

NCJRS

JAN 28 1977

GREATER NEWARK FAMILY CRISIS COUNSELING CENTER

Newark School District

A Project Report

JJDP Act

Submitted to the Executive Committee

of the

Delaware Agency to Reduce Crime

by

Kip Becker

Division of Evaluation - DARC

December, 1976

38946

PROJECT INFORMATION

General

Grant Number: 75-089
Grant Title: Greater Newark Family Crisis Counseling Center
Implementing Agency: Newark School District
Project Director: Dr. James Campbell
Grant Period: January 1, 1976 to December 31, 1976

Budget

Item	DARC	Match
Personnel and benefits	\$40,847	\$4,538
Travel	115	13
Supplies	594	66
Total Award	\$41,556	\$4,617

Organization

Dr. James Campbell, Associate Principal
Newark School District
Project Director

Non-Grant

Grant

Dr. Anthony Crane
Project Supervisor and Counselor

Marianne Bennett
Social Worker

Janice Good
Secretary

The Newark Family Crisis Counseling Center (hereafter referred to as the center) was established on January 1, 1976. The center was to provide counseling services to status offenders and their families residing in the greater Newark area. The total operating budget for the project was \$46,173 (\$41,556 DARC and \$4,617 match). The majority of the budget was for the salaries and benefits of a counselor, a social worker and a secretary. The remaining allocation provided for travel and supplies.

The center is located in the Hudson Social Services Building. This provides the project personnel with easy access to many referral agencies as a majority are located within this edifice.

The center stressed a family oriented approach and required that the client's parents become involved in family counseling. All clients and their families were provided both individual and family counseling on a weekly basis.

Objectives and Accomplishments

Objective. It was stated in the subgrant application that:

The Family Crisis Counseling Center will have a maximum load of 20 clients and their families at any specified period of time, due to the heavy concentration of the counseling schedule. The expected treatment period is projected to be six months. Therefore, in a year's time, the Center should treat 40 clients and their families.

Accomplishment. On November 2, thirty-one clients had received or were receiving services. There was a total active case load of twenty-three clients and eight cases had been closed. The maximum number of clients to be enrolled in the project at any one time (20), had been exceeded. It should be noted that many of the clients had been active longer than six months and as a re-

sult, were possibly effecting the total number of individuals the project would be capable of serving during the year. While it is important that individual client needs be considered, it is tantamount that project objectives be fulfilled.

This is particularly important in lieu of total project cost. The present yearly cost per individual is \$1,489 based on a client participation of thirty-one. If the project staff are able to accomplish their objective, a client enrollment of forty, the project cost per year per client would be \$1,154.

Objective. The application further stated that:

Thirty percent or twelve of the clients referred to the Center will have no further police contacts resulting in adjudication (as measured by a six month, one year and two year follow up).

Accomplishment. This project objective appears to have a minimum of substance as thirty percent of the clients would most likely be expected to improve without involvement with a rehabilitative service. Of the thirty-one clients who had received services, twenty-five had had no contact with the court system, five had been arrested for misdemeanors and one was charged with a felony. It is important to note that this data represents all cases both active (23) and closed (8). As only a limited number of cases have been closed, additional time is necessary before a statement of project impact is possible.

Client Profile

Target population. The target population for the Center was to be juveniles adjudicated by Family Court for status offenses between the ages of eleven and seventeen. It was stated that those to be accepted would reside in the area bounded by the Newark School District.

Fifteen males and sixteen females had been accepted into the project. Of the thirty-one, eight clients came from one parent homes. A description of client ages is provided in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Ages of Center Clients

Age	Number
5	1
6	1
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	1
11	0
12	4
13	0
14	6
15	9
16	2
17	6
18	1

The project services primarily the age group described in the subgrant application. Four clients were treated who did not fall within the designated age bracket, however, all four were status offenders and referred by Family Court.

All individuals receiving counseling services from the center were to have been adjudicated by Family Court for status offenses. Table 2 describes the types of charges which had been brought against center clients. Of the thirty-one clients receiving services, five had been detained in Bridge House and two in Governor Bacon prior to acceptance into the project.

TABLE 2

Charges Brought Against Center Clients Prior to Project Acceptance

Charge	Number
Status offense only	14
Criminal offense only	3
Status and criminal offenses	8
No charges	5
Charge brought against parent	1

Referrals. Center clients had been referred from five different sources. These are listed in Table 3. Of the thirty-one clients referred, fourteen clients had been ordered into the project by a Family Court judge. The remaining court referrals came from either the status offender or the central intake units.

TABLE 3

Sources Referring Clients to the Center

Agency	Number
Self	1
Protective services	1
Corrections	1
Family Court - Intake Unit	9
Family Court - Status Offenders Unit	19

Recommendations

It was recommended that:

1. Center staff delete age limitations in future applications and only restrict themselves to status offenders.
2. Both project staff and DARC monitors cooperate with individual project directors and judicial staff to prevent youth from being placed in double jeopardy. This often occurs to youth when they participate in one program (e.g., the center) for a period of time and then are required to complete additional

probationary or sentencing requirements without regard to the time spent in the first project.

3. Center staff, in accord with individual needs, attempt to terminate clients at a more rapid pace.

4. DARC staff screen applications carefully to prevent the acceptance of vague, overly simplistic and easily accomplished objectives. Project objectives should at a minimum require performance or changes at a level significantly greater than would be expected had no project been instituted.

END

7 10/10/10