

RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS
FOR COURT-INVOLVED YOUTH
IN MASSACHUSETTS

MARCH, 1979

59769



COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

**RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS
FOR COURT-INVOLVED YOUTH
IN MASSACHUSETTS**

March, 1979

Prepared by

*Juliette E. Fay
Juvenile Justice
Planning Specialist*

NCJRS

JUL 3 1979

ACQUISITIONS



**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

110 Tremont Street . 4th Floor . Boston 02108

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several members of the Massachusetts Committee on Criminal Justice contributed during the course of this project. Donald C. Main, Director of Research, Planning, and Evaluation provided a wide range of administrative and technical assistance without which this project could not have been completed. Stephen Perry, Research Associate, Statistical Analysis Center, provided invaluable assistance in the research design, training, and data analysis phases. Michael O'Connor, Corrections/Parole Program Specialist, facilitated the research team's access to both official data and officials of adult correctional facilities.

The grassroots experience in the juvenile justice system of the JJDPA monitors hired for this project is reflected in the high quality of the data collection and needs assessment.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge Greg Torres, Betsy Friedlander, Marion Toronto and the staffs of the Criminal Justice Development Agencies for their assistance and support throughout the project.

Juliette E. Fay
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. THE SCOPE OF THE 1978 MONITORING STUDY.	2
A. Directory of Residential Programs	2
B. Collection of Compliance Data	2
C. Needs Assessment for FY 1980.	2
III. METHODOLOGY	4
A. Monitoring of Juvenile Facilities	4
B. Monitoring Procedure for Adult Facilities	7
C. Data Analysis and Processing.	7
IV. COMPLIANCE INFORMATION RELATIVE TO SECTION 223(a)(12); THE REMOVAL OF STATUS OFFENDERS FROM JUVENILE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES	8
A. Progress Achieved in the Removal of Accused Status Offenders from Juvenile Detention Facilities.	8
B. Progress Achieved in the Removal of Adjudicated Status Offenders From Juvenile Correctional Facilities.	11
V. PROGRESS IN MEETING THE MANDATE FOR THE SEPARATION OF JUVENILES FROM INCARCERATED ADULTS; SECTION 223(a)(13)	15
A. State Correctional Facilities	15
B. County Houses of Correction	15
VI. RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM INFORMATION	18
A. Department of Youth Services/Department of Public Welfare Foster Care.	18
B. Department of Youth Services/Department of Public Welfare Contracted Foster Care	18
C. Intensive Foster Care	18
D. Group Care Facilities	19
E. Specialized Group Care.	21
F. Residential Schools	24
G. Secure Detention/Treatment Programs	27
H. CHINS Shelter Care Programs	32
I. DYS Shelter Care Programs	35
J. Residential Program Aggregate Information	37
VII. CONCLUSION.	41

I. INTRODUCTION

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been the recipient of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA) funds since August, 1975. These federal funds are made available in an effort to assist states in two major ways. JJJPA funds enable states to separate juvenile offenders from adult offenders in correctional institutions and jails. These funds are also used to help states redefine juvenile codes and policies to remove status offenders from juvenile detention and correctional facilities.

There are many requirements imposed upon the states by the JJJPA legislation that accompany the receipt of these funds. This report has been prepared pursuant to the monitoring requirement of the JJDP Act. States receiving JJJPA funds must annually monitor detention and correctional facilities to determine the degree to which adults and juveniles have been separated and to determine the progress made in achieving the deinstitutionalization of status offenders. Further, states are required to demonstrate a 75% reduction in the number of status offenders held in juvenile detention and correctional facilities after three years of participation in the Act. This report contains the results of the 1978 monitoring effort.

The juvenile justice system in Massachusetts has been the focus of attention nationally for several years because of the reform that took place in the late 1960's. This reform resulted in the closing of large training schools and industrial schools. Various research organizations and universities have studied the juvenile justice system from a number of perspectives. However, very little attention has been focused on the network of residential programs designed to work with both delinquent youth and status offenders.

In light of this, the Massachusetts Committee on Criminal Justice has committed extensive staff time and resources to expand upon the monitoring requirement of the JJJPA and look more closely at all group residential programs for court involved youth.

This study is not concerned with the programmatic quality of these facilities, rather, the Committee was interested in determining the number of programs open, types of services offered and types of youth served. This information should be useful for future planning efforts.

The Massachusetts residential service providers should be acknowledged for their cooperation in this project. Each group residential program for court involved youth was site-visited in 1978. Program directors were surveyed for the needs assessment and assisted in the collection of data. Without their cooperation, a research project of this nature could not have been completed.

II. THE SCOPE OF THE 1978 MONITORING STUDY

A. DIRECTORY OF RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS

The radical social reform movement in the late sixties culminated in the closing of the juvenile institutions in Massachusetts. The private sector responded to this situation through the implementation of many small, open, community based programs to work with the hundreds of court involved youth needing placement. Their efforts were hindered by their own inexperience and further by the bureaucracy's slow adjustment from an institutional system to a purchase of service system. This led to the opening and closing of several hundred programs within a short period of time. The result was a somewhat undocumentable universe of residential programs.

Ten years after deinstitutionalization, there is no single directory of residential programs and schools that serve court-involved youth. The first phase of the 1978 monitoring project has produced a complete and updated directory of residential facilities. The Committee will make this directory available to referral agencies, research organizations and the general public.

B. COLLECTION OF COMPLIANCE DATA

The second phase of the 1978 monitoring project was focused on the collection of data relevant to the deinstitutionalization and separation mandates of the JJDP Act.

Data was collected for a three month sample period (April 1 - June 30) for both 1975 and 1978. The Committee went beyond the monitoring requirements of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Program (OJJDP) and collected data from all residential programs regardless of whether or not they met the juvenile detention and correctional facility criteria. This endeavor was undertaken to present a more realistic reflection of the Massachusetts juvenile justice system.

In addition, 1967/68 data was secured from the Department of Youth Services (DYS) in an effort to reveal the true impact of deinstitutionalization. The 1967/68 information comes from the five state training schools and the four detention centers which were in operation at that time.*

C. NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR FY 1980

The third phase of the monitoring project, the 1980 needs assessment, was designed to gather input from residential providers for future program initiatives of the Committee. The residential providers are in many ways the backbone of the system as their employees are the front line workers with youth. Residential programs are certainly the most difficult to implement, as community resistance, cash flow, and a lack of resources are factors constantly working against them.

* The three county training schools Essex, Middlesex, and Hampden were not included in this study. These training schools were operated by their respective counties and not by the Department of Youth Services. (See Appendix A, Chart 9, pg. 61 for further information.)

In light of this, JJDPAs monitors conducted somewhat lengthy interviews at each facility and problems common to most providers were identified. This initiative on the part of the Committee was conceived in an effort to ensure the viability and longevity of residential programs.

Further, these interviews provided a basis for coordination between the Committee and the providers. Information regarding the OJJDP formula grants and special emphasis programs was disseminated. In addition, the interviews increased the providers' awareness of the function of and assistance available from the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC, state advisory group) and the Criminal Justice Development Agencies (CJDA, regional planning units).

III. METHODOLOGY

A. MONITORING OF JUVENILE FACILITIES

The 1978 monitoring effort consisted of two major phases of data collection. A mail survey was sent to 905 service providers identified in the 1977 JJDPAs monitoring effort. All identified residential facilities were site-visited by monitors to verify the screening and collect compliance information. Drug rehabilitation programs were screened out as they are not within the purview of the JJDP Act.

I. Communication and Clarification from OJJDP

During the planning phase of the monitoring project, many issues were raised regarding the classification of CHINS (status offenders) and definitions promulgated by OJJDP. The Committee worked with OJJDP to resolve these problems.

It was resolved that:

- (a) The Committee would judge whether or not a juvenile program is community-based by investigating and monitoring programs to determine if they are in keeping with the Massachusetts Office for Children (OFC) family component licensing regulations. This would be in lieu of the criteria of "one hour driving distance from the child's home". The other OJJDP community-based criteria (i.e., bed capacity, consumer and community participation, etc.) would also be used.
- (b) The Committee would reconstruct a base-line by screening all juvenile detention and correctional facilities that are presently open and determine the number that were in operation in 1975. Many of the programs that were open in 1975 have closed and the information is not available. As an adjunct to the analysis of the 1975 and 1978 data, the Committee will present an analysis of the 1967/68 data. This was done in an effort to present a more complete assessment of the impact of deinstitutionalization.
- (c) In regard to identifying "accused status offenders" to compute the degree of reduction for compliance, the Committee would classify all CHINS who are in temporary shelter care and foster care as "accused status offenders". This alternative was designed in light of the variance in juvenile district court practices and policies across the Commonwealth.

2. Identification and Classification of all Residential Facilities

In a previous research project contracted by the Committee, a consultant firm compiled a listing of 1,080 service agencies. There was no breakdown as to type of service. A classification survey was mailed to 905 of the services on the listing (the additional 175 services had incomplete addresses). The breakdown was as follows:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Surveys Sent Out	905	100%
Surveys Returned by Postmaster	74	8%
Completed Surveys Returned	403	45%
Telephone Follow Up/Completed	190	21%
Non-Responses	238	26%

The contact by phone or by completed mail survey totaled 593 programs, which is 66% of the total.

The residential programs identified through this activity were checked against lists maintained by state agencies. This cross-checking identified 22 recently opened programs. A total of 148 secure and non-secure residential programs for court involved youth were identified.

3. Design of Survey Forms

The Survey forms for juvenile and adult facilities were designed by staff from the Committee's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) and the Planning Unit. Three forms were designed: the mail survey, juvenile compliance survey, and adult compliance survey. The form for juvenile facilities allows for the collection of compliance data, verification of family work, facility description for the directory and the needs assessment interview. Input was received from an Office for Children licensing specialist in the design of the family work verification attachment. The substance of the needs assessment survey form was based on discussions with the following groups:

Greater Boston Legal Services - Juvenile Law Reform Project staff.

Massachusetts Halfway Houses: Management Training Program Staff.

The Committee Juvenile Justice Staff.

Sampling of Members of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee.

The Survey instrument was pretested prior to its use. The agency chosen provides a wide range of residential services. Appropriate changes to the survey were made prior to final distribution.

4. Monitors

Eight independent researchers were hired to conduct the 148 site visits. Initially, the Committee posted the monitoring positions with 25 universities and colleges that receive Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) funding. However, after interviewing several students and graduate students, it was apparent that effective monitors would have to be familiar with the provision of services to court involved youth. The specific nature of the information sought necessitated practical experience in the field, the reason being the inconsistencies in (a) the application of juvenile justice policy and (b) labeling procedures. The collective experience of monitors that were hired included:

Experience in all treatment modalities

Familiarity with the specific regionalized operations of the decentralized network of youth services

Experience with the provision of services and familiarity with a flow of clients through the state agencies and courts

Upon completion of the hiring process, the monitors received clearance from the following sources to gain entrance to facilities and access to records and client files:

Criminal History Systems Board which administers the Massachusetts Criminal Offender Record Information Act (CORI).

Department of Youth Services clearance.

Authorization from the Department of Public Welfare.

Two training sessions totalling seven hours were held to familiarize the monitors with the JJDP Act, the Committee, the survey instrument, and the potential sources for the collection of client data. Each monitor was assigned by the Committee's Juvenile Justice Planning Specialist to monitor approximately 18 programs. Assignments were based on geographical proximity and their expertise in program types.

The final consultation with the juvenile justice monitors produced the following:

148 juvenile programs scheduled for site visits

148 juvenile programs site visited

Three new residential programs identified that were not found in the initial screening.

13 programs site visited were not juvenile service providers (6 drug, 7 other).

138 programs constitute the universe of residential programs for court involved youth in 1978.

B. MONITORING PROCEDURE FOR ADULT FACILITIES

1. Communication and Clarification from OJJDP

The results of the 1977 Monitoring Mail Survey indicated that no juveniles under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court were held or detained in adult facilities. The 1978 mail survey produced the same information. In an effort to avoid duplication and to concentrate project resources on juvenile facilities, the OJJDP approved the following strategy for verifying adult information in 1978.

- (a) State Correctional Facilities - from a computer printout at the Department of Corrections (DOC) all files of inmates listed as juveniles (i.e., age 16 and under) upon admission would be checked to verify that their juvenile rights had been waived by the Superior Court.
- (b) County Houses of Correction and Jails - six to ten facilities would be site visited and an intake file check be performed to ascertain status of any juvenile held in any DOC facility.
- (c) Signed assurances from the Commissioner of Corrections, the DOC Area Commissioners and 22 facility superintendents would be secured stating that no juvenile under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court is held.

C. DATA ANALYSIS AND PROCESSING

The compliance data for the 148 sites were checked, classified and aggregated by the Statistical Analysis Center. Frequency Distributions were constructed for each of the appropriate categories for both 1975 and 1978. Percentage (reduction) figures for each class of juveniles were then computed using the formula:

$$\frac{(\text{No. in 1976} - \text{No. in 1978})}{\text{No. in 1975}} \times 100$$

The information on the number of juveniles in each category in each institution will then be used to create a permanent computer file listing of characteristics of all residential service agencies in the Commonwealth. This should greatly facilitate the updating of similar information in future years.

IV. COMPLIANCE INFORMATION RELATIVE TO SECTION 223(a) (12); THE REMOVAL OF STATUS OFFENDERS FROM JUVENILE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Several criteria have been devised by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) that states who participate in the JJDPA must use to determine which facilities are juvenile detention and correctional facilities for purposes of determining compliance with the deinstitutionalization mandate of the JJDPA Act. The following criteria are used:

- Any secure facility is a juvenile detention facility;
- Any facility that has a capacity of 21 to 40 beds that is not community based is a juvenile correctional facility;
- Any facility with a capacity of over 40 beds that commingles status offenders and delinquents is a juvenile correctional facility.

A. PROGRESS ACHIEVED IN THE REMOVAL OF ACCUSED STATUS OFFENDERS FROM JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITIES

Status offenders were decriminalized by the Massachusetts legislature in 1973 with the passage of M.G.L., Chapter 1073. Process and service responsibility for Children in need of Services (CHINS) youth was lodged with the Department of Public Welfare (DPW). The full transfer of responsibility for CHINS from the Department of Youth Services was not fully actualized until January of 1977. The completion occurred through an executive agreement between commissioners of DYS and DPW which divested DYS of all detention responsibility for CHINS youth.

The DPW is not mandated to operate any secure facilities for the detainment of any of their client groups. To accommodate and plan for the large number of CHINS youth in their care, DPW implemented a CHINS unit administered by a state CHINS coordinator. Once established, this unit sought to establish a state-wide network of service and advocacy for CHINS. CHINS liaisons were hired to work out of the district and juvenile courts to assist in the flow of CHINS through the system. Their role is predominantly that of advocacy for CHINS youth. Many shelter care units were established as well as were many specialized foster care programs. In keeping with its mandate DPW does not operate secure facilities.

The statistics presented below for accused status offenders were collected from three program categories: DYS secure detention, DYS shelter care and DPW shelter care (see Appendix A Chart 4, 5, 6, pg.55.) There were no accused CHINS youth detained in secure facilities during the three month report period. The three accused CHINS youth detained were held in a non-secure DYS shelter care facility. The reason given to the Committee's JJDPA monitor for this infraction was that police officers upon arrest will sometimes bring a CHINS youth to a DYS shelter if all DPW shelters in that region are at capacity. It is interesting to note that just as the fragmentation of the state agencies (DYS, DPW, DMH) produces many service gaps, their fiscal and programmatic autonomy is the basis for the separation of accused CHINS and delinquents in secure detention programs. DYS state operated programs and block funded detention programs do not feel obligated to hold CHINS and are resistant to police attempts to detain CHINS in their programs.

TABLES 1-4

Compliance Data: Section 223(a)(12)

Removal of Accused Status Offenders
From Juvenile Detention Facilities

Current Reporting Period: April 1 - June 30, 1978
Base Reporting Period: April 1 - June 30, 1975

TABLE 1: Number of Public and Private Juvenile Detention
and Correctional Facilities, as Defined by M4100.1F

	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Bed Capacity</u>
Current (1978):	9	17	26	660
Baseline (1975):	6	16	22	878
1967/68:	9	0	9	927

	<u>Total Residential Programs for Court Involved Youth</u>	<u>Percentage Public</u>	<u>Percentage Private</u>
Current (1978):	138	8%	92%
Baseline (1975):	95	7%	93%
1967/68:	9	100%	0%

TABLE 2: Number of Public and Private Juvenile Detention and Correctional
Facilities Receiving an On-Site Inspection During the Report
Period (1978)

Total: 26 Public: 9 Private: 17

TABLE 3: Total Number of On-Site Inspections to Residential Facilities
for Court Involved Youth (i.e., Detention/Correctional
Facilities plus other Residential Programs)

Total: 138 Public: 11 Private: 127

TABLE 4: Total Number of Accused Status Offenders and Non-Offenders
Held 24 Hours or More in Public and Private Juvenile
Detention Facilities During the Report Period (1978)

	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% Reduction (1975-1978)</u>
Current (1978):	3	0	3	94%
Baseline (1975):	34	13	47	
1967/68:	83	0	83	

Several public and private secure detention programs have closed since 1975 and information from these facilities is not available. This information would probably show a higher incidence of accused status offenders held in secure detention in 1975. At that time, DYS was responsible for the detainment of CHINS.

Table 4 shows a 94% reduction in the number of accused status offenders and non-offenders held in juvenile detention facilities since 1975. In addition, Table 4 shows a 96% reduction in the number of accused status offenders held in detention facilities since 1967.

B. PROGRESS ACHIEVED IN THE REMOVAL OF ADJUDICATED STATUS OFFENDERS FROM JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

An accurate determination of the deinstitutionalization of adjudicated status offenders can be obtained only by reporting data according to service category. The service categories in question are Department of Youth Services Secure Treatment programs, Department of Mental Health Secure Treatment Programs, Specialized Group Care (21-40 beds) and Residential Schools (over 40 beds). Three different client categories have been included. Youth within the 766 category are children who have special education needs and are not court involved. The category of private youth refers to all children who are referred to programs and funded in programs by their own parents. Private youth are also not court involved. DMH category refers to youth who have had commitments to the Department of Mental Health.

TABLE 5: Number of Adjudicated Status Offenders and Delinquents held in DYS Secure Treatment Program During the Report Period

	<u>Total Adjudicated CHINS</u>	<u>Total Delinquents</u>
Current Data:	0	176
Baseline Data:	0	134
1967/68:	377	823

These numbers correspond to Chart 4 in Appendix A (pg.55). Adjudicated CHINS youth are not held in Department of Youth Services operated or contracted secure treatment programs. The 1968 data are estimates provided by DYS, computed according to the percent of status offenders in the overall DYS population (see Appendix A, Chart 8, pg. 60).

TABLE 6: Number of Adjudicated Status Offenders, Delinquents, DMH, and 766 Youth Held in Department of Mental Health Secure Treatment Programs During the Report Period

	<u>Total Adjudicated CHINS</u>	<u>Total Delinquent</u>	<u>DMH</u>	<u>766</u>
Current Data:	7	17	6	19
Baseline Data:	1	0	0	12

These statistics correspond to Chart 4 in Appendix A (pg. 55). The last four programs in Chart 4 are operated by DMH. Only one of the four DMH secure treatment programs was in operation in 1975. This accounts for the increase in CHINS placed from 1975 to 1978. These programs are designed for seriously disturbed adolescents regardless of court involvement.

TABLE 7: Number of Adjudicated CHINS, Delinquent and 766 Youth Held in Specialized Group Care Facilities (21-40 beds) that are not Community Based, During the Report Period

	<u>Total Adjudicated CHINS</u>	<u>Total Delinquents</u>	<u>Total 766</u>
Current Data:	0	0	0
Baseline Data:	106	1	0

These numbers correspond to Chart 2 in Appendix A, (pg. 52). The baseline data refers to one program that did not meet community based criteria and, therefore, is a juvenile correctional facility. In all, three programs were not community based, however, all three are exclusively used for CHINS and non-offenders.

TABLE 8: Number of Adjudicated CHINS, Delinquents, 766 Youth, Private Youth Held in Residential Schools (over 40 beds) that are not Exclusive During the Report Period

	<u>Adjudicated CHINS</u>	<u>Delinquents</u>	<u>766</u>	<u>Private</u>
Current Data (1978):	192	14	130	63
Baseline Data (1975):	494	33	94	160

These statistics correspond to Chart 3 in Appendix A, (pg. 54). In 1975, nine residential schools were not exclusively operating for CHINS and non-offenders. In 1978, there are five schools that commingle CHINS and delinquents.

It is interesting to note that in 1978 approximately half of the client population in residential schools was not court involved (i.e., 766 and privately funded youth). Chart 3 indicates that the five residential schools that commingle delinquents and CHINS in 1978 provide service to youths between the average ages of eight years and 17 years. These two factors suggest that although these schools meet the criteria for juvenile correctional facilities their main focus is specialized education.

The presence of delinquents in these facilities is not cause for concern as they are a very small percentage of the over-all population. In summation the high degree of mix between CHINS youth and non-court involved youth can be viewed as a normalizing factor for both the CHINS youth and the delinquents. The client data on residential schools severely decreases the reduction in the removal of adjudicated status offenders from juvenile correctional facilities.

TABLE 9: Total Number of Adjudicated Status Offenders, 766 Youth, Private Youth, DMH Youth, and Non-Offenders Held in Public and Private Juvenile Correctional Facilities During the Report Period

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Current Data:	417	10	407
Baseline Data:	867	0	867

Table 9 shows the total number of adjudicated CHINS, non-offenders, 766 youth, DMH committed youth and privately funded youth held in facilities that meet the criteria for juvenile correctional facilities according to the OJJDP guidelines as stated in M4100, Change 3. These figures show a reduction of 51.9%. The presence of only 14 delinquents in these facilities results in 417 CHINS, non-offenders, 766 and private youth held in correctional facilities.

TABLE 10: Total Number of Adjudicated Status Offenders and Non-Offenders Held in Juvenile Correctional Facilities During the Report Period

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Current Data:	199	4	195
Baseline Data:	601	0	601
1967/68:	823	823	0

This table shows the total number of adjudicated CHINS and non-offenders (exclusively) that were held in juvenile correctional facilities according to the OJJDP definitions. Non-offenders in this table are defined as abused and neglected youth.

These figures represent a 66.8% reduction in adjudicated CHINS and non-offenders held in facilities that are juvenile correctional facilities. (Of the total 199 youth only seven youth were held in secure facilities during the current reporting period.)

Summary

The preceding data indicate that Massachusetts is in substantial compliance with Section 233(a)(12) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. In regard to accused status offenders, there has been a 94% reduction in their detainment in detention facilities since 1975. With respect to adjudicated status offenders, there has been 66.8% reduction in their placement in correctional facilities since 1975.

V. PROGRESS IN MEETING THE MANDATE FOR THE SEPARATION OF JUVENILES FROM INCARCERATED ADULTS (Section 223(a)(13))

In 1969, Massachusetts passed legislation which curtailed the commingling of juveniles with incarcerated adults. The following section of the law illustrates the legislative intent:

"...No child between fourteen and seventeen years of age shall be detained in a police station or town lockup unless the detention facilities for children at such police station or town lockup have received the approval in writing of the Commissioner of Youth Services. The Department of Youth Services shall make inspection at least annually of police stations or town lockups wherein children are detained. If no such approved detention facilities exist in any city or town, such city or town may contract with an adjacent city or town for the use of approved detention facilities in order to prevent children who are detained from coming in contact with adult prisoners. Nothing in this section shall permit a child between fourteen and seventeen years of age from being detained in a jail or house of correction. A separate and distinct place shall be provided in police stations, town lockups or places of detention for such children." M.G.L., Chapter 119, Section 67.

In the ten years since the enactment of this legislation, advocacy groups outside of the state system and "watchdog" groups within the system have been implemented to ensure the enforcement of these provisions. As a result, there is a very small incidence of juveniles under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court being detained in adult correctional facilities. Local jails must be approved by the Commissioner of DYS before they may detain youth. These jails provide total sight/sound separation and are usually used for overnight arrest.

A. STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

A computer printout listing an offender's age on the admission date was secured from the central office at the Department of Corrections. The case files of youth under the age of seventeen at admission were checked to ascertain their legal status. During the report period, five juveniles were incarcerated in state correctional facilities. All five offenders had their juvenile rights waived in Superior Court, and therefore, had been "bound over" to the jurisdiction of the adult or criminal court. As a result, all state correctional facilities are in compliance with Section 223 (a)(13).

B. COUNTY HOUSES OF CORRECTION

All responses to the mail survey from county houses of correction and jails indicated that no juveniles under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court were held during the report period.

Six houses of correction and their corresponding jails were site visited to verify the information received in the mail survey. Facilities from each region were chosen for the sample to provide a mixture of urban and rural areas. Intake files were checked to determine the number of juveniles that were held. The table below illustrates the results of those spot checks. The juvenile column represents the number of juveniles under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court that were detained during the sample period. The bindover column represents the number of youth who have had their juvenile rights waived.

House of Correction and Jail	1975		1978	
	Juveniles	Bindovers	Juveniles	Bindovers
Berkshire County	0	0	0	0
Hampden County	0	2	1	3
Worcester County	0	0	0	1
Middlesex County	0	1	0	0
Plymouth County	0	0	0	0
Suffolk County	0	0	0	0

In Hampden County, it was determined that one juvenile under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court had been held. The monitor checked the facility which was being renovated at the time to determine the degree of separation. Sight and sound separation exists in all areas.

1. Total Number of Facilities Used for the Secure Detention and Confinement of Both Juvenile Offenders and Adult Offenders which do not Provide Adequate Separation of Juveniles and Adults

Current Data (1978): 0
Baseline Data (1975): 0

2. Total Number of Juvenile Offenders and Non-Offenders who are not Adequately Separated in Facilities which were used for the Secure Detention and Confinement of Both Juvenile Offenders and Adult Criminal Offenders During the Report Period

Current Data (1978): 0
Baseline Data (1975): 0

Assurances from the Commissioner of Corrections, the area associate commissioners, and the facility superintendents indicating that youths under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court are not detained nor held in their respective facilities are on file at the Committee.

The results of the site-visits and the mail survey support the conclusion that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is in compliance with Section 223(a)(13) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

VI. RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

This section will provide general information about residential facilities. Program information is categorized according to service type.

During the course of this study, no program or client information was collected for foster care programs, specialized foster care, out-patient programs, tracking programs, and individual monitoring programs. Programs of this type constitute a large proportion of the placements and services for court involved youth. These service categories do not use physical facilities to house groups of youth, nor do they employ residential in-house staff. This distinction is made as many CHINS and delinquent youth on "detention status" are cared for in foster homes.

The reader is cautioned that detention in Massachusetts does not imply either a facility or a restrictive placement. Detention is the status of youth awaiting a court disposition or a longer term treatment placement. The first three service categories below were not included in this study as they are not addressed in the JJDP Act and also because of limited project resources. Program descriptions are provided to reflect an entire spectrum of placement programming for Massachusetts court involved youth. The information presented in the general information section pertains to programs open in 1978, unless stated otherwise.

A. Department of Youth Services/Department of Public Welfare Foster Care

DYS/DPW foster homes are found, developed and parent training is conducted by DYS or DPW workers. All casework services for either the foster family or the child in the home are provided by the assigned DYS or DPW worker. The ratio of workers to youths or homes varies widely.

B. Department of Youth Services/Department of Public Welfare Contracted Foster Care

Private agencies are contracted to do home finding and training and, in addition, they provide all the continuing casework for the home and the youth in it. The ratios range from one worker to five youths, one worker to seven youths.

C. Intensive Foster Care (Individual Monitoring)

The private contractor is responsible for home finding, training and for case-work as well as for a full "day program" for the child. An alternative structure provides for a full-time worker who lives with the child and has no other employment except for providing a full structured day program for one or two children. In a variation, two houseparents are employed with between one and three children with a small supplementary staff pattern, but not enough to provide coverage around the clock, seven days a week.

The above three service modalities DYS/DFW foster care, contracted foster care and intensive foster care are available for youth in treatment and on detention status. The following categories were the object of specific data collection. The 1975 data on all categories of residential programs was collected from programs that are presently operating. Therefore, the 1975 data might be somewhat incomplete as several programs have closed since 1975.

D. Group Care Facilities

A group home is a non-secure, community-based residence for between six and 15 children. Although group care facilities usually have a bed capacity between 6 and 15, the classification for group care for the purposes of this study will be non-secure programs with a capacity of 20 beds or less. This alteration of the definition has been made to keep service categories consistent with OJJDP definitions. The program will have a ratio of three staff to five youth or less. It may or may not have an educational program in the house. Group home youth are integrated into the community for school, employment and recreation. Child-care staff are responsible for family work, case management and advocacy for youth in the community.

Table I:

Total Group Care Facilities	<u>72</u>
Regional Distribution:	
DYS Region I, Springfield	<u>16</u>
DYS Region II, Worcester	<u>9</u>
DYS Region III, Concord	<u>12</u>
DYS Region IV, Middleton	<u>7</u>
DYS Region V, Braintree	<u>7</u>
DYS Region VI, Boston	<u>8</u>
DYS Region VII, Lakeville	<u>13</u>

TABLE 2: Group Care Programs and Capacity

	<u>Total Group Care Programs</u>	<u>Total Group Care Beds</u>	<u>Average Group Care Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	27	302	11.1
Girls	20	153	7.6
Coed	25	246	9.8
TOTAL	72	701	9.7

Only six group care programs out of a total of 72 programs had a capacity of over 15 beds. There was a total of 40 programs that had a capacity of less than 10 beds. More beds for court involved youth exist in group care programs than in any other service category. Residential schools have more beds, however; close to 50% of the clients in residential schools during the 1978 sample period were not court involved.

TABLE 3: DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS BY SEX AND STATUS IN TOTAL GROUP CARE (G.C.) PROGRAMS (1975 - 1978)

	APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1975						APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1978					
	DYS	%	CHINS	%	TOTAL	%	DYS	%	CHINS	%	TOTAL	%
BOYS G.C.	108	25.6%	138	32.7%	246	58.3%	174	23.8%	201	27.5%	375	51.3%
GIRLS G.C.	6	1.4%	98	23.2%	104	24.6%	2	.2%	121	16.6%	123	16.8%
COED G.C.	5	1.2%	67	15.9%	72	17.1%	30	4.1%	203	27.8%	233	31.9%
TOTAL	119	28.2%	303	71.8%	422	100%	206	28.1%	525	71.9%	731	100%

During both the 1975 and 1978 sample periods, approximately 72% of the group care population was made up of CHINS youth. There has been a 61% increase in the number of delinquent boys placed in boys group care programs since the 1975 sample period.

Table 3 shows that there were only two delinquent girls placed in girls group homes during the 1978 sample period. Further investigation showed that although there were 30 delinquents in coed group homes, an estimated maximum of six of these delinquents were girls making a total of eight DYS girls in group care. As a result, only 1% of the entire group care population was made up of girls committed to the Department of Youth Services during the 1978 sample period, verses approximately 27% of the total population being DYS boys.

E. Specialized Group Care (S.G.C.)

Specialized group care facilities have a bed capacity of 15 to 30. As in the case of group care facilities, the definition of specialized group care has been altered to maintain consistency with OJJDP definitions. For the purposes of this study specialized group care programs have been defined as having bed capacities of between 21 and 40 beds. Specialized group care is a highly structured residence. Many education or job programs occur within the program. Most programs have developed a therapeutic milieu with a full system of rules, group meetings and continuous reinforcement. Programs of this type have virtually the same staff ratio as a group care facility (three staff for every five to seven youths). All programs in this category are non-secure.

TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF SPECIALIZED GROUP CARE (SGC) PROGRAMS AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total S.G.C. Programs</u>	<u>Total S.G.C. Beds</u>	<u>Average S.G.C. Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	8	237	29.6
Girls	1	32	32.0
Coed	5	146	29.2
<hr/>			
TOTAL	14	415	29.6

There were a total of 14 specialized group care programs in operation during the 1978 report period. The total amount of available beds in these programs was 415, with an average capacity of 29.6 beds. Two new specialized group care programs have opened since 1975.

During the 1978 sample period, approximately 8% of the available specialized group care beds were specifically for girls, 57% exclusively for boys and 35% serve both girls and boys.

TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS BY SEX AND STATUS IN TOTAL SPECIALIZED GROUP CARE (SGC) POPULATION (1975 - 1978)

	APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1975										APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1978									
	DYS	%	CHINS	%	766	%	OTHER	%	TOTAL	%	DYS	%	CHINS	%	766	%	OTHER	%	TOTAL	%
BOYS SGC	3	.92%	143	43.60%	25	7.62%	10	3.0%	181	55.14%	5	1.15%	153	35.10%	61	13.99%	19	4.40%	238	54.64%
GIRLS SGC	1	.30%	33	10.03%	0	0%	2	.61%	36	10.94%	0	0%	28	6.43%	1	.23%	11	2.50%	40	9.16%
COED SGC	2	.61%	106	32.40%	1	.30%	2	.61%	111	33.92%	1	.23%	113	25.90%	38	8.70%	6	1.37%	158	36.20%
TOTAL	6	1.82%	282	86.0%	26	7.92%	14	4.26%	328	100.0%	6	1.36%	294	67.43%	100	22.92%	36	8.27%	436	100.0%

Table 5 shows that the types of clients placed in specialized group care programs has remained fairly consistent between 1975 and 1978. There has been a 32.9% increase in the total number of placements which is attributed to the opening of two new programs. CHINS youth make up the largest number and percentage of these placements. Delinquent youth are placed less often than the other types of clients.

There is presently only one specialized group care program operating specifically for girls and in 1978 the girls in that placement make up 9.16% of the total specialized group care population. Estimates regarding the percentage of girls in coed facilities were provided by the program administrators. The average estimate of girls in coed specialized group care is 37.5% (which projects to 59 girls). Further, computation shows that the estimate for total placements of girls in specialized group care programs is approximately 31.8%. The percentage of boys in specialized group care is 68.2%.

This suggests that there is a lack of girls specialized group care programs and beds. The beds available in the one program that is exclusively for girls are filled entirely with CHINS, 766 and other girls, rather than delinquent girls.

F. Residential Schools (R.S.)

Residential schools offer counseling services and psychological testing in a structured clinical program with degreed and licensed professionals. These schools maintain a fairly low ratio of students to personnel. The bed capacity of these non-secure settings is greater than 40. The schools accept a large number of CHINS youth, care and protection youth, 766 youth and private referrals. Residential schools offer a complete educational or vocational program certified by appropriate state agencies.

TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL PROGRAMS AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total R.S.</u>	<u>Total R.S. Beds</u>	<u>Average R.S. Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	5	260	52.0
Girls	2	131	65.5
Coed	6	511	85.2
TOTAL	13	902	69.4

Table 6 shows that there were 13 residential schools in operation during the 1978 report period. There were a total of 902 beds available in these schools. Coed schools have both the largest overall capacity and the largest average bed capacity (85 beds). Residential schools exclusively for boys have the smallest average bed capacity (52 beds). There have been no new schools established since the 1975 report period.

Nine of the 13 schools are private/non-profit establishments, four schools are private/profit corporations. None of these schools are operated by the state.

TABLE 7: DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS BY SEX AND STATUS
IN TOTAL RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL (R.S.) POPULATION (1975 - 1978)

	APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1975										APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1978									
	DYS	%	CHINS	%	766	%	PRI-VATE	%	TOTAL	%	DYS	%	CHINS	%	766	%	PRI-VATE	%	TOTAL	%
BOYS R.S.	10	1.05%	116	12.13%	63	6.59%	84	8.79%	273	28.56%	6	.70%	62	7.20%	87	10.10%	78	9.05%	233	27.05%
GIRLS R.S.	10	1.05%	147	15.40%	7	.73%	10	1.05%	174	18.23%	0	0%	120	13.90%	27	3.15%	0	0%	147	17.05%
COED R.S.	13	1.33%	311	32.53%	108	11.30%	77	8.05%	509	53.21%	2	.20%	238	27.60%	145	16.80%	97	11.30%	482	55.90%
TOTAL	33	3.43%	574	60.06%	178	18.62%	171	17.89%	956	100%	8	.90%	420	48.70%	259	30.05%	175	20.35%	862	100%

During the 1978 sample period approximately one half of the residential school population was made up of CHINS youth. The other half of the population was made up of non-court involved youth (766 and private referrals). Less than 1% of this population were delinquents.

The administrators of coed schools estimated the percentage of girls enrolled during the 1978 sample period. The average of the estimates for enrollment of girls was 28% (135 girls). The sum of the girls in coed schools and the enrollment in girls schools indicates that approximately 32.7% of the total population in residential schools were girls. Similarly, 67.3% of the residential school population during the 1978 sample period were boys.

Table 7 shows that there has been a 45.5% increase in the category of 766 youth placed in residential schools since 1975. There was a 27% decrease in the placement of CHINS in these schools since 1975. The delinquent population has also gone down substantially. It appears that the special education legislation has impacted the placement of all other types of youth in residential schools.

G. Secure Detention/Treatment Programs (SD/T)

Secure detention and secure treatment programs are funded predominately by the Department of Youth Services (DYS). The Department of Mental Health (DMH) is presently opening small secure units. These Regional Adolescent Programs are joint efforts between the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Youth Services. They are designed to work with seriously disturbed juvenile offenders. Placement decisions are made by caseworkers from the appropriate state agency. The Department of Public Welfare neither provides block funding nor operates any secure facilities. These centers are locked, closed facilities with a staff/youth ratio of 1:1. All programming occurs within the building. Secure treatment units have an average of 13 beds. Secure detention programs have between 12 and 35 youth.

TABLE 8: SUMMARY OF DYS SECURE DETENTION PROGRAMS AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total Programs</u>	<u>Total Beds</u>	<u>Average Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	7	129	18.4
Girls	3	32	10.7
Coed	0	0	0.0
TOTAL	10	161	16.1

There were no coed secure detention programs operating during the sample period in 1978. The average bed capacity for boys detention programs is substantially higher than the capacity in girls programs. The location of boys programs is more regionally balanced than the location for girls programs.

TABLE 9: SUMMARY OF DYS SECURE TREATMENT PROGRAM (SD/T) AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total Programs</u>	<u>Total Beds</u>	<u>Average Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	4	60	15.0
Girls	2	18	9.0
Coed	0	0	0.0
TOTAL	6	78	13.0

Table 9 shows that there were a total of six secure treatment programs in operation during the 1978 sample period. The average capacity for secure treatment programs (13 beds) is lower than secure detention (16 beds).

There were 60 secure treatment slots (76.9%) available for boys and 18 (23.1%) for girls. As is the case of secure detention programs, there are no coed secure treatment programs.

TABLE 10: SUMMARY OF DMH SECURE TREATMENT PROGRAMS AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total Programs</u>	<u>Total Beds</u>	<u>Average Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	0	0	0
Girls	0	0	0
Coed	4	46	11.5
TOTAL	4	46	11.5

All four of the DMH Secure Treatment programs are coed. Three of these programs have opened since the sample period in 1975. The average bed capacity for DMH secure treatment programs (11.5 beds) is lower than those for DYS secure detention (16.1) and treatment (13.0) programs. The Department of Mental Health is presently planning to open several new secure treatment programs within the next two years.

TABLE 11: SUMMARY OF TOTAL SECURE DETENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total Programs</u>	<u>Total Beds</u>	<u>Average Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	11	189	17.1
Girls	5	50	10.0
Coed	4	46	11.5
<hr/>			
TOTAL	20	285	14.2

Table 11 shows that there were a total of 20 secure detention and treatment programs in operation during the 1978 sample period. These 20 programs maintain 285 available beds. The average capacity for these programs is 14.2 beds. The average bed capacity in girls programs (10 beds) is substantially lower than boys (17 beds). The average capacity in coed programs (DMH) (11.5 beds) is about the same as girls' programs (10.7).

Table 12 shows that the population of secure programs is made up primarily of delinquent youth. There were no CHINS youths in DYS secure treatment and detention programs during the 1978 report period. This is due to the enactment of the CHINS legislation in 1973 and the transfer of detention responsibility for CHINS from the Department of Youth Services to the Department of Public Welfare in 1977.

As stated previously, the Department of Mental Health has opened three secure treatment programs for seriously disturbed youth regardless of legal status. This is believed to account for the increase in the number of CHINS youth in DMH secure treatment programs.

Several secure treatment and detention programs have closed since the 1975 sample period and client data from these programs are not available. Therefore, computations regarding either increases or decreases in the number of delinquents held in secure facilities since 1975 can not be validly made.

TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS BY SEX AND STATUS
IN SECURE DETENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS (1975 - 1978)

	APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1975						APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1978					
	DYS	%	CHINS NON- OFFENDERS	%	TOTAL	%	DYS	%	CHINS NON- OFFENDERS	%	TOTAL	%
Boys Secure Detention	730	66.72%	37	3.39%	767	70.11%	925	68.62%	0	0%	925	68.62%
Girls Secure Detention	180	16.46%	0	0%	180	16.46%	295	21.88%	0	0%	295	21.88%
Boys (DYS) Secure Treatment	134	12.24%	0	0%	134	12.24%	68	5.05%	0	0%	68	5.05%
Girls (DYS) Secure Treatment	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	11	.82%	0	0%	11	.82%
DMH Coed Secure Treatment	0	0%	13	1.19%	13	1.19%	17	1.26%	32	2.37%	49	3.63%
TOTAL	1044	95.42%	50	4.58%	1094	100%	1316	97.63%	32	2.37%	1348	100%

Table 12 shows that during the 1978 sample period, 68.62% of the total secure population were delinquent boys in detention programs. Delinquent boys represent 75.8% of the entire secure detention population. Of the total secure population, 21.8% were delinquent girls in detention programs. However, girls represent 24.2% of the entire secure detention population. These percentages are rather high considering that girls are approximately 12% of the entire DYS population.

H. Shelters for Children in Need of Services (CHINS)

Children in Need of Services is the designation for status offenders in Massachusetts. CHINS shelter care programs are small (6-10 beds) community-based open residences that house CHINS youth. For the purposes of this study, all youth held in CHINS shelters are considered "accused CHINS". CHINS youth may be housed up to 45 days. During this time, placement decisions are made by case-workers and families are worked with fairly intensively. Most shelters have slots for youth who are not funded by a state agency nor are court-involved.

TABLE 13: SUMMARY OF CHINS SHELTER CARE PROGRAMS AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total Programs</u>	<u>Total Beds</u>	<u>Average Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	0	0	0
Girls	3	26	9
Coed	10	81	8
TOTAL	13	107	8

There were no CHINS shelter care programs specifically designed for boys in operation during the 1978 sample period. There is a total of 197 shelter care program beds available across the state and a majority of these beds are in coed programs. Three shelter care programs consist entirely of girls.

The 1975 client statistics in Table 14 are based on six shelter care programs. Since the 1975 sample period, seven new shelters have opened for a total of thirteen programs. This accounts for the 159% increase in placements between 1975 and 1978. A total of 107 beds were available for shelter care placements in 1978.

TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS BY SEX AND STATUS IN CHINS SHELTER CARE UNITS (1975 - 1978)

	APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1975						APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1978					
	DYS	%	CHINS NON OFFENDER	%	TOTAL	%	DYS	%	CHINS NON OFFENDER	%	TOTAL	%
BOYS SHELTER CARE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
GIRLS SHELTER CARE	24	12.7%	14	7.4%	38	20.1%	1	.2%	131	26.7%	132	26.9%
COED SHELTER CARE	5	2.7%	146	77.2%	151	79.9%	2	.4%	356	72.7%	358	73.1%
TOTAL	29	15.4%	160	84.6%	189	100%	3	.6%	487	99.4%	490	100%

CHINS youth and non-offenders make up the largest portion of shelter care placements. Only three delinquent youths were served in shelter care during the 1978 sample period. This represents a 90% decrease in delinquents placed in shelter care since 1975.

No shelter care units which were in operation during the 1978 report period served boys exclusively. Ten of the shelter care units served boys and girls, while three programs served girls exclusively.

Ten of the shelters had beds available for youth who are from the local community, but who are without a particular funding source (e.g., DPW, DYS). These youths are either self-referred or referral is made by a concerned individual (e.g., parent, teacher).

I. DYS Shelter Care

DYS shelter care units are structured residences usually located in a YMCA. They house between 10 and 25 youths. A full staff component offers 24 hour coverage seven days a week. The ratio of staff to residents is usually 3:5. These shelters offer some clinical and educational services. They are non-secure settings.

TABLE 15: SUMMARY OF DYS SHELTER CARE PROGRAMS AND CAPACITIES BY SEX OF CLIENT (1978)

	<u>Total Programs</u>	<u>Total Beds</u>	<u>Average Bed Capacity</u>
Boys	6	124	20.7
Girls	0	0	0
Coed	0	0	0
<hr/>			
TOTAL	6	124	20.7

Table 15 shows that there were a total of six DYS shelter care facilities in operation during the 1978 report period. A total of 124 beds were available in these facilities. Three programs had opened since the 1975 report period.

The average capacity for DYS shelter care programs is 21 beds. DYS shelter care programs have much larger capacities than CHINS shelter care programs.

Table 16 shows that a total of 661 boys were held in DYS shelter care programs during the 1978 report period. DYS boys represent 99.5% of the total DYS shelter care population. There are no coed or girls' shelter care programs. This suggests that there is a limited number of options for DYS girls who are either awaiting placement or a court appearance. The options available for girls are either foster care or secure detention.

TABLE 16: DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS BY SEX AND STATUS IN DYS SHELTER CARE PROGRAMS (1975 - 1978)

	APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1975						APRIL 1 - JUNE 30, 1978					
	DYS	%	CHINS	%	TOTAL	%	DYS	%	CHINS	%	TOTAL	%
BOYS SHELTER CARE	495	98.0%	10	2.0%	505	100%	658	99.5%	3	.5%	661	100%
GIRLS SHELTER CARE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
COED SHELTER CARE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	495	98.0%	10	2.0%	505	100%	658	99.5%	3	.5%	661	100%

J. Residential Program Aggregate Information

Table 17 presents aggregate program information for the years 1968, 1975, and 1978, respectively. Specific information regarding the various types of programs is detailed in previous sections of this report.

Prior to deinstitutionalization, the Department of Youth Services (DYS) had a very small, flexible fund account which was used to place a few children in private facilities. Usually, these placements were subsidized by a charitable organization. (e.g., Catholic or Protestant churches). The 1967/68 column includes only state operated programs. Private programs (usually schools) which accepted a few court involved youths are not included in the reported data, as the placement of youths in those facilities did not occur on any regular basis. The Department of Youth Services did not have a formalized purchase of service system prior to being deinstitutionalized.

Table 17 indicates that there has been a 47% increase in the number of residential programs, from 94 to 138, since the 1975 sample period. This percentage is an estimate because several programs have closed since the 1975 sample period and information regarding these programs is not available; the number of programs operating in 1975 has, therefore, been estimated at 94. There has been a 1,433% increase in the number of programs since 1968, when nine such programs were in operation.

There has been an increase of 256% in the number of beds available exclusively for girls since 1968 from 110 to 392, and a 19% increase from 329 beds in 1975. At the same time, there has been a 59% increase in beds exclusively for boys since 1968 from 698 to 1,112 and a 17% increase from 950 beds in 1975. Coed slots have increased by 765%.

Table 17 shows that there has been a significant decrease in the average bed capacity since 1968. The average capacity for girls programs (12.6) is smaller than either boys (19.5) or coed (20.6) programs. Of the 2,534 total number of residential beds available during the 1978 reporting period, 43.9% are for boys, 15.5% are for girls, and 40.6% are coed.

The total CHINS population, broken down by sex, is estimated at 60% girls and 40% boys.* Approximately 12% of the DYS population is made up of girls and 88% of the DYS population is boys.

Table 17 illustrates the dramatic increase in the number of residential programs opened since 1968. The impact of this increase is that adolescents are treated in cities and towns across the state and in many cases are in closer proximity to their own communities. The industrial schools open prior to deinstitutionalization were often located in rural areas and were not readily accessible to families of the youth in placement.

*"Diagnostic Study of the Massachusetts Children in Need of Services Program", Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, MA, June 1978.

TABLE 17: FACILITY AGGREGATE CHART FOR 1967/68, 1975, 1978

	1967/68*	1975	1978
Total Residential Programs:	9	94	138
Total Secure Programs:	9	9	20
Total Non-Secure Programs:	0	85	118
Total Private Programs:	0	88	129
Total State Operated Programs:	9	6	9
Total Bed Capacity:	927	2077	2534
Average Bed Capacity:	103	22.0	18.3
Total Secure Bed Capacity:	Detention: 167 Treatment: 760	160	285
Average Secure Bed Capacity:	Detention: 41.7 Treatment: 152.0	17.7	14.2
Total Non-Secure Bed Capacity:	0	1917	2249
Average Non-Secure Bed Capacity:	0	22.5	19.0
Total Group Care Programs:	0	51	72
Total Specialized Group Care:	0	12	14
Total Residential Schools:	0	13	13
Total Secure Detention Programs:	4	6	10
Total Secure Treatment Programs:	5	3	10
Total CHINS Shelter:	0	6	13

*Data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services. Data on county operated training schools: Essex, Middlesex, and Hampden is not included.

(Continued)

(TABLE 17, Continued)

FACILITY AGGREGATE CHART FOR 1967/68, 1975, 1978			
	1967/68*	1975	1978
Total DYS Shelters:	0	3	6
Total Boys' Programs:	6	44	57
Total Boys Bed Capacity:	698	950	1112
Average Boys Bed Capacity:	116.3	21.5	19.5
Total Girls' Programs:	1	23	31
Total Girls Bed Capacity:	110	329	392
Average Girls Bed Capacity:	110	14.3	12.6
Total Coed Programs:	2	27	50
Total Coed Bed Capacity:	119	798	1030
Average Coed Bed Capacity:	59.5	29.5	20.6

*Data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services. Data on county operated training schools: Essex, Middlesex, and Hampden is not included.

The decline in the average bed capacity since 1968 is also quite substantial. This allows small agencies that operate residential programs to tailor their treatment focus for a specific clientele. This flexibility did not exist in the larger institutions. The size of these institutions prohibited their ability to focus on the needs of each individual youth.

Table 17 shows that during the 1978 sample period, 93.4% (129 of 138 programs) of the residential services were provided by the private sector on a purchase of service basis. The state operates only 6.5% of the existing residential services. Over the last 10 years, the state has relinquished the responsibility of the operation of facilities to the private sector. This has allowed for the implementation of a competitive system of service delivery. Private agencies are in competition with each other for contracts for programs and it should follow that contracts are awarded to quality minded agencies. State agencies also have the ability to stop sending referrals to programs that they deem ineffective. This places demands on programs to address programmatic issues and problems if the program is to survive. How well the private providers are monitored by state agencies cannot be determined at this point, but this presents an issue for further investigation.

These three factors; number of programs, average bed capacity and service provision by the private sector, are reflective of the philosophical transition regarding the treatment of court involved youth since the late 1960's. These changes earmark the direction the state has chosen in treating youth; however, the effectiveness of this approach in regard to the provision of services has not been thoroughly investigated. This study has focused on quantitative issues. Further, analysis of residential programs from a qualitative perspective would be necessary to thoroughly assess the impact of deinstitutionalization.

The 1975-1978 data analysis indicates that Massachusetts is in substantial compliance with the deinstitutionalization and separation mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. There has been a 94% reduction in the detainment of accused status offenders and non-offenders in juvenile detention facilities since 1975. In respect to adjudicated status offenders there has been a 66.8% reduction in their placement in correctional facilities. However, as stated previously, this reduction percentage would be much greater if the category of residential schools were not included in the aggregate (see pg. 13). In regard to the separation of juveniles from incarcerated adults, Massachusetts was in 100% compliance in the baseline year and similarly in 1978.

The most dramatic change in programming for status offenders in Massachusetts took place in the late 1960's, before which time all youths, accused or adjudicated, delinquent or status offenders, were commingled in large secure facilities called training schools. At that time, a massive deinstitutionalization effort was accomplished with the commitment and cooperation of various key groups in the Commonwealth.

Special interest groups such as the League of Women Voters and the Massachusetts Council on Crime and Corrections spearheaded the closing of the training schools by educating the legislature and the public as to the abuses and non-productivity of the juvenile institutions. The legislature halted the incarceration of juveniles in adult facilities and paved the way for decriminalization of status offenses.

Public response came in several forms. Local communities provided the means for the transition by allowing the establishment of small, open group homes and other alternatives to institutionalization. Private non-profit social service agencies opened and designed programs for youth in response to the critical need for placements.

In the private sector, agencies' boards proved invaluable allies. In the early critical years (1970) these boards of citizen volunteers provided for the survival of the community based movement with their endeavors in community relations, fund raising and donations of legal, medical and other professional and paraprofessional services. The state youth-serving agencies had to completely shift their focus from an institutional system to a purchase of service system.

The Commonwealth's deinstitutionalization efforts were furthered by the availability of federal funds through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) and the Omnibus Crime Control Act (LEAA). After the closing of the training schools LEAA funds supported projects such as group homes and shelter care units. These programs served as model projects that were replicated throughout the state and provided alternative placements for court involved youths.

Thus, the deinstitutionalization of court-involved youth in Massachusetts was a result of an effort instigated and supported by private citizens, advanced by the state and refined with federal funds.

Throughout this report we have in effect used two baseline years, 1967 and 1975. We have done this to provide a more accurate picture of the effects of deinstitutionalization which occurred in Massachusetts ten years ago, effects which predate the rest of the country by as much as five or ten years.

In addition, we feel that the real effect of deinstitutionalization can be more equitably measured by looking at the private sector's response to the closing of the training schools. For example, in 1967 there were five state-operated secure-training schools in Massachusetts with an average capacity of 152 beds. Since deinstitutionalization, these schools have been replaced by 118 privately operated, non-secure treatment programs with an average capacity of 19 beds. Similarly, four secure detention centers open in 1967 with an average capacity of 41 beds have been replaced by 20 secure treatment detention programs with an average of 14 beds. The replacement of large, state-operated training schools and detention centers with smaller, community based facilities is, we believe, the most accurate measure of Massachusetts' progress in deinstitutionalization. Clearly, this information is indicative of the Commonwealth's commitment to a community-based network of residential treatment programs for status offenders and delinquents.

APPENDIX A

KEY

Facility Code:	Numerical designation for each program
Capacity:	Maximum bed capacity for each program
Region:	DYS geographic region within which the program is located
Type: P-N =	Private non-profit agency
P-P =	Private profit-making agency
S =	State operated agency
Q =	Quasi state/private agency
	This is different type of purchase of service agreement. A private agency may receive funds from a state agency for a percentage of the beds or for all beds for their clients. In some cases, state personnel will work in the private program along with the private agency personnel.
Clients: CHINS -	Children in Need of Services - Status Offenders
N-O	Non-offenders - Abused and Neglected youth
Delinquent, DYS	A juvenile who has been charged with or adjudicated for conduct which would be a crime if committed by an adult.
766 -	Non-court involved youth in need of special educational services
Private -	Youth funded by and placed in programs and schools by their own parents.
DMH -	Youth in the care of the Department of Mental Health

KEY (Continued)

Focus: Program Focus

Educ. -	Education
Grp. Care -	Group Care
Treat. -	Treatment program
Det. -	Detention program
Diag. -	Diagnostic program
MH-tr. -	Mental Health treatment program

N/A: Information is not available

Not open: Program not in existence during report period

Community Based: Program meets OJJDP community based criteria and Office for Children licensing regulations for family work has been verified.

The 1975 client data is, in some cases, an estimation on the part of the facility administrator.

GROUP CARE PROGRAMS

CHART 1-A

Facility Code	Capacity	Region	Type	Client	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	
					CHINS N-0	Delinquent	CHINS N-0	Delinquent
24	6	7	P/N	Coed		Not Open	7	1
90	10	6	P/N	Girls	N/A	→		
91	8	6	P/N	Coed	8	0	9	0
92	8	6	P/N	Coed	8	0	8	0
117	15	1	P/N	Coed		Not Open	14	1
128	17	1	P/N	Coed	16	1	17	1
131	12	1	P/N	Coed		Not Open	7	2
132	6	1	P/N	Coed		Not Open	4	1
134	6	1	P/N	Coed		Not Open	6	0
135	6	1	P/N	Coed		Not Open	5	1
136	6	1	P/N	Coed		Not Open	4	2
168	6	1	P/N	Girls	5	0	4	0
169	6	1	P/N	Boys	5	0	5	0
TOTALS:					42	1	90	9

GROUP CARE PROGRAMS

CHART 1-B

Facility Code	Capacity	Region	Type	Client	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	
					CHINS N-0	Delinquent	CHINS N-0	Delinquent
173	5	1	P/N	Boys	1	3	1	4
196	6	1	P/N	Boys	Not Open		5	0
218	14	4	P/N	Boys	10	0	15	0
225	9	1	P/N	Coed	Not Open		7	1
226	7	1	P/N	Coed	Not Open		7	0
249	9	2	P/N	Girls	6	0	11	0
271	13	2	P/N	Boys	Not Open		19	0
272	18	2	P/N	Boys	15	5	22	0
292	7	2	P/N	Coed	Not Open		8	0
297	6	2	P/N	Girls	4	0	8	0
298	6	2	P/N	Girls	6	0	6	0
318	8	6	P/N	Girls	Not Open		Open Late 1978	
320	8	6	P/N	Boys	8	0	10	0
TOTALS:					50	8	119	5

GROUP CARE PROGRAMS

CHART 1-C

Facility Code	Capacity	Region	Type	Client	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	
					CHINS N-0	Delinquent	CHINS N-0	Delinquent
340	4	1	P/N	Girls	0	4	3	0
343	12	2	P/N	Boys	6	14	3	9
371	9	2	P/N	Boys	2	8	2	11
376	7	3	P/N	Girls	1	0	2	0
301	7	3	P/N	Girls	8	0	9	0
377	10	5	P/N	Coed	8	0	7	0
378	12	3	P/N	Boys	N/A →		5	10
393	9	7	P/N	Coed	16	4	14	5
401	15	3	P/N	Boys	Not Open		6	17
439	14	4	P/N	Girls	10	0	15	0
475	16	4	P/N	Boys	14	0	12	0
403	7	4	P/N	Boys	7	0	7	0
404	7	4	P/N	Boys	7	0	7	0
TOTALS:					79	30	92	52

GROUP CARE PROGRAMS

CHART 1-D

Facility Code	Capacity	Region	Type	Client	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	
					CHINS N-0	Delinquent	CHINS N-0	Delinquent
485	8	4	P/N	Girls	7	0	8	0
488	12	3	P/N	Coed	N/A →		4	6
515	15	3	P/N	Boys	4	13	8	12
527	6	3	P/P	Boys	Not Open		7	0
540	14	3	P/N	Boys	8	1	4	5
572	9	5	P/N	Coed	N/A →		8	0
583	10	5	P/N	Boys	6	0	9	0
586	8	7	P/N	Coed	Opened 8/78 →			
604	4	3	P/N	Girls	2	0	4	0
608	12	5	P/N	Girls	10	0	9	0
678	12	3	P/N	Coed	N/A →			
680	12	3	P/N	Coed	N/A →			
688	20	5	P/N	Boys	0	30	0	54
TOTALS:					37	44	61	77

GROUP CARE PROGRAMS

CHART 1-E

Facility Code	Capacity	Region	Type	Client	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	
					CHINS N-0	Delinquent	CHINS N-0	Delinquent
710	12	7	P/N	Coed	Not Open		18	3
720	12	7	P/N	Girls	12	0	16	1
724	9	6	P/N	Girls	8	2	8	1
774	16	7	P/N	Boys	11	0	10	4
780	6	7	P/N	Boys	6	0	7	0
781	8	7	P/N	Boys	8	0	7	0
803	8	4	P/N	Boys	4	1	8	0
808	18	7	P/N	Boys	15	16	19	11
859	12	6	P/N	Boys	Opened 1977		0	13
932	13	1	P/N	Coed	11	0	18	6
962	4	3	P/N	Girls	2	0	5	0
986	12	1	P/N	Boys	1	15	0	15
998	12	6	P/N	Boys	0	2	3	9
TOTALS:					78	36	119	63

GROUP CARE PROGRAMS

CHART 1-F

Facility Code	Capacity	Region	Type	Client	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	
					CHINS N-0	Delinquent	CHINS N-0	Delinquent
1004	8	2	P/N	Girls	N/A	→		
1055	14	5	P/N	Coed	Not Open		14	0
1081	7	7	P/N	Coed	Opened 12/78	→		
1083	4	7	P/N	Girls	Opened 11/78	→		
1084	7	7	P/N	Girls	7	0	7	0
1086	15	5	P/N	Coed	N/A	→	17	0
219	8	7	P/N	Girls	10	0	6	0
TOTALS:					17	0	44	0
GRAND TOTALS(GC):					303	119	525	206

SPECIALIZED GROUP CARE

CHART 2-A

Facility Code	Type	Capacity	Community Based	Focus	Client	1975				1978				
						April 1-June 30				April 1-June 30				
						DYS	CHINS	766	Other	DYS	CHINS	766	Other	
109	P-P	30	Yes	Educ.	Boys		Not Open				2	7	15	4
122	P-P	40	Yes	Educ.	Boys	0	27	4	0	0	29	11	0	
273	P-N	27	Yes	Diag.	Coed	2	25	0	0	1	26	3	0	
279	P-N	36	Yes	Educ.	Boys	0	28	8	0	0	26	10	0	
296	P-N	32	*	Educ.	Girls	1	33	0	2	0	28	1	11	
306	P-N	30	Yes	Educ.	Boys	0	4	13	7	0	1	22	7	
316	P-N	25	No	Educ.	Boys	0	20	0	0	0	23	0	0	
438	P-N	23	Yes	Educ.	Coed	0	16	1	1	0	21	3	4	
440	P-N	22	Yes	Educ.	Boys	0	15	0	0	0	20	3	3	
448	P-P	36	**	Educ.	Coed		Not Open				0	8	30	0
TOTALS:						3	168	26	10	3	189	98	29	

*policywise yes
verification no

**no verification

SPECIALIZED GROUP CARE

CHART 2-B

Facility Code	Type	Capacity	Community Based	Focus	Client	<u>1975</u> April 1-June 30				<u>1978</u> April 1-June 30			
						DYS	CHINS	766	Other	DYS	CHINS	766	Other
607	P-N	22	Yes	Educ.	Boys	2	22	0	0	1	20	0	0
711	P-N	25	Yes	Grp. Care	Coed	0	23	0	1	0	23	0	2
786	P-N	32	Yes	Grp. Care	Boys	1	27	0	3	2	27	0	5
1,015	P-N	35	Yes	Educ.	Coed	0	42	0	0	0	35	2	0
TOTALS:						3	114	0	4	3	105	2	7
GRAND TOTAL(SGC):						6	282	26	14	6	294	100	36

RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

CHART 3

Facility Code	Capacity	Type	Clients	Ages Served	DYS	<u>1975</u> April 1-June 30			<u>1978</u> April 1-June 30			
						CHINS	766	Private	DYS	CHINS	766	Private
676	49	P-P	Boys	7-21	0	20	23	3	2	9	34	3
181	88	P-P	Coed	7-21	0	10	50	7	1	16	50	5
959	48	P-N	Boys	12-16	3	56	0	0	3	32	9	0
1034	44	P-N	Boys	12-18	2	40	0	0	0	21	1	0
235	63	P-P	Boys	5-22	2	0	40	21	0	0	43	20
482	66	P-N	Coed	6-13	4	55	4	0	0	50	16	0
779	72	P-N	Coed	6-16	5	82	7	0	1	71	19	0
931	55	P-N	Girls	12-18	7	84	7	0	0	63	12	0
61	112	P-N	Coed	2-12	0	126	1	0	0	84	12	0
631	76	P-P	Girls	11-21	3	63	0	10	0	57	15	0
252	108	P-N	Coed	8-16	4	0	36	69	0	0	17	92
197	65	P-N	Coed	5-14	0	38	10	1	0	17	31	0
576	56	P-N	Boys	8-14	3	0	0	60	1	0	0	55
TOTALS:					33	574	178	171	8	420	259	175

SECURE DETENTION/TREATMENT PROGRAMS

CHART 4-A

Facility Code	Capacity	Clients	Type	Focus	1975				1978			
					DYS	CHINS	766	DMH	DYS	CHINS	766	DMH
328	12	Girls	Q	Treat.	opened 11/78 →							
748	8	Girls	Q	Det.	not open				30	0	0	0
930	12	Girls	Q	Det./ Diag.	not open				66	0	0	0
98	12	Girls	P-N	Det.	180	0	0	0	199	0	0	0
1,074	8	Boys	S	Det.	N/A →				270	0	0	0
94	12	Boys	S	Treat.	not open				36	0	0	0
410	14	Boys	P-N	Det.	not open				62	0	0	0
374	6	Girls	P-N	Treat.	not open				11	0	0	0
1,070	35	Boys	S	Det.	434	16	0	0	185	0	0	0
314	15	Boys	P-N	Treat.	opened 9/78 →							
1,075	12	Boys	S	Det.	not open				60	0	0	0
TOTALS:					614	16	0	0	919	0	0	0

SECURE DETENTION/TREATMENT PROGRAMS

CHART 4-B

Facility Code	Capacity	Clients	Type	Focus	1975				1978			
					DYS	CHINS	766	DMH	DYS	CHINS	766	DMH
364	14	Boys	Q	Treat.	19	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
1,078	21	Boys	Q	Det.	50	0	0	0	57	0	0	0
1,079	19	Boys	S	Treat.	115	0	0	0	18	0	0	0
1,077	24	Boys	Q	Det.	85	9	0	0	115	0	0	0
1,080	15	Boys	S	Det.	161	12	0	0	176	0	0	0
924	12	Coed	P-N	MH-tr.	0	1	12	0	0	2	12	0
472	11	Coed	S	MH-tr.	not open				5	0	0	6
1,099	12	Coed	S	MH-tr.	not open				6	4	0	0
42	11	Coed	P-N	MH-tr.	not open				6	1	7	0
TOTALS:					430	22	12	0	397	8	19	6
GRAND TOTAL(SD/T):					1044	38	12	0	1316	8	19	6

-56-

DPW-CHINS SHELTER CARE

CHART 5

Facility Code	Capacity	Type	Focus	Clients	<u>1975</u> April 1-June 30			<u>1978</u> April 1-June 30		
					Accused CHINS	DYS	Other	Accused CHINS	DYS	Other
590	13	P-N	Diag.	Girls	14	24	0	38	1	0
494	6	P-N	Shelter	Coed	not open			31	0	0
339	10	P-N	Shelter	Coed	not open			6	0	28
589	10	P-N	Shelter	Coed	not open			18	0	5
612	4	P-N	Shelter	Coed	1	0	36	1	1	30
342	10	P-N	Shelter	Girls	not open			68	0	24
392	7	P-N	Shelter/Drug	Coed	0	0	37	27	0	12
355	8	P-N	Shelter	Coed	26	2	2	50	0	5
396	7	P-N	Shelter	Coed	not open			43	0	1
1082	3	P-N	Diag.	Girls	not open			1	0	0
387	8	P-N	Shelter	Coed	not open			20	0	3
919	13	P-N	Shelter	Coed	16	3	4	18	0	16
200	8	P-N	Shelter	Coed	9	0	15	12	1	30
TOTALS:					66	29	94	333	3	154

DYS SHELTER CARE

CHART 6

Facility Code	Capacity	Type	Focus	Clients	<u>1975</u>		<u>1978</u>	
					Accused CHINS	Delinquent	Accused CHINS	Delinquent
796	25	Q	Shelter	Boys	0	283	0	232
983	18	P-N	Shelter	Boys		Not Open	0	42
795	24	P-N	Shelter	Boys	4	86	0	172
332	4	P-N	Shelter	Boys		Not Open	0	18
379	5	P-N	Shelter	Boys		Not Open	0	76
1072	48	S	Outward Bound	Boys	6	126	3	118
TOTALS:					10	495	3	658

FACILITIES FOR COURT
INVOLVED YOUTH OPEN
IN 1967/68

CHART 7

Facility	Capacity	Clients	Type	Focus
Lancaster Training School	110	Girls	State	Treatment
Bridgewater Training School	100	Boys	State	Treatment
Shirley Training School	150	Boys	State	Treatment
Lymon School	320	Boys	State	Treatment
Oakdale School	80	Boys	State	Treatment
Westfield Detention Center	24	Boys	State	Detention
Worcester Detention Center	24	Boys	State	Detention
Roslindale Center	84	Coed	State	Detention
Jamaica Plain/ Huntington Avenue Center	35	Coed	State	Detention

CLIENT INFORMATION SUPPLIED
BY DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES

CHART 8

	1967/68	
	<u>CHINS</u>	<u>DELINQUENTS</u>
Secure Treatment Institution Operated by DYS	377	823
Secure Detention Facilities Operated by DYS	83	183
Psychiatric Hospital	0	0
Residential/Boarding	0	0
Other: Over 20 beds	8	22
TOTALS:	<u>468</u>	<u>1028</u>

COUNTY-OPERATED TRAINING SCHOOLS
OPEN IN 1967/68

CHART 9

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Clients</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Focus</u>
Middlesex County Training School	100*	Boys	County	Treatment
Essex County Training School	100*	Boys	County	Treatment
Hampden County Training School	100*	Boys	County	Treatment

*approximations

END