

**Juvenile Detention Center (MDC) AYUDA Program  
Outcome Study Final Report**

**Prepared for:  
Bernalillo County and the  
Juvenile Detention Center**

**Prepared By:  
Institute for Social Research,  
University of New Mexico  
Paul Guerin, PhD  
Cindy Torres**

**July 2006**

## **Background and Introduction**

The primary purpose of the AYUDA program at the Bernalillo County Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) is to provide substance abuse treatment services for juveniles who come into contact with JDC and to reduce DWI recidivism. The AYUDA program contains two components; first, a detention center component for juveniles who remain in the detention center, and second an outpatient component for juveniles who are booked and released from the detention center into the community. Our evaluation concerns the second component. Most juveniles entering this component of the AYUDA program are charged with DWI. The program also accepts juveniles charged with Minor in Possession of Alcohol if the charge involves a vehicle. On occasion the program may also accept juveniles charged with other crimes.

The AYUDA program officially began in May 1994 and included both in-house and aftercare services<sup>1</sup> and was focused on juveniles abusing drugs. The current version of the program is focused to DWI offenders, alcohol, and early intervention. This evaluation focuses on juveniles who were admitted into the outpatient component of the program from 2001-2005. The initial research design and contract did not contain the use of a comparison group. This primarily occurred for two reasons. First, in early discussions with program staff, regarding the design of the evaluation we were told that all juveniles in Bernalillo County charged with DWI become program participants. Based upon this information we discussed using juveniles arrested in other similar matched counties including Santa Fe and Dona Ana for a comparison group. For various reasons this never happened. Second, the budget was not large enough to include the use of a comparison group.

After completing an initial draft of the report and discussing the findings with County and program staff we decided to include a comparison group comprised of all juveniles arrested for DWI in Bernalillo County during the study period (2001-2005) who did not participate in the AYUDA program. This was possible because during the course of the study we discovered that not all juveniles arrested for DWI participated in the AYUDA program. While the inclusion of a comparison group was not part of the contract or budgeted we agreed that it was important and worthwhile to include a comparison. Because of costs the comparison group is not matched on the characteristics of the AYUDA program participants (e.g. gender, age, race/ethnicity, charge, criminal history, grade level and school status) and is only matched on the time frame of January 2001-December 2005. The discussion of the AYUDA and comparison group is included towards the end of the report.

Juveniles accepted into the program participate in a six-week core curriculum program that includes the following components:

- Alcohol and the Individual – part 1
- The Costs

- Alcohol and the Individual – part 2
- Alcohol and the family
- Choices – Taking Responsibility
- Activity Group

Groups are psychoeducational and incorporate a therapeutic group activity to promote the educational components of the group. Specifically, *Alcohol and the Individual* focuses on the physiological effects of alcohol or drugs and the impact on driving, binge drinking, fetal alcohol syndrome, recognizing addiction and abuse, and teaches participants progressive relaxation, refusal skills, and helping resources for substance abuse. The *Costs* component covers DWI laws; penalties; consequences for self, family, and community; road rage; and a Tai Chi activity. The *Alcohol and the Family* component primarily focuses on how alcohol or drug abuse and addiction impact family systems, the effects of family dysfunction on individuals, and effective communication. *Choices – Taking Responsibility* focuses on decisions and planning, responsibility, and a meditation activity. The *Activity Group* ropes course is used to promote decision-making, problem-solving, communication, trust, emotional coping, and self-confidence. The AYUDA program was designed for adolescents and therefore does not follow the usual treatment modalities used for adults.

The program is designed so that prospective participants are contacted within 72 hours of being booked into the JDC under the assumption that early intervention is necessary for the program to be effective. The offender and their family are contacted and asked to complete a one hour intake session, where they are given information on the AYUDA program and its services. Offenders then have the option of voluntarily participating in the program or are subject to mandated participation after adjudication. Currently, after the participant is accepted into the program the Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory (SASSI) which is a brief screening tool used to identify those who suffer from alcohol or drug dependence, and self-report DWI Monitoring form, designed by the program, are administered by the counselor. During the 6-week program participants also receive at least one individual session with the counselor, which can be completed during the intake or during the 6-week program. If necessary, the program may refer the participant for follow-up treatment or other services after they complete the AYUDA program. AYUDA is an open group and designed for participants to enter during any week, making it more likely to be a quick and early intervention. An open group is one which allows new members to join during any week because the topics are on a recurring 6-week cycle.

### **Research Design**

This study focused on collecting data from three sources, AYUDA participant files including their booking sheet and other forms used to collect self-reported information, juvenile chronological criminal history records from Juvenile Probation/Parole, and Citation Tracking System (CTS) data maintained by the Motor Vehicle Division of the State of New Mexico. CTS data includes all DWI

arrests that occur in New Mexico. Our sample consisted of 347 individuals who participated in the AYUDA program from 2001-2005.

During our data collection of AYUDA participant files, we became aware that a variety of different alcohol and drug screening tools had been used between 2001 and 2005 including different versions of the SASSI, the Y-STOP and POSIT. This was confirmed by AYUDA staff. For this reason, we were not able to collect consistent information from these screening tools regarding alcohol and drug use and dependency. Additionally, these screening tools were not consistently used. Our study only includes program participants from 2001-2005 primarily because program files for those years were available.

In our collection of chronological criminal history data from Juvenile Probation/Parole we were only able to collect data on 62.5% of our sample. Participants who were born in 1983 and were 23 years old files had been destroyed and those who were born in 1984 were archived and not located in the local Juvenile Probation and Parole Office in Bernalillo County. Time constraints on our part and on the part of JPPO staff who would have had to request these files from State Archives restricted us to using files stored locally. Also, any study group members with an open case with Juvenile Probation/Parole were not collected because their files were stored in individual Juvenile Probation and Parole Officers offices.

### **Data Analysis**

This section contains a review of the collected information focusing on describing the juveniles served using frequencies and cross-tabulations.

<b>Table 1 – Demographics</b>		
Variable	Count	Percent
<b>Age</b>		
Average Age	17.4	
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	88	25.5
Male	257	74.5
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Anglo	103	30.8
Hispanic	212	63.5
American Indian	14	4.2
African American	3	.9
Asian American	2	.6
<b>Employed</b>		
Yes	171	52
No	158	48
<b>City of Residence</b>		
Albuquerque	310	94.2
Bernalillo	3	.9
Corrales	1	.3
Cuba	1	.3
Isleta Pueblo	1	.3
Los Lunas	1	.3
Rio Rancho	6	1.8
Sandia Park	3	.9
Santo Domingo Pueblo	1	.3
Tijeras	1	.3
Veguita	1	.3
<b>Albuquerque Quadrants</b>		
NW	77	23.8
NE	78	24.1
SW	123	38
SE	23	7.1
Other	23	7.1

A majority of the sample was male (74.5%), and a majority of the program participants were Hispanic (63.5%) followed by Anglos (30.8%), and American Indians (4.2%). Almost all program participants lived in Albuquerque. Zip codes were recoded into city quadrants (NW, NE, SW, SE) and those not within the city limits were recoded as 'other'. The SW quadrant of the city had the largest number of program participants (38%) followed by the NE (24.1%) and NW (23.8%). Both the SE quadrant and 'other' accounted for 7.1% of the participants. A little more than half (52%) of the study group members were employed and the average age of study group members was 17.4 years of age.

<b>Table 2 – Education</b>		
Variable	Count	Percent
<b>Grade Level</b>		
7 <sup>th</sup>	4	1.3
8 <sup>th</sup>	4	1.3
9 <sup>th</sup>	41	13.6
10 <sup>th</sup>	69	22.9
11 <sup>th</sup>	77	25.6
12 <sup>th</sup>	106	35.2
<b>School Status</b>		
Attending	239	75.4
Expelled	1	.3
Dropped Out	54	17.0
Suspended	2	.6
Graduated	12	3.8
Working on GED	9	2.8

On average students had an almost 11<sup>th</sup> grade education and the large majority of students were in high-school. The largest number and percentage of program participants (35.2%) were in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade, followed by 11<sup>th</sup> grade (25.6%), and 10<sup>th</sup> grade (22.9%). Slightly more than 80% of the program participants were still attending school (75.4%), had graduated (3.8%) or were working on their GED (2.8%). Seventeen percent of the program participants had dropped out of school, one participant had been expelled and two had been suspended.

<b>Table 3 – Referring Agency</b>		
Agency	Count	Percent
APD	265	82.8
BCSO	46	14.4
NMSP	5	1.6
Other	4	1.3

The Albuquerque Police Department accounted for the vast majority of referrals that resulted in individuals becoming program participants.

<b>Table 4 – Most Serious Charge</b>		
Charge	Count	Percent
DWI 1 <sup>st</sup>	240	69.2
Aggravated DWI 1st	69	19.9
DWI 2nd or Subsequent	9	2.6
Minor in Possession	15	4.3
Other	6	1.7

Almost 70% of program participants were in the AYUDA program because of a DWI 1<sup>st</sup> charge, followed by aggravated DWI 1<sup>st</sup> (19.9%), DWI 2<sup>nd</sup> or subsequent (2.6%), Minor in Possession (4.3%), and 'Other' (1.7%). Charges included in the 'Other' category include assault, battery, probation violation/warrants, receiving/transferring a stolen vehicle, and resisting arrest.

<b>Table 5 – Alcohol/Drug Use</b>		
	Count	Percent
<b>Average Age of First Alcohol Use</b>	13.3	
<b>Average Age of First Drug Use</b>	13.4	
<b>Drug Used</b>		
Marijuana	228	69.3
Cocaine	1	.3
Mushrooms	1	.3
Poly-substance	14	4.3
No Use	85	25.8
<b>Number of Times Drinking and Driving</b>		
None	7	2
1-5	224	64.6
6-10	52	15
11-15	7	2
20 or More	57	16.4
<b>Number of Times Driven Drunk</b>		
None	19	5.5
1-5	280	80.7
6-10	12	3.5
11-15	4	1.2
20 or More	32	9.2
<b>Ease of Obtaining Alcohol</b>		
Extremely Easy	53	15.7
Easy	162	47.9
Fairly Easy	71	21
Not that Easy	42	12.4
Hard	10	3
<b>Sources for Obtaining Alcohol</b>		
Friends	183	54
People in Front of Stores/Strangers	50	14.7
Family	7	2.1
Fake ID	1	.3
Parties	7	2.1
Multiple Sources	90	26.5

Almost 30% of the participants reported no drug use, while 64.6% reported having first used marijuana, 0.3% reported using cocaine or mushrooms first, and 4.3% reported poly-substance use for their first drug use. 64.6% of participants reported driving after drinking between 1-5 times, 15% reported this between 6-

10 times, 2% reported this 11-15 times, 16.4% reported this 20 or more times, and 2% reported none. 80.7% reported driving drunk at least 1-5 times, 3.5% reported this between 6-10 times, 1.2% reported this between 11-15 times, 9.2% reported 20 or more times and 5.5% reported none. A combined total of 84.6% reported some ease in obtaining alcohol while a combined total of 15.4% reported difficulty in obtaining alcohol. 54% reported 'friends' as their source of alcohol, while 14.7% reported 'strangers or bums', 2.1% reported family, 0.3% reported using a fake ID, 2.1% reported from 'parties, and 26.5% had multiple sources to obtain alcohol from.

Variable	Days
Days from Arrest to Program Start Median	62

The median number of days from the date of arrest to program start was 62 days. The median measures the number of day at which half the scores occur below that number and half the scores occur above that number. According to program records 23 participants began the program within three days (72 hours) of their arrest. In order to account for individuals who might be arrested on a Friday, Saturday and Sunday we decided to increase the number of days to six days. Doing this will effectively change the measure to three working days. Using this measure we found 36 individuals became program participants within 72 hours of arrest. The program is designed to accept individuals within 72 hours of arrest. As evidenced by the above the large majority of individuals are accepted much later than 72 hours and in fact approximately 50% are accepted 62 days or more after the date they are arrested.

Status	Count	Percent
Successful	278	80.8
Unsuccessful	66	19.2

A little over 80% of participants had a successful discharge from the program defined as attending the mandatory six sessions, while almost 20% had an unsuccessful discharge.

Tables 8 through 11 report juvenile probation information that was collected from Juvenile Probation and Parole records. The tables describe how the participants' cases were handled by the Juvenile Probation and Parole office in Bernalillo County.

<b>Table 8 – Court Result</b>		
Status	Count	Percent
Probation	38	18.4
Consent Decree	161	77.8
CYFD Commitment	2	1.0
Nolle Prosequi	2	1.0
Dismissed	4	1.9

N=207

A little more than 75% of program participants whose cases were handled formally received a consent decree and 18.4% were placed on probation. Only 2 individuals were committed to CYFD, 2 had their cases nolle, and 4 had their cases dismissed.

<b>Table 9 – Probation/Consent Decree Sentence Length</b>		
Status	Count	Percent
1 month	1	0.5
6 months	138	70.4
1 year	34	17.3
2 years	23	11.7

N=196

Program participants who received probation or a consent decree most frequently were given a sentence of 6 months (70.4%). Close to 17% received a one year sentence, almost 12% received a two year sentence, and 1 participant received a 1 month sentence.

<b>Table 10 – Probation Discharge Status</b>		
Status	Count	Percent
Successful Discharge	132	78.6
Revoked-technical/commitment from probation	4	2.4
New Adjudication/Continue with Supervision	12	7.1
Unsuccessful discharge from Probation	6	3.6
Absconders	1	.6
Other	13	7.7

Almost 80% of those with a probation sentence had a successful discharge. Of those who did not, 2.4% had their probation revoked, 7.1% received a new adjudication and continued with supervision, 3.6% had an unsuccessful

discharge, 0.6% absconded, and 7.7% were classified as 'other' by Juvenile Probation and Parole. We do not know what comprises the other category.

Status	Count	Percent
Yes	43	12.5
No	301	87.5

This table reports recidivism defined as a new DWI for program participants. For this report we were able to match program participants to CTS data from the date they left the program through early December 2005. Participants were exposed from less than 1 month to as many as 56.6 months or almost 5 years. On average program participants were exposed 24.6 months for a new arrest for DWI. Only 12.5% of the participants received a subsequent DWI after leaving the program. Individuals who were arrested for a DWI after they left the program on average took 33.9 months (range 2.4 months to 53.2 months) to pick up a new arrest for DWI. According to information compiled by UNM's Division of Government Research 21.2% of all individuals convicted of DWI in New Mexico in 2004 were repeat offenders and had at least one other conviction for DWI since 1999<sup>2</sup>. It would be useful to review recidivism rates for this sample for a five year period to compare them to state statistics. Currently it would appear that program participants are following state trends regarding recidivism.

Table 12 through Table 15 report on selected characteristics of participants who were arrested for a new DWI after they left the program.

Recidivism Status	Successful Program Discharge	Unsuccessful Program Discharge
Yes		
Count	31	11
Percent	73.8	26.2
No		
Count	244	55
Percent	81.6	18.4

X=1.434, p=.231

Of those who received a DWI after program discharge, 73.8% had a successful program discharge and 26.2% did not. Of those who have not received a subsequent DWI charge, 81.6% had a successful program discharge and 18.4% did not.

<b>Table 13 – Exposed Months Categorized by Received a DWI after Program</b>				
Recidivism Status	0-3 Months	4-12 Months	13-24 Months	25 Months or More
Yes				
Count	1	3	9	30
Percent	2.3	7.0	20.9	69.8
No				
Count	27	45	72	105
Percent	10.8	18.1	28.9	42.2

$\chi^2=12.404, p=.006$

Almost 70% of participants who received a subsequent DWI after the program were exposed for more than 2 years.

<b>Table 14 – Substance Use Needs Assessment by Received a DWI after Program</b>				
Recidivism Status	No use by youth	Experimentation with alcohol/ Marijuana	Substance Abuse/ Experimentation with other drugs	Chronic Substance Abuse
Yes				
Count	0	5	5	3
Percent	0	38.5	38.5	23.0
No				
Count	28	80	63	19
Percent	14.7	42.1	33.2	10.0

$\chi^2=3.976, p=.264$

The largest percentage of those who received a subsequent DWI after the program were individuals who experimented with alcohol/marijuana and substance abuse/experimentation with other drugs, both with 38.5%.

<b>Table 15 – Gender by Received a DWI after Program</b>		
Recidivism Status	Male	Female
Yes		
Count	38	5
Percent	88.4	11.6
No		
Count	217	83
Percent	72.3	27.7

$\chi^2=5.072, p=.024$

Of those who received a subsequent DWI after the program 88.4% were male and 11.6% were female.

## Brief Comparison

This section briefly provides a discussion of the use of a comparison group for this study. As noted in the introduction to this report the inclusion of a comparison group was not included in the original evaluation design and contract. This comparison group is comprised of all juveniles between 2001 and 2005 arrested for a charge of DWI who did not participate in the AYUDA program. The group is only matched within the time frame (2001-2005) and not on any participant characteristics (i.e. age and gender).

Between 2001 and 2005 we were able to find 708 juveniles between 12 years old and 17 years old who were charged with DWI in Bernalillo County and who we were found in the NM Motor Vehicle Division's Citation Tracking System (CTS). Table 17 reports the number of individuals in the AYUDA program and the number of individuals in the comparison group.

Group	Count	Percent
AYUDA	344	48.6
Comparison	364	51.4
Total	708	100.0

The AYUDA and Comparison group are approximately equal in size and approximately 50% of all juveniles between 12 years old and 17 years old arrested for DWI in Bernalillo County became program participants.

The next table provides an analysis of recidivism defined as a new arrest for DWI by the AYUDA group and the comparison group.

Recidivism Status	AYUDA		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
No	301	87.5	294	80.8
Yes	43	12.5	70	19.2

$p=.015$ ,  $df=1$

Almost 20% of the comparison group received a new DWI during the study period compared to 12.5% of the AYUDA group. This difference of 6.7% is statistically significant. This is an important and encouraging finding for this program. This preliminary finding suggests that AYUDA group participants recidivate at a lower rate than juveniles arrested for DWI who do not participate in the program. Future research should more completely match the comparison

group using variables such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, and prior criminal history and study how the program impacts recidivism.

## **Discussion**

On average, and as expected, most participants were male (75%). The average age of program participants was 17 years of age and a large majority of the sample was Hispanic (almost 65%), followed by Anglo, American Indian, African American, and Asian American. Almost all study group members lived in Albuquerque and the largest number of participants lived in the SW part of the city.

Slightly more than 50% of the participants were employed. Close to 75% of participants were still attending school and almost 7% were either working on their GED or graduated. The largest number and percent of participants were in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade (35.2%). A small percentage of participants were in the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades.

Over 90% of the program participants were in AYUDA after receiving a DWI related charge including Aggravated DWI and 2<sup>nd</sup> DWI or subsequent. Over 80% were referred by the Albuquerque Police Department. The average age of both initial alcohol consumption and initial drug use was 13. Almost 25% of participants reported no drug use and about 70% reported initial drug use with marijuana. Almost 65% of the program participants self-reported having driven after drinking between 1-5 times and about 16% reported doing this 20 or more times. When asked if they had ever driven drunk, close to 80% reported driving drunk between 1-5 times. A majority of program participants reported their friends as their source for obtaining alcohol, while over 25% reported multiple sources for alcohol. Over 70% reported some ease in finding alcohol, while almost 30% reported some difficulty.

It took the program a median of 62 days to accept individuals into the program, measured from the date of arrest to the date of assessment. The large majority of program participants did not receive their interview within the targeted 72 hours of arrest. This may occur because most juveniles do not become participants until their court case is resolved. Over 80% of program participants completed the program successfully attending the mandatory six sessions.

According to the data we were able to collect from the local Juvenile Probation and Parole office almost all cases were handled formally or referred to CCA. A small number of cases were handled informally or rejected by CCA. There was a single case where the offender failed to appear. Of those cases handled formally or referred to CCA almost 80% received a consent decree and a six-month sentence.

In our analysis 12.5% of the program participants received a subsequent DWI. Of those who received a new DWI 73.8% had successfully discharged from the

AYUDA program and 26.2% did not. Almost 70% of those who received a subsequent DWI received it after two year or more after leaving the program. About 15% of male participants and 6% of female participants received a subsequent DWI. According to the needs assessment provided by Juvenile Probation/Parole of those who received a subsequent DWI 38.5% were categorized as “experimentation with alcohol/marijuana” and another 38.5% were categorized as “substance abuse/experimentation with other drugs”.

In our review and collection of participant data from program files it was difficult to capture whether or not the participants in the program were substance/alcohol dependent because of lack of consistent data. It appears that in more recent years the AYUDA program has more systematically used the SASSI. This is not the case for older files. In our review of literature we found that the SASSI is not recommended for use as a screening tool for DWI offenders<sup>3</sup>. According to the University of Maryland, Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR), the SASSI was the lowest rated screening instrument. The instruments were evaluated on six criteria which were 1) the prediction of DWI recidivism; 2) assessment of alcohol use disorders (AUD's); 3) ease of administration and cost; 4) scope of the domains covered in the screenings; 5) reliability, validity, and an adequate record of DWI-related research; and 6) quality of the interpretation of the results and treatment recommendations. The SASSI however was not found to satisfy any of the above criteria. The instruments that were most highly rated by the study were the Alcohol Use Inventory (AUI) and the MacAndrew Alcoholism Scale (MAC). It is important to reliably and validly screen program participants for drug and alcohol use to ensure they are receiving adequate levels of substance abuse treatment. The AYUDA program does not currently distinguish among these needs by providing different levels of services for participants. In our review of program records we were not able to discover if participants were receiving treatment services outside AYUDA.

As noted in Table 5 almost 30% of participants reported no drug use, while 64.6% reported having first used marijuana, 0.3% reported using cocaine or mushrooms first, and 4.3% reported poly-substance use for their first drug use. Almost all participants reported driving after drinking with 16.4% reporting doing this 20 or more times. Similarly all by 5.5% of program participants reported driving drunk with 10.3% reporting driving drunk 11 or more times. Almost 85% reported some ease in obtaining alcohol and only 15.4% reported difficulty in obtaining alcohol. It would appear that based upon unverified self-reported information there is some reason to believe program participants differ in their drinking behaviors, illicit drug use, drinking and driving behaviors and how easily they believe they can obtain alcohol. This being the case it may prove useful for the program to target additional services to alcohol and/or drug dependent individuals and individuals at risk for dependency.

While not statistically significant we also know that a larger percentage of those who recidivated during the study period did not successfully complete the

program. Based upon the limited data we were able to access from Juvenile Probation and Parole records we also know that individuals who were assessed by the office as chronic users and having experimented with drugs other than alcohol and marijuana were more likely to recidivate. This finding was not statistically significant. It would be also be interesting and useful to evaluate the prior criminal history of program participants which might help us understand the severity of program participants' criminal histories and whether or not prior criminal histories impact program completion and recidivism rates. For this study we were not able to access prior criminal history data.

As noted in the *Background and Introduction* section of the report after completing an initial draft of the report and discussing the findings with County and program staff we decided to include a comparison group comprised of all juveniles arrested for DWI in Bernalillo County during the study period (2001-2005) who did not participate in the AYUDA program. Statistically significantly more comparison group members were arrested for a new DWI during the study period when compared to AYUDA program participants. Though preliminary, this is an important and encouraging finding. Further research could focus on the use of a better matched comparison group.

<sup>1</sup>Center for Applied Research and Analysis, UNM, January 1996. Evaluation of the Albuquerque Target Cities Initiative: Analysis of Length of Stay Utilizing Event History Analysis Bernalillo County Detention Center AYUDA Program.

<sup>2</sup>Division of Government Research, UNM, 2005. Driving While Impaired New Mexico 2004.

<sup>3</sup>CESAR, University of Maryland, April 2006. Evaluation of DWI Screening Instruments Gives Highest Ratings to MacAndrew Alcoholism Scale (MAC) and Alcohol Use Inventory (AUI). Available online at <http://www.cesar.umd.edu/cesar/cesarfax/vol15/15-16.pdf>.

**Appendices**

**Appendix A: AYUDA Data Collection Form**

**Appendix B: Juvenile Probation and Parole Office Chronological History  
Data Collection Form**

**Appendix A**

**AYUDA Data Collection Form**

(88 = Don't Know, 99 = Missing)

**Booking Sheet Info**

Booking #: \_\_\_\_\_

Booking Date/Time: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

*Last*

*First*

*MI*

DOB: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

*Street*

*City*

*State*

*ZIP*

SS#: \_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_

School Attending: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade level: \_\_\_\_\_

School Status: \_\_\_\_\_

Dangerous Score: \_\_\_\_\_

*1=Attending*

*2=Dropped Out*

*3=Expelled*

*4=Graduated*

*5=GED*

Race: \_\_\_\_\_

*1=White (non-hispanic)*

*2=African American*

*3=American Indian*

*4=Hispanic*

*5=Asian*

*6=Other, specify: \_\_\_\_\_*

Sex: \_\_\_\_\_

*1=Male*

*2=Female*

Arrest Date/Time: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_

Custody Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

1=APD  
2=BCSO  
3=State Police  
4=Other, specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Detention Center Status: \_\_\_\_\_  
1= Released/Discharged  
2=Held

Most Serious Charge: \_\_\_\_\_

### DWI Community Monitoring Info

Eligible: \_\_\_\_\_ Refused: \_\_\_\_\_  
0=No 0=No  
1=Yes 1=Yes

Interview Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Parent or Guardian: \_\_\_\_\_  
1=Parent  
2=Guardian

Lawyer: \_\_\_\_\_

Caseworker: \_\_\_\_\_

JPO: \_\_\_\_\_

Discharge Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

### DWI Survey Info

Age of First Use (alcohol): \_\_\_\_\_ From Whom:  
\_\_\_\_\_

Age of First Use (drugs): \_\_\_\_\_ Substance:  
\_\_\_\_\_

# of times driven after drinking: \_\_\_\_\_ # of times driven drunk: \_\_\_\_\_

Pulled over while Drinking: \_\_\_\_\_ If Yes, # of Times: \_\_\_\_\_  
0=No  
1=Yes

Ease of obtaining alcohol: \_\_\_\_\_

Sources for Alcohol: \_\_\_\_\_

Employment: \_\_\_\_\_

Dependent/Non-dependent: \_\_\_\_\_

*1=Dependent*

*2=Non-dependent*

Date of First Session: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

# sessions attended: \_\_\_\_\_

Discharge Status: \_\_\_\_\_

*1=Successful Completion*

*2=Unsuccessful Discharge*

**Appendix B**

**Juvenile Probation and Parole Office  
Chronological History Data Collection Form**

Booking #: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Last

First

MI

DOB: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Case #: \_\_\_\_\_

Referral Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Incident Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Charge 1: \_\_\_\_\_ Degree1: \_\_\_\_\_ F/M1: \_\_\_\_\_

Cts1: \_\_\_\_\_

Charge 2: \_\_\_\_\_ Degree2: \_\_\_\_\_ F/M2: \_\_\_\_\_

Cts2: \_\_\_\_\_

Charge 3: \_\_\_\_\_ Degree3: \_\_\_\_\_ F/M3: \_\_\_\_\_

Cts3: \_\_\_\_\_

Charge 4: \_\_\_\_\_ Degree4: \_\_\_\_\_ F/M4: \_\_\_\_\_

Cts4: \_\_\_\_\_

PI Decision: \_\_\_\_\_ Decision Date:

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Petition #: \_\_\_\_\_ Filed Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Charge Disposition: \_\_\_\_\_ Disposition Date:

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Charge 1: \_\_\_\_\_

Charge 2: \_\_\_\_\_

Charge 3: \_\_\_\_\_

Charge 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Result: \_\_\_\_\_

Length: \_\_\_\_\_

Termination: \_\_\_\_\_

Termination Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

# of Violations: \_\_\_\_\_

# of Arrests: \_\_\_\_\_

Education: \_\_\_\_\_

Substance Use: \_\_\_\_\_

Education Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Substance Use Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_