



GRADUATED RESPONSE SYSTEMS

Guiding Principles and Protocol Development

Developed by the PA Council of Chief
Juvenile Probation Officers'
Graduated Response Workgroup

June 2020

<p style="text-align: center;">Graduated Response Guiding Principles and Protocol Development</p>
--

- 1.1 [Introduction/Purpose](#)
- 1.2 [Supporting Research and Evidence from Learning Theory and Adolescent Brain Development](#)
- 1.3 [Mission Statement](#)
- 1.4 [Guiding Principles and Definitions](#)
 - [Rationale for Graduated Responses](#)
 - [Engagement of the Youth and Family](#)
 - [Application of Graduated Responses](#)
 - [Benefits of Graduated Responses](#)
- 1.5 [Development of a Graduated Response System](#)
 - [Gathering Information to Inform Graduated Response System Development](#)
 - [Information Gathering Methods](#)
- 1.6 [Eligibility](#)
- 1.7 [Orientation to Graduated Response Policies and Protocols](#)
- 1.8 [Administering Incentives](#)
- 1.9 [Classifying and Responding to Noncompliance by Youth under Consent Decree or Formal Probation Supervision](#)
- 1.10 [Documentation and Analysis](#)
- 1.11 [Tools](#)
- 1.12 [References](#)
- 1.13 [Appendix A](#)

1.1 Introduction/Purpose

The following document was created by the Graduated Response Workgroup of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers. The purpose of this document is to provide: 1) a philosophical, practical, and procedural overview of graduated response systems in juvenile probation; and 2) guidance for Pennsylvania counties to use when developing and implementing local graduated response policies and protocols.

The primary objectives for youth under juvenile probation supervision are to: 1) satisfactorily complete the requirements of their case plans, 2) successfully comply with probation requirements, and 3) refrain from becoming involved in additional acts of delinquency, which can be accomplished by internalizing long-term positive behavioral change. The use of a system of graduated responses can help youth achieve these critical objectives.

The graduated response approach provides empirically based strategies for responding effectively to behaviors. Within this framework, incremental, proportionate, and predictable responses are delivered so that youths' positive behaviors are encouraged and reinforced, and negative, noncompliant behaviors are effectively addressed with interventions that meet youths' needs and hold youth accountable. A graduated response system in juvenile probation encourages positive behavior change to help youth successfully complete probation and become productive, law-abiding members of the community, while also preventing the unnecessary use of detention and residential placement. Simply described, a graduated response system uses incentives and sanction/interventions¹, delivered in a structured, systematic manner, to encourage and discourage specified behaviors.

It is important to recognize that the development, implementation, and application of graduated response systems is required to be consistent with the purpose and mission of Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System and is defined by Pennsylvania's Juvenile Act at 6301(b) which states:

Purposes:

(1) To preserve the unity of the family whenever possible or to provide another alternative permanent family when the unity of the family cannot be maintained.

(1.1) To provide for the care, protection, safety and wholesome mental and physical development of children coming within the provisions of this chapter.

(2) Consistent with the protection of the public interest, to provide for children committing delinquent acts programs of supervision, care and rehabilitation which provide balanced attention to the protection of the community, the imposition of accountability for offenses committed and

¹ Throughout the protocol, we refer to sanctions/interventions interchangeably with "responses to" and "consequences".

the development of competencies to enable children to become responsible and productive members of the community.

(3) To achieve the foregoing purposes in a family environment whenever possible, separating the child from parents only when necessary for his welfare, safety or health or in the interests of public safety, by doing all of the following:

(i) employing evidence-based practices whenever possible and, in the case of a delinquent child, by using the least restrictive intervention that is consistent with the protection of the community, the imposition of accountability for offenses committed and the rehabilitation, supervision and treatment needs of the child; and

(ii) imposing confinement only if necessary and for the minimum amount of time that is consistent with the purposes under paragraphs (1), (1.1) and (2).

(4) To provide means through which the provisions of this chapter are executed and enforced and in which the parties are assured a fair hearing and their constitutional and other legal rights recognized and enforced.

Simply stated the mission of Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice System is: ***“To support and enhance the values, principles, and programs that advance the goals of Balanced and Restorative Justice while employing evidence-based practices whenever possible.”*** Therefore, all decisions, services and programs, including the use of a Graduated Response System, shall be consistent with this mission.

With 67 county jurisdictions in the Commonwealth, there is variability and uniqueness within Pennsylvania’s juvenile justice system. Although individual counties should develop Graduated Response systems that adhere to evidence-based developmental principals and effective behavior change practices (e.g., use of certain, swift, targeted, proportionate, and fair responses), it is anticipated that Graduated Response policies and procedures will vary across counties based on availability of resources, stakeholder priorities, and cultural factors with each county.

1.2 Supporting Research and Evidence from Learning Theory and Adolescent Brain Development

Using incentives and consequences to modify behavior is not a new approach. Indeed, this approach to behavioral shaping is grounded in instrumental learning and operant conditioning principles, theories that date back to the work of Edward Thorndike¹ and B.F. Skinner² and that have been supported by nearly a century of empirical research.³ Instrumental learning and operant conditioning are methods of learning in which behavioral change occurs by creating associations between behaviors and their consequences. Administration of desirable consequences increases the likelihood that an individual will

perform the behavior again in the future; administration of undesirable consequences decreases the likelihood of one repeating the behavior.⁴

Operant conditioning—in the form of incentives and responses to noncompliance—is used regularly in a variety of contexts. For instance, when teachers and parents provide praise, rewards, or privileges to children upon completing homework, they increase the probability that those children will complete their homework in the future.⁵ Similarly, when employees know that they will receive positive feedback or a promotion for completing a project, they are motivated to work faster and harder;⁶ paychecks also serve as a standard incentive for continued attendance⁷ and effort⁸ at work. To decrease the frequency of undesirable behaviors, sanction/interventions can be imposed, such as earlier curfew for a teen who came home late, docked pay for an employee who arrived late to work, or an unsatisfactory employee performance review for failing to meet deadlines. Importantly, to produce behavior changes, responses to undesirable behavior should meaningfully address the *reason(s)* for the behavior.⁹ For example, if a youth returns multiple positive drug screens, sanctioning the youth with earlier curfew or electronic monitoring may not prevent the behavior in the future. Rather, interventions (e.g., substance use treatment, mental health treatment, positive youth development activities) that target the reason for the youth's ongoing substance use (e.g., addiction, trauma history, negative peers) may be needed to effectively produce behavior change.

Some level of non-compliant or resistant behavior is considered normal for adolescents, regardless of whether they are involved in the juvenile justice system.¹⁰ However, consistent with the principles of balanced and restorative justice, the expectation of compliant behavior is greater and tolerance for misconduct is lower for youth under the supervision of the Juvenile Court.¹¹

It is important that juvenile probation officers have a basic understanding of adolescent brain development in order to identify responses that are likely to be effective when responding to youths' positive and negative behaviors.

Adolescents are in a critical period of developmental maturation. The adolescent brain differs in important ways from the adult brain,¹² and incomplete neurological development is associated with youths' less mature cognitive, psychosocial, and emotional functioning.¹³ For instance, the pre-frontal cortex, which is responsible for executive functioning¹⁴ – skills such as anticipating consequences, controlling impulses, reasoning, planning, and problem solving—continues to develop throughout the adolescent years and into the third decade of life.¹⁵ The limbic system, the center of the socio-emotional system,¹⁶ also continues to develop throughout adolescence and, at least partially, explains adolescents' strong emotions, quick mood changes, and intolerance for negative emotions.¹⁷ Further, the dopaminergic system is tied to the processing of rewards;¹⁸ the heightened sensitivity of this system during the adolescent years may make certain behaviors and situations—like risk taking¹⁹ and peer approval²⁰—particularly reinforcing and may lead to more reward-seeking behavior over the possibility of long-term negative outcomes; they are more driven by immediate rewards than delayed, negative consequences.²¹

Grounded in knowledge of adolescent development and behavioral shaping principles, graduated response policies should be evidence-based, guided by empirical research findings.²² Research indicates that responses are most effective in shaping behaviors²³ if they are:²⁴

- **Certain** – Responses to behaviors should be predictable. If an identified behavior occurs, a specific response should then occur.²⁵
- **Swift** – Incentives, as well as consequences, should be administered as soon as possible after the performance of a behavior.²⁶
- **Targeted** – Both desired and undesired behaviors must be clearly identified, communicated, and understood by the youth and his/her family. Additionally, responses to undesired behaviors should address the underlying reasons for such behaviors.²⁷ Incentives and consequences should be given only for the demonstration of the specific behavior; a behavior that is similar to the target behavior but not the target behavior should not be met with the target behavior's designated response.²⁸
- **Proportionate** – Responses, both incentives and consequences, should also be proportionate to the behavior exhibited. Excessive or lavish praise or incentives for minimally compliant behaviors may diminish the intrinsic value of the behavior and create unrealistic expectations for future praise or incentives.²⁹ Responses need not be severe to be effective; excessively punitive responses can have detrimental effects on behavior change.³⁰ In addition, higher risk youth often have long histories of punishment and disapproval, and they may have adapted and become immune to the discomfort associated with severe consequences. Just as services or interventions should match risk and needs, sanctions/interventions should match the behavior and address the reasons for the behavior.³¹
- **Fair** - The consequences for behaviors must be clearly understood, and the application of the incentives and responses to noncompliance should be transparent and issued equitably.^{32,33}

Historically, juvenile probation officers have relied primarily on the use of sanctions to achieve a youth's compliance with his/her probation requirements and case plan.³⁴ In contrast, the graduated response approach relies on the use of incentives, along with strategic sanctions/interventions, as a powerful tool to encourage and support desired behaviors and discourage undesired behaviors. Further, individuals are more likely to internalize and adopt desired behaviors if those behaviors are recognized, acknowledged, and affirmed.³⁵

Research findings indicate that providing incentives for desired behaviors and sanctions/interventions for undesired behaviors effectively shapes behavior and that the ratio of incentives to consequences should significantly favor incentives.³⁶ It is recommended that incentives exceed consequences by at least a 4:1 ratio.³⁷

It is also important for youth to understand that they will be held appropriately accountable for undesired behaviors. The use of a well-designed and objectively administered system of graduated responses increases the likelihood that youth will internalize and engage in desired positive behaviors in

the long-term. The use of Graduated Responses is identified as an element within Stage Three: Behavioral Change of Pennsylvania’s Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy (JJSES).³⁸

1.3 Mission Statement

It is recommended that each jurisdiction adopt a mission statement for the use of Graduated Responses. The Graduated Responses Workgroup of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers developed the following mission statement that jurisdictions may consider using or adapting.

“An evidence-based Graduated Response system uses incentives and sanctions/interventions to foster the pro-social behavior of juvenile justice-involved youth, promote accountability, restore victims, and decrease recidivism. Through a structured process that accounts for a youth’s level of risk, needs, and responsivity, graduated responses recognize and reinforce positive behaviors and provide proportional responses to negative behaviors to achieve short- and long-term goals and outcomes. Responses are certain, swift, targeted, proportionate, and fair

1.4 Guiding Principles and Definitions

The following Guiding Principles should be considered in the development of policies and protocols for use of graduated responses. It is recommended that existing graduated response policies and protocols be reviewed to see if they are consistent with these Guiding Principles.

Rationale for Graduated Responses

1. The use of graduated responses (the use of incentives and sanctions/interventions) in a structured, effective, and consistent manner can help shape the behavior of juvenile justice-involved youth and improve outcomes.
2. Simply defined, incentives are responses that are used to encourage continued positive behavior. Incentives can be as simple as verbal praise, extension of curfew, removal of sanctions/interventions, or tangible reinforcement. Sanctions/interventions are responses to undesired behaviors and are administered to discourage/modify those behaviors.
3. The use of graduated responses is consistent with Balanced and Restorative Justice³⁹ and, when applied properly, promotes community protection, victim restoration through youth accountability, and youth redemption through competency development.
4. Graduated response systems are guides for structured decision making and promote fundamental fairness, transparency, and consistency.⁴⁰ A graduated response system provides a menu of options, used in conjunction with a juvenile probation officer’s professional judgment, to address both positive and negative behaviors while considering the impacts on both victim and community.

5. Graduated response systems set short- and long-term SMART goals that are meaningful to youth. Juvenile probation officers help youth set clear action steps to accomplish short-term goals. Juvenile probation officers provide support to help youth accomplish action steps and goals and identify incentives for goal attainment. Consistent with adolescents' developmental capacities and effective behavior change strategies, juvenile justice personnel should emphasize youths' effort and progress toward goals, not perfect performance or immediate goal attainment.

Engagement of the Youth and Family⁴¹

6. Youth, as well as their families, must have a clear understanding of what is expected of them.⁴² They must know which positive behaviors are encouraged and which negative behaviors are discouraged. Youth must have the ability and opportunity to control the targeted behaviors.⁴³
7. The development of an effective professional alliance⁴⁴ among the probation officer, the youth, and the youth's family is critical to promoting behavior change. Juvenile justice professionals who possess effective relationship skills are able to increase treatment compliance, reduce noncompliance with court order(s)/requirement(s), reduce recidivism, engage the youth's family in short- and long-term goal setting, and improve outcomes.
8. Collaboration with and involvement of the family,⁴⁵ as well as the youth, should occur when identifying incentives and sanctions/interventions. When possible, the family should be responsible for or an active participant in identifying or administering an incentive or consequence.
9. Consideration should be given to identifying the individual(s) who would meaningfully deliver or administer an incentive. For example, a parent might be able to take an active role in swiftly and positively reinforcing desired behavior. A teacher, coach, mentor, juvenile probation officer, or judge might be identified as the most appropriate individual to administer the incentive.
10. Juvenile probation officers must work with the youth and his/her family to identify opportunities to practice and reinforce pro-social skills/behaviors.⁴⁶

Application of Graduated Responses

11. The application of incentives and sanctions/interventions should be consistent and integrated with the individual youth's case plan.
12. Responses must be individualized, based upon the youth's behavior and consistent with the juvenile's current level of risk, criminogenic needs, and responsivity factors. An effective

incentive or response to noncompliance for one youth may not be effective for another youth and it may differ for a single youth from situation to situation and over time.

13. While internal motivation for change is ideal in the long run, incentives and sanctions/interventions can provide external motivation when needed. The use of Motivational Interviewing⁴⁷ strategies in conjunction with graduated responses will strengthen the development of internal motivation.
14. Timeliness of administering incentives and consequences is critical for establishing the link between behaviors and consequences.⁴⁸
15. The behaviors for which incentives and sanctions/interventions are issued should be predictable. It should be clearly communicated by the juvenile probation officer and understood by the youth and his/her family under what circumstances incentives or consequences will be issued.⁴⁹
16. Incentives should be administered regularly, early on in the change process.⁵⁰ The importance of experiencing early success, even minor success, must be recognized. As a youth begins to respond favorably and behavior change becomes apparent, incentives should focus on more significant, long-term behaviors and should be administered on an intermittent schedule.⁵¹
17. Juvenile probation officers play a critical role in the effectiveness of graduated responses. Juvenile probation officers can help youth develop short- and long-term goals and identify action steps to help youth achieve those goals. Juvenile probation officers are instrumental in problem solving with the youth how to overcome challenges that halt or delay progress towards goals. Further, juvenile probation officers can offer youth positive feedback and praise as they complete action steps and make progress toward goals.
18. Research findings indicate that providing incentives for desired behaviors and sanctions/interventions for undesired behaviors effectively shapes behavior. Further, research finds that the ratio of incentives to consequences should significantly favor incentives. It is recommended that incentives exceed consequences by at least a 4:1 ratio.⁵²
19. Administration of an incentive or sanction/intervention should support a youth's participation in treatment, education, and/or intervention services. Services or referral for treatment should not be conveyed as a negative consequence, but rather, as an opportunity for positive change. To effectively change behavior, the sanction/intervention should address the underlying reason(s) for misbehavior.
20. Effective use of graduated responses may be challenged as other individuals involved in the juvenile's life (especially peers)⁵³ may reward negative behaviors (e.g., substance use, other illicit activities) that probation is discouraging. Also, these other individuals may discourage

behaviors (e.g., school attendance) that probation is attempting to support and encourage. Therefore, it is important to understand those incentives and sanctions/interventions that may have the greatest motivational effect on the youth and that are commensurate with the performed behaviors.

Benefits of Graduated Responses

21. Reinforcing pro-social behavior increases the chance that juveniles will be motivated to continue this positive behavior.⁵⁴
22. Recognition of positive behavior (pro-social and probation compliant behavior) increases the likelihood that youth will be motivated to initiate and continue the desired positive behaviors. The ultimate goal of the use of graduated responses is to have youth engage in and maintain positive behaviors.⁵⁵
23. A structured sanctions/interventions grid enables juvenile probation officers to address probation noncompliance equitably and commensurate with the seriousness of the noncompliant behavior(s) and the juvenile's current risk level.
24. Graduated response systems that incorporate positive youth development opportunities help youth identify and cultivate their strengths through activities, internships, and jobs, as well as establish meaningful connections with positive peers and supportive adults in their communities.

1.5 Development of a Graduated Response System

Pennsylvania's Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers (Chiefs' Council) and Juvenile Court Judges' Commission established the Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy (JSES) in 2010 and formally identified graduated response as part of JSES in 2012. Consistent with the JSES framework, graduated responses reflect evidence-based practices to achieve balanced and restorative (BARJ) objectives: youth competency development, accountability, and community protection. The Chiefs' Council created a statewide Graduated Response workgroup in 2013 to develop a developmentally informed, empirically based approach to juvenile probation case management and decision making that would help youth successfully complete probation, reduce likelihood of reoffending, and promote long-term wellbeing while maintaining accountability and enhancing community safety. The Graduated Response Workgroup consisted of juvenile probation staff and leaders from 12 counties, representatives from JCJC and PCCD, and members of the Center for Children's Law and Policy (with support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation) and the Juvenile Justice Research and Reform Lab at Drexel University (with support from the Stoneleigh Foundation). Within the JSES and BARJ structures, county priorities, resource availability, and local policy and practice approaches were integrated with empirical findings on adolescent development, youth behavior change,

and organizational culture shift to generate the Graduated Response Guiding Principles and Protocol Development manual, first released in 2014, refined over the next two years for statewide dissemination in 2017, and updated into this document in 2020.

As Pennsylvania counties were developing and implementing Graduated Response systems, these efforts began to become more widespread across the United States. In 2017, for example, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) affirmed Pennsylvania’s work on Graduated Response by passing a landmark resolution calling for juvenile probation reforms grounded in empirical findings on adolescent development and behavioral decision making. Critical elements of this NCJFCJ resolution align with the conceptual basis of graduated response systems, calling for juvenile probation approaches that, “(1) help youths understand, appreciate, and remember their probation requirements; (2) emphasize short-term, positive outcomes for probation compliant behaviors; (3) deliver sanctions for noncompliant behaviors in ways that enable youths to learn from their mistakes and modify their behaviors in the future; and (4) promote affiliation with positive peers” (NCJFCJ, 2017, p.2).

Although the NCJFCJ resolution represents a national paradigm shift in juvenile probation practices, Pennsylvania’s juvenile justice system operates largely at the county level. Core principles of Graduated Response must cut across all local systems, but each jurisdiction must translate the NCJFCJ resolution’s principles—and the guiding principles in this document—into local policy and practice that is feasible and meaningful for the individual jurisdiction.

For a graduated response system to be effectively developed and implemented in a county, consensus among key stakeholders is required. Consensus should be built around important issues, such as defining behaviors of youth under probation supervision that should be encouraged or “incentivized,” defining behaviors that should be discouraged or met with a sanction/intervention, and identifying appropriate responses to the behaviors.

A series of six structured steps (Goldstein et al., 2019) was published to assist juvenile justice personnel with engaging stakeholders, gaining consensus on foundational aspects of a graduated response system, and translating graduated response principles into individual juvenile probation department’s policies and procedures. These steps were based on guidelines for adapting manualized treatments for new populations (Goldstein et al., 2012) and on content from the Center for Children’s Law and Policy (CCLP) 2016 Graduated Responses Toolkit. The six steps include:²

- 1) Identify and engage stakeholders.
 - a. Identify key stakeholders in the Graduated Response development process.
 - b. Form a Graduated Response committee of key stakeholders and define committee members’ roles and responsibilities.

² For more detail on these steps, please see Goldstein, N.E.S., Gale-Bentz, E., McPhee, J., NeMoyer, A., Walker, S., Bishop, S.,...Schwartz, R.G. (2019). Applying the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges’ Resolution to juvenile probation reform. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 5, 170-181. Access to this article can be found here: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6863450/>.

- 2) Agree on reform effort goals.
 - a. Identify the goals of the Graduated Response system.
- 3) Concretely define relevant concepts.
 - a. Develop a list of behaviors and skills to promote among youth under supervision.
 - b. Identify a list of incentives to reward youth for meeting particular goals.
 - c. Develop a list of negative behaviors and categorize them as low-, moderate-, and high-severity.
 - d. Identify possible interventions and match these interventions to particular behaviors for low-, medium-, and high-risk youth.
- 4) Gather baseline data.
 - a. Collect data on youth under supervision.
- 5) Develop policies and procedures to support and sustain reforms.
 - a. Test draft materials of the Graduated Response system.
 - b. Develop the capacity to evaluate the effectiveness of the Graduated Response system.
 - c. Train staff and educate youth and family members on Graduated Response.
- 6) Evaluate effectiveness.
 - a. Roll out the Graduated Response system.
 - b. Evaluate implementation of the Graduated Response system and make adjustments.

Gathering Information to Inform Graduated Response System Development

When developing a graduated response system, it is critical to develop a team of juvenile justice system stakeholders (e.g., judges, probation officers, district attorneys, public defenders, law enforcement personnel), as well as those impacted by the system (e.g., justice-involved youth, parents, community leaders; CCLP, 2016) to provide diverse perspectives on desired outcomes, identify the rationale for intended changes to policies and practices, and offer feedback on feasible and effective strategies for identified reform efforts.

Youth and families can offer valuable input on reform efforts based upon lived experiences. For example, youth and families should be asked about the value of and desire for potential incentives to motivate positive behavior and the power of various sanctions/interventions to prevent/modify negative behavior. Youth and families can provide valuable information about the perceived proportionality and appropriateness of incentives and responses to desired and undesired behaviors, as well as the length of time they would be willing to wait to earn various incentives. Youth and families should also be asked to provide feedback about the procedures that probation officers use to convey information about probation requirements and the related graduated response system. Further, when developing a graduated response system, youth and families should be asked about meaningfulness of possible procedures for awarding incentives and imposing consequences—for instance, who youth want to administer the incentives, when they should be awarded, and whether parents should be informed of success. Youth and families should also be asked about obstacles and challenges to completing probation requirements.

Probation officers' input should also be sought to inform the development of a graduated response system. They should be asked about the pros and cons of current practices for promoting positive behaviors in youth and managing misbehavior. They should be asked for feedback about the graduated response philosophy, with particular attention to the use of incentives in response to positive probation-related behaviors and the use of various consequences in response to non-compliant behaviors. Probation officers' input should be sought on feasibility of graduated response procedures for evaluating behaviors, awarding earned incentives, and imposing identified consequences; an easy-to-use system is critical to promoting the consistent and predictable implementation of graduated incentives and sanctions/interventions. Probation officers should be asked to identify potential obstacles to successful implementation of the graduated response approach, and these obstacles should be addressed when creating the graduated response system. In addition to informing the development of a graduated response system within a jurisdiction, involvement of probation officers in the development process can promote buy-in of these key stakeholders.

Judges' input is also critical to the development process. In some jurisdictions, judges may wish to provide feedback and guidance throughout the graduated response development process, and in other jurisdictions, judges may be brought in at more specific development points. Judges' input is needed on the acceptability of specific incentives and responses to noncompliance; degree of probation officers' autonomy to evaluate youths' behaviors, award incentives, and impose various consequences; and procedures for probation officers' communication with the court about youths' progress and their recommendations within the graduated response context. It will also be helpful to seek input from other court actors, including defense attorneys and prosecutors, during the course of developing a graduated response system.

Finally, input from judges, probation officers, youth and families, and other juvenile justice system stakeholders is critical to promoting engagement and buy-in to local policy and practice changes. Such feedback also facilitates a county's translation of broad concepts from the NCJFCJ resolution (e.g., improving youth decision-making skills) into specific, measurable, and concrete policies and practices (e.g. dividing a youth's complex court requirements into small, attainable action steps). Stakeholder feedback is also critical for improving materials, including those used in the field, and data-tracking methods for evaluating long-term outcomes of a graduated response system for youth, the system, and communities.

Information Gathering Methods

Multiple methods can be used to gather the information described above to inform the development of a graduated response system. Methods for information gathering include, but are not limited to:

- focus groups of youth, parents/guardians, and probation officers,
- anonymous surveys of youth, parents/guardians, and probation officers,
- interviews with individual youth, parents/guardians, and probation officers,

- conversations with local juvenile court judges, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and community service providers, and
- conversations with probation officers and juvenile court judges from other jurisdictions that have implemented graduated response systems.

These methods are not mutually exclusive. Multiple methods may be used, and information may be sought from various stakeholder groups during the graduated response development process.

1.6 Eligibility

Although most counties with graduated response systems use it with all youth under probation supervision at all stages of court processing, it is recommended that eligibility criteria be established for youth with whom graduated responses may be used. At a minimum the following should be considered:

- At what stage in the juvenile court process should youth be eligible to participate in the graduated response system? Is the use of a graduated response system most appropriate as part of the disposition in a youth's case?
- Should participation in the graduated response process include youth on formal probation, consent decree, and informal supervision? Are graduated responses directed toward consent decree and formal probation or is graduated response applicable to all youth involved at various levels of the juvenile court process?
- What levels of criminogenic risk (as determined by the YLS) are eligible to participate in the graduated response process? Are all levels eligible to participate or is it limited to moderate- to high-risk youth?
- If all risk and supervision levels are eligible to participate, are there limits or ceilings for responses for low-risk youth? For example, should low-risk youth be excluded from the more severe, restrictive consequences, given that the original behavior(s) that brought them under the court's jurisdiction may have been relatively minor? Caution should be exercised to prevent "over servicing" low-risk youth, which research has shown to be harmful.⁵⁶
- Does a case plan exist, and how do the goals of the case plan relate to the incentives and sanctions/interventions that have been identified to encourage and discourage specified behaviors?

Agreements should be reached among key juvenile justice stakeholders about the authority of the supervising juvenile probation officer to issue incentives and sanctions/interventions within established parameters; this may be done at a system level or specified within an individual youth's dispositional court order. The graduated response system should be an integral part of the case plan. As the youth works toward or meets goals identified in the case plan, the probation officer delivers incentives to reinforce the desired behaviors. Conversely, if the youth violates conditions of the case plan, the officer should respond to the noncompliance with sanctions/interventions. Research has indicated that incentives and consequences should be administered as close in time to the behavior as possible to be most effective.⁵⁷ Delays in court processing, however, can inhibit the speed of this process; accordingly,

probation departments are encouraged to develop their own policies regarding the timeframe for swift incentive and consequence delivery.

1.7 Orientation to Graduated Response Policy & Protocols

All juvenile probation officers who are responsible for administering graduated responses should be trained on their department's graduated response policies and protocols. Thoroughly understanding the policies and protocols, including the Guiding Principles and Definitions, will help officers clearly explain the reasoning for implementing graduated responses and how this approach is grounded in evidence-based practices and Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy.

There are preparatory exercises that the juvenile probation officer may consider having the youth complete. For example, there are commercially available exercises (see section 1.11 Tools) that can be used as a mechanism to introduce the youth and his/her family to the graduated response system and to set the stage for their active engagement and involvement in the process. The questionnaire or tool can also be developed in-house. Counties may want to consider implementing a documentation method to verify and acknowledge that the youth, as well as his or her family, was informed of the expectations.

It is recommended that juvenile probation departments develop and present an overview of the graduated response system to youth and their families. This overview should provide a rationale for the approach and establish the expectations and responsibilities of the youth, parents/guardians, and juvenile probation officers. It is important that juvenile probation officers determine whether a youth and his/her family fully understand the requirements of the probation supervision, the expected behaviors, the behaviors that must be avoided, and the incentives and consequences that will result from engaging in those behaviors.

1.8 Administering Incentives

Incentives generally take one of two forms. Something positive can be given (e.g., verbal acknowledgement, a certificate, a book), or something considered by the youth to be negative can be taken away or diminished (e.g., easing curfew restrictions, fewer reporting requirements). The majority of incentives that can be used need not involve any financial resources, or at least not significant financial resources.

Again, research findings suggest that providing incentives for desired behaviors and consequences for undesired behaviors effectively shapes behavior and that the ratio of incentives to sanctions/interventions should significantly favor incentives. It is recommended that incentives exceed responses to noncompliance by at least a 4:1 ratio.⁵⁸

It is important to acknowledge positive behavior, especially early in the change process.⁵⁹ As the individual begins to respond favorably and behave in a positive manner on a consistent basis, incentives can be given less frequently so as not to lose relevancy. As time progresses and positive pro-social behavior is internalized, incentives should be earned for more significant behaviors and when case plan milestones are achieved. Incentives and positive reinforcement early on, followed by intermittent

reinforcement of more significant positive behaviors, should help transition youth from reliance on external motivation for change to internalized motivation to embrace positive attitudes and engage in positive behavior.⁶⁰

For youth participating in a graduated response system, the following should be considered in providing incentives to encourage continued positive behavior.

- Identifying which incentives are most important to each individual youth. Input from the youth is critical in making these determinations. Using a self-report inventory, the youth can identify incentives that he/she values and that will increase the likelihood that he/she will be motivated to engage in the desired behaviors. This self-report inventory will also provide a framework and structure to discuss what motivates the youth.
- Consideration should be given to identifying the individual(s) who would have the greatest impact or would most meaningfully deliver incentives to the youth. For example, a parent might be able to take an active role in swiftly and meaningfully reinforcing positive behavior. A teacher, coach, mentor, juvenile probation officer, or judge may also be identified as the most appropriate individual to administer the incentive.
- Youth should be encouraged to identify a specific goal or goals, as well as the steps leading to attainment of that goal or goals. Youth are more likely to be successful and not feel overwhelmed if three goals or fewer are targeted at one time.
- Probation officers should engage youth in the behavior change process and foster their understanding of the link between targeted behaviors and youths' broader, long-term success. Professional alliance traits⁶¹ are critical to these efforts.
- The department's Incentives Grid should be used in combination with information gathered directly from the youth and his/her family about appropriate and motivating incentives. This information can be gathered via interview, from a structured questionnaire, and/or with a commercially available tool. The incentive should be matched to the factors, circumstances, interests of youth, and characteristics that motivate the individual youth, with the understanding that these may change over time. These factors are considered responsibility factors and may reflect information about the youth's culture, cognitive ability, maturity, and gender.
- Document contacts, behavioral progress, incentives, and sanctions/interventions according to the department's policy.

1.9 Classifying and Responding to Non-compliance by Youth under Consent Decree or Formal Probation Supervision.

It is recommended that whenever noncompliance is identified, the following should occur:

1. **Sufficient information is gathered relating to the alleged noncompliant behavior** to confirm that the noncompliance with the court order(s)/requirement(s) occurred. This should include talking with the youth and his/her parent(s)/guardian(s), and, if appropriate, other agencies and/or individuals (e.g., school personnel, outpatient providers, and/or police).

2. **Understand reason(s) for noncompliant behavior and problem solve.** Intervene to address reasons for noncompliant behavior.
3. **Determine the youth's risk to re-offend** through the most recently scored YLS. If necessary, as indicated by the department's YLS policy, update the YLS before making this determination.
4. **Determine the severity of the noncompliant behavior** using the department's noncompliance matrix. If multiple forms of noncompliance result from a single event, local policy should establish how such noncompliant behavior should be addressed. As a general rule, it is recommended that only the most serious form of noncompliance be considered when determining the resulting sanction/intervention.
5. **Individualize the determination of an appropriate response to the noncompliant behavior** from the department's sanctions/interventions list, considering the information specified above, as well as the youth's responsivity factors and strengths. Some points for consideration include:
 - Responsivity factors may reflect information about the youth's culture, cognitive abilities, maturity, and gender. The choice of consequence should keep in mind the least restrictive option needed to redirect the youth's behavior.
 - It is important that responses to noncompliance effectively address the underlying reasons for the initiation and continuation of undesirable behavior.
 - If appropriate, input from the youth and/or his/her parent(s)/guardian(s) should be obtained when assigning a sanction/intervention.
 - It is possible that the same consequence may be used multiple times. A youth may repeat an undesired behavior, but it may not require that the severity of the response be increased. Normal adolescent development suggests that youth may engage repeatedly in undesired behaviors, but they can learn to refrain from participating in these behaviors if a proportional response is applied consistently and repeatedly⁶².
 - Approval for use of certain consequences may be required via a court order or some other form of communication.
 - Consequences that may require a court order or additional communication may include actions such as placement on electronic monitoring, attendance at an evening reporting center, or extension of supervision.
 - Probation officers should seek to identify the individual who may have the most powerful impact in administering or delivering a consequence.
6. **Document** the noncompliant behavior, all contacts, and the response to the noncompliance in accordance with the department's documentation policy.

7. **This process should be completed accurately and as quickly as possible** so that the sanction/intervention occurs as close in time to the behavior as possible to achieve maximum impact.⁶³ Timeliness of the response to the actual behavior will allow the youth to make the connection between his/her behavior and the response. Administration of an incentive will, therefore, increase the likelihood that the youth will repeat a desired behavior in the future, and imposition of a consequence will decrease the likelihood of the youth performing or continuing the undesired behavior in the future. It is also recommended that when assigned responses to noncompliant behavior (generally sanctions/interventions considered as minor and moderate) are successfully completed, the noncompliant behavior should be considered addressed and should not be included in future petitions for noncompliance with court order(s)/requirement(s). If the youth fails to complete an assigned sanction/intervention, however, or if the noncompliant behavior is defined as serious, the noncompliant behavior should be included in the information provided to the juvenile court in subsequent probation noncompliance proceedings.

1.10 Documentation and Analysis

The need to document and analyze the use and effectiveness of graduated responses is crucial. A Graduated Response Module has been developed in the Pennsylvania Juvenile Case Management System (PaJCMS) to enable Juvenile Probation departments to document and analyze the use of graduated responses. Prior to utilizing the Graduated Response module juvenile probation departments should engage appropriate stakeholders, develop policies and protocols, develop graduated response grids, train staff, and establish a date to officially begin use of the graduated response system.

Graduated Response management reports and dashboards have been developed to assist with analyzing the use of graduated responses. Examples of the the management reports and dashboards are provided as **Appendix A**. Any questions on the set up and use of the Graduated Response module may be directed to the PaJCMS Help Desk.

1.11 Tools

There are a variety of tools and techniques that can be employed to support the utilization of both incentives and sanction/interventions. Among these tools are:

- **Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS):** EPICS is a community supervision model that teaches probation officers how to apply the principles of Risk-Need-Responsivity and the use of core correctional practices (anti-criminal modeling, effective reinforcement, effective disapproval, effective use of authority, structured learning, problem solving, cognitive restructuring and relationship skills) within the context of one-on-one interactions with juvenile justice involved youth. The structure of each EPICS contact includes four parts:
 1. Check-In
 2. Review
 3. Intervention
 4. Homework
- **Motivational Interviewing:** A set of communication strategies designed to encourage and support an individual's internal desire for change and to resolve ambivalence about continued

change.⁶⁴ A Bench Card summarizing Motivational Interviewing can be downloaded at:
https://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/MI_Bench_Card.pdf.

- **Professional Alliance Traits.**⁶⁵ A set of interpersonal skills that contributes to the development of an effective professional relationship that can increase compliance with treatment, reduce violations and recidivism, and improve outcomes. A Bench Card summarizing Professional Alliance Traits can be downloaded at:
https://pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Professional_Alliance_Traits_Final_Draft.pdf
- **Interest Inventories:** A self-assessment tool that, in the context of graduated responses, can help identify the incentives and sanctions/interventions that youth believe will most effectively motivate them to perform desired behaviors and refrain from undesired behaviors
- **Parenting Skills Workbook-Setting Boundaries and Applying Rewards and Consequences:** The Parenting Skills Workbooks were developed as resources that juvenile probation officers can offer the families of the youth with whom they work. The workbooks would be useful for parent(s), or adult(s), responsible for the care of a child under juvenile probation supervision. The workbooks were designed to provide strategies to address common behaviors of children that, if left unaddressed, might increase the child's risk to reoffend. These strategies are rooted in the understanding of adolescent development and influences, and of the physiology of the brain and how the brain works at various stages of life, commonly referred to as "brain science." The publication can be downloaded at:
https://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Setting_Boundaries.pdf
- **The Carey Guides ("Responding to Violations" and "Rewards and Sanctions"):**⁶⁶ A commercially available set of tools to help structure interventions and interactions between a juvenile probation officer and youth under probation supervision. The Carey Guides also include a Probation Officer Self-Assessment, which is a tool to assist juvenile probation officers with effectively utilizing incentives and sanctions.
- **Skill Practice with Youth:** A critical component of cognitive-behavioral interventions that provides youth with structured opportunities to practice skills so that they will be available for use when needed. Skills practice promotes the internalizing of new, positive behaviors.⁶⁷
- **Skill Transfer Forms:** A tool to be utilized during or after the completion of a youth's participation in various Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) and Cognitive Behavioral Intervention (CBI) groups. The Skill Transfer Forms reinforce key components outlined in each program and can be interchangeably used within a residential or community-based setting.
- **Pro-Social Modeling:** A style of supervision in which the juvenile probation officer identifies and reinforces pro-social language, attitudes, and behaviors, as well as appropriately challenges and collaboratively addresses criminogenic needs.
- **Thinking Reports:** A tool to assist youth in identifying and recording their thoughts and feelings experienced during certain situations and when performing certain behaviors, including involvement in delinquent acts
- **Essays:** Assignments that can be given to youth under supervision on specific topics as a sanction/intervention for minor misconduct that may require research and self-examination.
- **Center for Children's Law and Policy's Graduated Responses Tool Kit:** The Center for Children's Law and Policy developed a "Toolkit" designed to help jurisdictions create an effective graduated response system or improve an existing system. The publication collects best practices from jurisdictions around the country that have successfully reduced incarceration for technical violations of probation. The publication can be downloaded at:
<http://www.cclp.org/graduated-responses-toolkit/>.

- **Graduated Response Bench Card:** Primary concepts provided in this document are summarized in a two-page Bench Card for easy reference. The Bench Card can be downloaded at: https://pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Graduated_Response_Bench_Card.pdf

1.12 References

- ¹ Thorndike, E. L. (1898). [Animal intelligence: An experimental study of the associative processes in animals](#). *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 2(4), i-109.
- ² Skinner, B. F. (1938). [The Behavior of Organisms: An Experimental Analysis](#). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts; Skinner, B. F. (1953). [Science and human behavior](#). New York: Macmillan.
- ³ For in-depth discussions of research on operant conditioning and its principles, see:
 Gámez, A. M., & Rosas, J. M. (2007). [Associations in human instrumental conditioning](#). *Learning and Motivation*, 38(3), 242-261. doi: 10.1016/j.lmot.2006.11.001
 Houwer, J. D., & Beckers, T. (2002). A review of recent developments in research and theories on human contingency learning. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology: Section B*, 55(4), 289-310. doi: 10.1080/02724990244000034
 Kirsch, I., Lynn, S. J., Vigorito, M., & Miller, R. R. (2004). [The role of cognition in classical and operant conditioning](#). *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 60(4), 369-392. doi: 10.1002/jclp.10251
 Staddon, J. E. R., & Cerutti, D. T. (2003). [Operant conditioning](#). *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 115.
- ⁴ See ¹⁻³.
- ⁵ Little, S. G., Akin-Little, A., & Newman-Eig, L. M. (2010). Effects on homework completion and accuracy of varied and constant reinforcement within an interdependent group contingency system. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 26(2), 115-131. (Effective use of positive reinforcement significantly increased students' homework completion rates).
- ⁶ Rynes, S. L., Gerhart, B., & Parks, L. (2005). [Personnel psychology: Performance evaluation and pay for performance](#). *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 571-600. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070254 ("The meta-analytic evidence... demonstrates a strong, positive average effect of incentives on employee productivity.").
- ⁷ Baker-McClearn, D., Greasley, K., Dale, J., & Griffith, F. (2010). [Absence management and presenteeism: The pressures on employees to attend work and the impact of attendance on performance](#). *Human Resource Management Journal*, 20(3), 311-328. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2009.00118.x (Employees reported increased aversion to absence from work when absences resulted in forfeiting sick pay).
- ⁸ Menguc, B., & Tansu Barker, A. (2003). The performance effects of outcome-based incentive pay plans on sales organizations: a contextual analysis. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 23(4), 341-358. doi: 10.1080/08853134.2003.10749008 (The relationship between pay and effort at work is equivocal, but studies that have contextualized incentive-pay plans have typically found significant, positive relationships between pay and productivity in the workplace).
- ⁹ Lynch, T.R., Chapman, A.L., Rosenthal, M.Z., Kuo, J.R., & Linehan, M.M. (2006). Mechanisms of change in Dialectical Behavior Therapy: Theoretical and empirical observations. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 62, 459-480. Doi: 10.1002/jclp.20243. ["A detailed chain analysis is conducted in order to determine, in minute detail, the antecedent events that increased the likelihood that the behavior would occur (vulnerability factors or establishing operations), the proximal discriminative stimuli or prompting events for the behavior, and the consequences of the behavior...Whereas a behavioral analysis is broad, focusing

on delineating patterns of behavior and their controlling variables, a chain analysis is a detailed evaluation of a single chain of behavior (Linehan, 1993).]

- O'Connor, K.J., & Ammen, S. (2013). Assessment. In Author (Eds.), *Play Therapy treatment planning and interventions : The ecosystemic model and workbook* (p. 97). Elsevier, Inc. ("Functional behavioral analysis is a form of behavioral assessment that targets that function of the child's behaviors rather than targeting the problem behaviors without identifying the function of those behaviors. In this context, the function of the behavior is defined in terms of its maintaining contingency or contingencies.")
- Schwartz, R.G. (2017, October). Youth on probation: Bringing a 20th century service into a developmentally friendly 21st century world. <https://stoneleighfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Youth-on-Probation-Report.pdf>. ["A young person may have many needs, but they are not equally important when it comes to reducing recidivism. It is important to "identify and address the key needs that are the primary causes of youth's delinquent behaviors" (Robert F. Kenney National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice/Council of State Governments Justice Center, unpublished power point, 2016).]
- ¹⁰ Smetana, J. G. (2005). Adolescent-parent conflict: Resistance and subversion as developmental process. In *Conflict, contradiction, and contrarian elements in moral development and education* (pp. 69-91). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. ("It is proposed that moderate amounts of resistance to parental authority may be normative, both historically and developmentally, that resistance and subversion [to authority figures] may be developmentally appropriate, and that, under certain conditions, they may be functional for adolescent development.").
- Spear, L. P. (2000). [The adolescent brain and age-related behavioral manifestations](#). *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 24(4), 417-463. doi: 10.1016/S0149-7634(00)00014-2 ("Similarly, Moffitt [369] concludes from a review of antisocial behavior in adolescence that it is statistically aberrant to refrain from such behavior during adolescence, with 'actual rates of illegal behavior soar(ing) so high during adolescence that participation in delinquency appears to be a normal part of teen life.'").
- ¹¹ Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ojdp.gov/pubs/implementing/contents.html>
- ¹² For a brief review of these differences, see National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health (2011). The Teen Brain: Still Under Construction (Report No. 11-4929). Retrieved from <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/publications/the-teen-brain-still-under-construction/index.shtml>
For a more detailed overview, see Spear, L. P. (2000). [The adolescent brain and age-related behavioral manifestations](#). *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 24(4), 417-463. doi: 10.1016/S0149-7634(00)00014-2
- ¹³ Steinberg, L. (2008). [A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking](#). *Developmental Review*, 28(1), 78-106. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.002
Yurgelun-Todd, D. (2007). [Emotional and cognitive changes during adolescence](#). *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 17(2), 251-257. doi: 10.1016/j.conb.2007.03.009
- ¹⁴ Funahashi, S. (2001). [Neuronal mechanisms of executive control by the prefrontal cortex](#). *Neuroscience Research*, 39(2), 147-165. doi: 10.1016/S0168-0102(00)00224-8
- ¹⁵ Gogtay, N., Giedd, J. N., Lusk, L., Hayashi, K. M., Greenstein, D., Vaituzis, A. C., Nugent III, T. F., Herman, D. H., Clasen, L. S., Toga, A. W., Rapoport, J. L., & Thompson, P. M. (2004). [Dynamic mapping of human cortical development during childhood through early adulthood](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101(21), 8174-8179. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0402680101

- ¹⁶ Braun, K. (2011). The prefrontal-limbic system: development, neuroanatomy, function, and implications for socioemotional development. *Clinics in Perinatology*, 38(4), 685-702. doi: 10.1016/j.clp.2011.08.013 (“The limbic system is an evolutionary old brain system that plays an important role in learning and memory functions. It is also involved in the generation, integration, and control of emotions, and connects them with the behavioral responses...it plays an important role in the mediation and control of emotions, including love and affection, fear, aggression, and reward, and therefore is essential for social behavior.”)
- ¹⁷ Casey, B. J., Jones, R. M., & Hare, T. A. (2008). [The adolescent brain](#). *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1124(1), 111-126. doi: 10.1196/annals.1440.010
- Hariri, A. R., Bookheimer, S. Y., & Mazziotta, J. C. (2000). Modulating emotional responses: effects of a neocortical network on the limbic system. *NeuroReport*, 11(1), 43-48.
- ¹⁸ For a review of this process, see:
Carlson, N. R. (2012). [Physiology of Behavior](#) (2012). (10th ed.; pp. 461-464). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- ¹⁹ Steinberg, L. (2008). [A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking](#). *Developmental Review*, 28(1), 78-106. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.002
- ²⁰ Steinberg, L. (2008). A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk taking. *Developmental Review*, 28, 78–106. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.002
- ²¹ Reyna, V. F., & Farley, F. (2006). [Risk and rationality in adolescent decision making implications for theory, practice, and public policy](#). *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(1), 1-44. doi: 10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00026.x (“[Many] adolescents take risks because perceived benefits outweigh risks, and long-term consequences are not considered or are undervalued.”)
- ²² Juvenile Court Judges Commission, Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, & Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers (2012). [Pennsylvania’s Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy: Achieving Our Balanced and Restorative Justice Mission Through Evidence-Based Policy and Practice](#). Harrisburg, PA.
- ²³ The listed response characteristics have been supported by and implemented in numerous empirically supported programs and treatment manuals. For examples and resources, see:
Barkley, R. A. (2002). Psychosocial treatments for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in children. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 63, 36-43.
Kazdin, A. E. (2005). [Parent management training: Treatment for oppositional, aggressive, and antisocial behavior in children and adolescents](#). Oxford University Press. [“Parameters...to guide training in delivering reinforcement (e.g., contingent, immediate, and [sic] continuous delivery of reinforcement) are based on an extensive literature.”].
Athens, E. S., & Vollmer, T. R. (2010). [An investigation of differential reinforcement of alternative behavior without extinction](#). *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 43(4), 569-589. doi: 10.1901/jaba.2010.43-569 (Some studies have found that combining these components produces more behavior change in youth than using each component individually).
- ²⁴ The listed response characteristics (e.g., certain, swift) is also drawn from deterrence theory research, which has focused largely on adult probationers. For more information about the use of deterrence theory principles with adults, see:
American Probation and Parole Association, National Center for State Courts, & The Pew Charitable Trusts (2012). *Effective Responses to Offender Behavior: Lessons Learned for Probation and Parole Supervision*. Retrieved from <https://www.appa-net.org/eWeb/docs/APPA/pubs/EROBLLPPS-Report.pdf>

- Grasmick, H. G., & Bryjak, G. J. (1980). The deterrent effect of perceived severity of punishment. *Social Forces*, 59(2), 471-491. doi: 10.1093/sf/59.2.471
- Nichols, J. L., & Ross, H. L. (1990). [Effectiveness and legal sanctions in dealing with drinking drivers](#). *Alcohol, Drugs and Driving*, 6(2), 33-60.
- Paternoster, R. (1989). [Decisions to participate in and desist from four types of common delinquency: Deterrence and the rational choice perspective](#). *Law and Society Review*, 23(1), 7-40. doi: 10.2307/3053879
- Taxman, F. S., Soule, D., & Gelb, A. (1999). Graduated sanctions: Stepping into accountable systems and offenders. *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 182-204. doi: 10.1177/0032885599079002004
- ²⁵ Acker, M. M., & O'Leary, S. G. (1988). Effects of consistent and inconsistent feedback on inappropriate child behavior. *Behavior Therapy*, 19(4), 619-624. doi: 10.1016/S0005-7894(88)80029-7 (Consistent use of reprimands to address students' problem behaviors significantly decreased students' inappropriate behavior in class, an effect that was not found when teachers used reprimands inconsistently).
- Luman, M., Oosterlaan, J., & Sergeant, J. A. (2005). [The impact of reinforcement contingencies on AD/HD: a review and theoretical appraisal](#). *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25(2), 183-213. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2004.11.001 [In multiple studies, higher reinforcement ratios (i.e., rewarding behaviors more consistently) have been associated with positive changes in children with ADHD].
- Sherrill, J. T., O'Leary, S. G., Albertson-Kelly, J. A., & Kendziora, K. T. (1996). When reprimand consistency may and may not matter. *Behavior Modification*, 20(2), 226-236. doi: 10.1177/01454455960202006 (Certainty of a sanction in response to problem behavior may significantly decrease future presentations of that behavior in students).
- ²⁶ Abramowitz, A. J., & O'Leary, S. G. (1990). Effectiveness of delayed punishment in an applied setting. *Behavior Therapy*, 21(2), 231-239. doi: 10.1016/S0005-7894(05)80279-5 (Teachers' immediate sanctions more effectively decreased rates of problem behavior in students when compared with delayed sanctions).
- Athens, E. S., & Vollmer, T. R. (2010). [An investigation of differential reinforcement of alternative behavior without extinction](#). *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 43(4), 569-589. doi: 10.1901/jaba.2010.43-569 (identifying a relationship between the immediacy of reinforcement and behavioral change in students).
- ²⁷See ⁹.
- ²⁸ Kazdin, A. E. (2005). [Parent management training: Treatment for oppositional, aggressive, and antisocial behavior in children and adolescents](#). Oxford University Press. ["The reinforcer is provided when and only when the behavior occurs" (p. 73). "The aversive consequence is provided when and only when the behavior occurs" (p. 97)].
- ²⁹ Burden, Paul (2006). *Classroom Management: Creating a Successful K-12 Learning Community*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- ³⁰ O'Leary, K. D., & Becker, W. C. (1969). The effects of the intensity of a teacher's reprimands on children's behavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 7(1), 8-11. doi: 10.1016/0022-4405(68)90111-8. O'Leary, K. D., Kaufman, K. F., Kass, R. E., & Drabman, R. S. (1972). The effects of loud and soft reprimands on the behavior of disruptive students In K. D. O'Leary & S.G. O'Leary (Eds.) [Classroom management: The Successful Use of Behavior Modification](#). New York: Pergamon Press, 1972. (Praise for good behavior and quiet reprimands reduced disruptive behavior, while loud reprimands increased disruptive behavior in school children).
- Gershoff, E. T. (2002). Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences: a meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(4), 539. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.128.4.539.
- Larzelere, R. E., & Kuhn, B. R. (2005). Comparing child outcomes of physical punishment and alternative

disciplinary tactics: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 8(1), 1-37. (Excessive punishment in the form of bodily harm may produce more problematic behaviors and responses in children.)

Mendel, R. A. (2011). [No Place for Kids: The Case for Reducing Juvenile Incarceration](#). *Annie E. Casey Foundation*. (Severe punishments, such as incarceration, are associated with a number of negative behavioral, cognitive, emotional, and social side effects in youth.)

³¹ See ⁹.

³² Juvenile Court Judges Commission, Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, & Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers (2012). [Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy: Achieving Our Balanced and Restorative Justice Mission Through Evidence-Based Policy and Practice](#). Harrisburg, PA.

³³ Inverse relationships have been identified between procedural justice and reoffending behavior. See: Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Bachman, R., & Sherman, L. W. (1997). [Do fair procedures matter? The effect of procedural justice on spouse assault](#). *Law and Society Review*, 163-204. doi: 10.2307/3054098
Penner, E. K., Viljoen, J. L., Douglas, K. S., & Roesch, R. (2014). Procedural justice versus risk factors for offending: Predicting recidivism in youth. *Law and Human Behavior*, 38(3), 225.

³⁴ Altschuler, D.M. (2005). [Chapter 4: Policy and program perspectives on the transition to adulthood for vulnerable populations](#) In Osgood, D. W., Foster, E. M. & Flanagan C. R. (Eds.), *On Your Own Without a Net: The Transition to Adulthood for Vulnerable Populations*. (pp. 92-108). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

³⁵ Pierce, J., & Cameron, W. D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(3), 363-423.

³⁶ The power of both tangible and non-tangible incentives to increase the frequency of youths' desired behaviors and decrease the frequency of their undesired behaviors has been supported by research findings over several decades and across a variety of settings.

For discussion and examples of effective behavior management strategies for youth with ADHD, oppositional defiant, and/or conduct disorder see:

Abramowitz, A. J., & O'Leary, S. G. (1990). Effectiveness of delayed punishment in an applied setting. *Behavior Therapy*, 21(2), 231-239.

Barkley, R. A. (2002). Psychosocial treatments for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in children. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 63, 36-43.

Kazdin, A. E. (2005). [Parent Management Training: Treatment for Oppositional, Aggressive, and Antisocial Behavior in Children and Adolescents](#). Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

For a discussion and examples of incentives within contingency management systems in juvenile justice settings and in adolescent substance use treatment programs, see:

Barkley, R. A., Hastings, J. E., Tousel, R. E., & Tousel, S. E. (1976). [Evaluation of a token system for juvenile delinquents in a residential setting](#). *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 7(3), 227-230. doi: 10.1016/0005-7916(76)90004-5

Field, C. E., Nash, H. M., Handwerk, M. L., & Friman, P. C. (2004). [A modification of the token economy for nonresponsive youth in family-style residential care](#). *Behavior Modification*, 28(3), 438-457.230. doi: 10.1177/0145445503258995

- Kamon, J., Budney, A., & Stanger, C. (2005). [A contingency management intervention for adolescent marijuana abuse and conduct problems](#). *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 44(6), 513-521. doi:10.1097/01.chi.0000159949.82759.64
- Krishnan-Sarin, S., Duhig, A. M., McKee, S. A., McMahon, T. J., Liss, T., McFetridge, A., & Cavallo, D. A. (2006). Contingency management for smoking cessation in adolescent smokers. *Experimental and clinical psychopharmacology*, 14(3), 306-310. doi: 10.1037/1064-1297.14.3.306
- Lott, D. C., & Jencius, S. (2009). [Effectiveness of very low-cost contingency management in a community adolescent treatment program](#). *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 102(1), 162-165. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2009.01.010
- Meichenbaum, D. H., Bowers, K. S., Ross, R. R., (1968). [Modification of classroom behavior of institutionalized female adolescent offenders](#). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 6(3), 343-353. doi: 10.1016/0005-7967(68)90067-3
- Stanger, C., Budney, A. J., Kamon, J. L., & Thostensen, J. (2009). A randomized trial of contingency management for adolescent marijuana abuse and dependence. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 105(3), 240-247. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2009.07.009

For a discussion of classroom-based research findings, see:

- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). [Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice](#). *Education and Treatment of Children*, 31(3), 351-380. doi: 10.1353/etc.0.0007

For a discussion of the importance of praise and positive feedback, see:

- Conroy, M. A., Sutherland, K. S., Snyder, A., Al-Hendawi, M., & Vo, A. (2009). Creating a Positive Classroom Atmosphere: Teachers' Use of Effective Praise and Feedback. *Beyond Behavior*, 18(2), 18-26.
- Flora, S. R. (2000). Praise's magic reinforcement ratio: Five to one gets the job done. *The Behavior Analyst Today*, 1(4), 64. doi: 10.1037/h0099898
- Friman, P. C., Jones, M., Smith, G., Daly, D. L., & Larzelere, R. (1997). Decreasing disruptive behavior by adolescent boys in residential care by increasing their positive to negative interactional ratios. *Behavior modification*, 21(4), 470-486. doi: 10.1177/01454455970214005
- Partin, T. C. M., Robertson, R. E., Maggin, D. M., Oliver, R. M., & Wehby, J. H. (2009). Using teacher praise and opportunities to respond to promote appropriate student behavior. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 54(3), 172-178. doi: 10.1080/10459880903493179

- ³⁷ Increasing the ratio of positive to negative responses is also supported by existing policy recommendations and intervention programming. For example, the delivery of positive feedback to negative feedback in a 4:1 ratio has been advocated by:

Accountability Works: Accountability Works (2007) *CD³: School Improvement Indicators*. Retrieved from <http://www.accountabilityworks.org/news.php?viewStory=24>

The Carey Guides 2nd Edition (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.careygrouppublishing.net/the-carey-guides-2nd-edition>

Power, T.J., Karustis, J.L., & Habboushe, D.F. (2001). Homework success for children with ADHD: A family-school intervention program. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

For research identifying the 4:1 ratio, see:

- Wodahl, E. J., Garland, B., Culhane, S. E., & McCarty, W. P. (2011). Utilizing behavioral interventions to improve supervision outcomes in community-based corrections. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(4), 386-405. doi: 10.1177/0093854810397866

- ³⁸ Juvenile Court Judges Commission, Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, & Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers (2012). [Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy](#):

[Achieving Our Balanced and Restorative Justice Mission Through Evidence-Based Policy and Practice.](#)
Harrisburg, PA.

³⁹ Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (n.d.). Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/implementing/balanced.html>

⁴⁰ Shook, J. J., & Sarri, R. C. (2007). Structured decision making in juvenile justice: Judges' and probation officers' perceptions and use. *Children and Youth Services Review, 29*(10), 1335-1351.

⁴¹ For a review of the literature on the impact of parental involvement on youth outcomes in educational settings, see: Cotton, K. & Wiklund, K. R. (1989), *Parent involvement in education*. Retrieved from <http://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/parent-involvement-in-education.pdf>

For information on the importance of parental involvement in juvenile justices settings, see:

Alarid, L. F., Montemayor, C. D., & Dannhaus, S. (2012). The effect of parental support on juvenile drug court completion and post-program recidivism. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 10*(4), 354-369. doi: 10.1177/1541204012438422ehavior. (Greater parental involvement predicted completion of a youth drug court program and decreased reoffending behavior).

Barkowitz, D., Franklin, K., Hunninen, M., & Luckenbill, W. (2012). A family guide to Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system [Monograph]. *Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers and its Family Involvement Committee*. Retrieved from <http://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Family%20Guide%20to%20PA%20Juvenile%20Justice%20System.pdf>

Burke, J. D., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., & Garbin, S. A. (2014). The challenge and opportunity of parental involvement in juvenile justice services. *Children and Youth Services Review, 39*, 39-47.

Harvell, S., Rodas, B., & Hendey, L. (2004). *Parental Involvement in Juvenile Justice: Prospects and Possibilities*. Retrieved from [http://www.oklaosf.state.ok.us/~oja/SAG%20Website/MacFound/Parental Involvement in Juvenile Justice.pdf](http://www.oklaosf.state.ok.us/~oja/SAG%20Website/MacFound/Parental%20Involvement%20in%20Juvenile%20Justice.pdf)

Luckenbill, W., & Yeager, C. (2009). Family involvement in Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system [Monograph]. *Models for Change (Family Involvement Subcommittee of the Mental Health/Juvenile Justice Workgroup for Models for Change-Pennsylvania and Family Involvement Workgroup of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officer's Balanced & Restorative Justice Implementation Committee)*. Retrieved from <http://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Family%20Involvement%20Monograph.pdf>

⁴² Medical: Farber, H. J., Capra, A. M., Finkelstein, J. A., Lozano, P., Quesenberry, C. P., Jensvold, N. G., Chi, F. W. & Lieu, T. A. (2003). [Misunderstanding of Asthma Controller Medications: Association with Nonadherence.](#) *Journal of Asthma, 40*(1), 17-25. (Child and family misunderstanding of requirements has been associated with non-adherence in a variety of contexts; this study provides one example).

⁴³ For a discussion of research on the impact of classroom rules and expectations on student behavior, see: Malone, B. G., & Tietjens, C. L. (2000). Re-Examination of Classroom Rules. *Special Services in the Schools, 16*(1-2), 159-170. doi:10.1300/J008v16n01_11

Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). [Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice.](#) *Education and Treatment of Children, 31*(3), 351-380.

⁴⁴Matthews, B., & Hubbard, D. (2007). The helping alliance in juvenile probation: the missing element in the "What Works" literature. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 45*(1-2), 105-122. doi: 10.1300/J076v45n01_09

Wild, W. E. (2011). Probation officer role orientation, helping alliance, and probationer readiness for change: The impact on juvenile offender recidivism. *Psychology Dissertations*. Paper 197.

⁴⁵ See ⁴¹.

⁴⁶ Many prevention, intervention, and treatment program increase positive behavior and motivation in youth by reinforcing and promoting practice of positive behaviors and prosocial skills. For examples, see:
Flay, B. R., & Allred, C. G. (2003). Long-term effects of the Positive Action® program. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 27 (Supplement 1), S6-S21.
Lösel, F., & Bender, D. (2012). Child social skills training in the prevention of antisocial development and crime In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Handbook of crime prevention* (pp. 102-129). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

⁴⁷ Miller, W. R. (1983). Motivational interviewing with problem drinkers. *Behavioural Psychotherapy*, 11(02), 147-172. doi: 10.1017/S0141347300006583.

⁴⁸ Lerman, D. C., & Vorndran, C. M. (2002). [On the status of knowledge for using punishment: Implications for treating behavior disorders](#). *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 35(4), 431-464. doi: 10.1901/jaba.2002.35-431

Also, see endnote # ²⁸.

⁴⁹ See ⁴³ for a discussion of the importance of providing rules and expectations.

⁵⁰ Athens, E. S., & Vollmer, T. R. (2010). [An investigation of differential reinforcement of alternative behavior without extinction](#). *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 43(4), 569-589. doi: 10.1901/jaba.2010.43-569
Borrero, C. S., Vollmer, T. R., Borrero, J. C., Bourret, J. C., Sloman, K. N., Samaha, A. L., & Dallery, J. (2010). [Concurrent reinforcement schedules for problem behavior and appropriate behavior: Experimental applications of the matching law](#). *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 93(3), 455-469. doi: 10.1901/jeab.2010.93-455

Kazdin, A. E. (2005). [Parent management training: Treatment for oppositional, aggressive, and antisocial behavior in children and adolescents](#). Oxford University Press.

⁵¹ Bennett, K. D. (2013). [Improving Vocational Skills of Students with Disabilities Applications of Covert Audio Coaching](#). *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 46(2), 60-67. doi: 10.1177/004005991304600207 (Elimination of supervision before full internationalization or mastery of the behavior occurs may result in decreased performance in students. In contrast, gradual reduction of praise frequency appears to maintain students' performance).

Spiegler, M. (2015). [Contemporary behavior therapy](#). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning. ("Continuous reinforcement is optimal for initially accelerating a target behavior, and intermittent reinforcement facilitates transfer, generalization, and long-term maintenance.")

⁵² See ^{36, 37}.

⁵³ Herrenkohl, T. I., Maguin, E., Hill, K. G., Hawkins, J. D., Abbott, R. D., & Catalano, R. F. (2000). [Developmental risk factors for youth violence](#). *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 26(3), 176-186. doi: 10.1016/S1054-139X(99)00065-8

⁵⁴ See ³⁶.

⁵⁵ Nelson, J. A. P., Young, B. J., Young, E. L., & Cox, G. (2009). Using teacher-written praise notes to promote a positive environment in a middle school. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and*

Youth, 54(2), 119-125. doi: 10.1080/10459880903217895 (Teachers' increased praise of students' positive social behaviors was negatively correlated with the need to send students to the office for socially problematic behavior).

Also, see ³⁶.

⁵⁶ Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2004). Understanding the risk principle: How and why correctional interventions can harm low-risk offenders. *Topics in community corrections*, 2004, 3-8. (Meta-analytic results revealed that assigning high-risk correctional interventions to low-risk adult and adolescent probationers can increase likelihood of failing to comply with intervention requirements).

⁵⁷ See ²⁸.

⁵⁸ See ^{36, 37}.

⁵⁹ See ⁵⁰.

⁶⁰ See ³⁶.

⁶¹ Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers, Juvenile Court Judges' Commission, Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, & The Carey Group (n.d.) *Professional Alliance Traits*. Retrieved from [http://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Professional Alliance Traits Final Draft.pdf](http://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Professional_Alliance_Traits_Final_Draft.pdf)

⁶² See ³⁶.

⁶³ See ²⁸.

⁶⁴ Miller, W. R. (1983). Motivational interviewing with problem drinkers. *Behavioural Psychotherapy*, 11(02), 147-172. doi: 10.1017/S0141347300006583.

⁶⁵ Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers, Juvenile Court Judges' Commission, Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, & The Carey Group (n.d.) *Professional Alliance Traits*. Retrieved from [http://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Professional Alliance Traits Final Draft.pdf](http://www.pachiefprobationofficers.org/docs/Professional_Alliance_Traits_Final_Draft.pdf)

⁶⁶ The Carey Guides 2nd Edition (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.careygrouppublishing.net/the-carey-guides-2nd-edition>

⁶⁷ See ⁴⁶.

1.13 Appendix A

Graduated Responses Management Reports & Dashboards

- *Graduated Responses for a Date Range by P.O.* ([see report sample](#))
 - By PO or All PO's who gave response
 - Selection option to show/ not show juvenile details
 - Juvenile Name
 - Juvenile's Last YLS Score (and override where applicable)
 - Juvenile's total Incentives
 - Juvenile's total Sanctions/Interventions
 - Selected PO's Totals for number of juveniles with responses, juveniles with incentives, juveniles with sanctions/interventions, and average ratio of incentives to sanctions/interventions
- *Graduated Responses for a Date Range by Unit/ P.O.* ([see report sample](#))
 - By Unit/District
 - By PO or All PO's who gave response
 - Selection option to show/ not show juvenile details
 - Juvenile Name
 - Juvenile's Last YLS Score (and override where applicable)
 - Juvenile's total Incentives
 - Juvenile's total Sanctions/Interventions
 - Selected Unit/District and PO's Totals for number of juveniles with responses, juveniles with incentives, juveniles with sanctions/interventions, and average ratio of incentives to sanctions/interventions
- *iDashboards – JCJC Data Dashboards*
 - Department Summary by P.O. – P.O. Caseload with Most Recent YLS Risk Level chart ([see dashboard sample](#))
 - P.O. and Department Totals for incentives and sanctions/interventions and average ratio of incentives to sanctions/interventions
 - Department Summary by Supervisor – Supervisor Caseload with Most Recent YLS Risk Level chart ([see dashboard sample](#))
 - Supervisor and Department Totals for incentives and sanctions/interventions and average ratio of incentives to sanctions/interventions

Graduated Responses for a Date Range by P.O.

Example 1 - By All PO's or Individual PO(s) and juvenile detail

Graduated Responses Given in the period of 1/1/2017 to 4/30/2017					
PO Name	# of Juveniles w/Responses	Incentives	Sanctions/ Interventions	Average Ratio	
Tan, Mike	8	6	4	1:0	
Juvenile Name	JID#	Last YLS Assessment (override)		Incentives	Sanctions/ Interventions
Alarcon, Isabel	JP16-17082	01/13/2016	Moderate	1	0
Allshouse, Mercedes	JP16-17107	03/10/2016	Low	0	1
Ansman, Kalysta	JP16-17110			1	0
Baez, Ramsey	JP14-16870			1	0
Cowher, Mykel	JP15-16970			1	0
Deangelo, Vincent	JP12-16416	10/10/2013	Low	0	1
Dillen, Vahta	JP15-16928	12/08/2015	Low	1	0
Test, Harvey	JP2016-014735	01/14/2017	Moderate	1	2

Note: It is suggested that responses should be delivered in a ratio of 4 incentives to 1 sanction/intervention

Print Date: 04/26/2017 9:51:17AM

Page 1 of 11

Continued Next Page →

**Graduated Responses Given
in the period of 1/1/2017 to 4/30/2017**

<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Houck, Bryan F	1	0	1	0:1

<u>Juvenile Name</u>	<u>JID#</u>	<u>Last YLS Assessment (override)</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>
Tan, Dawasy	2016-000069	03/17/2017 High	0	1

	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Selected PO(s) Totals	10	16	13	2 : 1

Note: It is suggested that responses should be delivered in a ratio of 4 incentives to 1 sanction/intervention

Print Date: 04/26/2017 9:51:17AM

Page 11 of 11

Example 2 - By All PO's or Individual PO(s) and no juvenile detail

Graduated Responses Given in the period of 1/1/2017 to 4/30/2017				
<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Batty, Bill	1	0	1	0:1
Bitzer, Jesse	1	4	0	1:0
Boone, Peggy	1	1	2	0:1
Cantwell, Stephen J.	2	0	2	0:1
Caramenico, Nicholas	1	0	1	0:1
Costigan-MacCauley, Annette	1	1	0	1:0
Houck, Bryan F	1	0	1	0:1
Tan, Mike	8	6	4	1:0
Tomlinson, Tyler	2	1	1	1:1
Voight, Jarrett	3	2	1	1:0
Voight, Jarrett E	1	1	0	1:0
	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Selected PO(s) Totals	10	16	13	2 : 1

Note: It is suggested that responses should be delivered in a ratio of 4 incentives to 1 sanction/intervention

Print Date: 04/26/2017 10:07:44AM

Page 1 of 1

Graduated Responses for a Date Range by Unit/ P.O.

Graduated Responses Given in the period of 1/1/2017 to 4/30/2017				
	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Zone 2	2	1	3	0 : 1
PO Name				
Cantwell, Stephen J.	2	0	2	0:1
<u>Juvenile Name</u>	<u>JID#</u>	<u>Last YLS Assessment (override)</u>		<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>
Tan, Dawasy	2016-000069	03/17/2017	High	0 1
Tankersly, Elijah	2015-000503			0 1
PO Name				
Caramenico, Nicholas	1	0	1	0:1
<u>Juvenile Name</u>	<u>JID#</u>	<u>Last YLS Assessment (override)</u>		<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>
Tan, Dawasy	2016-000069	03/17/2017	High	0 1
PO Name				
Costigan-MacCauley, Annette	1	1	0	1:0
<u>Juvenile Name</u>	<u>JID#</u>	<u>Last YLS Assessment (override)</u>		<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>
Tan, Dawasy	2016-000069	03/17/2017	High	1 0

Note: It is suggested that responses should be delivered in a ratio of 4 incentives to 1 sanction/intervention

Print Date: 04/26/2017 12:45:04PM

Page 5 of 6

Example 1 - By All Unit(s)/District(s) or Individual Unit(s)/District(S) and PO's or Individual PO(s) and juvenile detail

Continued Next Page →

Graduated Responses Given in the period of 1/1/2017 to 4/30/2017				
	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Zone 3	1	0	1	0 : 1
PO Name	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Houck, Bryan F	1	0	1	0:1
<u>Juvenile Name</u>	<u>JID#</u>	<u>Last YLS Assessment (override)</u>		<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>
Tan, Dawasy	2016-000069	03/17/2017	High	0 1
	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Selected PO(s) Totals	7	11	10	1 : 1

Note: It is suggested that responses should be delivered in a ratio of 4 incentives to 1 sanction/intervention

Print Date: 04/26/2017 12:45:03PM

Page 6 of 6

←End of Example 1

Example 2 - By All Unit(s)/District(s) or Individual Unit(s)/District(S) and PO's or Individual PO(s) and no juvenile detail

Graduated Responses Given in the period of 1/1/2017 to 4/30/2017				
	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Informal Adjustment	2	1	1	0 : 0
<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Tomlinson, Tyler	2	1	1	1:1
Institution PO- Zone 1	1	1	2	1 : 2
<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Boone, Peggy	1	1	2	0:1
Juvenile Probation	3	4	2	1 : 0
<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Voight, Jarrett	3	4	2	1:0
Zone 1	1	4	1	4 : 1
<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Batty, Bill	1	0	1	0:1
Bitzer, Jesse	1	4	0	1:0
Zone 2	2	1	3	0 : 1
<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Cantwell, Stephen J.	2	0	2	0:1
Caramenico, Nicholas	1	0	1	0:1
Costigan-MacCauley, Annette	1	1	0	1:0
Zone 3	1	0	1	0 : 1

Note: It is suggested that responses should be delivered in a ratio of 4 incentives to 1 sanction/intervention

Print Date: 04/26/2017 1:23:54PM

Page 1 of 2

**Graduated Responses Given
in the period of 1/1/2017 to 4/30/2017**

<u>PO Name</u>	<u># of Juveniles w/Responses</u>	<u>Incentives</u>	<u>Sanctions/ Interventions</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u>
Houck, Bryan F	1	0	1	0:1
Selected Unit(s)/District(s) and PO(s) Totals	7	11	10	1 : 1

Note: It is suggested that responses should be delivered in a ratio of 4 incentives to 1 sanction/intervention

Print Date: 04/26/2017 1:28:58PM

Page 2 of 2

←End of Example 2

Department Summary by P.O. – P.O. Caseload with Most Recent YLS Risk Level chart



Chiefs :: Department Summary by P.O.		
County	Active Juveniles	Active Allegations
Lancaster	1,166	2,371

P.O. Caseload With Most Recent YLS Risk Level

P.O. Name	Total	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	No YLS	Total Incentives/ Sanctions	GR Ratio
Allen, Cheryl	18	9	7	1	0	1	0 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Avery, Heather	24	6	13	0	0	5	0 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Davis, Kelli A	44	5	0	0	0	39	1 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Fink, Nadine	21	4	9	2	0	6	2 Inc / 0 San	0:2
Flowers, Makeda	17	3	7	3	0	4	4 Inc / 1 San	2:1
Gardner, Scott	1	0	1	0	0	0	0 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Glass, Ginger	25	6	11	2	0	6	1 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Heiserman, Erin	22	8	9	0	0	5	3 Inc / 5 San	1:1
Helm, Lisa	23	11	3	0	0	9	0 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Hindes, Thomas	29	4	13	12	0	0	0 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Hines, Aaron	24	11	3	4	0	6	1 Inc / 0 San	1:0
Ho, Thomas	18	7	10	0	0	1	21 Inc / 0 San	2:0
Keller, Kerby	22	8	12	0	0	2	33 Inc / 12 San	1:1
Totals	832	221	255	57	1	298	233 Inc / 76 San	2:1

Department Summary by Supervisor – Supervisor Caseload with Most Recent YLS Risk Level chart



Chiefs :: Department Summary by Supervisor		
County	Active Juveniles	Active Allegations
Lancaster	1,155	2,342

Supervisor Caseload with Most Recent YLS Risk Level

Supervisor Name	Total	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	No YLS	Total Incentives/ Sanctions	GR Ratio
Gardner, Scott	143	49	54	21	0	19	2 Inc / 0 San	2:0
Lauver, David	140	49	57	12	1	21	7 Inc / 5 San	0:0
Lupton, Sherry	99	34	43	14	0	8	35 Inc / 12 San	0:0
McCartin, Michael	122	38	52	16	0	16	42 Inc / 48 San	0:2
Modene, Cheri	86	41	27	3	0	15	122 Inc / 11 San	2:1
Shaffer, Charles	342	182	122	16	0	22	6 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Worley, Jeffrey	223	14	9	2	0	198	1 Inc / 0 San	0:0
Totals	1,155	407	364	84	1	299	215 Inc / 76 San	2:1