



#### THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of The Center is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning and preparation. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- . Generating knowledge through research
- . Developing educational programs and products
- . Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- . Installing educational programs and products
- . Operating information systems and services
- . Conducting leadership development and training programs

#### National Evaluation Program: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION: PRIORITY AREAS FOR EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

Prepared by:  
The Evaluation Division  
The Center for Vocational Education  
The Ohio State University

Jerry P. Walker - Principal Investigator (CVE)  
Albert P. Cardarelli - Co-Director (Boston University)  
Dennis L. Billingsley - Co-Director (CVE)

Prepared for  
The National Institute of Law Enforcement  
and Criminal Justice,  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration,  
U. S. Department of Justice

January 1976

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract . . . . .	v
Foreword . . . . .	vii
Preface/Acknowledgments . . . . .	ix
Summary . . . . .	xi
Introduction . . . . .	1
I. Self-Report Data: Input for Funding Allocation Decisions . . . . .	3
II. A Needs Assessment Survey of SPA Evaluation Capabilities . . . . .	5
III. Alternative Schools: A Basis for Comparison . . . . .	7
IV. Parental Consent Statutes and the Delivery of Prevention Services . . . . .	9
V. "Seed" Money Grants: A Help or a Hinderance? . . . . .	13
VI. Practitioners' Sensitivity to Evaluation . . . . .	15
VII. Practitioners' Attitudes Toward External Program Linkages: A Basis for Improvement . . . . .	17
VIII. Other Issues . . . . .	19

Prepared under Grant Number 75-NI-99-0089 from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 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.

## ABSTRACT

The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention/National Evaluation Program (JDP/NEP) was undertaken by the Evaluation Division of The Center for Vocational Education for LEAA's National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. The purpose of the JDP/NEP was to provide an information base for policymakers concerning the current state of the art of juvenile delinquency prevention, and to provide recommendations for filling policy relevant voids and gaps in the knowledge base of the field of delinquency prevention.

Major assessment findings of the JDP/NEP demonstrate the need to conduct further research on the following problematic areas: (1) The feasibility of utilizing self-reported delinquency data for funding allocation decisions by school district, building, and grade level. (2) The training and information needs of state planning agency (SPA) evaluators for approving and monitoring evaluation components of delinquency prevention programs. (3) A basis of comparative success for alternative schools. (4) The effects of "parental consent" statutes on the delivery of prevention services to youth. (5) The "pros and cons" of federal seed money grants from the perspective of delinquency prevention practitioners. (6) Prevention practitioners' sensitivity to evaluation problems and procedures. (7) The nature of external program linkages from the perspective of the practitioner.

## FOREWORD

In this document, the staff of the JDP/NEP project have prepared brief proposals (or prospecti) which reflect their views of the problem areas and evaluation approaches most appropriate to the state of the art in juvenile delinquency prevention. Most of the prospecti point more to the need for further understanding of the nature of delinquency and its possible prevention than they do to specific evaluation designs for assessing the effectiveness of prevention efforts. Our other surveys and reviews of the JDP field seem to support the fact that the level of current knowledge is one in which we are just beginning to ask some of the right questions. It is hoped that some of the questions raised in this document are the right ones toward increasing our understanding of delinquency and its prevention.

Robert E. Taylor, Director  
The Center for Vocational Education  
The Ohio State University

## PREFACE/ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This document is the fourth of a five volume report which describes and assesses the state of the art of juvenile delinquency prevention projects nationally. This study was conducted by the Evaluation Division of The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University between February 1975 and January 1976, for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice as part of its National Evaluation Program.

The present document proposes a series of short term, policy relevant research studies on selected topics derived from the JDP/NEP. The proposed studies are presented in the form of "mini-proposals" or "prospecti." The remaining JDP/NEP products are described below:

Volume I, "The Theory and Practice of Delinquency Prevention in the United States" is a synthesis of literature and expert opinion on delinquency causation, intervention strategies, and implications for social policy.

Volume II, "A Profile of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Projects in the United States" is a compilation of site visitation reports which describe the program elements of context, identification, intervention, and evaluation. Assessments of the logical linkages between the program elements are also provided.

Volume III, "Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: A Synthesis and Assessment" is reported by common program elements within and across program cluster types.

Volume V, "Principles and Guidelines for State and Local Administrators of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Projects" presents practical recommendations to be utilized by practitioners in improving the art and science of juvenile delinquency prevention.

The JDP/NEP staff acknowledges the contributions of Dr. James Short, Stanford University, and Dr. Charles Wellford, Florida State University, who critically reviewed and constructively commented upon the research efforts proposed here:

Note: Due to publication, dissemination, and utilization considerations, Volumes I and III have been combined under one cover entitled, "The Theory and Practice of Delinquency Prevention in the United States: Review, Synthesis and Assessment."

## SUMMARY

The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention/National Evaluation Program (JDP/NEP) was conducted for The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice by the Evaluation Division of The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

The prospecti for further research of selected JDP topics presented in this document were generated from the voids and gaps in the knowledge base of delinquency prevention programs and practices nationally. The topical areas for further research suggested here recurred across many projects and were found within the program elements of (1) client identification criteria and procedures, (2) actual intervention activities, and (3) prevention program evaluations.

Specific problems to be resolved are:

(I) Determining the feasibility of utilizing self-reported delinquency data for input into funding allocation decisions involving "primary prevention" for non-targeted populations within educational settings.

(II) Specifying the information and training needs of state planning agency (SPA) evaluators for approving and monitoring prevention program evaluation components.

(III) Assessing the level of impact of "alternative schools" on the academic achievement and social adjustment of problem youth.

(IV) Determining the extent to which state and local parental consent statutes inhibit the delivery of prevention services to youth who might otherwise participate in prevention programs voluntarily.

(V) Documenting the "pros and cons" of federal seed money grant practices from the perspective of the practitioner/administrator of JDP programs.

(VI) Determining practitioner sensitivity to evaluation problems and procedures.

(VII) Understanding the mistrust, suspicion, and inter-agency strife which inhibits prevention programs from having effective external linkage networks.

## INTRODUCTION

An important charge to the staff of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention/National Evaluation Program (JDP/NEP) was to determine whether and/or where important policy relevant voids and gaps exist in the current knowledge base of juvenile delinquency prevention in the United States. Additionally, if such voids and gaps exist in the vast field of delinquency prevention, the JDP/NEP was to propose a research design to fill the void.

The various volumes resulting from the JDP/NEP study suggest a multitude of voids in the present state of the art of delinquency prevention. Those included in this document are considered to be the more feasibly resolved, given NEP Phase II parameters, most relevant in providing input to policy decisions, and most important to the improvement of juvenile delinquency prevention practices and programs nationally.

Each of the seven prospecti comprising the following pages is structured by these topics:

1. A problem statement,
2. The purpose of the proposed research,
3. The rationale for and significance of the proposed research, and
4. The basic strategy for conducting the proposed study.

## I. Self-Report Data: Input for Funding Allocation Decisions

### Problem:

Non-targeted juvenile delinquency prevention programs focus upon large groups of youth, some of whom may be potential delinquents. Occurring primarily in educational settings, such programs expose youths to curriculum materials concerning mental health, problem solving, communication skills, consumer protection, community resources, laws, legal sanctions, or other special topics.

Due to the lack of qualified staff and financial resources, however, not all students in given school districts benefit from such educational delinquency prevention programs. Rather, lacking the tools necessary for discriminating or identifying appropriate audiences likely to receive maximum benefits from non-targeted programs, allocation decisions are arbitrarily made by school or program administrators or are primarily based upon intuition and/or convenience. These decisions result in the delivery of non-targeted programs to small portions of all youths within school districts whose relative propensity for delinquency remains unknown.

### Purpose:

The need exists to determine the feasibility of utilizing self-reported juvenile delinquency data in improving funding allocation decisions within and across school districts. The proposed research will determine whether significant differences in self-reported delinquency data occur within school districts, by building, and/or by grade level.

### Rationale/Significance:

Non-targeted, educational, juvenile delinquency prevention programs logically offer much potential to impact juvenile delinquency and provide much needed information to youth. In addition, with an increasing public awareness of and concern for the effects of the labeling process, non-targeted programs provide a unique opportunity to meaningfully intervene in the lives of young people without labeling or stigmatizing individual youths.

More informed decisions resulting in the selection of audiences most in need of non-targeted delinquency prevention services and information will permit projects with minimal resources to maximally impact juvenile delinquency.

### Strategy:

Ten citywide school districts, representative of diverse geographic locations, size, and ethnic makeup, etc., will be selected. A self-report instrument will elicit number, frequency, and ranked seriousness of delinquent acts. It is important that the instrument be readable and easily administered to enable completion by large numbers of students in a relatively short period of time. A random sample of students in grades six through twelve will respond anonymously to the self-report instrument.

Self-report data will be analyzed to determine if:

1. significant differences in self-reported delinquent acts can be discerned by geographic area, census tract/SES locales to provide information for school district level allocation decisions,
2. significant differences can be discerned within school districts to provide information for building level allocation decisions, and
3. significant differences can be discerned by grade level to provide information for allocation decisions within buildings.

The net result of the instruments and data will be more informed decisions about if, where and when to allocate resources for delinquency prevention programs in public schools.

## II. A Needs Assessment Survey of SPA Evaluation Capabilities

### Problem:

The provisions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (PL 93-415) are significant and far-reaching. Primary among the several mandates included within the act is the assignment to LEAA of a thorough and prompt evaluation of all federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs. Given LEAA's organizational structure and "block grant" funding system, a major portion of the responsibility for fulfilling this mandate has become the burden of state planning agency (SPA) evaluators. It will become the SPA's responsibility to approve evaluation designs submitted from the field and to monitor actual evaluations as well as program progress.

At the present time, SPA personnel assigned evaluation responsibilities represent a wide range of evaluation capabilities and expertise. Actual training and information needs necessary for SPA's to accomplish their evaluation responsibilities are unknown.

### Purpose:

The purpose of the proposed research is two-fold: (1) to conduct a needs assessment survey of SPA evaluation capabilities and (2) to develop and implement a strategy of training and information dissemination to adequately alleviate voids and gaps in SPA evaluation expertise.

### Rationale/Significance:

The elimination of important shortcomings of SPA evaluation capabilities has major ramifications for the quality of future information in virtually all areas of juvenile and criminal justice and for the field of delinquency prevention in particular. Adequately trained and sufficiently informed SPA evaluators have the unique opportunity to contribute more valid information to the field of delinquency prevention in a relatively shorter period of time than has been accumulated in the last half century.

### Strategy:

This effort will involve the development of two questionnaires. The first, to be mailed to all state planning agency personnel responsible for approving and monitoring evaluation components of delinquency prevention programs, will be structured to elicit broadly defined needs in rank order across major evaluation topics (e.g., research design, sampling, data analysis, etc.). Once completed, returned and analyzed, a second questionnaire will be developed to more specifically assess the needs of SPA evaluators.

From the results of the second questionnaire, ten region specific training workshops, involving two days each, will be developed and presented at a centralized location within each LEAA region. Emphasis will be placed upon filling important gaps and voids in SPA evaluation expertise, developing evaluation consistency regionally and nationally, and formulating guidelines for approving program evaluation components.

### III. Alternative Schools: A Basis for Comparison

#### Problem:

As acts of school violence, vandalism, and classroom disruptions increase, educational institutions in large numbers are turning or have turned to the "alternative school" concept to curtail disruptions and therefore educational and financial losses. Typically, students assigned to alternative schools are seen as having "failed" in the traditional school setting.

Teachers of students within alternative schools, under the burden (or challenge) of conducting remedial education while maintaining classroom discipline, have often resorted to innovative but unproven treatments or educational techniques. Under what would seem to be adverse conditions (i.e., classrooms of problem youth) the impact of such practices upon academic achievement and social adjustment remains unknown.

#### Purpose:

The proposed research will seek to determine the level of impact of alternative school practices upon academic achievement and social adjustment of alternative school students on a national aggregate basis. Such information will be useful in serving funding and program modification decisions.

#### Rationale/Significance:

It may be argued that academic achievement and social adjustment measures of alternative school students cannot be legitimately compared to similar measures obtained from youth remaining in traditional local school settings, or existing national norm-referenced measures. The proposed research will establish a basis for comparing and contrasting academic achievement and social adjustment of alternative school youth to a national aggregate of measurement scores obtained from similar efforts involving youth with similar characteristics. Federal, state, and local funding sources, as well as administrators of alternative school efforts will be provided a means of comparing or justifying alternative schools within their scope of interest.

#### Strategy:

The actual methodology to be employed in this effort is based upon two important assumptions:

1. the availability of existing standardized norm-referenced achievement scores for students enrolled in alternative schools, and

2. the availability of existing quantifiable indicators of social adjustment (e.g., dropout, suspension, expulsion rates, valid attitudinal indicators, etc.).

Provided that these assumptions are valid, a feasible but representative sample of alternative schools will be drawn from a universe of efforts funded by LEAA, HEW, and state departments of education. Initial academic achievement and social adjustment data will be gathered, processed, analyzed, and aggregated to provide a measure of comparative success.

#### IV. Parental Consent Statutes and the Delivery of Prevention Services

##### Problem:

Practitioners in the field of delinquency prevention frequently attribute actual causes of juvenile delinquency to the parents of "pre-delinquents" and youthful offenders. Family disintegration or disorganization, lack of sufficient supervision, and physical or emotional abuse are all thought to be primary causation factors for which parents are responsible. To the degree to which this assumption is valid, practitioners in the field of delinquency prevention are hindered and frustrated by state and local statutes which require parental consent before services can be rendered to youthful clients.

Too frequently, clients voluntarily contacting a prevention program for assistance in combatting drug abuse, venereal disease, child abuse, and even trivial problems, withdraw and disappear ("walk away") when informed of parental consent statute requirements. Programs offering shelter care services to runaways are probably most inhibited; youth are turned away to find food and shelter on the street. The potential ramifications are obvious.

When parents of youth are unavailable or unwilling to grant parental consent, authorization to render services may be obtained by practitioners from the juvenile justice system. The process, however, may be time consuming and present new parent/child conflicts for the family. Consequently, practitioners frequently risk legal sanctions and subvert parental consent statutes by various means to deliver services to youth.

The degree to which parental consent statutes are subverted and, more importantly, the number of youth who fail to receive prevention services due to parental consent statutes is unknown.

##### Purpose:

The problem of parental consent requirements is two-sided and brings into focus the basic rights and responsibilities of parents on the one hand and the rights and privileges of youth on the other. The proposed research will seek to determine by survey research the extent of this problem on a national basis.

##### Rationale/Significance:

The extent to which state and local statutes inhibit the delivery of delinquency prevention services to youth,

either directly or indirectly, is of major importance to the pressing problem of growing juvenile crime rates. Several program directors recently interviewed by the JDP/NEP staff estimated that 10 to 20 percent of potential clients are negatively affected by parental consent statutes. Even from such a small sample, the actual number of youth involved in these estimates is substantial. Knowledge of state and national figures in this regard may have major implications for legislative change.

Strategy:

Project directors of a relatively small but representative sample of delinquency prevention programs (150 to 200) recently identified by the JDP/NEP staff will be asked to respond to a structured questionnaire. The sample programs will be selected by criteria including: (1) program size, (2) geographic location, (3) client socio-demographic characteristics, and (4) funding sources.

Practitioners will be asked to respond to the following question areas:

1. Whether state and/or local statutes mandate the attainment of parental consent prior to the delivery of services to youth.
  - a. specifics of the statutes
  - b. exceptions to the statutes
  - c. sanctions for violating this statute and
  - d. actual operational procedures for conforming to such statutes or dealing with youth in spite of statute requirements
2. Total number of youthful clients served by the program/agency, over a one year period.
3. The number (from records or estimates) of youth who "walk away" when informed of parental consent requirements, over a one year period.
4. The number (again from records or estimates) of clients whose parents deny consent/authorization over a one year period.
5. The number of clients served by juvenile justice system authorization in lieu of parental consent.
6. The nature of reporting problems of youth denied services, directly or indirectly, because of parental consent statutes.

7. The practitioners perception of what happens to youth who are denied services.
8. Documentation of other state or local statutes which inhibit services to youth.
9. Practitioners' recommendations for change.

Responses to the above will be compiled and reported in one document. Attempts will be made to extrapolate from the numbers provided to estimate the total numbers of youth nationally who are affected by parental consent statutes.

V. "Seed" Money Grants: A Help or a Hinderance?

Problem:

Attitudes toward federal agency practices of providing "seed money" grants to juvenile delinquency prevention programs range from grateful to contemptuous. While seed monies are often very necessary for program start-up and implementation costs, expectations of subsequent funding from state or local levels are often unrealistic. Several practitioners interviewed by the JDP/NEP staff indicated that while the logic of seed money grants is sound, in actual practice seed money grants and the realities of future local funding constraints, contribute to staff insecurity. Staff insecurity promotes staff turnover and staff turnover affects training needs, treatment consistency, record keeping, evaluation data collection, client follow-up, etc., and thusly is detrimental to all major aspects of program development and maintenance.

Purpose:

The proposed survey will examine federal seed money grant practices from the perspectives of delinquency prevention program administrators and practitioners. The resulting data will provide either a justification for the existing system, point out particularly troublesome aspects, or provide a basis for recommendations for altering the current procedures.

Rationale/Significance:

Sufficient questions have been raised by the JDP/NEP study to justify further research into the area of federal seed money grant practices. Perhaps, as was suggested by several practitioners, current procedures are more detrimental than beneficial to successful program development and maintenance. Perhaps, other factors are responsible for staff turnover and program inconsistencies. Minimally, the proposed research may provide insights or explanations for the failure of many "federally planted seeds" to bear fruit.

Strategy:

From a universe of programs previously located and catalogued by the JDP/NEP study and additional efforts yet to be identified, a representative sample of program administrators and practitioners to be surveyed will be selected. Sample size is expected to be approximately 150-200. Selection criteria will include: (1) geographic area, (2) program size (i.e., number of staff, clients, fiscal dollars), and (3) diverse funding source, etc.

A mail survey is proposed for the administrators/participants selected. Although the survey instrument will incorporate questions covering a broad range of known "seed money" issues, every effort will be made to allow respondents to provide open-ended responses with sufficient allowances for qualifications.

While full quantification of much of the resulting data will not be possible, it is expected that an overall picture of federal seed money grant practices from the perspective of the program administrator/practitioner will be seen much more clearly than in the past.

## VI. Practitioners' Sensitivity to Evaluation

### Problem:

Programs visited and reviewed by the JDP/NEP staff were administered and staffed by persons representing a wide range of academic disciplines. In addition to a sizable number of "street people" not claiming to have any specialized, formal training vis a vis delinquency prevention, JDP administrators and practitioners reflected academic degrees in business, psychology, social work, theology, education, and law. This fact becomes particularly important with the realization that program evaluations are usually conducted by or are highly influenced by people involved in the project, contrary to many proposals or other program documentation. The JDP/NEP experiences to date suggest that project people are ill-equipped, by attitude and knowledge, to conduct sound evaluations.

### Purpose:

The intent of the proposed survey research is to take an initial step in providing one possible explanation for the sad condition of the state of the art in evaluating juvenile delinquency prevention; a condition which apparently has not benefited from fifty years experience and the allocation of literally millions of dollars.

### Rational/Significance:

In grasping for explanations of the state of the art and therefore hopefully providing remedies for improving the field of delinquency prevention, the credentials, qualifications, capabilities, and sensitivities to evaluation procedures of those persons actually staffing and evaluating such programs cannot be overlooked. The proposed research will provide a micro-level perspective of the state of the art of delinquency prevention program administrator/evaluator capabilities. An overall profile of JDP administrators/evaluators will be provided in a final report accompanied by a narrative assessment and recommendations for future policy decisions.

### Strategy:

Due to feasibility constraints in identifying and surveying even a representative sample of all JDP administrators/evaluators who receive funds from a vast multitude of federal, state, and local sources, and given LEAA's realm of responsibility mandated by the '74 act, this study will focus upon LEAA funded JDP programs. Recent experience with LEAA's Grant Management Information Service (GMIS) has indicated approximately 300 currently active, LEAA funded, "self-proclaimed" JDP programs. Assuming

that this figure will not change substantially before this study is conducted, those persons (as identified by the GMIS) having direct responsibility for administration, program policy, and data collection of JDP programs will be surveyed by mail.

The survey instrument will be designed to assess the practitioners' sensitivity to evaluation methodology as well as his/her qualifications and capabilities in this important area.

The survey will yield a profile of the JDP practitioners' inclinations and capabilities for evaluation. But beyond simply pointing out what are likely to be very low levels of knowledge of and attitudes toward evaluation, the report will elicit and provide recommendations for dealing with the problems identified in the survey.

## VII. Practitioners' Attitudes Toward External Program Linkages: A Basis for Improvement

### Problem:

Throughout the JDP/NEP study, staff and consultants consistently characterized the linkages of prevention programs to external agencies, community resources, and other prevention programs as tenuous and ineffective. Specifically, external linkages of JDP programs were described as (1) substantially lacking in cooperation for referral, feedback, and follow-up purposes; (2) riddled by mutual suspicion and mistrust; (3) competitive (for clients and funding); and (4) as ill conceived and haphazardly maintained.

The "bottom line" results of the above, as inferred by the JDP/NEP staff and consultants, are multiple.

1. Many prevention programs deal with clients whose needs could be better served by other agencies.
2. Youths are frustrated and perhaps worse off when their expectations of problem resolution are not met.
3. Positive program evaluation results suffer from inappropriately screened clientele whose problems are not ameliorated by a particular intervention activity.
4. Programs suffer tremendously from a lack of credibility from the general public and other JDP programs/agencies.

### Purpose:

The purpose of the scope of work suggested here is to provide an initial step toward resolving interagency/inter-program conflict by more clearly defining the reasons and conditions under which it is precipitated and maintained.

### Rationale/Significance:

With a thorough and precise understanding of those factors that cause and sustain interagency conflicts, mutual mistrust, and lack of cooperation among prevention programs and other agencies, it is anticipated that policy relevant recommendations can be derived to improve this situation. Resolution of inter-agency strife would contribute significantly to the improvement of the state of the art of delinquency prevention by (1) facilitating the establishment of referral networks, (2) improving channels of communication between practitioners of different theoretical persuasions and intervention strategies, (3) improving evaluation results, and (4) thusly improving program credibility in the eyes of the general public.

### Strategy:

Project directors and staff members of delinquency prevention programs (approximately 300) as identified by the Grant Management Information Service (GMIS) will be asked to respond to a questionnaire. The actual instrument will entail a section of highly structured questions related to the nature and extent of external linkages. A second section, while providing a framework, will allow respondents to provide a subjective narrative assessment of those agencies and programs documented in the first section.

It is anticipated that the perceptions of practitioners toward other agencies and programs will provide an insightful picture of the problems of establishing and maintaining external linkages. Responses and assessments will be categorized by type of agency or program assessed (i.e., J. J. S., Welfare, education, private agency, etc.) to further delineate problematic distinctions.

In an effort to increase the total percentage of responses and to further varify findings and conclusions, two substrategies will be employed.

1. The actual survey instrument will be mailed or delivered to all potential respondents by the appropriate LEAA-SPA or RPU representative responsible for monitoring the program. It will be presented as an important and necessary requirement and specific completion dates will be set.
2. At the initial contact with all potential respondents, the practitioner(s) will be informed that up to fifty programs will be subsequently selected for on-site visitation for validation purposes. The actual validation visits will be conducted as close to the return mailing date of the instrument as possible.

A final narrative report will provide a synthesis of the information obtained by survey and site visitation and provide what is expected to be a series of policy relevant recommendations for improving the establishment and maintenance of external program linkages.

### VIII. Other Issues:

All of the foregoing problems and strategies are seen by the JDP/NEP staff as reasonably important and feasible. Certainly, they do not exhaust the issues confronting delinquency prevention nor are they necessarily the thorniest and most profound of all JDP possible problems. They simply represent the areas, seen from this NEP's perspective, in need of additional research and evaluation.

There are many other issues facing delinquency prevention. They stem from the JDP/NEP experiences, from the personal hunches, hopes, and values of the staff, from the views of the project's consultants and reviewers, and from reviews of relevant literature. Some of these issues are briefly listed below in the form of questions. For several of the questions, no doubt there are numerous research and evaluation strategies which might be undertaken to seek insights and answers; others probably defy any attempts to be answered empirically. The purpose in providing this list is not to propose specific research studies; rather, it is to place this NEP in perspective with some of the other questions and answers that need to be raised/provided. If nothing else, it is hoped that the reader will share in part our perspective that the field of JDP is a massive, complex and shifting labyrinth of politics, personalities, and problems inseparable from the societal and cultural context in which it exists. The list follows:

- To what extent, for what reasons, and with what consequences does there exist a syndrome of "skimming" in which JDP projects subtly, but systematically, deal with the "best of the bad kids" and leave the genuine "hard cases" to fend for themselves?
- How does one resolve/cope with the almost paradoxical problem of forestalling or preventing acts that have yet to occur--especially when those acts have no consistently reliable predictors?
- If in fact "the family" is the source of all (most) evil vis a vis delinquency (as suggested consistently by literature and JDP practitioners), then how can JDP interventions deal directly with family issues in a society in which the nuclear family is a virtual "untouchable?"
- If block grants are actually seen by donor and recipient alike as essentially revenue sharing (legislative and bureaucratic rhetoric notwithstanding), then to what extent can/should centralized government agencies hold expectations and sanctions for how these monies are spent?

- If the vast majority of delinquent youth "grow out of it" eventually (as supported by research and common sense findings alike), then at what social and monetary cost threshold should non-intervention policies be considered?
- What tools, attitudes or policies are necessary to overcome the non-differentiation in identifying or intervening with delinquent youth which was found in nearly all JDP projects?
- Is the notion of looking at and dealing with the world in a logical, empirical, and consistent fashion (which is the premise underlying this entire NEP), a truly realistic expectation to hold for the JDP practitioner--given their personalized, crisis-oriented, and uncertain environments?
- Would not the elimination of contemporaneously defined delinquency (albeit idealistic) cause a cultural redefinition of youthful deviance such that today's normative behavior would become tomorrow's delinquencies?
- What are the political, ethical, and pragmatic consequences of an arm of any judicial agency having an official role in juvenile delinquency prevention?
- Could not an atmosphere of trust and honest experimentation be established such that a substantial reduction could be made in the practitioner, bureaucratic, and legislative syndromes of "Fooling the Feds," "Controlling the Grantees," and "Appeasing the Constituents"?

**END**