

58323

PROGRAM PLANNING  
OFFICE of EVALUATION

NCJRS

JUN 8 1979

ACQUISITIONS

THE IMPACT OF THE 1975 CINS  
DECRIMINALIZATION LEGISLATION

Prepared by:

Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services  
Office of Program Planning  
Office of Evaluation  
Tallahassee, Florida

January 1978

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project represents the combined efforts of those who worked on design, collection and analysis, those who assisted with materials or information from their own work, those who opened the appropriate doors for exposure to greater insight, and those who prepared this material for presentation at all stages of its development. To those contributors go our gratitude and appreciation. To those whose lives we study and attempt to serve - runaways, ungovernables, and truants - go our dedication.

Special recognition is given to :

### Project Staff

Patsy Eccles  
Sue Kenyon  
Rebecca McIntyre  
Laura Martin  
Eugenia Miller  
Sherri Runkle  
Chuck Smith  
JoAnn Wingler

### HRS Staff

Erwin Bodo,	Office of Evaluation
Pat Hicks,	SES Program Office
Susan Kirsch,	YS Program Office
David May,	Single Intake Project
Barbara Pennington,	YS Program Office
John Perry,	YS Program Office
Larry Polivka,	Office of Evaluation
Michael Watson,	YS Program Office

### YS, SES, and Single Intake Personnel in the HRS Districts

District II  
District IV  
District V  
District VI  
District VIII  
District X  
District XI

Special thanks is given to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration who provided the funding for this project through Grant number 75-AS-29-E103.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
CHAPTER I. Runaway, Ungovernable, and Truant Referrals To Intake	
Introduction . . . . .	1
Methodology . . . . .	2
Section 1. Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants in the Youth Services Program . . . . .	7
• Prior to the 1975 CINS Legislation . . . . .	7
• After the 1975 CINS Legislation . . . . .	11
Section 2. 1977: A Contemporary Overview of Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants . . . . .	15
• The Number of Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants Currently Being Referred to Single Intake . . . . .	15
• Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants: 1977 Overview . . . . .	19
Section 3. Comparison of Current Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants with Those Formerly Under the Juris- diction of Youth Services . . . . .	33
Summary . . . . .	41
CHAPTER II. Runaway, Ungovernable, and Truant Referrals to Social and Economic Services	
Introduction . . . . .	44
Methodology . . . . .	46

	<u>Page</u>
Section 1. Protective Services . . . . .	47
• Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	48
• Referral Characteristics . . . . .	55
• Family Characteristics . . . . .	64
• Outcome Characteristics . . . . .	74
Section 2. Foster Care . . . . .	78
• Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	80
• Referral Characteristics . . . . .	87
• Natural Family Characteristics . . . . .	95
• Foster Family Characteristics . . . . .	105
• Natural Family Characteristics versus Foster Family Characteristics . . . . .	116
• Outcome Characteristics . . . . .	118
Summary . . . . .	126
 CHAPTER III. Second-Time Ungovernability	
Introduction . . . . .	129
Methodology . . . . .	130
Section 1. The Incidence of Second-Time Ungovernability . . . . .	131
Section 2. Characteristics of the Second-Time Ungovernable . . . . .	136
Summary . . . . .	138
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . .	139
 APPENDICES	
Appendix A. Tracking Form For Runaways, Truants, And Ungovernables . . . . .	151

Appendix B.	The Protective Services Questionnaire .	153
Appendix C.	The Foster Care Questionnaire . . . . .	162
Appendix D.	Single Intake Dependency-Delinquency Intake Data Card and Detention Data Card . . . . .	175

# LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Dispositions to Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 . . . . .	7
2. Runaway, Ungovernable and Truant Dispositions to Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 . . . . .	8
3. Children Detained at Intake by Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 . . . . .	8
4. Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants Detained by Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 . . . . .	9
5. Additions to Youth Services Probation: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 . . . . .	9
6. Commitments to Youth Services Programs: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 . . . . .	10
7. Runaway, Ungovernable, and Truant Com- mitments to Youth Services Programs: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 . . . . .	11
8. Additions to Youth Services Probation: July 1, 1975 to December 31, 1976 . . . . .	13
9. Commitments to Youth Services Programs July 1, 1975 to December 31, 1976 . . . . .	13
10. Comparison of Pre and Post Legislation Referrals to Intake for Four Selected Sites: July to December 1974 and July to December 1976 . . . . .	17
11. Age by Offense Type . . . . .	20
12. Sex by Offense Type . . . . .	21
13. Race by Offense Type . . . . .	22
14. Referral Source by Offense Type . . . . .	24

	<u>Page</u>
15. Detainment by Offense Type . . . . .	25
16. Previous Referrals by Offense Type . . . . .	27
17. Previous Clinical Diagnosis by Offense Type . . . . .	28
18. Time Required to Process Case by Offense Type . . . . .	30
19. Offense Type by Disposition . . . . .	31
20. Age Distributions by Subsamples . . . . .	34
21. Sex Distributions by Subsamples . . . . .	35
22. Race Distributions by Subsamples . . . . .	35
23. Referral Type by Subsamples . . . . .	36
24. Referral Source Distributions by Subsamples . . . . .	37
25. Initial Holding Distributions by Subsamples . . . . .	38
26. Time From Complaint Filed to Disposition Distribution by Subsample . . . . .	39
27. Disposition Distribution by Subsamples . . . . .	40
28. SES Case Review Sample Construction . . . . .	46
29. SES Referral Types . . . . .	47
30. Present Age by Referral Type . . . . .	48
31. Age at First Referral by Referral Type . . . . .	49
32. Sex by Referral Type . . . . .	51
33. Race by Referral Type . . . . .	52
34. Referral Source by Referral Type . . . . .	55
35. Presently Attending School by Referral Type . . . . .	57

	<u>Page</u>
36. Working Below Appropriate Grade Level by Referral Type . . . . .	58
37. History of School Problems by Referral Type . . . . .	59
38. Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type . . . . .	60
39. Type of Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type . . . . .	61
40. Evaluations Received by Referral Type . . . . .	63
41. Clinically Diagnosed by Referral Type . . . . .	64
42. Parental Status by Referral Type . . . . .	65
43. Parent's Marital Status by Referral Type . . . . .	66
44. Mother's Age by Referral Type . . . . .	67
45. Father's Age by Referral Type . . . . .	69
46. Mother's Education by Referral Type . . . . .	70
47. Father's Education by Referral Type . . . . .	71
48. Annual Income Level by Referral Type . . . . .	73
49. Number of Siblings by Referral Type . . . . .	74
50. Subsequent Occurrences by Referral Type . . . . .	75
51. Length of Stay in Protective Services by Referral Type . . . . .	77
52. SES Referral Types . . . . .	78
53. Foster Care Unit by Referral Type . . . . .	79
54. Present Age by Referral Type . . . . .	80
55. Age at First Placement by Referral Type . . . . .	82
56. Sex by Referral Type . . . . .	84
57. Race by Referral Type . . . . .	86

	<u>Page</u>
58. Referral Source by Referral Type . . . . .	88
59. Presently Attending School by Referral Type . . . . .	89
60. Working Below Appropriate Grade Level by Referral Type . . . . .	90
61. History of School Problems by Referral Type . . . . .	91
62. Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type . . . . .	92
63. Type of Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type . . . . .	93
64. Evaluations Received by Referral Type . . . . .	94
65. Clinically Diagnosed by Referral Type . . . . .	95
66. Natural Parent Status by Referral Type . . . . .	96
67. Natural Parent's Marital Status by Referral Type . . . . .	97
68. Natural Mother's Present Age by Referral Type . . . . .	98
69. Natural Mother's Age at First Placement by Referral Type . . . . .	99
70. Natural Father's Present Age by Referral Type . . . . .	100
71. Natural Mother's Education by Referral Type . . . . .	101
72. Natural Father's Education by Referral Type . . . . .	102
73. Natural Family Annual Income Level by Referral Type . . . . .	104
74. Number of Siblings by Referral Type . . . . .	105
75. Foster Parent Composition by Referral Type . . . . .	106

	<u>Page</u>
76. Foster Mother's Age at Placement by Referral Type . . . . .	108
77. Foster Father's Age at Placement by Referral Type . . . . .	109
78. Foster Mother's Education by Referral Type . . . . .	110
79. Foster Father's Education by Referral Type . . . . .	111
80. Foster Family Annual Income by Referral Type . . . . .	113
81. Natural Children in Foster Family by Referral Type . . . . .	114
82. Other Foster Children in Foster Family by Referral Type . . . . .	115
83. Subsequent Occurrences by Referral Type . . . . .	119
84. Length of Stay in Foster Care by Referral Type . . . . .	121
85. Number of Foster Homes by Referral Type . . . . .	122
86. Reasons for Removal From Foster Homes by Referral Type . . . . .	125
87. Judicial Decisions for Referral to Intake . . . . .	132
88. Primary Reason for Referral for Adjudicated Ungovernables-Defined- As-Delinquents . . . . .	134

## CHAPTER I

### RUNAWAY, UNGOVERNABLE, AND TRUANT REFERRALS TO INTAKE

#### Introduction

In the spring of 1975, the Florida Legislature eliminated the category of Children in Need of Supervision (CINS) from the statutes. This action was taken in order to remove children who run away from home, become truant or ungovernable from the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system, in terms of processing through the Office of Youth Services (YS), as delinquents and place them in the Office of Social and Economic Services (SES) as dependent children.

A major rationale of this study was to assess the impact of the legislative change in Chapter 39 of the Florida Statutes. In this chapter, we attempt to address this issue from three vantage points. First, in order to determine the extent to which these children have been removed from the Office of Youth Services, the number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants in YS for the year-and-a-half period prior to and following the 1975 legislation are compared. Second, the referral rates and dominant characteristics of the population of runaways, ungovernables, and truants currently (1977) entering

Single Intake offices are presented. And third, current referral and disposition patterns, as well as demographic and previous history characteristics of the current population of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are compared to similar referrals to YS prior to the enactment of the legislation.

### Methodology

In evaluating the impact of this revision, the underlying logic of a pre-post comparison was followed whenever available data permitted. The design called for a comparison of runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals to YS prior to the legislation with similar current (post-legislation) referrals to Single Intake. Whereas the legislative transfer of these children from YS to SES became effective on July 1, 1975, that date is used as the pivotal point for the pre-post comparison. In order to allow for seasonal fluctuations and for policy ambiguity that may have surrounded the period of the actual transfer, data for a year-and-a-half period immediately prior to the legislative change was compared to a second year-and-a-half period immediately following (January 1, 1974 to December 31, 1976).

Statistical aggregate data presented in this section of the study were compiled from three separate sources. First, YS data describing client characteristics and program flow was used to document the extent to which the legislative mandate had been met and runaways, ungovernables, and truants have been removed from the juvenile justice system. Second, Intake log tallies were compiled at five sites in order to determine

referral rates and patterns following the legislation. And third, a tracking form was devised to follow statewide referrals to intake for a two-week period so that the current population of runaways, ungovernables, and truants could be described. Each data source and its use in this report is described below.

#### YS Statistical Data

Since runaways, ungovernables, and truants were under YS jurisdiction prior to the July 1, 1975 legislation, YS statistical data were the best source against which post legislation data could be compared. We compiled YS data on these referrals for the year-and-a-half prior to the legislation (January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975) to determine the extent to which runaways, ungovernables, and truants were in the juvenile justice system and what the referral and disposition patterns within YS were. In addition, we also present statistics on delinquent referral and disposition rates so that caseloads by offense type might be made more apparent. YS data for the year-and-a-half period following the legislation (July 1, 1975 to December 31, 1976) was also compiled so that the extent to which runaways, ungovernables, and truants had been removed from YS could be documented.

Data obtained from YS for purposes of this study focused on disposition, detention, probation, and commitment rates. In each case, special care was taken to ensure that we were sampling the appropriate time frame and clients. For example,

in establishing the pre-legislation referral rates, dispositions rather than referrals per se were sampled because disposition rates constitute unique cases while referral rates do not. Detention, probation, and commitment data were compiled from the additions to YS programs statistics so that again only unique cases were counted.

### Five-Site Case Studies

Since no statistical aggregate data were available for the period following the legislation in a consistent and reliable form, Intake log book entries for delinquent, runaway, ungovernable, truant, and "multiple charge" referrals were compiled at five sites. The five sites - Polk County (Bartow), Bay County (Panama City), Duval\*, Nassau, and Baker Counties (Jacksonville), Hillsborough County (Tampa) and Dade County (Miami) - were selected in an attempt to achieve a rural-urban mix representative of the state. It is important to note that these five sites do not constitute a statistically representative sample. Rather, these sites as "representative" were agreed upon during a meeting attended by SES and YS representatives.

Logbook entries at these sites were tallied for the year-and-a-half following the legislation (July 1, 1975 to

---

\*The Jacksonville Single Intake Unit handles referrals from these three counties jointly. Separating out just Duval referrals was not possible. Therefore, all three of these counties are included in this site. Unless otherwise indicated, throughout this report, this site will always refer to Duval, Baker, and Nassau Counties.

December 31, 1976). In Section 2, the tallies are presented only for a six-month period (July 1, 1976 to December 13, 1976). The year immediately following the legislation was characterized by some policy ambiguity over jurisdiction of runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals and further confounded by the simultaneous implementation of a Single Intake Unit for delinquent and dependent referrals. The second semester of 1976 provides a more stable picture of actual referral rates.

Miami, one of the five sites at which log entries were tallied, provided a special set of circumstances which made it impossible to gather accurate referral rates for the time frame of interest. Miami had not yet implemented Single Intake at the time this study was conducted. Because Miami contributes a large percentage of the state's juvenile caseload, attempts were made to include Miami in the study. However, runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals in Miami were not logged in a systematic format by SES. While SES log tallies were compiled for the time period, it became evident that the data was incomplete and might prove more misleading than useful. For that reason, Miami log book tally data is not presented in the by-site comparison section of this report.

#### Tracking Form

A Tracking Form (see Appendix A) was developed to gather extensive personal history and referral and disposition statuses for each runaway, ungovernable, and truant referral to Intake for a selected time period. The actual tracking was

conducted during two separate intervals - the week of January 31 to February 6, 1977 and the week of April 24 to April 30. With the assistance of District Intake Supervisors, each Intake office in the state participated in the study by completing the forms for runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals and returning them to the Office of Evaluation in Tallahassee.

Intake log book entries determined the actual number of referrals during these two weeks. During the week of January 31 to February 6, 660 runaway, ungovernable, and truant cases were referred to Intake. During the week of April 24 to April 30, there were 498 such referrals. The statewide referral caseload for the two weeks totaled 1158. After several intensive follow-up efforts, we were able to obtain tracking forms for 1072 of the 1158 actual referrals. The resulting return rate is 92.6%. The district distributions on the 86 missing cases are as follows: 2 from District IV (Jacksonville); 72 from District VI (Tampa); 12 from District XI (Miami).

Data analysis of the tracking forms was conducted primarily in the form of frequency distributions and two-and-three-way cross-tabulations. For the purposes of this study, .05 was the chosen statistical significance level. The results of the tracking form analysis are presented in Section 2 of this chapter.

## Section 1

### Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants in the Youth Services Program

#### • Prior to the 1975 CINS Legislation

As indicated in Table 1 below, prior to the legislation, runaways, ungovernables, and truants constituted approximately one-third of all YS referrals. During eighteen months immediately preceding the legislation, 56,841 runaways, ungovernables, and truants received some form of information YS disposition, accounting for 31% of all children referred to YS.

Table 1. Dispositions to Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975<sup>1</sup>

Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants	Delinquent	Total
31.4%	68.6%	100.0%
(56,841)	(124,181)	(181,022)

<sup>1</sup> Since a disposition may account for more than one referral per individual, the number of referrals will not equal the number of dispositions. YS has indicated that dispositions represent 90.9% of actual referrals to intake.

Table 2 shows the frequency distributions for these referrals by offense type. As clearly indicated in the table, runaways constitute the majority of these referrals (66.1%). Ungovernable and truant referrals were somewhat evenly split, 19.1% and 14.8% respectively. In sum, it is evident that most of the children charged with status offenses prior to the enactment of the 1975 legislation within YS were runaways.

Table 2. Runaway, Ungovernable and Truant Dispositions to Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975.

Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Total
66.1%	19.1%	14.8%	100.0%
(37,576)	(10,858)	(8,407)	(56,841)

Table 3 below shows the distributions for children detained by YS for the one-and-a-half year prior to the legislation. While runaways, ungovernables, and truants comprise only approximately one-third of all children receiving dispositions within YS, they constituted nearly one-half (47.6%) of children detained at YS intake.

Table 3. Children Detained at Intake by Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975<sup>1</sup>

Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants	Delinquent	Total
47.6%	52.4%	100.0%
(14,759)	(16,273)	(31,032)

<sup>1</sup>Children detained are held on secure or non-secure detention status. Above figures represent only those additions to Detention through Intake and not the entire detention population.

Table 4, below, showing detainment distributions by offense type, further explicates detainment characteristics. As made evident in the table, runaways are the group most likely to be detained. They constituted 90.4% of former "CINS" children detained but only 66.1% of former "CINS" dispositions.

Table 4. Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants Detained by Youth Services: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975.

Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Total
90.4%	7.9%	1.7%	100.0%
(13,335)	(1172)	(252)	(14,759)

Distributions for additions to YS probation for the same time period are reported in Table 5. Runaways, ungovernables, and truants accounted for 24.4% of additions to probation. Breakdowns by offense type are not available for this time period.

Table 5. Additions to Youth Services Probation: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975

Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants	Delinquent	Total
24.4%	75.6%	100.0%
(4603)	(14,250)	(18,853)

Commitments to YS programs for January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 are reported in Table 6 below. Runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals represented at least 9.9% of all commitments. Runaways, ungovernables, and truants were also committed for probation and aftercare violations, but the breakdown distinguishing these children from delinquent children for those commitments is not available.

Table 6. Commitments to Youth Services Programs:  
January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975

Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants	Delinquent	Probation Aftercare/ Violation	Total
9.9%	72.5%	17.6%	100.0%
(639)	(4678)	(1134)	(6451)

The breakdown for the 9.9% of YS commitments for which offense type was available is presented in Table 7. The plurality of commitments were runaways. Commitment distributions differ considerably from referral type distributions for the same time period. (See Table 2). When commitment/referral ratios are compared, it is evident that runaways were less likely to be committed to YS programs, while truants, and especially ungovernables, were more likely to have been committed.

Table 7. Runaway, Ungovernable, and Truant Commitments to Youth Services Programs: January 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975.

Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Total
45.7%	34.7%	19.6%	100.0%
(292)	(222)	(125)	(639)

Since the major focus of this study is on the impact of the legislation on current runaways, ungovernables, and truants, and therefore on the period after the legislation, the characteristics and dispositions of these children prior to the enactment of the law will not be described in this section. However, Section 3 of this chapter compares in greater detail the current status offender population with that previously under the jurisdiction of YS. For the time being, however, it should be noted that CINS were in the juvenile justice system in large numbers and that these children, runaways in particular, were frequently placed in programs with delinquents. Therefore, when considering the impact of this legislation, it is important to keep in mind that its effects involve a large number of children.

• After the 1975 CINS Legislation

The legislative intent of the 1975 revision of Chapter 39 was to remove status offenders from the juvenile justice system and place them with the Office of Social and Economic Services -

SES (formerly the Division of Family Services) on the assumption that the family oriented nature of SES was more appropriate to the needs of these children. Given this intent, the basic question which emerges is: Have these children actually been removed from the juvenile justice system, or more specifically, from Youth Services?

There are several ways in which the question may be answered. By using more recent data comparable to that available for the period prior to the legislation, the number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants in YS prior to and after the legislation can be compared. For example, it was noted earlier that for the year-and-a-half prior to the legislation, runaways, truants, and ungovernables made up 24.4% (n=603) of the YS additions to probation. Table 8 shows that for the year-and-a-half period after the legislation, runaways, ungovernables, and truants constitute only 0.9% (n=171) of YS additions to probation. While these 171 children may have had accompanying charges of truancy or running away, they all came in as second-time ungovernables. This is in keeping with the revised version of Chapter 39 which stipulates that second-time ungovernables may be handled as delinquents.

Table 8. Additions to Youth Services Probation  
July 1, 1975 to December 31, 1976<sup>1</sup>

Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants	Delinquent	Total
0.9%	99.1%	100.0%
(171)	(18,523)	(18,694)

<sup>1</sup>After July 1, 1975, former "CINS" Additions are reported by YS to be second-time ungovernables.

The same pattern is evident in commitments to YS programs. For the year-and-a-half prior to the legislation, 639 runaways, ungovernables, and truants were committed to YS programs - 9.9% of the total YS commitments. Table 9, below, shows that runaway, truant, and ungovernable commitments to YS during the year-and-a-half after the legislation, 3.8% (n=210) of all commitments involved these children. All of these children were committed as second-time ungovernables. However, many of them were charged with running away and truancy suggesting that perhaps some judges may be interpreting the "ungovernability" clause rather broadly.

Table 9. Commitments to Youth Services Programs  
July 1, 1975 to December 31, 1976

Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants	Delinquent	Probation Aftercare/ Violation	Total
3.8%	88.3%	7.9%	100.0%
(210)	(4872)	(436)	(5518)

In summary, these data indicate that runaways, ungovernables, and truants have, for the most part, been removed from YS jurisdiction. The fact that a few of these children continue to be committed to YS should not suggest that Chapter 39 is being violated. Rather, it should be noted that according to the law, those children adjudicated as second-time ungovernables may be handled as delinquents within YS. And it should also be noted that this particular adjudication is not being frequently invoked. This further suggests that the "ungovernable" clause, while perhaps being broadly interpreted by some judges, is not being flagrantly abused as had been feared by some. CHAPTER III deals with this issue in greater detail.

## Section 2

### 1977: A Contemporary Overview of Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants

A major rationale of this study was to learn more about the current status of runaways, ungovernables, and truants. In this section our findings are presented in three parts. First, the number of children currently being referred to Single Intake as runaways, ungovernables, and truants are discussed. Second, demographic characteristics and referral and disposition patterns of the current population of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are presented. Third, a comparison is made, on the basis of these characteristics, between the population of runaways, ungovernables, and truants prior to and after the 1975 legislation.

#### • The Number of Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants Currently Being Referred to Single Intake

Given that no data on the actual number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants being referred to Intake after the 1975 legislation were available in reliable or consistent form, two methods for estimating the number of these children currently entering Intake were employed. First, by way of a tracking form (see Methodology section), the total number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants entering Single Intake for two one-week periods was determined. Second, actual

Intake logs at the four selected sites were tallied by referral classification in order to investigate more closely any change in referral patterns that might have occurred over the one-and-a-half week period following the legislation.

During the two one-week tracking periods, 1158 runaways, ungovernables, and truants entered Single Intake. From this, it is estimated that approximately 28,599 runaways, ungovernables, and truants were referred to Single Intake during the 1976-1977 Fiscal Year.<sup>1</sup> A comparison of this number of referrals with the number of former "CINS" referrals to YS during the 1974-1975 Fiscal Year (38,672), suggests that runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals have decreased by 26.1%.

This trend is borne out with another set of data. At the four sites chosen for closer study (Bay, Duval, Hillsborough, and Polk Counties), the log book counts for runaways, ungovernables, and truants were obtained for a six month period following the legislation (July 1, 1976 to December 31, 1976). Those referrals were then compared with the number of runaway, ungovernable and truant referrals to YS for a similar six month period prior to the legislation (July 1, 1974 to December 31, 1974). The referral figures by county and year are presented in Table 10 on the following page. The site comparisons reflect the trend found in comparing the 1977 projected referrals with the

---

<sup>1</sup>This estimate is derived by projecting the proportion of runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals received during the two week sample to a year period according to past monthly referral patterns documented by the Office of Youth Services. In this manner, the seasonal characteristic of these types of referrals is taken into account.

Table 10. COMPARISON OF PRE AND POST LEGISLATION REFERRALS TO INTAKE  
FOR FOUR SELECTED SITES<sup>1</sup>  
July to December 1974 and July to December 1976

County	Referral Type <sup>2</sup>	Pre-Legislation 7/74 - 12/74	Post-Legislation 7/76 - 12/76	Percent Change
Bay	Runaways	312	207	-33.7%
	Truants	37	43	16.2%
	Ungovernables	35	43	22.9%
	<u>Total</u>	<u>384</u>	<u>325</u>	<u>-15.4%</u>
	Delinquents	404	389	-3.7%
Duval	Runaways	834	428	-48.7%
	Truants	183	83	-54.6%
	Ungovernables	277	71	-74.4%
	<u>Total</u>	<u>1294</u>	<u>661</u>	<u>-48.9%</u>
	Delinquents	3300	3030	-8.2%
Hillsborough	Runaways	1179	818	-30.6%
	Truants	51	77	51.0%
	Ungovernables	195	198	1.5%
	<u>Total</u>	<u>1425</u>	<u>1204</u>	<u>-15.5%</u>
	Delinquents	2848	3372	18.4%
Polk	Runaways	265	159	-40.0%
	Truants	46	11	-76.1%
	Ungovernables	48	48	0.0%
	<u>Total</u>	<u>359</u>	<u>223</u>	<u>-37.9%</u>
	Delinquents	1359	1487	9.4%

<sup>1</sup>Dade County had not yet implemented Single Intake at the time of this study. Since Dade SES does not utilize a log book procedure that is comparable to other sites, Dade County is omitted from this particular site comparison.

<sup>2</sup>Data for pre-legislation period was obtained from YS Statistical Reporting Card which does not include multiple CINS charge as a classification. Youth Counselors evidently made decision on basis of dominant CINS charge. Post-legislation period data was obtained from the log books which include multiple charge categories. Since we had no way of determining which one was the "dominant" charge, that number is excluded from the classification breakdown figures but included in the total CINS figure to make the comparison more nearly accurate.

1974 actual referrals - a decrease in the number. Referrals are consistently down in each of the four counties - ranging from 48.9% decrease in Duval to 15.4% decrease in Bay. Decreased referrals in these four counties average to a 29.42% decrease a figure remarkably close to that computed in the 1974 actual vs. 1977 projected referrals.

Closer inspection of Table 10 suggests that the trend is consistent for runaway referrals - the percent decrease ranges from 48.7% in Duval County to 30.6% in Hillsborough County. While truant and ungovernable referrals generally show a decrease, there are marked departures from this trend. For example, truant referrals have decreased in two areas, but increased in the remaining two. Current data do not allow for extensive elaboration of these shifting referral patterns. However, supplementary site data gathered with the assistance of key informants strongly suggest that local school board policy changes regarding internal disciplinary procedures for chronic truancy may account for the obtained referral distributions. In addition, these supplementary data indicate that such policy changes were initiated independently of the 1975 legislation. Ungovernable referrals also show some inconsistent fluctuations. Duval County experienced a 74.4% decrease in referrals while ungovernable referrals in Bay County increased by 22.9%.

- Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants: 1977 Overview

The tracking form utilized to follow two week's referrals to Intake allowed for collection of demographic, referral, disposition, and previous history data on each child. In this section, each of these categories is discussed.

Demographic Characteristics

Age

The mean age for this group of runaways, ungovernables, and truants is 14.3. As reflected in the mean, age frequency distributions reported in Table 11 indicate that most of these children are between the ages of 13 and 16. Table 11 shows age cross-tabulated by offense type. The relationship is statistically significant. Truants, as might be expected, are considerably more likely to be younger than runaways and ungovernables. Additional cross-tabulations, not shown here, indicate that, with the exception of the under age 11 group, the dominant offense in each age group is running away. The under 11 group varies from this pattern - 49.4% of them are referred for truancy.

Table 11. Age by Offense Type

Age	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
11 and under	4.6% (27)	5.6% (10)	18.3% (40)	4.7% (4)	7.6% (81)
12	4.4% (26)	8.3% (15)	7.3% (16)	2.3% (2)	5.5% (59)
13	13.3% (78)	13.3% (24)	15.6% (34)	14.0% (12)	13.8% (148)
14	19.3% (113)	16.1% (29)	28.0% (61)	15.1% (13)	20.2% (216)
15	20.4% (130)	14.9% (38)	25.7% (56)	36.0% (31)	23.8% (255)
16	22.1% (13)	22.2% (40)	3.2% (7)	20.9% (18)	18.3% (196)
17	13.5% (81)	13.3% (24)	1.8% (4)	7.0% (6)	10.7% (115)
Total	100.0% (586)	100.0% (180)	100.0% (218)	100.0% (86)	100.0% (1070)

( $\chi^2 = 123.57$ , 18dF;  $p = .00$ )

### Sex

Table 12, shows the cross-tabulation of sex by offense type. The relationship is statistically significant. The majority of all referrals are female (53.9%). Runaways are especially likely to be female (60.8%). Furthermore, one-third of all referrals within this two-week period are female runaways. As indicated in the chart, males are more likely to be referred as "ungovernable" than females. The

Table 12. Sex by Offense Type

Sex	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
Male	39.2% (231)	54.4% (98)	57.8% (126)	46.0% (40)	46.1% (495)
Female	60.8% (358)	45.6% (82)	42.2% (92)	54.0% (47)	53.9% (579)
Total	100.0% (589)	100.0% (218)	100.0% (180)	100.0% (87)	100.0% (1074)

( $\chi^2 = 28.27$ , 3dF;  $p = .00$ )

ungovernable offense category in Table 12 contains first- and second-time ungovernable referrals collapsed. When these two referrals are analyzed separately, however, the referral patterns change within each category - 56.1% of the first-time ungovernables are male while the majority of the second-time ungovernable referrals (56.5%) are female. Females are also significantly more likely to be referred for "multiple charges" but considerably less likely to be referred for truancy.

Additional cross-tabulations indicate that sex is not related to holding status (detention, etc.) at Intake, disposition, or number of days required to process cases. However, males are considerably more likely to have had a previous clinical diagnosis (emotional disturbance, etc.) than females.

Race

The majority of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are white (79.9%). The cross-tabulation of race by offense type is presented in Table 13 below. Non-white referrals are significantly more likely to be charged with truancy or "multiple charges," but considerably less likely to be referred as runaways. Further cross-tabulations indicate that non-white children are less likely to be referred to intake by law enforcement officials. Given that the majority of law enforcement referrals are runaways and that non-white children are not often referred on runaway charges, this relationship is not unexpected. Furthermore, non-white referrals are less likely to be held at intake.

Table 13. Race by Offense Type

Race	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
White	85.9% (504)	76.7% (138)	75.0% (162)	58.6% (51)	79.9% (855)
Non-White	14.1% (83)	23.3% (42)	25.0% (54)	43.7% (36)	20.1% (215)
Total	100.0% (587)	100.0% (180)	100.0% (216)	100.0% (87)	100.0% (1070)

$$(x^2 = 41.92, 3dF; p = .00)$$

Non-white referrals also are significantly more likely to be referred to SES, both in voluntary and court-ordered placements, than white referrals. Given that non-white children are "over-represented" in truancy referrals, and that the plurality of referrals to SES have accompanying truancy charges, the obtained relationship suggests an interaction between race, referral reason, and disposition.

### Referral and Disposition Patterns

#### Referral Source

As reflected in Table 14 on the following page most of these children were referred to intake by law enforcement officers (53.5%). Those children referred by law enforcement officials, as one would expect, are significantly more likely to be runaways, i.e., 80.2% of all law enforcement referrals are runaways. Family referrals constitute the second major referral source. Again, as expected, the majority (65.6%) of such family referrals are for ungovernability. Schools contributed 14.9% of all referrals - 67.7% of the school referrals were for truancy. In sum, the referral pattern obtained in Table 14 is exactly what one would expect given the particular jurisdiction of each referral source - runaways tend to be referred by law enforcement, ungovernables by their families, and truants by schools.

Table 14. Referral Source by Offense Type

Referral Source	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
Law Enforcement	85.4% (503)	21.7% (39)	22.9% (50)	31.0% (27)	57.6% (619)
Family	9.2% (54)	66.7% (120)	4.6% (10)	48.3% (42)	21.0% (226)
School	0.3% (2)	5.6% (10)	70.2% (153)	8.0% (7)	16.0% (172)
HRS/Self/Other	5.1% (30)	6.1% (11)	2.3% (5)	12.6% (11)	5.3% (57)
Total	100.0% (589)	100.0% (180)	100.0% (218)	100.0% (87)	100.0% (1074)

( $\chi^2 = 969.99$ , 9dF;  $p = .00$ )

### Holding at Intake

As reflected in Table 15 below, the majority (79.2%) were not detained at intake. The 20.8% who were held are significantly more likely to be runaways. This finding is as expected. Runaways are sometimes held after referral while arrangements are made to return them to their families. Table 15 also indicates that no truants, within our two-week sample were detained at intake.

Table 15. Detainment by Offense Type<sup>1</sup>

Detainment	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
Not Held	70.0% (411)	85.6% (154)	100.0% (218)	75.9% (66)	79.2% (849)
Held	30.0% (176)	14.4% (26)	0.0% (0)	24.1% (21)	20.8% (223)
Total	100.0% (587)	100.0% (180)	100.0% (218)	100.0% (87)	100.0% (1072)

( $\chi^2 = 104.24$ , 9dF;  $p = .00$ )

<sup>1</sup>Detainment includes any holding status, i.e., secure or non-secure detention, secure or non-secure shelter care, runaway shelters, etc.

Several other features of holding at Intake are of interest. Runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals were held in a variety of settings. The obtained distributions

for the 20.8% are as follows:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Secure Shelter Care	1.4%	(15)
Non-secure Shelter Care	5.4%	(58)
Secure Detention	3.7%	(40)
Non-secure Detention	0.2%	( 2)
Local Community Runaway Shelters	6.2%	(66)
Voluntary Crisis Homes	3.1%	(33)
Other	0.8%	( 9)

Secure shelter care and non-secure shelter care are SES programs and account for 6.8% of all referrals held. Most of the children held in SES were either runaways, who eventually were returned to their homes, or children who had received SES court ordered dispositions. Secure detention and non-secure detention represent YS holding programs and were responsible for holding 3.9% of this group. Nearly one half of those children detained in YS eventually received judicial dispositions. For the most part, the other children were runaways who were returned home to parents or relatives. As expected, the majority of the 6.2% placed in local community runaway shelters were again runaways and were returned home. Voluntary crisis homes served as placement for 3.1%. Various other programs or community agencies completed this group.

## Previous History

### Previous Referrals

As indicated in Table 16, the majority (56.1%) of these children had no previous referrals to intake. Table 16 presents the cross-tabulation of previous referral categories by offense type. The obtained relationship is statistically significant. Those children with some previous referral are slightly more likely to currently enter intake with multiple charges. Several additional features of Table 16 merit noting.

Table 16. Previous Referrals by Offense Type

Previous Referral	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
None	60.3% (354)	51.1% (92)	51.8% (113)	48.3% (42)	56.1% (601)
Runaway/ Ungovernable/ Truant	16.9% (99)	16.7% (30)	14.2% (31)	24.1% (21)	16.9% (181)
Abused/Neglected	1.7% (10)	6.1% (11)	5.5% (12)	6.9% (6)	3.6% (39)
Delinquent	8.9% (52)	6.7% (12)	14.7% (32)	9.2% (8)	9.7% (104)
Multiple Referrals	12.3% (72)	19.4% (35)	13.8% (30)	11.5% (10)	13.7% (147)
Total	100.0% (587)	100.0% (180)	100.0% (218)	100.0% (87)	100.0% (1072)

( $\chi^2 = 48.47$ ,  $df = 21$ ;  $p = .00$ )

Juvenile justice and child welfare personnel have expressed concern that "abused and neglected" children later tend to re-emerge in the system as "status offenders." Our evidence is to the contrary. Very few of these children (3.6%) have a previous referral of abuse/neglect. Rather, for these children currently referred to intake as runaways, ungovernables, and truants who have a previous referral, that referral is more likely to have been for a similar class of offenses, i. e., truancy, ungovernability and, most often, running away.

#### Former Clinical Diagnosis

As indicated in Table 17, only 5.5% (n=59) of these children were reported as having been previously diagnosed as emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, physically handicapped or developmentally disabled, e.g. epilepsy, dyslexia.

Table 17. Previous Clinical Diagnosis by Offense Type

Previous Clinical Diagnosis	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
No	96.1% (564)	88.9% (160)	94.5% (206)	95.4% (83)	94.5% (1013)
Yes	3.9% (23)	11.1% (20)	5.5% (12)	4.6% (4)	5.5% (59)
Total	100.0% (587)	100.0% (180)	100.0% (218)	100.0% (87)	100.0% (1072)

( $\chi^2 = 13.86$ ; 3dF;  $p = .00$ )

Ungovernables are especially likely to have had such a previous clinical diagnosis. Since these diagnoses may have occurred at any point in time prior to referral to intake, it is difficult to estimate the validity of these figures. If they were based on the child's previous medical records or parent reports, they may well be under-represented in light of incomplete records and recall.

### Disposition Patterns

#### Time Required to Process Cases

As indicated in Table 18, nearly one-half of the cases (46.1%) were processed in one day or less. Most of the cases which are closed in one day involve runaways. Given that runaway referrals are often filed for "information only" or returned to their families upon apprehension, this finding is not unexpected. Ungovernable and truant referrals are significantly more likely to require additional processing time, as expected, since such cases are more likely to involve voluntary or court-ordered placements within SES.

Table 18. Time Required to Process Case by Offense Type<sup>1</sup>

Time	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Charge	Total
1 Day or less	57.6% (311)	27.5% (38)	28.3% (43)	31.1% (19)	46.1% (411)
1 Week	22.4% (121)	18.1% (25)	17.1% (26)	31.1% (19)	21.4% (191)
2 Weeks	8.0% (43)	17.4% (24)	19.1% (29)	18.0% (11)	12.0% (107)
3 Weeks	5.9% (32)	18.8% (26)	14.5% (22)	9.8% (6)	11.1% (86)
4 Weeks	6.1% (33)	18.1% (25)	21.0% (32)	9.8% (6)	9.7% (96)
Total	100.0% (540)	100.0% (138)	100.0% (152)	100.0% (61)	100.0% (891)

( $\chi^2 = 119.26$ ; 12dF;  $p = .01$ )

<sup>1</sup>The number of cases reported above include only those cases in which disposition was complete within the four-week tracking period.

### Disposition

The cross-tabulation of disposition by offense type is presented in Table 19 on the next page. The relationship is statistically significant. Nearly 28% of all the cases required "no action." Nearly another fourth were closed after counseling. This is consistent with the previous finding that nearly one-half of all cases were processed in one day or less. The majority of the cases are processed non-judicially (84%). Of the remaining 16% which are processed judicially, nearly two-thirds are SES court-ordered referrals.

Table 19. Offense Type by Disposition

OFFENSE	NO ACTION	CLOSED AFTER COUNSELING	SES NON- COURT ORDER	YS AND OTHER HRS	NON-HRS AND OTHER	RETURN RUNAWAY	SES COURT ORDER	OTHER JUDICIAL	TOTAL
Runaway	38.1%	17.7%	1.4%	3.9%	3.5%	25.3%	4.3%	3.6%	100.0%
	(223)	(104)	(8)	(23)	(34)	(148)	(25)	(21)	(586)
Truants	12.8%	39.0%	11.0%	2.8%	6.4%	0.0%	22.9%	5.0%	100.0%
	(28)	(85)	(24)	(6)	(14)	(0)	(50)	(11)	(208)
Ungovernables	16.8%	33.0%	6.7%	3.9%	14.0%	0.6%	16.2%	8.9%	100.0%
	(30)	(59)	(12)	(7)	(25)	(1)	(29)	(16)	(179)
Multiple Charge	17.6%	29.4%	12.9%	2.4%	12.9%	3.5%	14.1%	7.1%	100.0%
	(15)	(25)	(11)	(2)	(11)	(3)	(12)	(6)	(85)
TOTAL	27.7%	25.6%	5.1%	3.6%	7.9%	14.2%	10.9%	5.1%	100.0%
	(296)	(273)	(55)	(38)	(84)	(152)	(116)	(54)	(1068)

( $\chi^2$  = 320.49, 21dF; p = .00)

Information is missing in 90 cases.

Disposition distributions by offense type reveal some interesting relationships. Truants are significantly more likely to receive SES voluntary or court-ordered dispositions. Nearly one-third of all truant referrals were sent to SES. Close to one-fourth of ungovernable referrals received an SES disposition. However, runaways exhibit a different pattern. Very few (5.7%) are sent to SES.

### Section 3

#### Comparison of Current Runaways, Ungovernables, and Truants with Those Formerly Under the Jurisdiction of Youth Services

Having established that runaways, ungovernables, and truants continue to enter Single Intake in fairly large numbers we compared this current population with the "CINS" population under YS jurisdiction during the first six months of 1975, the period immediately prior to the legislation. Actual numbers vary widely, of course, since we are comparing a six month population. For that reason, percentages are compared instead. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used to determine statistically significant differences ( $p=.05$ ) between the two populations.

#### Demographic Characteristics

##### Age

Frequency distributions for age within subsamples are presented in Table 20 on the next page. Differences between samples are statistically significant. The current population of runaways, ungovernables, and truants is significantly more likely to be younger than that under previous YS jurisdiction. The difference in mean age for both groups (14.6 in 1975 and 14.3 in 1977) is also statistically significant.

Table 20. Age Distributions by Subsamples

Age	1975 Referrals to Youth Services (N=20,550)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (N=1,070)
11 and under	4.9%	7.6%
12	5.2%	5.5%
13	12.1%	13.8%
14	21.5%	20.2%
15	25.4%	23.8%
16	19.7%	18.3%
17	11.3%	10.7%
Mean	14.6	14.3

( $\chi^2$  probability of differences between samples < .05)

### Sex

Sex distributions by subsamples are presented in Table 21. As indicated in the Table, the sex distribution has shifted. In 1975, more males than females entered YS as run-aways, ungovernables, and truants. In 1977, such referrals to Single Intake are more likely to be female. The differences between samples is statistically significant. There has been a 5.4% increase in female referrals.

Table 21. Sex Distributions by Subsamples

Sex	1975 Referrals to Youth Services (N=20,520)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (N=1,074)
Male	51.5%	46.1%
Female	48.5%	53.9%

( $x^2$  probability of differences between samples  $< .05$ )

#### Race

As indicated in Table 22, there has been a significant increase in the proportion of non-white runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals to Single Intake as compared to similar referrals to YS in 1975 - an increase of 3.7%.

Table 22. Race Distributions by Subsamples

Race	1975 Referrals to Youth Services (N=20,388)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (N=1,070)
White	83.6%	79.9%
Non-white	16.4%	20.1%

( $x^2$  probability of differences between samples  $< .05$ )

#### Referral Type

As reflected in Table 23, on the following page, there are significant differences in the type of referral offenses between the 1975 and 1977 samples. It should be noted that

YS Statistical Reporting Card did not allow for the "multiple offense" charge. YS counselors determined the dominant "CINS" charge and indicated it as the offense type. The 1977 Tracking Form did allow for the "multiple charge" category.

Table 23 shows the 1977 offense type distributions separately with multiple charge omitted and included. Statistical comparisons are made with the "multiple charge" category omitted and the adjusted frequency distributions. The most obvious change in referral type occurs in the category of "runaway" - the adjusted frequency indicates a 6.4% decrease. The decrease is considerably greater when "multiple charges" are included - 11.1%. Ungovernable and truant referrals show a slight increase.

Table 23. Referral Type by Subsamples

Referral Type	1975 Referrals to Youth Services Intake (N=20,550)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (Multiple Charges omitted; N=1,036)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (N=1,123)
Runaway	66.9%	60.5%	55.8%
Ungovernable	18.0%	21.8%	20.1%
Truant	15.1%	17.7%	16.3%
Multiple Charge	- -	- -	7.7%

( $\chi^2$  probability of differences between samples with multiple charge omitted <.05)

### Referral Source

When referral sources for the 1975 and 1977 groups are compared, as in Table 24 below, several factors emerge. Most salient, of course, is the significant decrease in law enforcement referrals which have decreased by 16.3%. As might be expected, family and school referrals have increased considerably - 9.8% and 5.3% respectively.

The shifts evidenced in referral type and referral source would appear to be interactive. Runaway referrals have decreased as have law enforcement referrals. Since most runaways are brought to Intake by law enforcement officials (85.4% in the 1977 population), then one would logically expect the joint fluctuations found. The relationship between the proportion of truants entering Intake and the increase in school referrals reflect a similar pattern.

Table 24. Referral Source Distributions by Subsamples

Referral Source	1975 Referrals to Youth Services (N=20,519)	1977 Referral to Single Intake (N=1,074)
Law Enforcement	73.9%	57.6%
Family	11.2%	21.0%
School	10.7%	16.0%
Other	4.3%	5.3%

( $\chi^2$  probability of differences between samples < .05)

### Initial Holding

As might be expected, significantly fewer runaways, ungovernables, and truants are being held at Intake. (See Table 25 below.) While 22.5% of these referrals were being held during the first six months of 1975, such detainment practices have been reduced to 20.8%. It should be noted that these figures do not necessarily indicate that 20.8% of these children were held in detention. In actuality, the majority of these children were held in secure and non-secure shelter. Therefore, the more accurate comparison may be with the 3.9% held in secure and non-secure detention specifically.

Table 25. Initial Holding Distributions by Subsample<sup>1</sup>

Initial Holding	1975 Referrals to Youth Services (N=20,440)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (N=1,072)
Held	22.5%	20.8%
Not Held	77.5%	79.2%

<sup>2</sup>  
(x<sup>2</sup> probability of differences between samples < .05)

<sup>1</sup>Includes secure and non-secure detention, secure and non-secure shelter care, runaway shelters, etc.

### Time Required to Process Cases

There are several limitations inherent in this particular comparison as noted at the bottom of Table 26. However, when 1977 data is made more nearly comparable to YS data, in Table 26 below, it appears that runaways, ungovernables, and truants are now requiring significantly longer time to process. In 1975, 54.4% of all cases required one day or less to process. In 1977, only 46.1% of the runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals were disposed in one day or less.

Table 26. Time From Complaint Filed to Disposition  
Distribution by Subsample<sup>1</sup>

Time From Complaint Filed to Disposition	1975 Referrals to Youth Services (N=19,220)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (N=891)
1 Day or Less	54.4%	46.1%
1 Week	20.6%	21.4%
2 Weeks	11.0%	12.0%
3 Weeks	6.7%	9.7%
4 Weeks	7.3%	10.8%

(x<sup>2</sup> probability of differences between samples < .05)

<sup>1</sup>Because 1977 tracking was done for four weeks, YS data is presented only for those cases in which dispositions were completed within four weeks.

### Disposition

Frequency distributions by category of disposition are presented by subsamples and appear in Table 27 below. The differences found between subsamples are statistically significant. Several changes are apparent in the 1977 subsample distribution. Considerably fewer cases required "no action" upon referral to Intake - a decrease of 6.9% such dispositions. Cases "closed after counseling" at Intake show little difference - 24% in 1975 and 25.6% in 1977. SES voluntary placement and supervision show a marked increase in 1977 - 5.1% as compared to 0.9% in 1975. Given that the 1975 legislation transferred runaways, ungovernables, and truants to SES, this increase is not unexpected. Judicial dispositions are also considerably increased in 1977 - an increase of 4.9%. As discussed in a previous section, this increase represents a greater tendency currently to recommended SES court-ordered placements for these children.

Table 27. Disposition Distribution by Subsamples

Disposition	1975 Referrals to Youth Services (N=20,550)	1977 Referrals to Single Intake (N=1,068)
No Action	34.6%	27.7%
Closed after Counseling	24.0%	25.6%
SES Voluntary Placement Plus Supervision	0.9%	5.1%
Other non-Judicial	29.4%	25.7%
All Judicial	11.1%	16.0%

( $\chi^2$  probability of differences between samples < .05)

### Summary

Statistical aggregate data compiled for the purpose of determining the extent to which runaways, ungovernables, and truants have been removed from YS jurisdiction suggest that the legislative mandate of revised Chapter 39 has been met. Prior to the 1975 revision, runaway, truant and ungovernable referrals comprised nearly one-third of the YS population. YS data for the period following the legislation indicate that only 0.9% to 3.8% of the youths under YS jurisdiction have "former CINS" charges. YS has indicated that these children have been referred as second-time ungovernables, a procedure in keeping with Chapter 39, as amended.

### Characteristics of 1977 Referrals

Current data indicate that the number of runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals to Intake have decreased by approximately one-fourth since the legislation was enacted. A two-week sample of runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals yielded the following distributions by offense type: runaway - 55.8%; ungovernable - 20.1%; truant - 16.3%; multiple charge - 7.7%. Law enforcement agencies account for 57.6% of all referrals. The remaining cases were referred primarily by families and schools.

Only 20.8% of these children (most often runaways) were held upon referral to Intake, predominantly in non-secure

shelter care and local community runaway shelters. The majority of runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals had no prior referral to Intake (56.1%). Those who did were likely to have had a referral for a similar class of offense. Very few (5.5%) had a previous clinical diagnosis of any kind.

Disposition patterns within this two-week sample indicate that nearly one-half of the cases are processed in one day or less. The majority of such cases are runaways who are "filed for information only" or returned home. Ungovernables and truants typically take more time to process. Dispositions by offense type suggest some underlying patterns. The majority of the cases were processed non-judicially (84%). Judicial dispositions tend to be SES court-ordered referrals. Over half of all cases received "no action" or were closed after counseling at Intake. As expected, truants and ungovernables were more likely than runaways to be referred to SES programs.

#### Comparison of 1975 and 1977 Referrals

A comparison of 1977 runaway, ungovernable, and truant referral data with similar data compiled by YS in 1975 shows some significant changes in referral and disposition patterns since the implementation of revised Chapter 39. Current referrals are somewhat younger and more likely to be female. There is also a slight increase in non-white referrals. Referral offense type analyses indicate that there has been a decrease in runaway referrals to Intake. Law enforcement referrals also show a decrease with an accompanying increase

in family and school referrals. Data further reflect a decline in the number of these children held at Intake but an increase in the time required to process cases. In 1977, fewer cases require "no action". Placements and supervision, as well as judicial dispositions generally, show an increase.

## CHAPTER II

### RUNAWAY, UNGOVERNABLE, AND TRUANT REFERRALS TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SERVICES

#### Introduction

The 1975 revision of Chapter 39 provided that runaways, ungovernables, and truants be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Office of Youth Services (YS) to that of the Office of Social and Economic Services (SES) where they would be processed as dependent children. In this section, runaways, ungovernables, and truants are examined at the point of referral to Protective Services and Foster Care and compared to all other dependent referrals to these SES units in terms of basic demographic data, selected characteristics of the referral situation, natural and foster family characteristics and to a limited extent, various outcome characteristics. Besides presenting an overview of the status of all SES referrals, a major objective in this investigation is to discover to what extent the runaway, ungovernable, and truant is similar to other dependent children currently being processed by SES units.

The two groups in this analysis (other dependent referrals versus runaway, ungovernable, and truancy referrals) are defined by the 1975 legislation. First, all other dependents are composed of any child who:

- (a) has been abandoned by his parents or other custodians;
- (b) for any reason, is destitute or homeless;
- (c) has not proper parental support, maintenance, care, or guardianship;
- (d) because of the neglect of his parents or other custodians, is deprived of education as required by law, or of medical, psychiatric, psychological, or other care necessary for his well-being;
- (e) is living in a condition or environment such as to injure him or endanger his welfare;
- (f) is living in a home which, by reason of the neglect, cruelty, depravity, or other adverse condition of a parent or other person in whose care the child may be, is an unfit place for him;
- (g) is surrendered to the Division of Family Services or a licensed child-placing agency for purpose of adoption.<sup>1</sup>

The second group (runaways, ungovernables, and truants) consists of any child who:

- (h) has persistently run away from his parents or legal guardian;
- (i) being subject to compulsory school attendance, is habitually truant from school;<sup>2</sup>

and

- (11) "Ungovernable child" means a child who persistently disobeys the reasonable and lawful demands of his parents or other legal custodians and is beyond their control. For the purposes of this act, the first time a child is adjudicated as ungovernable, he may be defined and treated as a dependent child, and all of the provisions of this act relating to dependency shall be applicable.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Florida Statutes, Chapter 39.01, Section 10 (a) through (g).

<sup>2</sup>Florida Statutes, Chapter 39.01, Section 10 (h) and (i).

<sup>3</sup>Florida Statutes, Chapter 39.01, Section 11.

### Methodology

Over 600 case files were reviewed from Protective Services and Foster Care units in five Florida sites during May and June of 1977. Bay, Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, and Polk Counties (and immediate areas in some cases) were selected as sites representative of the state in terms of urban/rural composition and geographic location. From the May, 1977 open case population, a 13.5% sample was randomly drawn with the site distributions shown in Table 28. Twenty additional cases in the original sample, invalid due to the transfer of records, a closing before review, time expiration on data collection or some other missing file problem, have been dropped from this analysis.

Table 28. SES Case Review Sample Construction

Site	Protective Services			Foster Care			Total		
	Population	Sample Size	Percent of Population	Population	Sample Size	Percent of Population	Population	Sample Size	Percent of Population
Bay	263	52	19.8%	100	20	20.0%	363	72	19.8%
Broward	430	71	16.5%	480	76	15.8%	910	147	16.2%
Duval	569	65	11.4%	481	70	14.6%	1050	135	12.9%
Hillsborough	695	59	8.5%	1159	95	8.2%	1854	154	8.3%
Polk	376	69	18.4%	370	67	18.1%	746	136	18.2%
Total	2333	316	13.5%	2590	328	12.7%	4923	644	13.1%

Besides the open population size, time and staff limitations were responsible for the limited sample size contributed by each site. In addition to review of all case file documents, case worker interviews were conducted when necessary for securing additional information or clarifying existing data. The following pages present the findings from this review.

## Section 1

### Protective Services

As reported in Table 29, 316 cases from Protective Services units were randomly selected for review. Of these, nearly a third (n=100) represent children referred as runaways, truants, ungovernables or some combination of these three charges. Of this group, the greatest single referral type is ungovernables (n=37), followed by truants (n=27), and then runaways (n=18) and multiple referrals (n=18) jointly.

Table 29. SES Referral Types

SES Unit	Total	Other Dependents	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Referrals
Protective Services	*100.0% (315)	68.3% (215)	31.7% (100)	18.0% (18)	37.0% (37)	27.0% (27)	18.0% (18)
Foster Care	**100.0% (325)	92.6% (301)	7.4% (24)	12.5% (3)	33.4% (8)	8.3% (2)	45.8% (11)

\*Information is missing in one case.

\*\*Information is missing in three cases.

Each characteristic presented in this section is first discussed for the entire group of children in Protective Services and then analyzed by referral type. Because of the small number of runaway, ungovernable, and truancy referrals found in the sample of cases reviewed, these specific types will be combined as one general group. All remaining referrals, as defined in the introduction of this chapter, comprise the group identified as other dependents (n=215).

## • Demographic Characteristics

### Age

Runaways, ungovernables, and truants are generally older than other dependents. While the mean age for all children in Protective Services is 8.6, for the group of runaways, ungovernables, and truants the mean age is 13.6 years and 6.3 years for all other dependents. The difference in these mean ages is statistically significant ( $p=.05$ ). Looking at Table 30, 98% of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants are presently 10 years and older with almost half (48.0%) between the ages of 14 and 15. Over half the other dependents (59.6%) are younger than 10 years.

Table 30. Present Age by Referral Type

Age (Present)	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
4 and under	0.0% (0)	27.0% (58)	18.4% (58)
5-9 years	2.0% (2)	32.6% (70)	22.9% (72)
10-13 years	20.0% (20)	19.5% (42)	19.7% (62)
14-15 years	48.0% (48)	10.7% (23)	22.5% (71)
16 and over	30.0% (30)	10.2% (22)	16.5% (52)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

Information is missing in one case.

Table 31 looks at the ages of children in the sample at the time of their first referral to Protective Services to determine the age distribution at initial entry. Once again, it is shown that while almost all the runaways, ungovernables, and truants were 10 years and older (95.9%), only slightly more than one fourth (27.4%) of all other dependents were this old, with the largest age group of other dependents (43.8%) being the 4 and under category.

Table 31. Age at First Referral by Referral Type

Age at First Referral	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
4 and under	0.0% (0)	43.8% (93)	30.1% (93)
5-9 years	4.1% (4)	28.8% (61)	21.0% (65)
10-13 years	36.1% (35)	19.8% (42)	24.9% (77)
14-15 years	44.3% (43)	3.8% (8)	16.5% (51)
16 and over	15.5% (15)	3.8% (8)	7.5% (23)
Total	100.0% (97)	100.0% (212)	100.0% (309)

Information is missing in 7 cases.

For the most part, age could not be shown to have any substantial effect on other major referral characteristics except as it relates to the sex of the child and the marital status of the child's parents. More specifically, females appear to be older than males in the total sample. This relationship, however, is significant ( $p < .05$ ) only in the case of runaways, ungovernables, and truants. No significant difference in age occurs between males and females referred for dependency reasons. A second significant difference ( $p < .01$ ) is noted in the relationship of child's age to the marital status of the child's parents. Over 40% of the children aged 4 years or under are from homes where the mother has never married. Older children more often indicated parents' marital status as separated or divorced except for the 16 and older group who are from married households. When this relationship is analyzed by referral type it again holds for other dependent referrals but disappears for the group of runaways, ungovernables, and truants who as pointed out, tend to all be older than other dependents.

### Sex

Slightly more females than males comprise the entire sample of children in Protective Services as shown in Table 32. Though the proportion of females is greater than for males in both referral groups, the difference is larger for runaway; ungovernable, and truancy referrals resulting in a statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) relationship between sex and referral type.

Table 32. Sex by Referral Type

Sex	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Male	34.0% (34)	47.4% (102)	43.2% (136)
Female	66.0% (66)	52.6% (113)	56.8% (179)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

$\chi^2=4.49$ , 1 d.f.,  $p<.05$

Information is missing in one case.

To point out differences based on sex, it has already been noted that while impartial to the ages of females, the use of Protective Services as a means for handling runaways, ungovernables, and truants, is limited to young males.

A further distinction between the sexes suggests that females more often than males are reported to have subsequent occurrences for which referrals could be made. In light of the facts that runaways, ungovernables, and truants more often are reported to have subsequent occurrences (to be discussed later) and that females comprise a greater proportion of the group of runaways, ungovernables, and truants, the above statement does not come unexpectedly. However, the fact that in the group of other dependents females again more often than

males indicate additional referral occurrences does support the generalization of the statement. The specific type of occurrence cannot be analyzed by sex with this data due to the small numbers per occurrence type.

### Race

Three-fourths (74.9%) of all children in Protective Services are white. As illustrated by Table 33 this proportion holds regardless of which referral type is examined.

Table 33. Race by Referral Type

Race	Runaways	Other	Both
	Ungovernables Truants		
White	81.0% (81)	72.1% (155)	74.9% (236)
Non-White	19.0% (19)	27.9% (60)	25.1% (79)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

Information is missing in one case.

Though race is not significantly differentiated according to age or sex in either referral group, it is found to be a statistically significant factor in several major areas. First, the composition of the family unit is overwhelmingly

related to race ( $p < .00$ ). Over 70.0% of the non-white children reported the family structure to consist of the natural mother only, while for white children, only slightly over a third (38.9%) indicated this. Both natural parents compose the family unit for 36.8% of the white children compared to only 12.8% of the non-white cases. Of the remaining categories, white families more often reported one natural parent and one step-parent, while non-white children were more likely to indicate some other relative. When analyzed by referral type, both groups indicated the same relationship exists. In each case, non-white families significantly more often consist of the natural mother only.

Lending additional support to the above relationship is the finding that race is significantly differentiated ( $p < .00$ ) according to the marital status of the natural parents. Whereas in only 6.5% of the white families, the mother is unmarried, over a third (36.1%) of the non-white families report this status. Parents of white children most often are reported to be married (40.5%). The percentage of parents divorced or separated is about the same for both white (37.9%) and non-white (41.7%) families. Though not as strong in the case of runaways, ungovernables, and truants as in the group of other dependents, this relationship is still statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) for both referral types.

Earned income is another area in which race plays a statistically significant ( $p < .00$ ) part.. White families

report higher levels of earned income consistently throughout, for the sample as a whole and for each of the referral types. Whereas only a fourth (25.7%) of white families reported no earned income over two-thirds of the non-white families responded with none.

Though not significant for other dependents, the referral source for runaways, ungovernables, and truants is statistically related ( $p < .01$ ) to the race of the child. Children of both races are most often directly referred to Protective Services by an HRS unit (usually Single Intake). However, for those children not referred in this manner, the family or friends of the family tend to refer white runaways, ungovernables, and truants, while the school system accounts for most of the non-white referrals of this type. In light of previous findings based on the tracking of 1977 runaways, ungovernables, and truants which indicated the greater percentage of truants to be non-white, this present relationship is expected.

The last significant ( $p < .05$ ) relationship based on race emerges again for only runaways, ungovernables, and truants. Though two thirds (66.0%) of this referral type report no previous HRS involvement, of the remaining third 94.1% are white. Because of small individual agency populations no significance can be attached to a specific type of previous HRS involvement.

• Referral Characteristics

Referral Source

While over half (57.4%) of the children referred to Protective Services come directly from an HRS office (generally Single Intake, SES, or YS) 42.6% of the cases are referred directly from sources outside of HRS. Of these, the source which most often refers cases is the family or friends. As listed in Table 34, the school refers 7.7% of the cases, law enforcement 6.5%, and other (such as court officials or community agencies) account for 9.0%. No significant difference in referral source is reported when the sample is reviewed by referral type.

Table 34. Referral Source by Referral Type

Referral Source	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
HRS	67.4% (66)	52.8% (112)	57.4% (178)
Family/Friend	16.3% (16)	20.8% (44)	19.4% (60)
School	7.1% (7)	8.0% (17)	7.7% (24)
Law	8.2% (8)	5.7% (12)	6.5% (20)
Other	1.0% (1)	12.7% (27)	9.0% (28)
Total	100.0% (98)	100.0% (212)	100.0% (310)

Information is missing in 6 cases.

It is necessary to enter a qualifier of the data at this point. Since the exact entry date of the referral is unknown in many of the cases along with the condition of varying implementation of Single Intake dates, no control is possible to examine the referral source of those cases referred before Single Intake with those referred afterwards. In those cases referred before, other HRS or non-HRS agencies were the most probable sources of referral to SES. Because this seriously affects the validity of the above finding, no other relationship involving referral source will be considered.

#### School Circumstances

Of the 315 cases sampled from Protective Services units, 225 children were determined to be eligible for school enrollment. Tables 35, 36, and 37 are based on this eligible number. The majority (81.0%) of all children in the sample are currently attending school. However, upon analyzing the sample by referral type, a significant relationship ( $p < .01$ ) is found to exist between school attendance and type of referral group. Almost 30.0% of the sample classified as runaways, ungovernables, and truants are not presently attending school compared to 11.5% of all other dependents.

Table 35. Presently Attending School by Referral Type

Presently in School	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Yes	70.5% (67)	88.5% (115)	81.0% (182)
No	29.5% (28)	11.5% (15)	19.0% (43)
Total	100.0% (95)	100.0% (130)	100.0% (225)

$\chi^2 = 10.29$ , 1 d.f.,  $p < .01$

Information is missing in 1 case.

Besides the greater probability of not attending school, runaways, ungovernables, and truants are more likely than other dependents to be working below the grade level appropriate for their age. This finding is presented in Table 36 where slightly more than half (52.6%) of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants compared to 29.7% of all other dependents are found to be working below the appropriate grade level. The difference in these groups is statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ).

Table 36. Working Below Appropriate Grade Level by Referral Type

Below Appropriate Grade Level	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Below	52.6% (41)	29.7% (33)	39.5% (74)
Not Below	47.4% (37)	70.3% (78)	60.5% (115)
Total	100.0% (78)	100.0% (111)	100.0% (189)

$\chi^2 = 9.09$ , 1 d.f.,  $p < .01$

Information is missing in 37 cases.

The relationship between referral type and a school factor is strongest ( $\phi = .59$ ), however, when the child's history of school problems such as truancy, suspension, expulsion, dropping out, failing a grade and the like is examined. Shown in Table 37, 88.4% of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants report some prior school related problem while only 28.5% of the other dependents indicated such a history. The relationship between school problems and referral type is statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ).

Table 37. History of School Problems by Referral Type

School Problems	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	11.6% (11)	71.5% (93)	46.2% (104)
Problems	88.4% (84)	28.5% (37)	53.8% (121)
Total	100.0% (95)	100.0% (130)	100.0% (225)

$\chi^2 = 76.99$ , 1 d.f.,  $p < .01$

Information is missing for one case.

In considering the relationship first presented in which the referral type is related to a history of school problems, the hypothesis emerged that perhaps this finding was really due to runaways, ungovernables, and truants being older and, having had longer exposure to the school system, had also had more opportunity to be involved in school problems. But this reasoning falters when tested. Though older children in both groups more often reported some problem, no statistically significant difference in the history of school problems occurred among age groups. (Small individual sample sizes prevented any analysis of the type of school problem). In

fact, the only school characteristic in which age is a significant factor pertains to the current status of being in school. For both the group of runaways, ungovernables, and truants and the group of other dependents, the older child was found to be significantly ( $p < .00$ ) less likely to be attending school.

None of the three major school circumstances considered were found to be statistically related to either the race or the sex of the child.

#### Previous HRS Involvement

Almost two-thirds of the cases reviewed revealed no mention of previous HRS involvement. When analyzed by groups, as in Table 38, a similar situation occurs with 66.0% of the

Table 38. Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type

Previous HRS Involvement	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
No HRS Involvement	66.0% (66)	60.9% (131)	62.6% (197)
Previous HRS Involvement	34.0% (34)	39.1% (84)	37.4% (118)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

Information is missing for one case.

runaway, ungovernable, or truant referrals and 60.9% of the other dependents giving no indication of previous HRS involvement.

For those children who have had previous dealings with HRS, Table 39 specifies select types. In order to accommodate multiple HRS agencies involvements per child, this breakdown refers to the number of involvements rather than the number of children referred.

Table 39. Type of Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type

Type of Previous HRS Involvement	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
SES	54.4% (25)	85.4% (76)	74.8% (101)
YS	32.6% (15)	1.1% (1)	11.9% (16)
Other HRS	13.0% (6)	13.5% (12)	13.3% (18)
Total	100.0% (46)	100.0% (89)	100.0% *(135)

\*Due to multiple referrals, this table accounts for number of involvements rather than number of children.

Information is missing for one case.

Almost three-fourths (74.8%) of all the previous involvements have been with SES. This figure rises to 85.4% when considering only the other dependents but drops to 54.4% of the runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals. Based on this sample distribution, runaways, ungovernables, and truants have a greater probability than other dependents of having had some previous involvement with YS. This is not surprising in light of the fact that children committing these offenses were previously handled by YS. Similar proportions of both groups have previously dealt with other HRS agencies such as the Office of Mental Health, the Office of Mental Retardation, and others.

#### Evaluations and Diagnoses

Almost two-thirds (63.2%) of the cases reviewed gave no indication of any previous evaluation such as psychological, medical, vocational, educational, or tests for retardation ever being conducted. When analyzed by referral type, no significant relationship emerges as demonstrated in Table 40. However, for those children who did receive evaluations, psychological and multiple evaluations were

Table 40. Evaluations Received by Referral Type

Evaluations Received by Client	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	58.0% (58)	65.6% (141)	63.2% (199)
One or more	42.0% (42)	34.4% (74)	36.8% (116)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

Information is missing in one case.

most often conducted for runaways, ungovernables, and truants while for other dependents this greatest frequency reported is for medical evaluations (N=41). In that the group of other dependents consists mainly of abused children, the greater frequency of medical evaluations is expected.

No clinical diagnosis for such conditions as emotional disturbance, mental retardation, physical handicaps, developmental disabilities, and the like were found to be known for 90.2% of all children sampled in the Protective Services units. Table 41 presents the distribution of clinical diagnosis by referral type. No statistically significant difference in occurrence of a diagnosis exists between referral types.

Table 41. Clinically Diagnosed by Referral Type

Clinically Diagnosed	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	89.0% (89)	90.7% (195)	90.2% (284)
1 or more	11.0% (11)	9.3% (20)	9.8% (31)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

Information is missing in one case.

#### • Family Characteristics

##### Parental Status

Almost half (47.0%) of the children in this sample currently live with only one natural parent. Of those living with two parents, 31.0% represent families with both natural parents while 15.7% consist of one natural parent and one stepparent. The remaining 6.7% currently live with relatives or other guardians. As demonstrated in Table 42, no significant difference in parental status occurs between referral types.

Table 42. Parental Status by Referral Type

Parental Status	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Both Natural Parents	30.0% (30)	30.8% (65)	30.6% (95)
1 Natural Parent & 1 Step Parent	15.0% (15)	16.1% (34)	15.7% (49)
1 Natural Parent Only	50.0% (50)	45.5% (96)	47.0% (146)
Relative /Other	5.0% (5)	7.6% (16)	6.7% (21)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (211)	100.0% (311)

Information is missing in 5 cases.

#### Parent's Marital Status

Table 43 displays the cross-tabulation of parent's marital status by referral type. As this table reports, one-third (33.7%) of the natural parents in this unit are currently married. Slightly more than another third (38.9%) are divorced or separated. No significant relationship exists between groups when the referral type is analyzed.

Table 43. Parent's Marital Status by Referral Type

Parent(s) Marital Status	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Married	33.3% (32)	33.8% (70)	33.7% (102)
Divorced or Separated	43.7% (42)	36.7% (76)	38.9% (118)
Parent(s) Dead or Deserted	18.8% (18)	11.6% (24)	13.9% (42)
Mother Unmarried	4.2% (4)	17.9% (37)	13.5% (41)
Total	100.0% (96)	100.0% (207)	100.0% (303)

Information is missing in 13 cases.

#### Parent's Age

Tables 44 and 45 relate to natural mother's age and natural father's age respectively. In both cases, a statistically significant relationship exists between the age of parent and the referral type.

Mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to be older than mothers of other dependents. The mean age for mothers of the first group is 39.5 and for all other dependents, 31.7 years, a statistically significant difference ( $p=.05$ ). About half (50.2%) of the mothers of other dependents are 30 or younger compared to only 4.7% of the mothers

of runaways, ungovernables, and truants. At the older end of this range, 36.0% of the mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are over 40 whereas only 19.3% of the other group are in this bracket. Compiled into these intervals again support a statistical relationship between the type of referral and the age of the natural mother ( $\chi^2=54.16$ , 3df,  $p<.01$ ).

Table 44. Mother's Age by Referral Type

Mother's Age	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
20 and under	0.0% (0)	7.9% (14)	5.3% (14)
21-25	0.0% (0)	25.4% (45)	17.1% (45)
26-30	4.7% (4)	16.9% (30)	12.9% (34)
31-40	59.3% (51)	30.5% (54)	39.9% (105)
41-50	26.7% (23)	16.4% (29)	19.8% (52)
51-60	8.1% (7)	2.3% (4)	4.2% (11)
over 60	1.2% (1)	0.6% (1)	0.8% (2)
Total	100.0% (86)	100.0% (177)	100.0% (263)

Information is missing in 53 cases.

In that runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to be older than other dependents, the above finding at first appears to be nothing more than stating the obvious. However, when further examined, the age of the parents is not determined to be significantly related to the age of the child neither for the entire group nor either of the referral types. Therefore, the conclusion that other dependents have younger parents still holds as a valid characteristic difference between the referral types.

As in the case of mothers, fathers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are older than fathers of other dependents. The mean age for the first group is 43.9 and 38.8 for the other dependents' fathers ( $p=.05$ ). Looking at a breakdown by various age categories reveals that while only 14.5% of the fathers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are 35 or under, 45.4% of the fathers of other dependents are in this age bracket. Analyzing these various age groups for fathers by referral type suggests a statistically significant relationship ( $\chi^2=16.86$ , 3d.f.,  $p<.01$ ).

Table 45. Father's Age by Referral Type

Father's Age	Runaways Ungovernable Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
30 and under	3.2% (2)	26.9% (29)	18.2% (31)
31-35	11.3% (7)	18.5% (20)	15.9% (27)
36-40	29.0% (18)	16.7% (18)	21.2% (36)
41-50	32.3% (20)	22.2% (24)	25.8% (44)
51-60	21.0% (13)	7.4% (8)	12.4% (21)
over 60	3.2% (2)	8.3% (9)	6.5% (11)
Total	100.0% (62)	100.0% (108)	100.0% (170)

Information is missing in 146 cases.

#### Parent's Education Level

Information concerning the educational level of the parents of all children in this sample was not easily attainable and as qualified in Tables 46 and 47, was found in only a third to a half of the cases.

However, based on cases in which this data was available, mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to collectively have a higher educational level than mothers of other dependents. Half (50.9%) of the mothers of the first group have a high school degree or more compared to about a third (32.0%) of the mothers of other dependents. (Statistically significant;  $p < .05$ ).

Table 46. Mother's Education by Referral Type

Mother's Education	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
1-8 grades	14.6% (8)	34.0% (36)	27.3% (44)
9-11 grades	34.5% (19)	34.0% (36)	34.2% (55)
HS or Vocational Degree	38.2% (21)	23.5% (25)	28.6% (46)
Over HS Degree	12.7% (7)	8.5% (9)	9.9% (16)
Total	100.0% (55)	100.0% (106)	100.0% (161)

$\chi^2 = 8.35$ , 3 d.f.,  $p < .05$

Information is missing in 155 cases.

Fathers, on the other hand, showed no significant difference between groups concerning level of education. At least 45.0% of the fathers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants along with 44.3% of the fathers of other dependents have a high school degree or more.

Table 47. Father's Education by Referral Type

Father's Education	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
1-8 grades	17.5% (7)	28.6% (20)	24.5% (27)
9-11 grades	37.5% (15)	27.1% (19)	30.9% (34)
HS or Vocational Degree	35.0% (14)	37.2% (26)	36.4% (40)
Over HS Degree	10.0% (4)	7.1% (5)	8.2% (9)
Total	100.0% (40)	100.0% (70)	100.0% (110)

Information is missing in 206 cases.

## Income

Due to inconsistent reporting of unearned income such as support, family assistance benefits, state supplementary payments, payments received as annuity, pension retirement, disability benefit and the like, only actually earned income is reviewed.

More than a third (37.4%) of the entire sample reports no evidence of earned income. Upon analysis of referral types, this figure approaches nearly a half (46.7%) of the families of other dependents. Families of runaways, ungovernables, and truants more often report higher annual incomes as the statistically significant relationship presented in Table 48 illustrates. Further examination adds that families of other dependents report a mean yearly income of about \$4500 which for families of runaways, ungovernables, and truants is nearly \$7500, again a statistically significant difference ( $p=.05$ ) though it is questionable how substantially different this is.

Of the major demographic characteristics reviewed, only race was found to be significantly related to income. Non-white families more often ( $p<.01$ ) than white families report lower levels of annual earned income.

Table 48. Annual Income Level by Referral Type

Income Level	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
No Earned Income	21.9% (16)	46.7% (57)	37.4% (73)
Less than \$5,000	16.4% (12)	18.8% (23)	17.9% (35)
\$5,000-\$7,000	12.3% (9)	10.7% (13)	11.3% (22)
\$7,000-10,000	27.5% (20)	12.3% (15)	18.0% (35)
Over \$10,000	21.9% (16)	11.5% (14)	15.4% (30)
Total	100.0% (73)	100.0% (122)	100.0% (195)

$\chi^2=16.81$ , 4 d.f.,  $p<.01$

Information is missing in 121 cases.

#### Number of Siblings

No significant difference in family size appears when comparing the number of siblings for other dependent referrals to that of runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals. As illustrated in Table 49, 88.1% of the children in Protective Services have at least one brother or sister.

Table 49. Number of Siblings by Referral Type

Number of Siblings	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
0	11.1% (11)	12.3% (26)	11.9% (37)
1-2	32.4% (32)	39.3% (83)	37.1% (115)
3-4	35.3% (35)	29.4% (62)	31.3% (97)
Over 4	21.2% (21)	19.0% (40)	19.7% (61)
Total	100.0% (99)	100.0% (211)	100.0% (310)

Information is missing in 6 cases

#### • Outcome Characteristics

##### Subsequent Referrals

Most cases (61.0%) in the sample could not document any referral or occurrence of charges subsequent to the one which last opened or reopened the case. Upon analysis of referral types, a statistically significant relationship ( $p < .01$ ) emerges between the type of current referral and the type of subsequent occurrence. Table 50 reveals that 45.0% of the runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals have experienced at least one similar referral since the current

case opened. Other dependents tend to be referred on subsequent abuse-neglect conditions most often (20.5%) if at all.

Table 50. Subsequent Occurrences by Referral Type

Subsequent Occurrences	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	42.0% (42)	69.7% (150)	61.0% (192)
Runaway, Ungovernable or truant	45.0% (45)	5.1% (11)	17.8% (56)
Delinquent	1.0% (1)	.5% (1)	.6% (2)
Abused/ Neglected	2.0% (2)	20.5% (44)	14.6% (46)
Multiple Referral	10.0% (10)	4.2% (9)	6.0% (19)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

$$\chi^2 = 89.77, 4 \text{ d.f.}, p < .01$$

Information is missing in one case

Length of Stay

The average length of time spent in Protective Services since the last referral which opened or reopened the case is 15 months\*. A statistically significant difference emerges, as shown in Table 51, when analyzing this figure by referral type as runaway, ungovernable, and truancy referrals report an average length of stay of 8 months compared to 18 months for other dependent referrals. However, in that legislation transferring authority for runaway, ungovernable, and truant children to Social and Economic Services has been in effect for only a little over two years, no meaningful conclusions about the comparison of time spent in Protective Services can be made between these referral types.

---

\*In the majority of all case files, documentation of entry and exit dates for Protective Services is typically inconsistent or totally missing. Through interviews with social workers and the piecing together of dates found on various forms and materials in the file, a rough approximation of length of stay was devised. Caution is urged in the use of this data beyond its acceptance as an outside estimation of time for which the child has been known to the Protective Services unit.

Table 51. Length of Stay in Protective Services by Referral Type

Length of Stay	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
1 Month or less	11.0% (11)	9.8% (21)	10.2% (32)
1 to 6 Months	20.0% (20)	12.1% (26)	14.6% (46)
6 Months to 1 Year	20.0% (20)	16.7% (36)	17.8% (56)
1 to 2 Years	16.0% (16)	12.5% (27)	13.6% (43)
2 to 3 Years	10.0% (10)	9.3% (20)	9.5% (30)
3 to 5 Years	20.0% (20)	17.7% (38)	18.4% (58)
5 to 7 Years	1.0% (1)	9.8% (21)	7.0% (22)
Over 7 Years	2.0% (2)	12.1% (26)	8.9% (28)
Total	100.0% (100)	100.0% (215)	100.0% (315)

$\chi^2=19.59$ , 7 d.f.,  $p<.01$

Information is missing in one case.

## Section 2

### Foster Care

Of the 328 cases reviewed from Foster Care files, type of referral is known for 325 of them. In this discussion and all subsequent remarks concerning the impact of runaways, ungovernables, and truants on other dependents in Foster Care, these 3 cases will be omitted and shown in all tables as missing information.

Only 7.4% (n=24) of the sample of Foster Care cases are children referred as runaways, ungovernables, truants, or some combination there of. More specifically, as shown in Table 52, 8 are classified as ungovernables, 3 as runaways, 2 as truants, and 11 are referred for more than one of these three charges.

Table 52. SES Referral Types

SES Unit	Total	Other Dependents	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Runaways	Ungovernables	Truants	Multiple Referrals
Protective Services	*100.0% (315)	68.3% (215)	31.7% (100)	18.0% (18)	37.0% (37)	27.0% (27)	15.0% (13)
Foster Care	**100.0% (325)	92.6% (301)	7.4% (24)	12.5% (3)	33.4% (8)	8.5% (2)	45.8% (11)

\*Information is missing in one case.

\*\*Information is missing in three cases.

As will be demonstrated, this small number will limit the analysis of groups in many areas of interest. However, following strict rules of sampling permits this study to report that 92.6% of all cases in Foster Care are referred as other depen-

dents, such as abused, neglected, abandoned, destitute, or children meeting any of those conditions previously defined for this group.

Most children (83.7%) in this sample are currently placed in foster homes. However, since Foster Care programs also provide supervision for a period of time following the return of a child to his own home or a permanent one, these cases were also sampled for this study. No significant difference appears in the proportion of these cases to their respective referral type. Table 53 shows this breakdown.

Table 53. Foster Care Unit by Referral Type

Foster Care Unit	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Placement	91.7% (22)	83.1% (250)	83.7% (272)
Supervision	8.3% (2)	16.9% (51)	16.3% (53)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (301)	100.0% (325)

Information is missing in 3 cases.

# • Demographic Characteristics

## Age

Runaways, ungovernables, and truants comprise an older group of foster care referrals than other dependents. Whereas the mean age for other dependents is 9.5, it is 13.3, a statistically significant difference ( $p=.05$ ), for runaways, ungovernables, and truants. Table 54 relates referral type to the present age of all children sampled by examining various age levels. Almost half (46.6%) of the other dependents are

Table 54. Present Age by Referral Type

Age (Present)	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
4 and under	0.0% (0)	22.3% (67)	20.7% (67)
5-9 years	12.5% (3)	24.3% (73)	23.5% (76)
10-13 years	29.2% (7)	27.4% (82)	27.4% (89)
14-15 years	25.0% (6)	12.3% (37)	13.3% (43)
16 and older	33.3% (8)	13.7% (41)	15.1% (49)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (300)	100.0% (324)

$\chi^2=14.27$ , 3d.f.,  $p<.01$

(For appropriate statistical comparison, the 4 and under and 5-9 years categories are combined in producing  $\chi^2$ )

Information is missing in 4 cases.

under 10 years of age compared to only 3 of the 24 children in the other group. At the older end of this range, only about a fourth (26.6%) of the other dependents are more than 14 years while over half (58.3%) of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants are in this age bracket. As reported in this table the relationship between these age groups and the referral type is statistically significant.

Of perhaps greater interest, however, is the age of the child at the time of the first placement through Foster Care. Once again, a statistically significant difference ( $p=.05$ ) emerges between the mean age for other dependents (5.7) and the mean age at first placement for runaways, ungovernables, and truants (10.9). Table 55 reviews this relationship by various age groups. While 45.7% of all children in foster care are reported as being under 4 years old at the time of their first placement, Table 55 shows that this figure is almost entirely due to the placement of other dependents at this age (49.0%) rather than runaways, ungovernables, or truants. In fact, 79.2% of all other dependents are less than 10 years old at the time of their first placement whereas only a third (33.4%) of the other group are this young. A statistically significant relationship is shown to exist between referral type and age at the time of first placement.

The age of the child is significantly related to several other characteristics. However, because the small sample size of runaways, ungovernables, and truants prevented the determination of significance in these relationships, the findings are reported to pertain only to the group of other dependents.

Table 55 . Age at First Placement by Referral Type

Age at First Placement	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
4 and under	4.2% (1)	49.0% (146)	45.7% (147)
5-9 years	29.2% (7)	30.2% (90)	30.1% (97)
10-13 years	35.2% (8)	14.8% (44)	16.2% (52)
14-15 years	29.2% (7)	5.0% (15)	6.8% (22)
16 and older	4.2% (1)	1.0% (3)	1.2% (4)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (298)	100.0% (322)

$\chi^2=31.40$ , 2d.f.,  $p<.01$

(For appropriate statistical comparison, the 4 and under and 5-9 categories are combined as well as the 14-15 and 16 and older groups to produce the  $\chi^2$ )

Information is missing in 4 cases.

Though age has no significant effect on whether or not a child is working below the level deemed appropriate for his age group, it is significantly ( $p<.01$ ) related to other school circumstances. For those eligible for school attendance, older children were found to more often not be presently attending school and not surprisingly, to more often indicate a history of one or more school problems such as

**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 3**

truancy, suspension, expulsion, dropping out, failing a grade or a similar experience.

As in the case of a history of school problems, previous HRS involvement is logically more likely to exist for older children in that more time has presented more opportunity for contact with these agencies. Meeting this expectation, older children in this sample were found to statistically ( $p < .01$ ) more often report some previous involvement with an HRS agency (usually SES).

Younger children are more likely to have unmarried mothers, while the parents of older children tend to be separated or divorced. The oldest group (16 and over) in this sample did however, report parents' marital status to be married as often as separated or divorced. This relationship between child's age and the marital status of parents is statistically significant ( $p < .00$ ).

Though the majority (83.4%) of all other dependents are usually placed in foster homes composed of two foster parents, a very definite relationship ( $p < .00$ ) between the age of the child and the frequency with which he is placed in a two-parent home is established. Older children are more likely than younger children to be placed in foster homes containing only one foster parent, usually a foster mother. Several explanations may be hypothesized from this finding: since older children are more difficult to place, foster care in the form of one parent is more beneficial than no foster care;

in that older children require less home supervision, one parent foster homes improve their appropriateness for foster care in the case of older children; or because of less need for a "family environment" but still a need for care and supervision, the one parent foster home is actually more appropriate for the older child.

### Sex

About as many males as females comprise the entire Foster Care caseload. Though a greater proportion of runaways, ungovernables, and truants than other dependents appear to be male in Table 56, no statistically significant difference actually exists when sex is analyzed by referral type.

Table 56. Sex by Referral Type

Sex	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Male	62.5% (15)	48.5% (146)	49.5% (161)
Female	37.5% (9)	51.5% (155)	50.5% (164)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (301)	100.0% (325)

Information is missing in 3 cases.

Two significant relationships based on sex were established during further analysis. Males, significantly ( $p < .05$ ) more often than females report some clinical diagnosis such as emotional disturbance, mental retardation, physical handicaps, developmental disability, etc. No explanation for this finding became apparent during this study. On the other hand, a history of school problems was developed significantly ( $p < .05$ ) more often for females than males. These relationships, it is reminded, pertain only to other dependency referrals, not runaways, ungovernables, or truants for which statistical testing was prevented due to the small size of the sample.

#### Race

Over two-thirds (67.0%) of the children in Foster Care are white. When analyzed by referral type no statistically significant difference emerges between the two groups. Table 57 illustrates the racial composition found in Foster Care.

However, several major characteristics are found to be related to race. For one, evaluations such as psychological, medical, vocational, educational, and retardation tests were reportedly conducted for white referrals significantly ( $p < .01$ ) more often than for non-white referrals. Yet the presence of some clinical diagnosis of such problems as emotional disturbance, mental retardation, physical handicaps, developmental disability, etc., did not demonstrate any greater need for the testing of white children than for non-white children.

Table 57. Race by Referral Type

Race	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
White	79.2% (19)	66.0% (198)	67.0% (217)
Non-White	20.8% (5)	34.0% (102)	33.0% (107)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (300)	100.0% (324)

Information is missing in 4 cases.

Non-whites are significantly ( $p < .01$ ) more likely than whites to have households consisting of only one parent, usually the natural mother. Furthermore, almost half (48.0%) of the non-white children have unmarried mothers while the greatest proportion of white children have parents who are separated or divorced, resulting in a statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ) relationship between race and the marital status of the natural parents. In addition, non-white families report lower levels of earned income significantly ( $p < .05$ ) more often than white families.

Though the majority (83.5%) of all children in Foster Care are placed in two-parent foster homes, a significantly ( $p < .01$ ) greater percentage of non-whites (23.0%) than whites (6.0%) are placed in one-parent foster homes which usually consist of only a foster mother. Other significant ( $p < .01$ )

differences between the foster parents of white and non-white children suggest that white foster parents more often have higher levels of education, are younger, and earn greater incomes than black foster parents.

- Referral Characteristics

- Referral Source

Over half (58.3%) of all children in Foster Care were referred directly by an HRS agency, usually a Single Intake unit, YS, or SES. However, another fourth (25.2%) of the referrals are made directly by the family or friends of the family. The remaining 16.5% are brought to Foster Care by the schools, law enforcement or other sources such as the court or community agencies.

Table 58 presents the distribution of these referral sources by referral type. No statistically significant relationship emerges in this analysis. Again, comparisons between groups are limited in producing significant conclusions due to the small number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants found in this sample.

It is again necessary to qualify this characteristic. Since the exact entry data of the referral is unknown in many of the cases along with the condition of varying implementation of Single Intake dates, no control is possible to examine the referral source of those cases referred before Single Intake with those referred afterwards. In those cases

Table 58. Referral Source by Referral Type

Referral Source	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
HRS	65.3% (15)	57.8% (170)	58.3% (185)
Family/ Friend	13.0% (3)	26.2% (77)	25.2% (80)
School	0.0% (0)	1.4% (4)	1.3% (4)
Law	8.7% (2)	7.8% (23)	7.9% (25)
Other	13.0% (3)	6.8% (20)	7.3% (23)
Total	100.0% (23)	100.0% (294)	100.0% (317)

Information is missing in 11 cases.

referred before, other HRS or non-HRS agencies were the most probable sources of referral to SES. Because this seriously affects the validity of the above finding, no other relationship involving referral source will be considered.

#### School Circumstances

From the case files of the 328 Foster Care children, 234 were determined to be eligible for school enrollment. Of these, 220 or 94.0% are presently attending school. Table 59 presents this figure and a further breakdown by

referral type. As shown, a statistically significant relationship exists. Only 3.8% of all other dependents are not in school compared to a fourth (25.0%) of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants in the sample. Besides the greater probability of being a runaway, ungovernable, or truant, the child who is not presently attending school is more likely ( $p < .01$ ) to be older (even among the group of other dependents). As already stated, no other major characteristic was found to distinguish those children presently attending school from those who are not.

Table 59. Presently Attending School by Referral Type

Presently in School	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Yes	75.0% (18)	96.2% (202)	94.0% (220)
No	25.0% (6)	3.8% (8)	6.0% (14)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (210)	100.0% (234)

$\chi^2 = 13.63$ , 1d.f.,  $p < .01$

Information is missing in 3 cases.

Based again on the number of children eligible for school attendance, Table 60 points out that almost a third of these children are currently working below the grade level appropriate for their age. About half of the runaways,

ungovernables, and truants fall into this category compared to 29.8% of the other dependents. This distinction, however, does not test out to be statistically significant.

Table 60 . Working Below Appropriate Grade Level by Referral Type

Below Appropriate Grade Level	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Below	50.0% (10)	29.8% (57)	31.8% (67)
Not Below	50.0% (10)	70.2% (134)	68.2% (144)
Total	100.0% (20)	100.0% (191)	100.0% (211)

Information is missing in 26 cases.

Slightly more than a third (36.8%) of those children found eligible for school attendance indicate some previous school related problem such as truancy, suspension, expulsion, dropping out, failing a grade, or similar experiences. Upon further analysis indicated in Table 61, it is found that while one third (33.3%) of other dependent referrals report some school problem, two thirds (66.7%) of all runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals are in this category. Thus the relationship between history of school problems and referral type is statistically significant.

To reiterate, older children and females more often ( $p < .05$ ) indicate a history of one or more types of school

related problems.

Table 61. History of School Problems by Referral Type

School Problems	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	33.3% (8)	66.7% (140)	63.2% (148)
Problems	66.7% (16)	33.3% (70)	36.8% (86)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (210)	100.0% (234)

$\chi^2=8.91$ , 1d.f.,  $p<.01$

Information is missing in 3 cases.

#### Previous HRS Involvement

The present referral is not the first contact with an HRS agency for over two-thirds (70.5%) of the children in Foster Care revealed in Table 62. When analyzed by referral type 21 of the 24 (87.5%) runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals and 69.1% of all other dependents indicate some previous involvement with HRS. Though the runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals show a greater percentage in this group, no statistically significant difference is determined to exist between this group and the other dependents.

Table 62. Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type

Previous HRS Involvement	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
No HRS Involvement	12.5% (3)	30.9% (93)	29.5% (96)
Previous HRS Involvement	87.5% (21)	69.1% (208)	70.5% (229)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (301)	100.0% (325)

Information is missing for 3 cases.

Table 63 examines the type of HRS agency for those who have had previous involvement. In order to account for multiple agency referrals, this analysis considers number of involvements (n=253) rather than number of children (n=229). As shown, the majority of previous referrals have been those made to SES (88.1%). Comparing referral types, both groups report the largest number of previous referrals to be involvements with SES (73.1% and 89.9%). However, runaway, ungovernable and truancy referrals indicate a larger percentage (19.2%) referred to YS than other dependents (1.7%) which is expected in light of previous legislation. Both groups again vary only slightly on referrals to other HRS agencies such as the Office of Mental Health, Office of Mental Retardation and others.

Table 63. Type of Previous HRS Involvement by Referral Type

Type of Previous HRS Involvement	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
SES	73.1% (19)	89.9% (204)	88.1% (223)
YS	19.2% (5)	1.7% (4)	3.6% (9)
Other HRS	7.7% (2)	8.4% (19)	8.3% (21)
Total	100.0% (26)	100.0% (227)	100.0% *(253)

\*Due to multiple referrals, this table accounts for number of involvements rather than number of children.

Information is missing in 3 cases.

#### Evaluations and Diagnoses

Only a fifth (20.6%) of all cases in the Foster Care sample gave no mention of any previous evaluation such as psychological, medical, vocational, educational, or tests for retardation ever being conducted. Whether reports of such tests were omitted in these case files or in fact no evaluations were made is unknown. Table 64 reviews the relationship between evaluations and referral types. Though statistically speaking, no significant difference exists between the referral types in regards to evaluations conducted, all of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants in this sample report some evaluation result. For 12 of the 24 in this group more than one test was administered and another 7 of the 24 received at

least psychological exams. Of the other dependent referrals, 77.7% reported at least one evaluation with over half (55.6%) of these indicating more than one. The evaluation most often conducted for other dependents is medical related, not surprising in that abused children make up most of the category of other dependents.

Table 64 . Evaluations Received by Referral Type

Evaluations Received By Client	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	0.0% (0)	22.3% (67)	20.6% (67)
1 or more	100.0% (24)	77.7% (234)	79.4% (258)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (301)	100.0% (325)

Information is missing in 3 cases.

No clinical diagnosis for such conditions as emotional disturbance, mental retardation, physical handicaps, developmental disabilities and the like were known for 79.4% of all cases reviewed. As presented in Table 65, no statistically significant relationship emerges when clinically diagnosed referrals are analyzed by referral type.

Table 65. Clinically Diagnosed by Referral Type

Clinically Diagnosed	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	75.0% (18)	79.7% (240)	79.4% (258)
1 or more	25.0% (6)	20.3% (61)	20.6% (67)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (301)	100.0% (325)

Information is missing in 3 cases.

#### • Natural Family Characteristics

##### Natural Parent Status

About half (48.7%) of the children in Foster Care are from households with one natural parent only, usually the natural mother (44.7%). Table 66 indicates that in 30.5% of the cases, both natural parents were present at the time of referral. Though no statistically significant relationship exists between parental status and referral type runaway, ungovernable, and truant cases are more evenly distributed among parental status types than other dependents. Whereas half (50.0%) of the other dependents indicate one natural parent only, 33.3% of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants are in this category. On the other hand, only 13.3% of the other dependents report one natural parent/one step parent compared to 29.2% in the other group.

Table 66. Natural Parent Status by Referral Type

Natural Parent Status	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Both Natural Parents	29.2% (7)	30.6% (90)	30.5% (97)
1 Natural Parent & 1 Step Parent	29.2% (7)	13.3% (39)	14.5% (46)
1 Natural Parent Only	33.3% (8)	50.0% (147)	48.7% (155)
Relative/Other	8.3% (2)	6.1% (18)	6.3% (20)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (294)	100.0% (318)

Information is missing in 10 cases.

#### Natural Parent(s)' Marital Status

For the entire group, the greatest percentage (34.1%) of cases report parent(s)' marital status as divorced or separated followed by 27.9% married and 26.2% with mother unmarried. In comparing referral types, Table 67 shows that while both groups report divorced or separated as the predominant marital status, for other dependents this figure is 32.4% but for runaways, ungovernables, and truants over half (57.1%) of these parents comprise this category. On the other hand, other dependents have a greater tendency (27.8%) to come from homes where the natural mother is unmarried, or homes where one or both natural parents are dead or have deserted (12.3%) than

runaways, ungovernables, and truants for whom only one out of 21 fell into each of these statuses.

Table 67. Natural Parents Marital Status by Referral Type

Natural Parent(s) Marital Status	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Married	33.3% (7)	27.5% (78)	27.9% (85)
Divorced or Separated	57.1% (12)	32.4% (92)	34.1% (104)
Parent(s) Dead or Deserted	4.8% (1)	12.3% (35)	11.8% (36)
Mother Unmarried	4.8% (1)	27.8% (79)	26.2% (80)
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (284)	100.0% (305)

Information missing in 23 cases.

As previously stated, nonwhite children are more likely ( $p \leq .01$ ) than white children to have one parent households and to report having unmarried mothers. As another characteristic, younger children most often ( $p \leq .00$ ) have unmarried mothers.

#### Natural Parent(s)' Age

Mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to be older than mothers of other dependents to a statistically significant degree ( $p=.05$ ). The mean age for mothers of the first group is 38.0 years while mothers of other dependents

report a mean age of 33.3 years. Table 68 shows that 40.4% of the mothers of other dependents are 30 years or younger while only 5 of the 21 mothers (23.8%) of the other group are of this age.

In that runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to be older than other dependents, the above finding at first appears to be nothing more than stating the obvious. However, when further examined, the age of the parents is not determined to be significantly related to the age of the child neither for the entire group nor either of the referral types. Therefore, the conclusion that other dependents have younger parents still holds as a valid characteristical difference between the referral types.

Table 68. Natural Mother's Present Age by Referral Type

Natural Mother's Present Age	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
20 and under	0.0% (0)	8.6% (21)	7.9% (21)
21-25	0.0% (0)	15.5% (38)	14.3% (38)
26-30	23.8% (5)	16.3% (40)	16.9% (45)
31-40	33.3% (7)	38.8% (95)	38.3% (102)
41-50	42.9% (9)	15.1% (37)	17.3% (46)
51-60	0.0% (0)	3.7% (9)	3.4% (9)
over 60	0.0% (0)	2.0% (5)	1.9% (5)
Total	100.0% (21)	100.0% (245)	100.0% (266)

Information is missing in 62 cases.

Along with present age, mother's age at the time of the child's first placement with Foster Care is examined. Once again, a statistically significant difference ( $p=.05$ ) is found between the mean age of 36.9 for mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants and 29.8, the mean age for mothers of other dependents. Table 69 analyzes the distribution of mothers by referral type for various age groups. As shown, over half (57.7%) of all mothers in the sample were 30 or younger at the time of their child's first placement. For mothers of other dependents, 60.0% were in this age bracket while less than a third (7 out of 21) of the mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants were this young.

Table 69. Natural Mother's Age at First Placement by Referral Type

Natural Mother's Age at First Placement	Runaways, Ungovernables, Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
20 and under	0.0% (0)	18.4% (46)	16.9% (46)
21-25	18.2% (4)	18.4% (46)	18.4% (50)
26-30	13.6% (3)	23.2% (58)	22.4% (61)
31-40	31.8% (7)	27.2% (68)	27.6% (75)
41-50	31.8% (7)	8.8% (22)	10.7% (29)
51-60	4.6% (1)	1.6% (4)	1.8% (5)
over 60	0.0% (0)	2.4% (6)	2.2% (6)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (250)	100.0% (272)

Information is missing in 56 cases.

When comparing the mean age for fathers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants (43.1 years) to the mean age for fathers of other dependents (40.2 years), no significant difference results. Table 70 reports the ages of fathers in the sample for which information can be found (160 out of 328 cases). In that only 15 cases are applicable for runaways, ungovernables, and truants any further comparisons by age groups would be inappropriate and possibly misleading.

Table 70. Natural Father's Present Age by Referral Type

Natural Father's Present Age	Runaways, Ungovernables, Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
30 and under	0.0% (0)	16.6% (24)	15.0% (24)
31-35	20.0% (3)	21.4% (31)	21.2% (34)
36-40	20.0% (3)	17.9% (26)	18.1% (29)
41-50	53.3% (8)	26.9% (39)	29.4% (47)
51-60	0.0% (0)	13.1% (19)	11.9% (19)
over 60	6.7% (1)	4.1% (6)	4.4% (7)
Total	100.0% (15)	100.0% (145)	100.0% (160)

Information is missing in 168 cases.

### Parents' Educational Level

A greater percentage of mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants than mothers of other dependents have higher educational levels. In turning to Table 71, a statistically significant relationship emerges between mother's educational level and referral type ( $p < .05$ ). Only 20.9% of all mothers for whom information is available, have a high school degree or more. When analyzed by referral type, 53.3% (or 8 of the 15) mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants report at least having a high school degree compared to just 17.9% of the mothers of other dependents.

Table 71. Natural Mother's Education by Referral Type

Natural Mother's Education	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Grades 1-8	20.0% (3)	48.8% (79)	46.3% (82)
Grades 9-11	26.7% (4)	33.3% (54)	32.8% (58)
H.S. or Vocational Degree	46.6% (7)	15.4% (25)	18.1% (32)
Over HS Degree	6.7% (1)	2.5% (4)	2.8% (5)
Total	100.0% (15)	100.0% (162)	100.0% (177)

$\chi^2=10.90$ ; 3d.f.,  $p < .05$

Information is missing in 151 cases.

Information concerning father's educational level was available for less than a third of the cases (n=99). Due to this and the pattern of distribution of cases by referral type, no statistical examination for significance was conducted to either support or reject the existence of a relationship. Nevertheless, Table 72 appropriately summarized the data collected. Almost two-thirds (65.6%) of the sample have less than a high school education. For other dependents, this figure is 70% compared to 2 of the 9 fathers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants. Though more fathers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants than of other dependents in this sample report a high school degree or more, no conclusions about the educational level of fathers in relation to the type of referral for the Foster Care child can be supported by this study.

Table 72. Natural Father's Education by Referral Type

Natural Father's Education	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Grades 1-8	11.1% (1)	47.8% (43)	44.4% (44)
Grades 9-11	11.1% (1)	22.2% (20)	21.2% (21)
HS or Vocational Degree	66.7% (6)	25.6% (23)	29.3% (29)
Over HS	11.1% (1)	4.4% (4)	5.1% (5)
Total	100.0% (9)	100.0% (90)	100.0% (99)

Information is missing in 229 cases.

### Natural Family Income

Almost two-thirds (63.1%) of all families in this study for which income information was available report receiving no earned income (excludes income from such sources as support, family assistance benefits, state supplementary payments, payments received as annuity, pension retirement, disability benefit, and similar types). Largely accounting for this figure, as evidenced in Table 73, is the 66.2% of other dependent referrals. More specifically, families of runaways, ungovernables and truants generally have higher annual incomes as suggested by the mean income figure of about \$7200 compared to families of other dependents whose mean income is approximately \$2200 a year, a statistically significant difference ( $p=.05$ ). Furthermore, in relating various income levels to referral type, half of the runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals reported annual family incomes of over \$7000 compared to 11.1% of the families of other dependents.

In review of other major characteristics, white families significantly ( $p<.05$ ) more often than non-white families report higher levels of earned income.

Table 73. Natural Family Annual Income Level by Referral Type

Natural Family Income	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
No Earned Income	28.6% (4)	66.2% (102)	63.1% (106)
Less than \$5,000	14.3% (2)	10.4% (16)	10.7% (18)
\$5,000 - \$7,000	7.1% (1)	12.3% (19)	11.9% (20)
\$7,000 - \$10,000	21.4% (3)	7.2% (11)	8.3% (14)
over \$10,000	28.6% (4)	3.9% (6)	6.0% (10)
Total	100.0% (14)	100.0% (154)	100.0% (168)

Information is missing in 160 cases.

#### Number of Siblings

No significant difference in number of siblings exists between runaway, ungovernable, and truancy referrals and referrals for other dependency. Table 74 indicates this cross tabulation of number of siblings by referral type. As evidenced, for those referrals in both groups who report having brothers and sisters the majority fall in the one to two siblings category (45.9% and 38.4%).

The number of siblings was not determined to vary significantly among age groups nor between sex or race categories.

• Foster Family Characteristics

Foster Parent Composition

Foster Care placement includes one or two parent licensed foster homes along with licensing relative and/or friends of the natural family to receive children under foster care. As Table 75 illustrates, most (82.3%) foster homes consist of both a foster mother and a foster father. In 12.1% of the homes, only one foster parent, usually a foster mother (11.4%), maintains responsibility for the care of the child. The remaining 5.6% are categorized as other type placements. A statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) relationship emerges when the foster parent composition is analyzed by referral type. As noted in the table, runaways, ungovernables, and truants are less often than other dependents placed in homes with two foster parents and more often than other dependents placed in other type homes. Little difference in the percentage placed in one parent foster homes exists between groups.

Table 75. Foster Parent Composition by Referral Type

Foster Parent Composition	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Both Foster Parents	68.2% (15)	83.4% (237)	82.3% (252)
One Foster Parent	13.6% (3)	12.0% (34)	12.1% (37)
Other	18.2% (4)	4.6% (13)	5.6% (17)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (284)	100.0% (306)

$\chi^2 = 7.43$ , 2 d.f.,  $p < .05$

Information is missing in 22 cases.

Based on the above conclusion, it is not surprising to find that older children are more likely ( $p < .01$ ) than younger ones to be placed in one parent foster homes. However, this relationship exists for other dependents referred as well as runaways, ungovernables, and truants. Also, as previously shown, non-white children are significantly ( $p < .01$ ) more often than white children placed in one parent foster homes. The type of foster home placement is not affected by the sex of the child.

Foster Parent's Age

No statistically significant relationship between referral type and the following various age distributions emerges upon analysis by age groups. However, this cannot conclude that a significant difference does not exist. A more accurate interpretation, due in part to the small number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants in the sample, reasons that this study can neither support nor reject findings relating to age differences.

Nevertheless, certain observations are still appropriate to review. For instance, as shown in Tables 76 and 77, more than half (61.0%) of all foster mothers and 68.5% of all foster fathers were over 40 years old at the time of the child's placement in the foster home. The average age of foster mothers at placement is 44.3 years and for foster fathers 46.6 years. As stated, when analyzed by referral type, no statistical significance is established in either the examination of age categories or the test for a difference in mean ages for either foster mothers or foster fathers.

Table 76. Foster Mother's Age at Placement by Referral Type

Foster Mother's Age at Placement	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
21-25	6.7% (1)	2.0% (5)	2.2% (6)
26-30	13.3% (2)	9.3% (24)	9.6% (26)
31-40	26.7% (4)	27.3% (70)	27.2% (74)
41-50	33.3% (5)	31.9% (82)	32.0% (87)
51-60	20.0% (3)	19.8% (51)	19.8% (54)
over 60	0.0% (0)	9.7% (25)	9.2% (25)
Total	100.0% (15)	100.0% (257)	100.0% (272)

Information is missing in 56 cases.

Table 77. Foster Father's Age at Placement by Referral Type

Foster Father's Age at Placement	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Dependents	Groups
30 and under	21.4% (3)	8.8% (20)	9.5% (23)
31-35	14.3% (2)	10.1% (23)	10.4% (25)
36-40	14.3% (2)	11.5% (26)	11.6% (28)
41-50	14.3% (2)	32.1% (73)	31.2% (75)
51-60	21.4% (3)	25.6% (58)	25.3% (61)
over 60	14.3% (2)	11.9% (27)	12.0% (29)
Total	100.0% (14)	100.0% (227)	100.0% (241)

Information is missing in 87 cases.

Of the other major characteristics examined, only the race of the child was determined to significantly be related to the foster parents ages as non-white referrals tend to more often ( $p < .01$ ) be placed with older foster families.

### Foster Parent's Educational Level

Half (50.4%) of all foster mothers have at least a high school degree or more. As seen in Table 78, more mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants (10 of the 13) than mothers of other dependents (48.9%) report this level of education. However, no statistical significance is attached to this breakdown by referral type.

Table 78. Foster Mother's Education by Referral Type.

Foster Mother's Education	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Grades 1-8	7.7% (1)	22.8% (50)	22.0% (51)
Grades 9-11	15.4% (2)	28.3% (62)	27.6% (64)
HS or Vocational Degree	61.5% (8)	36.1% (79)	37.5% (87)
Over HS Degree	15.4% (2)	12.8% (28)	12.9% (30)
Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (219)	100.0% (232)

Information is missing in 96 cases.

Turning to the analysis of foster fathers' education in Table 79, over half (55.3%) indicate having a high school degree or more. Though only 2 fathers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants compared to 44.7% of fathers of other dependents have less than this, again no statistical significance can be established.

Table 79. Foster Father's Education by Referral Type

Foster Father's Education	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
Grades 1-8	0.0% (0)	22.3% (43)	20.9% (43)
Grades 9-11	15.4% (2)	24.3% (47)	23.8% (49)
HS or Vocational Degree	53.8% (7)	38.9% (75)	39.8% (82)
Over HS Degree	30.8% (4)	14.5% (28)	15.5% (32)
Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (193)	100.0% (206)

Information is missing in 122 cases.

White foster families significantly ( $p < .01$ ) more often than non-white, report higher levels of education. Race is the only major demographic characteristic which significantly relates to the educational level of foster families.

#### Foster Family Income

The mean annual income for foster families which reported earned income figures (excludes 8.3%) is \$10,300 and ranges from about \$1300 to \$41,000 per year. Table 80 presents this income distribution by referral type. Once again, the small sample size of runaways, ungovernables, and truants prevents appropriate statistical testing between referral types. Six of the 11 homes with runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals reported annual incomes of over \$10,000 compared to only a third (33.8%) of those with other dependents, but not enough information is presented to determine the significance of these percentages.

A statistically significant variation in annual earned income occurs only between the categories of race as white foster families report higher income levels significantly ( $p < .01$ ) more often than non-white foster families.

Table 80. Foster Family Annual Income by Referral Type

Foster Family Income	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
No Earned Income	0.0% (0)	8.8% (16)	8.3% (16)
Less than \$5,000	18.2% (2)	14.9% (27)	15.1% (29)
\$5,000 - \$7,000	9.1% (1)	11.6% (21)	11.5% (22)
\$7,000 - \$10,000	18.2% (2)	30.9% (56)	30.2% (58)
over \$10,000	54.5% (6)	33.8% (61)	34.9% (67)
Total	100.0% (11)	100.0% (181)	100.0% (192)

Information is missing in 136 cases.

#### Other Children in the Foster Home

Almost two-thirds (62.2%) of all foster homes in this sample already contained at least one child related to the foster parents at the time of the foster child's placement with that home. When analyzed by referral type as in Table 81, no statistically significant relationship emerges.

Table 81. Natural Children in Foster Family by Referral Type

Natural Children in Foster Family	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
0	44.4% (8)	37.3% (100)	37.8% (108)
1	16.7% (3)	22.0% (59)	21.7% (62)
2	22.2% (4)	19.8% (53)	19.9% (57)
3 or more	16.7% (3)	20.9% (56)	20.6% (59)
Total	100.0% (18)	100.0% (268)	100.0% (286)

Information is missing in 42 cases.

Likewise, most foster homes (87.0%) already have at least one other foster child present at the time of this placement. However, a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) does exist when the number of other foster children in the foster home is examined by referral type. Runaways, ungovernables, and truants more often than other dependents tend to be placed in homes with fewer other foster children. Table 82 presents this crosstabulation showing that while 4 of the 17 runaway, ungovernable, and truant referrals are the only foster child in the foster home, only 12.3% of the other dependents were placed in such homes. Furthermore, when

placed in homes with other foster children; runaways, ungovernables, and truants more often go to foster homes with only one or two other foster children as compared to other dependents for which over half (54.5%) are in homes with more than three other foster children.

Table 82. Other Foster Children in Foster Family by Referral Type

Other Foster Children in Foster Family	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
0	23.5% (4)	12.3% (33)	13.0% (37)
1-2	58.8% (10)	33.2% (89)	34.7% (99)
3-5	11.8% (2)	34.7% (93)	33.3% (95)
6 or more	5.9% (1)	19.8% (53)	19.0% (54)
Total	100.0% (17)	100.0% (268)	100.0% (285)

$\chi^2=8.72$ , 3d.f.,  $p<.05$

Information is missing in 43 cases.

● Natural Family Characteristics Versus  
Foster Family Characteristics

Parental Composition

The natural parent composition has no bearing on the type of foster family unit with which the child is placed. This is evidenced by the findings presented earlier in which less than half (45.0%) of all children in Foster Care come from two parent homes while 82.3% of all foster homes consist of both a foster mother and a foster father. Upon statistical examination, no significant relationship occurs between the type of natural parent composition and the type of foster parent composition.

The small number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants in the sample ruled out testing for statistical significance in all relationships concerning only this group. However, in this discussion of parental composition and all those on family characteristics which follow, statistical tests of significance were conducted for the group of other dependents as well as for the entire sample of foster children.

Age

Foster parents tend to be significantly older than the natural parents of foster children when the average ages are compared. More specifically, the mean age for foster mothers (46.9 years) is statistically different ( $p=.05$ ) from that of

natural mothers (33.7 years). Likewise, a statistically significant ( $p=.05$ ) difference is produced when comparing the mean ages for foster fathers (48.6 years) and natural fathers (40.4 years).

However, the ages of the natural parents do not determine the foster home in which the child is placed in terms of similar foster parent ages. In this case, no significant relationship emerges.

### Education

Foster parents more often than natural parents report higher educational levels. As previously noted, about half (50.4%) of all foster mothers have completed at least a high school degree compared to only 20.9% of natural mothers. Similarly, 55.3% of the foster fathers compared to 34.4% of all natural fathers are in this category.

Yet, again no statistically significant relationship exists between the educational level of a child's natural parents and that of the particular foster parents with whom the child is placed. The chances of a child being placed in a foster home where the foster parents have at least a high school education are about the same whether his natural parents possess that degree or not.

### Income

The average annual earned income of foster parents is approximately \$10,300 and is significantly higher than that

reported by natural parents (about \$7,000). As further evidence of income difference, only 8.3% of all foster families reported no earned income compared to almost two-thirds (61.3%) of the natural families.

Nevertheless, though foster parents in general report higher income levels than the group of natural parents, no significant relationship results between the income level of an individual child's natural parents and that of his foster parents. Once again, the particular home in which a child is placed does not appear to be determined by this or any previously analyzed characteristic of his natural family.

#### • Outcome Characteristics

##### Subsequent Referrals

As can be seen in Table 83, the particular distribution of subsequent occurrences by type prevented statistical testing with which to either support or reject the existence of a relationship. Nevertheless, certain trends can be noted.

In 86.7% of the cases reviewed, no documentation of referrals or charges subsequent to the referral which last opened or reopened this case was found. When considering specific referral types, this observation also holds for 90.0% of the other dependents. However, slightly less than half (11 out of 24) of the runaways, ungovernables, and truants indicated no subsequent occurrence. For those cases in which subsequent referrals were recorded, a runaway, ungovernable

or truancy charge was most often reported for other dependents (14 of the 30) followed by a referral for abuse or neglect (10 of the 30). For runaways, ungovernables, and truants, a second runaway, ungovernable, or truancy charge (6 of the 13) or some combination of referrals (6 of the 13) was most often indicated.

Table 83.. Subsequent Occurrences by Referral Type

Subsequent Occurrences	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
None	45.8% (11)	90.0% (271)	86.7% (282)
Runaway, Ungovernable, Truant	25.0% (6)	4.7% (14)	6.2% (20)
Delinquent	4.2% (1)	0.3% (1)	0.6% (2)
Abused/ Neglected	0.0% (0)	3.3% (10)	3.1% (10)
Multiple Referral	25.0% (6)	1.7% (5)	3.4% (11)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (301)	100.0% (325)

Information is missing in 3 cases.

Length of Stay

The average length of stay for all children in Foster Care is 44 months.\* This figure is based on the length of time since the referral which last opened or reopened the case. When analyzed by referral type, runaways, ungovernables, and truants report an average length of stay of 18 months while other dependent and referrals indicate 45 months. Though this difference is statistically significant, in light of recent legislation it is not substantially meaningful. Table 84 allows for a more detailed review. Almost a fourth (24.0%) of all children in Foster Care have been there for six months or less. Of the remaining cases, all distributed over various lengths of time, almost another fourth (23.7%) report involvement with Foster Care for five years or longer indicating very little to no leveling off of case load sizes over time. Furthermore, at least 6.0% of the referrals reported length of stay of longer than ten years with the greatest time spent in Foster Care amounting to 18 years. These periods, as expected, are all for other dependent referrals. The extent to which runaway, ungovernable, and truant children resemble other dependents in terms of length of stay can be determined only after Foster Care units have had similar amounts of time for comparison of the two.

---

\*In the majority of all case files, documentation of entry and exit dates for Foster Care service is typically inconsistent or totally missing. Through interviews with social workers and the piecing together of dates found on various forms and materials in the file, a rough approximation of length of stay was devised. Caution is urged in the use of this data beyond its acceptance as an outside estimation of time for which the child has been known to the Foster Care unit.

Table 84. Length of Stay in Foster Care by Referral Type

Length of Stay	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
1 Month or less	16.7% (4)	12.3% (37)	12.6% (41)
1 to 6 Months	12.5% (3)	11.3% (34)	11.4% (37)
6 Months to 1 Year	37.5% (9)	9.7% (29)	11.7% (38)
1 to 2 Years	16.7% (4)	14.6% (44)	14.8% (48)
2 to 3 Years	8.3% (2)	13.6% (41)	13.2% (43)
3 to 5 Years	0.0% (0)	13.6% (41)	12.6% (41)
5 to 7 Years	8.3% (2)	10.3% (31)	10.2% (33)
Over 7 Years	0.0% (0)	14.6% (44)	13.5% (44)
Total	100.0% (24)	100.0% (301)	100.0% (325)

$\chi^2=22.52$ , 7 d.f.,  $p<.01$

Information is missing in 3 cases.

### Number of Foster Homes

Over half (53.6%) of all children presently in Foster Care have been placed in only one foster home. Even though a greater percentage of runaways, ungovernables, and truants (30.4%) than other dependents (12.7%) are shown in Table 85. to have been in four or more homes, no statistically significant relationship emerges when the number of foster homes is analyzed by referral type. However, though no statistical

Table 85. Number of Foster Homes by Referral Type

Number of Foster Homes	Runaways Ungovernables Truants	Other Dependents	Both Groups
1	47.9% (11)	54.1% (158)	53.6% (169)
2	13.0% (3)	22.9% (67)	22.2% (70)
3	8.7% (2)	10.3% (30)	10.2% (32)
4 or more	30.4% (7)	12.7% (37)	14.0% (44)
Total	100.0% (23)	100.0% (292)	100.0% (315)

Information is missing in 13 cases.

significance is determined, special attention is deserved of this finding. As has already been demonstrated, runaways, ungovernables, and truants report a much shorter average length of stay than other dependents. Yet, according to the above, they already indicate as much if not more movement from foster home to foster home, perhaps suggesting greater difficulty in placing this type of referral.

#### Reasons for Removal From Foster Homes

As just shown, 46.4% of all children in Foster Care have been placed in more than one foster home. In an attempt to better understand this occurrence, counselors were asked to determine the reason for each departure from a foster home. The following categories of reasons or conditions responsible for leaving a home were derived from those responses:

- (1) foster family problems; includes such areas as health, marital status, employment changes, vacations, residential moves, etc. as they are initiated by the foster parents
- (2) foster child problems; behavior such as acting out, committing delinquent offenses, or some behavioral problem initiated by the foster child
- (3) unsuitable foster home; refers to such problems as overcrowding, lack of resources, lack of supervision, or conflicts in relationships with other members in the foster home
- (4) special setting; pertains to a need to relocate due to some special need of the foster child in such areas as physical health, mental health, etc.

(5) temporary placement; removal which was inevitable from the start due to foster home functioning solely as a temporary shelter or emergency care unit (6) return to the natural parents; (from placement other than emergency shelter). Admittedly, these reasons or conditions are subjective and overlapping and certainly not exhaustive. Yet, they represent the major focus of removal conditions for the majority of Foster Care cases.

Based on the total number of children which have been placed in more than one foster home (N=156), Table 86 presents the percentage of children in their respective groups for which the stated reason for removal applies to one or more terminations from a foster home. Foster family problems (37.8%) was the reason most often indicated with both foster child problems (28.2%) and return to natural parents (28.8%) following.

When analyzed by referral type, foster child problems (69.2%) most often arise for runaways, ungovernables, and truants whereas the removal of other dependent children is most often associated with foster family problems (40.6%). The difference between referral types for both of these conditions is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). This finding supports the claim made by social workers that runaway, ungovernables, and truants, in that they are older and more likely to present behavior management problems, are more difficult to place and maintain in Foster Care.

Table 1 Reasons for Removal from Foster Homes by Referral Type

	Foster Family Problems	Foster Child Problems	Unsuitable Foster Home	Special Setting	Temporary Placement	Return to Natural Parents
	*% Yes	% Yes	% Yes	% Yes	% Yes	% Yes
Runaways Ungovernables Truants (13)	7.7% (1)	69.2% (9)	30.8% (4)	23.1% (3)	15.4% (2)	30.8% (4)
Other Dependents (143)	40.6% (58)	24.5% (35)	15.4% (22)	5.6% (8)	15.4% (22)	28.7% (41)
Total Group (156)	37.8% (59)	28.2% (44)	16.7% (26)	7.1% (11)	15.4% (24)	28.8% (45)
** Significance	p<.05	p<.01	not sig.	not sig.	not sig.	not sig..

\*Percentage of the group which were removed one or more times for this reason.

\*\*The statistical significance of the difference between the group of runaways, ungovernables, and truants and the group of other dependents.

Information is missing for one case.

### Summary

To briefly summarize the findings of Chapter II, runaways, ungovernables, and truants have been found to have the greatest quantitative impact on the Protective Services unit of Social and Economic Services. Whereas 31.7% of the current Protective Services caseload is composed of former status offenders, this group makes up only 7.4% of the Foster Care caseload.

When compared to other dependents in Protective Services, runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to be significantly older and more often female. Other statistically significant differences between these two referral types indicate that runaways, ungovernables, and truants are more often not currently attending school, are working below the grade level appropriate for their age group, and have a history of school problems such as truancy, suspension, expulsion, dropping out, failing a grade, and similiar experiences. Though having no greater incidence of previous referrals than other dependents; runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to have those previous involvements with the Youth Services program rather than the Social and Economic Services. In light of previous legislation, this is not an unexpected finding. When documentation of subsequent referral-since-the-case-opened is available, it was found that runaways, ungovernables,

and truants most often are referred for a similiar status offense and other dependents return on subsequent abuse or neglect conditions. While no significant difference exists between groups concerning evaluations conducted or clinical diagnoses made, runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to receive psychological evaluations whereas other dependents most often receive medical evaluations. This is also not a surprising finding in that abuse and neglect are referral reasons given most often for other dependents. Parents of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are significantly older, better educated, and report higher incomes. Finally, runaways, ungovernables, and truants tend to remain in care for a shorter period of time than other dependents. Whether this is due to their older age, a more intact family, the recentness of the legislative transfer of care to this program, or a specific combination of factors is not clear. More time following the legislation is needed in order to evaluate such occurrences.

In Foster Care, the determination of similiar relationships was extremely limited due to the small number of cases of runaways, ungovernables, and truants. In that the presence of a statistically significant relationship surfaced only in instances where the differences between groups was large, it is appropriate to conclude not that no relationship exists but that this study can not accept or reject the existence of it based on the evidence presented. However, of the areas in which a statistically significant difference is felt

to occur, it is concluded that children referred to Foster Care as runaways, ungovernables, and truants are older than those referrals for other dependency reasons. As in the previous program, runaways, ungovernables, and truants more often were found to not be attending school and to have a history of school problems such as truancy, suspension, expulsion, dropping out, failing, and similiar circumstances. Mothers of runaways, ungovernables, and truants are generally older and better educated than mothers of other dependents. Families of runaways, ungovernables, and truants have higher incomes. Concerning foster care placement, runaways, ungovernables, and truants are less often placed in two-parent foster homes. Their older age and shorter lengths of stay are felt to interact with this finding. Also related, runaways, ungovernables, and truants are typically placed in foster homes having fewer other foster children present. Finally, a finding with potentially the greatest departmental policy implications, reveals that though the number of foster home placements for runaways, ungovernables, and truants can not be shown to be statistically different than that of other dependents, the reason for movement is significantly related to the referral type. Runaways, ungovernables, and truants are removed from foster placement most often due to some behavior problem or condition that they initiate. Other dependents typically are removed due to some problem originating with the foster family such as illness, death, divorce, loss of employment, change of residence or similiar circumstance.

## CHAPTER III

### SECOND-TIME UNGOVERNABILITY

#### Introduction

With the legislation revising Chapter 39 of the Florida Statutes, runaways, ungovernables, and truants were removed from the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system, as represented by the Office of Youth Services (YS), and placed in the Office of Social and Economic Services (SES), the state agent representing the child welfare system. Though for most of these children this reflected a redefinition of status offenders as dependent rather than delinquent youths as previously viewed, one major provision in the law prevented a total relabelling of all former status offenders. As prescribed by this legislative revision, "for the second and subsequent adjudications for ungovernability the child may be defined and treated as a delinquent child and all the provisions of this act relating to delinquency shall be applicable." <sup>1</sup>

By including this measure, the potential for delinquency processing and possibly delinquency institutionalization remains for not just ungovernable children or even status

---

<sup>1</sup>Florida Statutes, Chapter 39.01, Section 11.

offenders in general, but for all referrals to the state. In that an ungovernable child, as defined by law, is one who "persistently disobeys the reasonable and lawful demands of his parents or other legal custodians and is beyond their control,"<sup>1</sup> virtually any type of behavior qualifies a child. If in fact not easier, subsequent adjudications are no more difficult to obtain than initial ones, thus allowing for the penetration of any juvenile into the juvenile justice system.

### Methodology

In order to address the issue of second-time ungovernability in Florida as a device for processing, detaining, and committing non-delinquents to the juvenile justice system, dependency and delinquency referrals to Single Intake during the period of July through September 1977 were analyzed to determine first, the extent to which this clause is being invoked and second, for whom it is being applied.

Dependency and delinquency intake data is currently collected and compiled by the Office of Youth services with the form shown in Appendix D. This particular data collection device and system was implemented July 1977 thus setting the time frame for this analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> Florida Statutes, Chapter 39.01, Section 11.

## Section 1

### The Incidence of Second-Time Ungovernability

Based on an analysis of all dependency and delinquency referrals to Single Intake during the period of July through September 1977, slightly more than fourth (27.6%) receive some type of judicial decision. As Table 87 summarizes, most of those judicial decisions result in the adjudication of a delinquent (33.8%) or the withholding of any adjudication (32.3%). However, in 0.8% of the judicial decisions or approximately 0.2% of the overall referrals, the legal consequence is the adjudication of an ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent. Projected over a year, this proportion estimates that roughly 300 children out of about 148,000 dependency and delinquency referrals will comprise the group commonly referred to as the second-time ungovernables.

Relatively speaking, this figure suggests that the use of the second-time ungovernability clause is not being invoked to the extent that former opponents feared. However, further analysis of the circumstance surrounding that use does cause concern for a different aspect. Of those youths adjudicated ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent, over a third (37.5%) are reported to have no prior referrals. In addition,

Table 87. Judicial Decisions for Referrals to Intake

JUDICIAL DECISION	PERCENT
1. Adjudicated Delinquent	33.8 %
2. Adjudicated Dependent	6.0 %
3. Adjudicated Ungovernable (defined delinquent)	0.8 %
4. Adjudicated Ungovernable (defined dependent)	2.7 %
5. Adjudication Withheld	32.3 %
6. Violation Probation	0.4 %
7. Violation Protective Supervision	0.1 %
8. Loss of Jurisdiction	2.5 %
9. Judicial Consent	1.5 %
10. Interstate Compact	0.2 %
11. Not Guilty	2.8 %
12. Nolle Prosequi	7.5 %
13. Other	9.4 %
TOTAL	100.0 %

\* Due to the implementation of a new information collection form, these percentages are based on the return of 63.0% of the actual referrals to intake during July through September, 1977. However, no known bias is believed to significantly alter the representativeness of these proportions. District VI, Hillsborough and Manatee Counties are omitted in this Table due to technical problems with the data collection.

another 18.8% reported that all previous referrals were handled non-judicially and thus had no corresponding adjudication. In that this does not follow the provisions of the 1975 legislation, two explanations have been offered. One, this adjudication is technically a violation of the provisions of the legislation, or second, two petitions for ungovernability are being applied to the same referral thus getting around the "technical" restraints of the law. In either event, certainly the intent of the legislation is being violated in over half (56.3%) of the adjudicated second-time ungovernable cases.

The inappropriate use of the second-time ungovernability clause is documented in a second and perhaps even more basic area, referral reason. Table 88 reports the frequency with which each primary referral reason occurs. Though the most frequently reported, ungovernability is the primary referral reason for only slightly more than a third (38.8%) of the adjudicated ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent cases. Even when the secondary reason for referral is considered, only 55.1% at most report ungovernability as a reason for referral. Continuing, almost a fourth (22.4%) of all adjudicated second-time ungovernables are referred primarily for delinquency reasons, ranging from trespassing and traffic delinquency to grand larceny and burglary. A relatively large percentage (22.4%) of local runaways also are adjudicated ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent. The remaining 16.3% report truancy or some other dependency category such as emotional abuse or neglect by lack of supervision as the primary reason for referral.

Table 88. Primary Reason for Referral for Adjudicated  
Ungovernable-Defined-As-Delinquents

PRIMARY REFERRAL REASON	%	N
1. Burglary	2.0	1
2. Grand Larceny	2.0	1
3. Receiving Stolen Property	2.0	1
4. Narcotic Drug Laws	2.0	1
5. Other Felony	2.0	1
6. Petty Larceny	4.1	2
7. -Vandalism	4.1	2
8. Traffic - Delinquency	2.0	1
9. Trespassing	2.0	1
10. Emotional Abuse	4.1	2
11. Unattended	6.1	3
12. Local Runaway	22.4	11
13. Ungovernable	38.8	19
14. Truancy	6.1	3
TOTAL	100.0	49

\* Due to the implementation of a new information collection form, these percentages are based on the return of 63.0% of the actual referrals to intake during July through September, 1977. However, no known bias is believed to significantly alter the representativeness of these proportions. District VI, Hillsborough and Manatee Counties, accounts for one adjudicated-ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent which is not included in this total.

In other words, the ungovernable referral accounts for only about half of the number of adjudicated second-time ungovernability cases. Essentially any type of referral may potentially receive a second-time ungovernability adjudication.

Explanations for this occurrence vary. Ungovernability, in that it is vague and non-specific behavior, requires little to no evidence and thus is often easier and quicker to demonstrate than a delinquency charge. In many areas, no facilities or shelters are available to hold a runaway defined as a dependent but do exist to detain a delinquent or second-time ungovernable defined as a delinquent. And finally, in at least one area, the problems of a too small, overworked SES staff resulting in inadequate supervision and counseling, or no SES programs for educational or vocational needs, have been presented as justification for this practice.

## Section 2

### Characteristics of the Second-Time Ungovernable

In order to gain some understanding of the adjudicated ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent, characteristics in such areas as basic demographic variables, the referral situation, placement details, and outcome-related events have been examined.

Ranging from one to 17, the average age of this group is 14 years with only 2.2% less than 11 years old. Whereas status offenders (runaways, ungovernables, and truants) in general are more likely to be female, this group of ungovernables has as many males as females. It is felt that the addition of delinquency referrals accounts in part for the increase in the proportion of males. An alternative explanation reminds that this level of analysis occurs at the adjudicated rather than the referral stage of the juvenile justice system where differential treatment based on sex is thought to occur. Again similar to the general group of status offenders, the majority (69.4%) of second-time ungovernables are white referrals.

Characteristic of the referral, more than half (55.1%) of these adjudications are made on cases new to Health and Rehabilitative Services (HRS). As the major source of referral,

law enforcement accounts for 51.0% followed by parents who refer 26.5%. Various sources including neighbors, school, court and other non-institutional HRS programs are responsible for referring the remaining cases.

At the time of referral, placement was requested for 57.1% but was initiated for only 44.9% of these cases with the majority (34.7%) held in YS detention and all others (10.2%) placed in shelter care. For those cases in which placement is requested, law enforcement most often (57.1%) is the source. The court requests placement in 17.9% of the cases and parents in another 10.7%. Major reasons for placement are to secure the presence of the youth at the hearing and to provide supervision or care not available in any other setting. Though no figures are available for length of stay in detention, shelter care ranges from one to 35 days with the greatest proportion of cases staying only one day.

As stated, slightly less than half of these cases were held before disposition. For those cases not held or released prior to disposition, 80.0% or more did not commit any subsequent offense nor runaway during this period. No one failed to show for subsequent court appearance.

In keeping with the legislation, 51.0% are placed on probation and 28.5% are referred to SES, both appropriate dispositions for adjudicated ungovernable-defined-as-delinquents. However, 6.1% of the cases were committed to YS,

a disposition which, though legally appropriate, is nevertheless questionable as a responsible decision for a referral based on vague behavior called ungovernability.

#### Summary

This review concludes that the legislative provision for handling second-time ungovernability in Florida is not being used to any great extent; certainly not to the extent feared by opponents of this measure. Nevertheless, when it is used, it is inappropriately applied in half of the cases.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

In the spring of 1975, the Florida Legislature eliminated the category of Children in Need of Supervision (CINS) from the statutes. This action was taken in order to remove children who run away from home, become truant or ungovernable from the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system, in terms of processing through the Office of Youth Services (YS), as delinquents and place them in the Office of Social and Economic Services (SES) as dependent children.

According to the revised legislation, a dependent child is further defined to include a child who:

- "(h) Has persistently run away from his parents or legal guardian.
- (i) Being subject to compulsory school attendance, is habitually truant from school."<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, an ungovernable child means a child who:

"persistently disobeys the reasonable and lawful demands of his parents or other legal custodians and is beyond their control. For the purposes of this act, the first time a child is adjudicated as ungovernable, he may be defined and treated as a dependent child, and all of the provisions of this act relating to dependency shall be applicable. For the second and subsequent adjudications for ungovernability, the child may be defined and treated as a delinquent child, and all the provisions of this act relating to delinquency shall be applicable."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Florida Statutes, Chapter 39.01, Section 15(11).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

Several states are in the process of deinstitutionalizing status offenders (children committing the offenses of running away, truancy, and ungovernability) or separating them from delinquents. To our knowledge, however, only California and Florida have taken the approach of simply removing runaways, truants, and ungovernables virtually in toto from the services of the juvenile justice system, by essentially decriminalizing status offenses.

The primary factor which contributed to the passage of the legislative change was the attitude on the part of most of the supporters of the legislation that status offenders could not be handled appropriately as law violators. According to this perspective, it was not reasonable to expect a system designed to process delinquents to respond effectively to the needs of children who run away, become truant or ungovernable. It was assumed by this legislation that intake procedures and programs that focus on the problems of families, such as those found in the child welfare system, rather than the rehabilitation of delinquent individuals would be more appropriate for children who had not actually committed a criminal offense. This assumption supported the effort to move responsibility for handling runaway, truant, and ungovernable cases from the Office of Youth Services into the Office of Social and Economic Services.

This report assesses the impact of the removal of runaways, ungovernables, and truants from the juvenile justice

system in Florida, two years after the implementation of the legislation. Impact is analyzed from two major perspectives: impact on state service systems, pertaining to both the juvenile justice system and the child welfare system, and impact on the status offender in terms of characteristics of referral and processing.

#### Impact on the Juvenile Justice System

Considering first the juvenile justice system, the more specific question arises: to what extent have runaways, ungovernables, and truants been removed from the authority of Youth Services.

Based on a sample of cases from the 1975 YS Intake records and from the 1977 Single Intake files, the number of runaways, ungovernables, and truants held in secure detention has experienced an 82% decrease, from 22.5% of all children held in detention in 1975 to 4.0% in 1977. During 18 months prior to July, 1975, 24.4% (4,603) of the additions to YS probation and 9.9% (639) of the commitments to YS programs were for runaway, ungovernable, and truancy charges. These figures dropped to 0.9% (171) for YS probation additions and 3.8% (210) for commitments to YS programs during the 18 months following July, 1975. All dispositions to YS based on these charges after the legislation (post July, 1975) are reported by YS as being twice adjudicated ungovernable cases which, in accordance with the legislation, may be processed as delinquents.

Critics of the legislation have claimed that the shift in responsibility was only partially completed because the legislation still allows status offenders to be handled as delinquents if they are adjudicated for a second time on an ungovernability charge. Based on an analysis of all dependency and delinquency referrals to Single Intake during the period of July through September, 1977, 0.2% were reported to have been adjudicated ungovernable - defined - as - delinquent. Projected over a year, this proportion suggests that roughly 300 children out of about 148,000 referrals will be adjudicated in this fashion. However, as further analysis reveals, only about half of these cases reflect a legitimate use of this statute.

Of those youths adjudicated ungovernable - defined - as - delinquent, over a third (37.5%) are reported to have no prior referrals. In addition, another 18.8% reported that all previous referrals were handled non-judicially and thus had no corresponding adjudication. In that this does not follow the provisions of the 1975 legislation, two explanations occur. One, this adjudication is technically a violation of the provisions of the legislation, or second, two petitions for ungovernability are being applied to the same referral thus getting around the "technical" restraints of the law. In either event, certainly the intent of the legislation is being violated in over half (56.3%) of the adjudicated second-time ungovernable cases.

The inappropriate use of the second-time ungovernability clause is documented in a second and perhaps even more basic area, referral reason. Though the most frequently reported, ungovernability is the primary referral reason for only slightly more than a third (38.8%) of the adjudicated-ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent cases. Even when the secondary reason for referral is considered, only 55.1% at most report ungovernability as a reason for referral. Almost a fourth (22.4%) of all adjudicated second-time ungovernables are referred primarily for delinquency reasons, ranging from trespassing and traffic delinquency to grand larceny and burglary. A relatively large percentage (22.4%) of local runaways also are adjudicated ungovernable-defined-as-delinquent. The remaining 16.3% report truancy or some other dependency category, such as emotional abuse or neglect by lack of supervision, as the primary reason for referral. In short, the ungovernable referral accounts for only about half of the number of adjudicated second-time ungovernability cases. Essentially any type of referral may potentially receive a second-time ungovernability adjudication.

Explanations of these data vary. Ungovernability, in that it is vague and non-specific behavior, requires little to no evidence and thus is often easier and quicker to demonstrate than a delinquency charge. In many areas, no facilities or shelters are available to hold a runaway defined as a dependent but do exist to detain a delinquent or second-time ungovernable defined as a delinquent. In at least one area,

staff shortages which result in inadequate supervision and counseling, or no SES programs for educational or vocational needs, has been presented as justification for this practice.

As a final note to the discussion of impact on the juvenile justice system, it should be noted that the delinquency populations for detention, probation, and commitment in Youth Services have not declined since July 1975, the enactment date for the CINS decriminalization legislation. This finding is surprising, in that some decline in these populations was expected to occur as a result of the removal of runaways, ungovernables, and truants, and the fact that non-CINS type delinquency referrals remained steady through 1976.

#### Impact on the Child Welfare System

The nature of the data collected in this study limits the evaluation of the impact of this legislation to a discussion of "quantitative" rather than "qualitative" effects of the legislation. With this in mind, the 1975 CINS decriminalization legislation was determined, by this study, to have had a rather moderate quantitative impact on SES programs. From the analysis of over 600 randomly selected case files from both Protective Services and Foster Care units, runaways, ungovernables, and truants were found to constitute little more than 7% of the Foster Care caseload which is reported by SES to total over 8,000 children. In the case of the Protective Services caseload, the impact has been more

substantial. Status offenders constitute about 32% of the total Protective Services caseload.

In several areas, interesting relationships emerged which may suggest an impact not yet realized. For example, over half (53.6%) of all children presently in Foster Care have been placed in only one foster home. Even though a greater percentage of runaways, ungovernables, and truants (30.4%) than other dependents (12.7%) are reported to have been in 4 or more homes, no statistically significant relationship emerges when the number of foster homes is analyzed by referral type. Nevertheless, this finding is interesting, particularly in light of the finding that status offenders average only 1 year and 6 months in foster care while the other dependency children stay an average of 3 years and 9 months.

This finding raises the question of "Why does a child leave a foster home?" Are there any differences in the reasons for leaving between referrals for runaways, ungovernables, and traunts and referrals for other dependency types? To answer these questions, all cases in which a child has been placed in more than one foster home were examined for some indication of reason for movement. These reasons or conditions leading to the removal are collapsed into the following categories:

- (1) foster family problems; includes such areas as health, marital status, employment changes, vacations, residential moves, etc. as they are initiated by the foster parents;
- (2) foster child problems, behavior such as acting out, committing delinquent offenses, or some behavioral problem initiated by the foster child;
- (3) unsuitable foster home; refers to such problems as overcrowding, lack of resources, lack of supervision, or conflicts in relationships with other members in the foster home;
- (4) special setting; pertains to a need to relocate due to some special need of the foster child in such areas as physical health, mental health, etc.
- (5) temporary placement; removal which was inevitable from the start due to the foster home functioning solely as a temporary shelter or emergency care unit;
- (6) return to the natural parents; (from placement other than emergency shelter).

Based on the total number of children which have been placed in more than one foster home (N=156), foster family problems (37.8%) was the reason most often indicated with foster child problems (28.2%) and return to natural parents (28.8%) following.

When analyzed by referral type, foster child problems (69.2%) most often arise for runaways, ungovernables, and truants whereas the removal of other dependent children is most often associated with foster family problems (40.6%). The difference between referral types for both of these conditions is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). This finding supports the claim made by social workers that runaways, ungovernables, and truants, in that they are older and more likely to present behavior management problems, are more difficult to place and maintain in Foster Care.

Impact on the Status Offender

It is estimated that approximately 28,000 runaway, ungovernable and truant referrals will be made to Single Intake during the Fiscal Year 1976-77. Over 38,000 such referrals were made to YS prior to the enactment of the legislation of July 1, 1975. In accounting for this drop of 10,000 cases, there is no reason to believe that these children are being handled as delinquents for, as noted above, the number of non-CINS type delinquency referrals from 1975-76 remained steady.

However, information on the processing of runaways, ungovernables and truants is available for those cases which do come to the attention of the state. Of the 1,158 cases for which dispositions or recommended dispositions were recorded, slightly more than one half (53.3%) were either filed for "information only" or closed at intake after counseling. Nearly a third of all cases (30.8%) received other non-judicial dispositions with the remaining 15.9% requiring judicial action, most of which were court orders to SES.

For cases which enter Foster Care and Protective Services, the SES case file analysis provides additional information. In Protective Services, the overall average length of stay (ALS) is 15 months. When analyzed by referral type, it is found that the ALS for runaways, ungovernables, and truants is 8 months while for other dependents it is 18 months. In Foster Care, the ALS is 3 years and 8 months for the group as a whole. Status offenders report 1 year and 6

months and other dependents indicate 3 years and 9 months as the average length of stay. In that status offenders enter Foster Care and Protective Services at an older age than other dependents, a shorter average length of stay is not surprising.

### Summary

Insofar as the main purpose of the 1975 CINS decriminalization legislation was to remove runaway, truant, and ungovernable children from the juvenile justice system and serve them through the child welfare system, the intent of the legislation has in large measure been achieved. It seems that the vast majority of the children who were formerly committed to juvenile corrections programs or placed on juvenile probation are now placed in foster care homes or served through the Protective Services program in Social and Economic Services. The quantitative impact of the legislation on the child welfare system is thought to be moderate. This report of numbers, however, cannot address fully the nature and scope of difficulties created by placing runaways, ungovernables, and truants in Foster Care and Protective Services.

Furthermore, whether or not these changes have resulted in an improvement of services to the children is still a matter of debate. Many supporters of the legislation have taken the position that insofar as children who have not committed delinquent acts are now handled outside the juvenile justice system and, therefore, avoid the presumably deleterious

effects of being unjustly labelled delinquent and committed to delinquency treatment programs, progress has been made and justice served. If, on the other hand, improved service is defined by such measures as increased counselor involvement, more appropriate counseling, program placement, and practices more compatible with protective rather than punitive purposes, then the issue remains unresolved and more extensive evaluative research is needed.

Finally, the fact that the delinquency populations for detention, probation and commitment to Youth Services have not declined since July 1975, when the legislation removed status offenders from the juvenile justice system, has significant policy implications. Some decline in these populations was expected to occur as a result of the removal of runaways, ungovernables, and truants and the fact that non-CINS type delinquency referrals remained steady through 1976. It appears that as status offenders were removed from the juvenile justice system, decisions were made to divert fewer delinquency referrals and to detain and commit more. If this is true, it would be a very unfortunate consequence of the legislation given the departmental policy emphasis on limiting unnecessary penetration of the juvenile justice system to a minimum.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

Tracking Form For Runaways,  
Truants, and Ungovernables

# TRACKING FORM FOR RUNAWAYS, TRUANTS, AND UNCOVERABLES

BEFORE COMPLETING, PLEASE READ INSTRUCTIONS ON BACK.

A. CHILD'S NAME

B. DATE OF REFERRAL

MONTH	DAY
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

C. AGE AT TIME OF REFERRAL

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------

D. SEX 1=MALE

2=FEMALE

☐

E. RACE 1=WHITE

2=NON-WHITE

☐

F. COUNTY CODE (SEE BACK OF FORM)

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------

G. SPECIFY BEHAVIOR(S) LEADING TO REFERRAL. (PRINT)

H. REFERRAL CLASSIFICATION

- 1 = OUT-OF-STATE RUNAWAY
- 2 = OUT-OF-COUNTY RUNAWAY
- 3 = LOCAL RUNAWAY
- 4 = TRUANCY
- 5 = FIRST TIME UNCOVERABLE
- 6 = SECOND TIME UNCOVERABLE
- 7 = UNCOVERABLE + RUNAWAY
- 8 = UNCOVERABLE + TRUANCY
- 9 = UNCOVERABLE + RUNAWAY + TRUANCY
- 0 = RUNAWAY + TRUANCY

I. REFERRAL SOURCE

- 1 = LAW ENFORCEMENT
- 2 = FAMILY
- 3 = SCHOOL
- 4 = YS COUNSELOR
- 5 = SES COUNSELOR

J. INITIAL HOLDING

- 1 = SECURE SHELTER CARE
- 2 = NON-SECURE SHELTER CARE
- 3 = VOLUNTARY CRISIS HOME
- 4 = SECURE DETENTION
- 5 = NON-SECURE DETENTION
- 6 = LOCAL COMMUNITY RUNAWAY SHELTER (SPECIFY)
- 7 = OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 8 = NOT HELD

K. INITIAL HOLDING FACILITY TYPE

- 1 = HRS FUNDED BUT NOT HRS OPERATED
- 2 = HRS FUNDED AND HRS OPERATED
- 3 = CITY OR COUNTY FUNDED
- 4 = PRIVATE FUNDED
- 5 = OTHER
- 6 = CLIENT NOT HELD

L. DISPOSITIONS

NON-JUDICIAL

- 01 = INTAKE DETERMINES INSUFFICIENT COMPLAINT
- 02 = FILED FOR INFORMATION ONLY
- 03 = DISMISSED BY STATE ATTORNEY
- 04 = CLOSED BY INTAKE AFTER INITIAL COUNSELING
- 05 = CLOSED BY INTAKE AFTER ADDITIONAL COUNSELING
- 06 = FOSTER CARE - VOLUNTARY PLACEMENT
- 07 = PROTECTIVE SERVICES - VOLUNTARY SUPERVISION
- 08 = YS - CONSENT SUPERVISION
- 09 = REFERRED TO OTHER HRS AGENCY (SPECIFY)
- 10 = REFERRED TO OTHER NON-HRS AGENCY (SPECIFY)
- 11 = RETURN RUNAWAY
- 12 = OTHER (SPECIFY)

JUDICIAL

- 13 = FOSTER CARE - COURT ORDERED
- 14 = PROTECTIVE SERVICES - COURT ORDERED
- 15 = RELATIVE OR OTHER LICENSED PLACEMENT
- 16 = YS - RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY BASED FACILITY
- 17 = YS - RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONAL FACILITY
- 18 = YS - NON-RESIDENTIAL FACILITY
- 19 = YS - PROBATION
- 20 = HRS AGENCY/INDIVIDUAL FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
- 21 = NON-HRS AGENCY/INDIVIDUAL FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
- 22 = HRS AGENCY/INDIVIDUAL FOR MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES
- 23 = NON-HRS AGENCY/INDIVIDUAL FOR MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES
- 24 = OTHER HRS AGENCY (SPECIFY)
- 25 = OTHER NON-HRS AGENCY (SPECIFY)
- 26 = RETURN RUNAWAY
- 27 = JUDICIAL DISMISSAL OR ACQUITTAL
- 28 = OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 99 = DISPOSITION INCOMPLETE

M. DISPOSITION RECOMMENDED (FOR THOSE CASES NOT DISPOSED OF BEFORE JUNE 5)

USE CODES IN ITEM K, EXCEPT FOR 99.

N. CASE PROGRESS OF REFERRAL

NUMBER OF DAYS

1. FROM COMPLAINT FILED TO INTAKE PETITION DECISION/RECOMMENDATION

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

2. FROM COMPLAINT FILED TO DISPOSITION

O. NUMBER OF PREVIOUS REFERRALS BY CLASSIFICATION

1. RUNAWAY

2. TRUANCY

3. UNCOVERABLE

4. ABUSED/NEGLECTED

5. DELINQUENCY

<input type="text"/>	NUMBER
<input type="text"/>	
<input type="text"/>	
<input type="text"/>	
<input type="text"/>	

P. NUMBER OF PREVIOUS DISPOSITIONS

- 1. FOSTER CARE - VOLUNTARY PLACEMENT
- 2. FOSTER CARE - COURT ORDERED PLACEMENT
- 3. PROTECTIVE SERVICES - VOLUNTARY SUPERVISION
- 4. PROTECTIVE SERVICES - COURT-ORDERED SUPERVISION
- 5. YS - CONSENT SUPERVISION
- 6. YS - RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITY
- 7. YS - RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONAL FACILITY
- 8. YS - NON-RESIDENTIAL FACILITY
- 9. YS - PROBATION
- 10. OTHER INFORMAL DISPOSITION (SPECIFY)
- 11. OTHER FORMAL DISPOSITION (SPECIFY)

NUMBER

<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>

Q. HRS STATUS AT TIME OF REFERRAL

- 00 = NO STATUS/STATUS NOT KNOWN
- 01 = FOSTER CARE - VOLUNTARY PLACEMENT
- 02 = FOSTER CARE - COURT-ORDERED PLACEMENT
- 03 = PROTECTIVE SERVICES - VOLUNTARY SUPERVISION
- 04 = PROTECTIVE SERVICES - COURT ORDERED SUPERVISION
- 05 = YS - CONSENT SUPERVISION
- 06 = YS - RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY BASED FACILITY
- 07 = YS - RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONAL FACILITY
- 08 = YS - NON-RESIDENTIAL FACILITY
- 09 = YS - PROBATION
- 10 = YS - AFTERCARE
- 11 = OTHER (SPECIFY)

R. CLINICALLY DIAGNOSED (1 = YES; 2 = NO)

- 1. EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED
- 2. MENTALLY RETARDED
- 3. PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED
- 4. DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED (E.G., EPILEPSY, DYSLEXIA, ETC.)
- 5. OTHER (SPECIFY)

S. ADJUDICATION

- 0 = NOT APPLICABLE (NON-JUDICIAL DISPOSITION)
- 1 = UNCOVERABLE (FIRST ADJUDICATION)
- 2 = UNCOVERABLE (SUBSEQUENT ADJUDICATION)
- 3 = DEPENDENT
- 4 = OTHER (SPECIFY)
- 5 = ADJUDICATION WITHHELD
- 9 = DISPOSITION INCOMPLETE AND NO ADJUDICATION BEFORE JUNE 5

PRINT COUNSELOR'S NAME

PHONE NO.

APPENDIX B.

The Protective Services Questionnaire

CHILD'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_  
SOCIAL WORKER'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
PHONE \_\_\_\_\_

3

## PROTECTIVE SERVICES

## 1. County Code:

03 = Bay  
06 = Broward  
16 = Duval  
29 = Hillsborough  
53 = Polk

## 2. Age:

99 = Don't Know

-Present Age

-Age at time of referral which last opened or reopened case

-Age at time of first referral to Protective Services

## 3. Race:

1 = White  
2 = Non-White

## 4. Sex:

1 = Male  
2 = Female

## 5. History of School Problems:

- Truancy

- Suspension

- Expulsion

- Dropped-Out

- Failed grade(s)

- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

1 = Yes

9 = Not Mentioned

☐

6. Is child below the appropriate grade level for his age group?

1 = Yes

2 = No

9 = Don't Know/Not applicable

☐

7. Is this child presently in school?

1 = Yes

2 = No

9 = Don't Know/Not Applicable

☐

If no, why not?

---

---

---

☐

8. Referral status which last opened or reopened case:

0 = Delinquent charge - adjudicated dependent

1 = Runaway

2 = Ungovernable

3 = Truant

4 = Multiple Status Offense

5 = Abused/Neglected

6 = Other Dependent

7 = Status Offense plus Dependency

8 = Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

9 = Don't Know

☐

9. Describe circumstances associated with referral (problem or behavior of family or child):

---

---

---

---

☐ ☐ 10. Who referred child directly to Protective Services?

- 01 = Single Intake
- 02 = Family/Self
- 03 = Neighbor/Friend
- 04 = Foster Care
- 05 = Protective Services
- 06 = Youth Services
- 07 = School
- 08 = Law Enforcement
- 09 = Community Agency
- 10 = Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 99 = Don't Know

☐ 11. Is this referral to Protective Services:

- 1 = Court Ordered Supervision
- 2 = Voluntary Supervision
- 9 = Don't Know

12. History of State Involvement:

- 1 = Yes
- 9 = Not Mentioned

Previous      Current

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Arrested or Picked-Up by Law Enforcement for Violation
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Detention
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Emergency Shelter Care
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- YS - Consent Supervision
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- YS - Residential Community Based Facility
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- YS - Residential Institutional Facility
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- YS - Non-Residential Facility
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- YS - Probation
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Foster Care
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Protective Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Mental Health Program
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Mental Retardation
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Other HRS (specify _____)

☐

13. What happened to child at termination of case with Protective Services?

- 1 = No further action necessary
- 2 = Referred to Foster Care
- 3 = Referred to Protective Services
- 4 = Referred to Youth Services
- 5 = Referred to Other HRS Agency  
(specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 6 = Referred to Non-HRS Agency  
(specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 7 = Client terminates service (age limit, moves, voluntarily terminates)  
(specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8 = Not Applicable - case still open
- 9 = Don't Know

☐ ☐

14. Reason for above termination decision:

---



---



---

9	9	9	9	9
9	9	9	9	9
9	9	9	9	9
9	9	9		

15 - 17. Not applicable.

☐ ☐ ☐

18. Case Number

CARD NUMBER

PROTECTIVE SERVICES

## 19. Case Progress (year/month/day)

(If unknown or not applicable, leave blank)

YEAR	MONTH		DAY	

- Date Referred to Single Intake \_\_\_\_\_
- Date of Disposition at Intake \_\_\_\_\_
- Date Received by Protective Services \_\_\_\_\_
- Date of Social Worker's Initial Contact with Client \_\_\_\_\_
- Date Case Plan Developed \_\_\_\_\_
- BLANK
- Date Case Terminated with Protective Services \_\_\_\_\_
- Date Information Completed \_\_\_\_\_

## 20. Evaluations Received By Client:

1 = Yes  
9 = Not Mentioned


- Psychological
- D&E for Retardation
- Medical (visual, audial, etc.)
- Vocational
- Educational or I.Q.
- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

## 21. Clinically Diagnosed:

1 = Yes  
9 = Not Mentioned


- Emotionally Disturbed
- Mentally Retarded
- Physically Handicapped
- Developmentally Disabled (e.g., epilepsy, dyslexia, etc.)
- Other (specify-----)

22. List the services that this child is receiving as a result of the above clinical diagnosis \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

23. Number of subsequent occurrences since referral which last opened or reopened case:

(Code 0 - 8 with 8 meaning 8 or more)

- Runaway
- Ungovernable
- Truant
- Delinquency
- Abuse/Neglect
- Other Dependent
- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

24. How would you evaluate this child? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

25. What do you feel this child needs? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

26. 9 = NOT APPLICABLE

BLANKS - Leave Blank

Case Number

CARD NUMBER

PROTECTIVE SERVICES

## NATURAL FAMILY

☐ 27. Parental Status:

- 1 = Natural Parents
- 2 = Natural Mother/Stepfather
- 3 = Natural Father/Stepmother
- 4 = Natural Mother only
- 5 = Natural Father only
- 6 = Foster Parents (only when natural parents not present)
- 7 = Relatives (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8 = Other (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 9 = Unknown

☐ ☐ 28. How many siblings does client have?

- 00 = None
- 99 = Don't Know

☐ ☐ 29. How many siblings have ever been put on Protective Services Supervision?

- 00 = None
- 99 = Don't Know

30. Parent's/Guardian's educational level:

☐

Mother 1 = Primary (grades 1 - 8)

2 = Secondary (grades 9 - 11)

☐

Father 3 = High School Graduate or G.E.D.

4 = Vocational Degree

5 = Some College

6 = Four Year college degree (B.A., B.S.)

7 = Graduate Degree

9 = Don't Know/Not Applicable

31. Parents'/Guardian's Age:

99 = Don't Know/NA

-Present Age

☐
☐

Mother

☐
☐

Father

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

-NOT APPLICABLE

## 32. Parents'/Guardian's Race:

☐

Mother

1 = White

☐

Father

2 = Nonwhite

9 = Don't Know/NA

☐

## 33. Marital Status of Parents at time of Referral which last opened or reopened case:

0 = Mother Unmarried

1 = Mother Dead

2 = Father Dead

3 = Both Parents Dead

4 = Married

5 = Separated

6 = Mother Deserted

7 = Father Deserted

8 = Divorced

9 = Unknown

☐☐☐☐☐

## 34. Total Annual Gross Income of Family

99999 = Don't Know

9	9	9	9	9
9	9	9	9	9
9	9	9	9	9
9	9	9	9	9
9	9	9	9	9

35 - 42. NOT APPLICABLE

SKIP TO COLUMN 77

☐☐☐

CASE NUMBER

☐

CARD NUMBER

APPENDIX C.

The Foster Care Questionnaire

CHILD'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_

CASE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

SOCIAL WORKER'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE \_\_\_\_\_

## FOSTER CARE

☒☐☐

1. County Code:

03 = Bay  
06 = Broward  
16 = Duval  
29 = Hillsborough  
53 = Polk

2. Age:

99 = Don't Know

☐☐

-Present Age

☐☐

-Age at time of referral which last opened or reopened case

☐☐

-Age at time of first placement in Foster Care

☐

3. Race:

1 = White  
2 = Non-White

☐

4. Sex:

1 = Male  
2 = Female

5. History of School Problems:

☐

- Truancy

1 = Yes

☐

- Suspension

9 = Not Mentioned

☐

- Expulsion

☐

- Dropped-Out

☐

- Failed grade(s)

☐

- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

- ☐ 6. Is child below the appropriate grade level for his age group?

1 = Yes

2 = No

9 = Don't Know/Not applicable

- ☐ 7. Is this child presently in school?

1 = Yes

2 = No

9 = Don't Know/Not Applicable

☐ If no, why not?

---

---

---

- ☐ 8. Referral status which last opened or reopened case:

0 = Delinquent charge - adjudicated dependent

1 = Runaway

2 = Ungovernable

3 = Truant

4 = Multiple Status Offense

5 = Abused/Neglected

6 = Other Dependent

7 = Status Offense plus Dependency

8 = Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

9 = Don't Know

- ☐ 9. Describe circumstances associated with referral (problem or behavior of family or child):

---

---

---

---

☐ ☐ 10. Who referred child directly to Foster Care?

- 01 = Single Intake
- 02 = Family/Self
- 03 = Neighbor/Friend
- 04 = Foster Care
- 05 = Protective Services
- 06 = Youth Services
- 07 = School
- 08 = Law Enforcement
- 09 = Community Agency
- 10 = Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 99 = Don't Know

☐ 11. Is this referral to Foster Care:

- 1 = Court Ordered Placement
- 2 = Voluntary Placement
- 9 = Don't Know

12. History of State Involvement:

- 1 = Yes
- 9 = Not Mentioned.

Previous      Current

- |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Arrested or Picked-Up by Law Enforcement for Violation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Detention  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Emergency Shelter Care                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - YS - Consent Supervision                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - YS - Residential Community Based Facility              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - YS - Residential Institutional Facility                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - YS - Non-Residential Facility                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - YS - Probation   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Foster Care  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Protective Services                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Mental Health Program                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Mental Retardation                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | - Other HRS (specify _____)                              |

- ☐ 13. What happened to child at termination of case with Foster Care?

1 = No further action necessary  
 2 = Referred to Foster Care  
 3 = Referred to Protective Services  
 4 = Referred to Youth Services  
 5 = Referred to Other HRS agency (specify \_\_\_\_\_)  
 6 = Referred to Non-HRS Agency (specify \_\_\_\_\_)  
 7 = Client terminates service (age limit, moves, voluntarily terminates) (specify \_\_\_\_\_)  
 8 = Not Applicable - case still open  
 9 = Don't Know

- ☐ ☐ 14. Reason for above termination decision:

---



---



---

- ☐ ☐ 15. In how many foster homes has this child been placed?

16. What is the length of stay in each home?

☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐

1 = One month or less  
 2 = One month to three months  
 3 = Three months to six months  
 4 = Six months to one year  
 5 = One year to two years  
 6 = Two years to five years  
 7 = Five years or more  
 8 = Don't Know  
 9 = Not Applicable

17. Why did child leave each of the above foster homes?  
Specify for each home.

- ☐ 1) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 2) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 3) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 4) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 5) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 6) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 7) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 8) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 9) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 10) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ ☐ ☐ 18. Case Number

☒ 1 CARD NUMBER

☒ 2 FOSTER CARE

## 19. Case Progress: (year/month/day)

(If unknown or not applicable, leave blank.)

YEAR		MONTH		DAY	
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

- Date referred to Single Intake
- Date of Disposition at Intake
- Date received by Foster Care
- Date Case Plan Developed
- Date child Removed from Natural Home
- Date Placed in First Foster Home
- Date Case Terminated with Foster Care
- Date Information Completed

## 20. Evaluations Received by Client:

1 = Yes

9 = Not Mentioned

☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐

- Psychological
- D&E for Retardation
- Medical (visual, audial, etc.)
- Vocational
- Educational or I.Q.
- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

## 21. Clinically Diagnosed:

1 = Yes

9 = Not Mentioned

☐  
☐  
☐  
☐  
☐

- Emotionally Disturbed
- Mentally Retarded
- Physically Handicapped
- Developmentally Disabled (e.g., epilepsy, dyslexia, etc.)
- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

☐ ☐

22. List the services that this child is receiving as a result of the above clinical diagnosis.

---

---

---

---

23. Number of subsequent occurrences since referral which last opened or reopened case:

(Code using 0-8 with 8 meaning 8 or more)

☐

- Runaway

☐

- Ungovernable

☐

- Truant

☐

- Delinquency

☐

- Abuse/Neglect

☐

- Other Dependent

☐

- Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

☐

24. How would you evaluate this child?

---

---

---

---

---

☐

25. What do you feel this child needs?

---

---

---

---

---

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 26. 9 = Not Applicable

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ BLANKS - LEAVE BLANK

☐ ☐ ☐ CASE NUMBER

☐ 2 CARD NUMBER

☐ 2 FOSTER CARE

## NATURAL FAMILY

☐ 27. Parental Status:

- 1 = Natural Parents
- 2 = Natural Mother/Stepfather
- 3 = Natural Father/Stepmother
- 4 = Natural Mother Only
- 5 = Natural Father Only
- 6 = Foster Parents (only when natural parents not present)
- 7 = Relatives (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 8 = Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- 9 = Unknown

☐ ☐ 28. How many siblings does client have in natural family?

- 00 = None
- 99 = Don't Know

☐ ☐ 29. How many siblings have ever been placed in Foster Care?

- 00 = None
- 99 = Don't Know

30. Natural Parent's/Guardian's educational level:

- |                          |         |                                       |
|--------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | -Mother | 1 = Primary (grades 1-8)              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | -Father | 2 = Secondary (grades 9-11)           |
|                          |         | 3 = High School Graduate or G.E.D.    |
|                          |         | 4 = Vocational Degree                 |
|                          |         | 5 = Some College                      |
|                          |         | 6 = Four Year College Degree (BA or ) |
|                          |         | 7 = Graduate Degree                   |
|                          |         | 9 = Don't Know/Not Applicable         |

31. Natural Parent's/Guardian's Age:

- 99 = Don't Know/NA

- Present Age:

☐ ☐ Mother

☐ ☐ Father

- Age at time of first placement:

☐ ☐ Mother

☐ ☐ Father

## 32. Natural Parent's/Guardian's Race:

☐

- Mother

1 = White

☐

- Father

2 = Non-White

3 = Don't Know/N/A

☐

## 33. Marital Status of Natural Parents At Time of Referral which last opened or reopened case:

0 = Mother Unmarried

1 = Mother Dead

2 = Father Dead

3 = Both Parents Dead

4 = Married

5 = Separated

6 = Mother Deserted

7 = Father Deserted

8 = Divorced

9 = Unknown

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

## 34. Total Annual Gross Income of Natural Family

99999 = Don't Know

## FOSTER FAMILY FOR CURRENT PLACEMENT

☐

## 35. Composition of Foster Family

1 = Foster Mother

2 = Foster Father

3 = Foster Mother and Foster Father

4 = Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

☐ ☐

## 36. How many natural children do foster parents have in the foster home?

00 = None

99 = Don't Know

☐ ☐

## 37. How many other foster children are presently in the Foster home?

00 = None

99 = Don't Know

## 38. Foster parent's educational level:

☐

- Mother

1 = Primary (grades 1-8)  
 2 = Secondary (grades 9-11)  
 3 = High School Graduate or G.E.D.

☐

- Father

4 = Vocational Degree  
 5 = Some College  
 6 = Four Year College Degree (B.A., B.S.)  
 7 = Graduate Degree  
 9 = Don't Know/Not Applicable

## 39. Foster Parent's Age:

99 = Don't Know

-Present Age

☐

Mother

☐

Father

-Age at Time of Placement of This Child

☐

Mother

☐

Father

## 40. Foster Parent's Race

☐

- Mother

1 = White  
 2 = Non=White

☐

- Father

☐

## 41. Total Annual Gross Income of Foster Parents

99999 = Unknown

☐

## 42. Was any foster care training provided for foster family prior to first placement received?

1 = Yes

2 = No

☐

If yes, describe training. (What kind, how long, etc.)

---



---



---



---

SKIP TO COLUMN 77

Three empty square boxes arranged horizontally, likely for entering a case number.

CASE NUMBER

A square box containing the number 3, likely for entering a card number.

CARD NUMBER

APPENDIX D.

Single Intake Dependency-Delinquency  
Intake Data Card  
And  
Detention Data Card

**CONTINUED**

**2 OF 3**

**Child's Name:**

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	[ ]
last	first	middle initial

**Date of Birth:**

[ ] [ ]	.	[ ] [ ]	[ ] [ ]	<b>Sex:</b>	1 Male	[ ]	<b>Race:</b>	1 White	[ ]
mo		day	yr		2 Female			2 Black	
								3 Other	

**County of Referral:**



[ ] [ ]	<b>Network:</b>	[ ]	<b>Title XX Eligibility</b>	[ ]
---------	-----------------	-----	-----------------------------	-----

(If child is screened for Detention or Placed in Shelter, complete B through F; if released to a Crisis Home, complete C only.)

1. Law Enforcement
2. Single Intake
3. YS
4. SES
6. Parents
8. Court
7. Other

- E. If Placed, Reason

1. Protection of the child
2. Protection of the person or property of others
3. No one to provide supervision or care
4. To secure presence at hearing
5. Felony referral twice previously adjudicated delinquent

- Initial   
Subsequent 
1. Detention YS  
2. Emergency Shelter  
3. Secure Shelter  
4. Placed in other licensed facility  
5. Released to parent or guardian  
6. Released to adult relative  
7. Released to CRISIS Home under parent's agreement  
8. Released to CRISIS Home under "Adult approved by the Court provision of Ch. 39.03 (2) F.S.S.  
9. Jail  
0. Other

- F. Original Placement Authority**

1. Intake on own authority
2. Court Order requested by HRS
3. Court Order not requested by HRS
4. Administrative Order  
Community Non-Residential
5. Administrative Order  
Community Residential
6. Administrative Order T.S.
7. SES Foster Care
8. SES Protective Supervision
9. Other

(The following items shall accompany child to detention: 1) this document; 2) copy of arrest report; 3) copy of child's prior record)

G. Facility Code:

- [illegible]

- J. School Grade:
- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
|--|--|

01-16 Actual grade  
22 Special School  
99 Not in School  
99 Not in School

- K. Employment: ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

- L. Non-Secure Program Placement:**

Accepted  
1. Placed in Non-Secure

- Not Accepted Because Of
2. Seriousness of Offense
  3. Child's Attitude
  4. Multiple Prior Referrals
  5. No Placement Available
  6. Court Order
  7. Administrative Order
  8. Other

- M. Assaultive Behavior while on detention status:
0. None
1. Against Staff
2. Against Other Children
3. Both of Above

- N. Was child referred to intake for new law violation while in detention status:
0. No
1. While in Secure
2. While in Non-Secure
3. While on Escape

- O. Escape:**

0. None
1. Escape from Secure Facility
2. Absconded from Attention Home
3. Absconded from Home Detention
4. Escape from Detention Staff  
Custody While Outside Facility
5. Escape from Custody of Other YS  
Staff while outside of Facility
6. Escape from Non-YS Custody While  
Outside of Facility

- | P.  | Transfers: | type | mo. |
|-----|------------|------|-----|
| 1   |            |      |     |
| 2   |            |      |     |
| 3   |            |      |     |
| 4   |            |      |     |
| 5   |            |      |     |
| 6   |            |      |     |
| 7   |            |      |     |
| 8   |            |      |     |
| 9   |            |      |     |
| 10  |            |      |     |
| 11  |            |      |     |
| 12  |            |      |     |
| 13  |            |      |     |
| 14  |            |      |     |
| 15  |            |      |     |
| 16  |            |      |     |
| 17  |            |      |     |
| 18  |            |      |     |
| 19  |            |      |     |
| 20  |            |      |     |
| 21  |            |      |     |
| 22  |            |      |     |
| 23  |            |      |     |
| 24  |            |      |     |
| 25  |            |      |     |
| 26  |            |      |     |
| 27  |            |      |     |
| 28  |            |      |     |
| 29  |            |      |     |
| 30  |            |      |     |
| 31  |            |      |     |
| 32  |            |      |     |
| 33  |            |      |     |
| 34  |            |      |     |
| 35  |            |      |     |
| 36  |            |      |     |
| 37  |            |      |     |
| 38  |            |      |     |
| 39  |            |      |     |
| 40  |            |      |     |
| 41  |            |      |     |
| 42  |            |      |     |
| 43  |            |      |     |
| 44  |            |      |     |
| 45  |            |      |     |
| 46  |            |      |     |
| 47  |            |      |     |
| 48  |            |      |     |
| 49  |            |      |     |
| 50  |            |      |     |
| 51  |            |      |     |
| 52  |            |      |     |
| 53  |            |      |     |
| 54  |            |      |     |
| 55  |            |      |     |
| 56  |            |      |     |
| 57  |            |      |     |
| 58  |            |      |     |
| 59  |            |      |     |
| 60  |            |      |     |
| 61  |            |      |     |
| 62  |            |      |     |
| 63  |            |      |     |
| 64  |            |      |     |
| 65  |            |      |     |
| 66  |            |      |     |
| 67  |            |      |     |
| 68  |            |      |     |
| 69  |            |      |     |
| 70  |            |      |     |
| 71  |            |      |     |
| 72  |            |      |     |
| 73  |            |      |     |
| 74  |            |      |     |
| 75  |            |      |     |
| 76  |            |      |     |
| 77  |            |      |     |
| 78  |            |      |     |
| 79  |            |      |     |
| 80  |            |      |     |
| 81  |            |      |     |
| 82  |            |      |     |
| 83  |            |      |     |
| 84  |            |      |     |
| 85  |            |      |     |
| 86  |            |      |     |
| 87  |            |      |     |
| 88  |            |      |     |
| 89  |            |      |     |
| 90  |            |      |     |
| 91  |            |      |     |
| 92  |            |      |     |
| 93  |            |      |     |
| 94  |            |      |     |
| 95  |            |      |     |
| 96  |            |      |     |
| 97  |            |      |     |
| 98  |            |      |     |
| 99  |            |      |     |
| 100 |            |      |     |

### Type of Transfer

1. To Secure Detention
2. To Non-Secure - Attention Home
3. To Non-Secure - Home Detention
4. To Other Non-Secure Program
5. To Jail

## Reason

1. Eligible for Less Secure Custody
2. Court Request or Order
3. Current Placement Terminated
4. Lack of Parental Supervision
5. Failure to Adjust
6. Absconded from Placement
7. Committed New Offense
8. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

- Q. If child was detained under an administrative order, what was the disposition of the case

- ☐ 1. Returned to the same program or facility  
☐ 2. Aftercare revoked  
☐ 3. Transferred to another Community Residential Program  
☐ 4. Transferred to another Community Non-Residential Program  
☐ 5. Transferred to Training School

1. Intake prior to detention hearing
2. Court at detention hearing
3. Court between detention hearing & final disposition
4. Court at final disposition

Name of Releasing Authority



**END**