

SELECTED PROGRAM SUMMARIES

Demonstration of Post-Adjudication Non-Residential Intensive Supervision Programs

Funded by:

**OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE
AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE**

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

77 Maiden Lane, Fourth Floor San Francisco, CA 94108 (415) 956-5651

6409 Odana Road Madison, WI 53719 (608) 274-8882

150337

150337

NCJRS

OCT 5 1994

ACQUISITIONS

SELECTED PROGRAM SUMMARIES

Demonstration of Post-Adjudication Non-Residential Intensive Supervision Programs

Barry Krisberg
Audrey Bakke
Deborah Neuenfeldt
Patricia Steele

JUNE 1989

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

77 Maiden Lane Fourth Floor San Francisco, CA 94108 (415) 956-5651

6409 Odana Road Madison, WI 53719 (608) 274-8882

This project was supported by grant 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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible by the financial support of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Special appreciation is acknowledged to all the intensive supervision programs which responded to our national search for program information. While not all programs could be selected for further study, NCCD appreciates the time that program staff invested in forwarding information and responding to requests for clarification. NCCD particularly acknowledges the cooperation from administrators and staff who allowed us to make on-site visits to their programs. These programs invested considerable time to provide us with program manuals and documents, patiently respond to our questions, and describe their programs for our project. We also appreciate the support and investment of the project advisory board: James W. Brown, Community Research Forum; 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.

150337

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

Public Domain/OJJDP/NCCD

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	i
The KEY Program, Inc. Framingham, Massachusetts.	1
Associated Marine Institutes, Inc. Tampa, Florida21
Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania39
Kentfields Rehabilitation Program Grand Rapids, Michigan64
Firestone Community Day Center School Los Angeles, California.88
Pennsylvania Intensive Probation Supervision	106
Specialized Gang Supervision Program Los Angeles, California.	131
Hennepin County Surveillance Program Minneapolis, Minnesota	147
Ramsey County Juvenile Intensive Supervision Project St. Paul, Minnesota.	166
Lucas County Intensive Supervision Unit Toledo, Ohio	188
Wayne County Intensive Probation Program Detroit, Michigan.	210

INTRODUCTION

This report describes eleven juvenile intensive supervision programs which were selected for on-site visits by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD). These assessments are part of a demonstration project funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to identify promising and effective non-residential programs which provide intensive supervision for delinquent juveniles.

OJJDP organized the project into four distinct stages and this report is one of two documents which outline the findings of Stage One, the Assessment Phase. The second document produced during Stage One outlines the literature review and the project methodology. It also provides a discussion of NCCD's findings and recommendations for proceeding into subsequent phases of the project.

The purpose of the Assessment Phase is to identify existing programs and assess relevant research related to the implementation and operation of post-adjudication non-residential intensive supervision programs. Of the four project stages summarized below, assessment is the most critical in that it establishes the basis for subsequent analysis and development:

- Stage 1 Conduct a comprehensive assessment of existing programs and information related to the implementation and operation of post-adjudication, non-residential, intensive supervision programs;
- Stage 2 Develop comprehensive, descriptive program operational manuals;

- Stage 3 Incorporate the program operation manuals and related materials into a training and technical assistance package for independent agency use and formal training sessions; and
- Stage 4 Provide intensive training and technical assistance to support selected demonstration sites.

During the Assessment Phase, NCCD completed a comprehensive review of the literature and conducted a nation-wide search to identify operational programs which represent different models for providing intensive, non-residential services to high risk juveniles. Based on analysis of the available research, review of the programs identified through the national search and with input from the OJJDP-appointed Advisory Board, eleven agency programs summarized in this report were selected for further investigation.

In order to obtain as much information as possible on a wide variety of programs, NCCD contacted numerous agency officials, juvenile justice planners, and professional organizations throughout the country. We sought to identify operational programs which met the general criteria of being post adjudication, were non-residential and offered services that were substantively greater than those which would be available on regular probation supervision. We also identified programs which were alternatives to out-of-home placement rather than enhancements to traditional probation services. Because OJJDP is also funding a separate project to address intensive aftercare services, NCCD excluded programs which primarily focused on aftercare populations. Programs which met these criteria were

further assessed against the following ten factors in order to select the programs for more in-depth, on-site assessments:

1. The program has been in operation longer than twelve months.
2. The program operates state-wide or in a larger county.
3. A mix of public/private sector and geographic balance should be included in the on-site selections.
4. Both day treatment and direct supervision programs should be represented in the on-site selections.
5. ISPs selected for on-site visits should represent a range of behavioral-educational and treatment-counseling approaches.
6. Programs should have an identified theory of delinquency control to guide their policies and procedures.
7. Programs should have some degree of data available on clients, outcome information, and program policies/procedures.
8. The programs should define their target population as high-risk juveniles.
9. The program contact requirements should reflect "intense" client contact and provide a high level of control.
10. Well-defined methods for responding to violations of program/probation rules should be reflected in program procedures.

The on-site visits focused on learning first hand how each program operates. Assessments included interviews with program administrators, line workers, supervisors and key judges. Additional interviews were selectively held with juvenile prosecuting attorneys, law enforcement personnel, program provider staff, school personnel, juveniles and their parents.

Documentation was obtained detailing program development, policy, organizational structure, and operating procedures.

When identifying programs for possible on-site assessments, NCCD looked for programs which met as many of the ten previously mentioned criteria as possible. Programs selected, however, did not necessarily meet all criteria. Factors one through five were established to assure that a variety of approaches were represented and that the programs were not in the initial stages of their own development. Factors six through ten reflect NCCD's assessment of basic requirements for an intensive program as identified through the literature review and staff knowledge of the field.

NCCD required that programs be operational for at least twelve months to reduce the likelihood that they would be in the initial stages of developing their own policies and procedures. It was presumed that after twelve months of operation, these ISPs would have refined their procedures, documented their operations, and have sufficient experience to contribute to the assessment. NCCD selected ISPs which operated in larger counties and state-wide systems because it was believed that principles from these programs would also transfer to smaller systems. Also, we wanted to emphasize programs which were more likely to have a fully developed administrative structure. It was felt that smaller programs would have more informal administrative and supervisory structures which would be difficult to replicate during the demonstration phase.

Several juvenile justice systems contract with private providers for services; therefore, we included a mix of both private and public sector models in the site visits. Because this is a national OJJDP project, NCCD wanted to include programs from various areas of the country.

There are two general structures for intensive supervision programs (ISPs): day treatment and direct supervision models. The type of ISP which is implemented reflects the resources available in the community, the needs of the juvenile justice system, and the philosophy of the program developers. For on-site visits, NCCD opted to include both program types. Within this structure, day treatment and direct supervision models represented a wide range of operational and philosophical strategies. Because the individual and family needs of participants often required a comprehensive service delivery system, we looked for programs which could utilize a variety of internal or external resources to provide these comprehensive services. We wanted a mix of programs which represented a range of behavioral-educational and treatment-counseling approaches.

NCCD sought to identify programs which had a delinquency control theory which was reflected in program goals, policies, and operational procedures. While theoretical assumptions were often suggested in program operations, they were rarely articulated at the outset and were not necessarily consistent throughout the program. To the degree possible, we looked for

clear references to an underlying principle in the program documentation or through telephone follow-up.

Our requests for program information specifically asked for any evaluations or data documenting program success. The amount of program data within individual ISPs was limited. Systemic, formal outcome evaluation at the program level was generally nonexistent. If case-specific data was available, it was generally not incorporated into an on-going management information system to provide for regular, current program monitoring and assessment. Data were most often limited to descriptive statistics on such things as length of time in the program, circumstance of termination, and participant demographics. Follow-up information after program completion was rare. Whenever possible, we selected programs that appeared to meet the other criteria and also had as much data as possible to describe their clientele and program success.

Programs were required to define their population as high risk delinquents who would otherwise be in placement, although we accepted the agency definition for that category of offenders. These definitions varied among programs and usually relied on a substantial degree of supervisor judgment. NCCD expected ISPs to reflect a high level of client contact and overall behavioral control. To the degree possible, we looked for daily juvenile contact (at least during the early phases of participation) with ISP staff involved in providing direction for client activities during the entire day. We wanted programs that were delivering

services at a substantially higher level than traditional probation.

High-risk delinquents who would otherwise be in placement can be expected to have a prior history of unsuccessful probation experiences or traditional probation. Because ISP participants test the limits of ISP rules, we looked for specific, progressive sanctions to hold juveniles accountable for their behavior. We wanted ISP models which would allow the child to remain in the program within reasonable behavioral limits. It was important that termination from the ISP to placement be reserved for the most serious violations, usually new offenses.

While each program we considered had unique characteristics, the number of on-site visits was narrowed to eleven programs. This number was consistent with available funding and proved to be a sufficient number of programs to provide an overview of different approaches.

The Key Program, Inc. (KEY), Associated Marine Institutes, Inc. (AMI), and Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. (YAP) represent private programs based in Massachusetts, Florida and Pennsylvania, respectively. KEY and AMI provide a variety of services to the juvenile justice system, including both residential and non-residential programs. We visited the KEY Outreach and Tracking, and Outreach Plus programs which utilize a 24-hour direct non-residential supervision approach. The AMI day treatment model combines individualized classroom education with specialized training in marine activities. YAP represents a

unique approach based on an advocacy model which matches a trained advocacy worker with the needs of the child and family.

Kentfields Rehabilitation Program in Grand Rapids, Michigan and the Firestone Community Day Center School (CDC) in Los Angeles, California represent two additional day treatment programs. Both programs give significant emphasis to the educational needs of the child, funded in conjunction with the local school districts. Kentfields operates on a behavior modification approach which also includes community service work and group counseling components.

The Pennsylvania Intensive Probation Supervision program was selected as an example of state-level oversight agencies which implemented intensive supervision programs in county-run probation departments. In a coordinated implementation effort, two state oversight agencies established policies for program development, provided initial funding and initiated mechanisms to providing training, technical assistance and monitoring during the implementation phase.

The Los Angeles County Specialized Gang Supervision Program and the Hennepin County Surveillance Program in Minneapolis, Minnesota typify programs whose primary focus is on providing surveillance services. Each program operates in a distinctly different environment with the Los Angeles program closely associated with police to apprehend violators and the Hennepin County program working closely with treatment and educational providers to broker child and family services.

The Ramsey County program in St. Paul, Minnesota and the Lucas County program in Toledo, Ohio operate within mid-size urban areas. Both programs utilize their staff to provide a combination of treatment and supervision services. Program staff exert a high level of control and surveillance by daily contacts, consistent sanctions and relationship building. While both programs recognize and support the surveillance and control aspects of intensive supervision, their primary focus is on the provision of services to meet participant needs. The Wayne County Intensive Probation Program in Detroit, Michigan assigns participants to one of three service strategies. Services can be provided by county workers in a surveillance and counseling approach, or the juvenile can be referred to one of two private programs. One program focuses on family counseling and the other on educational needs through a day treatment model.

The eleven assessment summaries provided in this report are organized within five analytic categories which allow an assessment of the overall structure for each program. The content of each of these five areas is summarized below:

Program Context

This refers to the set of conditions and assumptions which operationally and conceptually define the distinctive features of the program. Also included here are the socio-economic and demographic attributes of the community the program serves.

Client Identification

This includes the combination of techniques, procedures, and criteria employed to define, select and admit clients to various levels of service and supervision provided by the program. The analysis focuses on identifying target populations, selection procedures, and assessment processes.

Intervention

Intervention represents the full range of activities and services provided by the program to meet the needs of its clients. These services can be provided by program staff or coordinated with other resources.

Goals and Evaluation

The program's stated goals and objectives are outlined here. The discussion includes an assessment of whether program operations are consistent with the stated goals, and the criteria used to determine how effective the program is in meeting its objectives. Available program data are presented here, along with an analysis of whether an adequate evaluation design is in place to assess program success.

Program Linkages

Program linkages are those formal and informal conditions and relationships that may hinder or support program operations. These linkages include the nature of the program's relationship with the juvenile justice system, the schools and other community organizations.

Each of these eleven programs is discussed in the following program summaries. These program assessments, in combination with the literature review, form the basis for the findings and discussion contained in the Assessment Report, produced under separate cover.

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 this review concentrates on KEY's nonresidential Outreach and Tracking and KEY's 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.

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.

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. A unique aspect of KEY is that line caseworkers stay a maximum of fourteen 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.

With the exception of the urban Boston area, KEY currently operates state-wide in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and has implemented one Outreach program in New Hampshire in January of 1989. During fiscal year 1987, KEY provided services (excluding Intake Programs) to 2,139 clients from the Massachusetts Departments of Youth Services, Social Services, and Mental Health; the Rhode Island Department for Children and Their Families; and various school systems. Nine hundred ninety-three (46 percent) of these clients were served in the Outreach and Tracking or Tracking Plus programs, of which 499 (50 percent) were delinquent referrals from the Department of Youth Services. Approximately 50 percent of the juveniles in the Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus programs were enrolled as an alternative to residential placement, with the remaining 50 percent receiving aftercare services as follow-up to an out-of-home placement.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

KEY programs are operational in both urban and rural environments. The programs have a high level of operational clarity and consistency, as documented in policy and procedure manuals and reinforced through in-house training and support. Program strategies are, however, regionalized to respond to the more "criminal" behaviors of urban juveniles and the prevalent family and social problems of more rural environments.

KEY thrives in a political environment in which the states contract for direct services provided by private organizations, and the state's role is one of programmatic and fiscal oversight and monitoring. Founded in 1974 by William Wolfe, KEY was a direct response to juveniles in crisis after deinstitutionalization in Massachusetts. The initial program began through a contract with the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (DYS) to provide for each juvenile released from an institution 10 hours a week of outreach services and 18 hours a week of tracking services. Caseloads were limited in size at eight to ten juveniles. In 1978, KEY incorporated, for a selected population, an 18- to 30-day initial residential phase with a more intensive Outreach and Tracking component. Designed as a six-month treatment program known as Tracking Plus, the program targets juveniles who require removal from their home environments for a short period of time to stabilize their behavior before commencing Outreach and Tracking services in the community. Prior to being released from the residential phase,

the juvenile must have a stable residence and must be working or in school.

KEY has always served both status and delinquent offenders. With decriminalization of status offenders in the 1970s, KEY began contracting directly with the Massachusetts Department of Social Services for status offenders, while continuing contracts with DYS for delinquent juveniles.

While the political environment supports contracted services, KEY initially faced significant resistance from the court system and from police. Much of this resistance can be attributed to the deinstitutionalization that was occurring at the same time as KEY was evolving. This deinstitutionalization limited court options for removing juveniles from the community, and police felt the loss of a viable sanction. This resistance was resolved over time as KEY provided services consistent with its contracts and demonstrated to DYS and the community that it could be a reliable and convenient resource for courts and the police.

The basic philosophy of KEY is that almost all juveniles can benefit from a community and family support program which emphasizes an integrated approach to social, educational, and emotional needs. This approach incorporates holistic services to parents, peers, and significant others in the juvenile's life. Central to the KEY philosophy is the tenant that these supportive services must be provided within the least restrictive setting. Problems exhibited by juveniles are generally considered to be a

manifestation of the family dysfunction and KEY services are targeted towards family support and services for the good of the child.

KEY has an 11-member Board of Directors which meets quarterly, with the corporation founder serving as Chairman of the Board. Organizationally, six Regional Directors, the Directors of Personnel/Management, Administration/Finance, and Operations/Program Development report to the Executive Director who has overall management responsibility and serves as KEY's most visible, external spokesperson. A unique facet of the KEY organizational structure is the incorporation of an external management consultant into an on-going operational role. The Executive Director contracts for management development, training, and team building with a consultant who has been an integral part of the organizational culture since the mid-1970s. The consultant reports directly to the Executive Director and meets weekly with the management team (directors). The consultant has primary responsibility for structuring the peer consensus management approach which is the core of administrative operation. Within the structure of these weekly meetings and adjunct services, the consultant addresses most personnel and staff support issues within the context of the management team. The Executive Director is, therefore, free to concentrate on the functional, direction-setting roles of the organization.

From these weekly directors' meetings on through the organization to the direct line casework level, KEY places

substantial emphasis on internal staff support and consensus building. Within regions, directors meet as frequently as twice a week with their supervisory staff. One meeting will address the administrative and other functional organization matters, while the second meeting is designed for personnel matters, consensus, and team building issues. On a weekly basis, three regional directors also conduct sessions with groups of supervisors from various regions to provide training and resolve problems. The structure of these groups is based on individual interests, group dynamics, and level of supervisory experience. KEY has a three-tier supervisor training system, with the first level concentrating on technical skills and time management for the new supervisors, the second level concentrating on polishing technical skills for supervisors with at least one year of experience, and the third level focusing on refinement of overall skills as well as enhancing areas of specific expertise. This third level usually includes supervisors with two to three years experience.

Philosophically, the premise that KEY uses to build its organizational structure is to provide staff with a strong clinical support base within a well-developed corporate culture. This is done so that staff have the skills and information necessary to respond effectively to the behavior of their clients. KEY seeks to provide an environment in which staff need not look to their caseloads for personal validation and support; this support comes from within the organization. Much of the

organizational structure is designed to encourage internal leadership development; thus, KEY invests considerable staff time and money to increase the likelihood of this happening. In part, because of the long-term success of KEY, but also because they have developed a keen awareness of organizational dynamics, KEY staff are called upon to provide training and consulting to other providers throughout the country.

Each of six regions has three to eight supervisors with an average of six to seven caseworkers per supervisor. Currently, supervisors can have up to twelve caseworkers; however, when the caseworker ratio is that high, two of the twelve are lead workers who assume significant day-to-day responsibilities for case management support for less experienced workers. The Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus programs maintain a caseload rate of six to ten juveniles per caseworker and KEY has the flexibility to add part- and full-time positions as needed.

A unique aspect of the KEY personnel policy is that line caseworkers can only stay a maximum of fourteen months. This policy prevents staff "burnout" and assures that high energy staff are providing direct services, but it also requires supervisory and management consistency to maintain program integrity. There is a high level of casework turnover and in 1988 KEY hired 174 new caseworkers. KEY provides agency-wide orientation for all new staff. Prior to this session, staff will have gone through individual orientation to policies and procedures from their immediate supervisors and regional

directors. The largest sessions are in January and September, when class sizes range from 30 to 40. During other months class sizes average 20 new staff. Staff are formally evaluated within three months after initial employment and every six months thereafter. The casework position is sufficiently demanding that staff will leave the program within the first three months after hire if they don't assimilate into the KEY philosophy. Because of the high caseworker turnover and KEY's reputation for developing quality staff, KEY employees are in demand from other employers. At the end of fourteen months, most caseworkers proceed to graduate school or are hired by other employers (often state agencies with whom KEY contracts). Because KEY seeks to promote internally, staff are also promoted to lead casework positions or supervisors as those positions become available.

KEY requires a BA or BS degree in a related human science field for a casework position and maintains salaries that are competitive within their geographic area. In addition to active local and national recruitment, KEY recruits staff from England, Canada, and Jamaica. This increases the available pool of qualified employees; however, cultural differences frequently require an added adjustment period and increase the complexity of providing direct supervision to the caseworkers.

Excluding Intake Programs, KEY served 2,139 clients during fiscal year 1987. This represents an increase of 306 clients (17 percent) over the previous year. (In addition, there were 4,205 admissions into three intake programs operated by KEY in

Massachusetts, which represents an increase of 13 percent over the previous year.) Fifty-two percent of the clients served (1,119 clients) were referred from DYS. Of the DYS clients, 426 (38 percent) were served by the Outreach and Tracking program and 73 clients (7 percent) participated in the Tracking Plus program. For those terminating during fiscal year 1987, the average length of stay was 20.7 weeks in the Outreach and Tracking program and 19.9 weeks in the Tracking Plus program.

Approximately one-third of KEY's \$9 million annual operating budget is allocated to the Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus programs. In fiscal year 1988, all but \$55,000 of the operating budget came from direct contracts for services. State-wide contracts for services have been relatively stable. Currently, costs of Outreach and Tracking services hold reasonably constant at a rate of \$22.00 per day, while residential programs can go as high as \$120.00 per day.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

Approximately 50 percent of KEY referrals are delinquents from the DYS, with the remaining populations coming from the Massachusetts Department of Social Services, and Mental Health; the Rhode Island Department for Children and Their Families; and various school systems. The target population in the Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus programs for non-aftercare clients is juveniles ages 11 through 17 who would otherwise, in most instances, be placed in an out-of-home program.

Youths in Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus have an average of two prior offenses (formal charges) while juveniles in KEY residential programs have four to six prior offenses (formal charges). The typical offenses committed by juveniles referred to Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus include various property offenses, auto theft, simple assault and minor drug charges.

While KEY maintains a policy of accepting the majority of referrals from the contracting agency, it discourages referrals for juveniles who have severe drug and alcohol abuse problems requiring hospitalization; those with severe psychological problems or indications that they are actively psychotic and who refuse the intervention of a psychiatrist; and those with severe intellectual retardation. While these criteria form the guidelines for recommended referrals, KEY reviews each referral to individually determine its appropriateness. The referring state agency monitors KEY programs for consistency and quality of service.

During fiscal year 1987, KEY clients presented the following profile:

Sex:	Males	67%
	Females	34%
Race:	White	77%
	Black	11%
	Hispanic	8%
	Other	4%
Age:	14 and under	33%
	15 - 16	56%
	17 and over	11%

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

The referral process for delinquent youths begins with screening by the state caseworker who prepares and forwards a referral packet to the KEY program supervisor. Within five days of receipt of the referral, the KEY supervisor meets with the referring DYS supervisor. (With approval of the KEY regional director, emergency referrals may start immediately.) If a referral is accepted, the DYS caseworker discusses the placement plan with the juvenile and his/her family. After agreement by the juvenile and family, a formal intake staffing is arranged which includes the KEY program supervisor, KEY caseworker, the referring caseworker, the juvenile, the juvenile's parents, and other relevant individuals such as the clinician or DYS supervisor. During this one- to two-hour intake staffing, a 30-day KEY service plan and a behavioral contract are developed and the DYS issues a "grant of conditional liberty" to KEY. This allows the child to participate in the program, while remaining under the legal jurisdiction of DYS. Relevant case file documentation such as face sheets and medical authorizations are also completed at this time. No juvenile is accepted into the KEY program without at least one parent or guardian being present at the intake, unless specific exception is approved by the regional director.

During the first 30 days of participation in KEY, the juvenile's adjustment is staffed daily with the casework and supervisor team. An assessment and a full service plan are

completed and submitted to DYS within 30 days. Formal, routine staffings occur every ninety days thereafter and more frequently as behavior warrants. Written progress reports are submitted to DYS every 30 days.

KEY views its role as one of short-term intervention with a maximum amount of outreach work on behalf of juveniles and their families. It is expected that juveniles will remain in the program for three to six months. All components of the program combine accountability, structure, and advocacy to ensure that the individual goals are met for each juvenile. KEY staff serve as positive, adult role models. Caring relationships balance the program's structural requirements.

Each client participates in a community-based educational program that addresses his/her emotional, physical, social, academic, and vocational needs. KEY staff can attend all evaluations scheduled for the client to ensure involvement and provide input in the development of appropriate individual education plans. KEY places particular emphasis on developing strong and on-going working relationships with teachers, guidance counselors, and school administrators to provide the best opportunity for success. Program participants are encouraged to find part-time employment after school and KEY staff assist in obtaining working papers, completing job applications, and preparing for interviews. KEY staff also locate worksites in the community and provide support to the client and employer.

Life skills training is offered biweekly for participants who need assistance in such areas as sex education, reading newspaper advertisements, applying for jobs, meal planning, shopping, and money management. Recreational programming is designed to provide recreation and exercise, while at the same time providing opportunities to build appropriate social skills and positive peer interactions. Clients are involved in individual and/or group psycho-therapy as appropriate. Those clients beginning the program with their own therapists are encouraged to continue, and strong efforts are made to facilitate the maintenance of the on-going therapeutic relationship. If the client is not actively involved in therapy at intake but individual therapy appears necessary, a referral is made. The program supervisor and casework staff maintain consistent contact with all therapists to provide support and obtain input into on-going treatment planning.

In addition to individual counseling, weekly client groups are held for selected Outreach and Tracking and all Tracking Plus clients. The groups afford clients the opportunity to give and accept constructive peer feedback and build positive social interaction skills. Because many clients live within dysfunctional family settings, parent support is provided daily by casework staff through tracking clients at home and maintaining frequent contact with parents. If more regular meetings are needed with the family, this is facilitated by the program supervisor under clinical supervision of the regional

clinician. In the event that family therapy is deemed appropriate, KEY may work with the family to make a referral to an appropriate therapist.

KEY staff, at the direction of the referral agency, will accompany clients to court appearances and/or probation meetings. In addition to the direct contact from KEY caseworkers, emphasis is placed on encouraging the client to make use of relevant community programs, advocating for the client in those programs, and providing formal clinical support services as needed. Through a high degree of structure and supervision, KEY programs attempt to discourage further delinquency.

All clients sign a behavioral contract immediately upon intake, in which they agree to abide by certain rules and regulations. These contract expectations include such areas as:

- cooperation with parents or foster parents;
- daily attendance and participation in school;
- cooperation with KEY staff;
- active employment searching;
- attendance and participation in all mandatory recreational activities;
- abidance with a pre-determined curfew; and
- no intake of illegal drugs or alcohol.

Program control is reinforced through intensive contact which can occur anytime, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, at home, in the neighborhood, at school/work, in the KEY office, or on a program activity. Specifically, program controls include daily contact with the client and family, daily school or employment checks, daily curfew monitoring, and school/employment behavior monitoring. Formal family meetings are conducted once a week and individual counseling occurs for a minimum of one hour weekly. A

minimum of one individual or group recreational activity is required after school or during the evening each week with an additional activity required each weekend. If a program participant is suspended from school, that participant will be required to stay at the KEY office during regular school hours. KEY staff also provide tutorial and homework instruction.

Programming for youth in Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus is characterized by a high level of staff awareness, intervention, and direction setting within the juvenile's life. Of the required daily contacts, it was reported that approximately 90 percent are in person. Each Outreach and Tracking caseworker is assigned a primary caseload of six to ten juveniles, with teams of two to three caseworkers providing team supervision through daily team meetings in which all clients are reviewed with the supervisor and other team members. In the residential component of Tracking Plus, there are five to five and a half residential caseworkers for every six juveniles. Casework staff are formally on duty during two shifts, between 8 a.m. and 11 p.m., and on call thereafter. In addition, at least one supervisor is on call in each region at all times. KEY attempts to locate each Outreach and Tracking office in a KEY residential facility to increase the control and appropriateness of the 24-hour telephone back-up provided by residential staff during the night time hours when Outreach and Tracking program staff are off duty.

A series of consequences is provided within the programs which may include grounding, time in the KEY office, riding with caseworkers, earlier curfews, restitution, or meetings with DYS staff to discuss contract violations. Compliance with the behavioral contract may also bring special privileges such as later curfew or individual recreation with the caseworker. Because KEY has DYS contracts for programs which include short- and long-term residential programs, KEY can quickly remove a child from the community and make a placement in a more restrictive setting, with notification to the DYS caseworker. Throughout the program, emphasis is placed on consistent consequences which may be administered by any of the team members.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The overall goal of the KEY program is to bring juvenile behavior under control and, after stabilizing behavior, develop a comprehensive plan for meeting the juvenile's needs.

Specifically, program goals are stated as follows:

1. Strengthen the quality of family life by having each family member achieve the highest possible level of independent functioning in the community;
2. Cope with normal periods of stress and adjust to changes caused by the developmental stages of growth;
3. Cope with crises and develop ways to resolve the crises;
4. Prevent the placement of adolescents in substitute care; and,

5. Ensure public safety by curtailing juvenile delinquency.

Within the overall context and philosophy established by the KEY Board of Directors, programs goals are operationalized and monitored through KEY contracts for services with designated state agencies. Within the Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus programs, the overriding goal is to maintain the child in a supportive community environment rather than removing the child from the family.

KEY collects a variety of client-specific information for case management and program monitoring. Manual information is batched from each region to a central microcomputer in the main administrative office, including demographic characteristics, illegal activity, and client termination data. This information is summarized annually into a year-end client statistical report. Illegal activity is summarized from court appearance forms recorded by direct care staff, and termination data is summarized from termination sheets completed by supervisors and regional directors. Additional information is summarized manually from client activity logs which are maintained by casework staff.

Regional directors complete a monthly report for the DYS. This extensive report summarizes financial activities, the number of youth served, the number of referrals, intakes completed, charges and arrest data, and personnel changes together with contractual issues and client activities in various components including school, employment, and various training programs.

Contract monitoring is conducted by the referring agency. For internal purposes, KEY prepares its own annual statistical report; however, source and automation limitations limit the amount of information that can be collected and the degree of analysis which can be undertaken. Currently, KEY has no provision for a routine follow-up of terminations to evaluate subsequent problems.

Based on fiscal year 1987 data, of the 2,139 clients in KEY programs, 164 (8 percent) appeared in court on a total of 194 new charges. Of these 194 new charges, 166 occurred among the 993 juveniles in the Outreach and Tracking or Tracking Plus programs. The number of Outreach and Tracking and Tracking Plus clients who appeared in court is not readily available.

In fiscal year 1987, there were 712 terminations from Outreach and Tracking, of which 53 percent were deemed positive, 26 percent negative, and 21 percent neutral. There were 93 Tracking Plus terminations, of which 62 percent were considered positive, 7 percent negative, and 31 percent neutral.

Specific research on the KEY program has not been conducted. However, at the time of deinstitutionalization in Massachusetts during the early 1970s, Harvard researchers Coates, Miller, and Olin (1978) compared a sample of youth drawn from the new community programs with another sample of youth who were recently released from training schools. The Harvard researchers found that the youth in the training schools had a higher recidivism rate than those in the community-based sample. Closer analysis

of the data suggested that the better structured programs, particularly those programs that were best at dealing with post-release community living issues, produced even better results. The Harvard research presents a strong empirical brief for intensive community-based services. For instance, they found that the youth in the community-based programs greatly improved, in terms of pro-social attitudes and behavior, while they were in the community-based programs, but these observed gains eventually disappeared as the youths coped with the forces of ordinary community living. Results of this study supported the emphasis on aftercare planning and community support services as the center of a continuum of correctional care.

Although the Harvard evaluation was not specifically of the KEY program, it did provide the momentum for encouraging the KEY program to develop in the Massachusetts environment. Although no systematic research or evaluations have been conducted of KEY, there has been general acceptance that KEY provides high quality services to juveniles.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

As a non-profit organization, KEY contracts directly with state agencies and the schools to provide the services specified in each individual contract. Within the referral structure, the individual state agencies retain case management for the child with a "grant of conditional liberty" to the KEY program. KEY expends considerable time and energy in developing professional

peer relationships both at the regional and state levels with each of the contracting sources. This enables KEY to function quickly and flexibly in response to the contractor's needs, and also assures that the contractors are aware and supportive of KEY's organizational and client-related decisions.

Because KEY emphasizes reintegration of the juvenile into the community and family, KEY staff are also expected to maintain positive working relationships with schools, employers, and other community resources.

SUMMARY

KEY has been in operation since the early 1970s and was among the first organizations to evolve after the deinstitutionalization of juveniles in Massachusetts. It experiences a high level of support from its contracting agencies at both the regional and state levels. Contracting for services provides the state agencies with a resource that is not necessarily less expensive than providing services internally; however, the states receive services that are considered more flexible and responsive to community needs and the best interest of the client.

KEY maintains high (BA or BS) employment standards for professional level positions and, with its policy of a 14-month maximum length of stay as a line caseworker, assures the contractor that direct services staff are both qualified and capable of performing at the necessary high energy level. These

strengths also provide a number of challenges to the KEY organization; principally, that it is difficult to find qualified employees within the immediate geographic area of the KEY programs. Consequently, KEY actively recruits in other states such as Texas and Pennsylvania and has established relationships with American Youth Work Centers in England, Canada, and Jamaica to recruit caseworkers on 18-month work visas. The high turnover rate at the caseworker level has been one factor facilitating the development of a strong chain of command and a clearly defined program structure. The well-defined structure of team leaders, supervisors, and regional directors systematize on-going procedures and provide for continuity despite the high staff turnover. Thorough operations manuals have also been developed for each KEY program and reflect regional variations.

Substantial attention is devoted to developing and reinforcing organizational values and philosophy for all staff. This attention to the corporate values and personnel development distinguishes KEY from other intensive supervision programs which also provide high levels of contacts with juveniles in an intensive supervision environment. From a replication standpoint, few organizations may be willing to invest such resources into personnel development. The importance of internal consistency and quality services which meet the requirements of the contractor become critical if KEY is to continue in an increasingly competitive contractual environment.

ASSOCIATED MARINE INSTITUTES, INC.
TAMPA, FLORIDA

The Associated Marine Institutes, Inc. (AMI) is a network of affiliated but separate training programs for delinquent youth. Each program has an autonomous Board of Trustees and separate incorporation. Fiscal management and contracting services are provided by the corporate office in Tampa, Florida. AMI, a private, non-profit organization, operates a wide range of programs including residential and nonresidential 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 nonresidential programs: Pinellas Marine Institute (PMI) and Tampa Marine Institute (TMI). These nonresidential 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 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. Progression to the next level is determined by staff in a meeting at which the youth explains why he/she should be advanced to the next level. Variations from one institute to another result from the autonomy that each program is afforded, the regional differences in the areas that they serve, and the personalities and administrative styles of the staff. Within the structured expectations for AMI staff, individuality is encouraged. Staff are encouraged to make the human connection while keeping with the overall AMI philosophy.

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 statistics indicate that overall 70 percent of participants in AMI programs successfully complete, with a recidivism rate of 20 percent over a three-year follow-up period. 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.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Associated Marine Institutes, Inc. (AMI) is a private, non-profit organization which operates twenty-two rehabilitative programs for delinquent teens in seven states: Florida, Louisiana, Texas, South Carolina, Delaware, Virginia, and Maryland. The institutes are located in a variety of settings and serve diverse youths and communities. They are located in both urban and rural areas.

State agencies and local school boards contract with AMI to provide services for delinquent offenders. AMI works with juvenile justice agencies in each of the seven states: the Department of Youth Services in South Carolina; Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services in Virginia; Texas Youth Council; Juvenile Services Agency in Maryland; Offices of Juvenile Services in Louisiana; the Department of Services for Children, Youth, and Families in Delaware; and the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (HRS) in Florida. This report focuses on two Florida programs, Tampa and Pinellas Marine Institutes.

Each of the institutes is a separate organization with an autonomous Board of Trustees and separate incorporation. The board members are community leaders who volunteer their services, facilitate communication with other community members, and serve in an advisory capacity for the institutes. The central AMI office, located in Tampa, Florida, coordinates and supervises the fiscal management and operations for all of the programs. It is

through the central office that all state contracts for services are negotiated.

The Associated Marine Institutes have their roots in the marine sciences. In the late 1960s, the Florida Ocean Sciences Institute (FOSI) was engaged in numerous research projects in oceanography. In 1969, the president of FOSI, Robert A. Rosof (now president and Chief Executive Officer of AMI), worked with a local juvenile court judge, Frank Orlando, to assign delinquent youth to participate in the activities of the institute.

The teens responded positively to their experience and the FOSI program eventually became a school to serve these youth. By 1972, similar programs were started in Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Jacksonville. The AMI was incorporated in 1974 to coordinate the growing number of programs. Although the original programs were centered around marine activities, as their numbers expanded, their foci became more diverse. However, the organization has retained the AMI title.

All of the AMI programs operate under the philosophy that teamwork and personal achievement will improve a delinquent youth's self perception and self respect. The AMI philosophy focuses on the youth and his/her interaction with staff, family, and the larger community. The basic tenets of the AMI philosophy include the following:

- The utilization of small, community-based programs
- Protection of the community and concern for public safety

- Well-trained and professional staff who are versatile and enthusiastic
- Creative and challenging activities and work experiences in marine and wilderness settings
- Sense of family and teamwork fostered by the close interaction of staff and student
- Realistic goal-setting and rewards for positive behavior as well as appropriate punishment for negative actions

The organizational structure of each of the nonresidential institutes is standard. The activities of each institute are guided by the executive director and overseen by a Board of Directors. The executive director is responsible for the overall operation of the facility, budget monitoring, and cooperation with the larger AMI organization. The director of operations supervises staff assignments, admissions, and the daily schedule. Each facility has at least two full-time educational instructors plus a third who provides GED (General Equivalency Diploma) training. The marine-based institutes employ several instructors: one each for diving, sailing, aquatics, and seamanship (also known as a "captain"). Secretarial staff includes a full-time administrative assistant and a part-time operations secretary.

Although each of the staff members has a specific set of tasks and responsibilities, job descriptions are not rigid. In carrying out the program, staff members are often asked to wear many "hats" and are expected to be flexible in carrying out supervision of the youths in the program. For example, teachers may be involved in an outing on the sailboat. The diving

instructor may run a group meeting. This team approach is the mainstay of the AMI program. Staff are encouraged to become certified in diving, both for their personal achievement and for the flexibility it will give them in the workplace. Administrative staff, in general, have risen through the ranks and are also trained in diving, sailing, and other marine activities.

Staff members are recruited to fill positions based on their specific training, but are then trained by AMI to be well-rounded youth counselors. AMI's focus is on finding enthusiastic people who are willing to share their expertise and time with youths who need their help. Therefore, an extensive formal education is less important than a special skill and a genuine interest in teaching young people.

This flexibility is apparent in the relationship among the various institutes as well. When the need arises, a line staff person may be transferred to another institute in either a similar position or as a promotion. AMI staff are aware of the fact that such a move may be expected of them.

Purchase of service agreements with state and local agencies do not cover all of the costs of operation of the institutes. Annual fund raising functions are sponsored to provide additional funds. All of the institutes are encouraged to develop fund raising activities in their own communities. The cost of operating the programs is also offset by the Unified Boat Program. It previously operated as a cooperative effort between

community members and AMI through which individuals would donate their boats for charter and eventual sale by AMI. Today, because of changes in tax laws, the primary focus is on the distribution of such boats for the institutes' use. This program also becomes a project for the youth in AMI. The students at an institute will work on preparing, cleaning, and scraping the boats. In the process, they also learn about operating a business and customer relations.

A typical operating budget for a nonresidential institute program is approximately \$476,000. Personnel salaries and benefits account for 50 percent of the operating budget. The other half of the budget is used for staff training, education supplies, facility and equipment maintenance, student transportation and insurance. The average cost per day in AMI nonresidential program is \$36.91. Whether or not a youth is committed or not has no bearing on the cost. Because the state pays for the placement in the program, the job of the HRS counselors is streamlined. From their perspective, this enhances the cost effectiveness of the program because their time is efficiently used and eliminates a great deal of paperwork.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The marine institutes are designed for youths 15-18 years of age who have a history of delinquent behavior. On the average, the girls and boys have committed 8 to 12 offenses before being enrolled in an AMI program. As of November, 1988, 351 youth were

enrolled in AMI's nonresidential programs in Florida. Ninety-five percent were male; 57 percent were white; 32 percent black and 11 percent "other" racial category.

The program is designed for older teens. The majority of youth accepted into the program are 15 or 16 years old (70 percent), with another 19 percent 17 years old. Less than 10 percent of AMI students are 14 years old or younger. The boating and diving activities around which the program revolves require a certain level of maturity. Some staff members observed that the younger teens provide a special challenge to program development.

In Florida, the main source of referrals is HRS, although a very few youths are referred by local school boards. Youths who are under supervision of HRS are there on a committed or probation status. Committed youths are screened through the Department's commitment placement process, as being appropriate for the marine institutes. Probation youths are referred directly by the HRS field supervisors. Fifty-four percent of the youths enrolled in AMI's nonresidential programs in Florida were committed.

A number of slots are targeted for each group, but those numbers are flexible. For example, if a site has filled its number of committed youth slots, more committed youth will still be accepted. Likewise, if the slots are not filled with committed youth, noncommitted youth will be accepted into those slots. As an example, at the Pinellas Marine Institute (PMI), 27 of the 45 slots are targeted for committed youth. Thirty-nine

youth at the Tampa Marine Institute (TMI) have been committed; ten have not. At both sites, AMI assists the local school system by occasionally accepting youths who cannot be adequately placed in local schools.

According to the HRS community control counselors, there are few options available to them for the placement of delinquent youth. In recent years, placement in a training school setting has become reserved for only the most serious offenders. On the other end of the juvenile justice spectrum, programs have been expanded for dependent and neglected youth. For delinquents who have the potential to be handled outside a training school setting, AMI is a desirable and needed program option.

In the case of noncommitted youth, the HRS counselor contacts the institute directly and gives the HRS liaison information about the youth such as delinquent history, school participation, and any available information about serious violent activity and/or drug abuse. A court order is not necessary to enroll the youth in the program. The youth begins the program as soon as possible.

Placement of committed youth is more formal. Upon contacting the program and ascertaining whether a slot is available, the HRS officer makes a recommendation to the juvenile court judge. Such recommendations are usually heeded by the judiciary.

There are some committed youths in the program who have spent time in residential placements prior to coming to AMI.

Staff interviewed agreed that the program did not work well as an aftercare program. Youthful offenders set their sights on "paying their dues" when they complete their time at a state school, and it is very difficult for them to "buy into" the AMI nonresidential program. Staff remarked that the program is disrupted by this group of offenders.

From the administration's point of view, however, the AMI programs are designed to handle the challenge of all the youths who are accepted into their programs. Younger youths, more serious offenders, and aftercare youths can all benefit from the educational and vocational opportunities afforded by the program. Of major importance is the willingness of the staff to meet any new challenges.

When youths are accepted into the program, AMI requires that a number of forms be filled out and signed before the youth can attend the daily program. First, the youth must have an extensive physical examination, and be certified to be in good health without any physical problems that would prevent him/her from participating in the aquatic activities. Because of the physical nature of the activities, the students must sign a number of insurance forms and release forms. Both the student and his/her parent or guardian are made aware of the kind of activities that are central to the program. A standardized accident and medical procedure in case of an emergency is explained.

Also included in the admissions packet is an explanation of the program and a contract that the student and parent or guardian must sign. The student has the responsibility to adhere to the expectations of the program. The parents have the responsibility of notifying the institute when a youth will be absent. The youth has the right to know that there is a formal grievance procedure. All of this information is kept up-to-date in the youth's individual file by the staff member who is assigned to the youth as advisor.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

The program's design is structured to encourage success rather than failure. At the core of the program is a level system which rewards the youth for positive behavior.

Individualized academic instruction, GED training, and the tasks associated with the marine and wilderness activities are the means by which the program operationalizes its philosophy.

Ideally, the size of the nonresidential programs varies between 30 and 40 youth. The maximum set by AMI policy is 50, although a program may exceed that temporarily. Population size and make-up also fluctuate given the number and type of referrals (ie. committed versus noncommitted youth). It is important that the programs stay as close as possible to the limit set because of the nature of the activities. Besides the classroom setting, the scuba, sailing, and diving activities require close supervision for the youths' safety. A too-large student to staff

ratio undermines the individualized attention that the AMI programs are designed to provide. The average staff to student ratio is 7:1.

The student's progress through the AMI program is closely monitored from beginning to end. An extensive case treatment plan is drawn up when the youth is admitted to the program. Information is gathered about the youth's strengths and weaknesses in several areas: social (home, community, institute), behavior, medical, and educational.

As the youth progresses through the program, records are kept of completed lesson plans and levels achieved, and staff contacts with the youth's family. An integral part of the individual assessment is how well the students meet short-term goals that are set throughout the youth's term in the program. These short-term goals are the means by which youths meet the expectations of the original contract.

The AMI nonresidential programs provide individualized classroom instruction in the traditional educational subjects, GED preparation and testing. The marine-based institutes also teach classes in marine sciences and give classroom training and certification in diving, sailing, and scuba diving. Youths are also required to complete vocational training preparation.

All youths are given an academic diagnostic test when they are first accepted into the program. Academic level determines whether a youth's curriculum will consist of remedial instruction or GED preparation. If a student's academic level shows the

youth to be prepared to take the GED exam, but the individual is younger than 16, he/she will be assigned individual work to increase his/her grade level. However, the youth will not be put into the remedial classroom. Because of the ages of the youths enrolled in the AMI programs, attainment of the GED rather than return to the school system is generally the goal. In 1987, nearly 250 students received their GED. In recent years, the number of youths graduating has increased each year.

Youths who are too far below their grade level earn their educational credits through remedial instruction. As they complete their lessons nearing program discharge, they are tested again. If they have satisfactorily completed the lessons required and have improved their level two grades, they are ready to be considered for dismissal from the program.

In addition to educational instruction, there are several rehabilitative components. Group meetings provide a means by which youths and staff can discuss daily events and issues that affect the day-to-day activities of the program. Special student boards are held regularly to determine whether students should be advanced to the next privilege level.

One important feature that impacts the effectiveness of program service is transportation. In order for a day treatment program to be effective, youths assigned to the program must have a way to get there. Students in the program are required to have consistent and regular attendance. The Pinellas Marine Institute (PMI) has a van which transports students to and from the

program. The staff believes that this service has helped to improve program attendance. A number of the students do not live close to the program and would have had difficulty getting there each morning. As it is, their day is several hours longer than that of youths who live nearby. The Tampa Marine Institute (TMI) also has a van. At TMI, youth who reach a certain level can earn the privilege of using their own transportation to get to the program.

How each institute organizes its daily and weekly schedules is determined by the program staff, provided the institute meets the basic AMI requirements for percentage of time involved in educational activities. The AMI policy is that approximately 50 percent of the students' time be spent in classroom activity. At any given institute this may vary from week to week and from program to program. It is the responsibility of the operations director and executive director to make sure that the overall standards are being met. The central AMI office monitors this activity.

School activities begin early in the morning and end at approximately four o'clock in the afternoon Monday through Friday. In general, supervision ends when the youths are returned home from the program or when they leave the premises. There are also special activities on the weekends, but these events are for those who have earned the privilege of taking part and are not scheduled for every week. Any given weekly schedule may vary from the next. Sometimes a weekly schedule can be

changed drastically by the weather which would prohibit the planned activity.

Each institute has a level system which rewards youths for positive participation in the program. As youths pass through the program, they accumulate points for positive behavior and completion of classroom work. The names of the levels reflect the marine nature of the program - swabby, deckhand, bosun, seaman, etc. The two programs that NCCD visited had slightly different level systems in terms of the level monikers, and requirements and privileges for each level.

The students' participation is recorded on a daily point card which is color coded according to the youth's current level. Each morning and afternoon the youth is given a score for his/her participation in program activities. Points are given for such things as "performance", "respect", "cooperation", and "attitude". The point card is the student's responsibility and must be with him/her at all times. When a youth is considered for a level increase, the point card is used as a record of how well the student is participating.

As a youth collects points, he/she can petition the staff to have his/her case heard at a committee meeting. In the meeting, the youth explains why he/she should be advanced to the next level. A number of staff are in the meeting who present their observations about the youth's behavior. Each staff member present at the meeting votes on whether or not to advance the youth to the next level. Once a youth has been awarded a higher

level, the expectations become greater. He/she is expected to take on more of a leadership role with the other students and to act as an example. Levels can be taken away if a youth is not performing like a person of that status should.

The criteria for program completion include a combination of factors: course completion requirements, positive behavior (level attainment), improvement in academic standing (increase in grade level), and a specific plan for the future upon release (job secured, return to school, or plan to enter military). The average length of stay in the program is approximately six months. In general, when a youth completes a Florida AMI program, the court dismisses him/her from the supervision of the HRS. AMI follows the court history of youths for three years after they leave the program.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

AMI has established goals related to individual attainment and organizational success. In relationship to the youths served, there are three primary goals of the AMI programs, namely:

- to reduce or eliminate recidivism
- to increase pre-vocational and vocational skills
- to increase academic skills

Since AMI believes that programs can only be as good as the staff running them, AMI has developed a specific set of expectations and requirements for its employees. The second set of goals, then, relates to the AMI organization:

- to operate the best youth service organization of its type in the world
- to provide service to as many youth as possible without compromising the quality of the service
- to significantly, positively impact every youth and individual enrolled or employed by AMI

The goals of the AMI program have remained constant over the years. There is a great sense of tradition and family in the AMI organization. Many employees have been associated with AMI for many years and have advanced to administrative positions. Therefore, the people who set AMI policy and who oversee institute operations have a strong sense of what the AMI program is all about. The AMI administration is committed to continually improving an already successful program.

Information concerning the success of AMI programs, both residential and nonresidential, is recorded in the Annual Operations Report, compiled from individual institute reports and submitted by the AMI Vice President of Operations. Included in the statistical report is information about enrollment, attendance, school levels achieved, and GED graduates. The statistical report also includes information about terminations from the program and subsequent recidivism among AMI graduates.

Seventy percent of the youth who are enrolled in an AMI program successfully complete the program (1987 data). As mentioned earlier in this report, nearly 250 youth received GED's in recent years. On the average, youth who began the program with less than a 6th grade level increased their school level by

16 months. Nearly 90 percent of the youth who completed AMI programs either went to school, got a job, or joined the armed forces.

Recidivism is measured over a three-year follow-up period. "Recidivism" is defined as being convicted of a criminal offense after having been enrolled in an AMI program. Approximately 80 percent of the youth remain crime free. Of the 20 percent who recidivate, younger youth are slightly more likely to repeat (21 percent for those admitted at 14 and 15 years of age versus 17 percent for those 16 years of age and older). The lower the academic level upon entry into the program, the more likely the youth was to recidivate.

This sample of statistics indicates that the AMI program is targeting the needs of youth who are most likely to become involved in delinquent activity. The AMI programs provide the needed educational and vocational skills to give the youth alternatives to continued delinquent and criminal behavior.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The Associated Marine Institutes work closely with the county and state juvenile services agencies who make referrals to their programs. Each institute must work closely with the school system; some youth are actually referred to a program specifically for remedial education. A youth's transition back to the regular school system is made smoother by a coordinated

effort between the school and AMI. The working relationship between institute and school varies across the system.

Community groups and businesses are also a key part of the AMI programs. The board members are community leaders who volunteer their services and monitor the institute's progress. The students at the various institutes are visible in the community since part of the program involves doing community service. Members of the surrounding community get involved with the local institute by donating boats, equipment, and real property. AMI is responsible to all of these constituents, in addition to the most important one, the youth.

SUMMARY

The Associated Marine Institutes provide successful community-based programming for delinquent teens in a variety of settings. The programs are based on the premise that youths who are engaged in challenging and interesting tasks can be steered away from delinquent behavior, improve their education, and become young people with a productive future.

The long-standing tradition upon which AMI is based provides an anchor for the development of new programs in more states and settings. The administration and staff at AMI must continue to be mindful of the changes that may evolve in the delinquent population and develop programs that meet those new challenges.

YOUTH ADVOCATE PROGRAMS, INC.
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. (YAP) is a private not-for-profit agency headquartered in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, whose purpose is to provide humane community-based alternative programs for the care and protection of individuals subject to compulsory care, supervision, treatment, and/or incarceration in public or private institutions. YAP's corporate philosophy is that youths have the best chance of success in community-based programs serving the entire family, and that the vast majority of troubled juveniles can be effectively and safely supervised in the community if appropriate support, treatment, and supervision services are provided. This philosophy pervades the entire corporate structure, influencing program, personnel, and administrative policies and procedures.

YAP was originally established in 1975 as an aftercare program serving juveniles leaving a Pennsylvania prison. It has since expanded to serve delinquent and dependent youth in both aftercare and alternative-to-placement programs. Currently, YAP operates 29 programs in various counties in 4 states (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland).

YAP provides intensive intervention services to youth and families through an advocacy model under which trained advocates are assigned to work with youths in individual, group, and family activities designed to meet each youth's social, educational, and vocational needs. Advocates have an average caseload of four youths. YAP has 4 service options, ranging from limited service, in which the advocate has at minimum 3 face-to-face contacts totalling 7.5 hours a week with each youth, to intensive service, which provides a minimum of 5 face-to-face contacts totalling 30 hours a week. These levels of face-to-face contacts generally occur on nights and weekends, and provide an extremely high intensity of supervision.

YAP also offers a Supported Work program, which is used after the youth has been stabilized in the community. This component is for older youth whose primary goal is employment. Employers are expected to hire the youth upon successful completion of the supported work training period. While in Supported Work, wages are paid by YAP.

NCCD's on-site visit was conducted at the Baltimore, Maryland program, which serves adjudicated delinquents who are at imminent risk of residential placement. During its first year of operation, the Baltimore program served 130 juveniles and achieved a positive discharge rate of 78 percent.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. (YAP) began in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania in 1975, as an aftercare program, with funding and clients from the Center for Community Alternatives. The Center was the agency assigned the responsibility by the State of Pennsylvania for removing juvenile offenders from a Pennsylvania adult state correctional institution and placing them into more appropriate community-based programs and settings. When the work was completed through the Center for Community Alternatives, YAP received a grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare to continue serving juveniles released from prison. YAP then began to solicit direct referrals from juvenile courts and county children and youth agencies. As YAP began receiving direct referrals from counties, the program population shifted from solely an aftercare program for delinquent youths who were returning to the community to a program also serving as an alternative to placement in the state's juvenile correctional facilities.

YAP continued to expand and now serves both delinquent and dependent youth in both aftercare and alternative-to-placement programs. YAP operates 26 programs in various counties in 4 states (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland). The NCCD on-site visit was conducted at the Baltimore, Maryland, program. The Baltimore YAP began in November of 1987, funded through the Maryland Juvenile Services Agency (JSA), the state

agency responsible for placement and services for adjudicated delinquent youth. The Baltimore program was started as a direct response to Maryland's closing of Montrose Reform School in March of 1988.

The theoretical basis for YAP is a strong belief that juveniles have the best chance of success in community-based programs which provide services to the entire family system. YAP believes that the vast majority of troubled juveniles can be supervised in the community if the appropriate support, treatment, and supervision services are provided. The YAP program model is designed to work with a variety of target populations, including the high risk juvenile offender.

YAP has a 12-member Board of Directors which meets at least annually. The founder of YAP serves as President of the Board and as Chief Executive Officer. Organizationally, the Executive Director and four Vice-Presidents/Directors assigned by geographic region report to the Executive Director. Each of the 29 programs has a director and administrative assistant. The administrative office, called the Support Center, is located in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, with ten staff positions. There are six program managers and four assistant managers.

Advocates are hired by the director of each program. Under the supervision of the director, advocates are responsible for initiating, organizing, planning, developing, and implementing direct advocacy services for assigned young people. According to the written job description, an advocate is responsible for

ensuring that all services, advocacy hours, contacts, specified activities and monies are provided to each assigned youth as required by the youth's Service Plan. The advocate develops a supportive relationship with each youth's natural family and, where appropriate, foster family, and involves the family in activities. The advocate develops objectives to be achieved with each youth and identifies changing needs and interests in order to update the objectives. Further, the advocate assures that the youth is participating in an appropriate educational/vocational program and/or is maintaining employment. Finally, the advocate makes necessary arrangements to acquire medical assistance coverage for eligible youth and monitor the youth's nutritional needs and general health status, and assist each youth to identify appropriate community resources and obtain needed services.

Advocates are not considered full-time employees of YAP and are ineligible for full employee benefits. They receive no medical/life insurance, vacation, or sick leave. Consequently, 70 percent of YAP's advocates have another part-time or full-time job. There are no specific educational or experiential requirements for advocates, making in-house training essential. Staff development and training sessions are held biweekly, with at least half of the sessions provided by outside resources. Training includes such topics as crisis intervention, nutrition, planned parenthood, drug and alcohol abuse, and child abuse prevention. While a professional background is not a

requirement, YAP's advocates include teachers, social workers, institutional counselors, and other human services professionals. A staff census taken in January of 1989 indicated that 72 percent of the advocates have at least a B.S. or B.A. degree.

Advocates are paid according to the number of youth assigned and the number of face-to-face service hours obtained with each youth up to the maximum service level approved by the referring authority (see Services section). Advocates have a caseload of at least two but no more than six youths, with an average caseload of four. Specially certified advocates may exceed the caseload standards and typically serve eight families. At low enrollment times, advocates have worked with just one youth. Minimum standards for individual and group time were established in 1987 to ensure a mix of intervention hours are provided (group, family, and individual contacts).

YAP's personnel and organizational policies are carefully designed to achieve the corporate mission and objectives. To assure that the contract service hours and contact standards are met, in addition to monitoring, YAP provides weekly (paid) supervision time for advocates. Administrative assistants are eligible for merit pay based upon correct submission of weekly and monthly reports. Directors are eligible for merit pay based upon the percentage of advocate service hours provided. As a result, the corporate rate for meeting weekly service standards was reported to be approximately 85 percent; with a 95 percent rate for the Baltimore program. Because YAP believes that

involvement of the family is so important in achieving the goals of the youth and program, YAP does not pay advocates for time spent working on behalf of a youth if neither the youth nor a family member is present. For example, if an advocate meets with school personnel on a youth's behalf, that time is not reimbursed. However, if the advocate brings a parent to a meeting with school personnel, that time is reimbursable. In part to ensure that youths are not maintained at too intensive a level of service, salaries for YAP administrative assistants, directors, vice presidents, and the Executive Director and President are based on the number of program participants.

YAP has a tight administrative structure, with a comprehensive policy and procedures manual, and sophisticated management information system and monitoring procedures. A program audit of the Baltimore Advocate Program completed in November of 1988 by JSA noted that "two particular strengths of the program are the advocacy model and their own internal monitoring system." The organizational environment is conducive to focusing strictly on the needs of the youths and families, and not on internal staffing concerns. This enables the program to quickly match a youth accepted into the program with an advocate who is best suited to meet the youth's needs.

YAP's operating budget in 1988 was \$4.5 million. At the Baltimore YAP, the program expended \$252,000 and served 130 juveniles during its first year of operation. Of 69 terminations, 54 (78 percent) were positive; 5 (7 percent) were

neutral; and 10 (14 percent) were negative. YAP defines a "positive discharge" as those situations where a youth moves to less restrictive care, remains at home, or resides independently. "Neutral discharge" is defined as those situations where a youth or a family refuses services, is AWOL, or serious injury or death prevents service delivery from starting. "Negative discharge" is defined as those situations where a youth is discharged to a more restrictive environment.

Because of what was described by both YAP and JSA staff as a "technical" error in a response to a Request for Proposal, it appears that JSA will not be continuing the Baltimore YAP beyond December of 1989. The circumstances leading to that decision became a focal point in the discussions on-site at the Baltimore YAP. The history of the Baltimore YAP is instructive to those developing juvenile intensive supervision programs that circumstances beyond a program's control can have major ramifications on the program's ability to continue to operate, regardless of how "successful" a program may be.

In 1987, new administrators in JSA were actively pursuing a community-based strategy for dealing with delinquent youth, including closing the Montrose Reform School. Individualized community-based treatment plans were developed for each juvenile at Montrose by the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives (NCIA), a non-profit agency headed by Dr. Jerome Miller, who was responsible for the closing of the Massachusetts training schools and development of a variety of community-based

options in the early 1970s. NCIA and JSA found that many of Baltimore's community-based service providers were reluctant or not structured to provide services to the juveniles leaving Montrose, believing they were too difficult to work with. Therefore, JSA asked YAP to submit a proposal to implement the program in the City of Baltimore to serve these "hard-core" youths. YAP agreed, and the Baltimore program began accepting participants in December of 1987, with most of the referrals being juveniles leaving Montrose.

By February of 1988, Baltimore YAP was serving 48 youths, with many more referrals coming from JSA than slots available. YAP approached JSA in Summer of 1988 to consider opening another YAP program site in Baltimore to serve the backlog of referrals. With JSA support, YAP opened a second office in August of 1988 and doubled its Baltimore enrollments. In October of 1988, insufficient funds were available for the program, so 59 youth had to be terminated immediately and the second office was closed.

JSA will not continue funding the Baltimore YAP beyond December of 1989 because YAP's 1990 proposal was disqualified on a technicality. The program audit conducted by JSA in November of 1988 found the program in substantial compliance with the requirements of the contract, and found it to be "a sound and highly accountable program," with the "components of the program ... well planned and executed." All JSA officials interviewed indicated support and appreciation for the work YAP had done, and

labelled it "unfortunate" that YAP could not continue to serve Baltimore youth, citing the restrictive Maryland procurement requirements as the sole reason for the decision to discontinue funding.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

YAP provides service to delinquent, dependent, abused, mentally/emotionally disturbed, and retarded young people, both male and female. Services are provided to pre-adolescent children (7 to 12 years of age) as well as acting out, troubled youth (13 to 18 years of age) who are in need of family-based services to remain with or return to their natural or extended families. YAP also works with young adults who have exceeded the age of majority if the individual is under the jurisdiction of a contract agency.

Youths who are not deemed appropriate are those who are a demonstrable danger to themselves or the community, are profoundly retarded, or have a physical handicap that severely restricts their access to the community or requires constant medical attention. These exclusionary criteria are not considered absolute, and each referral is reviewed individually. Specific contracts with specific funding agencies may narrow the target group population to deal specifically with the funding source's client population. The original contract with JSA specified that Baltimore YAP was to serve City of Baltimore residents aged 14 or younger who were presently placed or at

imminent risk of placement in residential facilities. YAP staff indicate that the age limits have been changed to allow services to juveniles ages 9 to 18.

Referrals to YAP generally come from the funding agency. In Baltimore, JSA Juvenile caseworkers complete a referral form, and with the supervisor's approval, forward it to YAP. Accompanying the referral are applicable client reports, including recent psychological, psychiatric, and medical reports as well as educational records, arrest history, institutional records, and referring agency's family service plan. If referrals exceed available openings, JSA maintains a backlog of referrals.

While there are written exclusionary criteria, in practice YAP accepts virtually all program referrals. The Executive Director could recall only two referrals rejected in the program's history. One JSA official felt the Baltimore YAP was too "soft-hearted" in accepting all referrals from JSA. However, another official identified YAP's open door policy as a major program strength in that YAP. From that administrator's viewpoint, unlike other private providers, YAP does not pick and choose who it will accept, but is willing to work with the most difficult youth.

The JSA program audit report presents the following participant profile for the Baltimore YAP:

Sex:	Males	74%
	Females	26%
Age:	11-13	21%
	14	19%
	15	36%
	16-18	24%

Number of Delinquent Charges:

1	24%
2	29%
3	19%
4 or more	28%

Number of Out-of-Home Placements:

0	29%
1-2	31%
3 or more	41%

Factors for removal from home most frequently cited by JSA are as follows:

- 1) Unmanageable behavior, unable to comply with adults/parents, behavior problems
- 2) Truancy
- 3) School problems, fighting, non-compliance, disrespect
- 4) Parent has problem (ie. alcoholism, drug use)
- 5) Unstable environment
- 6) Runaway
- 7) Curfew violations
- 8) Number and type of charges

Offenses committed by youths include: stealing, shoplifting, possession of weapon, illegal entry, possession of drugs, intent to distribute, auto theft, breaking and entering,

assault, destruction of property, disturbing the peace, trespassing, disorderly conduct, firesetting, purse snatching, sex offenses, larceny, theft, and robbery.

Whether the Baltimore YAP enrollments are truly those who are at imminent risk of placement in residential facilities is not well documented. Each JSA worker, with supervisor concurrence, determines whether or not the juvenile being referred meets this criteria. In a review of YAP client files, the JSA program auditor identified a "couple" of youth she believed were not at risk of out-of-home placement. Given the profile of juveniles served during the program's first year and the "open door" policy of YAP in accepting the most difficult clients, it appears that the Baltimore YAP has, in general, been serving the appropriate target population. The Baltimore YAP has, however, become more of an alternative to placement and less of an aftercare program; as of February of 1989 the population was comprised of approximately 75 percent alternative and 25 percent aftercare clients. The client population could, therefore, become lower risk without monitoring to ensure that the selection criteria is being adhered to by JSA workers.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

After a referral has been received, the YAP director completes an intake interview with the referred juvenile and his/her parents or guardian in the youth's home, if possible, to maximize family involvement. Initial service goals are

established and reviewed with the referring worker. Upon authorization of services, an Individual Program Description (IPD) is forwarded to the committing judge, referring worker, and family. The director typically assigns an advocate within 48 hours of acceptance, and a letter is sent to the youth and parents notifying them of the youth's acceptance into YAP. The referring agency retains legal and case management responsibility while the youth is enrolled in YAP.

Within 30 days of acceptance, the director completes an Individual Service Plan (ISP). To maximize the family's active participation in the planning and implementation, an ISP conference is held in the youth's home, attended by the director, referring worker, advocate, and other involved service providers. At this time, goals are formulated for each of the following areas: family interaction, residence, educational/vocational development, employment/career development, health/hygiene, and social development. For each of the goals indicated, specific objectives are identified which include target dates, the person responsible, evaluation criteria and community linkages. Considerable emphasis is placed upon life skills development of the youth and family, through the use of a Life Skills Achievement Inventory, which is introduced at the ISP conference.

Each youth's service needs and progress are assessed weekly on the advocate's activity sheets and in a meeting with the director. Monthly progress reports are prepared and sent to the referring worker, committing judge, and the youth's parents or

guardian. The report details the service hours and activities provided, educational or vocational progress, employment status, and if applicable, re-arrests and outcomes, reports of special incidents, and other pertinent data.

A review of the ISP is conducted quarterly by the director at a meeting involving the youth and family, advocate, involved social service providers, and referring worker. The purpose of the conference is to review the youth's and family's progress on the ISP goals, the youth's progress on life skills, and community linkages developed during the quarter. The ISP is amended as needed and is forwarded to the referring worker and the family.

The primary component of YAP is the Community Advocacy Program, which provides intensive intervention services to youth and families through an advocacy model in which a consistent relationship is established between a supportive, trained advocate and the youth and family. An important aspect of the program is that advocates are selected on the basis of mutual interests so that a trust relationship may be developed. Every effort is made to hire advocates from the community in which the clients reside. This promotes an understanding of community and knowledge of community resources, and aids in the recruitment of staff who reflect the community's culture. YAP believes that this advocate/client relationship is the foundation for the development and growth of the youth's individual strengths and capabilities within the context of the family and community.

Advocates are assigned to work with youths in individual, small group, and family activities designed to identify and meet the youth's social, educational, and vocational needs. In addition, assistance is provided to other family members, including parents, in resolving conflicts that impact upon the family's ability to function in a positive manner. Advocates are reimbursed \$15 per week per client for expenses incurred in approved social, educational, and employment-related activities in which the youth and advocate participate together. Each youth also receives a \$5 weekly allowance at the discretion of the advocate. YAP policy limits recreational activities to one-third of the service option hours. Two-thirds of the service hours are to be spent in goal-oriented activities such as tutoring, financial planning, life skills education, job hunting, and decision-making skill development.

There are four service options available. The director determines which option is most appropriate for a youth at the time of acceptance. Changes during the youth's participation may result in the service level being increased or decreased, based upon the juvenile's needs. Generally, a youth starts at a more intensive service level, with the level reduced as the youth progresses in meeting his/her goals. Reasons for increasing the service level include a new charge, poor parental control, court order, regressed behavior, or increased unsupervised time. The four options are:

Service Option	Total # Face-To-Face Hours Per Week	Minimum Individual Youth And/Or Family Hours	Maximum Group Hours	Minimum Face-To-Face Contacts	1987-88 Daily Per Diem
Limited Service	7.5	1.5	6.0	3	\$14.50
Regular Service	15.0	2.5	12.5	3	\$19.00
Intermediate Service	22.5	3.5	19.0	5	\$23.50
Intensive Service	30.0	4.5	25.5	5	\$28.00

YAP also offers a Supported Work Program, which is used after the youth has been stabilized in the community. This component is for older youth whose primary goal is employment. While continuing with an advocate, a designated number of service hours are devoted to Supported Work employment. Supported Work is limited to those employers who can provide vocational development in skilled or semi-skilled positions or trades so that job skills are transferrable. Supported Work employers are expected to hire the client upon successful completion of the employment training period. While in Supported Work, client wages are paid by YAP, with the referring authority billed according to the Community Advocacy Program per diem rates.

Using the same hourly service options as with the Community Advocacy Program, youth are typically employed at 22.5, 15, or 7.5 hours a week. The youth continues to be seen by an advocate, usually at 7.5 hours a week, to monitor the youth's progress at the work site as well as continue other services. The employer

or advocate is reimbursed up to \$15 a week for work-related expenses such as needed tools, equipment, or uniforms. Supported Work contracts usually operate for two to three months.

YAP emphasizes education and employment, since the program believes that economic self-sufficiency is a critical element needed to break the recidivism cycle. An advocate is responsible for seeing that linkages to other needed services are available, either through direct advocacy or by working through the caseworker. If a participant gets in further trouble with the law, an advocate or director may appear on behalf of the youth before the court. At times, the YAP staff have recommended a disposition different from that which the caseworker from the referring agency has recommended. While this has caused some friction with funding sources, YAP feels strongly that its role of youth advocate requires this approach.

While YAP sees itself as an advocacy program and not a surveillance program, the extensive nature of face-to-face contacts provides an intensive level of program control. Under the intensive service level, an advocate meets with a youth 30 hours a week, usually on nights and weekends. Even at the limited service level, advocates see the juvenile 7.5 hours a week, which is more direct contact than that of many intensive supervision programs.

While sanctions are not an emphasis of the program, advocates may withhold the \$5 weekly allowance from the youth as a program sanction, and may also restrict participation in

recreational activities. YAP attempts to get parents to set sanctions themselves for their child's inappropriate behavior. YAP does not use discharge from the program as a sanction. Generally, negative discharges occur when the court or referring agency places a youth out of home and YAP can no longer work with the youth. YAP will continue to serve a youth, if appropriate, even if the youth has been placed out of home.

The length of stay in YAP is typically six to nine months. The original contract with JSA specified an average length of stay in the Baltimore YAP of four to six months; however, actual length of stay has been longer. A JSA official indicated that YAP keeps participants on the program longer than JSA wants, and a new contract has been negotiated to strictly limit enrollment to six months.

Discharge plans are formulated through the quarterly review process, and community linkages and a target discharge date are established. Youths are not discharged until YAP and the referring authority agree that the youth and family are ready. All ISP goals do not have to be completed before discharge. Generally, progress will have been made on all goals, and additional services needed by the youth and family are to be in place prior to discharge. Before the discharge date, a narrative discharge summary is sent to the committing judge, referring worker, and the youth's parents or guardian. In Baltimore, juveniles successfully completing YAP may be terminated from

probation or may continue on probation under regular supervision, with the length of supervision decided by the court.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The goal of YAP is to provide to social service and judiciary agencies a cost-effective alternative to residential care as well as aftercare service to those who are returning to the community. This is also the stated objective in YAP's contract with JSA. This goal is consistent with the corporate mission and philosophy of YAP. Program objectives relating to outcomes were not identified.

A strength of YAP is in its management information and monitoring systems. YAP has a computer-assisted client information system which produces for YAP administrators, directors, and referring authorities monthly client and summary statistical reports. These computer reports are generated through intake, progress, and termination reports prepared by advocates and directors. The monthly client report shows each youth's progress on educational, residential, behavioral, and employment-related goals to enable the reader to quickly assess whether or not client goals are being met. It identifies previous placements, last quarterly review, service hours received and contacts made, major activities with the advocate, noteworthy linkages, and demographic and health information. The report reflects the youth's activities and status during the reporting period and compares it to the youth's status prior to intake,

including arrest information, school status, and restitution information.

The statistical report is generated from the client progress reports, and reflects a statistical overview of each program's client population. The report shows a breakout of the population by service level, sex, race, and delinquent/dependent status. There is also a matrix which distributes the client population by age and provides data on school enrollment, status, and performance as well as employment. Arrest information by offense category, residence status, and runaway information is also provided. The program reports can be summarized by geographic region, state, and for the corporation as a whole.

Services are monitored by the program director and by the support center staff through the confidential advocate pay, activity, and progress report. This weekly report is completed for each client and presents a detailed report of the advocate's time and services provided. The report also identifies the permanency planning goal and ISP objectives, and efforts made during the week to work toward meeting the objectives. The progress reports serve as the primary documentation of client services; source documentation for advocate pay, agency billing, monthly client reports, and agency statistical reports; and primary documentation for external and internal auditors and monitors. Every report is reviewed with the advocate by the program's administrative assistant. A support center program manager also reviews each report and notes positive feedback as

well as corrective action required. At various intervals, the progress reports are submitted for monitoring by the telephone monitor (see below), who records the results of the calls on the report.

Each family is mailed a monthly progress report which describes service hours and activities provided. A letter with a postage-paid envelope is enclosed which requests confirmation of services and an indication of whether the family is satisfied with program services. A contract monitor calls each family every other month to determine if the advocate has visited the family as reported, and if the family is satisfied with the services provided. (Parents may also call the support center collect). These responses are reviewed and summarized by a program manager and sent to the director. Where fraud is suspected, the director completes an investigation within five working days. Confirmation of fraud results in the immediate termination of the advocate's employment with a credit adjustment made to the referring agency's bill.

A discharge and follow-up analysis is compiled monthly for external and internal evaluation of client outcomes. Each youth and family is contacted 1 month, 6 months, and 12 months after discharge to determine the youth's status and to evaluate the long-term effect of the services provided. Outcome at discharge and at follow-up are rated either positive, neutral, or negative, as defined earlier in this report. Statistics for each program include monthly and year-to-date results. For 1987-88, YAP

discharged a total of 1,138 delinquent or dependent youths, of which 817 (72 percent) were positive discharges, 88 (8 percent) were neutral, and 233 (20 percent) were negative.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

As a not-for-profit organization, YAP contracts directly with state and local juvenile justice, social services, and mental health agencies to provide advocacy services to juvenile client populations specified in each contract. (In addition to serving JSA clients, the Baltimore YAP also has a small contract with the Maryland Department of Social Services to serve a limited number of abuse/neglect clients.)

YAP also works hard to develop a good working relationship with the Juvenile Court. Advocates go to court with families to provide support. They review probation officer recommendations and, as previously mentioned, will develop alternative plans for the court if they disagree with the probation officer's recommendation.

In addition to agency-wide linkages, the development of community linkages for clients is an important part of the advocate's job in implementing the ISP. YAP considers it to be a major function of the program to help youths and families develop positive relationships and support systems with their communities and extended family systems. Linkages include the public schools, extra-curricular school activities, alternative educational programs, and employment. Other support systems may

include affiliation with local YMCAs, YWCAs, scouting, church groups, or other community activities. Where professional assistance is indicated, advocates are to assist the probation officer with referral to mental health programs, counseling services, medical resources, parent support groups, drug and alcohol services, legal services, and others as needed. These linkages to community resources and support systems are important in sustaining community adjustment after YAP services are terminated.

The Baltimore YAP has shied away from publicity, wanting instead to prove its success before widely publicizing the program. Ironically, this lack of wide-spread public and political support has undoubtedly hurt the program in its efforts to be considered for future funding in Maryland.

SUMMARY

As a private not-for-profit agency, YAP has more flexibility and can respond more quickly to community and client needs than can most governmental programs. The advocate model provides extensive face-to-face contact with each youth--7.5 to 30 hours per week--which provides an extremely high intensity of service. The model calls on staff to be an advocate for each youth in the fullest sense of the word. It provides troubled youth with a trusted role model which probation officer program models cannot fully duplicate, since the probation officer must serve many roles, including officer of the court.

The strong corporate philosophy permeates the staff and agency. There are no educational or experiential requirements for advocates. Instead, the focus when hiring is on finding persons who want to work with troubled kids and families and understand and support the corporate philosophy that the community-based approach is in the best interest of the youth, family, and community. YAP's willingness to work with youths with whom other program operators will not reflects this strong commitment to the community-based approach.

The corporate structure is also a program asset. YAP has been operational for 14 years, allowing for systems development. There are well defined and documented procedures and policies designed to work toward the corporate mission. The internal monitoring system in particular provides a level of program accountability which has not often been found in other programs.

Being a private agency can also be a weakness, as evidenced in the Baltimore program history. YAP is dependent upon the outside agencies for funding, target group definition, and referrals. While governmental programs also depend on political support, YAP has less control over its own destiny than governmental programs which have a generally greater degree of program control.

Another potential problem is that since YAP does not control program referrals and accepts all youth referred to it, it cannot assure that the youths being served meet its stated target population: youths who are in need of community-based services

in order to remain with or return to their natural or extended families. This definition can be readily determined with aftercare clients. For alternative-to-placement clients, this determination is more difficult to document. Without this documentation, however, a program may become a probation enhancement program rather than truly an alternative to out-of-home placement. For example, when JSA counselors were asked risk factors for removal from the home present in youth referred to Baltimore YAP, "number and type of charges" was only the sixth most frequently cited response. Truancy and school problems rated higher, and curfew violations were cited as often as offense history.

YAP presents a unique program model for serving delinquent youth as an alternative to institutionalization. Its success has demonstrated that community-based programs can serve as an alternative for out-of-home placement for even the most troubled youth, given the proper supervision, support, and services.

KENTFIELDS REHABILITATION PROGRAM
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

The Kentfields Rehabilitation Program in Grand Rapids, Michigan is a community-based sixteen week work/school and group therapy program operated by the Kent County Juvenile Court. To be eligible for the program, a youth must be an adjudicated delinquent on probation and living at home. The target population is youth with a history of school problems and law violations for whom out-of-home placement would otherwise occur. Kentfields operates on a behavioral management system where positive behavior in the home, community and school is reinforced through a "token economy" system. Participants are required to progress through various levels by earning points in school, on the worksite, and at home according to certain performance criteria. The points are redeemable for money and for restitution payments.

The school/work portion of the program lasts for eight weeks. As a group, a maximum of fourteen participants attend an alternative school in the morning and work at a designated community worksite in the afternoon. After completing the school/work phase, a juvenile enters the aftercare phase for an additional eight weeks. The purpose of aftercare is to provide a placement in a stable work or school setting with the goal of discharge from probation upon completion of all program requirements. During aftercare, a participant is phased off the reinforcers (points) which have effectively controlled his/her behavior.

Kentfields serves approximately 90 to 100 juveniles a year. The program was established in 1966, making it one of the first programs of its kind. Since adopting its current format in 1977, Kentfields has had a successful completion rate averaging 68 percent over the last eleven years. It is a stable program with strong judicial, political, and community support, and a dedicated staff with a strong sense of mission and belief in the behavior modification model. Kentfields has maintained its initial conceptual design while continuing to improve on the operational and structural components.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Kent County, with a population of approximately 474,000, is located in west central Michigan. Grand Rapids, the largest city in the county, has a population of approximately 187,000. Kent County is one of the fastest growing areas of Michigan, with an unemployment rate generally below the state average. The population of the county and the major urban area is primarily white, although the minority population of Grand Rapids is more than double that of the county as a whole. The crime rate for Kent County as of 1987 was below the state and national averages.

The Kentfields Rehabilitation Program was first established in 1966 through private foundation funds and operated as an independent project. When foundation funding expired, the Kent County Juvenile Court continued the program with county and municipal funding. The Juvenile Court assumed operation and administration of the program in July of 1969. The Court viewed Kentfields as a response to the increasing use of institutional placement which was becoming more expensive, with less than desired effectiveness in rehabilitating juveniles.

Kentfields has a strong theoretical base with a behavior modification approach. The treatment philosophy is the psychology of change rather than the psychology of adjustment. It is the program's premise that all behavior, deviant and non-deviant, is learned and, therefore, behavior patterns can be unlearned and new behavior patterns may replace them. It is not the program's goal to have juveniles adjust to or necessarily

understand the forces controlling their behavior, but to try to change as many of these conditions as possible.

Kentfields is part of the Juvenile Court's Field Department, which also includes Casework Services and the Juvenile Honor Camp. The Court also operates a Juvenile Detention Center, an Adoption Department, and a Crisis Intervention Program. The Director of Court Services administers these programs under the jurisdiction of the Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Division of the Probate Court. Of the four judges elected to the Kent County Probate Court, two are assigned full-time to the Juvenile Court and two work one day a week in the Juvenile Court. In 1987, the Juvenile Court employed 126 persons, with total expenditures of \$8.8 million.

Kentfields has three staff positions: a program director who oversees the general operation and administration of the program; a probation officer who handles the casework responsibilities for the program; and a work supervisor/counselor who acts as a van driver, classroom aide, and work supervisor/community liaison for the community service component of the program. In addition, the Grand Rapids School District provides a teacher. Kentfields had a 1988 operating budget of \$127,600, with Kent County funding approximately 60 percent of the program costs and the State of Michigan funding the remaining costs.

During 1987, the program served 90 juveniles, with the same number projected for 1988. Maximum program enrollment is 25 to

35, with enrollment in the school/work phase strictly limited to 14 juveniles. The 1988 daily per diem rate for Kentfields was \$13.87, with an average length of stay of 196 days.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The target population is youths between the ages of 14 and 16 (although 13 and 17 year olds are accepted), with histories of school problems and law violations, who are failing probation, and for whom out-of-home placement is pending. In the State of Michigan, crimes committed by 17 year olds are the jurisdiction of the adult court. However, 17 year olds can be ordered to Kentfields as a disposition for crimes committed when the juvenile was 16 years old.

This target population has evolved over time. Originally, Kentfields was used solely as an alternative to institutionalization. Since then, Kentfields has diversified in that it is no longer considered to be a program only for the "last chance" youngster. The program now serves as an alternative to any out-of-home placement, and serves juveniles with a wider range of needs and concerns. Two principal reasons were attributed to this change in target group: 1) there is a greater tendency today in Kent County to waive to adult court those who have committed serious crimes; and 2) Kent County has developed other programs which can also serve a juvenile in lieu of institutionalization. (For example, an adolescent sex offender treatment program was begun in 1987 and an intensive

surveillance program was implemented in 1988.) This changed target population is, therefore, somewhat inconsistent with the goal of providing an alternative to institutional placement.

To be eligible for Kentfields, a youth must be an adjudicated delinquent on probation and living at home (a requirement to qualify for state diversion funding). The program serves males and females, although most participants are males. Kentfields screens out juveniles who are severely retarded, those with severe alcohol or other drug abuse problems, and those who are involved habitually in prostitution.

A juvenile is referred to Kentfields through his/her probation officer. Typically, the youth is a school dropout or having school problems, and is failing on probation (has committed a new law violation). Occasionally, a juvenile may be accepted if probation adjustment is deteriorating, even without a new offense. Other community-based alternatives should have first been tried prior to referral to Kentfields. The probation officer completes a referral sheet which includes the juvenile's court history, current petition, restitution requirements, length of time on probation, reason for referral, transportation plans, goal for the juvenile after graduation from Kentfields, previous treatment plans, alternative if child fails Kentfields, and other salient factors. With the supervisor's approval, the probation officer submits the referral form and discusses the case with the Kentfields director. If the Kentfields director agrees to accept the referral, the probation officer recommends participation in

Kentfields as a disposition to a juvenile judge. All juveniles placed in Kentfields must have a dispositional order signed by a judge. Because of the good communication which exists between the Kent County juvenile judges, probation officers, and the Kentfields program, the director's recommendation is usually accepted. Because the program does not have final control over the population, a judge will order an occasional admission over the director's objections when the juvenile does not meet the target group criteria. However, there was general agreement about the program's target population among those interviewed. They agreed that if the program did not exist, out-of-home placement would be the alternative for the participants. The program generally appears to be serving those for whom it is designed.

Participant profile information is not compiled on an annual basis. The 1986 annual report presented the following participant profile:

Sex:	Males	88%
	Females	12%
Race:	White	44%
	Black	47%
	Other Minority	9%
Average Age at Referral:		15.2 years
Average Grade Level:		8th grade

Status in Year Preceding Kentfields:

Regular School:	30%
Alternative School:	53%
Not in School or Working:	14%
In an Institution or County Detention:	3%

Average Number of Referrals
to Juvenile Court: 2.9

Average Length of Time on Probation
Prior to Referral: 1.2 years

Offenses Leading to Kentfields
Placement:

Assaultive:	19%
Property:	63%
Other (Drugs, Prostitu- tion, Status):	18%

The director believes this profile generally reflects the current Kentfields population, except that the racial makeup is generally approximately 50 percent white and 50 percent minority. From this profile, one can see that the typical Kentfields participant is a 15 year old male who is in an alternative school, working at the 8th grade level. He has been on probation for over a year and has had nearly three referrals to Juvenile Court.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

There is no structured assessment phase in the Kentfields program. The referring probation officer prepares a case plan which is summarized on the Kentfields referral form. Following the dispositional order, the Kentfields director and the Kentfields probation officer meet with the juvenile and his/her

parents to discuss the program and answer questions. The orientation session focuses primarily on the first phase of the program, the school/work component. At the point of enrollment, the case is transferred from the original probation officer to the Kentfields staff, who have sole responsibility for the case. Juveniles always start on a Monday to give them a fair chance at earning points that week.

At the end of the school/work phase, the juvenile, parents, director, and probation officer meet again to assess the first eight weeks and to set individual goals. The probation officer then prepares a written aftercare treatment plan with goals for the youth, parents, and officer. As part of the plan, parents agree to provide supervision and accurate feedback on home progress to program staff.

Approximately every three months during the program, each juvenile appears before a judge for a review hearing. These hearings are designed to enable the judge to provide positive as well as negative feedback to the juvenile on his/her behavior and program performance, and to keep the Court informed on the juvenile's progress.

Kentfields operates on a behavioral management system, where positive behavior in the home, community, and school is reinforced through a "token economy" system. Participants are required to progress through various levels by earning points in school, on the worksite, in the community, and at home according to specified performance criteria. If a participant does not

earn the required amount of points in a week, he/she stays at the same level and does not progress. If a participant repeats three weeks, he/she is considered in violation of probation and may appear before the judge for a review of order.

School/Work Component. The school/work portion consists of four levels lasting two weeks each (eight weeks total). This component runs from Monday through Thursday. Friday is a combination of school activities and a group meeting. As a group, the participants attend school in the morning and work at a designated worksite in the afternoon. The worksite supervisor/counselor picks up participants in the morning at their homes or at a specified pickup point in the Kentfields van. (The van has room for fourteen juveniles, which sets the enrollment cap.) The work supervisor/counselor brings the juveniles to the school, takes them to lunch at the juvenile detention center, and to and from the afternoon worksite. The worksites are provided by the City of Grand Rapids, Kent County, and volunteer and service agencies.

Participants must earn 80 percent of the possible points in the first level (June Bug) and 90 percent of the points in the second level (Junior). In the third (Ace) and fourth (Helper) levels, participants must earn 100 percent of the points and show increasing levels of leadership and responsibility.

The point system is the heart of the program. Participants earn points for attendance; being on time; school, lunch room,

and work site behavior and performance; group meeting participation; and home behavior. Total possible weekly points range from 3,085 for June Bugs to 3,660 for Helpers, with additional bonus points possible. Points are exchanged for money at a penny a point with \$10 per week maximum, except the "high point person" for the week earns \$20. Excess points are kept in the juvenile's balance and redeemed in the aftercare component or used to make restitution payments. If a juvenile is involved in a law violation or has excessive absences, he/she is placed on inactive status and no longer receives a paycheck. The matter is handled as a violation of probation, with a judge deciding the juvenile's future status in the program. If terminated, the juvenile forfeits his/her point balance. If continued on the program, the balance is maintained and the paychecks are resumed.

A teacher assigned to the Kentfields program by the Grand Rapids Public School System conducts the school program, with the work supervisor/counselor serving as a teacher's aide. The class is held in an alternative high school for four hours Monday through Thursday, with a shortened session on Friday. On the first day, students take the Wide Range Achievement Test to determine appropriate grade level placement. Typically, participants are three to four grade levels behind. At Kentfields, the student begins working on materials at a level where he/she can experience success. The students also take a self-awareness test. The teacher and counselor use these test

results to better understand the students; the students use the information to discover the motivation behind their behavior.

The curriculum focuses on both basic and functional skills. Subject areas are mathematics, reading, science, English, social studies, and history. The only elective is woodshop. The school emphasizes reading and mathematics, as well as practical skills such as filling out job applications and various other forms. School credits are earned depending upon the amount of work that is completed in a particular subject area.

After lunch at the detention center, work projects are done as a group for two hours each Monday through Thursday afternoon. Specific work can be assigned either as a team project or as an individual project. Juveniles are expected to complete the assigned work tasks and cooperate with other participants. In 1988, the Kentfields work component provided over 1,100 hours of community service work in volunteer services to participating agencies.

Juveniles receive points for each hour of work completed, and for returning tools to the work supervisor. Further, each juvenile receives point bonuses for good behavior and good work performance. The juveniles also receive points for staying in their seats and not smoking in the van.

On Friday mornings, group sessions are held following a shortened school day. The purposes of the group meetings are to exchange information between the juveniles and staff; to provide an opportunity for juveniles to share their problems with the

other participants and to learn how to handle them through the group process; to allow the group to develop contracts for specific individuals in specific behavior situations, if needed; and to try to shape positive alternative attitudes in deviant behavior situations. An Ace leads the meeting and receives ten more points than the highest member of the group. The other members receive five points for each positive comment or question that helps encourage discussion.

Recreation activities and field trips make up the last part of the school/work component. Periodically throughout the year, Kentfields schedules activities so the group and staff can interact on a more personal level. Each youth who attends receives points for attendance, participation, and behavior. Activities include bowling, fishing trips, movies, and trips to baseball and basketball games and amusement parks.

Aftercare Component. The aftercare component begins immediately following completion of the school/work component. The purposes of aftercare are to provide an immediate placement in school or work, and to phase the juvenile off the point system. The aftercare component is eight weeks long, with four levels of two weeks each. Points are earned only in Levels I through III.

While the number of possible points which can be earned decreases in the aftercare component, the juvenile continues to receive the money that he/she has earned while participating in the school/work part of the program and the first six weeks of

aftercare. There is also an inactive phase in which a juvenile who has paid all ordered restitution and has not used up all the points during Level IV will continue to receive the remainder of his/her "bankroll" until it is gone. This inactive period also offers additional time for observation of the juvenile before discharge.

Three areas of behavior are monitored and reinforced during aftercare: home behavior, street behavior, and school behavior and performance. (For those working, job behavior is monitored in place of school behavior.) Each juvenile must earn a specific number of points each week in order to progress: 2,500 points for school behavior and performance and a total of 1,100 points for home and street behavior. If a juvenile does not earn the required number of points in a week, he/she earns no points that week, must repeat the week, and loses 2,000 points out of his/her balance.

Three repeated weeks in aftercare result in a return to Court. The aftercare manual tells juveniles what could happen then: "If the Judge takes you out of Kentfields, you will lose all of the money you made in the program. You could also be TAKEN OUT OF YOUR HOME!!!"

Before the start of aftercare, the probation officer meets with the juvenile and the parents to formulate plans for the aftercare component, explaining what the aftercare placement will be and specifically how the juvenile will be monitored. Placement can be at the alternative high school, the juvenile's

base school, a vocational training program, or employment. If in school, the juvenile receives points for classroom performance and behavior, being on time, doing the assigned work, and for following school rules. Timeouts, fights, problems with staff, and suspension result in a loss of points. If the juvenile has a job, he/she earns points for being on the job.

Home and street behaviors are rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent (worth 100 points) and 1 being poor (minus 100 points). Points are awarded for keeping curfew, doing chores, showing respect for parents, obeying house rules, having no police contacts or violations, and having positive attitudes and behaviors, including demonstrating self control and resisting negative peer influences. The probation officer contacts the parents at least twice a week to determine the home behavior points.

Beginning in January of 1989, aftercare participants can receive \$20 a week rather than \$10, with the high point person earning \$30 rather than \$20. Kentfields is providing this extra incentive because the transition from the highly structured work/school component to the aftercare component presents the most difficult time for juveniles. Successful completion of aftercare usually results in discharge from probation, unless the juvenile still owes restitution. Upon successful completion, the juvenile receives a framed award certificate signed by the Chief Judge, all three Kentfields staff, and the school principal.

During the school/work component, the primary controlling mechanism is the four and one-half day per week program scheduling. The primary staff contact during this phase is the worksite supervisor/counselor, who contacts parents at minimum three times a week to determine home behavior points. During aftercare, the Kentfields probation officer becomes the primary staff contact, making calls at least two times each week to parents to check home behavior for point awards and to provide both positive as well as negative feedback to parents. The probation officer also has contact with each juvenile at minimum three times a week. Since juveniles in aftercare may return to their base school, approximately two-thirds of the aftercare juveniles attend the alternative high school and one-third are at other schools or at work, so contacts with teachers to determine school/job behaviors are made at a variety of schools and job sites.

In addition to the worksite supervisor/counselor and probation officer contacts, the Kentfields director takes a "hands on" role, making contacts with both juveniles and parents, by phone and in person. All juveniles in aftercare must pick up their paychecks at the Kentfields office, which provides the director with at least weekly face-to-face contact with the juveniles. In total, there are approximately three to ten weekly contacts for each juvenile in Kentfields.

While Kentfields places more emphasis on rewards for positive behavior rather than punishment for poor behavior,

sanctions are a necessary part of the program. The first level of program sanctions is loss of points and loss of paychecks, with the requirement that juveniles repeat weeks. The Kentfields program has only four rules: 1) no drugs; 2) no weapons; 3) no fights; and 4) no police contacts. One violation of any of these rules can result in termination from the program. Since the program is a "last chance" for many of these juveniles, it takes a serious infraction to be removed; usually, either refusal to attend or a serious law violation. A "review of order," under which the juvenile appears before a judge because of a probation violation, is sometimes used as a warning device. The probation officer can have a juvenile held in the county juvenile detention facility for a review of order, with a preliminary hearing held within 48 hours of detention. This sanction, however, is rarely used.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The goals of Kentfields were established in 1969 and are to:

- 1) increase desirable behavior and decrease deviant behavior;
- 2) provide a less costly but more effective community alternative to institutional placement; and 3) establish the youngster as a productive member of society.

The goals conform with the treatment philosophy of the program. As part of state funding requirements, the program set certain objectives in 1980, which remain in effect, including: 1) successfully graduate 65 percent of the youngsters from the program, with success defined that the

child was not returned to the court for probation violation (including refusal to attend) or a new criminal offense; 2) demonstrate that the Kentfields program is cost effective to the county and state; and 3) demonstrate that a high percentage of the youngsters who successfully complete the Kentfields program establish themselves as productive members of society.

To measure the objectives and to run the token economy system, careful records are maintained on each juvenile's performance in a variety of areas. As a result, the staff devote considerable time on manual record keeping. The worksite supervisor/counselor compiles the point totals for the school/work component participants, and the probation officer compiles the point totals for the aftercare participants. The director then prepares a weekly report to each juvenile detailing the number of points earned that week, how points were spent, the point balance for the end of the week, the level attained by the juvenile, and the points required for the following week. The director uses these reports to compute payroll sheets so the juveniles can receive their checks the following week. The director also prepares a graph of points achieved by week, color coded by area of responsibility for each participant.

Other individual data forms used include a "P.O. Gram," a status sheet sent to the former parole officers detailing the juvenile's progress; a police contact sheet completed each time a juvenile comes in contact with the police while in the program; a restitution tally sheet, which details for the juvenile the

restitution amount ordered, the amount paid, and the balance remaining; and the aftercare treatment plan.

The director also maintains program summary information. Weekly reports include a worksite evaluation sheet; a behavior performance summary, which summarizes the point accumulation from the previous week; and a payroll checklist to document who received a check and how it was distributed. On-going summaries include a transfer sheet, listing the date each juvenile was transferred to Kentfields; a disposition sheet summary, listing for each juvenile the disposition after termination, the date of termination, and the number of days enrolled in the program; a restitution log; and a log of law violations. The director uses these records to compile information for the annual report and to answer any questions.

The annual report presents information on total served, number of new cases, successful completions, non-successful terminations, and active cases at year's end. It also provides a summary of worksites used and hours of community service work contributed to those worksites. Finally, the report provides average length-of-stay data and per diem cost information, and calculates the amount of money saved by the county in out-of-home placement costs as a result of the Kentfields program. Comparing Kentfields and private institution costs, the program estimates that Kent County saved over \$1.2 million in 1988 by diverting juveniles to Kentfields.

The primary outcome measure used by the program is successful program completion rate. Since adopting its current work/school/aftercare format in 1977, Kentfields has had a successful completion rate averaging 68 percent over the last eleven years. For 1988, the successful completion rate was 72 percent. These data show that the Kentfields program has consistently been able to work successfully with two-thirds to three-fourths of the juveniles enrolled in the program.

A key question concerning the success of any program is the success rate after program termination. To answer that question, Kentfields has participated in two evaluations. The first evaluation covered 125 juveniles referred to Kentfields during the first two years of its operation under the Juvenile Court (September 1, 1969, through August 31, 1971). Participants were given the Wide Range Achievement Test to measure academic achievement at program admission and at program completion. The mean grade level at admission was 5.3, and was 6.3 at completion, showing an average increase of one full grade in only nine weeks.

Arrest data showed that each participant had 2.95 offenses per year for the year prior to Kentfields admission. Follow-up data, which were taken an average of 18 months following completion (with a range of 2 to 26 months), found that arrest rates for program graduates were an average of .46 per year, a reduction of 84 percent over pre-enrollment levels. The study also found that program graduates had a greater likelihood than non-graduates of being employed or in school during the follow-up

period: 64 percent of the graduates were in school or employed, compared to 9 percent of the non-graduates.

The second evaluation covered 197 juveniles referred to the program from January of 1974 through April of 1978. At the time of the follow-up, juveniles had been out of the program an average of 34.4 months. The data showed a significant decrease in the frequency of petitions filed following program involvement, and suggest a reduction in the monthly rate of contacts with the authorities. In addition, 86 percent of the juveniles interviewed were employed or attended school during a substantial part of the third year following termination. The results of these two research efforts, conducted by William S. Davidson and Michael J. Robinson, have been published in Effective Correctional Treatment, edited by Robert R. Ross and Paul Gendreau.

The program has kept careful statistics on program results, and has participated in the two program evaluations conducted by Michigan State University assessing its progress and effectiveness over a ten-year period. Program results are disseminated yearly to staff, Juvenile Court personnel, other interested parties, and the general public through the annual report. Staff support and understanding of the goals and objectives of the program are, therefore, strong.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The Kentfields program has, over the years, developed strong working relationships with other agencies interested in juvenile programs. The strongest relationship is with the Grand Rapids Public School System, which provides the teacher. Without this linkage, the program could not operate as structured. As an example of this strong relationship, the alternative school which now houses the school component was established as an outgrowth of the Kentfields program. Another linkage is with a local family services agency. Kentfields has an informal agreement with the agency to provide counseling services for participant families when needed.

The Juvenile Court stresses the importance of communication. The Court wants to let people know what's working and, therefore, the Juvenile Court annual report receives wide-spread distribution. Juvenile Court staff make speaking engagements to tell the community about the Court and its programs. The Court has established a Police/Court Committee and a School/Court Committee to discuss issues of mutual interest and resolve problems. The chief judge believes that working at relationships and getting all actors involved is a key to the Juvenile Court's success. He indicates that when there is a disagreement or a mistake made, the foundation of trust among the agencies enables all to work through the problem in a positive manner. In addition, the Court established a Citizen's Advisory Council, which meets once a month to advise the Court on matters affecting

the community. According to the court director, the Advisory Council is very supportive of the Kentfields program. In addition, there are several active and structured neighborhood groups in Grand Rapids which also support Kentfields.

Kentfields has solicited donations from local merchants for program reinforcers. Approximately 25 to 30 merchants have contributed such things as gift certificates, movie passes, and lunch and dinner coupons. A judge will occasionally order that a juvenile donate a portion of the money earned in Kentfields to charity, with the juvenile selecting the charity. This not only teaches the juvenile the act of giving, it also provides another positive link with the community.

SUMMARY

The Kentfields Rehabilitation Program has a strong behavior modification base to frame the conceptual model for its program design. It is a stable program which has been in existence for nearly twenty-three years, much longer than other programs of this type. There is strong judicial, political, and community support and a stable budget and funding source. Those interviewed emphasized the program staff as a reason for its success. The three Kentfields staff persons have a combined 36 years of experience with the program, and the teacher has been with the program for nearly five years. The chief judge identified staff's efforts to continually seek to improve the program as a key to its success. The ability of the staff to

work together as a team and to be consistent in their approach is also a strength of the program.

The structure of the Juvenile Court System and the effective leadership of the juvenile judges are also program strengths. The Kentfields program, the court staff, the probation officers, and the juvenile prosecuting attorney are all housed within the Juvenile Court complex, making communication efficient and less institutionalized. The chief judge's focus on communication and public relations has enabled the program to maintain its level of community support.

Benefits mentioned in interviews include the success of keeping the juveniles in their own homes, and the positive reinforcement aspects of the program--the "we use a carrot, not a stick" approach. Several cited the cost effectiveness of the program, as well as the measure of increased community protection. According to the juvenile prosecutor, the program gives medium-risk juveniles an additional chance to remain at home, while presenting to them the reality of their situation should they fail at this effort.

Some areas were identified as needing improvement. The major difficulty has been at the point of transfer from the school/work component to aftercare, where the supervision is substantially reduced. Juveniles tend to think that the program is over once the first phase is completed. Efforts have been and are continuing to be made to improve that transition. The program used to have a 6-week school/work phase and a 10-week

aftercare phase. Two weeks were transferred from the aftercare phase to the first phase to better prepare participants for aftercare. In 1988, the aftercare point system was revised to provide for more objective measurement of performance. Finally, the 1989 Kentfields budget has been increased by \$5,000 to allow for increased monetary awards in aftercare.

One further area where staff are seeking improvements is in the family area. The program would like to have a stronger working relationship with parents, and would like to have more family counseling available. A program challenge is getting parents to buy into the program and make needed changes. Already underway is a plan to develop and conduct parenting classes.

The Kentfields Rehabilitation Program has many keys to its success--dedicated staff with a strong sense of mission, a well-developed program model which is constantly being improved upon without changing the basic behavioral design, and strong linkages and support within the community.

FIRESTONE COMMUNITY DAY CENTER SCHOOL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

The Firestone Community Day Center School (CDC), located in the Watts section of Los Angeles, is a fully accredited, non-residential, coeducational program which serves youths on probation who either 1) have not been sent to a residential facility and are residing in the community, or 2) are returning to the community upon release from a county camp or ranch. It is one of seventeen CDCs operated by the Los Angeles County Office of Education for youth under the protection or authority of the Juvenile Court. The Los Angeles County Office of Education and the Department of Probation work as a team in designing and implementing the CDC program. While the CDC program is conducted under the auspices of the Office of Education, the Probation Department has final jurisdiction over the youths enrolled in the program.

The youths in the CDC program have failed in the traditional school system. They have below average academic skills and a history of behavioral and disciplinary problems. The individualized learning program at the CDC is designed to develop the youth's self-esteem through improved academic performance. It is hoped that the youths will then avoid further delinquent activity in lieu of the pursuit of new-found educational and vocational opportunities.

Firestone is considered by the Probation Department to be the purest example of the CDC model. It is the only CDC which has a probation officer on site full-time. Firestone has a maximum enrollment of 35 juvenile offenders. The youths are in the classroom four hours each day, five days a week. Classes are in session year-round. Youths stay in the program from one semester to two years, with an average length of stay of two semesters. When youths successfully complete the program by completing at least one semester, graduating, or passing the examination for the General Equivalency Diploma (GED) or the California High School Proficiency Exam (CHPE), they either return to the public school system, start working, or continue their education. After a short follow-up period they are dismissed from probation if they have successfully completed other conditions of probation.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Los Angeles County covers over four thousand square miles and is home to nearly eight million people. The population is diverse, from the very wealthy in Hollywood to the very poor in East Los Angeles. Overall, the unemployment rate is 10.1 percent, slightly above the state average.

The city of Los Angeles has approximately three million inhabitants, second only to New York City. Seventeen percent of the population is Black; twenty-eight percent is Hispanic. Persons under the age of 18 make up one-fourth of the city's population. Approximately 600,000 crimes are committed each year in Los Angeles County, and it is estimated that 11 percent are committed by juveniles.

The Los Angeles County Office of Education operates a variety of programs through its Juvenile Court and Community Schools Division to serve children under the protection or authority of the Los Angeles Juvenile Court. Nearly 4,000 youths are annually taught in these schools, in both residential and non-residential settings, which include juvenile hall schools, emergency shelter schools, camp schools, group home schools and the non-residential Community Day Center Schools (CDCs).

The Office of Education has been operating schools for juvenile offenders since 1904. In the mid 1950s, the program grew rapidly as the Probation Department increased the number of juvenile residential facilities. In 1974, the Division also became affiliated with the Los Angeles Department of Public

Social Services when dependency and neglect cases were removed from Probation's jurisdiction. In 1979, the Division received its first accreditation from the Western Association for Schools and Colleges for a five-year period. In 1984, the accreditation was renewed for the maximum six-year period.

The NCCD site visit was conducted at the Firestone CDC, located in the Watts section of Los Angeles. Watts is a primarily Black and Hispanic low income area. Unemployment is high, as is the crime rate and related gang activity. The city has contributed a great deal of money to urban renewal in recent years, so there is some change occurring as Watts moves beyond the memories of the devastating riots of the late 1960s.

The philosophy underlying the CDCs is that education will improve a youth's self-esteem, increase his/her chances for success, and correspondingly inhibit further delinquent activity. An individualized education plan is cooperatively developed by the youth, teacher, parents, probation officer, and other social service representatives. Progress is closely monitored, and the youths are positively rewarded for participation in classroom and social activities.

There are seventeen CDCs in the Juvenile Court and Community Schools system. A one-day count on November 22, 1988, listed 408 youths on the CDC roster. Firestone CDC is unique in that there is a full-time probation officer on site at all times and all youths at Firestone are on probation. At some CDCs the on-site probation officer shares his/her time between two sites, and at

others there is no on-site probation officer. Although the curriculum at each CDC is consistent, the Firestone CDC is considered by the Probation Department to be the purest example of the CDC model.

The Firestone CDC began operation fifteen years ago with three DPOs assigned to the caseload. The program was established in response to the growing needs of high-risk youths in the immediate community. Several factors contributed to the development of the Firestone CDC. They were:

- 1) high drop-out rate of children in the area
- 2) high rate of delinquency
- 3) need for an alternative school program
- 4) scant resources in the community
- 5) personal needs of children in the area

The Firestone CDC has a maximum enrollment of 35 male and female juvenile offenders. In any given year, officials estimate that approximately 200 probationers are enrolled in Firestone. These juveniles are all under the supervision of the on-site probation officer. The Firestone CDC probation officer has been with the program for thirteen years and is fairly autonomous in conducting the CDC program. Although he works with the Office of Education personnel, he is answerable only to his direct supervisor. Each month he is required to submit a statistical report to the SDPO responsible for overseeing the juvenile cases assigned to the Firestone CDC.

In addition to the probation officer, the Firestone staff consists of two full-time teachers, a resource person who provides one-on-one instruction in addition to the regular

classroom curriculum, an aide for the resource person, and a part-time special assignment teacher whose time is shared over a number of sites. Support staff include a behavioral aide, a student intern, and a clerk typist. The principal of one of the CDC units (the CDC system is divided into several units) has office space at Firestone, with his time split among sites.

The costs of operating the CDCs are shared by the Office of Education and the Department of Probation. The Probation Department assumes all of the probation costs, which include the probation officers' salaries. The probation cost per youth is approximately \$238 per month. Probation pays approximately \$97,104 each year to support the CDC programs. The Office of Education assumes all of the operational costs including supplies, facilities, and school personnel salaries.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The target population for the Firestone CDC has changed over time. It was originally designed as a prevention program for younger children, first time offenders and predelinquent youngsters. These youths were just entering the juvenile corrections system and had not been placed in a residential program. The goal was to provide needed intensive services before the youth became delinquent. The original program design included intensive community involvement, alternative activities for youngsters, and intensive personal and family counseling. The purpose was to return these youths to the traditional school

system once they "caught up" with their grade level and developed some social skills.

Today all youths in Firestone CDC are adjudicated delinquent. While some do return to their regular schools, the majority never return and graduate instead from the CDC. Other youths are sent to the CDC upon release from the county camps and ranches. These youths have been out of the regular classroom for some time and are considered difficult to place in the traditional school setting. For them the CDC program assists with transition back into the community. Changes in the CDC population could significantly affect the nature of the program. If, for example, the CDC population increases to 80 percent aftercare youths as some school officials would like, the program would then become more autonomous and less tied in with the regular school system.

The youths in the program today are primarily property offenders, although youths with other offense histories may be accepted into the program. Although the program is coed, the majority of probationers in the program are boys, ages 15 to 17. The average age is approximately 15 years old. While the age of the students increased at one point as the population shifted from predelinquent to adjudicated delinquent youths, the age of the youths in the program is now decreasing. This trend is expected to continue as juveniles become involved in delinquent activity at an earlier age. The Firestone probation officer suggested that youth are most appropriate for the program when

they are younger than fifteen, since younger youths would be better suited to returning to the traditional school system. He believes that older youths are more suited for vocational training.

Referrals can come from a number of sources. The field probation officer may contact a CDC probation officer to make a referral. A juvenile court judge can order the youth to be placed in the CDC based on the probation officer's recommendation or based on his/her own knowledge of the program. Judicial support for the CDC program has been consistently strong and court-initiated referrals are likely to continue.

In addition to probation and court referrals, school officials and parents may contact the CDC program. When the enrollment is down for the CDC program, the CDC probation officer may initiate contact with other probation officers to ensure that appropriate youths are being considered for referral.

The CDCs are mandated to accept youths who have been released from county camps and youths living at home who are sent to the CDC through a Probation Department referral or by court placement. The CDCs are not required to accept school district referrals but may accept them if the next step is expulsion. The CDCs may also accept a school referral if the student is a status offender (status offenders have been under the jurisdiction of the Department of Dependent and Neglected Children since 1974). Finally, the CDCs may accept youths who have been referred to another alternative program, but have not been accepted. Unlike

the other CDCs, Firestone serves only adjudicated delinquents who are on probation.

Within the formal restrictions on who may be accepted to the program, the Firestone CDC probation officer has some latitude in deciding who will be admitted. The make-up of the current population must be taken into account before a new student can be accepted. Gang affiliation is one factor that is taken into consideration. While gang membership does not automatically exclude an individual from the program, gang leadership might. Program administrators are unwilling to jeopardize the program for the youth already enrolled. Potential conflicts between rival gang leaders are clearly a consideration by program officials.

Involvement with drugs is another acceptance consideration. Again, drug use in and of itself would not be a criterion for exclusion, but if the youth is an identified major drug dealer in the area, he/she would not be accepted into the program.

A final consideration is classroom size. One of the primary advantages of the program is the small size, with an optimum size of seventeen students for each classroom. While an individual would not be rejected from the program because the classroom size was at the limit, the juvenile's admission date might be delayed until another youth finishes the program. Program administrators may also allow the program to go over its designed limit for a few days or weeks.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

Once a referral of a probationer has been made, the CDC probation officer gathers information from the referral source about the youth in order to decide whether to accept the youth for a 30-day trial period. Upon intake, the expectations of the program are explained to the youth and the necessary paperwork is sent to the school system. After 30 days a review is sent to the field probation officer, based on a formal staffing with the CDC personnel and observations of the youth's performance to date. If the youth is accepted into the program, he/she is transferred to the CDC probation officer's caseload. If not, the probationer is referred back to the referring officer.

The primary purpose of the CDC program is to provide individualized academic instruction for youths who are likely to fall through the cracks of the traditional classroom setting. Classroom size is small and the lesson plans are designed for the individual student. When youths are first admitted, they are given a battery of tests to assess their achievement level in various subjects. As a consequence of an unstable living situation, many of these youths have been in several different schools and are also likely to have been truant. Both factors contribute to their low level of academic achievement. An individualized lesson plan is developed in each of the academic subjects based on the test results. Each lesson and test for that section is listed in the student's folder. As a youth successfully completes the lesson, it is recorded in his/her

file. The test information is also entered into the Office of Education's database for future reference.

School begins each day at 8 a.m. and ends at 1:15 p.m., with five 50-minute periods. One teacher is responsible for math and science instruction; the other for English and social studies. Additional instruction includes health science, driver's education, and career/job training. Although the CDC classroom is already more conducive to individualized learning than a regular classroom, the program also has a remedial resource person who works with students who need one-on-one attention to work on a particular subject.

Community groups also contribute to the learning experience of the students at the CDC. There are scheduled presentations by groups and activities which occur both on-site and off grounds. For example, some of the students wrote poetry for a book that was compiled by the Los Angeles Theatre Works. Community involvement is important in facilitating the youths' success in the community, a primary goal of the CDC program.

Behavior in the classroom is rewarded through a point system. Points are earned based on good behavior and academic efforts. Youth are expected to do their work, behave appropriately in the classroom so that others can work, and participate in the daily activities. The youth earns a star each week based on the following criteria:

RED star	= Failing
GREEN star	= Needs to improve

BLUE star = Satisfactory work and behavior
SILVER star = Work and overall behavior
 satisfactory; more obligations have
 been met
GOLD star = Very best effort

Both school teachers must agree on the star level the student has earned for the week. Youths who meet the expectations of the program are rewarded by being allowed to participate in some of the special activities that the school sponsors and by getting a positive report from the probation officer. A youth with a gold star is eligible for return to the traditional school setting.

The advantage of the CDC program is that during the school hours, the youths are closely supervised in a small classroom setting, completing educational tasks that are specifically geared toward their needs. Although the Firestone CDC probation officer is not present in the classroom, he is on the premises, which means he is available for the resolution of disputes that arise. The youths are also aware that as an officer of the court, the CDC probation officer has the obligation to address any probation violations or new offenses. Beyond the school hours, probation supervision is comparable to traditional probation, except that CDC youths are part of a small caseload of 35, rather than 100 or 150 youths.

The program does not have a formal family counseling component although some informal intervention may occur when the probation officer follows up on a youth's classroom behavior and

makes a home visit. In general, the supervision by the probation officer ends when the youth leaves the grounds of the school in the early afternoon. However, the youth is on the CDC probation officer's caseload and the officer has the option of making home visits after hours. If the youth violates probation in the evenings or on weekends, the CDC probation officer will be notified.

The educational system has authority in addition to the court's jurisdiction. Youth in the state of California must be enrolled in either a traditional school program or a vocational program until age 16. The majority of these youths have very few alternatives available to them since the traditional school system is reluctant to take them back. Return to the regular school would be difficult for the students as well, because of the disparity between their age and grade level.

In the beginning of a youth's term at the CDC, an educational plan is laid out for the youth. The youth agrees to the terms of the contract and knows that these are the conditions for successful completion of the program. The point system serves as a monitor and incentive for the youth to complete the program in an 80-day semester.

Inappropriate behavior and disciplinary problems while enrolled in the program are handled by the teacher, behavioral aide and the probation officer. It is the teaching personnel's responsibility to manage daily classroom behavior. When a youth is particularly disruptive he/she will be sent down to the

probation officer's office for some one-on-one counseling. A youth may be removed from the program if these disciplinary sessions become too frequent and the youth has earned too many red stars.

Violations of probation are handled directly by the probation officer and may result in a court hearing. New offenses are handled in court. Youths are not automatically dismissed from the CDC program when a new offense is committed unless the violation was serious and a residential placement is ordered. At the court hearing the CDC probation officer files a report on how well the youth has been doing in the program and how close he or she is to graduating.

Successful completion of the program is two-fold. From the educational standpoint those who complete an 80-day semester of work, graduate directly from the CDC or pass either the GED (General Equivalency Diploma) exam or the CHPE (California High School Proficiency Exam) qualify as successful graduates. The Probation Department considers the youth's ability to complete the conditions of probation and/or return to the traditional school system. A growing number of youths are graduating from the CDC program directly rather than returning to the school system. With a high school diploma they are able to pursue vocational training, the military, or full-time employment. A small number of youths have gone on to college. Once a youth is dismissed from the CDC program, the CDC probation officer follows the youth for a 10- to 15-week period. If the youth is

successfully adjusting, the probation officer petitions the court to dismiss the youth from probation. The average length of stay is two semesters. Youth who are dismissed from the program and who return to the traditional classroom may return at a later date to the CDC program.

PROGRAM GOALS AND EVALUATION

The mission statement for the Juvenile Court and Community Schools Division reads as follows:

"To provide quality learning opportunities for students to develop: academic skills, independent life skills, positive self-concept [and] effective relationship with others."

The philosophy of the Juvenile Court and Community Schools programs is embodied in the phrase, "We empower others to be the best that they can be." The overall goals of the Community Day Centers reflect this mission but also reflect the changing population which it has come to serve. Today the CDC philosophy statement expresses both preventive and reintegrative goals. According to the Office of Education philosophy statement, the goal for CDC students is:

"... to prevent their involvement in a delinquent lifestyle, to prepare them for return to regular schools, to help them make positive adjustments to living in the community, and for those making the transition from long-term placement, to help them successfully end their probation period."

The Office of Education has developed an elaborate mechanism for maintaining and updating the goals of the Juvenile Court and Community Schools programs. The unit which oversees the

operation of Firestone CDC has developed a three- to five-year plan which lays out specific goals. Education personnel at all levels have input into the workings of the programs.

The probation officer works with the Education Office to reinforce the goals set for the individual. In talking with the Firestone CDC probation officer and school program administrators, all appear to agree that the focus of the program is on education. The probation officer places more emphasis on the practical learning experience, particularly for the older student, while school administrators are understandably more education oriented. The CDC is not a vocational training program and the primary emphasis is on equipping participants with the basic academic skills.

Two types of individual records are kept at the CDCs. The educational file includes the results of the initial assessment test, all test scores, and the lessons that the youth has completed. The assessment test results are also entered into a central school file for future reference. The educational file also shows the youth's status immediately following CDC completion. The probation officer also keeps a file of the youth's behavior reports, and notes from meetings with the youth and with the education personnel. Any court action is also kept in the probation officer's record.

There are, however, few statistics available for the program as a whole. CDC has records of how many youths graduated from the program with their high school diploma. The probation

officer has a "feel" for how many youth committed additional offenses, but these statistics are not compiled. To date, there has been no outside evaluation of the program in relationship to recidivism. The personnel at the CDC suggested that this type of study could be useful to them.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The CDC program at Firestone is designed to meet the needs of youths on probation who have failed in the traditional school system. Although it is an educational program, the Firestone CDC probation officer and the juvenile court have ultimate authority for the students enrolled. The CDC programs have the support of the juvenile court system; two of the juvenile court judges indicate that the CDC programs are successful because they address the root causes of juvenile delinquency by developing a positive self image and giving the juvenile a stake in his/her own future.

The Firestone CDC encourages the community to get involved with the youths in the program. Guest speakers from various organizations are invited to the CDC program. The youths often take educational trips to local museums and organizations. The Los Angeles theatre group has been actively involved with the CDC program. A primary part of the CDC philosophy is to maintain and strengthen the ties between the youth and the community.

SUMMARY

The Firestone CDC program's strengths are its small caseload, small classroom, individual attention, and the presence of the probation officer on the premises. The program design addresses the needs of youths who have become disenfranchised from the traditional school system. The education plans are geared toward basic skills using real-life materials and problems.

Staff described the program as meeting the needs of the current population. However, it may not be serving high risk juveniles from the standpoint of delinquent behavior. The intense supervision for four hours of the day followed by traditional probation supervision for the balance of the day reduces the likelihood of its applicability to a higher risk delinquent population. If higher risk juveniles were included in the program, this problem could be rectified by structuring the afternoon, perhaps in a vocational work setting, and increasing surveillance during evening hours. This enhancement would increase the overall program structure and increase the likelihood that higher risk offenders could be considered.

The biggest frustration with the CDC programs seems to be that there are not enough of them. Even though there is little data on the subsequent recidivism of CDC graduates, there is a feeling among the personnel in the program and outside (ie. juvenile court and others in probation) that the CDC program is a good one. By its very nature, however, it does not serve very

many youth. Therefore, despite the fact that those who go through the program seem to benefit, it does not benefit a large number of the juvenile probation population.

There is an interest in more detailed follow-up information. Such information would help to substantiate the success of the program from Probation's point of view. Education personnel are encouraged by the measures of success in terms of increased educational achievement.

The juvenile court system to date has been supportive of the CDC programs. Juvenile judges endorse the program and have indicated that they wish there were more of them. The Probation Department, in general, is supportive of the CDC program in theory, but expressed concern regarding the small numbers of juveniles that can be served by any one probation officer, given budgetary pressure resulting from increased caseloads.

The future of the CDCs seem assured within the Office of Education's Juvenile Court and Community School Program. The Probation Department will no doubt have a continued need to utilize a program which educates delinquent youth in a small, non-residential setting.

PENNSYLVANIA INTENSIVE PROBATION SUPERVISION

Implementation of the Pennsylvania Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS) programs is an example of coordination between two state-level agencies to implement services at the county level. IPS was implemented to enable the more effective and economical community supervision of high-risk adjudicated juveniles under the jurisdiction of county juvenile probation departments. The primary implementation goal was to reduce the number of out-of-home placements in participating counties.

State-wide implementation began in the early 1980s with the coordinated efforts of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) and the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (JCJC). PCCD awarded and administered start-up grants to counties to provide a financial incentive for counties to participate. After two years of graduated funding through PCCD, counties assumed full financial responsibility for the programs, except for \$3,000 per county officer position which JCJC allocates through its Grant-in-Aid Program. During implementation, JCJC provided training, technical assistance, and project monitoring. In addition to IPS implementation, the two agencies coordinated a similar effort to implement aftercare services within the same time frame and with the primary goal of reducing the length of institutional stay.

Basic standards established by JCJC form the parameters of the IPS programs which local county probation agencies tailor to fit their individual operations. The IPS officer maintains a minimum of three weekly contacts with the juvenile to ensure that probation rules are followed and problems resolved. To assist in monitoring the juvenile's progress, collateral contacts are maintained with the family, school, employer, and significant others. Although administrative program oversight is less than what could be obtained when implementing a program in one agency, the JCJC monitors IPS standards through yearly audits of randomly selected counties.

The IPS and aftercare programs have been well accepted throughout the state. In 1987, 38 of the 67 Pennsylvania counties participated in the aftercare and/or intensive probation programs, employing 131 program officers. JCJC data indicate that out-of-home placements have been reduced in counties implementing IPS. When compared to 1986, the 1987 JCJC data indicate an overall decrease of 5.5 percent in the number of youth placed, with only 15.3 percent of the participants having new adjudicated offenses during that year.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

With a population of nearly 12 million, Pennsylvania represents a mix of very rural counties as well as the highly urbanized areas of greater Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

The impetus for state-wide IPS implementation came from the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (JCJC) which wanted to locate intensive probation programs within county probation departments to reduce the number and cost of out-of-home juvenile placements. As a grant administrator, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) provided grant money as a financial incentive to encourage county participation. Concurrent with PCCD and JCJC promotion of state-wide implementation, several counties were independently beginning IPS programs. It is helpful to summarize the structure and mandate of PCCD and JCJC to better understand their roles in the implementation process.

The Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (JCJC) was created in 1959 and organizationally located within the Pennsylvania Department of Justice until 1981 when it became an agency in the Office of the General Counsel, reporting directly to the Governor. The Judges' Commission consists of nine judges nominated by the Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and appointed to three-year terms by the Governor. A staff of ten serve the Commission under the direction of an executive director. JCJC is the primary state-level agency which oversees the quality of state-wide juvenile probation services provided by counties. JCJC's duties are broadly defined as advising judges

on all matters relating to children; examining administrative methods and judicial procedures; establishing standards; making recommendations to the court regarding personnel practices and administrative procedures; and collecting, compiling, and publishing relevant statistical data related to juvenile court matters. JCJC also administers the grant-in-aid fund which directly subsidizes county probation officers' salaries and specialized programs. JCJC conducts annual audits of juvenile probation departments, develops and provides training and research services in juvenile justice, and provides specific technical assistance and problem-solving resources for the counties. It has a positive working relationship with county administrators and, as a commission of juvenile court judges, also has judicial support. The JCJC is viewed not only as a monitor for overall quality and consistency, but also as a problem-solving resource and an initiator of new programs and policies.

Formerly the Governor's Justice Commission, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) was created in 1978 to provide state-wide criminal and juvenile justice planning, coordination, and policy analysis. The Commission consists of 24 members from the public and private sectors who direct policy and establish program goals. The enabling statute requires PCCD to develop policies, plans, programs, and budgets for improving the coordination, administration, and effectiveness of Pennsylvania's criminal and juvenile justice systems. Major functions include

training, technical assistance/coordination, policy analysis/research, and grant administration. PCCD is funded with a combination of state and federal monies, and administers a variety of federal grant programs. Its role includes the administration of federal funds under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 through the Juvenile Advisory Committee (JAC). During fiscal years 85-86, PCCD administered 256 subgrants totalling \$9.6 million.

A number of factors converged in Pennsylvania during the late 1970s and early 1980s to foster the development of alternatives to out-of-home juvenile placements. The 1974 federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act required community-based programming for treatment and prevention of juvenile delinquency as an alternative to institutionalization. Pennsylvania was an early participant in the JJDP Act by passing State Act 41 in 1976 which paralleled the federal legislation by decriminalizing status offenders and promoting community-based programming. In 1975, Pennsylvania's only juvenile prison, Camp Hill, closed and, consequently, a number of youth were placed in private sector programs or one of the four state-run youth development centers (training schools). Initially, juvenile placements in these youth development centers (YDCs) were at no cost to the counties. This resulted in a financial disincentive to utilize local programs, since YDC placement was "free." In 1976, Pennsylvania Act 148 revised the state financial reimbursement schedule for county children and

youth services. Counties were offered reimbursement incentives to provide youth services in the least restrictive settings, thus encouraging counties to use community-based alternatives. This act facilitated state-wide progress in meeting the federal de-institutionalization mandates by providing county reimbursement at the rate of 90 percent for emergency shelter care, 75 percent for group homes, and only 50 percent for state institution (YDC) placements. After implementation of Act 148, the number of public sector beds for juveniles decreased substantially, from 1,200 in 1979 to 591 at present.

Funding through Act 148 was considered an entitlement program until 1980 when a state budget shortfall resulted in a maximum cap on county reimbursements. Each county now receives an allocation based on a formula which includes consideration of the number of children under the age of 18 and the number under poverty level. Prior to this shortfall, JCJC proposals for piloting IPS programs had twice been rejected by the governor and/or legislature. In 1981, JCJC received state funding to pilot projects in five counties. PCCD subsequently assumed primary implementation funding through start-up grant monies to these counties. Between 1982 and 1984, seven additional county programs were funded.

While JCJC was developing legislative and executive support for IPS, PCCD was also actively involved in pursuing alternatives to institution placement. PCCD had an active, advocacy-oriented advisory board interested in reducing placements from the

philosophical standpoint that it was "good." This advocacy, combined with the pressure on limited placement beds and high placement costs, produced a common direction between the two organizations. While some counties began or would have subsequently started IPS programs without grant monies, several county governments were reluctant to proceed with new programs requiring additional funding. The PCCD start-up money provided an opportunity for the program to demonstrate its effectiveness before being funded locally within the county probation departments.

Among the counties developing IPS programs concurrent with the state-wide initiative were Dauphin (Harrisburg) and Allegheny (Pittsburgh) counties. Dauphin represents a relatively small program with 1.5 IPS officers; and Allegheny, a larger program with 11 officers. Both programs have been operational since the early 1980s and staff interviewed for this report concurred that JCJC/PCCD support enhanced a direction they were already going. Dauphin County experienced a loss of approximately 35 percent in placement revenues when the 1980 state funding cap began. The county began an aftercare program in 1982, with two positions receiving JCJC funding. The aftercare project reduced caseloads sufficiently to move an existing county probation position to IPS and, with the 1984 grant monies, Dauphin County entered into the JCJC/PCCD funding arrangement.

In Allegheny County, intensive probation supervision is called high-impact probation and began in 1980 with five officers

who volunteered for the unit. Although there was strong court and administrative support for this alternative program, there was significant union pressure to avoid the irregular hours required by staff in such a program. The early stages of implementation involved numerous meetings between staff and administration to discuss the philosophy that criminal activity could be controlled with intense contact during non-traditional work hours. Participation in the JCJC/PCCD project enabled Allegheny County administrators to provide financial incentives for ISP officers, thus expanding and solidifying the program.

The overriding principle of the state-wide implementation was that substantial numbers of juveniles who were being placed in out-of-home placements could be safely and effectively managed within the community. Counties were selected for participation in the JCJC/PCCD initiative after applying for grant money through PCCD. JCJC identified high placement counties and required that participating jurisdictions have a sufficient placement rate to support an alternative program which could potentially reduce placement numbers and costs. While all rural areas did not necessarily have low placement rates, it happened that the most rural areas were not the first jurisdictions to begin the program, and the major urban area of Philadelphia did not begin an IPS program until 1987.

With respect to organizational structure, JCJC and PCCD had a long history of working together on previous projects. Thus, resting the primary funding in PCCD with the technical assistance

and monitoring in JCJC did not present an organizational problem. In reality, the arrangement capitalized effectively on the implementation skills available in each agency. The county organizational structure always has the IPS program within the probation department with access to probation administration, supervision, and support staff. Each Chief Probation Officer (CPO) is responsible to the juvenile court judge and, subsequently, to the county board for funding. Depending upon the size of the county, the IPS supervisor reports directly to the CPO or to a mid-level manager.

In 1987, 31 counties participated in the IPS program, providing services to 1,502 probationers. JCJC standards limit the caseload size per officer to 15 clients, and in 1987, IPS caseloads averaged 10 clients. JCJC standards require that an officer must be allocated to the IPS position, although some smaller jurisdictions share an IPS officer with the aftercare program. Small programs also rely on the supervisor and regular probation officers to provide backup during sick leave, vacations, and holidays. In 1988, the 31 participating counties had 83 IPS officers, with only 3 counties (Allegheny, Burks, and Philadelphia) having more than 3 officers assigned to IPS. The majority of counties (19) had one identified IPS officer. Since 1985, the average length of stay in the IPS program has ranged between 6.5 and 7.5 months.

In Dauphin County, one full-time and one half-time officer supervise up to 18 IPS cases. The full-time officer works

primarily traditional work hours, with the half-time officer working the non-traditional hours. In the Allegheny County program, each of the 11 officers has caseloads of 10 to 12 clients, and officers are located with regular supervision units in each of 5 decentralized offices. Allegheny County classifies high-impact IPS officers as "specialists" which, in addition to lower caseloads, provides additional opportunities for training, greater opportunity to use their treatment skills, and greater work hour flexibility than the regular probation officers. The Allegheny County high-impact probation officer job description (1986) requires that the 160-hour month include a minimum of 8 weekend hours which can be scheduled in coordination with the individual supervisors, but which is to be used primarily for direct client contact.

During implementation, PCCD determined the number of positions eligible for funding in each county based on placement rates and county demographics. PCCD awarded first-year grant applications for up to \$20,000 per IPS position. During the second year, PCCD grants were for \$12,000 per position with the third and subsequent years funded by the local jurisdictions with JCJC providing only the \$3,000 per position grant-in-aid monies for which all county probation positions are eligible. Standards require that IPS officers be paid at least at the local pay scale for probation officers. In most instances, the \$3,000 JCJC position subsidy goes directly to the county general fund. However, Allegheny County gives the \$3,000 subsidy directly to

the IPS officers as an additional salary incentive. Allegheny IPS staff reported that this extra money was a consideration when accepting the job but was not a major incentive. However, it does represent an incentive to stay in the position because transfer back to a regular caseload cuts their salary by \$3,000. Administrators indicated that the \$3,000 was a factor during the early stages of implementation, as it provided additional incentive for officers to apply for the position. Prior to this incentive, administrators reported greater difficulty in soliciting qualified officers to volunteer for the added work and irregular hours of the IPS program.

Based on 1986 JCJC program data, it is estimated that the average daily per diem for IPS clients is \$5.43. This figure is based only on IPS salary and excludes any calculation for fringe, indirect, or administrative costs.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

JCJC standards specify that the target population is youth who would otherwise go into placement. Pennsylvania's Juvenile Act defines the age range for juvenile delinquents as 16 to 18, with jurisdiction remaining until age 21 for those charged with an offense prior to their 18th birthday. Local probation departments define who goes into placement based on their own standards, and state-wide implementation did not require consistency among programs. Local criteria for placement are not necessarily defined in objective terms.

Dauphin County policies require that the prior juvenile record justify an institutional placement if a child is to be considered for IPS. In Allegheny County, standards specify that participants be those who are not responding to regular probation and for whom out-of-home placement would be the next consideration. This program also admits younger offenders who do not have other support systems, and supervisors estimate that approximately 50 percent of the program enrollments are true alternatives to out-of-home placement.

JCJC standards do not require the systematic exclusion of any youth based on offense type or any other specific factors. However, most counties establish some internal selection criteria. For example, Dauphin County specifically targets juveniles whose prior record or present offense(s) justifies institutional placement. From this population individuals are selected who are not deemed to be an immediate threat to themselves or others, juveniles who have some degree of family stability with indications that the family will cooperate with intensive supervision, and juveniles who show some interest in pursuing employment and/or educational goals. Dauphin County uses a risk assessment instrument as a screening guide; however, it is only one additional piece of information that is evaluated when making the admission decision. As with most agencies in Pennsylvania, the first line supervisor is the key to internal consistency and assuring that juveniles in the program meet the local definition of "high risk."

A JCJC profile of 1985 cases indicates that the typical IPS client is a white male who is 15.63 years old, is in school, and has not completed the 9th grade. The typical client lives with a divorced mother with a household income between \$8,000 and \$16,000. His most serious offenses were theft, burglary, or simple assault. County programs may have geographical parameters which influence the profiles of program participants. Dauphin County primarily supervises juveniles who reside in the city of Harrisburg, and of the 29 juveniles in the 1987 program, all but four (13.7 percent) were minorities and had an average age of 15.8 years.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

State standards do not define an assessment process other than to require that an intensive probation plan be developed by the IPS officer within ten days after the dispositional order to place the child in IPS. Referral is initiated by the supervising or investigating probation officer who evaluates the case for IPS placement and discusses such placement with the designated IPS officer and/or supervisor. IPS staff decide whether or not to recommend IPS to the court. No child is admitted to IPS without a court disposition for the program.

Dauphin County represents a fairly typical structure for individual assessment. Specifically, it requires the supervising or investigating probation officer to develop goals and objectives for IPS participation prior to discussing the

placement with the lead IPS officer. After evaluating the file information and developing the IPS goals, the regular probation officer discusses the case with the IPS officer at least two weeks prior to the anticipated dispositional date. In most instances, IPS cases will be in the county home detention/house arrest program prior to IPS placement. (A home detention phase is not available in all counties.) The IPS officer then reviews the juvenile's background, school adjustment, prior record, and special needs, and evaluates the juvenile's performance in home detention. The IPS officer also interviews the juvenile and the juvenile's family before discussing the case with the IPS supervisor for final approval and a recommendation to the court. The juvenile must meet the selection criteria and be successful in home detention. If the juvenile has not been in home detention, IPS may recommend the home detention/house arrest program before further consideration is given to IPS. It was reported that 95 percent of the IPS juveniles completed the house arrest/home detention program, which can last up to 60 days.

Allegheny County's referral process is similar; referrals originate with the supervising or investigating officer who discusses the case with the high-impact supervisor for final recommendation to the court. While selection criteria remain flexible, supervisors make a concerted effort to determine that all reasonable regular supervision alternatives have been exhausted.

After admission to IPS, the specific services available are dependent upon the resources in the local counties; however, the overriding state-wide expectation is that the IPS officer will provide treatment and counseling to the degree necessary, in addition to surveillance and monitoring for adherence to the court conditions. Treatment plans are mandated by the JCJC standard which also requires that they be reviewed at least monthly by the IPS officer and the CPO or designee. In Dauphin County, the formal treatment plan specifies goals and objectives together with target and completion dates. Guidelines require that IPS officers provide individual and family counseling, refer to appropriate programs, assist in securing employment, monitor school/education progress as well as school attendance, and collect restitution.

The treatment philosophy is also evident in Allegheny County. While high-impact probation needs to emphasize safety, 75 percent of the staff have or are pursuing masters degrees in counseling, social work, or related fields, and officers view the high-impact program as an opportunity to use their skills within the smaller caseloads. In practice, while surveillance and monitoring provide the context for all services, Allegheny officers describe treatment as having a higher priority in their client relationships. From the position description (1986):

"The 'high-impact' probation officer's role is not viewed as one dimensional (i.e., surveillance only). Case contacts should reflect planning and purpose relative to stated behavioral goals and objectives on a per-case basis. 'High impact' probation officers will, therefore, find themselves, over a period of time,

exercising a broad range of diversified skills (counselor, broker, role model, advocate, mediator, authority figure, etc.) in attempting to accomplish these ends."

JCJC has established nine program standards governing intensive probation services. Each standard is audited specifically in the annual probation audit conducted in each county. Standards are summarized as follows:

1. Caseloads should not exceed 15 high-risk, adjudicated delinquent youths who would otherwise receive placement services;
2. A minimum of three face-to-face meetings are required each week with the juvenile and IPS officer;
3. A minimum of one weekly contact is required with the parent(s) and/or guardian;
4. A minimum of one contact every two weeks is required with the juvenile's school, employer, and with significant others, if applicable;
5. A minimum of 30 percent of the IPS officer's work hours must be scheduled outside normal office hours;
6. An intensive probation plan should be developed by the IPS officer and approved by the CPO or designee within 10 days after court disposition to place the juvenile in the IPS program;
7. The IPS plan shall be reviewed monthly by the IPS officer and CPO or designee to modify the plan when appropriate;
8. The chronological record of all direct and indirect contacts shall include at a minimum: name of person contacted; titles/relationships; date, time, and location of the contact; type of contact (face-to-face, telephone, etc.); and the nature of the contact; and
9. IPS services should normally be provided for a minimum of 6 months to a maximum of 12 months.

IPS practitioners indicated that the JCJC standards are well accepted and tend to form the minimum expectations, which most

counties exceed. For example, Dauphin County requires three to five face-to-face client contacts each week, and strives for five during the early stages of the program. The focus of contacts throughout the programs is to provide both surveillance and monitoring as well as the opportunity for counseling and problem solving. No formal phases of the program are mandated by JCJC, although the minimum contact standard is frequently exceeded in the early stages of the programs.

Program sanctions vary throughout the state but include such things as placement in house arrest, curfew changes, privilege restrictions, as well as participation in other local programs. Allegheny County is an example of a jurisdiction with a number of local options including a short-term day treatment program and a 90-day placement in a county facility with continuance in the high-impact program. Referrals to these programs can be used as program sanctions.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The overriding goal for the state-wide programs is to reduce the number of youth committed to placement facilities by providing higher, more effective supervision of high-risk, adjudicated youth while they remain in the community. Within the initial grant applications, recipients of PCCD grants agreed to:

1. Demonstrate a 10 percent reduction in the number of delinquent, high-risk youth placed by providing intensive supervision to youth (reduction based on the average number of placements made in the county during the previous three years).

2. Demonstrate an actual decrease in total costs of placements as compared to previous years' costs.

Penalties for not meeting these goals included possible ineligibility for second-year grant funding. Implementation presented difficulties in determining the degree to which counties could realistically meet these goals. PCCD and JCJC staff held numerous meetings and provided technical assistance with counties to resolve problems and set realistic target figures.

In addition to embracing the goals of the grant, recipient agencies can have additional goals of their own. In Allegheny County, while placement costs were not unimportant, the county has a long history of paying whatever costs are necessary to provide recommended services. The paramount impetus for their program development was the belief of the presiding judge and agency administrator that increased contacts together with intensive individual, group, and family counseling during non-traditional work hours could influence the behavior of the juveniles. Availability during non-traditional hours is considered critical because this is the time juveniles are more likely to become involved in criminal behavior. Allegheny County officials indicated their program would likely have been supported from a treatment effectiveness standpoint even if it was not cost effective.

In Pennsylvania, JCJC has the ultimate on-going monitoring responsibility for probation services, including IPS. On a state-wide basis, counties submit aftercare/intensive monthly

data sheets and an aftercare/intensive quarterly report to JCJC. These documents summarize the number of people in the program, costs, and dates of placement and release. These data are maintained by JCJC together with a standard juvenile court statistical card which provides individual client identification, background, offense, and disposition data on all juveniles. This information forms the basis of the annual publication of the JCJC on the dispositional status in Pennsylvania; however, any monthly management reports are a responsibility of the local programs.

During initial implementation, PCCD funded a monitoring and technical assistance position which was housed in JCJC and later assumed in its budget. This position proved to be critical as programs were monitored through the initial stages of implementation. While programs were receiving grant monies, PCCD was actively involved through this JCJC position in assuring that grant objectives were achieved or modified appropriately to fit the individual county's circumstance.

During initial implementation, JCJC sponsored regional training, completed on-site technical assistance for agencies, and completed formal IPS descriptive evaluations of the data. Summary reports of the project were completed in 1985, 1986, and 1987. Year-end data for 1985-1987 are summarized below. As indicated, the number of counties participating in the program increased each year, with the number of cases served increasing in relationship to the additional counties. During the three years, the average age of participants went up slightly, from

15.63 years to 15.97 years, and the average length of supervision also increased, from 6.74 months to 7.39 months. The JCJC measure of recidivism is based on the number of juveniles with new delinquency adjudications or adult convictions during the calendar year, and the recidivism percentage is based on a comparison of the number of adjudications or adult convictions with the number of cases served during that year. The recidivism period begins the day the juvenile is placed on intensive probation, and continues throughout supervision and for a six-month period following the youth's release from intensive probation. Based on the JCJC measure, the percentage of cases recidivating has gone down slightly from the beginning of the program, from 17.59 percent to 15.31 percent.

STATE-WIDE PROGRAM PROFILE

	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
# Counties in program	17	27	30*
# Cases served	864	1052	1502
Average age	15.63	15.80	15.97
Average length of stay (months)	6.74	7.65	7.39
# Recidivating**	152	205	230
% Recidivating	17.59	19.49	15.31

* One additional county began the program in December 1987, but is excluded from the 1987 data.

**Recidivism is based on new adjudications of delinquency.

A 1986 report to PCCD evaluated counties which implemented IPS in 1985 for the degree to which they met the grant objectives of reducing the number of placements by 10 percent and reducing overall placement costs. For the eleven projects, there was an overall reduction of 15.73 percent in the number of placements, from 642 to 541. Three of the eleven counties did not meet the 10 percent reduction goal, and specific target reductions were negotiated for the second year. Overall placement costs were reduced by \$877,000 (8.5 percent), from \$10,327,000 to \$9,450,000. All but three counties met the goal of reducing placement costs.

By the end of 1986, the 27 IPS programs reduced placements by 4.76 percent, from 1,470 in their counties to 1,400. The programs also reported a 4.86 percent decrease in placement costs (\$1,449,000) during 1986. The 30 counties participating in the programs during 1987 reduced their placements by 149, from 2,735 in 1986 to 2,586 in 1987 (5.45 percent). (Despite this overall reduction, 18 counties experienced increases in placements during 1987.) Placement costs were reduced from \$67,475,000 to \$67,410,000 in 1987. This was an actual dollar decrease of only \$65,000 or 0.10 percent.

An alternative measure of placement savings was presented in the JCJC 1987 annual report:

"When placement costs are related to individual youth, a higher placement cost savings can be determined. In 1987, 149 fewer youth were committed to placement facilities as compared to 1986. At an average per diem rate of \$100 and an average placement length of 8.43 months (based on 1987 aftercare data), \$25,300 was saved on each youth not committed to a placement facility. This would result in a project total of \$3,769,700."

Placement savings are often computed in terms of the number of juveniles in the program who would otherwise be in placement if the program did not exist. Project goals are that IPS should be an alternative to placement; therefore, the youth in the program, theoretically, would otherwise be in a placement program if IPS did not exist. Without a comparative study of IPS and placement populations, the degree to which IPS cases are actual diversions is not known; however, if we estimate that 25 percent of the 1987 cases served (excluding the 230 cases that recidivated and most likely went to a residential placement) were true diversion cases, 318 youth would otherwise have been in residential facilities during that year ($1502 - 230 \text{ recidivating} = 1272 \times 25\% = 318$). Based on the JCJC estimate of \$100/day per diem and an average length of 8.43 months (253 days), these youth would have represented 80,454 placement days and \$8,045,400. Costs of IPS supervision are estimated by JCJC at \$5.43/day (salary only) and these 318 juveniles were in the IPS programs an average of 222 days ($7.39 \text{ months} \times 30 \text{ days}$) for a total of 70,596 IPS days. This computes to a total salary cost of \$383,336. If these costs were doubled to \$766,672 to include an estimate for fringe benefits, overhead, and administrative costs, the savings in avoided placements would be \$7,278,728.

Two critical factors in this calculation are the degree to which IPS is an actual alternative to placement and actual recidivism rates, and these have not been systematically evaluated to date. The actual program cost in addition to salary is also not readily available and would vary from county to county. As probation referrals increase and population profiles change, the impact of an IPS program cannot be measured so validly against the reduction in costs over the previous year; but rather, in terms of the increasing diversion of new youth from placement.

The final state oversight tool is through JCJC audits of counties with IPS programs. Now that the concept of IPS is institutionalized within the Pennsylvania counties, the intensity of JCJC's implementation monitoring role changes to one that incorporates IPS into its standard court service visits for all services within county probation departments, as well as randomly selecting up to 10 probation departments for an audit specific to ISP. In addition, JCJC allocates its limited resources to initiate and develop new programs.

No formal evaluations have been completed on the state-wide program to date. With a JCJC grant, Dauphin County has contracted with the Criminal Justice Program at Pennsylvania State University in Harrisburg to complete a study of its program. That study is scheduled to begin in 1989 and will primarily focus on an assessment of the factors leading to IPS

implementation and the impact the program has had on the placement decision-making process in Dauphin County.

Through the Sociology Department at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Allegheny County is also evaluating its program. A longitudinal study assessing the degree to which program goals are being met is scheduled for publication in 1989. Additional studies comparing outcome information on program participants and other probation populations are planned.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The relationship between JCJC and PCCD was critical to state-wide implementation, as this cooperative endeavor required a clear delineation of tasks and mutual support. JCJC is legally mandated to establish standards for overall probation services and has an excellent relationship with both the courts and county probation departments. This relationship has developed over the years and through a number of projects. The funding resources, grant administration, and implementation accountability promoted through PCCD provided an environment in which county departments were held accountable. JCJC's role as an on-going funding and auditing organization serves to reinforce the importance of program integrity at the local level.

Within the local probation departments, the relationship between the chief probation officer and the courts becomes essential, both during implementation and during on-going phases of the program. Allegheny County provides an excellent example

of the importance of the CPO and chief judge consistently supporting the program. Support from the county board is critical in that IPS positions need to be funded within the county's probation budget. As with all community-based programs, it is critical to maintain on-going relationships with community resources, law enforcement, and prosecuting and defense attorneys.

SUMMARY

State-wide implementation of the Pennsylvania IPS occurred during a historical period when the program was seen as a potential resolution for a problem shared by many counties - reduced placement budgets. Implementation was successful for a number of reasons including the close working relationship between PCCD and JCJC as well as the relationship both organizations have with the individual counties. Implementation procedures were easily understood by counties, with a simple application process and straightforward project standards. While several counties were in the initial stages of developing their own intensive programs, the start-up money available through PCCD grants was considered crucial in encouraging the number of counties that eventually developed programs. During the early stages of the project, it was essential to invest money in the technical assistance and monitoring position housed at JCJC. This provided for program consistency and enabled the collection of preliminary monitoring data. Initial implementation targeted

mid-sized counties, avoiding the very rural areas as well as the major urban area of Philadelphia which would have taxed all available resources. (Philadelphia became involved in the program in 1987 and is the largest operational program in the state.)

IPS implementation was a major initiative for both JCJC and PCCD. There was considerable organizational staff commitment as well as financial commitment in order to make the project succeed. Both organizations had active and committed advisory boards who had both philosophical and financial interests in program success. County motivation for staying in the program was at least in part financial, as state reimbursement is capped and placement costs continue to rise.

State-level monitoring and oversight are complex in a system in which the programs are located within locally controlled county probation departments. Program integrity can be addressed on a broad policy level through JCJC standards and audit procedures; however, the actual operational integrity continues to rest at the local level where probation supervisors and CPOs are responsible for assuring that the programs remain intense and targeted to high-risk juveniles who would otherwise be in placement. To date, no comprehensive evaluations of the program have been conducted and central monitoring resources are limited; however, the programs continue to have strong support. The implementation effort is unique in that within approximately three years, two state agencies working cooperatively initiated and stabilized IPS programs in 30 jurisdictions, all of which continue to be operational.

SPECIALIZED GANG SUPERVISION PROGRAM
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

The Specialized Gang Supervision Program (SGSP) is operated by the Los Angeles County Department of Probation to supervise both juveniles and youthful adult offenders. This "generic" caseload is a key component of the gang program because the authorities recognize that gang activity does not stop upon a youth's 18th birthday. Following youth into their adulthood is a mechanism through which probation officers can maintain continuity in fighting the gang problem in Los Angeles.

The SGSP is based on the assumption that close monitoring, swift court action for probation violations and stepped-up surveillance of gang activity will help reduce the violent activities of probationers and reduce the amount of gang-related violence in the community. Gang membership is pervasive in the county juvenile probation population, but this program is geared toward only the most serious and violent gang members. The probation officer's job is primarily one of law enforcement, and a key component of the program is to bring gang participants into court for any violation of probation conditions. Probation officers work closely with the Los Angeles Police Department (L.A.P.D.) in this regard.

The second emphasis is on keeping apprised of gang activity and potential confrontations between warring groups. This requires probation officers to become involved with community groups and other agencies in the area. The SGSP operates two additional programs targeted toward adult gang members. The Gang Recording, Evaluation, and Tracking System (GREAT) uses probation and police tracking systems to more closely monitor the activities of adults in the program. The Gang Drug Pusher project uses electronic surveillance and intensive monitoring to reduce drug trafficking violence among adult gang members.

The SGSP operates in five regions throughout the county with 40 probation officers. The average caseload is approximately 50 per probation officer. As of November of 1988, the SGSP had 1,875 cases under supervision, including 1,310 juveniles and 565 adults. The SGSP is considered to be one of the most important programs to address gang activity in Los Angeles County.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Los Angeles County, the sprawling metropolis of nearly eight million people, is located in Southern California. The county covers over 4,000 square miles. The population is diverse, from the very wealthy in Hollywood to the very poor in East Los Angeles. Overall, the unemployment rate is 10.1 percent, slightly above the state average.

The city of Los Angeles has approximately three million inhabitants, second only to New York City. Seventeen percent of the population is Black; 28 percent is Hispanic. Persons under the age of 18 make up one-fourth of the city's population. Approximately 600,000 crimes are committed each year in Los Angeles County and it is estimated that 11 percent are committed by juveniles.

Juvenile gangs have long been a part of life in Los Angeles. In recent years, however, the activities of the youth gangs have become more rampant and more violent. The catalyst for this increased activity has been drug trafficking and, in particular, rock cocaine or "crack," as it is commonly known. All areas of Los Angeles County have been touched in some way by gang activity, and youth gangs are expanding their drug trade into other counties and states.

Recent estimates are that at least 500, and perhaps as many as 650, separate gangs operate in Los Angeles County. Of 503 identified gangs, 184 are Black, 275 Hispanic, 27 Pacific Islander and Asian, 14 White, and 3 of mixed ethnicity. The gangs range in the types of activities in which they engage, the

kinds of drugs they sell, and their histories (some Hispanic gangs are 50 years old).

Gang activity is responsible for an increasing number of deaths, both of known gang members and innocent bystanders who are caught in the cross-fire. From 1986 to 1987, gang-related murders in Los Angeles County increased 15 percent, from 246 to 284. The Probation Department estimates that non-gang members accounted for more than half of the victims.

The Specialized Gang Supervision Program (SGSP) was started in 1981, largely as a result of the efforts of one former gang member who became a probation officer and then a social worker and who saw the need to directly address the growing gang problem in Los Angeles. His efforts were supported by a member of the county Board of Supervisors who obtained program funding. This ex-gang member remains with the program today, serving as its director. Initially, the program was not readily accepted into the mainstream of the Probation Department's activities. Today, the SGSP is considered a valuable part of the department and an important tool in the county's efforts to address gang activities.

The SGSP is based on the assumption that close monitoring, swift court action for probation violations, and stepped-up surveillance of gang activity will help reduce the violent activities of youth already on probation and will reduce the amount of gang-related violence that occurs in Los Angeles County.

Other positive program effects are not the driving force behind the program. The program is less concerned with treatment or rehabilitation, although SGSP probation officers believe that if youth become less involved in gang activity, rehabilitation is a consequence. While the program is designed to serve as an alternative to incarceration, in practice it often serves as a postponement to institutionalization, since many of these youths go on to the California Youth Authority (CYA), the state-operated juvenile corrections system.

The Deputy Director of the Special Services Bureau of the County Probation Department oversees the operation of the SGSP. Staff include a director, 5 Supervising Deputy Probation Officers (SDPOs), 40 Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs), and clerical support staff.

The program is divided into five regional units across the county. Each unit consists of one SDPO and eight DPOs, with a collective caseload of 400 offenders. The average caseload for each DPO is approximately 50 persons and is designed to cover a specific geographic area so that the DPO can become familiar with that area's individuals, gangs, on-going disputes, and "hot spots." In talking with the DPOs, however, it is clear that some areas are widespread and a given DPO may have a great deal of territory to cover. As of November of 1988, there were 1,875 cases under supervision, including 1,310 juveniles and 565 adults. Program policy keeps the ratio of juveniles to adults in the program at 70:30, and this ratio is maintained in each of the five units.

When the program began, the director selected the five unit supervisors who were given the autonomy to interview and select the eight probation officers under their supervision. This confidence in each other's judgment has continued. The SDPO gives the DPOs the autonomy to handle their caseloads under certain guidelines, but is cognizant of their individual styles and personalities. The line staff represent a diverse group, with different approaches to working within the guidelines of the program.

In addition to the regular SGSP activities, two programs have been funded with additional monies and attached to the specialized gang program. The Gang Recording, Evaluation, and Tracking System (GREAT) is a program geared toward efficient use of probation and police tracking systems to more closely monitor the activities of adults in the program. This system is operated by two deputy probation officers who report directly to the program director.

The Gang Drug Pusher program is handled by two DPOs in one of the unit offices with a caseload of 54 offenders. This project is geared toward the reduction of drug trafficking violence among adult gang members. Electronic surveillance, drug testing, and intensive monitoring are the surveillance methods used in this special program.

The 1988-89 annual budget for the SGSP program is \$2,484,500, excluding supplies and services costs. The program is funded totally by the Los Angeles County Probation Department. The daily cost to have a youth placed on SGSP is somewhat higher

than that of regular probation: \$4.20 per day versus \$2.60. The annual cost of placing a youth on SGSP is \$1,512. Interestingly, it costs only 94 cents per day to place an adult on the program or \$336.00 per year.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The target population consists of identified violent gang-oriented probationers, male and female. The program has adhered to the concept of generic caseloads (juvenile and adult offenders), which was part of the original program design. The program has responded to the changing nature of gang activity (ie. drug trafficking and the related drug wars) by instituting the special Gang Drug Pusher program. Despite the increased gang activity, the total caseload size has remained the same since the program's inception.

The criteria for admission into the program are very specific. Juveniles must be adjudicated delinquent and adults must have a formal grant of probation in order to be eligible. In California, juveniles up to the age of 18 are under juvenile court jurisdiction (unless waived to adult court). The top priority group for the program consists of those probationers who have participated in a homicide, shooting, or other specified violent gang activity. The second priority group are those youths who have been identified as active members in a gang currently engaged in violent activity. Finally, siblings of members of the above groups may be included on the SGSP caseload, usually handled by the same DPO.

The diversity of the probationers served is illustrated in the profile of the current SGSP caseload. Probationers are primarily male (98 percent), Hispanic (54 percent) and range in age from 13 to 30 years old. The prior records of the youth accepted to the program include a wide range of offenses: alcohol and drug-related charges, theft, burglary, auto theft, robbery, assault and battery. There are very few sex offenders and minor status offenders enrolled in the program. The ethnic breakdown of the current SGSP program is as follows:

White	47	(2.3%)
Black	798	(39.4%)
Hispanic	1089	(53.7%)
Indian	0	(0.0%)
Asian	56	(2.8%)
Pacific Islander	29	(1.4%)
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>(0.3%)</u>
TOTAL	2025	100%*

*Total does not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Since gang activity is so rampant in Los Angeles and the SGSP caseload is finite, it is important that the inappropriate probationers be screened out. The SGSP handbook defines a "gang" as "a group of individuals which engages collectively in acts of violence or criminal behavior". Youths may be identified as serious gang members in one of the following ways:

- 1) admission by probationer;
- 2) identification by member of SGSP or other law enforcement or corrections agency;
- 3) arrested with other gang members or known to associate with other gang members;
- 4) participation in gang activity (ie. arrest);

- 5) reputation in the community and among peers as a gang member based on information from the Community Youth Gang Services; or
- 6) miscellaneous information (ie. dress, tattoos, wearing of "colors").

Once identified as a gang member, the information is recorded in the youth's file.

Youths are referred to the Specialized Gang Supervision Program through several avenues. A judge can order a youth to be screened by the SGSP after the youth has been adjudicated delinquent and a grant of probation has been entered. Youths already on probation may be referred to the program by a Supervising Deputy Probation Officer. In either case, personnel in the SGSP decide whether the youth is appropriate for the program.

There are other ways in which probationers can be accepted into the program. A youth may be arrested and detained for an offense which would clearly make the youth appropriate for SGSP. A SGSP DPO may take over supervision of the youth with consent of the field probation officer. Those youths who are being released from a camp placement can also be supervised by SGSP. All SGSP cases that have been sent to a camp placement are returned to SGSP jurisdiction upon graduation. Youths identified as gang members while in a camp placement are sent to the unit closest to their home upon release. Adults who are seriously involved in gang activity may be accepted into the program specifically for the narcotics testing component. An adult may also be directly court ordered to SGSP. Those being released from a residential placement are often referred to SGSP 30 days before their

release. Finally, both juvenile and adult offenders from other counties or other states may be transferred to the custody of the SGSP program.

The overriding criteria for acceptance into the program is serious and violent gang-related activity. The DPOs are aware of the need for accepting those offenders who are most appropriate for the program. Those youths or adults who the program personnel feel cannot be supervised in the community as well as those whose criminal behavior does not warrant the intensive supervision provided through the program are not accepted. The decision to accept an individual rests with the Specialized Gang Supervision Program.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

When a youth is first accepted into the program, conditions of probation are clearly laid out. SGSP probationers must meet the same standards of traditional probation with the addition of several other conditions. SGSP personnel must contact the probationer within two days of acceptance. In the initial meeting, the probationer is apprised of the conditions of his/her probation, penalties for noncompliance and how conditions of community service, restitution, etc. might be met.

SGSP is a surveillance program. Therefore, there are few services in the sense of treatment and rehabilitation. During the NCCD on-site visit, it was emphasized that the DPOs are law enforcement officers. Violations of probation are swiftly taken to court. The SGSP provides a service to the community in that

much of the DPO's time is spent in the neighborhoods monitoring the activities of the SGSP probationers and meeting with community leaders. The DPO can get to know the clients and the community very well. The requirements for contact with offenders in the SGSP are as follows:

1. Three (3) recorded contacts per month - these can be a combination of face-to-face and "collateral" contacts (ie. contacts with police or schools about the youth's activity).
2. At least three (3) face-to-face contacts over a two-month period are required.
3. For juvenile offenders, the parents or guardian must be contacted face-to-face during the first 30 days. After that, the parents must be contacted once every three months.

DPOs are required to spend 35 percent of their time in the field. This allows the probation officer to spend time contacting the police, district attorney, community groups, schools and courts in monitoring the activities of the youths. DPOs are required to spend time during the evenings and weekends keeping track of the activities of their clients and becoming informed about gang activity and warfare.

While these contact standards are intense within the context of the Los Angeles County Probation Department, the caseload of 50 per probation officer is the highest among the intensive supervision programs visited by NCCD for this report.

The youths on the SGSP caseload are seriously and repeatedly involved in gang activity. Therefore, it is to be expected that there will be violations of the conditions of their probation. Both technical violations and arrests for new crimes are reported

quickly to the court. Violations of probation are processed through the court system more quickly than new offenses, so minor offenses are often categorized as probation violations. The police, district attorney and probation officer work closely together in presenting the case to the juvenile court judge. The offender may be returned to the supervision of the SGSP, placed in short-term detention or held for placement and/or commitment to the California Youth Authority.

Offenders are kept on the SGSP caseload until a court order releases them from the program's custody, with an average length of stay of one year. This period of time is often interrupted by a stay in camp but upon release from camp, the case is returned to the SGSP. The SGSP DPO can initiate the transfer proceedings from SGSP to the regular probation caseload. This is to be done within 60 days after the youth is no longer appropriate for the program.

Termination statistics for the month of November 1988 show that 36.5 percent of the probationers were successfully terminated from supervision and 14.3 percent were transferred to a regular probation caseload. Probationers for whom bench warrants had been issued made up 19 percent of those removed from the roster. Nearly seven percent of the probationers were sent to CYA facilities, nine percent to state prison, and six percent to county jail. The remaining nine percent were terminated for other reasons.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The purpose of the SGSP is to reduce gang violence in the community. The creation of such a program was prompted by an increase in the incidence and prevalence of violent gang activity. Unfortunately, gang violence has not diminished; instead, it has reached new heights. Therefore, the overriding goals of the program have remained similar throughout its nine-year history. The SGSP does not propose to solve the gang problem in Los Angeles; rather it serves as a mechanism with which law enforcement can fight gang violence.

The overall goal of the program is translated into specific objectives. As presented in the program policy and procedure handbook, the program objectives are as follows:

- A. Reduce the rate of homicides committed by gang members who are actively under the jurisdiction of the Probation Officer.
- B. Reduce the incidence of violent acts resulting from gang activities involving persons actively on probation.
- C. Improve probation control and surveillance over gang-oriented probationers who actively participate in gang conflict, violence and crime.
- D. Ensure compliance with all conditions of probation, the prompt detection of all violations and the return of these offenders to court for appropriate disposition.

These objectives are clearly tied to the underlying philosophy that gang activity can be controlled by strict methods of surveillance and accountability.

Line staff are very supportive of the program's goals and objectives. There is a strong sense that their primary role is

that of law enforcement. The SGSP deputy probation officers are the personnel most informed about the gang activity in Los Angeles and surrounding regions. The information they have about gang activities is essential to the optimal utilization of program resources.

Individual case records as well as overall program outcome reports are maintained for the SGSP. Each case file is to be "court-ready"; that is, each case file must be kept up-to-date and legible in case it is subpoenaed for court use. The case file includes records of all interviews and contacts, intake information and any other action that was taken in reference to the client.

Monthly audits of case files are made by each SDPO as a quality control measure. Three cases are selected randomly from each caseload. These cases are assessed both in terms of record-keeping and in terms of how clients are being supervised (ie. number and type of contacts).

Computer records are kept of clients as well. Case status is entered into the Probation Department computer system. The GREAT system is a means by which adult offenders can be tracked in coordination with L.A.P.D. files. Plans are currently in progress to link court, police and probation juvenile records.¹

These case files provide the basis for the monthly and annual program reports. Juvenile and adult caseload information

¹ Each probation officer will have a computer terminal at his/her desk which will allow access to all types of records. This system will be department-wide, with implementation planned for Fall of 1989.

is reported to the deputy director of field services. The reports include caseload numbers, terminations, and a narrative about the activities in each of the five regions. This information is also subject to periodic internal audits.

While the Department had designed a program evaluation for the SGSP, it has never been carried out. Therefore, information is not available on objectives achievement and program impacts.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The SGSP works closely with several other agencies and constituencies in the community to coordinate the effort of fighting gang violence. Most important is the connection with the L.A.P.D. and, in particular, the CRASH program (Community Resources Against Street Hoodlums), and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Operation Safe Streets.

Periodically, the probation officers ride along with police officers in order to make a "sweep" of a particular area. During these sweeps numerous arrests are made. The DPOs also have to rely on the police department for protection, because it is becoming too dangerous to do the kind of supervision that the program design requires.

The SGSP also works closely with the "Hardcore" District Attorney's office. This is a special district attorney who handles the most serious cases in the county, which includes many of the youth on the SGSP caseload. SGSP works with that office in gathering information for presenting cases to the court.

Coordination with other agencies is both local and long distance. As the gang activities become more profitable and "business" becomes more competitive, gangs are expanding their activities to other areas. The DPOs work with neighboring counties as well as states across the country. One DPO flew to York, Pennsylvania to testify about a former client who had since set up a crack house. The sharing of such information with other agencies takes up a great deal of time and paperwork.

SUMMARY

The Specialized Gang Supervision Program is considered a valuable part of the juvenile justice system in Los Angeles County. The program focuses strictly on surveillance activities, with the goal of reducing gang violence in the community. There will be a need for such a program in the years to come because gang activity is not likely to decrease in the near future. Because of the program's population profile, many of the participants are eventually incarcerated. From this perspective, the program is not viewed by SGSP staff as a long-term alternative to institutionalization. The SGSP may, however, safely provide for the supervision of this high-risk population in the community. To meet the goal of community protection, increased surveillance is provided and violations of probation are promptly responded to. Short-term detention and revocation of probation with commitment to CYA are considered viable program options to provide for the protection of the community.

The program has the support of the juvenile courts. Communications between the program and the various police departments are being improved. With the increase in gang-related activities, it is likely that many more youths are appropriate for the program, but an increase in caseload size would defeat the purpose of the program, so the number served has remained steady.

Perhaps the greatest strength lies in the continuity of the program since its inception. The creator of the program serves as its director. Three other individuals who have been with the program since the beginning serve in administrative positions. Despite the long hours and demanding and often dangerous work, DPOs consider themselves lucky to be part of the SGSP team. In meeting with various personnel, it appears that all involved believe in the goals of the program.

The Specialized Gang Supervision Program is certainly needed in the Los Angeles area and, increasingly, in other areas across the country. Several other agencies have come to see how the program operates. Internal evaluation would be helpful in substantiating the success of the program.

HENNEPIN COUNTY SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

In 1984, the Juvenile Probation Division of the Hennepin County, Minnesota, Department of Court and Field Services implemented a conditional probation program, subsequently termed "Surveillance," as a response to judicial interest in developing alternatives to placement in an overcrowded county home school. The Surveillance program is used both as an alternative to out-of-home placement and to support juveniles transitioning from an institution back to the community. In all cases, the program goals are to ensure that participants adhere to court-ordered contracts and do not become involved in any additional delinquent or illegal activities.

The Surveillance program operates in the near north and south sides of Minneapolis, Minnesota, a limited geographic area which reports the highest delinquency rates in the city. As an alternative to correctional placement, the program targets youths who have a record of felony property offenses and/or juveniles with an extensive history of minor person and property offenses. Although more serious offenders may be placed in the Surveillance program upon release from an institution, they are not considered for program services as an alternative to placement. Program participants are referred to Surveillance by the supervising probation officer, accepted by the surveillance supervisor, and supervised within a team concept by four community corrections workers who provide two to six daily contacts with the juvenile. Contacts with the juveniles can occur at non-traditional working times, seven days per week, and the clients are required to keep the surveillance officers informed of their whereabouts at all times. While the primary purpose of the Surveillance program is to monitor and enforce adherence to specific probation and court-ordered conditions, program participants are generally involved in community non-residential treatment programs, public schools, alternative schools, or other resources with which the surveillance officers maintain contact and support.

While juveniles are in the Surveillance program, the regular supervising probation officer maintains primary jurisdiction and remains responsible for case planning. Day-to-day services are provided by the community corrections surveillance officer. Since its inception, the program has been well accepted by community resources and has developed into an integral part of the Hennepin County Juvenile Probation Division.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

During program development of the Hennepin County Surveillance program in 1984, it was decided to target the program to the highest crime areas of Minneapolis rather than to spread the limited resources over the entire county. The program currently serves two high-crime precincts in Hennepin County, Minnesota, which include the near north side and the near south side of Minneapolis. This is a highly urban population and the neighborhoods represent the highest juvenile crime concentrations in the county. The program was intended primarily as an alternative to placement in the county home school; however, it has also become an alternative to commitment to the State Commissioner of Corrections and other out-of-home sanctions.

Initial program efforts were to target offenders who were not responding to the prevalent "treatment" model in Hennepin County Probation. For selected juveniles, it was believed that by focusing on surveillance and controlling the negative behaviors of the juvenile in the community, it would be possible to create an environment in which long-term behavioral change was more likely to occur. Originally, the program was called the Conditional Probation Program. This was later changed to the Surveillance program because surveillance was clearly understood by both clients and resources and accurately described the fundamental premises of the program. The philosophy of the Surveillance program is incorporated within the mission statement of the Juvenile Probation Division which, in part, defines the division's role as one of promoting public safety, reducing

delinquency, providing for accountability, and developing individual responsibility for lawful behavior. Also within the Probation mission statement is the philosophical understanding that children should remain in the care of their families whenever possible, with placement decisions based on risk to the community and needs of the child.

While the role of the surveillance officer is clearly defined as not being one of providing treatment services, surveillance and treatment are not mutually exclusive. In a 1986 evaluation of the Surveillance program, most youth (87 percent) were in some type of alternative school, day treatment, or the public school system while on surveillance.

The Surveillance program is a separate unit within the Juvenile Probation Services Division, one of seven divisions reporting to the Department of Court and Field Services. Four surveillance officers report to a correctional supervisor who is responsible to the manager of the Juvenile Probation Services Division. The program is a well-integrated part of the Hennepin County Juvenile Probation System and is systematized to such a degree that it does not appear to be dependent upon any single individual for its continuance.

In 1987, 130 juveniles were referred to the program, an increase of 35 (37 percent) over 1986 figures. However, the average daily population in 1987 dropped to 34 juveniles, from 41 youth in 1986. This occurred primarily as a result of program expansion during 1986 to include a second precinct in the near north side of Minneapolis. Fewer juveniles could be supervised

at any given time due to the additional travel requirements for surveillance staff. Estimates for 1988 are 132 referrals and an average daily population of 37.

Four community corrections officers and one probation officer trainee provide surveillance services, using a team approach for the entire caseload. The surveillance unit is currently supervised by one supervisor who has an additional regular probation unit as well. While the community corrections officers are at a lower personnel grade than probation officers, the pay scales overlap with entry level probation officers. The program frequently makes use of student interns. The program is staffed from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., seven days a week, 365 days a year. Two shifts operate: 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and 3:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m., which allows one hour overlap for team meetings. The day shift is limited to one person, while the evening shift generally has two persons.

The program is housed in one central location with other Juvenile Division staff. The Surveillance program is incorporated into the overall Juvenile Division budget, where all costs other than staff salaries are assumed. Initial funding for the program came in 1984 with a re-allocation of funds from a discontinued volunteer probation program. The 1989 salary budget for the Surveillance program is approximately \$150,000. With an estimated number of "child days" at 13,688 days, the average cost per day is approximately \$11.00, excluding everything except staff salaries.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The target population for the Surveillance program are those juveniles who have a record of felony property offenses and/or youth with an extensive history of minor person and property offenses. Youth with a major history of person offenses and those who are considered violent are not referred as an alternative commitment, but may be placed on Surveillance after release from an institution. Staff throughout the organization consistently view the juveniles as being in the program as an alternative to out-of-home placement. The potential age range for program participation is the same as for probation as a whole. Under Minnesota statutes, children 10 and above can be assigned to supervision, and jurisdiction of the juvenile court can be maintained through a youth's 19th birthday if the offense was committed before the 18th birthday. In practice, the program considers those 15 and over to be the most appropriate candidates. The youngest child assigned to the program was 12 years old.

The following criteria are generally used for admission recommendations:

1. The juvenile should have been on regular probation supervision for a minimum of six months with the probation officer indicating that the juvenile is no longer amenable to further treatment;
2. A felony conviction within the last six months (the precipitating reason for the court order to Surveillance should be a felony);
3. A previous out-of-home placement, preferably to the county home school or Commissioner of Corrections;

4. Any habitual, serious offender that the court wants to control from the standpoint of public safety.

A 1986 study of the program, which is discussed further in the Goals and Evaluation section, showed that youths transitioning back into the community from out-of-home placement comprised 46.9 percent of the referrals, while 53.1 percent of the referrals were for youths living in the community. "Alternative to placement" was the referral reason for 28.7 percent, while 15.7 percent were referred to enhance community probation supervision when the juvenile was reaching the limits of being continued on regular supervision. An additional 8.7 percent were referred for monitoring prior to placement. (This monitoring role prior to placement has since been assumed by a house arrest/home detention program, and is no longer a component of the Surveillance program.)

The 1986 study presents the following participant profile:

Sex:

Males	81%
Females	19%

Race:

White	22.6%
Black	36.5%
Native American	35.7%
Other	5.2%

Living Arrangements:

Single Parent Household	58.2%
Two Parent Household	20.8%
Group Home	11.3%
Other	9.7%

Average Age: 15.1 years

The 1986 study provides several indications that higher risk juveniles are, in fact, being admitted into the Surveillance program, with 61.1 percent of the referrals having been on probation at least one year prior to acceptance. Data also suggest that the youths coming into the program present a continuing community threat, not merely a continuation of court activity on an old offense. Forty-five percent of the youth had a new offense admitted or proven in court within three months prior to their Surveillance referral, and 87 percent had a new offense admitted or proven within the last year. Surveillance participants also had a high number of prior court referrals and prior proven offenses, with an average of 6.7 prior court referrals and an average of 4 proven prior offenses. Approximately two-thirds of the participants had proven felony-level prior offenses. These juveniles also averaged two prior out-of-home placements, with only 13 percent having no prior placement.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

The individual assessment process begins with the supervising probation officer evaluating the juvenile for placement in Surveillance. This assessment can occur as part of the pre-dispositional report, within the context of probation revocation proceedings, or within the structure of the risk/need assessments. After determining that a referral is warranted, the supervising probation officer discusses the case with the Surveillance supervisor. If the case meets supervisor approval,

a Surveillance recommendation is made to the court, where program participation must be ordered as a disposition.

After the court order, the Surveillance officer meets with the juvenile and the parents to sign an intensive probation contract which outlines the terms and conditions of the Surveillance program, and specifies possible sanctions consistent with the court order. Conditions include residential arrangements, curfew, school/work requirements, other special activities, driving, and friends and associates. The juvenile is also required to sign special rules of the Surveillance program. The written case plan is then established by the supervising probation officer. Participation in the Surveillance program, juvenile progress, and case plans are discussed daily at the Surveillance team meeting which occurs at the afternoon shift change.

Surveillance juveniles generally participate in one or more treatment and/or educational programs. During the 1986 study, 59.2 percent of the youth were attending an alternative treatment program, 27.8 percent were attending public schools, and 13 percent were not in school, either because of summer vacation or because they had legally dropped out. Surveillance officers refer and monitor treatment programming which is consistent with the court order and the best interests of the child. The primary function of the Hennepin County Surveillance Program is to provide this monitoring service, not to engage in "treatment." As a practical matter, surveillance officers become very familiar

with the juveniles in the program and try to develop a trusting relationship which is, in itself, a treatment approach.

Clients are placed in the Surveillance program for 90 "good" or violation-free days. On Surveillance, personal privileges are earned or retracted according to the juvenile's behavior. The program is structured around four phases. Phase One begins with seven days of house arrest during which the juvenile's movement is restricted to pre-approved activities such as school and counseling sessions, or movement with the parents. Upon completion of seven "good" days in the house arrest phase, the juvenile moves to Phase Two, the prior permission phase, which requires fourteen "good" days. During Phase Two, the juvenile is allowed unsupervised movement if given prior permission by both the surveillance officer and the parents. This phase continues the attempt to curtail spontaneous activity. Phase Three lasts from 45 to 60 "good" days, depending upon the recommendations of the probation officer and/or the family. During this phase, the juvenile is allowed unsupervised movement; however, advance calling to report his/her whereabouts is required at all times. When calling, the juvenile is required to report the address, telephone, length of time, contact, and transportation arrangements prior to leaving. At the completion of Phase Three, the juvenile is transitioned into a thirty-day Phase Four during which time curfew is extended, there are fewer personal surveillance contacts, and the juvenile is prepared for return to regular probation or release directly to the community without additional supervision.

Juveniles need a minimum of 90 "good" days to complete the program. The 1986 study of 105 program participants had an average length of stay of 116 days (3.8 months). Current staff estimates are that most juveniles remain in the program between four and five months.

The primary mechanism of program control is a high level of personal contact with the juveniles. Policy requires a minimum of two to six daily contacts, generally unannounced and at non-traditional times, seven days per week. As the juvenile progresses through the final stages of the program, contacts are reduced to the lower end of the continuum. The 1986 study included a random sample of twenty youths for which the daily log entries on each youth were analyzed to count the number of daily person and phone contacts. On a weekly basis, youths with telephones were estimated to average 35 contacts and youths without phones, 24.5 contacts.

The program uses a telephone answering machine which records the date and time of the juvenile's call. During regular working hours, this answering machine is staffed by one of the Surveillance staff. During off hours, youth call both the answering machine and a special beeper number. A comprehensive log book is maintained by the surveillance officer who is staffing the answering machine or, during off hours, has the beeper. One county car is available for the Surveillance program and is equipped with a mobile telephone. This telephone enables the duty officer to respond immediately to telephone requests that are received on the beeper. It also enables the officer to

save considerable time by avoiding stops at a telephone booth or a return to the office during the shift.

The program emphasizes a high level of internal consistency among the surveillance officers and meticulous logging of juvenile activities which are discussed at shift meetings. Parental support is critical to the program and surveillance staff will never intentionally allow a juvenile to do something the parents would not allow. Policy direction with supervisory control and involvement is encouraged within the Surveillance program. Staff are admonished to follow the program rules and avoid making "decisions in the field." A "tighten-up board" notes policy lapses on the part of staff and encourages overall compliance and consistency when the supervisor wants to improve adherence to a policy.

Surveillance officers have a variety of sanctions available to them. Sanctions include the determination of a "bad" day, thereby extending the client's time on Surveillance. Officers can also ground the juvenile by placing him/her on house arrest; assign work squad (unpaid community service); utilize placement in the juvenile detention center overnight (or pending a court hearing); or, ultimately, initiate court proceedings which would result in residential placement. Throughout the program's phase system, juveniles can be returned to a prior phase. The most frequent violations are failure to notify surveillance staff of their whereabouts, curfew violations, truancy, positive urinalysis, and lying about activities.

The 1986 study assessed the use of consequences. It was found that the first violation is usually met with a warning and the second with three days house arrest or eight hours of work squad. For additional violations, youths often experienced additional work squad hours, grounding, or even a trip to the juvenile center where the youth can be held for eight hours. The study found that nearly 92 percent of the youths were given work squad at some point on Surveillance. Juveniles were also brought to the juvenile detention center an average of 2.5 times; however, this figure includes the times youths were brought to the center when arrested or picked up while on the run. Nearly 42 percent of the youths were on the run at least once during the time on Surveillance.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The overall program goal is to protect the community and avoid costly out-of-home placements by providing intensive surveillance to selected youth who have not been amenable to traditional probation services. Simply, the program seeks to ensure that participants meet the conditions of their court-ordered contracts and refrain from delinquent or illegal activities.

Program operation reinforces the surveillance goals. Teamwork and consistency are reinforced through emphasis on clear policies and procedures such as requiring an "unusual occurrence report" for any contact in excess of twenty minutes. This policy

is consistent with the philosophy that long contacts should not be required within a surveillance model.

As part of the Hennepin County Juvenile Probation Division, the Surveillance program is included in the county-wide computerized information system. While considerable offense and tracking data are entered, they are not readily accessible for program planning. Daily management information is maintained manually through statistical logs, the surveillance log book, and the manual record of good/bad days. This data is aggregated monthly into program statistics.

The most comprehensive study of the Surveillance program was completed in July of 1986 by the Hennepin County Bureau of Community Corrections, Planning and Evaluation Unit. This study, "A Descriptive Study of the Juvenile Conditional Probation Program" had as its main goal:

"to document the social and criminal profiles of program referrals, to survey the reasons youth were referred to and dismissed from the program, to document client's performance on surveillance and the consequence received for rule violations, and to document the number of youth who committed new offenses while under surveillance."

The research sample included the 115 youths who were referred to and completed the Surveillance program between February of 1984 and March of 1986, including ten youths who were referred to the program for supervision pending availability of placement. For most outcome measures, these ten youths were excluded from the analysis. While the study was not conducted with a rigorous research design, the results appeared

encouraging. Of the 115 youths in the sample, 14 juveniles (12.2 percent) admitted or were found guilty of a delinquent offense they committed while on the program. (In addition, another six youths had new referrals pending at the time they were dismissed from the Surveillance program and, ostensibly, these referrals were for offenses committed while under surveillance.) For purposes of comparison, the 1986 study referenced an earlier recidivism study of Hennepin County Juvenile Probationers which:

"found that 16.2% of all youth have new misdemeanors or felonies admitted/proven in court during the first six months of probation. This sample included low-risk, medium-risk, and high-risk youth, as well as youth in institutions and in the community. This study also found that 56.1% of youth classified as "high risk" had new misdemeanor or felony offenses admitted/proven during the first six months on probation."

The report concludes that while there is no empirical or objective basis for labeling surveillance youth as high risk, their criminal history profiles, prior placements, and reason for referral suggest some definition of a high-risk client, thus:

"the 12.2% rate of proven/admitted criminal offenses while on the program suggests that surveillance youth re-offend less than high-risk youth during the first six months of regular probation supervision. In turn, this also suggests that the intense supervision and monitoring of youth by the surveillance program is providing an extra degree of protection for the community."

When reviewing the data for the 105 juveniles who were referred for reasons other than pending placement, the reasons for dismissal would be classified as positive for 46 juveniles (43.8 percent), neutral (needed treatment, moved, other) for 16

juveniles (15.3 percent), and negative for the remaining 43 juveniles (40.9 percent). Negative reasons for dismissal included court determination as ineffective, failed court orders, on the run, or a new offense.

From a more subjective standpoint, the study found that "the general consensus of people in the Hennepin County Juvenile Justice System is that surveillance is a much-needed and effective intervention method for dealing with offenders in the community." The planning and evaluation unit is replicating the 1986 study during 1989 to assess the changes in the client profiles and description data.

In 1988, the Surveillance program also conducted a process evaluation which included interviews with staff and an external assessment of program operations. Recommendations from that process evaluation are expected to form the basis for reassessment and program modifications in 1989.

In 1988, a self-report survey on criminal activity was conducted on 37 youths who recently completed the Surveillance program. Preliminary analysis indicates that admitted incidences of assault, burglary, car theft, and shoplifting dropped markedly during the follow-up period after Surveillance from that which juveniles reported prior to their first probation disposition. One liability of this survey is that the follow-up period differs from 6 to 24 months, with most of the 37 juveniles having been out of the Surveillance program between 6 and 12 months. Preliminary analysis of this data is outlined below:

PRELIMINARY DATA

Surveillance Program 1988 Survey Client Self Report of Criminal Activity (N=37)

	<u>Offense Rate for Month</u>			
	<u>Assault</u>	<u>Burglary</u>	<u>Car Theft</u>	<u>Shoplifting</u>
Prior to First Probation Disposition	3.97	4.24	2.11	7.08
During Regular Probation	4.32	5.81	3.11	4.11
During Surveillance	1.43	2.22	1.32	2.38
After Surveillance*	1.46	1.38	1.86	1.27

*follow-up ranged from 6-24 months, with most juveniles in 6-12 month ranges

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The program maintains positive relationships with other probation officers and the court system, as well as the public defender and the county attorney's office. Hennepin County has a strong network of community programs which serve as resources to individuals on the Surveillance program. Programs which were contacted for this report indicated that they received a high level of support for their program from the surveillance officers. The Surveillance program was described as being highly responsive and consistent in working with clients. Within the school environment, particularly, prompt response to negative behavior is critical and surveillance officers received high praise. It was reported that during the Surveillance program, attendance improves and juveniles are more attentive to school activities. It is the consensus that juveniles respond well to

the structure provided by the Surveillance program. When the transition from surveillance back to regular probation occurs, it was stressed that it is critical that all interested parties be involved in the transition phase so that the juvenile does not go from maximum structure to a sense of ultimate freedom. School programs, particularly, reported that deterioration occurs in the juvenile's attendance and behavior when the Surveillance program terminates. This was described as "planned negative behavior" and directly linked to the date of program termination.

SUMMARY

One of the most readily apparent strengths of the Surveillance program is the internal consistency that has been maintained between the goals of the program and the actual program operation. Program supervisors and staff see themselves as providing surveillance functions and, while this includes monitoring and supporting treatment activities, they do not view themselves as the primary treatment resource. In this context, surveillance is not viewed negatively, but considered a means of gaining control of the juvenile's behavior so that treatment and long-term intervention have the potential of occurring.

Hennepin County has a long history of contracting with private providers for specific treatment services. When talking with private providers and representatives of the school system, it was the overwhelming consensus that a major strength of the program is its consistency, immediate support, and consequences

for the juveniles. It was noted, particularly by the school system, that the juveniles seemed to appreciate the predictability and consistency that was available in the Surveillance program; however, they graphically described a phenomenon of "planned negative behavior" at the time of termination from Surveillance. The school reported that while student attendance and attention improves while on Surveillance, immediately after release from the Surveillance program there is a marked deterioration for most juveniles. This transition back to regular supervision (or in some cases, community life with no supervision) may be particularly traumatic for a juvenile population that has experienced little external or internal control prior to the Surveillance program.

The referring probation officer technically remains the responsible party while the case is referred for surveillance services. In practice it was reported that, at best, this is an informal involvement that is guided more by the inclination of the individual probation officer than by program structure in either the surveillance or regular probation procedures. When transitioning back to regular probation, it is critical that the probation officer become actively involved in the case to reinforce the activities begun in the Surveillance program.

To date, the Surveillance program has intentionally been kept small and targeted to the highest crime areas in central Minneapolis. A by-product of this targeting of resources is that a disproportionate number of minority offenders are in the

program, while chronic offenders with similar criminal profiles in other parts of the county are not eligible for the program. County-wide expansion proposed by the Division in 1990 is expected to compound the complexity of maintaining the high level of face-to-face client contact. Program administrators are looking at technical enhancements, including voice verification telephone monitoring systems which would assist, but in no way replace, the level of personal contact while providing high levels of accountability in monitoring. These technical enhancements are expected to become a viable tool for the program as a whole.

The Surveillance program is an integral part of Hennepin County's juvenile system and is well accepted by the courts, regular probation officers, and community programs. It has stayed consistent with its goals of providing surveillance, and anticipates maintaining quality of service while expanding county-wide in 1990.

RAMSEY COUNTY JUVENILE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROJECT
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

During the early 1980s, philosophical and economic pressures converged within the Ramsey County, Minnesota juvenile justice system to encourage the reduction of out-of-home juvenile placements. The goal was to do this without reducing the delivery of appropriate services or compromising community protection. While this report concentrates on the Intensive Supervision Project (ISP), two other special projects were initiated in 1983 and 1984 to provide a level of treatment and supervision beyond that of traditional probation services. The intent of all three projects is to provide community protection and quality rehabilitation services through intensive contact with both juveniles and their families. The Family Counseling Project (FCP) serves youth who would otherwise be placed outside their own homes due to a combination of delinquent behavior and family conflict. In addition to traditional probation services, these juveniles and their parents are required to participate in weekly family counseling sessions individually or together with other families, with services provided by specialized probation staff. The Intensive Truancy Project (ITP) provides daily enforcement and supervision of school attendance to youth whose chronic truancy would otherwise result in out-of-home placement.

The third initiative, the Intensive Supervision Project (ISP), serves youth whose delinquent offenses would otherwise result in their placement in correctional treatment centers. A team of ISP staff are responsible for supervision of these juveniles by maintaining contact and enforcing strict rules of conduct. Requirements such as school attendance, making restitution to victims, curfew, required approval of friends and activities, and participation in court-ordered counseling are included. Violations of project rules result in immediate consequences of restricted activities, extended time under project supervision, community service work, or short-term periods of detention.

The ISP includes a three-phase system, the first of which consists of detention followed by home detention for a total of 30 violation-free days. Phase Two requires 60 to 90 violation-free days with the juvenile needing permission for all activities. An optional Phase Three is used for juveniles who are within 30 days of dismissal from probation, and provides a reduction in the face-to-face staff contact.

Felony offenders remain in the program for 120 days, while misdemeanants remain for 90 days. Excluding serious violent offenders who are committed for public safety reasons, the ISP targets juveniles considered to be higher risk. Preliminary studies by Ramsey County indicate that the overall program goals of reducing placement costs and providing for public safety are being achieved.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

With a population of approximately 600,000, Ramsey County, Minnesota includes the urban area of St. Paul and surrounding suburbs. The 1980 census data indicate that approximately 92 percent of the Ramsey County population is Caucasian, with 8 percent minorities (Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian, and Other). In 1984-1985, community corrections data for arrests, diversions, probation, alternative programs, detention, and the county juvenile institution (Boys Totem Town) consistently have a minority representation of between 26 percent to 30 percent.

Prior to initiating the ISP, Ramsey County Probation had implemented an intensive street program through LEAA in 1976. This model utilized a caseload ratio of 1:6 and a relationship-based casework model with the most serious, chronic offenders. This program was dropped after 18 months with the consensus that it did not work as well as hoped, in part because the target population was a danger on the street and was subsequently committed to the State Department of Corrections. As a result of this experience, Ramsey County currently uses the term "moderate risk" to distinguish offenders in their ISP from the chronic juveniles targeted by the earlier program. During the earlier program, it was the staff consensus that intervention came too late. The new ISP also chose a team supervision approach, rather than the one-to-one model with a small caseload.

During the early 1980s, the Federal Permanency Planning Law focused attention on reducing the number and length of out-of-

home placements. This occurred at a time when Ramsey County officials were under local pressure to reduce their \$4 million private placement budget. This budget excluded the costs of the county commitments to the county-run Boys Totem Town (BTT) and to the State Department of Corrections. Subsequent to attending a 1982 national conference on the serious juvenile offender, the presiding judge requested that the County Board divert a portion of the 1983 placement money to develop alternatives to out-of-home placements. Several factors converged to obtain approval of this diversion, including the influence of the judge, the attractiveness of cutting the \$4 million budget, and the fact that no new money was being requested for intensive supervision. In addition, the county had successfully operationalized an intensive family-based program in social services during the previous two years, so the overall concept was not new. As a result of this diversion of money from the placement budget, six workers were hired for the ISP at a time when other divisions were not receiving additional staff.

In addition to developing a new program, administration and ISP staff had to convey an understanding of the program to other probation officers who were concerned about the low caseloads of ISP and the possible repetition of the earlier negative experience with the intensive street program. During early 1983, ISP staff investigated programs in Marshall, Michigan and Duluth, Minnesota; reviewed existing ISP literature; and developed

policies and procedures. The ISP began accepting clients in mid-1983, and in 1987, the program was expanded county wide.

Administration of juvenile probation and parole services rests within the Juvenile Probation and Parole Division with a division director who has overall responsibility for court services, investigations, detention, and BTT. Thus, ISP exists within a division that reports to a director who has comprehensive responsibility for county juvenile services. The juvenile division director reports to the Ramsey County Community Corrections director who is responsible to the county board and the county court judges.

The mission statement of the Juvenile Probation and Parole Division sets the stage for ISP and states, in part, that the probation/parole function is to protect the community by providing services and specialized programs for juveniles referred by the court. The Division's directives include providing alternatives to residential placement that will enable selected juveniles to remain in their own homes while experiencing levels of supervision, accountability, and consequences that approximate those provided through residential placement. The philosophy of the Intensive Supervision Project is that a combination of accountability, consequences, limit setting, structure, and support with role modeling to both the juvenile and parents can lead to increased self esteem and confidence, self discipline and goal setting, parenting skill development, and acceptance of responsibility for self

determination. When these factors occur in the client's home and surrounding environment, the likelihood of success is enhanced. The ISP is viewed by the agency as a correctional alternative; and while most juveniles and their families are supportive of the non-residential alternative, voluntary participation is not required.

ISP policy emphasizes community-based contact with youth and families. Both the juvenile and parents are ordered by the court to participate and cooperate with program expectations which are strict, have very real time-limited consequences, and are clearly defined. While surveillance, monitoring, and control are clearly required, officers view their role as including counseling treatment and referral.

County probation and parole services are located in three neighborhood offices within Ramsey County, each with a unit supervisor. One ISP team is assigned to each office. Eight ISP line staff positions are allocated to the three juvenile branch offices, giving ISP two teams of three probation officers and one team of two officers. A supervisor is responsible for the ISP unit and regular probation staff in each branch office. ISP represents 8 of a total county probation and parole officer staff of 50. ISP officers are on active duty on two shifts, from 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m., with team meetings during the overlap time in midafternoon. Coverage is provided through holidays and weekends with staff on call during the off-duty hours.

Branch staff express a high level of support for locating the ISP units in the branch offices. The probation officer knows the neighborhood, the juveniles are closer to the office, the officer can better utilize his/her time, and it is easier to coordinate community resources. Staff also liked the "individual flavor" that each office provides the program, even though it is required that supervisors evaluate the program periodically so that policies remain consistent among offices. ISP statistics are aggregated every six months. Administration and supervisors formally review these statistics to discuss and respond when branch office differences are indicated. In 1987, supervisors revised the operational manual for ISP when, as one supervisor put it, "operational drift" was beginning to occur. The working relationship among the three supervisors and between the supervisors and administration is a positive one in which the few problems that occur are readily managed. All parties concede that program consistency is more difficult to maintain within three separate units; however, it becomes a matter of the degree to which the value of consistency takes precedence over neighborhood individuality and responsiveness. Currently, staff believe that there is consensus with the overall parameters of the program, and office differences are not detracting from the program.

Each of the three ISP units can accept a maximum of 20 juveniles, giving the program a capacity of 60 youth. During 1987, the ISP program expanded from two to three branch offices

and served a total number of 167 juveniles, with 138 new admissions. During 1988, the program received 128 new admissions. As of December 31, 1988, the total active caseload was 31 juveniles.

The 1989 ISP operating budget of \$393,254 represents 16.3 percent of an overall \$2,532,745 probation and parole budget. Six of the eight ISP positions are funded from placement savings and two positions were converted from regular probation staff vacancies. In combination with the Family Counseling Project and the Intensive Truancy Project, ISP has contributed to an overall reduction in the county out-of-home placement budget: from \$4 million in 1982 to \$2.4 million in 1987 and \$2.3 million in 1988. It is the consensus of administrative staff that further financial reductions in the out-of-home placement budget are unlikely. The daily per diem rate for juveniles in ISP was calculated at \$17.41 per day, excluding administrative costs, overhead, and costs of placement after termination from the program. In 1988, the agency estimated that 217 placements were prevented as a result of the three special programs, resulting in a net savings to the county of slightly over \$1 million.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The target population is delinquent offenders who would otherwise be in an out-of-home placement or offenders who need additional supervision as a follow-up to out-of-home placement. Eleven admissions (8 percent) during 1987 and 6 admissions (5

percent) during 1988 were admitted to the program as a placement follow-up. While the Juvenile Court's jurisdiction includes juveniles between the ages of 10 and 18, in practice the ISP works with juveniles between the ages of 13 and 17. Personnel at all levels consistently describe the target population; however, they value the ability to review each case individually before admission.

The selection criteria seeks to exclude juveniles who give evidence of severe emotional disturbances requiring residential treatment, those offenders who are deemed to be an immediate threat to public safety, and chronic chemical users. As a practical matter, juveniles are not recommended for the program if the family is not cooperative, as family investment in supervision is considered critical. When informally asked what the single most important factor was for admission, staff consistently cited a cooperative family. In addition, a telephone in the residence is considered essential. Adherence to the target population and selection criteria is monitored by the three program supervisors who participate in the referral process and also by monthly statistics which are formally aggregated and administratively reviewed every six months.

Admissions to ISP during 1988 show the following participant profile:

Sex:		
	Males	84%
	Females	16%

Race:

White	73%
Black	13%
American Indian	4%
Asian	1%
Hispanic	9%

Average Age: 15.2 years

Most Serious Offense:

Felony	63%
Misdemeanor	37%

Alternative to Out-of

Home Placement	95%
Aftercare Placement	5%

PROGRAM INTERVENTION AND SERVICES

While the initial request to refer an individual to ISP can originate with someone other than the probation officer, the referral process requires that the probation officer and the unit supervisor discuss the case in an informal screening process. During this process, some juveniles are not recommended for the program, primarily due to reasons of public safety, emotional problems, or other specific treatment needs. Those juveniles who are recommended by the supervisor and the probation officer are scheduled for a formal staffing. It is required that this staffing consider all possible alternatives including residential placement for the juvenile. With a positive staffing committee recommendation, the juvenile is brought before the court for the dispositional hearing. If ordered into the program by the court, the referring probation officer must complete a transfer summary to ISP which includes a complete court history, summary of the juvenile's current situation, specific court orders which need

adherence, psychological evaluations, and next scheduled court review date.

When providing services to this juvenile population, staff encourage but do not attempt to force an attitude change. Rather, the program enforces accountability for behavior by providing short-term consequences for outward behavior through quick and consistent response, seven days per week. Each juvenile's right and power of self determination is recognized, along with their responsibility for the consequences of those choices.

The juvenile's behavior is reviewed and discussed at daily team meetings of the ISP probation officers in each branch office. The program uses informal case plans which are incorporated into the log book on each juvenile. ISP staff are required to enter information on each juvenile's individual progress sheet and make daily log notes at the end of each shift.

Juveniles in the ISP are eligible to participate in the Family Counseling Project (FCP) if circumstances warrant. During 1988, 12 ISP participants (9 percent of admissions) were also referred to FCP. FCP includes weekly formal family counseling with individual families and groups of families. ISP participants are expected to be in school, employed, or in some other non-residential program dictated by the court. Ramsey County Juvenile Probation uses a variety of community support programs to provide services as needed. The primary responsibilities of the intensive supervision officer are to hold

the juvenile accountable, maintain constant awareness of the juvenile's whereabouts and behavior, and provide support services or refer the juvenile and/or family for services as needed.

The ISP requires that juveniles whose most serious offense is a misdemeanor spend 90 "successful" days in the program while juveniles with a felony on their record are required to have 120 "successful" days prior to completion. Juveniles are returned to court for a review hearing after completing the program. The court may return the child to regular probation or dismiss from court jurisdiction.

The ISP is divided into three phases. Phase One requires 30 "successful" days and begins with up to seven days in detention. The average time served in detention is actually three days, during which time the ISP officer explains the program requirements and consequences, begins developing the juvenile's individual program requirements, conducts an orientation meeting with the parents, and completes written contracts/conditions of probation for the juvenile. Each program phase requires that the juvenile sign a written statement of expectations, specifying the date the phase is beginning, routine reporting requirements, curfew, and any special conditions.

The detention phase of the program enforces the importance of adherence to the court conditions and the power of the ISP program to curtail the juvenile's freedom. Pragmatically, it also provides an opportunity to stabilize the juvenile's behavior and devote his/her attention to understanding the program rules.

After release from detention, the juvenile continues Phase One on a home detention during which time the juvenile is required to be with the ISP officer or his parents at all times or be at home, school, or work. Home detention requirements include daily contacts with program staff, including telephone checks, one-to-one meetings, group activities, and/or unannounced monitoring by staff of compliance to requirements. Specific expectations for school/work attendance are developed along with scheduled group activities, curfews, and behavioral expectations at home and in the community. There is also weekly contact between the parents and program staff. Consequences during this period can range from imposing tighter restrictions, increasing staff contact, assigning supervised service work, or returning to secure detention. Those juveniles who are admitted to the ISP program as a follow-up transitional placement after residential program completion go directly to home detention in Phase One without spending any time in the detention facility.

Upon successful completion of Phase One, the juveniles sign an agreement specifying Phase Two requirements which, again, include specific requirements for activities, curfews, court conditions including restitution and community service hours, and special ISP conditions and activities. Phase Two lasts from 60 to 90 days. During this phase, juveniles are allowed to engage in unsupervised activities after notifying the ISP office of where they're going and how they can be contacted. Phase Two continues to require school or work attendance, daily contact

with project staff, group activity participation, curfew and free-time restrictions, and weekly contact with the juvenile's parents.

Juveniles who are within 30 days of their probation dismissal date may be supervised in an optional Phase Three of the program. During this phase, daily face-to-face contacts are reduced to two times per week with curfew and activity restrictions relaxed. If the juvenile is returning to regular probation, a discharge meeting will be held with the juvenile, parents, ISP staff, and referring probation officer. The purpose of this review is to discuss the behavior while on ISP and make plans for continued probation. At the time of transfer back to regular probation, the ISP staff will complete a transfer summary, containing the juvenile's adjustment and behavior while on ISP and any changes in the information furnished originally by the referring probation officer.

The basic method of program control is extensive personal contacts between the supervising ISP officers and the juvenile, the parents, and significant others. During Phases One and Two, staff are responsible for daily face-to-face contacts with the juveniles, weekly meetings with the juvenile's parents, regular school and/or employer contact, and response to all violations within 24 hours, including a determination of consequences. One ISP officer on each team is assigned as the primary worker for each child to assure that the relevant file documentation, court papers, and transfer summaries are completed. An intensive

supervision log is maintained on each juvenile and contains the following items: a face sheet; Phases One, Two, and Three contracts and conditions of probation; daily log notes; and individual progress sheets. Staff are required to begin each shift by reviewing each juvenile's individual progress sheet and daily log notes.

Considerable emphasis is placed on out-of-office activity in the ISP program. During 1988, the agency completed a longitudinal time study as part of a workload evaluation. During that study, data was collected on a sample of 67 supervision months. When the juvenile was on Phases One or Two and available for supervision (not on the run), officers needed 17.9 hours per month to provide services to each child. Of that time, only 35 percent was spent in the office. The ISP officers averaged 88 contacts per month, 41 percent of which were face-to-face with the juvenile, the juvenile's parents, or some other significant collateral such as the school or treatment program.

The program utilizes a telephone answering machine available 24 hours a day in which participants are required to call in their whereabouts and keep program staff informed of their activities. When staff are on duty during their assigned shift, they frequently return to their branch office to review the messages on the telephone answering machine and take appropriate action.

The ISP program uses a number of positive consequences which include receiving credit for successful days, individual

activities with staff, behavioral contracts to regain "lost" credits or earn "extra" credits for specific improvements and accomplishments, positive person-to-person feedback and support, and eventual return to court with a positive report from the program.

A variety of sanctions are also available to respond to negative behavior. Staff deduct full or half days for violations; initiate home restrictions including earlier curfews and restriction of outside activities; increase staff contact including additional specified times at which the juvenile is expected to report to staff; increase activity participation, community service work, or work assignments at home; and initiate set periods for home detention. Staff can also return the juvenile to detention for up to 72 hours. The juvenile can request or waive a court hearing on the detention sanction. Significant and/or recurring negative behaviors may result in a return to court, at which time the court can place the juvenile in a shelter for up to 30 days; secure detention for up to 7 days; a special short-term program at the county corrections facility (BTT) for 30-45 days; or return the juvenile to a prior phase. The return to a prior phase takes away time earned toward completion of the program and extends the stay on ISP. Days in which program violations occur, those days spent in placements or secure detention, or days on the run are automatically considered unsuccessful and do not count towards completion of the current phase.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The overall goal of the ISP program is to provide an alternative to placement that will enable juveniles to remain in their homes while still experiencing levels of supervision, accountability, and consequences which approximate those provided through out-of-home placement. The program objectives are to have a successful completion rate of at least 50 percent and to have at least 50 percent of the youths remain in their homes with no new criminal offense for a one year follow-up period.

Routine management information for program operation and assessment is collected manually. ISP officers are responsible for maintaining daily log notes and completing routine probation paperwork. Supervisors complete a monthly report listing each child on ISP, indicating that child's progress, related programs, start and end dates, date of birth, sex, race, offense history, and follow-up or alternative-to-placement status. This information is aggregated every six months for review and monitoring by the supervisors and managers.

The supervisors' monthly log sheets, in combination with additional information, are used to create a variety of descriptive statistics which allow management to track program changes over time. Supervisors and administrators meet regularly to discuss program issues.

When compared with 1983 data, 1987 figures indicate that the ISP, in combination with FCP and ITP, appears to have contributed to substantial reductions in placements. Overall, juvenile cases

under supervision have increased 14.5 percent, from 2,040 in 1983 to 2,337 in 1987. Within that same time period, new juvenile placements have decreased 26.9 percent, from 929 to 679. When private placements are evaluated separately, the decrease is even more dramatic: from 735 in 1983 to 336 in 1987, for a 54.3 percent reduction. Data over the five-year period indicate that placement cases now represent a lower proportion of Ramsey County probationers. In 1983, 29 percent of the probationers were on placement status, while in 1987, 19 percent of the probationers were in placement. The proportion of public and private placements has also become more balanced in recent years. Of the placements that were occurring in 1983, 70 percent were to private vendors, 19 percent to county and state correctional institutions, and 11 percent were to community-based, non-residential programs. By 1987, this distribution changed dramatically so that 34 percent of the placements were to private vendors, 35 percent to correctional institutions, and 31 percent to community-based alternatives.

The following table outlines the number of juveniles admitted to the program during the years 1983 through 1988. The table also summarizes the number of successful completions and the number of juveniles terminated for placement. Successful program completion occurs when a juvenile completes the program and is dismissed from ISP or transferred back to regular probation without an out-of-home placement. "Terminated with Placement" indicates juveniles who have been terminated from ISP

participation due to a new offense or rule violation which returned them to court with a recommendation for out-of-home placement. With the exception of 1987 when the successful completion rate dropped to 52 percent when the program was expanded county wide, over two-thirds of participants have successfully completed the program.

RAMSEY COUNTY ISP COMPLETION RATES

	<u># Referred</u>	<u># S/C*</u>	<u># T/P**</u>	<u>% S/C</u>
1983 (June-Dec.)	54	11	6	65%
1984	93	67	34	66%
1985	113	72	37	66%
1986	107	74	37	67%
1987 (expanded county-wide)	138	67	61	52%
1988	128	99	36	73%
TOTALS	633	390	211	65%

* S/C = Successful Completion

**T/P = Terminated with Placement

In addition to the regular descriptive statistics, the Ramsey County Community Corrections Department conducted two internal evaluations of the ISP, the first occurring in 1984 and the second in 1986. The 1984 evaluation studied all juveniles who were admitted and terminated from ISP between June 1, 1983, and June 30, 1984, and compared them to a group of 14 juveniles

from two branch offices who met ISP selection criteria but were not enrolled in ISP and were placed in a residential facility by the court. During this 13-month period, 72 juveniles were terminated from ISP, with 47 (65 percent) of those terminations considered successful. The ISP was as effective as the residential comparison group in controlling the need for subsequent placements during the follow-up period. Fifty-seven percent of both groups required one placement after termination from ISP or release from a residential program. The evaluation estimated that had the ISP and FCP not existed during that time frame, an additional six to seven new placements would have occurred each month. The net savings to the county were estimated at \$181,040 for both the ISP and FCP programs, with \$45,927 in savings attributable to the ISP.

The second evaluation was conducted for youth admitted to and terminated from the program between June of 1983 and March of 1986, with a one year follow-up period after termination. The evaluation encompassed youth from FCP, ITP, and ISP. Of 593 youth terminated from the three programs, 378 (64 percent) juveniles required no follow-up placement during the year following project termination. For ISP, 149 of the 240 terminations (62 percent) had no placement during the one-year follow-up.

ISP juveniles who were successfully terminated were less likely to have subsequent residential placements during the follow-up year. Of the 240 terminations, 156 (65 percent) were

successful and only 26 of these (17 percent) were subsequently placed an average of 1.1 times during the year following termination. Sixty-five of the 84 unsuccessful terminations (77 percent) were subsequently placed an average of 1.7 times.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

Implementation of the Intensive Supervision Program was initiated by the presiding juvenile court judge, and strong judicial support for the program has continued to the present. The program has also developed strong working relationships with the county juvenile attorneys and public defenders who view themselves as providing the necessary checks and balances with respect to public protection issues and negotiating the least restrictive arrangements for juveniles. These parties expressed strong support for the program and were in consensus that the juveniles would be in long-term placement if it were not for ISP. The public defender expressed an interest in having assaultive offenders considered for ISP on an individual basis and felt that the program bias towards juveniles with stable home environments excluded appropriate referrals that happened to reside in a group home. There was also concern about the requirement that all juveniles spend the initial days in detention upon admittance to ISP. It was felt that this stage could be waived for delinquents who served detention time and were released prior to disposition.

ISP officers have strong and supportive relationships with the school systems in the county, and are described as being

consistent and prompt in responding to school problems. Officers also develop and maintain close working relationships with community treatment programs. Within the juvenile probation and parole system, ISP officers must maintain professional relationships with referring probation officers and with staff from supporting programs such as ITP and FCP. At an administrative program level, a critical relationship is with the County Board. Currently, the County Board is pleased with the program's ability to contribute to a reduction in out-of-home placements and to control that budget as well as providing for public safety.

SUMMARY

The ISP has earned acceptance and respect throughout the county by contributing to substantial reductions in overall out-of-home placement costs while continuing to safely provide services for juveniles in the community. As with other community programs, this ISP is highly dependent upon parental support, as services become highly intrusive and, in effect, both the family and the juvenile are on supervision.

Supervisors and line ISP officers are very supportive of maintaining the ISP services through branch offices rather than creating a separate ISP unit. This arrangement reinforces the program philosophy of developing community and neighborhood services, but provides the opportunity for program inconsistencies to develop. Under this arrangement, program

integrity is highly dependent upon supervisors to review program inconsistencies and resolve problems. Supervisors recently revised a manual of operational procedures in an effort to reinforce consistency among the three units. This arrangement seems to work well in Ramsey County because of the high level of compatibility among supervisors as well as the manageable size of the program (maximum of 60 juveniles). In this environment, the program is managed with a high degree of informality that would not be possible in a larger organization.

The program primarily serves juveniles as an alternative to out-of-home placement rather than as an aftercare follow-up to placement. The referral process is highly dependent upon the supervisor's approval, but also requires a positive recommendation from a formal unit staffing. All participants are placed in the program as a result of a court disposition. They begin ISP with a 30-day phase that includes up to seven days in the detention facility, followed by house arrest. Program services revolve around policies that include daily contact with the child, team supervision within three decentralized units, and extensive coordination and referral with community resources.

ISP was initiated with and has maintained a high level of judicial and county board support. The program exists within an environment that is supportive of community alternatives and in a geographic area that has a variety of program options.

LUCAS COUNTY INTENSIVE SUPERVISION UNIT
TOLEDO, OHIO

The Lucas County, Ohio, Intensive Supervision Unit (ISU) is operated by the Juvenile Court as part of the Court Probation Department. The Intensive Supervision program consists of a four-phased approach to case management services and surveillance for adjudicated delinquents who have been committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services for the first time. Delinquents with drug trafficking or weapons offenses, or whose offenses caused serious injury to the victim are ineligible.

Under the phase system, youths gain more freedom and privileges as they exhibit more responsibility and socially appropriate behavior through the accumulation of "credit days." At the start of each phase, a juvenile must pass a test given by the ISU probation officer on the rules and expectations of that phase. The program starts with Phase I, in which the juvenile is on house arrest, and concludes with Phase IV, in which rules are individually negotiated in a contract developed by the youth, his/her parents, and the ISU officer.

The ISU is designed to provide treatment as well as control of behavior. Restitution and/or community service work is a program requirement. Structured family counseling, provided by trained probation staff, is a program option. Successful completion of program requirements results in discharge from probation.

The ISU began operating in October of 1987 with the goals of reducing the number of state commitments and recidivism rates. Program development was carefully done, with program goals, design, and internal policy and procedures spelled out before program implementation. Maximum enrollment is 60, with a caseload ratio of 15 juveniles per probation officer. The ISU served 53 juveniles during the first 13 months of operation. Program capacity has not yet been reached, attributed to the recent emergence of a cocaine/crack problem in Lucas County and the ineligibility of drug traffickers for the ISU.

As part of the Juvenile Court, the ISU has strong judicial support, and has developed strong linkages with other agencies including the Toledo Police Department and School System, and the Juvenile Prosecuting Attorney's Office. The program is too new to evaluate program success. It is anticipated that, if evaluation shows that the program meeting its goals, support for the program will continue.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Lucas County, with a population of approximately 464,000, is located in northwestern Ohio. Toledo, the largest city in the county, has a population of approximately 345,000. Lucas County's economy is largely dependent on the automobile industry (the county is an hour's drive from Detroit), with some diversification in recent years. The unemployment rate for the county is somewhat higher than the state average. The population is primarily white, with a minority population of approximately 16 percent.

The Juvenile Court developed the ISU to serve as an alternative to institutionalization in response to the high rate of Lucas County commitments to the Ohio Department of Youth Services (ODYS). ODYS operates three training schools and two youth camps. For a number of years, Lucas County had the highest per capita commitment rate of any county in the state, and commitments by Lucas County in 1986 increased 17 percent over 1985 levels. A 1984 study of comparative offense histories of the ODYS population showed that, compared to the ODYS population as a whole, Lucas County commitments included a larger percentage of first-time felony adjudications (nearly one-half of Lucas County commitments had only one felony adjudication compared to 26 percent state-wide). However, Lucas County committing offenses were less serious than the state-wide average (two-thirds of Lucas County commitments were for the least serious felony offenses compared to 43 percent state-wide). Because of the

overcrowding in ODYS institutions and a legislative mandate to reduce the correctional population, the state of Ohio provided state and federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention grant funds for program start-up.

The development of the ISU began in 1987 with an investigation of other intensive supervision programs throughout the country. Calhoun County, Michigan served as the initial program model, with modifications made to meet the specific needs of Lucas County. Program planning was thorough, involving the use of a planning committee and an outside consultant. Program goals, design, and internal policy and procedures were spelled out before program implementation. As a result of this careful development work, little change in program design has occurred after 14 months of implementation experience.

The ISU was developed as an outgrowth of the Probation Department's classification implementation. The classification system includes the use of systematic and comprehensive intake information and standardized risk and needs assessments to determine placement in one of four probation supervision categories. As a result of this new system, a supervisor and three probation officer positions were reassigned from regular probation to the ISU.

The theoretical basis for the program is the belief that delinquency is related to the breakdown of family function and factors in the immediate environment. It is nearly impossible, therefore, to address these issues when the youth is removed from

the family and the community. The mission of the ISU is to provide intensive supervision and treatment to youths and their families. The planned result is an increased ability of these youths and families to successfully participate in community life and avoid unlawful behavior.

The ISU is part of the Probation Department which provides regular probation services and specialized probation programs for sex offenders, chemical awareness education, volunteer services, diversion and restitution. The Court also operates the juvenile detention center, called the Child Study Institute. The court director administers these programs under the jurisdiction of the judge of the Juvenile Division of the Court of Common Pleas. There are nine court referees who serve at the pleasure of the judge, four of whom handle delinquency cases. The juvenile judge has delegated much authority to the referees, who have the power to act in the stead of the judge in virtually all instances, with referee's orders then signed by the judge. The Lucas County Juvenile Court has a staff of 210, with a 1988 budget of \$4.4 million.

The ISU has 7.6 staff positions (a supervisor, 4 probation officers, and 2.6 surveillance officers), and a 1988 operating budget of \$189,300. Lucas County funds approximately 68 percent of the program costs, state subsidy money through the Ohio Department of Youth Services provides 11 percent, and federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention funds through the state Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services provides 21

percent of the program costs. The federal subsidy is part of a three-year grant provided to the county for program start-up.

The ISU began accepting juveniles in October of 1987. Through October of 1988, 53 juveniles have been accepted. Of 16 terminations, 7 (44 percent) have successfully completed the program, and 9 (56 percent) have been terminated unsuccessfully. Since juveniles who were enrolled shortly after the program began were still in the program in October of 1988, the successful termination rate cannot yet be accurately measured. (Generally, non-positive terminations occur before successful program completions.)

Maximum program enrollment is 60, with a caseload ratio of 15 juveniles per probation officer. At the time of the NCCD site visit in December of 1988, program enrollment was 37. The caseload for the ISU is smaller than expected because of the large increase in ineligible drug-related commitments in 1988 (see Client Identification section).

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The target population for the ISU are youths between the ages of 12 and 18 who have been committed to the ODYS for the first time. The ISU excludes from consideration youths who have previously been committed to the state. This target population has not changed since the ISU's inception.

After a referee commits a youth to ODYS, the ISU supervisor conducts a screening to exclude juveniles who are not considered

the best candidates to succeed under the ISU guidelines. Factors considered during this screening include: 1) committing offense, including whether there was injury to the victim and whether a weapon was used; 2) prior history; 3) whether the youth presents a danger to the community; 4) whether the youth is amenable to treatment; 5) whether there is a significant adult/other family member willing to provide support and guidance; 6) school history; 7) whether the youth and parents are willing to comply with the ISU guidelines and treatment contract; 8) probation officer feedback and recommendations; 9) feedback from the prosecutor; and 10) feedback from the committing referee. Lucas County ISU screens out juveniles whose committing offense is drug trafficking, those who used a weapon in connection with the offense, and those whose offense caused serious injury to the victim. The supervisor either makes a determination that the juvenile is not a candidate for ISU, or recommends a formal assessment for further consideration.

The 1988 annual report presents the following participant profile:

Sex:	Males	90%
	Females	10%
Race:	White	58%
	Black	38%
	Other Minority	4%
Age:	12-14	18%
	15	30%
	16	26%
	17-18	26%

Referring Offense:

Grand Theft	28%
Receiving Stolen Property	14%
Breaking and Entering	14%
Aggravated Burglary	11%

Participation in ISU is voluntary. The demands placed on both juveniles and parents during ISU enrollment are so great that the program believes that non-voluntary enrollments would not work. In about 5 percent of the cases considered for the ISU, either the juvenile or his/her parents have refused to participate and have opted instead for state commitment.

There are several mechanisms in place to assure there is internal consistency between the target population and the selection criteria. The target population is clearly those who would have otherwise been committed to ODYS. To ensure this, there is no "referral process" in the ISU screening procedure. Referees cannot order ISU as a disposition. The ISU screens every first commitment to ODYS, after the commitment disposition has been ordered.

The program is, therefore, serving those for whom it was designed. There were, however, concerns raised about the exclusionary criteria, particularly that involving drug traffickers. When the program was designed, drug trafficking was not a serious problem in Lucas County. In 1988, the incidence of drug trafficking cases skyrocketed. In all of 1987, Lucas County committed three juveniles on cocaine/crack trafficking offenses. Through November there were approximately 70 commitments for

these offenses in 1988. Because of the sudden emergence of this problem, Lucas County court officials are reviewing this policy and may modify the ISU screening criteria to discontinue the automatic exclusion of these cases.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

For those cases still under consideration after the screening, the supervisor assigns one of the four ISU probation officers to conduct an assessment and compile an ISU checklist. The checklist consists of: 1) levels of function and dysfunction within the client and family unit; 2) discipline, power hierarchy, and communication within the family unit; 3) prior counseling, therapy, and/or intervention; 4) risk/need assessment; 5) drug/alcohol assessment; and 6) family interview and assessment. Once the required information is obtained, the case is reviewed by the entire ISU staff at a team meeting to reach a consensus opinion about whether the juvenile is appropriate for the ISU.

If the ISU staff determine not to enroll the juvenile in the program, the juvenile is committed to ODYS as ordered at the time of disposition. If the staff determine that the case is appropriate, the ISU petitions the Court for a "Change of Disposition" on the offender's behalf. Before the Change of Disposition hearing, the ISU develops a comprehensive treatment plan for the juvenile, using information gathered in the

assessment. A combination of any of the following interventions can be identified in the treatment plan:

- individual counseling for the youth
- psychological assessments of youth and/or families
- family counseling
- group counseling
- assessment for chemical dependency of youth and/or family members
- school evaluations and testing
- random monitoring of urinalysis
- restitution and public service work

The juvenile judge (not a referee) makes the final decision to divert or not divert a juvenile from commitment. In the first 14 months, the judge denied ISU placement and committed the juvenile in 5 percent of the cases. In an additional 5 percent of the cases, the judge concurred with the ISU recommendation for regular probation instead of commitment or ISU placement.

After enrollment, reassessment occurs on an on-going basis. Each case is staffed weekly at the ISU team meeting. Changes in the treatment plan are formulated through staff consensus.

The ISU is designed to provide for both control and treatment of youthful offenders. Under the program design, the control aspects of the program diminish as the youth progresses through the various phases, while the treatment components remain high throughout program participation. The program consists of

four phases which allow the youth to systematically gain more freedom and privileges as he/she exhibits more responsibility and socially appropriate behavior. A youth starts the program with no freedom or privileges, and gains small amounts of each by earning successive "credit" days. A "credit" day is defined as one in which the youth meets all stipulations of the contract and violates no general or specific rules of his/her probation.

At the start of each phase, the youth must pass a test given by the ISU probation officer on the rules and expectations of the particular phase. The juvenile and his/her parents must sign a contract for each phase. In the contract, the juvenile agrees to follow the stated rules, and the parents agree to supervise the child under the rules of the program and to report any violations to the ISU officer. A youth cannot begin to accumulate "credit" days until he/she passes the phase test. The accumulation of "credit" days is dependent upon behavior at home, at school, and in the community. The rules are clear and concise, and possible consequences for not complying are outlined in advance. The consequences and privileges follow the youth's actions as immediately as possible. The anticipated length of stay in the program is six to nine months.

Phase I is house arrest and begins immediately upon the juvenile's release from the detention center. The juvenile may leave his/her home with the ISU officer's permission only to attend school, church, counseling sessions, or AA meetings, and to perform public service work. After earning 30 "credit" days

and passing the Phase II rules test, participants move to Phase II, a 60- to 90-day period with a required minimum of 55 "credit" days. Phase II emphasizes therapeutic intervention which focuses on family, individual, and group therapy. Phase III is also designed as a 60- to 90-day period with a minimum of 55 "credit" days. The intervention strategy in Phase III is still therapeutic, although the youth and family begin to make more decisions about privileges and consequences with the probation officer's continued support. Phase IV is designed as a 30- to 45-day period with a minimum of 27 "credit" days. In Phase IV, parents deal with all of the youth's behavior, except illegal acts. The focus of this phase is on termination from the program. An important part of Phase IV is to ensure that a support network is established for the juvenile and his/her family so needed resources will continue to be available for the family after termination. In Phases II through IV, additional credit may be earned by accumulating ten "credit" days in a row. Throughout all phases, a youth cannot earn "credit" days if he/she is in inpatient treatment or detention.

The ISU has positive consequences built into the program through the use of coupons. Coupons can be earned in several ways, including honor role, involvement in extracurricular school activities, positive involvement in groups, satisfactory work performance, and extreme improvement in a specific area. These coupons can be used for such things as a free meal, extension of curfew, special interest activities or classes, buy-back of a

lost "credit" day, an activity with a staff member, or a weekend day at the next phase. If the youth earns ten "credit" days in a row, he/she is given a free "credit" day.

There are program mandates and optional program services in addition to the supervision and surveillance requirements. The ISU requires a minimum of 60 hours of restitution and/or community service work. ISU participants spend eight hours each Saturday working at designated public worksites. Each offender must repay the victim(s) of his/her crime(s) for lost property, damaged property, or for any injuries. Additionally, the juveniles make a symbolic pay-back to the community through community service work. Juveniles are allowed to keep 10 percent of the earnings from the work program to pay for transportation and lunch expenses, if they are completing a restitution order. According to the Lucas County Court, there are several benefits of this requirement. The supervised work performed under the restitution and community service program builds surveillance into the ISU program, which in turn provides for community protection. The work requirement also holds juvenile offenders responsible for their actions, and contributes to competency development through the teaching of positive work values and habits.

The Juvenile Court operates a structural family counseling program under the supervision of a staff psychologist, using probation staff trained in-house. The ISU supervisor and two ISU officers are trained to provide this counseling service. This

optional component is available to ISU participants and their families, with referrals made by the ISU officer. A problem with the program is the waiting list for service ranging from six weeks to three months. If families have insurance coverage or can afford to pay, they are referred to outside counseling resources. An advantage of the Court program is that the Court can more readily get non-voluntary clients involved in counseling.

Program control is a key aspect of the ISU program, beginning with house arrest in Phase I. In addition to the two full-time surveillance officers, the ISU utilizes the part-time services of two crew leaders from the juvenile restitution program for surveillance activities. ISU staff provide coverage seven days a week, with the surveillance officers working nights and weekends. Holidays are covered as well, with someone from the ISU or the detention center always on call. The contact standards are as follows:

	<u>Surveillance Contact Standards</u>	<u>Face-to-Face Contact Standards</u>	<u>Family Contact Standards</u>
Phase I	2 random check/day	2 contacts/week	1 meeting/week
Phase II	40 random checks/mo.	2 contacts/week	2 meetings/mo.
Phase III	30 random checks/mo.	1 contact/week	2 meetings/mo.
Phase IV	20 random checks/mo.	2 contacts/mo.	1 meeting/mo.

Monitoring school attendance and performance are important parts of the ISU. In Ohio, school attendance is mandatory until age 18 and, therefore, virtually all of the participants must attend school. Juveniles carry an hourly school report form to school each day which is signed by teachers from each class attended. Teachers mark these reports for behavior, participation, cooperation in class, and completion of homework. Any minuses result in the loss of earning a "credit" day. If a youth receives a disciplinary action at school for any acting out behavior or absences/tardiness, this becomes a violation of the ISU contract. The Court may issue appropriate consequences.

Approximately one-third of the ISU participants are enrolled in an alternative school run by the Toledo Public School System. According to representatives of the school system, the working relationship between the ISU and the schools is excellent. Surveillance officers are in contact with the school daily, and ISU officers are on-site at the school several times a week.

Another surveillance activity is urinalysis checks. These are conducted on a random basis once a week in Phase I on all participants, and randomly in Phases II through IV on only those who warrant it.

According to the ISU staff, the contact standards have been met or exceeded in all cases. The number of surveillance contacts at home, in the community, at school, and by phone are tabulated and totalled by month and year-to-date. During October

of 1988, 1,301 surveillance contacts were made on 37 participants for an average of 35 contacts per participant.

There are a series of sanctions the ISU uses when program rules have been violated, beginning with loss of "credit" days. Other sanctions include increases in the hours of public service work required; "Phase Restriction," in which a juvenile must meet the more restrictive rules of the previous phase; and use of detention. Detention is considered a last resort and generally is used only on weekends. The Lucas County juvenile detention center has severe overcrowding problems which limit the use of this sanction.

A juvenile is terminated unsuccessfully from the ISU program only if he/she has committed a new felony, or if there has been repeated, flagrant lack of cooperation. If unsuccessfully terminated, the juvenile will be committed to ODYS or adult jail. According to the ISU staff, the bottom line is if the juvenile is a danger to him/herself or others, then he/she must be unsuccessfully terminated.

Successful completion of the ISU requirements results in discharge from probation. The ISU officer schedules a hearing with the judge at the end of Phase IV. The judge makes the final termination order.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

The goals of the ISU are to: 1) provide community-based daily supervision of high-risk offenders who would otherwise be

incarcerated or placed out of home; 2) strictly monitor the daily activities of each participant to assure a high level of community safety; 3) develop an individual treatment plan for each participant and closely monitor its implementation; 4) have a consistent framework and means to consequence client behaviors not socially acceptable; and 5) evaluate the effectiveness of this combination of treatment and surveillance approaches to supervision in terms of cost effectiveness, recidivism, and community reaction. As part of its state grant, the following two objectives were set: 1) reduce the number of juvenile offenders committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services by Lucas County by 60 youths during a 12-month period (32 percent of eligible 1986 population); and 2) 75 percent of youths assigned to the Intensive Supervision Unit will not be committed to ODYS.

The goals and objectives were established with ISU staff and correspond with the overall mission and intent of the ISU program. A written policy and procedures manual, with the mission and goals clearly stated, has been distributed to all staff. Staff support and understanding of the goals of the program are, therefore, strong.

The ISU collects a variety of client-specific information for case management and program monitoring. Screening information is collected on each juvenile concerning age, sex, race, committing offense(s), prior court history, school history, and history of drug and alcohol use. The assessment report expands on this information and includes details on family

dynamics, educational and community adjustment, and prior treatment and/or placements. Each juvenile's record contains the pre-assessment and assessment reports, any psychological tests, the treatment plan, a data sheet with school and work schedule, daily school reports, and a surveillance log. This information forms the basis of the case file.

In addition to individual records, program summary information is compiled monthly and annually. Assessment, caseload, and surveillance statistics are kept by month, year-to-date, and program-to-date. This monthly report includes information on number of pre-assessments and assessments conducted; youth accepted into ISU; cases terminated successfully and unsuccessfully; home/community, school, and phone surveillance contacts; and current caseload by Phase. These statistics are compiled and maintained manually. The reports are provided to the ISU staff, Probation Department administrator, the court director, and the juvenile judge.

The ISU is too new to evaluate outcome information and assess program success. The primary concern for evaluating the ISU's success will be whether or not the program keeps juveniles out of ODYS by preventing further recidivism, as reflected in the state grant objective that 75 percent of the juveniles assigned to ISU not be committed to ODYS. Currently, program evaluation is planned as an outgrowth of internal program monitoring.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The Lucas County ISU has established strong working relationships with other agencies. As part of the Juvenile Court, the ISU has the network and authority of the Court behind it. The Court has a Juvenile Justice Advisory Board made up of county commissioners, program providers, and local citizens who advise the Court on juvenile issues and reviews and approves the ISU state grant applications. According to the juvenile judge, the Lucas County Juvenile Court has worked hard to put together a network (a "wheel") of service providers to coordinate youth efforts.

In addition to Court staff, interviews were conducted with the juvenile prosecuting attorney and representatives of the Toledo Public School System, the Toledo Police Department, and the East Toledo Family Center. All interviewed indicated a good working relationship with the ISU staff and voiced strong support for the program. The prosecuting attorney called it a "wonderful program," and suggested it could be expanded to deal with drug-related offenders. An example of community support is a grant given to the ISU from the local Bar Association to enable the surveillance officers to have some money to provide participants with informal rewards, such as lunch at a fast food restaurant.

According to the police representative, the perceptions and support of the ISU program vary somewhat among officers but, overall, the Toledo Police Department works well with the ISU staff. There is no formal coordination mechanism in place, but

there is good informal communication. The school representatives expressed strong support for the ISU program. According to the representatives, the schools take for granted their good working relationship with the Court. When the ISU was being developed, concerns were expressed by some teachers about surveillance and probation officers coming into the schools so regularly. Now that the program is operational, there have been few problems and the teacher's union supports the program.

Efforts to further improve communication and coordination are underway. A Court/School/Police Committee will be implemented in 1989. This committee is part of Lucas County's development of a Serious Habitual Offender Community Action Program (SHOCAP), targeted to start in Fall of 1989. A goal of SHOCAP is to share up-to-date information among the Juvenile Court, the police, the schools, and the Children's Services Board (the child protection agency) concerning a small number (25-30) of juvenile serious habitual offenders.

Although there has been an editorial in a Toledo newspaper supporting the program concept, program staff want to assure program stability and demonstrate positive results before widely publicizing the program. Publicity for the ISU program has, therefore, intentionally been kept low key.

SUMMARY

The Lucas County ISU is a well-designed program with careful planning and development before program implementation. One

strength of the program is its target population and selection criteria. The program likely has a diversionary impact in that it is serving only those juveniles who would otherwise have been incarcerated. This commitment occurs prior to assessment for program admission. Because Lucas County has a higher commitment rate than the rest of Ohio, this population may not be as serious an offender population as it would be in other jurisdictions with the same target population. The assessment process was identified as the key to the program's success--making sure the juveniles who have the best chance of success get into the program. Of the 92 juveniles assessed by the ISU from program inception through October of 1988, over one in four (26 percent) were rejected. A counterpoint may be that the program is too selective and is rejecting those who may have been successful (for example, drug trafficking offenders).

Other strengths of the program are its skilled and dedicated staff, its focus on family treatment, its strong Juvenile Court and judicial support, and the strong linkages with other agencies. Ohio law gives great discretion to juvenile judges in the operation of the Court (for example, referees serve at the pleasure of the judge). Therefore, judicial support is critical. With the retirement of the previous judge, a new judge took office January 1, 1989. The new judge has served as the chief referee of the Juvenile Court, and judicial support for the program is expected to remain strong.

Some program areas were identified as needing improvement. One unanticipated problem was the reaction of the regular Probation Officers. The perception has developed that the ISU is the "elite unit" that receives priority for services at the expense of regular probationers. The Probation Department, which includes both regular probation and the ISU, is working on this problem and expects that the friction can be minimized but not eliminated. Another problem has been the waiting list for services, particularly the structural family counseling. When the ISU began, participants received priority for family counseling services, but this priority no longer exists.

The ISU staff identified keeping the participants gainfully occupied during the summer as their biggest problem area. During the Summer of 1988, limited jobs were available for participants through the Private Industry Council's summer youth employment program, but it could not serve all the participants. There were efforts to organize a summer sports league, but few of the juveniles got involved. This area will be emphasized in the Summer of 1989.

Program funding presents another potential problem. The ISU's funding source is not stable, with nearly one-third of the budget coming from short-term (three year) state grants. In Ohio, local programs are funded by the counties, while commitments to ODYS are funded by the state. Consequently, the ISU provides no financial incentive to the county. It is anticipated that three years will be a sufficient amount of time

for the ISU to demonstrate its success. If the program does indeed meet its goals, future funding is expected to be resolved with county support.

The biggest frustration expressed was the skyrocketing drug problem in Lucas County. Drug users who are not traffickers are eligible for the program and are being served, if treatment is available. Since juveniles with drug trafficking offenses are ineligible for the ISU, the program is not directly dealing with this problem. Both the prosecuting attorney and the police representative suggested that the Juvenile Court consider including selected traffickers as potential candidates for the ISU. There is also some judicial support for using the ISU as an aftercare component of a shock parole program. At this time, the program administration recommends keeping the ISU a pure diversionary program.

Lucas County's Intensive Supervision Unit is a well-designed program with strong staff support, strong linkages with other agencies, and a well-defined target population. It is anticipated that the program will continue to evolve as the staff gain experience with the program and outcome results become clearer.

WAYNE COUNTY INTENSIVE PROBATION PROGRAM
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

The Wayne County Intensive Probation Program (IPP) in Detroit, Michigan is administered by the Juvenile Court, and operated by the Court Probation Department and two private non-profit agencies under contract with the Court. The IPP target population is adjudicated delinquents between the ages of 12 and 17 who have been committed to the State Department of Social Services (DSS). The program was initiated in 1983 with state funding with the intent of reducing the level of delinquency commitments to the state. Screening for the program occurs after disposition, with acceptance into the program requiring a change in court order.

After a youth is determined appropriate for intensive probation by the Court, he/she is referred to one of three programs for casework services and supervision. The Intensive Probation Unit (IPU) within the Court's Probation Department represents the traditional intensive supervision model, with low caseloads (a maximum of ten per probation officer) and frequent probation officer contacts and surveillance activities. The IPU operates through a system of four steps, with diminishing levels of supervision as the juvenile demonstrates more responsibility and lawful behavior.

The two private programs have different approaches. The In-Home Care Program, operated by Spectrum Human Services, Inc., provides a family-focused treatment services approach, with teams of family counselors meeting frequently with the juvenile and his/her family. The State Ward Diversion Program, operated by the Comprehensive Youth Training and Community Involvement Program, Inc. (CYTCIP), is a day treatment program with on-site educational and counseling services. This single screening process with subsequent referral to different program models makes the Wayne County program an interesting one for assessment.

Maximum enrollment for all three programs is 220 (IPU - 70; Spectrum - 100; and CTYCIP - 50). Research results suggest that the IPP has been as successful as institutionalization in reducing recidivism among Wayne County delinquents who have been committed to the State DSS. All three programs have consistently achieved successful completion rates of approximately 45 to 55 percent. The IPP demonstrates that a variety of program models can be successful in serving high-risk juvenile offenders in the community.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Wayne County is located in southeastern Michigan, with a population of approximately 2.2 million. Wayne County is a major metropolitan area which includes Detroit, with a population of 1.1 million, and surrounding suburban areas. Nearly two-thirds of the County's population is White, while nearly two-thirds of Detroit's population is Black. The economy is largely dependent on the automobile industry, with its periodic fluctuations in employment. Detroit's inner city has severe socio-economic problems, with high unemployment, school dropout and crime rates, and an escalating cocaine/crack problem.

The Intensive Probation Program (IPP) was developed in 1983 as an effort to reduce the level of juvenile delinquency commitments to the State Department of Social Services (DSS). In Michigan, the State DSS administers the out-of-home placement system including the state training schools, public and private residential treatment centers, group homes, and specialized and regular foster care. After commitment to the state, DSS assesses each ward and places the juvenile in the least restrictive appropriate setting, so a placement other than institutionalization is possible. However, an estimated 99 percent of the state commitment cases from Wayne County are placed in institutions, either state training schools or residential treatment facilities.

The Calhoun County, Michigan Intensive Probation program served as the initial program model, with the State DSS providing

grant funding for an initial intensive probation demonstration project. The original goal of the IPP was to reduce the number of annual delinquency commitments to 460; however, this goal has never been met. In 1987, Wayne County committed 760 delinquent juveniles to the State. Program administrators attribute this not to failure of the program, but as a result of caseload increases and a more serious offender profile.

The Court's guiding philosophy concerning the IPP is to demonstrate that risk to the community is not increased by the program. When the IPP began in 1983, it was directly attached to the Office of the Director of Court Services and was operated as a separate unit until 1987, when it was transferred to the Court's Probation Department. There has been some problems integrating the IPP within the overall Probation Department structure because of the autonomy the program developed in its early years. In addition to Probation, the Court also operates a Youth Assistance Program, Adoption Services, and Intake, which are administered by the Director of Court Services under the jurisdiction of the presiding judge of the Juvenile Division of the Probate Court. Wayne County has three juvenile judges, a visiting judge who works three days a week in the Juvenile Court, and eleven Juvenile Court referees to handle juvenile matters. Dispositional orders issued by the referees are signed by a judge. The Wayne County Juvenile Court has a staff of 325.

The IPP actually consists of three separate programs. The Intensive Probation Unit (IPU) within the Probation Department

conducts the screening for admission into all three programs, provides direct supervision and casework services for some IPP clients, and has administrative oversight for the program as a whole. In addition, the Court has purchase of service contracts with two private non-profit agencies to provide intensive probation services: Spectrum Human Services, Inc., which operates the In-Home Services Program; and the Comprehensive Youth Training and Community Involvement Program, Inc. (CYTCIP), which operates the State Ward Diversion Program. The total 1987 budget for intensive probation services was \$2.2 million. Program funding is split 50/50 between the County and the State, with State funding requiring that juveniles live at home in order to participate in the program. During 1988, 313 juveniles received intensive probation services through the three programs. Per diem costs for the IPP program are approximately \$25/day, compared to institutional per diem rates of approximately \$136/day.

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION

The target population for IPP is youths between the ages of 12 and 17 who have been adjudicated delinquent and who have been committed to the state Department of Social Services (DSS).

After a referee orders a youth committed to the state DSS (most delinquency cases are handled by referees), the IPU supervisor and coordinator conduct a screening to determine if IPP may be appropriate. The assumption to be made in the

screening process is that every juvenile will be diverted to intensive probation unless there is a specific reason which excludes him/her from the program. The following cases are automatically excluded:

- 1) youths previously diverted to intensive probation;
- 2) cases where the commitment was ordered by a judge;
- 3) abuse/neglect wards who are in placement at the time of commitment; and
- 4) youths who have a history of chronic home truancy.

The following additional factors may result in exclusion:

- 1) certain serious felony cases are not automatically excluded, but are more carefully screened for their history of chronic offenses, assaultiveness, or other excluding factors;
- 2) psychiatric or psychological reports indicating severe emotional disturbance and/or that the child presents a danger to himself/herself or to others;
- 3) abuse/neglect wards living at home at the time of commitment;
- 4) no home for the child to return to or the parent refuses to have the child return home;
- 5) a memo from the referee documenting a reason why the child should not be diverted; and
- 6) a pattern of alcohol and/or drug abuse by the juvenile or the parent serious enough to hinder their participation in the program, or involvement in the drug culture serious enough to endanger the youth if he/she is left in the community.

After the dispositional hearing at which state commitment is ordered by the referee, a conference is held with the IPP coordinator and the juvenile's parents. A structured interview

form is completed which focuses on the parent's ability to supervise the youth in the home. Court policy requires that all juveniles for whom a probation officer is recommending state commitment be evaluated by the Clinic for Child Study, the psychological/psychiatric assessment/treatment unit of the court, prior to the court dispositional hearing, and that this information be available for the IPP screening. In practice, approximately 95 percent of the cases have had this evaluation completed. A pre-diversion assessment scale is then completed, which assigns points based on offense type, drug and/or alcohol use, family situation, peer relations, school adjustment and mental health. The combined score results in three categories: 1) acceptable for diversion; 2) marginal, requires further review; and 3) unacceptable. A decision to accept or reject a juvenile is generally made within 12 to 14 days. After the IPU decides to accept a juvenile, IPU staff requests that the referee's order committing the youth to the state be cancelled. If a judge concurs, the judge will issue a new order specifying participation in one of the three intensive probation programs.

After program acceptance, cases are assigned to either the court's IPU or one of the two private programs in a "somewhat random manner" (as stated in the court's written selection procedures). Cases are generally assigned on a rotating basis, depending on caseload and availability of openings; however, individual needs of the juvenile and his/her family may result in assignment to a particular program which seems best suited to fit

these needs. For example, Spectrum is the only program which serves females.

The selection process generally keeps the enrollments true alternatives to state commitment and is therefore consistent with the target population. Probation officers cannot recommend intensive probation as a disposition, and referees cannot order intensive probation. Referees can, however, find a juvenile to be a good candidate and request IPP in a memo to the IPU after state commitment has been ordered. All state delinquency commitment dispositions, except those ordered by a judge, are screened by the IPU. While a state commitment ordered by a judge cannot be diverted to intensive probation, judges can order juveniles directly into IPP. As a result, judges have on occasion ordered cases that do not meet the IPP criteria, but IPU staff indicate that this seldom happens.

Enrollment in the IPP as of December of 1988 was below program capacity (capacity of 220 compared to 146 enrollments). This was attributed by various persons to: 1) vacancies in program staff positions; 2) state law changes making it easier to waive juveniles to adult court, thereby reducing the pool of eligibles; and 3) the cocaine/crack epidemic in Detroit which has caused an increase in the number of violent, drug-related offenses. According to those interviewed, this has resulted in reductions in the numbers of juveniles appropriate for diversion, and an increase in the numbers of dysfunctional families where parental participation is not possible.

Some interviewed argue that because of the low enrollments in IPP and the continued rise in the number of state commitments, there is pressure to enroll juveniles who, in the past, would have been rejected. Since participant profile statistics are not maintained by the Court, these changes cannot be documented. However, the selection criteria was modified approximately one and a half years ago. Before that time, certain serious felony cases (murder, manslaughter, attempted murder, criminal sexual conduct, kidnapping, arson, armed robbery, possession, delivery or sale of heroin/cocaine, and aggravated assault) were automatically excluded; now these cases are included in the screening process for possible IPP diversion. It is not known, however, how many of these cases are actually enrolled in IPP.

While the Court does not regularly compile client characteristics data, a study of youths entering IPP between February of 1983 and March of 1985 showed the following profile: most of the youths were Black (68.7 percent), Detroit residents (76.3 percent), from single parent households (67.2 percent) in which no adult was employed (58.3 percent). Their average age at entry was 15.4 years old. Most (68.9 percent) had been on regular probation at some time, with an average of 3.2 prior charges. The majority (78.1 percent) entered the study as a result of a criminal charge and for about half (51.3 percent) that charge could be considered quite serious (Barton and Butts, 1988).

While there are no comparable statistics available on the present IPP population, the IPU supervisor felt that the crimes committed by the IPP participants of today are more serious than those five years ago, as evidenced by the change to not automatically waive from consideration juveniles who had committed certain violent crimes.

PROGRAM INTERVENTION

The length of enrollment for the IPP averages 12 to 14 months. The maximum length of stay is two years, set by the State DSS as a funding condition.

The Court requires all three programs to have a 30-day assessment period following program referral, with a written assessment to be submitted to the court. Specific needs and goals are outlined in a treatment plan, and psychological testing is conducted on each child if not previously done. Each program has seven days from the time a case is assigned to determine whether the juvenile is appropriate for intensive probation. If within those seven days a program determines a juvenile not to be appropriate, a rehearing can be requested before a judge to rescind the IPP placement. If the judge refuses to rescind the order, the program must accept the client. In 1987, 70 of the 239 initial enrollments were rescinded through the rehearing process.

Since each of the three IPP programs has a separate program design, they will be discussed separately.

Intensive Probation Unit. The Court's Intensive Probation Unit (IPU) provides supervision and casework services to delinquent males ages 12 through 17 years old. The IPU operates through a system of four steps, with diminishing levels of supervision as the juvenile demonstrates more responsibility and lawful behavior. The purpose of the IPU is to provide intensive treatment for a child and his family in order to insure compliance with the rules of the program and the laws of the state, and to prevent incarceration and decrease recidivism. The program is designed to be completed in a minimum of seven or a maximum of eleven months, although this can be extended. At each step, the juvenile and his parent must, in a signed a contract, agree to follow the step's rules. In addition, a juvenile must pass a written and oral test regarding each step's rules before he can earn any days towards advancing to the next step.

Step I lasts for a minimum of 30 days and a maximum of 60 days. The rules of Step I are very restrictive and are designed to control the juvenile's movements to prevent his acting out. It is also designed to aid parents in supervising the child. During Step I, the juvenile cannot go anywhere without the parent with the exception of to and from school or work. School attendance is mandatory, and is monitored on a daily basis. The juvenile must report in with the probation officer when he comes home from school.

During Step I, the probation officer is in frequent contact with the juvenile and his parents. The probation officer relies

heavily on the cooperation of the parents to report any rule infraction. Negative behavior is confronted immediately with negative consequences to be applied as appropriate. Positive behavior is rewarded with outings with the probation officer or the earning of days toward completion of a step.

Based on the treatment plan, the probation officer also attempts to match resources with the juvenile's needs. Resources are sought for such things as jobs, educational programs, skill training, and alcohol and drug counseling as needed. The probation officers see themselves as "child advocates" in their casework function. Unlike the two contract programs which have staff specializing in educational and family services, the IPU officers perform these functions alone.

Step II lasts from 60 to 90 days. The purpose of Step II is to continue the parental supervision and to allow the juvenile more freedom with added responsibilities. School attendance is checked weekly, and group counseling is initiated at this time. A token economy is established in the groups, with tokens redeemable for items negotiated with the probation officer.

The rules for Step II are essentially the same as for Step I, except that the juvenile can leave the house without parental supervision, with notification to both parent and probation officer. Weekend activities without parental supervision must be approved and planned in advance.

Steps III and IV also last from 60 to 90 days. Step III allows for continued individual and group counseling. Under Step

III, the juvenile no longer needs to notify the probation officer when he goes on an activity, but must get permission from the parent. Greater responsibility is placed on the juvenile and parent for the resolution of problems.

Step IV has no set time period and no formal written rules. At this stage, the juvenile is functioning independently and within acceptable behavioral guidelines. The focus of Step IV is preparation for termination. Group counseling is available at the juvenile's option as a continued means of support. Successful completion of this step will result in termination of probation.

The IPU also has recreational activities for the juveniles. In the summer, there's a softball league, which has proven very successful. A juvenile's involvement in regular recreational activities with the probation officer serves as a reward for positive behavior and also serves as a platform for the development of good social skills.

During Step I, the probation officer is required to have at least two to three weekly face-to-face contacts with the juvenile and his family. In Steps II through IV, the officer is to have at least one face-to-face contact each week. The officers indicate that these standards are met and generally exceeded. In addition, telephone contacts checking school attendance, curfew and home behavior are maintained regularly. Specific contact standards beyond these have not been adopted; each officer determines the frequency of the contacts depending upon the

unique circumstances and needs of the juvenile and his family. All IPU probation officers are on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

There has been limited experimentation with electronic monitoring. The success of this approach has not been assessed; however, the probation officers indicate that there have been some problems using this with juveniles.

The IPU is designed to have a continuum of sanctions. The first level of program sanction is keeping a juvenile in a step for a longer period of time. Probation officers also have the authority to return the juvenile to detention for up to five days. However, the overcrowding at the juvenile detention facility, which is operated by the County Executive's Office and not the Juvenile Court, precludes the use of this option. The probation officers indicated that this option is one which is needed to back up enforcement of probation and program rules. The ultimate sanction is to return a juvenile to court with a violation of probation petition. Non-positive terminations will result in commitment to the state.

The IPU has ten staff positions: a supervisor, seven probation officers, a coordinator, and a secretary. Maximum enrollment in the IPU is 70. At the time of the NCCD site visit in December of 1988, enrollment was at 57, with one vacant probation officer position.

In addition to their regular caseload of ten juveniles each, the IPU probation officers also have legal responsibility for the

juveniles assigned to the two private programs, with up to 40 juveniles assigned to each probation officer. The IPU probation officers have no contact with these juveniles, as supervision is a responsibility of the private providers. However, if a new charge is filed against a juvenile in one of the private intensive supervision programs which results in a hearing to waive the juvenile to adult court, the IPU probation officer assigned the paper oversight must handle the court work on the case. This can be problematic since the probation officer has no direct knowledge of the juvenile and his/her circumstances.

Spectrum In-Home Services Program. The In-Home Services Program, operated by Spectrum Human Services, Inc., provides family-focused services and treatment to 13 through 17 year old male and female delinquents and their families. The philosophy of Spectrum is the belief that comprehensive family treatment utilizing community resources is needed to alleviate the causes of delinquent behavior. The In-Home Services Program provides comprehensive services including supervision; individual, family and group counseling; educational planning; recreational activities; and comprehensive employment training and placement services.

Spectrum staff work in teams consisting of two family workers and a supervisor. All three are actively involved in all cases assigned to the team. Caseload ratios are at maximum one worker for every eight juveniles, or sixteen juveniles and their

families per team. Each team is responsible for carrying out treatment goals and providing backup case coverage. The supervisors comprise the treatment group, with each providing a special service to the program. The education coordinator assesses the youth's needs and develops a individual education plan. The psychologist administers tests and is available for individual counseling. The social work coordinator monitors social skills training and provides training in parenting skills. The employment coordinator provides employability training and develops job contacts. The resource coordinator ensures that each family has its basic needs met. The family treatment coordinator provides direct services in difficult family situations and staff consultation on counseling families. The supervisors meet for case planning, case review, and program planning.

Family counselors meet with the juvenile and/or families three to five times a week during the early stages of the program. While there is no formal step system, contacts are reduced as youths are able to demonstrate progress with face-to-face contact reduced to, at minimum, once a week. Family counselors work with the juvenile and family on problem solving, decision making, communication, relationship building, and appropriate behavior. Behavior contracts are drawn up to bring about behavioral change. Counselors work with parents to supplement and support the efforts of the juvenile. There's 24-

hour a day beeper coverage, with staff on rotating call evenings and weekends.

The program is designed to last nine to twelve months, although length of stay can vary depending upon individual needs. This has been a recent change in program design. Clients used to stay in the program up to two years. However, Spectrum found that if families want to make a change, they will and can do so in a year. Treatment goals are reviewed every three months, with termination planning beginning three months prior to termination. Once the treatment goals have been completed or nearly completed, the juvenile is ready for termination. As a juvenile nears program completion, staff begin to decrease their involvement to prepare the family for termination. An important aspect of termination is to make sure that needed support services are in place. If the team feels the juvenile is ready for termination, a graduate review form is completed, outlining what's been accomplished and not accomplished, the family's response to the program, and the youth's potential for success over the next year. If approved in the supervisors' meeting, a termination summary and supplemental court order is filled out requesting the Court to terminate probation. A judge hears the case and, in most instances, approves the recommendation.

Spectrum, with its focus on family treatment, was not originally established to emphasize sanctions. However, that approach is being changed, with the adoption of a series of repercussions for violations of program rules. Among the

sanctions which are now being used is the extension of probation time; withdrawal of participation in certain activities; and efforts to get the family to make certain restrictions, such as an earlier curfew. One new sanction is that for each group meeting a juvenile misses, probation is extended by four weeks. The ultimate sanction is the filing of a Violation of Probation petition in which the juvenile is returned to court.

Staffing for the program consists of 12 worker and 6 supervisor positions, a director and assistant director, 3 clerical positions, and 3 driver positions, for a total of 25 positions. Maximum program enrollment is 100. At the time of the NCCD site visit in December of 1988, enrollment was 70, with 4 vacant positions (2 family workers, 1 supervisor, and the assistant director).

State Ward Diversion Program. The Comprehensive Youth Training and Community Involvement Program, Inc. (CYTCIP) operates the State Ward Diversion Program, a day treatment/school program for delinquent males ages 12 through 17. The program's contention is that if a youth is free to reside in the home and community, there is a greater opportunity to help him develop his skills conducive for positive self growth, ability to interact with others and function successfully in today's society. To bring this about, the program is actively involved in several key areas of the youth's life--the home, family, school, employment and community. The program endeavors to provide a structured and

stable environment in which a youth can make positive changes in his life, and to provide alternative methods for handling obstacles and conflicts so that success becomes a normal experience.

The State Ward Diversion Program (SWDP) has an alternative education program on site staffed by a full-time certified teacher. Each juvenile is tested to determine the appropriate academic grouping. Classes are held for 5 hours a day, Monday through Friday, 12 months a year, and include social studies, reading, mathematics, English and language arts classes as determined in the individual assessment. Individual tutoring is available, if needed. In addition, special classes such as arts, crafts, and drama therapy are available. In addition to the education component, the following services are provided to all clients: on-going group and individual counseling, information youth groups, parenting group sessions, psychological evaluations, pre-employment preparation for all 16 and 17 year olds, family outings and structured group activities, and a one-to two-week camping experience in the summer.

Program enrollment is for a minimum of eleven months. While there is no official maximum, generally participation does not exceed fifteen months. Successful completion results when the maximum program benefit has been met. Staff look for decreased family conflict, increased educational attainment and ability to abide program rules for successful completion. As with the other

programs, successful completion results in termination from probation, with the Court's concurrence.

The primary controlling mechanism for SWDP is the five day per week on-site program scheduling. In addition, the probation counselor meets with the youth, parents, and with both at least once a week. When off-site, the program depends on the parents to notify the probation counselor of violations of probation or contract rules. CYTCIP has twice used electronic monitoring as a surveillance tool, but flaws in the equipment precluded assessment of its success.

CYTCIP has a Review Board, made up of senior staff members, that allows the youth, his parents, and SWDP staff to address continuing or major inappropriate behavior. Parents and the youth attend a hearing before the Review Board, after which the Board can structure consequences, such as additional work duties, assignment of a late activity, or extension of probation. Placement in detention is a paper option not now available because of overcrowding. As with the other programs, filing a petition and returning the youth to court is the ultimate program sanction.

The SWDP has fourteen staff positions with a maximum caseload of 50. The positions include a manager, three coordinators (program, family, and educational services), a senior counselor, six probation counselors, a family counselor, and two clericals. At the time of the NCCD site visit,

enrollment was at 32, with one vacant probation counselor position.

GOALS AND EVALUATION

Goals of the Wayne County Juvenile Court are to increase the quality of services to youths and maintain cost-effective ways of dealing with youths. The original goal of the IPP was to reduce the number of delinquency commitments to the state DSS. An additional goal, to reduce the recidivism rate, was later added. These goals correspond with the Court's intent that the IPP reduce costs by avoiding expensive out-of-home placements and protect the public by not increasing the risk to the community.

Client and program summary information on all three programs is maintained by the IPU. The IPU has a case file for each IPP participant containing a face sheet with identifying information, a social history, the 30-day assessment, a quarterly summary of progress, and court summaries. The psychological assessment, if performed, is also included, as well as available school information. Every 4 months the IPU Supervisor audits each case file to ensure that the social history, the 30-day assessment, and the quarterly summaries have been completed.

The IPU manually compiles program summary information on a monthly basis. For the court-operated program, the following information is maintained by probation officer: number of field, office, and phone interviews by child, parent, and collateral; number of reports prepared; and caseload information including

beginning caseload, new enrollments, terminations, and ending enrollment.

All three programs prepare a monthly report for the Court detailing number of children under supervision at the end of the month; the number of line staff; the largest and small caseloads; and the number of home calls, office interviews, quarterly summaries, court summaries, and collateral contacts.

The IPU further maintains monthly statistics on number of commitments, numbers and reasons for program rejection, numbers of rehearings, and enrollments by program. Finally, information is kept on number of cases committed to the State DSS and number of cases terminated from probation. While cases committed to the state DSS can clearly be labelled non-positive terminations, cases in the probation termination category cannot all be labelled successful completions. For example, the probation terminations include those juveniles who have been remanded to the adult system and those who have died. The Court does not keep statistics on successful completions. Program staff at each program estimated their successful completion rates as follows: IPU--approximately 50 percent; Spectrum--55 percent as of June 1988; and CYTCIP--approximately 47 percent. A program evaluation determined that over a five-year period, all three programs consistently retained about 45 to 50 percent of their cases through to successful completion (Barton and Butts, 1988). When looking at 1988 statistics, a different pattern emerges for one program: the IPU had a 50 percent probation termination rate,

CYTCIP had a 53 percent rate, while Spectrum had a 71 percent probation termination rate. While successful completion rates would likely be somewhat lower, it appears that Spectrum had greater success in 1988 in successfully terminating participants. This review indicates that Spectrum appears to have greater resources available in serving their clients, when looking at client/staff ratios, budget, and the availability of ancillary services.

There is no on-going evaluation component in the Wayne County IPP. However, there was an independent five-year program evaluation recently completed by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research (Barton and Butts, 1988). This research project randomly assigned comparable youths to each IPP program (IPU, Spectrum, and CYTCIP) and to a control group of state wards. (Characteristics of the study group can be found under the Client Identification section.) A total of 511 cases were assigned between February of 1983 and March of 1985. Each case was then followed for two years. The study results showed that assignment to any of the intensive probation programs or the control group made little difference in terms of recidivism, although the seriousness of subsequent offenses was slightly reduced by assignment to the intensive probation programs. Overall, the intensive probation programs achieved similar results as commitment (principally to the state training schools), at about one-third the cost.

PROGRAM LINKAGES

The Juvenile Court has an active Advisory Committee comprised of community leaders, which looks at needs and assists the court in obtaining resources. For example, the IPU obtained a van through the Committee's efforts. The Director of Court Services meets monthly with police agencies, of which there are 43 in Wayne County. There is a Detroit Public School System administrator who serves as a court-school liaison, who has an office in the juvenile court building. There is also a state-run alternative education program, separate from the school district, which is used by IPU participants if indicated in the education treatment plan. The Court does not have a formal drug education program, which is surprising in light of the serious drug-related problems in the community and represented in the IPP caseload. Beyond these formal linkages which apply to the entire court and not specifically the IPU, each IPU probation officer develops individual networks and contacts to obtain resources for individual clients.

As private non-profit organizations, Spectrum and CYTCIP each have a Board made up of community and corporate leaders who donate time and money for community work and fund raising. Spectrum also has an Advisory Board for the In-Home Services Program which, however, is being restructured and is not active at this time.

SUMMARY

The Wayne County IPP has an interesting program design: a single screening and selection process, with subsequent referral to one of three quite different program models. The Court's IPU represents the traditional intensive supervision model, with high probation officer contacts and surveillance activities.

Spectrum's In-Home Care Program provides a family treatment focus, with a wide range of ancillary services available through Spectrum's other programs. CTYCIP's State Ward Diversion Program provides a day treatment model with on-site educational and counseling services. Evaluation results indicate that all three program models are as successful in reducing recidivism as state commitment, and have consistently achieved successful completion rates of approximately 45 to 55 percent.

The program has a diversionary impact in that it is serving, for the most part, only those juveniles who would otherwise have been committed to the State DSS. This is somewhat mitigated by the fact that commitments made by one of the judges are not subject to intensive probation screening, and that judges can order IPP without the case being screened for eligibility. This effect is not great, since judges generally do not hear delinquency cases. Referees, while they cannot order intensive probation, can and do recommend IPP after they have ordered commitment.

Despite major budget deficits in the County, funding for the program has been stable, partly because it has been proven to

save money. The private providers indicate a good working relationship with the Court as a program strength. The small caseloads, reduced paperwork and increased flexibility were identified by the IPU probation officers as program strengths.

There were problems identified as well. Crack/cocaine-related arrests are overwhelming the system, which has had an impact on the IPP. Even though program enrollments are down, the Court considers the IPP population to be more dysfunctional than in the past. While drug abusers are screened out of the program, staff contend that drug traffickers are now making up a large percent of the IPP population. Staff indicate that this population is more difficult to work with, and also that safety of workers is now a greater concern. Better training of line staff was identified as a program need. Staff at all three programs indicated that the seven-day period for determining a juvenile's appropriateness for the program was not long enough, and that more in-depth assessment prior to acceptance into the program is needed to more effectively screen out those who have little chance of success. Evaluation results, however, show that institutionalization is not more effective in serving these juveniles.

Another problem raised was the lack of resources available at the county level. Since the County operates only the probation system and the State operates the out-of-home placement system, programs cannot get short-term out-of-home placements for IPP participants. If a juvenile cannot live at home, even if

he/she is otherwise succeeding on IPP, the program must take the juvenile back to court and have the juvenile committed to the State in order to get needed services. The juvenile is then no longer eligible for IPP, since living at home is a requirement for the State share of program funding. Short-term respite care within the County system was identified as an important unmet need.

The Court's increased caseloads and funding shortfalls have resulted in a system stretched beyond its limits. For example, not having short-term detention available as a program sanction because of the overcrowding problems at the juvenile detention center was identified as a problem. Also mentioned was the lack of consequences for parents who do not meet the court-ordered contract requirements. The court order states that parents are to cooperate with all probationary rules, including individual and/or family therapy, if required by the program, and that failure to do so may result in contempt charges against the parent. However, there is no enforcement mechanism for this provision.

The Wayne County Intensive Probation Program has a commitment to developing successful alternatives to costly residential care for juvenile offenders. The IPP demonstrates that a variety of program models can be successful in serving the high-risk juvenile offender in the community.