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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
### State Supervision Administrator View

#### Comparison CPC scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Youth</th>
<th>CPC Score 1</th>
<th>CPC Score 2</th>
<th>Six Month Change</th>
<th>One Year Convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Third District</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>51.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Third District</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>First District</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>57.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Second District</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>53.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Second District</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Third District</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Fourth District</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparison recidivism measures

- Correctional Program Checklist Overall Score
- % With New Conviction 1 Year

---

- Graphical comparison of CPC scores and recidivism
- Comparison CPC scores
- Comparison recidivism measures
Comparison of participants’ risk levels

Demographic information of participants

Risk assessment domain scores
CPC evaluation

**domain scores & norms**

**Definitions and data parameters**

PSRA Risk Level and PRA Domain Scores

The PRA domain scores are calculated as percentile scores. The bars represent 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 scores. It does not take into account other factors that may influence offense rate.

Offense data is updated in June and December of each year.

**Change in risk level over time**
Provides overview of charges received before and during the program and compares to statewide norm.
Provides program recidivism rates by offense type during and after the program and compares to a similar control group.
Provides demographic and risk information on program participants for each program.
Presents overview of each program's length, risk factors targeted, capacity, and summary of CPC results.

### Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Intended Program Length</th>
<th>Actual Program Length</th>
<th>PRA Domains Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>General delinquency</td>
<td>7 at one time, 50 per year</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>1.39 Months</td>
<td>Delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anger management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CPC Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Youth</th>
<th>CPC Score 1</th>
<th>CPC Score 2</th>
<th>Six Month Change</th>
<th>One Year Convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Third District</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Third District</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>First District</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Name]</td>
<td>Second District</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?
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.

- 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.