

11-2017

2017 Youth Recidivism: Diversion to Discharge in Maine's Juvenile Justice System

Robyn Dumont

University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service

Erica King MSW

University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.usm.maine.edu/justice>

 Part of the [Juvenile Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dumont, R. & King, E. (2017). Youth recidivism: Diversion to discharge in Maine's juvenile justice system. Retrieved from the Maine Statistical Analysis Center, University of Southern Maine website: <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Cutler Institute for Health & Social Policy at USM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Justice Policy by an authorized administrator of USM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jessica.c.hovey@maine.edu.

2017



Youth Recidivism

*Diversion to Discharge
in Maine's Juvenile
Justice System*

University of Southern Maine
Muskie School of Public Service
November 2017

**2017 YOUTH RECIDIVISM:
DIVERSION TO DISCHARGE IN MAINE'S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM**

MUSKIE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE

Report Authors	Robyn Dumont, Research Analyst Erica King, Policy Associate
Peer Review/Editing	Evan Long, Graduate Assistant George Shaler, Research Associate
Layout and Design	Sheri Moulton, Project Assistant

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, DIVISION OF JUVENILE SERVICES

Josh Ash	Ray Bernier	John Coyne
Mike Mack	Colin O'Neill	Nate Randall
Chris Raymond	Pam Richards	

STATE OF MAINE, OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Chris Coughlan Jack Matheson

SUGGESTED CITATION

Dumont, R. & King, E. (2017). Youth recidivism: Diversion to discharge in Maine's juvenile justice system. Retrieved from the Maine Statistical Analysis Center, University of Southern Maine website: <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch>

The findings and conclusions in this report reflect the views of the authors; they do not necessarily represent the views of the Maine Department of Corrections

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Methodology & Limitations.....	5
I. Diversion.....	6
2014 Diversion Cohort Description.....	6
Trends (2010-2014).....	12
Recidivism.....	16
II. Supervision.....	22
2014 Cohort Description.....	22
Trends (2010-2014).....	26
Recidivism.....	31
III. Community Reintegration.....	36
2014 Cohort Description.....	36
Trends (2010-2014).....	40
Risk Assessments.....	43
Length of Stay.....	45
Returns.....	46
IV. Discharge.....	49
2014 Cohort Description.....	49
Trends (2010-2014).....	53
Length of Supervision.....	58
Recidivism.....	58
Appendix A.....	63
Appendix B.....	64
Appendix C.....	65
Appendix D.....	66
Appendix E.....	67
Appendix F.....	68

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For nearly two decades, Maine has used data to track, analyze, and report on youth involved in the juvenile justice system. The goal of this research is to help assess the success of responses to system-involved youth by identifying which youth return to the justice system; to inform risk reduction efforts to benefit public safety; and to ensure that all Maine youth experience a fair, equitable, and responsive juvenile justice system that contributes to positive youth outcomes.

This summary reflects what is happening with the young people who encounter Maine’s juvenile justice system at various points of contact (e.g., diversion, community supervision, commitment). It shows that fewer youth are entering the system and that more of those who do are quickly and successfully diverted. It shows that youth supervised in the community are decreasing in risk level and offense severity and that the majority do not recidivate. It shows that committed youth are decreasing in risk level as well; the majority are assessed at low to moderate risk at time of commitment and are adjudicated with misdemeanor charges.

These positive findings are outlined in further detail below along with findings that are more concerning. These latter findings indicate opportunities to align policy and practice with the primary purpose of Maine’s Juvenile Code, which is “to secure for each juvenile . . . such care and guidance, preferably in the juvenile’s own home, as will best serve the juvenile’s welfare and the interest of society.”¹ A closer look at youth involved with the “deep end” of the system—those committed to Long Creek Youth Development Center—present some of the greatest areas of concern and opportunities for reform.

FOUR SYSTEM RESPONSES TO YOUTH REFERRED TO DJS (2010-2014)

<p style="text-align: center;">DIVERSION</p> <p>These youth have been referred to DOC, which has determined that it is in the best interest of the juvenile, his/her victim(s), and the community to resolve the case without pressing formal charges.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Recidivism rate</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N=8,621</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SUPERVISION</p> <p>These youth had formal charges brought against them, were adjudicated by a judge, and were subsequently placed under the supervision of DOC within the community.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Recidivism rate</p> <p style="text-align: center;">35%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N=2,105</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">COMMUNITY REINTEGRATION</p> <p>These youth have been adjudicated, committed to a secure facility and then released back into the community for additional supervision.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Return rate²</p> <p style="text-align: center;">42%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N=261</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">DISCHARGE</p> <p>Discharged youth have been adjudicated, committed to a secure juvenile facility, and subsequently discharged from all supervision.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Recidivism rate</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N=458</p>

¹ Maine Juvenile Code, 15 M.R.S. § 3002

² These youth may or may not have committed new offenses; some youth are returned for technical reasons.

Executive Summary

The full report³ summarizes data from four system responses to youth involved with the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) between 2010 and 2014 (see system response descriptions above). Included are analyses of youth demographics (gender, age, and race/ethnicity); offense class and type; length of supervision; Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI) risk scores and levels; and recidivism rates, or in the case of youth on community reintegration, return rates.

It is important to note that the same youth may experience more than one system response (e.g., diversion, supervision, etc.) and that youth have different risk and protective factors. This contributes to outcomes that vary not only by system but by individual as well. Thus, policy solutions must be tailored to the system of response, and programmatic interventions must be tailored to individual characteristics.

The one theme that appeared across all system responses was a decrease in number—fewer youth entered Maine’s juvenile justice system over time, and this was reflected in each of the four types of responses studied.

Fewer youth entered Maine’s juvenile justice system over time; this was reflected in each of the system responses studied.

The majority of youth referred to DJS are being *diverted* and do not return to the justice system.

The majority of youth referred to Maine DOC from law enforcement were diverted. From 2010 to 2014, diversion rates increased from 74% to 77%. **Ninety-three percent (93%) of youth who were diverted did not recidivate within two years of diversion.** It is clear that the practice of diversion works.

While the vast majority of youth who were diverted overall did not reoffend, there were some regional and gender differences worth noting. Youth diverted from Region 1 had lower recidivism rates compared to youth diverted from the other two regions, and females diverted in Region 2 had higher rates than females diverted from the other regions.

Fewer youth are being *supervised*, and those who are supervised have less serious offenses and lower risk levels.

The majority of youth supervised were low or moderate criminogenic risk.

From 2010 to 2014, the number of youth supervised decreased by 47%, resulting in 259 fewer youth supervised in 2014 compared to 2010. This decrease was primarily due to a decrease in the number of youth adjudicated for the first time. That decrease was accompanied by a decrease in the number of youth supervised with felony offenses. The proportion of youth supervised with felonies decreased from 17% in 2010 to 10% in 2014.

The initial risk level of youth decreased as well. While 12% of youth supervised were assessed as high risk (with scores of 23-42) on the YLS-CMI in 2010, less than half that

³ Available at: <http://muskie.maine.edu/justicepolicy>

proportion (5%) were assessed as high risk in 2014. Thus, by 2014, the majority of youth supervised (95%) were low or moderate criminogenic risk. **Most youth who were supervised (65%) did not recidivate.**

While forty-two percent (42%) of youth who are released from commitment to *community reintegration* are subsequently returned to a facility, most are returned for technical reasons.

The majority of youth (53%) who were returned to a facility within two years were returned quickly—within the first three months of their release. **Twice as many youth (64%) were returned for technical reasons as were returned for new criminal conduct (31%),** and the proportion of youth returned for technical reasons increased over time, from 55% in 2010 to 86% in 2014.

The majority of youth who are *discharged* were committed with misdemeanors and assessed at low to moderate risk at time of commitment.

Fifty-nine percent (59%) of youth committed to a secure juvenile facility were committed with misdemeanor offenses, and 56% presented a low to moderate criminogenic risk to public safety. (The degree to which the practice of pleading down offenses at the point of adjudication impacts the proportion of misdemeanors is unknown.) It is possible that the young people who pose a low criminogenic risk to public safety have concurrent and acute mental health and psychosocial needs.^{4,5} This is of particular importance given that the preponderance of evidence finds that confining these youth has the effect of increasing, rather than decreasing, their risk level. While risk reduction is evident for high risk youth, intensive, secure interventions produce the opposite effect for low risk youth and their communities.⁶ This should be of concern to all juvenile justice stakeholders.

Intensive, secure interventions are counterproductive for low risk youth and their communities.

While the number of youth being *discharged* is decreasing along with offense severity, length of DOC supervision for these youth is increasing.

Overall, length of supervision increased from just under two years (21.7 months) in 2010 to just over two years (24.3 months) in 2014. This increase was driven by an increase in length of commitment for youth who were never released to community reintegration. Their length of stay increased from a low of 16.7 months in 2010 to a high of 20.5 months in 2014. This difference cannot be explained by a corresponding decrease in age at time of commitment.

Youth who were released to community reintegration spent an average of 13.6 months in a secure facility prior to release and were supervised for an average of 26.2 months total. While these metrics remained stable over

⁴ Disability Rights Maine. (2017). Assessing the Use of Law Enforcement by Youth Residential Service Providers. Retrieved from <http://drme.org/assets/uncategorized/Law-Enforcement-08.08.17.pdf>

⁵ Maine Department of Corrections. (2017). Profile of Youth Committed at Long Creek Youth Development Center as of July 1, 2016. Retrieved from http://digitalmaine.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1032&context=doc_docs

⁶ Andrews, D.A. (2015). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 5th Edition. New York: Routledge.

Executive Summary

the years of this study, they increased in a previous study.⁷ Thus, length of supervision for youth released to community reintegration has stabilized, but it has done so at a point higher than that observed in 2008. Youth in the current study were held an average of 2.9 months longer prior to release than the 2008 cohort and had a total supervision time that was 6.5 months longer than that of the 2008 cohort.

Gender, age at commitment, offense type, and risk level are predictive of recidivism for *discharged* youth.

Overall, two-year recidivism rates remained relatively stable over the years of the study, averaging 53% and ranging between 44% and 58%. Males were more likely to recidivate than females. Youth who were 17 years of age at time of commitment were more likely to recidivate than youth belonging to other age groups. Youth with property offenses were more likely to recidivate than youth with non-property offenses. Youth assessed as moderate and high risk were more likely to recidivate than youth assessed as low risk.

More than half of *discharged* youth (51%) are discharged with misdemeanors and recidivate with misdemeanors.

An additional 30% were originally discharged with felonies but recidivated with misdemeanors. Approximately 10% were originally discharged with misdemeanors but recidivated with felonies, and 9% were both discharged and recidivated with felonies.

Risk level is a predictor of recidivism for both *supervised* and *discharged* youth, and low risk youth from both these groups recidivate at low rates.

All other factors being equal, only 20% of low risk youth who were supervised recidivated, compared to 39% of moderate risk youth and 50% of high-risk youth. Likewise, only 36% of low risk discharged youth recidivated, compared to 51% of moderate risk youth and 58% of high-risk youth.

The commitment of low risk youth appears to be counterproductive.

Furthermore, recidivism rates might have been lower for low risk youth had they not been pulled so deeply into the system (i.e., committed). Low risk committed youth who were reassessed prior to release *increased* in risk score, placing them at greater risk of recidivating upon release than they were prior to commitment. Thus, the commitment of low risk youth appears to be counterproductive.

Youth of color continue to be overrepresented, particularly in the “deep end” of Maine’s juvenile justice system (i.e., commitment).

Seventeen percent (17%) of youth leaving facilities in 2014 were youth of color—more than double their representation in Maine’s youth population at large. In 2014, youth of color made up 8% of Maine’s youth population and 13% of the discharged youth from DOC supervision.

⁷ Dumont, R. (2016). 2016 Juvenile Recidivism Report. Retrieved from http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch/Publications/Juvenile/2016_Juvenile_Recidivism_Report.pdf

METHODOLOGY & LIMITATIONS

For the purposes of this report, recidivism is defined in terms of adjudication or conviction. Following diversion, start of supervision, or discharge *for the first time* during the study period (2010 to 2014), youth were tracked for two years to determine if they were subsequently adjudicated (as a youth) or convicted (as an adult) within that time period. Adjudications or convictions for civil offenses, which are violations of administrative rules rather than violations of criminal statute, were not counted as recidivating offenses in this report unless otherwise stated.

Because Maine Department of Corrections' data system (CORIS) does not easily allow users to obtain the date of offense associated with the first subsequent non-civil adjudication, date of adjudication is used as the date of recidivism. Since the time it takes for a case to wend its way through the justice system varies from case to case (e.g., a misdemeanor that occurs near the end of the two-year tracking period may be more likely to reach adjudication within the tracking period than a felony), using the date of adjudication poses a limitation to this study.

Furthermore, the date of recidivism is different for youth who are tracked into the adult system. While data for youth comes from CORIS, data for those who age out of the juvenile system during the two-year tracking period is obtained from the Department of Public Safety (DPS). DPS records contain information regarding all arrests that result in convictions, but the date provided in these records is arrest date rather than adjudication date. Arrest, of course, occurs earlier than conviction, which may make it appear that older youth recidivate faster and at a higher rate than their younger counterparts do.⁸ Thus, the difference in dates of recidivism is another limitation of this study.

One final limitation is the inability to track youth across state lines. It is possible that youth with no recidivism record in Maine did, in fact, recidivate elsewhere. Because older youth who became young adults during the tracking period may have had greater mobility during that period than their younger counterparts, this limitation may disproportionately affect the recidivism rates of older youth. Thus, the actual recidivism rates of all youth, but particularly older youth, are likely to be higher than the rates calculated with existent data.

This report also measures rate of return for youth released to community reintegration. Youth who were released *for the first time* during the study period (2010 to 2014) were tracked for two years to determine if they were returned to a facility within that two-year window. One challenge encountered during this portion of the study was missing data. When a large proportion of an important field (e.g., return reason, risk score) is left blank, findings are less reliable than they would have been with a complete dataset.

⁸ In fact, older youth did appear to recidivate faster. They did not appear to recidivate at a higher rate. However, the rate for older youth may still be overinflated compared to the rate for younger youth, who may have offended with the two-year tracking period but were not adjudicated until after it had lapsed.

I. DIVERSION

This section of the report examines youth diverted from the Maine Juvenile Justice System for the first time from 2010 to 2014. Diversion occurs when the Juvenile Community Corrections Officer (JCCO) in charge of a referred case reviews the relevant facts and determines that it is in the best interest of the youth and his/her victim(s) to resolve the case without pressing formal charges. These youth may or may not be given conditions to fulfill as part of their diversion requirements, such as maintaining regular school attendance or performing community service. Youth who are successfully diverted do not continue through the juvenile justice system. They may, however, return to the justice system if they do not fulfill the terms of diversion.

This report will describe the most recent diversion cohort for which recidivism data are available (2014), review trends for all the cohorts included in the study (2010 to 2014), and examine recidivism.

2014 DIVERSION COHORT DESCRIPTION


The 2014 cohort is the most recent cohort for which recidivism data are available. All of this cohort had been tracked for a full year at the time data were extracted for this analysis.

DEMOGRAPHICS, 2014 COHORT

GENDER


Approximately 60% of the youth in the 2014 cohort were male.

Gender Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
Female	590	40%
Male	880	60%
Total	1,470	100%



AGE

Youth 17 years of age made up the largest age group of youth diverted in 2014 at 30%, followed by 16-year-olds (24%), 15-year-olds (17%), youth ages 13 and younger (14%), 14-year-olds (11%), and youth ages 18 and older⁹ (4%). The median age was 16.




Age Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
≤ 13	204	14%
14	165	11%
15	244	17%
16	348	24%
17	445	30%
≥ 18	64	4%
Total	1,470	100%

RACE/ETHNICITY

White youth made up 92% of youth who were diverted, youth of color made up 7%, and no race/ethnicity was recorded for the remaining 1% of youth diverted. Approximately 8% of Maine’s overall youth population were youth of color in 2014.¹⁰

Racial/Ethnic Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
White	1,348	92%
Youth of Color	102	7%
Unknown	20	1%
Total	1,470	100%



⁹ While these youth were 18 at the time of diversion, all but a small number of the 2014 cohort (n=1) were 17 years of age at the time of offense.


¹⁰ Population data for Maine were obtained from the Easy Access to Juvenile Populations website for youth ages 10-17, accessed at <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop>.

OFFENSE CLASS AND TYPE, 2014 DIVERSION COHORT

While youth may have had more than one offense at the time of diversion, this analysis focuses on the most serious offense associated with each diversion. Seriousness is determined first by offense class (felony, misdemeanor, civil) and then by offense type (personal, property, drug/alcohol, other). Thus, if a youth was diverted with both misdemeanor and civil offenses, only the misdemeanor offense is reflected here. If a youth was diverted with both personal and property offenses, only the personal offense is reflected here.


	#	%
Misdemeanor (53%)		
Personal	217	28%
Property	462	59%
Drugs/Alcohol	46	6%
Other	56	7%
Total	781	100%
Civil (42%)		
Personal	0	0%
Property	0	0%
Drugs/Alcohol	613	100%
Other	1	0%
Total	614	100%
Felony (5%)		
Personal	22	29%
Property	39	52%
Drugs/Alcohol	11	15%
Other	3	4%
Total	75	100%

The majority of offenses, **53%**, associated with diversion in 2014 were **misdemeanor offenses** (n=781). More than half (59%) of these misdemeanor offenses were property offenses, 28% were personal offenses, 7% were “other”¹¹ offenses, and 6% were drug/alcohol offenses.



Another **42%** of offenses associated with diversion in 2014 were **civil offenses** (n=614). The vast majority of these (99.8%) were drug and alcohol offenses (n=613).

Only **5%** of offenses associated with diversion in 2014 were **felony offenses** (n=75). Of these, a little more than half (52%) were property offenses, 29% were personal offenses, 15% were drug/alcohol offenses, and 4% were “other” offenses.




¹¹ Please see Appendix F for a list of offenses and offense types, including offenses categorized as “other.”

DIVERSION TYPES, 2014 COHORT¹²

There are different types of diversion—*no further action*, which requires, as its name suggests, no further action on the part of the youth, and *informal adjustments*, which do require some type of action. Informal adjustments can be broken down further, into *sole sanctions*, which require a singular action or behavior on the part of the youth, and *other informal adjustments*, requiring additional action or behavior(s).


Almost three-quarters of diversions (72%) were *informal adjustments* (16% *sole sanctions* and 56% *other informal adjustments*). The remaining diversions (28%) required *no further action*.



¹² Because type of diversion is not directly captured in CORIS, time from start to end of diversion is used as a proxy. Cases that are resolved in one day are assumed to have had no conditions (no further action). Cases that are resolved in less than one month are assumed to have had a sole sanction. Cases resolved in one to six months are assumed to have had additional conditions (other informal resolutions). Cases open for longer than six months (n=65, 4.4%) are not included in this analysis.

Type of diversion varied by offense classification, as depicted in the graphic below, which includes all offenses for which youth were diverted in order of their frequency (from greatest to least). There were a total of 21 offenses for which youth were diverted. The top 9, which account for 97% of all offenses, appear separately in this graphic, while the remaining 3% are subsumed under the final “Other” column.


No further action was taken most frequently with public order offenses; 48% of public order offenses resulted in *no further action*. *Sole sanctions* were most often used with liquor offenses; 23% of liquor offenses resulted in *sole sanctions*. *Other informal adjustments* were used most often with burglary; 79% of these offenses resulted in *other informal adjustments*.



TRENDS (2010-2014)

NUMBER OF YOUTH DIVERTED

From 2010 to 2014, the number of youth diverted decreased by 23%, resulting in 440 fewer youth diverted in 2014 compared to 2010. This decrease is not the result of a lessening tendency to divert. In fact, the rate of diversion increased slightly over the years, from 74% in 2010 to 77% in 2014.¹³



AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHARGES

The average number of offenses with which youth were diverted was 1.18, and this average remained relatively unchanged across the five-year study period. Approximately 86% of youth had one offense, an additional 12% of youth had two offenses, and the remaining 2% had three or more offenses associated with diversion.

86% One charge


12% Two charges

2% Three or more charges

¹³ Diversion rates were not part of this analysis; they were provided by the Department of Corrections.


OFFENSE CLASS

From 2010 to 2014, the proportions of youth diverted with felony, misdemeanor, and civil offenses remained relatively unchanged. A little more than half of youth were diverted (54%) with misdemeanor offenses, 40% were diverted with civil offenses, and 6% were diverted with felony offenses.




OFFENSE CATEGORIES

The top five offenses across all offense classes were as follows:



OFFENSE TYPE

From 2010 to 2014, the proportions of youth diverted with drug/alcohol, property, and personal offenses remained relatively unchanged at 45%, 34%, and 16%, respectively. The proportion of youth with “other” offenses, however, decreased from 6% in 2010 to 4% in 2014.¹⁴ This change was small, but statistically significant¹⁵.



GENDER

The proportion of youth that was female fluctuated over the years of the study, composing, on average, 38% of youth diverted. Compared to other youth populations (e.g., youth supervised and committed), females composed a larger proportion of youth. Females composed 21% of youth supervised and 10% of youth committed.




¹⁴ The top 5 “other” offenses are as follows: disorderly conduct (43% of other offenses); carrying a concealed weapon (9%); false public alarm or report (8%); disorderly conduct; fighting (7%); and trafficking in dangerous knives (5%).

¹⁵ $\chi^2(4, 8621)=12.31, p=.015; Cramer's V = .038$

RACE/ETHNICITY

The proportion of diverted youth who were youth of color remained stable over the years of the study, composing approximately 7.6% of the diverted population between 2010 and 2014. The proportion of youth of color in the overall Maine youth population, however, increased from 7.2% in 2010 to 8.1% in 2014.¹⁶ Reaching parity in 2014 would have required that an additional 16 youth of color be diverted (for a total of 118 youth of color diverted).



AGE AT DIVERSION

Age at diversion decreased slightly, from 15.6 years of age (15 years, 7 months) in 2010 to 15.5 (15 years, 6 months) in 2014. While this difference is small (a little over a month), it is nevertheless statistically significant.¹⁷


¹⁶ Population data for Maine were obtained from the Easy Access to Juvenile Populations website for youth ages 10-17, accessed at <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop>.

¹⁷ Independent t-test: $t(3378)=1.994, p=0.046, d=0.069$

RECIDIVISM¹⁸

TWO-YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES

Only a small proportion (7%) of diverted youth recidivated within two years of diversion. While this rate is expected to increase slightly as updates become available for the 2013 and 2014 cohorts, it nevertheless bears mentioning that the overwhelming majority (93%) of these youth did not recidivate.¹⁹



ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH RECIDIVISM

A number of variables were explored using logistic regression to determine if they had an impact on recidivism. The variables tested included gender, race/ethnicity, age at diversion, offense type, offense class, offense region, months on diversion, and number of charges. Only four of these variables—gender, race/ethnicity, age at diversion, and region—were shown to be predictive of recidivism among youth who were diverted.²⁰

¹⁸ Civil class recidivating offenses are not included in recidivism rates.

¹⁹ These rates do not include the 2014 cohort since this rate is likely to change. Some of the 2014 cohort were not tracked for two years at the time data were queried and were not included in this analysis. Also, some of this cohort (as well as some of the 2013 cohort) may have committed offenses during the two-year tracking period that had not yet been adjudicated at the time of data collection.

²⁰ The logistic regression model is significant at the .001 level, predicts 92.6% of the responses correctly, and has a Nagelkerke R Square of .094. Logistic regression results table is presented in Appendix A.

RACE/ETHNICITY


When other attributes (such as age, gender, and region) were held constant, the proportion of white youth who recidivated was 5%, while the rate for youth of color was 7%.

It is important to note that the absence of relevant variables from the regression model may cause the existent variables to appear to have a direct impact on recidivism when they do not. In the regression model summarized here, race/ethnicity appears to impact recidivism, but if youth of color were more likely than their white counterparts to come from low socioeconomic families—an attribute not captured by the model—the impact of low socioeconomic status will be expressed through the race variable that is present in the model. This creates a “spurious” relationship between race/ethnicity and recidivism. In order to clarify the relationship between race and recidivism, other variables thought to impact recidivism would need to be added to the regression model. One of the limitations of this study is the unavailability of some of these variables.

AGE AT DIVERSION

Age at diversion was likewise a factor in recidivism. When other attributes (such as race/ethnicity, gender, and region) were held constant, youth who were 14 years old at diversion had a two-year recidivism rate of 13%. Youth who were older at diversion were increasingly less likely to recidivate. Only 2% of youth who were 17 years of age at diversion recidivated, and less than 1% of youth who were 18 years of age at diversion recidivated.

Interestingly, the youngest youth, those 13 years of age and younger at diversion, do not fit the trend. That is, they were not the most likely to recidivate. Recidivism peaked with those who were 14 years of age and then decreased, creating a linear trend for 14 to 18 year olds.




GENDER AND REGION²¹

Gender and region were also factors in recidivism. While this was true of both gender and region separately, there was also an interaction between these variables, meaning that the impact of gender on recidivism varied from region to region. Therefore, looking at gender or region separately obscures important differences. For example, all other variables (age and race/ethnicity) held constant, approximately 6% of all youth from Region 3 recidivated within two years of diversion, but only 4% of females from Region 3 recidivated, while 8% of males from Region 3 recidivated. The differences between males and females in Regions 1 and 2 are not as great.

Key findings related to gender and region include the following:

- Outcomes for males and females were most divergent in Region 3, where 4% of females recidivated and 8% of males did so.
- Youth from Region 1 had the lowest recidivism for both males and females. Approximately 3% of females recidivated, while 5% of males did so.
- Among females, those from Region 2 had the highest recidivism rate, at 6%, nearly equal to the rate of males from that region.
- Among males, those from Region 3 had the highest recidivism rate, at 8%.




²¹ Juvenile corrections regions are divided by county, as follows:
 Region 1: Cumberland and York
 Region 2: Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford, and Sagadahoc
 Region 3: Aroostook, Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo, and Washington

COUNTY

Differences among counties were also explored using logistic regression.^{22, 23} When other attributes (such as age, gender, and race/ethnicity) were held constant, the proportion of youth from Sagadahoc that recidivated was 11%—the highest rate for all the counties. It is interesting to note that while Region 3 had the highest recidivism rate of the three regions, a number of counties within Region 3 had relatively low rates. Specifically, Hancock, Aroostook, and Washington counties had recidivism rates of 4%, 4%, and 3%, respectively. The two Region 3 counties with the highest rates, Waldo and Somerset (at 9% and 8%, respectively), were in fact part of Region 2 for 3 ½ years of the 5 years covered in this analysis.

Given the low rate of recidivism overall and the relatively small number of youth in these two counties, it is not possible to do a meaningful comparison of recidivism rates before and after the reassignment of these counties to Region 3.




* Waldo and Somerset were in Region 2 for 3 ½ of the 5 years covered in this analysis.

²² The logistic regression model is significant at the .001 level, predicts 93.0% of the responses correctly, and has a Nagelkerke R Square of .101. Logistic regression results table is presented in Appendix B.

²³ Interaction terms for gender and county were tested in a logistic regression but were not found to be statistically significant.

TIME TO RECIDIVATE

One quarter of the small proportion who recidivated (7%) within the two-year tracking period did so within approximately nine months of the start of diversion. Half of those who recidivated did so within 13 months, and 75% of those who recidivated did so within 18 months.



RECIDIVISM AND CHANGES IN OFFENSE CLASS²⁴

Diverted youth who recidivate may reoffend with offenses similar to their original offenses, less severe offenses, or more severe offenses. The majority of youth who recidivated (57%) within two years did so with similar offenses. A little less than a quarter (23%) recidivated with more serious offenses, and a smaller proportion (20%) recidivated with less severe offenses.

The majority of recidivating felony offenses (60%) were committed by youth who were originally diverted with misdemeanor offenses.

		Original Offense							
		Civil		Misdemeanor		Felony		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Recidivating Offense	Civil	164	19%	127	15%	9	1%	300	35%
	Misdemeanor	157	18%	319	37%	30	4%	506	59%
	Felony	15	2%	27	3%	3	<1%	45	5%
	Total	336	39%	473	56%	42	5%	851	100%

	Increase in severity
	No change
	Decrease in severity

RECIDIVISM AND CHANGES IN OFFENSE TYPE²⁵

The majority of youth (54%) did not recidivate with the same type of offense with which they were original diverted. Youth originally diverted with drug and/or alcohol offenses were most likely to reoffend with additional drug or alcohol offenses; all other youth were likely to reoffend with property offenses, regardless of the original offense.

		Original Offense									
		Personal		Property		Drugs/Alcohol		Other		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Recidivating Offense	Personal	48	6%	50	6%	35	4%	11	1%	144	17%
	Property	54	6%	124	15%	108	13%	18	2%	304	36%
	Drugs/Alcohol	31	4%	110	13%	217	25%	6	1%	364	43%
	Other	10	1%	16	2%	12	1%	1	<1%	39	5%
	Total	143	17%	100	35%	372	44%	36	4%	851	100%

²⁴ This piece of analysis includes civil class adjudications and/or convictions.

²⁵ See footnote 24.

II. SUPERVISION

This section of the report examines youth who were supervised for the first time from 2010 to 2014. In this context, supervised refers to youth who had formal charges brought against them, were adjudicated by a judge, and subsequently placed under the supervision of the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) within the community (i.e., probation).

This section will describe the most recent cohort of youth who were supervised for which recidivism data are available (2014), review trends for all the cohorts included in the study (2010 to 2014), and examine recidivism.

2014 COHORT DESCRIPTION


The 2014 cohort is the most recent cohort of youth for which recidivism data are available. All of this cohort had been tracked for a full year at the time data were extracted for this analysis.

DEMOGRAPHICS, 2014 COHORT

GENDER


Approximately 81% of the youth in the 2014 cohort were male.

Gender Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
Female	55	19%
Male	239	81%
Total	294	100%



AGE

Youth 16 years of age made up the largest age group of youth in the 2014 cohort at 23%, followed by 17-year-olds (23%), 15-year-olds (19%), 14-year-olds (14%), youth ages 13 and younger (11%), and youth ages 18 and older (9%).²⁶ The median age was 16.




	#	%
≤ 13	33	11%
14	42	14%
15	57	19%
16	69	23%
17	67	23%
≥ 18	26	9%
Total	294	100%

RACE/ETHNICITY

White youth made up 87% of youth supervised, youth of color made up 12%, and no race/ethnicity was recorded for the remaining 1% of youth. Given that approximately 8% of Maine’s overall youth population were youth of color in 2014,²⁷ youth of color are disproportionately represented in this cohort.

	#	%
White	255	87%
Youth of Color	35	12%
Unknown	4	1%
Total	294	100%



²⁶ While these youth were 18 or older at the time of supervision, presumably they were 17 years of age or younger at the time of offense.

²⁷ Population data for Maine were obtained from the Easy Access to Juvenile Populations website for youth ages 10-17, accessed at <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop>.


Section II: Supervision

OFFENSE CLASS AND TYPE, 2014 COHORT


While youth may have had more than one offense at the time of supervision, this analysis focuses on the most serious offense associated with each supervision. Seriousness is determined first by offense class (felony, misdemeanor, civil) and then by offense type (personal, property, drug/alcohol, other). Thus, if a youth was supervised with both misdemeanor and civil offenses, only the misdemeanor offense is reflected here. If a youth was supervised with both personal and property offenses, only the personal offense is reflected here.

	#	%
Misdemeanor (90%)		
Personal	99	38%
Property	128	48%
Drugs/Alcohol	20	8%
Other	17	6%
Total	264	100%
Felony (10%)		
Personal	13	43%
Property	14	47%
Drugs/Alcohol	3	10%
Other	0	0%
Total	30	100%

The majority of offenses, **90%**, associated with supervision in 2014 were **misdemeanor offenses** (n=264). A little less than half (48%) of these misdemeanor offenses were property offenses, 38% were personal offenses, 8% were drug/alcohol offenses, and 6% were "other"²⁸ offenses.



Only **10%** of offenses associated with supervision in 2014 were **felony offenses** (n=30). Of these, a little less than half (47%) were property offenses, 43% were personal offenses, and 10% were drug/alcohol offenses.




²⁸ Please see Appendix F for a list of offenses and offense types, including offenses categorized as "other."

TRENDS (2010-2014)

NUMBER OF YOUTH SUPERVISED

From 2010 to 2014, the number of youth supervised decreased by 47%, resulting in 259 fewer youth supervised in 2014 compared to 2010. This decrease was primarily due to a decrease in the number of youth adjudicated for the first time; from 2010 to 2014, the number of these youth decreased by 49%. The proportion of adjudicated youth who were supervised remained relatively unchanged between 2010 and 2014 at approximately 52%.



AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHARGES

From 2010 to 2014, the average number of charges associated with supervision was 2.13, and this average remained relatively unchanged across the five-year study period. Approximately 53% of youth had one offense, an additional 26% had two offenses, and the remaining 21% had three or more offenses associated with supervision.


53% One charge

26% Two charges

21% Three or more charges


OFFENSE CLASS

From 2010 to 2014, the number of supervisions associated with felony charges decreased by two-thirds (67%), while the number of supervisions associated with misdemeanor charges decreased by 43%. Thus, the proportion of youth charged with felonies decreased from a high of 17% in 2010 to a low of 10% in 2014. The difference between these two rates is statistically significant.²⁹



OFFENSE CATEGORIES

The top five offense categories across all offense classes were as follows:




Almost four-fifths (79%) of all supervisions were associated with one of these five offenses.

²⁹ Because there were only two records associated with civil charges from 2010 to 2014, civil charges were not included in this analysis. $\chi^2(1, 846)=6.49, p=.011; Phi=.088$

Section II: Supervision

With the exception of the 2013 cohort, the proportions of youth supervised with property, personal, drug/alcohol, and other offenses remained relatively unchanged at 49%, 38%, 7%, and 6%, respectively. In 2013 the proportions of youth supervised with property and personal offenses were nearly equal, at 43% and 42%, respectively.



GENDER


The proportion of supervised youth who were female remained relatively stable at around 21%.

AGE AT SUPERVISION

Age at supervision remained stable across the years of the study, at approximately 15.6 years of age.


RACE/ETHNICITY

The proportion of youth who were youth of color remained relatively stable at 10%. The proportion of youth of color in the overall Maine youth population, however, increased from 7.2% in 2010 to 8.1% in 2014.³⁰ Achieving parity in 2014 would have required supervising 13 fewer youth of color (supervising 22 youth of color rather than the 35 that were supervised).



RISK SCORES

The YLS-CMI risk scores decreased over the years of the study, from an average score of 12.1 in 2010 to an average of 10.7 in 2014.³¹ The difference between these two scores is statistically significant.³²



³⁰ Population data for Maine were obtained from the Easy Access to Juvenile Populations website for youth ages 10-17, accessed at <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop>.


³¹ The YLS-CMI is a risk/needs assessment and case management tool designed for use with youth.

³² Independent t-test: $t(629.09)=2.523, p=.012, d=0.19$

Section II: Supervision


RISK LEVELS

The decrease in risk scores (above) is explained by a decrease in the proportion of youth who were assessed at high risk. Approximately 12% of youth supervised in 2010 were assessed as high risk in 2010, while less than half that proportion (5%) were assessed as high risk in 2014.



RISK ASSESSMENT COMPLETION

Over the five-year period, risk assessment scores were present in approximately 83% of the records that were eligible for analysis. This rate varied across the years of the study, improving in more recent years.




RECIDIVISM³³

TWO-YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES

A little over a third (35%) of youth who were supervised recidivated within two years of the start of supervision. While this rate is expected to increase slightly as updates become available for the 2013 and 2014 cohorts, it nevertheless bears mentioning that almost two-thirds (65%) of these youth did not recidivate.³⁴

Almost two-thirds
(65%) of supervised
youth did not
recidivate.



³³ Civil class recidivating offenses are not included in recidivism rates.


³⁴ These rates do not include the 2014 cohort since this rate is likely to change. Some of the 2014 cohort were not tracked for two years at the time data were queried and were not included in this analysis. Also, some of this cohort (as well as some of the 2013 cohort) may have committed offenses during the two-year tracking period that had not yet been adjudicated at the time of data collection.

ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH RECIDIVISM

A number of variables were explored using logistic regression to determine if they had an impact on recidivism. The variables tested included gender, race/ethnicity, age at adjudication, offense region, offense type, offense class, YLS-CMI risk level, and number of charges. Only four of these variables—age at adjudication, YLS-CMI risk level, gender, and offense type—were shown to be predictive of recidivism among youth who were supervised.³⁵


AGE AT ADJUDICATION

When other attributes (such as YLS-CMI risk level, gender, and offense type) are held constant, age is a predictor of recidivism. Youth who were 18 years old at the time of adjudication had a two-year recidivism rate of 27%. Youth who were 15 or 16 years old at the time of adjudication had a two-year recidivism rate of 29%. The rates for 15- and 16-year-olds were significantly lower than those 13 years of age and younger; these youngest youth had a recidivism rate of 39%.³⁶



YLS-CMI RISK LEVEL

Risk level was also a predictor of recidivism. When other attributes (such as age at adjudication, gender, and offense type) were held constant, low risk youth had a two-year recidivism rate of 20%, moderate risk youth had a recidivism rate of 39%, and high risk youth had a rate of 50%.



³⁵ The logistic regression model is significant at the .001 level, predicts 68.2% of the responses correctly, and has a Nagelkerke R Square of .099. Logistic regression results table is presented in Appendix C.


³⁶ Rates for 14-, 17-, and 18-year-olds did not differ significantly from the rate of those 13 and younger.

GENDER AND OFFENSE TYPE

Gender and offense type were also factors in recidivism for youth who were supervised. While this was true of both gender and offense type separately, there was also an interaction between these variables, meaning that the impact of gender on recidivism varied depending on offense type. Therefore, looking at gender or offense type separately obscures important differences.


Key finding related to gender and offense type include the following:

- Females recidivated at lower rates than males, regardless of offense type.
- Recidivism rates among males were lowest when offense type was personal; 31% of these males recidivated.
- Recidivism rates among females were lowest when offense type was drug/alcohol; only 6% of these females recidivated.
- While few females with drug/alcohol offenses were supervised (n=31), the recidivism rate for these females (6%) is substantially lower than the corresponding rate for males (35%).
- Recidivism rates for males and females are most similar when looking at youth with property offenses; 30% of these females recidivated and 35% of males did.



TIME TO RECIDIVATE

One quarter of supervised youth who recidivated within the two-year tracking period did so within seven months of the start of supervision. Half of those who recidivated did so within 11 months of supervision, and 75% of those who recidivated did so within 16 months.



RECIDIVISM AND CHANGES IN OFFENSE CLASS³⁷

Youth who recidivate may reoffend with offenses similar to their original offenses, less severe offenses, or more severe offenses. The majority of youth who recidivated (70%) within two years did so with similar offenses. A little more than four-fifths (23%) recidivated with less serious offenses, and a smaller proportion (8%) recidivated with more serious offenses.

The majority of recidivating felony offenses (70%) were committed by youth who were originally supervised with misdemeanor offenses.

		Original Offense							
		Civil		Misdemeanor		Felony		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Recidivating Offense	Civil	0	0%	102	13%	8	1%	110	14%
	Misdemeanor	1	<1%	513	66%	67	9%	581	74%
	Felony	0	0%	64	8%	28	4%	92	12%
	Total	1	<1%	679	87%	103	13%	783	100%

	Increase in severity
	No change
	Decrease in severity

RECIDIVISM AND CHANGES IN OFFENSE TYPE³⁸

Supervised youth who recidivated were most likely to do so with property offenses; 44% of all recidivating youth reoffended with property offenses. Youth who were initially supervised with personal offenses were equally likely to recidivate with personal or property offenses. Youth who were initially supervised with property offenses were most likely to recidivate with property offenses. Youth who were initially supervised with drug/alcohol offenses were equally likely to recidivate with property or drug/alcohol offenses. Youth with "other" offenses were most likely to recidivate with personal offenses.

		Original Offense									
		Personal		Property		Drug/Alcohol		Other		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Recidivating Offense	Personal	98	13%	79	10%	9	1%	20	3%	206	26%
	Property	99	13%	210	27%	19	2%	15	2%	343	44%
	Drugs/alcohol	58	7%	85	11%	19	2%	5	1%	167	21%
	Other	24	3%	30	4%	3	<1%	10	1%	67	9%
	Total	279	36%	404	52%	50	6%	50	6%	783	100%

³⁷ This piece of analysis includes civil class adjudication and/or convictions.

³⁸ This piece of analysis includes civil class adjudication and/or convictions.

III. COMMUNITY REINTEGRATION

This report section examines youth who were adjudicated and committed to a secure facility *for the first time* and then released back into the community for additional supervision *for the first time* between 2010 and 2014. This supervision, called community reintegration, entails a less restrictive form of supervision than the commitment portion of the sentence. It is carried out by juvenile community correction officers (JCCOs) and is meant to help youth transition from facility life to life among the general population. Those who take the skills learned in a facility and successfully apply them when they return to the community remain in the community. Those who do not can be returned to a facility, and this cycle may be repeated as many times as necessary until a youth is successful or until he/she is released from all formal supervision sometime between the ages of 18 and 21.

This report will describe the most recent cohort for which return data are available (2014); review trends for all the cohorts included in the study (2010 to 2014); and examine risk levels, lengths of stay prior to release, and returns.

The terms “released” and “community reintegrated” will be used interchangeably throughout this section to refer to these youth.

2014 COHORT DESCRIPTION


The 2014 release cohort is the most recent cohort for which return data are available. All of this cohort had been tracked for two full years at the time data were extracted for this analysis.

DEMOGRAPHICS, 2014 COHORT

GENDER


Approximately 94% of the 35 youth released in 2014 were male.

Gender Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
Female	2	6%
Male	33	94%
Total	35	100%



AGE AT COMMITMENT

Youth 15 years of age and younger at commitment made up the largest age group of youth released to community reintegration in the 2014 cohort at 29%, followed by 17-year-olds (26%). Youth who were 16 years of age and youth who were age 18 and older made up 23% of the cohort each.³⁹ The median age was 16.




	#	%
≤15	10	29%
16	8	23%
17	9	26%
≥ 18	8	23%
Total	35	100%

RACE/ETHNICITY

White youth made up 83% of released youth, and the remaining 17% were youth of color. Given that approximately 8% of Maine’s overall youth population were youth of color in 2014,⁴⁰ youth of color are disproportionately represented in this cohort.

	#	%
White	29	83%
Youth of color	6	17%
Total	35	100%



³⁹ Percentages appear to total more than 100% due to rounding.

⁴⁰ Population data for Maine were obtained from the Easy Access to Juvenile Populations website for youth ages 10-17, accessed at <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop>.

Section III: Community Reintegration


OFFENSE CLASS AND TYPE, 2014 COHORT

While youth who were released to community reintegration may have had more than one offense at the time of commitment, this analysis focuses on the most serious offense associated with commitment. Seriousness is determined first by offense class (felony, misdemeanor, civil) and then by offense type (personal, property, drug/alcohol, other). Thus, if a youth was committed and released with both felony and misdemeanor offenses, only the felony offense is reflected here. If a youth was committed and released with both personal and property offenses, only the personal offense is reflected here.


The majority of youth released in 2014 (66%) were released with misdemeanor offenses, followed by youth with felony offenses (31%). One youth was released with a civil offense (3%).

	#	%
Misdemeanor (66%)		
Personal	12	52%
Property	8	35%
Drugs/Alcohol	1	4%
Other	2	9%
Total	23	100%
Felony (31%)		
Personal	2	18%
Property	7	64%
Drugs/Alcohol	2	18%
Total	11	100%
Civil (3%)		
Other	1	100%
Total	1	100%

The majority of offenses, **66%**, associated with release in 2014 were **misdemeanor offenses** (n=23). A little more than half (52%) of these misdemeanor offenses were personal offenses, 35% were property offenses, 9% were "other" offenses,⁴¹ and 4% were drug/alcohol offenses.



Another **31%** of offenses associated with release in 2014 were **felony offenses** (n=11). Of these, nearly two-thirds (64%) were property offenses, 18% were personal offenses, and 18% were drug/alcohol offenses.⁴²



⁴¹ Please see Appendix F for a list of offenses and offense types, including offenses categorized as "other." In this context, "other" includes *disorderly conduct* and *escape*.

⁴² Another 3% of offenses associated with community reintegration in 2014 were civil offenses. This percentage represents one youth with an "other" offense.

TRENDS (2010-2014)

TIME TO RELEASE


Youth were supervised in a facility for a little over a year (13.6 months) prior to their release to community reintegration, and this timeframe remained relatively stable across the years of the study.

OFFENSE CLASS⁴³

The proportion of youth who were released with felony offenses (as opposed to misdemeanor offenses) was relatively stable, ranging between 32% and 45%. While these differences may sound significant, they are not; the difference is negligible given the small number of youth released each year (between 34 and 80).

OFFENSE CATEGORIES (2010-2014)


The top five offenses across all offense classes for released youth were as follows:



⁴³ In 2014, one youth was released with a civil offense. That record is not included in this analysis.

OFFENSE TYPE

From 2010 to 2014, the proportions of youth released with property, personal, drug/alcohol, and other offenses were fairly stable at 51%, 36%, 8%, and 5%, respectively.



GENDER


The proportion of community reintegrated youth who were female remained relatively stable at around 11%.

AGE AT COMMITMENT

Released youth were approximately 16.3 years of age at the time of commitment. This average remained stable over the years of the study.


RACE/ETHNICITY

While the proportion of released youth who were youth of color appears to have fluctuated over the years of the study, these fluctuations are not statistically significant. The proportion of released youth who were youth of color remained relatively stable at 16%. The proportion of youth in the overall Maine youth population, however, remained well below that rate. The 2014 cohort was 17% youth of color—more than double their representation in Maine’s youth population at large.⁴⁴



RISK SCORES

Initial Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI) risk scores, measured at the time of commitment, remained stable over the years of the study, at an average score of 19.8.⁴⁵ This score is at the top of the moderate risk level, which spans scores of 9 to 22.



⁴⁴ Population data for Maine were obtained from the Easy Access to Juvenile Populations website for youth ages 10-17, accessed at <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop>.


⁴⁵ The YLS-CMI is a risk/needs assessment and case management tool designed for use with youth.

RISK ASSESSMENTS


One of the primary goals of commitment is to reduce the likelihood of future criminal behavior. One way to measure the likelihood of such behavior entails the use of risk assessment instruments, such as the YLS-CMI. Youth who were released to community reintegration were given two risk assessments—one done around the time of commitment (initial assessment) and another following release (reassessment).

While initial risk assessment scores were present in most release records, they were nevertheless missing from 5% of them. Reassessment scores were missing from approximately 30% of release records.

Youth initially assessed at moderate risk made up the largest group of released youth at 48%, followed by high-risk youth at 41%. Approximately 10% of released youth were initially assessed at low risk, and a small proportion, 1%, were initially assessed at very high risk.




At reassessment, youth assessed at low risk made up the largest group of released youth at 50%, followed by moderate risk youth at 42%. Approximately 8% of released youth were reassessed at high risk.



Section III: Community Reintegration

The majority of youth who were released (80%) saw a decrease in risk score from initial assessment to reassessment. Overall, released youth were 9 points lower at reassessment. However, this decrease was not uniform for youth across all risk levels:


- Youth who were initially assessed at high or very high risk (scores of 23 and higher) had an average initial risk score of 27.6 and a reassessment score of 10.6, a decrease of 16.9 points. On average, these youth were no longer high risk but moderate risk at reassessment.
- Youth who were initially assessed at moderate risk (scores of 9-22) had an average initial score of 15.9 and a reassessment score of 10.4, a decrease of 5.5 points. On average, these youth remained moderate risk but nevertheless had a decrease in risk.
- Youth who were initially assessed as low risk (scores of 0-8) had an average initial score of 4.4 and a reassessment score of 6.6, an *increase* of 2.2 points. On average, these youth remained low risk but nevertheless had an increase in risk.




LENGTH OF STAY

Youth are released to community reintegration as soon as they progress through a series of phases, demonstrating that they have achieved behavioral and cognitive goals relevant to each phase.

On average, youth were released to community reintegration after **13.6 months** of supervision within a facility.



Youth who were 17 years of age and older at time of commitment were released faster (after 12.0 months) than those 16 years of age and younger at time of commitment (after 15.1 months).⁴⁶



Using logistic regression, other variables in addition to age were explored in conjunction with time to first release, including *gender*, *race/ethnicity*, *initial risk level*, *offense class*, and *offense type*. None of these variables were related to length of stay.

⁴⁶ Independent t-test: $t(246.7)=4.353, p<0.001, d=0.54$

RETURNS



TWO-YEAR RETURN RATE

Youth who are released to community reintegration may be returned to a facility if their behavior in the community does not conform to the conditions of their release. Over the years of the study, approximately 42% of released youth were returned within two years of release.

REASON FOR RETURN

Following release to community reintegration, youth can be returned to a facility for several reasons. They may be returned if they engage in criminal conduct, if they violate conditions of release, or if their welfare is at risk.

For almost half of the records (45%) for which youth were returned, information regarding the *reason for return was missing*. This makes any analysis on return problematic, since the addition of these records to any of the existing categories could significantly change the distribution.




Records for which a return reason were provided indicate that about twice as many youth (64%) were returned for technical reasons as for new criminal conduct (31%).

The tendency to return youth for technical reasons appears to have increased over the years of the study. Over the first three years, 59% of youth were returned for technical reasons; in the last two years, 80% were. Given the small number of youth who were returned (especially in 2013 and 2014) as well as the number of records for which return reason was missing, these results should be interpreted with caution.


TIME TO RETURN

The majority of youth (53%) who were returned to a facility within two years were returned quickly—within the first three months. Very few (5%) were returned after the first year.



ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH RETURN

A number of variables were explored using logistic regression to determine if they had an impact on return. The variables tested included gender, age at commitment, race/ethnicity, original offense class, original offense type, length of stay, initial risk level, and subsequent risk level. Of these variables, only one—age at commitment—was shown to be predictive of return.⁴⁷ Approximately 62% of youth who were 15 years of age or younger at time of commitment were returned to a facility following release. For youth who were 16 years of age at commitment, that proportion dropped to 43%. Yet smaller proportions of older youth were returned—33% of 17-year-olds and 27% of those 18 and older.



⁴⁷ The logistic regression model is significant at the .001 level, predicts 64.4% of the responses correctly, and has a Nagelkerke R Square of 0.095. Logistic regression results table is presented in Appendix D.

IV. DISCHARGE

This section of the report examines youth who were adjudicated, committed to a secure juvenile facility, and then discharged from all supervision *for the first time* between 2010 and 2014. This report will describe the most recent discharged cohort for which recidivism data are available (2014), review trends for all the cohorts included in the study (2010-2014), explore length of supervision, and examine recidivism.

2014 COHORT DESCRIPTION


The 2014 cohort is the most recent cohort for which recidivism data are available. All of this cohort had been tracked for two full years at the time data were extracted for this analysis.

DEMOGRAPHICS, 2014 COHORT

GENDER

Approximately 96% of the youth in the 2014 cohort were male.


Gender Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
Female	3	4%
Male	69	96%
Total	72	100%



Section IV: Discharge

AGE AT COMMITMENT

Youth who were 17 years of age at commitment made up the largest group of discharged youth in the 2014 cohort at 36%, followed by 16-year-olds (26%), youth ages 15 and younger (25%), and youth age 18 and older (13%). The median age was 16.




Age Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
≤15	18	25%
16	19	26%
17	26	36%
≥18	9	13%
Total	72	100%

RACE/ETHNICITY

White youth made up 88% of discharged youth with the remaining 13% youth of color.⁴⁸ Given that approximately 8% of Maine's overall youth population were youth of color in 2014, **youth of color are disproportionately represented in this cohort.**

Racial/Ethnic Distribution of 2014 Cohort		
	#	%
White	63	88%
Youth of Color	9	13%
Total	72	100%



⁴⁸ Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.


OFFENSE CLASS AND TYPE, 2014 COHORT

While discharged youth may have had more than one offense at the time of commitment, this analysis focuses on the most serious offense associated with commitment. Seriousness is determined first by offense class (felony, misdemeanor, civil) and then by offense type (personal, property, drug/alcohol, other). Thus, if a youth was committed and discharged with both felony and misdemeanor offenses, only the felony offense is reflected here. If a youth was committed and discharged with both personal and property offenses, only the personal offense is reflected here.


	#	%
Misdemeanor (60%)		
Personal	14	33%
Property	21	49%
Drug/Alcohol	3	7%
Other	5	12%
Total	43	100%
Felony (40%)		
Personal	8	28%
Property	14	48%
Drug/Alcohol	7	24%
Total	29	100%

Section IV: Discharge

The majority of offenses, **60%**, associated with discharged youth in 2014 were **misdemeanor offenses** (n=43). A little less than half (49%) of these misdemeanor offenses were property offenses, 33% were personal offenses, 12% were “other” offenses,⁴⁹ and 7% were drug/alcohol offenses.



Another **40%** of offenses associated with discharged youth in 2014 were **felony offenses** (n=29). Of these, almost half (48%) were property offenses, 28% were personal offenses, and 24% were drug/alcohol offenses.




⁴⁹ Please see Appendix F for a list of offenses and offense types, including offenses categorized as “other.” In this context, “other” includes *disorderly conduct*, *escape*, and *tampering with public records or information*.

TRENDS (2010-2014)


NUMBER OF DISCHARGED YOUTH

From 2010 to 2012, the average number of discharged youth was 103; from 2013 to 2014, the average number was 75. This difference is a **decrease of 28%** and reflects the **decline in commitments** to a secure facility.




COMMUNITY REINTEGRATION RELEASE RATES

Youth who are committed to a secure facility may be released back into the community for a less restrictive form of supervision prior to discharge. This step down in supervision, called community reintegration, is meant to help youth transition between facility life and life among the general population. From 2010 to 2014, the *number* of discharged youth who were released to community reintegration prior to discharge decreased by 32%. In 2010, 68 of the 100 youth discharged from all supervision had been previously released to the community. In 2014, 46 out of the 72 youth had been previously released. The decrease, then, was not the result of a lessening tendency to release but the result of smaller cohorts of youth moving through secure juvenile facilities. The rate of release remained relatively stable, ranging between 61% and 68%.




LENGTH OF SUPERVISION

Youth who were discharged spent an average of 23.3 months on supervision from time of commitment to discharge, but the length of supervision crept upward over the study period, from 21.7 months (just under two years) in 2010 to 24.3 months (just over two years) in 2014.⁵⁰ This increase cannot be explained by a corresponding decrease in age at commitment.



This increase was driven by an increase in length of supervision for youth who were not released to community reintegration.

- Youth who were discharged without community reintegration (n=165) spent an average of 18.1 month under DJJ supervision within a facility, but this average increased over time, from a low of 16.7 in 2010 to a high of 20.5 in 2014. The difference between these lengths of stay is statistically significant⁵¹ and cannot be explained by a corresponding decrease in age at commitment.
- Youth who were released to community reintegration continued to be supervised in the community until discharge. The average total time of supervision for these youth was 26.2 months. While this metric increased over the years in a previous study,⁵² it remained fairly constant over the years of the current study.



⁵⁰ Independent t-test: $t(170)=1.721, p=0.087, d=0.26$

⁵¹ Independent t-test: $t(56)=1.927, p=0.059, d=0.50$


⁵² Dumont, R. (2016). 2016 Juvenile Recidivism Report. Retrieved from http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch/Publications/Juvenile/2016_Juvenile_Recidivism_Report.pdf

OFFENSE CLASS

From 2010 to 2014, the proportion of youth committed with felony offenses remained unchanged at 41%.


OFFENSE TYPE

From 2010 to 2014, the proportions of youth released with property, personal, drug/alcohol, and other offenses were fairly stable at 51%, 36%, 7%, and 5%, respectively.⁵³



GENDER

The proportion of discharged youth that were female decreased over the years of study, from a high of 15% in 2011 to a low of 4% in 2014. This difference is statistically significant⁵⁴ and reflects the declining number of females committed to a secure facility.




⁵³ The only statistically significant difference between cohorts occurs in the drugs/alcohol offense category. The proportion of offenses that fell into this category increased significantly in 2014, from 4% in 2013 to 14% in 2014 [$\chi^2(1,149)=4.666$, $p=0.031$, $Phi=0.177$].

⁵⁴ $\chi^2(1, 176)=5.560$, $p=0.018$, $Phi=0.178$

RACE/ETHNICITY

While the proportion of discharged youth who were youth of color appears to have fluctuated over the years of the study, these fluctuations are not statistically significant. The proportion of discharged youth who were youth of color remained relatively stable at 16%. The proportion of youth in the overall Maine youth population, however, remained well below that rate. In 2014, youth of color made up 8% of the general youth population and 13% of the discharged youth population.⁵⁵




AGE AT COMMITMENT

The average age of discharged youth at time of commitment remained stable at 16.5.


⁵⁵ Population data for Maine were obtained from the Easy Access to Juvenile Populations website for youth ages 10-17, accessed at <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop>.

RISK SCORES & LEVELS

All discharged youth were given risk assessments prior to commitment.⁵⁶ The average YLS-CMI score for youth who were discharged in 2014 (18.1) was 3.5 points lower than the average score for youth discharged in 2010 (21.5). This decrease was statistically significant.⁵⁷



The decrease in average risk score comes from a decrease in the proportion of high-risk youth and a corresponding increase in the proportion of youth who were assessed as low risk. In 2010, a total of four low risk youth were discharged; in 2014, a total of ten low risk youth were.⁵⁸



⁵⁶ While all youth are assessed prior to commitment using the YLS-CMI, a risk/needs assessment and case management tool designed for use with youth, risk scores were missing from 5% of the records.


⁵⁷ Independent t-test: $t(162)=2.799$, $p=0.006$, $d=0.44$

⁵⁸ A disproportionate number of low risk youth came from Kennebec County. While Kennebec accounted for 9% of all discharged youth, it accounted for 43% of all low risk youth. Also, while 4.8% of youth from other counties were low risk, 33.3% of youth from Kennebec were.

Section IV: Discharge

LENGTH OF SUPERVISION


Approximately 58% of youth were supervised (from commitment to discharge) for two years or less, 32% were supervised for 3 years, and the remaining 10% were supervised for four to six years.



RECIDIVISM

TWO-YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES

Two-year recidivism rates for discharged youth remained relatively stable over the years of the study, averaging 53% and ranging between 44% and 58%.



ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH RECIDIVISM


A number of variables were explored using logistic regression to determine if they had an impact on recidivism. The variables tested included gender, age at commitment, race/ethnicity, length of supervision (from commitment to discharge), original offense class, original offense type, prior release to community reintegration, and YLS-CMI risk level. Four of these variables—gender, age at commitment, offense type, and risk level—were shown to be predictive of recidivism among discharged youth.⁵⁹

GENDER

When other attributes (i.e., age at commitment, offense type, and risk level) were held constant, **females had a lower two-year recidivism rate, at 37%, compared to males, at 55%.**

AGE AT COMMITMENT


Age at commitment was also a predictor of recidivism. When other attributes (i.e., gender, offense type, and risk level) were held constant, **youth who were 17 years of age at the time of commitment had a two-year recidivism rate of 60%, higher than the rates of other age groups, which ranged from 47% to 54%.**



⁵⁹ The logistic regression model is significant at the .004 level, predicts 58% of the responses correctly, and has a Nagelkerke R Square of .063. Logistic regression results table is presented in Appendix E.


OFFENSE TYPE

Offense type was also a predictor of recidivism. When other attributes (i.e., gender, age at commitment, and risk level) were held constant, youth who were discharged with property offenses had a two-year recidivism rate of 57%, compared to youth who were discharged with non-property offenses,⁶⁰ who had a rate of 48%.



YLS-CMI RISK LEVEL


Lastly, risk level was a predictor of recidivism. When other attributes (i.e., gender, age at commitment, and offense type) were held constant, low risk youth had a recidivism rate of 36%, moderate risk youth had a recidivism rate of 51%, and high-risk youth had a rate of 58%.



⁶⁰ Non-property offenses include personal, drug/alcohol, and "other" offenses.


TIME TO RECIDIVATE

One-quarter of those who recidivated within the two-year tracking period did so within the first three and a half months following discharge. Half of those who recidivated did so within the first eight months following discharge, and 75% of those who recidivated did so within 13 months.



RECIDIVISM AND CHANGES IN OFFENSE CLASS

A little more than half (51%) of discharged youth were discharged with misdemeanors and recidivated with misdemeanors. An additional 30% were originally discharged with felonies but recidivated with misdemeanors. Approximately 10% were originally discharged with misdemeanors but recidivated with felonies, and 9% were both discharged and recidivated with felonies.



CHANGE IN OFFENSE TYPE

At 56%, discharged youth were most likely to be discharged with property offenses. While discharged youth were also most likely to reoffend with property offenses, at 43% the margin over the remaining offenses was not as wide. "Other" offenses and drug/alcohol offenses made up a larger proportion of recidivating offenses, at 19% and 16%, respectively.



The largest subcategory of "other" recidivating offenses (42%) was *violations of conditions of release*, suggesting that these youth committed offenses subsequent to discharge, were detained for them, and then released with conditions, which they in turn violated. The next largest subcategory of "other" recidivate offenses was *disorderly conduct*, 33% of "other" recidivating offenses fell into this category.

The largest subcategories of drug/alcohol recidivating offenses were *unlawful possession of a scheduled drug*, at 26%, and *furnishing/trafficking* offenses, also at 26%.

APPENDIX A

Logistic Regression Analysis, Diverted Youth, Two-Year Recidivism

Independent variables	β	s.e.	Sig.	Exp(β)
Gender (reference group = female)				
Male	0.359	0.179	0.045	1.431
Age at diversion (reference group = ages \leq 13)				
Age 14	0.312	0.141	0.027	1.366
Age 15	0.029	0.136	0.829	1.030
Age 16	-0.367	0.139	0.008	0.693
Age 17	-1.669	0.178	0.000	0.188
Age 18	-3.619	1.007	0.000	0.027
Race/ethnicity (reference group = white)				
YOC	0.367	0.153	0.016	1.443
Regions (reference group = Region 1)				
Region 2	0.579	0.193	0.003	1.785
Region 3	0.214	0.214	0.316	1.239
Gender * Region, interaction			0.035	
Male, Region 2	-0.264	0.236	0.263	0.768
Male, Region 3	0.345	0.252	0.170	1.412
Constant	-2.692	0.179	0.000	0.068

Indicates statistical significance at .05 level

Model $\chi^2 = 295.919$ $p < .001$

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .094$

$n = 7,570$

Note: The dependent variable in this analysis is two-year recidivism where 0= no and 1=yes.

APPENDIX B

Logistic Regression Analysis, Diverted Youth, Two-Year Recidivism

Independent variables	β	s.e.	Sig.	Exp(β)
Gender (reference group = female)				
Male	0.371	0.098	0.000	1.449
Age at diversion (reference group = ages ≤ 13)				
Age 14	0.310	0.142	0.029	1.364
Age 15	0.031	0.137	0.821	1.031
Age 16	-0.347	0.140	0.013	0.707
Age 17	-1.654	0.179	0.000	0.191
Age ≥ 18	-3.633	1.007	0.000	0.026
Race/ethnicity (reference group = white)				
YOC	0.381	0.156	0.015	1.463
Counties (reference group = York County)				
Androscoggin	0.405	0.173	0.020	1.499
Aroostook	-0.007	0.222	0.974	0.993
Cumberland	-0.121	0.166	0.464	0.886
Franklin	-0.139	0.384	0.717	0.870
Hancock	0.027	0.321	0.933	1.027
Kennebec	0.336	0.188	0.075	1.399
Knox	0.536	0.283	0.058	1.709
Lincoln	-0.080	0.347	0.818	0.923
Oxford	0.004	0.249	0.986	1.004
Penobscot	0.491	0.172	0.004	1.634
Piscataquis	0.466	0.357	0.192	1.593
Sagadahoc	0.982	0.235	0.000	2.670
Somerset	0.660	0.210	0.002	1.934
Waldo	0.799	0.222	0.000	2.224
Washington	-0.305	0.528	0.563	0.737
Constant	-2.651	.163	.000	.071

Indicates statistical significance at .05 level

Model $\chi^2 = 320.666$ $p < .001$

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .101$

n = 7,570

Note: The dependent variable in this analysis is two-year recidivism where 0= no and 1=yes.

APPENDIX C

Logistic Regression Analysis, Supervised Youth, Two-Year Recidivism

Independent variables	β	s.e.	Sig.	Exp(β)
Gender (reference group = female)				
Male	0.506	0.228	0.026	1.658
Age at commitment (reference group = ages \leq 13)				
Age 14	-0.187	0.218	0.391	0.830
Age 15	-0.448	0.204	0.028	0.639
Age 16	-0.431	0.203	0.034	0.650
Age 17	-0.303	0.202	0.133	0.738
Age \geq 18	-0.538	0.286	0.060	0.584
Offense type (reference group = personal)				
Property	0.427	0.271	0.115	1.533
Drugs/alcohol	-1.502	0.768	0.050	0.223
Other	0.192	0.449	0.670	1.211
YLS-CMI risk level (reference group = low risk)				
Moderate risk	0.938	0.123	0.000	2.554
High risk	1.407	0.192	0.000	4.082
YOC (control variable)	0.325	0.170	0.056	1.384
Gender * Offense type, interaction				
Male, property offense	-0.232	0.300	0.439	0.793
Male, drug/alcohol offense	1.691	0.804	0.035	5.427
Male, other offense	0.061	0.521	0.906	1.063
Constant	-1.614	0.278	0.000	0.199

Indicates statistical significance at .05 level

Model $\chi^2 = 124.185$ $p < .001$

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .099$

$n = 1,684$

Note: The dependent variable in this analysis is two-year recidivism where 0= no and 1=yes.

APPENDIX D

Logistic Regression Analysis, Community Reintegration, Return to a Facility (Within Two Years)

Independent variables	β	s.e.	Sig.	Exp(β)
Age at commitment (reference group = ages \leq 15)				
Age 16	-1.773	0.350	0.027	0.461
Age 17	-1.234	0.345	0.000	0.291
Age \geq 18	-1.515	0.419	0.000	0.220
Constant	0.503	0.248	0.043	1.654

Indicates statistical significance at .05 level

Model $\chi^2 = 19.179$ $p < .001$

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .095$

$n = 261$

Note: The dependent variable in this analysis is *return to a facility* where 0= no return and 1=return.

APPENDIX E

Logistic Regression Analysis, Discharged Youth, Two-Year Recidivism

Independent variables	β	s.e.	Sig.	Exp(β)
Gender (reference group = female)				
Male	0.733	0.339	0.031	2.082
Age at commitment (reference group = ages ≥ 18)				
Age ≤ 15	0.237	0.313	0.449	1.268
Age 16	-0.038	0.299	0.899	0.963
Age 17	0.494	0.283	0.081	1.640
Offense type (reference group = non-property)				
Property	0.372	0.200	0.062	1.451
YLS-CMI risk level (reference group = low risk)				
Moderate risk	0.615	0.396	0.120	1.850
High risk	0.864	0.400	0.031	2.373
Constant	-1.625	0.541	0.003	0.197

Indicates statistical significance at .10 level

Model $\chi^2 = 20.977$ $p = .004$

Nagelkerke $R^2 = .063$

n = 434

Note: The dependent variable in this analysis is two-year recidivism where 0= no and 1=yes.

APPENDIX F

Offenses by Type

Personal

Aggravated assault
 Assault
 Assault on an emergency medical care provider
 Assault on an officer
 Criminal restraint
 Criminal threatening
 Criminal threatening w/dangerous weapon
 Criminal use of disabling chemicals
 Criminal use of explosives
 Criminal use of laser pointer
 Dissemination of sexually explicit material
 Domestic violence assault
 Domestic violence assault, priors DV
 Domestic violence criminal threatening
 Domestic violence terrorizing
 Elevated aggravated assault
 Endangering the welfare of a child
 Endangering the welfare of a dependent person
 Gross sexual assault
 Harassment
 Harassment by telephone
 Manslaughter
 Possess sexual explicit material of minor under 12
 Possession of sexually explicit material
 Protective order from harassment violation
 Reckless conduct
 Reckless violation of protective order
 Refuse to submit to arrest or deten, bodily injury
 Refusing to submit to arrest or detent, phys force
 Refusing to submit to arrest or detention
 Robbery
 Sexual exploitation of a minor
 Solicitation of child by computer
 Stalking
 Terrorizing
 Unlawful sexual contact
 Unlawful sexual touching
 Violating protection order
 Violation of privacy

Property

Aggravated criminal invasion computer privacy
 Aggravated criminal mischief
 Aggravated criminal trespass
 Aggravated forgery
 Arson

Burglary
 Burglary of a motor vehicle
 Criminal invasion of computer privacy
 Criminal mischief
 Criminal simulation
 Criminal trespass
 Desecration and defacement
 Misuse of identification
 Possession or transfer of burglar's tools
 Theft by deception
 Theft by extortion
 Theft by receiving stolen property
 Theft by unauthorized taking
 Theft by unauthorized taking or transfer
 Theft by unauthorized use of property
 Theft of lost, mislaid, or mis-delivered property
 Theft of services
 Theft, unauthorized taking or transfer
 Trespass by motor vehicle

Drugs/Alcohol

Acquiring drugs by deception
 Aggravated furnishing of schedule W drug
 Aggravated furnishing of schedule X drug
 Aggravated furnishing of schedule Y drug
 Aggravated furnishing of schedule Z drug
 Aggravated furnishing of scheduled drugs
 Aggravated operating under the influence
 Aggravated traffick or furnish schedule drugs
 Aggravated trafficking of schedule W drug
 Aggravated trafficking of schedule Y drugs
 Aggravated trafficking of schedule Z drugs
 Aggravated trafficking of scheduled drugs
 Aggravated trafficking scheduled drugs-bus/school
 Aggravated trafficking scheduled Y or Z drug
 Allow minor to possess or consume liquor
 Allowing minor to consume liquor
 Allowing minor to possess liquor
 Cultivating marijuana
 Drinking in public
 Furnishing liquor to a minor
 Illegal possession of liquor by minor
 Illegal transportation of drugs by minor
 Illegal transportation of liquor by minor
 Illegal transportation of liquor within the state
 Minor consuming liquor
 Minor having liquor on person

Drugs/Alcohol (continued)

Minor possessing liquor
 Minor purchasing liquor
 Minor transporting liquor
 Operating under the influence
 Operating under the influence-1 prior
 OUI (alcohol)
 OUI (drugs or combo)
 Possessing imitation drugs
 Possessing liquor by minor
 Possessing marijuana
 Possession of drug paraphernalia
 Possession of liquor by minor on premises
 Possession of marijuana
 Procuring liquor for minor
 Sale and use of drug paraphernalia
 Stealing drugs
 Trafficking or furnishing imitation scheduled drug
 Transportation of drugs by minor
 Unlawful furnishing scheduled drug
 Unlawful possession of cocaine base
 Unlawful possession of hydrocodone
 Unlawful possession of hydromorphone
 Unlawful possession of oxycodone
 Unlawful possession of scheduled drug
 Unlawful possession of scheduled drugs
 Unlawful trafficking in scheduled drugs
 Unlawful trafficking scheduled drugs
 Unlawfully furnishing scheduled drugs
 Unlawfully possessing alcohol
 Use of drug paraphernalia

Other

Attempt to alter voting machine
 Attempt to commit a crime
 Boarding or leaving a moving train
 Carrying concealed weapon
 Conspiracy to commit a class C crime
 Criminal attempt
 Criminal conspiracy
 Criminal solicitation
 Cruelty to animals
 Cruelty to birds
 Disorderly conduct
 Disorderly conduct, fighting
 Disorderly conduct, funeral
 Disorderly conduct, loud noise, private place
 Disorderly conduct, loud unreasonable noise
 Disorderly conduct, offensive words, gestures
 Eluding an officer
 Escape

Fail to give correct name, address or DOB
 Failing to appear as subpoenaed
 Failing to stop for officer
 Failing to stop motor vehicle for officer
 Failure to control or report a dangerous fire
 False identification by minor
 False public alarm or report
 Falsifying physical evidence
 Forgery
 Hindering apprehension or prosecution
 Illegal deposit or possession with intent to sell
 Illegal possession of firearm
 Indecent conduct
 Interfering with railroad signals
 Leaving the scene of an accident
 Misuse of credit identification
 Misuse of E-9-1-1 system
 Obstructing government administration
 Obstructing public ways
 Obstructing report of crime
 Operating vehicle without a license
 Passing a roadblock
 Permitting unlawful use of vehicle
 Place tattoo on person under 18
 Possessing false identification
 Possessing firearm near school
 Possessing forged motor vehicle document
 Possession of false ID card
 Possession or distribution of dangerous knives
 Provide false information or failure to cooperate
 Refusing to submit to arrest or detention, refuse to stop
 Solicitation
 Tampering with a victim
 Tampering with a witness, informant or juror
 Tampering with public records or information
 Tampering with witness, informant, juror or victim
 Theft, unauthorized taking transfer
 Threatening display of weapon
 Trafficking in dangerous knives
 Trafficking in or furnishing counterfeit drugs
 Trafficking in prison contraband
 Unlawful prize fighting
 Unlawful use of license
 Unlawfully permitting operation
 Unsworn falsification
 Violating condition of release
 Violation of requirements for shipping

About the Muskie School of Public Service

The Muskie School of Public Service is Maine's distinguished public policy school, combining an extensive applied research and technical assistance portfolio with rigorous undergraduate and graduate degree programs in geography-anthropology; policy, planning, and management (MPPM); and public health (MPH). The school is nationally recognized for applying innovative knowledge to critical issues in the fields of sustainable development and health and human service policy and management, and is home to the Cutler Institute for Health and Social Policy.

About the Cutler Institute for Health and Social Policy

The Cutler Institute for Health and Social Policy at the Muskie School of Public Service is dedicated to developing innovative, evidence-informed, and practical approaches to pressing health and social challenges faced by individuals, families, and communities.

About the Maine Statistical Analysis Center

The Maine Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) informs policy development and improvement of practice in Maine's criminal and juvenile justice systems. A partnership between the University of Southern Maine Muskie School of Public Service and the Maine Department of Corrections, SAC collaborates with numerous community-based and governmental agencies. SAC conducts applied research, evaluates programs and new initiatives, and provides technical assistance, consultation and organizational development services. The Maine Statistical Analysis Center is funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and supported by the Justice Research Statistics Association.

*Funding provided by the Maine Department of Corrections, Division of Juvenile Services.
For more information about this report, call (207)780-5835.*

Muskie School of Public Service

University of Southern Maine
PO Box 9300
Portland, Maine 04104-9300
www.muskie.maine.edu



A member of the University of Maine System

This report is available on the Maine
Statistical Analysis Center Website at:
<http://muskie.maine.edu/justicersearch>