

daniel

Improving the odds for kids.



THE EARLY DELINQUENCY INTERVENTION PROGRAM

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF 1999 -2001 CLIENTS

July 2002



C.C.I.

Jeffrey A. Will, Director and Associate Professor of Sociology
Timothy Cheney MS, Coordinator, Research and Data Analysis

Northeast Florida Center For Community Initiatives
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice
University of North Florida
Jacksonville, FL 32224

EARLY DELINQUENCY INTERVENTION PROGRAM ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF 1999-2001 CLIENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

July 2002

Prepared By

Jeffrey A. Will, Director and Associate Professor of Sociology
Timothy Cheney MS, Coordinator, Research and Data Analysis

Northeast Florida Center For Community Initiatives
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice
University of North Florida

In this report, we review results from the annual assessment of the Early Delinquency Intervention Program (EDIP). For this analysis, we examined data on clients from EDIP programs in Jacksonville and Clearwater from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2001. Below we present a brief Executive Summary of findings from this analysis. Please note that these findings represent the entire EDIP population. When appropriate, we only discuss data for a site when data are available.

Client Profiles

- A total of 619 clients were served over the two-year period, 347 from the 1999-00 program year and 272 from 2000-01.
- Males represented 73.7 percent of the population in 1999-00 and 72.7 percent in 2000-01. The proportion of non-white clients reached a high in 1999-00 at just over 51 percent, however, returned to a lower level of 42 percent in 2000-01.
- The average age of the clients was slightly over 14 years old for each program year.

Family Social And Economic Profiles

- In the EDIP I program, close to 50 percent of all families are headed by single parents, while at EDIP II it is only a slightly lower 40 percent.
- Over 50 percent of EDIP I clients had an adult family member with an arrest record and close to 30 percent had a family member with a history of drug abuse. At EDIP II, the numbers were slightly lower (39.3 percent and 23.7 percent respectively).

Recidivism Rates

- EDIP I clients averaged 3.6 prior arrests while EDIP II clients averaged 3.9 prior arrests.
- The overall recidivism rate for the 1999-00 program year was 39.9 percent, with EDIP I at 30.6 percent and EDIP II at 54.1 percent.
- The overall recidivism rate for the 2000-01 program year was 31.6 percent, with EDIP I at 27.1 percent and EDIP II at 34.7 percent.

EARLY DELINQUENCY INTERVENTION PROGRAM ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF 1999-2001 CLIENTS

July 2002

Prepared By
Jeffrey A. Will, Director and Associate Professor of Sociology
Timothy Cheney MS, Coordinator, Research and Data Analysis

Northeast Florida Center For Community Initiatives
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice
University of North Florida

INTRODUCTION

The Early Delinquency Intervention and Prevention Program (EDIP) began operations in Jacksonville, Florida, in August of 1992, the result of legislation introduced by St. John's County Senator, Bill Bankhead. The Jacksonville program (EDIP I) is contracted to Daniel Inc. from the Department of Juvenile Justice to serve youths in Circuit 4, and the Clearwater program (EDIP II) is designed to serve in Circuit 6, who are 15 years and younger who had two arrests. The EDIP model consists of two primary phases: a two to six week residential stay, followed by six to nine months of case management services.

Because the EDIP design focuses solely on youth with judicial involvement, program referrals originate through three primary sources: the Department of Juvenile Justice, Juvenile Court, and the State Attorney's Office. Juveniles are either diverted from the court system and referred through "diversion" or ordered by the court to participate in the program.

Referrals through diversion originate from the State Attorney's Office, by passing the court system, thus sanctioning the youth while allowing him or her to avoid prosecution pending successful program completion. Clients that are unable to successfully complete the program may be prosecuted for their original charge, therefore, sending them back to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Court ordered youth are ordered in Juvenile

Court, either with or without a pre-dispositional recommendation from the Department of Juvenile Justice, as a sanction condition of a youth's probation. Failure to complete EDIP as a

YEAR - LOCATION	n	Community Control	Diversion
1999-00 EDIP I (Jacksonville)	170	94.7%	5.3%
2000-01 EDIP I (Jacksonville)	147	54.7%	48.3%
1999-00 EDIP II (Clearwater)	127	14.2%	85.8%
2000-01 EDIP II (Clearwater)	96	0.0%	100.0%

sanction of their probation may result in a violation of Community Control resulting in further judicial action. As seen in Table 1, EDIP I clients are mostly on community control, while EDIP II clients tend to be diverted.

The residential component is the initial phase of the EDIP program, also known as the assessment phase. This component introduces daily structure, intensive school monitoring, individual, family and group therapy, behavioral analysis, social problem interventions, and community service work coupled with a battery of assessments to provide a holistic look into the issues affecting the client. The Program Therapist then develops a comprehensive treatment plan from the information gathered in the assessment. The treatment plan is the guiding force that provides “directions” for client success in the home, school, and community. The performance plan identifies individual needs in mental health, family, judicial, substance abuse, academic, and leisure. Clients begin the six to nine months of case management aftercare following discharge from the residential component. Case Managers monitor the behavioral progress of the child at home and school, in addition to coordinating necessary linkages identified in the treatment plan. Case Managers provide incentives for goal achievements, judicial advocacy, as well as a reminder of punitive action for non-compliance. Case Managers are responsible for providing crisis intervention and support on an “on-call” basis to the client and family at home, school, and in the community. This multi-systemic approach wraps services around the family, with the emphasis on the client.

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of the Early Delinquency Intervention and Prevention program (EDIP) by the Northeast Florida Center for Community Initiatives (CCI). Over the past six (6) years, research team members from CCI have worked with staff from Daniel to assess the outcomes of the EDIP program. Over this period of time, the program, including expansion to a second site serving the Pasco and Pinellas county area in Southeast Florida, has made significant changes. This report represents the assessment of EDIP operations during the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 periods, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data. Overall, we examine the EDIP program from July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2001. This layout of the report is based on the comparison of program years with specific references to sites where applicable.

It is important to note that this report is significantly behind the originally planned project schedule. In previous years, CCI worked with EDIP staff to prepare a report for each contract year. Due to a number of problems and unforeseen circumstances encountered during the preparation of the report in 2000, it was necessary to combine these contract periods into this one report.

Specifically, during Summer 2000, The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice began requiring background checks on all persons from CCI involved in the data collection and analysis of the program. This resulted in significant delays in obtaining needed data from EDIP sites. In addition, problems in obtaining data from both DJJ and EDIP, as well as delays within CCI, final data collection for the project was not completed until June 2002. Fortunately, we believe that all issues relating to these delays have been resolved, and future assessment efforts will run smoothly.

RESEARCH METHOD

As stated above, *CCI* staff utilized several methodological approaches to assess the EDIP program. The primary data used in the analysis of EDIP client outcomes was derived from two sources. First, files containing client demographics, limited school information, and parent and family characteristics were obtained from the EDIP program office. Second, information on client involvement with the Florida Juvenile Justice System was determined from computer files sent to CCI by the Department of Juvenile Justice. In order to fully establish the database, it was necessary to return to various data sets to supplement and obtain all needed information. The primary data is supplemented with surveys and focus groups of clients, staff, and management at both the Jacksonville and Clearwater sites.

In this analysis, three primary areas of interest were examined. First, demographic characteristics, academic performance, and family issues were examined to develop an understanding of the makeup of EDIP clients. The perspectives of the clients and staff on the program are discussed. Finally, we examine the criminal characteristics and potential risk factors of clients, including activities prior to EDIP enrollment, during the program, and after discharge. An examination of data for EDIP clients from prior years is also used when germane.

VARIABLES

The database from EDIP, DJJ, and education files represents a potential wealth of information on client activities and backgrounds. The major headings for the data are Child Background, Family Background (parental, sibling, and financial), Family History (home environment and life-conditions), Academic Profile, Medical/Mental Health History, and Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Records. The information discussed in this report represents client activity for the program years ending June 30, 2000 and 2001.

CLIENT PROFILE

Demographics Overall

CCI had access to data for a total of 619 clients served over the two-year period, 347 from the 1999-00 program year and 272 from 2000-01. The 2000-01 Program year figures are a slight

	1999-2000	2000-2001	TOTAL
EDIP I	186	154	340
EDIP II	161	118	279
TOTAL	347	272	619

decline from previous years and can be attributed to the job transitions within EDIP and the number of eligible clients in the Juvenile Justice System. As seen in Table 1, EDIP I maintained a relatively high number for its population despite these factors.

As reflected in Table 3, the breakdown of the sex and race of clients in the programs has remained consistent over the past seven years. Males represented 73.7 percent of the population in 1999-00 and 72.7 percent in 2000-01. The proportion of non-white clients reached a high in 1999-00 at just over 51 percent; however, returned to a lower level of 42 percent in 2000-01. Attempts to service more non-white clients in response to recommendations set forth in past reports have been successful in raising these percentages. The EDIP program has made a conscience effort to reflect the State of Florida’s juvenile population in an effort to reduce the recidivism rates of those with the greatest risk. Further, the average age of clients over the two years (approximately 14) has also remained in line with past program years.

	2000-01	1999-00	1998-99	1997-98	1996-97	1995-96	1994-95
RACE (n)	264	297	388	309	348	218	171
Non-White Females	8.7%	14.1%	11.9%	9.7%	13.7%	10.1%	7.6%
Non-White Males	33.3%	37.0%	32.2%	30.4%	26.8%	36.7%	37.4%
White Females	18.6%	12.1%	12.4%	12.9%	15.2%	10.6%	9.4%
White Males	39.4%	36.7%	43.6%	46.9%	44.3%	42.6%	45.6%
AGE at ADMISSION (n)	268	317	422	327	343	218	171
Average Age	14.10	14.02	13.9	13.6	13.9	13.6	13.5
11 and Under	5.5%	6.6%	7.3%	9.2%	4.9%	6.5%	4.8%
12	8.4%	11.0%	11.4%	12.8%	8.6%	16.1%	9.1%
13	22.6%	28.1%	23.2%	17.4%	21.6%	19.1%	34.5%
14	28.8%	25.9%	27.7%	27.5%	29.4%	32.2%	31.5%
15	30.3%	24.6%	28.2%	29.4%	28.8%	25.1%	18.8%
16 and Up	4.4%	3.8%	2.1%	3.7%	6.9%	1.0%	1.2%
Note: Overall, there were 347 clients served in 1999-2000 and 272 clients served in 2000-2001. The discussion here does not include clients with missing data fields on Race, Sex, and Age.							
Data Source: 1994-2001 EDIP DataTrack Databases							

Demographics By Site

With respect to age, there are no real differences between EDIP I and EDIP II. Both sites admit clients around the average age of 14 years. Both sites have an equally distributed range of ages as well, with many of the clients falling between the 14 and 15 year-old category. Neither site has many young clients (11 and younger) or old (16 and older). The major difference between the sites was the race of the client. While EDIP I admitted 62.9 percent non-White clients in 1999-00 and 59.7 percent in

	Jacksonville Discharged	Clearwater Discharged
RACE (n)	186	111
Non-White Females	18.3%	7.2%
Non-White Males	44.6%	24.3%
White Females	12.4%	11.7%
White Males	24.7%	56.8%
AGE at ADMISSION (n)	186	131
Average Age	14.02	14.01
11 and younger	7.5%	5.3%
12	11.3%	10.7%
13	29.0%	26.7%
14	24.7%	27.5%
15	23.7%	26.0%
16 and older	3.8%	3.8%
* All clients were discharged at the time of this report.		
Data Source: 1999-00 EDIP DataTrack Database		

2000-01, EDIP II admitted only 31.5 and 25.2 percent during the same periods.

Client Background

In order to better understand the clients' background, an analysis of family characteristics, including their parental background and economic history, and the clients' abuse record are examined. It is important to examine the clients in this way to find out where these clients are coming from and how the EDIP program has been able to help them. It further solidifies the fact that the EDIP program deals with clients who have, for the most part, troubled lives and poor home life conditions. For the purpose of this analysis, only the discharged clients will be examined because of the relatively small number of clients who were at the time of data collection still in the program.

	Jacksonville		Clearwater	
	Non-Discharged	Discharged	Non-Discharged	Discharged
RACE (n)	81	72	8	103
Non-White Females	14.8%	6.9%	0.0%	5.8%
Non-White Males	42.0%	40.3%	12.5%	23.3%
White Females	17.3%	12.5%	50.0%	21.4%
White Males	25.9%	40.3%	37.5%	49.5%
AGE at ADMISSION	80	72	9	107
Average Age	14.11	14.16	14.56	14.02
11 and younger	2.5%	6.9%	0.0%	7.5%
12	7.5%	6.9%	11.1%	8.4%
13	36.3%	25.0%	0.0%	12.1%
14	32.5%	33.3%	11.1%	25.2%
15	18.8%	26.4%	77.8%	38.3%
16 and older	2.5%	1.4%	0.0%	8.4%
Data Source: 2000-01 EDIP DataTrack Database				

In the EDIP I program, close to 50 percent of all families are headed by single parents, while at EDIP II it is only a slightly lower, 40 percent. There is also quite a history of both arrests and substance abuse in each family on average. Over 50 percent of EDIP I clients had an adult family member with an arrest record and close to 30 percent had a family member with a history of drug abuse. At EDIP II, the numbers were slightly lower (39.3 percent and 23.7 percent respectively), but still troublesome. Further, as seen in Table 6 and 7, over 16 percent of the clients in EDIP I over the two-year period had a family with an annual income of less than \$15,000.

TABLE 6		
1999-00 FAMILY MEASURES BY LOCATION		
	Jacksonville Discharged	Clearwater Discharged
PARENT	186	161
Single Parent (YES)	53.2%	37.3%
Attended a Parenting Class (YES)	6.0%	27.3%
Family History of Arrest (YES)	54.8%	35.4%
Family History of Drugs (YES)	31.2%	17.4%
INCOME	186	161
AFDC/TANF (YES)	7.5%	4.3%
SSI (YES)	15.6%	13.7%
Child Support (YES)	8.1%	5.6%
Food Stamps (YES)	16.1%	9.3%
Medicaid (YES)	19.9%	18.6%
Annual Income (\$15,000 or less)	18.3%	*
* Insufficient Data		
Data Source: 1999-00 EDIP DataTrack Database		

TABLE 7		
2000-01 FAMILY MEASURES BY LOCATION		
	Jacksonville Discharged	Clearwater Discharged
PARENT	73	109
Single Parent (YES)	47.9%	42.2%
Attended a Parenting Class (YES)	57.5%	21.1%
Family History of Arrest (YES)	34.2%	45.0%
Family History of Drugs (YES)	21.9%	33.0%
INCOME	73	109
AFDC/TANF (YES)	4.1%	6.4%
SSI (YES)	19.2%	11.9%
Child Support (YES)	2.7%	10.1%
Food Stamps (YES)	5.5%	10.1%
Medicaid (YES)	19.2%	30.3%
Annual Income (\$15,000 or less)	11.0%	*
* Insufficient Data		
Data Source: 2000-01 EDIP DataTrack Database		

TABLE 8		
1999-00 EDIP CLIENT ABUSE FACTORS BY LOCATION		
	Jacksonville Discharged	Clearwater Discharged
PRIOR TO EDIP	186	161
Physical Abuse (YES)	14.5%	6.2%
Sexual Abuse (YES)	6.5%	6.8%
Emotional Abuse (YES)	15.1%	11.2%
Neglect (YES)	17.2%	3.1%
Alcohol Use (YES)	14.0%	33.5%
Drug Use (YES)	21.5%	37.9%
Data Source: 1999-00 EDIP DataTrack Database		

In Tables 8 and 9, the history of abuse of the client is examined for several different types of abuse: experienced (physical, sexual, emotional, and neglect) and participated (alcohol and drug) abuse. These figures have been compiled from the assessment form which reports abuse based on both parental interviews and actual PDR reports. As seen in the tables, the EDIP I program has a greater percentage of reported experienced abuse, while the EDIP II program reports far greater participated abuse.

TABLE 9		
2000-01 EDIP CLIENT ABUSE FACTORS BY LOCATION		
	Jacksonville Discharged	Clearwater Discharged
PRIOR TO EDIP	73	109
Physical Abuse (YES)	15.1%	16.5%
Sexual Abuse (YES)	6.8%	12.8%
Emotional Abuse (YES)	23.3%	11.9%
Neglect (YES)	11.0%	3.7%
Alcohol Use (YES)	24.7%	43.1%
Drug Use (YES)	37.0%	50.5%
Data Source: 2000-01 EDIP DataTrack Database		

Academics

As stated in previous reports and above, a major component of the EDIP program is improving the educational performance of clients. An attempt in recent years has been made to improve the collection of educational data, including GPA's, referrals, absences, and failed grades through new communications with the School System and higher priorities set within EDIP. At the time of this report, there was still some missing data, but far less than in past reports.

The average grade point average (GPA) of clients at admission into the EDIP program was 1.72, while at discharge was 1.70. Though an extremely slight decrease, it is important to look at the clients' overall educational profile. During the same time period, clients entered the program with an average of 8.73 unexcused absences and 5.09 referrals. At discharge, these figures had dropped substantially to 2.64 unexcused absences and 1.00 referrals, a difference of minus 6.09

and 4.09 respectively. Further, over 55 percent of the clients entering EDIP had at one time failed a grade. In table 9, one can see the academic data results by year and location with the percent change for discharged clients.

TABLE 10 ACADEMIC PROFILE						
	2000-01			1999-00		
	Admission	Discharge	Percent Change	Admission	Discharge	Percent Change
EDIP I						
GPA	1.54	1.55	*	1.59	1.20	- 25%
Unexcused Absences	6.17	5.94	- 4%	5.55	.31	- 94%
Referrals	4.02	3.27	- 19%	4.51	.26	- 94%
Grades Failed	73.6%	n/a	n/a	68.1%	n/a	N/a
EDIP II						
GPA	2.01	1.89	- 6%	1.70	1.94	+ 14%
Unexcused Absences	17.01	6.43	- 62%	7.65	1.38	- 82%
Referrals	7.39	1.36	- 82%	4.56	.63	- 86%
Grades Failed	41.4%	n/a	n/a	34.0%	n/a	n/a
* Less than 1%						
n/a Not Applicable						
Data Source: 2000-01 EDIP DataTrack Database						

FOCUS GROUPS

CLIENT FOCUS GROUPS

Introduction

Each year, the clients are given an opportunity to provide insight into the EDIP program from within. Focus groups are conducted which concentrate on the clients' perspectives of the program and how they deal with it. The focus groups are basically an interview with several clients at one time in a group setting with no staff present. All clients who choose to participate in a focus group had given consent, had parental consent, and were informed that their answers would be confidential and only to be reported in summary form. Two groups from each of the program sites were interviewed each year; the first group consisted of clients who were in the Residential Component for the two to six-week mandatory stay and the second group consisted of clients who were under case management supervision. The first group will be referred to as 'Residential Clients', while the second group as 'Case Managed Clients' for the purposes of the discussion below.

Activities

Clients were asked what type of recreational activities they participate in. The Residential Clients clearly know that one of their main responsibilities while staying at the cottage is to perform community service. The scope of “community service” is interpreted quite broadly by cottage staff, but usually revolves around some form of “community cleanliness.” The Residential Clients also participate in group discussions and guest speakers, limited TV and radio, and several sports, including basketball, swimming, football, and soccer. The Case Managed Clients also participate in community service, but are also free to do other activities at their schools.

School

The EDIP program requires clients to attend classes while in both the residential and case management components. The Residential Clients felt that their schoolwork was the easy part and that adjusting to the teacher’s attitudes was more difficult. “Some teachers know your reputation and that makes it hard.” said one client. The general consensus was that classes tended to be “boring,” though some were fun, albeit only gym, recess, and lunch were mentioned. The Case Managed Clients differed in respect to the excitement level of their classes. They felt that the EDIP program was helping them to do better in school, while maintaining a better attendance record. When asked about the use of computers in their lives, almost all clients used them at least 3 times a week. Several clients used one everyday at school or home. The computers were used for homework, playing games, and chatting with friends.

Treatment and Rules

During the focus group EDIP clients were asked if they felt they were treated fairly and if not, why. The Residential clients all agreed that the rules of the program were fair. One client said, “It is easy. I know the consequences. If I do something wrong, I drop a level.” referring to the level system used while the client stays at the cottage. There were the expected comments of unfairness and lack of freedom from some of the clients. However, other clients reflected on that and mentioned that they knew they did something wrong and that they should lose some of their normal privileges and freedom. One client even said, “I can understand why we needed to knock on the door [to let the staff know they wanted to come out], we are in a program.” The Case Managed Clients believed that the rules of the EDIP program were fair, though not always easy to follow. Interestingly, a few of the EDIP II clients mentioned that they were not real worried about breaking the rules. One client said, “We heard from other kids that if you runaway they can’t do nothing to you anyway.” This has been an issue for the EDIP II staff due to the sites use as a diversion program, but as seen later in the recidivism section, an issue that is being addressed.

Program and Personal Goals

As in past years, the Residential and Case Managed Clients of EDIP knew the program goals. The clients immediately explained that the goals were to stay out of trouble, do better in school, know the difference between right and wrong, and get along better with their family. Other less global goals included respecting the staff, advancing in levels, and to be positive role models for the other clients.

The personal goals of the EDIP clients varied according to their current situation. The Residential clients had dreams of joining the NBA/NFL, just wanted to get out of school, or as

one client put it, “Own a club, have a car, lots of money and be an audio star.” Their goals lacked focus and were either temporary or unrealistic. However, to the credit of the EDIP, the Case Managed Clients had an almost complete different view. Their goals were centered on graduating from High School and then going on to college. Several professions were listed, such as computer technician and lawyer, as well as the rare basketball star. Overall, their goals were much more focused and one could clearly see the influence of the staff that had been working with them.

Staff

When asked about the staff, the Residential Clients responded positively. They felt that the staff was concerned about their needs, supportive, and that the staff was willing to talk to them. However, clients at the EDIP II site did mention that the staff did not seem to get along together all of the time. These clients said “Sometimes the staff just don’t get along.” Among the clients interviewed, these were the only negative comments towards the staff. Overall, the clients were pleased with their treatment and felt the staff was “just doing their jobs.”

Parents

Parental involvement was another topic discussed at the focus group. The clients were asked if their parents attended events and worked with them in the program. Several of the Residential Clients liked the fact that their parents came to the parent nights and spent time with them. Other clients were glad, however, when their parents did not come. One client snapped, “They will just get mad at me anyway.” Overall, the Residential Clients felt that their parents were supportive and that if they were not able to come visit it was due to work. The Case Managed Clients had mixed reviews over the support they received. They explained that usually one of their parents would be supportive, but that one would not, if they even had another parent at home. “Mom is, dad isn’t,” replied one client. It was clear that the clients in case management did not want to talk too much about their lives at home.

When asked about what role their parents should play in the client’s lives, a variety of answers were offered. Some clients enjoyed spending time with them and hoped to continue this relationship. Others wanted them to be more active, while still others wanted nothing to do with their parents. Once again, the Case Managed Clients did not have a lot to say on the subject of parents. Whatever role parents were playing, they were fine with that.

Best/Least/Change

Another important aspect of the focus group was finding out what the clients liked best and least about EDIP, as well as what they would like to see changed. For the Residential Clients the answer came easy, ‘The Food’. Several of the clients commented that, “The food is great.” and “The food actually tastes good.” Surprisingly, these comments came from clients at both the EDIP I and II sites. Other comments included playing video games, the activities, and being able to sleep when there is nothing to do. One client even mentioned that it “Teaches you right from wrong.”

The clients also had several dislikes. Clients mentioned that “The rules are too strict.” and “I don’t like having to knock to leave my room.” However, other clients again were quick to refute those claims and reiterated that rules were not that bad. Other dislikes included the attitudes of

other clients, staying in their room, having their room searched while they are gone, and sometimes getting punished for someone else's mistake. Overall, these comments were rather mild and one client could not think of anything they disliked.

When asked what they would change, the clients asked for later curfews, more free time, and less community service. Other clients mentioned that the rooms tend to get cold and that the beds were very hard. Still others wanted a TV in their rooms and a diving board for the pool. In general, however, the clients sought to change the amount of freedom they had and the activities that they could participate in.

Synopsis

It is clear that the EDIP program is having a direct impact on the lives of their clients. It is also clear that the staff play a major role in that impact. The Residential Clients learn quickly what the program goals are; however, it takes months of case management to reinforce those goals and foster growth and development in the client's lives. Along the way, the clients learn the importance of school and many of the values that they need to be successful in life.

STAFF FOCUS GROUPS

Introduction

As mentioned earlier, it is important to examine the perceptions of not only the clients, but also the staff. In an attempt to gain a better understanding of the staff's feelings about EDIP, they were invited to participate in focus groups of their own. Staff from EDIP I and EDIP II were interviewed, as well as employees of the Sheriffs Youth Ranch (SYR)¹. In a group setting similar to the Client Focus Groups discussed earlier, the staff was asked several open-ended questions about the clients they work with, the administration/organization, and the EDIP program overall. This report refers to the two staff groups as Residential Staff and Case Managers, with reference to the SYR Staff when appropriate.

The Goals of EDIP

The interviews began with the question, "What are the goals of EDIP?" Every group answered it with the same precision and accuracy as the clients. "To keep them out of trouble and to get them to do better in school." one staff answered. "We try to get them to understand the difference between right and wrong." another staff replied. Overall, everyone agreed to these statements and also included, "Enable them to get a second chance," "Better themselves and their families," and "To stay away from negativity." It was obvious during the interviews that the staff knew what goals they were setting for the clients and what both of them were reaching for. The staff also believed that the clients were motivated to be successful on their own; but most of the time they "Do what needs to be done to get out."

The Clients/Caseloads

¹ The Sheriffs Youth Ranch is the organization that operated the cottage that housed EDIP II in Clearwater, FL.

In general, the Residential Staff believed that the clients had enough activities during their mandatory stay at the cottage. The staff provides several sporting activities and speakers, and also community service. When asked about the topic of community service, the Residential Staff knew that the clients did not always appreciate the activity and thought that it was at times boring. Nonetheless, community service, “Provides structure and a sense of pride in giving back to the community.” The Residential Staff also were not exactly sure how skillful the clients were at using computers. As far as they could determine, they used them for games. The Case Managers knew that some of their clients did use computers for homework. They encouraged the clients to use them at school when they could. Though most of the clients don’t need a lot of help with their homework, in part because they are not assigned too much, the Case Managers helped when appropriate and worked to get the parents involved.

Concerning the issue of school relationships, the staff was adamant about trying to get their clients a fair shot. One Case Manager said, “Several teachers just try and push them [the client] through without worrying about their education.” They felt that they were constantly trying to communicate with not only the teachers, but also the principals about their clients and any trouble they may be getting in, though often times to no avail. Another Case Manager told the research team “Some principals won’t even let you in the building.” The Case Managers just want to make sure that they are aware of their client’s activities and participation in school. When asked if they have access to their client’s records at school, the staff just shook their head, “No.” “It is the same way with the Juvenile Justice record.” one staff said.

Discipline

When the staff was asked about the discipline of the clients and if it was a problem for the staff, responses varied among the different programs. The Residential Staff explained that the clients work on a level system that enables them to advance by following the rules. They explained, “As their behavior gets better, their privileges get better.” They believe in the team approach to discipline, everyone helps to discipline and enforce the rules.

One consequence for negative behavior is having the client write an essay. The Case Managers believed that they have a problem with disciplining the clients. They believed that the family is more of a problem than the environment. When a problem exists the case manager is paged so they can talk to their client and set consequences for their behavior. These consequences can vary from having to do community service to admittance into the residential program.

EDIP Facilities

The staff was also asked to evaluate the program facilities, educational equipment, and materials. The EDIP II staff said that conditions were getting better. One SYR Residential Night Staff said, “The roof used to leak and you didn’t always get hot water, but things have been getting better.” The Residential Staff at both sites mentioned that the facilities were good and that the educational information provided to the clients to read while staying there was ‘a little out dated’, but overall still relevant. The Residential Staff felt that the computers were also old, but seemed to continue to work for the clients.

Client Contact/Parental Involvement

For the most part, the staff does not keep in touch with the client after they have exited the program. Though occasionally a client will stop by to chat, the majority of clients are not seen again. It was clear that the relationship stops once the client is discharged from the program.

The staff was also asked how they felt about the importance of parental involvement and the level of parental involvement in their programs. The Residential Staff still felt that a low percentage of parents were active, which is also consistently mentioned in previous reports and supported by the parent night attendance data. One staff mentioned interestingly enough that “Some parents are active, some are not. It really just depends on the kid and their attitude.” implying that it was up to the client as to how much the parent participated. As mentioned in previous reports, the Case Managers felt that parental commitment is a very important aspect because the child believes if the parent is involved they care about them. Regrettably, the parents do not always get involved. One staff commented, “We have been told that they [the parents] are done parenting and that we have to fix it. This is unfortunate because the parents are often the piece of the puzzle that determines whether or not a client succeeds.” All of the staff agreed that the parents are a critical factor in making sure that the client achieves the goals set forth by EDIP.

Administration

In past interviews for previous reports, the staff had many negative perceptions and statements concerning the administration and management. For the most part, that was still the case in the current round of interviews, particularly at the EDIP II site. Both the SYR Staff and Case Managers at EDIP II had nothing good to say about their current or previous SYR Manager. The staff said that they were never really supportive, and did not appreciate them in the least. Further, one staff remarked, “He [the current manager] doesn’t seem to care. The kids don’t come first. He does not encourage us at all.” Unfortunately, the list of complaints and concerns continues on and on. The staff felt that their manager lacks communication skills, does not follow through on promises made, and just sort of “feel into a management position.” Finally, the staff told the researchers that they received no real training on how to do their job, but was merely expected to learn from others.²

At the EDIP I site, the situation seems to be much better. “Overall things are O.K. They seem to appreciate us and are open to suggestions.” This statement seemed to be the sentiment of the other staff as well, confirmed by several yes nods. The only problem it seems is communication. It appears that the staff felt “Out of the loop” sometimes and would like to be more involved in the program decision process. Overall, the upper management seems to be doing a good job according to the staff.

Best/Least/Change

Overwhelmingly, the Residential Staff and Case Managers felt that the best thing about working at EDIP was, “Helping the kids!” and working with the other staff. One staff said it best, “What do I like the best? When you do something that helps those kids.” There were some things that they did not like or at least would like to see changed. For instance, some felt that there was not enough therapy and that checking on the clients every 15 minutes was too much of an

² Since the time of these interviews, the EDIP II program has been relocated to a new site with different management.

interruption. Further, the EDIP II site staff did not like the management and wanted it changed. Other things that could use some change according to the staff were the need for more in-service staff trainings, more autonomy for the Case Managers, more money, and finally “to not wait until the next admission to bring recycles in.”

Concerns/Comments

The staff were also given the opportunity to address any other concerns or make any additional comments that they felt were not covered during the focus group. The following is a compellation of those statements:

- “Communication is the key.”
- “The Staff is extremely overworked and tired.”
- “We thought our last manager was bad, but then we got the new one.”
- “Staff is extremely willing to work, but sometimes lack direction.”
- “Sometimes it seems that the management doesn’t really know what staff does.”
- “Every kid deserves a chance.”
- “There are really no advancement opportunities.”
- “Some days you feel important, especially when you get through to a client.”

Synopsis

The staff is extremely concerned with the well-being of their clients and wants each one of them to be successful. They have a desire to help that can not be taught and feel a sense of accomplishment each time they assist a client. Each staff takes the responsibility for the job that has been entrusted to them and tries their best. The situation is not always the best, for clients and managers can stretch them to their limits, but overall, they deserve recognition as to why the EDIP program is as successful as it is.

RECIDIVISM AND RISK

The data below represents two years worth of Recidivism data and reflects both the Jacksonville and Clearwater sites. The face sheets were obtained from both DJJ and EDIP staff using the client’s name, DJJ number, and date of birth as identifiers. The face sheets are used to gather data on the number of charges, arrests, and convictions both prior to and after discharge from EDIP.

Prior Charges

The EDIP program attempts to serve its target population by admitting only clients that have 2 prior arrests. Though this can be a difficult task due to the court-ordering clients to attend, it is a task that the EDIP program is performing well. Both EDIP sites have maintained a relatively low amount of prior arrests, with the lowest coming at EDIP I in 1999-00 at 3.26 charges per client.

TABLE 11 AVERAGE PRIOR CHARGES		
LOCATION	2000-01	1999-00
EDIP I (Jacksonville)	4.01	3.26
EDIP II (Clearwater)	3.91	3.84

Recidivism Rates

Recidivism rates for the current report have been calculated using the State of Florida method. For this measure of recidivism, both technical violations and arrests in which the disposition field on the face sheet indicated the charges were dropped or the client was not guilty are omitted. Further, the State also measures recidivism after one year from discharge of the program. This means that if the client is arrested, charged, and convicted within one year, they will be included in the recidivism rate.

The rates for the program years 1999-01 are shown in Table 11. We see that overall EDIP I has maintained their relatively low recidivism rate, which has been right at or below 30 percent since 1998. This means that close to 70 percent of EDIP I clients have stayed out of trouble up to one year after release. Compared to the 58 percent figure the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice reported in 1998 for juveniles released from a delinquency treatment program, the EDIP I program is doing an outstanding job of making their clients successful.

	2000-01	1999-00
Overall	31.6% (n=171)	39.9% (n=308)
EDIP I (Jacksonville)	27.1% (n=70)	30.6% (n=186)
EDIP II (Clearwater)	34.7% (n=101)	54.1% (n=122)

In the case of EDIP II, the recidivism rate for 1999-00 of 54.1 percent was almost identical to the 1998-99 figure of 53.6 percent. However, there was a significant drop of nearly 20 percent from 1999-00 to 2000-01. The 34.7 percent figure posted for EDIP II during the 2000-01 program year is the lowest it has ever been for that site and is nearly as low as EDIP I. This means that while only 45 percent of clients were successful in 1999-00, over 65 percent of clients (7 percent higher than the state average) were deemed successful.

This decrease is also considerable due to the fact that EDIP II clients are ordered there as a diversion, while EDIP I clients are court ordered. Being mainly a diversion program tended to limit the ability of the Case Managers to control their clients because they did not have the serious threat of sending the client back to court. As mentioned earlier, several of the EDIP II clients knew that if they did not follow the rules or even ran away that nothing was going to happen to them, at least as far as the courts go. The EDIP II program has adapted to this limited ability and is now seeing lowered recidivism rates because of it.

The national average for recidivism is around 59 percent or higher depending on the source. Both EDIP sites were well under this figure for the 2000-01 year, with EDIP I also much lower

in 1999-00. As we can see, the EDIP recidivism rates decreased from 1999-00 to 2000-01, and remains well below the state and national average.

Risk Factors

While it is important to understand the characteristics of the clients from EDIP, and to examine recidivism rates, it is also important to understand the factors that put these clients at further risk for trouble. It is important to understand the impact that risk factors identified in the research literature have on recidivism among clients in the EDIP program. In order to understand these factors among EDIP clients, we examine the correlation between a number of risk factors and recidivism. In Tables 13 and 14, the correlation matrices for the two project years are presented with significance levels and number of clients valid for each association.

As can be noted in Table 13, a number of risks factors can be identified in the EDIP database, although few are statistically related to recidivism among the clients. Indeed, of the 10 risk factors identified, only two factors, Location and DJJ Referral, appear to be significantly correlated with recidivism. Those two factors are similar in nature in that clients from EDIP I are usually referred as community control and clients from EDIP II are diverted. In Table 14, only the client’s drug history is a slightly significant related to recidivism.

	Single Parent	Income Assistance	Prior Abuse	Client Alcohol History	Client Drug History	Family Under 18 Arrested	Family Over 18 Arrested	Failed a Grade	DJJ Referral	Recidivism
Location	-.368** (347)	.146** (347)	.149** (347)	-.232** (347)	-.180** (347)	.069 (282)	.017 (279)	.332** (288)	-.814** (297)	-.234** (308)
Single Parent	-----	-.246** (347)	-.234** (347)	-.156** (347)	-.220** (347)	-.001 (282)	.098 (279)	-.040 (288)	.323** (297)	.023 (308)
Income Assistance		-----	-.014 (347)	-.048 (347)	-.064 (347)	.044 (282)	.062 (279)	.071 (288)	-.169** (297)	-.027 (308)
Prior Abuse			-----	.151** (347)	.128* (347)	.076 (282)	.200** (279)	.058 (288)	-.111 (297)	.074 (308)
Client Alcohol History				-----	.613** (347)	-.002 (282)	-.019 (279)	-.123* (288)	.185** (297)	.033 (308)
Client Drug History					-----	-.053 (282)	.022 (279)	-.047 (288)	.154** (297)	.051 (308)
Family Under 18 Arrested						-----	.025 (272)	-.005 (274)	-.068 (243)	.086 (258)
Family Over 18 Arrested							-----	-.007 (275)	-.016 (240)	.053 (255)
Failed a Grade								-----	-.271** (247)	-.071 (262)
DJJ Referral									-----	.185** (277)

TABLE 14
2000-2001 EDIP I & II
CORRELATIONS OF SELECT RISK FACTORS WITH DELINQUENCY INDICATORS

	Single Parent	Income Assistance	Prior Abuse	Client Alcohol History	Client Drug History	Family Under 18 Arrested	Family Over 18 Arrested	Failed a Grade	DJJ Referral	Recidivism
Location	-.093 (268)	-.109 (272)	.161** (272)	-.187** (272)	-.169* (272)	-.026 (259)	-.078 (260)	-.344** (259)	-.545** (243)	-.079 (171)
Single Parent	-----	-.068 (268)	-.076 (268)	-.108 (268)	-.132* (268)	-.019 (255)	.047 (256)	.089 (255)	.021 (239)	.048 (168)
Income Assistance		-----	.065 (272)	-.147* (272)	-.114 (272)	.008 (259)	.086 (260)	-.050 (259)	.061 (243)	-.115 (171)
Prior Abuse			-----	.126* (272)	.145* (272)	.043 (259)	.104 (260)	.003 (259)	.084 (243)	.016 (171)
Client Alcohol History				-----	.692** (272)	.013 (259)	.094 (260)	-.013 (259)	.173** (243)	.124 (171)
Client Drug History					-----	-.019 (259)	.129* (260)	-.052 (259)	.231** (243)	.169* (171)
Family Under 18 Arrested						-----	.066 (257)	.058 (253)	-.079 (231)	-.108 (162)
Family Over 18 Arrested							-----	-.044 (254)	.103 (232)	-.029 (163)
Failed a Grade								-----	-.233** (232)	.098 (161)
DJJ Referral									-----	-.017 (149)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Over the six (6) years research team members from the Northeast Florida Center For Community Initiatives, at the University of North Florida, have conducted the annual evaluation of the EDIP Program. In the previous pages, we have outlined the findings from this evaluation for the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 contract years. Within this report, several important findings warrant review.

Overall, it is clear from the analysis presented here that EDIP is reaching the targeted client base. The socio demographic, as well as criminal offense profile both match closely the clients that were to be considered in the original EDIP program design. The one anomaly in this profile concerns arrest records. Clients at both EDIP locations averaged close to four arrests prior to entering the program, well above the target of two previous arrests.

In addition, focus groups with clients and staff indicate that, while there are some “issues” that needed to be addressed, the overwhelming majority of comments were supportive of the program. Clients felt that the staff cared for them, and that the program helped them do better in school and to stay out of trouble. Staff expressed a number of concerns, although in all these comments indicated a strong *support* of the “kids” and a desire to do more. The most pressing problems were expressed at EDIP II, where concerns were particularly harsh with the arrangements with the Sheriff’s Youth Ranch (particularly in 1999-2000). Although this final report is somewhat delayed, information gained from these focus groups was shared with EDIP directors throughout the process. Indeed, the concerns from EDIP II staff, when relayed to the Director, was used in part in the decision to first change the relationship of the program and the Youth Ranch, and subsequently the move of EDIP II to a new location.

Most promising in the findings from this report, however, is the success EDIP shows with regard to recidivism rates among clients. This is particularly important given the significant decrease in recidivism at EDIP II. As discussed in the previous section, recidivism rates from EDIP I remain at or below 30 percent for the past six years, well below recidivism figures cited in research reports on other programs dealing with clients with similar arrest records. For EDIP II, however, we found a dramatic decline in recidivism rates in 2000-2001. Indeed, for all prior years, EDIP II recidivism rates were over 50 percent. Yet in 2000-2001, EDIP II recidivism rates decreased by over one third, dropping to only 34.7 percent.

One of the main purposes of this year's effort was to assess the impact of client referral on recidivism. There was concern that clients referred to EDIP through diversion (the vast majority of referrals to EDIP II) were less successful than clients referred through community control. Through our analysis, we found that there were virtually no differences in outcomes when comparing referral type. Rather, what appears to have occurred is a "managerial" difference. Once the Director of EDIP II took control of the residential component from the Youth Ranch staff, we find reduced recidivism rates. While we do not have conclusive evidence of the effect of managerial change on outcomes (that will be a major focus of our analysis over the next contract period), it is clear that something dramatic, and positive, happened at EDIP II during the 2000-2001 period that resulted in reduced recidivism. As such, it is clear that the EDIP operations and program philosophy of a pro-social model for working with clients works.