

418076

D. H. S.

Final Evaluation  
Of Home Detention

48076

NCJRS

JUN 23 1978

ACQUISITIONS

LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY.

DEPARTMENT FOR HUMAN SERVICES

FINAL EVALUATION OF HOME DETENTION

MAY, 1978

This report was prepared in  
conjunction with a grant from  
the Law Enforcement Assistance  
Administration.  
Grant No. 2529-138-3/77

Prepared by:

The Office of Research and Planning  
George B. Haarmann, Director  
Thomas A. Hildenbrand, Principle Investigator

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	ii
INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	1
SECTION I. <u>The Objectives</u>	4
SECTION II. <u>Characteristics of the Population</u>	10
SECTION III. <u>Characteristics of the Non-Recidivists, Returnees and Recidivists</u>	13
SECTION IV. <u>Follow-Up Recidivism</u>	16
SUMMARY - <u>Entire Program</u>	32
<u>In the Third Year</u>	33
IMPRESSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	34

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1	<u>Average Daily Population by Month and Detention Status</u>	17
2	<u>Outcome by Year in Program</u>	17
3	<u>Grouped Reasons Referred for In-Treatment Offenses by Year in Program</u>	18
4	<u>Frequency of Contacts by Year in Program</u>	18
5	<u>Mean Total Contacts per Day by Year in Program</u>	19
6	<u>Mean Home Visits per Day by Year in Program</u>	19
7	<u>Length in Program by Year Entering Program</u>	20
8	<u>Time Between Referral and Disposition by Year Entering Program</u>	20
9	<u>Reason Referred (FBI Classification) by Sex and Race</u>	21
10	<u>Reason Referred (Grouped) by Sex and Race</u>	22
11	<u>Sex and Race by Number of Prior Offenses</u>	22
12	<u>Pre-History Score by Sex and Race</u>	23
13	<u>Sex and Race by Age</u>	23
14	<u>Sex and Race by Living Arrangement</u>	24
15	<u>Income by Sex and Race</u>	24

LIST OF TABLES  
(Con't.)

Table	Title	Page
16	<u>Receiving Public Assistance by Sex and Race</u>	25
17	<u>School Status by Sex and Race</u>	25
18	<u>Planning Service Community of Residence by Sex and Race</u>	26
19	<u>Length in Program by Sex and Race</u>	27
20	<u>Court Disposition by Sex and Race</u>	27
21	<u>Summary Description by Outcome (Entire Home Detention Population)</u>	28
22	<u>Number of Follow-Up Offenses by Sex and Race (Entire Program)</u>	30
23	<u>Type of Follow-Up Offense by Sex and Race (Entire Program)</u>	30
24	<u>Follow-Up Master Score by Sex and Race (Entire Program)</u>	31

## HOME DETENTION - FINAL EVALUATION

### INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

The Home Detention Program was begun in April, 1975, with financing through the Kentucky Crime Commission from the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA).

This program was designed to remove from secure detention, children who could be released to their own homes if intensive supervision and supportive services could be provided. Two types of children were considered appropriate candidates for Home Detention:

- a) children who are considered questionably dangerous to themselves or the community who have an adequate home to return to; and
- b) children who are not a danger to themselves or the community but whose homes are questionably adequate.

The youths were assigned to the program by a Juvenile Court Judge during a detention hearing at which time they were released to their own homes. Intensive supervision was provided by a Home Detention worker who had a maximum caseload of five juveniles.

The goal of the Home Detention Program was to test the feasibility of an alternative to detention so that money would not be wasted on an unnecessarily large Detention Center. Specifically, the major objective was to reduce the average daily population of the Detention Center by six as compared to 1974. Other objectives of the program were:

- to reduce the total number of children detained by 100 per year as compared to 1974;

- to detain, in a non-secure setting, 200 children per year who do not constitute a clear danger to themselves or the community;
- to assist the program participants to remain arrest-free and to make scheduled court appearances while in the program;
- to provide care at a cost comparable to or less expensive than secure detention; and
- to counsel each youth daily during his home detention period.

A preliminary evaluation of the Home Detention Program covering the period from April, 1975, through the end of October, 1975, was published in March of 1976. A second evaluation which covered the program from its inception through the end of October, 1976, was published in May, 1977.

The present study essentially replicates the earlier two evaluations except that it covers an additional year. This study examines Home Detention from its beginning in 1975, through October, 1977.

There are four sections to the report. The First Section is a study of how well the program met its objectives as stated in the grant application. The Second Section presents the demographic characteristics of the children participating in the program, while the Third Section is an examination of these characteristics in the light of the following definitions of outcome categories:

Non-Recidivists - those with no detected offenses during the program;

Returns - those returned to secure detention either by a bench warrant or

by the worker; and

Recidivists - those charged with new offenses while on Home Detention.

The final section of the report discusses the Juvenile Court contacts of the Home Detention population after completion of participation in the project.

## SECTION I.

### THE OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this section is to examine how well the program met its objectives.

The major objective of the Home Detention Program was to reduce the average daily population of the Detention Center by six as compared to 1974. In the period from May to October, 1974, the average daily population at the Detention Center was 60.7 youth. During the same period, the Alternative to Detention (ATD) Program had an average of 5.1 persons per day.

Table 1 presents the average daily population for Detention, ATD and Home Detention for the period from May, 1975 through October, 1977. In this period following the initiation of the Home Detention Program, the overall daily population held at the Center has been 51.6 persons. While the goal was met if the entire 30 month period of the existence of Home Detention is considered, this was not the case for the most recent year. As can be seen in Table 1, the average detention population has been going up, especially in 1977. Particularly disturbing in this regard is the figure for October, 1977, when the average was 74.3 youths. In fact, as many as 89 juveniles were held in detention on one day in October, 1977, and there were 80 or more juveniles in detention on ten days in that month.

As the table also indicates, the average daily populations for both Home Detention and ATD have also been increasing in recent months. It can be inferred from this data that the increase in the detention population has not been caused by an under-utilization of the alterna-

tive programs. Since this is the case, the failure of the program to meet this goal apparently was brought about by factors beyond the control of the Home Detention Program.

From the perspective of the entire 30 month period of the Home Detention Program, it appears that the program had considerable impact on the daily population of the Detention Center initially, but gradually the population in secure detention has crept back up to near pre-program levels.

A second objective of the program was to reduce by 100 per year the number of children held in secure detention. Due to data limitations this objective could not be tested.

A third objective of the program was to detain in a non-secure setting 200 children per year who do not constitute a clear danger to themselves or the community. Over the entire 30 months of the program, a total of 508 juveniles entered the program. This averages out to just slightly more than 200 children per year. However, in the most recent 12 month period (from November, 1976 through October, 1977) only 182 youths entered the program. The program, therefore, failed to meet this objective in its third year. This occurred despite the fact that through most of the year the program's capacity was 25 children per day which was five more per day than in previous years.

Another objective of the program was to assist the program participants to remain arrest-free while on Home Detention. Successful completion of the Home Detention Program was determined by two basic criteria: 1) that the youth commit no new offenses while on Home Detention

and 2) availability of the child for Court appearances.

The outcome results are given in Table 2. Overall, there were 332 non-recidivists, 93 returnees, and 83 recidivists. Of the 93 returnees, 26 were returned to Detention for a variety of reasons such as violations of the conditions of Home Detention and 67 were returned to Detention on a bench warrant.

The program outcome for the most recent 12 months was less successful than the outcome for the previous 12 months. During the period from November, 1975 to October, 1976 (the second year), over 71 percent of the program participants were non-recidivists while 11.4 per cent committed new offenses. This compares with the data on the third year when only 61.5 per cent of participants were non-recidivists, and 18.7 per cent were charged with new offenses.

Table 3 presents the reasons referred for those who committed new offenses while on Home Detention. Overall, more than half of those charged with new offenses were charged with major property offenses and another 13 per cent committed major offenses against persons while on Home Detention.

A fifth objective called for the Home Detention Program to provide care at a cost comparable to or less expensive than secure detention.

In 1976 and 1977, the net cost to operate the Detention Center was \$1,426,784. During these two years, a total of 38,562 child/days were spent in the Center. Thus, the average cost per child per day for secure detention was \$37.00.

From April, 1975 through October, 1977, the total cost for Home Detention was \$140,361. Of this amount, \$119,226 was from the actual grant and \$21,135 was the cost for administrative support. Through October, 508 juveniles have spent a total of 16,185 days in Home Detention. Thus, the average cost per child per day for Home Detention was \$8.67.

Therefore, this objective has been met since the cost of keeping a child in secure detention was more than four times as high as the cost of maintaining a child on Home Detention.

A final objective of the Home Detention Program was to counsel each youth daily. The Home Detention worker was expected to see each child everyday. The data on daily contacts by Home Detention personnel is shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6. From this information, it is obvious that the objective of daily in person contact or counseling with each child has not been met. In fact, both home visits and total contacts were less frequent in the third year than in the second year of the program.

The overall average of .35 home visits per day was approximately one home contact every third day. In the third year, the average was .30 home visits per day which was less than one visit every third day. As can be seen in Table 6, for nearly two-thirds of those in the program in the third year, the average number of home visits per day was .3 or less.

The average number of total contacts (which included phone contacts) also decreased from the second to the third year of the program. Overall, the average for total contacts was .67 or the equivalent of two contacts every three days. Thus, even if phone contacts were included,

the objective of daily counseling was not met.

One very significant change in the program took place in the most recent 12 month period, a change which undoubtedly affected the program's ability to meet its objectives. The third year population stayed in the program much longer than the population from the first 18 months. This is illustrated in Table 7. The mean length on Home Detention for the third year group was 45.4 days, while the earlier group averaged only 25.9 days. In the first 18 months of the program, 28.5 per cent of the population were on Home Detention for more than 30 days. In the most recent 12 months, the percentage of youths in the program longer than 30 days had risen to 61.0 per cent.

There is evidence to suggest that the lengthening stay on Home Detention was caused by factors beyond the control of the program. Specifically, the court process (the time between referral and disposition) lengthened in the third year of the program. Table 8 compares the length of court proceedings for those in Home Detention in the first 18 months with those in the program in the third year. As can be seen, the mean number of days between referral and disposition increased from 69.8 days to 93.0 days. In the first 18 months, court processing exceeded 90 days for about one-fourth of the juveniles entering Home Detention. However, in the most recent year, court processing exceeded 90 days for 44.4 per cent of the youth.

The implication of lengthening the court process and thereby the stay in Home Detention is that the longer a child is in the program, the greater are the youth's chances of commit-

ting a new offense or going AWOL. Likewise, maintaining juveniles for longer periods of time reduces the total number of youths that can be served by the program.

The other implication of a lengthening court process is that those in secure detention are held for longer periods of time which has the effect of increasing the daily population in detention.

## SECTION II.

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION

The purpose of this section is to present the characteristics of the entire Home Detention population. It will be noted where the third year population differs significantly from the population of the previous 18 months. In Section III, these same characteristics will be examined in relation to the three outcome categories.

Overall, about four-fifths of the Home Detention population were males and about one-fifth were females. There were slightly more blacks than whites.

Tables 9 and 10 exhibit the admitting offense for the entire population. Slightly more than one-fifth of the population was admitted to the program on a charge of Burglary or Breaking and Entering. Nearly one-fifth entered the program as a result of a felony larceny/theft offense. Behavior problems was the next most common reason for referral.

When the offenses are grouped in Table 10, it becomes apparent that the major property offenses were the most prevalent referral reason among males, while two-thirds of the females in the program had been charged with status offenses.

The prior delinquent history of the population is presented in Tables 11 and 12. About one-fourth of the males and more than one-half of the females had one or fewer delinquent offenses in their pre-history. Nearly three-fourths of the males had at least one major offense in their pre-history while about ten per cent of the females had previously been

charged with a major offense.

Table 13 lists the age distribution at admission to the Home Detention Program. Overall, nearly three-fourths of the participants were 15 years of age or older at the time of entry into the program. Males tended to be slightly older than females with over half of the males 16 or older while one-third of the females were of that age. The third year population was older than the population of the previous 18 months, primarily because of an increase in 17 year olds in the third year. (p<.05)

The living arrangement of those in the program is presented in Table 14. Over half of the youths resided with their mother only, while less than a third were living with both parents.

The income and public assistance characteristics of the participants in the program are given in Tables 15 and 16. Less than one-third of the youths came from families with incomes in excess of \$7,500. Income differences between males and females were minimal. However, race differences with regard to income were apparent since the mean income for whites was several thousand dollars higher than the mean income for blacks. The same pattern was reflected in the distribution of receipt of public assistance. Blacks had a higher rate of receipt of public assistance than whites. Overall, about 45 per cent of the children resided in households receiving public assistance.

Overall, three-fourths of those entering Home Detention were attending school as presented

in Table 17. Females were slightly more likely to be attending school than males. Among females, little differences between whites and blacks were apparent. Among males, however, whites were much more likely to have withdrawn from school than blacks. ( $p < .001$ ).

The Planning Service Community (PSC) of residence for those in the program is given in Table 18. As can be seen in the table, the participants were widely dispersed among all areas of the county.

The length in the program for each youth is listed in Table 19. Overall, the mean length on Home Detention was 32.8 days. On the average, males tended to be on Home Detention longer than females. Over 40 per cent of the total number of children in the program were on Home Detention for more than 30 days. As noted in Section I, the length of stay in the program increased considerably for the third year.

The ultimate court disposition of those in the Home Detention Program is listed in Table 20. About 30 per cent were placed on probation either to DHS or to a Volunteer Probation Officer. Slightly more than a fourth had their cases dismissed or filed away, while 22.6 per cent were committed to a delinquent institution.

### SECTION III.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NON-RECIDIVISTS, RETURNEES AND RECIDIVISTS

This section examines the characteristics of the population by the various outcome categories. A summary of these characteristics by the three outcome categories is presented in Table 21.

The sex of the youth was an important factor in predicting outcome. Males had a higher rate than females of committing a new offense while on Home Detention ( $p < .05$ ). However, females were returned to detention either on a bench warrant or by the worker at a higher rate than males ( $p < .01$ ).

The type of offense which led to the court proceeding also yielded differences for the outcome groupings. Status offenders were much less likely to become recidivists than those charged with a criminal offense ( $p < .01$ ). However, those initially charged with a major property offense had higher rates among the returnees and recidivists ( $p < .01$ ).

Those in the three outcome groups differed considerably in their delinquent pre-history. Very few first offenders recidivated while on Home Detention. Those who did commit a new offense were more likely to have had a major offense in their pre-history ( $p < .01$ ). Likewise, recidivists had a higher mean number of prior offenses. Those with only status offenses in their pre-history had a greater likelihood of being returnees ( $p < .01$ ).

The age of the child on entering the program was somewhat predictive of outcome. Most noticeably, those aged 14 and under had a higher rate among the returnees ( $p < .01$ ). This difference is reflected in the mean age as well which indicates that the mean age for returnees was younger than that of the recidivists and the non-recidivists.

No significant differences among the outcome groups were apparent with regard to the factors of living arrangement, family income, receipt of public assistance and school status.

Few noticeable differences among the outcome groups were apparent with regard to the Planning Service Community of residence of those in the program. The only exception was PSC-8 (Old Louisville). Only one-third of those who resided in PSC-8 were non-recidivists. This contrasts with the overall population where 65.4 per cent were non-recidivists.

The ultimate court disposition was highly related to the juvenile's performance in the program. Non-recidivists were more likely than recidivists and returnees to have their cases filed away or dismissed ( $p < .01$ ), or placed on probation to a probation officer or volunteer probation officer ( $p < .001$ ). Likewise, non-recidivists were less likely to be committed to a delinquent institution ( $p < .001$ ).

The length of time on Home Detention also differed depending on the youth's behavior in the program. Those returned to secure detention had the shortest time in the program. About a third of the returnees were brought back in ten days or less, while over 60 per cent were brought back to detention in 20 days or less. As for those who committed new offenses while

on Home Detention, nearly one-fourth did so within ten days from the time of entering the program and 55 per cent were arrested within 20 days of entering the program.

Outcome was somewhat related to the frequency of home contacts, however, the difference was less noticeable than what was apparent in the previous evaluation of Home Detention. The one significant difference is that recidivists were more likely to have had .3 or fewer home visits per day than the non-recidivists and returnees ( $p < .05$ ).

## SECTION IV.

### FOLLOW-UP RECIDIVISM

One of the expected indirect benefits of the Home Detention Program ~~was a reduction in~~ recidivism for those who participated in the program. The theory is that because the program can provide intensive supervision and assessment, the child might receive a more appropriate judicial disposition and therefore a subsequent reduction in delinquent behavior.

In order to test this theory, a follow-up was done by examining juvenile court records. Those with less than six months of follow-up (178 juveniles) were excluded. This left a sample of 330 children who were traced a minimum of six months after they had left Home Detention.

The follow-up recidivism information is given in Tables 22, 23 and 24. The mean number of follow-up offenses was 1.5. Nearly a third of the sample committed no further offenses. Slightly more than one-fifth were charged with more than two subsequent offenses. As shown in Table 23, 29.4 per cent of the sample were charged with major property offense in the follow-up period and another 12.4 per cent were arrested for a major offense against persons.

Table 24 adds in the factor of a subsequent Grand Jury referral or commitment to a delinquent institution. The categories in this table correspond to those used in previous follow-up studies. As can be seen, 28.5 per cent of the sample were committed to a delinquent institution or were referred to the Grand Jury in the follow-up period.

TABLE 1. Average Daily Population by Month and Detention Status

	JAN.	FEB.	MAR.	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	SUB T.	TOT.
<u>DETENTION</u>														
1975					56.0	50.1	45.7	47.1	37.7	49.9	40.9	41.8	46.2	
1976	53.8	59.5	56.4	48.5	44.1	47.4	45.9	46.0	42.4	58.3	61.9	47.1	50.9	
1977	40.6	40.0	51.6	60.1	63.2	58.0	55.8	62.3	62.0	74.3			56.9	51.6
<u>A.T.D.</u>														
1975					7.5	7.4	6.6	8.1	9.7	10.6	6.9	6.4	7.9	
1976	9.0	13.1	13.0	14.7	14.2	11.4	9.7	7.4	7.9	9.9	11.8	13.7	11.3	
1977	13.0	13.7	15.7	21.2	20.1	16.4	18.8	17.1	22.3	22.9			18.1	12.7
<u>HOME DETENTION</u>														
1975					9.3	9.3	11.5	18.6	16.3	15.7	14.4	18.7	14.2	
1976	15.2	16.9	16.0	16.4	17.0	16.6	13.0	16.4	15.0	15.3	16.8	22.2	16.4	
1977	23.0	15.6	17.9	28.9	23.6	17.3	20.6	22.0	22.4	24.1			21.6	17.5
<u>TOTAL DET. STATUS</u>														
1975					72.8	66.8	63.8	73.8	63.7	76.2	62.2	66.9	68.3	
1976	78.0	89.5	85.4	79.6	75.3	75.4	68.6	69.8	65.3	83.5	90.5	83.0	78.7	
1977	76.6	69.3	85.2	110.2	106.9	91.7	95.2	101.4	106.7	121.3			96.6	81.8

TABLE 2. Outcome by Year in Program

	1st SIX MO.		2nd YEAR		3rd YEAR		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Offenses/No Warrants	64	59.8	156	71.2	112	61.5	332	65.4
Returned to Center	4	3.7	11	5.0	11	6.0	26	5.1
Bench Warrant/No Offense	15	14.0	27	12.3	25	13.7	67	13.2
Committed New Offense	24	22.4	25	11.4	34	18.7	83	16.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 3. Grouped Reasons Referred for In-Treatment Offenses by Year in Program

	1st 18 MONTHS		3rd YEAR		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Major vs. Person	6	12.2	5	14.7	11	13.3
Major vs. Property	28	57.1	15	44.1	43	51.8
Minor	12	24.5	14	41.2	26	31.3
Status	3	6.1	0	-	3	3.6
TOTAL	49	99.9	34	100.0	83	100.0

TABLE 4. Frequency of Contacts by Year in Program

	2nd YEAR SAMPLE	3rd YEAR SAMPLE	TOTAL
Total Days	4,894	8,170	13,064
Total Home Visits	2,113	2,455	4,568
Total Phone Contacts	1,439	2,712	4,151
Total Contacts	3,552	5,167	8,719
Mean Home Visits per Child per Day	.43	.30	.35
Mean Phone Contacts per Child per Day	.29	.33	.32
Mean Total Contacts per Child per Day	.73	.63	.67

TABLE 5. Mean Total Contacts per Day by Year in Program

MEAN TOTAL CONTACTS	2nd YR. SAMPLE		3rd YR. SAMPLE		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
.3 or Less	14	7.8	24	13.6	38	10.6
.4 to .6	39	21.7	65	36.7	104	29.1
.7 to .9	72	40.0	63	35.6	135	37.8
1.0 to 1.2	38	21.1	18	10.2	56	15.7
1.3 to 1.5	11	6.1	3	1.7	14	3.9
1.6 & Over	6	3.3	4	2.3	10	2.8
TOTAL	180	100.0	177	100.1	357	99.9

TABLE 6. Mean Home Visits per Day by Year in Program

MEAN HOME VISITS	2nd YR. SAMPLE		3rd YR. SAMPLE		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
.3 or Less	50	27.8	113	63.8	163	45.7
.4 to .6	87	48.3	58	32.8	145	40.6
.7 & Over	43	23.9	6	3.4	49	13.7
TOTAL	180	100.0	177	100.0	357	100.0

TABLE 7. Length in Program by Year Entering Program

DAYS	1st 18 MONTHS		THIRD YEAR		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-10	68	20.9	13	7.1	81	15.9
11-20	91	27.9	34	18.7	125	24.6
21-30	74	22.7	24	13.2	98	19.3
31-40	36	11.0	28	15.4	64	12.6
41-50	21	6.4	25	13.7	46	9.1
51-60	13	4.0	9	4.9	22	4.3
61-70	11	3.4	14	7.7	25	4.9
71-80	6	1.8	7	3.8	13	2.6
81+	6	1.8	28	15.4	34	6.7
TOTAL	326	99.9	182	99.9	508	100.0
Mean		25.9		45.4		32.8

TABLE 8. Time Between Referral and Disposition by Year Entering Program

DAYS	1st 18 MONTHS		THIRD YEAR		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-30	49	15.2	11	6.8	60	12.4
31-60	98	30.3	33	20.4	131	27.0
61-90	94	29.1	46	28.4	140	28.9
91-120	47	14.6	34	21.0	81	16.7
121+	35	10.8	38	23.5	73	15.1
No Dispo.	3	-*	20	-*	23	-*
TOTAL	326	100.0	182	100.1	508	100.1
Mean		69.8		93.0		77.5
Median		64.7		83.1		68.1

\*Percentages, means and medians exclude those with no disposition.

TABLE 9. Reason Referred (FBI Classification) by Sex and Race

REASON REFERRED	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Homicide	0	-	1	.5	1	.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	.2
Rape	3	1.5	4	1.9	7	1.7	0	-	0	-	0	-	7	1.4
Aggravated Assault	3	1.5	10	4.8	13	3.2	0	-	1	1.8	1	1.0	14	2.7
Burglary/Breaking & Entering	47	23.9	60	29.1	107	26.6	2	4.1	1	1.8	3	2.8	110	21.7
Felony Larceny/Theft	46	23.4	48	23.3	94	23.3	2	4.1	4	7.1	6	5.7	100	19.7
Misdemeanor Larceny/Theft	5	2.5	15	7.3	20	5.0	2	4.1	10	17.9	12	11.4	32	6.3
Auto Theft	10	5.1	3	1.5	13	3.2	0	-	1	1.8	1	1.0	14	2.7
Other Assault	10	5.1	14	6.8	24	6.0	1	2.0	2	3.6	3	2.8	27	5.3
Arson	6	3.1	3	1.5	9	2.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	9	1.8
Vandalism	2	1.0	3	1.5	5	1.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	5	1.0
Weapons	4	2.0	6	2.9	10	2.5	0	-	2	3.6	2	1.9	12	2.4
Sex Offenses	2	1.0	1	.5	3	.7	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	.6
Drug Law Violations	15	7.6	2	1.0	17	4.2	2	4.1	0	-	2	1.9	19	3.7
Liquor Law Violations	4	2.0	0	-	4	1.0	1	2.0	0	-	1	1.0	5	1.0
Breach of Peace	6	3.1	6	2.9	12	3.0	0	-	2	3.6	2	1.9	14	2.7
Behavior Problems	21	10.7	20	9.7	41	10.2	21	42.9	27	48.2	48	45.7	89	17.5
Runaway	5	2.5	3	1.5	8	2.0	11	22.4	6	10.7	17	16.2	25	4.9
Truancy	5	2.5	1	.5	6	1.5	6	12.2	0	-	6	5.7	12	2.4
Other	3	1.5	6	2.9	9	2.2	1	2.0	0	-	1	1.0	10	2.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>100.1</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100.1</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 10. Reason Referred (Grouped) by Sex and Race

	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Major vs. Person	38	19.3	62	30.1	100	24.8	3	6.1	3	5.4	6	5.7	106	20.9
Major	99	50.3	92	44.7	191	47.4	3	6.1	8	14.3	11	10.5	202	39.8
Minor	33	16.8	29	14.1	62	15.4	6	12.2	12	21.4	18	17.1	60	15.7
Status	27	13.7	23	11.2	50	12.4	37	75.5	33	58.9	70	66.7	120	23.6
TOTAL	197	100.1	206	100.1	403	100.0	49	99.9	56	100.0	105	100.0	508	100.0

TABLE 11. Sex and Race by Number of Prior Offenses

NUMBER OF PRIOR REFERRALS	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	27	13.7	25	12.1	52	12.9	13	26.5	15	26.8	28	26.7	80	15.7
1	33	16.8	21	10.2	54	13.4	8	16.3	20	35.7	28	26.7	82	16.1
2- 5	86	43.7	72	35.0	158	39.2	23	46.9	15	26.8	38	36.2	196	38.6
6-10	36	18.3	46	22.3	82	20.3	4	8.2	6	10.7	10	9.5	92	18.1
11-15	12	6.1	32	15.5	44	10.9	1	2.0	0	-	1	1.0	45	8.9
16-20	2	1.0	7	3.4	9	2.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	9	1.8
21+	1	.5	3	1.5	4	1.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	4	.8
TOTAL	197	100.1	206	100.0	403	99.9	49	99.9	56	100.0	105	100.1	508	100.0

TABLE 12. Pre-History Score by Sex and Race

PRE-HISTORY SCORE	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No Prior Offenses	24	12.2	24	11.6	48	11.9	12	24.5	15	26.8	27	25.7	75	14.8
Prior Dependencies Only	3	1.5	1	.5	4	1.0	1	2.0	1	1.8	2	1.9	6	1.2
Dependent/Delinquent	5	2.5	0	-	5	1.2	0	-	0	-	0	-	5	1.0
Status Offenses	16	8.1	10	4.9	26	6.5	25	51.0	16	28.6	41	39.0	67	13.2
Minor Offenses	14	7.1	17	8.3	31	7.7	9	18.4	16	28.6	25	23.8	56	11.0
At Least One Prior Major Offense	135	68.5	154	74.8	289	71.7	2	4.1	8	14.3	10	9.5	299	58.9
TOTAL	197	99.9	206	100.1	403	100.0	49	100.0	56	100.1	105	99.9	508	100.1

TABLE 13. Sex and Race by Age

A G E	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
10	2	1.0	1	.5	3	.7	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	.6
11	2	1.0	4	1.9	6	1.5	0	-	0	-	0	-	6	1.2
12	7	3.6	3	1.5	10	2.5	1	2.0	2	3.6	3	2.9	13	2.6
13	11	5.6	16	7.8	27	6.7	4	8.2	5	8.9	9	8.6	36	7.1
14	29	14.7	23	11.2	52	12.9	13	26.5	16	28.6	29	27.6	81	15.9
15	48	24.4	50	24.3	98	24.3	17	34.7	12	21.4	29	27.6	127	25.0
16	48	24.4	57	27.7	105	26.1	8	16.3	12	21.4	20	19.0	125	24.6
17	50	25.4	52	25.2	102	25.3	6	12.2	9	16.1	15	14.3	117	23.0
TOTAL	197	100.1	206	100.1	403	100.0	49	99.9	56	100.0	105	100.0	508	100.0
Mean	15.3		15.4		15.3		14.9		15.0		14.9		15.3	

TABLE 14. Sex and Race by Living Arrangement

LIVING ARRANGEMENT	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mother & Stepfather	13	6.6	7	3.4	20	5.0	4	8.2	1	1.8	5	4.8	25	4.9
Mother Only	83	42.1	134	65.0	217	53.8	18	36.7	38	67.9	56	53.3	273	53.7
Relative	12	6.1	8	3.9	20	5.0	2	4.1	7	12.5	9	8.6	29	5.7
Both Parents	74	37.6	49	23.8	123	30.5	19	38.8	8	14.3	27	25.7	150	29.5
Father Only	9	4.6	2	1.0	11	2.7	2	4.1	1	1.8	3	2.9	14	2.8
Other	6	3.0	2	1.0	8	2.0	3	6.1	1	1.8	4	3.8	12	2.4
Unknown	0	-	4	1.9	4	1.0	1	2.0	0	-	1	1.0	5	1.0
TOTAL	197	100.0	206	100.0	403	100.0	49	100.0	56	100.1	105	100.1	508	100.0

TABLE 15. Income by Sex and Race

I N C O M E	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than \$3,500	26	25.5	27	29.0	53	27.2	5	16.7	13	31.0	18	25.0	71	26.6
\$ 3,500-\$ 5,499	10	9.8	28	30.1	38	19.5	4	13.3	13	31.0	17	23.6	55	20.6
5,500- 7,499	21	20.6	17	18.3	38	19.5	3	10.0	11	26.2	14	19.4	52	19.5
7,500- 9,999	17	16.7	10	10.8	27	13.8	6	20.0	3	7.1	9	12.5	36	13.5
10,000 & Over	23	27.5	11	11.8	39	20.0	12	40.0	2	4.8	14	19.4	53	19.9
Unknown	95	-*	113	-*	208	-*	19	-*	14	-*	33	-*	241	-
TOTAL	197	100.1	206	100.0	403	100.0	49	100.0	56	100.1	105	99.9	508	100.1
Mean		\$7,468		\$5,610		\$6,582		\$8,475		\$5,048		\$6,476		\$6,553

\*Not included in percentages.

TABLE 16. Receiving Public Assistance by Sex and Race

RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
YES	73	37.2	108	53.7	181	45.6	8	17.0	31	59.6	39	39.4	220	44.4
NO	123	62.8	93	46.3	216	54.4	39	83.0	21	40.4	60	60.6	276	55.6
Unknown	1	-*	5	-*	6	-*	2	-*	4	-*	6	-*	12	-*
TOTAL	197	100.0	206	100.0	403	100.0	49	100.0	56	100.0	105	100.0	508	100.0

\*Not included in percentages.

TABLE 17. School Status by Sex and Race

SCHOOL STATUS	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Attending	122	61.9	173	85.2	295	73.8	39	81.3	43	78.2	82	79.6	377	75.0
Withdrawn	75	38.1	29	14.3	104	26.0	9	18.8	12	21.8	21	20.4	125	24.9
Completed	0	-	1	.5	1	.3	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	.2
Unknown	0	-*	3	-*	3	-*	1	-*	1	-*	2	-*	5	-*
TOTAL	197	100.0	206	100.0	403	100.1	49	100.1	56	100.0	105	100.0	508	100.1

\*Not included in percentages.

TABLE 18. Planning Service Community of Residence by Sex and Race

PLANNING SERVICE COMMUNITY	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	1	.5	30	14.6	31	7.7	0	-	11	19.6	11	10.6	42	8.3
2	29	14.9	17	8.2	46	11.5	5	10.4	5	8.9	10	9.6	56	11.1
3	1	.5	22	10.7	23	5.7	0	-	4	7.1	4	3.8	27	5.4
4	15	7.7	22	10.7	37	9.3	6	12.5	2	3.6	8	7.7	45	8.9
5	2	1.0	50	24.3	52	13.0	1	2.1	7	12.5	8	7.7	60	11.9
6	4	2.1	26	12.6	30	7.5	0	-	17	30.4	17	16.3	47	9.3
7	5	2.6	16	7.8	21	5.3	0	-	2	3.6	2	1.9	23	4.6
8	12	6.2	0	-	12	3.0	5	10.4	1	1.8	6	5.8	18	3.6
9	17	8.8	1	.5	18	4.5	2	4.2	1	1.8	3	2.9	21	4.2
10	28	14.4	5	2.4	33	8.3	9	18.8	1	1.8	10	9.6	43	8.5
11	22	11.3	0	-	22	5.5	5	10.4	0	-	5	4.8	27	5.4
12	24	12.4	2	1.0	26	6.5	5	10.4	1	1.8	6	5.8	32	6.3
13	24	12.4	14	6.8	38	9.5	6	12.5	2	3.6	8	7.7	46	9.1
14	7	3.6	0	-	7	1.8	3	6.3	2	3.6	5	4.8	12	2.4
15	3	1.5	1	.5	4	1.0	1	2.1	0	-	1	1.0	5	1.0
Out of County & Unknown	3	-*	0	-	3	-*	1	-*	0	-	1	-*	4	-*
TOTAL	197	99.9	206	100.1	403	100.1	49	100.1	56	100.1	105	100.0	508	100.0

\*Not included in percentages.

TABLE 19. Length in Program by Sex and Race

LENGTH IN PROGRAM (DAYS)	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-10	30	15.2	29	14.1	59	14.6	8	16.3	14	25.0	22	20.9	81	15.9
11-20	47	23.9	48	23.3	95	23.6	13	26.5	17	30.4	30	28.6	125	24.6
21-30	37	18.8	40	19.4	77	19.1	11	22.4	10	17.8	21	20.0	98	19.3
31-40	26	13.2	27	13.1	53	13.2	4	8.2	7	12.5	11	10.5	64	12.6
41-50	25	12.7	15	7.3	40	9.9	4	8.2	2	3.6	6	5.7	46	9.1
51-60	8	4.1	11	5.3	19	4.7	2	4.1	1	1.8	3	2.9	22	4.3
61-70	7	3.6	15	7.3	22	5.5	2	4.1	1	1.8	3	2.9	25	4.9
71-80	5	2.5	5	2.4	10	2.5	2	4.1	1	1.8	3	2.9	13	2.6
81+	12	6.1	16	7.8	28	6.9	3	6.1	3	5.4	6	5.7	34	6.7
TOTAL	197	100.1	206	100.0	403	100.0	49	100.0	56	100.1	105	100.1	508	100.0
Mean		32.7		35.2		34.0		31.5		25.8		28.4		32.8

TABLE 20. Court Disposition by Sex and Race

COURT DISPOSITION	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Dismissed/FAWL	48	24.4	63	30.6	111	27.5	10	20.4	15	26.8	25	23.8	136	26.8
Foster Care/ Protective Services	4	2.0	1	.5	5	1.2	1	2.0	4	7.1	5	4.8	10	2.0
Mental Health Cntrs.	8	4.1	8	3.9	16	4.0	2	4.1	3	5.4	5	4.8	21	4.1
Probation/VPO	69	35.0	62	30.1	131	32.5	14	28.6	11	19.6	25	23.8	156	30.7
Day Treatment	9	4.6	7	3.4	16	4.0	2	4.1	1	1.8	3	2.9	19	3.7
Group Home	9	4.6	4	1.9	13	3.2	8	16.3	7	12.5	15	14.3	28	5.5
Del. Institution	40	20.3	54	26.2	94	23.3	9	18.4	12	21.4	21	20.0	115	22.6
No Disposition	10	5.1	7	3.4	17	4.2	3	6.1	3	5.4	6	5.7	23	4.5
TOTAL	197	100.1	206	100.0	403	99.9	49	100.0	56	100.0	105	100.1	508	99.9

TABLE 21. Summary Description by Outcome (Entire Home Detention Population)

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	NON RECIDIVISTS		RETURNEES		RECIDIVISTS		TOTAL	
	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean
<u>SEX/RACE</u>								
Male	80.7		64.5		90.4		79.3	
Female	19.3		35.5		9.6		20.7	
White	47.9		51.6		47.0		48.4	
Black	52.1		48.4		53.0		51.6	
Major vs. Person Offenders	23.5		11.8		20.5		20.9	
Major vs. Property Offenders	35.2		44.1		53.0		39.8	
Minor Offenders	16.6		10.8		18.1		15.7	
Status Offenders	24.7		33.3		8.4		23.6	
First Offenders	18.7		16.1		3.6		15.7	
Previous Major Offenses	57.5		45.2		79.5		58.9	
Previous Status Offenses Only	11.7		24.7		6.0		13.2	
Mean Number Prior Offenses		4.1		4.0		7.0		4.6
Age 14 & Under	25.0		39.8		22.9		27.4	
Age 15 & 16	50.0		45.2		53.0		49.6	
Age 17	25.0		15.1		24.1		23.0	
Mean Age		15.3		14.8		15.5		15.3
Living with Mother Only	52.1		52.7		61.4		53.7	
Living with Both Parents	30.7		31.2		22.9		29.5	
Mean Income		\$6,735		\$6,045		\$6,515		\$6,553
Below \$3,500	24.1		32.8		28.2		26.6	
Above \$7,500	33.5		31.0		35.9		33.3	
Receiving Public Assistance	41.9		49.5		48.2		44.4	

TABLE 21. Continued.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	NON RECIDIVISTS		RETURNEES		RECIDIVISTS		TOTAL	
	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean	%	Mean
Withdrawn From School:	26.9		19.4		22.9		24.9	
<b>DISPOSITION</b>								
Filed Away/Dismissed	31.3		15.1		21.7		28.6	
Probation/VPO	37.7		16.1		19.3		30.7	
Del. Institution	10.8		43.0		47.0		22.6	
<b>LENGTH IN PROGRAM</b>								
Mean Number of Days in Home Detention		36.9		20.2		31.0		32.8
10 Days or Less	8.7		34.4		24.1		15.9	
20 Days or Less	30.7		62.4		55.4		40.6	
<b>HOME CONTACTS</b>								
Mean Home Contacts per Day		.36		.37		.30		.35
.3 or Less per Day	44.1		40.6		60.4		45.7	
.4 to .6 per Day	40.0		48.4		33.3		40.6	
.7 or More per Day	15.9		10.9		6.3		13.7	
<b>TOTAL CONTACTS</b>								
Mean Total Contacts per Day		.67		.67		.64		.67
.3 or Less per Day	11.4		10.9		6.3		10.6	
.6 or Less per Day	38.4		45.3		39.6		39.8	
1.0 or More per Day	22.4		26.6		16.7		22.4	

TABLE 22. Number of Follow-Up Offenses by Sex and Race (Entire Program)

	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Inadequate Follow-Up	72	-*	73	-*	145	-*	11	-*	22	-*	33	-*	178	-*
None	35	28.0	41	30.8	76	29.5	15	39.5	13	38.2	28	38.9	104	31.5
1	36	28.8	31	23.3	67	26.0	16	42.1	10	29.4	26	36.1	93	28.2
2	25	20.0	25	18.8	50	19.4	2	5.3	11	32.4	13	18.1	63	19.1
3-4	21	16.8	26	19.5	47	18.2	5	13.2	0	-	5	6.9	52	15.8
5+	8	6.4	10	7.5	18	7.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	18	5.5
TOTAL	197	100.0	206	99.9	403	100.1	49	100.1	56	100.0	105	100.0	508	100.1
Mean	1.5		1.7		1.6		1.0		.9		1.0		1.5	

\*Percentages and Means exclude those with inadequate follow-up.

TABLE 23. Type of Follow-Up Offense by Sex and Race (Entire Program)

	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Inadequate Follow-Up	72	-*	73	-*	145	-*	11	-*	22	-*	33	-*	178	-*
None	35	28.0	41	30.8	76	29.5	15	39.5	13	38.2	28	38.9	104	31.5
Major vs. Person	8	6.4	31	23.3	39	15.1	1	2.6	1	2.9	2	2.8	41	12.4
Major	47	37.6	45	33.8	92	35.7	5	13.2	0	-	5	6.9	97	29.4
Minor	29	23.2	13	9.8	42	16.3	6	15.8	13	38.2	19	26.4	61	18.5
Status	6	4.8	3	2.3	9	3.5	11	28.9	7	20.6	18	25.0	27	8.2
TOTAL	197	100.0	206	100.0	403	100.1	49	100.0	56	99.9	105	100.0	508	100.0

\*Percentages exclude those with inadequate follow-up.

TABLE 24. Follow-Up Master Score by Sex and Race (Entire Program)

	M A L E						F E M A L E						TOTAL	
	White		Black		Sub T.		White		Black		Sub T.			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Inadequate Follow-Up	72	-*	73	-*	145	-*	11	-*	22	-*	33	-*	178	-*
No Offenses	35	28.0	41	30.8	76	29.5	15	39.5	13	38.2	28	38.9	104	31.5
Minor or Status	23	18.4	11	8.3	34	13.2	7	18.4	10	29.4	17	23.6	51	15.5
Major	37	29.6	41	30.8	78	30.2	3	7.9	0	-	3	4.2	81	24.5
Institution or Grand Jury	30	24.0	40	30.1	70	27.1	13	34.2	11	32.4	24	33.3	94	28.5
TOTAL	197	100.0	206	100.0	403	100.0	49	100.0	56	100.0	105	100.0	508	100.0

\*Percentages exclude those with inadequate follow-up.

## SUMMARY

### ENTIRE PROGRAM

- ✓ The average daily population in secure detention during the program was 51.6 juveniles, a reduction of 9.1 persons per day as compared to 1974.
- ✓ The total number of youths entering Home Detention in the first 30 months of operation was 508 which was slightly more than 200 per year.
- ✓ Nearly two-thirds of those entering Home Detention successfully completed the program (were non-recidivists).
- ✓ The average cost per child per day for Home Detention was less than one-fourth of the cost of detention.
- ✓ The average number of home contacts was about one contact every third day.
- ✓ The average time in the program was 32.8 days.
- ✓ About four-fifths of the population were males and about one-fifth were females.
- ✓ The number of blacks in the program was slightly more than the number of whites.
- ✓ Over half of the youths resided with their mother only.
- ✓ Males were more likely than females to commit a new offense while in the program, but females were more likely to be returnees than males.
- ✓ Status offenders were less likely than public offenders to become recidivists.
- ✓ Younger participants had a higher rate among the returnees.
- ✓ The ultimate court disposition was highly related to performance in the program.
- ✓ The Home Detention Program differed considerably in several key aspects in the most recent 12 month period as compared to the first 18 months of the program.

IN THE THIRD YEAR

- The average daily population in detention was 56.5.
- Only 182 juveniles entered the program despite an increase in staff.
- The percentage of non-recidivists was lower.
- The frequency of home contacts was less.
- The average length in the program increased to 45.4 days.

## IMPRESSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first 30 months of the Home Detention Program have demonstrated that the program's concepts are basically sound and workable. The problems that have arisen appear to have been largely beyond the control of the program itself. The primary difficulty seems to be with the court system. First, in order for a youth to enter the program, he must be placed in the program by order of a judge following a detention hearing. This process usually results in the child spending at least several days in the Detention Center before ever entering the program. Secondly, and most disturbingly, the length of time it takes to process cases through the courts has greatly increased in the last year. As a result, juveniles are staying on Home Detention for much longer than originally envisioned. The court process should be speeded up. If this cannot be done, the Home Detention Program should revise its procedures by establishing an active and inactive status for the youths in the program. A youth would be on active status for normally no more than 30 days at which time he would go on inactive status if he cannot be released from supervision by the court. During active status, the child would be seen daily by a Home Detention worker, but once the child goes on inactive status, contact would be much less frequent, perhaps once a week. Such a procedure would insure the frequent in-person contact that seem important in the early stages of a case to prevent further delinquent activity. Also, limiting intensive contact to 30 days should free Home Detention workers to increase their caseloads which should further reduce the population in secure detention.



**END**