

CR Sent  
4-29-88  
108798

**EVALUATION OF THE  
JUVENILE DELINQUENCY  
REDUCTION FUND PROGRAMS  
for the  
ARIZONA SUPREME COURT**

**FINAL REPORT  
JUNE 1986**

**NCJRS**

**JAN 22 1988**

**ACQUISITIONS**

108798

**Borcher & Borcher, Inc.**

**Vicki Romero & Associates**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . . ii

INTRODUCTION. . . . . 1

STUDY METHODOLOGY . . . . . 3

PERCEPTIONS OF THE SIX CONDITIONS OF ADJUSTMENT . . . . . 5

    Analysis of Parent Responses. . . . . 6

    Analysis of Program Effectiveness by Groups Other  
    Than Parents . . . . . 8

    Summary of the Perceptions Concerning the  
    Effectiveness of the Six Consequences. . . . . 9

SUMMARY OF PIC-ACT IMPLEMENTATION BY COUNTY . . . . . 11

ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR 1985 PIC-ACT PROGRAM . . . . . 14

    Demographic Characteristics of PIC-ACT Juveniles. . . 15

    Offenses of PIC-ACT Juveniles . . . . . 20

    Consequences of PIC-ACT Juveniles . . . . . 24

    Repeat Rate of PIC-ACT. . . . . 27

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . . 30

APPENDIX . . . . . 32

    Apache. . . . . 33

    Cochise . . . . . 39

    Coconino . . . . . 46

    Gila . . . . . 53

    Graham . . . . . 61

    Greenlee . . . . . 66

    La Paz . . . . . 72

    Maricopa . . . . . 79

    Mohave . . . . . 84

    Navajo . . . . . 89

    Pima . . . . . 94

    Pinal . . . . . 105

    Santa Cruz . . . . . 113

    Yavapai . . . . . 119

    Yuma . . . . . 127

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of the first biennial evaluation of the Juvenile Delinquency Reduction Fund Programs mandated by A.R.S. 8-230(E). The evaluation included the following three components: (1) Determination of how the programs are perceived in the community, (2) Determination of how the programs are being implemented in each county, and (3) Analysis of the database of program participants to determine whether program participation reduces the number of repetitive juvenile offenders.

Juvenile probation officers, school principals, law enforcement agencies and parents of juveniles who are or have been in the program were surveyed. All groups were asked if they think it is appropriate for first and second time juvenile offenders to receive consequences for their behavior. Over 83 percent of the respondents indicated that juveniles should always be assigned consequences. Sixteen percent responded that juveniles should sometimes be assigned consequences and less than one percent replied never.

Over 85 percent of the parents responded that the program consequences were appropriate and that they perceive the consequences will help to prevent further delinquent behavior by their child.

In 1985, 10,941 juveniles were adjusted state-wide through the PIC-ACT program; two-thirds were male and one-third were females. The racial/ethnic background of the juveniles in the program were about 70% White, 20% Hispanic, 5% Black, and 5% American Indian.

A total of 14,343 offenses were adjusted with 12,614 consequences during calendar year 1985. About half of the offenses were misdemeanors and about one-quarter were felonies. The remainder were for status offenses, violations of ordinances and similar offenses. State-wide the most frequent offense of juveniles in the program was Shoplifting.

The rate of repeat for first-time offenders who entered the program in 1985 and returned on a second offense before the end of the year varied from 7.5% in one county to 44.4% in another. Several factors, including the short time since implementation of the program, may affect the reliability of the rate.

Overall, the PIC-ACT program provides a lever for the court to insure that juveniles participate in programs which should reduce the possibility of a second offense. While it is unrealistic to expect that this program or any other program will eliminate juvenile delinquency, the PIC-ACT program seems to have the potential to reduce the number of repetitive juvenile offenders.

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Juvenile Delinquency Reduction Fund Programs mandated by A.R.S. 8-230(E) which states:

"The supreme court shall contract for a biennial evaluation to determine if the provisions of this article reduce the number of repetitive juvenile offenders."

The provisions of the article provide for the adjustment of delinquency complaints without filing a petition if the juvenile acknowledges responsibility for the delinquent act. Before adjusting the complaint, however, the juvenile probation officer must require the juvenile to comply with one or more of the following conditions:

1. Participation in unpaid community service work.
2. Participation in a counseling program approved by the court, which is designed to strengthen family relationships and to prevent repetitive juvenile delinquency.
3. Participation in an education program approved by the court, which has as its goal the prevention of further delinquent behavior.
4. Participation in an education program approved by the court, which is designed to deal with ancillary problems experienced by the juvenile such as alcohol or drug abuse.
5. Participation in a non-residential program of rehabilitation or supervision offered by the court, or offered by a community youth serving agency and approved by the court.
6. Payment of restitution to the victim of the delinquent act.

Funds to support the development of programs to be used as consequences in implementing this legislation were appropriated by the Arizona Legislature beginning in FY 1984-85. The Arizona Supreme Court distributes these funds to the various counties through the juvenile courts. The program has come to be known as the PIC-ACT Program (Progressively Increasing Consequences Act) and that designation is used in this report.

This evaluation included the following three components:

1. Determination of how the programs are perceived in the community.
2. Determination of how the programs are being implemented in each county.
3. Analysis of the database of program participants to determine whether program participation reduces the number of repetitive juvenile offenders.

This Final Report includes results of the evaluation for each of the three components. The first section of the Report explains the Study Methodology. The second section presents analysis of data collected on perceptions of the program and the third section presents a summary of the implementation of the program in the counties. The fourth section is the analysis of the program database and the final section includes a summary and recommendations.

## STUDY METHODOLOGY

Phase I - Documentation of the implementation of PIC-ACT programs in each county.

Interviews were conducted in each of the fifteen counties to obtain information about how the programs for adjusting delinquency complaints have been implemented. Interviews were conducted with the following persons:

1. Chief juvenile probation officer
2. Chief juvenile judge
3. County attorney or deputy with juvenile responsibilities
4. Representative of county sheriff's office
5. One or more representatives of local police departments

Based on the data from these interviews, profiles of the programs for each county were developed and are presented in this Report.

Phase II - Evaluation of the perceptions of the six conditions of adjustment throughout the state.

Questionnaires were developed and mailed to selected samples of targeted groups state-wide to determine perceptions of the effectiveness of the six conditions in reducing the number of repetitive juvenile offenders. The selected target groups were: juvenile probation officers, school principals, police departments, sheriff departments, and parents of juveniles who have been in the program.

Phase III - Analysis of the database concerning participants of the program who had delinquency complaints adjusted through PIC-ACT programs.

The Administrative Office of the Arizona Supreme Court has coordinated the development and implementation of a computerized database that includes all juveniles who have had delinquency complaints adjusted in all counties except Maricopa and Pima. Maricopa and Pima counties have their data on these juveniles on individual mainframe computer systems. Data from these three sources was analyzed to determine the number of juveniles who have been adjusted, the types of consequences imposed and, to the extent possible, the number of juveniles who were repetitive offenders.

The analysis was conducted using 1985 calendar year data, which was the first full year of data since implementation of the program. This time period was limited for assessing the full impact of the program in reducing the number of repetitive offenders. The second year data (calendar year 1986) will provide more extensive and conclusive data concerning the long-term impact of the program. Research studies on recidivism usually set 18 months as a minimum time in which no further crime has been committed as the standard for whether a client has become a repeat offender.

The evaluation was further limited in that no comparable data on repetitive rates for first and second offenders existed on a state-wide basis in Arizona prior to the implementation of the program. This lack of benchmark data precluded a direct comparison of recidivism rates before and after implementation of the program to determine the program's effectiveness in reducing the number of repetitive offenders. Since the program was implemented state-wide, there were no groups of comparable juveniles available who had not received PIC-ACT type consequences for first and second offenses that could be used for comparison.

The lack of comparative data sources along with the relative short period of implementation has required the evaluation to focus on formative evaluation (the degree of program implementation) and on attempting to develop benchmark repetitive rates for the first and second offenders who received PIC-ACT consequences. The second biennial evaluation to be conducted in two years will have a more extensive database available that will provide a more accurate source for computing recidivism rates. This time period will allow for using an eighteen month period for computing the recidivism rates.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE SIX CONDITIONS OF ADJUSTMENT

A major objective of this Evaluation was to determine the perceptions of those people who work with and are affected directly by the program. Specifically, they were surveyed to determine if they perceive that the program is successful in contributing to a reduction in the number of repetitive juvenile offenders. The targeted groups surveyed were:

1. Juvenile probation officers
2. School principals
3. Law enforcement agencies (police and sheriff)
4. Parents of juveniles who are or have been in the program

Table 1 presents the number of survey questionnaires sent by group and the number and percent of response.

Table 1  
Response Rate by Targeted Group

Target Group	Number in Sample	Number Returned	Percent of Response
Juvenile Probation Officers	286	197	68.8%
Law Enforcement Agencies	86	57	66.3%
School Principals	301	216	71.2%
Parents	1803	496	27.5%
	====	===	=====
Total	2476	966	39.0%

Some of the questions were the same for all groups and others were specific to each targeted population. The questionnaires for the sheriffs' departments and the police departments were the same.

All groups were asked if they think it is appropriate for first and second time juvenile offenders who commit crimes to receive consequences for their behavior. The results for this question are presented in Table 2. Over 83 percent of the respondents indicated that juveniles should always be assigned consequences. Sixteen percent responded that juveniles should sometimes be assigned consequences and less than one percent replied never.

Table 2  
Appropriateness of Consequences by Respondent Group

Respondent Group	Should Juveniles Receive Consequences?							
	Always		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parents	411	82.9	84	16.9	1	0.2	496	100
Law Enforcement Agencies	47	82.5	10	17.5	0	0.0	57	100
School Principals	194	90.2	21	9.8	0	0.0	215	100
Juvenile Probation Officers	153	78.9	40	20.6	1	0.5	194	100
	===	====	===	====	=	===	===	===
Total	806	83.7	155	16.1	2	0.2	963	100

### Analysis of Parent Responses

The remainder of the questions on the parent questionnaire were different than for the other targeted groups. This section summarizes the results of the remainder of the parents' responses.

Table 3 presents the types of consequences in which the responding parents indicated their child had participated. The largest reported participation was in community service work (77.2 percent). It should be noted that the total is greater than 100 percent as some parents reported that their child was involved in more than one consequence. This is a valid response as many juveniles have been assigned multiple consequences by the juvenile probation officers.

Table 3

## Types of Juvenile Consequences as Reported by Parents

Type of Consequence	Number	Percent
Community Service Work	383	77.2
Counseling	76	15.3
Prevention Education	61	12.3
Restitution	57	11.5
Non-residential Treatment	24	4.8
Substance Abuse Counseling	22	4.4
	===	=====
Total	623	125.5

Note: Percentages are computed based on 496 responses

The parents were asked three questions concerning their opinion as to whether the program experience(s) were appropriate and if they will help their child avoid illegal activities in the future. The responses to these questions are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

## Summary of Responses by Parents Concerning Consequences

Question	Yes		No		No Resp.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Do you feel the program(s) your child participated in helped him/her to understand the responsibility for the consequences of his/her act?	437	88.1	51	10.3	8	1.6
Was the penalty or consequence your child received appropriate for the crime committed?	425	85.7	62	12.5	9	1.8
Do you think the consequence your child received will help him/her avoid further involvement in illegal activities?	432	87.1	50	10.1	14	2.8

Over 85 percent of the parents responded that the program consequences were appropriate and that they believe the consequences will help to prevent further delinquent behavior by their child.

#### Analysis of Program Effectiveness by Groups Other Than Parents

All groups but the parents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the six types of consequences in reducing the number of repetitive juvenile offenders. The results of the ratings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Percent of Probation Officers, Law Enforcement Agencies and School Principals Rating the Consequences Effective or Very Effective

Consequence	Percent of Respondents		
	Juvenile Probation Officers	Law Enforcement Agencies	School Principals
Community Service Work	81.6	86.0	71.3
Restitution	76.6	82.5	76.4
Counseling	76.5	70.2	63.9
Prevention Education	55.6	61.4	57.4
Substance Abuse Counseling	56.2	54.4	64.8
Non-residential Treatment	44.4	33.4	43.1

Over one-half of the respondents rated five of the six consequences as effective or very effective in reducing the number of repetitive juvenile offenders. Non-residential treatment was the lowest rated consequence.

The results of the ratings were used to rank the consequences by group and then to compute a combined group ranking of the consequences. The results of each group and the combined ranking are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Ranking of the Effectiveness of the Six Program Consequences  
by Probation Officers, Law Enforcement Agencies  
and School Principals

Consequence	Ranking by Group			
	Combined Groups	Juvenile Probation Officers	Law Enforcement Agencies	School Principals
Community Service Work	1	1	1	2
Restitution	2	2	2	1
Counseling	3	3	3	4
Prevention Education	4.5	4	4	5
Substance Abuse Counseling	4.5	5	5	3
Non-residential Treatment	6	6	6	6

The juvenile probation officers and the law enforcement agencies rankings are identical with community service work and restitution as the highest ranked consequences. Counseling programs were ranked third by these two groups. The ranking by the school principals was slightly different in that they ranked substance abuse counseling more effective than the other two groups.

#### Summary of Perceptions Concerning the Effectiveness of the Six Consequences

The survey of various groups associated with the program provides useful information concerning the potential success of the program. The parents of juveniles in the program, school principals, law enforcement agencies and juvenile probation officers all agree that consequences for first and second time offenders is appropriate. This type of support should help to ensure the success of the program.

The responses of the parents also support the program because the majority feel that the penalty or consequences assigned to their children are appropriate. This would indicate that the juvenile probation officers are objectively and fairly imposing consequences.

The rating of the effectiveness of the six consequences by the juvenile probation officers, law enforcement agencies and school principals reflects the degree of program implementation in each of the fifteen counties. All counties have implemented community service work and restitution as consequences. These two were ranked the most effective by all three groups.

## SUMMARY OF PIC-ACT IMPLEMENTATION BY COUNTY

This section of summarizes the implementation of PIC-ACT in the counties. Table 7 shows a state-wide summary of PIC-ACT programs in each county. In many instances, the consequences were being used prior to implementation of PIC-ACT. In some cases, they were only used for adjudicated youth prior to PIC-ACT. Many counties have expanded their existing programs or added new programs since PIC-ACT was implemented.

The following are definitions for entries for Table 7:

Existed Prior\*\*-Indicates that the county operated this program prior to PIC-ACT for adjudicated and non-adjudicated youth and is now using the program as a PIC-ACT consequence.

Existed Prior, Adjudicated Only - Indicates the county operated this program prior to PIC-ACT only for adjudicated youth and has now expanded the program to include PIC-ACT juveniles.

Expanded-Indicates county has expanded existing program for non-adjudicated youth. The prior number of programs and the current programs are indicated.

New-Indicates that this program was added with the implementation of PIC-ACT.

None-Indicates that this program did not exist prior to PIC-ACT and has not been implemented as a PIC-ACT consequence.

Detailed profiles of the implementation of PIC-ACT programs in each county are in the Appendix of this report. Information for the profiles was gathered during interviews in each county and drafts of the individual profiles have been reviewed by representatives of local juvenile probation offices.

\*\*Note: Although the consequence existed prior to PIC-ACT, the extent of use, implementation, and follow-through may have increased since PIC-ACT.

Table 7

## Summary of PIC-ACT Implementation by County

County	Community Service Work	Restitution	Counseling
Apache	New	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	Existed Prior
Cochise	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only
Coconino	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	Existed Prior	Existed Prior 2 Programs
Gila	Existed Prior	Existed Prior	Expanded 2 to 3 Programs
Graham	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	Existed Prior
Greenlee	Existed Prior	Existed Prior	Existed Prior
La Paz	Existed Prior	Existed Prior	Existed Prior
Maricopa	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	Existed Prior	Existed Prior
Mohave	Existed Prior	Existed Prior	Existed Prior
Navajo	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	New	Existed Prior
Pima	Expanded 2 to 3 Programs	Existed Prior	Expanded 3 to 4 Programs
Pinal	Existed Prior	Existed Prior 2 Programs	Existed Prior
Santa Cruz	Existed Prior Adjudicated Only	New	Existed Prior
Yavapai	Existed Prior	Existed Prior	Existed Prior
Yuma	Existed Prior	Existed Prior	Existed Prior 2 Programs

Note: Although a consequence existed prior to PIC-ACT, the extent of use, implementation, and follow-through may have increased since PIC-ACT.

Table 7 (Continued)  
 Summary of PIC-ACT Implementation by County

County	Prevention Education	Substance Abuse Education	Non-residential Treatment
Apache	New	New	None
Cochise	New	New	Existed Prior
Coconino	New	New	New
Gila	New	Existed Prior	Existed Prior
Graham	New	None	None
Greenlee	None	New	Existed Prior
La Paz	New	New	Existed Prior
Maricopa	None	New	None
Mohave	None	None	Existed Prior
Navajo	None	None	Existed Prior
Pima	Existed Prior	New	Expanded 1 to 3 Programs
Pinal	New	New	New
Santa Cruz	New	None	New
Yavapai	New	Existed Prior	Existed Prior
Yuma	Existed Prior	Existed Prior	Existed Prior

Note: Although a consequence existed prior to PIC-ACT, the extent of use, implementation, and follow-through may have increased since PIC-ACT.

## ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR 1985 PIC-ACT PROGRAM

Maricopa and Pima Counties were already automated on mainframe computers prior to the implementation of PIC-ACT programs on July 1, 1984. Part of the implementation of PIC-ACT included the installation of an automated database in each of the other thirteen counties. Uniform microcomputer systems with hard disks and data base management software were purchased for each of these counties.

Each of the thirteen counties implementing the microcomputer systems were provided extensive training by the Supreme Court administrative staff. This training was to help insure uniform and timely installation of the systems. The targeted date for total implementation of the systems in all counties was January 1, 1985. This schedule was to allow time for staff to become familiar with the system and to input the data concerning juveniles who entered the system since July 1, 1984.

The data for the analysis of PIC-ACT participants was down-loaded from each of the fifteen county data systems. Copies of the databases from the thirteen rural counties using the microcomputer systems were collected on floppy disks by the Administrative Office of the Supreme Court. Magnetic tape copies of the relevant data items were obtained from Pima and Maricopa counties.

The data utilized in the analysis was limited to the 1985 calendar year for the following reasons:

- None of the counties had fully implemented the total PIC-ACT program for the first six months of the 1984/85 fiscal year. It was felt that the programs should be implemented as fully as possible prior to the use of the data for evaluation.
- Due to the rapid implementation of the microcomputer databases, the data for the first six months of the fiscal year was not complete or consistent among the counties.
- It was felt that enough time should be allowed for a sufficient number of juveniles to complete some of the PIC-ACT consequences before the data was analyzed.

Based on the above limitations and the need for adequate time to obtain copies of the data files and to evaluate the consistency of data coding, the administrative staff of the Supreme Court agreed that the database for analysis would be for the calendar year 1985.

## Demographic Characteristics of PIC-ACT Juveniles

The total population of 1985 PIC-ACT juveniles was analyzed. Table 8 presents the total unduplicated number of PIC-ACT program participants by county and sex. A total of 10,941 juveniles were involved in PIC-Act programs in 1985. Males outnumbered females in the programs two to one on a state-wide basis.

Greenlee (86.4%), Santa Cruz (85.7%), La Paz (81.5%) and Yuma (80.3%) counties had over 80 percent males in the programs in 1985. Pima (37.5%), Maricopa (32.0%) and Navajo (31.5%) had the highest portion of females in their programs.

The age distribution of the 1985 participants is displayed in Table 9. The most frequent age of participants was 15 years followed by 16 years and 17 years. There is a marked increase between 12 and 13 years on a state-wide basis.

The racial/ethnic backgrounds of the participants are presented in Table 10. Almost seventy percent of the participants on a state-wide basis were white, twenty percent hispanic, and blacks, American Indians and orientals composed less than ten percent of the total participants.

A comparison of the unduplicated juveniles, total offenses, and total consequences for the 1985 are presented in Table 11. The purpose of this comparison is to document that more than one offense is often included in each referral of a juvenile. Each juvenile in the program state-wide had approximately 1.3 offenses adjusted.

A state-wide average of 1.2 consequences were assigned to each of the juveniles in program. Because of these factors it was impossible to relate the type of consequence assigned to the type of offense for which the juvenile was referred.

Table 8

## Sex of Juveniles in 1985 PIC-ACT Program

County		Male	Female	Total
Apache	N	105	30	135
	%	77.8	22.2	
Cochise	N	341	93	434
	%	78.6	21.4	
Coconino	N	166	53	219
	%	75.8	24.2	
Gila	N	150	49	199
	%	75.4	24.6	
Graham	N	49	20	69
	%	71.0	29.0	
Greenlee	N	51	8	59
	%	86.4	13.6	
La Paz	N	22	5	27
	%	81.5	18.5	
Maricopa	N	3658	1725	5383
	%	67.9	32.1	
Mohave	N	142	31	173
	%	82.1	17.9	
Navajo	N	172	79	251
	%	68.5	31.5	
Pima	N	1761	1056	2817
	%	62.5	37.5	
Pinal	N	262	81	343
	%	76.4	23.6	
Santa Cruz	N	48	8	56
	%	85.7	14.3	
Yavapai	N	359	138	497
	%	72.2	27.8	
Yuma	N	224	55	279
	%	80.3	19.7	
State Total	N	7510	3431	10941
	%	68.6	31.4	

Note: Maricopa County data did not include juveniles assigned to PIC-ACT programs who turned 18 in 1985.

Table 9

## Age of Juveniles in 1985 PIC-ACT Program

County		8 and Under	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18 and over	Un-known	Total
Apache	N	1	2	4	5	9	12	18	24	22	25	10	3	135
	%	0.7	1.5	3.0	3.7	6.7	8.9	13.3	17.8	16.3	18.5	7.4	2.2	
Cochise	N	6	4	11	15	34	45	67	75	86	58	30	3	434
	%	1.4	0.9	2.5	3.5	7.8	10.4	15.4	17.3	19.8	13.4	6.9	0.7	
Coconino	N	2	5	15	13	18	17	27	41	37	29	14	1	219
	%	0.9	2.3	6.8	5.9	8.2	7.8	12.3	18.7	16.9	13.2	6.4	0.50	
Gila	N	0	0	8	4	19	18	26	35	39	31	13	6	199
	%	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	9.5	9.0	13.1	17.6	19.6	15.6	6.5	3.0	
Graham	N	0	1	0	4	4	4	13	15	10	13	5	0	69
	%	0.0	1.4	0.0	5.8	5.8	5.8	18.8	21.7	14.5	18.8	7.2	0.0	
Greenlee	N	0	0	2	0	2	7	11	10	12	9	6	0	59
	%	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	3.4	11.9	18.6	16.9	20.3	15.3	10.2	0.0	
La Paz	N	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	5	7	3	2	1	27
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	25.9	18.5	25.9	11.1	7.4	3.7	
Maricopa	N	11	63	132	201	299	548	874	1112	1089	1054	0	0	5383
	%	0.2	1.2	2.5	3.7	5.6	10.2	16.2	20.7	20.2	19.6	0.0	0.0	
Mohave	N	0	2	4	6	9	14	22	35	29	34	16	2	173
	%	0.0	1.2	2.3	3.5	5.2	8.1	12.7	20.2	16.8	19.7	9.2	1.2	
Navajo	N	4	5	2	15	11	25	42	44	38	38	12	15	251
	%	1.6	2.0	0.8	6.0	4.4	10.0	16.7	17.5	15.1	15.1	4.8	6.0	
Pima	N	17	29	61	79	136	301	459	558	509	479	189	0	2817
	%	0.6	1.0	2.2	2.8	4.8	10.7	16.3	19.8	18.1	17.0	6.7	0.0	
Pinal	N	5	10	14	17	37	45	55	56	56	43	5	0	343
	%	1.5	2.9	4.1	5.0	10.8	13.1	16.0	16.3	16.3	12.5	1.5	0.0	
Santa Cruz	N	0	1	0	3	2	2	11	14	7	6	8	2	56
	%	0.0	1.8	0.0	5.4	3.6	3.6	19.6	25.0	12.5	10.7	14.3	3.6	
Yavapai	N	3	9	10	21	37	56	73	101	87	74	21	5	497
	%	0.6	1.8	2.0	4.2	7.4	11.3	14.7	20.3	17.5	14.9	4.2	1.0	
Yuma	N	1	2	6	8	15	24	44	44	51	51	25	8	279
	%	0.4	0.7	2.2	2.9	5.4	8.6	15.8	15.8	18.3	18.3	9.0	2.9	
State Total	N	50	133	269	391	634	1118	1749	2169	2079	1947	356	46	10941
	%	0.5	1.2	2.5	3.6	5.8	10.2	16.0	19.7	19.0	17.8	3.3	0.4	

Note: Maricopa County data did not include juveniles assigned to PIC-ACT programs who turned 18 in 1985.

Table 10

## Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds of Juveniles in 1985 PIC-ACT

		White	Hispanic	Black	American Indian	Oriental	Unknown	Total
Apache	N	87	12	0	33	3	0	135
	%	64.0	8.9	0.0	24.4	2.2	0.0	
Cochise	N	293	117	17	2	5	0	434
	%	67.5	27.0	3.9	0.5	1.2	0.0	
Coconino	N	124	13	3	79	0	0	219
	%	56.6	5.9	1.4	36.1	0.0	0.0	
Gila	N	148	41	2	5	0	3	199
	%	74.4	20.6	1.0	2.5	0.0	1.5	
Graham	N	31	32	1	5	0	0	69
	%	44.9	46.4	1.4	7.2	0.0	0.0	
Greenlee	N	29	29	0	1	0	0	59
	%	49.2	49.2	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	
La Paz	N	18	6	2	1	0	0	27
	%	66.7	22.2	7.4	3.7	0.0	0.0	
Maricopa	N	4008	809	337	148	33	48	5383
	%	74.5	15.0	6.3	2.7	0.6	0.9	
Mohave	N	165	2	0	6	0	0	173
	%	95.4	1.2	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	
Navajo	N	127	23	7	92	0	2	251
	%	50.6	9.2	2.8	36.7	0.0	0.8	
Pima	N	1767	825	133	57	27	8	2817
	%	62.7	29.3	4.7	2.0	1.0	0.3	
Pinal	N	197	97	14	35	0	0	343
	%	57.4	28.3	4.1	10.2	0.0	0.0	
Santa Cruz	N	26	30	0	0	0	0	56
	%	46.4	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Yavapai	N	447	32	2	16	0	0	497
	%	89.9	6.4	0.4	3.2	0.0	0.0	
Yuma	N	133	126	9	9	2	0	279
	%	47.7	45.2	3.2	3.2	0.7	0.0	
		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
State Total	N	7600	2194	527	489	70	61	10941
	%	69.5	20.1	4.8	4.5	0.6	0.5	

Note: Maricopa County data did not include juveniles assigned to PIC-ACT programs who turned 18 in 1985.

Table 11

Comparison of Unduplicated Juveniles, Total Offenses,  
and Total Consequences for the 1985 PIC-ACT Program

County	Total Unduplicated Juveniles	Total Offenses	Total Consequences
Apache	135	167	177
Cochise	434	602	498
Coconino	219	220	239
Gila	199	255	253
Graham	69	83	84
Greenlee	59	70	110
La Paz	27	37	97
Maricopa	5383	6350	6203
Mohave	173	224	221
Navajo	251	276	277
Pima	2817	4128	2870
Pinal	343	530	409
Santa Cruz	56	88	107
Yavapai	497	676	668
Yuma	279	637	401
	=====	=====	=====
State Total	10941	14343	12614

Note: Maricopa County data did not include juveniles assigned to PIC-ACT programs who turned 18 in 1985.

## Offenses of PIC-ACT Juveniles

Table 12 shows the offenses of juveniles assigned to the PIC-ACT program by class of offense for each county. This Table includes a duplicated count of offenses because frequently juveniles were assigned to the program for more than one offense. Because of differences in recordkeeping practices among the counties, comparisons among counties may not be appropriate.

Misdemeanor offenses accounted for just over half of the total number of offenses for which juveniles were adjusted in the PIC-ACT program. About one-fourth of the offenses for which juveniles were assigned to the program were felony offenses.

Although probation officials are required to forward all felony offenses to the County Attorney for review and possible prosecution, the County Attorney has the option to return the case to the Probation Department for adjustment. For example, in the case of criminal damage, the decision may be that participation in one or more components, perhaps restitution and community work service, of the PIC-ACT program may better serve the interests of the court system, the juvenile and the victim.

The Other category (20.6%) included status offenses, violations of ordinances and similar offenses.

State-wide, a total of 14,343 individual offenses were adjusted through the PIC-ACT program in 1985. The largest number was in Maricopa County and the smallest number was in La Paz County.

Table 12

## Class of Offense Adjusted Through PIC-ACT in 1985

County		Misdemeanor	Felony	Other	Total
Apache	N	53	62	52	167
	%	31.7	37.1	31.2	
Cochise	N	378	160	64	602
	%	62.8	26.5	10.7	
Coconino	N	125	51	44	220
	%	56.8	23.2	20.0	
Gila	N	103	77	75	255
	%	40.4	30.2	29.4	
Graham	N	46	3	34	83
	%	55.4	3.6	41.0	
Greenlee	N	24	6	40	70
	%	34.3	8.6	57.1	
La Paz	N	7	16	14	37
	%	18.9	43.3	37.8	
Maricopa	N	4100	1358	892	6350
	%	64.6	21.4	14.0	
Mohave	N	100	107	17	224
	%	44.6	47.8	7.6	
Navajo	N	148	73	55	276
	%	53.6	26.4	20.0	
Pima	N	1803	1033	1292	4128
	%	43.7	25.0	31.3	
Pinal	N	296	181	53	530
	%	55.8	34.2	10.0	
Santa Cruz	N	48	20	20	88
	%	54.6	22.7	22.7	
Yavapai	N	367	181	128	676
	%	54.3	26.8	18.9	
Yuma	N	311	157	169	637
	%	48.8	24.6	26.6	
STATE TOTAL	N	7909	3485	2949	14343
	%	55.1	24.3	20.6	

Note: Maricopa County data did not include juveniles assigned to PIC-ACT programs who turned 18 in 1985.

Table 13 presents a rank-ordered list of the offenses for which more than 100 juveniles state-wide were assigned to the PIC-ACT Program. A total of 187 different offense codes were included in the database as the offenses for which juveniles were assigned to the program.

Shoplifting (2303) accounted for about one-fourth of all offenses state-wide for which juveniles were assigned to the program. The second most frequent offense, Runaway, (6001) accounted for only about 5% of the total offenses.

Closer analysis of types of offenses included in the list shows that Theft, Runaway, and Marijuana offense groups were the largest groups following Shoplifting, however, none of these groups accounted for more than 10% of the total offenses.

Table 13

Rank-ordered List of Most Frequent Offenses  
of PIC-ACT Juveniles State-wide

Offense Code	Offense Name
2303	Shoplifting
6001	Runaway
2391	Theft, less than \$100
1313	Assault-Simple
5315	Loitering-Drugs
3562	Marijuana-Possess
2294	Burglary, Commercial
3567	Marijuana
2900	Damage Property
4104	Liquor
5790	Criminal Trespass-3rd degree
2995	Criminal Damage over \$100
5311	Disorderly Conduct
2300*	Theft-General/Theft over \$100
6002	Incorrigible Offense
2996	Criminal Damage-Petty
5700	Invasion of Privacy
2200	Burglary-General
0014	Runaway-Within the County
0012	Truancy-Habitually from School
4100*	Liquor and/or False Information to Police
5300	Public Peace/Against Public Order
2291	Burglary of Residence
4803	False Report-Give
3500	Dangerous Drugs/Narcotics
2317*	Theft, under \$100
3564	Marijuana-Other
2396	Theft-\$100-\$250
5313	Curfew
5792	Criminal Trespass-Residence
5791	Criminal Trespass-2nd degree
6003	Vagrancy

\*Inconsistencies due to lack of uniformity in offense codes used by the various counties.

## Consequences of PIC-ACT Juveniles

The statute provides for six consequences which are to be used to adjust juvenile offenders assigned to the PIC-ACT program. The consequences are community service work, restitution, counseling, prevention education, substance abuse education, and non-residential treatment. Frequently, juveniles are assigned to more than one of the six consequences for one offense or a group of offenses associated with a referral to the juvenile court.

Each county operates programs through the juvenile probation department which are used as consequences. The types of programs available in each county are included on Table 7 in this Report and detailed information about the individual programs in each county are included in the Appendix to this Report. Some counties have more than one program in some categories; others have no programs in some of the categories.

Table 14 shows the total number of consequences to which PIC-ACT juveniles were assigned in the 1985 calendar year. The number exceeds the total number of juveniles who participated in the program because juveniles may be assigned to more than one program. In addition, some juveniles committed subsequent offenses for which additional consequences were imposed. It is important to note that coding practices differed among counties and in some cases, the data for participation in some programs could not be included in the analysis.

Community service work was the most frequently assigned consequence. Nearly 62% of all individual consequences assigned were community service work and it was the most frequently used consequence in all counties. The second largest program was counseling, however, it accounted for a much smaller percentage of the total consequences assigned. These two programs were the only ones for which the database reflected use in all counties. However, restitution was actually used by all the counties. Greenlee County coded restitution with the work program because the Court pays juveniles who owe restitution for their community service work and the money earned compensates victims.

The Other (1.1%) category included a small number of fines which were not on the list of consequences for the period of this evaluation but which were added as a seventh consequence in the most recent legislative session. Also included in the Other category were donations. Home service, a way of assigning work to very young juveniles in one county, was included in the Other category. Also included in this group were license suspensions, essays and sentences, and other consequences which were not directly referenced in the statute.

Nearly 10% of the consequences assigned were in the area of substance abuse education. Prevention education, which included first offender programs and shoplifting programs, accounted for about 5% of all consequences assigned. It should be noted that

about 5% of all consequences assigned. It should be noted that some counties operate parent effectiveness training in this category but, in some cases, since only parents participate it was not coded in the database. Non-residential treatment was used the least as a consequence and accounted for only 2.5% of all of the consequences assigned.

A total of 12,614 consequences were assigned to juveniles during the 1985 calendar year.

Table 14

## Consequences Assigned for PIC-ACT Adjustments in 1985

County	Community		Counseling	Prevention	Substance	Non-Residential	Other	TOTAL
	Work	Restitution		Education	Abuse Ed			
Apache	N	108	11	53	0	0	5	177
	%	61.0	6.2	30.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	
Cochise	N	343	51	74	14	6	10	498
	%	68.9	10.2	14.9	2.8	1.2	2.0	
Coconino	N	121	20	12	58	0	25	239
	%	50.5	8.4	5.0	24.0	0.0	10.5	
Gila	N	151	8	34			38	253
	%	59.7	3.2	13.4	0.0	0.0	15.0	8.7
Graham	N	37	4	6	37	0	0	84
	%	44.0	4.9	7.1	44.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Greenlee	N	56	0	11	0	43	0	110
	%	50.9	0.0	10.0	0.0	39.1	0.0	0.0
La Paz	N	35	5	6	25	0	26	97
	%	36.1	5.1	6.2	25.8	0.0	26.8	
Maricopa	N	4574	212	447	0	848	122	6203
	%	73.7	3.4	7.2	0.0	13.7	2.0	0.0
Mohave	N	219	0	0	0	0	2	221
	%	99.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0
Navajo	N	216	12	36	0	5	8	277
	%	78.0	4.3	13.0	0.0	1.8	2.9	0.0
Pima	N	1287	324	708	311	186	54	2870
	%	44.8	11.3	24.7	10.8	6.5	1.9	0.0
Pinal	N	82	61	122	73	38	33	409
	%	20.0	14.9	29.8	17.9	9.3	8.1	0.0
Santa Cruz	N	53	5	49	0	0	0	107
	%	49.5	4.7	45.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Yavapai	N	268	72	141	62	63	24	668
	%	40.1	10.8	21.1	9.3	9.4	3.6	5.7
Yuma	N	263	4	3	30	62	27	401
	%	65.6	1.0	0.7	7.5	15.5	6.7	3.0
STATE	N	7813	789	1702	610	1251	311	12614
TOTAL	%	61.9	6.3	13.5	4.8	9.9	2.5	1.1

Note: Maricopa County data did not include juveniles assigned to PIC-ACT programs who turned 18 in 1985.

## Repeat Rate of PIC-ACT Juveniles

In order to examine the number of juveniles who committed offenses subsequent to participation in the PIC-ACT program, all first offenders who were assigned to the PIC-ACT program during calendar year 1985 were identified. Then, their subsequent contacts with the juvenile court system were examined, whether or not they resulted in another assignment to the PIC-ACT program. No attempt was made to examine the amount of time between the first offense and/or assignment to the PIC-ACT program because the timeframe for the study was too short to make such an analysis feasible.

Because recidivism rates can only grow with the amount of time between the initial offense and the point at which analysis is undertaken, the recidivism rates reported for this group of juveniles will not drop below those reported. However, the actual impact of the program will be shown over time if the rates become stable and do not continue to increase.

The data presented in Table 15, with the exception of Maricopa County, includes only repeat offenses during calendar year 1985. The Maricopa data also includes data for the first five months of 1986.

It should be recognized that full implementation of the program in some counties was not accomplished until the latter part of 1985. Therefore, the period of time between assignment of the juvenile to the program and the end of the data collection period was shorter than in other counties where the program was implemented sooner. This fact could have the effect of showing a lower rate of repeat in counties who implemented the program later because juveniles who were assigned to the program early in the year had a longer period of time in which to commit a subsequent offense.

Table 15 shows the number of first offenders in the PIC-ACT program who repeated during the 1985 calendar year. The first column shows the total number of individual juveniles in the county who entered the system in 1985 and were assigned to the PIC-ACT program. The second column shows how many of that group committed a second offense and the percentage indicates the proportion of the original group who committed a second offense. The third column shows how many of the original group committed a third offense and so on. Data on the Table was limited to the the first five contacts but in a small percentage of the cases juveniles had more than five contacts during the year. The largest number of contacts reported for the year was eleven.

The highest repeat rate was in La Paz County (44.4%) and the lowest repeat rate was in Gila County (7.5%).

Table 15

Number of First Offenders in the PIC-ACT Program Who  
Repeated During the 1985 Calendar Year

		Number of Contacts				
		1	2	3	4	5
Apache	N	124	19	5	3	1
	%	100.0	15.3	4.0	2.4	0.8
Cochise	N	335	70	19	10	6
	%	100.0	20.9	5.7	3.0	1.8
Coconino*	N	*	*	*	*	*
	%	*	*	*	*	*
Gila	N	147	11	2	1	0
	%	100.0	7.5	1.4	0.7	0.0
Graham	N	68	16	4	1	0
	%	100.0	23.5	5.9	1.4	0.0
Greenlee	N	59	20	6	1	0
	%	100.0	33.9	10.2	1.7	0.0
La Paz	N	27	12	5	3	2
	%	100.0	44.4	18.5	11.1	7.4
Maricopa**	N	4409	1084	373	161	82
	%	100.0	24.6	8.5	3.7	1.8
Mohave	N	145	30	8	5	0
	%	100.0	20.7	5.5	3.4	0.0
Navajo	N	223	41	15	4	2
	%	100.0	18.4	6.7	1.8	0.9
Pima	N	2734	318	79	28	11
	%	100.0	11.6	2.9	1.0	0.4
Pinal	N	334	71	27	8	5
	%	100.0	21.3	8.1	2.4	1.5
Santa Cruz	N	55	13	4	1	0
	%	100.0	23.6	7.3	1.8	0.0
Yavapai	N	362	62	17	8	2
	%	100.0	17.1	4.7	2.2	0.6
Yuma	N	150	27	14	8	5
	%	100.0	18.0	9.3	5.3	3.3

See notes for Coconino and Maricopa counties on following page.

\*The majority of records in the database for Coconino County did not contain contact numbers.

\*\*Data for Maricopa County includes juveniles who had repeated through May of 1986 but does not include juveniles assigned to PIC-ACT programs who turned 18 in 1985.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The reduction of juvenile crime has the potential to decrease the number of adult offenders because most begin committing crimes in their teenage years. If programs can be developed, implemented and shown to break the cycle of juvenile crime, the goal of the criminal justice system to protect the public can be better served. In addition, since juvenile delinquency and poor academic achievement are usually related, it should follow that reducing the juvenile crime rate should help at-risk juveniles stay in school and ultimately become productive citizens.

The PIC-ACT program is designed to provide first and second-time juvenile offenders who have committed minor crimes with an early introduction into the criminal justice system. The hope is that this early contact will deter further offenses. In reality, a large portion of these youth would be unlikely to return to the system, even with no intervention.

However, some juveniles are just beginning what could become a cycle of repeat offenses that ultimately results in incarceration as an adult. For this group, early entry into the criminal justice system allows for earlier treatment and rehabilitation. Since the effect of treatment is usually greater if it is begun while the youth is still in his/her formative years, this fact alone supports the value of the PIC-ACT program.

### Summary

The concept of taking responsibility for criminal actions is central to the PIC-ACT program. All programs used as consequences are meant to assist the youth in avoiding further criminal behavior while demonstrating the power of the court system in forcing compliance with the law. This balance between rehabilitative and punitive approaches to juvenile justice appears to be supported by all groups surveyed during this evaluation.

Juvenile probation officers, school principals, law enforcement agencies and parents of juveniles who were involved in the program were asked if they think it is appropriate for first and second time juvenile offenders to receive consequences for their behavior. Over 83 percent of the respondents indicated that juveniles should always be assigned consequences. Sixteen percent responded that juveniles should sometimes be assigned consequences and less than one percent replied never.

All groups asked to rate the effectiveness of the six consequences rated community service work and restitution as the most effective in reducing the rate of repetitive juvenile offenders. The community service work programs and restitution programs are especially meant to force the offending youth to accept responsibility for their own actions and to recognize the obligation citizens have to fellow citizens and the community. These two programs are slightly more punitive than the others, however over 85 percent of the parents responded that the program consequences were appropriate. They also believe the consequences will help to prevent further delinquent behavior by their child.

The work program operates in all counties and most juveniles are assigned to it, frequently with one or more other programs. Restitution is assessed by all counties when it is appropriate. The work program provides a way of making the juvenile personally "pay" for the crime with his/her work. The restitution programs ordinarily encourage youth to earn the money necessary to restore the victim rather than the parents taking the ultimate responsibility for payment.

### Conclusions

Although it is too early to accurately measure the impact of the program by recidivism rates, it is clear that many juveniles have been introduced into the juvenile court system and have been assigned consequences through the PIC-ACT program. However, the evaluation supported the following:

- All counties have implemented the PIC-ACT program.
- The consequences utilized by the counties appear to:
  - Meet the needs of juveniles served
  - Are consistent with the judicial philosophies of the communities served
- The program provides a cost-effective way of introducing a large number of juveniles to the criminal justice system.
- The consequences used by the counties provide juveniles with both rehabilitative and punitive consequences designed to reduce the probability of repeat offenses.

Overall, the PIC-ACT program provides a lever for the court to ensure that juveniles participate in programs which should assist them in avoiding further criminal activities. While it is unrealistic to expect that this program or any other program will eliminate juvenile delinquency, the PIC-ACT program seems to have the potential to reduce the number of repetitive juvenile offenders.

**APPENDIX**

**COUNTY IMPLEMENTATION SUMMARIES**

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN APACHE COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Apache County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse, restitution and counseling services for juveniles and their families. The work and education programs were not available for adjudicated or non-adjudicated juveniles in Apache County prior to the PIC-ACT. The services of a full-time family counselor were also added with the PIC-ACT. The counseling program and the restitution program were available before the PIC-ACT.

Because of the County's wide geographical dispersion of population, various components of the PIC-ACT program are offered in St. Johns, Springerville-Eagar-Round Valley and Chinle.

Apache County has experienced an increase in juvenile referrals since the inception of the PIC-ACT. Superior Court staff and law enforcement personnel attribute the increase to the community's improved perception of follow-through by the probation office. An additional probation officer position has allowed for more time in the field and the community work service program has been visible, especially to police officers and sheriff's deputies.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$55,322.00	\$57,180.00
Amount Expended	\$48,011.52	

Apache County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Yard clean-up, painting, woodcutting, washing cars
Examples of Work Sites:	County Court House, Police/Sheriff's Departments, Senior Center
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies with offense; 5-10 hours for for minor offense; 40-50 hours for serious offense. Average is about 15 hours.
Contracted Services:	None
General Structure:	Work crews of 10-20 juveniles supervised by part-time work supervisors; usually Saturdays for 5 hours.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Apache County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family/Individual Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Ten 1-hour sessions; additional if required
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Various mental health agencies in individual communities
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Apache County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program: First Offender Program

Number/length of Sessions: One 8-hour session

Average Number in a Group: 50

Contracted Services: None

General Structure: Separate sessions offered in Round Valley and St. Johns. One parent or guardian must attend with juvenile. Presenters include: Judge, County Attorney, Probation Officers, and MSW from DES. Topics include: Juvenile Justice System, Substance Abuse, Parenting, Community Resources, Problem Solving.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: No

Apache County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Family Counseling and Community/School Presentations
Number/length of Sessions:	12-15 one-hour sessions of counseling; presentations vary
Contracted Services:	None (Intergovernmental Agreement with Navajo Nation-Court provides Family Counselor at Chinle; Navajos provide probation services to non- Indian juveniles on the Reservation).
Provider:	Family Counselor employed by Court
General Structure:	Counselor at Chinle conducts family counseling sessions and gives presentations in schools and for various community groups.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Apache County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile pays the Court or Probation Office who pays victim.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles.

PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN COCHISE COUNTY

---

OVERVIEW

---

Cochise County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family and individual counseling, non-residential treatment, restitution, and education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse. The education programs were not available prior to the PIC-ACT, however, the non-residential treatment program existed previously. The work, counseling, and restitution programs were available before the PIC-ACT, but only for adjudicated youth.

Because of the number of population centers in the County, various components of the the program are offered in Benson, Willcox, Douglas, Bisbee, Sierra Vista and Tombstone.

Cochise County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Some court personnel attribute the increase to an awareness and support of the program on the part of law enforcement agencies. Others feel that possible factors may be broken homes, family breakdown, and the recent addition of a Judge Pro Tempore.

---

FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$76,170.00	\$80,250.00
Amount Expended	\$66,311.13	

Cochise County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Clean-up, maintenance, newspaper collection, washing cars
Examples of Work Sites:	County Buildings, Police/Fire Departments, Detention Center, Schools
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies with offense. For minor offense, usually 16 hours. Average is about 25-50 hours.
Contracted Services:	None
General Structure:	Juveniles individually assigned to work sites by Probation Officers who coordinate and monitor program. Parents may help find work sites in local community.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles.

Cochise County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family/Individual Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Four 1-hour sessions; additional if required. Average is 8 hours.
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Cochise Community Counseling
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles

Cochise County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	Parenting Groups
Number/length of Sessions:	Four 3-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	10-17
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Catholic Community Social Services
General Structure:	Separate sessions offered in five major population areas. Parent or guardian attend with juvenile. Two therapists work with each group.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Cochise County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Drug/Alcohol Groups
Number/length of Sessions:	Four 2-hour sessions
Average Number in a group:	7-9
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Norma Allmon, M.S.
General Structure:	Separate sessions offered in different communities each month on a rotating basis. Parent or guardian is asked to attend. Includes information and group counseling.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Cochise County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	None
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Money is paid to a clerk in the probation office who writes check to the victim. Always assigned if appropriate.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles

Cochise County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program: Juveniles with adjustments through consent decrees are monitored for six months by Probation Officers.

Contracted Services: None

General Structure: Two Probation Officers handle intake and screening of incoming referrals. Located in Sierra Vista and Douglas, these Probation Officers assign consequences and monitor juveniles for six months. If juveniles fail to complete, they are referred to Probation Officers with formal caseloads for filing a petition.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN COCONINO COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Coconino County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family, group and individual counseling, non-residential treatment, restitution, and education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse. The education programs and non-residential treatment program were not available prior to the PIC-ACT. The work program, although in existence before the PIC-ACT, was only for adjudicated youth. The counseling program and restitution programs were available before the PIC-ACT.

Because of the geographic dispersion of population in Coconino County, components of the program are available in Flagstaff, Williams, Page and Fredonia.

It should be noted that the community service work program was suspended between August and November of 1985 due to County problems with liability insurance coverage.

Coconino County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Among the reasons given for the increase were enhanced community awareness of the philosophy of the PIC-ACT program, more sophisticated juveniles, support for the program from local law enforcement agencies, and better communications with school personnel.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$55,322.00	\$75,593.00
Amount Expended	\$47,376.03	

Coconino County

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Clean-up, trash pick-up
Examples of Work Sites:	Parks/recreational areas, senior citizen centers, schools, fairgrounds, Chapter Houses, county-owned sites
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies with offense. Minimum is 10 hours; maximum is 50 hours. Average is about 20 hours.
Contracted Services:	None
General Structure:	Intake Probation Officer or Detention Officers transport work crews on Saturdays and supervise in Flagstaff. Programs in Williams and Page also supervised by court employees. Also use individual placements in Fredonia and other outlying areas.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles.

Coconino County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service: Family/Individual/Group Counseling  
Number/length of Sessions: Varies  
Average Number in a Group: 9 juveniles  
Contracted Services: Yes  
Providers: Coconino Community Guidance  
Adventure Discovery  
Coconino Behavioral Consultants  
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

Type of Service: Parent Effectiveness Training  
Number/length of Sessions: Nine 2-hour sessions (weekly)  
Average Number in a Group: 5 parents  
Contracted Services: Yes  
Providers: Adventure Discovery  
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

Coconino County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	Property Offender (Shoplifting) Program
Number/length of Sessions:	One 3 1/2 hour session
Average Number in a Group:	10-14
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Juvenile Probation Officer
General Structure:	Juveniles and at least one parent attend class for property offenders held after school. Includes films and lectures, especially targeted for shoplifters. Meets evenings or Saturdays as often as necessary.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Coconino County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Alcohol and Substance Abuse Workshop
Number/length of Sessions:	Two 3 and 1/2 hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	12-14
Contracted Services:	Yes (No Charge to Court - \$25 fee paid by juvenile/parents.
Provider:	Coconino Behavioral Consultants
General Structure:	Juvenile and at least one parent attends two sessions from 6:00-9:00 P.M. on consecutive Tuesdays. Class scheduled once a month.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Coconino County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program: Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim

Contracted Services: None

General Structure: Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Money is paid to the Juvenile Court who pays the victim.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

Coconino County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	In-home Detention Program
Contracted Services:	None
General Structure:	Probation Officers assign juveniles to a minimum of two weeks in-home detention. Monitered by Probation Office staff during the day who call to be sure juvenile is in school. Intake Officer calls in the evening to be sure juvenile is home.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN GILA COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Gila County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family, group and individual counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse, restitution and non-residential treatment. The counseling program for parent effectiveness and the delinquency prevention after school tutoring program were new with the PIC-ACT. All other programs were previously available for adjudicated and non-adjudicated juveniles.

Because of the population centers in the County, various components of the program are available in Payson, Hayden, and Globe.

Gila County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Among the reasons given for the increase were that law enforcement personnel know that something will happen, greater visibility of probation officers in the community, community support and awareness of consequences for juvenile offenders, and that a larger number of sex-related crimes are being reported.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$37,750.00	\$32,385.00
Amount Expended	\$37,167.40	

Gila County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Clean-up, trash pick-up, building renovation
Examples of Work Sites:	Local streets, high school football field, Court House, Chamber of Commerce, Museums, Schools
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies with offense. Maximum is 100 hours. Average is 16-24 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	One salaried (Community Service Work Coordinator) and two contract employees who are work crew supervisors.
General Structure:	Crews of 8-22 juveniles meet on Saturdays and Sundays at central location and are transported by van to work sites. Two contract employees supervise. Also some individual placements for after school work.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Gila County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family Counseling Groups and Individual Family Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Groups meet for 6 one-hour sessions in Payson and Hayden. Minimum of four one-hour individual family sessions.
Average Number in a Group:	6-8
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Gila Guidance Clinic Private Psychologist
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes
Type of Service:	Parent Effectiveness Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Nine 2-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	8 (four couples)
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	PIC-ACT Coordinator and a Probation officer
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Gila County

COUNSELING (Continued)

---

Type of Service:	Summer Camping Trips
Number/length of Sessions:	Four trips in summer; average juvenile spends about a week total usually 3 days and 2 nights at a time.
Average Number in a Group:	8 juveniles and staff
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	PIC-ACT Coordinator and Probation Officers
General Structure:	Trips to Roosevelt Lake and Payson. Program emphasizes counseling, lifeskills, survival skills.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Gila County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	After School Tutoring Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Operates 2-5 days per week, depending on community, from 4:00-6:00 P.M. Average juvenile attends two days per week.
Average Number in a Group:	10
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Certified teachers on contract
General Structure:	Tutoring provided in Globe, Miami, and Payson. Juveniles participate until they have a "C" average. Then, grades are monitored; if they fall below a "C", juvenile is put back in program.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Gila County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Visits to La Cuesta Drug Rehabilitation facility
Number/length of Sessions:	One 2-hour session
Average Number in a Group:	5-6 juveniles
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Probation staff and therapists from the La Cuesta facility.
General Structure:	Juveniles, addicts, probation officers and drug therapists meet for about two hours to discuss problems of drug/alcohol abuse.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Gila County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Money is paid to the Clerk of the Court who pays the victim.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Gila County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Supervison and Consent Program
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Usually juveniles between 10-12 years are placed in this program. Supervision/Consent contracts are usually for three months. Youth is monitored closely by regular probation officer. Two to four face-to-face contacts per week.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN GRAHAM COUNTY

---

OVERVIEW

---

Graham County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, individual counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention, and restitution. All programs were used prior to the the PIC-ACT ,however, community service work and restitution were only for adjudicated.

Graham County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. The PIC-ACT program was not believed by those interviewed to be a factor in the increase, because few changes have been made since the program began. Community and law enforcement awareness of the program was thought to be negligible; law enforcement personnel reported that consequences may not be strict enough until the third offense.

---

FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$11,475.00	\$11,461.60
Amount Expended	\$10,469.55	

Graham County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Yard clean-up, building construction, maintenance
Examples of Work Sites:	Local churches, homes of senior citizens, public offices
Number of Hours Assigned:	Usually 5 hours for first offense and 12-24 for second offense. Curfew violations may be only 1-2 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Parents, child and Probation Officer agree on number of hours. Parents and juvenile find work site for individual placement and a contract is signed.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles.

Graham County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Individual Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	One 1-hour session
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Graham/Greenlee Counseling Various private providers
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Graham County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program: LAMP (Layton's Attitude Modification Program)

Number/length of Sessions: One 1-hour session

Average Number in a Group: 1-6

Contracted Services: No

Provider: Chief Probation Officer

General Structure: Classes meet every other week from 4:00-5:00 P.M. Juveniles spend half the time reading pamphlets about the type of offense they committed (i.e. shoplifting, vandalism, alcohol) and then take a 20 question test. Remainder of class is an interactive discussion on positive attitude. Parents may attend.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: No

Graham County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program: Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Money is paid through the Clerk of the Court to the victim. Always assigned when appropriate.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles.

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN GREENLEE COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Greenlee County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, individual counseling, substance abuse education program, restitution and non-residential treatment. All programs except the substance abuse education program existed before the PIC-ACT, however, the restitution component did not include the Court paying juveniles to work prior to the PIC-ACT.

Greenlee County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Major reasons cited for the increase were problems with the mine and the flood. Many families suffered economic hardships and stress that led to an increase in juvenile delinquency. Assaultive crimes increased as did property crimes.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$14,000.00	\$12,210.00
Amount Expended	\$12,741.23	

Greenlee County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work: General clean-up, construction

Examples of Work Sites: Local churches, cemeteries, parks, county buildings, schools, Coronado Trail

Number of Hours Assigned: Usually ten hours for first offense. Minimum is 3 hours. Maximum is 80 hours. Average is 12-15 hours.

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Juveniles work after school and on Saturdays. Combination of work crews and individual placements. Report directly to work sites in their community. Program operates in Morenci, Clifton, and Duncan. Usually 7-9 juveniles supervised by work crew supervisor hired by Court. Participant Performance Evaluations are completed by work supervisor.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

Greenlee County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Individual or Family Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	One 1-hour session; then counselor recommends
Contracted Services:	No (Pay for services provided)
Providers:	Graham/Greenlee Behavioral Health
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Greenlee County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Substance Abuse Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Four 3-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	7
Contracted Services:	No (Pay for Services as Provided)
Provider:	Graham/Greenlee Behavioral Health
General Structure:	Classes meet weekly from from 3:00-6:00 P.M.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Greenlee County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program: Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim by working on community service work with salary paid by Court.

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile is paid \$2.50 per hour. Court makes check payable to juvenile who signs it over to victim.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes, but without Court paying salaries for community service work

Greenlee County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Informal Supervision
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Probation Officers
General Structure:	Usually assigned for 6 months. Report once a week. Almost daily contact with some.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAM IN LA PAZ COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

La Paz County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, individual counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention, substance abuse education programs, non-residential treatment and restitution. All the programs except the education programs were operating before the PIC-ACT. All components of the program operate in Parker, but community service work assignments are made on an individual basis in outlying communities.

La Paz County reported no change in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85	1985-86
	-----	-----
Amount Awarded	\$9,440.00	\$9,440.00
Amount Expended	\$7,917.86	

La Paz County

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Trash pick-up, general clean-up, landscape construction/maintenance
Examples of Work Sites:	Cemetaries, football/baseball fields, public buildings, Ehrenberg Cactus Garden, Salome Justice Court, local parks
Number of Hours Assigned:	Younger/less severe juveniles are assigned 4-5 hours. Average is 16-48 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Juveniles report to work site on Saturdays for 8 hours; sometimes work after school. Supervised by work crew supervisor on an hourly rate. Usually about 5 juveniles on a crew. Use individual placements in areas outside Parker.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

La Paz County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Individual or Family Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Varies; average 6-9 one-hour sessions based on counselor recommendations.
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Life Health Center
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

La Paz County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	Property Offenses Program
Number/length of Sessions:	One four-hour session
Average Number in a Group:	5-6
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Part-time education coordinator employed by Court
General Structure:	Classes after school and on Saturday. One group per month. Topics include legal system, values clarification, peer pressure, and alternatives.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

La Paz County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Substance Abuse Program
Number/length of Sessions:	One 4-hour session
Average Number in a Group:	5-6
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Part-time education coordinator employed by Court
General Structure:	Classes meet after school and on Saturdays. About one and a half groups per month. Topics covered include values clarification, criminal justice system, self-esteem, peer pressure, and consequences.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

La Paz County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile pays money directly to victim or gives it to Probation Officer who gives juvenile a receipt and pays victim. Infrequently used because usually a petition would be filed.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

La Paz

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Informal Supervision
Contract Services:	No
Providers:	Probation Officer
General Structure:	Usual assignment is 90 days. Includes follow-up to be sure counseling is completed. Juvenile usually reports one to four times per month. Includes field supervision.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAM IN MARICOPA COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Maricopa County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family counseling, education programs for alcohol and drug abuse, and restitution. The drug and alcohol education program was not in existence before the PIC-ACT program. The other programs were available, but only for adjudicated youth.

Maricopa County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Reasons given for this increase include population growth and the effects of high density population.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$464,432.00	1,328,875.35
Amount Expended	239,781.19	

Maricopa County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	General clean-up, trash pick-up, janitorial work
Examples of Work Sites:	Schools, libraries, fire/ sheriff's departments, public and government offices
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies with offense. Usually 10-24 hours; average is about 10 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Probation Officer personnel
General Structure:	Individual placements with public and government agencies. Juveniles are responsible for transportation to work site. Supervision and verification is by officials at placement site. Probation staff also verify compliance with placement site personnel.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles.

Maricopa County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Seven 1-hour sessions
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	35 different providers
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Maricopa County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Chemical Abuse Education
Number/length of Sessions:	One 7-hour session
Average Number in a group:	20-30 juveniles
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	TASC of Maricopa County
General Structure:	Five or 6 classes per month; a minimum of 1 in Phoenix. Topics/areas covered include: information about dangers of drug use, decision-making skills, self-concept development, and attempts to modify attitudes about drug use.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Maricopa County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Money is paid directly to the victim by the juvenile.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but compliance verification for non-adjudicated juveniles was minimal.

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN MOHAVE COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Mohave County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family, group and individual counseling, restitution, and non-residential treatment. All these programs were available before the PIC-ACT program.

Mohave County provides components of the PIC-ACT program in Lake Havasu, Bullhead City and Kingman in order to serve juveniles throughout the County.

The number of juvenile referrals in Mohave County has increased over the past year. Among the reasons cited for the increase are population growth and the addition of police officers when Bullhead City was incorporated.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$44,839.00	\$44,558.00
Amount Expended	\$28,074.37	

Mohave County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Painting, weeding, clean-up, trash pick-up, grounds maintenance
Examples of Work Sites:	Highways, streets, Chamber of Commerce, county buildings
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies with offense and number of prior referrals from 4-512 hours. Average is 4-8 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Two part-time work service coordinators hired by the Court.
General Structure:	Crews of no more than 6 youths work after school and on Saturdays. Parents transport juveniles to work site.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, however individual placements were made and monitored by the Probation Officer.

Mohave County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family/Individual/Group Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Varies from 1-6 one-hour sessions.
Average Number in a Group:	5
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Mohave Mental Health-Kingman Private Psychologist-Lake Havasu
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Mohave County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Money is paid directly to the victim by the juvenile.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Mohave County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Informal Supervision
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Juveniles ususally assigned for for 30-60 days. One contact at beginning and one follow-up. May also be doing other consequences.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN NAVAJO COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Navajo County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family counseling, restitution and non-residential treatment. The restitution program was not in existence before the PIC-ACT program. The work program was operational before the PIC-ACT, but only for adjudicated youth in individual placements. The counseling program and non-residential treatment program were available before the PIC-ACT.

Because of population dispersion in several geographic areas, portions of the program are available in Winslow, Holbrook, Snowflake and the White Mountain Districts.

Navajo County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. The reasons cited for this increase are population growth, unemployment and an increase in part-time residents whose unattended homes become targets for crimes like burglary and vandalism.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$78,313.00	\$79,265.00
Amount Expended	\$26,320.68	

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work: Yard clean-up, waste water treatment, janitorial, painting, clerical, road patching, woodcutting

Examples of Work Sites: Golf courses, churches, schools, senior citizen centers, public buildings, police/fire departments, parks, private homes of widows

Number of Hours Assigned: Varies. Minimum 16 hours. Maximum 160 hours. Average 40 hours.

Contracted Services: No

Providers: Part-time work supervisors and voluntary supervisors.

General Structure: Crews of 6 juveniles work with supervisor on Saturdays for 8 hours and after school for 2-4 hours on community projects. Also have individual placements at various sites. North program for Winslow and Holbrook; South program for White Mountain Districts and Snowflake.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes, but only individual placements monitored by Probation Officers for adjudicated juveniles.

Navajo County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family and individual Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Six 1-hour sessions; more if recommended by counselor.
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Community Counseling Centers in Winslow, Holbrook, and Show Low
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Navajo County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program: Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim by working on community service projects with salary paid by the Court.

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile is paid \$2.00 an hour but is only allowed to work the number of hours necessary to repay victim. Payroll record is submitted in the juvenile's name, but the check is written to the victim by the Navajo County Finance Department.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: No

Navajo County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Diversion Program
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Probation Officers
General Structure:	Juveniles assigned to 3-6 months of informal supervision. Juvenile reports once a month. Probation Officer monitors compliance with PIC-ACT consequences. Contract with Probation Officer, juvenile and parent.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAM IN PIMA COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Pima County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family, group and individual counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse, restitution and non-residential treatment. Two of the work programs, one of the counseling programs, a drug/alcohol education program, and the day support programs were new with the PIC-ACT. All other programs were operating before PIC-ACT.

Because of the dispersion of population, some components of the program operate in Green Valley/Sahaurita and Marana.

Pima County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Among the reasons given for the increase were population growth, a change in policy of the Tucson Police Department and the Pima County Sheriff's Office in the handling of status offenders, and a shift in the demographics of the City.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$434,789.00	\$452,588.00
Amount Expended	\$345,462.12	

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Clean-up; general maintenance, painting
Examples of Work Sites:	Parks, Mt. Lemmon Forest Service lands, county-owned sites, "A" Mountain, highways and Palo Verder Overpass
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies. Maximum is 80; minimum is 8 hours. Average is 26 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Two and a half Probation Aides hired by the Court serve as work supervisors.
General Structure:	For juveniles who are very young or those who are not cooperative or for those who have missed assigned times. Program targets youths who need stronger supervision.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Pima County

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK (Continued)

---

Examples of Work:	Clean-up; general maintenance
Examples of Work Sites:	City park lands and equipment
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies. Maximum is 100 hours. Minimum is 8 hours. Average is 30 hours.
Contracted Services:	No (Intergovernmental Agreement with City provides funds for recreation in exchange for service work done by juveniles.)
Providers:	City of Tucson (Community Service Program-Carson)
General Structure:	For juveniles 11-18 who reside in a specific geographical area designated as "high crime." Juveniles must complete work hours before participation in recreational activities. Also includes self-development education (i.e. drug abuse, peer relations, shoplifting) and educational/vocational tutoring and assistance.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Pima County

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK (Continued)

---

Examples of Work:	Clean-up, trash pick-up, painting, janitorial
Examples of Work Sites:	In community non-profit agencies and nursing homes
Number of Hours Assigned:	25 or more
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Voluntary Action Program
General Structure:	Juveniles 14-18 are placed individually at work sites. Youth is responsible for transportation.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but at no charge and only for adjudicated juveniles.

Pima County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family, Individual, and Group Counseling (Reading Clinic, Outreach Services, Spanish-speaking services, substance abuse and counseling)
Number/length of Sessions:	Varies, depending on type of service and provider.
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	40 different agencies
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but with less flexibility for non-traditional programs.
Type of Program:	Sex Offender Treatment Program and Treatment for Sexually Abused
Number/length of Sessions:	Can be up to 18 months. Average is 1 year. Individual and family sessions are 1 hour; group sessions are 1 and 1/2 hours.
Average Number in a Group:	6-8
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Catalina Counseling Associates
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but very limited.

Pima County

COUNSELING (Continued)

---

Type of Service:	In-house Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	One 1-hour session
Average Number in a Group:	2 (Juvenile and Parent)
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Probation Officers
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes
Type of Service:	Level III- Substance Abuse Counseling (Individual, Family and Group)
Number/length of Sessions:	Up to twenty-four 1-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	20
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	La Frontera
General Structure:	Substance abuse screening and counseling. May include youth and family in individual and/or group sessions. Juveniles attend once a week.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Pima County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	Shoplifting Program for First-time Referrals
Number/length of Sessions:	One 3-hour session
Average Number in a Group:	20-25
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Probation Officer
General Structure:	Probation Officer, police officers and County Attorney present class once a month. Discuss court system and show a film on shoplifting. Parents attend with juvenile.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Pima County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Substance Abuse Education-Level II
Number/length of Sessions:	One 3-hour session
Average Number in a group:	20-25
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	La Frontera (Assisted by one Probation Officer)
General Structure:	Juveniles attend once on Saturday to receive information about substance abuse. Includes time for questions/answers and discussion. Parents attend with juvenile.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Pima County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program: Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile directly pays victim or gives a money order to the Court. Always used as a consequence if appropriate.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

Type of Program: Juveniles give donations to various charities

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Juvenile is required to make donation to a charity of his/her choice. Probation officer determines amount and provides a list of charities if juvenile doesn't know of one.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

Pima County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Day Support Program (Second Chance-Phase I)
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Tucson Urban League
General Structure:	Juveniles receive weekly individual, group and family counseling for 6-8 hours per week. Also includes individual program plan with counseling, recreational activities, and volunteer services placements. (90 day program)
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Pima County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT (Continued)

---

Type of Program:	Day Support Program (Self Awareness through Feminine Expression Program)
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Creative Learning Systems
General Structure:	Juvenile girls with a past history of emotional, sexual, or physical abuse receive services for 6 hours per week. Includes family/child counseling and some group activities. Usual length of treatment is 3-4 months.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No
Type of Program:	Formal Diversion Program
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Intake Probation Officers
General Structure:	Targets juveniles on first or second felonies. Usually for 3-4 months. Requires initial office contact and 3 field contacts. Juvenile may call in and Probation officer may call juvenile. Usually have some contact at least once a week.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN PINAL COUNTY

---

OVERVIEW

---

Pinal County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family, group and individual counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse, restitution and non-residential treatment. The work, counseling and restitution programs existed before the PIC-ACT, but the education programs and non-residential treatment programs were new with the PIC-ACT. Various components of the program are offered in Florence, Apache Junction and Casa Grande to meet the needs of the County's population.

Pinal County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Among the reasons given for the increase were that law enforcement personnel know "that something will happen" and are writing more referrals.

---

FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85	1985-86
	-----	-----
Amount Awarded	\$91,350.00	\$74,314.21
Amount Expended	\$23,549.85	

Pinal County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Clean-up, trash pick-up, wash police/fire vehicles, landscaping
Examples of Work Sites:	Senior citizen's center, police/fire departments, cemeteries, county jail, churches
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies. Minimum is 10 hours. Maximum is 100 hours. Average is about 30 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Probation Officers
General Structure:	Intake officers place juveniles at individual work sites and monitor compliance.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Pinal County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family, Individual and/or Group Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Twelve 1-hour family sessions; more if counselor recommends and Probation Officer agrees. All PIC-ACT youth are referred for a minimum of 10 hours.
Average Number in a Group:	Family members/5 in juvenile groups
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Behavioral Health Agency of Central Arizona Tri-Community Behavioral Health La Clinica del Pueblo Copper Basic Behavioral Health Epicenter
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Pinal County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	Shoplifter Program
Number/length of Sessions:	One 8-hour session
Average Number in a Group:	10
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	National Correctional Training Institute
General Structure:	Juvenile is expected to pay the \$40 fee; however, the Court will pay a maximum of \$30 if youth/family is not able. Youth must pay \$10. Class is offered on Saturdays in Casa Grande and Apache Junction.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Pinal County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR (Continued)

---

Type of Program:	Parenting Education Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Five 2-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	17
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	In-house Counselors
General Structure:	Meets weekly from 6:00-8:00 P.M. Only parents attend. Includes communications skills, encouragement skills, discipline, and techniques for effective family management. Interested parents from the community may attend along with juveniles.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Pinal County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Substance Abuse Program- Defiance to Dependency (Other than alcohol)
Number/length of Sessions:	Two 1 and 1/2 hour sessions plus one 1-hour individual follow-up
Average Number in a Group:	6-8
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	In-house Counselors
General Structure:	One class offered per month. Topics include information addition/dependency problems and alternatives.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No
Type of Program:	Alcohol Abuse Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Two 1 and 1/2 hour sessions plus one 1-hour individual follow-up
Average Number in a Group:	6-8
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	In-house Counselors
General Structure:	Offered once a month. Topics include information on problems of dependency and alternatives to drinking. Includes group discussion.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Pinal County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program: Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim or hours of direct victim service to repair damage.

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Money is paid to the Chief Probation Officer who pays the victim.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes

Pinal County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Intake Supervision (Informal Probation)
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Intake Probation Officers assign supervision as a consequence. Usually used for those 12 and under for a period of 3 months. Probation Officer makes visits to home to monitor, sends letter monthly, meets twice a month and/or call periodically.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

---

OVERVIEW

---

Santa Cruz County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention, restitution, and a non-residential treatment program. The community service work and restitution programs existed before the PIC-ACT but only for adjudicated juveniles. The counseling program operated before the PIC-ACT, but the education for delinquency prevention program and the informal supervision were new with PIC-ACT.

Santa Cruz County has not experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year.

---

FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$24,000.00	\$23,285.00
Amount Expended	\$16,902.81	

Santa Cruz County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work: General clean-up, trash pick-up, janitorial work, office assistance, tour guide

Examples of Work Sites: Twenty non-profit work sites including library, churches, historical society, government buildings, police/fire/sheriff's departments

Number of Hours Assigned: Varies from 1-100. Usually 25-40 hours.

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Individual placements with public and government agencies. Juveniles are responsible for transportation to work site. Supervision and verification is by officials at placement site. PIC-ACT staff also verify compliance and performance with placement site personnel.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles.

Santa Cruz County

EDUCATION PROGRAMS - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program: Job Training/Counseling Program

Number/length of Sessions: Program operates twice a week after school for 2 hours.

Average Number in a Group: 11-15

Contracted Services: No

Provider: Probation Officer Aide

General Structure: Juveniles participate in program for up to 40 hours. Minimum is 10 hours. Activities include counseling, pre-employment skills development, juvenile justice system, self-esteem, and drug awareness.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: No

Santa Cruz County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program: Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim by working on community service work with salary paid by the Court.

Contracted Services: No

General Structure: Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile is paid \$2.25 per hour. County Treasurer writes check to the victim.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: No

Santa Cruz County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Individual, family and group counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Varies. Based on counselor recommendation after first session.
Contracted:	Yes
Provider:	Santa Cruz Family Guidance Center
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Santa Cruz County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Service: Informal Supervision

Contract: No

Providers: PIC-ACT Probation Officer Aide

General Structure: Juveniles are usually assigned for 3-6 months depending on anticipated time for completion of consequences. Weekly call-ins and weekly face-to-face meetings. Contact may be more frequent depending on the juvenile.

Existed Prior to PIC-ACT: No

PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN YAVAPAI COUNTY

---

OVERVIEW

---

Yavapai County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family, group and individual counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse, restitution and non-residential treatment. With the exception of the education program for delinquency prevention, all programs were available prior to the PIC-ACT. The non-residential Day Support Program was only for adjudicated youth, but the other previously available programs were used with pre-adjudicated juveniles. In order to meet the needs of the population centers, some of the consequences are available in Prescott and the Verde Valley.

Yavapai County has experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year. Population increase is the major reason given for the increase.

---

FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$52,250.00	\$54,703.00
Amount Expended	\$48,490.24	

Yavapai County

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Trash pick-up; general maintenance
Examples of Work Sites:	Forest Service campgrounds, schools, community agencies
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies. Minimum is 8 hours up to 24 hours. Over 40 hours handled by Youth Employment Program.
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Three part-time work supervisors
General Structure:	Each supervisor takes a crew of 5 juveniles every Saturday. One crew works weekly in Prescott. Two others work biweekly in Prescott and Verde Valley. Juveniles meet at central site and are transported to work site by supervisors in private vehicles.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but all placements were individually monitored by the Probation Officers.

Yavapai County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family and Individual Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Eight 1-hour sessions
Contracted Services:	Fee for service basis
Providers:	West Yavapai Guidance Clinic Verde Valley Guidance Clinic
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yavapai County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	Shoplifting Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Four 2-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	6 juveniles plus parents for some sessions
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	West Yavapai Guidance Clinic
General Structure:	Parents attend with juveniles for first and last sessions. Targets 8-14 year old first-time referrals. Program is offered once a month. Topics include effects of shoplifting, peer pressure and decision-making.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	No

Yavapai County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Alcohol/Drug Abuse Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Four 2-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	8 juveniles plus parents
Contracted Services:	No (Self-supporting; youths/parents pay \$41)
Provider:	West Yavapai Guidance Clinic Verde Valley Guidance Clinic
General Structure:	Juveniles and parents attend all four sessions. Topics covered include: information on effects, peer pressure, decision-making.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yavapai County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile pays the Probation Office with a money order or check and Probation Department writes check to victim. Sometimes juvenile directly pays the victim.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yavapai County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	Day Support Program
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Prescott Child Development Center
General Structure:	Targets high-risk juveniles. Program operates from 1:30 P.M. to 5:30 P.M., Monday through Friday. Includes counseling, recreation, tutoring and mandatory parent support group. Usual assignment is 6 months.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes, but only for adjudicated juveniles
Type of Program:	Volunteer in Probation Program
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Big Brother/Big Sister Program
General Structure:	Big Brother/Big Sister screens volunteers and matches referred juveniles with appropriate volunteer. Caseworkers from contractor meet monthly with child, parent, and volunteer to monitor progress. Match is for 6 months; may be extended for 6 additional months. Training for volunteers is also provided by contractor.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yavapai County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT (Continued)

---

Type of Program:	Diversion Supervision
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Probation Officers
General Structure:	Juvenile is usually assigned for 6 months. Probation Officer sees juvenile weekly to monitor progress.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

## PROFILE OF PIC-ACT PROGRAMS IN YUMA COUNTY

---

### OVERVIEW

---

Yuma County's PIC-ACT programs are community service work, family and individual counseling, education programs for delinquency prevention and alcohol and drug abuse, restitution and non-residential treatment. All programs existed before the PIC-ACT.

Because of the dispersion of population, the education program for delinquency prevention is offered in Yuma, Wellton and the Somerton/San Luis area. Community service work program is also available in the areas outside Yuma with individual placements.

Yuma County has not experienced an increase in the number of juvenile referrals in the past year.

---

### FUNDING INFORMATION

---

	1984-85 -----	1985-86 -----
Amount Awarded	\$75,250.00	\$79,200.00
Amount Expended	\$35,764.87	

---

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

---

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

---

Examples of Work:	Trash pick-up; general maintenance, janitorial, yard clean-up
Examples of Work Sites:	Schools, library, streets, senior citizen center, parks, cemeteries
Number of Hours Assigned:	Varies. Minimum is 8 hours. Maximum is 80 hours. Average is about 16 hours.
Contracted Services:	No
Providers:	Full-time work supervisor hired by the Court.
General Structure:	Work crews of 10-12 juveniles are picked up in County van by work supervisor and taken to work site. Usually work after school 3 days a week and on Saturday. Some individual placements, especially for those in outlying areas.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yuma County

COUNSELING

---

Type of Service:	Family and Individual Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Eight 1-hour sessions; more if necessary.
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Rio Colorado Health Services Behavioral Health Services of Yuma Catholic Community Services Various private providers
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes
Type of Service:	Group Counseling
Number/length of Sessions:	Eight 1 and 1/2 hour sessions; more if necessary.
Average Number in a Group:	8
Contracted Services:	Yes
Providers:	Catholic Community Services
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yuma County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - PREVENTION OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

---

Type of Program:	First Offender's Program
Number/length of Sessions:	Seven 1-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	6-12 juveniles plus parents for some sessions
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Catholic Community Services (Yuma) Yuma Behavioral Health (Wellton and San Luis)
General Structure:	Parents attend with juveniles for three of seven sessions. Topics include peer relationships, society and the law, drug/alcohol education, communication skills, and family relationships.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yuma County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL

---

Type of Program:	Drug Education Program-Level I (First Offenders)
Number/length of Sessions:	Six 1-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	15-20 plus parents at some sessions
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Catholic Community Services
General Structure:	Program targets first offenders and provides drug/alcohol education and counseling aimed at modifying behavior. Parents are required to attend 3 sessions.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes
Type of Program:	Drug Education Program-Level II (Second Offenders)
Number/length of Sessions:	Six 1-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	5-6 plus parents at some sessions
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Catholic Community Services
General Structure:	Program targets second offenders and stresses decision-making skills and counseling. Parents attend 3 sessions.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yuma County

EDUCATION PROGRAM - DRUG/ALCOHOL (Continued)

---

Type of Program:	Drug Education Program-Level III
Number/length of Sessions:	Weekly 1-hour sessions
Average Number in a Group:	8-12
Contracted Services:	Yes
Provider:	Behavioral Health Services of Yuma
General Structure:	Program targets serious substance abusers. Includes urine screening and counseling. Juveniles stay in the program 30 days to 6 months.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yuma County

RESTITUTION

---

Type of Program:	Juveniles provide monetary compensation for damages to the victim
Contracted Services:	No
General Structure:	Amount of damage determined by law enforcement personnel and/or victim reports to Probation Officer. Juvenile pays the Court who pays victim.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes

Yuma County

NON-RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT

---

Type of Program:	In-home Detention Program
Contracted Services:	No
Provider:	Probation Officers
General Structure:	Juvenile, parent, and Probation Officer agree to confining the juvenile to his/her home for a given period of time. Child is allowed to leave home when supervised by parent/guardian. Target group is 10 years old and under. Usually for 3 weekends.
Existed Prior to PIC-ACT:	Yes