

147793

**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

National Council on Crime
and Delinquency

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

N C C D
FOCUSTHE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME
AND DELINQUENCY

FEBRUARY 1991

Juvenile Intensive Supervision Programs: The State of the Art

By Barry Krisberg, Ph.D., Deborah Neuenfeldt and Audrey Bakke

.....

INTRODUCTION

Burgeoning court caseloads and overcrowded juvenile facilities, have stirred a growing interest in programs providing serious juvenile offenders with intensive supervision as an alternative to long-term residential placements. There also has been increasing concern that traditional probation supervision is ineffective in controlling the recidivism of serious and chronic juvenile offenders.

To respond to these perceived needs, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) funded a project titled *Post-Adjudication Non-Residential Intensive Supervision Programs*. This project, conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD), is designed to accomplish the following:

- Identify and assess effective operational intensive supervision programs;
- Provide the capability to selected localities to implement effective intensive supervision programs for serious offenders through intensive training and technical assistance; and
- Disseminate effective post-adjudicatory non-residential intensive supervision program designs for supervision of serious juvenile offenders.

This article discusses our findings, and briefly describes the juvenile intensive supervision program model NCCD is developing.

PROJECT APPROACH

As part of the assessment, NCCD conducted a literature review of research findings on the success of community-based interventions. NCCD also conducted a nationwide search for promising juvenile intensive supervision programs. This search has shown that intensive supervision programs (ISPs) encompass a wide variety of approaches and strategies for supervising serious offenders in the community.

While more prevalent in adult correctional systems, ISPs targeted at serious offenders are also gaining popularity in juvenile justice systems. A 1986 survey concluded that ISPs were operating in 35 percent of the juvenile justice agencies throughout the country (Armstrong, 1986).

While the definition of a "serious" juvenile offender varies among programs, this category includes chronic juvenile offenders as well as individuals who have committed repetitive minor offenses, and for whom regular probation has been ineffective. *Juvenile ISPs are community-based (non-residential) programs characterized by high levels of contact and intervention by the probation officer or caseworker, small caseloads, and strict conditions of compliance.* Some ISPs include treatment and services components, while others emphasize surveillance and controls.

NCCD sent out an extensive mail questionnaire to professional organizations and state agencies to locate juvenile ISPs. Slightly less than half of the 90 programs which called themselves ISPs actually delivered intensive supervision. From these 41 programs, we selected 11 programs for intensive site visits. Selection was based on a variety of factors, including whether the programs defined their target population as high risk, whether contact requirements reflected a high level of control, and whether there were specified methods for responding to rule violations. We looked for geographic variety and a mix of public and private sector approaches.

In our program review, we found two general types of ISPs:

- day treatment, in which youths are on site at the ISP facility full-time during the day; and
- direct supervision, in which probation officers or caseworkers closely supervise youths in the community and, in some programs, provide or broker for needed services.

NCCD examined both day treatment and direct supervision models, and programs reflecting a variety of surveillance and treatment approaches.

The site visits included program observations and semi-structured interviews with program and court administrators,

TABLE 1
ISP PER DIEM COSTS

Program	Daily Per Diem
Associated Marine Institutes, Inc.	\$36.91
Firestone Community Day Center School	\$7.83 (probation costs only - not school costs)
Hennepin County (MN) Surveillance Program	\$11.00 (staff salary only)
Kentfields Rehabilitation Program	\$13.87 (excluding some administration and school costs)
The KEY Program, Inc.	\$22.00 (Outreach/Tracking and Tracking Plus)
Lucas County (OH) Intensive Supervision Unit	Not available
Pennsylvania Intensive Probation Supervision	\$5.43 (line staff only)
Ramsey County (MN) Juvenile Intensive Supervision Project	\$17.41 (excluding administration and overhead)
Specialized Gang Supervision Program	\$4.20 (excluding supplies and services costs)
Wayne County (MI) Intensive Probation Program	\$25.00 (all three programs) (estimate)
Youth Advocate Programs, Inc.	\$14.50 (Limited Service) to \$28.00 (Intensive Service)

line workers, supervisors, and juvenile judges. Additional interviews were selectively held with prosecuting attorneys, law enforcement personnel, program provider staff, school personnel, and juvenile participants and their parents. In addition to the interviews, we obtained documentation detailing program development efforts, policies, organizational structure and operating procedures.

The visits were structured around five key areas of assessment:

- program context - program development, theoretical underpinnings, and organizational structure;
- client identification - target group definition, congruency between target population and clients served, and locus of control over selection and acceptance of youth;
- intervention - the nature of the services provided, and the nature and number of contacts;
- goals and evaluation - the process by which goals are set and measured; and

- program linkages - administrative and agency support, and coordination with other agencies.

FINDINGS

The 11 juvenile ISPs visited had several characteristics in common. All targeted an important client population -- serious juvenile offenders -- in a non-residential setting (although one had a short-term residential component). The programs did not target aftercare clients, although some also served youth who have been released from a residential placement. The selected ISPs were all designed to serve as alternatives to out-of-home placement. Regardless of the impetus for their development, these programs all assumed that juvenile offenders can be supervised effectively within the community without jeopardizing public safety. NCCD believes these 11 programs represent a broad variety of the best ISP approaches currently in operation (see sidebar on page six for descriptions of two programs).

Program Context

Theory and Philosophy. Although the literature suggests that the design of any correctional program should be guided by a theory of crime causation, NCCD found that ISPs were not founded upon a specific theoretical base. Most jurisdictions developed their programs with the belief that the needs of youth could best be met in a non-institutional setting within their family environment. Second, the need to control skyrocketing out-of-home placement costs was a major factor spurring development in most jurisdictions.

Organizational Structure. NCCD selected programs operated by both public and private agencies. In general, "public" is synonymous with "probation." The ISP officer typically has a smaller caseload than a regular probation counterpart. The smaller caseload, combined with more frequent contacts, distinguish the ISPs from traditional probation. Elsewhere private providers, under contract with state or county agencies, supervise youth on a day-to-day basis. However, legal responsibility for the youth remains with the public agency.

Both organizational structures have strengths. For example, the private programs can respond quickly to programming needs and have greater staffing and administrative flexibility than most probation departments. Public programs, on the other hand, can share administrative costs with other juvenile services, and may have a greater degree of program control. Whether ISP should be provided through a public or private agency depends on the needs of the individual juvenile justice system. However, it is NCCD's conclusion that the multiplicity of services and the need for extensive and flexible staff coverage in an ISP favor the private contractor approach.

Program Costs. To determine whether or not a program is cost effective, actual program costs must be calculated and compared with actual costs of alternative programming. However, it proved difficult to obtain accurate cost estimates for the 11 ISPs. Often, administrative costs, and even direct services costs, could not be separately allocated to the ISP. Therefore, cost figures are not directly

comparable among programs. Table 1 presents an estimate of the daily per diem costs of the 11 programs at the time of the on-site visits (conducted between November 1988, and February 1989). As indicated in Table 1, they include (and exclude) a variety of program and administrative costs. Interestingly, only the private programs could provide full cost estimates. For these programs, the daily per diem ranged from \$14.50 for limited service (defined as 7.5 hours of direct client contact per week) in the Youth Advocates Program, to \$36.91 for the Associated Marine Institutes' day treatment program.

Client Identification

There are two major aspects of client identification. The first is defining the target population: who does the program seek to serve? The second is the selection procedures and criteria that assure the target population actually is selected for participation.

The target population for the 11 ISPs was high risk youths who would otherwise be placed in institutions. However, no uniform definition of "high risk" applied across the programs investigated and, often, a uniform definition of "high risk" was not evident within a single ISP. Staff judgment was generally used to identify high risk youth. Because programs had little objective data to demonstrate that participants actually were drawn from an otherwise residentially-bound population, it was difficult to assess the degree of departure from the target population.

ISPs which target residentially-bound youth widen the net if they accept youth who would otherwise be on traditional probation. Research has shown that net-widening is a problem common to ISPs (Barton and Butts, 1988; Clear and Hardyman, 1990). The informality and lack of documentation of selection procedures suggest there is inconsistency between the intended and the actual population in these programs.

Intervention

We found no uniformly agreed upon standard on how much contact constitutes "intensive" supervision. Many programs required daily contact with the youth during initial phases,

TABLE 2

CASELOAD RATIOS AND OFFENDER CONTACT STANDARDS

Program	Approximate Caseload Ratios (Juveniles To Primary Worker)	Minimum Face-to-face Contact Standards
Associated Marine Institutes, Inc.	7	Day Treatment
Firestone Community Day Center School	35	Day Treatment
Hennepin County (MN) Surveillance Program	12	Phase 1: 2-6 per day
Kentfields Rehabilitation Program	9-11	Phase 1: Day Treatment Phase 2: 3-10 per week
The Key Program, Inc.	6-10	1 per day
Lucas County (OH) Intensive Supervision Unit	15	Phase 1: 2 per week
Pennsylvania Intensive Probation Supervision	15	3 per week
Ramsey County (MN) Juvenile Intensive Supervision Project	5-8	Phases 1 & 2: 1 per day
Specialized Gang Supervision Program	50	3 per 2 months
Wayne County (MI) Intensive Probation State Ward Diversion Program	4	Day Treatment
Intensive Probation Unit	10	Phase 1: 2-3 per week
Spectrum In-Home Services Program	8	3-5 per week
Youth Advocate Programs, Inc.	2-6	3-5 per week

plus required contacts with the family, schools and other treatment providers. Table 2 summarizes the approximate caseload ratios and minimum offender face-to-face contact standards for the programs. The contact standards vary considerably among programs, ranging from two to six per day in the Hennepin County (MN) Surveillance Program, to three every two months in the Los Angeles (CA) Specialized Gang program.

Contacts decrease as offenders enter the final stages of intensive supervision and their behavior becomes consistent with program rules. Staff emphasized the importance of a structured transition from the control of intensive supervision to community life with no supervision. While all programs reduced contacts before discharge, ISP staff rarely considered the transition time sufficient.

There was no agreement on the ideal length of stay for optimal program

participation. Some programs specified a minimum or maximum length of stay as part of the program design; others provided an average length of stay. Table 3 provides the length-of-stay information for the 11 programs. They ranged from as little as 3 months in the Ramsey County (MN) Juvenile Intensive Supervision program, to a maximum of 15 months in the Wayne County (MI) State Ward Diversion Program, operated by a private provider.

A second feature common to ISPs was the *network* of services provided. While the intervention strategies varied considerably among programs, all had lower caseload ratios with more frequent contacts than traditional probation. With one exception (the Specialized Gang Supervision Program in Los Angeles County), these programs did not eliminate rehabilitation from their mission. Rather, control and structuring of the juvenile's behavior was employed to provide for public safety and to create

TABLE 3

PROGRAM LENGTH OF STAY

Program	Length Of Stay*
Associated Marine Institutes, Inc.	6 months (average)
Firestone Community Day Center School	2 semesters (average)
Hennepin County (MN) Surveillance Program	116 days (average)
Kentfields Rehabilitation Program	4 months
The Key Program, Inc.	
Outreach & Tracking	20.7 wks. (average)
Tracking Plus	19.9 wks. (average)
Lucas County (OH) Intensive Supervision Unit	6-9 months
Pennsylvania Intensive Probation Supervision	6-12 months
Ramsey County (MN) Juvenile Intensive Supervision	
Misdemeanants	90 successful days
Felons	120 successful days
Specialized Gang Supervision Program	12 months (average)
Wayne County (MI) Intensive Probation	
State Ward Diversion Program	11-15 months
Intensive Probation Unit	7-11 months
Spectrum In-Home Services Program	9-12 months
Youth Advocate Programs, Inc.	6-9 months

*Length of stay based on program design unless indicated as an average.

an environment in which treatment can occur. Most ISPs provided access to a full range of activities and services to meet the needs of the juvenile, with formal referral for needed services not directly available through the ISP.

The third common intervention strategy was program reinforcement. ISPs must provide sanctions which are certain and proportionate to the violations for rule infractions, yet designed so violators can stay in the program. The ISPs that NCCD visited reserved unsuccessful termination only for new offenses or repetitive negative behavior. A rewards system for positive behavior was also found in most programs. Programs considered positive reinforcement, through such rewards as relaxation of rules, a special outing or meal, or ceremonies recognizing achievement, a crucial program strategy.

Goals and Evaluation

Empirical data on the efficacy of juvenile ISPs are limited, but the findings from

available research are generally favorable (Barton and Butts, 1988). The ISPs reviewed by NCCD did not rely on these research results in the design of their programs.

Effectiveness is measured in both dollars saved and in the extent to which other process goals are met. For an ISP to be cost effective, it must serve high risk youth who would otherwise be in residential placement. Goals should be clearly articulated, widely accepted and objective enough to be evaluated. However, agencies were generally operating ISPs without the resources to systematically assess their programs, and programs had virtually no information with which to measure cost or program effectiveness.

To assure the adoption of ISP in the juvenile justice system, it is critical that programs clearly articulate goals and develop strategies to systematically assess progress toward meeting these goals.

Program Linkages

Positive relationships with others in the juvenile justice system, both formal and informal, are crucial for both program development and operation of any ISP. These include relationships with court personnel, regular probation staff, community programs, law enforcement and schools. Judicial support is key, since in many programs it is the judges who make the final placement decision. We often found that an influential individual, such as a judge or juvenile justice administrator, initiated the program concept. No program was implemented or sustained without strong administrative commitment and support of others in the juvenile justice system.

Conclusions

NCCD found great diversity among the programs calling themselves "intensive supervision programs." Our assessment indicated that there is promise in the use of intensive supervision for juvenile offenders who would otherwise be in residential placements. However, for intensive supervision to be an effective alternative, existing ISPs must be strengthened on a number of key program components.

We found strengths and weaknesses in all programs that were reviewed. NCCD, therefore, is designing a model of ISP, guided by research and theory, that capitalizes on the observed strengths of current programs. In the next section of this report we briefly describe the model ISP that we are developing.

THE ISP PROGRAM MODEL

Program Context

The ISP model being designed by NCCD is guided both by the risk control and rehabilitation strategies. Under the risk control approach, the central purpose of a sanction is to prevent an offender from committing future criminal acts. Therefore, the degree of control should be commensurate with the predicted potential for future delinquent activity. Rehabilitative efforts are fundamental to the risk control approach, since reducing the likelihood of future offending is dependent upon affecting change in cognitive, emotional and behavioral patterns (Clear, 1986).

Program interventions are designed to address the major causal factors identified in the Integrated Social Control (ISC) model (Elliott et al., 1985). ISC theory argues that the combined forces of inadequate socialization, blockage from achieving conventional goals, and social disorganization lead to weak bonding to conventional values. This, combined with strong bonding with delinquent peers, provides a powerful push toward law-violating behavior.

Given these etiologic factors, the interventions in the ISP model are designed to:

- provide external control over the offender until the locus of control can be shifted to traditional social units (such as the family, school and work);
- strengthen offender bonds to conventional values, persons, activities and institutions;
- provide offenders with the skills and opportunities to achieve in traditional settings; and
- provide a system of reinforcements (rewards and sanctions) to support desirable behaviors and to reduce the influence of delinquent peer groups.

Client Identification

The target population for the ISP model is adjudicated delinquents who would otherwise be in a long-term residential placement for at least 12 months (or the average length of stay in the state training school, if less than 12 months). Assuring selection of this target population is the single most important element in ISP implementation, because target group selection impacts both program and cost effectiveness. If an ISP accepts juveniles who would otherwise be placed on regular probation, the program will provide, at substantially more expense, a degree of control not warranted by the juvenile's offense or risk to the community. Further, research suggests that more intensive supervision may not be as effective as regular probation for low-risk offenders (Clear and Hardyman, 1990).

Proper selection criteria and procedures must be in place to assure that the target

population actually gets selected for participation. The model specifies that the screening and selection for program enrollment should occur after an initial decision for a residential placement has been made. Use of program acceptance criteria based on uniform factors, including structured risk and needs assessments, and strict management control procedures, are additional strategies to ensure proper selection.

Intervention

Because of the theoretical framework guiding intervention strategies and the troubled population that this program intends to serve, the model requires a comprehensive effort encompassing both highly structured supervision and a broad array of treatment alternatives. This includes a phased system of controls, case planning and management, core service requirements, and a system of both rewards and graduated sanctions.

The model includes five program phases, namely:

- short-term residential placement or incarceration;
- day treatment, with on-site educational and other programming;
- outreach and tracking, with frequent client and ancillary contacts and aggressive case management;
- regular supervision (transition); and
- discharge from supervision.

Contextual and Implementation Issues

The model assumes that an ISP is most effective when it enjoys a broad base of on-going community support and is used in conjunction with other community resources. Efforts to build and maintain external and internal program support are necessary for successful implementation. These include the support of juvenile judges and other key policy makers, program and community linkages, and appropriate administrative policies. The comprehensive program design entails cooperative efforts of multiple agencies, requiring both formal and informal agreements to secure needed services for clients.

Goals and Evaluation

The essential goal of ISP implementation is to demonstrate that this approach can manage large numbers of serious juvenile offenders at no greater risk to the community and at lower cost than long-term residential placement. Without proper selection of a placement-bound population, this comprehensive model would be prohibitively expensive. However, it is our expectation that the model will be cost-effective if used as an alternative to costly residential placements. A rigorous evaluation design to test these premises is outlined in the model design.

NEXT STEPS

NCCD is currently developing a detailed operations manual to provide guidance for those wishing to implement this ISP model. A limited amount of technical assistance and training to jurisdictions will be available through the project. We are now seeking juvenile justice agencies interested in implementing the ISP model. If your agency is interested, contact:

Frank Smith
Program Manager
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 307-5914

The selection of agencies to receive technical assistance will occur in early 1991.

If you would like more information about the ISP assessment findings, two project reports are now available from NCCD: Selected Program Summaries, which includes the full site visit reports for all 11 sites; and Assessment Report, which includes the literature review and methodology along with the findings and recommendations.

PROGRAM SITES VISITED BY NCCD

ASSOCIATED MARINE INSTITUTES, INC. TAMPA, FLORIDA

The Associated Marine Institutes, Inc. (AMI) is a network of affiliated training programs for delinquent youth. Each program has an autonomous Board of Trustees and separate incorporation with fiscal management and contracting services provided by the corporate office in Tampa, Florida. AMI, a private, non-profit organization, operates a wide range of programs, including residential and non-residential placements in seven states: Florida, Louisiana, Texas, South Carolina, Delaware, Virginia and Maryland. In general, the AMI programs are centered around remedial education and training in marine activities such as scuba diving, sailing, and boating. The NCCD site visit was conducted at two of the Florida non-residential programs: Pinellas Marine Institute and Tampa Marine Institute. These non-residential programs are examples of day treatment models in two slightly different settings: the Pinellas facility is located on the waterfront at Tampa Bay and the Tampa Institute is located near the water.

The curricula and level systems are similar at each of the marine institutes. The day treatment program combines individualized classroom education with specialized training in marine activities. Participants progress through levels by accumulating points for positive behavior and completion of classroom work. Staff determine progression to the next level at a meeting in which the youth explains why he or she should be advanced. Variations from one institute to another result from the autonomy that each program is afforded, the regional differences in the areas they serve, and the personalities and administrative styles of the staff. Within the structured expectations for staff and the overall AMI philosophy, individuality is encouraged.

Three goals for youth achievement have been established by AMI, namely: to reduce or eliminate recidivism, to increase pre-vocational and vocational skills, and to increase academic skills. AMI presents a unique focus on marine training and has demonstrated its premise that youths who are engaged in challenging and interesting tasks can be steered away from delinquent behavior.

THE KEY PROGRAM, INC. FRAMINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

The KEY Program, Inc. (KEY) was organized in Massachusetts in 1974 as a private, non-profit corporation as a direct response to deinstitutionalization of juveniles in Massachusetts reform schools. While the NCCD assessment concentrated on KEY's non-residential Outreach and Tracking, and Tracking Plus programs, KEY serves troubled adolescents through several additional program models including long- and short-term residential treatment, shelter care, and foster care. KEY also provides juvenile intake services and protective service assessment and evaluation in selected areas. Except for the urban Boston area, KEY currently operates statewide in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and has implemented one Outreach program in New Hampshire in January 1989.

The Outreach and Tracking program, which serves both males and females, is designed to serve as an alternative to residential out-of-home placement. It also serves as an aftercare program following residential placement to provide reintegration into the community. Services include daily contact with the child and significant others, constant awareness of the child's whereabouts, advocacy with other community resources, and systematic referrals for clinical services, such as family and individual counseling. The Tracking Plus program provides the same types of services as the Outreach and Tracking program; however, youths (males only) in Tracking Plus begin their placement with an 18- to 30-day stay in a restricted residential setting, in order to stabilize the youth, develop a plan for the youth's return to home and school, and provide more intensive family work. A unique aspect of KEY is that line caseworkers stay a maximum of 14 months. This policy assures that high energy staff are providing direct services, but also requires extensive training efforts and supervisory and management consistency to maintain program integrity.

KEY views its role as providing an integrated approach which combines accountability, structure, and advocacy to ensure that the individual goals for each juvenile are met within the least restrictive setting. KEY receives strong support from its contracting agencies at both the regional and state levels. These agencies believe KEY provides flexible services which are responsive to community needs and in the best interest of clients.

ASSOCIATED MARINE INSTITUTES, INC. (AMI) - TAMPA, FL

Contact Person: Robert Weaver
Executive Vice President, (813) 963-3344
See sidebar

FIRESTONE COMMUNITY DAY CENTER SCHOOL - LOS ANGELES, CA

Contact Person: Mary Ann Greene
Probation Director, (213) 586-6401

This day treatment alternative school is operated in a cooperative effort by the local education and probation departments for youth on probation and aftercare. While educational in focus, a probation officer with casework responsibility for the students is onsite full-time.

HENNEPIN COUNTY SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM - MINNEAPOLIS, MN

Contact Person: Jim Seward
Correctional Unit Supervisor, (612) 348-3673

The probation department operates this surveillance program which incorporates frequent contacts and strict adherence to court-ordered conditions of probation. The program features a team concept to provide two to six daily contacts with each juvenile, and is staffed with two shifts, 365 days a year. It emphasizes a high level of internal consistency and meticulous logging of juvenile activities.

KENTFIELDS REHABILITATION PROGRAM - GRAND RAPIDS, MI

Contact Person: Michael Robinson
Director, (616) 774-3242

This court-operated program combines classroom education and work experience with gradual relaxation of strict probation requirements in an aftercare component. The program operates on a behavioral modification system where positive behavior in the home, community and school is reinforced through a "token economy" system. Points earned are redeemable for money, and these weekly paychecks are a unique program aspect.

THE KEY PROGRAM, INC. - FRAMINGHAM, MA

Contact Person: William Lyttle
Executive Director, (508) 877-3690
See sidebar

LUCAS COUNTY INTENSIVE SUPERVISION UNIT - TOLEDO, OH

Contact Person: Sandy Strong
IPU Supervisor, (419) 249-6663

This four-phase program is operated by the juvenile court's probation department. The program begins with house arrest; freedom increases as the youth's behavior warrants. Restitution and community service are required of all participants. The Intensive Supervision Unit has strong judicial and community program support. Careful planning and development involving a variety of juvenile justice actors occurred before program implementation, accounting, in part, for this support.

PENNSYLVANIA INTENSIVE PROBATION SUPERVISION

Contact Persons:

Keith Snyder, Juvenile Court Consultant, Juvenile Court Judges Commission, (717) 787-6910

Ruth Williams, Juvenile Justice Program Manager, PA Commission on Crime and Delinquency, (717) 787-8559

The Pennsylvania Intensive Probation Supervision programs began when two state agencies worked together to provide start-up funding and establish basic program standards for county probation departments. Oversight is provided by the two state agencies. State standards require frequent contacts with the youth, the family and school, while the specific operational design varies by county.

RAMSEY COUNTY INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROJECT-ST. PAUL, MN

Contact Person: James Hayes
Juvenile Division Director, (612) 298-6934

This court-operated program places an emphasis on strict adherence to court-ordered conditions. The three-phase program lasts for 90 to 120 days and includes home detention at the onset followed by a period of restricted activities. The project has staff assigned to branch probation offices to provide for ease of access and better understanding of the neighborhood. The "individual flavor" of each office is considered a program strength, although program consistency is more difficult to maintain.

SPECIALIZED GANG SUPERVISION PROGRAM - LOS ANGELES, CA

Contact Person: Ernie Castro
SGSP Director, (213) 780-2127

High profile gang members are supervised in the community by a special unit of Los Angeles County probation officers. The program supervises both juveniles and young adult offenders to provide continuity in fighting the Los Angeles gang problem. The focus is on close surveillance and swift court action for violations to reduce gang-related violence in the community.

WAYNE COUNTY INTENSIVE PROBATION PROGRAM-DETROIT, MI

Contact Person: Kathleen VandenBrulle,
IPU Supervisor, (313) 577-9426

Screening occurs in this court-administered program after a juvenile has been committed to the state. After acceptance, juveniles are referred to one of three programs for supervision and services. One program operated by probation includes small caseloads and frequent contacts. Private providers offer the In-Home program, which has a family treatment focus; and the State Ward Diversion program, a day treatment program with on-site education and counseling. Research suggests all three are as successful as institutionalization in reducing recidivism.

YOUTH ADVOCATE PROGRAMS, INC. (YAP) - HARRISBURG, PA

Contact Persons: Tom Jeffers, President
or Minette Bauer, Executive Director,
(717) 238-4123

In this private program, trained advocacy workers make frequent contacts with delinquent youth and their families. YAP supports the notion that troubled youth have the best chance of success in community-based programs serving the entire family. A four-tiered level of service provides the structure to maintain strong ties with the community. Advocates meet with each juvenile, generally at night and on weekends, for 7.5 to 30 hours each week, in activities designed to meet the youth's social, educational and vocational needs.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, Troy (1986). "National Survey of Juvenile Intensive Probation Supervision." Paper presented at JIPS Symposium, co-sponsored by Hennepin County Juvenile Court and National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Minneapolis, MN, October 19-22.

Barton, William H. and Jeffrey A. Butts (1988). *The Metro-County Intensive Supervision Experiment: Project Brief, Selected Results from a Five-Year Program Evaluation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Clear, Todd R. and Patricia L. Hardyman (1990). "The New Intensive Supervision Movement," *Crime and Delinquency*, January.

Elliott, D., D. Huizinga and S. Ageton (1985). *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the 11 programs which allowed us to make on-site visits and which invested considerable staff time to provide us with program documents and respond to our questions. We also appreciate the assistance of the project advisory board: Judge David Grossmann, Hamilton County, Ohio Juvenile Court; Peter Greenwood, RAND Corporation; Douglas Lipton, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.; and Cal Terhune, California Youth Authority.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Barry Krisberg, Ph.D. is President of NCCD. Deborah Neuenfeldt is a Program Analyst with NCCD Midwest. Audrey Bakke is the former Director of NCCD Midwest, and is currently with the California Board of Corrections.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Headquarters Office
685 Market Street, Suite 620
San Francisco, California 94105
(415) 896-6223

Midwest Office
6409 Odana Road
Madison, Wisconsin 53719
(608) 274-8882

East Coast Office
S.I. Newhouse Center at Rutgers
15 Washington Street, Fourth Floor
Newark, New Jersey 07102
(201) 643-5805

© Copyright 1991 - National Council on Crime and Delinquency - All rights reserved

This project was supported by cooperative agreement number 87-JS-CX-K101 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice. 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 U.S. Department of Justice.

Members of the news media are encouraged to reproduce any tables contained in the publication with proper credit to NCCD. For further information about this or other NCCD publications, please contact Frances Terry, Editor, at (415) 896-6223.



NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
685 Market Street, Suite 620
San Francisco, California 94105

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
PERMIT NO. 12793