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### **Executive Summary**

This study analyzed the criminal histories of 349 youth, formerly committed to the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services’ (DYS) custody and discharged from the agency during 2016. The information on their post discharge arraignments, convictions and incarcerations was evaluated to find the rate of recidivism for the entire cohort, as well as the recidivism rates for selected segments of that cohort.

Of the 349 subjects, 25% were convicted within one year of discharge from DYS. This compares with a 28% rate for the 2015 discharges; a 26% rate for the 2014 discharges; and a 26% rate for the 2013 discharges. Youth at high risk for conviction as adults were males who had been committed to DYS’ custody for weapons, motor vehicle, and drug offenses.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **One-Year** |
| **Gender** | **Reconviction Rate** |
| Males | 29% |
| Females | 2% |
|  |  |
| **Ethnicity** |  |
| Caucasian | 25% |
| Afr. American | 31% |
| Hispanic | 21% |
| Other | 23% |
|  |  |
| **DYS Committing**  **Offense Type** |  |
| Weapons | 46% |
| Drugs | 31% |
| Motor Vehicle | 31% |
| Person | 23% |
| Property | 22% |
| Public Order | 13% |
|  |  |
| **Grid Level 1** |  |
| <= Grid 2 | 20% |
| Grid 3 | 30% |
| Grid 4 | 33% |
| >= Grid 5 | 36% |

1See page 9, Table 5 for DYS Offenses and Grids

## **Key Findings:**

* In the current study, the overall one-year reconviction rate was 25%
* The recidivism rate for males was 29% while the rate for females was 2%.
* Youth whose first arraignment was before age 14 had a recidivism rate of 27% while those whose first arraignment was at 14 or older had a rate of 24%.
* Youth with fewer than 5 juvenile arraignments had a recidivism rate of 18%. Those with 10 or more juvenile arraignments had a rate of 39%.
* Youth committing 3 or more assaults while in juvenile facilities had a recidivism rate of 41%. Those committing no assaults had a rate of only 20%.
* Youth earning a high school diploma or equivalency prior to DYS discharge had a recidivism rate of 23%. Youth without a diploma or equivalency had a rate of 26%.
* Youth whose DYS committing offenses were felonies had a recidivism rate of 29% while those committed on misdemeanors had a rate of 21%.
* Youth who opted for YES services following DYS discharge had a recidivism rate of 21% while youth not opting for those services had a rate of 29%.
* On the PTSD Screen, youth strongly agreeing with the statement ‘If someone pushes me too far, I am likely to become violent’ were convicted at a 30% rate. All others had a rate of 24%. Youth strongly agreeing with the statement ‘I have trouble concentrating on tasks’ were convicted at a 34% rate. All others had a rate of 24%. Youth agreeing with the statement ‘I enjoy the company of others’ were convicted at a 24% rate. All others had a rate of 32%.
* Eight protective factors were identified that were associated with lower recidivism: (1) First arraignment at age 14 or older; (2) Less than 5 juvenile arraignments; (3) No assaults in residential facilities while committed; (4) More than 6 months of YES services; (5) Earning a high school diploma or equivalency prior to discharge; (6) Scoring in the low to middle ranges on the Level of Service Inventory (see page 21); (7) Disagreeing with the statement ‘If someone pushes me too far, I am likely to become violent’ on the PTSD Screen; and (8) Agreeing with the statement ‘I enjoy the company of others’ on the PTSD Screen.
* The number of protective factors was calculated for each youth in the sample. Those with less than 2 protective factors had a 46% recidivism rate. As more protective factors were added on, recidivism rates decreased. Youth with 6 or more protective factors had a recidivism rate of only 13%.

**Table 1 Recidivism Rates for DYS Youth Discharged in 2016 with Selected DYS Offenses**

**DYS Offense # Committed Total in Recidivism Rate**

**Sample**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Firearm Charges | 15 | 35 | 43% |
| Robbery | 12 | 42 | 29% |
| Larceny | 7 | 27 | 26% |
| Assault | 28 | 131 | 21% |
| Breaking and Entering | 2 | 18 | 11% |

**Table 2 Recidivism Rates for DYS Youth Discharged in 2016 - Misdemeanors vs. Felonies**

**DYS Offense # Committed Total in Recidivism Rate**

**Sample**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Misdemeanor | 35 | 165 | 21% |
| Felony | 53 | 184 | 29% |

**Table 3 Recidivism Rates for DYS Youth Discharged in 2016 From Six Major Cities**

## **Youth Hometown # Committed Total in Recidivism Rate**

**Sample**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Boston | 15 | 46 | 33% |
| Worcester | 10 | 33 | 30% |
| Brockton | 4 | 15 | 27% |
| Lynn | 3 | 12 | 25% |
| Springfield | 8 | 34 | 24% |
| New Bedford | 0 | 14 | 0% |

## **Introduction**

The Department of Youth Services (DYS) is the juvenile justice agency for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Our mission is to promote positive change in the youth in our care and custody and to make communities safer by improving the life outcomes for the youth we serve. DYS invests in highly qualified staff and a service continuum that engages youth, families and communities in strategies that support positive youth development.

Total Programs:

As of January, 2016, DYS operated 88 programs including:

* 63 residential programs that include staff secure group homes, and hardware secure locked units, and
* 25 community-based district and satellite offices to serve youth who live in the community (residing with a parent, guardian, foster parent or in an independent living program).

Total DYS Population:

* On January 1, 2016, DYS served 626 youth who were committed to DYS.
* 468 of these 626 youth were adjudicated delinquent and were committed to DYS’ custody until age 18.
* 158 of these youth were adjudicated as youthful offenders and were committed to DYS’ custody until age 21.
* As a result of court orders, approximately 190 youth on any given day in 2016 were detained and in DYS’ care while awaiting their next court appearance.

Juvenile Crime in Massachusetts:

* In FY 2016, Massachusetts had 9,658 juvenile delinquency filings.
* Of these youth, 2203 were detained, and committed to DYS’ care while they awaited their court appearance.
* 365 of these youths were committed to DYS’ custody which represents approximately 4% of all juvenile filings.

Recidivism is generally the most common measure used to determine the effectiveness of interventions with juvenile offenders. This report details recidivism data for a sample of former DYS youth who were discharged from the agency’s custody during calendar year 2016. For purposes of this report, recidivism is defined as a conviction in the adult system for an offense committed within one year of discharge from DYS’ custody.

Prior research has found associations between juvenile recidivism and various factors related to age, socioeconomic status, educational history, peers, family dynamics, and substance use. The following have been identified (Lattimore et al., 2004; Cottle et al., 2001; Wiebush et al., 1995) as primary risk factors for juveniles:

* Age of onset of criminality (usually age at first referral, first arrest, or first adjudication)
* Number of prior arrests
* Prior assaults / institutional misconduct
* Prior out-of-home placements
* Poverty
* Unemployment
* Drug / alcohol abuse
* School problems (including poor achievement, misbehavior in school, and truancy)
* Association with delinquent peers / gang involvement
* Family problems (including problems with parental control and poor relationships with family members)
* Mental health diagnoses, especially depression and conduct disorder

Treatment for the typical youth committed to DYS custody has been shown to be cost-effective in terms of reduced recidivism. Efforts have been made to estimate the costs to the community of a criminally-involved youth over the course of his/her lifetime. Research has shown that, “Discounted to present value at age 14, [estimated] costs total $3.2-$5.8 million. The bulk of these costs ($2.7-$4.8 million) are due to crimes, while an additional $390,000 to $580,000 is estimated to be the value of lost productivity due to dropping out of high school”. The cost of treating an individual who heavily abuses substances is estimated to range between $480,000 and $1.1 million, although $700,000 of that amount is the cost of crime committed by individuals who heavily abuse substances. (Cohen & Piquero, 2009).

## **Method and Subjects**

The sample for the study consisted of 349 DYS youth discharged during the year 2016 (Table 4). *A detailed demographic breakdown of the sample can be found in Appendix C*. The 2016 discharge group was studied because the offense histories of all the youth in the sample needed to be tracked for two years following DYS discharge. An additional year was required for all the court cases to be closed before the study could begin. Based on data collected at intake, 86% of the sample were male; 31% were Caucasian; 25% African American; and 34% Hispanic. 43% of the sample had been classified as DYS grid level 3 and above. The remaining 57% were classified grid levels 1 or 2 (Table 5). Excluded from the study were youth for whom a criminal history was incomplete or could not be located. The subjects’ criminal histories were checked using the Commonwealth’s Criminal Offenders Record Information (CORI). The date of first post discharge conviction was defined as the date of the arraignment leading to that conviction. All data was then entered for analysis into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. Using client information gathered from the Department’s Juvenile Justice Enterprise Management System (JJEMS), it was possible to calculate recidivism rates with respect to gender, grid level, DYS region, hometown, county, age at first commitment to DYS custody, offense type, and assessment scores.

**Table 4 Characteristics of the Sample**

**N Minimum Maximum Mean Std. Deviation**

Age at First Arraignment 349 9 17 14.0 1.7

Age at Commitment to DYS

Custody 349 12 18 16.1 1.2

Length of Stay in DYS (Yrs.) 349 0.1 7.4 1.7 1.5

**Table 5 Selected DYS Offenses and Grids**

**Offense Grid**

Disturbing the Peace 1

Petty Larceny 1

Possession of Marijuana 1

Distributing Marijuana 2

Possession of Cocaine 2

Poss. of a Dangerous Weapon 2

Receiving Stolen Property 2

B&E (Felony) 3

Larceny (Felony) 3

A&B With a Dangerous Weapon 4

Armed Robbery 4

Distributing Cocaine 4

Armed Assault & Robbery 5

Attempted Murder 5

Rape 5

Home Invasion 6

Murder in the 1st Degree 6

**Results**

**Overall Rates:** Of the 349 youth in the study, 25% were convicted of an offense within one year of discharge from DYS. This compares with a 28% rate for the 2015 discharges; a 26% rate for the 2014 discharges; and a 26% rate for the 2013 discharges (Figures 1 and 2).

**Table 6 Rates of Arraignments, Convictions, and Incarcerations Within One Year**

**N %**

Arraignments 188 54

Convictions 88 25

Incarcerations 72 21

**Gender:** Males re-offended at a much higher rate than females (29% and 2% respectively). For most of the 2007 - 2016 discharge cohorts, the re-conviction rate for females was less than 10%. (Figure 3).

**Ethnicity:** 31% of the African Americans; 25% of the Caucasians; and 21% of the Hispanics in the sample were reconvicted for offenses committed within one year of discharge (Figure 4).

**Offense Type:** With respect to the most serious offenses of DYS committed youth discharged in 2016, 46% of the weapons offenders; 31% of the motor vehicle offenders; 31% of the drug offenders; 23% of the person offenders; 22% of the property offenders; and 13% of the public order offenders were reconvicted for offenses committed within one year of discharge. Historically, drug and weapons offenders tended to have high recidivism rates. (Figure 5). *Refer to Appendix A for a detailed list of offenses and offense types.*

**Grid Levels:** The one-year reconviction rates by grid level for the 2016 cohort were: 20% for grid levels 2 and below; 30% for grid level 3; 33% for grid level 4; and 36% for grid levels 5 and above (Figure 6). The highest rates of recidivism have generally been by youth who have been committed to DYS for offenses at the grid level 4 and above.

**Age at First Arraignment:** Youth in the 2016 cohort who were younger than age 14 at the time of their first arraignment had a higher reconviction rate (27%) than those first arraigned at age 14 and older (24%; see Figure 7). Previous research has often shown high recidivism rates for individuals who have a young age at first arraignment.

**County:** The re-conviction rates for the 2016 cohort from the major Massachusetts counties were as follows: Suffolk County, 39%; Essex County, 36%; Worcester County, 28%; Hampden County, 20%; and Bristol County, 9% (Figure 8). Historically, the highest rates of recidivism have been for youth living in Suffolk County.

**DYS Region:** The reconviction rates for the five DYS regions were: Metro, 39%; Northeast, 34%; Central, 29%; Southeast, 16%; and Western, 15% (Figure 9). Compared to the previous year, the Southeast and Western Regions showed significant decreases in reconviction rates. *A breakdown of each DYS Region by County can be found in Appendix B.*

**Length of Time Until First Adult Conviction:**  Of the 349 former DYS youth in the study, 16% were reconvicted of an offense committed within six months; 25% were reconvicted of an offense committed within one year; and 35% were reconvicted within two years (Figure 15). Research has consistently found that when discharged youth re-offend, they tend to do so within a short period of time. Of the former DYS youth who re-offended within one year, 63% committed their offense within six months of discharge.

**Other Factors**

Number of Juvenile Arraignments

Youth with less than 5 juvenile arraignments had a recidivism rate of 18%. Those with 5-9 juvenile arraignments had a rate of 31%. Those with 10 or more juvenile arraignments had a rate of 39% (Figure 16).

Number of Assaults While Committed

Youth committing 3 or more assaults in residential facilities while committed had a recidivism rate of 41%. Those committing 2 assaults had a rate of 29%. Those committing one assault had a rate of 26%, while those committing no assaults had a rate of only 20% (Figure 17).

Youth Engaged in Services (YES)

Youth who opted for YES services following DYS discharge had a recidivism rate of 21% while youth not opting for those services had a rate of 29%. See the Methods section for an explanation of YES services (Figure 18).

A meta-analytic study, including 22 studies and 5764 participants (Chrissy et al.), examined the effects of aftercare programs on recidivism in juvenile and young adult offenders released from correctional institutions. Recidivism was measured by re-arrests and/or reconvictions and was based on official reports. Results showed that aftercare is most effective if it is well-implemented and consists of individual instead of group treatment, and if it is aimed at older and high-risk youth. More intensive aftercare programs were associated with lower recidivism rates.

Youth Level of Service Inventory (YLS/I)

The Youth Level of Service Inventory (YLS/I) is a risk assessment instrument that is administered to DYS youth during their assessment phase to inform placement and treatment. Youth who were in high/very high risk range had a recidivism rate of 27%. Those scoring in the moderate range had a rate of 21%, while those scoring in the low range had a rate of only 19% (Figure 19).

PTSD Screen

Youth strongly agreeing with the statement, ‘If someone pushes me too far, I am likely to become violent’ had a recidivism rate of 30%. The remaining youth had a rate of only 24% (Figure 20).

Youth disagreeing with the statement, ‘I enjoy the company of others’ had a recidivism rate of 32%. Youth in agreement with the statement had a rate of 24% (Figure 21).

Youth strongly agreeing with the statement, ‘I have trouble concentrating on tasks’ had a recidivism rate of 34%. The remaining youth had a rate of 24% (Figure 22).

Substance Abuse

Each DYS committed youth is assigned to either a substance abuse treatment track or a substance abuse prevention track. The treatment track is designed for youth who have a history of abusing substances. The prevention track is designed for youth who have no known history of substance abuse. Youth who were in the substance abuse prevention track had a recidivism rate of 15% while those who were in the treatment track had a rate of 29% (Figure 23).

Youthful Offenders

Youth adjudicated delinquent and discharged at age 18 had a recidivism rate of 25%. Youthful Offenders discharged at age 21 had a rate of 24% (Figure 24).

High School Attainments

Youth earning a high school diploma or equivalency prior to DYS discharge had a recidivism rate of 23%. Youth without a diploma or equivalency had a rate of 26% (Figure 25).

Protective Factors

The recidivism literature has identified several factors which are associated with lower juvenile recidivism. These are referred to as ‘protective factors’. Among them are low institutional misconduct; constructive use of leisure time; current employment; little or no use of alcohol or drugs; and involvement in school (Baglivio et al.). The current study identified 8 protective factors (See Figure 26).

**Figure 26**

**8 PROTECTIVE FACTORS**

* Age at first arraignment > 13 Years
* Less than 5 juvenile arraignments
* No assaults while committed to DYS
* More than 6 months of YES services
* Earned high school diploma or equivalency
* Scored in the lower risk ranges on the Youth Level of Service Inventory
* Disagreed with ‘I’m Likely to Become Violent’ on PTSD Screen
* Agreed with ‘I Enjoy the Company of Others’ on PTSD Screen

The number of protective factors was calculated for each youth in the sample. Those with less than 2 protective factors had a 46% recidivism rate. As more protective factors were added on, recidivism rates decreased. Youth with 6 or more protective factors had a recidivism rate of only 13% (Figure 27).

**Discussion**

This study examined the characteristics of recidivism frequency among a sample of discharged DYS youth. Jurisdictions across the United States vary greatly in the way recidivism is measured. Different states use re-arrests, re-convictions, or re-incarcerations as criteria for recidivism events. Tracking periods vary from 6 months to 24 months. In addition, a recidivism event can be defined as a juvenile offense, an adult offense, or a combination of both. For these reasons, juvenile recidivism rates for Massachusetts were not compared to those from other states. Further complicating the issue is the fact that (1) each state has its own unique population; (2) in some states, juvenile rearrests or re-convictions are referred to as “relapses” rather than recidivism events; and (3) policy changes in local police departments and courts can influence recidivism rates. Additionally, many crimes are not reported to the authorities. For example, victims of sexual assault only report offenses 5 to 20% of the time.

Juvenile recidivism rates for Massachusetts have generally been lower in the years 1998 through 2016, as compared to the years 1993 through 1997. In an attempt to improve outcomes for youth, DYS has increased investments in clinical, educational, and gender specific services; as well as intensive case management services for violent juvenile offenders in the Metro Boston Region (Suffolk County). Those investments signaled a shift from “warehousing” youth in the 1990s (when recidivism rates were close to 50%) to a strength-based model of juvenile justice grounded in positive youth development which has demonstrated positive outcomes for youth. The shift in focus from containment to treatment is more consistent with the Massachusetts juvenile code and DYS’ statutory mandate (M.G.L. c. 18A).

Previous research has found that juveniles who re-offend tend to do so within a short period of time following release to the community. In the current study, among the subjects who re-offended within one year of discharge, 63% re-offended within six months. Youth at high risk for reconviction tended to be males who had committed weapons offenses.

Research has shown improved outcomes (including reduced recidivism rates) when a highly structured transition is implemented from secure juvenile facilities to the community. This transition generally includes:

* Preparing confined youth for re-entry into the communities in which they reside.
* Making the necessary connections with resources in the community that correspond with known risk and protective factors.

DYS has implemented a Community Services Network for committed youth who have been released to the community. The features of this model include increased contact with DYS youth by caring adults; emphasis on pro-social development; community connectedness; and building life skills and social competencies. DYS has seen significant decreases in recidivism rates since the agency began implementing a community supervision model in the 1990s. In 2019, DYS was awarded a three year $775,775 Second Chance Grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). This was the fourth Second Chance Act grant awarded to DYS since 2015. DYS was awarded the grant to continue the implementation phase of its community supervision reform initiatives as well as expanded efforts at additional regions. The overarching goal of the project is to improve positive youth outcomes and reduce the recidivism rate among juvenile justice-involved youth. Main activities include (1) scaling up the use of Probation’s new graduated response strategy; (2) expanding DYS’s graduated response to include a balance of incentives and sanctions; (3) coordination of interagency work to re-focus state systems on positive youth outcomes as a driver of recidivism reduction; and (4) addressing housing needs for youth by the hiring of a housing transition specialist.

The 2018 DYS Strategic Plan identified discharge and post discharge planning as a critical facet of the overall rehabilitative process. Every youth committed to DYS now goes through a thorough discharge planning process and every youth is offered an opportunity to remain involved with DYS on a voluntary basis (Youth Engaged in Services). Services offered include, but are not limited to: case management support, independent living options, employment and training support, and support for pursuit of secondary education. These additions to the service continuum could potentially have significant positive impacts on recidivism.

Juvenile justice research has emphasized the importance of education for youth in the justice system. One study found that incarcerated youth with higher levels of educational attainment were more likely to return to school after release, and that those youth who returned to and attended school regularly were less likely to be rearrested within 12 and 24 months. Among the youth who were rearrested, those who attended school regularly following release were arrested for significantly less serious offenses compared to youth who did not attend school or attended less regularly (Blomberg et al., 2011). It is the intent of DYS that education services facilitate a successful transition of youth to their home schools, alternative education settings, Hi-Set preparation, and/or post-secondary education.

The DYS strategic planning process has targeted education, vocational training, and employment for committed youth. This sustained focus on positive youth outcomes is a strategic attempt to interrupt the delinquency trajectory and to assist youth in becoming productive and law abiding as they return to their home communities.
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#### Appendix A

Offense List

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Offense** | **Offense Type** |
| A&B | Person |
| A&B ON A CORRECTIONS OFFICER | Person |
| A&B ON A PUBLIC SERVANT | Person |
| A&B ON CHILD WITH INJURY | Person |
| A&B ON ELDER (+60)/DISABLED PERSON; BODILY INJURY | Person |
| A&B ON RETARDED PERSON | Person |
| A&B W/INTENT TO MURDER | Person |
| A&B WITH DANGEROUS WEAPON | Person |
| ABANDONMENT | Public Order |
| ABDUCTING FEMALES TO BE PROSTITUTES | Public Order |
| ABDUCTION | Person |
| ABUSE OF A FEMALE CHILD | Person |
| ABUSE PREVEVENTION ACT (VIOLATING RESTRAINING ORDER) | Public Order |
| ACCESSORY AFTER THE FACT | Public Order |
| ACCESSORY TO MURDER - AFTER FACT | Person |
| ACCOSTING | Public Order |
| ADULTERY | Public Order |
| AFFRAY | Public Order |
| ARMED ASSAULT & ROBBERY | Person |
| ARMED ASSAULT IN DWELLING | Person |
| ARMED ROBBERY | Person |
| ARMED ROBBERY WHILE MASKED | Person |
| ARSON | Property |
| ASSAULT | Person |
| ASSAULT W/INTENT TO MURDER | Person |
| ASSAULT WITH DANGEROUS WEAPON | Person |
| ASSUMING TO BE AN OFFICER | Public Order |
| ATTACHING WRONG PLATES-124P, 124B | Motor Vehicle |
| ATTEMPT TO COMMIT A CRIME | Public Order |
| ATTEMPT TO KIDNAP | Person |
| ATTEMPTED ARSON | Property |
| ATTEMPTED B&E DAYTIME | Property |
| ATTEMPTED B&E NIGHT | Property |
| ATTEMPTED MURDER | Person |
| ATTEMPTED RAPE | Person |
| ATTEMPTED SUICIDE | Public Order |
| ATTEMPTED UNARMED ROBBERY | Person |
| B&E | Property |
| BIGAMY OR POLYGAMY | Public Order |
| BOMB THREAT | Weapons |
| BOXING MATCHES | Public Order |
| BREAKING GLASS | Property |
| BRIBE | Public Order |
| BURGLARY, UNARMED | Property |
| BURN A MEETING HOUSE | Property |
| BURNING A DWELLING | Property |
| **Offense** | **Offense Type** |
| CARJACKING | Motor Vehicle |
| CARNAL ABUSE OF A FEMALE | Person |
| CARRYING A DANGEROUS WEAPON IN SCHOOL | Weapons |
| CARRYING A FIREARM IN A MOTOR VEHICLE | Weapons |
| CARRYING DANGEROUS WEAPON | Weapons |
| CIVIL RIGHTS ORDER VIOLATION | Public Order |
| COERCION TO JOIN A GANG | Public Order |
| COMPULSORY INSURANCE LAW-118A | Motor Vehicle |
| CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE DRUG LAWS | Drug |
| CONSPIRACY-OTHER CRIME | Public Order |
| CONTEMPT OF COURT (COURT VIOLATION) | Public Order |
| CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELENQUINCY OF A MINOR | Public Order |
| COUNTERFEIT MONEY | Property |
| DISCHARGING A FIREARM WITHIN 500 FEET OF A BUILDING | Weapons |
| DISORDERLY CONDUCT | Public Order |
| DISTRIBUTE (CLASS A) | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTE (CLASS B)-COCAINE | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTE (CLASS C) | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTE (CLASS D) | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTE (CLASS E) | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTE TO MINOR (CLASS A) | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTE TO MINOR (CLASS B) | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTE TO MINOR (CLASS C) | Drug |
| DISTRIBUTING IN A SCHOOL ZONE | Drug |
| DISTURBING A SCHOOL ASSEMBLY | Public Order |
| DISTURBING THE PEACE | Public Order |
| FAILURE TO APPEAR ON PERSONAL RECOGNIZANCE | Public Order |
| FALSE FIRE ALARM | Public Order |
| FORGERY ON CHECK OR PROMISSORY NOTE | Property |
| GAMBLING | Public Order |
| GUN LAW-CARRYING A FIREARM | Weapons |
| HAVING A FIREARM W/O A PERMIT | Weapons |
| HAVING ALCOHOL ON MDC RESERVATION | Public Order |
| HOME INVASION | Person |
| IDLE AND DISORDERLY | Public Order |
| ILLEGAL POSSESSION OF FIREWORKS | Weapons |
| INDECENT A&B | Person |
| INTIMIDATING A GOVERNMENT WITNESS | Public Order |
| KIDNAPPING | Person |
| LARCENY LESS | Property |
| LARCENY MORE (FELONY) | Property |
| LEAVING SCENE OF ACCIDENT AFTER INJURING PERSON | Motor Vehicle |
| LEAVING SCENE OF ACCIDENT AFTER INJURING PROPERTY | Motor Vehicle |
| MALICIOUS DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY-OVER $250 | Property |
| MALICIOUS DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY-UNDER $250 | Property |
| MANSLAUGHTER | Person |
| MAYHEM | Person |
| **Offense** | **Offense Type** |
| MINOR POSSESSIONG ALCOHOL | Public Order |
| MURDER IN THE 1ST DEGREE | Person |
| MURDER IN THE 2ND DEGREE | Person |
| OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE | Public Order |
| OPEN AND GROSS LEWDNESS | Public Order |
| OPERATING AS TO ENDANGER LIVES AND SAFETY-112A | Motor Vehicle |
| OPERATING UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF LIQUOR-111A | Motor Vehicle |
| OPERATING WITHOUT A LICENSE-114F | Motor Vehicle |
| PERJURY | Public Order |
| POSSESSION (CLASS A) | Drug |
| POSSESSION (CLASS B) | Drug |
| POSSESSION (CLASS C) | Drug |
| POSSESSION (CLASS D) | Drug |
| POSSESSION (CLASS E) | Drug |
| POSSESSION OF A DANGEROUS WEAPON | Weapons |
| POSSESSION OF BURGULAROUS TOOLS | Property |
| POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISPENSE (CLASS A) | Drug |
| POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISPENSE (CLASS B) | Drug |
| POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISPENSE (CLASS C) | Drug |
| POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISPENSE (CLASS D) | Drug |
| POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISPENSE (CLASS E) | Drug |
| POSSESSION-MARIJUANA (CLASS D) | Drug |
| PROSTITUTION | Public Order |
| RAPE | Person |
| RAPE OF CHILD | Person |
| RECEIVING AND/OR CONCEALING STOLEN PROPERTY | Property |
| RESISTING ARREST | Public Order |
| SHOPLIFTING | Public Order |
| SPEEDING-116A | Motor Vehicle |
| STALKING | Public Order |
| STATUTORY RAPE | Person |
| THREATENING | Public Order |
| TRESSPASS | Public Order |
| UNARMED ROBBERY | Person |
| USE WITHOUT AUTHORITY-114A | Motor Vehicle |
| VIOLATION OF PROBATION | Public Order |
| WANTON DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY-OVER $250 | Property |
| WANTON DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY-UNDER $250 | Property |

#### Appendix B

#### DYS Regions by County

**DYS Central Region**

* Worcester County

**DYS Metro Region**

* Suffolk County

**DYS Northeast Region**

* Essex County
* Middlesex County

**DYS Southeast Region**

* Barnstable County
* Bristol County
* Dukes County
* Nantucket County
* Norfolk County
* Plymouth County

**DYS Western Region**

* Berkshire County
* Franklin County
* Hampden County
* Hampshire County

#### Appendix C

Demographics of the Subjects