

Maine Juvenile Justice Advisory Group
Detention Project: Maine Survey/Interview
January 2003

Introduction

The Maine Juvenile Justice Advisory Group (JJAG) directed a project to explore alternatives to secure detention with the goal of outlining strategies to reduce the use of secure detention in Maine. One facet of this exploration was a survey to ascertain the perceptions of people whose professional lives are involved in the juvenile justice system, including judges, District Attorneys (DAs) or Assistant District Attorneys (ADAs), Defense Attorneys, and Juvenile Community Corrections Officers (JCCOs).

The survey asked for respondents' perceptions of the use of secure detention as well as the viability and availability of a variety of potential alternatives to secure detention. The survey also asked for qualitative information from respondents regarding their perceptions of:

- 1) Problems with secure detention in Maine
- 2) Solutions to the problems
- 3) The value of secure detention

The survey was designed to be administered either as a telephone interview or as a manually completed survey that could be returned via mail. The survey instrument was also accessible through email, allowing respondents to open the survey document, complete the survey, and return it by email. The JJAG and the Muskie School research team made decisions to expand the sampling universe for the survey; the survey instrument was made available in different formats to encourage higher response rates. The final sampling universe consisted of 118 individuals, including:

- 1) 30 District Court Judges, representing all District Courts in Maine
- 2) 16 ADAs, representing the eight prosecutorial districts in Maine
- 3) 16 Defense Attorneys from Maine, matched by prosecutorial district with the number of ADAs
- 4) 58 JCCOs representing the four Department of Corrections (DOC) regions in Maine

The information in this report is presented in the order that the items appeared on the survey instrument. The exception to this is Section IV, the examination of alternatives to secure detention. This section is presented twice, first organizing responses by the series of questions asked about each alternative, and second reviewing all of the responses for each individual alternative.

Section I: Respondent Profiles

Overall, 78 people responded to the survey for a response rate of 66 percent. Twenty-two Judges, 11 from the Northern half of the state, nine from the Southern half of the state, and one Judge who did not indicate a region, provided input. Thirteen Deputy and/or Assistant District Attorneys, eight from Northern Maine, four from Southern Maine, and one who did not disclose a location, completed the survey. Five Defense Attorneys completed the survey, including one from Northern Maine, three from Southern Maine, and one whose location was not disclosed. Finally, 38 JCCOs representing the four DOC regions, 21 from Southern Maine and 17 from Northern Maine, responded to the survey via email or regular mail. Table 1 details the respondents and the part of the state they serve.

Table 1: Respondents

Unknown	Position	Frequency	Percent
	DA/ADA	1	50
	Def Attorney	1	50
	Total	2	100
North	Judge	11	29.7
	DA/ADA	8	21.6
	Def Attorney	1	2.7
	JCCO	17	45.9
	Total	37	100.0
South	Judge	11	28.2
	DA/ADA	4	10.3
	Def Attorney	3	7.7
	JCCO	21	53.8
	Total	39	100.0

Many individual survey items were completed by fewer than 100 percent of respondents; therefore, the number of respondents is included in each table.

Section II: Detention Criteria

Survey respondents were furnished with a list of six criteria for secure detention and asked to rank them in order of the frequency in which they have observed the criteria used. A ranking scheme for the criteria was developed using the mean value of all of the responses for each criterion. Table 2 shows the criteria and their corresponding rank order. According to respondents, “No adequate supervision” is the most frequently used criterion, while “Punishment (Shock sentence)” is used least frequently. Dividing the responses by North and South shows that respondents from the Southern portion of the state ranked the criteria slightly differently than those from the North, whose responses matched the overall ranking.

Table 2: Detention Criteria

Detention Criteria	Rank	North	South
No adequate supervision (n=77)	1	1	2
Violation of Probation/Conditional Release (n=77)	2	2	1
Public Safety (n=75)	3	3	4
Safety of Youth (n=75)	4	4	3
New Offense (n=74)	5	5	5
Punishment (Shock) (n=73)	6	6	6

Section III: Offense Profiles of Detained Youth

This section of the survey focused on the profiles of offenses committed by youth in secure detention. The section was divided into three parts: severity of offense, type of offense, and whether the offense was violent or non-violent. In each of the three instances respondents were asked to apportion the offense profile of detained youth in accordance with their professional experiences. Tables 3-5 display the results. The mean score of all responses to each question was used to develop a single set of proportions based on the respondents’ perceptions. Means were calculated excluding 0 values, which had three effects:

- 1) The number of calculated responses may have been reduced, due to the exclusion of responses indicating 0
- 2) Means are higher as a result of excluding 0 values
- 3) Excluding 0 values, the sums of the means total approximately 100 percent

Table 3 illustrates the average offense profile of youth based on severity of offense(s). “Technical” refers to violations of probation or conditional release conditions. Northern and Southern responses differed most in their perceptions of felony offenses and technical violations.

Table 3: Severity of Offense

Severity of Offense (Ave.) (0s excluded)	Mean	North	South
Felony (n=53, North = 28, South = 24)	51%	61%	38%
Misdemeanor (n=52, North = 27, South = 24)	27%	27%	29%
Technical (n=47, North = 23, South = 23)	23%	17%	29%
Total	101%	104%	96%

Table 4 displays the average of responses apportioning the types of crimes where youth in detention were involved. The sums do not total to exactly 100 percent in two of the three instances.

Table 4: Type of Offense

Type of Offense (Ave.) (0s excluded)	Mean	North	South
Property (n=49, North = 25, South = 23)	46%	44%	49%
Person (n= 49, North = 25, South = 23)	50%	55%	42%
Total	96%	100%	91%

Table 5 shows respondents’ perceptions of the proportion of violent and non-violent crimes they have observed in their experience with detained youth. Again, as in Table 4, two of the three proportions fail to sum to 100 percent. Northern and Southern perceptions were nearly opposite in their perception of the violent/non-violent offense profiles of detained youth.

Table 5 : Violent and Non-Violent Crime

Violent/Non-violent (Ave.) 0s excluded	Mean	North	South
Violent (n=49)	48%	54%	42%
Non-violent (n=49)	48%	46%	51%
Total	96%	100.0%	93%

Section IV: Alternatives to Secure Detention

The fourth section of the survey looked at alternatives to secure detention. First, respondents were asked:

In your opinion, what proportion of youth in secure detention could be better served in a different context?

The mean of all responses is 48 percent, while the median (50% above/ 50% below) is 50 percent. The range of responses was between 14 percent and 90 percent. Responses for each group of respondents are contained in Table 5. Defense Attorneys indicated they felt, on average, that 80 percent of youth in secure detention could be better served in a different context. Judges’ and prosecutors’ perceptions were very similar, at averages of 51 percent and 55 percent respectively. JCCO estimates were much lower; on average JCCOs estimated that only 36 percent of youth in secure detention could be better served in a different context. This is a substantial difference given a JCCO’s role in initial decisions to detain youth. The largest difference between Northern and Southern practitioners was among the Judges; their perceptions differed by 24 percent.

Table 6: Youth Better Served in Different Context

Youth better served in different context (% , 0s excluded)	Mean	North	South
Judges (n=21)	51%	31%	55%
Prosecutors (n=11)	55%	52%	62%
Defense Attorneys (n=5)	80%	90%	87%
JCCOs (n=27)	36%	34%	37%
Overall Means	48%	40%	55%

Next, respondents were asked a series of questions about 10 possible alternatives to secure detention. The list of alternatives was developed through a review of the literature including DeMuro (1999)¹ and Gaines, Kelly & Treahy (1996)². The 10 alternatives, with definitions provided by DeMuro (1999) and others, where noted, are:

- 1) *Home Detention*: Youth maintained in their homes and supervised through “frequent, random, unannounced, face-to-face community supervision (and telephone contacts)” (DeMuro, p. 15)
- 2) *Electronic Monitoring*: According to DeMuro (p. 18) Electronic monitoring may accompany home detention in circumstances where:
 - Youth have failed to meet standard program rules.
 - As a means to release youth who might not otherwise meet home detention criteria.
- 3) *Day Reporting Centers*: Non-secure community programs that provide 6-12 hours of daily supervision and structured activities for youth who require more supervision than an in-home program can provide. (DeMuro, p. 19)
- 4) *Intensive Supervision Services (ISS)*: ISS services in Maine provide three levels of service that can function as alternatives to secure detention:
 - Intensive Supervision
 - Attendant Care
 - Emergency Foster Care
- 5) *Attendant Care*: Youth are temporarily housed in an Attendant Care Facility, supervised 24 hours a day by a trained child care worker. (Rumford Group Homes, 2002)³
- 6) *Shelters*: Non-secure residential facilities to provide time-limited housing for youth as an alternative to secure detention. (DeMuro, 1999)
- 7) *Foster placement (relative/non-relative)*: DeMuro (1999) refers to foster care placements for, “younger children, girls, lower-risk case, or other youths who may not be suitable for placement in a congregate care facility”. (p. 23)
- 8) *Case management*: DeMuro (1999) refers to the Center for Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ)⁴ definition of Intensive Case Management which includes:
 - Case planning
 - Release advocacy
 - Daily face-to-face contacts at school and at home
 - Referral to community services and programs
 - Daily curfew checks
 - Crisis intervention

¹ DeMuro, Paul (1999) Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform: Consider the Alternatives: planning and implementing detention alternatives. Baltimore, MD. The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

² Gaines, J.A., Kelly, R.L., Treahy, J.P. (1996). A Guide to Non-Secure Detention Practice. *Journal for Juvenile Justice and Detention Services*. Spring, 1996, pp. 19-32.

³ Rumford Group Homes (2002). <http://www.rumfordgrouphomes.org/programs/juvenilless.htm>

⁴ <http://www.cjcj.org/>

- Presentation of progress reports and disposition recommendations to the courts (p. 26)
- 9) *Substance Abuse Unit*: Substance abuse units provide secure placement and treatment for youth with severe substance abuse issues.
 - 10) *Adolescent Psychiatric Unit*: Adolescent psychiatric units provide secure placement and treatment for youth suffering from severe mental health problems.

Respondents were not provided with these definitions.

Respondents were asked to consider each alternative from the following perspectives:

- 1) Do you consider this resource a viable alternative?
- 2) Does this resource exist in your region?
- 3) If it does exist, is it large enough to meet the demand for it?
- 4) Does it sufficiently meet the needs of the youth it serves?
- 5) If it does not exist, should it be implemented/established/developed?
- 6) Are there funding and payment issues?

During a review of preliminary findings by the Detention Alternatives Committee (the group overseeing this project), the Committee reached consensus that Question 4 was not phrased in a manner that elicited the consideration of youths’ needs, that the Committee sought. Answers to Question 4 nearly paralleled the answers to Question 3. The Committee concluded that the survey question failed to provide enough guidance to help respondents move from a consideration of supply to a consideration of the treatment needs of youth. Therefore, responses to Question 4 are not presented in this report.

The presentation of responses regarding various detention alternatives is organized by content. Comparisons between the Northern and the Southern respondents in this portion of the report are made only for the four highest ranked alternatives and only where respondents’ perceptions differed by more than 20 percentage points. The 20 percent margin is large enough to accommodate the different Ns of the two respondent groups, and serves to highlight only areas of substantial disagreement.

Do you consider this resource a viable alternative?

The highest level of agreement on an alternative as a “viable alternative to secure detention” occurred in the instance of Intensive Supervision Services (ISS). Seventy-two (96%) of 75 respondents agreed that ISS is a viable alternative. Electronic Monitoring generated the least consensus. Forty-three (58%) respondents indicated that Electronic Monitoring is a viable alternative, while 31 (42%) respondents indicated that Electronic Monitoring is not a viable alternative to secure detention. Table 6 displays respondents’ rankings of the viability of alternative resources.

Table 6: Viable Alternatives

Do you consider this resource a viable alternative?	Yes	No	Yes%	No%
Intensive Supervision Services (n=75)	72	3	96.0%	4.0%
Foster Care Placements (n=69)	60	9	87.0%	13.0%
Adolescent Psychiatric Unit (n=71)	61	10	85.9%	14.1%
Home Detention (n=73)	62	11	84.9%	15.1%
Day Reporting (n=67)	56	11	83.6%	16.4%
Youth Attendant Care (n=66)	55	11	83.3%	16.7%
Substance Abuse Units (n=70)	57	13	81.4%	18.6%
Case Management (n=67)	54	13	80.6%	19.4%
Youth Shelters (n=75)	57	18	76.0%	24.0%
Electronic Monitoring (n=74)	43	31	58.1%	41.9%

Does this resource exist in your region?

Sixty-six (93%) respondents indicated that Home Detention exists in their region; five (7%) respondents indicated that it does not exist in their region. Thirty-seven (53%) respondents indicated that Adolescent Psychiatric Units exist in their region, while 33 (47%) respondents indicated they do not. Only 13 (19%) respondents indicated that Day Reporting exists in their region; this is understandable given that there is currently only one Day Reporting Center operating in Maine.

Table 7: Resources by Region

Does this resource exist in your region?	Yes	No	Yes%	No%
Home Detention (n=71)	66	5	93.0%	7.0%
Intensive Supervision Services (n=75)	66	9	88.0%	12.0%
Electronic Monitoring (n=72)	63	9	87.5%	12.5%
Case Management (n=68)	58	10	85.3%	14.7%
Youth Shelters (n=76)	62	14	81.6%	18.4%
Youth Attendant Care (n=52)	52	12	81.3%	18.8%
Foster Care Placements (n=66)	49	17	74.2%	25.8%
Adolescent Psychiatric Unit (n=70)	37	33	52.9%	47.1%
Substance Abuse Units (n=70)	30	40	42.9%	57.1%
Day Reporting (n=68)	13	55	19.1%	80.9%

If it does exist, is it large enough to meet the demand for it?

From this point on, responses for Day Reporting are restricted to survey respondents who indicated that Day Reporting is available in their region. The Committee felt that restricting the responses to those experienced with the resource would provide a more accurate guideline for perceptions of Day Reporting.

Fifty-two (87%) respondents indicated that Home Detention resources are sufficient to meet the demand for service. Thirty (46%) respondents indicated that Intensive Supervision Services are sufficient to meet the demand for the service. Seventy-seven percent or more of respondents indicated that the supply of Foster Care Placements, Adolescent Psychiatric Units, and Substance Abuse Units are inadequate to meet the demand for the services. The North/South perception of whether Intensive Supervision Services are large enough to meet system demand varied by 26 percentage points, with 51.4 percent of Northern respondents indicating that services are sufficient to meet demand compared to 25.6 percent of Southern respondents.

Table 8: Availability of Resources by Region

If it does exist, is it large enough to meet the demand for it?	Yes	No	Yes%	No%
Home Detention (n=60)	52	8	86.7%	13.3%
Electronic Monitoring (n=66)	36	22	62.1%	37.9%
Day Reporting (n=13)	8	5	61.5%	38.5%
Intensive Supervision Services (n=66)	30	36	45.5%	54.5%
Case Management (n=57)	25	32	43.9%	56.1%
Attendant Care (n=51)	22	29	43.1%	56.9%
Youth Shelters (n=65)	20	45	30.8%	69.2%
Ad Psychiatric Unit (n=48)	11	37	22.9%	77.1%
Substance Abuse Units (n=45)	9	36	20.0%	80.0%
Foster Care Placements (n=57)	11	46	19.3%	80.7%

Does it sufficiently meet the needs of the youth it serves?

Responses to this question are not being reported, as mentioned previously.

If it does not exist, should it be implemented/established/developed?

Respondents appear to have used this question to advocate for expansion of services. With the exception of Electronic Monitoring (48%), more than half of respondents indicated that all of the listed alternatives should be implemented/expanded/developed. There are five alternatives, each of which over 80 percent of respondents indicated should be developed:

- 1) Substance Abuse Units (91%)
- 2) Adolescent Psychiatric Units (91%)
- 3) Intensive Supervision Services (87%)
- 4) Foster Care Placements (86%)
- 5) Case Management (84%)

Table 10: Implementation of Resources

If it does not exist, should it be implemented, established, or developed?	Yes	No	Yes%	No%
Substance Abuse Units (n=45)	41	4	91.1%	8.9%
Adolescent Psychiatric Unit (n=42)	38	4	90.5%	9.5%
Intensive Supervision Services (n=30)	26	4	86.7%	13.3%
Foster Care Placements (n=35)	30	5	85.7%	14.3%
Case Management (n=31)	26	5	83.9%	16.1%
Attendant Care (n=26)	19	7	73.1%	26.9%
Youth Shelters (n=37)	21	8	72.4%	27.6%
Home Detention (n=30)	19	11	63.3%	36.7%
Day Reporting (n=13)	7	6	53.8%	46.2%
Electronic Monitoring (n=29)	14	15	48.3%	51.7%

Are there funding and payment issues?

The majority of respondents indicated that funding/payment issues exist for nine of the 10 listed alternatives. The four alternatives that ranked highest are:

- 1) Substance Abuse Units (90%)
- 2) Foster Care Placements (87%)
- 3) Adolescent Psychiatric Units (87%)
- 4) Case Management (82%)

Thirty-three percent of respondents indicated that funding/payment is an issue for Home Detention.

Table 11: Funding and Payment

Are funding and payment issues?	Yes	No	Yes%	No%
Substance Abuse Units (n=62)	56	6	90.3%	9.7%
Foster Care Placements (n=55)	48	7	87.3%	12.7%
Adolescent Psychiatric Unit (n=61)	53	8	86.9%	13.1%
Case Management (n=56)	46	10	82.1%	17.9%
Intensive Supervision Services (n=65)	52	13	80.0%	20.0%
Attendant Care (n=56)	44	12	78.6%	21.4%
Day Reporting (n=11)	8	3	72.7%	27.3%
Youth Shelters (n=69)	43	26	62.3%	37.7%
Electronic Monitoring (n=60)	35	25	58.3%	41.7%
Home Detention (n=42)	14	28	33.3%	66.7%

The next several tables display responses to individual alternatives in comparisons to similar responses between alternatives. The format allows more than one alternative to be displayed at a time. The tables are organized by the six questions that were asked regarding each alternative. Each alternative has a Rank column, which indicates where the responses for that particular alternative fell in relation to other alternatives. For example, Home Detention, Question 1 asks: Resource a viable alternative? Forty-seven respondents indicated Yes, while eight indicated No. These responses place Home Detention in 5th place in terms of viability, compared to response rates for this same question under other alternatives.

Table 12: Home Detention, Electronic Monitoring, and Day Reporting Centers

	Home Detention					Electronic Monitoring					Day Reporting Centers				
	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank
1. Resource a viable alternative?	47	8	85.5%	14.5%	5	63	9	87.5%	12.5%	2	8	5	61.5%	38.5%	10
2. Resource exists in your region?	49	5	90.7%	9.3%	1	36	22	62.1%	37.9%	7	13	55	19.1%	80.9%	10
3. Resource meets demand?	40	7	85.1%	14.9%	1	36	22	62.1%	37.9%	2	8	5	61.5%	38.5%	3
4. Resource meets youth needs?	31	17	64.6%	35.4%	2	21	41	33.9%	66.1%	9	8	5	61.5%	38.5%	4
5. If none, resource should be developed?	14	7	66.7%	33.3%	9	14	15	48.3%	51.7%	10	6	0	100.0%	0.0%	1
6. Is funding/payment an issue?	14	28	33.3%	66.7%	10	35	25	58.3%	41.7%	9	8	3	72.7%	27.3%	8

Table 13: ISS, Attendant Care, Shelters

	ISS					Attendant Care					Shelters				
	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank
1. Resource a viable alternative?	72	3	96.0%	4.0%	1	55	11	83.3%	16.7%	6	57	18	76.0%	24.0%	9
2. Resource exists in your region?	66	9	88.0%	12.0%	2	52	12	81.3%	18.8%	5	62	14	81.6%	18.4%	4
3. Resource meets demand?	30	36	45.5%	54.5%	4	22	29	43.1%	56.9%	6	20	45	30.8%	69.2%	7
4. Resource meets youth needs?	46	20	69.7%	30.3%	1	31	21	59.6%	40.4%	5	24	41	36.9%	63.1%	8
5. If none, resource should be developed?	26	4	86.7%	13.3%	4	19	7	73.1%	26.9%	8	29	8	78.4%	21.6%	7
6. Is funding/payment an issue?	52	13	80.0%	20.0%	6	44	12	78.6%	21.4%	7	43	6	87.8%	12.2%	2

Table 14: Foster Placement, Case Management, Substance Abuse Unit

	Foster Placement					Case Management					Substance Abuse Unit				
	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank
1. Resource a viable alternative?	60	9	87.0%	13.0%	3	54	13	80.6%	19.4%	8	57	13	81.4%	18.6%	7
2. Resource exists in your region?	49	17	74.2%	25.8%	6	58	10	85.3%	14.7%	3	30	40	42.9%	57.1%	9
3. Resource meets demand?	11	46	19.3%	80.7%	10	25	32	43.9%	56.1%	5	9	36	20.0%	80.0%	9
4. Resource meets youth needs?	21	32	39.6%	60.4%	6	36	21	63.2%	36.8%	3	19	30	38.8%	61.2%	7
5. If none, resource should be developed?	30	5	85.7%	14.3%	5	26	5	83.9%	16.1%	6	41	4	91.1%	8.9%	2
6. Is funding/payment an issue?	48	7	87.3%	12.7%	3	46	10	82.1%	17.9%	5	56	6	90.3%	9.7%	1

Table 15 : Adolescent Psychiatric Unit

	Adolescent Psychiatric Unit				
	Yes	No	Yes %	No %	Rank
1. Resource a viable alternative?	61	10	85.9%	14.1%	4
2. Resource exists in your region?	37	33	52.9%	47.1%	8
3. Resource meets demand?	11	37	22.9%	77.1%	8
4. Resource meets youth needs?	17	35	32.7%	67.3%	10
5. If none, resource should be developed?	28	4	87.5%	12.5%	3
6. Is funding/payment an issue?	53	8	86.9%	13.1%	4

Section V: Open-ended Questions

Section V of the survey solicited respondents' opinions on the following questions:

- 1) From your professional position, what are the two biggest problems you see in Maine's pre-adjudication detention system?
- 2) How would you solve them? What would better serve youth? (Please think about this question from the perspective of unlimited resources and/or working within existing resources.)
- 3) In your opinion, what value does the practice of detention have? What goal does it serve? What objective does it achieve?

Respondents' opinions are summarized below in Tables 16-27. Looking across the four groups (Judges, DAs/ADAs, Defense Attorneys, JCCOs), a number of common themes emerge. Referring to problems, all four groups cited the lack of treatment resources, and three of the four groups mentioned the lack of alternatives to detention. Three groups mentioned the lack of education and other services for youth in detention.

There were also some common themes put forth as solutions. Three of the four groups cited the need to increase treatment resources. Defense Attorneys sounded a similar note in their call for prompt evaluations. Three of the four groups also cited the need for more alternatives to secure detention; two of these groups, Judges and DAs/ADAs, called for more placement resources.

Two common themes also emerged in respondents' opinions on the values, goals, and objectives of secure detention. All four groups cited safety and punishment most frequently. Three of the four groups mentioned stabilization as a value, goal, and objective of secure detention.

Judge Responses (n=22)

In addition to the themes cited above, two (11%) Judges also cited delays in processing time/length of stay in detention as a problem.

Table 16: Judges, Problems

Problems	Frequency	Percent
Lack of alternatives	10	45.5%
Lack of treatment resources	8	36.4%
Lack of resources/funds	3	13.6%
Delays in processing time/duration	2	9.1%
Too many hold for courts	2	9.1%
Insufficient education	1	4.5%
Distance from parents	1	4.5%
Lack of responsible parent/adult in home	1	4.5%

Six (33%) Judges cited more treatment resources and more non-secure facilities as solutions to problems in secure detention practice. Five (22%) Judges specifically cited more community supervision and services as solutions to secure detention.

Table 17: Judges, Solutions

Solutions	Frequency	Percent
More treatment resources	6	27.3%
More non-secure facilities	6	27.3%
More community supervision/services	5	22.7%
More foster care placements	2	9.1%
More legislative funding	2	9.1%

Thirteen (59.1%) Judges cited the safety of the youth and public safety as a value/goal/objective of secure detention. Nine (40%) Judges cited punishment as a value/goal/objective of secure detention.

Table 18: Judges, Value/Goal/Objective

Value/Goal/Objective	Frequency	Percent
Safety of public/youth	13	59.1%
Punishment/Deterrent	9	40.9%
Stabilization/supervision/planning	5	22.7%
No value due to lack of education/MH	1	4.5%
Rehabilitative if services were available	1	4.5%

DA/ADA Responses (n=13)

Five (38.5%) DAs/ADAs mentioned the lack of treatment resources and lack of alternatives as a problem. Four (30.8%) mentioned the lack of available services for youth in secure detention as problems.

Table 19: DAs/ADAs, Problems

Problems	Frequency	Percent
Lack of treatment resources	5	38.5%
Lack of alternatives	5	38.5%
Few services in detention	4	30.8%
Not enough resources	1	7.7%
Lack of cooperation from parents/professionals	1	7.7%
Should not be warehouse for MH & Sub Abuse	1	7.7%

Three (23.1%) DAs/ADAs mentioned the need for more facility-based and community-based treatment resources as solutions to current problems.

Table 20: DAs/ADAs, Solutions

Solutions	Frequency	Percent
More treatment (facility & community based)	3	23.1%
More placement resources	1	7.7%
More money to pay for existing resources	1	7.7%
Funding for emergency adolescent services	1	7.7%

Eight (61.5%) DAs/ADAs mentioned the safety of the youth and the public as a value/goal/objective of secure detention. Five (35.8%) respondents mentioned punishment as a value/goal/objective.

Table 21: DAs/ADAs, Value/Goal/Objective

Value/Goal/Objective	Frequency	Percent
Safety of public/youth	8	61.5%
Punishment/Deterrent	5	38.5%

Defense Attorney Responses (N=5)

All five Defense Attorneys cited lack of placement and treatment resources as a problem in the detention system. The five additional problems they listed are contained in Table 22.

Table 22: Defense Attorneys, Problems

Problems	Frequency	Percent
Lack of short-term/long-term placements/treatment	5	100.0%
Length of stay determined by court schedule	1	20.0%
Punishment	1	20.0%
Used as DHS dumping ground	1	20.0%
Can be only place to get timely psych evaluation	1	20.0%
Lack of integration of services	1	20.0%

Two Defense Attorneys made suggestions for solutions, as displayed in Table 23.

Table 23: Defense Attorneys, Solutions

Solutions	Frequency	Percent
Flexible court scheduling	1	20.0%
Local providers to do prompt evaluations	1	20.0%

Three (60%) Defense Attorneys mentioned safety for the public and youth as a value/goal/objective of detention. Two (40%) Defense Attorneys mentioned: Punishment, Stops negative behavior, and None/Can be counterproductive.

Table 24: Defense Attorneys, Value/Goal/Objective

Value/Goal/Objective	Frequency	Percent
Safety of public/youth	3	60.0%
Punishment	2	40.0%
Stops negative behavior	2	40.0%
None/Can be counterproductive	2	40.0%
Opportunity to plan/assess	1	20.0%
Access to treatment	1	20.0%

JCCO Responses (N=38)

Twelve (31.6%) JCCOs included lack of treatment resources as a problem in Maine's detention system. Five (13.2%) JCCOs mentioned a lack of alternatives as a problem and four (10.5%) mentioned problems involving the courts.

Table 25: JCCOs, Problems

Problems	Frequency	Percent
Lack of treatment resources	12	31.6%
Lack of alternatives	5	13.2%
Court (scheduling, transportation, inconsistency)	4	10.5%
Lack of services/education in detention	3	7.9%
Length of stay too long	1	2.6%

Eleven (28.9%) JCCOs suggested increasing treatment resources as a solution. Eight (21.1%) JCCOs suggested more alternatives to detention. Table 26 contains a summary of all solutions proposed by JCCOs.

Table 26: JCCOs, Solutions

Solutions	Frequency	Percent
Increase treatment resources	11	28.9%
More alternatives to detention	8	21.1%
More consistency, easier access to courts	5	13.2%
More training and accountability for JCCOs	3	7.9%
More educational resources	1	2.6%

Twenty-six (68.4%) JCCOs mentioned public safety and the safety of the youth as a value/goal/objective of secure detention. Eleven (28.9%) JCCOs cited punishment and/or accountability as a value/goal/objective of secure detention. Table 27 lists all of the JCCO perceptions of the value/goal/objective of secure detention.

Table 27: JCCOs, Value/Goal/Objective

Value/Goal/Objective	Frequency	Percent
Safety of public/youth	26	68.4%
Punishment/Accountability	11	28.9%
Stabilization of crisis	10	26.3%
Ensures court appearance	1	2.6%