

Evaluation of the Guardian Ad Litem/Advocate Pilot Project

Susan Pate, Muskie School of Public Service

This report was made possible through a cooperative agreement between the
Maine Department of Corrections, Division of Juvenile Services
&
University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service
Institute for Public Sector Innovation

December 2007

Special thanks to all Maine Department of Corrections staff,
Jobs for Maine Grads staff, and all participants for their contributions.

For more information: <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justicersearch>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword and Acknowledgements	i
Introduction	1
Methodology	3
Findings	6
1. Project Implementation	6
2. Compliance with Resolve	7
3. Additional Comparisons	10
4. Survey Responses	11
5. Open-Ended Responses	15
Conclusions	19
Recommendations	21
References	22
Appendices	23

About the Muskie School of Public Service

The Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service educates leaders, informs public policy, and strengthens civic life through its graduate degree programs, research institutes and public outreach activities. By making the essential connection between research, practice, and informed public policy, the School is dedicated to improving the lives of people of all ages, in every county in Maine and every state in the nation.

About the Maine Statistical Analysis Center (SAC)

The Maine Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) operates as a collaborative service of the University of Southern Maine's Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service, and the Maine Department of Corrections. The SAC is partially supported by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and guided by an advisory group of policy makers from the Maine Department of Public Safety, Maine Department of Corrections, Maine Criminal Justice Commission, and Maine Judicial Branch. The SAC collects, analyzes, and provides criminal justice data and information to criminal justice professionals, policy makers, researchers, students, advocates, and the public. The Maine SAC website address is <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch>.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the following for their assistance and support:

- Barry Stoodley, Associate Commissioner of Juvenile Services, Maine Department of Corrections
- Roxy Hennings, Director of Continuous Quality Improvement, Maine Department of Corrections
- Colin O'Neil, Creek Deputy Superintendent, Maine Department of Corrections
- Carol Conner, Director of Classification, Maine Department of Corrections
- Rebecca Thompson, Director of Classification, Maine Department of Corrections
- Kathy Kemp, Program Manager/Trainer, Jobs for Maine's Graduates

Credits

Author: Susan Pate

Project Staff: Becky Noréus

Editors: Carmen Dorsey, George Shaler, and Erica King

INTRODUCTION

During the First Special Session of the 122nd Legislature, the Legislature enacted S.P. 474 – L.D. 1376 Chapter 101, Resolve, Directing the Department of Corrections to Establish a Pilot Project at the Department's Juvenile Correctional Facilities. As stipulated in the resolve, a pilot project was established to determine the need of judicial review for the services provided to at-risk juveniles committed to a Maine Department of Corrections (MDOC) juvenile correction facility.¹ Aside from the stipends given to Guardian Ad Litem, there was no funding for this project. MDOC staff took on extra responsibilities in order for this project to be implemented.

MDOC hired the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine, to conduct an evaluation of the pilot. This report describes the pilot project and evaluation methodology, and provides findings and recommendations.

The Guardian Ad Litem/Advocate Pilot Project began on January 1, 2006 and is scheduled to end on April 1, 2008. Over the course of the pilot, up to 15 juveniles in special need of intensive services are being identified at Long Creek Youth Development Center and another 15 juveniles identified at Mountain View Youth Development Center. Juveniles at Long Creek Youth Development Center (Long Creek) are appointed a Guardian Ad Litem (GAL) and juveniles at Mountain View Youth Development Center (Mountain View) are assigned to the MDOC's Chief Advocate.

Selection for Juvenile Participation

Juveniles selected to participate in the project will have the following:

- Serious mental health needs
- Moderate cognitive impairment or developmental disabilities
- Limited parental involvement
- Identified Special Education needs
- Long history of placement(s) and specialized services in the community
- Not in Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) custody

While this list is not exhaustive, it does indicate the most important selection criteria. The last criteria listed, *not in DHHS custody*, was included because when a child/juvenile enters into DHHS custody, the court automatically assigns a GAL to that child/juvenile. If a juvenile were to have two GALs, roles may be unclear.

In the early stages of the pilot project, juveniles under the age of 16 were targeted for selection. However, due to the changing demographics at both facilities, most juveniles committed to either facility are 16 and 17 years old. Due to the lack of younger juveniles, older juveniles were eventually selected.

Selection and Evaluation of Guardian Ad Litem

The Commissioner of Maine Department of Corrections appointed a Selection Committee consisting of the Associate Commissioner of Juvenile Services, a juvenile defense attorney, and a juvenile prosecuting attorney. Individuals interested in participating in the project must be listed on the GAL roster of the

¹ Laws of Maine, Resolves, 1st Special Session of the 122nd, Chapter 101, S.P. 474 – L.D. 1376

Maine District Court and successfully complete training provided by MDOC. The Selection Committee assigns a GAL for each juvenile chosen for participation in the pilot project at Long Creek Youth Development Center. The Maine District Court will appoint a Guardian Ad Litem for each juvenile selected. Juveniles selected at Mountain View will be assigned to the Advocate. At least quarterly, the selection committee reviews the Guardian Ad Litem's performance.

Guardian Ad Litem and Advocate Duties

The following are some of the key roles and responsibilities of the GAL and Advocate:

- The GAL or Advocate must meet with their assigned juvenile, their parents, guardians or legal custodians within seven days of being assigned and at least once every three months thereafter.
- The GAL or Advocate must review pertinent portions of the juvenile's record within 30 days of being assigned and at least every three months thereafter.
- The GAL or Advocate shall attend all Classification Committee meetings regarding the juvenile.
- The GALs and Advocate must submit a report to the Juvenile Court and the Facility Superintendent within 12 months of the juvenile's commitment regarding the services being provided to the juvenile.
 - Each GAL and the Advocate will make recommendations regarding appropriate services, taking into account each juvenile's criminogenic needs and responsivity factors, as identified by the assessment and orientation units, in a timely manner and in the best interest of each juvenile.
 - This report must be provided to the juvenile, her or his parents/guardians/legal custodian at least two weeks prior to the review.
- The GAL or Advocate may request a separate judicial review once in a six month period.

Pilot Project Evaluation

Evaluators examined whether the project was implemented in accordance with the Legislative Resolve. The GALs, Advocate, sentencing Judges, MDOC staff, juvenile participants, and parents/guardians/legal custodians were surveyed to learn their perception of the effectiveness of the pilot. Evaluators also examined indicators of the perception of service quality as compared to similar groups within the facilities.

METHODOLOGY

Participant Selection

Participation in the pilot project is voluntary. The Director of Classification at each facility identifies juveniles that meet the identified criteria as outlined in the *Selection for Juvenile Participation* section of the introduction of this report. At Long Creek, the Director of Classification identifies and refers juveniles to the selection committee established by the Department of Corrections Commissioner. The selection committee reviews the referral and makes the final decision as to whether a juvenile meets the identified criteria. Once a juvenile is accepted into the program, the selection committee assigns a GAL, who is then appointed by the Maine District Court. At Mountain View, the Director of Classification identifies and refers juveniles to the Advocate.

The juveniles selected at each facility between January 1, 2006 and October 31, 2007 made up the control group. The comparison group was selected based on similarities to juveniles in the control group. The Directors of Classification tried to match comparisons as closely as possible to commitment date, multiple needs in multiple domains, age, and gender. Twenty-three juveniles were assigned to the control group and 21 juveniles were assigned to the comparison group.

Evaluators and MDOC staff identified several groups of key stakeholders. These participants included juveniles, parents/guardians/legal custodians, Juvenile Community Corrections Officers, Psychiatric Social Workers, Directors of Classification, Sentencing Judges, GALs, and the Advocate. Evaluators created a survey for each of these groups.

Data Collection

Data were collected via three separate methods.

1. **Contact logs.** Contact logs were created to measure the GALs and Advocate's compliance to the Resolve. MDOC completed a template and developed specific instructions for use. See Appendix I for template and instructions.
2. **Service plan monitors.** Service plan monitors were created to measure timeliness of services. Service plan monitors were completed by staff at Long Creek and Mountain View in which the frequency of Classification meetings, Unit Treatment Team meetings, or their equivalents were recorded as well as commitment date, assessment completion date, case plan completion date, referral date to pilot project, date of assignment to a GAL or Advocate, and release date. Service plan monitors were completed for both the control and comparison group. See Appendix II for the service plan monitor.
3. **Stakeholder surveys.** Surveys were created to measure stakeholders' perception of the effectiveness of GALs and Advocate. Surveys were administered to juveniles assigned to the pilot project, their parents/guardians, Juvenile Community Corrections Officers, Psychiatric Social Workers, Directors of Classification, Sentencing Judges, GALs, and the Advocate. See Appendix III for stakeholder surveys.

MDOC and Muskie School of Public Service jointly participated in data collection. Muskie School staff developed stakeholder surveys, while MDOC developed the service plan monitor and contact logs. Facility

staff collected service plan monitors and contact logs and mailed them to Central Office at MDOC who then turned them over to Muskie School for analysis.

Muskie School staff administered and collected juvenile stakeholder surveys at Long Creek. A representative of Jobs for Maine's Graduates administered the juvenile surveys at Mountain View and mailed the completed surveys to the Muskie School. Facility staff administered or distributed all other surveys. Postage paid envelopes were included and surveys were mailed directly to the Muskie School.

Data Limitations

Data collection ended before many juveniles were released from the applicable facility. In order to meet the evaluation mandate of the Resolve, final data collection ended on 10/31/07. The effectiveness of the pilot project is difficult to evaluate when two-thirds of the pilot's participants have not completed the project.

Ideally, the control and comparison groups should be identical as it relates to their characteristics with the only difference being the control group is assigned a GAL or Advocate while the comparison group is not. While the comparison groups are similar to the control groups at each facility, there are some significant differences. The juveniles assigned to the comparison group for various reasons did not meet all of the criteria necessary for acceptance to the pilot project. Juveniles in the control group typically met all of the criteria listed under *Selection of Juvenile Population* listed in the introduction of this report. Evaluators do not know which of the criteria the comparison group members did not meet, so while one juvenile in the comparison group may have had family support, another may not have had significant mental health issues.

Contact logs were not consistently completed per the *Instructions for Completing Advocate/Gal Log*, which gave detailed examples for completing the log. Many contact log entries did not include purpose of activities, used unclear abbreviations, and were handwritten and at times illegible. Contact logs were not submitted monthly to the Director of Classification at each facility, reviewed, and submitted to Central Office.

Service plan monitors were not completed in the same manner between facilities. One facility entered the type of service under the Service column, while the other entered the treatment plan goal. One entered Expected Completion Date or Actual Date of Completion, while the other entered "End of Phase IV" in the Expected Completion Date which signifies overall program completion and entered the juvenile's release date as the Actual Date of Completion. Finally, in the Service Delivered column, one facility indicated with a check mark if a service was completed or indicated "referral" if a referral was made and the other facility listed the type of service to be provided.

Service plan monitors were not designed to collect start dates for services, making it impossible to report timeliness of service. A random review of case plans in MDOC's Corrections Information System (CORIS) revealed that many case plans were not updated in CORIS. Often case plan updates were listed in the Notes Screen in CORIS and comprehensive review of notes is beyond the scope of data collection.

Difference in practice between the facilities created differences in mandatory meeting frequencies such as Unit Treatment Team (UTT) meetings and Classification Meetings. Long Creek holds UTT meetings at least every 30 days and Classification Meetings at least every 90 days. At Long Creek, a Classification Meeting or similar meeting does not take the place of a UTT meeting. Mountain View holds

meetings monthly and allows Classification Meetings or similar meetings to replace monthly UTT meetings. Under direction of the MDOC Director of Continuous Quality Improvement, the evaluators analyzed whether a meetings had occurred monthly, regardless of the type of meeting (i.e. UTT meeting, Classification meeting, Quarterly Review, Special Review, Phase Review, and Community Reintegration). Therefore, it is not possible to report specifically on MDOC policy regarding the frequency of UTT meetings or Classification Meetings.

As mentioned earlier, Muskie staff administered and collected stakeholder surveys for juveniles at Long Creek and a representative from Jobs from Maine's Graduates administered and collected surveys for juveniles at Mountain View. The Directors of Classification were to administer and collect surveys for the remaining stakeholders at Community Reintegration Meetings and mail out surveys to stakeholders not in attendance. To the knowledge of evaluators, this practice did not occur and surveys had to be mailed out to stakeholders, which could account for the low response rate seen among some of groups.

Another factor affecting the survey results is that two-thirds of the juveniles were still in one of the facilities at the end of data collection for the evaluation. Many stakeholder surveys reflect the experiences of the stakeholder up to the point of final data collection instead of the end of project participation.

FINDINGS

Project Implementation

To measure the project's implementation, evaluators analyzed the contact logs and service plan monitors. The information drawn from these two data sources and presented in this section only identifies areas of noncompliance to specific mandates and does not identify why there was noncompliance. More research is needed to understand why there was not always compliance in regard to resolve requirements.

Contact logs were submitted for 9 of the 10 participants from Mountain View.² Contact logs were submitted for all 13 participants from Long Creek. In some cases, contact logs were missing, meaning MDOC Central Office received some monthly logs but not all monthly logs from the GAL or Advocate.

Service plan monitors were submitted for 9 of the 10 participants at Mountain View.³ Service plan monitors were submitted for 12 of the 13 juveniles at Long Creek.⁴

The referral and assignment protocol differed between facilities. At Long Creek, the Director of Classification submitted participant referrals to the Selection Committee established by the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections. Once the committee approved the participant, a member of the Selection Committee contacted a GAL on the list of approved GALs. Efforts were made to make the best match between juvenile and GAL. Once a GAL accepted the assignment, the committee submitted necessary paperwork to the applicable District Court, and the Court then drafted an appointment letter and sent it to the GAL. Upon receipt of the appointment letter, the GAL contacted the facility to arrange a meeting with the juvenile and review of pertinent documents. At times this was a lengthy process due to GALs on the approved list being unavailable and delays within the Courts.

At Mountain View, the Director of Classification selected the juvenile for participation and made the referral to the Advocate. If the juvenile was willing to participate, the Advocate was assigned.

Table 1: Length of Time Between Commitment and Assignment to GAL/Advocate

	Mean Length in Days	Median Length in Days	Range in Days
GAL	105	98	25 to 224
Advocate	46	46	20 to 80

Table 1 compares the length of time between commitment date and assignment date to a GAL or to an Advocate. The mean (average) and median⁵ number of days between commitment date and assignment date to a GAL was approximately double of what was seen for an Advocate where the mean and median

² One juvenile was released during the early stages of data collection and this may account for the missing log.

³ It is suspected the missing service plan monitor is for the juvenile that was released during the early stages of data collection.

⁴ One juvenile was transferred from one facility to the other and a service plan monitor was not submitted to Central Office for this juvenile.

⁵ The median indicates the middle value; half are above it and half are below it.

number of days between commitment and assignment to an Advocate was 46 days.⁶ The median number of days between commitment date and assignment to a GAL was lower than the average which indicates that a small number of cases are significantly different than most cases and are causing a slant in the data. In this case, the median should be used. Due to the differences in participant selection and assignment among the facilities, this is the only measure of time that can be used to compare the two facilities.

Compliance with the Resolve

1. *The GAL or Advocate shall meet with their assigned juvenile, their parents, guardians, or legal custodian within seven days of being assigned and at least once every three months thereafter.*

Table 2: GAL – Met With Juvenile and Parent, Guardian, or Legal Custodian Within 7 days of Assignment and At Least Once Every 30 Days Thereafter

Meeting/Contact Frequency	GAL			
	Yes	No	Unknown	Total
Met Juvenile Within 7 Days	7 (54%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	13 (100%)
Met Parents, Guardian, or Legal Custodian within 7 Days	1 (8%)	9 (69%)	3 (23%)	13 (100%)
Met With Juvenile at Least Once Every 3 Months	10 (77%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	13 (100%)
Met With Parents, Guardian, or Legal Custodian at Least Once Every 3 Months	5 (39%)	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	13 (100%)

Table 3: Advocate – Met with Juvenile and Parent, Guardian, or Legal Custodian within 7 days of Assignment and At Least Once Every 30 Days Thereafter

Meeting/Contact Frequency	Advocate				
	Yes	No	Unknown	N/A	Total
Met Juvenile Within 7 Days	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	10 (100%)
Met Parent, Guardian, or Legal Custodian within 7 Days	5 (50%)	3 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	10 (100%)
Met With Juvenile at Least Once Every 3 Months	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	10 (100%)
Met With Parent, Guardian, or Legal Custodian at Least Once Every 3 Months	0 (10%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	10 (100%)

As seen in Table 2, just over 50% of the GALs met with their assigned juvenile within seven days of receiving the assignment; however, only 8% contacted or met with the parent, guardian, or legal custodian within seven days of receiving the assignment. Seventy-seven percent of the GALs met at least once every three months with their assigned juvenile, while 39% contacted/met with the parents, guardians, or legal

⁶ The GAL selection process had two additional steps for selection and assignment. The mean number of days between commitment date and referral date was 48 days with a median of 42 days. The mean number of days between referral date and assignment date was 58 days with a median of 33 days. In both cases, the median should be used.

custodian at least once every three months. The “unknowns” are due to missing contact logs and missing assignment dates on the service plan monitors and/or contact logs.

As seen in Table 3, the Advocate met with 70% of assigned juveniles within seven days of assignment and contacted/met with 50% of the parents, guardians, or legal custodians. The Advocate met with 40% of the assigned juveniles at least once every three months, but did not meet with their parents, guardians, or legal custodians at least once every three months. The “unknowns” are due to missing contact logs and the “N/As” were a result of a legal guardian issue with one juvenile and two juveniles were in the program less than three months at the time data collection ended.

While the Advocate had the higher rate of meeting/contacting juveniles and their parents, guardians, or legal custodians within seven days of receiving the assignment, the GALs maintained more frequent contact with juveniles and their parents, guardians, or legal custodian at least once every three months after the initial contact/meeting. Analysis of the contact logs showed significant differences among the GALs and level of activity. Some GALs recorded numerous activities and spent much more time on a juvenile’s case, while others just met the minimum requirements.

The Advocate is also the Chief Advocate for MDOC and under the role of Chief Advocate serves other juveniles within Mountain View; therefore the Advocate may have met with assigned juveniles informally in the cafeteria, hallways, etc., but did not always log the activity which could account for the drop in meetings seen after initial contact. It is also possible that the GALs and Advocate had more contact with juveniles and their parents, guardians, and legal custodians, but due to issues with the contact logs, such as vague entries and the absence of purpose, the evaluators had to assume there was no contact.

2. *Within 30 days of being assigned to the juvenile’s case and at least every three months thereafter, the GAL or the Advocate shall review the following documents if generated by or for the department since the juvenile’s commitment: the integrated assessment, or its equivalent; the resident plan, or its equivalent; any modifications to the case plan; any psychological evaluation, including any sexual behavior treatment assessment, if applicable; any sexual behavior treatment plan, if applicable; any psychiatric evaluation; any assessment of the juvenile prepared by a treatment provider under contract with the department; and, with the juvenile’s written consent, any substance abuse treatment assessment and treatment plan, if applicable.*

Table 4: GAL – Review Pertinent Documents within 30 Days of Assignment and At Least Once a Month Every Three Months Thereafter

Document Review Frequency	GAL			Total
	Yes	No	Unknown	
Review of Pertinent Documents within 30 Days	7 (54%)	4 (31%)	2 (15%)	13 (100%)
Review of Pertinent Documents at Least Once Every Three Months	4 (31%)	6 (46%)	3 (23%)	13 (100%)

Table 5: Advocate – Review Pertinent Documents within 30 Days of Assignment and At Least Once a Month Every Three Months Thereafter

Document Review Frequency	Advocate				Total
	Yes	No	Unknown	N/A	
Review of Pertinent Documents within 30 Days	8 (80%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)
Review of Pertinent Documents at Least Once Every Three Months	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	10 (100%)

Fifty-four percent of the GALs reviewed the juvenile’s pertinent documents within 30 days of receiving the assignment, while only 31% reviewed these documents at least once every three months of the initial review (Table 4). The Advocate reviewed 80% of the assigned juveniles within 30 days and reviewed 60% of the juvenile’s records at least once every three months (Table 5). *Once again, it is possible that more record reviews occurred than were documented in the contact logs.* It is also possible that when the GAL or Advocate attended a meeting such as a Classification Meetings or UTT Meeting, they consider the attendance to take the place of a record review. Additionally, many contact logs listed phone calls and emails to various people and it is not know whether the GAL or Advocate considered these transactions to take the place of a record review.

3. *The GAL or Advocate shall attend all Classification Committee Meetings regarding the juvenile and must have access to minutes of the Classification Committee Meetings and Unit Treatment Team Meetings or their equivalents.*

Table 6: Attend All Classification Meetings

	Attended All Classification Meetings	Attended Some Classification Meetings	Unknown	Total
GAL	6 (46%)	6 (46%)	1(8%)	13 (100%)
Advocate	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	10 (100%)

As shown in table 6, 46% of the GALs attended all Classification Meetings, 46% attended some of Classification Meetings, and the attendance of 8% was unknown due to missing contact logs. The Advocate attended all Classification Meetings for 30% of the assigned juveniles, 20% some of the time, and it was unknown whether the Advocate attended all classification meetings for the remaining 50% of assigned juveniles. Of the five “unknowns”, the Advocate attended some of the Classification Meetings for three of the assigned juveniles but there was a discrepancy between contact log entries and service plan entries as far as dates and type of meetings attended, the contact log was missing for two juveniles. Because of these discrepancies, it was not known to the evaluators if the meetings in question had been attended; therefore, they were classified as “unknown”.

4. *That, within 12 months of a juvenile’s commitment, the GAL or Advocate shall prepare a written report regarding the services being provided to the juvenile, including any recommendations for additional or different services. A copy must be provided to the juvenile court and be reviewed by the court at the judicial review provided for in the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 15, section 3315, subsection 3. A copy of the report must also be provided to the superintendent of the facility, the juvenile and the juvenile’s parents, guardian, or legal custodian at least two weeks prior to the review.*

Not all juveniles were committed to a facility for 12 months. Six of the juveniles that were assigned a GAL were committed to the facility for 12 or more months. Of those six juveniles, it was clear in contact logs that reports were completed for two juveniles and a report for another juvenile was submitted to MDOC Central Office by one facility. In one of these cases, copies of the report had been provided to the parties mentioned in the resolve, in one case the contact log was not clear as to whether copies had been provided, and in the final case, it is known that the facility received a copy, but not if other parties received a copy. It is not known if reports were written or submitted for the remaining three juveniles.

Four of the ten juveniles assigned to the Advocate were committed to the facility for 12 or more months. Reports were not completed for these juveniles.

5. *That the superintendent of the facility, the juvenile and the juvenile's parents, guardian, or legal custodian must be notified of the review of the report of the GAL or Advocate at least two weeks prior to the review date. The GAL or Advocate shall attend the review.*

Contact logs do not specify if relevant parties were notified at least two weeks prior to the review date. Contact logs for two of the GALs indicate attendance at the judicial review, while the contact log for one GAL is missing for the applicable months.

Additional Comparisons

Monthly Meetings

Using the service plan monitors, the evaluators made additional comparisons. An outcome important to MDOC is that monthly meetings are held for every juvenile. For the purpose of this analysis, any meeting is counted regardless of the title, i.e. Classification Meeting, Unit Treatment Team Meeting, Special Review, Phase Advancement, etc. Only one meeting is counted per month. For example, if there was a UTT Meeting, Special Review, and Classification Meeting held in one month, only one meeting is counted. The reason for this is the desire to know whether a meeting is held once a month for each juvenile not how many meetings were held a month.

In order to determine the degree to which these meetings were occurring in a timely manner, the evaluators determined the percentage of meetings held "on time" (or monthly) for each juvenile in the control and comparison groups at each facility. The percentage of "on time" meetings for each juvenile in a specified group were added together and a percentage taken of the sum.

The results were the same for both the control and comparison group at Long Creek. Of the juveniles assigned to either group, 87% of their monthly meetings were held on time. The results for Mountain View were slightly different between the two groups. Ninety percent of monthly meetings occurred on time for juveniles assigned an Advocate (control group), while 84% of monthly meetings occurred on time for juveniles in the comparison group. One interesting note is that while Long Creek had fewer monthly meetings on time, service plan monitors showed that overall they had significantly more meetings for juveniles than Mountain View. For example, UTT Meetings are held approximately every 30 days, Classification Meetings are held approximately every 90 days, and Special Reviews and Phase Advancement Meetings occurred as necessary. One meeting could not take the place of another meeting. At Mountain View one meeting could and often did take the place of another meeting, such as a Classification Meeting took the place of the UTT Meeting.

Average Length of Commitment

Evaluators also looked at the average length of commitment for those juveniles in the control and comparison groups that were released before final data collection on 10/31/07. At Long Creek the average length of commitment for juveniles in the control group (assigned a GAL) was 12 months, with a median of 11 months. The juveniles in the comparison group at Long Creek had longer commitment lengths with an average of 15 months and a median of 16 months. The difference between the two groups at Mountain View was smaller. The average length of commitment for juveniles in the control group was 11 months with a median of 12 months. The average length of commitment for juveniles in the comparison group was 12 months with a median of 12.5 months.

Survey Responses

Evaluators administered stakeholder surveys to juveniles assigned a GAL or Advocate, their parents/guardians, Juvenile Community Corrections Officers, Psychiatric Social Workers, Directors of Classification, sentencing Judges, GALs, and the Advocate. Surveys were created to measure stakeholders' perception of the effectiveness of the GALs and Advocate.

Surveys differed depending on the stakeholder group. Some questions were similar enough that they could be measured across some groups, while others were very specific to the stakeholder group. Table 7 provides the number of survey respondents and response rate by stakeholder group.⁷

Table 7: Possible Number of Survey Respondents, Actual Number and Response Rate

Stakeholder Group	Total Possible Respondents	Actual Number of Respondents	Response Rate
Juveniles	23	20	87%
Parent/Guardian	23	3	13%
Psychiatric Social Worker (PSW)	10	5	50%
Director of Classification	2	2	100%
Juvenile Community Corrections Officer (JCCO)	15	9	60%
Sentencing Judge	8	5	63%
Guardian Ad Litem	13	9	69%
Advocate	1	1	100%
Total	95	54	57%

The responses to eight questions asked on the juvenile surveys are listed in Table 8.⁸ It is clear that most juveniles liked their assigned GAL/Advocate and believed the assigned GAL/Advocate liked them. Most

⁷ The answers to the scaled section of the survey were discarded for one juvenile, one PSW, one JCCO, and four judges. In most cases, it was because the respondent did not have contact with a GAL/Advocate or memory of the pilot project. The questions that were specific to judges are not presented in this report since the data represents the perception of one judge. The evaluators can say that the judge had only positive remarks about the GALs she/he had worked with as part of the pilot project.

⁸ One juvenile responded that she/he had not met their assigned GAL/Advocate and answered strongly disagree to all questions on their survey. Contact logs indicate that each GAL/Advocate met with their assigned juveniles. It is possible that this juvenile did not understand the role of the GAL/Advocate at the initial meeting and therefore was not aware they had met the assigned GAL/Advocate.

juveniles believed their GAL/Advocate would speak up for them and indicated the GAL/Advocate talked to them about their family. While the majority of juveniles responded that their GAL/Advocate helped them understand what to expect while at Long Creek or Mountain View and explained to them what would happen when released, these two questions received the highest number of strongly disagree or disagree responses. This may be a responsibility that was not made clear to GAL/Advocate. As mentioned earlier in this report, two-thirds of the juveniles were still in the pilot project at the end of data collection on 10/31/2007, which may also account for the lower ratings for these two questions.

While the N/A responses were small, it may indicate that juveniles were not always aware of the work their GAL/Advocate was doing or not doing.

Table 8: Responses to Questions Answered by Juveniles

Question	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	N/A
I liked my GAL/Advocate (n=20)	95%	5%	
My GAL/Advocate like me (n=20)	90%	5%	5%
My GAL/Advocate talks to me about my family (n=20)	90%	10%	
I could count on my GAL/Advocate to speak up for me (n=20)	80%	15%	5%
My GAL/Advocate knew how I was doing in school (n=20)	75%	15%	10%
My GAL/Advocate talked to other people important to me (n=20)	75%	15%	10%
My GAL/Advocate helped me understand what to expect while I was at Long Creek/Mountain View (n=20)	65%	25%	10%
My GAL/Advocate explained to me what would happen when I am released (n=20)	65%	25%	10%

Table 9 shows the responses to six questions that were asked for the judges, JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, and Parents/Guardian. In general, respondents thought the GALs were professional, respectful of their opinion, understood the needs of the juveniles, worked in the best interest of the juvenile, and would like to see more juveniles served by a GAL. As seen in Table 7, the number of respondents in each stakeholder group was relatively small and for that reason responses of these stakeholders are grouped together to protect individual identity. If those that provided N/A as an answer or did not answer a question are taken out of the analysis, all respondents responded favorably to these questions.⁹

⁹ One respondent answered N/A for all questions, while one respondent answered N/A for all but one question. Both of these respondents said they did not have contact with the GAL or Advocate.

Table 9: Responses to Questions Answered by Judges, JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, and Parents/Guardian

Question	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	N/A	Did Not Answer
GAL/Advocate acted professionally (n=19)	89%		11%	
GAL/Advocate understood needs of youth (n=19)	89%		11%	
GAL/Advocate asked my opinion (n=19)	83%		11%	6%
GAL/Advocate respected my opinion (n=19)	89%		11%	
GAL/Advocate worked for the best interest of the youth (n=19)	89%		11%	
I would like to see more youth served by a GAL/Advocate (n=19)	79%	16%	5%	

Table 10 shows the responses to eight questions that were asked on the GAL and Advocate surveys. All respondents agreed that they received adequate training; they felt comfortable making recommendations, and liked their role in the pilot project. The questions that resulted in the most N/A responses were related to judicial reviews, i.e. “I think my recommendations are taken seriously by the judge” and “I attend all judicial review hearings”.¹⁰ Thirty percent of the respondents did not think they received the documents needed to be effective in their role as GAL or Advocate.

Table 10: Responses to Questions Answered by GALs and Advocate

Question	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	N/A	Did Not Answer
I feel I received adequate training	100%			
I am comfortable making recommendations in my role as GAL/Advocate (n=10)	100%			
I liked my role as a GAL/Advocate in this project (n=10)	100%			
I think my recommendations are taken seriously by the judge (n=10)	40%		60%	
I attended all judicial review hearings (n=10)	60%		40%	
MDOC personnel respected my opinion (n=10)	80%		10%	10%
I feel valued by the parents (n=10)	60%	20%	10%	10%
I attended all classification meetings (n=10)	80%	20%		
I received documents I needed to be effective in my role as GAL/Advocate (n=10)	70%	30%		

¹⁰ The N/A responses most likely indicate the activity did not occur and therefore, an opinion could not be given.

Table 11 summarizes the answers to questions asked of JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, Parents/Guardian, and juveniles. Most respondents agreed that the GAL/Advocate explained their role to them. Twenty-four percent of the respondents selected N/A or strongly disagree or disagree.

While the majority of respondents agreed that the GAL/Advocate visited the juveniles regularly, a fair number disagreed or did not have the information they needed to answer the question. Interesting differences resulted between the GAL program and the Advocate program. When analyzing only the juvenile responses and removing the N/A responses and the “did not answer” responses from the analysis, 90% of juveniles assigned a GAL agreed their GAL visited enough; however, only 56% of those assigned an Advocate agreed their Advocate visited enough.

When all responses except the N/A responses and the “did not answer” responses were analyzed, the difference between the GAL program and Advocate program narrowed. Nevertheless, 74% of the respondents from the GAL program agreed the GAL visited the juvenile enough and 67% of the respondents from the Advocate program agreed the Advocate visited the juvenile enough.¹¹

Table 11: Responses to Questions Answered by JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, Parents/Guardian, and Juveniles

Question	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	N/A	Did Not Answer
The GAL/Advocate explained their role (n=38)	76%	11%	13%	
The GAL/Advocate visited the juvenile regularly (n=38)	63%	21%	11%	5%

“I understand the role of the GAL/Advocate” was common to all surveys¹². Ninety-four percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they understood the role of the GAL/Advocate, while 6% strongly disagreed or disagreed.

Of the remaining questions:

- 93% of the respondents agreed the GAL/Advocate was prepared for meetings¹³
- 89% agreed the GAL/Advocate asked good questions¹⁴
- 88% agreed the GAL/Advocate made appropriate recommendations¹⁵
- 87% agreed the GAL/Advocate made a difference with the juveniles they served¹⁶
- 85% agreed the GAL/Advocate was helpful¹⁷
- 78% agreed the GAL/Advocate provided an objective opinion¹⁸.

¹¹ The term “enough” was left undefined on the surveys and therefore may mean something different to each respondent. Analysis of the contact logs indicated the GALs were slightly more often in compliance with the mandate to meet at least once every three months with the juvenile.

¹² “I understand what I was expected to do as a GAL/Advocate” on the GAL/Advocate surveys.

¹³ Respondents included JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, GALs, and Advocate, n=28.

¹⁴ Respondents included JCCOs, PSWs, and Directors of Classification, n=18.

¹⁵ Respondents included Judge, JCCOs, PSWs, and Directors of Classification, n=16.

¹⁶ Respondents included Judge, JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, Parents/Guardian, GAL, and Advocate, n=29.

¹⁷ Respondents included Judge, JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, Parents/Guardian, and juveniles, n=27.

Open-Ended Responses

Evaluators also conducted analysis on open-ended questions asked on each survey. JCCOs, PSWs, and Directors of Classification answered identical questions; the GAL and Advocate surveys answered identical questions, while the parent/guardian survey and juvenile survey answered unique questions not asked of other stakeholder groups.

The follow subsections summarize the perceptions of various stakeholders based on responses to the open-ended questions on the survey. Those respondents that answered identical questions are grouped together.

Juveniles

Juveniles were asked the following open-ended questions: *What did you like most about your GAL/Advocate? What didn't you like about having a GAL/Advocate? What is one thing you wish your GAL/Advocate would have done that she or he did not do? Is there anything else you would like to say about having a GAL/Advocate?*

Juveniles that were assigned an Advocate overall thought the Advocate was being honest, nice, and respectful, and helpful. Some of the specific examples provided by juveniles were the Advocate explained things that were confusing to the juvenile, helped juveniles deal with problems, gave good advice, understood where they were coming from, and informed the juvenile of what was going on. One juvenile said they had not met their Advocate.

Juveniles with a GAL generally had comments about the helpfulness and kindness of the GALs. Their responses indicated that the GALs communicated what was going on and what the juvenile needed to do, answered questions the juvenile had, did what they said they would do, and were willing to help. Some juveniles believed that their GAL was concerned about their situation and understood what they are going through.

JCCOs, PSWs, and Directors of Classification

The following questions were asked of JCCOs, PSWs, and Directors of Classification: *In what ways could a GAL/Advocate position better serve youth? In what ways could a GAL/Advocate work better with you? Please give an example of something the GAL/Advocate did that you found most helpful. Do you have any other comments about GALs/Advocates?*

Relationship with Advocate – Responses indicated that the working relationship between the Advocate, PSWs, and Director of Classification was very open and positive. The Advocate listened and offered helpful suggestions. The Advocate provided fresh ideas, helpful feedback from the perspective of the family and juvenile, support for juveniles, and reiterated the significance of the case plan. Some respondents noted that better communication should occur between the JCCO and Advocate.

Role Clarity – Respondents of questionnaires related to the GALs performance thought there could be better role clarification. Most responses indicate the GAL can be a voice for the juvenile in terms or advocacy and provides a fresh option/direction to work towards goals important to the juvenile. However, respondents reported that some GALs do better working as a team and navigating the various systems than others. GALs that relied on exerting too much pressure to try and get things done were seen as creating a distraction instead of helping to create a solution. GALs were seen as more successful when they took the

¹⁸ Respondents included JCCOs, PSWs, Directors of Classification, and Parents/Guardian, n=16.

time to understand the juvenile and structures of various systems and were able to press where appropriate without exerting pressure.

Communication – Many respondents thought communication by the GAL could be better to include frequent contact and information sharing, attending meetings more frequently, attending Drug Court, emailing and calling the JCCO, better discussions on expectations and goals for juvenile, listening to all options, and developing a work plan that identifies what the GAL believes is best for juvenile with suggestions of providers and funding sources.

One respondent went to court on three separate occasions to attend a judicial review. On these occasions the review time/date had been changed and they were not notified by the GAL of the change, which resulted in lost work time. Additionally, GALs did not always provide notice of reviews and did not submit reports on time.

Benefits – GALs were helpful in engaging the family and getting their participation and support. It was helpful when they took the lead in certain areas and helped arrange for services in certain situations, especially when they are the most qualified individual to address certain issues. The GALs' facilitation skills were also beneficial in complicated cases.

Improvements – The respondents thought that having an Advocate dedicated to the facility would be a benefit to the juveniles because they would have more access to the Advocate. They noted that the Advocate did come to the facility whenever the request was made, but the Chief Advocate is also responsible for serving all adults and juveniles under the supervision of MDOC. Additional responsibilities were added when the pilot project began in that the Chief Advocate also filled the role of the Advocate for juveniles in the pilot. Some respondents felt there should be standardized reviews for GALs. While the Resolve does stipulate that the Selection Committee should review each GAL's performance quarterly, these reviews did not occur. However, the Selection Committee did not receive complaints on any GAL.

Finally, a few respondents believed that not all juveniles need someone from the outside to be involved. The facilities have high functioning teams that work well together to ensure all juveniles are getting services in a timely manner.

Parents/Guardians

Parents/Guardians were asked the following questions: *In what ways could a GAL/Advocate better serve youth? In what ways could a GAL/Advocate work better with you? Please give an example of something the GAL/Advocate did that you found most helpful? Do you have any other comments about GALs/Advocates?*

The parents/guardians that responded believed that the Advocate did an excellent job and listened to their child. The parents/guardian whose child was assigned a GAL commented that they would like to be contacted after visits to receive updates about how their child is doing.

Advocate

The following questions were asked of the Advocate: *Please describe additional training you might find helpful. What has been most difficult for you as an Advocate? What have you found most helpful or rewarding? Please explain any areas of concern you have.*

The Advocate identified an area of difficulty as when a juvenile was unmotivated to move through the program, even though staff and treatment teams have attempted to motivate them. The Advocate felt the most rewarding aspect of their role was working with juveniles on a much more in-depth level and seeing hard earned progress in obtaining valuable skills that will assist them in the community.

The Advocate expressed concern that the pilot project would not definitively identify the need for additional support. The Advocate believes that two full time advocates could go a long way to not only create a solid check and balance as it relates to the parameters of the pilot, but could also to expand to other areas of the operation of both juvenile facilities as it relates to the role of the advocate defined in the statute.

GAL

GALs were asked the following questions: *Please describe additional training you might find helpful. What has been most difficult for you as a GAL? What have you found most helpful or rewarding? Please explain any areas of concern you have.*

Training – Generally, responses reflected that training was adequate. Some responses identified additional trainings for the GALs, such as conducting annual trainings that focus on single topics or include additional information in standard training, such as how juveniles progress through and out of the facility, aftercare, and what would cause aftercare to be revoked. One response indicated that it would be helpful for the GALs to be provided with job descriptions and contact information for MDOC staff, as well as an opportunity to meet staff.

Challenges – Some areas of difficulty identified by the GALs concerned meetings and other scheduled reviews. Specific comments indicated that GALs had to request invitations to classification meetings, GALs are not always given pertinent information prior to meetings, and thus feel unprepared compared to others in attendance, and the difficulty in scheduling meetings.

Some of the GALs experienced difficulty meeting with the juveniles and found it a challenge knowing how to get in and visit juveniles, establishing relationships with the juveniles, and also knowing how to be most beneficial to the juvenile after she/he is released from the facility. GALs also identified obtaining a juvenile's record and other relevant documents and how information was conveyed as a challenge. This included receiving relevant information about juveniles in a timely fashion, and being informed of new criminal charges prior to a new court appearance. Some GALs would like to receive summaries of their juvenile's progress while committed, or be able to touch base with the juvenile on a weekly basis.

Concerns – Other specific concerns included a GAL who was assigned a juvenile in another district where the GAL did not know the Assistant District Attorneys, Judges, or other people involved. Not having these established relationships made it more difficult to serve the juvenile. In addition, the distance made it difficult to see the juvenile and parents on a regular basis. Others noted the flat fee was much less than what GALs would have billed for services. One GAL noted that they were not convinced they made a difference.

There were also individual concerns about the lack of mental health interventions at the facility, parents not consistently included in the formal process, and concern that the pilot project would not continue. It was also suggested that GALs be paired up with Social Workers, GALs be used more to help plan for aftercare, and a GAL be appointed to the Selection Committee.

Rewarding Features – GALs found many rewards of the pilot project such as the relationship with the juvenile, seeing the juvenile improve in the facility, or watching the juvenile do well after being released from the facility. Other rewarding features included supportive judges, frequent meetings with other GALs, and the training with DOC staff.

While some comments expressed the importance of the GAL at discharge, there was recognition that Long Creek staff deserved credit for the juvenile doing well during commitment. Some GALs whose juvenile was still at Long Creek, believed their value and reward would come during the discharge planning and beyond.

CONCLUSIONS

Limitations in the data made it difficult to draw solid conclusions. **First**, given the fact that approximately two-thirds of the juveniles in the pilot project remained in their respective facility at the end of data collection made it difficult to compare the GAL and Advocate components. **Second**, the exclusion of start dates for services on the data collection instrument made it impossible to compare timeliness of services. **Third**, the discrepancies found in the completion of the service plan monitors made it difficult to compare certain protocol practices between the two facilities. **Fourth**, vague entries, legibility issues, and missing logs made it difficult to analyze the contact logs. **Fifth**, due to the small number of participants, many stakeholders' perceptions had to be combined in an effort to protect the identity of survey participants. **Sixth**, aside from being assigned to the pilot or not being assigned to the pilot, there were many differences in the control and comparison group. Ideally, the only difference should be one group is assigned to the project and one group is not. Even with the limitations, several conclusions can be drawn.

Overall, the perception of the GAL/Advocate Pilot Program was very positive. It was clear from responses to the open-ended questions that not all GALs' performance were perceived equally. There were various characteristics that made a GAL more effective.

Compliance – There were several differences in compliance between the GALs and Advocate. The Advocate was more likely to meet with their assigned juvenile and parents, guardians, or legal custodian within seven days of their appointment. The Advocate also had more compliance with record review within 30 days and at least once every three months thereafter. According to contact logs, GALs attended more Classification Meetings than the Advocate.

It appears that the mandate with the lowest level of compliance was the report regarding services that should have been completed within 12 months of a juvenile's commitment. Based on contact logs, reports were written for just three of the ten juveniles that had been committed for 12 months or more in either facility. There was also very little information about whether copies of the reports were sent to those identified in the Resolve as well as little information whether the appropriate people were notified of the judicial review.

Challenges – Not understanding the roles of MDOC staff and not understanding how to get in to see the juvenile were some of the difficulties expressed by GALs. Over time, the GALs had higher compliance with meeting/contacting the juvenile or parents, guardian, or legal custodian at least once every three months. As an MDOC employee, the Advocate has immediate access to juvenile records through CORIS, whereas the GALs must request the needed documents and wait to receive them.

Lengths of Commitment – Mountain View tended to have shorter lengths of commitment than juveniles at Long Creek; regardless of whether they were in the control group or comparison group. Juveniles in the comparison group at Long Creek stayed on average three to four months longer than those in the control group at Long Creek.

Monthly Meetings – Monthly meetings were held fairly regularly at both facilities. However, juveniles in the comparison group at Mountain View had fewer monthly meetings than those in the control group while there was no difference in the control and comparison groups at Long Creek.

Areas of Improvement – The surveys only picked up a few areas for improvement. Some GALs did not receive the documents they needed in a timely manner. The GAL and Advocate could have done a better job explaining their role to key stakeholders including the juveniles and their parents/guardians. Many GALs did not feel valued by the juvenile’s parents which may not be surprising considering that one of the criteria’s for selecting a juvenile for participation was low family involvement. However, many stakeholders were pleased with how the GAL was able to engage the families. GALs and Advocates should spend more time with the juveniles. The juveniles surveyed identified that the GALs/Advocate could have helped them better understand what to expect while in the juvenile facility and could have explained what would happen to them when released. It is not clear to the evaluators if this was an expectation made clear to the GALs and Advocate. Other areas for improvement were better communication, clearly defined roles for everyone, better explanation of roles for everyone.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Roles for all those involved should be clearly defined and explained to everyone.* Communication should occur more frequently, particularly between the JCCOs and GALs/Advocate. Many judges and JCCOs were not familiar with the Pilot Project or the roles of the GAL/Advocate.
2. *Collect data concerning services including the type of services received, the start date, and end dates.* The facilities view this data as difficult to track because a juvenile receives most services over the entire length of commitment and are often set up with the same services in the community once they are released. It is important that this data is collected consistently within and across facilities. Facilities need to understand what they need to collect and should be collecting it in the same manner.
3. *Contact logs should be standardized and list detailed activities including the purpose of the activity.* Monitoring the contact logs submitted will help ensure all contact logs are submitted monthly and provide a means of checking compliance. Improvement in the consistency and clarity of contact logs can benefit future evaluations and allow for better monitoring of program compliance. There should also be regular standardized reviews of the GALs and Advocate performance.
4. *The facilities should be using the same protocols for the same policies.* The facilities have different interpretations of MDOC policy. One interprets monthly as every 30 days while the other interprets it as calendar month, meaning a meeting can take place on February 1st and the next on March 31st and the monthly requirement has been met. One facility allows certain meetings to take the place of some meetings while the other conducts all meetings separate of one another.
5. *Identify those characteristics that are considered to make a GAL more effective is important to consider when selecting, training, and mentoring GALs.*
6. *Conduct an evaluation of the pilot project once all the youth in the pilot have been released to community reintegration.* This will allow a better comparison of the impact a GAL or Advocate has on the services a juvenile receives and the length of commitment. Other measures can also be used such as returns to facility. Case studies of these juveniles should also be conducted in order to have a better idea of services delivered and the timeliness of service delivery.

REFERENCES

Laws of Maine, Resolves, 1st Special Session of the 122nd, Chapter 101, S.P. 474 – L.D. 1376, retrieved on 7/24/2006 from http://janus.state.me.us/legis/ros/lom/LOM122nd/Res101-128/Res101-128.htm#P13_74

APPENDIX I

Instructions for Completing Advocate/Gal Log

1. One form should be maintained for each Juvenile in the project
2. Enter the name of the Advocate or GAL in the box provided
3. Enter the name of the Juvenile for which the log is being maintained in the box provided.
4. Every time there is a meeting with or about that juvenile or an activity completed on behalf of that juvenile, it should be recorded on the log:
 - a. Enter the date of the activity
 - b. Enter the Activity – Examples “Met with Juvenile,” “Filed request for Review,” “Read reports,” “Attended classification committee meeting”
 - c. Enter the Purpose – Examples “discuss service plan with juvenile,” request review of services,” “prepare for classification committee meeting”
 - d. Enter any comments

Note that this record is not to gather information about the juvenile, just the activities completed on behalf of the juvenile.

APPENDIX I

Guardian Ad Litem or Advocate Log for Pilot Project

Name of GAL or Advocate

Date Referred

Juvenile

Date Committed

Date

Activity

Purpose

Comments

APPENDIX II

GAL/ADVOCATE Project Service Plan Monitor

1. Juvenile: "Enter Name of Juvenile" MDOC #: "Enter Juvenile's Number"
2. Treatment Group: Comparison Group:
3. Date of Commitment: "Enter date youth committed"
4. Enter Date Assessment Completed: "Enter date of assessment "
5. Was Assessment completed within 30 days of commitment? Yes No
6. Enter Date Case Plan was Completed: "Enter date of case plan "
7. Services Planned:

	Service	Responsible Party	Expected completion Date	Service Delivered?	Date of Completion
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					

8. Date of first monthly review: "Enter date of first review "
9. Was Review completed within 30 days of assessment? Yes No
10. Date of second monthly review: "Enter date of 2nd review "
11. Was Review completed within 30 days of last review? Yes No
12. Date of first Classification meeting: "Enter date of meeting "
13. Was meeting held within 90 days of assessment? Yes No
14. Date of next monthly review: "Enter date of next review "

APPENDIX II

15. Was Review completed within 30 days of last review? Yes No
16. Date of next monthly review: "Enter date of review "
17. Was Review completed within 30 days of last review? Yes No
18. Date of Classification meeting: "Enter date of meeting "
19. Was meeting held within 90 days of last meeting? Yes No
20. Date of next monthly review: "Enter date of review "
21. Was Review completed within 30 days of last meeting? Yes No
22. Date of next monthly review: "Enter date of review "
23. Was Review completed within 30 days of last review? Yes No
24. Date of first Classification meeting: "Enter date of review "
25. Was Review completed within 30 days of meeting? Yes No
26. Date of Release from facility: "Enter date"

APPENDIX III

Youth Survey of Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)

For each statement, circle the one response which best describes your feelings about the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. I understand the role of my GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My GAL talks to me about my family.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My GAL knew how I was doing in school.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My GAL helped me understand what to expect while I was at Long Creek.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The GAL talked to other people that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My GAL was helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My GAL explained to me what will happen when I am released.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I could count on my GAL to speak up for me.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I saw my GAL enough.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I liked my GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
11. My GAL explained their role to me.	1	2	3	4	5
12. My GAL liked me.	1	2	3	4	5

What did you like most about your GAL?

****Survey continues on the back****

APPENDIX III

Youth Survey of Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)

What didn't you like about having a GAL?

What is one thing you wish your GAL would have done that she or he did not do?

Is there anything else you would like to say about having a GAL?

APPENDIX III

Youth Survey of Advocate

For each statement, circle the one response which best describes your feelings about the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. I understand the role of my Advocate.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My Advocate talked to me about my family.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My Advocate knew how I was doing in school.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My Advocate helped me understand what to expect while I was at Mountain View.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My Advocate talked to other people that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My Advocate was helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My Advocate explained to me what will happen when I am released.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I could count on my Advocate to speak up for me.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I saw my Advocate enough.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I liked my Advocate.	1	2	3	4	5
11. My Advocate explained their role to me.	1	2	3	4	5
12. My Advocate liked me.	1	2	3	4	5

What did you like most about your Advocate?

****Survey continues on the back****

APPENDIX III

Youth Survey of Advocate

What didn't you like about having an Advocate?

What is one thing you wish your Advocate would have done that she or he did not do?

Is there anything else you would like to say about having an Advocate?

APPENDIX III

PSW/CD/JCCO Survey of Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)

If you have had experience with more than one Guardian Ad Litem (GAL), please evaluate the GAL based on your most recent experience.

For each statement, circle the response which best describes your feelings about the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. I understand the role of the GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The GAL acted professionally.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The GAL understood the needs of youth.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The GAL respected my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The GAL worked for the best interest of the youth.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I found the GAL helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The GAL made a difference with the youth they served.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The GAL provided an objective opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would like to see more youth served by a GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The GAL visited the youth regularly.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The GAL made appropriate recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The GAL asked good questions.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The GAL explained their role to me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. The GAL asked my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The GAL had a good working relationship with others involved in the case.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The GAL was prepared for meetings.	1	2	3	4	5

What is your role? (Please choose the one answer that best applies.)

- Psychiatric Social Worker
- Juvenile Community Corrections Officer
- Director of Classification

APPENDIX III

PSW/CD/JCCO Survey of Guardian Ad Litems (GAL)

In what ways could a GAL better serve youth?

In what ways could a GAL work better with you?

Please give an example of something a GAL did that you found most helpful.

Do you have any other comments about GALs?

APPENDIX III

PSW/CD/JCCO Survey of Advocates

If you have had experience with more than one Advocate, please evaluate the Advocate based on your most recent experience.

For each statement, circle the one response which best describes your feelings about the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. I understand the role of the Advocate.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The Advocate acted professionally.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The Advocate understood the needs of youth.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The Advocate respected my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The Advocate worked for the best interest of the youth.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I found the Advocate helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The Advocate made a difference with the youth they served.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The Advocate provided an objective opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would like to see more youth served by an Advocate.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The Advocate visited the youth regularly.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The Advocate made appropriate recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The Advocate asked good questions.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The Advocate explained their role.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The Advocate asked my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
14. The Advocate had a good working relationship with others involved in the case.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The Advocate was prepared for meetings.	1	2	3	4	5

What is your role? (Please choose the one answer that best applies.)

- Psychiatric Social Worker
- Juvenile Community Correction Officer
- Director of Classification

APPENDIX III

PSW/CD/JCCO Survey of Advocates

In what ways could an Advocate position better serve youth?

In what ways could an Advocate work better with you?

Please give an example of something the Advocate did that you found most helpful.

Do you have any other comments about Advocates?

APPENDIX III

Judges Survey of Guardian Ad Litem (GAL) – DRAFT

If you have had experience with more than one Guardian Ad Litem (GAL), please evaluate the GAL based on your most recent experience.

For each statement, circle the one response which best describes your feelings about the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. I understand the role of the GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The GAL acted professionally.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The GAL understood the needs of youth.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The GAL respected my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The GAL worked for the best interest of the youth.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I found the GAL helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The GAL made a difference with the youth they served.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The GAL made the wishes of the youth known to the Court.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would like to see more youth served by a GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The GAL was prepared with a completed report on services provided to the youth.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The GAL made appropriate recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5
12. GALs are valuable to the courts.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The GAL had a good working relationship with others involved in the case.	1	2	3	4	5

In what ways could a GAL better serve youth?

****Survey continues on reverse side****

APPENDIX III

Judges Survey of Guardian Ad Litem (GAL) – DRAFT

In what ways could a GAL work better with you?

Please give an example of something a GAL did that you found most helpful.

Do you have any other comments about GALs?

When applicable, did Maine Department of Corrections respond appropriately to issues raised by the GAL?

APPENDIX III

Parent/Guardian Survey of Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)

If you have had experience with more than one Guardian Ad Litem (GAL), please evaluate the GAL based on your most recent experience.

For each statement, circle the one response which best describes your feelings about the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do not know
1. I understand the role of the GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The GAL acted professionally.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The GAL understood the needs of my child.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The GAL respected my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The GAL worked for the best interest of my child.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I found the GAL helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The GAL made a difference with the youth they served.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The GAL provided an objective opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would like to see more youth served by a GAL.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The GAL visited my child regularly.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The GAL asked good questions.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The GAL explained their role to me.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The GAL asked my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I was treated respectfully by the GAL.	1	2	3	4	5

What is your relationship to the youth? (Please choose the one answer that best applies.)

- Biological Parent
- Relative
- Foster Parent
- Adoptive Parent
- Non-Family Member Caretaker
- Other _____

APPENDIX III

Parent/Guardian Survey of Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)

In what ways could a GAL better serve youth?

In what ways could a GAL work better with you?

Please give an example of something the GAL did that you found most helpful?

Do you have any other comments about GALs?

