
USM MUSKIE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
DIVISION OF JUVENILE SERVICES

ANNUAL
JUVENILE RECIDIVISM
REPORT

2011

ANNUAL MAINE JUVENILE RECIDIVISM REPORT

ISSUED BY THE MAINE DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, DIVISION OF JUVENILE SERVICES,
AND PRODUCED BY THE
MUSKIE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE,
MAINE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER

AUTHOR
BECKY NORÉUS

JANUARY 2011

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary..... 1**
 - Key Findings..... 1*
- Introduction 2**
 - Recidivism Research in Maine 2*
 - Maine Department of Corrections Division of Juvenile Services 2*
- Study Overview 3**
 - The Annual Recidivism Report..... 3*
- Section I. Cohort Characteristics..... 5**
 - How Many Youth Are Adjudicated for the First Time?..... 5*
 - What Is Supervision?..... 6*
 - How Many Youth Receive Supervision? 6*
 - What Are the Population Characteristics of the Cohort?..... 7*
 - What Are the Offense Characteristics of the Cohort?..... 9*
 - Do Gender, Race, or Age, Relate to Offense Characteristics? 11*
- Section II. One Year Recidivism 12**
 - How Many Youth Recidivated Within One Year?..... 12*
 - Do Recidivism Rates Differ by Gender, Race, or Age?..... 13*
 - Do Recidivism Rates Differ by Cohort Offense Characteristics?..... 14*
 - Are Recidivating Offenses Typically More or Less Serious?..... 15*
 - What Are Recidivating Offense Characteristics?..... 16*
- Section III. Recidivism Trends 17**
 - How Many Months After First Adjudication did Youth Tend to Recidivate?..... 17*
 - How Did Recidivism Rates Change over Time? 17*
 - Did Three Year Recidivism Rates Differ by Gender, Race or Age?..... 19*
 - Did Three Year Recidivism Rates Differ by Offense Characteristics?..... 20*
- Section IV. Risk Level Analysis 21**
 - How is Risk Assessed? 21*
 - How Many Youth in the Cohort Received a YLS-CMI Score? 21*
 - What Risk Level Were Youth? 22*
 - Did One Year Recidivism Rates Differ by Risk Level?..... 22*
 - Did Risk Levels Relate to Time to Recidivate? 23*

<i>Did Risk Scores Differ by Gender, Race, and Age?</i>	23
<i>Did Risk Scores Relate to Recidivism?</i>	24
<i>Did Risk Scores Relate to Recidivism by Gender, Race and Age?</i>	24
<i>Did Three Year Recidivism Differ by YLS-CMI Risk Level?</i>	25
Section V: County Level Analysis	26
<i>Did Adjudication and Supervision Rates Differ by County?</i>	26
<i>What Were Demographic Differences among Counties?</i>	27
<i>What Were Offense Differences among Counties?</i>	28
<i>What Were One Year Recidivism Rates, By County?</i>	30
References	31
Appendix I: Department of Juvenile Services Case Management	32
Appendix II: Glossary of Terms	34
Appendix III: Offenses by Type	38
Drugs/Alcohol:	38
Acknowledgements	

Executive Summary

The Maine Department of Corrections (MDOC) Division of Juvenile Services (DJS) contracts with the Muskie School of Public Service in a state-university partnership to analyze juvenile recidivism rates. DJS measures juvenile justice outcomes to guide policy and program development geared toward recidivism reduction. Reduction of youth recidivism in Maine increases public safety.

Recidivism in this report is defined as **a re-adjudication (juvenile) or conviction (adult) for an offense committed by a youth in Maine within three years of his or her first adjudication**. This report measures DJS impact on youth who have been adjudicated and placed under supervision by examining rates of recidivism.

The number of youth adjudicated for the first time decreased 15.8% between 2006 and 2008, from 1,480 to 1,246. Half of these youth are placed under DJS supervision. The key findings section discusses these supervised youth, which decreased in number 20.5%, between 2006 and 2008, from 825 to 656.

Key Findings

- **More than half of youth were adjudicated for one offense.**
- **Approximately 80% of youth were adjudicated for a misdemeanor.**
- **Approximately 80% of youth were boys.**
- **Approximately 70% of youth were between the ages of 15-17 when they were adjudicated.**
- **One year recidivism rates ranged between 21.1% and 26.5% in the three year study period.**
- **Even after three years, most 2006 cohort youth (61%) did not recidivate.**
- **Youth who recidivated tended to do so quickly, with the highest number of youth recidivating within the first three months compared to any other time period.**
- **Youth classified as low risk recidivated at lower rates than moderate and high risk youth.**
- **Girls and minority youth scored higher on the YLS-CMI risk assessment in 2007 and 2008 but these groups did not recidivate at higher rates.**

Introduction

Recidivism Research in Maine

The Maine Department of Corrections (MDOC) Division of Juvenile Services (DJS) contracts with the Muskie School of Public Service in a state-university partnership to analyze juvenile recidivism rates. DJS measures juvenile justice outcomes to guide policy and program development geared toward recidivism reduction. Reduction of youth recidivism in Maine increases public safety.

Maine Department of Corrections Division of Juvenile Services

The two major functions of DJS are **diversion**¹ and **supervision**², which occur at different points in the juvenile justice system, before (pre) and after (post) adjudication. **Adjudication means that a youth has gone before a judge and has been found to have committed an offense for which, if the youth was over the age of 18, would have resulted in a conviction.** DJS manages the pre-adjudicatory process by diverting appropriate youth away from the juvenile justice system. DJS also provides supervision to youth who have been adjudicated and placed under DJS supervision by a judge. The chart below illustrates diversion and supervision procedure in the juvenile justice system in Maine.³

Figure 0-1: Juvenile Justice System Procedure in Maine



¹Diversion means that a youth is not petitioned to court, and instead receives an informal adjustment or no further action. See Appendix II for definitions of these court actions.

²Supervision means that a youth receives either a) a disposition of suspended commitment and placed on probation or b) a disposition of commitment and is sent to a Youth Development Center.

³There are several other decision points in the juvenile justice system (e.g., petition); however to illustrate the primary functions of DJS, only those decision points directly relating to diversion and supervision are illustrated above.

Study Overview

The Annual Recidivism Report

This report measures DJS impact on youth who have been adjudicated and placed under supervision by examining rates of recidivism. Recidivism in this report is defined as **a re-adjudication (juvenile) or conviction (adult) for an offense committed by a youth in Maine within three years of his or her first adjudication.**

Study Population

This report describes three cohorts of youth who were adjudicated for the first time and were placed under supervision in the 2006, 2007, or 2008 calendar years. It tracks the youth for up to three years from the date of adjudication to determine whether they recidivate. This report follows youth who are re-adjudicated or convicted for an offense committed after his or her first adjudication, regardless of whether a youth was still under supervision at the time of second offense. Youth who reached the age of 18 were tracked into the adult criminal system. This report does not determine recidivism rates for youth who were diverted from the juvenile justice system, or who went before a court but were not adjudicated. Youth are tracked in only one cohort. If a youth was adjudicated in 2006, that youth would be excluded from future cohorts.

Table 0-1: Cohort and Recidivism Timeframes

Cohort	Adjudicated Between	Recidivism Rates Calculated At
2006	January 1 – December 31, 2006	Six months, one year, two years, three years
2007	January 1 – December 31, 2007	Six months, one year, two years
2008	January 1 – December 31, 2008	Six months, one year

Report Sections

This report examines characteristics of the youth in each cohort, including the types and severity of offenses associated with adjudication and recidivism. The report examines one year recidivism rates, multi-year recidivism rates and multi-year recidivism trends. For the first time, this report presents recidivism by level of risk. DJS assesses the risk of recidivating with the Youth Level of Service-Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI), a tool which also provides information for case planning. The report also examines county differences in recidivism rates.

Data Sources

The Maine Correctional Information System (CORIS) is the primary data source for the report. CORIS is a comprehensive, multi-purpose, information system that captures information on youth and adults involved in Maine's juvenile justice and correctional systems. The study tracks each cohort for three years, although only the 2006 cohort can be tracked for the full follow-up period.

The report includes youth who become adults during the tracking period. Looking to the adult system to measure recidivism provides a more accurate picture.

While the youngest cohort youth (14 and under) cannot age out of the system during the three year follow-up, older youth can. Youth who become adults are first tracked using CORIS to determine whether they were convicted and sentenced to adult supervision. CORIS, however, will not capture data on youth who become adults and are convicted, but not sentenced to supervision. To capture those data, researchers accessed data from The Maine Department of Public Safety (MDPS) Criminal Information System (CHRIS).

Limitations

Maine is a rural state. Analysis is limited in some areas of analysis due to small numbers. Where fewer than 10 cases occur, numbers/percentages are not reported because: (1) small numbers may make it possible to identify individuals, and (2) small changes in numbers make percent changes and proportions in subset analysis less meaningful. For example, a change from two incidents to three is a 50% increase, which by itself is misleading.

Because the analysis is based on a secondary data set, only data collected and entered into CORIS is analyzed. Potential for error exists, even if staff are well-trained in data entry. Missing data may impact findings, specifically in YLS-CMI analysis.

While DJS has reported on juvenile recidivism since the 1998 cohort, the cohort definition changed. Therefore, recidivism rates from previous reports are not comparable to recidivism rates in this report.

In this report, only the 2006 cohort can be tracked for three years. Subsequent reports will continue to track the 2007 and 2008 cohorts for up to three years.

Other Recidivism Research


This report is the first of four that will provide a comprehensive picture of youth who are involved with the juvenile justice system in Maine and their outcomes. The reports will examine four different populations:

1. Youth who are adjudicated for the first time and placed under supervision (this report)
2. Youth who are discharged from supervision
3. Youth who are committed to one of Maine's Youth Development Centers
4. Youth who are diverted

Section I. Cohort Characteristics

The number of youth who are adjudicated for the first time in any of the three years (2006, 2007, 2008) is a fraction of Maine's youth population ages 10-17.


Figure I-1: Youth Adjudicated For the First Time as a Percentage of Maine's Youth Population, Ages 10-17, 2006-2008 Average



How Many Youth Are Adjudicated for the First Time?

Maine's overall youth population ages 10-17 decreased 5.4% between 2006 and 2008. The number of youth who were adjudicated for the first time decreased 15.8% during this time.

Figure I-2: Youth Who Were Adjudicated for the First Time: Number and Percent of Maine's Youth Population Ages 10-17, by Cohort Year




What Is Supervision?

Supervision in the Maine juvenile corrections system means a youth has gone before a judge, been adjudicated, and either a) placed under community supervision (probation) or, b) committed to a Youth Development Center (YDC)⁴. Supervised youth receive case management services from DJS, and also may be required to participate in individual, family or group therapy, or other services.

How Many Youth Receive Supervision?

Just over half of youth who are adjudicated for the first time are placed under supervision. The number of youth placed under supervision decreased 20.5% between 2006 and 2008.

Figure I-3: Number and Percent of Youth Who Were Adjudicated for the First Time and Placed Under Supervision, by Year



From this point forward in the report, youth who were adjudicated for the first time and placed under supervision of DJS are referred to as “the cohort” or “cohorts.” The rest of the report describes the 2006, 2007, and 2008 cohorts.

⁴Maine has two Youth Development Centers: Long Creek Youth Development Center, located in South Portland and Mountain View Youth Development Center, located in Charleston.

What Are the Population Characteristics of the Cohort?

Gender

Girls comprise approximately one-fifth of each cohort. While the number of girls decreased more than the number of boys between 2006 and 2008, the change is not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).


Table I-1: Number and Percent Supervised by Gender

	2006		2007		2008		Percent Change
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Male	652	79.0%	582	79.1%	528	80.5%	-19.0%
Female	173	21.0%	154	20.9%	128	19.5%	-26.0%
Total	825	100.0%	736	100.0%	656	100.0%	-20.5%

Race

Minority youth are increasingly disproportionately represented in the cohorts. Minorities comprised 5.4% of Maine's youth population ages 10-17⁵ in 2006, and 6.0% by 2008. During this time, the proportion of the cohorts comprised by minority youth increased from 6.1% to 10.1%.

Figure I-4: Cohort Compared with Maine's Youth Population Ages 10-17 That Are Minority



Maine's white youth population ages 10-17 decreased 6.0% between 2006 and 2008, while the minority population in the state increased 6.5% during this time. In the cohorts, the number of white youth decreased 23.9%, while the number of minority youth increased 32.0%.

⁵OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile populations (<http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>)

Table I-2: Cohort and Youth Population by Race, 2006-2008


	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		2008 Cohort		Percent Change
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Number of Cohort Youth							
White Youth	775	93.9%	679	92.3%	590	89.9%	-23.9%
All Minority Youth	50	6.1%	57	7.7%	66	10.1%	32.0%
Black/African American Youth	27	3.3%	32	4.3%	34	5.2%	25.9%
All other Minority Youth	23	2.8%	25	3.4%	32	4.9%	39.1%
Total Cohort Youth	825	100.0%	736	100.0%	656	100.0%	-20.5%

Maine Youth Population Ages 10-17							
	#	%	#	%	#	%	Percent Change
White Youth	131,234	94.6%	127,790	94.3%	123,305	94.0%	-6.0%
All Minority Youth	7,446	5.4%	7,688	5.7%	7,933	6.0%	6.5%
Black/African American Youth	2,532	1.8%	2,658	2.0%	2,750	2.1%	8.6%
All other Minority Youth	4,914	3.6%	5,030	3.7%	5,183	3.9%	5.5%
Maine's Youth Population	138,680	100%	135,478	100%	131,238	100%	-5.4%

Age

The number of cohort youth ages fourteen and under decreased 37.6% between 2006 and 2008. The mean (average) age of youth placed under supervision remained stable at just under 16 years (15.65 in 2006 to 15.82 in 2008).

Figure I-5: Cohort by Age



What Are the Offense Characteristics of the Cohort?

Offense characteristics analysis is based on the most serious offense at adjudication. Offenses, in order of most to least severe, are: felony, misdemeanor, and civil⁶. Offense types are characterized as most to least severe as follows: personal, property, drug/alcohol, and 'other'⁷.

Number of Offenses

More than three quarters of each cohort were adjudicated for two or fewer offenses. While the number of offenses per youth increased from 2006 to 2008, from 2.07 to 2.25, the total number of offenses decreased by 13.8% during that time.

Table I-3: Offenses at First Adjudication, Mean, Sum, 2006-2008

	2006 Cohort	2007 Cohort	2008 Cohort
Number of youth	825	736	656
Mean number of offenses	2.07	2.30	2.25
Total number of offenses	1,710	1,693	1,474

Offense Class

Consistently in each of the three cohorts, about 80% of the most serious offenses were misdemeanors.

Table I-4: Cohort Youth by Offense Class

	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		2008 Cohort	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Felony	154	18.7%	151	20.5%	130	19.8%
Misdemeanor	668	81.0%	581	78.9%	526	80.2%
Total Youth⁸	825	100.0%	736	100.0%	656	100.0%


⁶Youth whose most serious charged offense is a civil offense are typically diverted by JCCOs, or if sent to the courts and adjudicated, are not placed under supervision. Civil offenses are mainly alcohol, such as minor possessing or consuming alcohol.

⁷For a list of 'Other' offenses, please see Appendix III.

⁸Because of the small number of civil offenses in 2006 and 2007, the number of misdemeanors and felonies is less than the total number of youth.

Offense Type

Property offenses were the most common offense type in all three years. The percentage of personal offenses increased from 2006 to 2008.



Offense Class and Type

Consistently, property offenses were the most common offense, regardless of offense class. Personal offenses increased, especially at the misdemeanor level¹⁰.

Table I-5: Cohort by Type and Class (misdemeanor)

Misdemeanor	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		2008 Cohort	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Personal	259	39.7%	230	40.4%	237	45.8%
Property	335	50.9%	304	53.3%	241	46.5%
Drugs/Alcohol	64	9.7%	36	6.3%	40	7.7%
Total Misdemeanor	658	100%	570	100%	518	100%

Table I-6: Cohort by Type and Class (felony)

Felony	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		2008 Cohort	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Personal	41	27.1%	45	30.2%	40	31.3%
Property	94	62.3%	90	60.4%	72	56.3%
Drugs/Alcohol	16	10.6%	14	9.4%	16	12.5%
Total Felony	151	100%	149	100%	128	100%

⁹Totals do not equal 100% because 'Other' offenses were not included.

¹⁰The following tables exclude 'other' offenses and will be less than the total offenses reported in table 1-5.

Do Gender, Race, or Age, Relate to Offense Characteristics?

Gender


Boys were more likely to be adjudicated for more than one offense, and for more serious offenses (felonies), while girls were more likely to be adjudicated for one offense and for less serious offenses (misdemeanors). This difference was statistically significant in 2007 and 2008, ($p < 0.05$) but not in 2006 ($p > 0.05$).

Table I-7: Number of Offenses by Gender, 2006-2008

	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		2008 Cohort	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Number of Youth	652	173	582	154	528	128
Total number of offenses	1,424	286	1,453	240	1,230	244
Mean number of offenses	2.18	1.65	2.50	1.56	2.33	1.91
Median	2	1	2	1	1	1

More than one fifth of boys were adjudicated for a felony, a much higher percentage than girls. This difference was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Figure I-6: Percent of Offenses That Are Felony, by Gender



Race

While minority youth were disproportionately represented in the cohort, there were no statistically significant differences in number of offenses, offense type, or class.

Age

Age did not differ significantly by offense class or type.

Section II. One Year Recidivism

The analysis tracked youth into the adult system to ensure the most accurate recidivism analysis. This section discusses one year recidivism rates.

How Many Youth Recidivated Within One Year?


One year recidivism rates fluctuated across cohorts. With the exception of 2007, the one year recidivism rate was just over 21%. In other words, nearly 80% of youth did not commit a new offense within one year of their first adjudication.

Table II-1: Total Cohort Recidivism Rate, 2006-2008

	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		2008 Cohort	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Recidivism	174	21.1%	195	26.4%	143	21.8%
Did Not Recidivate	651	78.9%	541	73.5%	513	78.2%
Total Youth	825	100.0%	736	100.0%	656	100.0%

Adult convictions made up a very small proportion of youth who recidivated within one year, at just over two percent.

Figure II-1: One Year Recidivism Rates, Juvenile Re-adjudication and Adult Convictions




Do Recidivism Rates Differ by Gender, Race, or Age¹¹?

Gender

Boys recidivated at higher rates than girls in each cohort with the 2006 cohort showing statistical significance ($p < 0.05$).


Figure II-2 One Year Recidivism Rate, by Year 2006-2008



Race

Minority youth recidivated at higher rates than white youth in the 2006 and 2007 cohorts, with 2006 showing statistical significance. White youth recidivated at higher rates in the 2008 cohort, but this difference was not statistically significant.

Figure II-3: One Year Recidivism Rates by Race, 2006-2008



¹¹Small numbers may influence findings when recidivism is broken down by population characteristics.

Age


On average, youth who recidivated within one year were younger at first adjudication than those who did not (on average, 15.4 compared to 15.8 years old). While the difference was less than half a year, it was statistically significant ($p < 0.00$). Youth who recidivated within a year were, on average, 15.9 years old at the time of the second offense.

Do Recidivism Rates Differ by Cohort Offense Characteristics?

Number of Offenses at First-Adjudication

Youth who were first adjudicated for multiple offenses recidivated at higher rates than those who were adjudicated for one offense.

Figure III-4: One Year Recidivism Rates by Number of Offenses at First Adjudication, 2006-2008 Cohorts



Offense Class at First-Adjudication

Between 20% and 26.8% of the cohort recidivated within one year, regardless of whether the offense was a misdemeanor or felony.


Table II-1: Recidivism Rate by Most Serious First-Adjudicated Offense Class, 2006-2008

Class	2006 Cohort		2007 Cohort		2008 Cohort	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Felony	35	22.7%	34	22.5%	23	17.7%
Misdemeanor	139	20.8%	160	27.5%	120	22.8%
Total Recidivism	174	21.1%	195	26.5%	143	21.8%

Offense Type at First-Adjudication

Property offenses were associated with higher recidivism rates. In each cohort, less than 10 youth whose most serious offense was a drug/alcohol offense at the time of their first adjudication recidivated within one year, which is why they are not included in the graph below.


Figure II-5: One Year Recidivism Rate by Most Serious Offense Type



Are Recidivating Offenses Typically More or Less Serious?

The vast majority of youth who recidivated were re-adjudicated for or convicted of an equal or lesser offense than at first adjudication. Approximately 20% of each cohort who were adjudicated for a felony at first adjudication cannot be re-adjudicated for a more serious offense because, by definition, felony is the most serious offense.

Figure II-6: One Year Recidivism: Change in Offense Severity Between First and Second Adjudication



What Are Recidivating Offense Characteristics?

Number of Recidivating Offenses

Most youth who recidivated had one recidivating offense. The mean number of offenses rose between 2006 and 2008. The mean number of recidivating offenses was smaller than the mean number of offenses per youth at first adjudication.

Table II-3: Recidivating Offense: Total Youth, Total Offenses, Mean and Median

	2006	2007	2008
Number of youth who recidivate	174	195	143
Total number of offenses	312	385	345
Mean number of offenses	1.79	1.97	2.41
Median	1	1	1

Recidivating Offense Class

Between 13% and 17% of youth recidivated with a non-criminal, civil offense¹².

Table II-4: Most Serious Recidivating Offenses, One Year Recidivism, 2006 to 2008

	2006		2007		2008	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Felony	35	20.1%	30	15.4%	31	21.7%
Misdemeanor	116	66.7%	139	71.3%	88	61.5%
Civil	23	13.2%	26	13.3%	24	16.8%
Total Recidivism	174	21.1%	195	26.5%	143	21.8%

Recidivating Offense Type

Between 20.0% and 26.6% of youth recidivated with a drug/alcohol offense. This statistic was driven by civil offenses. Between 40.0% and 65.7% of the most serious recidivating drug/alcohol offenses were civil offenses.

Table II-5: Most Serious Recidivating Offense Type

	2006		2007		2008	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Personal	66	37.9%	69	35.4%	33	23.1%
Property	71	40.8%	87	44.6%	72	50.3%
Drug/Alcohol	35	20.1%	39	20.0%	38	26.6%
Total	174	100%	195	100%	143	100%


¹²These offenses are noncriminal drug or alcohol offenses.

Section III. Recidivism Trends

How Many Months After First Adjudication Did Youth Tend to Recidivate?

The first three months of supervision are critical, with the highest number of youth recidivating during that period.

Figure III-1: Months to Recidivate, 2006 to 2008 Cohorts



How Did Recidivism Rates Change over Time?

The highest percentage of youth recidivated within six months. The percentage of youth who recidivated within one year was roughly double the percentage that recidivated between one and two years.

Figure III-2: Recidivism Rates over Time, 2006 to 2008 Cohorts




Table III-1: Recidivism Rates by Time, 2006 to 2008

	2006		2007		2008	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Six Months	111	13.5%	121	16.4%	92	14.0%
One Year	174	21.1%	195	26.5%	143	21.8%
Two Years	259	31.4%	274	37.2%		
Three Years	322	39.0%				

2006 Cohort, Re-Adjudication and Conviction

Over time, as youth aged out of the system, the proportion of youth who re-offended as adults increased. Within three years, 9% of cohort youth recidivated as adults. This was just under a quarter of the 322 youth who recidivated within 3 years.

Figure III-3: Three Year Recidivism Rate, Juvenile Re-Adjudications and Adult Convictions, 2006 Cohort (N = 825)




Table III-2 Three Year Recidivism Rate, Juvenile Re-Adjudications and Adult Convictions, 2006 Cohort

	Total		Juvenile Adjudications		Adult Convictions	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Six Months	111	13.5%	104	12.6%	<10	-
One Year	174	21.1%	157	19.0%	17	2.1%
Two Years	259	31.4%	222	26.9%	37	4.5%
Three Years	322	39.0%	248	30.0%	74	9.0%

Did Three Year Recidivism Rates Differ by Gender, Race or Age?

In 2006, minority youth and the youngest youth recidivated at the highest rates, while the oldest youth in the cohort recidivated at lower rates.

Figure III-4: Three Year Recidivism Rates by Population Characteristics, 2006 Cohort




Table III-3: 2006 Cohort, Recidivism Rates by Population Characteristic

Population	Total	Three Year Recidivism		Total Juvenile		Total Adult	
	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
Girls	173	57	32.9%	45	26.0%	12	6.9%
Boys	652	265	40.6%	203	31.1%	62	9.5%
14 and under	189	94	49.7%	94	49.7%	0	0.0%
15-17	561	210	37.4%	154	27.4%	56	10.0%
18 and older	75	18	24.0%	0	0.0%	18	24.0%
White	775	295	38.1%	230	29.7%	65	8.4%
Minority	50	27	54.0%	18	36.0%	<10	-
Three Year Recidivism Rate	825	322	39.0%	248	30.0%	74	9.0%

Did Three Year Recidivism Rates Differ by Offense Characteristics?

Youth adjudicated for property offenses and multiple offenses recidivated at the highest rates. Youth adjudicated for drug/alcohol offenses recidivated at the lowest rates.

Figure III-5: Three Year Recidivism Rate by Offense Characteristics, 2006 Cohort




Table III-4: Three Year Recidivism Rate by Offense Type, 2006 Cohort¹³

Population	Total	Three Year Recidivism		Total Juvenile		Total Adult	
	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
One Offense	429	150	35.0%	109	25.4%	41	9.6%
Multiple Offense	396	172	43.4%	139	35.1%	33	8.3%
Felony	154	60	39.0%	47	30.5%	13	8.4%
Misdemeanor	668	261	39.1%	201	30.1%	60	9.0%
Personal	300	112	37.3%	86	28.7%	26	8.7%
Property	429	187	43.6%	153	35.7%	34	7.9%
Drug/Alcohol	83	17	20.5%	<10	-	11	13.3%
Three Year Recidivism Rate	825	322	39.0%	248	30.0%	74	9.0%

¹³Adult and juvenile rate totals may not equal 100% because of rounding

Section IV. Risk Level Analysis

This section examines the Youth Level of Service-Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI), including completion rates, average scores and classifications, and discusses how the risk level and score relates to recidivism.

How Is Risk Assessed?

DJS uses the YLS-CMI to measure risk of recidivism and to guide case planning of supervised youth. The tool is comprised of 8 domains¹⁴. The score has been shown to correlate with recidivism¹⁵. Per DJS policy, all youth under supervision should be administered the YLS-CMI within 30 days after placement under supervision. For this analysis, YLS-CMIs that were administered within the following timeframe were included: 180 days before first adjudication to 30 days after first adjudication.

A YLS-CMI score can range from 0-42, with higher scores indicating a higher risk of recidivism. Because the tool has not been normed for Maine's population, and no detailed analysis has been conducted to develop a classification scheme specifically for Maine's youth, DJS uses four levels, 'low', 'moderate', 'high', and 'very high'. High and very high were combined for analysis because of the small number of 'very high' (see table).

YLS-CMI Levels		
Low	Moderate	High
0-8	9-22	23-42

There are limitations with YLS-CMI analysis. Missing data may affect YLS-CMI findings. This may be a data entry issue or that youth were not administered the YLS-CMI within the target timeframe. Also, the tool needs to be scored consistently across staff for it to be most predictive. All JCCOs receive training on scoring the YLS-CMI, but Maine's inter-rater reliability level is currently unknown.

How Many Youth in the Cohort Received a YLS-CMI Score?

More than three quarters of youth in the cohort received a YLS-CMI score within the timeframe. The remaining youth either did not receive a YLS-CMI, or did not receive one within the study timeframe.

Table IV-1: Number Cohort Youth with a YLS-CMI

	2006	2007	2008
YLS Completed	644	555	517
Total Cohort	825	736	656
Percentage YLS Supervised	78.1%	75.4%	78.8%


¹⁴YLS-CMI domains are: Prior and Current Offenses, Family Circumstances, Education/Employment, Peer Relations, Substance Use, Leisure/Recreation, Personality/Behavior, and Attitudes/Orientation.

¹⁵Schmidt, Hoge, & Gomes. (2005). Reliability and Validity Analysis of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32(3).

What Risk Level Were Youth?

Average YLS-CMI scores were 12 to 13 among the three cohorts, which is at the lower end of 'Moderate' risk. Most youth in the cohorts were classified as low or moderate risk.


Figure IV-1: YLS-CMI Risk Levels



Did One Year Recidivism Rates Differ by Risk Level?

Low risk youth consistently recidivated at lower rates than their moderate and high risk counterparts. The one year recidivism rate for low risk youth, however, increased from the 2006 to the 2008 cohort.


Figure IV-2: One Year Recidivism by Risk Level, 2006-2008



Did Risk Levels Relate to Time to Recidivate?

Youth classified as high risk who recidivated did so more quickly than youth classified as low risk, however only in 2008 was the difference statistically significant.

Figure IV-3: One Year Recidivism, Average Months to Recidivate by YLS-CMI Risk Level



Did Risk Scores Differ by Gender, Race, and Age?

Several factors were associated with risk score. With the exception of 2006, minority youth scored higher on the YLS-CMI than white youth. Girls also tended to score higher than boys. Results are statistically significant unless indicated.

Table IV-2: YLS-CMI Mean Scores by Gender, Race, and Age

	2006		2007		2008	
	Mean score	N	Mean Score	N	Mean Score	N
Girls	15	132	14	116	14	96
Boys	12	512	13	439	12	421
Minority	13*	38	16	40	16	53
White	12*	606	13	515	12	464
13 and under	13	66	12	40	12	32
14	13	86	14	78	13	69
15	14	141	14	129	12	107
16	12	146	14	140	14	134
17	12	154	12	135	11	135
18 and above	9	51	9	33	9	40
Total Cohort Score	13	644	13	555	12	517

*Results are not statistically significant (p>0.05)

Did Risk Scores Relate to Recidivism?

Youth who recidivated had higher initial YLS-CMI scores than youth who did not at each follow up period. This difference was statistically significant (p=0.00). Those who recidivated within 6 months had the highest scores in all three years.

Table IV-3: YLS-CMI Mean Score by Recidivism

YLS-CMI mean score at:	2006		2007		2008	
	Recidivated	Did Not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did Not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate
Six Months	16 (86)	12 (558)	16 (93)	13 (462)	17 (71)	11 (446)
One Year	15 (135)	12 (509)	16 (151)	12 (404)	15 (115)	11 (402)
Two Years	15 (199)	11 (445)	16 (210)	12 (345)		
Three Years	15 (252)	11 (392)				

YLS-CMI Score

IN 2006 and 2008, higher scores were associated with shorter times to recidivate (p<0.05, Pearson's r = 0.181, 0.217 respectively). Youth with higher scores tended to recidivate more quickly.

Did Risk Scores Relate to Recidivism by Gender, Race and Age?

Gender

In the 2007 and 2008 cohorts, both girls and boys who recidivated at one year scored statistically significantly higher on the YLS-CMI than those who did not.

IV-4: Mean YLS-CMI Score and Number (N) by Gender

	2006		2007		2008	
	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate
Girl	16* (22)	14* (110)	17 (28)	14 (88)	18 (22)	13 (74)
Boy	15 (113)	11 (399)	16 (123)	12 (316)	14 (93)	11 (328)

* Results are not statistically significant (p <0.05)

** Results are significant at p<0.10

Race

YLS-CMI scores were not as predictive of recidivism among minority youth compared to white youth. This is likely due to the small number of minority youth.

Table IV-5: Mean YLS-CMI Score and Number (N) by Race

	2006		2007		2008	
	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate
Minority	16** (13)	11** (25)	16* (14)	17* (26)	23 (10)	14 (43)
White	15 (122)	12 (484)	16 (137)	12 (378)	14 (105)	11 (359)

*Results are not statistically significant (p <0.05)

** Results are not significant (p<0.05) but are at p<0.10

Age

The YLS-CMI was not consistently predictive of recidivism when age was examined.

Table IV-6: Mean YLS-CMI Score and Number (N) by Age

Mean Score (N)	2006		2007		2008	
	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate	Recidivated	Did not Recidivate
13 and under	16 (18)	12 (48)	15** (10)	11** (30)	<10	12 (23)
14	16** (16)	12** (70)	19 (22)	13 (56)	16* (15)	12* (54)
15	15* (32)	14* (109)	15* (36)	13* (93)	13* (27)	11* (80)
16	15 (38)	12 (108)	16 (46)	13 (94)	17 (35)	13 (99)
17	15 (28)	12 (126)	14 (36)	11 (99)	13** (26)	10** (109)
18 and above*	<10	8 (48)	<10	8 (32)	<10	9 (37)

*Results are not statistically significant (p <0.05)

** Results are not significant (p<0.05) but are at p<0.10

Did Three Year Recidivism Differ by YLS-CMI Risk Level?

Youth classified as low risk in the 2006 cohort recidivated at lower rates than other youth. Moderate and high risk youth recidivated at similar levels until the two year mark when the gap widened.

Table IV-7: Recidivism Rate by YLS Classification, 2006 Cohort

2006 Cohort	Total	One Year Recidivism		Two Year Recidivism		Three Year Recidivism	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
YLS-CMI Risk level	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low	213	18	8.5%	38	17.8%	51	23.9%
Moderate	348	97	27.9%	128	36.8%	157	45.1%
High	83	20	24.1%	33	39.8%	44	53.0%
Not Assessed	181	39	21.5%	60	33.1%	70	38.7%
Cohort	825	174	21.1%	259	31.4%	322	39.0%

Section V: County Level Analysis

Analyzing county data by demographic or offense characteristics often results in numbers less than 10, which are not reported to ensure confidentiality. To increase the amount of county level data that can be reported, the report examines three year averages and three year totals. Even so, some counties do not meet the minimum of 10 youth required for reporting.

Did Adjudication and Supervision Rates Differ by County?

First adjudication and supervision rates varied by county. Oxford County had the lowest rate of first adjudication and supervision, while Sagadahoc County had the highest rate.

Table V-1: First Adjudicated and Supervised Youth Rates, by County 2006-2008

	3 Year Average 10-17 Year Old Population per year	Average Number first Adjudicated per year	Average Number Supervised per year	Average First Adjudicated Rate per 1,000	Average Supervised Rate per 1,000
Oxford	5,857	36	17	6.2	2.8
Hancock	5,086	53	22	10.4	4.3
Kennebec	12,306	113	54	9.2	4.4
Penobscot	14,440	139	69	9.6	4.8
Washington	3,265	29	16	9.0	4.9
Piscataquis	1,685	16	8	9.3	4.9
Androscoggin	11,111	146	55	13.2	4.9
Lincoln	3,450	26	18	7.6	5.2
Cumberland	28,531	283	152	9.9	5.3
Statewide	135,132	1,328	739	9.8	5.5
Waldo	3,966	33	22	8.2	5.6
York	21,975	177	132	8.1	6.0
Aroostook	7,132	70	42	9.8	6.0
Knox	3,852	45	25	11.6	6.4
Franklin	2,926	31	19	10.6	6.6
Somerset	5,466	68	43	12.5	7.9
Sagadahoc	4,083	62	44	15.3	10.8

What Were Demographic Differences Among Counties?

Gender¹⁶

Statewide, girls comprised just over 20% of the cohorts. This ranged from 15.2% in Hancock County to 27.0% in Knox County.

Table V-2: First Adjudicated, Supervised Youth, by Gender, 2006-2008 Average

	Girls	Boys
Hancock	15.2%	84.8%
Sagadahoc	18.0%	82.0%
Aroostook	18.1%	81.9%
Lincoln	18.5%	81.5%
Somerset	19.2%	80.8%
Waldo	19.4%	80.6%
Kennebec	19.6%	80.4%
Penobscot	20.3%	79.7%
Statewide	20.5%	79.5%
Washington	20.8%	79.2%
York	21.0%	79.0%
Androscoggin	21.3%	78.7%
Oxford	22.0%	78.0%
Cumberland	22.9%	77.1%
Knox	27.0%	73.0%


Race

In December 2009, Maine released a report examining differences between minority and white youth in the juvenile justice system¹⁷. It found that within counties, the rate of white youth contact with the juvenile justice system differed from the rate of minority youth contact. Because of small numbers, only six counties were included in the report: Androscoggin, Aroostook, Cumberland, Kennebec, Penobscot, and York. These are the only counties in which sufficient numbers existed for reporting or analysis.

¹⁶Even combining three years, fewer than 10 girls were in the cohort in Franklin and Piscataquis Counties. As a result these counties do not appear in the following table.

¹⁷Noréus, B., Hubley, T. Rocque, M., (2009, December). Disproportionate Minority Contact in Maine: DMC Assessment and Identification. Portland, ME: University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service and Maine Juvenile Justice Advisory Group.

Figure V-1: Supervised Youth: White Versus Minority, 2006-2008



Age

The mean age range was between 15.3 and 16.3 years of age at first adjudication by county.

What Were Offense Differences Among Counties?

Number of Offenses at Adjudication

The average number of offenses at first adjudication ranged from 1.64 in York County, to 3.55 in Hancock County. In three counties, the average number of offenses exceeded 3.0. The statewide average was 2.20.

Table V-3: Number of Offenses per Youth, by County

County	Youth	Total Offenses	Mean Number of Offense per Youth	County	Youth	Total Offense	Mean Number of Offense per Youth
York	396	648	1.64	Statewide	2,217	4,877	2.20
Sagadahoc	133	251	1.89	Franklin	58	135	2.33
Androscoggin	164	310	1.89	Aroostook	127	336	2.65
Cumberland	455	880	1.93	Oxford	50	139	2.78
Lincoln	54	110	2.04	Piscataquis	25	74	2.96
Knox	74	152	2.05	Kennebec	163	522	3.20
Penobscot	207	428	2.07	Somerset	130	419	3.22
Waldo	67	139	2.07	Hancock	66	234	3.55
Washington	48	100	2.08				

Offense Class

Felonies were the most serious offense class and varied from 7.9% in Androscoggin County to 48.0% in Piscataquis County. The statewide average was 19.6%.


Table V-4: Proportion of Offenses, Misdemeanor and Felony 2006-2008

	Percent Felony	Percent Misdemeanor		Percent Felony	Percent Misdemeanor
Androscoggin	7.9%	92.1%	Aroostook	27.6%	72.4%
Cumberland	11.7%	88.3%	Kennebec	28.2%	71.8%
York	13.0%	87.0%	Washington	29.8%	70.2%
Penobscot	13.0%	87.0%	Franklin	37.9%	62.1%
Lincoln	13.0%	87.0%	Hancock	39.4%	60.6%
Knox	13.5%	86.5%	Oxford	42.9%	57.1%
Waldo	16.4%	82.1%	Somerset	46.9%	53.1%
Sagadahoc	19.5%	80.5%	Piscataquis	48.0%	52.0%
Statewide	19.6%	80.1%			

Offense Type

Personal offenses were the most serious offense type, and varied from 26.1% in Penobscot County to 48.5% in Hancock County. The statewide average was 38.4%.


Figure V-2: Proportion of Offenses for Personal Offenses, 2006 to 2008



What Were One Year Recidivism Rates, by County?

One year recidivism rates were based on the aggregate number of youth in the three cohorts and the aggregate number of youth who recidivated within one year in the three cohorts.¹⁸

Figure V-3: One Year Recidivism Rate by County, 2006-2008 Aggregate



¹⁸Even after aggregating all three years, three counties totaled less than 10 youth who recidivated: Piscataquis, Lincoln, and Oxford. These were excluded from analysis.

References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The psychology of criminal conduct (4th ed.)*. Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Dowden, C & Andrews, D.A. (1999). What works in young offender treatment: A meta-analysis. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 11(2).
- Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2008*. National Center for Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>
- Frederico, J.M (2009). *Maine Criminal Statutes 2009-2010 Edition*. Bowdoinham, ME: Swan Island Press.
- Garner, B. A (Ed.). (2006). *Black's law dictionary (3rd pocket ed.)*. St. Paul, MN: Thomson/West.
- Harris, P.W., Lockwood, B., & Mengers, L. (2009). *A CICA white paper: Defining and measuring recidivism* [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://www.cica.net>
- Hoge, R. D., Andrews, D. A. (2002). *Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory: YLS/CMI Manual*. Toronto: MultiHealth Systems.
- Holsinger, A., Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2006). Predicting institutional misconduct using the Youth Level of Service/ Case Management Inventory. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 267-284. DOI: 10.1007/BF02885895
- McElfresh, R., Yan, J., & Janku, A. (2009). *Juvenile offender recidivism report: A 2009 statewide juvenile court report*. Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator, Division of Court Programs and Research. Retrieved from <http://www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=34387>
- Noréus, B., Rocque, M., & Hubley, T. (2009, December). *Disproportionate minority contact in Maine: DMC assessment and identification*. Portland, ME: University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service and Maine Juvenile Justice Advisory Group. Retrieved from http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch/Publications/Juvenile/Juvenile_DMC_Assessment_andIdentificationReport2009.pdf
- Pate, S. (2008, March). *Maine Department of Corrections annual juvenile recidivism report*. Portland, ME: University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service, Maine Statistical Analysis Center and the Maine Department of Corrections. Retrieved from http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch/Publications/Juvenile/Annual_Juvenile_Recidivism_Cohort2005.pdf
- Schmidt, F., Hoge, R., Gomes, L. (2005). Reliability and validity analyses of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32(3).

Appendix I: Department of Juvenile Services Case Management


The Maine Department of Corrections is the agency of state government responsible for the incarceration and community supervision of adult and juvenile offenders. The Division of Juvenile Services resides within MDOC and is responsible for the provision of correctional services to Maine's juvenile offenders. The mission of DJS is:

To promote public safety by ensuring that juveniles under the Department of Correction's jurisdiction are provided with risk-focused intervention, quality treatment, and other services that teach skills and competencies; strengthen pro-social behaviors to reduce the likelihood of re-offending and require accountability to victims and communities.

There are three field services regions in Maine that respond to juvenile crime and provide services known to be effective in reducing recidivism among juveniles. DJS has two secure facilities to serve juveniles who cannot be served in the community. Mountain View Youth Development Center (MVYDC) is located in Charleston, Maine, and serves juveniles from Northern and Eastern Maine. Long Creek Youth Development Center (LCYDC) is located in South Portland serves juveniles from southern Maine. The responsibilities of DJS field services span the entire juvenile justice system. These responsibilities begin when a youth is referred to DJS by police after being charged with an offense and end when a juvenile is discharged from DJS aftercare supervision. Field services operations are conducted throughout the state and are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Juvenile Community Corrections Officers (JCCOs) serve as the correctional case managers for juveniles who are under supervision of the Division regardless of their status with the legal system. Youth under supervision of the Division may be²⁴:

- On a supervised conditional release following a detention request decision,
- Detained in a juvenile facility awaiting a court hearing,
- On informal adjustment as a diversion from the court,
- On probation,
- Committed to a juvenile facility, or
- On community reintegration (aftercare) status following release from a juvenile facility.



Maine Department of Corrections
Division of Juvenile Services
Case Management Flowchart

Appendix II: Glossary of Terms

Here are some definitions that could be helpful in understanding juvenile recidivism issues.

Research Report Terms

Cohort - A group of subjects on whom data is being collected as they "move forward in time" (In ancient Rome, a cohort was a group of foot soldiers).

Juvenile/Youth – Any person who has not attained the age of 18 years.

Population/Target Population - The total group of people who are represented by the random selection of members, usually connoting the whole population but possibly connoting the population of any subset, e.g., women.

Recidivism – for this report, recidivism is defined as a re-adjudication (juvenile) or conviction (adult) for an offense committed by a youth in Maine within three years of his or her first adjudication.

Recidivism Rate – The number of youth who recidivate divided by the total number of cohort youth during a specific time period.

Sample - A subset of subjects from the population of all who have a particular characteristic, such as a disease.

Statistic - A number computed from data on one or more variables.

Statistical Analysis - Analyzing collected data for the purposes of summarizing information to make it more usable and/or making generalizations about a population based on a sample drawn from that population.

Statistical Significance - in statistics, a difference that is unlikely due to chance is considered statistically significant. The level of statistical significance is measured using a probability value, usually called a **p-value**. When $p < 0.05$ (a common accepted value for statistical significance), the probability that a difference is due to chance is less than 5%. When $p = 0.10$, the probability that a difference is due to chance is 10%.

Juvenile Justice Terms

Adjudication - Adjudication is the court process that determines (judges) if the juvenile committed the act for which he or she is charged. The term "adjudicated" is analogous to "convicted" in the criminal court and indicates that the court concluded the juvenile committed the act.

Bindover – Bindover occurs when charges are transferred to the corrections system following a hearing to determine whether the circumstances meet the criteria to try the youth in the criminal court.. This is commonly referred to as being tried as an adult.

Diversion – The process of gathering information and developing a case plan with youth and family to divert youth from the court process. Diversion occurs during pre-adjudicatory process (prior to court). Upon referral to the juvenile justice system, a JCCO either authorizes filing of a petition with the court or develops a diversion plan to avoid court action. Diversions take the form of *No Further Actions*, or *Informal Adjustment*.

Intake decision - The decision made by Juvenile Community Corrections Officers that results in a case either being handled informally at the intake level or authorizing a petition

Juvenile Community Corrections Officer (JCCO) – A DJS employee who manages the pre-adjudicatory process (diversions from the system), detention decisions, and provides community supervision post adjudication.

Judicial decision - The decision made in response to a petition that asks the court to adjudicate the youth.

Judicial disposition - Definite action taken as a result of adjudication regarding a particular case after the judicial decision is made, include the following categories:

- *Indeterminate Commitment* - Cases in which youth were placed in a youth development center
- *Indeterminate Commitment, Suspended -Probation* - Cases in which youth were placed on community supervision
- *Dismissed* - Cases dismissed (including those warned, counseled, and released) with no further action anticipated.
- *Miscellaneous* - A variety of actions not included above. This category includes fines, restitution and community services, referrals outside the court for services with minimal or no further court involvement anticipated, and dispositions coded as “Other” by the reporting courts.

Petition - A document filed in court alleging that a juvenile is a delinquent and asking that the court assume jurisdiction over the juvenile or asking that an alleged delinquent be bound over to criminal court for prosecution as an adult.

Placement status – Identifies categories of juveniles held in residential placement facilities.

- *Committed (Commitment)* - Includes juveniles in placement in the facility as part of a court-ordered disposition. Committed juveniles include those whose cases have been adjudicated and disposed in juvenile court.
- *Detained (Detention)*- Includes juveniles held prior to adjudication while awaiting an adjudicatory or probation revocation hearing in juvenile court, as well as juveniles held after adjudication while awaiting disposition or awaiting placement elsewhere. Also includes juveniles awaiting bindover hearings to adult criminal court.

Referral – After an arrest is made or summonsed issue, law enforcement may refer the case to the juvenile justice system to be either petitioned or diverted.

- *Petitioned (formally handled)* - Cases that appear on the official court calendar in response to the filing of a petition or other legal instrument requesting the court to adjudicate the youth delinquent or to bind over the youth to criminal court for processing as an adult.
- *Non-petitioned (informally handled)* - Cases that Juvenile Community Corrections Officers (JCCOs) screen for adjustment without the filing of a formal petition (see **Diversions**).

Risk Assessment Tool – An actuarial instrument that is used to predict the risk of future behavior. In the juvenile justice system, risk assessment tools are often used to predict risk of recidivism. Maine uses the Youth Level of Service-Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI)

Supervision – Supervision means that the youth is placed on probation (community supervision) or is committed to a youth development facility. This occurs when a youth receives a disposition of indeterminate commitment (commitment to a youth facility) or indeterminate commitment, suspended (probation) (see **Judicial Disposition**)

Youth Development Center (YDC). A facility that holds youth who are committed to the Division of Juvenile Services by the courts, or who are detained. Maine has two YDCs: Long Creek Youth Development Center, in South Portland, and Mountain View Youth Development Center, in Charleston.

Offense Definitions

Aggravated assault - Unlawful intentional inflicting of serious bodily injury with or without a deadly weapon, or unlawful intentional attempting or threatening of serious bodily injury or death with a deadly or dangerous weapon. The term is used in the same sense as in the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) Crime Index. It encompasses conduct included under the statutory names aggravated assault and battery, aggravated battery, assault with intent to kill, assault with intent to commit murder or manslaughter, atrocious assault, attempted murder, felonious assault, and assault with a deadly weapon.

Arson - Intentional damaging or destruction by means of fire or explosion of the property of another without the owner's consent, or of any property with intent to defraud, or attempting the above acts.

Burglary - Unlawful entry or attempted entry of any fixed structure, vehicle, or vessel used for regular residence, industry, or business, with or without force, with intent to commit a felony or larceny. The term is used in the same sense as in the UCR Crime Index.

Civil offense – A noncriminal, or status, offense. These include: minor possessing liquor, possessing marijuana, minor consuming liquor, sale and use of drug paraphernalia, illegal transportation of liquor by a minor, possession of drug paraphernalia, illegal transportation of drug by a minor, permit minors to consume liquor, possession of fireworks.

Disorderly conduct - Unlawful interruption of the peace, quiet, or order of a community, including offenses called disturbing the peace, vagrancy, loitering, unlawful assembly, and riot.

Operating under the influence - Driving or operating any vehicle or common carrier while drunk or under the influence of liquor or narcotics.

Drug abuse violations - State and/or local offenses relating to the unlawful possession, sale, use, growing, and manufacturing of narcotic drugs. The following drug categories are specified: opium or cocaine and their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine); marijuana; synthetic narcotics - manufactured narcotics that can cause true addiction (Demerol, methadone); and dangerous non-narcotic drugs (barbiturates, Benzedrine).

Forcible rape, Maine legal term for this offense is **Gross Sexual Assault** - Sexual intercourse or attempted sexual intercourse with a person against his or her will by force or threat of force. (Statutory offenses are excluded.)

Forgery and counterfeiting - Making, altering, uttering, or possessing, with intent to defraud, anything false in the semblance of that which is true. Attempts are included.

Fraud - Fraudulent conversion and obtaining money or property by false pretenses. Included are confidence games and bad checks, except forgeries and counterfeiting.

Larceny-theft (except motor vehicle theft) - The unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Examples are thefts of bicycles or automobile accessories, shoplifting, pocket-picking, or the stealing of any property or article that is not taken by force and violence, or by fraud. Attempted larcenies are included. Embezzlement, "con" games, forgery, worthless checks, etc., are excluded.

Motor vehicle theft - Unlawful taking, or attempted taking, of a self-propelled road vehicle owned by another, with the intent to deprive the owner of it permanently or temporarily.

Murder and non-negligent manslaughter - Intentionally causing the death of another without legal justification or excuse, or causing the death of another while committing or attempting to commit another crime. Deaths caused by negligence, attempts to kill, suicides, accidental deaths, and justifiable homicides are excluded.

Obstruction of justice - All unlawful acts committed with intent to prevent or hinder the administration of justice, including law enforcement, judicial, and correctional functions. Examples include contempt, perjury, bribing witnesses, failure to report a crime, and nonviolent resisting of arrest.

Offense Type: Offenses fall into four categories: person, property, drugs/alcohol, and other. Please see Appendix III for a list of offenses by type.

Offense Severity/Offense Class: All offenses are given an offense class of A-E, or V, which represents the level of offense severity. Offenses classes are categorized as:

Felony (A-C). The most serious offense class

Misdemeanor(E-F):

Civil (V): Non-criminal

Property Crime Index - Includes burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. This is often reported as a rate

Robbery - Unlawful taking or attempted taking of property that is in the immediate possession of another by force or the threat of force.

Sex offenses (except forcible rape, prostitution, and commercialized vice) - Statutory rape and offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like. Attempts are included.

Simple assault - Unlawful threatening, attempted inflicting, or inflicting of less than serious bodily injury, in the absence of a deadly weapon. The term is used in the same sense as in UCR reporting. Simple assault is often not distinctly named in statutes since it consists of all assaults not explicitly named and defined as serious.

Stolen property (buying, receiving, possessing) - Buying, receiving, or possessing stolen property, including attempts.

Trespassing - Unlawful entry or attempted entry of the property of another with the intent to commit a misdemeanor, other than larceny, or without intent to commit a crime.

Vandalism - Destroying or damaging, or attempting to destroy or damage, the property of another without the owner's consent, or public property, except by burning.

Weapons offenses - Unlawful sale, distribution, manufactures, alteration, transportation, possession, or use of a deadly or dangerous weapon, or accessory, or attempt to commit any of these acts.

Appendix III: Offenses by Type

Person:

Aggravated assault
Aiding or soliciting suicide
Assault
Assault on an emergency medical care provider
Assault on an officer
Assault while hunting
Assault W/Dangerous Weapon
Criminal restraint
Criminal restraint by parent
Criminal threatening
Criminal use of disabling chemicals
Disorderly conduct
Driving to endanger
Elevated aggravated assault
Endangering the welfare of a child
Failing to aid injured person or to report a hunting accident
Felony murder
Gross sexual assault
Harassment
Harassment by telephone
Indecent conduct
Kidnapping
Manslaughter
Murder
Reckless conduct
Refusing to submit to arrest or detention
Robbery
Sexual misconduct with a child under 14 years of age
Solicitation of child by computer to commit a prohibited act
Stalking
Terrorizing
Unlawful sexual contact
Violation of a protective order
Violation of privacy

Visual sexual aggression against a child

Property:

Aggravated criminal invasion of computer privacy
Aggravated criminal mischief
Aggravated criminal trespass
Aggravated forgery
Arson
Attempted Burglary
Burglary
Burglary of a motor vehicle
ChamPERTY
Consolidation
Criminal invasion of computer privacy
Criminal mischief
Criminal mischief w/firearm
Criminal simulation
Criminal trespass
Criminal use of explosives
Desecration and defacement
Failure to control or report a dangerous fire
Falsifying private records
Forgery
Illegal possession or sale of gravestones
Insurance deception
Interference with cemetery or burial ground
Marijuana cultivation
Misuse of credit identification
Negotiating a worthless instrument
Possession of forgery devices
Possession or transfer of burglar's tools
Receiving stolen property
Suppressing recordable instrument
Theft by deception
Theft by extortion
Theft by misapplication of property
Theft by unauthorized taking or transfer

Theft of a firearm
Theft of lost, mislaid or mistakenly delivered property
Theft of services
Trespass by motor vehicle

Drugs/Alcohol:

Acquiring drugs by deception
Aggravated operating under the influence
Aggravated trafficking, furnishing or cultivation of scheduled drugs
Aggravated trafficking, furnishing, or cultivation of scheduled drugs
Consuming liquor by a minor
Drinking Alcohol while operating motor vehicle
Furnishing a place for minors to consume alcohol
Furnishing liquor to a minor
Hunting while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs
Illegal transportation of drugs by a minor
Operating ATV while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs
Operating snowmobile while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs
Operating under the influence
Operating watercraft while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs
Possessing imitation drugs
Possession of butyl or isobutyl nitrate
Possession of liquor by a minor
Possession of liquor on premises licensed to sell liquor by a minor
Possession of liquor or wine making by a minor
Possession of marijuana
Purchasing liquor by a minor
Sale and use of drug paraphernalia
Stealing drugs
Trafficking in or furnishing counterfeit drugs

Trafficking in or furnishing hypodermic apparatuses
Trafficking or furnishing imitation scheduled drugs
Transportation of liquor by a minor
Unlawful possession of scheduled drugs
Unlawful trafficking in scheduled drugs
Unlawfully furnishing scheduled drugs

Other:

Abandoning an airtight container
Abuse of corpse
Aiding escape
Attempting to commit a class A or B crime
Attempting to Commit a Class C Crime
Attempting to elude an officer
Bribery in official and political matters
Carrying Concealed Weapon
Causing a catastrophe
Conspiracy
Conspiracy to commit a class A or B crime
Conspiracy to commit a class C crime
Conspiracy to commit a class D crime
Conspiracy to commit a class E crime
Cruelty to animals
Engaging in prostitution
Escape
Failure to disperse
Failure to report treatment of a gunshot wound
Failure to stop for an officer
False public alarm or report
False swearing
Falsifying physical evidence
Giving false age by a minor
Giving minor false identification
Habitual offender
Having false identification by a minor
Hindering apprehension or prosecution
Impersonating a public servant
Improper compensation for past action
Improper compensation for services

Improper gifts to public servants
Improper influence
Leaving scene of motor vehicle accident
Maintaining an unprotected well
Misuse of information
Obstructing criminal prosecution
Obstructing government administration
Obstructing private ways
Obstructing public ways
Obstructing report of crime or injury
Official oppression
Operating after license suspension
Passing/attempting to pass roadblock
Perjury
Possessing firearm by felon
Possessing firearm without permit
Possession of armor-piercing ammunition
Possession of firearms in an establishment
licensed for on-premises consumption of
liquor
Possession of machine gun
Presenting false identification to enter
Purchase of public office
Refusal to provide proper identification
Riot
Selling false identification
Solicitation
Tampering with a witness, informant, victim
or juror
Tampering with public records or information
Trafficking in dangerous knives
Trafficking in prison contraband
Unlawful assembly
Unlawful interference with law enforcement
dogs
Unlawful prize fighting
Un-sworn falsification

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The annual MDOC Juvenile Recidivism Report was produced through a cooperative agreement between the Maine Department of Corrections, Juvenile Services Division and the Maine Statistical Analysis Center at the Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine.

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, DIVISION OF JUVENILE SERVICES

Bartlett Stoodley
Roxy Hennings
Joel Gilbert
Mike Mack

Galan Williamson
Larry Austin
Chris Coughlin

USM MUSKIE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE, MAINE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER

REPORT AUTHOR

Becky Noréus

PEER REVIEW/EDITING


Carmen Dorsey
Erica King
George Shaler
Robyn Dumont

LAYOUT AND DESIGN

Sheri Moulton

*Funding Provided By the Maine Department of Corrections, Division of Juvenile Services
For More Information about This Report, Call (207) 287-4378*

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE
Muskie School of Public Service



©Maine Department of Corrections
Division of Juvenile Services

USM MUSKIE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE

This report is available on the Maine Statistical
Analysis Center Website at:
<http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch>
or by calling: 207.780.5835



University of Southern Maine
P.O. Box 9300
Portland, Maine 04104-9300
www.muskie.usm.maine.edu

A member of the University of Maine System