

A Comparative Study Of Florida Delinquency Commitment Programs



STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

★ ★ ★

CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES PROGRAM OFFICE

★ ★ ★

NOVEMBER 1987

TED TOLLETT
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

GREGORY L. COLER, SECRETARY

BOB MARTINEZ, GOVERNOR

114769

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FLORIDA DELINQUENCY
COMMITMENT PROGRAMS

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

*

CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES PROGRAM OFFICE

*

NCJRS

JAN 3 Rec'd

TED TOLLETT ACQUISITIONS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

114769

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been
granted by
Florida Dept. of Health and
Rehabilitative Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Executive Summary

A special cooperative agreement was reached with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement to permit access to statewide computerized criminal history records. By combining these records with data on delinquency offenses from the HRS Client Information System and disposition information obtained by telephone and written correspondence, it was possible to conduct the most thorough follow up study ever done on children released from Florida delinquency commitment programs. The sample consisted of 1664 subjects released from the fourteen types of CYF commitment programs during 1984. The follow up period was one year.

During that time period 44.2 percent of the subjects were found to have received judicial sanctions indicating they had committed a delinquent or criminal act with which they had been charged. This represents a very broad definition of recidivism since it encompasses dispositions ranging from adult prison commitment to fines for minor offenses. Those subjects who were actually sentenced to juvenile or adult commitment constituted only 25.9 percent of the sample population.

Recidivism rates were considerably higher for males, non-whites, those who had been committed for property felonies, and those who had a history of previous commitments. Felony offenders with prior commitments had a recidivism rate of 58.9 percent.

Delinquents released from two types of non-residential commitment programs, Associated Marine Institutes and TRY Centers, were found to have the lowest recidivism rates at about 33 percent. Six kinds of other community based commitment programs had recidivism rates of about 40 percent. Five programs had rates close to 50 percent, and the rate for training schools was 60 percent.

Four variables were listed and combined for each type of program to determine a rough index of relative cost effectiveness. These variables were the proportion of first commitments (as a measure of client difficulty), the program completion rate (since only clients who complete the program are counted in that program's recidivism measure), the cost per case for clients who complete the program, and the one year recidivism rate. Thus a program which deals with a high rate of chronic delinquents and has a low rate of transfers or recommitments from the program, a low cost per case, and a low recidivism rate would be ranked as relatively more cost effective.

Using a summary of these ratios the San Antonio Boy's Village was found to have the best cost effectiveness score. This is due to their dealing with a very high proportion

of delinquents who had previously been committed while maintaining a high program completion rate and a very moderate cost per case. Although due to the type of clients they serve their recidivism rate was worse than average at 48.6 percent, it was still well below the rate for training schools.

Among programs designed for less serious offenders Project STEP, which is run under contract with the Hurricane Island Outward Bound organization, had the best cost effectiveness rating. This is due to their demonstrating the lowest recidivism rate for all residential programs and having a very low cost per case, since this is a one month program.

The next best score in the rankings is also a wilderness program, STOP Camps. This program is operated by the state, with a relatively high completion rate and low cost, since the budgeted length of stay is two months.

The next three types of programs in the ranking are the non-residential commitment programs. These include the two programs with the lowest recidivism rates, AMI and TRY Centers, and the least expensive program, Special Intensive Groups (which had the fourth best recidivism measure).

Of the remaining programs, Halfway Houses, START Centers, and Group Treatment Homes all had lower than average recidivism rates, but scores on other variables brought them down in the rankings.

Examination of these measures related to program operation, cost, client type and treatment outcome indicates that there are program alternatives for dealing more effectively with committed delinquents in the community, even with more serious and chronic offenders. San Antonio Boy's Village has demonstrated a high level of cost effectiveness in dealing with children similar to those who were placed in training schools. Among programs dealing primarily with less serious offenders, the wilderness camp programs and non-residential commitment alternatives were found to have the best ratings for cost effectiveness. As the phase-down of training school populations proceeds, substantial resources should be reallocated to programs like these which have demonstrated success. The CYF program office has already begun this process. Information from this study was taken into consideration in the development of the 1988-89 legislative budget request for delinquency programs.

Measurement of recidivism is considered important by many and has been incorporated into the HRS Agency Functional Plan as a means for tracking program improvement. Recidivism alone is, however, of very little use for

comparative evaluation unless it is examined in conjunction with other variables which may impact upon what can reasonably be expected of the given programs. The four factors chosen in this report to be summarized as a relative measure of program cost effectiveness can serve as a beginning. The recidivism measures determined can serve as baseline data. It is of importance that this process be continued and improved upon. We should continue to take advantage of the cooperative arrangement which has been established with FDLE. Additional variables should be tracked and analyzed. Longitudinal measurement over the coming years should provide valuable information on the effects of major program initiatives which have been and will be implemented. These include such things as improved staffing ratios, overlay services to supplement commitment program resources, and intensive aftercare services.

Another aspect of the findings of this study is clear indication that certain programs exhibit very poor measures of cost effectiveness. This should be cause for concern and action. In 1985 the CYF program office reduced the client capacity of the Jacksonville Youth Development Center and implemented an improved program design. The facility now operates as a START Center. Associated Marine Institutes should be credited with having recognized problems with its Florida Keys Marine Institute and taken steps to improve the situation and move the program to a more suitable location. Group Treatment Homes had an even lower cost effectiveness index and should be examined for ways to improve operations. Theirs was the lowest score for any state operated program. The program measured to be least cost effective overall was Pinellas Youth Homes. They dealt with the lowest proportion of repeat commitments and had a high rate of transfers (mostly to training schools) and recommitments, a relatively high cost and a recidivism rate well above average. Based upon these findings it would appear that Pinellas Youth Homes should be closed so that the funds can be used in a more cost effective manner. It is recommended that program office staff review information from monitoring and any other available sources to ensure that this action is warranted. Measurement of cost effectiveness is of little value unless the results are employed to guide a realignment of funding from less to more efficient programs.

The author wishes to express appreciation to the following individuals, each of whom made a substantial contribution to this study:

Noreen Beattie
Mary Bell
Julie Blankenship
Robert Brake
Elizabeth Brooks
Susan Chase
Pete Kreis
Christopher McCarty
Roger Lunt
Gail Myers
Edward Neu
and

FDLE Commissioner Robert Dempsey

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	ii
Acknowledgment.	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables.	vii
Introduction.	1
Methodology	3
Findings.	5
Cost Effectiveness.	17
Conclusions	23
Recommendations	25
Appendix A.	A-1
Appendix B.	B-1

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1	
Recidivism by Sex.	5
Table 2	
Recidivism by Race	6
Table 3	
Recidivism by Age at Discharge	6
Table 4	
Recidivism by Type of Release.	7
Table 5	
Recidivism by Type of Commitment	
Offense.	8
Table 6	
Disposition for Recidivism Offenses.	9
Table 7	
Average Length of Commitment	
in the Program from Which	
the Child was Released by	
Program Type and Recidivism.	11
Table 8	
Recidivism by Type of Commitment	
Program.	13
Table 9	
Commitment Offense Category by	
Program Type	15
Table 10	
Type of Commitment by Program	
Placement.	16
Table 11	
Selected Variables Related to Program	
Cost and Effectiveness.	18
Table 12	
Ordinal Ranking of Scores on Selected	
Variables Related to Program Cost	
and Effectiveness.	20
Table 13	
Summary of Ratio Measures of Selected	
Variables Related to Program Cost	
and Effectiveness.	22

INTRODUCTION

In 1968 Florida opened its first community based residential facility for committed delinquents as an alternative to placement in state run training schools. During the years which followed, an extensive array of community based programs was developed throughout the state. These included both residential and non-residential commitment programs. By the end of the 1970's there were fourteen different types of programs for committed delinquents. Appendix A presents descriptions of each type of program and lists the admission criteria.

The existence of such a variety of commitment alternatives obviously provides an opportunity for certain interprogram comparisons, with the understanding, however, that the characteristics of delinquents placed in different programs may vary significantly. Early interest in measurement of recidivism led to some preliminary studies. These studies were limited by available resources and, particularly, by lack of information on subsequent cases handled in the adult criminal justice system. Access to information on specific adult court case dispositions has been and remains the major area of difficulty in conducting such a study.

The advent of the strategic planning process within the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (HRS) brought about a renewed interest in the measurement of recidivism. The department's 1984-89 strategic plan included an objective specifying a reduction in delinquency recidivism of twenty percent by June 30, 1989. There was, however, no baseline data for calculating the reduction nor even an accepted definition of recidivism.

Another consideration was the anticipated reduction of training school populations and the need for measures of program effectiveness to guide the development of alternative placements for children who otherwise would be sent to these institutions.

This report is a result of steps which were taken to define and determine these effectiveness measures for delinquency commitment programs. By the end of March, 1984, the Data Analysis Unit of the Children, Youth and Families Program Office had conducted a survey of measures of recidivism used in fifteen other states. An operational definition of recidivism was then developed and subsequently received departmental approval. The definition is quite broad in terms of counting any offense, however slight, if there is some judicial indication of guilt, even if adjudication is withheld. Since a major reason for measuring recidivism in Florida is to be able to make interprogram comparisons, a relatively short follow up period of one

year was selected. It was felt that by time periods in excess of one year there would have been so many intervening variables that variations in recidivism are less likely to be attributable to program differences. Most of the delinquents who were to become recidivists were expected to have committed subsequent offenses within one year following release from the commitment programs. The definition used in this study is presented in the methodology section of the report.

The HRS Client Information System provided a source for automated information on reported instances of subsequent delinquency allegations, but the problem of access to adult criminal history records remained. In December of 1984, at the conclusion of five months of negotiation with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) and review by the Federal Bureau of Investigations, FDLE Commissioner Robert Dempsey generously agreed to provide free access to computerized criminal history records for the purposes of this study. This information contained references only to charges and dispositions within the state of Florida.

Thus we were finally able to begin this study to determine recidivism rates for children released from delinquency commitment programs in Florida during 1984. It was particularly important to establish measures for that time period since so many changes were soon to come about in delinquency commitment programs, and base line rates were needed to enable us to gauge the effects of these improvements. From the beginning, the primary focus of the study was simply to determine an overall recidivism rate and rates for the various types of commitment programs. In the course of the project a number of other variables were recorded for each subject to provide for additional analyses which might help to interpret the findings.

Methodology

In April of 1985 we began selecting samples from listings of children discharged during each month of 1984 from Children, Youth and Families (CYF) delinquency commitment programs. A total of 1664 were selected for the year. Subjects were selected based upon the program from which they were discharged.

For each selected subject, client identifying information, demographic information and release data were obtained from the monthly Facility Recapitulation Reports and printouts from the departmental Client Information System (CIS). Required information was arranged each month in a format specified by the FDLE and submitted to them to obtain a computerized adult criminal history records check on each individual.

CIS printouts of Face Sheets were also obtained for each month's sample. Face Sheets are designed to display a history of all instances where clients have been referred to HRS for dependency or delinquency offenses.

Information already known on each subject was then combined with the CIS Face Sheet and the adult criminal history record, if one had been found. Information on subsequent referrals, arrests and dispositions was then coded. The most difficult aspect of this study was the effort required to obtain specific dispositions for subsequent delinquent or criminal charges. FDLE records often indicated only that the case had been handled in adult court. In many instances it was necessary to obtain information on dispositions directly from the courts or local law enforcement agencies. Following up a particular case often required numerous telephone calls. Some judicial circuits would not provide the information by telephone, and written correspondence was then required. Once specific dispositions had been determined for each charge, the individual was classified according to whether the child was a recidivist.

Recidivism was defined for this project as subsequent placement in an HRS delinquency commitment program or community control, conviction as an adult, or being sentenced to jail or adult probation with adjudication withheld, for a delinquent or criminal offense committed in Florida within one year of release from a delinquency program. If more than one subsequent offense met the definition, the one which occurred first was coded as the recidivism

offense. The specific offense and the date it was committed were coded, along with the disposition of that offense. Disposition categories included commitment as a juvenile, adult prison commitment, fine, jail, juvenile probation and adult probation.

Additional information recorded for the study included whether each child was arrested, if there was a technical violation of community control or a revocation of furlough and, if the child was recommitted to a juvenile facility, that facility was coded.

Certain historical information was also collected for each sample subject. This included the total number of delinquency referrals prior to the commitment from which they were released in 1984. Also coded were the number of prior delinquency adjudications and the date of the first adjudication. The number of prior status offense referrals was recorded. Also included was information on the number of prior dependency (primarily abuse or neglect) referrals, the number of those referrals indicated valid, and the date of the first indicated referral. With regard to the commitment which got the subject into the sample population, information was coded on the most serious commitment offense, type of commitment, date of admission to the facility from which the subject was discharged, previous facility for transferred cases, and the county where the commitment took place. Release date and type of release were also recorded.

The final sample consisted of 1664 individuals selected from those released from the various CYF delinquency commitment programs during 1984. Selections from each program category were random. Proportionately larger samples were selected for smaller programs, and all releases were selected for those which released the fewest children.

Findings

The sample consisted of 1,462 males and 202 females. The 12.1 percent female composition of the sample compares to the 14.3 percent of fiscal year 1983-84 commitments who were female. During the one year follow-up period, 46 of the females became recidivists, for a rate of 22.8 percent. The 689 male recidivists comprise a rate of 47.1 percent, more than double that for females. The chi square statistic for the sex variable indicates significance at well beyond the .01 alpha level. Committed females tend to be less serious offenders in terms of prior number of commitments and severity of offenses. The total overall recidivism rate for the 1,664 cases was 44.2 percent. These data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Recidivism by Sex

	<u>Not Recidivists</u>	<u>Recidivists</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	773 (52.9%)	689 (47.1%)	1462
Female	156 (77.2%)	46 (22.8%)	202
TOTAL	929 (55.8%)	735 (44.2%)	1664

The recidivism rate for white delinquents was 38.1 percent, substantially below the 53.2 percent rate for non-whites. Chi square analysis of the race variable indicates that it is also significant at well beyond the .01 level. This is another example of the commonly observed over representation of non-whites in more restrictive levels of the justice system. Non-whites comprised 40.1 percent of the sample, compared to their 46.1 percent of the 1983-84 commitment population. Table 2 summarizes the racial breakdown of recidivists.

Table 2

Recidivism by Race

	Not Recidivists	Recidivists	Total
White	617 (61.9%)	380 (38.1%)	997
Non-White	312 (46.8%)	355 (53.2%)	667

Table 3 presents the recidivism variable by age of the clients when they were discharged from commitment. For children less than 17 at discharge there appears to be relatively little variation in recidivism rates among the years of age. For those 17 and 18, however, the recidivism rates are considerably lower. The high rate for 19 year olds is based on only four cases.

Table 3

Recidivism by Age at Discharge

Age	Not Recidivists	Recidivists	Total
12 and Under	27 (54.0%)	23 (46.0%)	50
13	47 (48.5%)	50 (51.5%)	97
14	110 (47.8%)	120 (52.2%)	230
15	198 (55.5%)	159 (44.5%)	357
16	217 (53.8%)	186 (46.2%)	403
17	226 (61.4%)	142 (38.6%)	368
18	103 (66.5%)	52 (33.5%)	155
19	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	4

Seventy percent of the sample leaving commitment programs were released on furlough supervision, 17.3 percent were placed on post-commitment community control with the court retaining jurisdiction, and 12.7 percent were discharged without supervision. Those released without supervision showed the lowest recidivism rate, 40.3 percent. Furlough releases were slightly higher at 43.5 percent, and those on post-commitment community control had the highest rate at 49.7 percent. This information is contained in Table 4. Judicial requirements for delinquents released on post-commitment community control include mandatory reporting by counselors of technical violations of the supervision order, which they are not authorized to deal with informally. They would, therefore, be expected to come back to court more frequently than those on furlough and those who are not on supervision. In addition, children released without supervision tend to be the less serious offenders.

Table 4
Recidivism by Type of Release

	Not Recidivists	Recidivists	Total
Released on Furlough	658 (56.5%)	507 (43.5%)	1165
Post Commitment Community Control	145 (50.3%)	143 (49.7%)	288
Discharged Without Supervision	126 (59.7%)	85 (40.3%)	211

Information on the most serious offense for which each child had been committed was available for 682 of the subjects. These offenses were grouped into categories and compared on the recidivism variable. The highest failure rate of 45.7 percent was found for delinquents committed for property felonies, which are comprised primarily of burglary, grand larceny, auto theft, forgery, receiving stolen property and arson. At 22.7 percent, the rate for children committed for victimless felonies was the lowest. The specific offenses included in each category are listed in Appendix B. Summary results for each category are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Recidivism by Type of Commitment Offense

	<u>Not Recidivists</u>	<u>Recidivists</u>	<u>Total</u>
Felony Against Person	50 (56.2%)	39 (43.8%)	89
Property Felony	221 (54.3%)	186 (45.7%)	407
Victimless Felony	17 (77.3%)	5 (22.7%)	22
Misdemeanor Against Person	13 (61.9%)	8 (38.1%)	18
Property Misdemeanor	46 (59.7%)	31 (40.3%)	77
Victimless Misdemeanor	28 (59.6%)	19 (40.4%)	47
Other Delinquency	17 (77.3%)	5 (22.7%)	22
	392 57.2%	293 42.8%	685

Specific dispositions were determined for recidivism offenses. If more than one offense or disposition were found to coincide, the most serious offense or the most severe disposition were coded. The categories included juvenile commitment, adult commitment, fine, jail sentence, juvenile probation and adult probation. A few cases fell into a miscellaneous other category. Recommitment to a juvenile program was the mode at 46.0 percent of recidivism dispositions. In 12.7 percent of the cases recidivists were sent to adult prison. Juvenile probation was the disposition for 19.9 percent of the cases, while 9.1 percent were placed on adult probation, 8.0 percent were sentenced to jail, and 1.9 percent were just assessed a fine. The miscellaneous category accounted for 2.4 percent of the dispositions. Thus in 58.7 percent of the recidivism cases long-term commitment was considered necessary, while in 41.3 percent of the cases the sentence could be considered less severe than their prior commitment. Even though this 41.3 percent were recidivists, there may have been some degree of success with these children since the subsequent offenses required less serious sanctions than their previous commitments. Those delinquents sentenced to recommitment or prison constituted 25.9 percent of the sample population we tracked. The actual number and percentage for each disposition category are presented in Table 6.

Table 6
Disposition for Recidivism Offenses

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Adult Commitment	93	12.7%
Juvenile Commitment	338	46.0%
Jail Sentence	59	8.0%
Adult Probation	67	9.1%
Juvenile Probation	146	19.9%
Fine Only	14	1.9%
Other Disposition	18	2.4%
	<hr/> 735	<hr/> 100%

For some time there has been debate concerning the relationship between longer lengths of stay in commitment programs and recidivism. To address this issue, data was collected on the length of time each subject spent in the commitment program from which he was released. This period would not include any time spent in previous programs for cases who had been transferred. Table 7 presents these data in weeks by program type for cases not found to be recidivists and for those who were classified as recidivists. There is obviously no clear pattern, with recidivists having slightly longer lengths of stay in six program types and non-recidivists having slightly longer lengths of stay in the other eight. Overall, recidivists had an average length of stay which was almost a week longer, but this was not found to be significant at the .05 level using a t-test.

Table 7

Average Length of Commitment in the Program
from Which the Child Was Released
by Program Type and Recidivism

	Not Recidivists Average Length of Commitment (in Weeks)	N	Recidivists Average Length of Commitment (in Weeks)	N	Overall Average Length of Commitment (in Weeks)
Special Intensive Groups	17.5	96	16.5	60	17.2
TRY Centers	22.2	43	19.2	21	21.2
Associated Marine Institutes (Non-residential)	25.9	72	23.0	35	24.9
Florida Keys Marine Institute	24.7	13	24.3	12	24.5
Family Group Homes	17.6	50	17.5	52	17.6
STOP Camps	7.4	96	7.6	70	7.5
Project STEP	3.9	82	4.1	51	4.0
Group Treatment Homes	17.0	31	18.4	21	17.5
START Centers	18.4	72	16.0	45	17.4
Halfway Houses	18.9	201	19.3	133	19.0
Pinellas Youth Homes	21.6	9	20.3	10	20.9
Jacksonville Youth Development Center	17.8	27	19.2	26	18.5
San Antonio Boy's Village	22.4	17	19.8	16	21.1
Training Schools	<u>26.3</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>27.4</u>	<u>183</u>	<u>26.9</u>
Total	17.9	929	18.8	735	18.3

Presented in Table 8 are recidivism rates for various types of commitment programs available in Florida. Individual programs are listed by name if there is only one such program in the state. Releases from the Associated Marine Institutes and TRY Centers showed the best success rates of all delinquency commitment programs, with only 32.7 percent and 32.8 percent falling into the recidivism category. These are both non-residential commitment programs which provide a structured day treatment program for children who continue to live elsewhere in a home environment. Children placed in these programs tend to be less serious offenders than those placed in residential programs. Special Intensive Groups, the other non-residential type of program, had a relatively low recidivism rate of 38.5 percent. The lowest recidivism rate for residential commitment programs was found for Project STEP, which is run by the Hurricane Island Outward Bound School. Their recidivism rate was 38.3 percent. Halfway Houses, START Centers, Group Treatment Homes, and STOP Camps demonstrated slightly higher rates, near 40 percent. Another grouping of programs show rates near 50 percent. These include Florida Keys Marine Institute, San Antonio Boy's Village, Jacksonville Youth Development Center, Family Group Homes and Pinellas Youth Homes. The recidivism rate for Training Schools was 60.4 percent. Descriptions of the various types of commitment programs are contained in Appendix A.

Table 8
Recidivism By Type Of Commitment Program

	Not Recidivists		Recidivists		Total
	<u>N</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>N</u>
Associated Marine Institutes (non- residential)	72	67.3	35	32.7	107
TRY Centers	43	67.2	21	32.8	64
Project STEP	82	61.7	51	38.3	133
Special Intensive Groups	96	61.5	60	38.5	156
Halfway Houses	173	60.9	111	39.1	284
START Centers	100	59.9	67	40.1	167
Group Treatment Homes	31	59.6	21	40.4	52
STOP Camps	96	57.8	70	42.2	166
Florida Keys Marine Institute	13	52.0	12	48.0	25
San Antonio Boy's Village	17	51.5	16	48.5	33
Jacksonville Youth Development Center	27	50.9	26	49.1	53
Family Group Homes	50	49.0	52	51.0	102
Pinellas Youth Homes	9	47.4	10	52.6	19
Training Schools	<u>120</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>183</u>	<u>60.4</u>	<u>303</u>
	929	55.8	735	44.2	1664

Considerable caution should be exercised in making comparisons of differential program success rates. As shown in Table 9, programs may vary considerably with respect to the severity of the offenses for which their clients have been committed. For each type of program, this table indicates the proportion of children admitted upon commitment during 1983-84 whose most serious commitment offense was a felony, misdemeanor, or other delinquent act. Specific offenses included in each category are listed in Appendix B. This data is presented according to the program where the child was initially placed upon commitment. Recidivism rates, on the other hand, were determined based upon the program from which the child was discharged. Therefore, another factor to be taken into account is the extent to which more difficult cases are transferred on to other programs from which they are later released. Training schools, for example, received 35.7 percent of their 1983-84 admissions as transfers from less restrictive programs.

An additional important factor which precludes simple comparisons of program recidivism rates is the proportion of admissions who are first commitments as opposed to those who have been in commitment programs before. Initial placements in training schools and San Antonio Boys Village were comprised of 68.6 and 63.3 percent of delinquents who had previously been committed. All other programs admitted much higher percentages of first commitments and would be expected to show better success rates. Table 10 presents the proportion of children initially placed in each type of program who were first commitments as opposed to those who had one or more previous commitments. Again it is evident that types of children placed in programs are not comparable across program types. Admission criteria for each type of program can be found in Appendix A. These are obviously a factor in the differing characteristics of delinquents admitted to various programs.

Table 9
Commitment Offenses Category by Program Type
Initial Program Placements During 1983-84

	<u>Percent Felony</u>	<u>Percent Misdemeanor</u>	<u>Percent Other Delinquent Act</u>
Special Intensive Groups	66.4	29.7	3.9
TRY Centers	80.6	18.6	.7
Associated Marine Institutes (non- residential)	83.5	14.9	1.5
Florida Keys Marine Institute	94.8	5.2	.0
Family Group Homes	67.1	27.1	5.8
STOP Camps	63.8	34.7	1.5
Project STEP	44.8	47.9	7.2
Group Treatment Homes	84.8	12.7	2.5
START Centers	73.6	19.4	6.9
Halfway Houses	81.3	15.7	3.0
Pinellas Youth Homes	85.0	15.0	.0
Jacksonville Youth Development Center	84.1	15.8	.0
San Antonio Boy's Village	85.2	14.8	.0
Training Schools	88.7	10.6	.7
	<u>77.7</u>	<u>19.5</u>	<u>2.7</u>

Table 10
Type of Commitment by Program Placement
1983-84

	<u>First Commitments</u>	<u>One or More Prior Commitments</u>
Special Intensive Groups	81.4	18.6
TRY Centers	82.6	17.4
Associated Marine Institutes (non- residential)	87.8	12.2
Florida Keys Marine Institute	66.3	33.7
Family Group Homes	82.4	17.6
STOP Camps	81.6	18.4
Project STEP	75.9	24.1
Group Treatment Homes	81.2	18.4
START Centers	76.4	23.6
Halfway Houses	72.8	27.2
Pinellas Youth Homes	90.5	9.5
Jacksonville Youth Development Center	75.9	24.1
San Antonio Boy's Village	36.7	63.3
Training Schools	<u>31.4</u>	<u>68.6</u>
	65.6	34.4

The extent to which recidivism figures varied based upon the variables listed in Tables 9 and 10 was examined. The effect of the interaction of these variables was also examined for the 593 cases in the sample for which both data elements were available. Of the 682 cases where the original commitment offense was available, the recidivism rate for children who had been committed for felony offenses was 44.4 percent, compared to 37.8 percent for those committed for lesser offenses. Examination of the chi square statistic for this offense variable fails to detect significance even at a .10 alpha level.

Of the 1233 cases where the type of commitment was available, the recidivism rate for first commitments was found to be 39.5 percent, compared to 57.1 percent for children who had prior commitments. Chi square analysis indicates that the variable is significant beyond the .01 alpha level. Combining these variables we find the following ascending pattern of recidivism rates:

Non-felony offense first commitments:	36.1% (N=119)
Felony offense first commitments:	39.9% (N=338)
Non-felony offenders with prior commitments:	51.7% (N=29)
Felony offenders with prior commitments:	58.9% (N=107)

Cost Effectiveness.

Listed in Table 11 are four rates determined for each type of program which relate to the cost and effectiveness of these commitment options. While there are many more factors which may be related to cost effectiveness, this is a relatively simplified way of presenting a comparative summary of certain major variables.

The proportion of initial placements who had one or more prior commitments was selected as a measure of the type of clients served. These figures are listed in the first column of Table 11. The second column indicates the percent of children leaving who were either directly discharged or released to supervision in the community, as opposed to those who were transferred, recommitted or sent to the adult system. This figure was chosen as an indicator of successful program completion which relates to both the effectiveness the program demonstrates in completing treatment of assigned clients and to recidivism, since a program could show a better rate by simply transferring difficult clients to other programs. The cost per case figures listed in the third column were calculated by multiplying the overall average cost per child per day in the program by the average length of stay for children who were directly discharged or released to supervision in the community. The fourth column presents the proportion of these releases who were found to be recidivists during the one year follow-up period of this study.

Table 11

Selected Variables Related to Program Cost and Effectiveness

	Proportion of Placements with Prior <u>Commitments</u> ¹	Completion <u>Rate</u> ²	Cost Per <u>Case</u> ³	One-Year Recidivism <u>Rate</u> ⁴
Special Intensive Groups	18.6%	61.5%	\$1,110	38.5%
TRY Centers	17.4%	50.7%	2,243	32.8%
Associated Marine Institutes (non- residential)	12.2%	73.6%	3,735	32.7%
Florida Keys Marine Institute	33.7%	75.4%	6,869	48.0%
Family Group Homes	17.6%	56.0%	1,148	51.0%
STOP Camps	18.4%	84.7%	2,117	42.2%
Project STEP	24.1%	83.8%	1,529	38.3%
Group Treatment Homes	18.8%	55.0%	7,093	40.4%
START Centers	23.6%	66.9%	4,037	40.1%
Halfway Houses	27.2%	56.3%	3,626	39.1%
Pinellas Youth Homes	9.5%	59.1%	6,051	52.6%
Jacksonville Youth Development Center	24.1%	65.0%	3,697	49.1%
San Antonio Boy's Village	63.3%	87.5%	2,789	48.5%
Training Schools	<u>68.6%</u>	<u>72.4%</u>	<u>7,259</u>	<u>60.4%</u>
Mean	34.2%	67.3%	\$4,416	44.2%

¹Percent of 1983-84 initial program placements who had one or more prior commitments.

²Percent of children exiting the programs who were released on supervision or direct discharges during 1983-84. The other exits were transfers, recommitments or commitments to the adult system.

³Program cost per day times average length of stay for those released on supervision or directly discharged during 1983-84.

⁴Percent found to be recidivists during the one year follow-up period.

As an extension of the presentation of rates in the previous table, Table 12 lists an ordinal ranking by program type for each of the four variables and a summary total score. Programs with higher proportions of initial placements who had previously been committed, higher program completion rates, lower cost per case figures and lower rates of clients becoming recidivists earned lower rankings in each category. As a rough index, the programs with lower overall scores could be said to be more cost effective. There are obviously many more variables which could be examined and combined using more sophisticated methodologies. This is just one way of summarizing relative standings on four selected variables. Although the proportion of placements with prior commitments was chosen as one significant indicator of the characteristics of the population served, other factors could be considered in a more detailed analysis, such as those listed as admission criteria in Appendix A.

Table 12

Ordinal Ranking of Scores on Selected Variables Related
to Program Cost and Effectiveness

(First Place Score = 1, Last Place Score = 14)

	Proportion of Placements With Prior Commitments ¹	Program Completion Rate ²	Cost Per Case ³	One-Year Recidivism Rate ⁴	Total Score
Project STEP	5	3	3	3	14
San Antonio Boy's Village	2	1	6	10	19
Special Intensive Groups	9	9	1	4	23
STOP Camps	10	2	4	8	24
Halfway Houses	4	11	7	5	27
Associated Marine Institutes (non- residential)	13	5	9	1	28
Florida Keys Marine Institute	3	4	12	9	28
START Centers	7	7	10	6	30
Jacksonville Youth Development Center	5	8	8	11	32
TRY Centers	12	14	5	2	33
Training Schools	1	6	14	14	35
Family Group Homes	11	12	2	12	37
Group Treatment Homes	8	13	13	7	41
Pinellas Youth Homes	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>48</u>
Mean Score	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	30

¹Percent of 1983-84 initial program placements who had one or more prior commitments.

²Percent of children exiting the programs who were released on supervision or direct discharges during 1983-84. The other exits were transfers, recommitments or commitments to the adult system.

³Program cost per day times average length of stay for those released on supervision or directly discharged during 1983-84.

⁴Percent found to be recidivists during the one year follow-up period.

The above method of ordinal ranking has the advantage of simplicity but fails to take into account the magnitude of differences among programs on the listed variables. Slight modification of these same four variables allows them to be presented in Table 13 as ratios. In this instance we are examining the proportion of initial placements who had not previously been committed, the proportion of delinquents exiting the program who had not completed their stay in commitment programs, the cost per case divided by \$10,000, and the one year recidivism rate. For the sake of simplicity each variable is considered of equal importance and the ratios are added together to obtain an overall score for each type of program. Again, the programs with lower scores may be considered relatively more cost effective. The average total score was 1.873. The five top rated programs each had better than average scores. These programs were San Antonio Boy's Village, Project STEP, STOP Camps, Special Intensive Groups, and non-residential Associated Marine Institutes. STOP Camps and Special Intensive Groups are state operated programs, while the other three are operated on contract by private nonprofit providers.

Table 13

Summary of Ratio Measures of Selected Variables
Related to Program Cost and Effectiveness

	Proportion of First Commitments ¹	Proportion of Exits which had not Completed Commitment ²	Cost Per Case Divided By \$10,000 ³	One Year Recidivism Rate	Total ⁴
San Antonio Boy's Village	.367	.125	.279	.485	1.256
Project STEP	.759	.162	.153	.383	1.457
STOP Camps	.816	.153	.212	.422	1.603
Special Inten- sive Groups	.814	.385	.111	.385	1.695
Associated Marine Institutes (non- residential)	.878	.264	.373	.327	1.842
TRY Centers	.826	.493	.224	.328	1.871
Family Group Homes	.824	.440	.115	.510	1.889
START Centers	.764	.331	.404	.401	1.900
Halfway Houses	.728	.437	.363	.391	1.919
Training Schools	.314	.275	.726	.604	1.919
Jacksonville Youth Develop- ment Center	.759	.350	.370	.491	1.970
Florida Keys Marine Institute	.663	.246	.687	.480	2.076
Group Treatment Homes	.812	.450	.709	.404	2.375
Pinellas Youth Homes	<u>.905</u>	<u>.409</u>	<u>.605</u>	<u>.526</u>	<u>2.445</u>
Mean	.658	.327	.442	.442	1.873

¹Proportion of 1983-84 initial program placements who had not previously been committed.

²Proportion of children exiting the programs during 1983-84 who were not released on supervision or directly discharged.

³Program cost per day times average length of stay for those children released on supervision or directly discharged during 1983-84 divided by \$10,000.

⁴The sum of the four measures for each type of program.

Conclusions

The overall recidivism rate for the sample of 1664 delinquents released from CYF commitment programs during 1984 was found to be 44.2 percent for the one year follow up period. Of the total sample, however, only 25.9 percent were found to have been subsequently committed to the juvenile system or adult prison. The remainder of the recidivists received less serious dispositions.

Recidivism rates were considerably higher for males, non-whites, those who had been committed for property felonies, and those who had a history of previous commitments. Felony offenders with prior commitments had a recidivism rate of 58.9 percent.

Delinquents released from two types of non-residential commitment programs, Associated Marine Institutes and TRY Centers, were found to have the lowest recidivism rates at about 33 percent. Six kinds of other community based commitment programs had recidivism rates of about 40 percent. Five programs had rates close to 50 percent, and the rate for training schools was 60 percent.

Four variables were listed and combined for each type of program to determine a rough index of relative cost effectiveness. These variables were the proportion of first commitments (as a measure of client difficulty), the program completion rate (since only clients who complete the program are counted in that program's recidivism measure), the cost per case for clients who complete the program, and the one year recidivism rate. Thus a program which deals with a high rate of chronic delinquents and has a low rate of transfers or recommitments from the program, a low cost per case, and a low recidivism rate would be ranked as relatively more cost effective.

Using a summary of these ratios the San Antonio Boy's Village was found to have the best cost effectiveness score. This is due to their dealing with a very high proportion of delinquents who had previously been committed while maintaining a high program completion rate and a very moderate cost per case. Although due to the type of clients they serve their recidivism rate was worse than average at 48.6 percent, it was still well below the rate for training schools.

Among programs designed for less serious offenders Project STEP, which is run under contract with the Hurricane Island Outward Bound organization, had the best cost effectiveness rating. This is due to their demonstrating the lowest recidivism rate for all residential programs (38.3 percent) and having a very low cost per case. Costs are low since this is a one month program.

The next best score in the rankings is also a wilderness program, STOP Camps. This program is operated by the state, with a relatively high completion rate and low cost, since the budgeted length of stay is two months.

The next three types of programs in the ranking are the non-residential commitment programs. These include the two programs with the lowest recidivism rates, AMI and TRY Centers, and the least expensive program, Special Intensive Groups (which had the fourth best recidivism measure).

Of the remaining programs, Halfway Houses, START Centers, and Group Treatment Homes all had lower than average recidivism rates, but scores on other variables brought them down in the rankings.

Recommendations

Examination of measures related to program operation, costs, client type and treatment outcome indicates that there are program alternatives for dealing more effectively with committed delinquents in the community, even with more serious and chronic offenders. San Antonio Boy's Village has demonstrated a high level of cost effectiveness in dealing with children similar to those who were placed in training schools. Among programs dealing primarily with less serious offenders, the wilderness camp programs and non-residential commitment alternatives were found to have the best ratings of cost effectiveness. As the phase-down of training school populations proceeds, substantial resources should be reallocated to programs like these which have demonstrated measurable success. The CYF program office has already begun this process. Information from this study was taken into consideration in the development of the 1988-89 legislative budget request for delinquency programs.

Measurement of recidivism is considered important by many and has been incorporated into the HRS Agency Functional Plan as a means for tracking program improvement. Recidivism alone is, however, of very little use for comparative evaluation unless it is examined in conjunction with other variables which may impact upon what can reasonably be expected of the given programs. The four factors chosen in this report to be summarized as a relative measure of program cost effectiveness can serve as a beginning. The recidivism measures determined can serve as baseline data. It is of importance that this process be continued and improved upon. We should continue to take advantage of the cooperative arrangements which has been established with FDLE. Additional variables should be tracked and analyzed. As time and resources allow, additional and more sophisticated analyses can also be done using data which have already been collected but could not be included in this report. Information is available, for instance, by individual facilities within program categories. Longitudinal measurement over the coming years should provide valuable information on the effects of major program initiatives which have been and will be implemented. These include such things as improved staffing ratios, overlay services to supplement commitment program resources, and intensive aftercare services.

Another aspect of the findings of this study is clear indication that certain programs exhibited very poor measures of cost effectiveness. This should be cause for concern and action. In 1985 the CYF program office reduced the client capacity of the Jacksonville Youth Development Center and implemented an improved program design. The facility

now operates as a START Center. Associated Marine Institutes should be credited with having recognized problems with its Florida Keys Marine Institute and taken steps to improve the situation and move the program to a more suitable location. Group Treatment Homes had an even lower cost effectiveness index and should be examined for ways to improve operations. Theirs was the lowest score for any state operated program. The program measured to be least cost effective overall was Pinellas Youth Homes. They dealt with the lowest proportion of repeat commitments and had a high rate of transfers (mostly to training schools) and recommitments, a relatively high cost and a recidivism rate well above average. Based upon these findings it would appear that Pinellas Youth Homes should be closed so that the funds can be used in a more cost effective manner. It is recommended that program office staff review information from monitoring and any other available sources to ensure that this action is warranted. Measurement of cost effectiveness is of little value unless the results are employed to guide a realignment of funding from less to more efficient programs.

APPENDIX A
PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Special Intensive Counseling

The Special Intensive Counseling Program is a nonresidential community-based delinquency program. Counselors with limited caseloads provide intensive treatment for a budgeted period of four months.

The primary thrust of the program is the use of intensive groups which meet a minimum of four times weekly. Eight to ten delinquent youths comprise a group. Attendance is required and counselors must thoroughly evaluate group effectiveness and individual participation.

Counselors maintain contact with parents, teachers, employers, law enforcement officials and persons in the community who have knowledge of the youth's behavior outside the group. This information is weighed and compared with the youth's discussion, behavior, participation, and progress in group to ascertain that behavioral changes noted in group are consistent with outside behavior. Crisis intervention in situations with members of the group is sometimes necessary.

Parental support and participation is an essential element of the Special Intensive Group if behavioral changes are to be maintained after treatment is terminated. Therefore parents of the youths in this program are required to attend weekly group sessions. Emphasis in parent group discussions is on understanding the youth and effectively dealing with problem behaviors.

In addition, counselors seek to employ available community resources to assist the youth. The services of vocational rehabilitation, mental health agencies, special education classes, drug programs and other community programs are used to meet the special needs of the youth and his/her family. Volunteers are sought by the counselor to supplement group and individual counseling and provide an additional source of support for the youth. Recreational activities planned by the counselor add another dimension of therapeutic intervention with the delinquent youths.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Preference is give to children 14 to 18 years of age who are committed for the first time or who are misdemeanor offenders.
- 2) Children who are approved by the committing judge for placement in the program.
- 3) Children who have no transportation hardship and can attend group meetings as required.
- 4) Children who live with their parents or guardians.
- 5) Children whose parents or guardians agree to attend parent groups once a week.

TRY Centers

The TRY Centers are coeducational, nonresidential programs designed for 30 youths. The youths participating in TRY Center programs live at home while receiving intensive counseling and day treatment services. The budgeted length of stay is four months.

TRY Centers provide an intensive day treatment program which offers individual, family and group counseling. Involvement and counseling with parents or guardians is heavily emphasized. The TRY Center coordinates services to meet the individualized needs of youth served. A structured program of activities may include recreational activities, tutoring services, community services, volunteer services and other wholesome learning experiences. Each youth participates in educational or vocational programs during the day. Close daily contact is made with the youth in community placements whether at school or work.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Preference is given to children 14 to 18 years of age, who are committed for the first time or are misdemeanor offenders.
- 2) Children who have no transportation hardships and can attend the program daily.
- 3) Children who live at home with parents or guardians.
- 4) Children whose parents or guardians agree to attend parent groups once a week.

Associated Marine Institutes

Associated Marine Institutes, Inc. (AMI) is a public, nonprofit organization from whom the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services purchases specialized educational, vocational, and counseling services for delinquent youth. Children on community control and furlough as well as those in commitment status are appropriate for AMI services. Seven Marine Institutes are operated within the state. Cities include Miami, Pompano Beach, Jacksonville, Panama City, St. Petersburg, Tampa and Ft. Lauderdale. The programs are budgeted for an average length of stay of six months.

Each AMI program is a nonresidential facility which provides educational and training services while allowing the participating youth to remain with their families. For its participants, the vocational program provides the opportunity to develop a wide variety of occupational skills, through classroom instruction and on-the-job training. Specific areas of vocational instruction include boat handling, seamanship, scuba diving, practical oceanography, marine mechanics and maintenance. Basic academic programs are also provided at each institute as well as remedial classes. Overnight trips or cruises are conducted periodically for selected youth to practice skills learned in the classroom.

The program is designed to provide individualized counseling and instruction for each participant. In addition, AMI develops and maintains an active job placement program to assist participants in finding employment upon completion of the program.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Committed males or females from 15 to 18 years of age.
- 2) Children who have a home placement available.
- 3) Children who are physically able to participate.

Florida Keys Marine Institute

Florida Keys Marine Institute (presently known as Biscayne Bay Marine Institute) is a residential program operated by Associated Marine Institutes, Inc. Although the design is similar to the nonresidential programs operated by the Institute, the Florida Keys program actually provides housing and 24 hour care for 50 committed youth with an average length of stay of six months.

The youths are involved in a program of classroom instruction as well as participatory training in boat handling, seamanship, scuba diving, practical oceanography, marine mechanics and maintenance and other marine related skills. Over night trips and cruises help to reinforce skills learned in the classroom. The program provides a similar learning experience as the nonresidential programs in a more restrictive setting. Individualized treatment plans are developed through a comprehensive assessment of the youth's needs. Specific behavioral, and educational and vocational objectives are prescribed. Through the structured program and experiences and the counseling and case management activities of the program staff, participants develop the skills and habits necessary to function in their home communities.

Admission Criteria:

- 1). Committed youth who are 15 to 18 years of age.
- 2) Youth who are physically able to participate in program activities.
- 3) Placement of youth with history of severe assaultive or aggressive behavior is discouraged.

Family Group Homes

The Family Group Home concept provides residential community-based delinquency services in trained foster family residences. The number of youths who receive services in a FGH ranges from one to eight, depending on the physical capacity of individual homes and the number of youth for which the group home parents are willing and able to provide appropriate care. The budgeted length of stay is six months.

A CYF counselor is assigned to work with each youth in the program. The counselor provides group and/or individual counseling, and makes referrals to community resources to meet the client's specialized needs. Individualized treatment plans are developed. Reality Therapy serves as the basic mode of counseling in FGH. The youths' parents are encouraged to be involved through visits to youth, interacting with group home parents, parent meetings, and family counseling.

Youths may attend public school, may work in the community, and are encouraged to take part in extracurricular activities.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Priority consideration is given to youth 14 years of age and younger.
- 2) Primary consideration should be given to youth on first commitment.
- 3) Children who have not demonstrated habitual serious or violent delinquent behavior.
- 4) Children who are amenable to living with group home parents and their children in a private home environment.
- 5) Preference is given to children from local districts to allow for involvement of parents in facilitating reintegration into the natural home.
- 6) Children who have demonstrated through placement in more restrictive programs, that they can benefit from the FGH program as a transitional re-entry experience.

STOP Camps

One of the community-based alternatives to sending delinquent youths to an institution is the Short-Term Offender Program (STOP). The program consists of various campsites located in state parks and forests. Through the combination of rigorous outdoor work, counseling, wholesome recreation and educational activities, youth have an opportunity to change behavior patterns. The budgeted length of stay is two months, although length of stay may vary from 30 to 90 days.

STOP Camp facilities house 18 committed delinquents. Youth participate in physically challenging daily work projects developed by either the Division of Forestry or the Department of Natural Resources. A forester or park ranger is provided to each camp for the planning, site selection, technical instruction and coordination of various work projects. Projects include nature trail construction, controlled burning, improvement of timber stands, fence repair and construction, culvert cleaning, and general maintenance and support functions of the camp.

Performance contracts are designed for each youth entering the program. The contract states expectations of the youth as well as what the youth can expect of program staff. Release from the program is appropriate when the conditions of the contract have been met by the youth.

Educational services are provided by the local school district. Efforts are made to integrate the work project activities into the educational curriculum. Counseling is provided as needed.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Youth from 14 to 18 years of age.
- 2) Youth who have demonstrated through successful placement in a more restrictive program that they can benefit from a STOP Camp as a re-entry experience.
- 3) First commitments and minor offenders such as second degree misdemeanants are preferred.
- 4) Recommitments and transfers from other less restrictive programs may be considered on an individual basis.

Project STEP

The Short-Term Elective Program (Project STEP) is a program developed and managed by the Hurricane Island Outward Bound School of Rockland, Maine. Two STEP projects are currently contracted by Florida to serve delinquents. STEP I serves 216 boys on an annual basis, and STEP II serves 150 girls. Length of stay averages 30 days.

Each program is divided into two phases: an orientation phase and an Outward Bound course. The orientation phase is a preparation course which teaches campcraft, canoeing, cooking, and first aid skills in an instructional setting. Concurrently, the youth begins to participate in the group treatment process which fosters a relationship between staff and participating youth.

The second phase is a wilderness course designed to be a success-oriented, stressful and challenging experience. The course includes a 350 mile canoe trip from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico.

Project STEP is a unique program designed to rehabilitate selected committed youth by providing a strict physical regimen to instill self-discipline and confidence and by helping them to learn more about themselves.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) A medical examination is required to determine the child's physical ability to participate in program activities.
- 2) Child cannot be dependent on medication.
- 3) Child must have a home placement available.
- 4) Children without a history of violent or aggressive behavior.

Group Treatment Homes

A Group Treatment Home is a seven bed facility designed to provide committed youth with a treatment oriented, home-like atmosphere. The budgeted length of stay is six months.

Group sessions are conducted daily, taking on the character of family get-togethers to discuss specific personal problems as well as to settle the day-to-day problems that arise within the home, school, and community environments. The youth attend public schools, work at community projects and participate in recreational activities to receive academic instruction and to learn appropriate social behavior. Frequent educational and entertainment outings are planned to expose the youth to activities and experiences available in their own communities. The group treatment home parents are expected to become closely involved with each child both as parent substitutes and as counselors. Children are released from the facility upon reaching a stage of development where adequate functioning can be reasonably expected. Group Treatment Homes are located in the following counties: Volusia, Hillsborough, Palm Beach, Broward, and Dade.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Children from 10 to 13 years of age (Some younger or older children may be accepted based on individual needs).
- 2) Committing offenses are reviewed on an individual basis. Second degree misdemeanants are typically excluded.

START Centers

START Centers were originally designed to serve delinquent youth having emotional or behavioral problems which prohibited their adjustment to less restrictive halfway houses. However, in 1984 there were few differences in the two programs or in the populations they served. START Centers did tend to accept the more youthful offender, serving children as young as 12.

START Centers operate in a suburban or rural setting and serve either 22 to 28 girls or 28 boys depending on the facility. The focus of intervention is based on a Reality Therapy model. Utilizing continuous staff involvement, individual counseling, contingency application to socially unacceptable behavior and peer support groups, the residents develop social skills which will enable them to function more adequately when returned to the community. Group meetings are conducted daily by trained group leaders. A structured activity program provides the opportunity for recreation, education, religious and other community activities. The budgeted length of stay is six months.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Children below the age of 14 are preferred. Placement of older children may be made based on individual need.
- 2) Youth committed for a felony or first degree misdemeanor.

Halfway Houses

A halfway house is a short-term residential treatment center housing either 25 to 30 boys or 25 girls. The program is budgeted for an average length of stay of six months.

Residents live at the facility, attend public schools, and/or maintain employment in the community. In addition, alternative and remedial education programs are provided by local county teachers in each facility.

Reality Therapy techniques provide the basis for the program's design. Residents are involved in an intensive, responsibility oriented program geared toward helping them lead more socially acceptable lives. Individualized assessments are conducted and treatment plans formulated when the child enters the program. Group meetings are conducted by trained group leaders. These same staff provide individual and family counseling to committed youth and their families to facilitate a more successful adjustment at home after release as well as to improve peer relationships and social interaction.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Children from 14 to 18 years of age .
- 2) A child committed for a second degree misdemeanor is excluded from halfway house placement. Commitment for serious offenses will be reviewed on an individual basis.

Youth Homes of Florida, Inc.
(formerly Pinellas Youth Homes)

Youth Homes of Florida, Inc. is a private nonprofit organization providing a comprehensive residential treatment program for delinquent and pre-delinquent youths. The Department contracted with this program to provide 12 slots for committed children during 1983-84 and 24 slots during 1984-85.

The specific methods used to implement the program are group living, supervision, counseling, treatment, tutoring, vocational awareness, and positive individualized experiences.

There are seven residential homes for troubled youth in Pinellas County. Five homes are restricted to the housing of males; two are for females. Each home accommodates six youths who are supervised by trained, live-in, married couples. A full-time counselor provides assistance in the treatment program. The residents actively participate in the upkeep of their homes and learn basic household skills such as meal planning, cooking, laundry, gardening, etc.

Youth Homes of Florida has designed a program to provide a structured, therapeutic place for troubled youth to live. The intention is to provide intervention and a liaison with courts, school, police, home and social agencies on behalf of the child. Parents or guardians are encouraged to attend monthly parent groups.

Academically, youth are diagnostically tested during the first week of placement by a learning disabilities teacher. If there is a need for remediation, the youth may then receive individual reading and math tutoring. Services through the public and vocational school system are available.

Children are required to provide community services and are expected to exhibit good work habits. A minimum of 75 "good" days in the program are required before a child is released. Length of stay typically averages 5 to 6 months.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Committed males or females from 12 to 17 years of age.
- 2) Parents or foster family who are willing to work with program and accept the child back into their home.
- 3) Children with severe drug dependence are not accepted.
- 4) Children whose physical handicaps would preclude treatment are not accepted.

Jacksonville Youth Development Center

Jacksonville Youth Development Center is a specialized residential facility for younger boys between the ages of 11 and 14 who require intensive supervision and services in response to the seriousness of their committing offense and/or their history of aggressive or assaultive behaviors. Some even younger children are accepted when less restrictive, residential alternatives are not available. The program is budgeted for an average length of stay of six months. The program has the capacity to serve 40 boys.

The program's design is based on several significant features. "In-house" alternative and remedial education programs are provided by local county teachers. A combination of reality therapy/behavior modification techniques are used to track day to day event behaviors, establish a system of rewards and disciplines, and encourage responsibility among program participants. The staffing pattern allows for intensive individual, group and family counseling.

Another significant component of the overall treatment program is the outdoor camping experiences conducted by facility staff or specially trained resource people. A formal working agreement with the Explorer Scouting Program has been formulated and the program has been designated as a bona fide scout troop. Three day hiking or canoe trips are planned regularly. Residents are encouraged to continue in scouting programs upon their return home.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Boys from 11 to 14 years of age.
- 2) Children who have committed any offense are acceptable, although second degree misdemeanants are not encouraged.

San Antonio Boys Village

San Antonio Boys Village is a purchase of service, community-based residential program that provides diversified treatment to committed delinquent boys. The program was contracted to provide 14 commitment slots during 1983-84, and this was increased to 16 slots for 1984-85. The program site is a thirty-six acre wooded area in the rural community of San Antonio, Florida. A length of stay of six months is budgeted.

A full-time teacher and teacher aide, provided by the Pasco County School System, are employed at the facility. After a full school day, the youths are involved in either community work projects or work experience in a licensed full service wholesale plant nursery operated by the agency. Guided group interaction sessions, using the concepts of reality therapy, are held five nights a week and individual counseling sessions are conducted weekly and as necessary. Parents of the youths are required to attend weekly counseling sessions and to evaluate their son's behavior during weekend home visits. The sharing of information between parents and staff is an integral part of the therapeutic approach used by the San Antonio Boys Village.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Committed males from 13 to 17 years of age.
- 2) Parents or guardians must be willing to participate in all aspects of the program, including family counseling, parent training and counseling sessions, and transportation for weekend visits.
- 3) Highly assaultive or immature youth, capital offenders, and youth addicted to drugs or alcohol are not accepted.

Training Schools

Training schools are juvenile institutions providing custody and care for youths who require the highest level of security within the delinquency continuum. Two training schools, Arthur G. Dozier Training School and Eckerd Youth Development Center, provide custodial care to children who have committed serious offenses. Both institutions have twenty four (24) hour staffing to ensure continuous supervision and care as well as counseling and treatment. The two schools are budgeted for a combined total of approximately 860 children.

Arthur G. Dozier Training School's curriculum includes a strong vocational program, an academic program operated through the Washington County School Board, a therapeutic horticulture program, work restitution, gardening, day release and campus activities. A thorough educational and vocational assessment is completed on each youth and is used to develop an educational plan individualized to meet each child's academic needs. Dozier has an active student council with members selected by their peers. Professionals from the state hospital as well as local psychologists and psychiatrists volunteer their time for out-patient counseling services.

Eckerd Youth Development Center's programmatic services are similar to Dozier's. Their academic curriculum includes a G.E.D. program for older youths. Certified teachers are employed by the facility to provide the educational program. Vocational skills are explored and several programs have been developed that range from auto mechanics to building maintenance to culinary arts classes. Day release programs are available where selected youths can work in the community and are paid minimum wage. Contracted psychiatrists are utilized for assessment, consultation and planning therapeutic intervention with problem clients. Close supervision by Eckerd staff accentuates the secure custodial function by Eckerd's program.

Both programs serve the most serious juvenile offenders and offer the most restrictive environment in the delinquency system.

Admission Criteria:

- 1) Youth ages 14 and above committed for capital, life or first degree felonies with at least two prior felony commitments involving violence against persons or property.
- 2) Youth ages 14 and above who are transferred from the Department of Corrections.
- 3) Youth whose records indicate multiple or repeat offenses for crimes against persons or property where violence or threat of violence was involved, but who have had no prior commitments, will be admitted upon special approval.

APPENDIX B
OFFENSE CATEGORIES

OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Felony Against Person

- Murder and non-negligent manslaughter
- Negligent manslaughter
- Sexual battery
- Other felonious sex offenses
- Armed robbery
- Other robbery
- Aggravated assault and/or battery
- Resisting arrest with violence

Property Felony

- Arson
- Burglary
- Auto theft
- Grand larceny (excluding auto theft)
- Receiving stolen property-over \$100
- Forgery
- Other felony offenses

Victimless Felony

- Concealed firearm
- Felony violation of drug laws (excluding marijuana)
- Felony marijuana offenses
- Escape (as defined in F.S. 39.112)

Misdemeanor Against Person

- Assault and/or battery (all except aggravated)
- Resisting arrest without violence

Property Misdemeanor

- Unauthorized use of motor vehicle
- Petty larceny (excluding retail theft)
- Retail theft
- Receiving stolen property-under \$100
- Vandalism (malicious mischief)
- Trespassing

Victimless Misdemeanor

- Prostitution
- Sex offenses (excluding sexual battery, other felonious sex offenses, prostitution)
- Concealed weapon, all except firearms
- Disorderly conduct
- Loitering and prowling
- Misdemeanor violation of drug laws (excluding marijuana)
- Misdemeanor marijuana offenses
- Possession of alcoholic beverages
- Disorderly intoxication
- Other misdemeanors

Other Delinquent Act

- Contempt of Court
- Violation of local penal ordinance
- Traffic/fleeing or attempting to elude a police officer
- Traffic/leaving the scene of an accident
- Traffic/driving while under the influence of alcohol or drugs
- Traffic/driving without a valid operator's license
- Traffic/other

This document was printed at a cost of \$203.70
for the purpose of disseminating information on
the relative cost effectiveness of delinquency
commitment programs in the State of Florida.