

# STAFF STUDY OF THE COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS RELATED TO DELINQUENCY PREVENTION & CONTROL

85325

STATE OF MARYLAND



**Governor's  
commission**

ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

STAFF STUDY OF THE COORDINATION OF  
PROGRAMS RELATED TO  
DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND CONTROL

PREPARED BY:

THE STAFF OF THE GOVERNOR'S  
COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT  
AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

January 1, 1975

NC

JUN 1 1975

ACQUISITIONS

PROJECT STAFF

Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration  
of Justice

Richard C. Wertz, Executive Director  
John E. O'Donnell, Deputy Director  
Robert H. Bendler, Director of Planning  
Harvey C. Byrd, III, Chief of Program  
Development and Planning  
James DeSarno, Juvenile Delinquency Programs Manager



**EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT**  
**GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT**  
**AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**  
**SUITE 302, EXECUTIVE PLAZA ONE**  
**COCKEYSVILLE, MARYLAND 21030**

PHONE: 301-666-9610

MARVIN MANDEL  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL S. SILVER  
CHAIRMAN

RICHARD C. WERTZ  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Memo From: Richard C. Wertz, Executive Director

Date: July 13, 1976

Subject: Staff Study of the Coordination of Programs  
Related to Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control

Attached is a copy of a staff study of programs related to juvenile delinquency prevention and control. The study and recommendations for coordination of various efforts aimed at the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency were the result of a legislative request.

RCW:le

INTRODUCTION

On May 7, 1973, the Governor signed House-Joint Resolution 92 which requested the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, in conjunction with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning, to make a study and develop recommendations for coordination of various efforts aimed at the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. As a result of this request, a study team from the two agencies was assigned to prepare any studies necessary for the task. During the early part of the study, assistance and guidance was given by an advisory committee composed of major service agencies in the field. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the advisory committee members. The advisory committee consisted of the following members:

Dr. Kenneth Barnes, Secretary, Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning  
Mr. Richard C. Wertz, Executive Director, Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice  
Dr. Frederick Keyton, Consultant Pupil Services, State Department of Education  
Dr. Richard W. Bateman, Department of Employment and Social Services  
Mr. Robert C. Hilson, Director, Department of Juvenile Services  
Mr. William O'Hara, Staff Specialist, Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services  
Mr. Robert McColley, Deputy Commissioner, Division of Correction

This study was divided into two components. The first deals with the overall general recommendations made as a result of the study. The second part provides more detailed guidance and recommendations for approaches to integrating and coordinating the delivery of complex service programs. Recommendations are also made as to measurements of effectiveness in actually delivering planned services. This report contains only the results and recommendations of the first part of the study.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that a special State level coordinating council be formulated to monitor and to facilitate improved coordination between State and local agencies involved in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Such a council could serve as an advisory board to the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice or be an independent entity appointed by the Governor (the Commission is required to have a juvenile delinquency advisory board as a result of recent Federal legislation), or be an expanded form of the current Department of Juvenile Services' Advisory Board. The board should be composed of representatives of public and private agencies dealing with youth, law enforcement, private citizens and public officials. State and local government should also be represented. Its function should be to facilitate operational coordination and sharing of existing resources and the development of more effective programs.
2. It is recommended that local jurisdictions establish local level juvenile delinquency prevention coordinating councils in order to identify problems and improve coordination within the scope of the needs of particular communities. Such councils should be established by local legislation on a county basis and be composed of representatives of State, local, and private agencies.
3. It is recommended that interdisciplinary cooperation and coordination be improved through the expanded use of an interdisciplinary team treatment approach to the problems of troubled youth.
4. It is recommended that case tracking, planning and evaluation systems be developed in order to maximize continuity of treatment and effective use of resources.
5. It is recommended that active service delivery mechanisms be established in all local subdivisions aimed at providing services to youth, coordinating existing agencies and suggesting improvements in youth services delivery. The youth service bureau concept should be considered as one possible mechanism to provide this capability.
6. It is recommended that the Executive and Legislative branches of government review the current administrative and statutory assignments of juvenile delinquency treatment and prevention agencies and make changes as appropriate. Strong consideration should be given to re-evaluating the current systems for handling Children in Need of Supervision. Local government should undertake similar reviews of their agencies in order to maximize coordination and effectiveness.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS Continued

7. Agency responsibilities, State and local relationships including fiscal responsibility regarding juvenile delinquency prevention and control activities, should be clearly defined in writing.
8. Interagency training programs should be developed and delivered to youth service agencies at the State, regional and local level to insure sharing of resources, knowledge and treatment continuity.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS (Relating to the Department of Juvenile Services)

1. The Department should clearly define its program in furtherance of statutory mandates (particularly in the prevention area) so that other State and local agencies know what to expect from the Department in terms of programs and fiscal assistance.
2. It is recommended that in Maryland's juvenile justice system, the responsibilities of the courts and the Department of Juvenile Services be clearly delineated and separated. It is recommended that the courts' responsibility be limited to adjudication and review and that the Department of Juvenile Services have the sole responsibility for providing court services and in selecting staff.
3. It is recommended that if the delivery system is not changed, legislative changes be made to allow the Department of Juvenile Services to purchase residential and other services for juveniles on informal and probation status. This change would negate the necessity for commitment solely to obtain such services.
4. It is recommended that voluntary informal supervision be encouraged at intake with the intake staff acting as a treatment team coordinator.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS (Relating to the Schools)

1. It is recommended that State and local educational officials implement inservice training aimed at improving teacher skills in assisting delinquent youth and those with less severe behavioral problems. These programs should be developed in conjunction with the Department of Juvenile Services and other youth services agencies.
2. It is recommended that specially-trained supplementary staff be employed by school districts to help teachers in assisting delinquent youth and those with other behavioral problems in resolving their problems.
3. It is recommended that youth with severe delinquency and educational problems that are not responding to the normal classroom experience be placed in special programs aimed at dealing with social/psychological dimensions as well as academic. These programs should be developed in conjunction with the Department of Juvenile Services and other appropriate rehabilitative agencies.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS (Relating to the Schools) Continued

4. It is recommended that each school system within the State establish definite referral patterns for troubled youth that require resources outside the school system. This process should include clearly defined staff responsibility and should include a clear understanding of case management and follow-up beyond referral.

On May 7, 1973, Governor Marvin Mandel signed House-Joint Resolution Number 92. That resolution (see Appendix 1) calls for the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, in conjunction with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning, to study the programs related to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency which are carried out by the State Departments of Juvenile Services; Health and Mental Hygiene; Education; Employment and Social Services; and Public Safety and Correctional Services for the purpose of developing feasible recommendations for a plan of coordination of the various efforts aimed at the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency.

The problem of juvenile delinquency has often received the attention of many citizens in the State of Maryland including the private citizen and government officials. As noted in House-Joint Resolution 92 "...it is in the interest of the children and youth, as well as the citizens of the State of Maryland for these children and youth to receive the most effective possible services from the State Departments serving them, thus increasing the possibilities of their development into mature and responsible citizens and, at the same time, possibly saving the taxpayers of the State of Maryland tax dollars in the future..." As a means of achieving this objective, the Resolution calls for the development of feasible recommendations for a plan to coordinate the various efforts aimed at the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. It is apparent from these statements that more effective alternatives are being sought to deal with the problems of children and youth in danger of becoming delinquent or who have already committed delinquent acts. It is with this objective in mind that the present report addresses the current practices relating to the diagnosis and treatment of troubled youth in the State of Maryland.

In recent years, three basic questions have been raised: (1) What causes juvenile delinquency? (2) How can it be prevented? (3) What type of treatment systems are needed for delinquent youth? The present state of knowledge on this subject unfortunately does not permit complete resolution of any of these questions. At best, there are available tentative explanations that are sometimes useful in organizing the established facts about delinquency and in making researchers and practitioners aware of specific areas that warrant concentration of their efforts. The day when complete answers to all questions pertaining to delinquency are available remains in the future.

The state of knowledge regarding the problems of delinquency treatment and prevention is best illustrated by reviewing the publications of individuals who are supposedly the most knowledgeable about these issues. Writers in this field offer an almost limitless variety of perspectives on these subjects. These individuals, who have often invested considerable time and energy in the study of delinquency, are generally very cautious in presenting their viewpoints. They seldom offer simple, if complete, solutions and frequently qualify their statements and findings, giving the impression that they know very little about delinquency. Although there is considerable divergency of



opinion between representatives of different disciplines, similar divergencies also exist within disciplines. The variety of explanations offered view delinquency as the result of learning experiences, early childhood training practices, extreme poverty, defective character structures, disorganized social structures, physical defects, emotional disturbances, and many other characteristics and conditions.<sup>1</sup> The techniques, suggested for effectively preventing delinquency are equally varied, although available information dealing with prevention is less abundant than that dealing with causation, which perhaps reflects the complexity of the prevention problem as well as the social scientist's general lack of emphasis on prevention analysis. Thus, with respect to this study, there is very little definitive information available from which to draw clear conclusions. Therefore, the task of designing a plan for coordination of the juvenile delinquency program in Maryland is a difficult one. However, the already noted discussion of causes and treatment mentioned makes it clear that coordination between the public and private sectors is needed.

This lack of knowledge relating to delinquency reduction is a result of many factors, but it is in part caused by the non-systematized nature of many prevention efforts and the reluctance to impartially and critically evaluate existing theories and practices. Adequate knowledge can only be developed through careful and critical analysis and research.

In an effort to coordinate efforts in identifying problems and setting objectives for the juvenile justice system, the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice has been given the broad responsibility for developing comprehensive plans to reduce delinquency and improve Maryland's criminal justice system.

The Comprehensive Plan prepared by the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice has identified three basic problems in the crime prevention area: first, the average citizen is not sufficiently involved in crime prevention efforts; second, potential delinquency behavior is not identified and treated at an early stage; and finally, there is a lack of community-based crime prevention programs.<sup>2</sup>

The first problem, lack of citizen involvement, is a paradoxical one. While there may be a concern about crime and delinquency, and even a "self-preserved" effort to keep crime from the doorstep, few citizens take an active role in organized prevention activity. Reasons for such behavior vary.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Delinquency Label: The Epidemiology of Juvenile Delinquency. Victor Eisner, University of California, Berkeley, Random House, N. Y., 1969.

<sup>2</sup>The Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice 1974 Comprehensive Plan.

Some view crime control as strictly a governmental battle. Some feel that there is little the average citizen can do to prevent crime, and others have never been touched by crime, and therefore, do not feel the need to help prevent it.

The Comprehensive Plan of the Commission points out that crime reduction goals can be achieved by effectively preventing youth from entering into anti-social behavior and deal with it prior to the child entering the criminal justice system. In order to do this, it is necessary to identify behavioral problems and deal with them effectively. Activities which would effectively address this problem include implementation of additional diagnostic and early intervention programs.

There is also a need to improve treatment services through wider establishment of group home and emergency care facilities and the broadening of family counseling, clinical, medical, social, and psychiatric services. Statistics contained in the Commission's 1974 Comprehensive Plan show that the total number of children's cases disposed of by Maryland's juvenile courts is continuing to increase. While the lack of community-based delinquency prevention programs is not the sole reason for the increase, it is apparent that effective community-based programs could have an impact on the kinds of problems that contributed to the rise. Such programming, as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and recommended by the Citizens Conference on Juvenile Delinquency sponsored by the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in November, 1972, should be structured to strengthen the child's interpersonal relationships. The kinds of services available through such programs should include: individual and family counseling; voluntary placement in foster homes; work and recreation programs; special education (remedial and vocational); placement in shelter care or group homes; job training and counseling; and physical and mental health services. At the present time, a number of community-based prevention programs funded by the Governor's Commission are operating, but there is a need for more programs and increased effectiveness in operations.

The Plan indicates that in the past, the needs of youth have been poorly anticipated in many areas such as community-based prevention and treatment and points out that if the crime prevention problem is to be effectively addressed, there must be a viable, coordinated system of community-based programs operating in all parts of the State, especially in Baltimore City and the urban counties.<sup>3</sup>

In 1971, the Maryland General Assembly, recognizing the need for improved methods and additional alternatives to the methods of disposition of cases involving young offenders (an individual who is older than the State's juvenile court jurisdiction, i.e., 18 years of age, or has been waived from juvenile court to adult criminal court but has not reached the age of 25), requested the Governor, the President of the Senate and The Speaker of the House of Delegates to appoint a Commission on Young Offenders. Joint Resolution No. 28 requesting

---

<sup>3</sup>The Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice 1974 Comprehensive Plan, p. 67.

the establishment of the Commission was approved by Governor Marvin Mandel on April 22, 1971.

The Commission on Young Offenders was requested to receive testimony, collect information, and conduct analysis in order to:

- ° Review existing sentencing alternatives and treatment programs for the young offenders;
- ° Define the nature and extent of the problem of young offenders in the State of Maryland;
- ° Propose executive and legislative guidelines for the handling of young offenders in the criminal justice system; and
- ° Make recommendations on the administration, program, and facilities for young offenders.

While the Commission studied young adult offenders, their recommendations are applicable in gaining insight to the problem of youth.

To assist the Commission on Young Offenders, the staff of the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice was asked to provide technical and clerical support.

The Commission on Young Offenders held several meetings for the purpose of receiving testimony. The individuals testifying before the Commission included both experts in the criminal justice system and the academic profession. A special hearing also was held in Baltimore to receive the testimony of ex-offenders.

The hearings revealed that there is a wide variety of opinion relating to the handling of young offenders in the criminal justice system of Maryland. The individuals testifying recognized the need to divert young offenders away from the criminal justice system and the "labeling" process. Young people were recognized as the nation's future and their conduct could affect the society for years to come. The Commission members recognized that prevention and rehabilitation are most needed and hold the greatest promise with young offenders.<sup>4</sup> A summary of the Commission recommendations is included in Appendix 2.

Another source of information regarding these problems in the State of Maryland is the Comprehensive Long Range Master Plan for the Department of Juvenile Services. The development of this plan was supported through funding by the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and was the direct result of a training and consultation report prepared by the John Howard Association, Chicago, Illinois. The report is quite

---

<sup>4</sup>Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, A Report of the Governor's Commission on Young Offenders, December, 1971.

extensive and includes a description of problems as well as recommendations regarding all areas of functioning and responsibilities of the Department of Juvenile Services. With respect to the immediate task of this report, some of the more significant discussions involve the responsibilities of the Department of Juvenile Services in regard to community services including delinquency prevention and control.

The common thread of concern in all of these reports is the recognition that the young offender constitutes the largest group of persons breaking the law and the group for which prevention and rehabilitation efforts hold the greatest promise. This promise is represented in the President's Task Force Report:

"Clearly it is with young people that prevention efforts are most needed and hold the greatest promise. It is simply more critical that young people be kept from crime, for they are the nation's future, and their conduct will affect society for a long time to come. They are not set in their ways; they are still developing, still subject to the influence of the socializing institutions that structure -- however skeletally -- their environment: Family, school gang, recreation program, job market. But that influence, to do the most good, must come before the youth has become involved in the formal criminal justice system."<sup>5</sup>

In addition to the emphasis on the need for improved prevention and rehabilitation programs, these reports also address the problems surrounding the delivery of services to youth. One of the major areas of concern is the coordination of services.

In a discussion regarding the coordination of services, the John Howard Association report indicates that the Department of Juvenile Services many times requires the availability of comprehensive services in order to have a positive effect on the individual child or youth. The Association further indicated that other State agencies frequently aid in the rehabilitation process, but the coordination of this vast variety of services and programs to produce the greatest possible benefit to the client presents a formidable problem.

The report states that the problems of coordination seem to fall into two broad categories: (1) inter-disciplinary coordination; and (2) inter-agency coordination.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, p. 41.

<sup>6</sup>John Howard Association, Comprehensive Long Range Master Plan, Maryland Department of Juvenile Services (Chicago, 1972), p. 28.

In the discussion of the first of these categories, the study offers an illustration which points to the difficulties surrounding various disciplines being involved in the same case. The case study indicated that these difficulties usually involve arguments regarding primacy; the determination of which of the professional workers has the primary responsibility for seeing that necessary services are provided to the child. Such arguments, if they should occur, are, of course, false arguments since each of these services and each discipline has, as its basic purpose, the provision of help to an individual in need.<sup>7</sup>

It has also been well established, and indeed is often stated by knowledgeable members of each of the disciplines involved, that inter-disciplinary cooperation and coordination are vital if a child is to receive the combination services that he uniquely requires. The question of primacy should be resolved on the basis of the most pressing need the child has at a given point in time. If an inter-disciplinary team of specialists cooperating to provide a solution to the problem is considered, the team leader should be that individual who is most needed at that particular point in time. Should the child be able to remain in the school setting, then the teacher could be the team leader. This in no way would diminish the contributions that could be made by the social worker who would add his skills to the resolving of family problems, and the contributions of the Juvenile Services' worker with his or her in-depth understanding of the circumstances surrounding and perhaps causing the child's behavioral problems.

At another point in time, it would be more appropriate for the social worker to serve as a team leader, since the current problem might, in time, be focused within the family.

The report states that it is this concept of a team approach with a changing leadership, depending upon the most difficult aspect of the problem at a given point in time, that seems to be most reasonable when resolving the problem of interdisciplinary coordination.

Since it is the basic purpose of each of these disciplines to serve the needs of the child, any possible arguments over who has the primary responsibility should be suspended for that reason alone. All that is needed is a genuine team approach with a first among equals to serve as a leader on particular aspects of the problem.

Another reason for supporting the concept of a team with a changing leadership is a recognition of the professional satisfactions that the personnel involved seek to obtain from their positions.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 26-27.

With respect to the second category, interagency coordination, the report states that almost all top administrators in state departments and agencies engaged in providing services to people would be in complete agreement that interagency cooperation is essential if effective help is to be given. The fact is that individual cases still fall between the agency cracks. Effective coordination, when it is achieved, is often the product of middle-level specialists who manage to work with counterparts and other agencies with little regard for the parochial interests of their agencies. Fortunately, for the child's sake, such coordination does happen more often than not. The top administrators, while agreeing to the need, find themselves usually immersed in the daily problems and activities of running their departments and agencies. What is needed is more attention from top-level administrators to the development of a somewhat formal system of determining the factor of primacy, so that their specialists do not become preoccupied with properly representing their departments.<sup>9</sup>

In an effort to better understand the problems surrounding the effective delivery of services to juveniles, the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice conducted a field study in three areas of the State. This study included interviews with State and local personnel dealing directly with youth problems in an urban (Baltimore City), suburban (Baltimore County), and rural (Kent County) area within the State. Although this selection was not based on pure sampling techniques, it was felt that this type of survey did meet the objective of the task in gaining an adequate overview of three communities within the State and how they deal with the problems of troubled youth and the prevention of delinquency. Conclusions and recommendations regarding the problems faced with respect to the coordination of programs to prevent and control delinquency are based on information and data collected from: (1) a sample of three school systems interviewed with a uniform set of questions; (2) interviews with persons from local offices of the Department of Juvenile Services, local health departments, vocational rehabilitation and related public and private community social services agencies; (3) review of previous state and national literature and reports; and (4) a special study carried out by the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning.

#### GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that a special State level coordinating council be formulated to monitor and to facilitate improved coordination between State and local agencies involved in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Such a council could serve as an advisory board to the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice or be an independent entity appointed by the Governor (the Commission is required to have a juvenile delinquency advisory board as a result of recent Federal legislation), or be an expanded form of the current Department of

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid, p. 27.

Juvenile Services' Advisory Board. The board should be composed of representatives of public and private agencies dealing with youth, law enforcement, private citizens and public officials. State and local government should also be represented. Its function should be to facilitate operational coordination and sharing of existing resources and the development of more effective programs.

2. It is recommended that local jurisdictions establish local level juvenile delinquency prevention coordinating councils in order to identify problems and improve coordination within the scope of needs of particular communities. Such councils should be established by local legislation on a county basis and be composed of representatives of State, local, and private agencies.
3. It is recommended that interdisciplinary cooperation and coordination be improved through the expanded use of an interdisciplinary team treatment approach to the problems of troubled youth.

These recommendations relate to a primary problem concerning the broad area of coordination (i.e., fragmentation and duplication of services and the lack of cooperative agreements between agencies). This problem of poor coordination of services appears to be most evident in the urban inner-city where juvenile delinquency is most prominent.

It was noted in the three jurisdictions reviewed in this study that, all too often, the many public and private agencies created specifically to deal with the problems of troubled youth are unaware of the others' existence or they fail to communicate with the agencies to develop agreements to deal with clients with which they both have an interest.

The survey also indicated that a problem of even greater importance and primacy to that on interagency coordination in the delivery of services is that of intra-agency coordination. It was noted that with respect to prevention and intervention programs, many agencies whose functions relate to these areas limit themselves within narrow operational parameters. For example, it was noted that within the schools the personnel often will not take the responsibility of dealing with behavioral problems except to have them withdrawn from the system so as not to interfere with the educational process. In this respect, agencies that should have a real interest in the problems of youth not only insulate themselves from other helping agencies, but insulate themselves from the needs of the child. Public agencies quite often act only when placed in a crisis situation with the child.

As noted previously, this problem of coordination is especially serious in more urban areas of the State. Coordination problems usually appear to be directly proportional to the size of the community concerned. It must also be concluded that the number of services available does not mean more effective prevention and control of delinquency. These conclusions are based on the observation that within these larger urban areas, where the majority

of services are available, the expansiveness of the "span of control" and "responsibility" does not appear to promote the effective coordination and delivery of services. As stated by the International Association of Chiefs of Police Delinquency Prevention/Juvenile Justice Conferences, "Delinquency problems cannot be solved simply by infusing money and programs into prevention agencies: There is NO WAY TO PURCHASE PREVENTION. What is needed is a re-establishment of community concern for youth problems. Delinquency prevention and control are local issues which should revolve around each neighborhood and the quality of family life in that community."<sup>10</sup>

With respect to these coordination problems, the question which must be asked is: What action needs to be taken by professionals in the various disciplines of the juvenile justice system to encourage their colleagues to collaborate in the development of interdisciplinary approaches to delinquency prevention, diversion and rehabilitation of youthful offenders?

In response to this question, it is felt that communities, whether they be urban or rural, need to establish some means for the restructuring of individual agency organizations from independence to interdependency. This would enable the components of the juvenile service system to treat the child in trouble as a "whole person" rather than as a collection of "symptoms."

In this respect, it is noted that the juvenile justice and related agencies within local jurisdictions (both State and local agencies - police, courts, probation, corrections and social welfare) can be so fragmented and disjointed that juvenile justice agencies often find themselves working at supporting conflicting policies and competing for scarce resources. In the long run, the child who most needs the services of these agencies is the one who ultimately suffers from the lack of interagency cooperation.

It is anticipated that the suggested coordinating councils will act as coordinating bodies identifying coordination problems and facilitating service delivery. It is further anticipated that coordinating councils would make recommendations on a continuing basis for the purpose of coordinating, sharing resources, suggesting priorities for budgetary expenditures, and program development, particularly in the area of delinquency prevention.

As noted by the November, 1972 Citizens' Conference on Juvenile Delinquency sponsored by the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, greater efforts should be made to coordinate the services of the various State and local agencies offering services to juveniles. The Conference participants indicated that this should be done in such a way as to encourage citizen awareness, interest and involvement in juvenile delinquency prevention

---

<sup>10</sup>Dr. Robert C. Trojanowicz, "Factors That Effect the Functioning of Delinquency Prevention Programs," The Police Chief, Vol. 38, No. 2, February, 1971, p. 444.



and rehabilitation activities, particularly at the local level. The suggested coordinating councils should include private citizen representation in addition to professional involvement.

4. It is recommended that case tracking, planning and evaluation systems be developed in order to maximize continuity of treatment and effective use of resources.
5. It is recommended that active service delivery mechanisms be established in all local subdivisions aimed at providing services to youth, coordinating existing agencies and suggesting improvements in youth services delivery. The youth service bureau concept should be considered as one possible mechanism to provide this capability.

In developing active service delivery mechanisms, certain objectives should be set and achieved. Some of the suggested objectives as identified by the authors of Juvenile Justice Administration are as follows:

A. Provide More Socially Acceptable and Meaningful Roles for Youth.

One of the reasons why most youth don't get into trouble is that they have access to a variety of positive, socially acceptable roles such as student, family member, peer group member, club group member, and employee. The community process opens up progressively wider roles for youth as they successfully perform their present role functions. It is at the point where the denial of access to increasingly responsible roles occurs so that delinquency is more apt to become an option. The denial of completing the student role (i.e., suspension from high school or dropping out) makes it extremely difficult for the ex-student to fulfill the employee role since a high school diploma is a minimal requirement for most jobs. In addition, the loss of the student role creates a strain on the existing family roles, peer group roles, and club group roles which often results in the process of alienation from those social institutions which have, in effect, "closed their doors."

A program-by-program analysis will be completed which will indicate whether the youth services system succeeds in providing the socially acceptable roles that are necessary to "make it" in our society. Criteria are: the reduction of dropout rates, the opening of job opportunities, the process of youth involvement, and participation in community life.

B. Divert Youth Away From the Juvenile Justice System Into Alternate Programs.

The measure for this objective will be a statistical procedure reflecting a reduction in the annual rate of referrals to juvenile courts.

C. Reduce Negative Labeling.

A great deal of interest has legitimately been generated over the process of labeling, particularly the labeling that attaches a stigma. The process of searching for an approach to eliminate the negative labeling of youth leads directly to those agencies and institutions which apply the labels, most notably the schools, welfare departments, juvenile courts, employment services and some private agencies that stress eligibility determinations. An evaluative paradox occurs, for instance, in the schools; special dropout prevention programs have been instituted which, in themselves, denote a very positive effort. Nevertheless, the programs rely on certain predictors which identify potential dropouts for special services. In effect, the children and youth selected for special services to keep them in school are labeled as potential dropouts and, very shortly, their peers are aware of the distinction despite official silence.

D. Reduce Youth-Adult Alienation.

Criterion measurements for this objective are in the process of assembly and development. The measures of a reduction in alienation will necessarily be a part of each program's internal monitoring system and will apply to observed behavioral patterns of the youth being served in that system. The assumption is that a reduction in youth-adult alienation will bring about an increased participation by youth in the total community's activities and will be reflected in lower rates of official delinquency.<sup>11</sup>

6. It is recommended that the Executive and Legislative branches of government review the current administrative and statutory assignments of juvenile delinquency treatment and prevention agencies and make changes as appropriate. Strong consideration should be given to re-evaluating the current systems for handling Children in Need of Supervision. Local government should undertake similar reviews of their agencies in order to maximize coordination and effectiveness.

While it is recognized that the responsibility of each State and local agency dealing with youth must be clearly defined, it is felt that a review of the juvenile justice system as it is currently structured should be carried out in the State. This process should include a reconsideration of administrative and statutory assignments for juvenile delinquency and prevention agencies. There have been some recent changes in the juvenile justice system in Maryland.

---

<sup>11</sup>Juvenile Justice Administration 1973, pp. 477-479.

With the passage of SB 1064, youth found to be Children in Need of Supervision (CINS) can no longer be placed in juvenile institutions. In reviewing these matters and making appropriate changes in the laws governing the treatment and handling of youth, the Legislature has noted the differences between CINS and those youth adjudicated as delinquent. In recognizing a need for a difference in treatment, the Legislature has seen the Child in Need of Supervision as a youngster who should not be institutionalized. In view of this development and recent recommendations concerning youth made by the U. S. Department of Justice Inter-Departmental Council to Coordinate all Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs, it is apparent that further review should be made in order to determine the feasibility of removing the so called "status" offenses (i.e., charges which relate to activities that would not be criminal if committed by adults), from the jurisdiction of the Department of Juvenile Services and the juvenile justice system.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, serious thought should be given to placing primary responsibility for delinquency prevention activity at the local level. It should be noted that one negative impact of the current system is that community resources are given to (CINS) youth while delinquents are often institutionalized because of this priority being given to those youth who cannot be institutionalized by law.

In reviewing such responsibilities, it is important to develop an overall organizational management and accountability framework which gives adequate attention to potential delinquents as well as youthful law breakers, avoids duplication of jurisdiction and services to the extent possible and properly defines the operational and fiscal relationship between various levels of government. Currently, the Department of Juvenile Services has clear primary jurisdiction over alleged and adjudicated delinquents. However, there is a great deal of overlapping jurisdiction as it relates to status offenders and generalized prevention clients. In fact, it would appear that despite differing statutory definitions, the categories of Children in Need of Supervision (jurisdiction of the Department of Juvenile Services) and dependent, neglected (jurisdiction of the Department of Social Services) are often being utilized interchangeably by some courts. It also appears that greater attention is needed on the juvenile offender who commits serious multiple offenses. The suggested review should be accomplished in conjunction with a review of the present status and development of resources outside the juvenile justice system (i.e., The Department of Employment and Social Services, Mental Health Administration, Department of Education and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation) to handle these behavioral problems. These responsibilities should be directed to those community agencies which are most capable of dealing with the particular problems (i.e., truancy might be best handled by a referral to special programs within the education system). It should be noted, however, based on the field research noted earlier in this report, that there are serious gaps in the availability and coordination of these community resources.

---

<sup>12</sup>Interdepartmental Council to Coordinate all Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs, Proposed National Policy Objectives in the Juvenile Delinquency/Youth Development Area, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1972, pp. 7-34.

In an effort to provide an organizational structure to improve the delivery of delinquency prevention and treatment services, the following alternative service delivery structures are recommended for consideration.

It should be noted that youth service systems, as outlined in the following models, should be considered in light of the State's preparation of a program and plan, including a feasibility study for State multi-service centers to provide for convenient and efficient service delivery.

One alternative for service delivery would be to clearly place only the prime responsibility for dealing with delinquent youth and those alleged to be delinquent with the State Department of Juvenile Services. While most services to be provided in carrying out this responsibility would be provided directly by the Department of Juvenile Services, significant activities could be carried out on a cooperative or coordinated basis. The existing laws and systems for dealing with the Children in Need of Supervision would be changed. Maryland law defines this youth as follows: "Children in Need of Supervision means a child who requires guidance, treatment or rehabilitation, and:

1. Is required by law to attend school and who is habitually truant from school;
2. Is habitually disobedient, ungovernable, and beyond control of the person having custody of him without substantial fault on the part of that person;
3. Departs himself so as to injure or endanger himself or others; or
4. Has committed an offense applicable only to children."

Under this alternative, youth currently in this category would no longer be the responsibility of the Department of Juvenile Services. Access to court for these cases would be eliminated or possibly severely limited (possibly to cases where it can be shown the youth poses a clear danger to himself or the community). This is being suggested not only because there are many who feel that existing laws (such as a prohibition against institutionalization), have made dealing with these youth in the juvenile justice system impossible, but more importantly, because it is felt that these problems can be best dealt with by local community agencies. Finally, under this alternative it is recommended that the primary responsibility for generalized prevention programs be that of local government. It would appear that such prevention efforts are more appropriately directed, funded, and carried out by public and private agencies in the counties and municipalities. It is suggested, however, that the Department of Juvenile Services and the Department of Social Services provide technical assistance, encouragement and, in some instances, fiscal assistance to local subdivisions and private agencies dealing with troubled youth. One example of such assistance would be to provide funds to such agencies as youth services bureaus when these agencies are also providing purchase of care services to delinquent youth. (The Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice is currently working on such a purchase of care system).

The second alternative would also place prime responsibility for dealing with delinquent youth in the State Department of Juvenile Services. Jurisdiction over Children in Need of Supervision would be placed with the Department of Employment and Social Services. This arrangement would allow for clear and intensive undivided activity aimed at dealing with large numbers of serious juvenile offenders within the Department of Juvenile Services. At the same time, by consolidating the activities relating to Children in Need of Supervision and dependent and neglected youth, there could be a more coherent and logical basis for dealing with youth that need assistance but that are not engaged in violations of the law. If it is felt that the State should retain significant responsibility for what are now categorized Children in Need of Supervision, this alternative has several advantages. First, it clearly focuses responsibility for control and rehabilitation of delinquent youth with the Department of Juvenile Services. Secondly, since even under current legislation CINS jurisdiction and dependent and neglected jurisdiction are often used interchangeably by the court. Placing both types of jurisdiction within Social Services would eliminate this type of activity. More importantly, for the purposes of this study, a large amount of duplication in jurisdiction, lack of coordination, and duplication and competition of resources that now exists with respect to CINS and dependent or neglected youth would be eliminated. Even under this alternative, it is recommended that CINS-type youth be given program services where requested, but not be brought into the juvenile court system.

Under this alternative, primary prevention activities, except to the extent CINS-type activity is clearly involved, would be the responsibility of local government.

A third alternative would be to leave the current jurisdictional arrangements as they are except to place CINS jurisdiction within the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, but not within the Department of Juvenile Services. Under this option, the Department of Juvenile Services would have jurisdiction over alleged delinquents and adjudicated delinquents while the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene would develop a broad program aimed at operating programs aimed at delinquency prevention and youth development. This alternative would place the State in the prime responsibility for delinquency prevention and it is likely that the State would operate and purchase services in various programs such as youth services bureaus. It should be noted that this type of prevention program responsibility could be operated by the Department of Employment and Social Services if CINS jurisdiction were placed there as a fourth alternative.

A final alternative would be to place delinquency jurisdiction within the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, place CINS jurisdiction within the Department of Employment and Social Services, and divide the prevention type activity between the Department of Employment and Social Services, private agencies, and local government. This approach would have the advantage of assuring the continuity in dealing with the law violator and facilitate sharing of knowledge and experience between treatment and custody personnel. Regardless of the alternative selected, a change in the delivery system would have to include some re-allocation of resources based on new responsibilities. Additionally, the sharing of resources and programs should be encouraged wherever possible. However, it is recommended that consideration be given to retaining a separation of delinquent youth from the other categories in residential programs.

7. Agency responsibilities, State and local relationships including fiscal responsibility regarding juvenile delinquency prevention and control activities should be clearly defined in writing.

Although, in the past, the State has experienced some sporadic State-wide, county-wide, or city-wide development of investigative reports on coordination and delivery of various services, there has been no on-going agency response to these problems. One such effort which points out the lack of follow-up and response is the report of the Mini-Task Force to Study Relations between the Baltimore City Public Schools and the Department of Juvenile Services. As noted in the introduction of this report the Task Force was to make recommendations and propose a course of action in improving coordination between the two agencies. Although the Task Force carried out its duties and presented the report with the recommendation that the solution suggested be implemented in September, 1973, very little formal action has been taken to date.

As suggested by reports such as the one produced by the Education Department/Juvenile Services Task Force, noted above, there is action that each agency needs to take in order to improve their own component, thus improving the system. Each agency must establish and clearly identify its role in delinquency prevention and control. Each State agency involved in the juvenile delinquency and prevention areas should work with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning and other appropriate agencies in this process. Although the responsibility of the State for youthful law breakers is fairly clear, there is a great deal of further definition needed relating to specific services, delivery responsibility, and fiscal responsibility for status offenders or general prevention activities. It is clear, however, that local subdivisions and private agencies should bear some portion of these costs.

8. Interagency training programs should be developed and delivered to youth service agencies at the State, regional and local level to insure sharing of resources, knowledge and treatment continuity.

As noted previously in this report, the problems of coordination and continuity of services play a very significant role in the juvenile justice system. With this in mind and the fact that delinquency problems lay at the intersection of a broad variety of disciplines, the development of interagency training programs takes on new significance. One specific problem for training occurs repeatedly and is noted by most personnel in the field of delinquency. This is the problem of inadequate training and communications between those who are responsible for various parts of the total delinquency prevention and control process. It is in an effort to resolve this issue that programs offering training which crosses disciplinary and occupational boundaries should be developed.

Currently, no adequate funding sources are available to provide interagency training programs. The resources for funding these programs should be explored with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning. It should also be noted that the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice has recognized the need for programs in this area and provided some limited assistance in well-defined areas.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Relating to the Department  
of Juvenile Services

1. The Department should clearly define its program in furtherance of statutory mandates (particularly in the prevention area) so that other State and local agencies know what to expect from the Department in terms of programs and fiscal assistance.
2. It is recommended that in Maryland's juvenile justice system the responsibilities of the courts and the Department of Juvenile Services be clearly delineated and separated. It is recommended that the courts' responsibility be limited to adjudication and review and that the Department of Juvenile Services have the sole responsibility for providing court services and in selecting staff.
3. It is recommended that if the delivery system is not changed, legislative changes be made to allow the Department of Juvenile Services to purchase residential and other services for juveniles on informal and probation status. This change would negate the necessity for commitment solely to obtain such services.
4. It is recommended that voluntary informal supervision be encouraged at intake with the intake staff acting as a treatment team coordinator.

As part of a community juvenile justice system, the Department of Juvenile Services and the Juvenile Court are present in the community to deal with many diverse social issues and serve as the judicial body created to dispense individualized justice to juvenile offenders. The problem of broad responsibility with insufficient deliverability is not understood by the communities' other youth agencies and the public. This leaves the Department of Juvenile Services' court services staff with a "responsibility dilemma;" they are dependent upon other local agencies for support and cooperation for proper case handling and service; therefore, it must react to demands of these agencies and must be accountable to them for functions the Department of Juvenile Services has been assigned. The Department of Juvenile Services in Maryland, like many governmental agencies of government, has been given broad duties and responsibilities without the authority and sufficient resources to carry out these responsibilities.

If, for example, the Department of Education will not deal with truancy cases on the local level, the school system can shift this obligation to the Department of Juvenile Services whose legal mandate requires that it deal with these children. It is felt that because the Department of Juvenile Services is mandated with such broad and encompassing responsibility that interagency cooperation becomes a complex maze of intergovernmental and community relationships.

As indicated in the April, 1971 LEAA Technical Assistance Report on the State of Maryland, Department of Juvenile Services, the Department's capacity to reach its goal is seriously compromised at present by the presence of what might be termed joint jurisdiction in defining rehabilitation and treatment plans for children in trouble within the State. The consultant report cites numerous areas in which the judiciary impinges upon the Department's capacity to discharge its statutory responsibilities.<sup>13</sup> An example of such an area is referenced in Section 14 of Article 52A which stipulates that the Departmental employees performing probation or other court services are "under the immediate direction, supervision, and control of the judges of the respective juvenile courts."

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's report concludes that with these limitations, the Department's authority and ability to discharge its responsibilities are negatively affected by the corresponding authority granted to the courts by the State Legislature. It is difficult for two masters to determine simultaneously what is best in the way of treatment and rehabilitation. Under such an administrative structure, the Legislature cannot properly hold the Department of Juvenile Services completely responsible for its program. It has divided authority and responsibility for rehabilitation between the juvenile courts and the Department of Juvenile Services.

Although the field study carried out during this survey did not permit an extensive evaluation of the Court Service Division of the Department of Juvenile Services, certain impressions were gained. It was noted that even after a case is referred to the Department of Juvenile Services, there are problems with the securing of, and coordination of services. As noted previously, it is the court that is quite often determining the treatment plan and the individuals who should be involved. In this respect, it was noted that many cases are entering the juvenile court system with formal judicial proceeding based only on a need for a particular service. The intake consultant will, in many cases, recognize that a child and the community would benefit from a particular service and would, therefore, petition the court for a formal hearing in order to reach that end. It appears that this approach to the treatment of troubled youth is contrary to the projected prevention and control objectives in the State of Maryland.

It was also noted that in many areas of the State, the juvenile court is the only publicly recognized agency with the responsibility for the delivery and coordination of services for troubled youth. As a result of this view of the court, the Department of Juvenile Services is dependent on the court for the acquisition of services.

The Department of Juvenile Services should have the responsibility for establishing treatment plans for all youth brought to the attention of the Department of Juvenile Services. It is felt that if the Department of Juvenile Services is to meet its responsibility, the intake process should emphasize the delivery of needed services without unnecessarily petitioning for formal

---

<sup>13</sup>LEAA Report.



adjudication. This process should include the coordinated delivery of services developed as a treatment plan to be delivered by a treatment team, as previously discussed.

While this method of case adjustment has both critics and supporters, its advocates readily point out that it does offer advantages both to the child and the court. The principal advantage, as explained by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, is that informal probation avoids the "evils" of adjudication, such as curtailment of employment opportunities, acquiring a quasi-criminal record, harm to personal reputation in the eyes of family, friends, and the public, and reinforcement of anti-social tendencies.<sup>14</sup> Second, it is maintained that informal probation saves judicial time and is, therefore, more economical.<sup>15</sup>

In support of case disposition through informal supervision, the Maryland Judges Conferences on Juvenile Delinquency sponsored by the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice recommended that "A review should be made of the '45-day rule' which limits the period of informal supervision of juveniles with a view toward expanding it."<sup>16</sup>

#### ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

##### Relating to the Schools

1. It is recommended that State and local educational officials implement inservice training aimed at improving teacher skills in assisting delinquent youth and those with less severe behavioral problems. These programs should be developed in conjunction with the Department of Juvenile Services and other youth services agencies.
2. It is recommended that specially-trained supplementary staff be employed by school districts to help teachers in assisting delinquent youth and those with other behavioral problems in resolving their problems.

---

<sup>14</sup>The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, supra note 25, p. 16.

<sup>15</sup>Howard E. Fradkin, "Dispositional Dilemmas of American Juvenile Courts," Margaret Rosenheim (ed.), Justice for the Child, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962, p. 125.

<sup>16</sup>Governor's Commission Newsletter Vol. 3, No. 1, p. 3, January-February, 1973.

3. It is recommended that youth with severe delinquency and educational problems that are not responding to the normal classroom experience be placed in special programs aimed at dealing with social/psychological dimensions as well as academic. These programs should be developed in conjunction with the Department of Juvenile Services and other appropriate rehabilitative agencies.
4. It is recommended that each school system within the State establish definite referral patterns for troubled youth that require resources outside the school system. This process should include clearly defined staff responsibility and should include a clear understanding of case management and follow-up beyond referral.

The State and local school systems represent community agencies which should also plan an integral role in the development of a delinquency prevention and treatment system in Maryland.

In the research for the study, an apparent hesitancy in the schools to become involved in programs directed toward delinquency prevention has been noted. It appears that the attitudes of teachers and administration in many school systems tend to foster the narrow academic approach to education. Schools in general, and teachers in particular, are often not willing to view the socialization process (affective education) as part of their role. They remain content-bound and, therefore, refuse to deal with the "troubled" student. It has become very evident that many schools are not responding to troubled youth beyond special academic needs. Although these special education programs have considerable indirect impact on the delinquency problem, in terms of their attempts to reduce student frustration and reduce factors which might be contributing to delinquency, it is felt that there is a responsibility to respond to the total child beyond the academic. In light of the fact that society cannot mandate responsible family life, it must become the responsibility of all agencies dealing with youth to be socializing and preventive forces within the community.

In meeting the special needs of troubled youth, it is felt that the in-service training programs should be offered in order to improve teacher skills in dealing with delinquent and potential delinquent youth. These programs should be developed in coordination with the Department of Juvenile Services. This type of training becomes increasingly important in areas which draw a student population which is socio-culturally disadvantaged. In these areas, it is necessary for paraprofessionals to become involved in assisting the teacher to deal with socially relevant education.

Because the majority of youth are legally bound to attend school, the educational system becomes the logical place to develop cooperative prevention programs. Schools at the community level must become involved in programs which are individually developed to provide needed services to troubled youth. School programs are seemingly rigid and structured in such a way as to offer little relevance to today's youth. While the general academic program should be directed toward all children, the individual social needs of children should not be ignored.

In an effort to make the school systems more responsive to the total needs of the students and a part of the delinquency prevention system, counseling efforts need to be emphasized. It is the school system's responsibility to improve intra-agency coordination of services to troubled youth. With this in mind, schools should not assign the serious responsibility of counseling to the least competent faculty members, but rather to enthusiastic and interested teachers trained to deal with students' needs. This interest implies that counseling must go beyond mere guidance counseling or dealing with a student's educational problems. It must also be recognized that if the counselors are to have any effect at all, they must appear at the elementary level as well as secondary.

APPENDIX

1. House Joint Resolution No. 92.
2. Summary of Recommendations of the Governor's Commission on Young Offenders .

APPENDIX I

R3097

H O U S E   O F   D E L E G A T E S

---

BY DELEGATES AVARA, KENT, GRUMBACHER, NICHOLS, BOLDEN, C. MITCHELL, SILK,  
BONVEGNA, PESCI, CHESTER, REDDING, THOMASON, J. DOUGLASS, W. ALLEN, LEVITAN,  
MACKIE, AND HEFFNER

Constitutional and Administrative Law

---

By the HOUSE OF DELEGATES, March 13, 1973.  
Rules suspended. Introduced, read first time and referred to the Committee  
on Constitutional and Administrative Law.

By order, JAMES P. MAUSE, Chief Clerk.  
Jacqueline M. Spell, Assistant.

---

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION  
No. 92

House Joint Resolution calling for the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, in conjunction with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning to study the programs related to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency which are carried out by the State Departments of Juvenile Services, Health and Mental Hygiene, Education, Employment and Social Services and Public Safety and Correctional Services for the purpose of developing feasible recommendations for a plan of coordination of the various efforts aimed at the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. In making the study, the advice and assistance of the appropriate State Departments should be sought. The Commission may call upon other public or private agencies as it deems appropriate. The recommendations of the Commission may include, but need not be limited to, possible areas of improved coordination among departments, suggestions for joint responsibilities and cooperative program efforts, and ideas for maximum efficiency in the utilization of monies expended in the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency.

WHEREAS, It is in the interest of the children and youth, as well as the citizens, of the State of Maryland for these children and youth to receive the most effective possible services from the State departments serving them, thus increasing the possibilities of their development into mature and responsible citizens and, at the same time, possibly saving the taxpayers of the State of Maryland tax dollars in the future; and

WHEREAS, Dedicated personnel in the departments serving children and youth in the State of Maryland could benefit from coordination of their efforts on behalf of these children and youth; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, in conjunction with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning is hereby requested to study the programs related to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency which are carried out by the State Departments of Juvenile Services, Health and Mental Hygiene, Education, Employment and Social Services and Public Safety and Correctional Services for the purpose of developing feasible recommendations for a plan of coordination of the various efforts aimed at the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. In making the study, the advice and assistance of the appropriate State Departments should be sought. The Commission may call upon other public or private agencies as it deems appropriate. The recommendations of the Commission may include, but need not be limited to, possible areas of improved coordination among departments, suggestions for joint responsibilities and cooperative program efforts, and ideas for maximum efficiency in the utilization of monies expended in the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this Commission shall make its preliminary report to the Governor and General Assembly by January 1974 and its final report to the Governor and General Assembly by June 30, 1974 with any specific legislative recommendations and that the study begin by July 1, 1973; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Governor, the Executive Director of the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, the Secretary of Budget and Fiscal Planning, the Director of the Department of Juvenile Services, and the Secretaries of the Departments of Health and Mental Hygiene, Employment and Social Services and Public Safety and Correctional Services and the State Superintendent of Schools.

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON YOUNG OFFENDERS

- (1) Pre-trial diversionary programs should be utilized for the purpose of removing non-dangerous amenable youthful offenders from the criminal justice system. These programs should provide the offender with vocational, educational, and follow-up services for the purpose of enabling the offender to demonstrate over a period of time his adjustment in the community. Successful participation in the program would mean removal from the criminal justice judicial process; while unsuccessful participation in the program would result in return to the criminal justice judicial process. Pre-trial programs should be initiated in close coordination with police, courts, and correctional agencies. The objective of such a program would be to offer the young offender the opportunity to avoid receiving a criminal label and the problems that follow.
- (2) The Commission on Young Offenders endorsed the major policy recommendations of the Community Corrections Committee Report and urged the implementation of the system of community corrections outlined in the Committee Report.
- (3) The Division of Parole and Probation and the Division of Correction, through the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, should be given resources necessary to "purchase services" from private or public community-based programs providing employment, educational, counseling services, and other appropriate programs available to the offender in the community. The Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services should develop standards of service, operations, and programs for these facilities. Additionally, the Division should emphasize programs involving the offender's family in the rehabilitation process.
- (4a) The Division of Correction should continue intensifying its efforts to obtain the cooperation of labor unions and employers in vocational training and job placement programs. The Commission commended the labor unions and employers providing vocational training and job placement programs for their cooperation with the Division of Correction. Greater emphasis and study should be given to job related programs and services. The Commission further recommended that study efforts have the full involvement of private industry and organized labor, and provide continual evaluation of ongoing vocational training programs to insure training responsive to the needs of industry. Additionally, the State and local governments should lead the way for providing employment opportunities for ex-offenders to encourage others (private sector) to provide employment and job opportunities. Ex-offenders should also be considered as staff in correctional treatment programs where appropriate.

- (4b) The Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services should initiate a review with appropriate State boards and agencies and associations including the State Bar Association for the purpose of reducing barriers to employment posed by discrimination against ex-offenders and the unnecessary restrictions on the hiring and licensing of ex-offenders.
- (5) In those subdivisions in the State where the criminal caseload has large numbers of young or youthful offenders, a youth court should be considered with assigned judges aware of the purpose, objectives, and results of established pre-trial diversionary projects and community treatment programs. If the youth courts are not established, judges should be continually trained in the use of resources and services available to offenders through a comprehensive criminal justice training and education program. Additional consideration should be given to expanding the use of psychological and psychiatric counseling and parole and probation services to the courts.
- (6) The Division of Correction of the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services should have the capability to expand its social services to aid in the development of comprehensive pre-parole reports and community placement services. In order to assist in the eventual reintegration of the offender into the community, parole staff involvement should begin the moment an offender enters an institution. Additionally, the Parole Board should be informed of the development of all pre-release and community treatment alternatives available throughout the State. As treatment alternatives become available, the use of parole prior to completion of a quarter of term of sentence should be considered.
- (7) Complete classification and evaluative-diagnostic capabilities should be developed within the Division of Correction for the expressed purpose of directing the offender to the program (institutional or community) providing the greatest possible change of successful reintegration into the community. All offenders entering the system should have a treatment prescription developed for their individualized needs, with release related to successful completion or performance. As treatment alternatives and diagnostic capabilities are expanded, further study should be given to the use of indeterminate sentence as a treatment tool.