

October 2013

aarin

arizona arrestee reporting information network

Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department Report:

2013 juvenile probation report

Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network

2013

Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department Report

**By
David E. Choate
November 2013**

Suggested citation:

Choate, David E. (2013). *Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network: 2013 Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department Report*. Phoenix, AZ: Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety, Arizona State University.

Contents

Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information System Overview	1
Methodology and Sampling	2
Survey Instrument	3
Introduction and Key Findings	5
Characteristics of the Sample	6
Drug and Alcohol Use Results	11
Positive Urinalysis Results	14
Substance Abuse / Dependence	16
Criminal Involvement	19
Gang Involvement	28
Mental Health	29
Firearm Possession	32
Police Contact	33
Victimization	34
Caregiver Characteristics	39
Probation Officer Perceptions	41

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1: Sample of Arrestees	6	Exhibit 8: Gang Involvement	28
Exhibit 2: Characteristics	8-10	Exhibit 9: Mental Health	30-31
Exhibit 3: Drug Use Results	12-13	Exhibit 10: Firearm Possession	32
Exhibit 4: Positive UA Results	15	Exhibit 11: Police Contact	33
Exhibit 5: Substance Abuse / Dependence	17-18	Exhibit 12: Victimization – 12 months	35-36
Exhibit 6: Arrest History	20	Exhibit 13: Victimization – 30 days	37-38
Exhibit 7: Criminal Involvement by Type	25-27	Exhibit 14: Caregiver Characteristics	40
Exhibit 7: Gang Involvement	26	Exhibit 15: Probation Officer	41

AARIN Program Overview

The Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network (AARIN) is a monitoring system that provides ongoing descriptive information about drug use, crime, victimization and other characteristics of interest among individuals arrested in Maricopa County, Arizona. Funded by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors beginning in 2007, AARIN is modeled after the former National Institute of Justice (NIJ) national-level Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program (ADAM). In three facilities throughout the county, professionally trained interviewers conduct voluntary and confidential interviews with recently booked adult arrestees and juvenile detainees. Questions focus on a range of topics including education, employment and other demographics, patterns of drug use (lifetime and recent), substance abuse and dependence risk, criminal activity, gang affiliation, victimization, mental health, interactions with police, public health concerns, incarceration and probation, citizenship and treatment experiences. Each interviewee also provides a urine specimen that is tested for the presence of alcohol and/or drugs. Arrestees who have been in custody longer than 48 hours are ineligible for participation in AARIN, due to the 72-hour time limitation for valid testing of urine specimen.

The instruments used and the reporting mechanism underwent a substantial revision in 2011. While maintaining all of the data elements from the previous core set of questions, the baseline interview expanded by more than 60%. Additionally, with the change in the core questionnaire, the project shifted its reporting strategy to focus reports to each of six key Maricopa County criminal justice agencies: Maricopa County Manager's Office, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Office of the Public Defender, Adult Probation Department and the Juvenile Probation Department.

Overall, AARIN serves as a near-real time information source on the extent and nature of drug abuse and related activity in Maricopa County, AZ. This information helps to inform policy and practice among police, courts and correctional agencies to increase public safety and address the needs of individuals who find themselves in the criminal justice system.

For information using the most recent set of data, please see the following reports:

- **Maricopa County Manager's Office** – Report detailing substance abuse and public health concerns among the Maricopa County arrestee population.
- **Maricopa County Sheriff's Office** – Reports broad characteristics of the entire AARIN sample and a detailed comparison of arrestees' perception of police in general, and use of force by and against police, by arresting agency.
- **Maricopa County Attorney's Office** – Detailed report covering street gangs using key core questionnaire elements and a comprehensive interpretation of the Gang Addendum.

- **Office of the Public Defender** – Report comparing arrestees who are at-risk for a mental health problem, substance abuse/dependence problem, a co-occurring disorder (both substance abuse/dependence and mental health), or not at risk.
- **Adult Probation Department** – Comprehensive summary of the core questionnaire comparing Maricopa County probationers to probationers from elsewhere and those arrestees who have not served probation.
- **Juvenile Probation Department** - Comprehensive summary of the core juvenile questionnaire comparing Maricopa County juvenile probationers to those who have served probation elsewhere and those detainees who have not served probation.

For other reports and more information about the project, visit the AARIN page of the Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety's website: <http://cvpcs.asu.edu/>.

Methodology: Sampling and Data Collection

In order to ensure representative results for the entire population of juvenile detainees in Maricopa County, the AARIN project employs a systematic sampling protocol that includes the collection of data in defined periods throughout the year, and with as comprehensive a sample as is available at time of collection. Data are collected during three cycles each calendar year – with interviews conducted during a continuous two-week period at each of the County's two juvenile detention intake facilities – Durango and the Southeast Facility (SEF) – each collection cycle. Dispersing data collection cycles across three different four-month blocks helps control for possible seasonal variations in crime and detention patterns, and conducting collections covering all seven days of the week account for possible differences between weekdays and weekends, or other day-to-day variations. Sampling from both facilities eliminates possible systematic bias based on the geographic boundary used to determine booking location for a given juvenile to one or the other of the two intake facilities for juveniles. The periodic data collection cycles combined with the sampling protocols ensures a representative sample of all Maricopa County detainees. The same procedures employed by AARIN were tested under ADAM (Maricopa County was one of the sites used in the evaluation) comparing the selected sample to comprehensive detention census data to assess the representativeness of the sample to the population on key characteristics. The National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago was the national data manager for ADAM at the time and concluded that the periodic data collection cycles, sampling protocols and daily quotas would result in a scientifically representative sample of study participants that could be generalized to the whole of arrestees for the particular jurisdiction (i.e. Maricopa County arrestees). While this analysis was limited to adult arrestees, the sampling protocols for juveniles are similar and consistent with the adult protocols in every way possible.

Daily collection quotas are not used for juvenile detainee sampling, principally due to the smaller number of juvenile detainees compared to adult arrestees. Rather than using daily quotas from a pool of hundreds of potential participants, the juvenile sampling protocol calls for the attempted recruitment of

all available and eligible detainees during data collection times. Some of the potential participants are either unavailable or otherwise ineligible for participation. Most commonly this applies to those detainees who have already been released from custody, but may also include those whose behavior constitutes a safety risk to the facility and/or interview staff. Upon initial contact, detainees are read an informed consent script (see inset), to which they voluntarily either decline or agree to participate; typically more than 95% of juveniles agree to participate. They also are informed about the urine specimen request, and that it is also voluntary and anonymous.

Consent Script:

Hello, my name is _____. I am working on a research project run by Arizona State University. The purpose of the project is to understand issues and problems confronted by people and to help give advice on how to provide services to individuals who have been arrested. I would like to ask you a series of questions that will take 15-45 minutes to answer. There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research, and there are no benefits to you individually. Jail personnel will not have access to the information that you provide us. The information you provide is confidential and anonymous, and it will not help or hurt your case. If, for any reason, you become distressed or anxious during the interview, you can request to speak with the facility's medical personnel or psychological counselors.

I will not write down your name or any other identifying information the questionnaire. You can refuse to answer any question, and you may stop the interview at any time for any reason. This means you can ask for any question to be explained, skip any questions you do not want to answer and stop participating in the interview at any time. At the end of the interview I will ask you to provide a urine sample. If you listen to my questions, I will give you a candy bar. Do you understand what you are agreeing to? Do you have any questions?

During the data collection period, interviews are conducted during a three to four hour period each day, with detainees who have been booked from the time interviews were concluded the previous day up to and including those who are booked while interview staff are in the detention facility on the current day. This process is employed to ensure a sample of detainees across any given 24-hour period.

Survey Instrument

The core AARIN survey instrument is modeled after the ADAM and Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) instruments, and was developed with input from Maricopa County officials. Starting with the third collection cycle of 2011, AARIN began using a new core instrument. The new instrument included the same elements of the previous version, but expanded by more than 60% following extensive input from Maricopa County officials representing six key agencies related to the criminal justice system and the arrestee population – the County Manager's Office, Sheriff's Office, County Attorney, Public Defender, Adult Probation and Juvenile Probation.

The instrument is broken down into a variety of sections that include: demographics and background information (sex, race/ethnicity, age, citizenship, educational level, methods of income), current and past drug use (ever, past 12 months, 30 days and three days), drug dependency and treatment, medical marijuana and marijuana acquisition, criminal history (ever, past 12 months), gang involvement, firearms possession, victimization (past 12 months, 30 days), police interactions mental health issues (ever and past 12 months), correctional health services and public health concerns, and incarceration and probation history (ever and past 12 months). There are no differences between the instruments used with adult arrestees and juvenile detainees other than the education questions. Adults are asked to report their highest level of educational attainment, while juveniles are asked whether or not they still attend school, and if not, why.

Additionally, the AARIN platform includes addenda instruments to the core set of questions. Addenda are used to collect more detailed information regarding a particular topic and/or population. Recently, both a police contact and gang addenda were used, collecting information from arrestees about in general, use of force by and against the police (Police Contact Addendum), reasons and methods for joining and leaving a gang, gang organizational structure and criminal activities, and the respondents' perceptions of cohesion and connectedness to their gang (Gang Addendum).

Urinalysis Testing

Once an interview is completed, the arrestee then submits a urine sample. The urine specimens are tested for alcohol and four illicit drugs: cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine and opiates. The testing is done using the enzyme-multiplied immunoassay technique (EMIT), which has shown a high degree of accuracy with very few false-positive results (Reardon, 1993). As a reliability check, all specimens that test positive with the EMIT methods are then tested again using Gas Chromatography with Mass Spectrum Detection (GC/MS). The EMIT technique with GC/MS confirmation procedures are well-established and offer highly reliable results for the illicit drugs under study here – cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine and opiates – for up to 72 hours after use. Unfortunately, these procedures offer high reliability results for alcohol for only 12-24 hours after use. The adoption of more sensitive alcohol screening procedures was cost-prohibitive.

Sample Used in the Present Report

The analyses presented in this report are derived from 177 completed interviews. Initial analyses, presented in characteristics of the sample used 179 completed interviews, but 2 cases were dropped from subsequent analyses because the “other” probation category contained just 2 respondents, which neither provides sufficient anonymity, nor statistical validity. Originally, 246 detainees were screened used the methodology described above, at which time 24.4% (n=60) were eliminated as ineligible for a variety of reasons (e.g. released, transferred to another facility, segregated to isolation due to violent behavior, etc.). Of the remaining 186 available and eligible detainees, 97.3% (n=181) agreed to participate, and of those 98.9% (n=179) completed the interview.

Juvenile Probation Department Report

The analysis and report presented here is prepared specifically for the Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) on behalf of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) and Maricopa County Manager as part of their support of the Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network (AARIN). The researchers at Arizona State University and its Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety are the authors of this report and any errors, omissions and opinions are their own and do not necessarily reflect the other parties.

The analysis plan and the format of this report are derived from numerous meetings held over more than an eighteen month span with the AARIN project advisory board, Maricopa County leadership, and representatives from JPD. Following the guidance of the advisory board, the dissemination strategy for the AARIN project shifted from a single, broadly scoped annual summary report supplemented by smaller topic-specific reports into shorter individual reports, tailored to the specific needs and wants of six key county criminal justice agencies. Meetings with JPD representatives regarding their individualized report indicated they would be most interested in a broad analysis akin to the traditional AARIN annual reports. A key modification to this broad traditional analysis strategy, this report compares juvenile detainees in two categories of probation history – never served probation and served probation in Maricopa County, each defined for either lifetime or currently serving probation, ultimately yielding four analysis categories. Each of the two probation categories are mutually exclusive within a given time period (i.e. lifetime and currently). Given the JPD's need for the broadly scoped analysis as opposed to a topically focused and interpretive report, the report here primarily provides analyses across most of the core instrument elements, presented in tabular form, with a list of key findings and highlights.

Key Findings

The analyses for this report are derived from the 177 (n=179 for sample and characteristics analyses) juvenile detainees who completed the interview (with or without a testable urine sample). Participants were interviewed at either the Durango detention facility or the Southeast Facility (SEF) of the Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department. The majority (64.2%) of participants reported to have been on probation with Maricopa County at some time in their life, 1.1% (n=2) of detainees reported having been on probation outside of Maricopa County, and the remaining 34.6% reported never having been on probation. See Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1: Sample of Detainees by Probation Status (n=179)

	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently
n	62	83	2	2	115	94	179	179
%	34.6	46.4	1.1	1.1	64.2	52.5	100.0	100.0

Characteristics of the Sample (Exhibit 2)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- The majority of past Maricopa County juvenile probationers were male (80.0% ever; 78.7% currently).
- Most were 15-16 years old (60.0% ever; 59.6% currently), followed by 17 year-olds (26.1% and 25.5%, respectively).
- The majority identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino (44.3% ever; 43.6% currently), followed by white (7.8% and 29.8%, respectively) and “other”¹ (12.2% and 10.6%, respectively).
- The vast majority of past and current Maricopa JPD probationers reported US citizenship (94.8 and 95.7%, respectively).
- More than half (56.5% ever; 57.4% currently) were still attending school; and of those who were no longer attending school, 40-43 percent had dropped-out, and 3-6 percent had been expelled.
- Approximately 17 percent (16.7% ever; 17.0% currently) reported working at least part-time in the 30 days prior to their detention. Roughly one-third (33.0% ever; 31.9% currently) reported income from illegal sources and about one in six reported that they only had income from illegal sources.
- Though the vast majority of past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported residing in a private residence in the month before their arrest (88.7% ever; 88.3% currently), 13.8% of current Maricopa probationers reported experience with chronic homelessness.² The vast majority also reported that other children lived in their home (88.7% ever; 88.3% currently).
- Most commonly, past Maricopa County juvenile probationers were detained for “other” offenses³ (61.4% ever; 65.6% currently), though 1 in 7 were arrested for a violent offense (14.0% ever; 12.9% currently).

¹ The “other” race/ethnicity category collapsed Asian/Pacific Islander and “other” responses into a single category.

² Chronic homelessness is defined by AARIN using the definition provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Respondents are classified as having a chronic homelessness problem if they had no fixed residence or were residing/sleeping in a place not intended for human habitation and were either: 1) homeless for 12 continuous months; or 2) had experienced at least four (or more) episodes in the past three years.

³ Offenses in the other/miscellaneous category typically include, but are not limited to: probation violation, failure to appear, failure to pay fines, prostitution, driving on a suspended license, and disorderly conduct.

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers versus Non-Probationers

- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers were less likely than non-probationers to be male (80.0% vs. 87.1%, ever), Hispanic/Latino (44.3% v. 53.2%, ever) and to be attending school (56.5% v. 62.9%, ever), but there was no difference in citizenship/legal immigrant status.
- Past probationers were more likely to attend charter schools than non-probationers (35.7% v. 19.4%, ever) and “other” schools (21.4% v. 9.7%, ever).
- Past probationers were more likely to be working than non-probationers (16.7% v. 13.4%, ever).
- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported similar rates of illegal-only income (16.5% ever; 14.9% currently) as non-probationers (14.5% ever; 16.9%, currently). However, they were more likely to have reported both legal and illegal income (16.5% ever; 17.0% currently) in the past 30 days than non-probationers (8.1% ever; 9.6% currently).
- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers were more likely to have been homeless (or had no fixed residence) in the month prior to detention (4.3% ever; 5.3% currently) than non-probationers (0.0% ever and currently).
- Past Maricopa JPD probationers have more extensive prior arrest and incarceration histories than non-probationers (70.2% and 71.0% v. 24.2% and 34.9%, respectively – ever and currently), though they were less likely to have been arrested for violent (14.0% v. 29.0% ever; 12.9% v. 26.5% currently) or property (13.2% v. 43.5% ever; 10.8% v. 38.6% currently) charges.
- Nearly half (48.7%) of respondents who had ever been on probation with Maricopa County reported to have been incarcerated within the past 12 months, compared to 4.8% of non-probationers.

Exhibit 2: Characteristics of the Detainee Population by Probation Status (n=179)

	n =	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
		Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently
		62	83	2	2	115	94	179	179
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sex									
Male		87.1	86.7	50.0	50.0	80.0	78.7	82.1	82.1
Female		12.9	13.3	50.0	50.0	20.0	21.3	17.9	17.9
Age category									
12 or younger		6.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	1.7	2.1	3.4	3.4
13		4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.5
14		11.3	9.6	0.0	0.0	7.8	8.5	8.9	8.9
15		22.6	22.9	0.0	0.0	20.9	20.2	21.2	21.2
16		32.3	33.7	100.0	100.0	39.1	39.4	37.4	37.4
17		22.6	24.1	0.0	0.0	26.1	25.5	24.6	24.6
Mean *		15.58	15.48	15.37	16.00	15.69	15.66	15.58	15.58
Race/ethnicity									
White		17.7	18.1	0.0	0.0	27.8	29.8	24.0	24.0
Black		17.7	15.7	0.0	0.0	9.6	9.6	12.3	12.3
Hispanic		53.2	51.8	50.0	50.0	44.3	43.6	47.5	47.5
Native American		1.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	6.1	6.4	4.5	4.5
Other		9.7	12.0	50.0	50.0	12.2	10.6	11.7	11.7
US Citizenship or Current Legal Status * †									
Illegal		1.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.1	2.2	2.2
Legal (visa, etc.)		1.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.1	2.2	2.2
US Citizen		96.8	95.2	100.0	100.0	94.8	95.7	95.5	95.5
Still attending school		62.9	60.2	50.0	50.0	56.5	57.4	58.7	58.7
Reason no longer attending school	n=	24	33	1	1	49	40	74	74
Graduated or GED		8.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.4	20.0	14.9	14.9
Expelled		25.0	24.2	0.0	0.0	6.1	2.5	12.2	12.2
Suspended		8.3	6.1	0.0	0.0	10.2	12.5	9.5	9.5
Drop Out		50.0	51.5	100.0	100.0	42.9	40.0	45.9	45.9
Other		8.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	22.4	25.0	17.6	17.6

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p \leq .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Exhibit 2 (cont): Characteristics of the Detainee Population by Probation Status (n=179)

	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently
	n =							
	62	83	2	2	115	94	179	179
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Type of school most recently attended *								
Public district school	71.0	63.4	50.0	50.0	31.4	30.0	43.7	43.7
Charter school	19.4	24.4	50.0	50.0	35.7	35.0	31.1	31.1
Private school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.7	1.0	1.0
Detention school	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	6.8	6.8
Other	9.7	9.8	0.0	0.0	21.4	23.3	17.5	17.5
Main source of income (past 30 days)								
Working full time	1.7	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.7	4.5	2.9	2.9
Working part time	11.7	12.5	50.0	50.0	13.0	12.5	12.9	12.9
Welfare, SSI, or AFDC	1.7	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.2
Family or other legal sources	53.3	48.8	50.0	50.0	42.6	44.3	46.5	46.5
Prostitution or drug sales	10.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	13.0	11.4	11.8	11.8
Other illegal sources	10.0	11.2	0.0	0.0	14.8	14.8	12.9	12.9
No income	11.7	12.5	0.0	0.0	12.0	11.4	11.8	11.8
Income in past 30 days								
Legal Income Only	66.1	61.4	100.0	100.0	53.9	55.3	58.7	58.7
Illegal Income Only	14.5	16.9	0.0	0.0	16.5	14.9	15.6	15.6
Both Legal and Illegal Income	8.1	9.6	0.0	0.0	16.5	17.0	13.4	13.4
No Income Reported	11.3	12.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	12.8	12.3	12.3

* *t* test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Exhibit 2 (cont): Characteristics of the Detainee Population by Probation Status (n=179)

	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently	Ever	Currently
	n =							
	62	83	2	2	115	94	179	179
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Type of residence (past 30 days)								
Private residence	98.4	96.4	100.0	100.0	88.7	88.3	92.2	92.2
Public or group housing	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.1
Hospital or care facility	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.2	2.2	2.2
Incarcerated	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shelter	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No fixed residence or on the street	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	5.3	2.8	2.8
Other	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.1	1.7	1.7
Chronic Homelessness								
Yes	11.3	9.6	50.0	50.0	12.2	13.8	12.3	12.3
Children in the home								
Yes	98.4	96.4	100.0	100.0	88.7	88.3	92.2	92.2
Medical Insurance Coverage †								
Yes	62.9	64.6	100.0	100.0	75.7	81.5	71.5	74.0
Most serious offense at arrest * †								
Violent	29.0	26.5	0.0	0.0	14.0	12.9	19.1	19.1
Drug	11.3	10.8	0.0	0.0	9.6	9.7	10.1	10.1
Property	43.5	38.6	0.0	0.0	13.2	10.8	23.6	23.6
Status	1.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.1	1.7	1.7
Miscellaneous	14.5	21.7	100.0	100.0	61.4	65.6	45.5	45.5
Prior arrest (past 12 months) *†								
Yes	24.2	34.9	100.0	100.0	70.2	71.0	54.5	54.5
Prior incarceration (past 12 months) *†								
Yes	4.8	10.8	50.0	50.0	48.7	53.2	33.5	33.5

* *t* test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Drug Use Results of Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status (Exhibit 3)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- Among past Maricopa County juvenile probationers, alcohol was the most common drug “ever used” (90.4% ever; 90.4% currently), closely followed by marijuana (89.6% ever; 89.4% currently), then powder cocaine (43.5% ever; 44.7% currently), methamphetamine (23.5% ever; 26.6% currently), heroin (13.0% ever; 16.0% currently), and crack cocaine (4.3% ever; 5.3% currently).
- Of those detainees who reported they were currently on probation in Maricopa County, 71.3% reported they had used marijuana in the past 12 months, 27.7% had used powder cocaine, 18.1% methamphetamine, 13.8% heroin, and 2.1% crack cocaine.
- Almost half (41.7% ever; 41.5% currently) of Maricopa County juvenile past probationers reported having used marijuana in the past 3 days, and more than half tested positive for it in urinalyses (57.4% ever; 56.4% currently).
- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers were, on average, 11.5 years old the first time they ever used marijuana, which was younger than for any other drug or alcohol (12.5 ever).
- About 1 in 20 Maricopa JPD past probationers tested positive for heroin or other opiates (6.1% ever; 7.4% currently) and 1 in 10 current Maricopa JPD probationers tested positive for methamphetamine (9.6%).

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- Respondents who were currently on probation with Maricopa County JPD were more likely than non-probationers to have used alcohol in the past 30 days, 52.1% compared to 39.8%.
- The results revealed significant differences in lifetime alcohol, powder cocaine and heroin use between those juveniles who have been on probation in their lifetime and those who have not. Among those juveniles who are currently on probation in Maricopa County, the results indicated significant differences between lifetime methamphetamine, powder cocaine and heroin use.
- Heroin use revealed the most pronounced differences between non-probationers and Maricopa County probationers, who were significantly more likely to report lifetime, past 12 month, past 30 days and past 3 day use, and were more likely to test positive for it on the urinalysis.
- Overall, juveniles who had never been on probation, or who were currently not on probation, were less likely to report use of any of the five drugs and alcohol.

Exhibit 3. Drug Use Results of Detainees by Probation Status (n=177)

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	n=					
	62	115	177	83	94	177
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Alcohol						
Lifetime *	80.6	90.4	87.0	83.1	90.4	87.0
Past 12 month	67.7	66.1	66.7	65.1	68.1	66.7
Past 30 days	41.9	48.7	46.3	39.8	52.1	46.3
Past 3 days	21.0	23.5	22.6	24.1	21.3	22.6
Positive UA	4.8	3.5	4.0	3.6	4.3	4.0
Age of first use (mean)	13.26	12.50	12.75	13.14	12.42	12.75
Marijuana						
Lifetime	82.3	89.6	87.0	84.3	89.4	87.0
Past 12 month	71.0	73.0	72.3	73.5	71.3	72.3
Past 30 days	50.8	60.5	57.1	53.1	60.6	57.1
Past 3 days	38.7	41.7	40.7	39.8	41.5	40.7
Positive UA	64.5	57.4	59.9	63.9	56.4	59.9
Age of first use (mean)	12.33	11.66	11.90	12.28	11.56	11.90
Methamphetamine						
Lifetime †	12.9	23.5	19.8	12.0	26.6	19.8
Past 12 month †	9.7	14.8	13.0	7.2	18.1	13.0
Past 30 days †	4.8	12.2	9.6	3.6	14.9	9.6
Past 3 days †	3.2	7.8	6.2	2.4	9.6	6.2
Positive UA	8.1	7.8	7.9	6.0	9.6	7.9
Age of first use (mean)	14.75	14.19	14.42	14.90	14.08	14.42

* *t* test or Chi-square significant at $p \leq .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Note: The urinalysis test used cannot distinguish between crack and powder cocaine, and thus UA results could be either.

Exhibit 3 (cont.). Drug Use Results of Detainees by Probation Status (n=177)

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	n=					
	62	115	177	83	94	177
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Crack						
Lifetime	1.6	4.3	3.4	1.2	5.3	3.4
Past 12 month	0.0	1.7	1.1	0.0	2.1	1.1
Past 30 days	0.0	1.7	1.1	0.0	2.1	1.1
Past 3 days	0.0	1.7	1.1	0.0	2.1	1.1
Positive UA	4.8	4.3	4.5	3.6	5.3	4.5
Age of first use						
(mean)	13.00	14.00	13.83	13.00	14.00	13.83
Powder Cocaine						
Lifetime * †	24.2	43.5	36.7	27.7	44.7	36.7
Past 12 month * †	12.9	26.1	21.5	14.5	27.7	21.5
Past 30 days †	4.8	12.2	9.6	3.6	14.9	9.6
Past 3 days	1.6	3.5	2.8	1.2	4.3	2.8
Positive UA	4.8	4.3	4.5	3.6	5.3	4.5
Age of first use						
(mean)	15.70	14.25	14.46	15.00	14.15	14.46
Heroin or other opiates						
Lifetime * †	1.6	13.0	9.0	1.2	16.0	9.0
Past 12 month * †	1.6	11.3	7.9	1.2	13.8	7.9
Past 30 days * †	0.0	7.0	4.5	0.0	8.5	4.5
Past 3 days	0.0	3.5	2.3	0.0	4.3	2.3
Positive UA * †	0.0	6.1	4.0	0.0	7.4	4.0
Age of first use						
(mean)	13.00	14.47	14.47	13.00	14.47	14.47

* *t* test or Chi-square significant at $p \leq .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Note: The urinalysis test used cannot distinguish between crack and powder cocaine, and thus UA results could be either.

Positive Urinalysis Results among Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status and Race/Ethnicity (Exhibit 4)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- Across all categories of probationers and race/ethnicity, marijuana was the most common drug for which detainees tested positive.
- A larger percentage of White past Maricopa JPD probationers tested positive for opiates (11.5% ever; 5.0% currently) than any other race/ethnicity. Those reporting Hispanic/Latino were second with 2.4% of lifetime probationers and 3.3% of current probationers.
- Native American/American Indian past probationers did not test positive for any drug except marijuana. Two-thirds (66.7%) of Native American/American Indian Maricopa County probationers (both lifetime and currently) tested positive for marijuana.

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- Among White detainees, higher percentages of current Maricopa County probationers tested positive for methamphetamine (20.0%) and opiates (5.0%) than non-probationers (8.3% for methamphetamine and 0.0% for opiates).
- Among Black/African-American respondents, non-probationers tested positive for marijuana at the highest rates among lifetime probation status (88.9%) and current status (72.7%) for all respondents.
- About two-thirds of all Hispanic/Latino detainees tested positive for marijuana, regardless of probation status.
- Among those reporting other race/ethnicity, 8.3% of past Maricopa County probationers and 14.3% of current probationers tested positive for methamphetamines, compared to 0.0% of non-probationers of either lifetime or current status.

Exhibit 4. Positive UA Results by Probation Status and Race/Ethnicity of Detainees

	n=	Lifetime			Currently		
		Never	Maricopa	Total	Never	Maricopa	Total
		62	115	177	83	94	177
		%	%	%	%	%	%
White Detainees							
Alcohol		9.1	3.7	5.3	7.7	0.0	3.0
Marijuana		40.0	42.3	41.7	41.7	35.0	37.5
Methamphetamine		10.0	15.4	13.9	8.3	20.0	15.6
Cocaine		10.0	0.0	2.8	8.3	0.0	3.1
Opiates		0.0	11.5	8.3	0.0	5.0	3.1
Black Detainees							
Alcohol		10.0	0.0	4.8	8.3	0.0	5.0
Marijuana		88.9	54.5	70.0	72.7	62.5	68.4
Methamphetamine		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cocaine		0.0	27.3	15.0	0.0	25.0	10.5
Opiates		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic/Latino Detainees							
Alcohol		3.0	2.3	2.6	2.4	3.2	2.7
Marijuana		63.6	61.9	61.8	65.9	60.0	62.5
Methamphetamine		12.1	2.4	6.6	9.8	3.3	6.9
Cocaine		6.1	2.4	3.9	4.9	3.3	4.2
Opiates		0.0	2.4	1.3	0.0	3.3	1.4
Native American Detainees							
Alcohol		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Marijuana		0.0	66.7	57.1	0.0	66.7	57.1
Methamphetamine		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cocaine		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Opiates		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Race/Ethnicity Detainees							
Alcohol		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Marijuana		80.0	66.7	70.6	66.7	85.7	75.0
Methamphetamine		0.0	8.3	5.9	0.0	14.3	6.3
Cocaine		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Opiates		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Total							
Alcohol		5.0	2.0	3.1	3.9	1.4	2.7
Marijuana		63.8	56.7	59.0	62.2	56.3	58.9
Methamphetamine		8.6	6.0	7.1	6.8	8.5	7.5
Cocaine		5.2	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.2	4.1
Opiates		0.0	4.1	2.6	0.0	2.8	1.4

* *t* test or Chi-square significant at $p \leq .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Drug Abuse and Dependence Screening Questions by Probation Status (Exhibit 5)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- Detainees who were currently on probation with Maricopa County were significantly more likely to have reported problems with drugs or alcohol than non-probationers. MCJPD probationers reported the following:
 - 32.2% reported using drugs (including prescription drugs) other than those required for medical reasons;
 - 21.7% felt sick, shaky or depressed when they stopped drinking or using drugs;
 - 40.0% continued to use drugs or alcohol despite problems caused by their use;
 - 34.8% engaged in illegal activities in order to obtain alcohol or drugs;
 - 26.1% neglected their family or friends because of their alcohol or drug use;
 - 29.6% had to increase the amount they drink or use more drugs to get the desired effect; and
 - 32.2% have neglected important work, social or recreational activities or responsibilities because of their alcohol or drug use.

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- More than a third of past probationers (34.8%) reported having engaged in illegal activities in order to obtain drugs or alcohol, compared to 22.6% of non-probationers.
- Almost a third (29.6%) of past probationers reported having to increase the amount of drugs or alcohol they use to get the effect they want, significantly more than the 14.5% of non-probationers.
- Past probationers who had neglected important school, social or recreational activities or responsibilities (32.2%) nearly tripled the percentage of non-probationers who had (11.3%).
- Past probationers ranked as at risk for either substance abuse or dependence (53.9%) according to the DAST-10⁴ scale significantly more often than non-probationers (37.1%), although both groups were at an alarmingly high risk for substance abuse or dependence.

⁴ Skinner, H.A. (1982) The Drug abuse screening test. *Addictive Behaviors* 7, 363-371.

Exhibit 5. Percentage of Detainees Responding "yes" to Substance Abuse and Dependence Screening Questions

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	n=					
	62	115	177	83	94	177
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Are you always able to stop using drugs or alcohol when you want to?	83.9	78.3	80.2	81.9	78.7	80.2
Have you ever felt sick, shaky, or depressed when you stopped drinking or using drugs? †	14.5	21.7	19.2	13.3	24.5	19.2
Have you used drugs other than those required for medical reasons?	25.8	32.2	29.9	26.5	33.0	29.9
Does your family or friends ever complain about your involvement with drugs or alcohol?* †	24.2	44.3	37.3	27.7	45.7	37.3
Have you continued to use alcohol or drugs despite problems caused by your use? *†	14.5	40.0	31.1	18.1	42.6	31.1
Have you ever engaged in illegal activities in order to obtain alcohol or drugs?	22.6	34.8	30.5	25.3	35.1	30.5
Do you abuse more than one drug at a time [<i>of any type</i>]? * †	24.2	41.7	35.6	26.5	43.6	35.6
Have you ever had blackouts or flashbacks as a result of drug or alcohol use? †	21.0	30.4	27.1	20.5	33.0	27.1

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Exhibit 5. Percentage of Detainees Responding "yes" to Substance Abuse and Dependence Screening Questions

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n=	62	115	177	83	94	177
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Do you ever feel bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use? * †	24.2	39.1	33.9	25.3	41.5	33.9
Have you ever neglected your family because of your alcohol or drug use? * †	8.1	26.1	19.8	9.6	28.7	19.8
Have you had medical problems as a result of your alcohol your drug use?	3.2	6.1	5.1	2.4	7.4	5.1
Has there ever been a time when you needed to increase the amount you drink or use more drugs to get the effect you want? *	14.5	29.6	24.3	16.9	30.9	24.3
Have you neglected important work, social or recreational activities or responsibilities because of your alcohol or drug use? * †	11.3	32.2	24.9	15.7	33.0	24.9
DAST 10-Drug Abuse Screening Test for risk of abuse or dependence? * †						
No Problem	8.1	2.6	4.5	7.2	2.1	4.5
Low Level	54.8	43.5	47.5	54.2	41.5	47.5
Moderate-Risk of Abuse	30.6	26.1	27.7	28.9	26.6	27.7
Substantial-Risk of Dependence	6.5	27.8	20.3	9.6	29.8	20.3

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Criminal Involvement of the Sample (Exhibits 6 and 7)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported extensive and frequent criminal involvement. For example, at some point in their lives, 19.5% have stolen a car, 35.4% have committed a burglary, 49.6% have assaulted someone (without a weapon), and 35.1% have sold or made drugs (see the lifetime MCJPD probation columns in Exhibit 7).
- In many cases, past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported frequent criminal activity, in many instances averaging one (or more) offense per month. For example, past probationers reported stealing property worth less than \$1,000 an average of 12.0 times in the past year, drove under the influence of drugs an average of 29.6 times, and possessed a firearm an average of 104.3 times in the past 12 months. The most frequent crime involved making or selling drugs, at an average of 124.9 times in the past year.
- Respondents currently serving probation with Maricopa County JPD reported frequent involvement in a variety of crimes of varying seriousness. In the past 12 months:
 - 21.5% had written or drawn graffiti, an average of about 100 times;
 - 29.0% had destroyed property worth less than \$250 (a misdemeanor), an average of 4.0 times;
 - 35.5% had stolen property worth less than \$1,000 (a misdemeanor), an average of 15.1 times;
 - 21.7% had committed a burglary, an average of 2.4 times;
 - 16.3% had stolen a car, an average of 7.4 times;
 - 22.6% had sold or made drugs an average of 119.9 times;
 - 31.5% had attacked or assaulted someone without using a weapon, an average of 7.1 times;
 - 12.0% had assaulted someone using a weapon, an average of 5.1 times; and
 - 20.7% had illegally carried a firearm an average of 109.5 times.

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported significantly younger average age of first arrest, 13.4 years compared to 14.2 years among non-probationers.
- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers were arrested/detained more than double the number of times as non-probationers in the past year (mean=1.9 v. 0.7).
- Criminal involvement among past Maricopa County juvenile probationers was far more extensive than non-probationers. For example, past probationer rates (ever) were about double those of non-probationers for stealing property worth more than \$1,000 (14.9% v. 8.1%), selling or making drugs (35.1% v. 16.1%), and assaulting someone without a weapon (49.6% v. 24.2%).
- Current Maricopa County probationers were significantly more likely than non-probationers to have destroyed property worth more than \$250 (26.9% v. 10.8%), stolen property worth more than \$1,000 (15.1% v. 9.6%), stolen a car (22.8% v. 9.6%), committed domestic violence (34.4% v. 18.1%), attacked/assaulted someone with a weapon (12.0% v. 6.0%), and committed an armed robbery (14.1% v. 4.8%). These patterns also generally extended to frequency of crimes committed.

Exhibit 6. Arrest/Detention History by Probation Status

		Lifetime			Probation Currently		
		Never on Probation	MCJPO Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCJPO Probation	Total
n =		62	115	177	83	94	177
How old were you the first time you were arrested? * †							
	Mean	14.2	13.4	13.7	14.1	13.3	13.7
	SD	1.98	2.12	2.09	2.00	2.16	2.11
Is this the first time you have been arrested? * †							
	N	26.0	7.0	33.0	27.0	5.0	32.0
	%	41.9	6.1	18.4	34.2	5.9	19.3
How many times have you been arrested in the past 12 months, not including this time? * †							
	Mean	0.7	1.9	1.5	0.8	2.0	1.4
	SD	1.81	2.22	2.15	1.69	2.33	2.12

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Exhibit 7. Criminal Involvement by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n =	62	114	176	83	93	176
Written/drawn graffiti on neighborhood houses, walls, schools, stores etc?						
Ever committed crime?	27.4	38.6	34.7	32.5	36.6	34.7
Done crime in past 12 months?	14.5	23.7	20.5	19.3	21.5	20.5
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	26.5	54.4	48.1	39.7	99.8	48.1
Standard Deviation	50.12	112.99	102.09	97.14	237.85	102.09
Ever arrested for this crime?	6.5	13.2	10.8	8.4	12.9	10.8
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.52	0.51	0.54	0.53	0.51
Destroyed property worth LESS than \$250?						
Ever committed crime?	9.7	41.2	30.1	13.3	45.2	30.1
Done crime in past 12 months?	8.1	27.2	20.5	10.8	29.0	20.5
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	2.2	3.7	3.4	2.4	4.0	3.4
Standard Deviation	1.64	5.55	5.19	1.81	6.23	5.19
Ever arrested for this crime?	3.2	18.4	13.1	3.6	21.5	13.1
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	1.0	0.7	0.7	1.3	0.6	0.7
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.64	0.62	0.58	0.62	0.62
Destroyed property worth MORE than \$250?						
Ever committed crime?	6.5	26.3	19.3	10.8	26.9	19.3
Done crime in past 12 months?	1.6	19.3	13.1	6.0	19.4	13.1
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	5.0	8.0	7.9	2.8	25.1	7.9
Standard Deviation	0.00	12.92	12.64	1.79	71.86	12.64
Ever arrested for this crime?	3.2	11.4	8.5	4.8	11.8	8.5
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4
Standard Deviation	0.71	0.65	0.63	0.58	0.68	0.63

Exhibit 7. Criminal Involvement by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n =	62	114	176	83	93	176
Stolen property worth LESS than \$1000?						
Ever committed crime?	30.6	50.9	43.8	36.1	50.5	43.8
Done crime in past 12 months?	19.4	36.8	30.7	25.3	35.5	30.7
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	1.7	12.0	9.7	2.6	15.1	9.7
Standard Deviation	1.16	22.67	20.41	4.11	26.46	20.41
Ever arrested for this crime?	16.1	19.3	18.2	21.7	15.1	18.2
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.9	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.8
Standard Deviation	0.57	0.50	0.52	0.49	0.51	0.52
Stolen property worth MORE than \$1000?						
Ever committed crime?	8.1	14.9	12.5	9.6	15.1	12.5
Done crime in past 12 months?	6.5	10.5	9.1	7.2	10.8	9.1
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	1.8	6.8	5.6	1.5	8.8	5.6
Standard Deviation	1.50	13.87	12.11	1.23	15.73	12.11
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.8	1.8	2.8	3.6	2.2	2.8
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.0	0.6
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.71	0.55	0.58	0.00	0.55
Stolen a car or motor vehicle?						
Ever committed crime?	11.3	19.5	16.6	9.6	22.8	16.6
Done crime in past 12 months?	11.3	14.2	13.1	9.6	16.3	13.1
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	7.4	2.8
Standard Deviation	2.24	3.66	3.24	2.19	20.28	3.24
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.8	7.1	6.3	6.0	6.5	6.3
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	1.3	0.6	0.8	1.2	0.5	0.8
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.52	0.60	0.45	0.55	0.60

Exhibit 7. Criminal Involvement by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n =	62	114	176	83	93	176
Driven under the influence of alcohol [DUI]?						
Ever committed crime?	14.5	19.5	17.7	14.5	20.7	17.7
Done crime in past 12 months?	9.7	15.0	13.1	9.6	16.3	13.1
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	39.0	7.4	9.0	13.0	6.9	9.0
Standard Deviation	78.97	12.10	13.50	15.43	12.40	13.50
Ever arrested for this crime?	0.0	3.5	2.3	1.2	3.3	2.3
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.3	0.5
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.58	0.58	0.00	0.58	0.58
Driven under the influence of drugs (not including alcohol)?						
Ever committed crime?	14.5	29.2	24.0	15.7	31.5	24.0
Done crime in past 12 months?	11.3	23.9	19.4	12.0	26.1	19.4
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	27.0	29.6	29.1	21.4	32.3	29.1
Standard Deviation	37.24	72.98	66.71	32.07	77.11	66.71
Ever arrested for this crime?	0.0	1.8	1.1	0.0	2.2	1.1
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.71	0.71	0.00	0.71	0.71

Exhibit 7. Criminal Involvement by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n =	62	114	176	83	93	176
Broke into a house, store, or building to commit theft?						
Ever committed crime?	29.0	35.4	33.1	28.9	37.0	33.1
Done crime in past 12 months?	19.4	21.2	20.6	19.3	21.7	20.6
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	17.6	2.3	2.1	1.7	2.4	2.1
Standard Deviation	57.54	1.88	1.93	1.85	2.06	1.93
Ever arrested for this crime?	17.7	11.5	13.7	16.9	10.9	13.7
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.9	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.8
Standard Deviation	0.30	0.51	0.44	0.36	0.53	0.44
Used someones ID or identity to commit theft, forgery, or fraud?						
Ever committed crime?	0.0	7.0	4.5	1.2	7.5	4.5
Done crime in past 12 months?	0.0	4.4	2.8	0.0	5.4	2.8
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	0.0	1.4	1.4	0.0	5.8	1.4
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.55	0.55	0.00	9.50	0.55
Ever arrested for this crime?	0.0	0.9	0.6	0.0	1.1	0.6
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sold or made drugs?						
Ever committed crime?	16.1	35.1	28.4	20.5	35.5	28.4
Done crime in past 12 months?	11.3	24.6	19.9	16.9	22.6	19.9
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	14.7	124.9	102.2	69.5	119.9	102.2
Standard Deviation	16.81	170.00	157.69	135.65	170.53	157.69
Ever arrested for this crime?	1.6	4.4	3.4	2.4	4.3	3.4
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.2
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.84	0.75	0.71	0.82	0.75

Exhibit 7. Criminal Involvement by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n =	62	114	176	83	93	176
Threaten to attack someone without using a weapon?						
Ever committed crime?	17.7	38.9	31.4	25.3	37.0	31.4
Done crime in past 12 months?	8.1	28.3	21.1	15.7	26.1	21.1
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	2.6	9.8	8.9	2.6	17.4	8.9
Standard Deviation	1.82	17.67	16.60	1.90	31.31	16.60
Ever arrested for this crime?	1.6	8.0	5.7	4.8	6.5	5.7
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.0	1.2	1.1	0.8	1.0	1.1
Standard Deviation	0.00	1.09	1.10	0.50	1.41	1.10
Threaten to attack someone using a weapon?						
Ever committed crime?	9.7	20.4	16.6	13.3	19.6	16.6
Done crime in past 12 months?	3.2	3.0	12.6	8.4	16.3	12.6
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	1.0	2.7	2.8	2.7	6.5	2.8
Standard Deviation	0.00	10.38	2.65	3.25	13.87	2.65
Ever arrested for this crime?	1.6	4.4	3.4	2.4	4.3	3.4
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.71	0.63	0.00	0.71	0.63
Committed domestic violence (including assault, disorderly conduct, criminal damage, etc.)?						
Ever committed crime?	8.1	36.8	26.7	18.1	34.4	26.7
Done crime in past 12 months?	6.5	22.8	17.0	10.8	22.6	17.0
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.7
Standard Deviation	0.50	1.25	1.18	0.73	0.78	1.18
Ever arrested for this crime?	6.5	24.6	18.2	12.0	23.7	18.2
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8
Standard Deviation	0.00	1.00	0.93	0.92	0.67	0.93

Exhibit 7. Criminal Involvement by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	n = 62	114	176	83	93	176
Attacked, assaulted or beaten-up someone without using a weapon?						
Ever committed crime?	24.2	49.6	40.6	33.7	46.7	40.6
Done crime in past 12 months?	16.1	33.6	27.4	22.9	31.5	27.4
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	6.6	5.6	5.7	3.9	7.1	5.7
Standard Deviation	11.23	12.38	12.06	8.16	14.47	12.06
Ever arrested for this crime?	3.2	8.8	6.9	8.4	5.4	6.9
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	2.0	0.8	1.0	1.3	3.0	1.0
Standard Deviation	1.41	1.03	1.13	0.95	6.71	1.13
Attacked, assaulted or beaten-up someone using a weapon?						
Ever committed crime?	3.2	12.4	9.1	6.0	12.0	9.1
Done crime in past 12 months?	0.0	11.5	7.4	2.4	12.0	7.4
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	0.0	2.4	2.4	1.0	5.1	2.4
Standard Deviation	0.0	2.18	2.18	0.00	7.75	2.18
Ever arrested for this crime?	0.0	2.7	1.7	1.2	2.2	1.7
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Standard Deviation	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Possessed a firearm while prohibited (felony conviction, probation, underage, etc.)?						
Ever committed crime?	21.0	29.2	26.3	22.9	29.3	26.3
Done crime in past 12 months?	12.9	20.4	17.7	14.5	20.7	17.7
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	1.1	104.3	76.8	36.3	109.5	76.8
Standard Deviation	0.35	163.75	146.87	104.60	170.04	146.87
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.8	6.2	5.7	6.0	5.4	5.7
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	1.0	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.7
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.54	0.48	0.00	0.55	0.48

Exhibit 7. Criminal Involvement by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	n = 62	114	176	83	93	176
Participated in a drive-by shooting?						
Ever committed crime?	0.0	6.2	4.0	1.2	6.5	4.0
Done crime in past 12 months?	0.0	2.7	1.7	0.0	3.3	1.7
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.7	1.7
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.58	0.58	0.00	0.58	0.58
Ever arrested for this crime?	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Robbed someone by force or by threat of force without using a weapon?						
Ever committed crime?	3.2	15.9	11.4	6.0	16.3	11.4
Done crime in past 12 months?	1.6	10.6	7.4	3.6	10.9	7.4
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	1.0	4.3	4.0	1.0	5.2	4.0
Standard Deviation	0.00	4.39	4.30	0.00	4.71	4.30
Ever arrested for this crime?	1.6	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Robbed someone by force or by threat of force using a weapon?						
Ever committed crime?	1.6	14.2	9.7	4.8	14.1	9.7
Done crime in past 12 months?	1.6	12.4	8.6	4.8	12.0	8.6
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months	2.0	3.6	3.5	1.3	4.5	3.5
Standard Deviation	0.00	2.93	2.85	0.50	3.03	2.85
Ever arrested for this crime?	0.0	0.9	0.6	0.0	1.1	0.6
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Gang Involvement among Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status (Exhibit 8)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- Approximately 1 in 4 (31.4% lifetime, 24.7% currently) past probationers were either current or former gang members, or had multiple friends who were.
- Lifetime past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported current gang membership status 15.7% of the time, and similarly 15.3% of current probationers were current gang members.

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- Past probationers were more likely to have identify as current or former gang members themselves, than were non-probationers, 19.2% lifetime and 18.8% current probationers compared to 6.4% lifetime and 8.8% currently, respectively.
- Current probationers reported much lower rates of having friends who were gang members than non-probationers, 5.9% compared to 20.3%, respectively.

Exhibit 8. Gang Involvement Among Detainees by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	n=					
	62	115	177	83	94	177
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Relationship						
None	75.8	68.7	71.5	70.9	75.3	73.5
Current	4.8	15.7	11.7	6.3	15.3	10.8
Former	1.6	3.5	2.8	2.5	3.5	3.0
Friend	17.7	12.2	14.0	20.3	5.9	12.7

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Mental Health History among Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status (Exhibit 9)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- On average, about one-third (30.4%) of those juveniles who reported being on probation in their lifetime, said they had been treated for a mental health problem.
- Almost one-fourth (22.3%) of those currently on probation in Maricopa County said they have been treated by a counselor, social worker or other mental health professional for a mental health problem within the past 12 months.
- Nineteen percent of current Maricopa County probationers felt that they could use treatment, medication or other help from a mental health professional at some time in the year, contrasted against the 8.5% who actually sought help.

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- Among past Maricopa County juvenile probationers, twice as many (24.3%) had been diagnosed with a mental health problem in the past 12 months compared to 12.9% of non-probationers.
- Current Maricopa County juvenile probationers were about twice as likely (31.9%) to have been treated by a mental health professional than non-probationers (15.7%).
- Juveniles currently on Maricopa County probation were about twice as likely than juveniles who had not been on probation to report having been prescribed medication for a mental health, emotional or psychiatric problem by a mental health professional (28.1% v. 9.7%, ever; 27.7% v. 14.6%, currently).
- Maricopa County juvenile probationers were significantly more likely than non-probationers to present with at least a medium-high risk for a co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorder (14.9% v. 3.2%, ever; 16.0% v. 4.9%, current).

Exhibit 9. Mental Health History Among Arrestees by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n=	62	114	176	82	94	176
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Have you been told by a counselor, social worker, or doctor that you have a mental health illness, or emotional problem?						
Ever	25.8	35.7	32.2	28.9	35.1	32.2
Past 12 months *	12.9	24.3	20.3	15.7	24.5	20.3
Have you ever been treated by a counselor, social worker for a mental health problem?						
Ever * †	12.9	30.4	24.3	15.7	31.9	24.3
Past 12 months * †	6.5	20.9	15.8	8.4	22.3	15.8
Have you ever been given or prescribed medication for a mental health, emotional or psychiatric problem by a mental health professional?						
Ever * †	9.7	28.1	21.6	14.6	27.7	21.6
Past 12 months * †	6.5	20.2	15.3	8.5	21.3	15.3
Have you ever been hospitalized for a mental health problem?						
Ever	6.5	14.0	11.4	11.0	11.7	11.4
Past 12 months	4.8	7.0	6.2	6.1	6.4	6.2
Have you been diagnosed with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, or PTSD?						
Ever	3.2	2.6	2.8	2.4	3.2	2.8
Past 12 months	3.2	2.6	2.8	2.4	3.2	2.8
Have you been civilly committed for a mental health problem?						
Ever	0.0	2.6	1.7	1.2	2.1	1.7
Past 12 Months-Refused	0.0	2.6	1.7	1.2	2.1	1.7

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Exhibit 9. Mental Health History Among Arrestees by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n=	62	114	176	82	94	176
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Have you felt that you could use treatment, medication, or other help from a mental health professional?						
Ever *†	6.5	18.4	14.2	8.5	19.1	14.2
Past 12 months* †	4.8	16.7	12.5	7.3	17.0	12.5
Have you sought help for a mental problem?						
Ever	1.6	8.7	6.2	3.6	8.5	6.2
Past 12 months	1.6	7.0	5.1	2.4	7.4	5.1
Have you experienced the death of someone close to you?						
Ever * †	48.8	67.9	61.3	50.0	70.1	61.3
Past 12 months	24.4	23.1	23.5	23.1	23.9	23.5
Lifetime Prevalence of Co-Occurring Risk Factors for Mental Health Problems						
No Risk	71.0	57.9	62.5	68.3	57.4	62.5
Low Risk	12.9	7.9	9.7	9.8	9.6	9.7
Medium-Low Risk	9.7	13.2	11.9	12.2	11.7	11.9
Medium-High Risk	3.2	9.6	7.4	2.4	11.7	7.4
High Risk	3.2	11.4	8.5	7.3	9.6	8.5
Past 12 Months Prevalence of Co-Occurring Risk Factors for Mental Health Problems * †						
No Risk	85.5	66.7	73.3	81.7	66.0	73.3
Low Risk	4.8	13.2	10.2	6.4	13.8	10.2
Medium-Low Risk	6.5	5.3	5.7	7.3	4.3	5.7
Medium-High Risk	0.0	10.5	6.8	1.2	11.7	6.8
High Risk	3.2	4.4	4.0	3.7	4.3	4.0

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Firearm Possession among Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status (Exhibit 10)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- One in eight (12.3%) of past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported having had a gun in their possession while committing a crime in the past 12 months, whether or not they actually used the gun.
- Nearly half (43.6%) of current Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported having had a gun in their possession at some time in their life.

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers

- Gun carrying in the past year was nearly identical among past Maricopa County probationers (29.6%) and non-probationers (24.2%).
- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers were significantly more likely than non-probationers to have used a gun to commit a crime in the past year (12.3% v. 3.2%).

Exhibit 10. Firearm Possession By Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n=	62	115	177	83	94	177
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Have you had a gun in your possession?						
Ever	40.3	42.2	42.4	41.0	43.6	42.4
Past 12 Months	24.2	29.6	27.7	25.3	29.8	27.7
Have you had a gun in your possession while committing a crime, whether or not you actually used the gun?						
Ever *	4.8	14.0	10.8	7.2	14.0	10.8
Past 12 Months *	3.2	12.3	9.1	6.0	11.8	9.1
Have you used a gun to commit a crime?						
Ever *	4.8	12.3	9.7	7.2	11.8	9.7
Past 12 Months *	3.2	10.5	8.0	4.8	10.8	8.0

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Police Contact Experiences among Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status (Exhibit 11)

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers

- Four in five (69.6%) of past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported that during their most recent interaction with police, the officer treated them with respect.
- Nearly three-quarters of past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported the officer during their most recent interaction behaved professionally (72.2%) and treated them fairly (79.1%).

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- Reported physical injury during the most recent police contact was the only significant difference between Maricopa County juvenile probationers (13.9%) and non-probationers (3.2%).

Exhibit 11. Police Contact Among Detainees by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	n=					
	62	115	177	83	94	177
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Did the police officer...						
...treat you with respect?	67.7	69.6	68.9	66.3	71.3	68.9
...treat you fairly?	72.6	79.1	76.8	74.7	78.7	76.8
...act professionally?	64.5	72.2	69.5	66.3	72.3	69.5
...threaten to use force against you for any reason?	14.5	22.8	19.9	18.3	21.3	19.9
...use force against you for any reason?	9.7	17.5	14.8	11.0	18.1	14.8
Were you physically injured as a result of this incident? * †	3.2	13.9	10.2	4.8	14.9	10.2
Did you argue or disobey with the officer for any reason?	9.7	13.0	11.9	10.8	12.8	11.9
Did you physically resist being searched or handcuffed?	4.8	6.1	5.6	4.8	6.4	5.6

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Currently".

Victimization Experiences among Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status (Exhibits 12 and 13)

Maricopa County Probationers

- Past Maricopa County probationers have significant histories with violent victimization. Nearly one-third (31.3%) of lifetime Maricopa County probationers had been assaulted or attacked without a weapon in the past 12 months and 33.0% of current MCJPD probationers had been threatened with a gun in the past 12 months. See Exhibit 12.
- Victimization in the past 30 days was also significant. For example, 14.9% of current probationers reported that they had been threatened with a gun at some time in the past 30 days, and 10.6% had been assaulted or attacked (without a weapon). See Exhibit 12.

Maricopa County Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- Lifetime non-probationers reported lower rates of 12-month victimization compared to probationers. For example, Maricopa County juvenile probationers were about five times as likely to have been threatened with a weapon (other than a gun) (33.9% v. 6.5%) or having been attacked or assaulted (31.3% v. 14.5%) in the past 12 months, and to be threatened with a gun (13.9% v. 4.8%), or shot or shot at (8.7% v. 1.6%) in the past 30 days.

Exhibit 12. Victimization Rates in the Past 12 Months Among Detainees by Probation Status

		Lifetime			Probation Currently			
		Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	
		n=	62	115	177	83	94	177
			%	%	%	%	%	%
Threaten with a gun	%		24.2	30.4	28.2	22.9	33.0	28.2
		n=	15	35	50	19	31	50
			% of those Threatened			% of those Threatened		
Was the incident DV related?			6.7	14.3	12.0	5.3	16.1	12.0
Was the incident gang related?			46.7	48.6	48.0	57.9	41.9	48.0
Did you know the offender? †			20.0	68.6	54.0	31.6	67.7	54.0
Shot or Shot At	%		14.5	19.1	17.5	15.7	19.1	17.5
		n=	9	22	31	13	18	31
			% of those Shot or Shot At			% of those Shot or Shot At		
Was the incident DV related?			0.0	18.2	12.9	0.0	22.2	12.9
Was the incident gang related?			33.3	77.3	64.5	46.2	77.8	64.5
Did you know the offender? †			11.1	59.1	45.2	38.5	50.0	45.2
Threatened with a weapon (not a gun) *†	%		6.5	33.9	24.3	13.3	34.0	24.3
		n=	4	39	43	11	32	43
			% of those Threatened with a weapon (not a gun)			% of those Threatened with a weapon (not a gun)		
Was the incident DV related? *			0.0	30.8	27.9	27.3	28.1	27.9
Was the incident gang related?			0.0	41.0	37.2	36.4	37.5	37.2
Did you know the offender?			25.0	69.2	65.1	45.5	71.9	65.1

* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

Exhibit 12. Victimization Rates in the Past 12 Months Among Detainees by Probation Status

		Lifetime			Probation Currently		
		Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n=		62	115	177	83	94	177
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Injured with a weapon (not a gun) *	%	1.6	13.9	9.6	3.6	14.9	9.6
n=		1	16	17	3	14	17
		% of those injured with a weapon (not a gun)			% of those injured with a weapon (not a gun)		
Was the incident DV related?		0.0	25.0	23.5	0.0	28.6	23.5
Was the incident gang related?		0.0	37.5	35.3	33.3	35.7	35.3
Did you know the offender?		100.0	56.2	58.8	66.7	57.1	58.8
Attacked or assaulted without a weapon * †	%	14.5	31.3	25.4	18.1	31.9	25.4
n=		9	36	45	15	30	45
		% of those attacked or assaulted without a weapon			% of those attacked or assaulted without a weapon		
Was the incident DV related?		11.1	36.1	31.1	33.3	30.0	31.1
Was the incident gang related?		22.2	27.8	26.7	20.0	30.0	26.7
Did you know the offender?		55.6	75.0	71.1	60.0	76.7	71.1

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

Exhibit 13. Victimization Rates in the Past 30 Days Among Detainees by Probation Status

		Lifetime			Probation Currently		
		Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n=		62	115	177	83	94	177
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Threaten with a gun * †	%	4.8	13.9	10.7	6.0	14.9	10.7
n=		3	16	19	5	14	19
		% of those Threatened			% of those Threatened		
Was the incident DV related?		0.0	12.5	10.5	0.0	14.3	10.5
Was the incident gang related?		33.3	56.2	52.6	60.0	50.0	52.6
Did you know the offender?		33.3	56.2	52.6	60.0	50.0	52.6
Shot or Shot At * †	%	1.6	8.7	6.2	2.4	9.6	6.2
n=		1	10	11	2	9	11
		% of those Shot or Shot At			% of those Shot or Shot At		
Was the incident DV related?		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Was the incident gang related?		0.0	70.0	63.6	50.0	66.7	63.6
Did you know the offender?		0.0	50.0	45.5	50.0	44.4	45.5
Threatened with a weapon (not a gun) * †	%	4.8	7.0	6.2	4.8	7.4	6.2
n=		3	8	11	4	7	11
		% of those Threatened with a weapon (not a gun)			% of those Threatened with a weapon (not a gun)		
Was the incident DV related?		0.0	12.5	9.1	0.0	14.3	9.1
Was the incident gang related?		0.0	62.5	45.5	25.0	57.1	45.5
Did you know the offender?		0.0	75.0	54.5	25.0	71.4	54.5

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

Exhibit 13. Victimization Rates in the Past 30 Days Among Detainees by Probation Status

		Lifetime			Probation Currently		
		Never on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
n=		62	115	177	83	94	177
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Injured with a weapon (not a gun) *	%	1.6	3.5	2.8	2.4	3.2	2.8
n=		1	4	5	2	3	5
		% of those injured with a weapon (not a gun)			% of those injured with a weapon (not a gun)		
Was the incident DV related?		0.0	50.0	40.0	0.0	66.7	40.0
Was the incident gang related?		0.0	75.0	60.0	50.0	66.7	60.0
Did you know the offender?		0.0	100.0	80.0	50.0	100.0	80.0
Attacked or assaulted without a weapon	%	4.8	10.4	8.5	6.0	10.6	8.5
n=		3	12	15	5	10	15
		% of those attacked or assaulted without a weapon			% of those attacked or assaulted without a weapon		
Was the incident DV related?		0.0	33.3	26.7	20.0	30.0	26.7
Was the incident gang related?		0.0	33.3	26.7	0.0	40.0	26.7
Did you know the offender?		33.3	66.7	60.0	40.0	70.0	60.0

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

Caregiver Characteristics among Juvenile Detainees by Probation Status (Exhibit 14)

Maricopa County Probationers

- Past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported significant criminal history experiences among those with whom they have lived in the past 12 months. For example, 45.7% said someone in their home had been arrested at some time in their life, and 34.3% had served time in jail or prison.
- The majority of all respondents identified a biological parent as their primary caregiver in the past month. For example, 73.1% of current Maricopa County juvenile probationers identified a biological parent as their primary caregiver, as did 77.0% of non-probationers (currently).

Maricopa County Probationers vs. Non-Probationers

- The only significant difference between probationer status and identified past month primary caregiver was for siblings, where 9.8% of lifetime non-probationers identified a sibling compared to 0.0% of Maricopa County juvenile probationers.
- One in four (23.3%) current Maricopa County juvenile probationers said that someone (other than themselves) in their home had been on probation in the past 12 months, compared to just 8.3% of non-probationers. This was the only significant difference between probation status and criminal justice involvement of household members.

Exhibit 14. Detainee Caregiver Characteristics by Probation Status

	Lifetime			Probation Currently		
	Never on Probation	Maricopa Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Maricopa Probation	Total
	n=					
	41	78	119	52	67	119
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Primary caregiver in the past 30 days:						
Mother	58.5	53.8	55.5	55.8	55.2	55.5
Father	19.5	19.2	19.3	21.2	17.9	19.3
Stepmother	2.4	1.3	1.7	3.8	0.0	1.7
Stepfather	0.0	2.6	1.7	0.0	3.0	1.7
Foster parent(s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grandparent(s)	9.8	3.8	5.9	7.7	4.5	5.9
Sibling(s) * †	9.8	0.0	3.4	7.7	0.0	3.4
Other family	4.9	6.4	5.9	3.8	7.5	5.9
Group home staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Treatment facility staff	0.0	6.4	4.2	1.9	6.0	4.2
Other	7.3	17.9	14.3	11.5	16.4	14.3
	40	70	110	49	61	110
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Of the people with whom you have lived over the past 30 days, have any of them been...						
Arrested - Ever	62.5	45.7	51.8	57.1	47.5	51.8
Arrested - In the past 12 months	20.0	18.6	19.1	16.3	21.3	19.1
On probation - Ever	28.2	33.3	31.5	27.1	35.0	31.5
On probation - In the past 12 months †	10.3	20.3	16.7	8.3	23.3	16.7
On probation - Currently	10.3	17.4	14.8	8.3	20.0	14.8
In jail or prison - Ever	45.0	34.3	38.2	40.8	36.1	38.2
In jail or prison - In the past 12 months	15.0	17.1	16.4	12.2	19.7	16.4
In jail or prison - Currently	7.5	2.9	4.5	6.1	3.3	4.5

* t test or Chi-square significant at $p < .05$ for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

Maricopa County Juvenile Probationer Perceptions of Probation Officers (Exhibits 15)

Maricopa County Probationers

- The majority of past Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported favorable interactions with probation officers. During data collection in 2013, Maricopa County juvenile probationers were asked whether they felt their probation officer generally treated them respectfully, fairly and acted professionally.
- Lifetime Maricopa County juvenile probationers reported that their probation officer treated them respectfully (88.2%), fairly (81.6%) and acted professionally (89.5%).
- Current Maricopa County probationers similarly reported that their probation officer treated them respectfully (86.6%), fairly (80.6%) and acted professionally (89.6%).

Exhibit 15. Maricopa County Perceptions of Probation Officers

	Lifetime MCJPD	Current MCJPD
n=		
	%	%
Did your probation officer...		
...treat you with respect?	88.2	86.6
...treat you fairly?	81.6	80.6
...act professionally?	89.5	89.6

About the Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety

Arizona State University, in order to deepen its commitment to the communities of Arizona and to society as a whole, has set a new standard for research universities, as modeled by the New American University. Accordingly, ASU is measured not by whom we exclude, but by whom we include.

The University is pursuing research that considers the public good and is assuming a greater responsibility to our communities for economic, social, and cultural vitality. Social embeddedness – university-wide, interactive, and mutually-supportive partnerships with Arizona communities – is at the core of our development as a New American University.

Toward the goal of social embeddedness, in response to the growing need of our communities to improve the public's safety and well-being, in July 2005 ASU established the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety. The Center's mission is to generate, share, and apply quality research and knowledge to create "best practice" standards.

Specifically, the Center evaluates policies and programs; analyzes and evaluates patterns and causes of violence; develops strategies and programs; develops a clearinghouse of research reports and "best practice" models; educates, trains, and provides technical assistance; and facilitates the development and construction of databases.

For more information about the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety, please contact us using the information provided below.

MAILING ADDRESS

Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety
College of Public Programs
Arizona State University
Mail Code 3120
500 N. 3rd Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2135

PHONE

602.496.1470

WEB SITE

<http://cvpcs.asu.edu>

