UTAH'S CPC PROGRAM EVALUATION INTERACTIVE WEB-BASED TOOL

Utah Administrative Office of the Courts
Utah Criminal Justice Center at the University of Utah

Overview of Program Assessment Tool

- Interactive website accessible to the program, probation managers, and court administrators
- Presents comparison of Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) scores and recidivism rates across programs
- Provides overview of program participants' demographics, risk levels, risk area targets, recidivism during and after the program
- Outlines strengths and areas of needed improvement identified by the CPC

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help Links »

State Supervision Administrator View

All Districts

See Detailed View Status: Logged In

Contracted SS Programs Other SS Programs Help logout Chart

Program Name	District	Number of Youth	CPC Score 1	CPC Score 2	Six Month Charge	One Year Convictions
[Program Name]	Third District	87	47.37		38.81	51.81%
[Program Name]	Third District	42	48.05		31.72	54.84%
[Program Name]	First District	74	43		42.81	57.83%
[Program Name]	Second District	47	20.51	40	31.85	53.66%
[Program Name]	Second District	40	44	63	27.61	60.0%
[Program Name]	Third District	30	57	57	14.18	25.0%
[Program Name]	Fourth District	Missing	26			

Graphical comparison of CPC scores and recidivism

Comparison CPC scores

Comparison recidivism measures

Contracted SS Programs Other State Supervision Help



State Supervision Tool

Click on bar of Program to Select:



Comparison of participants' risk levels

Demographic information of participants

Risk assessment domain scores

All Districts

Age | Race/Ethnicity | Gender | Risk Level



PRA Domain Scores | Risk Level Over Time | CPC Program Evaluation



PRA Domain Scores | Risk Level Over Time | CPC Program Evaluation



State Supervision Tool Data

PSRA Risk Level and PRA Dom

The PRA domain scores are calculated as percentile scores. The bars repre[illegible] the average PRA score in a particular domain for the youth entering the program. The State Supervision Mean score represents the average score on that domain for all youth on State Supervision.

Number of Offenses (Prior and During Program)

Offenses are identified by incident date (indicated by State of Utah court records). To mitigate the effects of 'charge piling', that is adding as many charges as possible in a single incident, the following procedure is used:

- Within a category each incident can only be counted once.
- An incident is one or more offenses that take place during a single calendar day.

Prior offenses were calculated for all individuals that had a State Supervision program start date. Offenses during program were calculated for all individuals who had *both* a start and end date for a State Supervision program.

The comparison group for each category is an average of all State Supervision youth weighted for high, medium and low PSRA risk scores. This is a very rough approximation of what one might expect a similar group of youth to look like based on categorical PSRA risk score. It does not take into account other factors that may influence offense rate.

Offense data is update in June and December of

Definitions and data parameters

PRA Domain Scores | Risk Level Ov



CPC evaluation domain scores & norms

PRA Domain Scores | Risk



Change in risk level over time

Show By Number

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help Links »

Offenses | New Charges | Risk and Protective Factors

Average Charges During Program by Type

[Program Name]

Prior to Program Start

During Program

Mean Number of Offense

Comparison Mean



Provides overview of charges received before and during the program and compares to statewide norm

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help Links »

Offenses | New Charges | Risk and Protective Factors

Percent of Youth with No New Charges Over Time

[Program Name]

Felony
(Control)Felony
Status
(Control)Status
Technical
(Control) Technical

Drag Tile To Box Below to View In Chart

Misdemeanor or Felony
N = 53 Better than Expected

(Control)Misdemeanor or Felony



Provides program recidivism rates by offense type during and after the program and compares to a similar control group

Age | Race/Ethnicity | Gender | Risk Level

[Program Name]



Age | Race/Ethnicity | Gender | Risk Level

[Program Name]



Provides demographic and risk information on program participants for each program

Age | Race/Ethnicity | Ge

[Program Name]



Age | Race/Ethnicity | Gender | Risk Level

[Program Name]

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help Links »

State Supervision Administrator View

All Districts

See Detailed View Status: Logged In

Contracted SS Programs Other SS Programs Help logout Chart

Program Name	District	Number of Youth	CPC Score 1	CPC Score 2	Six Month Charge	One Year Convictions
[Program Name]	Third District	87	47.37		38.81	51.81%
[Program Name]	Third District	42	48.05		31.72	54.84%
[Program Name]	First District	74	43		42.81	57.83%
[Program Name]	Second District	47	20.51		31.85	53.66%
[Program Name]	Se				27.61	60.0%
[Program Name]	Th				14.18	25.0%
[Program Name]	Fo				--	--

Presents overview of each program's length, risk factors targeted, capacity, and summary of CPC results

Program Summary | Recommendations

[Program Name]

Program Type
General delinquency

Capacity
7 at one time, 50 per year

Intended Program Length
3 months

Actual Program Length
1.39 Months

PRA Domains Targeted
Delinquency

Specific Problem Targets
Anger management

Summary:

- March 9, 2009
- **Are appropriate offenders referred to this program?**
- Current PSRA data shows that 41% of the youth referred to the program are low risk. At the most recent CPC assessment, the program and probation staff believes the number of low risk youth entering the program has been reduced substantially in the past six months. PRA recidivism rates will be updated by May 2009.
- **How does the program compare to the most effective juvenile and correctional interventions?**

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help Links »

State Supervision Administrator View

All Districts

See Detailed View Status: Logged In

Contracted SS Programs Other SS Programs Help logout Chart

Program Name	District	Number of Youth	CPC Score 1	CPC Score 2	Six Month Charge	One Year Convictions
[Program Name]	Third District	87	47.37		38.81	51.81%
[Program Name]	Third District	42	48.05		31.72	54.84%
[Program Name]	First District	74	43		42.81	57.83%
[Program Name]	Second District	47	20.51		31.85	53.66%
[Program Name]	Second District	40	44		27.61	60.0%
[Program Name]	Third District	30	57		14.18	25.0%
[Program Name]	Fourth Dist					--

Provides summary of CPC recommendations for areas of needed improvement and links to research article summaries that provide details on how these changes can be made

Program Summary | Recommendations

Recommendations [Program Name]

- The relationship between case management and clinical services should be clarified so that program philosophy, training, and day-to-day management are unified.
- All staff should review current literature on offender treatment programs, with a focus on how all program components fit within the risk, needs, and responsivity model. Click here, here, here, and here for more information.
- Because every staff member does not have at least two years of experience, it is highly recommended that program retain the current staff.
- Formal exclusionary criteria should be developed and shared with the probation department.
- The program should work with the probation department to share the case planning and PRA assessments so the program has a better knowledge of each offender's risk and needs. All program staff should also receive training with these tools so they understand how to use this information.