

Third Analysis and Evaluation

Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs

Third Analysis and Evaluation

Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs

63692

**Office of
Juvenile
Justice and
Delinquency
Prevention**



**Law Enforcement
Assistance Administration**

**U.S. Department
of Justice**

Letter of Transmittal

To the President and to the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit the Third Analysis and Evaluation of Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs as required by Section 204 (b) (5) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 95-115).

The period of this report, fiscal year 1978, represents a time of growth and maturation for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and for the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Effort. This report shows a good deal of significant activity on the part of OJJDP:

- . Thirty-seven states were required to demonstrate by December 31, 1978, a 75% reduction in the number of non-criminal children held in their detention and correctional facilities.
- . A new technical assistance strategy was developed which assisted both OJJDP and the TA recipients to focus their assistance priorities and which facilitated proactive TA planning by OJJDP.
- . Two important Special Emphasis discretionary initiatives were developed during the fiscal year, Juvenile Restitution and School Crime Prevention.
- . The National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention began to harvest the results of evaluation and research projects which were initiated in the earliest years of the Office.
- . The National Advisory Committee continued its active role in assisting the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, while the Federal Coordinating Council began to formulate its role in over-all coordination of Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

In essence, fiscal year 1978 was a period in which OJJDP became the possessor of a wealth of knowledge garnered from past research and demonstration efforts, as well as from the concerns and ideas expressed by experts and practitioners who are most aware of the real life situations of young people and the systems designed to support them.

The next, and perhaps most difficult, task facing the Office is the task of putting our experience and knowledge to maximum use. Whether or not we succeed in serving the best interests of children will be determined by how well we plan for the future. . . how well we listen to and act upon the advice given to us by governments, public and private organizations, youth advocates, minorities and youth. In fiscal year 1979, OJJDP has developed a process for systematically receiving and using the expertise of these various groups and individuals. This process will be formally implemented in fiscal year 1980.

A major task outlined in this fiscal year 1978 report, namely the process for submission of annual Delinquency Development Statements by Federal agencies which administer programs for juveniles, is indicative of OJJDP's commitment to coordinate juvenile justice programs, not only at the state and local levels, but also at the Federal level. During fiscal years 1979 and 1980, OJJDP will work diligently to strengthen the roles of the Federal Coordinating Council and the National Advisory Committee, and to provide both groups with staff support through OJJDP's Concentration of Federal Effort funds.

I am proud of OJJDP's accomplishments in fiscal year 1978, and I invite the comments of all who read this report.

Respectfully submitted,

David D. West

David D. West
Acting Associate Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PART ONE -- INTRODUCTION	
A. OVERVIEW	1
B. PHILOSOPHY OF THE ACT	2
C. FUNDING	2
PART TWO -- OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE	3
A. CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORT	3
B. FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAM/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	7
C. SPECIAL EMPHASIS PROGRAM	18
D. NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION	29
PART THREE -- NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE	45
A. INTRODUCTION	45
B. NAC AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND RESULTS -- OCTOBER 1, 1977 -- SEPTEMBER 30, 1978	46
C. TESTIMONY	59
D. COMMITTEE STAFFING	60
E. CONCLUSION	60
PART FOUR -- COORDINATING COUNCIL	61
A. INTRODUCTION	61
B. COUNCIL FUNCTION	62
C. MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS	63
D. DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS CONSIDERED BY THE COORDINATING COUNCIL	68
PART FIVE -- REPORT ON SIX SELECT FEDERAL PROGRAMS	73
A. INTRODUCTION	73
B. METHODOLOGY	73
C. DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS	76
D. ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS	89
E. IMPLICATIONS FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL	93
F. BIBLIOGRAPHY	94
PART SIX -- PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OF DELINQUENCY DEVELOPMENT STATEMENTS	97

Part One

Introduction

A. OVERVIEW

To serve as the focal point for Federal efforts to control delinquency, a new Federal program within the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) was established by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. The Act created the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) composed of two operating divisions: the Office of Operations and the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJD).

The Office of Operations:

- Coordinates all Federal juvenile delinquency programs,
- Provides formula grants to the States,
- Awards discretionary grants through the Special Emphasis Program, and
- Provides technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments, agencies, and organizations.

The National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:

- Conducts research into the problems of juvenile delinquency and evaluates juvenile justice programs,
- Develops standards for the administration of juvenile justice,
- Provides training for persons working or preparing to work in the delinquency field, and
- Acts as an information clearinghouse.

The functions of the operating divisions are closely coordinated. In funding a Special Emphasis Grant program, for example, NIJJDP prepares background research and conducts evaluations, while the technical assistance staff works with the grantees to improve project operations.

B. PHILOSOPHY OF THE ACT

The Act emphasizes the prevention of delinquency and the treatment of offenders. It encourages programs and policies that deter young people from initial contact with the juvenile justice system, diverts them from further contact, and ensures that status offenders are not institutionalized in correctional facilities. In addition, the Act recognizes that a large proportion of serious crime is committed by juveniles and, therefore, for the safety of Society, that serious crimes must be curtailed.

C. FUNDING

During Fiscal Year 1978, the OJJDP administered a budget in excess of \$150 million.

Part Two

Office of Juvenile Justice

The Office of Operations is responsible for the overall administration of OJJDP's grants and assistance programs and for the promulgation of national juvenile delinquency policies, objectives, and priorities. Specific areas of responsibility include:

- o the Concentration of Federal Effort;
- o the Special Emphasis Grant Program;
- o Formula Grants; and
- o Technical Assistance.

A. CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORT

Under the Concentration of Federal Effort Program, the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is responsible for implementing overall policy and developing objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities relating to prevention, diversion, training, treatment, rehabilitation, evaluation, research, and improvement of the juvenile justice system. The Administrator advises the President, through the Attorney General, as to all matters relating to federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs and Federal policies regarding juvenile delinquency.

As mandated in Sections 204(a), 204(b)(3), and 204(3) of the JJDP Act of 1974, Concentration of Federal Effort calls for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency to:

- Develop objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs;
- Conduct and support evaluations of Federal juvenile delinquency programs;
- Implement Federal juvenile programs among and with other Federal agencies;
- Develop annually a concise report of Federal juvenile delinquency programs;

- Provide technical assistance to governments and agencies concerning juvenile delinquency programs; and
- Develop a comprehensive plan for Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

The term "Federal juvenile delinquency program" is defined by Congress as any program or activity related to juvenile delinquency prevention, control, diversion, treatment, rehabilitation, planning, education, training, and research, including drug and alcohol abuse programs; the improvement of the juvenile justice system; and any program or activity for neglected, abandoned, or dependent youth and other youth to help prevent delinquency.

In carrying out its coordinating functions, the OJJDP works closely with the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and with the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Coordinating Council is made up of the heads of Federal agencies most directly involved in youth-related program activities. The National Advisory Committee has 21 members appointed by the President. The Office has provided staff assistance for both organizations, including arranging and scheduling meetings, providing background information, and developing agenda. The Office has encouraged the groups to work together and to be aware of each other's activities.

1. National Advisory Committee Activities

Since its creation, the National Advisory Committee has met thirteen times and has provided valuable citizen input to the President, Congress, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Committee continues to provide particular focus through its three subcommittees:

- (1) the Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention;
- (2) the Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice; and
- (3) the Advisory Committee for the Concentration of Federal Effort.

Activities and recommendations of the National Advisory Committee are described in Part 3.

2. Coordinating Council Activities

As required by law, the Coordinating Council met four times

during the fiscal year. Meetings during FY-1978 focused on identifying and reviewing Federal juvenile programs for consistency or inconsistency with Sections 223(a)(12) and (13) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 1977. The Council activities are described in detail in Part 4.

3. Specific Projects in Concentration of Federal Efforts

Examples of several projects in which the OJJDP has been involved are described below:

- a. Information Dissemination -- Coordination of Federal Assistance for the Election/Appointment of County Officials. Award Amount: \$158,004; Award Date: 25 Sept. 1978.

The objectives of the Project are to:

- Promote knowledge about and wider use of existing Federal, State and local resources for deinstitutionalization, diversion and youth development;
- Encourage youth advocacy and the coordination of community services through the creation of organization and planning capabilities;
- Develop collaboration and coalition building among public and private agencies, services, and programs for youth;
- Foster communication and partnership arrangements between State and County governments; and
- Promote conciliation, mediation, and arbitration as alternative dispositional processes to the traditional Justice Systems.

Program activities during the one year demonstration project included provision of technical assistance to county officials and agencies, operation of an information clearinghouse, analysis of legislative proposals and Federal Program guidelines, preparation of issue papers, workshops and presentations during National, State and local meetings, a survey of counties on organizations and services for youth, and preparation and distribution of a directory of Federal programs and funding sources to help coordinate Federal juvenile delinquency programs. The primary clients of the project were elected and appointed county officials and their staffs; however, other Government officials and private organizations also will benefit.

- b. Today's Girls, Tomorrow's Woman -- Advocacy for Adolescent Girls.
Award Amount: \$181,466; Award Date: 30 Sept. 1978

This 15-month demonstration project provided training to Girls Clubs of America, local and regional leadership on the needs of adolescent females, and increase the capacity of Girls Clubs of America and other national youth-serving organizations to provide and coordinate services to adolescent females. The project focused on three primary issues: young females and the law; young females and sexuality/sexual exploitation; and, young females and education/career development. The project was nationwide in scope and involved all 258 Girls Club service centers which serve more than 205,000 members. The project activities included preparation and publication of a book of facts and readings dealing with the relationship of adolescent girls to the law, sexuality, and employment; development of a training manual and program to be conducted at seven regional sites to be attended by a total of more than 400 persons; and, assistance to local Girls Clubs in planning and conducting training programs in their communities that will bring together the agencies and individuals with major responsibility for providing services to young females. In addition, a national coalition was formed to advocate on behalf of and coordinate services to adolescent females.

- c. Institution/Deinstitution of Children and Youth Project
Award Amount: \$299,800; Award Date: 21 June, 1978

This study assessed the impact of Federal Programs and policies on institutionalization of children and youth. Four analytic tasks were undertaken.

- An assessment of Federal Resources that contribute to institutionalization of children and youth;
- An assessment (in three to five States) of patterns of responsibility for non-offenders with special attention to the boundaries of responsibility between the sectors of juvenile justice, welfare and social services, education, and mental health;
- An assessment in the same states of the impact on State service delivery systems of Federal programs and policies relating to institutionalization of children and youth; and,
- Selected case studies and commissioned papers.

The study was conducted by a panel constituted under the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Child Development Research and Public Policy with the assistance of a small professional staff.

The programs that will be reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences will include: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles IVA, IVB, XIX (Medicaid) and XX of the Social Security Act, and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts programs (LEAA).

B. FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAM/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

1. Formula Grants Program

a. Introduction

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, provides formula grant funds to participating States and Territories, based on relative populations under the age of 18. All States are eligible for a minimum of \$225,000 a year. The annual allotment to American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory, and the Virgin Islands is \$56,250. During the Fiscal Year 1978, \$63,750,000 in Federal Funds were available as formula grants (see Table 1). Fifty States and Territories of a total of 56 eligible jurisdictions received formula grant awards. Those States not participating in the program included Nebraska, Nevada, Oklahoma, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. Although the awards are viewed as Formula Grants, they are in reality a performance contract, because each participating State must achieve specific changes in its Juvenile Justice System and the way in which services are delivered to young people.

b. Formula Grant Objectives

TABLE 1

FORMULA GRANTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978 UNDER JJDP ACT

	<u>FY 1978</u>	<u>'78 Sup</u>	<u>FY '78 Total</u>
Alabama	1,098,000	182,000	1,280,000
Alaska	225,000	21,000	246,000
Arizona	692,000	115,000	807,000
Arkansas	623,000	103,000	726,000
California	5,929,000	981,000	6,910,000
Colorado	748,000	124,000	872,000
Connecticut	863,000	143,000	1,006,000
Delaware	225,000	28,000	253,000
Dist. of Columbia	225,000	31,000	256,000
Florida	2,184,000	361,000	2,545,000
Georgia	1,524,000	252,000	1,776,000
Hawaii	264,000	44,000	308,000
Idaho	260,000	43,000	303,000
Illinois	3,262,000	539,000	3,801,000
Indiana	1,598,000	264,000	1,862,000
Iowa	834,000	138,000	972,000
Kansas	631,000	104,000	735,000
Kentucky	1,009,000	167,000	1,176,000
Louisiana	1,230,000	203,000	1,433,000
Maine	314,000	52,000	368,000
Maryland	1,202,000	199,000	1,401,000
Massachusetts	1,617,000	268,000	1,885,000
Michigan	2,813,000	465,000	3,278,000
Minnesota	1,179,000	195,000	1,374,000
Mississippi	773,000	128,000	901,000
Missouri	1,345,000	223,000	1,568,000
Montana	229,000	38,000	267,000
Nebraska*	449,000	---	---
Nevada*	225,000	---	---
New Hampshire	241,000	40,000	281,000
New Jersey	2,069,000	342,000	2,411,000
New Mexico	383,000	63,000	446,000
New York	4,988,000	825,000	5,813,000
North Carolina	1,602,000	265,000	1,867,000
North Dakota*	225,000	---	---
Ohio	3,180,000	526,000	3,706,000
Oklahoma*	762,000	---	---
Oregon	637,000	105,000	742,000
Pennsylvania	3,237,000	535,000	3,772,000
Rhode Island	256,000	42,000	298,000
South Carolina	882,000	146,000	1,028,000
South Dakota*	225,000	---	---
Tennessee	1,209,000	200,000	1,409,000
Texas	3,749,000	620,000	4,369,000
Utah	421,000	70,000	491,000
Vermont	225,000	23,000	248,000
Virginia	1,437,000	238,000	1,675,000
Washington	1,013,000	167,000	1,180,000
West Virginia	512,000	85,000	597,000
Wisconsin	1,376,000	228,000	1,604,000
Wyoming*	225,000	---	---
Puerto Rico	1,101,000	182,000	1,283,000
American Samoa	56,250	2,000	58,250
Guam	56,250	6,000	62,250
Trust Territories	56,250	4,000	60,250
Virgin Islands	56,250	8,000	64,250
N. Mariana	---	---	---
Total	63,750,000	10,133,000	73,883,000

*Monies allocated, but not used.

The major objectives of the Formula Grant Program follow:

- To assist State and local communities with resources to develop and implement effective methods of preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency;
- To increase the capacity of State and local governments to conduct effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs;*
- To promote and expedite system and process changes necessary for the deinstitutionalization of status offenders (those offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult) from detention and correctional facilities; and
- To remove or provide adequate separation of juveniles alleged to be delinquent or found delinquent from adults incarcerated in jails and other correctional facilities.

c. Participation Requirements

All States and Territories participating in the JJDP Act Formula Grant Program are required to develop and submit a comprehensive plan application embodying provisions of the Act. This application must be submitted by an agency designated by the Chief Executive Officer of the State or Territory. As an example of the specific provisions required in the plan application, the following must be addressed:

- (1) Provisions for the deinstitutionalization of status offenders from juvenile detention or correctional facilities;
- (2) Provisions for the separation of juveniles from adults incarcerated in jails and other correctional facilities;
- (3) A detailed study of the State's needs for an effective, comprehensive, and coordinated approach to delinquency prevention and the improvement of the Juvenile Justice System; and
- (4) Establishment of a State Juvenile Justice Advisory Group to provide recommendations to the Chief Executive Officer for the improvement of the system and for advising on funding decisions within the State.

d. Maintenance of Effort

The Formula Grants Division also reviews the compliance of the maintenance of effort provision of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. This provision requires that at least 19.15% of all Federal funds awarded to States and Territories under that Act be expended for programs directly related to delinquency prevention or the improvement of the

*To divert juveniles from the traditional Juvenile Justice System, and to provide alternatives to institutionalization.

Juvenile Justice System. In those entities participating in the JJDP Act program, these funds are generally used to support the objectives of the JJDP Act. In all states, the funds are supporting the overall thrust of improvement of the Juvenile Justice System. During Fiscal Year 1978, \$66,447,659 of Crime Control Act funds were allocated for this purpose.

2. Technical Assistance

a. General Introductory Remarks

The authority for technical assistance is contained in Sections 102(a)(2), 204(b)(2) and 204(b)(b) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. These sections require the OJJDP to provide technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments and public and private agencies in developing and implementing juvenile delinquency programs.

b. Purpose of Program

The OJJDP has developed a technical assistance strategy to support four major goals which accomplish the mandates of the JJDP Act:

Goal 1: To reduce the commission of acts by juveniles which are categorized as delinquent or status offenses;

Goal 2: To alter traditional approaches to juvenile behavior which is often punishable as a status offense, and to the treatment of children who have been labeled dependent or neglected;

Goal 3: To establish programs which offer alternative responses to delinquent behavior and which reduce the commission of delinquent acts by juveniles who have had official contact with the juvenile justice system; and

Goal 4: To improve the administration of justice for juveniles.

Technical assistance is one of the tactics used by the OJJDP to accomplish these goals. Each of the Office's technical assistance contractors is assigned one goal area and provides support to all Office and grantee activities which fit into that goal area. Requests for technical assistance, whether they be from Special Emphasis or Formula grantees, or have been generated through our semi-annual needs assessment process, are assigned to a contractor based on the goal area into which the request falls.

The OJJDP's technical assistance strategy is planned and proactive in nature. The major elements are as follows:

- (1) Technical assistance is planned and delivered in regular six-month cycles.
- (2) The technical assistance cycle consists of the following steps: needs assessment, work plan development, delivery, documentation, and follow-up (if warranted).
- (3) Technical Assistance attempts to improve the capacity of programs to address future problems without outside assistance.
- (4) Technical assistance efforts are coordinated with other OJJDP activities. In addition, technical assistance providers have access to and draw upon research and evaluation efforts being supported by OJJDP and other agencies.

The semi-annual needs assessment process is the focal point for OJJDP's technical assistance process. All State planning agencies, State advisory groups, and other organizations receive a letter requesting their Technical Assistance needs in relation to the purposes of the JJDP Act. They are asked to provide the following information for each need:

Recipient organization,
Problem to be addressed,
Type of Assistance,
Skills and expertise needed,
Level of effort,
Coordination with other agencies,
Product expected,
Recipient agency contact,
Source of Technical Assistance request, and timing.

All approved requests are assigned to the appropriate contractor for response. They, in turn, develop a work plan for each need which provides the basic information necessary to deliver the Technical Assistance -- a definition of the problem, the proposed response, the scheduling of tasks, assignment of resources, product expected, and an estimate of person-days involved in the effort.

After delivery of the Technical Assistance, a Technical Assistance report is prepared for the recipient and copies are sent to the cognizant SPA and to the OJJDP. This report contains a summary of all services provided, specific products developed, and recommendations for future operations and improvements.

c. Technical Assistance Activities

The OJJDP currently supports four Technical Assistance contracts and grants which provide nationwide assistance in a wide variety of areas. The OJJDP is especially concerned with several objectives which relate to the goals outlined above, namely, alternatives to secure confinement; removing juveniles from adult jails and lock-ups; maximum utilization

of existing resources; deinstitutionalization of status offenders and non-offenders; legislative reform; monitoring for compliance with the deinstitutionalization and separation requirements of the JJDP Act; building community support for positive system change; increased management capability; and delinquency prevention.

d. Technical Assistance Examples

The following are a few examples of Technical Assistance provided by our contractors:

Recipient: Iowa First Judicial District

Assignment: Assistance in reorganizing the Juvenile Court Services System.

The objective for this Technical Assistance effort was to examine the feasibility and desirability of reorganizing the Juvenile Court Services System for the First Judicial District of Iowa. As of July 1, 1973, legislation established a unified trial court known as the "Iowa District Court." Eight judicial districts were established, the First District consisting of 11 counties in the northeast section of the State.

At the time, there existed three independently operated probation offices within the judicial district. In an effort to coordinate and improve the delivery of services to youth, interest had been expressed in consolidating the Juvenile Court Services on a district-wide basis.

This Technical Assistance effort was designed to work with court staff and other interested individuals in developing a reorganization plan by considering the following issues:

- The most effective organizational structure for juvenile court services in the district;
- Whether corresponding changes in judicial assignment were desirable;
- The effect of reorganization on the level of services; and
- Issues and problems that could arise as a result of reorganization.

Recommendations as to the reorganization of the Juvenile Court Services System were then made.

* * * * *

Recipient: New Jersey State Association for Youth Services

Assignment: Management training for public and private sector Youth Service providers.

The New Jersey State Association for Youth Services was provided technical assistance in the form of four management training workshops as part of the Association's Second Annual Conference. Approximately 30 administrators and counselors from local agencies and programs attended each session. Each presentation was prepared so as to provide a broadly based coverage of the subject area and to stimulate discussion among participants, culminating in specific suggestions for assessing individual program or agency performance and ways of applying the ideas of the trainers and other group participants. The workshops covered the following topics:

- Program Funding: This workshop focused on the development of a program-funding strategy in the context of total organizational development and presented specific technical information related to the Financial problems often encountered by local Youth Service programs.
- Staff Development: The topics of this workshop included staff organization -- a determination of the employee's role or place within the structure of an organization; staff -- the process of acquiring staff and linking their duties/tasks with identifiable programs; and staff supervision -- the process of directing staff functions/duties related to program implementation and service delivery.
- Community Relations: This session contained lectures, discussions, and group problem-solving, geared to help program staff organize and act on ideas to engender better community relations. Topics covered included: assessing program standing in the community; techniques to improve community relations; and special problems associated with the presentation of program information and ways of using the media.
- Monitoring and Evaluation for Program Management: This workshop consisted of a series of brief presentations, each followed by a question/answer and discussion period. The purpose of the workshop was to describe monitoring and evaluation as tools to support the functions of program and agency managers. The features and benefits of monitoring and evaluating functions were explored, and special attention was paid to information-gathering techniques for both functions and the management applicability of the information which would be produced.

* * * * *

Recipient: South Carolina Department of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare

Assignment: Assistance in implementing departmental reorganization

Prior to the 1976 Judicial Reform Act in South Carolina, three

distinct departments had responsibility for providing services to juveniles who were in the South Carolina justice system. Parole, or aftercare, was the responsibility of the Department of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare. Between 1976 and 1978, extensive thought was given to the juvenile justice functions performed by the State. It was decided, and passed into law, that the Department of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare should assume more responsibility, specifically to provide intake and probation services formerly provided by the Division of Youth Services.

Anticipating the passage of this legislation, the Department of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare began preliminary planning. The change would augment the Department threefold -- both in terms of budget and staff. It was also imperative that the Department be prepared to assume its new responsibilities as soon as the law was operative to ensure the unbroken delivery of services to youth in the State.

After some initial planning, assistance was requested to help develop an implementation plan which would state, in detail, all the tasks which needed to be done by July 1978 and who would do them.

The major tasks accomplished under this assignment were as follows:

- A detailed needs assessment;
- Preparation of a preliminary schedule of implementation tasks;
- Development of a detailed list of tasks to be completed in keeping with the new legislation;
- On-site consultation to refine tasks; and
- Implementation consultation.

Because of the Spring passage of the Bill and the July implementation date, the Department had only 9-10 weeks during which new policies and procedures had to be developed, new staff hired and trained, and new facilities opened. Thus, the implementation plan had to be very concise.

The products and results of this effort had a significant impact on the Department's ability to effect a smooth reorganization. After the July deadline occurred, the Department of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare indicated that the implementation assistance was an invaluable guide without which they would have faced serious difficulties in their reorganization.

* * * * *

Recipient: Wisconsin Juvenile Officers Association

Assignment: Assistance in developing a certification process for Police Juvenile Officers

Police Juvenile Officers (PJO) associations throughout the country have been considering ways of upgrading their profession. There is a growing recognition that special skills are necessary to deal with the youth in trouble, and that many police departments have not given this responsibility the attention it deserves. One vehicle is through a formal certification process for officers working with youth. The Wisconsin Juvenile Officers Association requested help in:

- Assessing the training needs of PJO's;
- Setting guidelines for PJO certification;
- Developing an administrative structure to certify PJO's;
- Identifying issues relating to certification; and
- Researching activities in related matters throughout the country.

The Technical Assistance provider met with the Association twice to address these issues and to discuss ways in which a PJO certification program could be implemented.

Various models for certification were described for the recipient, including the voluntary approach based on the Missouri model and the statutory plan used in Illinois. Also, eight implementation steps were presented which the Wisconsin Association might follow to upgrade the juvenile officer function:

- Development of a rationale for the certification program;
- Establishment of an advisory committee;
- Development of a certification body;
- Identification of a certification body;
- Development of a procedural plan;
- Development of training for different levels of certification;
- Development of strategies to gain statewide support for the plan; and
- Implementation.

Each of these points was discussed in full with the recipient and was described in the final report of the effort.

* * * * *

Recipient: Lincoln, Nebraska

Assignment: Development of satisfactory pre-trial placements for juveniles.

Limitations in facility design and available programs in the County detention center resulted in some disruptive children being transferred to the adult jail. Because of a complex juvenile code, police also used the jail for arrested youth who were not clearly under Juvenile Court jurisdiction. An overcrowded adult jail population required these children to be placed in the same four-bed cell. Several juveniles had been seriously assaulted or had attempted suicide in this cell. Technical assistance was requested to help find solutions to these problems.

The first step of the planning process was to organize an advisory board and to identify issues to be addressed by the study. These issues took the form of the following questions:

- What are the secure and non-secure custody needs of the community?
- What should the roles of the jail and detention center be in the local Juvenile Justice System?
- What non-secure alternatives to detention have yet to be tried?
- Does the Juvenile Code and/or local policy need modification to solve these problems?

With these issues outlined, the Technical Assistance provider then identified existing Youth Service programs, interviewed officials in the Criminal Justice System, reviewed State statutes and court rules, inspected facilities, studied prior reports on the local Criminal Justice System, and analyzed recent statistics of local Youth Service Programs. A 30-day survey of juvenile admissions to the jail and detention center was conducted to learn characteristics of the children detained. The detention center staff also participated in a survey to record opinions about the center's operations.

A preliminary report was drafted and copies were circulated to the advisory board, the media, and interested citizens. A public hearing was held, and with this input, a final report was prepared. This report addressed the areas of concern, and proposed a mechanism for implementing the recommendations. Specifically, it was suggested that the ad hoc board or a committee of the regional criminal justice planning commission be given the mandate to set local policy concerning juvenile pretrial placement matters addressed by the report (such as, arrest and court intake procedures, secure custody admission criteria, etc.). The committee would also be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the other recommendations and to forward the report to the State Legislature. Action has already begun to carry out this implementation plan.

One of the tasks under each of OJJDP's contracts and grants is the preparation of papers and monographs on subjects within each contractor's goal area. These monographs are designed as generic, "how to" manuals geared to assist juvenile justice practitioners in establishing programs for youth or improving on-going services to them. Thirteen publications were issued during 1978, as follows:

1. CHANGE: A Juvenile Justice Quarterly;
 2. The Serious Juvenile Offender: Proceedings of a National Symposium, September 19 and 20, 1977, Minneapolis, Minnesota;
 3. Diversion of Youth from the Juvenile Justice System: Project Orientation Training Manual;
 4. Youth Services Information System Manual (YSIS);
 5. Diversion of Youth from the Juvenile Justice System: Project Orientation Resource Handbook;
 6. Foster Parenting;
 7. Community Alternatives;
 8. Evaluation Issues;
 9. Program Monitoring;
 10. Publicity Strategies;
 11. Volunteer Services;
 12. Free! Youth Programs That Don't Cost Dollars;
 13. The Cost and Service Impacts of DSO in Ten States: Responses to Angry Youth.
3. Future Plans

OJJDP's technical assistance plans for FY 79 will support the goals of the JJDP Act and continue nationwide assistance to State and local governments and public and private agencies in developing and implementing juvenile delinquency programs. Some \$3 million in Technical Assistance funds will be available to provide support to the Formula Grants program, to Special Emphasis initiatives, and to assist State, local, and private Youth Service agencies in improving their capacity to plan, manage, and evaluate their programs. Funds have been allocated to support the Special Emphasis Restitution initiative, status offender and non-offender activities, and to assist States in verifying their data regarding progress in deinstitutionalizing status offenders and separating juveniles and adults.

4. Other Division Activities

In Fiscal Year 1978, the OJJDP implemented a program designed to improve the process of deinstitutionalization of juvenile offenders and to provide for the separation of juveniles and adults detained or confined in any jail, detention, or correctional facility in which they have regular contact. Sixty grants, ranging up to \$200,000 were awarded to States, local units of government, and public and private non-profit agencies and organizations throughout the United States. Projects awarded under this program fall into six categories: alternative education, counseling, shelter care, training, separation, and coordination-advocacy. Twenty-two of these projects were awarded to private non-profit agencies. This program was not directed at the status offender exclusively, but allowed for a wide range of programs providing alternatives to incarceration ranging from the status to the serious offender.

The Division also developed and implemented a major initiative for children in custody. The Children in Custody Initiative is a multi-faceted program which will address the problems of removing status offenders and non-offenders from correctional and detention facilities, of separating juveniles from adults who are incarcerated in correctional and detention facilities, and of monitoring facilities to ensure that deinstitutionalization and separation are implemented. These goals are consistent with the mandate of Section 223(a)(12) (13), and (14) of the JJDP Act.

The Children in Custody Initiative has three components designed to help youth. The first component is a \$10 million supplemental award to the States to assist them in achieving compliance with the provisions of the JJDP Act. The second, or incentive component, is designed to reward States that have been rather successful in deinstitutionalizing substantial portions of their status offender population and that have committed large amounts of resources to ensure that deinstitutionalization is implemented. The third component is targeted to private not-for-profit agencies and recognizes that their involvement is critical to successful implementation of the deinstitutionalization and separation efforts.

Several awards were made under the Children in Custody Initiative during Fiscal Year 1978 with the rest planned for distribution early in Fiscal Year 1979.

C. SPECIAL EMPHASIS PROGRAM

1. Responsibilities

Pursuant to the authority of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and the Title I of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, the Special Emphasis Division has responsibility for implementation of Section 224 of the Juvenile Justice

and Delinquency Prevention Act. In carrying out this responsibility, the Special Emphasis Division has responsibility for the development and implementation of grants programs which implement and test program strategies and approaches. These responsibilities cover:

- Developing and implementing new approaches, techniques, and methods in juvenile delinquency programs;
- Deinstitutionalizing categories of juveniles from correcitonal facilities through the development and maintenance of community-based alternatives to traditional forms of institutionalization;
- Diverting juveniles from traditional juvenile justice and correc-tional systems;
- Improving the capacity of public and private agencies and organi-zations in providing services to juveniles thought to be in danger of becoming delinquent;
- Developing and implementing model programs and methods to keep students in elementary and secondary schools and to prevent un-warranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;
- Rehabilitating serious offenders and reducing serious juvenile crime; and
- Facilitating the adoption of the standards on the administration of juvenile justice recommended by the Advisory Committee on Standards.

One type of discretionary aid is provided by LEAA from funds author-ized by the 1968 Crime Control Act; the other is provided by the JJDP Act. Discretionary funds may be granted to States, local governments, organizations, or individuals. At least 20 percent of the special em-phasis funds are earmarked each year for private, non-profit organiza-tions and institutions with experience in dealing with youths.

2. Program Development

These discretionary funds are being used to support program initiatives in priority areas. The development of the objectives and goals of each initiative is based on an assessment of the existing data and previous research and evaluation studies undertaken by NIJJDP. Each initiative is then coordinated with technical assistance and evaluation efforts.

There were two initiatives developed during Fiscal Year 1978.

- Restitution by Juvenile Offenders: An Alternative to Incarceration.

- School Crime -- The issuance of the National School Resource Network to prevent violence and vandalism in schools and school districts.

Special Emphasis activities can be summarized in each of the major action program initiative areas as follows:

a. Restitution by Juvenile Offenders Program

In Fiscal Year 1978, the OJJDP initiated a program entitled Restitution by Juvenile Offenders: An Alternative to Incarceration, which called for the development of projects that would provide a restitution alternative to adjudicated juvenile offenders who would have otherwise been incarcerated. Restitution for the purposes of this program is defined as payments by an offender in cash to the victim or service, either to the victim or the community, when such payments or service are made within the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court.

In response to the Program announcement issued on February 27, 1978, OJJDP received 117 pre-applications. Fifty-four of these pre-applicants were requested to submit final applications and 49 final applications were submitted on July 21, 1978.

To assist final applicants in developing their applications, OJJDP held two cluster application development conferences for applicants who requested Technical Assistance. The National Office of Social Responsibility, as Technical Assistance contractor for this initiative, organized these conferences and provided training, along with the staff of the OJJDP.

LEAA/OJJDP then funded 23 of these projects (out of the 41 to eventually be funded under this program). The total amount awarded in Fiscal Year 1978 was \$13,244,532.

These projects represent 5 state-wide projects, 2 rural projects, and 16 urban-centered projects. Five were awarded to private not-for-profit agencies and the remainder were awarded to court or court-related agencies. Tense grantees project serving 33,400 youth in the two-year grant period.

In addition to a Technical Assistance contract with the National Office of Social Responsibility, Arlington, Virginia, this program is supported by evaluation control to the Institute for Policy Analysis in Eugene, Oregon.

It is expected that this initiative will provide significant information on the impact of restitution as an alternative disposition.

b. Prevention of Delinquency Program

In September, 1977 the OJJDP, Special Emphasis Division, awarded 16 action grants under the guideline "Programs to Prevent Juvenile Delinquency." The grants were awarded for one year at a cost of \$6.0 million, with second-year funding being contingent upon the availability of funds and the performance of the projects. Five of the grants were awarded to national youth-serving agencies for implementation through local affiliates, and 11 of the grants were awarded to community, or regional level, not-for-profit agencies.

The objective of the prevention initiative was to develop and implement new approaches, techniques, and methods to prevent juvenile delinquency in communities where youths are in greatest danger of becoming delinquent. The facilitating agencies were to be private, not-for-profit organizations which would implement projects that increase or expand social, cultural, educational, vocational, recreational, and health services to youth.

Grant funds supported direct services to youth, community development activities, and activities designed to increase the capacity of private agencies to meet the needs of youth. While there is no single approach to the prevention of delinquency that has been consistently successful, "positive youth development" is an approach that encompasses individual, environmental and definitional causes. These 16 projects employ the positive youth services theory and seek to provide those services through the wide variety of programs offered by national, private, non profit organizations and local, not-for-profit youth-serving agencies.

Private youth-serving organizations offer several extremely important strengths which enable them to serve as vehicles for prevention programs:

- (1) The organizational structure of many of these organizations provides a potential for the rapid and inexpensive expansion of services and mobilization of resources;
- (2) These organizations have a natural involvement with the communities they serve, with many of their adult members being indigenous community leaders; and
- (3) A facilitating attribute of private service organizations is their extensive use of volunteers.

During Fiscal Year 1978, all of the projects became fully operational and successfully implemented a wide variety of activities in target communities characterized by high-risk socio-economic indicators. Under the requirements of the guideline, the projects aggressively worked to attract children and youths to their programs who normally do not participate in supervised activities. Each of the projects made a concerted effort to reduce obstacles to participation by relaxing barriers, such as membership fees and uniforms, and implemented an active outreach and public awareness program. During the first six months of project activity, the 16 programs served more than 7,000 youths in recreational programs, tutorial activities, counseling, and referral.

Monitoring the programs resulted in recognition that all of the projects had met the goals and objectives outlined in the applications, and each of the projects was recommended for a second-year grant. Continuation awards were made in 1978 for a second year at a cost of \$6.3 million.

The prevention grantees and their target sites follow:

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Girls Clubs of America:	National Federation of
Allentown, Pa.;	Settlements and Neighborhood
Birmingham, Ala.;	Houses:
Chattanooga, Tenn.;	
Lynn, Mass.;	Rochester, N.Y.;
Omaha, Neb.;	Richmond, Va.;
Santa Barbara, Calif.; and	Hamtramck, Mich.;
Worcester, Mass.	Akron, Ohio;
	Davenport, Iowa; and
	Lincoln, Nebraska
Aspira of America:	Boys Clubs of America:
Yonkers, N.Y.;	Bridgeport, Conn;
Hoboken, N.J.;	Schenectady, N.Y.;
Jersey City, N.J.;	Las Cruces, N.M.;
Bethlehem, Pa.;	Binghamton, N.Y.;
Waukegan, Ill.; and	Richmond, Calif.;
Carolina, Puerto Rico.	Omaha, Nebraska;
	Waco, Texas and
	Hollywood, Calif.
The Salvation Army:	
Pensacola, Fla.;	
Winston-Salem, N.C.;	
Gulfport, Miss.;	
Marietta, Ga. and	
Ponca City, Oklahoma	

LOCAL AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Tuskegee Youth Services Program	Venice Drug Coalition
Tuskegee, Alabama	Venice, Calif.
Delinquency Prevention	
Delinquency Prevention Collaboration	Boston Teen Center Alliance
Seattle - King County Seattle,	Boston, Mass.
Washington	
Fort Peck Youth Service Bureau	Girls Coalition
Poplar, Montana	Philadelphia, Pa.
Dallas County Delinquency Prevention	United Neighborhood Houses
Project	N.Y., N.Y.
Dallas, Texas	
	Tulare Youth Service Bureau
	Tulare, CA
Chicago Youth Alliance Project	Consortium for Youth of
Chicago, Illinois	South Central Connecticut
	Hartford, Connecticut

3. School Crime Initiative

Two Interagency Agreements between OJJDP and the Office of Education, HEW, have resulted in programs that respond to school crime and develop strategies for improving the education of troubled youth. These Interagency Agreements provided an entree into schools that OJJDP did not have previously. The program is a coordination of the effort which was funded in September 1976.

OJJDP has initiated a variety of additional programs to provide innovative ways to deal with juvenile justice issues. While these efforts are directed by OJJDP, the programs often involve the collaboration of contractors or grantees with other Federal agencies at the Federal, State, or local levels. The Special Emphasis Division of OJJDP is responsible for the implementation of national initiatives supportive of Section 223 of the JJDP Act. In fulfilling this mandate, the Special Emphasis Division has the responsibility for the development and implementation of programs which demonstrate innovative or effective programs strategies in the following areas:

- The development and implementation of new approaches, techniques and methods in juvenile delinquency programs;
- The deinstitutionalization of juveniles from correctional facilities, and the development of community based alternatives to incarceration;
- Diversion of youth from the traditional juvenile justice and correctional system;
- Improvement of the capability of public and private agencies and organizations to provide preventive services to juveniles;
- Development and implementation of model methods and programs to keep youth in school and prevent unwarranted suspensions and expulsions;
- Rehabilitation of serious offenders and reduction of serious juvenile crime; and
- Facilitation of the adoption of the standards on the administration of juvenile justice.

Funds are specially targetted to strategies in these areas. The development of goals and objectives for each initiative is determined by the assessment of existing data, research, and evaluations undertaken by NIJJDP. Each initiative is then coordinated with technical assistance and evaluation efforts. The programs which were in operation in 1978 under the Special Emphasis Division are described below:

a. OJJDP-HEW/Office of Education, Teacher Corps. Advocacy

The School Crime Intervention Component, Teacher Corps Advocacy Program, received \$2,029,851 for a program which was initiated on September 8, 1976 and was completed on September 30, 1978. The program was an interagency agreement between OJJDP - Special Emphasis Division, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

The purpose of this program was to demonstrate the degree student-based intervention initiatives could reduce the incidence of crime, violence, and disruption occurring in the Nation's schools and the climate of fear associated with these events. Instruction was provided students in the skills and knowledge needed to design and implement effective interventions, and training was furnished to school, community, and participating Juvenile Justice System personnel to enable them to support this program. Students recruited for the program included a cross section of those enrolled at the participating school, although special emphasis was given to the inclusion of students with a history of delinquency, including those released from correctional institutions, those returning from alternative correctional programs, those under the jurisdiction of juvenile authorities, and those identified as highly disruptive in the school setting. Participating students were given responsibility for planning and carrying out initiatives to reduce school crime and alleviate its consequences in their own school, at a nearby school encompassing a different grade level, or on the way to and from these schools. Initiatives encouraged by the program were expected to be concerned directly with school crime, violence, and disruption and not with long-range prevention issues.

The sites involved in this program included:

Phoenix, Arizona	-	Arizona State University/ Phoenix Public Schools
Stockton, California	-	California State University/ Stockton Public Schools
Denver, Colorado	-	Loretto Heights College/ Denver Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia	-	Atlanta Consortium/ Atlanta Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois	-	Northwestern University/ Chicago Public Schools
Indianapolis, Indiana	-	Indianapolis Public Schools

Bradley/Milford, Maine	-	University of Maine/ Bradley/Milford Schools
Baltimore, Maryland	-	Morgan State University/ Baltimore City Schools
Farmington, Michigan	-	Oakland University/ Farmington Public Schools
Burlington, Vermont	-	University of Vermont/ Burlington Public Schools

b. University of Vermont/Burlington Public Schools,
Burlington, Vermont

These sites were in a mixture of large, medium, and small cities. Student-Initiated Activities (SIA) constituted the major concept implemented in the 10 projects. The SIA model is grounded in the spirit of youth participation, which goes beyond involvement of youth to initiation. Adults in their relations to youth are expected to provide support, guidance, and information as well.

Each project was committed to demonstrate how the SIA model could be used to reduce crime and its associated fears in school settings. Testing of the SIA model took as many forms as there were projects.

A wide range of major activities was implemented which included school/community advisory councils, teacher corps staff training, site school staff in-service training, training for adult education group participants (e.g., parents, police officers, agency representatives), training for student participants, work skills training activities, academic tutoring/counseling programs, school curriculum development, and others.

Each project made its own contribution to our knowledge of how the student resources could be maximized in order to create an improved school climate.

c. OJJDP-Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program (ADAEP) --
Interagency Agreement

The purpose of this program was to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program (ADAEP) School Team Approach in assisting schools in developing appropriate local strategies aimed at preventing and reducing the incidence, severity, and consequences of crime and disruptive behavior which are manifested in personal and property offenses, drugs, alcohol abuse, and other problems within the schools.

The program was funded September 21, 1976, for \$2 million and was continued to permit the development and implementation of an experimental design using control groups for comparison. Teams composed of teachers, students, administrators, community members, and others received training and technical assistance to facilitate the design and implementation of school crime prevention action programs in local schools and school districts.

The five Regional Training Centers trained 36 school clusters comprising 142 school teams. The trained school teams implemented a large and varied number of activities such as: training to avoid victimization; developing school policy regarding offenders (such as positive discipline alternatives); group counseling; the development of values clarification and decision-making skills; and the application of security hardware (such as electronic surveillance or detection devices).

A total of 782 days of technical assistance were rendered to the 142 school teams trained in Fiscal Year 1978. A total of 267 days of technical assistance were delivered to 81 school teams trained in Fiscal Year 1977.

ADAEP and the five Training Centers worked with the evaluation contractor, the Social Action Research Center, to persuade the 142 school teams trained in Fiscal Year 1978 to provide the action plans, progress reports, and school surveys necessary for the OJJDP evaluation.

d. Diversion of Youth from the Juvenile Justice System

In the Fall of 1976, the OJJDP, Special Emphasis Division, funded 11 projects which were designed to divert juvenile offenders from the Juvenile Justice System. These 11 grantees were selected from a field of 260 applicants who had submitted proposals under the Program Announcement entitled, "Diversion of Youth from the Juvenile Justice System." The total amount of funds awarded under this initiative was \$8,556,918 in the first two years of three-year projects. During the period covered by this report (Fiscal Year 1978), all of the projects were fully operational and were evaluated by the Behavioral Research Institute of Boulder, Colorado.

For the purpose of this program, diversion is defined as a process designed to reduce the further penetration of youths into the Juvenile Justice System. Diversion can then occur at any point following apprehension by the police for the alleged commission of a delinquent act and prior to adjudication. The diversion process focuses on community alternatives to traditional Juvenile Justice System processing.

Major program goals include:

- 1) A reduction in the number of juveniles adjudicated;

- 2) The achievement of a more comprehensive approach to the diversion process through the redirection and expansion of existing community resources and provision of more cost-effective services;
- 3) A reduction in delinquent behavior among those youth diverted to alternative services; and
- 4) An improvement in the quality and efficiency of Juvenile Justice decision-making.

The target population intended for service under these projects constituted youths who would otherwise be adjudicated delinquent. While youths charged with such violent crimes as murder, armed robbery, and forcible rape were not considered appropriate participants in these projects, most other juveniles charged with serious offenses were eligible. The eleven projects sites included:

Boston, Massachusetts	Memphis, Tennessee
Puerto Rico	Florida
New York City	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
• Mobilization for Youth	Kansas City, Missouri
• John Jay College	Denver, Colorado
• Convent Avenue Baptist Church	Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council, South Dakota

The diversion grantees included a wide variety of agencies including a city college, a private religious organization, a Tribal government, a State youth agency, and a municipal department. Each of the 11 projects was unique in that it was directly affected by the characteristics of the local Juvenile Justice System and by the liberal or conservative nature of the community in which it was operating. During Fiscal Year 1978, the projects experienced a wide variety of problems and successes. For instance, in some jurisdictions start-up delays and low referral rates occurred because of a reluctance of the courts and the community to accept the philosophy of the diversion of "high-risk" juvenile offenders. Also, in many communities the referring agencies, i.e., police and court officials, were unfamiliar with the services available through community-based agencies and the projects had to devote a substantial amount of time and effort to building confidence and establishing credibility with established public agencies. On the other hand, in some areas the implementation of the diversion project provided ready alternatives to a greatly overburdened Juvenile Justice System and high referral rates were achieved without difficulty.

As of September 1978, the diversion programs had served approximately 5,600 youths who would otherwise have been adjudicated delinquent by the Juvenile Court. Of this number, 46% of the participants were Black, 19% were Hispanic, 5% were native American, and 30% were White. The age range varied according to the statutory requirement of the individual jurisdictional mandate. The number of referrals reflects a significant decrease in the number originally projected.

Although evaluation data are not yet available, it appears that the decrease in numbers is due, in part, to inflated projections of the applicant agencies, project start-up delay and reluctance on the part of the Court and police in the early months of the projects to refer juveniles in lieu of traditional processing and adjudication. In general, the projects are meeting stated goals and objectives.

d. Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)

The purpose of the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders Program effort was to design and implement model programs which would both prevent the entry of juvenile status offenders into correctional institutions and detention facilities, and remove such juveniles from institutions and detention facilities by providing community-based alternatives and using existing detention diversion resources. Removal was to result in reduction of the total population of juveniles in correctional institutions within the designated jurisdiction, as well as provide assurance that reentry would not occur following the grant period. In Fiscal Year 1976, the OJJDP funded 13 DSO projects for a total of \$11,926,876. Support for many of these projects continued through Fiscal Year 1978.

As of June 30, 1977, some 9,787 status offenders received services which included crisis intervention, residential placement, counseling, and others. Approximately 11% received no services. The ethnic data of the participant youths served indicated the following percentages: Whites, 67%, Blacks, 21%; Mexican Americans, 8%; American Indians, 2%; and Asian and Pacific, 5%. For the most part, the DSO projects were successful in removing status offenders from detention and correctional institutions.

While implementation of the program involved resolving complex problems, the objectives of the program have been met. A survey of subject reports indicated that the number of status offenders in State training schools has been significantly reduced or eliminated in all of the affected jurisdictions. In Washington and Arizona, no status offenders have been committed from project jurisdictions since these programs became operational. In South Carolina and Arkansas, between 8 and 15 status offenders were in State reception and diagnostic centers as a result of State laws which permit judges to refer to these facilities, but only three status offenders were in South Carolina training schools as compared to 159 in 1975. In Delaware, only two were in training schools as compared to 112 when the project started. While a significant number are still being detained, one girls training school has been closed, and the average length of stay in detention is less than a day with the range being from a few hours to 1.7 days.

With respect to blocking re-entry into detention and training schools, California and Washington have effective legislation, Arkansas has somewhat limited legislation, and South Carolina and Delaware have taken steps to secure legislation.

With respect to detention, reports indicate that there has been a significant decrease in numbers detained and length of stay in detention in all project jurisdictions. In Spokane, Washington, the length of stay has decreased to a maximum of six hours for status offenders eligible for the program, and in Alameda County and El Dorado County, California, no status offenders have been detained since the project started.

At this point, no staff members have been displaced because of de-institutionalization, but some staff members have been reassigned and trained to work in community-based alternatives.

While a number of elements must be considered when comparing costs of institutionalization in relation to community alternatives, from any view, the cost per child is significantly less for community alternative than for institutional placement. According to the 1977 edition of "Children in Custody," operating expenses for public detention and correctional facilities for juveniles nationwide have risen from \$409.1 million in 1971 to \$483.3 million in 1974. During that same period, expenditure per child in the 11 DSO Special Emphasis projects, as of June 30, 1977, was \$367.63. This reflects a total expenditure of \$6,609,262 in 11 sites and a range of \$862 per child, in South Carolina, to \$119 in Clark County, Washington.

4. Other Grants

In addition to grants awarded through the initiative areas, the Office funded some unsolicited grants which enhance the flexibility of the Office to respond to youths' special needs and situations. The total amount of funding for 13 Model Program grants was \$7,637,990.

D. NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

The National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP) was created to serve as the research, evaluation, and information center for the Federal Government's effort to deal with the growing problem of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The JJDP Act requires the Institute to:

- Conduct research relating to delinquency and juvenile justice;
- Evaluate juvenile justice and delinquency programs at the Federal and State levels;
- Collect, synthesize, and disseminate information on all aspects of delinquency;
- Develop standards for the administration of juvenile justice; and
- Train professionals and others in the field

The Institute's mission is integrated with that of OJJDP as a whole. The Institute works closely with all of the elements of the program: it provides research, program development, and evaluation support for the action initiatives of the Special Emphasis Program; it assists in the effort to coordinate Federal delinquency programs; and it provides information for use in technical assistance activities.

NIJJDP's activities in Fiscal Year 1978 are described in this Section. The Institute's programs in the five areas mandated by the Act are discussed and the results of these activities are reviewed. Where appropriate, the assessments of their applications to juvenile delinquency programming and recommendations are made.

1. Basic Research and Research and Development Program

Over the past year, several of NIJJDP's basic research projects have produced noteworthy results that have made significant contributions to our understanding of juvenile delinquency and related factors.

a. Causes and Correlates of Delinquency

The landmark study of delinquency in Illinois was completed in the past year at the Institute for Juvenile Research in Chicago. This three-year study involved analyzing data collected during 1972 through a State-wide Illinois survey of a random sample of more than 3,000 youths, aged 14-18, and a field study of Illinois communities and social institutions. Delinquency involvement was measured through self-reports from the youths themselves and correlated with such factors as family, peer group, community, and school influences. The results have shed new light on the nature of delinquency. Among the major findings were the following: 1) contrary to popular conceptions based on arrest data, kids reporting delinquent behavior (other than armed robbery) are nearly as likely to be white as black, just about as likely to be a girl as a boy, as likely to live anywhere in Illinois as in highly urbanized Chicago, and just as likely to come from an intact as a broken home; 2) peer group pressure is the single most important factor in determining the presence or absence of delinquent behavior; 3) the community context serves as an important mediating influence in delinquency--particularly in the case of violent conduct; and 4) much of delinquency arises out of youths' response to contradictions or tensions displayed by authority figures in the family, school, and Juvenile Justice System contexts.

These findings suggest that future delinquency prevention programming ought to have a major focus on peer group dynamics and the interactions between authority figures and youth. In the latter area, this research supports the need to change the way society views youth. The application of a double standard of behavior for adults and youths causes tension which appears to increase the likelihood of delinquency.

b. Learning Disabilities

The Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency Research and Development Program was designed to examine the relationship between learning disabilities and juvenile delinquency. The two major components of this study are: 1) a comparison of the incidence of learning disabilities (LD) in groups of adjudicated delinquents and officially non-delinquent populations, and 2) an evaluation of a remediation program for adjudicated delinquents. This study was conducted in three states: Indiana, Maryland and Arizona. The preliminary results of the incidence study show that 16 percent of the officially non-delinquent school population are LD compared to 32 percent of the delinquent population. However, based on self-report measures of delinquency, it appears that LD and non-LD youths engage in similar amounts of delinquent activity. Thus, the relationship between LD and delinquent behavior remains unclear at this time.

The implication of these preliminary findings is that youths with LD are disproportionately referred to the Juvenile Justice System. Should these preliminary findings be substantiated in the course of completion of this research, future programming in the school area should include further development of LD remediation programs therein, rather than referring youths with LD's to the justice apparatus. Likewise, diversion programming should include procedures for the identification, referral, and treatment of LD's.

c. Delinquency and Drug Use

This study provided extensive information on the incidence, distribution, and patterns and styles of drug use and delinquent behavior among a national sample of approximately 2,000 youths, aged 11-17. It also included an examination of the relationship between drug use, including alcohol, and other kinds of delinquent behavior and the variables associated with changes in patterns of drug use and delinquency over time. Particular attention was paid to the variables or conditions associated with the commencement of drug use, the connection between drug use and delinquency, and development sequences of drug use over time.

d. Serious Juvenile Crime

The Institute undertook a number of studies focused on serious juvenile crime with particular emphasis on the development and maintenance of delinquent careers. Two studies made significant contributions to our understanding of delinquent career patterns as they relate to adult careers in criminality. The first of these was a follow-up study to the landmark Philadelphia research conducted in the early 1960's of almost all males born in that city in 1945.

The follow-up study involved gathering data up to age 30 on the offender careers of a 10 percent sample of the original group. Significant findings from this effort include the following: about 15 percent

of youths in the 10 percent sample were responsible for 80-85 percent of serious crime; and chronic offenders (five or more police contacts), who made up only 6 percent of the larger group from which the 10 percent sample was drawn, accounted for 51 percent of all offenses among the total sample--including more than 60 percent of the personal injury and serious property offenses.

The second of the two major offender career studies was a project conducted at the University of Iowa, which assessed the relationship of adult criminal careers to juvenile criminal careers. This project consisted of a follow-up study of 1352 juveniles born in 1942, and 2099 juveniles born in 1949, in Racine, Wisconsin. The study was designed to 1) provide information on the nature of urban delinquent careers (including age, race, sex, and other offender characteristics such as seriousness of offense) and their relationship to later adult careers; 2) determine the extent to which various alternative decisions by Juvenile Justice System authorities or by the juvenile contributed to continuing careers; and 3) evaluate the effectiveness of the Juvenile Justice System and other community factors in deterring or supporting continuing delinquent and criminal behavior.

The major preliminary findings follow: 1) about 5 percent of the white males in the 1942 and 1949 groups accounted for more than 70 percent of the felony offenses (police contacts); 2) about 12 percent of the white males in these two groups accounted for all police contacts of white males for felonies; and 3) minorities (blacks and Chicanos) were disproportionately represented, in comparison with whites, among those referred to court and placed in correctional institutions.

These data made it clear that-- at least in Philadelphia and Racine, Wisconsin--a very small proportion of juvenile offenders accounted for an extremely large volume of serious and violent crime. However, the difficulty in taking the next step--that of responding appropriately to reduce crime through focusing on chronic offenders--was in predicting who, in the future, would be a chronic offender. A major conclusion of the Philadelphia and Iowa research was that juveniles do not specialize in particular types of offenses, nor do they necessarily progress from less serious to more serious offenses. Prediction of delinquency remains an elusive goal.

Another study recently concluded under Institute funding constituted a seven-year evaluation of the Massachusetts experience in its Statewide community-based movement. In 1969-72, Massachusetts replaced its training schools for juveniles with community-based alternatives to traditional incarceration. This is the only State that has deinstitutionalized Statewide by closing its large training schools in either the juvenile or adult areas. Only about 10 percent of the total number of youths presently committed to the Department of Youth Services are determined to require secure care.

The results of the evaluation indicated that youths did better in those regions where the new programs were firmly in place as compared to the old training schools. However, youths in the more open residential and non-residential programs did better than those in the more secure units. Youths in programs providing diversity of treatment options and extensive community linkages did much better than those in the programs which lacked these features. In addition, the community-based programs provided a much more humane and fair way of treating youths than did the large institutions previously used. A major conclusion of the study was that the important factors affecting success or failure with individual youths lay not so much in the qualities of specific individual programs to which the youths were exposed, but in the characteristics of the total social network for each youth in the community.

The results of this research and the success of the Massachusetts experience led to two other projects conducted in that State. The first of these was a research effort focused on the problem of secure care in a community-based correctional system. This research involved examining how the State (particularly police, court, and correctional agencies) reached decisions about those youths who required secure treatment. (The research also involved an examination of how a few other States address the secure care problem.) In Massachusetts, these youths constitute about 10 percent of the total number of youths presently committed to the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services. The significance of this research is that the key to long-run success in persuading States to adopt policies of deinstitutionalization and establishment of community-based programs depends in large measure on devising means of alleviating public fears about protection in the community. The second of the two new Massachusetts projects was a rather large-scale training program. It is described below in Section II-D.4--Training.

During Fiscal Year 1979, a high priority of the Office will be to carefully review all available materials on violent juvenile crime and its prevention. Once assessed we intend to distribute it widely, not in the form of lengthy esoteric volumes that collect dust, but as information tailored to the actual needs of all interested persons.

The results of these studies in the serious juvenile crime area must be combined with information regarding the offense histories of incarcerated youths, if we are to make substantial progress toward the identification of the 85 percent (approximately) of youths presently incarcerated, who, following Congressional intent, should not be locked up.

The Institute does not presently have reliable nationwide data on the types of offenses for which youths in juvenile correctional facilities were placed there. Our best estimate is that approximately one-third of the youths presently in training schools are status offenders. One source for this estimate is the 1973-74 Survey of Juvenile Corrections programs conducted by the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections (NAJC) project. That study included a survey of a sample of 1,500 youths

in correctional facilities in 16 states. Among these youths, 35 percent were committed for status offenses; 3 percent for probation or parole violation; 4 percent for misdemeanors; 9 percent for drug offenses; 34 percent for property crimes; and 15 percent for personal crimes (aggravated assault, rape, robbery, kidnapping, manslaughter, and murder). Thus, only about 15 percent of the youths in correctional facilities at the time of the NAJC survey were incarcerated for what typically would be considered serious/violent crimes.

The NAJC study also produced some other very interesting findings. For example, incredible variations in patterns of institutionalization were observed among the states. Some states committed about 20 times more youths to institutions than others (after controlling for differences in state populations). During Fiscal Year 1974, 43 reporting states spent slightly less than \$30 million to operate their community-based programs for juveniles. This sum is about one-tenth that spent on institutions, camps, and ranches, and clearly shows that community-based programs are not receiving their fair share of state juvenile corrections budgets.

That they should receive a much larger share of these funds is supported by several cost analyses which have been conducted. For example, the NAJC study found the 1974 average costs per offender-year for state institutions, camps, and ranches to be \$11,657. By contrast, the 1974 average costs per offender-year for State-related, community-based residential programs were \$5,501 -- or less than one-half the cost of incarceration. The NAJC project staff estimated that collectively 41 states could have realized a potential total savings of more than \$50 million during 1974 through the achievement of a 50 percent level of deinstitutionalization.

A cost analysis of the Massachusetts community-based programs in comparison with the old training schools was conducted by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company. It revealed the costs of the two types of programs to be about the same. However, in interpreting this finding, one must take into account the start-up costs associated with provision of community-based service delivery. Massachusetts had very little in the way of community-based services prior to the closing of its training schools.

A recent comparative cost analysis of OJJDP programs designed to deinstitutionalize status offenders revealed that community-based services can be provided for status offenders at about 20 percent less than the cost of Juvenile Justice System processing. This finding was based on a study by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, and Company, using the methods developed in the Massachusetts cost analysis of 3 of 11 OJJDP status offender deinstitutionalization projects. These three projects were located in Delaware, Arizona, and the State of Washington.

e. Victimization

The Institute recently awarded a grant to the Criminal Justice Research Center in Albany, the major purpose of which is to develop a comprehensive descriptive analysis of the involvement of juveniles in illegal behaviors in which victims come face-to-face with offenders (rape, personal and commercial robbery, assault and personal larceny) by analyzing the National Crime Survey victimization data. Some of the more significant questions to be addressed are:

1. Changes in the rate of criminal victimization by juvenile offenders;
2. Changes in the nature of seriousness of crimes by juvenile offenders;
3. Changes in race, sex, and age of juvenile offenders; and
4. Comparisons of the results from analyzing the victimization data with findings from studies using self-reported delinquency and official record studies.

The latter comparison will make possible examination of the relationship of victimization data to self-report and arrest data, thereby increasing our understanding of the relationship of these indicators of delinquency to each other, and, in general, better estimates of the volume of delinquency in the United States.

2. Program Development

In 1975, the Office implemented a "program development process" for identification of action program areas that need addressing, and the design and implementation of them. The Institute plays an important role, that has been recognized by the Congress and others, in this program development process. Through the Institute, a comprehensive information and data gathering and assessment program has been undertaken which is being expanded. Assessments are undertaken in specific topic areas to be addressed by major action programs.

This work resulted in a background (state-of-the-art) paper that included information on promising approaches. It was used in the overall design of the action program initiative and in the development of the individual projects funded thereunder. The Institute also supported the evaluation of a selected sub-set of the funded projects.

The Institute is in the process of strengthening the Office's program development process in the following ways: 1) placing more emphasis on the use of assessments in development of action programs; 2) evaluating fewer projects among the total funded; 3) placing more emphasis on examination of procedures involved in the implementation of projects--problems

and obstacles encountered and solutions to them--and the use of this information in subsequent program development in other areas; 4) restructuring the reporting requirements placed on overall program evaluation projects in order to generate and make available current information regarding program implementation problems and progress; and 5) developing an extensive information dissemination capability so as to make useful information available to selected groups which need it in their efforts related to accomplishment of the mandates of the JD Act and the objectives of the OJJDP.

a. Youth Advocacy

The Institute funded a group to assume responsibility for assisting in program development work in relation to the Fiscal Year 1979 Youth Advocacy Program. In addition to the background (state-of-the-art) work, this group assisted individual projects funded under the program in developing their approaches, by making available to them current information on effective youth advocacy techniques tried elsewhere, and also through monitoring and reporting their progress back to them, to the OJJDP, and to others undertaking or planning to undertake youth advocacy efforts.

b. Restitution

The first phase of the national evaluation (Institute for Policy Analysis, Eugene, Oregon) of OJJDP's Juvenile Restitution Special Emphasis Initiative was mainly devoted to developing information on operational programs to inform the development of OJJDP Restitution Program Guidelines. A mail survey of a national representative sample of juvenile courts was undertaken to provide an overview of current restitution practices in juvenile courts. Based on the survey sample, 15 jurisdictions were selected for site visits to develop more detailed information on what appear to be the most promising restitution program models for the Juvenile Justice System. This information has been summarized in a "plain english" document that the Institute is sharing with the restitution grantees to assist them in their development of individual projects.

The Institute for Policy Analysis has also undertaken of a sample of the recipients of the Restitution Program Announcement to learn why some organizations did not apply and other reactions to the Guidelines. This information will assist us in preparing guidelines for future OJJDP programs of this magnitude.

c. Assessment Centers

The four Centers under the Assessment Centers Program are responsible for the collection, assessment, and synthesis of research data and program experience, and the preparation of reports, on topics of interest to OJJDP. Topics completed and under preparation include:

- Center on Alternatives to Juvenile Justice System Processing: 1) An Assessment of Achievement Place: An Alternative to Incarceration; 2) An Assessment of Self-Reported Delinquency: Implications for Alternative Programs; 3) Young Women in the Juvenile Justice Process: Promising Program Alternatives; 4) Diversion Programs: Legal Issues; 5) An Assessment of Alternatives to Detention; 6) Youth Services Bureaus: An Alternative to Detention; 7) Police Diversion: An Alternative to Detention; 8) Court Diversion Programs: Alternatives to Detention; and 9) An Assessment of the Use of Detention for Juveniles.
- Center on the Juvenile Justice System: 1) An Assessment of Serious Juvenile Crime (8 volumes, 996 pages); 2) The Status Offender and the Juvenile Justice System (245 pages); 3) A preliminary Assessment of Child Abuse & Neglect and the Juvenile Justice System (154 pages); and 4) An Assessment of Case Disposition and Classification in the Juvenile Justice System (3 volumes, 774 pages).
- Center on Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention: 1) A Comparison of Status Offenses and Delinquent Behavior; 2) Delinquency Prevention Experiments; 3) Child Abuse: A Contributing Factor to Delinquency; 4) Genetic Aspects of Psychiatric Syndromes Relating to Anti-social Problems in Youth; 5) Descriptions of the Current Youth Population; 6) An Assessment and Evaluation of Drug Prevention Programs; 7) Delinquency Prevention: A Taxonomy of Strategies and Programs; 8) Peer Relations and Delinquency; 9) Learning Problems and Juvenile Delinquency; 10) Media Violence; 11) Projected Changes in the Youth Population and Their Impact on Juvenile Crime Rates; 12) An Assessment of Evaluations of School Prevention Programs; 13) Prevention Program Implementation: An Analysis and Assessment of the Process; 14) Prevention Program Implementation Guidelines; 15) Alternative Education and Youth Crime; 16) Washington State's New Juvenile Code: Its Delinquency Prevention Aspects; and 17) Delinquency Prevention: Some Innovative Programs.
- Coordinating Assessment Center: 1) Juvenile Delinquency in America: A Comprehensive View and 2) Draft Design: OJJDP/NIJDP Clearinghouse. This Center is also responsible for providing coordination and management support to the entire program and for preparation of a periodic summary volume on juvenile delinquency in America. The first of these volumes is now in final edited form.

The Institute is currently refocusing the Assessment Centers Program consistent with the mandates contained in the amended JD Act and current objectives of OJJDP. At the same time, Phase II of this program has been revised to accomplish its integration with the Clearinghouse.

d. Clearinghouse

In response to a specific legislative mandate, the design work is near completion for an OJJDP Clearinghouse. It will be funded during Fiscal Year 1979. Useful information for a variety of audiences is generated under basic research; program development, evaluation and standards programs. It is the purpose of the Clearinghouse to actively link State and local audiences, and individuals with sources of information and assistance to advance OJJDP's program goals.

e. Residential Care Study

The Institute awarded a grant early in Fiscal Year 1979 for a replication of the landmark 1966 Census of Children Residential Institutions in the United States and territories, to be directed by Donnel M. Pappenfort. This survey differed from the original Census in that it involved much more comprehensive coverage of residential programs (including facilities and programs for dependent, neglected, emotionally disturbed, physically disabled, retarded, status offenders, and delinquents). It provided a valuable data base for assessing contemporary institutional care for juveniles, noting past trends, and preparing for measurement of changes in residential care practices in the future.

This grant also initiated a nationwide survey of programs for youths that serve as alternatives to Juvenile Justice System and traditional social services processing. The range of program alternatives encompasses those programs and services for the categories of youths listed above.

The results of these two surveys not only provided guidance to the OJJDP and other Federal agencies' action programs, but also served as a basis for standards development and implementation, and guidelines development in conjunction with the OJJDP formula grant program.

f. Information System Development

The Institute's current work in this area consists of three major efforts. The first was maintenance and expansion of the nationwide Juvenile Court Statistics Reporting System, through which information on juvenile court handling of youth is generated. The Institute awarded a new grant to the National Center for Juvenile Justice for this purpose.

The second effort in this area was the development and implementation of automated information systems for juvenile courts. Under previous grants, a national assessment of such systems was conducted and the requirements of a model system were developed. The Institute recently awarded a new grant to the National Council of Juvenile Family Court Judges for the purpose of implementing the model system statewide in Rhode Island.

The third effort in this area was a Fiscal Year 1978 grant for implementation of an automated information system in the D.C. Superior Court, which combined a court and prosecutor information system.

g. Due Process

During Fiscal Year 1978 a major grant was awarded to the National Center for State Courts for a nationwide survey of juvenile courts. The major purpose of the survey (which included intensive studies of 10 to 15 juvenile courts) was to examine the extent to which due process procedures were followed in juvenile courts, as required by the Supreme Court's Gault decision.

h. Interstate Placement, Waiver, Subsidies and Non-judicial Duties of Juvenile Courts.

A major grant was awarded during Fiscal Year 1978 to the Academy for Contemporary Problems (ACP) in Columbus, Ohio, for the purpose of nationwide studies in each of the above four areas. Each study included intensive case studies within 6 to 10 states.

The interstate placement study was based on a pilot study of this area, completed by the ACP in Fiscal Year 1978. It was aimed at examining the extent of, and practices associated with, interstate placement of children. The second study involved an examination of the extent, practices, and implications of a waiver of youths from juvenile to adult court.

The third study was aimed at providing detailed information on the availability and purposes of juvenile justice subsidies at State and local levels this information will assist States in accomplishing the purposes of the JD Act. The fourth study consisted of an assessment of the desirability of Juvenile Court administration of such non-judicial responsibilities as detention, probation, and other court services.

3. Evaluation

Consistent with the Office's "program development" approach, the evaluation activity was focused almost entirely on programs funded by the OJJDP. However, the Office is beginning to broaden the range of evaluation activity to include other programs of LEAA funded with maintenance of effort monies (e.g., family violence) and assessments of implementation of unique state legislation (California and Washington).

The seven evaluations funded to date are briefly described below, together with preliminary findings.

a. Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders

This effort consisted of an overall evaluation of the program and

independent local evaluations of 8 of the 10 individual projects (Alameda, Wash. State, Arizona, Arkansas, Illinois, South Carolina, Delaware, and Connecticut).

The central objectives of this evaluation were to determine:

- 1) The extent to which status offenders already in detention and in correctional institutions, as well as those newly defined as status offenders during the life of the program, have been transferred or referred to community-based facilities and programs;
- 2) The progress achieved in the development and utilization of community-based services; and
- 3) The impact of these services on (a) the social adjustment and recidivism of program clients, (b) the acceptance and support of the program by community opinion leaders and personnel of collaborating private and public social service organizations and by the Juvenile Justice agencies, and (c) the fiscal, organizational, and personnel aspects of the Juvenile Justice System.

In addition to these areas, the evaluation addressed such specific topics as the following: sex-based differences in status offense behavior and program effectiveness, age and maturation effects on status offense behavior, relabelling, the existence of the "widening-of-the-net" phenomenon, and a comparative cost analysis of intervention programs.

One of the most significant preliminary findings pertained to the reluctance of foster and group homes to accept youths who had been apprehended by the police. Such programs tend to find status offenders "disruptive" to their programming. This finding pointed directly to the need for efforts to increase the flexibility of foster and group home programs, including effective use of 24-hour intake, if significant gains are to be made in reducing the incarceration of status offenders.

b. Prevention

The national evaluation of the OJJDP Prevention Program Initiative was conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. It was designed to develop information that will increase our understanding of the concept of delinquency prevention and contribute to practical improvements in prevention programming. Intensive evaluations were conducted on a sample of six regional and five national affiliates. Management information (service delivery) data were collected on almost all of the 43 individual projects funded under the program. Data collected on the planning and implementation phases of the prevention projects indicated that identification of the project target population and coordination with other youth-serving agencies are two of the most difficult tasks. Also, few projects seemed to perform the exercise of specifying theories of delinquency causation and developing interventions which directly addressed the presumed causes. The result was excessive reliance on traditional services, particularly counseling.

c. Diversion

The national evaluation of the OJJDP Diversion Program was conducted by the Behavioral Research Institute (Boulder, Colo.). This study was structured to answer the following major questions: 1) What difference does diversion make for youth (as opposed to Juvenile Justice System referral) and the Juvenile Justice System? 2) What difference does service delivery make (as opposed to diversion without services)? The evaluation also addressed such issues as the impact of diversion programs on juvenile justice system processes and procedures, and the extent to which diversion programs actually reduced the level of delinquent adjudications.

While the evaluation covered all 11 of the diversion action program sites, only 4 were intensively evaluated as part of the national evaluation (Orange Co., Fla; Kansas City; John Jay College, N.Y.; and Memphis). The preliminary evidence suggested that the intensive sites were generally diverting youths who otherwise would have been referred to court.

d. Restitution

The national evaluation of the Juvenile Restitution Special Emphasis Initiative was designed to determine what types of restitution were most effective for what types of offenders, and under what conditions. The evaluator participated in the tentative selection of projects to be included in the national evaluation to ensure that these projects represented a variety of basic program models. The models were identified by the national evaluator through the survey and site visits to existing restitution programs to gather program information that would assist the applicants in developing their programs. About 9 of the approximately 50 restitution projects that the Office funded in Fiscal Year 1978-1979 were selected for intensive evaluation. However, a management information system was implemented at all restitution project sites to gather current data on their activities. This information will be used in the Office's program development work (i.e., in the identification of areas in which TA is needed, determining the progress of implementation, etc.) and also reported back to the respective projects to assist them in further programming.

e. School Crime

The OJJDP is in the second year of a large-scale evaluation (Social Action Research Center) of its Schools Initiative. The initiative is comprised of Interagency Agreements with the U.S. Office of Education, Teacher Corps, and Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program, Division of Drug Education.

The Teacher Corps Program involved nine Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy projects in demonstrations of student planned, implemented, and evaluated efforts to reduce school crime. In the second joint program, teams of representatives of the school community (teachers, students, administrators,

community members, etc.) received intensive training and follow-on technical assistance to facilitate the design of programs which are geared to the unique needs of local schools or school districts.

The evaluation answered four questions: 1) Are there measurable changes in the level of crime and fear of crime in the schools participating in the Initiative? 2) Were the programs carried out as intended? 3) What approaches -- and with what underlying rationales -- appear to work best under different conditions? and 4) What is involved in bringing about specific changes in the school?

Preliminary data are available on the results of classifying programs in both the Teacher Corps and School Teams Approach. An analysis of the results of student responses to a questionnaire on the extent of the crime problem and fear of victimization has also been prepared.

f. Family Violence Evaluation

A grant was awarded during Fiscal Year 1978 for the national evaluation of the LEAA Family Violence Program, funded by the Office of Criminal Justice Programs. Five to seven projects received an intensive evaluation, and management information data were collected on all projects funded under the overall program to allow the progress of their operations to be followed. The major objective of the evaluation was to develop information on the effectiveness of various community organizational strategies for providing services to families in which violence occurs. Data were collected on the program planning and implementation process; and on the impact of the program on community service agencies; the criminal justice system, community residents, and program clients.

g. Assessment of New California Legislation

The Assessment of the Impact of the new California juvenile justice legislation (AB 3121) on the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and on the processing of serious juvenile offenders involved examining both the intended as well as unintended effects of the legislation. The assessment was focused on changes in Juvenile Justice System procedures at various points in the system, and changes in general processing patterns across the State, with more detailed information from selected counties. Other components were focused on juveniles' experience and attitudes. Preliminary findings indicated a statewide reduction of about 50 percent in the number of juveniles arrested for status offenses since implementation of the new legislation -- which prohibits secure confinement for such offenses.

4. Training

During the past year, the Office has made significant progress in developing its training program, which previously had been given low priority. Three major areas of new activity are described briefly below: delinquency prevention, law-related education, and deinstitutionalization.

a. Delinquency Prevention

Three projects were undertaken through which about 1,000 juvenile justice and youth worker personnel in both the public and private sectors were provided training in such areas as evaluation and decision-making, youth participation, and community leadership skills development.

b. Law-Related Education

The Office also developed a comprehensive law-related education program for funding early in Fiscal Year 1979. This program tested various methods and approaches to improving youths' understanding of the juvenile, civil, and criminal justice systems, their rights and responsibilities as citizens, and the lawful means of securing and enforcing those rights. This program included grants to the following organizations: American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Law in a Free Society, the National Street Law Institute, the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity International and the Children's Legal Rights Foundation and Training Program.

c. Deinstitutionalization

Through a Fiscal Year 1978 grant, the Institute established in Massachusetts a rather large-scale training program, focused on deinstitutionalization of all youths presently incarcerated, except approximately 10-15 percent (serious violent offenders). Through this project, with other OJJDP training, technical assistance, and action programs, the Institute hopes to persuade other States to deinstitutionalize Statewide their large juvenile correctional institutions. The content of the training program draws mainly upon the results of the seven-year Massachusetts study, the new secure care study, and the results of other OJJDP research, evaluation, and action program activities in the deinstitutionalization area.

The primary trainees in this training program are State Juvenile Justice Advisory Groups, private non-profit agency youth workers, juvenile justice planners, legislators, judges, correctional workers, and others engaged in deinstitutionalization efforts.

5. Standards

Since being relieved of the responsibility of staff work for the National Advisory Committee's subcommittee in Standards, OJJDP's standards program has devoted increasing attention to reviewing other related national standards developed by Federal and State agencies and national organizations, as well as new State legislation, for their consistency with the principles and mandates of the JJDP Act. In addition to providing continued support to the IJA/ABA Juvenile Justice Standards Project for the review and comment on the IJA/ABA draft standards, the Office sponsored a symposium to analyze and compare the positions taken by the three national standards groups on the critical issues facing the

Juvenile Justice System. The proceedings of the symposium have been made available for nationwide dissemination.

An assessment of the implementation of California's revised State statute, which incorporates some of the standards recommendations, was continued in Fiscal Year 1978. Two other such assessments are planned for Fiscal Year 1979 (Washington and Maine). General areas being investigated include: provisions regarding using the least restrictive alternative to incarceration, accountability for decision-making, limiting judicial discretion through determinate sentencing, increasing the role of the prosecutor, limiting the jurisdiction of the juvenile/family court, and providing due process safeguards for the juvenile.

The Office has awarded a grant to Boston University for a project on the testing and implementation of standards. Two communities are participating in the development of police guidelines for the handling of juveniles. The program encourages community and police line staff involvement in the development and implementation process. The guidelines were based on the standards developed to date which encourage diversion, due process, and accountability for police decision-making at the arrest stage.

Part Three

National Advisory Committee

A. INTRODUCTION

The National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was created in 1974 by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The Act charges the Advisory Committee with making recommendations annually to LEAA on "planning, policy, priorities, operations, and management of all Federal juvenile delinquency programs."

The Committee is composed of 21 members appointed by the President from among those with expertise in the fields of youth, juvenile delinquency, or the administration of juvenile justice. Under the law, seven Advisory Committee members must be younger than 26 years of age when appointed. This provision brings to the group the views and special concerns of the young in formulating public policy, and in the design and development of programs for delinquency prevention and justice for young people.

National Advisory Committee membership is further strengthened by the requirement that a majority cannot be full-time Federal, State, or local government employees. Initially, members were appointed for terms of one, two, and three years. Subsequent members are appointed for terms of four years.

Specific responsibilities of the Advisory Committee include the following:

1. Advising the LEAA Administrator on objectives, priorities, and standards for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs;
2. Helping the Administrator prepare reports that analyze and evaluate Federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs; and
3. Making recommendations on the development of an annual comprehensive plan for Federal programs, i.e., one that emphasizes delinquency prevention and the diversion of young people from the traditional Juvenile Justice System.

The chairman of the National Advisory Committee is authorized to designate subcommittees on specific issues. During the first year, the group created the following subcommittees:

1. The Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (the Standards Committee);
2. The Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (the National Institute Committee); and
3. The Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort (the Concentration of Federal Effort Committee).

B. NAC AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND RESULTS -- OCTOBER 1, 1977-SEPTEMBER 30, 1978

This Section presents a compilation of legislatively mandated recommendations to the President, the Congress, and the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and a description of relevant actions taken by the Committee over the reporting period (October 1, 1977--September 30, 1978).

1. 10th NAC Meeting, Washington, D.C.

The Committee's 10th meeting took place November 30-December 2, 1977, in Washington, D.C. During the course of the meeting, the Committee took the following actions:

- (a) The Chair announced subcommittee assignments approved by the Executive Committee.
- (b) The Committee agreed that the 1977 Annual Report to be transmitted to the Administrator of OJJDP, the President and the Congress, and to be made available to the public should describe the NAC organization and objectives as well as accomplishments and recommendations.
- (c) The Committee adopted the following major objective, as a means of furthering its mandate as set forth in Section 208(b) of the Act: To develop a constituency to work toward delinquency prevention and improvements to the juvenile justice system.
- (d) Included in the broader goal outlined in item c is the Committee's objective, adopted in February 1977, viz., to develop effective working relationships with its counterparts at the State level. As the first step in accomplishing that objective, the NAC planned a meeting of State juvenile justice and delinquency prevention advisory groups:

- (1) to develop a national constituency for prevention of delinquency and improvement in the administration of juvenile justice; and
 - (2) to provide technical assistance to States and to their juvenile justice advisory groups in implementing the provisions of the Act, as amended.
- (e) The Committee approved the following Subcommittee recommendations:

Advisory Committee to the Administrator of the Office on Standards for Juvenile Justice -- A minimum of two hours are to be set aside on the agenda for the February NAC meeting to discuss and resolve the Committee's position on the issue of court jurisdiction over status offenders and to reconsider previous actions regarding Standards that have been adopted.

Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (the Institute) -- The Administrator of OJJDP is to be asked to clarify the role of research in the overall agency program; and the Administrator of OJJDP is to be informed that unfilled authorized staff positions within the Institute must be filled and additional positions authorized to enable the Institute to effectively carry out its Congressional mandate and efficiently expend its \$16 million appropriation.

Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort -- Letters are to be sent to the Administrator of OJJDP and to the Attorney General requesting that: the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (the Coordinating Council) be convened by March 1, 1978; the Administrator of the Office report by the February NAC meeting on the status of the Coordinating Council meeting; and the Attorney General establish a policy of citizen participation in Coordinating Council meetings by inviting members of the Subcommittee to participate as ex-officio members; and the NAC should actively seek independent staff (two professionals and one support staff positions).

- (f) The Committee reviewed and commented upon agenda materials prepared by the Advisory Committee to the Administrator of OJJDP in conjunction with staff and contractors for the meeting of State juvenile justice advisory groups. The Subcommittee was given the responsibility to plan the meeting.

2. 11th NAC Meeting, Arlington, Virginia

The Committee's 11th meeting took place February 6-8, 1978, in Arlington, Virginia. During the course of the meeting, the Committee took the following actions:

- (a) Reviewed progress made in planning the First National Meeting of State Advisory Groups to be co-sponsored by the NAC and OJJDP.
- (b) Requested the OJJDP staff to prepare and send letters to Directors of State Planning Agencies informing them about the meeting of state advisory groups and urging them to send their Juvenile Justice specialists.
- (c) The Chair was asked to request an appearance at the ongoing meeting of SPA Directors in Reston, Virginia, to invite them personally to send their Juvenile Justice specialists to the meeting.
- (d) In a roll call vote, following vigorous discussion and debate, the members of the Committee disapproved a motion to reaffirm the original position of the NAC that status offenders be removed from the jurisdiction of the Juvenile and Family Court.
- (e) The Committee voted to advise the Administrator of OJJDP that in its view, States could comply with the requirements of the law concerning the composition of the State Advisory Groups and that sanctions should be imposed in the event of non-compliance.
- (f) The Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort was charged with the responsibility of contacting the Administrator of OJJDP to discuss his plans for furthering goals set out for OJJDP in the area of coordination and concentration of Federal Effort.
- (g) The Committee approved a motion that the Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort seek to meet with the Administrator of OJJDP to discuss the staff proposal and task outline that the Subcommittee has developed and to receive a report on the status of the proposal.
- (h) The Committee voted to elect a Vice Chair and a Secretary and to adopt a set of Bylaws to be formed by a Bylaws Committee to be named before the adjournment of the meeting.
- (i) The Committee recommended that in meeting the requirements of the legislation concerning the appointment of

youths under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Justice System, special consideration should be given to the appointment of minority representatives, with particular attention to the appointment of at least one black.

- (j) The Committee approved the following Subcommittee recommendations:

Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention -- The evaluation of the meeting of State Advisory Groups is to include information on training needs from States; in addition, NAC members are requested to solicit that information during workshop discussions to assist the Institute in carrying out its mandated responsibilities.

Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards for Juvenile Justice -- Procedures for Review, Refinement, and Recommendations of Standards, were adopted, after striking the phrase: "The Standards Committee shall consider thoroughly the points of view, comments, reservations, and suggestions of the NAC, OJJDP and its members."

3. Special Meeting of the NAC at the First National Meeting of State Advisory Groups, Reston, Virginia

The National Advisory Committee met in a special session on March 3, 1978, following the National Meeting of State Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Groups. The primary purpose of the NAC meeting was to review the conference and to discuss outcomes and follow-up activities.

At the Special Meeting, the Committee took the following substantive actions:

- (a) Anticipating the need for elected leadership during a possible interim period between the expiration of terms of one third of the membership and the appointment of replacements by the President, the members of the Committee approved a resolution creating the Office of Vice Chair (person) and elected Barbara T. Sylvester to serve in that capacity until the first election held under Bylaws to be adopted by the Committee.
- (b) Directed the Vice Chair to send a letter to the President on behalf of the Committee, requesting that the four incumbents who had announced their interest in continuing to serve on the Committee, be reappointed to new terms and that the remaining new appointments be made promptly.

4. 12th NAC Meeting, Kansas City, Missouri

The Committee's 12th meeting took place July 12-14, 1978 in Kansas City, Missouri. During the course of the meeting, the Committee took the following actions:

- (a) Approved the adoption of Bylaws.
- (b) Approved the scheduling of an orientation program for new members at the Committee's next meeting in San Antonio, Texas.
- (c) Approved a motion to co-sponsor (with OJJDP) a Second Annual Meeting of State Advisory Groups in 1979.
- (d) Approved the preliminary report of the Chairperson's Caucus at the First Annual Meeting of State Advisory Groups and referred the recommendations contained therein to the Advisory Committee to the Administrator of OJJDP.
- (e) Approved three resolutions concerning NAC participation in the upcoming 1979 observance of the International Year of the Child (IYC):
 - "Be it resolved that the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is in full support of the 1979 International Year of the Child and, accordingly, urges all State Advisory Groups, JJDP Act-funded projects, and citizen supporters of the Act to participate in IYC by holding special seminars, research projects and educational programs on some aspect of the value and needs of children and youth. Be it further resolved that the NAC encourages citizen groups to sponsor legislative programs to improve laws affecting children, youth and families.
 - "That the National Advisory Committee request membership on the National Organizations Advisory Council for IYC.
 - "That the NAC Chair designate an IYC Steering Committee to coordinate the NAC's planning activities and liaison functions with respect to IYC."
- (f) Approved two resolutions concerning proposed Formula Grant Guidelines to be communicated to the Administrator of OJJDP:
 - The NAC recommends that Section (b): any public or private facility used primarily (more than 50

percent of the facility's population during any consecutive 30-day period) for the lawful custody of accused or adjudicated criminal-type offenders, even if the facility is non-secure, be deleted from Paragraph 52n(2) which defines juvenile detention or correctional facilities for purposes of monitoring, and

- The NAC recommends that the Guidelines address the issue of size of facilities for the care and treatment of status offenders, i.e., that consideration be given to limiting the size of such facilities to conform to the intent of the Juvenile Justice Act.

Because of the organizational nature of the meeting and the lack of opportunity to make Chairperson assignments or to consult with new members concerning their subcommittee preferences, no subcommittee meetings were held in conjunction with the 12th meeting of the NAC.

5. 13th NAC Meeting, San Antonio, Texas

The Committee's 13th meeting took place August 16-18, 1978, in San Antonio, Texas. During the course of the meeting, the Committee took the following substantive actions:

- (a) The Committee approved eight resolutions concerning the juvenile who has committed a violent offense:
 - The NAC recommends that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention set as a top priority the identification and evaluation of all programs serving juveniles who have committed violent offenses and also the identification of programs that have some measurable degree of success.
 - The growing negative reaction at the state level to violent acts committed by youthful offenders, the increasing number of state legislatures that have reduced the age at which juveniles can be tried as adults, and, in many localities, the often ill-informed, reflex reactions to the complex phenomenon of violent offenders, leads the NAC to recommend that State Advisory Groups focus on this problem area as one of their primary areas of interest. It is further recommended that SAG members actively participate in, and provide enlightened input into any code revisions being considered in their respective states which are likely to have impact on the types of dispositions of cases involving juveniles who have committed a violent offense. Lastly, the OJJDP is urged to intensify the level of technical assistance being provided the states in this area.

- All references to violent juvenile offenders or delinquents in the recommendations of the NAC shall read, "the juvenile who has committed a violent offense."
 - The NAC concurs with Paul Strasburg's recommendation for research in the treatment of juveniles who have committed a violent offense (as outlined in "Violent Delinquents: A Report to the Ford Foundation from the Vera Institute of Justice"). Specifically, research efforts are needed to:
 - (1) determine the nature of treatment programs to be offered,
 - (2) examine the issue of voluntariness in treatment programs,
 - (3) assess the feasibility of integrating rehabilitation and punishment objectives.
 - Treatment programs for juveniles who have committed a violent offense, funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, should continue to contain, and make more extensive evaluation components; in the alternative, OJJDP should award an independent evaluation contract to develop comparative data on program effectiveness.
 - The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention should develop training modules for line staff in community-based and institutional settings which are tested in geographically representative areas and the results of which are made available to the public.
 - The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention should develop some model training curricula and related materials for training line staff working in community-based and institutional settings with juveniles who have committed a violent offense.
 - The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, in cooperation with HEW's Office of Child Development, should place a priority on research into the incidence and relationship between child abuse, family violence, and incest, and violent offenses later in life.
- (b) In a roll call vote after debate and discussion, the Committee approved a motion to adopt a standard opposing

the waiver of any person under the age of 18 to the jurisdiction of the adult court. Immediately thereafter, the Committee voted to reconsider the motion at its next meeting in Washington, D.C., and requested the Chair to assign the matter to a subcommittee for further study and preparation of written recommendations for the full Committee.

- (c) The Committee voted to recommend to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention that a priority be given to research into the impact of waiver to the adult court.
- (d) The Committee approved an \$140 million dollar level of appropriation for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- (e) The Committee voted to recommend to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention that the areas of vocational training and work study for juveniles be addressed in the Special Emphasis Program on Alternative Education.
- (f) The Committee approved the following Subcommittee recommendations:

Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards for Juvenile Justice -- The Subcommittee is authorized to make application for funding from OJJDP for additional staff support to complete the remaining Standards' commentaries for the Prevention Strategies.

Advisory Committee to the Administrator of OJJDP -- The Committee endorses the Administrator's appeal of the LEAA General Counsel's Legal Opinion 76-14 which prohibits programs originally funded by Crime Control Act monies from receiving Juvenile Justice Act monies.

Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort -- The National Advisory Committee authorizes and directs the Chair of the Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort to urge the Coordinating Council to abide by the mandate contained in Section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended; and

The National Advisory Committee request technical assistance from OJJDP in the assessment of youth participation in the SAG's, specifically information concerning number and proportion of youth member slots filled in all SAG's, records of attendance of SAG members and

analysis of attendance, analysis of youth attendance and participation in SAG-sponsored activities and names and addresses of all SAG youth members.

6. Executive Committee Meeting, Washington, D.C.

The Executive Committee of the National Advisory Committee was formed soon after the establishment of the full Committee to provide leadership and to enable the Committee to carry on its activities between scheduled meetings. The Committee Bylaws, adopted at the 12th meeting, called for the continuing existence of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee's mandated activities are primarily in the areas of development of Committee procedures and agendas, and review of Committee reports.

The Executive Committee met on October 31, 1977, in Washington, D.C. At the meeting, the Executive Committee took the following actions (in addition to agenda development) not already recorded in the report of the full Committee:

- (a) Approved retention of the firm of A.L. Nellum and Associates to provide professional, administrative, and technical support to the NAC.
- (b) Approved hosting a National Meeting of State Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Groups in light of furthering the Committee's adopted objective of developing effective working relationships with its counterparts at the State level.
- (c) Adopted policies developed by the Department of Justice regarding travel and conference attendance.

7. Executive Committee Meeting, Washington, D.C.

The Executive Committee met on November 30, 1977, in Washington, D.C. At the meeting, the Executive Committee took the following actions not already recorded in the report of the full Committee:

- (a) Appointed an ad hoc committee composed of Ms. Barbara Sylvester (Chair), Mr. John Florez and Mr. Timothy Davis to contact the President to urge prompt attention to the seven NAC appointments due March 18, 1978 and to raise the issue of Committee staffing needs.
- (b) Approved a schedule of 1978 NAC meetings.

8. Executive Committee Meeting, Arlington, Virginia

The Executive Committee met on February 6, 1978, in Arlington, Virginia. At the meeting, the Executive Committee took the following actions not already recorded in the report of the full Committee:

- (1) Approved the printing of the Annual Report in its current version,
- (2) Approved the scheduling of a Special Meeting of the Committee on March 5, 1978, following the last session of the meeting of State Advisory Groups, and
- (3) Assigned responsibility for identifying independent Committee staff to the Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort.

9. Executive Committee Meeting, Washington, D.C.

The Executive Committee met on April 10, 1978, in Executive Session at the Office of the Administrator of OJJDP. At the meeting, the Executive Committee and the Administrator agreed to postpone the Committee's regularly scheduled May meeting until the seven new members were appointed by the President.

10. Executive Committee Meeting, Kansas City, Missouri

The Executive Committee met on July 11, 1978, in Kansas City, Missouri. The meeting was organizational in nature; no action was taken beyond the normal process of agenda review and development.

11. Executive Committee Meeting, San Antonio, Texas

The Executive Committee met on August 16, 1978, in San Antonio, Texas. At the meeting, the Executive Committee took the following actions:

- (a) Approved the Chair's appointment of Ms. Diana Tamez to explore publication of a Committee newsletter and to serve as its editor. The newsletter is to be a Committee product designed to further the requirement of Section 208(b) of the Act; and
- (b) Called for the development of a Committee work plan to be developed by review and approval at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

The Executive Committee met in a second session on August 18, 1978 at the same location. The Committee selected sites and dates for meetings in 1979.

12. Meetings of NAC Subcommittees (October 1, 1977-September 30, 1978)

This subsection records Subcommittee activities and those recommendations which do not appear in the full Committee report.

a. Advisory Committee to the Administrator of OJJDP

The Chairman shall designate a Subcommittee of members of the Advisory Committee to advise the Associate Administrator on particular functions or aspects of the work of the Office (Section 208(c)).

- (1) In the meeting of December 1, 1977, in conjunction with the 10th meeting of the NAC, the Subcommittee focused activities on carrying out the assignment to plan the National Meeting of State Advisory Groups.
- (2) On January 6, 1978, the Subcommittee met to continue planning the National Meeting of State Advisory Groups. A preliminary agenda was reviewed and discussed and decisions were made concerning number and type of participants. Conference products were identified and assignments made for their development.
- (3) On February 5, 1978, in conjunction with the 11th meeting of the NAC, the Subcommittee met to assess progress and to continue planning the National Meeting of State Advisory Groups. Reports were heard on agenda format, agenda participants, resource persons, conference products and schedule to accomplish remaining tasks.
- (4) On August 17, 1978, the Subcommittee took the following actions:
 - Adopted a set of operating procedures and developed a work plan;
 - Requested that the Administrator of OJJDP provide a staff member as liaison to the Subcommittee; and
 - Requested that the Administrator of OJJDP provide the Subcommittee with his views on issues and matters which are appropriately within the province of the Committee.

The Subcommittee made the following recommendations:

- (1) That one day, or its equivalent in time, be allocated to Subcommittee meetings during NAC quarterly meetings (approved by NAC).

b. Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort

The Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort makes recommendations for improving the coordination of Federal juvenile delinquency programs and provides advice to the Office on the preparation of the Annual Report, containing an analysis and evaluation of

Federal juvenile delinquency programs and a comprehensive plan for implementing Federal policy on the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency.

The Advisory Committee on the Concentration of Federal Effort, established by the National Advisory Committee, met on December 1, 1977; February 7, 1978; and August 7, 1978. Recommendations that ensued from these meetings are recorded in the full Committee report.

c. Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (the Institute)

The Chairman shall designate a subcommittee of not less than five members of the Committee to serve, together with the Director of the National Institute of Corrections, as members of an Advisory Committee for the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to perform the functions set forth in Section 245 of this title (Section 108(d)).

The Advisory Committee shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Associate Administrator concerning the overall policy and operations of the Institute (42 U.S.C. 5655)(Section 245).

The Committee met on December 1, 1977, and February 7, 1978. In the latter meeting, the Subcommittee approved the following resolutions:

- The Administrator of OJJDP is strongly urged to proceed with all vigor to fill all vacant positions on the Institute staff.
- Concern is expressed over the apparent inability of the Institute to implement its major objectives in light of current staffing difficulties.
- The Subcommittee plans to request a meeting with the Associate Administrator to discuss the role of the Institute in the overall program of the Office.

On August 17, 1978, in conjunction with the 13th meeting of NAC, the Subcommittee met and took the following action:

- Developed a preliminary version of a one-year plan which focuses on the provision of advice, counsel and recommendations to the Administrator. The major elements of the work plan were:
 - (1) to comment on the Institute's Annual Report and to make recommendations on the Institute's program work plan;

- (2) to become familiar with the recommendations concerning the proposed National Institutes of Justice in the proposed Juvenile Justice System's Improvement Act of 1979 and to frame policy recommendations for NAC approval; and
- (3) to assess and make recommendations concerning the clearinghouse and information-sharing functions and the training functions of the Institute.

d. Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards for Juvenile Justice

The Chairman shall designate a Subcommittee of not less than five members of the Committee to serve as an Advisory Committee to the Associate Administrator on Standards for Juvenile Justice to perform the functions set forth in Section 247 of this title (Section 208(e)).

On December 1, 1977, in conjunction with 10th meeting of the NAC, the Subcommittee approved commentaries for the following Standards:

- 0.111 Organization of the Local Juvenile Justice System
- 0.112 Development of a Local Juvenile Service Plan
- 0.121 Organization of the State Juvenile Service System
- 0.122 Development of a State Juvenile Service Plan
- 0.123 Development of State Standards and Guidelines
- 0.124 Provision of Financial and Technical Resources
- 0.131 Organization and Coordination of the Federal Juvenile Service System
- 2.11 Intervention for Commission of a Delinquent Act
- 2.12 Intervention for Non-Criminal Misbehavior
- 2.13 Intervention to Protect Against Harm
- 2.21 Authority to Intervene (Law Enforcement Agencies)
- 2.221 Criteria for Referral to Intake -- Delinquency
- 2.222 Criteria for Referral to Intake -- Non-Criminal Misbehavior
- 2.223 Criteria for Referral to Intake -- Neglect and Abuse
- 2.31 Authority to Intervene (Non-Law Enforcement Agencies)
- 2.321 Criteria for Referral to Intake -- Non-Criminal Misbehavior
- 2.322 Criteria for Referral to Intake -- Neglect and Abuse

- 4.215 Training Schools -- Individual and Group Counseling Programs
- 4.2152 Training Schools -- Semi-autonomous Living Units
- 4.216 Training Schools -- Educational Services
- 4.2162 Training Schools -- Vocational Education

On February 7, 1978, in conjunction with the 11th meeting of the NAC, the Subcommittee approved a resolution recommending to the NAC that its action (the vote concerning jurisdiction of the Juvenile and Family Court over status offenders) be transmitted to the ABA and to the ABA/IJA Standards Commission, together with a summary of the discussion and a transcript, if available, of the total meeting.

The Subcommittee approved commentaries for the following Standards:

- 4.2161 Training Schools -- Academic Education
- 4.2163 Training -- Special Education
- 4.217 Health and Mental Health Services
- 4.2171 Training Schools -- Initial Health Examination and Assessment
- 4.2172 Training Schools -- Responsibility toward Patients
- 4.2173 Training Schools -- Diets
- 4.219 Training Schools -- Recreational Facilities
- 4.234 Form of Citation, Summons and Order to Take Into Custody
- 2.241 Procedures Following a Decision Not to Refer to Intake (Law Enforcement Agencies)

On August 17, 1979, in conjunction with the 13th meeting of the NAC, the Subcommittee met and concluded that, without the level of staff support previously supplied by OJJDP, it could not carry out its assignment (estimated at 270 man-days to complete the commentaries for Standards and 60 man-days to complete the commentaries for Prevention Strategies). A recommendation was made to the full Committee that funding be requested for such support.

C. TESTIMONY

On June 27, 1978, at an Oversight Hearing on the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, Ms. Barbara Sylvester, Vice Chair, testified on behalf of the NAC before the House Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Committee on Education and Labor. Her testimony focused on the problems encountered by the Committee in carrying out its mandate, brought about by the lack of staff and inaction by the Executive Branch in selecting new Committee members to replace those whose terms had expired. The Committee's recommendations were as follows:

- (1) The NAC strongly recommends that a line item appropriation be made for the Committee.
- (2) The NAC recommends that appointees to the Committee be allowed to actively serve until their successors are named by the President.
- (3) The NAC pleads with the Congress to insist that the Coordinating Council meet and get on with the responsibilities charged to it in the Act.

D. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The Chairman, with the approval of the Committee, shall request of the Associate Administrator such staff and other support as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Advisory Committee (Section 208(f)). The Associate Administrator shall provide such staff and other support as may be necessary to perform the duties of the Advisory Committee (42 U.S.C. 5618) (Section 208(g)).

As previously noted, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention provided all of the substantive staff support to the Committee up through the 11th meeting of the NAC. Logistical and administrative support was provided by a contractor. Shortly after the National Meeting of State Advisory Groups in early March 1978, OJJDP withdrew all professional staff assistance to the Committee, with the exception of that provided by the Government Project Monitor. The contractor then assumed greater responsibilities and took on the role of independent staff to the Committee.

E. CONCLUSION

In the three and one half years since it was established, the National Advisory Committee has seen its membership and the personnel providing its staff support undergo a complete turnover. While this lack of continuity has brought about some predictable difficulties, nevertheless, the Committee has addressed major issues in the field of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention through the development of national standards for the administration of juvenile justice at all Governmental levels and through the transmittal of recommendations on various policy issues to the President, the Congress, and the Administrator of OJJDP. At the threshold of a new year, the National Advisory Committee is ready to move forward with energy and conviction to assist the Federal Government in providing leadership in the reduction of youth crime and the improvement of the nation's juvenile justice system.

Part Four

Coordinating Council

A. INTRODUCTION

Within the Federal Government, several agencies administer programs directly or indirectly related to the problems of juvenile justice and youth crime. In the past, each agency has developed and conducted its youth-oriented programs independently, often unaware of the efforts of other agencies working toward the same end, and generally missing valuable opportunities to pool resources and expertise and share experiences.

Recognizing that coordination among Federal agencies with juvenile delinquency-related responsibilities would increase productivity, in 1971 Congress created the Interdepartmental Council to Coordinate all Federal Juvenile Delinquency programs. The Council was disbanded in 1974 with passage of the JJDP Act. The JJDP Act created a new body -- the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention -- with expanded responsibilities that included not only the coordination of Federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, but programs administered at the State and local levels as well.

The Coordinating Council is composed of the Attorney General (chairman); the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (vice-chairman); and the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. In addition, a special subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has been appointed to attend Council meetings and assist in the concentration of Federal effort. The Coordinating Council members, in turn, serve as ex-officio members of the Advisory Committee.

The functions and composition of the Coordinating Council are similar to those of its predecessor. But whereas the former Council was unable to make major program decisions because it lacked both funding and clearcut decision-making authority, with the creation of

OJJDP, the present Coordinating Council has been given both a secure source of funding and the authority to establish important policy priorities and program objectives.

For 1978, the members of the Coordinating Council were as follows:

- John Rector, Vice Chairman, Administrator, OJJDP
- Dr. James Howell, Director, National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP
- Dr. Lynn Curtis, Special Assistant to the Secretary, HUD
- Ms. Sandra Gray, Special Assistant to the Administrator, Office of Education, HEW
- Mr. T.M. Parham, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Human Development, HEW
- Mr. Don Smith, Office of Policy and Planning, ACTION
- Mr. Robert Taggart, Administrator, Office of Youth Programs, Employment and Training Administration.

B. COUNCIL FUNCTION

The JJDP Act of 1974, Section 206(c) states:

Section 206(c)

(c) The function of the Council shall be to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs. The Council shall make recommendations to the Attorney General and the President at least annually with respect to the coordination of overall policy and development of objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities. The Council is authorized to review the programs and practices of Federal agencies and report on the degree to which Federal agency funds are used for purposes which are consistent or inconsistent with the mandates of Section 223(a)(12)(A) and (13) of this Title.

In 1978, the Coordinating Council undertook four main tasks:

1. Examined the Federal program study to be completed by the National Academy of Sciences and identified areas that they could be of assistance in the study and areas that would complement the Coordinating Council's efforts.

2. Selected the Federal programs to be examined for the 1978 Concentration of Federal Effort report.
3. Adopted their first priority -- to conduct a review of Federal policies and practices and report on the extent ~~that~~ Federal programs funds comply with Section 223(a)(12) and (13) of the JJDP Act of 1974.
4. Examined the Runaway Youth Program as established by Title III of the JJDP Act of 1974.

C. MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS

1. JJDP Council Meeting -- December 18, 1978

A meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was held on December 18, 1978. It was chaired by Vice Chair, John M. Rector, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Department of Justice. Mr. Rector stated that, in August 1978, the Council members adopted as their first objective a review of the policies and practices of Federal agencies to determine to what degree Federal funds are used for purposes that are consistent, or inconsistent, with the provisions of Section 223(a)(12) and (13) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. Those provisions are part of the Formula Grants Program of OJJDP and require states participating in the program to separate juveniles from adults in correctional facilities and to remove status offenders and dependent and neglected children from detention and correctional institutions. Mr. Rector commented that the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1977 specifically authorize the Coordinating Council to undertake the review.

Mr. David West, Director of the OJJDP Formula Grants and Technical Assistance Division, explained that under the Formula Grants Program, states are eligible to receive a specified amount of money based on the population of persons under the age of 18. The minimum Formula Grant is \$225,000. The largest Formula Grant awarded during Fiscal Year 1978 was \$5.9 million.

The overall goal of the program is to assist states and units of general local government in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating and evaluating projects directly or through grants and contracts with public and private agencies for the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment and rehabilitation programs to improve the juvenile justice system. To participate in the program, a State must establish an advisory group, submit a plan, and agree to: (1) separate juveniles from adults in correctional facilities; and (2) provide within three years of submission of the initial plan that status offenders and such non-offenders as dependent and neglected children will not be placed in juvenile detention or correctional facilities. Presently, 50 States

and territories are participating in the program. In terms of dollars, the program has grown from \$9 million available in Fiscal Year 1975 in grants to the states to more than \$63 million in Fiscal Year 1979.

Consistent with the immediate objective of the Council, Mr. West focused his remarks on the Formula Grant Program requirement regarding removal of juveniles from detention and correctional institutions. Mr. West estimated that 40% to 50% of the children and youth under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system have committed no criminal-type offense. On an average day there are approximately 12,000 juvenile non-offenders in detention or correctional facilities and approximately 100,000 juveniles in adult jails and lock-ups. Of those juveniles that are institutionalized, over 50% are placed in privately operated facilities which may or may not be licensed or monitored.

The deinstitutionalization requirement of the Formula Grant Program has caused considerable controversy in the States. However, the extremely high percentage of States participating indicates endorsement by the State of the overall policy thrust. While States must comply with the deinstitutionalization requirements, they are not required to spend the Formula Grant funds on activities related to deinstitutionalization. In fact, only a small percentage of the money is applied toward the deinstitutionalization objective. Mr. West explained that it is essentially a decentralized program. State-level juvenile justice planners oversee the program and expenditure of funds within the States. OJJDP staff oversee the planners.

2. JJDP Council Meeting -- December 19, 1978

A meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was held on December 19, 1978, with Vice Chair John M. Rector, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Department of Justice, presiding.

a. Presentation on National Academy of Sciences Project

Dr. James C. Howell, Director of OJJDP's National Institute on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, introduced Dr. Julie Katz, senior researcher for the OJJDP-funded National Academy of Sciences study, who briefed the Council members on the study and identified areas where the study might complement Council activities and where Council members could provide information of use to the study. Dr. Katz stated that the Academy was founded in 1863 as a private, self-governing institution to serve as an official, independent advisor to the Federal Government. Every study undertaken must meet certain strict Academy criteria. One criterion is that the study must address a significant social science policy issue. The Academy study will assist the impact of Federal programs and policies on institutionalization of children and youth. Four analytic tasks will be undertaken:

- (1) An assessment of Federal resources that contribute to institutionalization of children and youth;

- (2) An assessment, in three to five States, of patterns of responsibility for non-offenders with special attention to the boundaries of responsibility between the sectors of juvenile justice, welfare and social services, education, and mental health;
- (3) An assessment in the same States of the impact on State service delivery systems of Federal programs and policies relating to institutionalization of children and youth; and
- (4) Selected case studies and commissioned papers.

The Academy panel made a tentative selection of Federal programs to be studied in detail: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles, IVa, IVb, XIX (Medicaid), and XX of the Social Security Act, and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act programs (LEAA).

b. Discussion of Federal Programs to be Reviewed During 1979

Dr. Howell reiterated that the objective of the discussion was to move toward tentative agreement on which programs should be reviewed by the Council during 1979. It was suggested and agreed that the programs selected should represent the most glaring examples of either: (1) programs that are inconsistent with Sections 223(a)(12) and (13); or (2) programs that are consistent, but could be used more effectively to implement Sections 223(a)(12) and (13).

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussion of individual programs. It was agreed that the list of programs under discussion included all those of major importance to the Council.

3. JJDP Council Meeting -- December 20, 1978

A meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was held on December 20, 1978, with Vice Chair John M. Rector, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, presiding.

Mr. Rector summarized the proceedings of the previous meeting, emphasizing that, as the discussion of the December 19, 1978, Council Meeting demonstrated, the issues concerned Federal policies and programs are extremely complex.

Deputy Assistant Secretary Parham of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare commented that, during the previous day's discussion, numerous references were made to identifying and reviewing programs that may designate funds for deinstitutionalization of children and youth. He commented that the problems are not restricted to those programs and the dollars associated with them. Rather, the problem is

one of changing the "lock-up mentality" that permeates the entire system. Alternative programs need to be developed and supported. It is a matter of understanding the need to change the way children are cared for, he opined.

a. Presentation on the Runaway Youth Program

Dr. Larry Dye, Director of the Youth Development Bureau, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, who is responsible for administering the Runaway Youth Program (established by Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974), explained that, under his program, grants are made to establish or strengthen community-based projects and services to meet the needs of runaway and otherwise homeless youth. States, localities, non-profit private agencies and coordinated networks of private non-profit agencies are eligible to receive grants unless they are part of the law enforcement structure or the juvenile justice system. Dr. Dye pointed out that services for homeless youth were included in the program as a result of the 1977 Juvenile Justice Amendments in recognition of the growing number of youth that are classified as homeless and the lack of services for this extremely vulnerable population group.

The goals of the program are to:

- (1) Alleviate the problems of the runaway crisis and provide for immediate stabilization of the youth;
- (2) Reunite youth with their families;
- (3) Strengthen the family situation through aftercare services; and
- (4) Assist youth to make responsible decisions regarding their future.

The program operates in concert with, but outside of, the traditional law enforcement system. The aim is to work with status offenders and other youth in crisis to divert them away from formal involvement with the juvenile justice system.

In Fiscal Year 1978, the program authorization was \$25 million; the budget appropriation was \$11 million. At present, there are 166 runaway youth projects operating. Approximately 33,000 youth were served in a residential/crisis intervention capacity in 1978. In addition, a toll-free "hotline" is operated which, during 1978, handled more than 130,000 calls. Through the program's extensive data collection activities, it has been determined that 30% of the youth served are referred by police, courts, and correctional agencies. Dr. Dye pointed to this statistic as documentation of the usefulness of the runaway centers as a means of diverting youth from the juvenile justice system.

b. Selection of Federal Programs for Review in 1979

The Council members resumed discussion of the Federal programs nominated for review during 1979. Individual programs were discussed at length after which members were asked to agree on a final list. Mr. Parham recommended Titles IVA, IVB, and XX of the Social Security Act. The recommendation met with unanimous agreement of the Council.

Other programs recommended and approved by the members were: the Title I Program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Administration Programs, the Bureau of Prisons Operation of Children and Youth Institutions Program, the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Uniformed Services.

4. JJDP Council Meeting -- August 24, 1978

A meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was held on August 24, 1978, with Council Chairman, the Honorable Griffin B. Bell, Attorney General of the United States, presiding.

The Attorney General stated that the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, which established the Council, is the cornerstone of Federal policy on prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency and serious youth crime. He stressed that the issues which are of most importance to the Administration are those that are identified in the Juvenile Justice Act, and that there is a critical need to review and refine Federal juvenile delinquency policy implemented throughout the Government to assure that programs and practices are consistent with the provisions of that Act. Mr. Bell recommended that the emphasis of the Council not be on studying what has been done in the past, but rather reviewing existing policies and practices to determine what should be done within existing resources.

Later, Council Vice Chairman John M. Rector, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice, described the history of the Council and efforts to coordinate Federal juvenile delinquency prevention and control activities starting in 1961 under the late Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Mr. Rector went on to explain that 50 States and Territories are participating in the Juvenile Justice Act and, to date, approximately \$180 million has been made available to assist them to meet the separation and deinstitutionalization requirements. He commented that of the young people institutionalized under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system, nearly 50% are non-criminal. In the case of young women, the percentage increases to approximately 70% and most are institutionalized for offenses for which their male counterparts would not be detained at all. He stated that the Congress and the Administration share a special concern that immediate attention be given to development of appropriate alternative placements for non-criminal children.

Mr. Rector then called for comments and suggestions from the members. There was considerable further discussion of the OJJDP program and suggestions as to the way the Council should proceed.

Before concluding, the Council unanimously decided that the Council's immediate objective would be to review Federal policies and report on the degree to which those policies conform with the deinstitutionalization and separation mandates of the Juvenile Justice Act. A recommendation was made that, as a first step, the Council should look at research findings, evaluation results, and program models before attempting policy review and coordination. It was decided, however, that the Council should restrict itself to policy-level concerns and begin by identifying those Federal policies and programs that contribute to the institutionalization and deinstitutionalization of children and youth, and, in particular, those that can be brought into conformity with the Juvenile Justice Act in the short-term. The Council would then select programs for detailed review, and based on that review, make recommendations to the Attorney General and the President.

D. DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS CONSIDERED BY THE COORDINATING COUNCIL

1. Social Security Act

a. Title IVA

The AFDC Program, established by Title IVA of the Social Security Act, provides Federal funds on a matching basis to States to cover the costs of food, shelter, clothing, and other necessities for poor families with dependent children. Most of the funds in this program are used to maintain children in their own homes. Under Section 408, however, payments are provided for foster care and institutionalization in cases of court-adjudicated abandonment, abuse and neglect. Section 408 is the major source of Federal support for out-of-home care of dependent and neglected children (although payments for out-of-home care represent only a small percentage of total AFDC expenditures). Section 408, insofar as it covers institutional costs, covers only the cost of maintaining a child in a public or private non-profit institution; it does not cover in-home services to prevent placement, reunite separated families, or move neglected children into permanent living arrangements (e.g., costs connected with termination of parental rights and placement for adoption).

b. Title IVB

Title IVB funds supplement State and local funds for non-AFDC child welfare activities, such as services to prevent the removal of children from their homes, provision of protective services, licensing and setting standards for private child-care institutions, and assistance in providing day care, homemaker services, and adoptive placements. The

program also provides reimbursement for out-of-home care. The tendency of States under Title IVB has been to de-emphasize in-home services and accentuate out-of-home care. For example, in 1976, 70% of total Title IVB expenditures went to foster care; less than 10% was spent on day care, and 2% on adoption services.

c. Title XX

Under Title XX, the Federal Government provides states with partial reimbursement for social services for low-income families. In addition, four services are mandated to be provided without charge regardless of income level: information and referral, protective services for children, protective services for adults, and family planning. Out-of-home services subsidized under Title XX include basic costs for institutionalizing abused, neglected, crippled, emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, and physically handicapped youth. Other child welfare services paid for in all or in part by Title XX funds include adoption, group home and residential treatment arrangements, and emergency shelter and interstate placements.

Critics of Titles IVA, IVB and XX have pointed to several weaknesses in these enactments which tend to contribute to the unnecessary removal of children from their homes. For example, the requirement that children eligible for Title IVA funds must be under a court order promotes excessive reliance on shifting legal custody in order to obtain reimbursement for necessary services. Title IVB foster care payments are higher than monthly AFDC payments for care of children in their homes.

d. Medicaid

Under Title XIX, States receive financial assistance for two categories of recipients in need of medical care: public assistance clients (e.g., AFDC families who are automatically eligible for Medicaid), and poor persons not presently on public assistance despite potential eligibility. Medicaid indirectly influences State placements of dependent and neglected children and status offenders. For example, States reimbursed for providing care to children and adolescents with acute medical problems are supposed to provide short-term care when in-patient treatment is necessary. However, Medicaid funds have been used in some States to maintain children in hospitals long after the need for medical treatment has passed.

2. Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS)

CHAMPUS is the military counterpart of Medicaid. It establishes a system of reimbursing private medical care providers for treatment of military personnel and their dependents. Because psychiatric care was added to the list of reimbursable services in 1967, the number of eligible profit-making residential treatment centers expanded. These treatment centers have been plagued with problems of fraud and

mismanagement as well as alleged abuse of children maintained within these facilities. It has also been charged that CHAMPUS provides incentives for out-of-home placements, since parents are required to pay less toward the cost of care in residential facilities than for clinical treatment when children remain in home.

3. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

Under Title I of ESEA, funds are available for the design and implementation of special educational programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children in low-income areas whether enrolled in private or public schools. Although theoretically funds are available for educational assistance in various settings, the tendency under ESEA has been to support institutional education of children at the expense of smaller, innovative community-based treatment programs. It has also been alleged that institutions receiving ESEA funds frequently commingle status offenders, delinquents, and dependent and neglected children.

The Vocational Educational Amendments of 1968 also relate to status offenders and dependent and neglected children. Assistance is provided to States in offering courses which combine classroom work and on-the-job training through part-time employment in local business and industry. Special programs are also aimed at children with academic, socio-economic, or other types of impairment preventing success in the regular vocational education program.

4. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)

CETA has the potential for offering the target population (particularly status offenders) programs which would keep them out of institutions. Programs under CETA include classroom training, on-the-job training, public service employment, work experience, and the like. A special section of the Act provides employment, training, counseling and job preparation for economically disadvantaged youth during summer months. Funds are channeled through prime sponsors (SMSA's or State manpower offices) and through State manpower services councils. A difficulty with the administration of CETA funds has been the Department of Labor's policy of measuring success and awarding future funding on the basis of the success of job placements and the number of temporary jobs which have become permanent, thus discouraging inclusion of court-related youth in local employment programs.

5. Housing and Community Act

Under this Act, subsidies are available for low-income rental housing. Although there is no uniform policy within the Department of Housing and Urban Development as to whether group homes for neglected children and status offenders are eligible for subsidy, it has been suggested that the program may have potential in assisting local deinstitutionalization initiatives.

6. Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act

The objective of this Act is to assist States in developing and implementing a comprehensive and continuing plan for meeting the needs of persons who have a disability originating before the age of 18 and resulting from mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, or autism. Funds available under this Act could have a bearing on deinstitutionalization to the extent that out-patient psychiatric services are utilized as opposed to long-term residential care.

7. Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children

Forty-three states have adopted the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children which defines procedures to be used for transferring children to other States for treatment, placement, or adoption. The agreement protects receiving States from having to assume fiscal responsibility for out-of-state children, and theoretically provides a mechanism for keeping track of such children and ensuring suitable placements. Technical assistance is provided to the States through the Association of Interstate Compact Administrators (an affiliate of the American Public Welfare Association).

Although this Act provides a potential mechanism for monitoring residential placements, HEW and APWA have undergone continuing criticism for their failure to collect accurate statistics relating to out-of-state placements of children from State compact administrators. In-depth analyses have found numerous cases of children sent out of state by local authorities not appearing on the sending States' central registry.

8. Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act

The Act provides research and demonstration grants to teaching institutions, consulting firms, and local public and private service providers. Grants and technical assistance are available for agencies engaged in identifying and reporting cases of abuse and neglect; developing and testing innovative treatment approaches; developing prevention programs; disseminating information; and improving adoption opportunities for hard-to-place children.

9. Runaway Youth Act

The Runaway Youth Act is Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 1977. Under the Runaway Youth Act, Federal funds administered by HEW are available to help State and local governments and private non-profit agencies establish, strengthen, or fund an existing or proposed runaway house, a locally controlled facility providing temporary shelter care and counseling services to juveniles who have left home without permission of their parents or guardians. Such youths may be status offenders, dependent and neglected children, or children not within juvenile court jurisdiction at

all. The Acts' emphasis is on diversion from the Juvenile Justice System and development of an effective system of temporary care outside the law enforcement structure.

10. Indian Child Welfare Act

Prior to 1978, Indian child welfare services were administered by State welfare departments and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The BIA provided funds for foster care and institutional care for dependent, neglected, delinquent, and handicapped youth. According to recent Congressional testimony, out-of-home placement decisions were often made by non-Indian social workers who considered the general poverty of many Indian communities as prima facie evidence of the need to remove children to non-Indian settings. Hearings in the last Congress revealed that 25% of all Indian children are currently living away from their homes in foster care or institutions (a total of 100,000 Indian children in out-of-home care). The Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 was passed to ameliorate this situation. The Act returns jurisdiction of Indian children to tribal courts; provides procedural protection for Indian children (and their parents) in all judicial proceedings which may result in removal of children from home; mandates the provision of preventive services before a welfare agency can petition for court removal of a child; gives preference to on-reservation substitute care when removal from home is required; and requires all placements to be in the least restrictive setting, most nearly approximating a family setting capable of meeting a child's special needs. The Act authorizes \$45 million for a five-year period to assist tribes in developing on-reservation preventive services, foster care, and counseling and treatment programs.

Part Five

Report on Six Select Federal Programs

A. INTRODUCTION

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is required by Section 204-b(5) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (JJDP Act) to develop annually "an analysis and evaluation of Federal juvenile delinquency programs conducted and assisted by Federal departments and agencies, the expenditures made, the results achieved, the plans developed, and problems in the operations and coordination of such programs."

The purpose of this report was to analyze six different Federal programs for youth to ascertain their impact on delinquency prevention, status offenders, and delinquents, and to determine what programmatic areas have the most potential impact on these youth.

For 1978, the Office developed a concise description of each program, including program development, budget, purpose, and goals, and compared their program activities with major JJDP Act provisions. The Office also identified program areas which provide both innovative and advanced techniques in dealing with youths as specified in JJDP Act (Section 223 A(10)). Following the description and analysis of these Federal programs, the Office described coordinated efforts which took place between OJJDP and other Federal offices working with youth of concern to OJJDP.

B. METHODOLOGY

The Office investigated and analyzed six Federal Programs and their activities aimed specifically toward youth: CETA, Title XX and Title IV-B of the Social Security Act, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services -- CHAMPUS -- within the Department of Defense. These six programs were chosen because they represented a range of Federal efforts which might potentially have an impact on delinquency prevention and juvenile justice. Also, they were chosen by the Coordinating Council as specified under JJDP Act Section 206a(1).

In collection and compiling the program information, the Office's approach was to employ a variety of information-gathering tools to ensure maximum levels of data collection from each program. Thus, program summaries, budgets, Federal legislation, annual reports, and other significant data were collected as a main thrust of its effort. A thorough review of these data was completed after the information previously received from the data collection had been analyzed. On-site interviews were conducted for the purposes of gathering additional information, and for validating information previously received from the data collection.

In general, the JJDP Act emphasizes delinquency prevention and the treatment of criminal, status, and non-offenders. The JJDP Act also emphasizes the development of programs and policies that serve to deter youth from the Juvenile Justice System and programs that ensure the de-institutionalization of status offenders. The specific provisions of the JJDP Act which were referenced were:

Section 223(a)(10)

. . . provide that no less than 75 per centum of the funds, available to such State. . . be used for advanced techniques in developing, maintaining, and expending programs to prevent juvenile delinquency, to divert juveniles from the Juvenile Justice System, to provide community-based alternatives to juvenile detention and correctional facilities, to encourage a diversity of alternatives within the Juvenile Justice System, and to establish and adopt juvenile justice standards. . .

Section 223(a)(12)

. . . provide within three years after submission of the initial plan that juveniles who are charged with or who have committed offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, or such non-offenders as dependent or neglected children, shall not be placed in juvenile detention or correctional facilities.

Section 223(a)(13)

. . . provide that juveniles alleged to be or found delinquent and youths within the purview of paragraph (12) shall not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have regular contact with adult persons incarcerated because they have been convicted of a crime or are awaiting trial on criminal charges.

The activities of each program were compared with these sections to determine whether or not the programs were in compliance with the JJDP Act. The programs were then analyzed in relation to the mandates of Section 224(a) Special Emphasis Prevention and Treatment Programs. The specific areas which were compared were:

- (1) Develop and implement new approaches, techniques, and methods with respect to juvenile delinquency programs;
- (2) Develop and maintain community-based alternatives to traditional forms of institutionalization;
- (3) Develop and implement effective means of diverting juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice and correctional system, including restitution projects which test and validate selected arbitration models, such as neighborhood courts or panels, and increase victim satisfaction, while providing alternatives to incarceration for detained or adjudicated delinquents;
- (4) Improve the capability of public and private agencies and organizations to provide services for delinquents and other youths to help prevent delinquency;
- (5) Develop and implement, in coordination with the Commissioner of Education, model programs and methods to keep students in elementary and secondary schools to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions and to encourage new approaches and techniques with respect to the prevention of school violence and vandalism;
- (6) Develop, implement, and support, in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor, other public and private agencies and organizations and business and industry programs for youth employment;
- (7) Develop and implement programs relating to juvenile delinquency and learning disabilities.

Finally, the Office analyzed the programs in reference to the implications for the Coordinating Council, as specified in Section 206(c):

(c) The function of the Council shall be to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs. The Council shall make recommendations to the Attorney General and the President at least annually with respect to the coordination of overall policy and development of objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and activities. The Council is authorized to review the programs and practices of Federal agencies and report on the degree to which Federal agency funds are used for purposes which are consistent or inconsistent with the mandates of Section 223(a)(12) and (13) of this title.

In conducting this analysis, the Office faced some difficulties which impeded the compilation of the data. One of the limitations was that some of the programs which were examined did not maintain separate

information on youth involvement in their respective programs. Figures for youths and adults were aggregated, thus making it difficult to accurately identify the type and amount of services offered to youths through that program.

Second, there was a reluctance on the part of some programs to share information with the research team. Initially this made it difficult to obtain precise data on the effects of the program on youths.

Finally, it was difficult to ensure that interviews were conducted with appropriate personnel. Thus, it was frequently necessary to conduct numerous interviews in one agency to ensure precise, accurate information.

C. DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The six youth programs chosen for this review represent a variety of different Federal agencies: The Department of Justice (Bureau of Prisons), the Department of Defense (CHAMPUS), the Department of Labor (CETA), and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Title I, Title XX, and Title IV-B). Each agency represents a unique way of dealing with youth issues, and each agency professes its own individual strategies and philosophy.

In general, the programs encompass a broad scope of youth programs: CETA deals with youth employment issues; CHAMPUS handles placement of military personnel children in various facilities; Title I of ESEA provides for alternative education; Title XX assists welfare recipients to attain the least possible dependence upon public welfare; Title IV-B provides supplemental or substitute parental care; and the Bureau of Prisons provides placement for youths who have been committed by the U.S. District Court. They represent a cross-section of the types of services which the Federal Government provides for youth.

The differences in programs offered by these agencies relate directly to their differences of philosophy and goals. The Bureau of Prisons deals specifically with corrections, while the remainder of the programs can be described as prevention-oriented. This is not to say, however, that the only focus of these latter programs is on prevention; rather, that the programs offer services to youths before they become involved in the justice system, if indeed they ever do.

The administration of funds varies from program to program as well. Title XX requires that the States make their own program plans relative to the needs of their residents. In this respect, communities can be held accountable for their own problems and resolutions to these problems. Citizen participation in State and community planning is an important aspect in helping to resolve issues that are of community concern. The other five programs do not make allowances for direct citizen participation.

The basic similarity with all of these programs is that youths are beneficiaries -- of services or, in some cases, of funds. While the thrust of some of the programs is totally on youths (such as CETA, Title IV), others serve youths only because they are part of a larger subgroup of disadvantaged or otherwise needy people. To understand these programs and their differences and similarities clearly, it is necessary to examine each in greater detail.

1. Title XX

Title XX of the Social Security Act (PL 93-647), 1975, is managed by the Public Service Administration, Social and Rehabilitative Services of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. A principal concept behind the law is that the States, rather than the Federal Government, should have the responsibility for defining their needs and solving their own problems. Through the State's disbursement of funds and citizen participation, States order their specific needs and determine the appropriate response. Citizen participation in planning and reporting helps to keep the State accountable for its actions. Title XX aims to make this a cooperative effort between the State and the citizens of that State. The philosophy of Title XX is that the function of social services is to assist public welfare recipients in becoming as self-sufficient as possible and to attain minimal dependence on public welfare. To achieve this goal, local areas identify the needs of problem groups and individuals, identify the resolution to these problems, and therefore assist individuals in becoming as independent as possible.

Title XX monies are disbursed to States on a sliding scale, based upon population. Under Federal law, States must match every three Title XX dollars with one State dollar. Title XX funds cannot be used for existing programs, and adequate planning by each State and locality must be done before funds are disbursed. Some \$2.5 billion are allocated annually for use by Title XX.

Title XX services are aimed toward helping individuals obtain employment, self-care, and family stability. Federal law mandates that States provide nine services with their Title XX funds:

- Adoption;
- Early diagnosis and treatment of chronic and potential illnesses;
- Employment assistance and counseling;
- Foster care;
- Family planning;
- Various information and referral services;

- Day care;
- Placement and protective services for persons who are abused, neglected, or exploited; and
- Services for the elderly and disabled.

The goal of Title XX is to protect individuals who cannot protect themselves, ensure placements in institutions and facilities when it is in the best interest of the individual, and to assist persons in adequately caring for themselves and their families.

By Federal law, half of Title XX funds go to persons on welfare. The rest of Title XX funds must go to persons who work and whose income is less than 50% of the State average. Persons whose income is greater than the State average (115% or more) may receive Title XX services, but they are required to pay a fee based upon a sliding scale in each State. There are no specific age requirements for Title XX.

Specific services aimed toward youths are:

- Emergency shelter facilities,
- Assistance for children who are handicapped or abused,
- Unemployment referral networks for youths who are unemployed,
- Assistance to children whose parents must work, and
- Counseling services for persons in crisis situations.

Title XX mandates that programs be created to assist those in greatest need of services. Programs assist public welfare youths to obtain employment skills, vocational skills, and, ultimately, positive employment. Title XX helps to protect vulnerable youths by providing them with proper placements outside of their home, protective services, and counseling services while they are in need of these services.

Although Title XX is somewhat unusual in its approach toward the disbursement of funds and the collaborative effort between States and citizens, there are some major difficulties with Title XX in its present form.

When Title XX was developed in 1975, an annual ceiling of \$2.5 billion was placed on the funds. This has gradually increased to approximately \$2.8 billion for 1978, but, with the annual rate of inflation, this increased expenditure represents a decrease in real dollars. With the mandated approaches to programs of Title XX, little money or room is left for new and innovative, let alone some necessary, programs for which funds do not exist.

Another problem is that some States report low citizen participation in the planning process for Title XX funds. Maryland, for example, reports low numbers of citizens in attendance at planning meetings, and those in attendance have questioned the impact of their input into the planning process.

Another difficulty of the Title XX Program is a problem which affects a study such as this, but whose real dimensions cannot be ascertained without closer analysis. Because States play such a major role in providing Title XX services, there are aspects of the program which lack uniformity nationwide. For example, eligibility requirements can vary between States, depending upon each State's interpretation of such terms as "family." The differences in interpretation can mean that some States recognize juveniles or status offenders who are not living at home as a family, while other States may not recognize that individual as a family unit and therefore would not approve direct Title XX support comparable to what other families may receive.

2. CHAMPUS

The Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) is operated by the Office of Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Defense. CHAMPUS is a medical benefits program that provides payments for civilian medical care for the spouses and children of active, retired, or deceased Uniformed Services personnel. Since military personnel are already guaranteed medical care, CHAMPUS benefits do not apply to them.

CHAMPUS provides payments for medical and surgical conditions, for mental problems, and for specialized services in institutions and in hospitals. This includes residential treatment centers, institutions and oftentimes care provided in group homes. Payments include diagnostic testing, psychological evaluations, family counseling, and psychiatric services.

CHAMPUS contracts with private organizations, such as insurance companies, to process claims for medical and institutional care received by program beneficiaries. CHAMPUS pays for benefits in institutions and facilities which are authorized by the program. There are approximately 70 presently approved programs for residential care. For residential care, billings may be submitted directly to insurance companies for payments and these insurance companies then submit bills to CHAMPUS for reimbursement.

Each residential treatment center (RTC) must have a medical base in order to be approved by CHAMPUS. (Detention facilities, jails, etc., would not be approved by CHAMPUS.) RTC's must be in operation for six months and be approved by the Joint Accreditation of Hospitals in order to be approved by CHAMPUS for placement. CHAMPUS would then investigate the facility and perform its own accreditation procedures prior to

utilizing the facility for placement. This procedure is similar to the one performed by the Joint Accreditation of Hospitals. A contract is made with the facility after the accreditation is completed for services which are available to CHAMPUS beneficiaries. Monitoring of the facility usually takes place every 18 months, but CHAMPUS is not performing this task at the present time and expects to resume this in the near future.

There is no specific age limit on youths using placement services of CHAMPUS. Age requirements would be specified by the specific residential treatment center. The only eligibility requirement is that the youth must be the child of an armed services worker. CHAMPUS approves placements through medical reports and requires periodic medical reports to validate continued placement.

CHAMPUS appropriations are not to exceed \$614,583,000 each year. Unfortunately, CHAMPUS does not maintain separate statistical data on services provided to youths. All records on adult and youth placements are maintained together, making it difficult to determine the number of youths in institutions, the number of youths in out-of-state placements, and the length of stay in facilities used by CHAMPUS. In addition, the amount of appropriated funds utilized for youth placements is also merged with adult funds, making it impossible to determine the extent to which CHAMPUS provides services to youths.

The average length of stay of individuals in RTC's is 18-24 months. The residential treatment centers vary in size, with 50 beds being the average size. It is estimated that there were approximately 200 children supported in approved CHAMPUS facilities for non-handicaps in August 1978.

CHAMPUS does not provide direct services to youths, but serves as a placement agency for children of service persons. CHAMPUS was under attack in 1974 by the U.S. Senate for overexpenditures, lack of monitoring of its facilities, and for negligence by personnel in their placement of youths in facilities. One of the outcomes of this investigation was the CHAMPUS' decision to accredit facilities in addition to the joint accreditation of Hospitals. Regular monitoring of these facilities was another direct result of this investigation, but this is not being done at the present time.

3. CETA

The Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) is operated by the Department of Labor. CETA provides for block grants to be awarded to State and local government units, who act as Prime Sponsors under CETA. The goal is to provide a well developed network of training and employment programs to enable the disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed to become self-sufficient and contributing members of the economy. This is done through the development of education, skill training, and work experience programs which increase the opportunities available in the work force to the participants.

Local and State government units serve as Prime Sponsors for CETA funds. The task of these Prime Sponsors is to identify the employment and training needs of their particular area, and to develop and provide the resources necessary to meet those needs. The Prime Sponsors are responsible for the disbursement of funds. Total appropriations for youth programs for fiscal year 1978 were approximately \$2.9 billion.

CETA has developed a substantial number of programs for dealing with the unemployment needs of youths. Programs have been designed to assist youths who are economically disadvantaged, have severe employment problems, and who require skills, training, and employment which is not found in schools or the job market. The goal of CETA is to help these youths become contributing, positive members of the economy.

CETA makes provisions exclusively for youths under Title IV -- Youth Programs, and Title VIII -- Young Adult Conservation Corps. Opportunities for youths are also available under Title II -- Comprehensive Employment and Training Services, and Title III -- Special Federal Responsibilities, but eligibility for these programs includes both youths and adults.

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act was signed by President Carter on August 5, 1977, and four new programs were authorized under CETA by this Act. In October 1979, the 95th Congress reauthorized this legislation, and youth programs were reclassified under Title IV. The four new programs are the:

- Youth Incentive Pilot Projects,
- Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects,
- Youth Employment and Training Programs, and
- Young Adult Conservation Corps.

In addition to this reclassification, some of the programs were modified to enhance services to special target groups of youths.

Each program for youths provided under CETA has a specific target group and purpose. The overall goal of these programs is to provide positive employment experience to help youths eventually achieve maximum benefit from unsubsidized employment and to become positive contributing members of the economy. To understand specifically how this is accomplished, it is necessary to examine the types of programs offered to youths through CETA.

a. CETA -- Title IV -- Job Corps

The Job Corps serves youths most in need of extensive training and development services to ensure life-long gains in both employment opportunities and upward mobility. Youths must be between the ages of 16 and 21, be economically disadvantaged, and be out of school to be eligible.

The unique feature of the Job Corps is that it provides training and education in 74 residential facilities throughout the United States. The maximum placement in the Job Corps is two years, with the average of six months to one year. Training is provided in areas such as skilled workers and laborers, office workers, and nurses. Education is in the form of preparation for the GED (high school equivalency diploma) and in general living skills and hygiene.

In Fiscal Year 1978, the enrollment figures were approximately 49,000. There were approximately 27,000 enrollees at any one time, with the following breakdown: 68% black, 12% Spanish speaking, 2% Indian, and 26% white. The fiscal 1978 budget was \$417 million with an anticipated \$296 million for 1979.

The Job Corps was originally authorized through the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and has served more than 600,000 youths since its start. It recently expanded from 22,000 to 44,000 slots for youth.

b. CETA, Title IV -- Part A, Subpart I:

Youth Incentive Entitlement Project (YIEPP)

YIEPP was created to help economically disadvantaged youth complete high school by guaranteeing year-round, part-time employment as an incentive. The criteria for enrollment are that youths must be between the ages of 16-19, they must have not completed school, and must reside in the 17 geographic areas selected to serve as Prime Sponsors for the initial phase of the programs.

The 17 areas were selected to begin the program and to provide approximately 30,000 jobs during the first 18-month period. The total program received \$115 million initial funding for the first 18 months, and the 17 original areas were chosen on the basis of need, size of community, and program plans. In July 1978, enrollments for the program totaled 29,500 with 24,500 non-white participants and 5,000 white participants. Operating agencies are community-based, private, non-profit agencies, local educational facilities, local government units, and businesses. The program pays the salaries of the students that are employed, and employment must be a minimum of eight weeks in the summer or six months during the school year. The goal of the program is to keep youths in school, and to assist youths who are economically disadvantaged in gaining meaningful employment as an incentive and as financial assistance.

c. CETA, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2:

Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP)

The purpose of this program is to develop the vocational potential of unemployed youths through employment and training programs which

benefit the community. Youths must be between 16 and 19 years of age and must be unemployed. Preference is given to those youths that are economically disadvantaged and are out-of-school and unemployed.

YCCIP was created to help those youths who had severe problems finding employment gain meaningful work experiences. The youths are employed in non-profit, community-based programs that benefit from their employment and offer the youths a positive employment experience. Employment is for a period not to exceed 12 months, with assistance given to the youths to obtain unsubsidized employment after the 12-month period. YMCA's, the Red Cross, activities such as repairs to low-income housing, removal of architectural barriers for handicapped persons, and other similar efforts are utilized for employment of these youths.

Some \$115 million were allocated for Fiscal Year 1978, with 75 percent (\$86.25 million) going to CETA Prime Sponsors, and the remaining 25 percent (\$28.75) to native American youths, migrant and seasonal farmwork youths, and the Secretary of Labor for discretionary use.

In July 1978, YCCIP had a total enrollment of 19,700, with 7,300 non-white participants and 12,400 white participants.

In October 1978, an important change was made in the YCCIP program. Localities requested that special emphasis be placed on increasing enrollment to courts and other jurisdictions for status offenders.

d. CETA Title IV, Part A, Subpart 3:

Youth Employment Training Programs (YETP)

The purpose of this program is to increase employment opportunities and career goals of disadvantaged youths through programs designed to make significant long-term impacts on these youths in terms of career awareness and employment mobility. Youths must be from families with low incomes, be between 14 through 21 years of age, and must be unemployed, underemployed, or in school. Youths must come from families whose income is \$8,900 per year or less, and assistance is given to them in career awareness and employment preparation. Programs formerly funded under CETA-Title I, except public service employment, are now funded under this program. The programs are on-the-job training, career-awareness training, classroom training, and work experience. The purpose is to improve the quality of work experience and related education of the youths.

In July 1978, 174,900 youths had participated in the program since its start in 1977. Of these participants, 160,000 were between the ages of 16 and 19, and from that figure, 60,300 were non-white. In Fiscal Year 1978, 75 percent (\$402.5 million) of the funds available was granted to CETA Prime Sponsors, \$88.5 million (22%) of which was allocated for in-school youth programs. The total Fiscal Year 1978 allocation was approximately \$537 million.

e. CETA Title IV -- Part C:

Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP)

The purpose of SYEP is to provide economically disadvantaged youths by providing both employment and training programs throughout the summer. Youths must be between the ages of 14 and 21 and must be economically disadvantaged.

SYEP is designed to provide employment opportunities to youths who need financial assistance in order to remain in school, and to provide training opportunities to those youths. The program runs only in the summer months. Youths who are out-of-school are encouraged to return in the fall.

In Fiscal Year 1978, the total allotment of funds was \$756 million, which included \$62 million from supplemental appropriations. Prior year carryover of funds, plus additional discretionary funds, brought the total funds to \$795.4 million. The projected funding for 1979 is \$740.2 million.

During the summer of 1978, approximately 1,009,300 youth participated in the program for approximately 9 weeks. The average work-hours per week compiled by the youths numbered 26. Through funds from the CETA titles, the Civil Service Commission, the National Alliance of Businesses, and other governmental and private agencies, an additional 1,195,000 summer job opportunities were developed. It is anticipated that these figures will be similar in Fiscal Year 1979.

f. CETA -- Title VIII:

Young Adult Conservation Corps -- YACC

The purpose of YACC is to give youths an opportunity to experience various occupational skills by providing them with employment on Federal and non-Federal lands and waters. Youths from 16 through 23 who are unemployed, out-of-school, and capable of this type of employment are eligible for this program. Maximum participation in the program is 12 months.

YACC is operated in conjunction with the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Interior. Conservation work is the focus of this program, and this includes preservation of wildlife, development and maintenance of recreational facilities, control of insects, and disaster damage control and cleanup.

YACC has both residential and non-residential programs for youths. There is a program capacity for approximately 25,000 persons. Funding for fiscal 1978 was \$216.4 million, 30 percent of which was for State conservation programs subcontracts and 70 percent for programs run by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

Another portion of CETA which focuses on youths is the Child Labor Bureau. This Department in the Department of Labor administers and enforces child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended. The Bureau aims to maximize protection of young workers without unnecessarily restricting employment opportunities.

4. Title I

The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, Title I, was established to expand and improve educational programs for youths in State and local educational facilities and institutions. Emphasis is placed on handicapped youths, children of migrant workers, and neglected or delinquent children. Title I is administered by the Bureau of School Systems -- Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Money is disbursed by each State Department of Education, with appropriations given to each state for administering this program. Each State disburses its Title I funds to those private and State-operated programs which qualify for assistance. Formula grants are awarded, based upon the numbers of children and types of programs.

Title I money is used for basic skills and education. Services provided by Title I are designed to meet special needs of three groups of youths; youths in institutions, migrant workers, and handicapped and educationally deprived children. States of local agencies must submit a plan for these target groups prior to receiving funds under Title I. Title I provides specific services to these three target groups. Both State and local educational agencies apply for Title I funds based upon the population they wish to serve.

The first target group, educationally-deprived children, received approximately \$1,940 million in appropriations for Fiscal Year 1978. The services provided are aimed toward offering supplemental services which are normally provided by State and local education agencies. The objective is to expand and improve the educational programs in order to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged youths in low-income areas. Funds are used for vocational training, cultural development instruction, and health, nutrition, and counseling services.

Educationally deprived migrant children are the second target group addressed by Title I. Local education agencies apply for and disburse funds for the purpose of expanding and improving educational projects to meet the needs of children of migrant farmworkers, fishermen, and agriculture workers. Funds are used to provide remedial education, health, nutrition and psychological services, cultural development and vocational training. Total appropriations for 1978 were \$147 million.

The final target group addressed by Title I are educationally deprived children in institutions serving neglected and delinquent children. Funds are available to State agencies that operate school programs for delinquents and to local public and private non-profit institutions

for delinquent or neglected youth. Funds are used for the improvement of teaching and curriculum for youths in institutions. In 1978, approximately \$32 million were appropriated for delinquent and neglected youths. Local education agencies spent \$4.7 million for neglected or delinquent youths. \$8.4 million were spent on 14,000 youths in 258 adult correction facilities.

Title I is a positive step in providing youths who experience educational difficulties and opportunity to increase skills, develop academically, and experience education in a positive manner. It must be pointed out, however, that there is a large difference in the amount of funds appropriated for delinquent-neglected youths, and for other migrant and educationally deprived youths. Of the more than \$2 billion used annually by Title I, delinquent-neglected youths receive approximately 1.5%, migrant youths receive approximately 7%, and educationally deprived youths receive approximately 91.5%. In addition, of the funds appropriated to delinquent-neglected youths, state institutions receive approximately 2 times as much funding as do the private institutions. Another problem with this program is that funds are targeted to institutions -- a tactic which some have said encourages institutionalization over the use of community-based programs.

5. Title IV-B

Title IV-B of the Social Security Act, also titled Child Welfare Services, is administered by the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Office of Human Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Title IV-B is designed to provide public social services to children through supplemental or substitute parental care.

Title IV-B provides formula grants to States for disbursement. Any agency which receives Title IV-B funds must match at least 5% of the total direct costs of the projects. Grants are available for one to three years, with renewals available to the participating agencies. Title IV-B provides funding under three separate categories: Child Welfare Research Demonstration and Evaluation Program, Child Welfare Services, and Child Welfare Service Training Program.

The purpose of Title IV-B is to establish, extend, and strengthen State and local services to child welfare programs, and to develop preventive and protective services for children. The specific services which utilize Title IV-B funds are foster care, adoptive care, homemaker services, institutions, and day care services, services to prevent child abuse, and health counselling services for families. All of these programs are intended to improve the quality of life for families and children, and to help protect youths by offering substituted or supplemental parental care.

Any child is eligible for Title IV-B services, regardless of income levels or social status. The program operates in all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The Child Welfare Research Demonstration and Evaluation Program provides funding for research in child development and welfare areas which are of regional or national significance. Funds are available to public or private, non-profit agencies involved in research and child welfare activities. The purpose of these grants is to seek new ways to improve child care delivery systems, improve the quality of life for children and families, and to increase efficiency in providing assistance to vulnerable persons. Specific examples of types of grants would be in the areas of early detection of child abuse and services for runaway youths. The program also collects, analyzes and interprets data obtained from child and family studies, and identifies positive programs and models for other service agencies and programs. The program also serves as a clearinghouse for information related to research in the areas of child development and the family.

An estimated \$15,700,000 were spent in this area during 1978, with grants ranging from \$10,000 to \$500,000. The formula used in providing financial support to the States is based upon the ratio of the child population to the per capita income.

Child Welfare Services, a second component of Title IV-B, provides formula grants to States for the purpose of developing prevention and protective services to youths who are neglected, exploited, abused, or delinquent. The funds are used by child welfare agencies to provide supplemental or substitute parental care for the youths addressed by Child Welfare Services. Specific programs that use Title IV-B funds include: foster care, day care services, adoption care, programs to deal with the prevention of child abuse, and homemakers services. All children and families in need of Child Welfare Services are eligible for this program on the basis of need, rather than economic or social status.

The ultimate goal of Child Welfare Services is to provide services to children and their families to enable them to remain in their homes under their own parental care, or, where that is not possible, to provide alternative permanent homes or services to ensure that they are properly cared for and protected.

In 1978, an estimated \$56,500,000 were spent on Child Welfare Services. Uniform grants are awarded each State and one-half to two-thirds of the total funding must be matched by each State. An estimated 274,000 families and 494,000 children received services during 1978.

The third area of Title IV-B is Child Welfare Services-Training Program. This program provides funds to public or private non-profit schools and institutions of higher learning to train persons who are preparing for entrance into the field of child welfare, or those who are in the field of child welfare. The specific focus of the program is to improve the quality of staff and services in the area of child and family welfare. In addition, the program aims toward the implementation of teaching material and methods used in this field. Grants are awarded

for training seminars to improve the skills and knowledge of child welfare workers, for teaching grants to faculty, and for traineeships to social work students.

In 1979, approximately \$8,150,000 were appropriated for use by this training program.

A main thrust for Title IV-B is preventive services for youths and their families. The extent to which these services are provided is questionable, since there are no specific requirements to the States specifying that they must provide preventive services prior to providing protective services. It is reported that Title IV-B funds are being utilized for foster care and day care services as protective measures and that very little money is being spent on preventive measures as specified under Title IV-B, which is to provide services that would enable children to remain in their homes, and to develop new ways of preventing the abuse and neglect of children.

6. Bureau of Prisons

The Bureau of Prisons is located within the Department of Justice and provides correctional services to individuals who have been committed to the Bureau of Prisons by a U.S. District Court. Approximately 10 years ago there existed within the Bureau of Prisons a separate department solely to serve youths who were committed to the Bureau of Prisons. That has since been abolished and the Bureau of Prisons incorporates youths into its entire operations rather than having a separate department for this group.

In 1975, seven Federal facilities were utilized by the Bureau of Prisons for youths: Englewood, Colorado; Morgantown, W. Virginia; Pleasanton, California; Tallahassee, Florida; Fort Worth, Texas; Lexington, Kentucky; and Miami, Florida. These facilities were used for placements for youths who were found delinquent and committed by the U.S. District Court.

The JJDP Act of 1974 made an impact on the Bureau of Prisons in terms of its placement of youths in institutions, and as a result of that Act, the trend has been for reduction in incarceration in Federal institutions.

From 1974 to 1977, the number of juveniles in Federal institutions decreased from 500 to 260. In January 1977, there were 220 youths institutionalized and 40 youths boarded out. Just one year later there were 2 youths institutionalized and 218 boarded out.

The Bureau of Prisons contracts with State and local facilities to provide placements for the youths in their care. Placements are generally sought in communities in the youth's home state, including juvenile facilities, private facilities, ranches, group homes, and foster homes.

The Bureau of Prisons rarely uses group homes and foster homes, but more frequently uses highly structured secure settings. This is due to the nature of the youths who are served and the perceived need for greater control.

Because of this type of contractual services, the per diem rate for youths is fairly high. Consider the variation in rates for Fiscal Year 1978:

Highest per diem	\$62.33
Lowest per diem	9.50
Average per diem	32.20

Placement is made in these facilities by a community placement officer in conjunction with the Parole Board. The Placement officer is responsible for monitoring the youth's progress while in the facility, and provides input with regard to the transfer or release of a youth. Community placement officers are located in each State.

The definition of "juvenile," as utilized by the Bureau of Prisons, is that youth who has been committed as a juvenile, regardless of his age. Those youths who have been waived to adult court are not considered juveniles by the Bureau of Prisons, even though they may be 16 or 17 years old.

There has been a decline in the number of youths committed to the Bureau of Prisons over the past few years. In 1971, there were 500 juveniles; in 1977 there were 250 juveniles out of a total caseload of 30,000; and in 1978 the number of juveniles again decreased. Some of this decrease in total youth commitment has been due to an increase in delegation at the U.S. Attorney level to State and local authorities. Information sought to examine possible increases in the amount of waivers to adult court was not available.

D. ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

In addition to the description of the six Federal programs, the Office examined the extent to which they relate to the JJDP Act, specifically in Sections 223(a) and 224(a), as noted previously in this report. The procedure for this analysis was to identify specific mandates of the Act which significantly related to the programs and to determine the extent to which these Federal programs conform to and further the principles and mandates of the JJDP Act. Finally, the information was evaluated and analyzed to determine the correlation between the Federal programs and the mandates of the Act.

The analysis of the programs is presented in the form of specific questions which seek to define the commitment of the programs to youths, and more especially to youths and the Juvenile Justice System. The specific questions asked were reflective of the following concerns:

1. Who benefits from the program, and what is the total program commitment to youths in the Juvenile Justice System?
2. Are the programs preventive in nature, or are they enforcement-oriented or corrections-oriented?
3. How do the program goals correspond to the provisions of the JJDP Act?

Each of these concerns as it relates to the separate Federal programs is discussed below.

1. Beneficiaries of the Program

Although many of the programs reviewed are connected with a larger program that serves youths, adults, and families, only those components which were addressed in the program description above are discussed.

The question can be broken into two areas: those programs serving youths, and those programs serving youths, adults, and families. The breakdown is as follows:

<u>Youths</u>	<u>Youths, Families, Adults</u>
Title I	CHAMPUS
CETA (Title IV & VIII)	Title XX
Bureau of Prisons (Youth Section)	Title IV-B

Of the programs that serve youths, families, and adults, the combined totals of Title XX and Title IV-B (both programs in the Social Security Act that are closely related) show that approximately twice as many adults receive services as do youths. The other program in this category, CHAMPUS, does not maintain adequate data on youth involvement, so the numbers served by CHAMPUS were not accessible. It is evident that the thrust of these three programs is to serve the needs of many individuals rather than to specifically serve the needs of juveniles.

It is important to note that for all programs the definition of "juvenile" is different. The Bureau of Prisons serves those youths who have been committed as juveniles, regardless of age. CETA serves primarily economically disadvantaged youths between the ages of 14 and 21. Title XX serves youths and families with low incomes. Title IV-B serves all youths and families. Title I serves youths of all ages who are economically disadvantaged, and CHAMPUS serves youths of military personnel.

While examining the beneficiaries of the program, it is also important to examine what other types of programs or agencies benefit from

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

these programs. Section 224(a) (4) of the JJDP Act places special emphasis on "improving the capabilities of public and private agencies and organizations to provide services for delinquents and other youths to help prevent delinquency." Title IV-B makes provisions for funds to help improve the capabilities and skills of individual persons and programs, and CETA and Title I are programs that are geared toward helping the overall program structure of a facility by providing alternatives for youths in the areas of employment and education.

2. Program Intervention in the Juvenile Justice System

Answers to the question of where in the Juvenile Justice System does the program intervene can be used to determine whether the programs are preventive or enforcement/corrections in scope. The Bureau of Prisons is the only program that fits the latter category, with the remaining five programs offering preventive measures to juveniles. Title IV-B addresses the JJDP Act mandate to promote the development of division programs by providing funds for research to prevent child abuse and neglect and to develop new techniques for dealing with youth issues of major significance.

3. Specific Thrust of the Program and Its Relation to the JJDP Act

The thrust of CETA is to develop employment and vocational opportunities for youths. Section 224(a) (8) of the JJDP Act places special emphasis on the development, implementation, and support of youth employment programs. CETA addresses this issue through its network of youth programs and serves primarily economically disadvantaged youths between the ages of 16 to 21.

In 1978, CETA placed special emphasis on serving status offenders in the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects Program. While this is an important commitment to the provisions of the JJDP Act, this concern was not addressed or incorporated in any of the other CETA programs.

Title I serves educationally deprived youths in three areas: migrants, handicapped, and delinquent/neglected. Title I makes a commitment to the JJDP Act through its special services to delinquent/neglected youths, but this commitment is weak because of the imbalances of funds appropriate to this category. Delinquent/neglected children receive approximately 1-1/2% of the total funds available in Title I, and of those funds, State institutions receive approximately twice as much money as do local institutions. Therefore, Title I is only minimally geared to the needs of delinquent/neglected youths and to community-based facilities and alternatives for youths.

Section 224(a) (6) of the JJDP Act is directed to:

"Develop and implement, in coordination with the Commissioner of Education, model programs and methods to keep students in elementary and secondary schools and to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions and to encourage new approaches and techniques with respect to the prevention of school violence and vandalism."

The provisions of section 224(a) (11) are to:

"Develop and implement programs relating to juvenile delinquency and learning disabilities."

Title I funds do not address either of those issues. The only program that addresses the issue of keeping youths in school is CETA. The Youth Incentive Entitlement Project is designed to keep youths in school by guaranteeing year-round employment but, like Title I, CETA does not address the issue of the prevention of school violence and vandalism, or the establishment of programs relating to juvenile delinquency and learning disabilities.

CHAMPUS serves youths of military personnel by providing out-of-home placements when necessary. CHAMPUS makes placements in state and local facilities for medical and emotional reasons. CHAMPUS serves merely as the funding source and placing agency for youths of military personnel and provides no direct services to these youths. Its relationship to the JJDP Act is difficult to ascertain because of its purpose. CHAMPUS can be viewed as being supportive of the concept of prevention, but its commitment to this goal is not clearly definable. Records and data including numbers of placements, type of services offered, and length of stay are not maintained separately for youths. Information concerning types of services offered prior to placements is also not readily available. It is difficult to determine if CHAMPUS provides services to strengthen home situations as preventive measures, or if they merely support out-of-home placement as the resolution to emotional difficulties in the family structure.

The Bureau of Prisons provides placements for youths who have been found delinquent and are placed in their care by the U.S. District Attorney. The Bureau of Prisons has followed the mandates of the JJDP Act, Section 223(a) (13), which removes youths from adult institutions. Since 1974, the Bureau of Prisons has decreased the number of juveniles in Federal institutions from approximately 500 to 2, and presently utilizes state institutions and local facilities for placement of these juveniles. While this process supports the concept of deinstitutionalization, the extent to which this process supports Section 223(a) (3), calling for alternatives to incarceration for detained or adjudicated delinquents, is questionable. Exact statistics on the numbers of State institutions utilized in comparison to community-based facilities were not available, but it can be assumed that State institutions and more highly structured facilities are used to a greater extent.

Another important factor to be considered when examining the procedures of the Bureau of Prisons is to look at the decrease in cases committed to the Bureau of Prisons. There has been a definite decrease in the number of commitments to the Bureau of Prisons since the JJDP Act. Information received indicates that in the juvenile justice process, juveniles are being diverted to State or local authorities. It may be possible that more youths are waived to the adult court, but information was not available to substantiate this claim. Validated information does indicate that the number of youths in Federal institutions has decreased, and that there has been a major thrust towards alternatives to incarceration in State and local facilities.

Title XX provides services that enable individuals to become as self-sufficient as possible, and strives to reduce the number of persons in institutions. States are directly responsible for defining needs and target areas in their own particular areas, and this can be defined as a cooperative effort between States and their populations.

Title XX supports the concepts of Sections 223(a) (10-A,B) and 224(a) (2) requiring the development of community-based support programs to help juveniles remain in their homes. Title XX provides funding for out-of-home placements, but encourages measures to prevent removal from one's home. But Title XX, combined with Title IV-B, served twice as many adults as youths in 1978, and the majority of children received protective services from both programs.

Title IV-B also supports Sections 223(a) (10) and 224(a) (2) as does Title XX, and makes an additional commitment to youths who are neglected, abused, exploited, or who are delinquent by providing supplemental or substitute parental care for those youth.

The programs reviewed for 1978 all support various concepts and mandates of the JJDP Act. Each program offers different services to youths as specified in Section 223(a) (10) (12) (13), and each program addresses, either by specific program mandates or tasks, juveniles and the Juvenile Justice System.

It is difficult to determine the true commitment of each program to the mandates of the JJDP Act. Each program either makes special, written provisions for juveniles in the Juvenile Justice System, or by the nature of the program, serves youths in the system. The comprehensive analysis of the six Federal programs indicates that the programs, when examined as a group, are not strongly directed to these juveniles.

E. IMPLICATIONS FOR COORDINATING COUNCIL

In view of all information obtained in this section of the report, a recommendation would be for the Coordinating Council, as specified in Section 206C, to play a more active role in monitoring Federal programs for the purposes of determining their compliance with the mandates of the JJDP Act of 1974. Secondly, the Coordinating Council should

assist the Administrator of the OJJDP in obtaining clear, precise data on the youths served in each Federal program for use in the future Concentration of Federal Efforts reports. Finally, the Coordinating Council should help to ensure that the mandates of the JJDP Act of 1974 are achieved by each Federal agency.

For purposes of preparing Delinquency Development Statements, the Coordinating Council may wish to consider the following information needs:

- Specific data on youths served by the program (maintained separately from other records);
- Appropriated funds for youth programs as well as actual expenditures;
- An analysis of the total expenditures for youths as compared to the overall program expenditures;
- The extent to which the program conforms to specific sections of the JJDP Act; and
- The types of services offered to youths who are in the Juvenile Justice System and plans for future program operations.

F. BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Interstate Placement of Children: A Planning Report," Council of State Government, Lexington, Kentucky, August 1978.

"First Analysis and Evaluation: Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs-Volumes 1 & 2" OJJDP, LEAA, U.S. Dept. of Justice.

"First Comprehensive Plan for Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs," OJJDP, LEAA, U.S. Dept. of Justice, March 1, 1976.

"Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance," Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C.

Wooden, Kenneth, Weeping in the Playtime of Others, McGraw Hill, 1976, N.Y.

CHAMPUS Brochures

"Second Analysis and Evaluation, Federal Juvenile Development Program, Volumes 1 and 2, OJJDP, LEAA, U.S. Department of Justice.

"Catalog of Federal Youth Programs," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Human Development, Office of Youth Development, Division of Youth Activities, Lawrence Johnson & Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Summary of Youth Programs under CETA-PL 95-524, October 27, 1978.

Program Fact Sheet, U.S. Department of Labor, ETA, Office of Information, "CETA: A Thumbnail Sketch by Titles," December 1979.

Program Fact Sheet, U.S. Department of Labor, ETA, Office of Information, "Employment and Training Programs for Youth," April 1979.

"One Year Later -- Carter's Administration Youth Employment, Background," Office of Media Liaison, the White House Press Office, August 19, 1978.

"Government Manual -- 1974-1975," Office of Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, GSA.

"Annual Register of Grant Support -- 1978-1979," Margies Academic Media, Chicago, Illinois.

Federal Programs that Relate to Children, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1979.

Part Six

Procedures for Submission of Delinquency Development Statements

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, provides the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention with several mechanisms to insure that Federal juvenile delinquency programs are coordinated and consistent with goals, policies, and objectives established for such programs by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Accomplishment of these critical tasks of coordination and implementation of goals, policies, and objectives for Federal juvenile delinquency programs was left to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in conjunction with the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

In the judgment of Congress, the Juvenile Delinquency Development Statements required by Section 204(1)(1)(2)(3) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, constitutes an important tool for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to improve the coordination of Federal juvenile delinquency prevention programs. Federal agencies administering juvenile delinquency programs, as defined by the Administrator, LEAA (through the OJJDP), are required to submit to the Administrator annually for review and comment, a Juvenile Delinquency Development Statement indicating the extent to which the respective agencies' programs conform to Federal juvenile delinquency goals and policies. The statement, our evaluation comments, and the recommendations of the Administrator shall be forwarded each year by the agency with its budgetary requests to the appropriate Congressional committees. The intent is that said committees will review and consider the documents as an integral part of the legislative budgetary process.

This Third Analysis and Evaluation, as required by Section 204(e) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, is to address the issue of procedures to be used with respect to submission of the Juvenile Delinquency Development Statements. OJJDP believes the procedures, as well as the statements, can be simple and non-bureaucratic and still yield information of value to Congress. To this end OJJDP intends to

use the following five-step approach for submission of the statements:

1. Administrator, LEAA or OJJDP sends letter to Secretary of Federal agency or department administering juvenile delinquency program(s) as defined by OJJDP, setting out the following:
 - a. Purpose of Juvenile Delinquency Development Statements
 - b. Statement of essential juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment goals, objectives, and policies as established by OJJDP under Section 204(a) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended.
 - c. Questions to be addressed specific to the juvenile delinquency program(s) administered by said agency.
 - d. General questions relevant to all Federal juvenile delinquency programs, such as:
 - Specific data on youths served by the program;
 - Appropriated funds for youth programs as well as actual expenditures;
 - An analysis of the total expenditures for youths as compared to the overall program expenditures;
 - The extent to which the program conforms to specific sections of the JJDP Act; and
 - The types of services offered to youths who are in the Juvenile Justice System and plans for future program operations.
 - e. Date for submission of statements and explanation of remaining four steps in procedure.
2. Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (and staff) review and comment of statements.
3. OJJDP reviews statements and Council recommendations and prepares final evaluations and recommendations.
4. OJJDP returns Juvenile Delinquency Development Statements, together with OJJDP evaluations and recommendations, to respective Federal agencies.
5. Agencies submit Juvenile Delinquency Development Statements (with OJJDP's evaluation and recommendations) along with said agencies' budgetary request to the appropriate Congressional committees.

With the active support and participation of the Coordinating Council, OJJDP is optimistic that the Juvenile Delinquency Development Statements can be an important tool for improving the coordination of Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

END

END