



ICPSR 3965

## Case Classification for Juvenile Corrections: Evaluation of the Youth Level of Service Inventory in Ohio, 1998-2001

User Guide

Lawrence Travis

*University of Cincinnati. Division of Criminal  
Justice. Center for Criminal Justice Research*

Edward Latessa

*University of Cincinnati. Division of Criminal  
Justice. Center for Criminal Justice Research*

Anthony Flores

*University of Cincinnati. Division of Criminal  
Justice. Center for Criminal Justice Research*

First ICPSR Version

October 2004



National Institute of Justice  
Data Resources Program

# ICPSR

P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106  
[www.icpsr.umich.edu](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu)



# Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	iii
Terms of Use.....	v
Bibliographic Description.....	vii
ICPSR Study No.....	vii
Title.....	vii
Principal Investigator(s).....	vii
Funding Agency.....	vii
Grant Number.....	vii
Bibliographic Citation.....	vii
Scope of Study.....	vii
Summary.....	vii
Subject Terms.....	vii
Smallest Geographic Unit.....	viii
Geographic Coverage.....	viii
Time Period.....	viii
Date(s) of Data Collection.....	viii
Unit of Observation.....	viii
Universe.....	viii
Data Type.....	viii
Data Collection Notes.....	viii
Methodology.....	viii
Purpose of the Study.....	viii
Study Design.....	ix
Sample.....	x
Sources of Information.....	x
Description of Variables.....	x
Response Rates.....	x
Presence of Common Scales.....	x
Extent of Processing.....	xi
Access and Availability.....	xi
Extent of Collection.....	xi
Restrictions.....	xi
Data Format.....	xi
File Specifications.....	xi
Publications.....	xi
Related Publications.....	xi
Final Reports and Other Publications.....	xii
NIJ Data Resources Program.....	xii
About the DRP.....	xii



## Terms of Use

**Bibliographic Citation:** Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Travis, Lawrence, Edward Latessa, and Anthony Flores. CASE CLASSIFICATION FOR JUVENILE CORRECTIONS: EVALUATION OF THE YOUTH LEVEL OF SERVICE INVENTORY IN OHIO, 1998-2001 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati [producer], 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

**Request for Information on Use of ICPSR Resources:** To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Visit the ICPSR Web site for more information on submitting citations.

**Data Disclaimer:** The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

**Responsible Use Statement:** In preparing data for public release, ICPSR performs a number of procedures to ensure that the identity of research subjects cannot be disclosed. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data obtained from the ICPSR archive and/or any of its special topic archives agree:

- To use these datasets solely for statistical analysis and reporting of aggregated information, and not for investigation of specific individuals or organizations, except when identification is authorized in writing by ICPSR
- To make no use of the identity of any person or establishment discovered inadvertently, and to advise ICPSR of any such discovery
- To produce no links among ICPSR datasets or among ICPSR data and other datasets that could identify individuals or organizations

**Redistribution:** ICPSR data may not be redistributed or sold to other individuals, institutions, or organizations without the written agreement of ICPSR.



## **Bibliographic Description**

ICPSR Study No.: 3965

Title: Case Classification for Juvenile Corrections: Evaluation of the Youth Level of Service Inventory in Ohio, 1998-2001

Principal Investigator(s): Lawrence Travis, University of Cincinnati. Division of Criminal Justice. Center for Criminal Justice Research  
Edward Latessa, University of Cincinnati. Division of Criminal Justice. Center for Criminal Justice Research  
Anthony Flores, University of Cincinnati. Division of Criminal Justice. Center for Criminal Justice Research

Funding Agency: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice

Grant Number: 98-JB-VX-0108

Bibliographic Citation: Travis, Lawrence, Edward Latessa, and Anthony Flores. CASE CLASSIFICATION FOR JUVENILE CORRECTIONS: EVALUATION OF THE YOUTH LEVEL OF SERVICE INVENTORY IN OHIO, 1998-2001 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati [producer], 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

## **Scope of Study**

Summary: This study assessed the effectiveness of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI or Y-LSI). The Y-LSI is an instrument for classifying juvenile offender risk of recidivism and for identifying areas of treatment need that, if addressed, will result in a reduced risk of recidivism. Three juvenile correction agencies in Ohio that used the Y-LSI for case classification were the settings for this study. Data in Part 1 were collected on 1,679 youths received in the three correctional settings between July 1, 1998, and June 30, 1999. Youths' files were reviewed to complete the data collection instruments. These files contained demographic and background information, Y-LSI assessments, and information relating to treatment and service referrals, completion of programming, and supervision outcome. One year after the initial Y-LSI assessments, reassessment data were collected on youths. Reassessments were completed on youth at the time of program completion or one year after the initial assessment. Supervision outcome data were collected two years after the initial data collection. Data in Part 2 were collected in 2001 through a survey of 196 agency staff members on their reactions to the use of the Y-LSI as a classification instrument.

Subject Terms: case management, juvenile offenders, juvenile recidivists, recidivism prediction, risk assessment, treatment

Smallest Geographic Unit: None.

Geographic Coverage: Ohio, United States

Time Period: Part 1: 1998-2001. Part 2: 2001

Date of Collection: Part 1: 1998-2002. Part 2: 2001

Unit of Observation: Individuals.

Universe: Part 1: Individuals who entered the Ohio Department of Youth Services, the Butler County Juvenile Rehabilitation Center, or the Clermont County Juvenile Probation Department in Ohio between July 1998 and December 1999. Part 2: Staff at these agencies in 2001.

Data Type: Part 1: administrative records data. Part 2: survey data

Data Collection Notes: The user guide and codebook are provided by ICPSR in separate Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

## **Methodology**

Purpose of the Study: This study assessed the effectiveness of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI or Y-LSI). The Y-LSI is an instrument for classifying juvenile offender risk of recidivism and for identifying areas of treatment need that, if addressed, will result in a reduced risk of recidivism. Three juvenile correction agencies in Ohio that used the Y-LSI for case classification were the settings for this study. These were the Ohio Department of Youth Services (ODYS), the Clermont County Juvenile Probation Department, and the Butler County Juvenile Rehabilitation Center. The ODYS operates juvenile institutions and aftercare for approximately 2,000 delinquent youth each year. ODYS operates a Release Authority that is authorized to grant release to youth under its custody. The department and its Release Authority have adopted the Y-LSI as a central component of case classification. All youth received by ODYS are administered the Y-LSI. The Butler County Juvenile Rehabilitation Center is a residential program for males and females with a program capacity of 46. The average length of stay is about seven months, and the program is almost always at capacity. The Clermont County Juvenile Probation Department receives about 1,500 youths each year who were ordered to probation by the Clermont County Juvenile Court. The department uses the Y-LSI to classify approximately two-thirds of these youths. This study was designed to answer three separate but related



questions: (1) Is the Y-LSI a valid predictor of case outcome for juvenile delinquents under correctional supervision? (2) How do juvenile correctional agencies use the Y-LSI for the allocation of correctional supervision and resources? and (3) Are changes in the areas of risk measured by the Y-LSI through correctional treatment associated with reductions in re-offending rates by youth?

**Study Design:** Data for Part 1, Y-LSI and Follow-up Data, were collected on 1,679 youths received in the three correctional settings between July 1, 1998, and June 30, 1999. The sample included 960 individuals from ODYS, 626 from Clermont County Juvenile Probation, and 93 from the Butler County Rehabilitation Center. Youth files were made available to research staff and were reviewed to complete the data collection instruments. These files contained a wide variety of demographic and background information about each youth, including Y-LSI assessments (which were completed by agency staff at each site). As a measure of quality control, reliability checks were conducted on the sites. Y-LSI trained researchers conducted separate Y-LSI interviews and compared their assessments with those completed by agency staff. In these checks, a very small random sample of individuals was selected from each site and interviewed by researchers. In these comparisons no significant differences were revealed in terms of the overall Y-LSI risk or in terms of the individual subcomponent scores. The Y-LSI gathered information relevant to the youths' offending behavior, assessing the following eight domains: prior and current offenses/adjudications, family circumstances/parenting, education/employment, peer relations, substance abuse, leisure/recreation, personality/behavior, and attitudes and orientations. Demographic characteristics, as well as information relating to treatment and service referrals, completion of programming, and supervision outcome, were also collected from case files and recoded on the data collection tool. One year after the initial Y-LSI assessments, reassessment data were collected on youths. Reassessments were completed on youth at the time of program completion or one year after the initial assessment. Approximately two years after the initial data collection, supervision outcome data were gathered including checks for program completion, violations, new arrests, seriousness of new arrest, adjudications, and institutional commitments. These data were collected from each agency in a different fashion. ODYS and Clermont County Probation provided outcome data while researchers visited the Butler Residential Treatment Facility and examined youth files to obtain relevant outcome data. Data in Part 2, Practitioner Survey Data, were collected in 2001 through a survey of 196 staff at the three agencies. Packets of surveys and return envelopes were mailed to each research site. One individual from each site (usually an administrator) was responsible for staff completion of these surveys. Responses were kept anonymous to assure confidentiality. Upon completion surveys were mailed back to the researchers where the responses were coded and entered into a

database. The survey inquired about agency administrators' and staff's reactions to the use of the Y-LSI as a classification instrument. It asked respondents to rate the utility of the instrument and report their perceptions of ease of use and strengths and weaknesses of the process. The survey also asked the respondents how the classification information was used in the management of cases.

**Sample:** The sampling ratio was 50 percent for the ODYS and Clermont County Juvenile Probation Department and 100 percent for the Butler County Rehabilitation Center.

**Sources of Information:** Data in Part 1 were collected from administrative records kept by each of the juvenile correction agencies. Part 2 data were collected through mailback questionnaires.

**Description of Variables:** Variables for Part 1, Y-LSI and Follow-up Data, include date of birth, age, date of first two Y-LSI administrations, answers for each Y-LSI item, Y-LSI subcomponent composite scores, and total score for both Y-LSI administrations, gender, race, scores on other instruments administered by the correctional agencies, including IQ, parents' criminal history, history of involvement with child services, presence of siblings, siblings' criminal history, mental health history, abuse history, school attendance and performance, gang affiliation, family structure, current offenses and sentences, date supervision began, level of supervision, violations while under supervision, violation dates, disciplinary action, type of treatment undertaken, dates of treatment, whether treatment was successfully completed, institutional transfers, dates of transfers, prior offenses for up to 11 offenses, prior offense dates, prior offense dispositions, date of release, recidivism at three, six, and twelve months after release, and several derived variables. Variables for Part 2, Practitioner Survey Data, include date, gender, date of birth, years at agency and in current position, education completed, experience with the Y-LSI, assessment of how appropriately placed youths in agency were, the most critical needs of youths in the agency, most important types of treatment youths should receive, time spent assessing youths at intake, rating of how objective Y-LSI was, amount of paperwork involved in using the Y-LSI, how difficult it was to administer the Y-LSI, how helpful the Y-LSI was for youth placement, identifying treatment needs, case planning, helping the youths, and decision justification, extent of use of Y-LSI by agency, strengths of the Y-LSI, weaknesses of the Y-LSI, and ways to improve the Y-LSI.

**Response Rates:** Part 1: Not available. Part 2: The individuals responsible for ensuring the completion of surveys by staff administering the Y-LSI provided assurances that surveys were completed by all appropriate staff.

**Presence of Common Scales:** Part 1: Scales include the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory, the Juvenile Automated Substance Abuse Evaluation, Test Taking Attitude, Intelligence Quotient, and the Sex Offender

Assessment Tool. Part 2: Several Likert-type scales were used.

Extent of Processing: ICPSR produced codebooks, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, reformatted the data and documentation, and standardized missing data codes.

## Access and Availability

Extent of Collection: This data collection consists of two data files, a user guide, codebook, and data collection instruments in separate PDF files, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

Restrictions: These data are restricted from general dissemination. Users interested in obtaining these data must complete a Data Transfer Agreement Form and specify the reasons for the request. A copy of the Data Transfer Agreement Form can be requested by calling 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The Data Transfer Agreement Form is also available as a Portable Document Format (PDF) file from the NACJD Web site at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/Private/private.pdf>. Completed forms should be returned to Director, National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248, or by fax: 734-647-8200.

Data Format: Logical Record Length with SAS and SPSS data definition statements

## File Specifications

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Part Name</i>	<i>File Structure</i>	<i>Case Count</i>	<i>Variable Count</i>	<i>LRECL</i>	<i>Records Per Case</i>
1	Y-LSI and Follow-up Data	rectangular	1,679	342	2,375	1
2	Practitioner Survey Data	rectangular	196	73	771	1

## Publications

Related Publications: Flores, Anthony, Lawrence Travis, and Edward Latessa. "Case Classification for Juvenile Corrections: An Assessment of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI)" (Executive Summary). NCJ 204006. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, May 2003.  
<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/204006.pdf>

Flores, Anthony, Lawrence Travis, and Edward Latessa. "Case Classification for Juvenile Corrections: An Assessment of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI)" (Final

Report). NCJ 204005. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, May 2003.  
<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/204005.pdf>

Final Reports and Other  
Publications:

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS Web site is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

## **NIJ Data Resources Program**

About the DRP:

The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The URL for the NACJD Web site is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/>

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3965.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values\*

=====

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1679)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
---	---

-----

20.5% (70 of 342 variables) have 0% Missing Values

5.0% (17 of 342 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.6% (2 of 342 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.9% (3 of 342 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

19.3% (66 of 342 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

LSI2TOTL Y-LSI2 TOTAL	5.3%
ENROLLED ENROLLED IN SCHOOL	5.7%
OFFENSE OFFENSE LEVEL 1	7.3%
V145 ORC CODE1	7.6%
OFFLEVEL OFFENSE LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS	8.3%
GANG GANG AFFILIATION	8.5%
V143 CASE NUMBER	8.6%
SUICIDE SUICIDE	8.8%
OFFTYPE TYPE OF OFFENSE	9.2%
SIBLINGS PRESENCE OF SIBLINGS	9.8%
LSI1TOTL Y-LSI TOTAL	9.8%
SC4CAT SUBCOMPONENT 4 PUT INTO CATEGORIES	9.9%
LSI1B Y-LSI 1B	9.9%
LSI1C Y-LSI 1C	9.9%
LSI1D Y-LSI 1D	9.9%
LSI1E Y-LSI 1E	9.9%
LSI2A Y-LSI 2A	9.9%
LSI2B Y-LSI 2B	9.9%
LSI2D Y-LSI 2D	9.9%
LSI2E Y-LSI 2E	9.9%
LSI2F Y-LSI 2F	9.9%
LSI2S Y-LSI 2S	9.9%
LSI3B Y-LSI 3B	9.9%
LSI3C Y-LSI 3C	9.9%

=====

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
LSI3D	Y-LSI 3D	9.9%
LSI3E	Y-LSI 3E	9.9%
LSI4A	Y-LSI 4A	9.9%
LSI4B	Y-LSI 4B	9.9%
LSI4C	Y-LSI 4C	9.9%
LSI4D	Y-LSI 4D	9.9%
LSI4S	Y-LSI 4S	9.9%
SC4	SUBCOMPONENT 4 COMPOSITE SCORE	9.9%
LSI5B	Y-LSI 5B	9.9%
LSI5C	Y-LSI 5C	9.9%
LSI5D	Y-LSI 5D	9.9%
LSI5E	Y-LSI 5E	9.9%
LSI5S	Y-LSI 5S	9.9%
LSI6A	Y-LSI 6A	9.9%
LSI6B	Y-LSI 6B	9.9%
LSI6C	Y-LSI 6C	9.9%
LSI6S	Y-LSI 6S	9.9%
SC6	SUBCOMPONENT 6 COMPOSITE SCORE	9.9%
LSI7A	Y-LSI 7A	9.9%
LSI7B	Y-LSI 7B	9.9%
LSI7C	Y-LSI 7C	9.9%
LSI7E	Y-LSI 7E	9.9%
LSI7F	Y-LSI 7F	9.9%
LSI7G	Y-LSI 7G	9.9%
LSI7S	Y-LSI 7S	9.9%
LSI8A	Y-LSI 8A	9.9%
LSI8B	Y-LSI 8B	9.9%
LSI8C	Y-LSI 8C	9.9%
LSI8E	Y-LSI 8E	9.9%
SC2CAT	SUBCOMPONENT 2 PUT INTO CATEGORIES	9.9%
SC5CAT	SUBCOMPONENT 5 PUT INTO CATEGORIES	9.9%
LSI1A	Y-LSI 1A	9.9%
SC1	SUBCOMPONENT 1 COMPOSITE SCORE	9.9%
LSI2C	Y-LSI 2C	9.9%
SC2	SUBCOMPONENT 2 COMPOSITE SCORE	9.9%
LSI3A	Y-LSI 3A	9.9%
LSI3F	Y-LSI 3F	9.9%
LSI3G	Y-LSI 3G	9.9%
LSI3S	Y-LSI 3S	9.9%
LSI5A	Y-LSI 5A	9.9%
SC5	SUBCOMPONENT 5 COMPOSITE SCORE	9.9%
LSI8S	Y-LSI 8S	9.9%

Table 1 (continued)

```
=====
Variable Name and Label                                     Percent of Cases with
-----                                                    Missing Values
-----
```

6.1% (21 of 342 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

SC3CAT	SUBCOMPONENT 3 PUT INTO CATEGORIES	10.0%
SC3	SUBCOMPONENT 3 COMPOSITE SCORE	10.0%
LSI7D	Y-LSI 7D	10.0%
SC7	SUBCOMPONENT 7 COMPOSITE SCORE	10.0%
LSI8D	Y-LSI 8D	10.0%
SC8	SUBCOMPONENT 8 COMPOSITE SCORE	10.0%
DYNAMIC	TOTAL OF ALL DYNAMIC SUBCOMPONENTS	10.4%
LSITOTL1	Y-LSI TOTAL RECALCULATED REFLECT MISSIN	10.4%
LSICAT1	Y-LSI CAT. CREATED RECIDIVISM MEASURE	10.4%
LSICATHA	Y-LSI CATEGORIES (HOGE & ANDREWS)	10.8%
PHYSABUS	PHYS ABUSE	11.0%
FAMSTRCT	FAMILY STRUCTURE	11.4%
GRADLVL	GRADE LEVEL	11.7%
SEXABUS	SEX ABUSE	12.2%
PSYCHASS	PSYCH ASSESSMENT	12.4%
SIBPRIOR	PRIOR RECORD FOR SIBLINGS	13.8%
ALLRECID	REINCARCERATION FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE	15.1%
SPECIAL	SPECIAL ED	15.8%
CHS	CHLD SRVCS HISTORY	15.9%
MOTHER	MOTHER PRIOR	17.4%
FELORMIS	OFFENSE RECODED TO FELONY OR MISDEMEANO	19.4%

3.8% (13 of 342 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

REARREST	REARREST	21.8%
LSI1DATE	DATE OF LSI 1	23.1%
VIO1TYPE	TYPE 1 VIOL	24.6%
MH	NUMBER OF MENTAL HEALTH REFERRALS	25.3%
SUSPENDE	SUSPENDED\EXPELLED	29.7%
MALELSI	Y-LSI TOTAL FOR MALES	30.3%
VIO2TYPE	TYPE 2 VIOL	31.3%
FATHER	FATHER PRIOR	34.1%
VIO3TYPE	TYPE 3 VIOL	34.7%
TRANDATE	TRANSFER 1 DATE	35.3%
VIO4TYPE	TYPE 4 VIOL	36.9%
INSTVIO	ANY INSTITUTIONL VIOLATION ENTIRE SAMPL	37.4%
BDREINC	BUTLER AND DYS REINCARCERATION	39.1%

43.9% (150 of 342 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

=====

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
GRADES GRADES PAST YEAR	41.5%
DYSRCDRE DYS RECIDIVISM RECODED	42.8%
INCONDYS DYS RECONVICTED OR REINCARCERATED	42.8%
DYSRCDDM DYS RECIDIVISM DUMMY	42.8%
INSTDIS INSTITUTIONAL DISCIPLINE	42.8%
IDISREC INSTITUTIONAL DISCIPLINE RECODED	42.8%
ODYSCAT ODYS Y-LSI CATEGORIES FROM REARREST	43.4%
AGE2 AGE1 TRANSFORMED	47.0%
OUTCOME TRANSFER RECODED TO REFLECT CASE OUTCOM	52.9%
TRANSFER TYPE OF TRANSFER	52.9%
V141 SINGLE PARENT	56.8%
VIOLATE TECHNICAL VIOLATIONS FOR SAMPLE	57.2%
ANYTX RECEIVED TREATMENT	57.2%
JASAER JASAE RECODED W/ 0 MISSING	57.5%
TTAR TEST TAKING ATTITUDE W/ 0 MISSING	59.3%
REARRSER REARRSER	59.6%
DYSRECID RECIDIVISM FOR DYS	62.4%
V198 PRIOR OFFENSE 1	63.4%
INITIAL INITIAL CONTACT LEVEL	64.2%
V201 DISPOSITION 1	65.5%
V197 PRIOR 1	66.1%
V203 PRIOR OFFENSE 2	69.6%
V202 PRIOR 2	71.4%
V200 LEVEL 1	71.7%
V206 DISPOSITION 2	71.9%
BLACKCAT Y-LSI CATEGORIES FOR BLACK OFFENDERS	73.5%
V208 PRIOR OFFENSE 3	74.7%
V207 PRIOR 3	75.7%
V205 LEVEL 2	75.9%
V211 DISPOSITION 3	76.5%
V148 CURRENT OFFENSE2	77.1%
RECIDTIM TIME TO RECIDIVISM IN MONTHS	77.5%
V150 OFFENSE LEVEL 2	77.5%
V151 SENTENCE 2	77.6%
V199 ORC CODE 1	77.7%
V149 ORC CODE2	77.8%
V213 PRIOR OFFENSE 4	79.0%
V212 PRIOR 4	79.7%
V210 LEVEL 3	80.0%
FEMLSI Y-LSI TOTAL FOR FEMALES	80.6%
V216 DISPOSITION 4	80.9%
V204 ORC CODE 2	81.2%



Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
DISPOSIT DISPOSITION 1 VIOL	82.4%
V218 PRIOR OFFENSE 5	83.0%
V215 LEVEL 4	83.2%
V217 PRIOR 5	83.5%
V221 DISPOSITION 5	84.1%
V209 ORC CODE 3	84.5%
STATUS1 STATUS 1	85.8%
V173 1 BEGIN	85.9%
V223 PRIOR OFFENSE 6	86.0%
V220 LEVEL 5	86.2%
V222 PRIOR 6	86.2%
VIOLATIO VIOLATION 1 DATE	86.4%
TXCOMPLT SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF TREATMENT	86.4%
V214 ORC CODE 4	87.1%
V226 DISPOSITION 6	87.3%
V163 VIOLATION 2 DATE	88.6%
V174 1 END	88.7%
RECIDVSM TYPE OF RECIDIVISM FROM MARK	88.9%
V165 DISPOSITION 2 VIOL	89.0%
V225 LEVEL 6	89.0%
V227 PRIOR 7	89.3%
V228 PRIOR OFFENSE 7	89.5%
V142 OTHER STRUCTURE	89.6%
V219 ORC CODE 5	89.8%
V190 TO 1	89.9%
V231 DISPOSITION 7	90.1%
V155 SENTENCE 3	91.1%
V153 ORC CODE3	91.1%
V154 OFFENSE LEVEL 3	91.1%
V152 CURRENT OFFENSE3	91.2%
V230 LEVEL 7	91.3%
V224 ORC CODE 6	91.4%
V232 PRIOR 8	91.6%
V233 PRIOR OFFENSE 8	91.6%
V166 VIOLATION 3 DATE	92.0%
V168 DISPOSITION 3 VIOL	92.1%
V236 DISPOSITION 8	92.2%
V235 LEVEL 8	93.0%
TX1 TREATMENT 1 TYPE	93.4%
V229 ORC CODE 7	93.5%
V237 PRIOR 9	93.7%
V238 PRIOR OFFENSE 9	93.7%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
V169	VIOLATION 4 DATE	94.1%
V241	DISPOSITION 9	94.2%
V171	DISPOSITION 4 VIOL	94.2%
INSTVIO1	INSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION1	94.5%
INSTVIO3	INSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION3	94.5%
INSTVIO4	INSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION4	94.5%
INSTVIO2	INSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION2	94.6%
ANYINVIO	ANY INSTITUTIOANL VIOLATION FOR BUTLER	94.6%
LSI2DATE	Y-LSI 2 DATE	94.6%
IQTYPE	TYPE OF IQ TEST	94.6%
RECOMMIT	ANY DYS RECOMMITMENT	94.7%
PRGCOMIT	COMMITTED TO DYS WHILE IN BCJRC	94.7%
V234	ORC CODE 8	94.7%
DATRELES	DATE OF RELEASE	94.7%
LSI2REC	LSI2TOTL RECODED WITH 0 MISSING	94.8%
BUTCAT	BUTLER Y-LSI CATEGORIES FROM REARREST	94.9%
YLSICHG	CHANGE IN Y-LSI SCORE	94.9%
V242	PRIOR 10	95.3%
V243	PRIOR OFFENSE 10	95.3%
V240	LEVEL 9	95.4%
V246	DISPOSITION 10	95.5%
SOATR	SOAT RECODED W/ 0 MISSING	95.5%
V239	ORC CODE 9	96.2%
THREEMO	THREE MONTH OUTCOME	96.2%
THREMOVI	THREE MONTH TECHNICAL VIOLATION	96.2%
SIXMO	SIX MONTH OUTCOME	96.3%
SIXMOVIO	SIX MONTH VIOLATION	96.3%
V245	LEVEL 10	96.3%
V248	PRIOR OFFENSE 11	96.7%
V158	DAT OF CHANGE IN CONTACT LEVEL	96.7%
V247	PRIOR 11	96.7%
V251	DISPOSITION 11	96.8%
THRENEW	THREE MONTH NEW CRIME	96.9%
TRANSOUT	TRANSOUT	97.0%
SIXMONEW	SIX MONTH NEW CRIME	97.1%
V244	ORC CODE 10	97.2%
TX2	TREATMENT 2 TYPE	97.3%
ONEYEAR	ONE YEAR OUTCOME	97.3%
ONEYRVIO	ONE YEAR VIOLATION	97.3%
ARRESTB	ANY REARREST FOR BUTLER WITHIN 1 YEAR	97.3%
VIOLATB	TECHNICAL VIOLATION FROM BUTLER IN 1 YR	97.3%
V250	LEVEL 11	97.3%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
STATUS2 STATUS 2	97.4%
IQ1 IQ RECODED WITH ODD VALUES MISSING	97.4%
V122 TYPE OF OTHER TEST	97.5%
V177 2 BEGIN	97.6%
V249 ORC CODE 11	97.8%
ONEYRNEW ONE YEAR NEW CRIME	98.0%
TX3 TREATMENT 3 TYPE	98.2%
V178 2 END	98.2%
NEWCONB CONVICTION AFTER RELEASE BUTLER IN 1 YR	98.5%
OFFYEAR ARRESTED FOR AT YEAR	98.7%
V191 TRANSFER 2 DATE	98.9%
OFFSIX ARRESTED FOR AT SIX MONTHS	98.9%
STATUS3 STATUS 3	98.9%
OFFTHREE ARREST FOR AT THREE MONTHS	99.0%
V181 3 BEGIN	99.3%
TX4 TREATMENT 4 TYPE	99.4%
STATUS4 STATUS 4	99.4%
V182 3 END	99.5%
V186 4 END	99.5%
V185 4 BEGIN	99.6%
V194 TRANSFER 3 DATE	99.7%
IDISDATE DATE OF INSTITUTIONAL DISCIPLINE	100.0%
V193 TO 2	100.0%
V196 TO 3	100.0%

\*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.  
 Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected  
 in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3965.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values\*

=====

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=196)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
--	---

-----

12.3% (9 of 73 variables) have 0% Missing Values

12.3% (9 of 73 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

13.7% (10 of 73 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

2.7% (2 of 73 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

8.2% (6 of 73 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

SEX	GENDER RECODED	6.1%
TRTMT_1	MOST IMPORTANT TREATMENT TYPES 1	8.2%
NEEDS_YL	NECESSARY IS Y-LSI FOR ID OF TX NEEDS	8.7%
CP_YLSI	NECESSARY IS Y-LSI FOR CASE PLANNING	8.7%
HY_YLSI	NECESSARY IS Y-LSI FOR HELPING YOUTHS	8.7%
DEC_YLSI	NECESSARY FOR DECISION JUSTIFICATION	9.2%

11.0% (8 of 73 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

YLSI_PLC	NECESSARY IS THE Y-LSI FOR PLACEMENT	10.2%
TRTMT_2	MOST IMPORTANT TREATMENT TYPES 2	11.2%
NEEDS_B1	BOYS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 1	12.8%
NEEDS_B2	BOYS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 2	14.8%
OBJ_YSLI	HOW OBJECTIVE IS THE Y-LSI	16.3%
DOB	DOB	16.8%
NEEDS_B3	BOYS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 3	18.4%
TRTMT_3	MOST IMPORTANT TREATMENT TYPES 3	19.4%

6.8% (5 of 73 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

NEEDS_B4	BOYS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 4	26.0%
PLCD_GRL	HOW APPROPRIATELY PLACED GIRLS	28.1%
WRK_YLSI	AMOUNT OF PAPERWORK OF Y-LSI	28.1%
EASY_YLS	EASY Y-LSI	29.6%

=====

Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
TRTMT_4 MOST IMPORTANT TREATMENT TYPES 4	38.3%
32.9% (24 of 73 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
WHOTRAIN IF TRAINED, BY WHOM	42.9%
TIME_ASS TIME ASSESSING YOUTHS AT INTAKE	43.4%
TIMEASS TIME SPENT ASSESSING WITH Y-LSI	43.9%
TIME_YLS TIME Y-LSI	44.4%
NEEDS_B5 BOYS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 5	46.4%
YLSI_WEA Y-LSI WEAKNESSES	46.4%
NEEDS_G1 GIRLS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 1	49.0%
NEEDS_G2 GIRLS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 2	51.0%
NEEDS_G3 GIRLS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 3	53.1%
YLSI_STR Y-LSI STRENGTHS	53.1%
NEEDS_G4 GIRLS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 4	57.7%
TRTMT_5 MOST IMPORTANT TREATMENT TYPES 5	58.2%
NEEDS_G5 GIRLS' MOST CRITICAL NEEDS 5	66.3%
IMPROV HOW WOULD YOU IMPROVE THE Y-LSI	73.0%
RISK_OTH RISK OTHER	88.8%
OTHER_US OTHER USES 1	91.3%
NEEDS_OT NEEDS OTHER	94.4%
OTHER OTHER	94.4%
V59 OTHER USES 2	96.4%
RES_OTHE RES OTHER	96.9%
V60 OTHER USES 3	99.0%
V61 OTHER USES 4	99.5%
TBOTHER OTHER TRAINED BY	100.0%
V62 OTHER USES 5	100.0%

\*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.  
 Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected  
 in the data as coded.