious offender, a violent offender, or a chronic offender, while 83% of the non-recidivist population did not meet such definitions.

Table 47: Prevalence of Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
	Number of No Serious, Violent, OR Chronic Classification	Number of Serious, Violent, OR Chronic Offender Classification	Percentage of Population Who Were NOT a Serious, Violent, or Chronic Offender	Percentage of Population Who Were a Serious, Violent, or Chronic Offender
Recidivists	2,430	1,395	64%	36%
Non- Recidivists	12,449	2,598	83%	17%
Total of Combined Populations	14,879	3,993	79%	21%

Serious Offenders



Prevalence of Serious Offenders

Of the 18,872 juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 1,086 were serious offenders. This is the equivalent of 6% of the entire sample for the current study. Approximately 10% (N= 373) of the recidivist population were serious offenders, while only 5% (N= 713) of the non-recidivist population were serious offenders (See Table 48). In addition, 34% (N= 373) of all serious offenders were recidivists.

Table 48: Prevalence of Serious Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of Serious Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage of Population Who Were Serious Offenders
Recidivists	373	3,825	10%
Non-Recidivists	713	15,047	5%
Total of Combined Populations	1,086	18,872	6%

Gender

As illustrated in Figure 31, 93% of serious juvenile offenders were male, while only 7% of serious juvenile offenders were female. In comparison to the gender breakdown of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (Figure 32), males were much more likely to comprise the serious offender population than would be expected (93% vs. 76%). Conversely, females were much less likely to be serious offenders than would be expected (7% versus 24%).




In addition, 7% (N= 1,010) of males in the entire sample of juveniles were serious offenders, while only 2% (N= 76) of all female offenders were serious offenders (Refer to Table 49).

Table 49: Gender of Serious Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Male	Female	Total
Serious Offenders	1,010	76	1,086
Not Serious Offenders	13,151	4,612	17,763
Total	14,161	4,688	18,849
Percentage Who Were Serious Offenders	7%	2%	


* The gender of 23 not-serious offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Race

White offenders and Black offenders comprised more than 99% of the serious juvenile offender population (See Figure 33). In addition, White offenders were more likely to be serious offenders than would be expected given the proportion of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (67% versus 58%). Black offenders and Asian offenders were less likely to be serious offenders than would be expected (33% versus 41% and 0% versus 1%, respectively) (See Figure 34).



*The race of 11 serious offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.





As shown in Table 50, 14% (N= 2) of American Indian or Alaska Native juveniles were serious offenders, while 6% (N= 353) of Black offenders and 6% (N= 716) of White offenders were serious offenders. Furthermore, 5% (N= 4) of Asian offenders were serious offenders, while no Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander or Other juveniles were serious offenders.

Table 50: Race of Serious Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure							
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Other	White	Total
Serious Offenders	2	4	353	0	0	716	1,075
Not Serious Offenders	12	79	5,689	9	6	11,829	17,624
Total	14	84	6,042	9	6	12,545	18,710
Percentage Who Were Serious Offenders	14%	5%	6%	0%	0%	6%	

*The race of 11 serious offenders and 152 not-serious offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Ethnicity

Non-Hispanic juveniles accounted for 87% (N= 942) of the serious offender population, while Hispanic juveniles accounted for 13% of this population (N= 138) (See Figure 35). In comparison to the ethnicity breakdown of dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (Figure 36), Hispanic youth comprised slightly more of the serious offender population than would be expected (13% vs. 10%). Conversely, non-Hispanic youth comprised slightly less of the serious offender population than would be expected (87% versus 90%).



* The ethnicity of 6 serious offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

In addition, approximately 8% (N= 138) of the Hispanic population were serious offenders, while only 6% (N= 942) of the Non-Hispanic population were serious offenders (Refer to Table 51).

	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Total
Serious Offenders	138	942	1, 080
Not Serious Offenders	1,636	15,833	17,469
Total	1,774	16,775	18,549
Percentage Who Were Serious Offenders	8%	6%	

* The ethnicity of 6 serious offenders and 317 not-serious offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

*Written Allegations*³²

³² The figures presented include all written allegations that occurred in the juveniles’ offending histories up to the date of the 2007 case closure.

Serious offenders in this sample averaged 4 written allegations. Serious offenders who were recidivists averaged 4 written allegations, while non-recidivist serious offenders averaged only 3 written allegations. The number of written allegations for recidivists who were serious offenders ranged from 1 to 15, while non-recidivists ranged from 1 to 18.

Age at First Written Allegation

Among the 1,086 serious offenders, the average age at first written allegation was 14 years. The average age at first written allegation of recidivists who were serious offenders was also 14 years, though the average age at first written allegation for non-recidivist serious offenders was 15 years.

Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency

Among the 1,086 serious offenders, the average age at the time of their first delinquency adjudication was 16 years. The average age at first adjudication of serious offenders who were recidivists was 15 years, while the average age at first adjudication for serious offenders who were non-recidivists was 16 years.

Span of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System

Serious juvenile offenders spent an average of 41 months involved with the juvenile justice system, as calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure.³³ Recidivists who were serious offenders spent an average of 48 months involved with the juvenile justice system, while non-recidivists spent less time involved with the system: 38 months.

³³ Span of involvement with the juvenile justice system is calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation in his or her juvenile offending history to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure. Periods of time in which the youth was NOT active with the juvenile justice system between those two dates are included in these figures as well. The span of involvement with the juvenile justice system is unknown for 29 juveniles who were serious offenders. This is the result of either the date of the juvenile's first written allegation or the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure being missing from the PaJCMS.

Violent Offenders



Prevalence of Violent Offenders

Among the 18,872 juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 1,067, or 6%, were violent offenders (See Table 52). Furthermore, 9% (N= 328) of recidivists were violent offenders, while 5% (N= 739) of non-recidivists were violent offenders. Finally, 31% (N= 328) of all violent offenders were recidivists.

Table 52: Prevalence of Violent Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of Violent Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage of Population Who Were Violent Offenders
Recidivists	328	3,825	9%
Non-Recidivists	739	15,047	5%
Total of Combined Populations	1,067	18,872	6%

Gender

As shown in Figure 37, 87% of violent offenders were male, while 13% were female. In comparison to the gender breakdown of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (Figure 38), males comprised more of the violent offender population than would be expected (87% vs. 76%). Conversely, females comprised less of the violent offender population than would be expected (13% versus 24%).



* The gender of 1 violent offender was not reported in the PaJCMS.



In addition, 7% (N= 925) of males with a 2007 case closure were violent offenders, while 3% (N= 141) of females were violent offenders (please refer to Table 53).

Table 53: Gender of Violent Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Male	Female	Total
Violent Offenders	925	141	1,066
Not Violent Offenders	13,236	4,547	17,783
Total	14,161	4,688	18,849
Percentage Who Were Violent Offenders	7%	3%	

* The gender of 1 violent offender and 22 not-violent offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Race

White juvenile offenders and Black juvenile offenders comprised approximately 99% of the violent offender population, while Asian juvenile offenders comprised 1% (See Figure 39). In addition, as illustrated in Figure 40, Black offenders accounted for more of the violent offender population than would be expected given the proportion of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (61% versus 41%). White offenders accounted for less of the violent offender population than would be expected (38% versus 58%). The proportion of Asian offenders that were violent offenders was what would be expected given the percentage of dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (1%).



* The race of 8 violent offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.



As shown in Table 54, 11% (N= 648) of Black juvenile offenders, 6% (N= 5) of Asian juvenile offenders, and 3% of White juveniles were violent offenders. No American Indian or Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or Other offenders were violent offenders.

	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Other	White	Total
Violent Offenders	0	5	648	0	0	406	1,059
Not Violent Offenders	14	78	5,394	9	6	12,139	17,640
Total	14	83	6,042	9	6	12,545	18,699
Percentage Who Were Violent Offenders	0%	6%	11%	0%	0%	3%	

* The race of 8 violent offenders and 165 not-violent offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Ethnicity

Non-Hispanic juveniles comprised 86% of the violent offender population, while Hispanic offenders comprised 14% of the violent offender population (See Figure 41). In comparison to the ethnicity breakdown of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (see Figure 42), Hispanic youth accounted for slightly more of the violent offender population than would be expected (14% vs. 10%). Conversely, non-Hispanic youth accounted for slightly less of the violent offender population than would be expected (86% versus 90%).



* The ethnicity of 5 violent offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

As shown in Table 55, 8% (N= 144) of Hispanic juvenile offenders were violent offenders, while 5% (N= 918) of non-Hispanic juvenile offenders were violent offenders.

Table 55: Ethnicity of Violent Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Total
Violent Offenders	144	918	1,062
Not Violent Offenders	1,630	15,857	17,487
Total	1,774	16,775	18,549
Percentage Who Were Violent Offenders	8%	5%	

* The ethnicity of 5 violent offender and 318 not-violent offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Written Allegations³⁴

The average number of written allegations for all violent offenders in the sample was 3. Violent offenders who were recidivists, however, averaged 4 written allegations, while non-recidivist violent offenders averaged only 3 written allegations. The number of written allegations for recidivists who were violent offenders ranged from 1 to 21, while non-recidivists ranged from 1 to 16.

Age at First Written Allegation

The average age at the time of their first written allegation for all violent offenders was 14 years. The average age at the time of the first written allegation of recidivists who were violent offenders, however, was 13 years, while the average age at first written allegation for non-recidivist violent offenders was 14 years.

Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency

Among the 1,067 juveniles who were violent offenders, the average age at the time of their first delinquency adjudication was 15 years. The average age at first adjudication of both recidivists and non-recidivists who were violent offenders was also 15 years.

Span of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System

Among the 1,067 juveniles who were violent offenders, the average span of time involved with the juvenile justice system, calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure, was 46 months.³⁵ Recidivists who were violent offenders averaged 51 months involved with the juvenile justice system, while non-recidivist violent offenders averaged 43 months.

³⁴ The figures presented include all written allegations that occurred in the juveniles' offending histories up to the date of the 2007 case closure.

³⁵ Span of involvement with the juvenile justice system is calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation in his or her juvenile offending history to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure. Periods of time in which the youth was NOT active with the juvenile justice system between those two dates are included in these figures as well. The span of involvement with the juvenile justice system was unknown for 17 juveniles who were violent offenders. This is the result of either the date of the juvenile's first written allegation or the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure being missing from the PaJCMS.

Chronic Offenders



Prevalence of Chronic Offenders

As shown in Table 56, of the 18,872 juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 2,608, or 14%, were chronic offenders. Furthermore, 25% (N= 964) of the recidivist population were chronic offenders, while only 11% (N= 1, 644) of the non-recidivist population were chronic offenders. Lastly, 37% (N= 964) of chronic offenders were recidivists.

Table 56: Prevalence of Chronic Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of Chronic Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage Who Where Chronic Offender
Recidivists	964	3,825	25%
Non-Recidivists	1,644	15,047	11%
Total	2,608	18,872	14%

Gender

Males accounted for 85% of the chronic offender population, while females accounted for only 15% of it (See Figure 43). As shown in Figure 44, males comprised much more of the chronic offender population than would be expected given the total proportion of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (85% vs. 76%). Conversely, females accounted for much less of the chronic offender population than would be expected (15% versus 24%).



*The gender of 1 chronic offender was not reported in the PaJCMS.


As illustrated by Table 57, 16% (N= 2,215) of males with a 2007 case closure were chronic offenders, while 8% (N= 392) of females were chronic offenders.

Table 57: Gender of Chronic Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Male	Female	Total
Chronic Offenders	2,215	392	2,607
Not Chronic Offenders	11,946	4,296	16,242
Total	14,161	4,688	18,849
Percentage Who Were Chronic Offenders	16%	8%	


*The gender of 1 chronic offender and 22 not-chronic offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Race

White and Black juveniles accounted for over 99% of the chronic offender population, while the remaining juvenile offenders (i.e., American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and Other) accounted for less than 1% of this population (See Figure 45). In addition, White juveniles, Black juveniles, and Other juveniles were no more likely to be chronic offenders than would be expected given the proportion of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (See Figure 46). Asian offenders comprised slightly less of the chronic offender population than would be expected (0% versus 1%).



*The race of 15 chronic offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.





As shown below, 18% (N= 1,066) of Black juveniles with a 2007 case closure were chronic offenders, while 17% (N= 1) of juveniles who identified themselves as an Other race were chronic offenders. In addition, 12% (N= 1,519) of White juveniles with a 2007 case closure were chronic offenders, while 11% (N= 1) of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander were chronic offenders. Of the 14 American Indian or Alaska Native juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 7% (N= 1) were chronic offenders. Only 6% (N= 5) of Asian juveniles with a 2007 case closure were chronic offenders (See Table 58).

Table 58: Race of Chronic Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure							
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Other	White	Total
Chronic Offenders	1	5	1,066	1	1	1,519	2,593
Not Chronic Offenders	13	78	4,976	8	5	11,026	16,106
Total	14	83	6,042	9	6	12,545	18,699
Percentage Who Were Chronic Offenders	7%	6%	18%	11%	17%	12%	

*The race of 15 chronic offenders and 158 not-chronic offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Ethnicity

Non-Hispanic offenders accounted for 88% of the chronic offender population, while Hispanic offenders accounted for only 12% of this population (See Figure 47). In comparison to the ethnicity breakdown of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (see Figure 48), Hispanic youth comprised slightly more of the chronic offender population than would be expected (12% vs. 10%). Conversely, non-Hispanic youth comprised slightly less of the chronic offender population than would be expected (88% versus 90%).



*The ethnicity of 13 chronic offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Of all the Hispanic juveniles who had a 2007 case closure, however, 17% (N= 302) were chronic offenders. In addition, 14% (N= 2, 293) of non-Hispanic offenders with a 2007 case closure were chronic offenders (See Table 59).

Table 59: Ethnicity of Chronic Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Total
Chronic Offenders	302	2,293	2,595
Not Chronic Offenders	1,472	14,482	15,954
Total	1,774	16,775	18,549
Proportion Classified as Chronic Offender	17%	14%	

* The ethnicity of 13 chronic offenders and 310 not-chronic offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

*Written Allegations*³⁶

The average number of written allegations for all chronic offenders in the sample was 5. Chronic offenders who were recidivists averaged 6 written allegations, while non-recidivist chronic offenders averaged 5 written allegations. The range of written allegations for recidivists and non-recidivists who were chronic offenders ranged from 4 to 21.

Age at First Written Allegation

Among the 2,608 chronic offenders in the sample, the average age at the time of their first written allegation was 13 years. The average age of both recidivist and non-recidivist chronic offenders at the time of the first written allegation was also 13 years.

Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency

The average age at the time of the first adjudication of delinquency for all chronic offenders was 15 years. In addition, the average age at the time of the first delinquency adjudication for both recidivist and non-recidivist chronic offenders was also 15 years.

Span of Involvement with Juvenile Justice System

The average span of time involved with the juvenile justice system for chronic offenders, calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure, was 53 months.³⁷ Chronic offenders who were recidivists spent an average of 55 months involved with the juvenile justice system, while non-recidivist chronic offenders spent an average of 52 months involved with the juvenile justice system.

³⁶ The figures presented include all written allegations that occurred in the juveniles' offending histories up to the date of the 2007 case closure.

³⁷ Span of involvement with the juvenile justice system is calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation in his or her juvenile offending history to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure. Periods of time in which the youth was NOT active with the juvenile justice system between those two dates are included in these figures as well. The span of involvement with the juvenile justice system was unknown for 24 juveniles who were chronic offenders. This is the result of either the date of the juvenile's first written allegation or the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure being missing from the PaJCMS.

Combination Offenders

Unsurprisingly, many juveniles with a 2007 case closure met the definition of more than one offender classification. Below is the breakdown of juvenile offenders from the sample who were classified as: chronic and serious offenders, chronic and violent offenders, violent and serious offenders, and serious, violent, and chronic offenders.

Serious and Chronic Offenders

As illustrated by Table 60, of all the juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 430, or 2%, were both serious and chronic offenders. In addition, 5% (N= 201) of the recidivist population were serious and chronic offenders, while only 2% (N= 229) of the non-recidivist population were serious and chronic offenders. Furthermore, 40% of serious offenders were chronic offenders, and 17% of chronic offenders were serious offenders. Finally, 47% (N= 201) of serious and chronic offenders recidivated.

Table 60: Prevalence of Serious and Chronic Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of Serious & Chronic Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage Who Were Serious & Chronic Offenders
Recidivists	201	3,825	5%
Non-Recidivists	229	15,047	2%
Total	430	18,872	2%

Violent and Chronic Offenders

Among all the juveniles who had a 2007 case closure (N= 18, 872), 414 (2%) were violent and chronic offenders. Within the recidivist population, 4% (N= 169) were violent and chronic offenders, whereas 2% (N= 245) of non-recidivists were violent and chronic (See Table 61). Furthermore, 16% of chronic offenders were violent offenders, and 39% of violent offenders were chronic offenders. Finally, 41% (N= 169) of violent and chronic offenders recidivated.

Table 61: Prevalence of Violent and Chronic Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of Violent & Chronic Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage Who Were Violent & Chronic Offenders
Recidivists	169	3,825	4%
Non-Recidivists	245	15,047	2%
Total	414	18,872	2%

Serious and Violent Offenders

Only 0.6% (N= 163) of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were serious and violent offenders. Approximately 1% (N= 44) of the recidivist population were both serious and violent, while 0.4% (N= 64) of the non-recidivist population were serious and violent (refer to Table 62). Furthermore, 10% of serious offenders were violent offenders, and 10% of violent offenders were serious offenders. Finally, 41% (N= 44) of serious and violent offenders recidivated.


Table 62: Prevalence of Serious and Violent Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of Serious & Violent Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage Who Were Serious & Violent Offenders
Recidivists	44	3,825	1%
Non-Recidivists	64	15,047	0.4%
Total	108	18,872	0.6%

Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders

As illustrated by Table 63, only 0.4% (N= 77) of juveniles with a 2007 case closure were serious, violent, and chronic offenders. Of the 3,825 juvenile recidivists in the sample, 1% (N= 37) were serious, violent, and chronic offenders. Only 0.3% (N= 40) of the non-recidivist population were serious, violent, and chronic offenders. Finally, 48% (N= 37) of serious, violent, and chronic offenders recidivated.

Table 63: Prevalence of Serious, Violent, and Chronic (SVC) Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of SVC Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage Who Were SVC Offenders
Recidivists	37	3,825	1%
Non- Recidivists	40	15,047	0.3%
Total	77	18,872	0.4%

**Figure 49: Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders in Pennsylvania:
Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure**




S= Serious
V= Violent
C= Chronic

S & V= Serious and Violent
S & C= Serious and Chronic
V & C= Violent and Chronic

SVC= Serious, Violent, and Chronic

Finally, Figure 50 presents the recidivism rates of serious, violent, and/or chronic offenders in one snapshot. Again, recidivism rates ranged anywhere from 31% (violent offenders) to 48% (serious, violent, AND chronic offenders).



Child Offenders

Another area of interest within the juvenile justice literature is the concept of *child offenders*, or juveniles who are adjudicated delinquent under the age of 13. Research suggests that the younger a juvenile is when he or she begins offending, the more severe his or her offending career will be. Child offenders not only begin their delinquent careers at early age, but their offenses are severe enough to warrant delinquency adjudication. The following is an examination of child offenders in Pennsylvania.



Prevalence of Child Offenders

Of all juveniles with a 2007 case closure, 2% (N= 377) were child offenders. Approximately 3% (N= 109) of recidivists were child offenders, while 2% (N= 268) of non-recidivists were child offenders (Refer to Table 64). In addition, 29% (N= 109) of child offenders were recidivists in the current study.

Table 64: Prevalence of Child Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Number of Child Offenders	Total Number of Juveniles in Population	Percentage Who Were Child Offenders
Recidivists	109	3,825	3%
Non-Recidivists	268	15,047	2%
Total	377	18,872	2%

Gender

Males accounted for 84% of the child offender population, while females accounted for only 16% (See Figure 51). As shown in Figure 52, males comprised much more of the child offender population than would be expected given the total proportion of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (84% vs. 76%). Conversely, females accounted for much less of the child offender population than would be expected given the proportion of dispositions that occurred (16% versus 24%).



As illustrated by Table 65, 2% (N= 315) of males with a 2007 case closure were child offenders, while 1% (N= 62) of females were child offenders.



**Table 65: Gender of Child Offenders*:
Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure**

	Male	Female	Total
Child Offenders	315	62	786
Non-Child Offenders	13,846	4,626	18,063
Total	14,161	4,688	18,849
Proportion Classified as Child Offender	2%	1%	

* The gender of 23 non-child offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Race

White and Black juveniles comprised 99% of the child offender population (See Figure 53). Asian juveniles and juveniles with a race classification of Other accounted for approximately 1% of the child offender population. As shown in Figure 54, Black offenders comprised slightly more of the child offender population than would be expected given the total proportion of all dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (49% vs. 41%). Conversely, White offenders comprised less of the child offender population than would be expected given the proportion of dispositions that occurred (50% versus 58%). The proportion of Asian child offenders and Other child offenders was reflective of the percentage of dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (1% and 0%, respectively).



* The race of 5 child offenders was not reported in PaJCMS.


As shown in Table 66, 17% (N= 1) of juveniles with a 2007 case closure who had a race classification of Other were child offenders, while 4% (N= 3) of Asian juvenile offenders and 3% (N= 184) of Black juveniles were child offenders. In addition, 1% (N= 184) of White juvenile offenders were child offenders. No American Indians or Alaska Natives or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander juveniles were child offenders.

Table 66: Race of Child Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure							
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Other	White	Total
Child Offenders	0	3	184	0	1	184	372
Non-Child Offenders	14	80	5,858	9	5	12,361	18,327
Total	14	83	6,042	9	6	12,545	18,699
Proportion Classified as Child Offender	0%	4%	3%	0%	17%	1%	


* The race of 5 child offenders and 168 non-child offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Ethnicity

Non-Hispanic offenders accounted for 89% of the child offender population, while Hispanic offenders accounted for only 11% of this population (Refer to Figure 55). Hispanic youth and Non-Hispanic youth, however, comprised approximately the same amount of the child offender population that would be expected given the total proportion of dispositions that occurred between 2005 and 2007 (See Figure 56).



* The ethnicity of 8 child offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.



In addition, of all the Hispanic juveniles who had a 2007 case closure, 2% (N= 42) were child offenders. Similarly, of all the non-Hispanic offenders who had a 2007 case closure, 2% (N= 327) were child offenders (See Table 67).

Table 67: Ethnicity of Child Offenders*: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure			
	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	Total
Child Offenders	42	327	369
Non-Child Offenders	1,732	16,446	18,178
Total	1,774	16,773	18,547
Proportion Classified as Child Offender	2%	2%	

* The ethnicity of 8 child offenders and 317 non-child offenders was not reported in the PaJCMS.

Written Allegations³⁸

Child offenders had an average of 3 written allegations each by the time their case closed in 2007, with these juveniles ranging 1 to 14 written allegations. Child offenders who were recidivists averaged 4 written allegations, and this population also ranged 1 to 14 written allegations. Child offenders who were non-recidivists averaged 3 written allegations, and this group of juveniles also ranged 1 to 14 written allegations.

Age at First Written Allegation

The average age at the time of their first written allegation for all child offenders was 11 years. The average age at first written allegation for both recidivist and non-recidivist child offenders was also 11 years.

Age at First Adjudication of Delinquency

The average age at the time of their first delinquency adjudication for all child offenders was 12 years. The average age of recidivist and non-recidivist child offenders was also 12 years.

³⁸ The figures presented include all written allegations that occurred in the juveniles' offending histories up to the date of the 2007 case closure.

Span of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System

Child offenders spent an average of 48 months involved with the juvenile justice system, as calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure.³⁹ Recidivists who were child offenders spent an average of 54 months involved with the juvenile justice system, while non-recidivist child offenders spent 46 months involved with the juvenile justice system.

Child Offenders Who Developed SVC Careers

The proceeding analyses were conducted to determine whether child offenders were more likely to be serious, violent, and/or chronic offenders than were non-child offenders. The results indicated that 45% (N= 170) of child offenders were either a serious offender, a violent offender, or a chronic offender, while only 20% (N= 3,716) of non-child offenders were a serious offender, a violent offender, or a chronic offender.

Serious Offender Careers

As illustrated by the table below (Table 68), 15% (N= 57) of child offenders were serious offenders, while only 6% (N= 1,029) of non-child offenders were serious offenders.

Table 68: Percentage of Child Offenders and Non-Child Offenders Who Were Serious Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
	Serious Offenders	Not Serious Offenders	Total	Rate
Child Offenders	57	320	377	15%
Non-Child Offenders	1,029	17,466	18,495	6%
Total	1,086	17,786	18,872	

³⁹ Span of involvement with the juvenile justice system is calculated from the date of the juvenile's first written allegation in his or her juvenile offending history to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure. Periods of time in which the youth was NOT active with the juvenile justice system between those two dates are included in these figures as well. The span of involvement with the juvenile justice system was unknown for 25 juveniles who were child offenders. This is the result of either the date of the juvenile's first written allegation or the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure being missing from PaJCMS.

Violent Offender Careers

Similarly, approximately 17% (N= 63) of child offenders were violent offenders, whereas only 5% (N= 1,004) of non-child offenders were violent offenders (Refer to Table 69).

Table 69: Percentage of Child Offenders and Non-Child Offenders Who Were Violent Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
	Violent Offenders	Not Violent Offenders	Total	Rate
Child Offenders	63	314	377	17%
Non-Child Offenders	1,004	17,491	18,495	5%
Total	1,067	17,805	18,872	

Chronic Offender Careers

Finally, 31% (N= 116) of child offenders were chronic offenders, while only 13% (N= 2,492) of non-child offenders were chronic offenders (See Table 70).

Table 70: Percentage of Child Offenders and Non-Child Offenders Who Were Chronic Offenders: Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
	Chronic Offenders	Not Chronic Offenders	Total	Rate
Child Offenders	116	261	377	31%
Non-Child Offenders	2,492	16,003	18,495	13%
Total	2,608	16,264	18,872	

Comparison of Pennsylvania’s SVC Offender Results to Other Serious, Violent, and Chronic (SVC) Offender Results

Pennsylvania was not the first state to examine serious, violent, and chronic (SVC) offender patterns among their delinquent population. For example, in 1998, Howard Snyder conducted a similar analysis in Maricopa County, Arizona. In addition, Mike Baglivio conducted a SVC offender analysis in Florida. Below is a comparison of Pennsylvania’s results to Arizona’s findings and Florida’s results.

Snyder’s Maricopa County, Arizona, Study

As previously mentioned, Howard Snyder conducted a SVC offender analysis in Maricopa County, Arizona, in 1998. Snyder (1998) used data from all individuals born between 1962 and 1977 who had a referral to juvenile court in Maricopa County before their 18th birthday. In addition, these juveniles attained the age of 18 during the years 1980-1995 and were aged 18 or older at the time of the study. Snyder (1998) generated a sample of 151,209 delinquent juveniles to examine who were serious, violent, and/or chronic offenders. To view the definitions that Snyder (1998) employed in his study, please refer to Appendix F.

Table 71 below illustrates the outcomes of Pennsylvania’s analysis, Snyder’s (1998) analysis, and Baglivio’s analysis.

Table 71: Comparison of State Serious, Violent, and Chronic (SVC) Offender Analyses			
	Pennsylvania Fowler et al. (2013)	Maricopa County, Arizona Snyder (1998)	Florida Baglivio (2012)
Non-Serious, Non-Violent, Non-Chronic Offenders	79%	64%	46%
Serious Offenders	6%	34%	52%
Violent Offenders	6%	8%	29%
Chronic Offenders	14%	15%	15%
Serious, Violent & Chronic Offenders	0.4%	3%	9%
Chronic Offenders + Violent Offenders	16%	29%	N/A
Serious Offenders + Chronic Offenders	40%	35%	N/A
Violent Offenders + Chronic Offenders	39%	53%	N/A

Snyder (1998) concluded that 64% of the delinquent population in his sample were non-serious, non-violent, and non-chronic offenders. In addition, within his population samples, 34% of juveniles were serious offenders, 8% were violent offenders, 15% were chronic offenders, and 3% were serious, violent, and chronic offenders.⁴⁰ Finally, Snyder's (1998) research revealed that 29% of chronic offenders were also violent offenders, 35% of serious offenders were also chronic offenders, and 53% of violent offenders were also chronic offenders. As illustrated above, in the current study there were a higher percentage of juveniles who were non-serious, non-violent, and non-chronic than in Arizona (79% vs. 64%). In addition, in the current study there were a lower percentage of chronic offenders (14%) and serious offenders and violent offenders (6% each) than in Arizona (15%, 34% and 8%, respectively), as well as fewer serious, violent, and chronic offenders (0.4% versus 3%). Furthermore, Pennsylvania had a lower percentage of chronic offenders who were also violent offenders (16% versus 29%) and violent offenders who were also chronic offenders (39% versus 53%) than Arizona. On the other hand, Pennsylvania had a larger proportion of serious offenders who were also chronic offenders than did Arizona (40% versus 35%).

Many of these differences can be explained by both the methodology and operationalization of variables used in each study. For example, all juveniles in Snyder's (1998) study were aged 18 or older, and thus their juvenile offending "careers" were over (since the juvenile court no longer had jurisdiction). In the current study, juvenile offenders were between the ages of 10 and 21, and many still have the potential to be involved with the juvenile justice system for several more years, thus increasing the probability of becoming a serious, violent, or chronic offender. For example, if a 14-year old in the current study's sample fell in the non-serious, non-violent, non-chronic offender category, but he commits a robbery at the age of 16, the non-serious, non-violent, non-chronic offender figure presented previously would decrease, while the violent offender figure would increase.

In addition, the only sex offense included in Pennsylvania's definition of violent offender was rape, whereas Snyder's (1998) study included all violent sexual assaults. Furthermore, Pennsylvania included certain firearms/weapons offenses in the definition of violent offender, while Arizona included these offenses in their definition of serious offender.

Baglivio's Florida Analysis

Michael Baglivio of the Florida Department of Justice also completed a SVC offender analysis for Florida. Baglivio examined 72,750 youth who were referred to the Department of Juvenile Justice in FY 09-10 to determine which percentage were classifiable as serious, violent, chronic, or SVC offenders. The definitions that Baglivio used to operationalize these offenders can be found in Appendix F. Like the current study, not all of the youth in Baglivio's sample had reached the age of majority (18 years) in the Florida juvenile justice system. Therefore, the results of his study are not necessarily comparable to Snyder's (1998) findings either; juveniles who were under the age of

⁴⁰ It is inappropriate to sum these percentages because some individual offenders are represented in multiple categories.

majority still have the potential to become a serious, violent, chronic, or SVC offender if they have not already.

Baglivio concluded that 46% of juveniles with a referral in FY 09-10 were non-serious, non-violent, and non-chronic. This percentage was lower than both Pennsylvania's rate (79%) and Arizona's rate (64%). In addition, there were more serious and violent offenders in Florida (52% and 29%, respectively) than in Pennsylvania (6% and 6%, respectively) and Arizona (8% and 15%, respectively). Furthermore, Pennsylvania also had the lowest percentage of chronic offenders (14%) compared to Arizona (15%) and Florida (15%).

The differences between Pennsylvania's and Florida's rates can be attributed to both the methodology and operationalization of variables used in each study. For example, Baglivio examined all juveniles with a delinquency *referral* in FY 09-10, whereas Pennsylvania examined juveniles with a *case closure* in 2007 who had a valid disposition⁴¹. In addition, Baglivio counted only misdemeanor and felony referrals in his operationalization of chronic offenders, while Pennsylvania counted all referrals (written allegations). Finally, Baglivio used an adjudication for *any* felony offense on a juvenile's record to categorize serious offenders, while Pennsylvania used *select* offenses.

⁴¹ Please refer to page 15 for a list of valid dispositions.

Limitations of Study

As detailed earlier, it is critically important to note that expunged cases create a significant limitation to this study. In Pennsylvania, when a case is expunged, all of a juvenile's identifying information pertaining to that case is "erased" and is therefore not available for analysis. Consequently, juveniles with a 2007 case expungement were omitted from the study's sample, unless they had a separate case closed in 2007 that was not expunged.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine how a particular county's recidivism rate was affected by the number of expungements for a variety of reasons, including that the unit of measurement for the recidivism study was a *juvenile*, while the unit of measurement for an expungement was a *case* (one juvenile may have had several cases from 2007 expunged).

Arguably, juveniles whose cases are expunged are presumed to be individuals who are considered to be at lower risk to recidivate (i.e., first-time, relatively minor offenders). However, since no risk assessment instruments (e.g., the Youth Level of Service) were being utilized in Pennsylvania prior to 2009, there is no way to determine the actual risk levels of juveniles with a 2007 case closure⁴². In general, counties that expunged significant numbers of cases had higher recidivism rates than their counterparts. A possible explanation for this result is that a significant number of lower risk youth were removed from the research sample in these jurisdictions.

Moreover, these recidivism rates do not take into account the specific treatment and services that were provided to juveniles while under supervision. Readers are cautioned, therefore, to make no comparisons between counties due to varying juvenile court policies and practices, including those relating to expungement. Rather, it is our goal to measure whether recidivism rates within each county decline as evidence-based practices are implemented.

An additional limitation of this study involved a methodological issue. Since only Pennsylvania-based case management systems were queried for recidivating events, re-offending that occurred in other states or jurisdictions was not captured in the analysis. Other states that have conducted similar recidivism analyses, however, have only used case management systems unique to their state, so this is a common limitation to recidivism research.

Finally, the recidivism rates of the specific facilities in Section 4 do not take into account the provision or quality of post-placement supervision and services, the risk levels of juveniles who had received services at each facility, and the impact of case expungements for juveniles who may have been placed at these facilities.

⁴² The YLS, a tool used to determine a juvenile's strengths, criminogenic needs, and risk to recidivate, has since been implemented in Pennsylvania. Please refer to Appendix A for more information on the YLS.

Implications for Future Research

Though a significant amount of information was ascertained from this research, there are several ways in which this knowledge base could be expanded in future studies. As with any research project, only data that is collected can be analyzed and, in this instance, data analysis was limited to what was available in the PaJCMS and the AOPC's case management systems. Several areas that were highlighted in the literature as being significant predictors of recidivism were not readily or reliably obtainable in any of the case management systems utilized for this study. These variables included participation in in-home services, involvement with the child welfare system⁴³ and involvement with gangs⁴⁴. The systematic collection and analysis of these data elements would enhance future recidivism studies.

In addition, there are several pieces of data that have been historically collected at the time of case closure that would assist in predicting future re-offending. These data elements include violations of probation, the commission of new offenses while under probation supervision, employment and educational status, and the unsuccessful completion of programs or dispositions. In 2007, some counties reported these data elements in the PaJCMS, while others submitted hard copies of these figures to the CJJT&R. As such, this information was incomplete in the PaJCMS. The PaJCMS currently has the capacity to collect all of this data, though not all counties utilize it. The systematic collection and analysis of these data elements would enhance future recidivism studies.

Finally, as was previously mentioned, as part of Pennsylvania's JJSES, the YLS has been incorporated into probation practices in 65 of 67 jurisdictions in Pennsylvania⁴⁵. This tool is used to determine a juvenile's strengths, criminogenic needs, and risk to recidivate by evaluating his or her responses to several domain areas (e.g., prior and current offenses, education). The PaJCMS has begun tracking the YLS scores of juveniles who were administered the instrument and, in the future, analyses will be conducted on the association between youths' overall YLS risk categorization and their recidivism rates. Furthermore, in addition to capturing risk scores, the PaJCMS also captures data related to the specific domains of the YLS that are known to be strong predictors of recidivism but are currently missing from the case management system. These domains include substance abuse, family, personality/behavior, peers, leisure/recreation, and attitudes/orientation. The other two domains of the YLS, prior and current offenses and education, are already available in the PaJCMS. Future studies will also include analyses of the relationship between these domains and recidivism rates.

⁴³ The PaJCMS has the capability to capture involvement with the child welfare system, though this function is not utilized consistently across the state.

⁴⁴ The PaJCMS has recently begun collecting gang affiliation information. This data was not available for 2007 case closures, however.

⁴⁵ Elk and Monroe Counties currently do not utilize the YLS.

References

- Agnew, R., & Petersen, D. M. (1989). Leisure and delinquency. *Social Problems*, 36(4), 332-350.
- Alaska Judicial Council. (2007). *Criminal recidivism in Alaska*. Available at: <http://www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/1-07CriminalRecidivism.pdf>.
- Altschuler, D. (1998). *Intensive aftercare for high-risk juvenile parolees: Overview*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Archwamety, T., & Katsiyannis, A. (1999). Academic remediation, parole violations, and recidivism rates among delinquent youths. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21(3), 161-170.
- Austin, J., Johnson, K. D., & Weitzer, R. (2005). *Alternatives to the secure detention and confinement of juvenile offenders*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <http://partnersforlatinyouth.org/Alternatives%20to%20Secure%20Detention.pdf>.
- Bartollas, C. (2003). *Juvenile delinquency*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Benda, B. B., & Tollett, C. L. (1999). A study of recidivism of serious and persistent offenders among adolescents. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(2), 111-126.
- Bilchik, S. (1998). *Mental health disorders and substance abuse problems among juveniles*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <http://www.regionsex.com/ResourceLibrary/Mental%20Health/Mental%20Health-Dual%20Diagnosis%20Juveniles.pdf>.
- Bondeson, U. V. (2002). *Alternatives to imprisonment: Intentions and reality*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Bynum, J. E., & Thompson, W. E. (2005). *Juvenile delinquency: A sociological approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Calhoun, K., Etheridge, V., Flinchum, T., Hevener, G., Katzenelson, S., & Moore-Gurrera, M. (2008). *Correctional program evaluation: Offenders placed on probation or released from prison in fiscal year 2003/04*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission. Available at: http://www.nccourts.org/Courts/CRS/Councils/spac/Documents/recidivismreportR_2008.pdf.

- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2010). *2010 juvenile justice outcome evaluation report: Youth released from the Division of Juvenile Justice in fiscal year 2004-2005*. Sacramento, CA: Office of Research, Juvenile Justice Research Branch, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Available at: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/docs/Recidivism%20Report.FY0405.%20FINAL.DJJ.pdf.
- Cantelon, S., & LeBoeuf, D. (1997). *Keeping young people in school: Community programs that work*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Cernkovich, S., & Giordano, D. (1987). Family relationships and delinquency: A partial replication and extension. *Social Problems*, 20, 471-487.
- Cocozza, J. (1992). *Responding to the mental health needs of youth in the juvenile justice system*. Seattle, WA: The National Coalition for the Mentally Ill in the Criminal Justice System.
- Cocozza, J. J., & Skowrya, K. R. (2000). Youth with mental health disorders: Issues and emerging responses. *Juvenile Justice*, 7(1), 3-13.
- Cohen, M. A. (1998). The monetary value of saving a high-risk youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 14(1), 5-33.
- Colorado Department of Human Services. (2010). *Recidivism evaluation of committed youth discharged in fiscal year 2007-08*. Denver, CO: Research and Evaluation Unit, Division of Youth Corrections, Office of Children, Youth, and Family Services, Colorado Department of Human Services. Available at: <http://www.colorado.gov/cdhsdyc/Resources-Publications/Recid2010.pdf>.
- Corrado, R. R., Cohen, I. M., Glackman, W., & Odgers, C. (2003). Serious and violent young offenders' decision to recidivate: An assessment of five sentencing models. *Crime and Delinquency*, 49(2), 179-200.
- Cottle, C. C., Lee, R. J., & Heilbrun, K. (2001). The prediction of criminal recidivism in juveniles: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(3), 367-394.
- DeComo, R. E. (1998). Estimating the prevalence of juvenile custody by race and gender. *Crime and Delinquency*, 44(4), 489-506.
- Derzon, J. H. (2010). The correspondence of family features with problem, aggressive, criminal, and violent behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 6(3), 263-292.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Erickson, K. G., Laird, J., & Wong, C. A. (2001). The relation of family and school attachment to adolescent deviance in diverse groups and communities. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 16(4), 396-422.

- Duncan, R. D., Kennedy, W. A., & Patrick, C. J. (1995). Four-factor model of recidivism in male juvenile offenders. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 24(3), 250-257.
- Elliot, D. S. (1994). Serious violent offenders: Onset, development course, and termination: The American Society of Criminology 1993 presidential address. *Criminology*, 32, 1-21.
- Elliot, D., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- English, D. J, Widom, C. S., & Brandford, C. (2002). *Childhood victimization and delinquency, adult criminality, and violent criminal behavior: A replication and extension*. Final Report presented to the National Institute of Justice under grant 97-IJ-CX-0017. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/192291.pdf>.
- Fagan, J. (1996). The comparative advantage of juvenile versus criminal court sanctions on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. *Law and Policy*, 18(1 and 2), 77-113.
- Farrington, D. P. (1989). Early predictors of adolescent aggression and adult violence. *Violence and Victims*, 4, 79-100.
- Farrington, D. P. (1992). Criminal career research in the United Kingdom. *British Journal of Criminology*, 32, 521-536.
- Farrington, D. P. (1995). The development of offending and antisocial behavior from childhood: Key findings from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 36, 929-964.
- Farrington, D. P. (1998). Predictors, causes and correlates of male youth violence. In M. Tonry and M. H. Moore (Eds.), *Youth violence, crime and justice* (pp. 421-475). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Farrington, D. P. (2010). Crime and the family. *The Criminologist*, 35(2), 1-6.
- Farrington, D. P., & Loeber, R. (1999). Transatlantic replicability of risk factors in the development of delinquency. In P. Cohen, C. Slomkowski, & L. N. Robins (Eds.), *Historical and geographical influences on psychopathology* (pp. 299-329). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fendrich, M. (1991). Institutionalization and parole behavior: Assessing the influence of individual and family characteristics. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 19(2), 109-122.
- Foote, J. (1997). *Expert panel issues report on serious and violent offenders*. Washington, DC: Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/fs9768.pdf>.

- Frederick, B. (1999). *Factors contributing to recidivism among youth placed with the New York State Division for Youth*. Albany, New York: Office of Justice Systems Analysis, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. Available at: http://criminaljustice.state.ny.us/crimnet/ojsa/dfy/dfy_research_report.pdf.
- Gewirtz, M., Revere, E. J., Caliguire, R., Bernstein, J. P., Nehwadowich, W., Tejaratchi, A., & Su, A. (2007). *Recidivism among juvenile offenders in NYC*. New York, NY: New York City Criminal Justice Agency, Inc. Available at: <http://www.cjareports.org/reports/jorecid0407.pdf>.
- Grumwald, H. E., Lockwood, B., Harris, P. W., & Mennis, J. (2010). Influences of neighborhood context, individual history, and parenting behavior on recidivism among juvenile offenders. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(9), 1067-1079.
- Haapasalo, J., & Tremblay, R. E. (1994). Physically aggressive boys from ages 6 to 12: Family background, parenting behavior, and prediction of delinquency. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 1044-1052.
- Harms, P. (2003). *Detention in delinquency cases, 1990-1999*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Harrison, P., Maupin, J. R., & Mays, G. L. (2001). Teen court: An examination of processes and outcomes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47(2), 243-264.
- Hawkins, J. D. (1999). Preventing crime and violence through Communities That Care. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 7(4), 443-458.
- Hawkins, J. D., Herrenkohl, T. I., Farrington, D. P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R. F., Harachi, T. W., & Cothorn, L. (2000). *Predictors of youth violence*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/179065.pdf>.
- Hawkins, J. D., Jenson, J. M., & Catalano, R. F. (1988). Delinquency and drug abuse: Implications for social services. *Social Service Review*, 62(2), 258-284.
- Henry, K. L., & Slater, M. D. (2007). The contextual effect of school attachment on young adolescents' alcohol use. *Journal of School Health*, 77(2), 67-74.
- Hetz-Burrell, N., & English, K. (2006). *Community corrections in Colorado: A study of program outcomes and recidivism, FY00-FY04*. Denver, CO: Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice, Colorado Department of Public Safety. Available at: http://dcj.state.co.us/ors/pdf/docs/Comm_Corr_05_06.pdf.
- Hindeland, M. J., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. (1981). *Measuring delinquency*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Howell, J. C. (1995). Gangs and youth violence: Recent research. In J. C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J. D. Hawkins, & J. J. Wilson (Eds.). *A sourcebook: Serious, violent, & chronic juvenile offenders* (pp. 261-274). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Huizinga, D., Loeber, R., & Thornberry, T. P. (1995). *Urban delinquency and substance abuse*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED416294.pdf>.
- Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections. (2008). *Juvenile recidivism in Idaho*. Available at: http://www.idoc.idaho.gov/content/facts_and_statistics.
- Katsiyannis, A., & Archwamety, T. (1997). Factors related to recidivism among delinquent youths in a state correctional facility. *Journal of Crime and Family Studies*, 6(1), 43-55.
- Kelly, M. (2011). *A new perspective on evidence-based juvenile justice practice*. [PowerPoint slides]. Presentation presented to the Berks County Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP) Team on October 18, 2011 in Berks County, Pennsylvania.
- Klein, S. P., & Caggiano, M. N. (1986). *The Prevalence, predictability, and policy implications of recidivism*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Klinterberg, B. A., Andersson, T., Magnusson, D., & Stattin, H. (1993). Hyperactive behavior in childhood as related to subsequent alcohol problems and violent offending: A longitudinal study of male subjects. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15, 381-388.
- Kohl, R., Hoover, H. M., McDonald, S. M., & Solomon, A. L. (2008). *Massachusetts recidivism study: A closer look at releases and returns to prison*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center. Available at: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411657_machusetts_recidivism.pdf.
- Krisberg, B. (1997). *The impact of the juvenile justice system on serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report (NCJ, 193427). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Langan, P. A., Schmitt, E. L., & Durose, M. R. (2003). *Recidivism of sex offenders released from prison in 1994*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

- Leschied, A. W., Nowicki, E., Rodger, S., Chiodo, D., Marquis, R., Nash, J., Heng, C. L., & Sookoor, M. (2006). *Better to build a child than fix an adult*. Ontario, Canada: Canadian National Crime Prevention Council. Available at: <http://www.johnhoward.on.ca/pdfs/ncpcffinal.pdf>.
- Lipsey, M. (2009). The primary factors that characterize effective interventions with juvenile offenders: A meta-analytic overview. *Victims and Offenders*, 4, 124-147.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Chapman, G. L. (2011). *Bridging the gap between research and practice in juvenile intervention programs*. [PowerPoint slides]. Presentation presented to the Berks County Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP) Team on October 18, 2011 in Berks County, Pennsylvania.
- Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (2001). *Child delinquents: Development, interventions, and service needs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Maguin, E., Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K., Abbott, R., & Herrenkohl, T. (1995). *Risk factors measured at three ages for violence at age 17-18*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November 1995, Boston, MA.
- Mahoney, J. L. (2000). Participation in school extracurricular activities as a moderator in the development of antisocial patterns. *Child Development*, 71, 502-516.
- Mahoney, J. L., & Stattin, H. (2000). Leisure activities and adolescent antisocial behavior: The role of structure and social context. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 113-127.
- Marsh, R. L., & Patrick, S. B. (2006). Juvenile diversion programs. In B. Sims & P. Preston (Eds.), *Handbook of juvenile justice: Theory and practice* (pp. 473-489). Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Matsueda, R. L., & Anderson, K. (1998). The dynamics of delinquent peers and delinquent behavior. *Criminology*, 36(2), 269-308.
- Mayeda, D. T. (2010). *Hawaii youth correctional facility recidivism study*. Honolulu, HI: Department of Attorney General. Available at: <http://hawaii.gov/ag/cpja/main/rs/Folder.2006-02-06.3414/hycf2.pdf>.
- Mbuba, J. M. (2004). *Juvenile recidivism: An analysis of race and other socio-demographic predictors within three intervention modalities in the state of Louisiana*. Doctoral Dissertation. Available from the Louisiana State University, Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- McElfresh, R., Yan, J., & Janku, A. (2009). *Juvenile offender recidivism report: A 2009 statewide juvenile court report*. Jefferson City, MO: Division of Court Programs and Research, Office of State Courts Administrator, Supreme Court of Missouri. Available at: www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=34387.

- Mersky, J. P., & Reynolds, A. J. (2007). Child maltreatment and violent delinquency: Disentangling main effects and subgroup effects. *Child Maltreatment*, 12(3), 246-258.
- Messner, S. F., & Krohn, M. D. (1990). Class, compliance structures, and delinquency: Assessing integrated structural-Marxist theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96, 300-328.
- Michigan Department of Human Services. (2005). *Recidivism for juvenile justice youths*. Available at: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dhs/DHS-BJJRecidivismShort_217024_7.pdf.
- Miner, M. H. (2002). Factors associated with recidivism in juveniles: An analysis of serious juvenile sex offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(4), 421-436.
- Moore, R. G., Stageberg, P., Wilson, B., Thorpe, E., Watson, A., & Wenck, B. (2001). *Recidivism of state FY96 prison releases in Iowa*. Des Moines, IA: Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, Statistical Analysis Center. Available at: http://www.humanrights.iowa.gov/cjpp/contact_us/index.html.
- Mulder, E., Brand, E., Bullens, R., & van Marle, H. (2011). Risk factors for overall recidivism and severity of recidivism in serious juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(1), 118-135.
- Nagin, D. S., & Paternoster, R. (1991). On the relationship of past to future participation in delinquency. *Criminology*, 29, 163-189.
- National Council on Crime and Delinquency and Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections Research and Development. (2002). *Outcome evaluation fifth annual report*.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1995). *Guide for implementing the comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic offenders*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/guide.pdf>.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2001). *The 8% solution*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/fs200139.pdf>.
- Olson, D. E., Dooley, B., & Kane, C. M. (2004). *The relationship between gang membership and inmate recidivism*. Research Bulletin from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 2(12), 1-12.
- Paternoster, P., Brame, R., & Farrington, D. P. (2001). On the relationship between adolescent and adult conviction frequencies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 17(3), 201-205.

- Patterson, G. R., & Dishion, T. J. (1985). Contribution of families and peers to delinquency. *Criminology*, 23, 63-79.
- Pealer, J. A. (n.d.). *What works/what doesn't in changing behaviors: The principles of effective interventions*. [PowerPoint slides]. Available at: www.sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/What_Works.pps.
- Pond, E. M., Watkins, A., Jenkins, L., Tjaden, C., & Engle, D. (2004). *Baseline recidivism rates FY 1998-FY2002*. Decatur, GA: Planning, Research, and Program Evaluation Unit, Department of Juvenile Justice, State of Georgia. Available at: <http://childwelfare.net/SJDC/recidivismresearch.pdf>.
- Puzzanchera, C. M. (2003). *Delinquency cases waived to criminal court, 1990-1999*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ryan, J. P., & Testa, M. F. (2005). Child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency: Investigating the role of placement and placement instability. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27(3), 227-249.
- Sampson, R. J., & Lauritsen, J. L. (1994). Violent victimization and offending: Individual-, situational-, and community-level risk factors. In A. J. Reiss and J. A. Roth (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing violence: Social influence* (pp. 1-115). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Scudder, R. G., Blount, W. R., Heider, K. M., & Silverman, I. J. (1993). Important links between child abuse, neglect, and delinquency. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 37(4), 315-323.
- Seydlitz, R., & Jenkins, P. (1998). The influence of families, friends, schools, and community in delinquent behavior. In T. P. Gullota, G. R. Adams, and R. Montemayor, R. (Eds.), *Delinquent violent youth: Theory and interventions* (pp. 53-91). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency in urban areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shepard, J. (1995). State pen or playpen? Is prevention 'pork' or simply good sense? *American Bar Association Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10, 34-37.
- Shufelt, J. L., & Cocozza, J. J. (2006). *Youth with mental health disorders in the juvenile justice system: Results from a multi-state prevalence study*. Delmar, NY: The National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice. Available at: <http://www.ncmhjj.com/pdfs/publications/PrevalenceRPB.pdf>.

- Sickmund, M., Snyder, H., & Poe-Yamagata, E. (1997). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1997 update on violence*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Sims, B. (2006). Theoretical explanations for juvenile delinquency. In B. Sims & P. Preston (Eds.), *Handbook of juvenile justice: Theory and practice* (pp. 77-92). Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Skowrya, K. R., & Coccozza, J. J. (2007). *Blueprint for change: A comprehensive model for the identification and treatment of youth with mental health needs in contact with the juvenile justice system*. Delmar, NY: The National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice. Available at: http://www.umt.edu/sociology/faculty_staff/burfeind/documents/Soc438_SkowryaCoccozza2007_s08.pdf.
- Snyder, H. (1998). Serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders: An assessment of the extent of and trends in officially-recognized serious criminal behavior in a delinquent population. In R. Loeber & D. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Stattin, H., & Magnusson, D. (1989). The role of early aggressive behavior in the frequency, seriousness, and types of later crime. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 710-718.
- Stattin, H., & Mahoney, J. L. (2000). Leisure activities and adolescent antisocial behavior: The role of structure and social context. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(2), 113-127.
- Strom, K. J. (2000). *Profile of state prisoners under age 18, 1985-97*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report (NCJ, 193427). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Sullivan, C. J., Veysey, B. M., Hamilton, Z. K., & Grillo, M. (2007). Reducing out-of-community placement and recidivism: Diversion of delinquent youth with mental health and substance use problems from juvenile justice. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(5), 555-577.
- Tennyson, H. R. (2009). *Reducing juvenile recidivism: A meta-analysis of treatment outcomes*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Pacific University, School of Professional Psychology: <http://commons.pacificu.edu/spp/109>.
- Thornberry, T. P. (1987). Toward an interactional theory of delinquency. *Criminology*, 25(4), 863-891.

- United States Sentencing Commission. (2004). *Measuring recidivism: The criminal history computation of the federal sentencing guidelines*. Washington, DC: Research Series on the Recidivism of Federal Guideline Offenders.
- van der Laan, A. M., Veenstra, R., Bogaerts, S., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2010). Serious, minor, and non-delinquents in early adolescence: The impact of cumulative risk and promotive factors. The TRAILS study. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 38, 339-351.
- van der Put, C. E. (2011). *Risk and needs assessment for juvenile delinquents*. Doctoral Dissertation. Available from the University of Amsterdam.
- Virginia Department of Justice. (2005). Juvenile recidivism in Virginia. *DJJ Quarterly*, 3, 1-12.
- Wallace, L. H. (2006). Increase in school violence: Myth or reality? In B. Sims & P. Preston (Eds.), *Handbook of juvenile justice: Theory and practice* (pp. 559-601). Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Warr, M. (1993). Parents, peers, and delinquency. *Social Forces*, 72(1), 247-264.
- Washington Sentencing Guidelines Commission. (2005). *Recidivism of juvenile offenders: Fiscal year 2005*. Available at: http://www.sgc.wa.gov/PUBS/Recidivism/Juvenile_Recidivism_Report_FY05.pdf.
- Wasserman, G. A., Keenan, K., Tremblay, R. E., Coie, J. D., Herrenkohl, T. I., Loeber, R., & Petechuk, D. (2003). *Risk and protective factors of child delinquency*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/193409.pdf>.
- Wiebush, R., Wagner, D., McNulty, B., Wang, Y., & Le, T. (2005). *Implementation and outcome evaluation of the intensive aftercare program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Herrnstein, R. (1985). *Crime and human nature*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Wilson, J. J., & Howell, J. C. (1993). *A comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Winner, L., Lanza-Kaduce, L., Bishop, D., & Frazier, C. (1997). The transfer of juveniles to criminal courts: Reexamining recidivism rates over the long term. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43(4), 548-563.

Winokur, K. P., Smith, A., Bontrayer, S. R., & Blakenship, J. L. (2008). Juvenile recidivism and length of stay. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(2), 126-137.

Wong, S. K. (2005). The effects of adolescent activities and delinquency: A differential involvement approach. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 24, 321–333.

Appendix A: List of Pennsylvania Counties by Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory Implementation Phases

One major component of the Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy (JJSES) was the implementation of a structured decision-making tool to evaluate the risk and need levels of youth under juvenile court supervision. Pennsylvania adopted the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI; hereafter referred to as YLS) to accomplish these goals. This tool is used to determine a juvenile’s strengths, criminogenic needs, and risk to recidivate by evaluating his or her responses to several domain areas (e.g., prior and current offenses, education, substance abuse, family, personality/behavior, peers, leisure/recreation, and attitudes/orientation). Based on the results of the YLS, probation officers can then develop a case plan that targets specific areas of risk and need unique to each juvenile.

Training regarding the use of the YLS was provided in four phases, listed below, in order to manage the implementation of this tool. The data collection process for the current study was also completed in four stages, consistent with the YLS implementation strategy.

PHASE I

Beaver	Bucks	Lehigh	Philadelphia
Berks	Cambria	Luzerne	
Blair	Cumberland	Northampton	

PHASE II

Adams	Columbia	Lancaster	Sullivan
Armstrong	Dauphin	Lycoming	Venango
Bradford	Franklin	Montgomery	Westmoreland
Centre	Huntingdon	Northumberland	Wyoming

PHASE III

Allegheny	Erie	Mercer	Union
Butler	Fayette	Mifflin	Washington
Chester	Fulton	Pike	Wayne
Clarion	Green	Schuylkill	York
Clinton	Jefferson	Snyder	
Crawford	Lawrence	Somerset	
Delaware	McKean	Tioga	

PHASE IV

Bedford	Elk*	Lackawanna	Perry
Cameron	Forest	Lebanon	Potter
Carbon	Indiana	Monroe*	Susquehanna
Clearfield	Juniata	Montour	Warren

* These counties have opted not to utilize the YLS and are thus not part of any YLS phase. For the current study, they were included in Phase 4 of the data pull.

Appendix B: County and Statewide Recidivism Rates Using an Alternative Definition of Recidivism

Inquires were made about how recidivism rates would be affected if the definition of recidivism was expanded, particularly to include certain instances which did not involve a judicial adjudication or determination of guilt. The following are recidivism rates using an alternative definition of recidivism where: 1.) *dismissed, not substantiated* was included as a valid disposition, thus including juveniles with this disposition in the base sample of youth analyzed, and 2.) *consent decrees* and *accelerated rehabilitative dispositions (ARDs)* were valid recidivating events, thus increasing the possibility of recidivism. As illustrated below, using this alternative definition of recidivism increased recidivism rates by only 2%.

****Please refer to page 19 for a detailed discussion on the impact that expunged cases have on calculating recidivism rates.****

Alternative County and Statewide Recidivism Rates for 2007 Case Closures: Rates with <i>Dismissed Not Substantiated, Consent Decrees, and Accelerated Rehabilitative Dispositions (ARDs)</i> Included					
County	Actual Recidivism Rate	Alternative Recidivism Rate	Alternative Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Alternative Definition	Number of Expunged Cases ^x
Adams	23%	25%	258	65	26
Allegheny	16%	18%	1,813	323	181
Armstrong	14%	16%	49	8	0
Beaver	17%	23%	315	72	0
Bedford	14%	19%	75	14	0
Berks	21%	26%	780	200	158
Blair	9%	10%	160	16	60
Bradford	19%	24%	68	16	0
Bucks	20%	18%	872	153	154
Butler	19%	20%	174	34	97
Cambria	16%	16%	436	71	20
Cameron	20%	20%	10	2	0
Carbon	8%	12%	112	13	0
Centre	11%	11%	55	6	11
Chester	19%	19%	631	123	38
Clarion	45%	48%	29	14	36
Clearfield	25%	25%	72	18	0
Clinton	0%	0%	7	0	0
Columbia	17%	19%	70	13	4
Crawford	17%	17%	127	21	0
Cumberland	29%	34%	90	31	894
Dauphin	22%	24%	874	206	13
Delaware	22%	23%	299	68	N/A**
Elk	22%	24%	37	9	4
Erie	21%	22%	711	159	6
Fayette	13%	22%	284	62	1
Forest	33%	33%	3	1	4
Franklin	24%	27%	351	95	4

County	Actual Recidivism Rate	Alternative Recidivism Rate	Alternative Number of Juveniles Who Had a Case Closed in 2007	Number of Recidivists by Alternative Definition	Number of Expunged Cases ^x
Fulton	6%	12%	17	2	0
Greene	8%	13%	38	5	88
Huntingdon	23%	22%	54	12	0
Indiana	13%	18%	80	14	1
Jefferson	25%	28%	74	21	98
Juniata	33%	29%	7	2	12
Lackawanna	25%	27%	267	73	102
Lancaster	28%	29%	399	114	7
Lawrence	17%	20%	203	41	1
Lebanon	30%	31%	304	95	0
Lehigh	10%	12%	904	107	36
Luzerne	21%	23%	406	95	318
Lycoming	29%	33%	300	98	74
McKean	27%	27%	52	14	91
Mercer	19%	19%	165	32	0
Mifflin	36%	35%	57	20	19
Monroe	9%	10%	249	24	0
Montgomery	21%	24%	1,052	254	117
Montour	19%	19%	26	5	2
Northampton	16%	19%	581	110	13
Northumberland	22%	24%	185	45	53
Perry	21%	21%	63	13	3
Philadelphia	29%	25%	2,703	687	306
Pike	12%	13%	87	11	0
Potter	15%	15%	27	4	0
Schuylkill	13%	13%	301	40	2
Snyder	27%	30%	64	19	2
Somerset	9%	10%	145	15	5
Sullivan	0%	0%	6	0	0
Susquehanna	23%	23%	57	13	0
Tioga	24%	29%	66	19	8
Union	29%	29%	38	11	10
Venango	9%	12%	49	6	18
Warren	15%	16%	77	12	1
Washington	25%	28%	354	98	4
Wayne	20%	22%	74	16	2
Westmoreland	13%	17%	564	95	88
Wyoming	28%	30%	71	21	1
York	24%	26%	1,015	266	57
Total:	20%	22%	19,943	4,342	3,250

^xThis figure represents the number of cases that were closed in 2007 and subsequently expunged. One juvenile may have had multiple expunged cases. Expunged cases are not included in recidivism rates.

N/A**: The number of expunged cases in Delaware County is unavailable.

**Appendix C: Private Provider Placement Facilities' Recidivism Rates:
Facilities with Less than Ten Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure**

****Please refer to page 66 for a cautionary note regarding placement facility recidivism rates****

Private Provider Placement Facilities' Recidivism Rates: Facilities with Less than Ten Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
Facility Name	Recidivists	Non- Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Academy Girls Residential Program	2	1	3	67%
Agape	1	2	3	33%
Anchor House	0	1	1	0%
Angel Baby Ministries	0	1	1	0%
Arbor Vale Independent Living	0	1	1	0%
ARE Of Reading	2	4	6	33%
Ashler Manor	1	4	5	20%
Auberle Home (Girls)	0	7	7	0%
Bair Foundation	1	6	7	14%
Baptist Children's Home	1	0	1	100%
Beaver County Children and Youth Foster Care	1	2	3	33%
Benchmark	0	2	2	0%
Bethesda Day Treatment	4	4	8	50%
Bethesda Residential Treatment Program	0	4	4	0%
Blackwell Center For Adolescent Treatment	1	1	2	50%
Bridgeview	1	7	8	13%
Brighter Horizons	0	1	1	0%
Brookside Adolescent Behavioral Health	0	1	1	0%
Bucks (Group Homes 1 - 4)	3	3	6	50%
Camp Adams	1	3	4	25%
Canal Waves	0	1	1	0%
Caron Foundation	1	4	5	20%
Catholic Social Services	1	0	1	100%
Chad Youth Enhancement Center	1	0	1	100%
Charter Prep	0	1	1	0%
Children's Center For Treatment	0	2	2	0%
Children's Choice	0	2	2	0%

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Children's Comprehensive Services of Ohio	0	1	1	0%
Children's Home Of Easton	0	1	1	0%
Children's Home Of York	4	4	8	50%
Children's Services, Inc.	0	2	2	0%
Christian House	0	1	1	0%
Cinnamon Hills	0	5	5	0%
Clearbrook Manor Drug And Alcohol	1	7	8	13%
Colorado Boys Ranch	2	1	3	67%
Community Alternative, Inc.	0	1	1	0%
Community House Group Home	0	1	1	0%
Community Specialists Corporation	1	0	1	100%
Cove Forge	2	6	8	25%
Creekside	0	1	1	0%
Crossroads Group Home	0	2	2	0%
Crossroads Home For Girls	0	3	3	0%
De LaSalle Vocational School	2	0	2	100%
Delaware Valley Mental Health Foundation	2	1	3	67%
Drug And Alcohol Rehab Services	1	1	2	50%
Edison Court	3	3	6	50%
Erie County Foster Care	3	2	5	60%
Evergreen	1	1	2	50%
Families Who Care	1	2	3	33%
Family Acts Group Home	0	1	1	0%
Family Care For Children & Youth	1	1	2	50%
Family United Foster Care	0	1	1	0%
Felder-Wright Independent Living	0	2	2	0%
First Step	1	2	3	33%
Florence Crittenton Services	1	3	4	25%
Friendship House	0	4	4	0%
Glade Run	0	3	3	0%
Gulf Coast Treatment Center	0	4	4	0%

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Gwen's Girls' Program	0	1	1	0%
High Point	1	1	2	50%
Holpen Village	0	5	5	0%
Holy Family Institute	1	8	9	11%
Impact Services, Inc.	1	0	1	100%
Jefferson County Specialized Foster Care	2	2	4	50%
Joshua House	0	2	2	0%
Keystone Center	0	1	1	0%
Keystone City Residence	1	1	2	50%
Kidstep	0	1	1	0%
Krause Intensive Treatment	0	1	1	0%
La Sa Quik	0	3	3	0%
Lake Grove	0	1	1	0%
Laurel Oaks	1	0	1	100%
Laurel Ridge	0	3	3	0%
Lutheran Children/ Family Service	1	0	1	100%
Lycoming County Children and Youth Foster Care	0	1	1	0%
Madalyn Program For Girls	0	2	2	0%
Madalyn Rite Of Passage	1	1	2	50%
Manito Day Treatment Services	4	3	7	57%
Mathom House	1	2	3	33%
McKean County Children and Youth Foster Care	1	1	2	50%
Meadows	0	2	2	0%
Mentor Clinical Care	0	1	1	0%
Middlecreek Secure Treatment Unit	0	3	3	0%
Mission Home Ministries	0	1	1	0%
Mitchell Program	1	1	2	50%
Monsour Medical Center	0	2	2	0%
Mountain Valley Center For Human Services	0	1	1	0%
New Dominion School, Inc.	1	0	1	100%

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
New Vitae	0	2	2	0%
Northeast Treatment	0	2	2	0%
Northern Tier Alternative Lifestyle Program	1	0	1	100%
Northern Tier Residential Treatment Program	0	1	1	0%
Northern Tier Youth Services Program	4	3	7	57%
Northumberland County Foster Care	0	2	2	0%
Northwestern Hospital of Psychiatry	1	1	2	50%
Open Hearts Youth Services	1	0	1	100%
Pennsylvania Child Care Center	2	3	5	40%
Pentz Run Youth Services	2	4	6	33%
Perkiomen Valley Academy	1	1	2	50%
Philadelphia Juvenile Justice Center	0	4	4	0%
Philhaven Mental Health	0	1	1	0%
Pinebrook Services For Child/Youth	4	1	5	80%
Pines Residential Treatment Center	8	1	9	89%
Pinkmeys Vineyard Of Faith Ministries	0	1	1	0%
Prescott House	6	3	9	67%
Pyramid Harmony	0	1	1	0%
Pyramid Healthcare (Brookside Adolescents)	0	1	1	0%
Pyramid Healthcare (Skyline Lodge)	0	2	2	0%
Reaching at Problems	1	0	1	100%
Right Of Passage	3	5	8	38%
Roselia Manor	0	1	1	0%
San Marcos (Texas) Sex Offenders	1	2	3	33%
Sarah Reed Children's Center	3	3	6	50%
Self Help	1	0	1	100%
Seven Mountain Academy	0	1	1	0%
Sleepy Hollow Academy	0	1	1	0%
Sleighton School	0	1	1	0%
Some Other Place	0	2	2	0%
Southwood Psychiatric Hospital	4	1	5	80%
SPHS Behavior Health	0	1	1	0%

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
St. Francis Vocational School	2	0	2	100%
Stepping Stone	1	1	2	50%
Stormbreak Youth Program	0	1	1	0%
The Oaks Residential Treatment Facility	1	2	3	33%
Tioga County Intensive Foster Care	0	1	1	0%
Tioga County Residential Treatment Center	1	3	4	25%
Valley Youth House Committee, Inc.	1	1	2	50%
ViaQuest	1	3	4	25%
Ward Home For Children	0	1	1	0%
Warwick House	0	1	1	0%
Wesley Institute	2	5	7	29%
Western Pennsylvania Adolescent Center	0	1	1	0%
Westmeade	2	5	7	29%
Whale's Tale	1	2	3	33%
Wind Gap	1	1	2	50%
Windsor Pointe York County	0	2	2	0%
Wings For Life	0	3	3	0%
Women's Association For Women's Alternatives	0	3	3	0%
Wordsworth	0	1	1	0%
Youth Build	1	0	1	100%
Zerby Gap	1	2	3	33%

**Appendix D: Youth Development Centers'/Youth Forestry Camps'
Recidivism Rates: Facilities with Less than Ten Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure**

****Please refer to page 66 for a cautionary note regarding placement facility recidivism rates****

Youth Development Centers'/Youth Forestry Camps' Recidivism Rates: Facilities with Less than Ten Juveniles with a 2007 Case Closure				
Facility Name	Recidivists	Non- Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Allentown Secure Treatment Unit	4	1	5	80%
Embreeville (Formally SESTU)	0	1	1	0%
North Central Secure-Ravine	3	3	6	50%
Weaversville	3	2	5	60%
YDC Bensalem	1	0	1	100%

Appendix E: Detention and Shelter Facilities' Recidivism Rates

Detention and Shelter Facilities' Recidivism Rates				
Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Adelphoi Village	0	2	2	0%
Allencrest	31	66	97	32%
Barnes Hall/Lancaster County	95	155	250	38%
Berks County-Detention	107	244	351	30%
Bethany Home, Inc.	9	30	39	23%
Blair County-Detention	9	38	47	19%
LBHS Shelter	0	1	1	0%
Bucks County- Detention	89	198	287	31%
Cambria County-Detention	23	91	114	20%
CAYC	0	1	1	0%
Central Counties Youth Center	41	51	92	45%
Chester County-Detention	54	14	68	79%
Children's Aid Society	1	2	3	33%
Children's Home Of Easton	0	1	1	0%
Children's Home Of Reading	1	0	1	100%
Children's Home Of York	1	1	2	50%
Community Based Shelters (Philadelphia)	255	398	653	39%
Cornell Abraxas- Detention	67	104	171	39%
Cornell Abraxas-Shelter	2	2	4	50%
Delaware County- Detention Center	29	108	137	21%
E. L. Thomas	83	165	248	33%
Family Care Service	2	2	4	50%
Franklin County Children Aid Society	0	4	4	0%
Hermitage House/Crawford County	3	16	19	16%
Jefferson County Ohio Detention Center	35	60	95	37%
Keystone Adolescent Center	5	4	9	56%
Keystone Shelter Care	1	1	2	50%
KidsPeace	0	1	1	0%
Krause Shelter	1	3	4	25%
Lackawanna County- Detention	38	65	103	37%
Lehigh County- Detention	67	276	343	20%
Luzerne County- Detention	54	152	206	26%

Facility Name	Recidivists	Non-Recidivists	Total	Recidivism Rate
Lycoming County-Shelter	1	0	1	100%
Mid-Atlantic Youth Services - Secure	1	0	1	100%
Montgomery County- Detention	123	241	364	34%
Northampton County- Detention	41	159	200	21%
Northumberland County Foster Care	0	2	2	0%
Northwestern Academy	41	109	150	27%
Pathways Adolescent Center	1	1	2	50%
S.M. Shelter	1	0	1	100%
Schaffner Youth Center- Detention	111	258	369	30%
Schaffner Youth Center- Shelter	0	1	1	0%
Shuman	194	695	889	22%
Tioga County-Detention	60	104	164	37%
Valley Youth House	0	1	1	0%
West PA CC Shelter	2	2	4	50%
Westmoreland County- Detention	51	137	188	27%
York County- Detention	77	109	186	41%
Youth Study Center	113	208	321	35%
Unknown	9	24	33	

Appendix F: Definitions of Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders

Pennsylvania's Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offense Charge Codes			
Type of Offender	Serious Offenses	Violent Offenses	Chronic Offender
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burglary (18 Pa. C.S. §3502); • Felony Thefts (18 Pa. C.S. §3921-3927); • Arson (18 Pa. C.S. §3301); and • Manufacture/ Deliver/ Possession with Intent to Deliver Drugs (35 Pa. C.S. §780-113A30) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murder (18 Pa. C.S. §2501, 18 Pa. C.S. §2502); • Non-Negligent Manslaughter (18 Pa. C.S. §2503); • Rape (18 Pa. C.S. §3121); • Robbery (18 Pa. C.S. §3701, 18 Pa. C.S. §3702); • Aggravated Assault (18 Pa. C.S. §2702); • Kidnapping (18 Pa. C.S. §2901); and • Weapons Offenses (excluding weapon on school property; 18 Pa. C.S. §2716, 5122, 6103, 6105, 6106, 6108, 6110, or 6110.1) 	<p>Four or more written allegations for separate incidents that occurred up to the date of the juvenile's 2007 case closure</p>

Snyder's (1998) Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offender Definitions

Definition	<p>Juvenile offenders who committed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burglary; • Serious Larceny; • Motor Vehicle Theft; • Arson; • Weapon Offenses; or • Drug Trafficking 	<p>Juveniles offenders who committed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murder or Non-Negligent Manslaughter; • Kidnapping; • Violent Sexual Assault; • Robbery; or • Aggravated Assault 	<p>Juvenile offenders who had four or more court referrals</p>
-------------------	---	--	--

Baglivo's (2012) Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offender Definitions

Type of Offender	Serious Offender	Violent Offender	Chronic Offender
Definition	Juvenile offenders who had an official record of a felony offense	Juvenile offenders who had a firearm/weapon charge OR an against-person felony referral	Juveniles offenders who had four or more referrals for misdemeanor or felony offenses