

ncjrs

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

**National Institute of Justice
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20531**

DATE FILMED

9/30/81

An Examination of National Data
And
Summaries of Fourteen Alternative Programs

By
SANDRA M. STEHNO
and
THOMAS M. YOUNG

NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF
ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE JUSTICE PROCESSING

The School of Social Service Administration
The University of Chicago
969 East Sixtieth Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

February 1980

17899

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FORWARD.	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL DATA:	
Arrests.	2
Arrest Trends.	4
Data From Self-Report Studies.	11
Trends in Data From Self-Report Studies.	14
Court Intake and Diversion	15
Detention.	19
Correctional Institutions.	21
Summary.	24
ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG WOMEN	25
NATIONAL PROGRAMS:	
National Youthworker Education Project: Minneapolis, Minnesota	28
National Board YWCA Intervention Programs: New England and Texas.	33
LOCAL PROGRAMS:	
Career Awareness Program: Omaha, Nebraska	37
Girls' Coalition: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.	40
New Directions for Young Women: Tucson, Arizona	44
Girls' Adventure Trails: Dallas, Texas.	47

NCJRS

MAY 14 1981

ACQUISITIONS

77899

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Sandy Stehno
University of Chicago

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

	Page
Transitional Living Process: Chicago, Illinois.	51
Kaleidoscope, Inc.: Chicago, Illinois	55
Neighborhood Alternative Center: Sacramento County, California	58
PACIFIC: Minneapolis, Minnesota	60
Proctor Program: New Bedford, Massachusetts	63
MSSD Home Detention Program: Louisville, Kentucky	65
STATEWIDE PROGRAMS	
Girls' Services Unit: Massachusetts	67
Unified Delinquency Intervention Services: Chicago, Illinois.	72
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	78
FOOTNOTES.	81
APPENDIX	110

FORWARD

Research for this paper was done between June 1977 and June 1978. A draft was completed in November 1978. This draft was sent to the directors of each of the programs described for review and comment. It was also sent to selected individuals for advice and suggestions to improve the paper. In the time elapsed since information was first gathered, some changes have occurred within some of the programs that are not reflected in the paper.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are indebted to Professors Donnell M. Pappenfort and Charles H. Shireman for the assistance they gave us in preparing this report. They helped clarify both our thinking and our writing on numerous occasions. In several places in the manuscript we have simply adopted their wording to express certain points.

We are especially grateful to the following individuals who provided us with information we could not have obtained otherwise: Rhetta Arter, Jan Bauer, Susan Behm, Carol Blackman, Ed Boswell, Arnita Browder, Jean Cogburn, Ruth Crow, Curt Dale, Karl Dennis, Theodore Ferdinand, Mary Fleming, Pam Goodson, John Hagan, Susanne Harker, Earl Huch, Gwen Jones, Deborah Knutsen, David Kozlowski, Martha Lomax, Wan-Ling Louie, John McManus, Anne Melgren, Marie Mildon, Patricia Miller, David Nelson, Carol Peacock, Mike Plecki, Jan Roberta, Stefanie Rosenberg, Rita Simon, Darrell Steffensmeier, Jean Taylor, Ruth Teeter, Pauline Tesler, Aletha Turner, Gail Viale, Heather Ware, Margaret Wood, Kim Zalent.

We owe special thanks to our colleagues on the Center's staff--particularly Jan Lawrence for her help with data from self-report studies and Jude Seibold for her care and diligence in typing the manuscript.

Phyllis Modley from the National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Emily Johnson and Carolyn Johnson from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service helped us locate relevant literature on several occasions.

The work for this report was carried out with the support of Grant Number 77-JN-99-0002 from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Arrests of Persons Under Age 18 by Offense, Percents Male and Female: 1976.	3
2. Number and Percent of Arrests of Males and Females Under Age 18, by Offense: 1976.	5
3. Arrests of All Persons and of Persons Under Age 18 (By Gender) 1960, 1975 and Percentage Increases 1960-1975 for All Persons Under Age 18 by Gender: Selected Offenses	6
4. Percent of Females Among Arrests of Persons Under Age 18, 1960 and 1975, By Offense.	8
5. Arrests, by Offense, Persons of All Ages 1960 and 1975; Percent of Persons Under 18 by sex, of All Arrests, 1960 and 1975.	10
6. Distribution of Arrests, By Offense, for Males and Females Under Age 18, 1960 and 1975.	12
7. Estimated Number and Percent Distribution of Delinquency Cases Disposed of By Juvenile Courts, By Sex, United States, 1958-1975	16
8. Estimated Number and Percent of Juvenile Court Referrals of Males and Females Under Age 18, by Offense, 1975	17
9. Adjudicated Youth in Public Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities by Offense and Gender: June 30, 1974	23
A. Adjudicated Youth in Public Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities, Selected States, June 30, 1974.	97
APPENDIX 1:	
Adjudicated Youth in Public Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities, by Region, June 30, 1974	110

This report on young women in the juvenile justice system has two purposes. The first is to encourage decision makers in the juvenile justice system to examine the equity and effectiveness of how young women are treated in their jurisdictions. Accordingly, the first section of the report presents such information as is available on the number and nature of offenses committed by young women, compared to those by young men, and on the manner in which the justice system may differentially process young men and women. It tries to present a national picture, but also looks to some degree at variations among local court jurisdictions. Such an examination is consistent with the mandate to the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to prepare studies and recommendations related to "the extent to which youth in the juvenile justice system are treated differently on the basis of sex and the ramifications of such practices."¹

The second purpose of the report is to provide information about some promising programs and models for providing services which have been used as alternatives to juvenile justice processing of young women. These are described to assist practitioners interested in developing more alternatives to juvenile justice processing in their jurisdictions. Programs and services such as these can be needed alternatives for some young women who have entered the juvenile justice system. However, we emphasize that the first priority in the development of alternatives is to identify those young women who do not need programs or whose needs can best be met by agencies outside the juvenile justice system. The appropriate alternative to juvenile

justice processing for these young women is simple removal from the system.

Arrests

A much larger proportion of arrests of all persons under age 18 are of young men; females made up only 21.5 percent of all arrests of persons under 18 in 1976. (Table 1). Young women accounted for only 11.2 percent of arrests for the four offense categories of murder, aggravated assault, rape, and robbery--classified as violent crimes in the Uniform Crime Reports.² They were a larger proportion (19.5 percent) of arrests for offenses classified as major property crimes but this is due mainly to the numbers arrested for larceny-theft, 28.3 percent of the total so arrested. Females constituted only 5.3 percent of arrests of juveniles for burglary and 7.9 percent of those for auto theft.

An examination of arrests of young women for four additional crimes of particular public concern--other assaults, arson, vandalism, and weapons law violations again shows that young women are less frequently arrested for offenses that threaten public safety than young men. Young women accounted for 20.7 percent of all arrests of juveniles for simple assault (a residual category of "assaults which are not of an aggravated nature,"³) but were only 9.3 percent of arrests for arson, 7.5 percent of those for vandalism, and 6.3 percent of those for weapons violations. The only offenses for which more young women than young men were arrested in 1976 were prostitution (77.1 percent) and running away (57.2 percent).

Table 1. Arrests of Persons Under Age 18
By Offense, Percents Male and Female; 1976

Offense Charged	Arrests of Persons Under 18	Percent Female	Percent Male
Total	1,768,046	21.5	78.5
Criminal Homicide:			
(a) Murder and non-negligent manslaughter	1,116	12.1	87.9
(b) Manslaughter by negligence*	258	11.2	88.8
Forcible Rape	3,260	1.7	98.3
Robbery	27,600	17.1	92.9
Aggravated Assault	27,707	16.3	83.7
Burglary - breaking or entering	187,822	5.3	94.7
Larceny-Theft	369,691	28.3	71.7
Motor Vehicle Theft	51,326	7.9	92.1
Violent Crime 1	59,683	11.2	88.8
Property Crime 2	608,839	19.5	80.5
Subtotal for Above Offenses	668,780	18.7	81.3
Other Assaults	62,272	20.7	79.3
Arson	7,004	9.3	90.7
Forgery and Counterfeiting	6,020	31.0	69.0
Fraud	4,223	28.7	71.3
Embezzlement	492	16.1	83.9
Stolen Property; Buying; Receiving; Possessing	25,769	8.4	91.6
Vandalism	99,829	7.5	92.5
Weapons; carrying; possessing, etc.	17,581	6.3	93.7
Prostitution and commercialized vice	2,384	77.1	22.9
Sex Offences (Except forcible rape and prostitution)	8,918	10.5	89.5
Narcotic drug laws	109,559	16.6	83.4
Gambling	2,320	11.2	88.8
Offenses Against Family and Children	3,999	32.0	68.0
Driving Under the Influence	16,109	7.9	92.1
Liquor Laws	104,802	20.7	79.3
Drunkenness	37,014	13.4	86.6
Disorderly Conduct	103,889	18.2	81.8
Vagrancy	4,152	15.6	84.4
All Other Offenses (except traffic)	241,447	21.6	78.4
Suspicion (non included in totals)	7,346	16.5	83.5
Curfew and loitering law violation	85,783	20.0	80.0
Runaways	155,590	57.2	42.8

1. Violent crime is offenses of murder forcible rape, robbery, & aggravated assault.

2. Property Crime is offenses of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft.

* Not included in violent crime totals; but included in index crime subtotal.

Source: Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1976, p.180.

The same data can be rearranged to show even more dramatically that young women are arrested more often than young men for crimes that do not involve the use of force or the destruction of property. Table 2 contains the number and percent of arrests for males and females under 18 by offense. This is, of all arrests of females (and males) under age 18, what percentage were arrested for each offense?

Only 1.8 percent of all arrests of young women were for the indexed offenses of violence, compared with 3.8 percent of the arrests of young men. Of all arrests of young women 2.6 percent were for burglary as compared with 12.8 percent for young men. Two percent of all arrests of young women were for vandalism as compared with 6.7 percent for young men. A similar pattern exists for arson. Only for other assaults are the proportions similar. On the other hand, 23.4 percent of all arrests of young women were for running away as compared with 4.8 percent for young men.

Young women before juvenile authorities, if arrest statistics are any indication, are there for offenses considerably less dangerous to the community than those committed by young men.

Arrest Trends

Arrests of young women increased markedly between 1960 and 1975-- a percentage increase considerably greater than that for arrests of young men or of arrests of all persons, including adults (Table 3).⁴ Also, in 1975 young women accounted for a greater percentage (21.2 percent) of all juveniles arrested than they had in 1960 (14.6 percent). (Table 4).

Table 2 Number and Percent of Arrests of Males and Females
Under Age 18, By Offense: 1976

	Males Under Age 18		Females Under Age 18	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Criminal Homicide:				
(a) Murder and Non-negligent manslaughter	981	.1	135	*
(b) Manslaughter by negligence ^x	229	*	29	*
Forcible Rape	3,204	.3	56	*
Robbery	25,630	1.9	1,970	.5
Aggravated Assault	23,184	1.7	4,523	1.2
Burglary	177,929	12.8	9,902	2.6
Larceny-Theft	265,201	19.1	104,490	27.5
Motor-Vehicle	47,273	3.4	4,053	1.1
Violent Crime ¹	52,999	3.9	6,684	1.7
Property Crime ²	490,394	35.3	118,445	31.2
Subtotal For Above Offenses	543,622	39.2	125,158	32.9
Other Assaults	49,396	3.6	12,876	3.4
Arson	6,352	.5	652	.2
Forgery and Counterfeiting	4,154	.3	1,866	.5
Fraud	3,010	.2	1,213	.3
Embezzlement	413	*	89	*
Stolen Property; Buying; Receiving; Possessing	23,618	1.7	2,151	.6
Vandalism	92,379	6.7	7,450	2.0
Weapons; Carrying; Possessing, etc.	16,482	1.2	1,099	.3
Prostitution and Commercialized Vice	545	*	1,839	.5
Sex Offenses (except Forcible Rape and Prostitution)	7,978	.6	940	.3
Narcotic Drug Laws	91,431	6.6	18,128	4.8
Gambling	2,061	.2	259	.1
Offenses Against Family and Children	2,719	.2	1,280	.3
Driving Under the Influence	14,839	1.1	1,270	.3
Liquor Laws	83,101	6.0	21,701	5.7
Drunkenness	32,057	2.3	4,957	1.3
Disorderly Conduct	84,960	6.1	18,929	5.0
Vagrancy	3,503	.3	649	.2
All Other Offenses (except traffic)	189,408	13.7	52,039	13.7
Suspicion	6,134	.4	1,212	.3
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	68,648	5.0	17,135	4.5
Runaways	66,648	4.8	38,422	23.4
Total**	1,387,424	100.7	380,622	100.6

* Less than one tenth of one percent (0.1%)

** Columns will not add exactly to 100 percent due to rounding

1. Violent Crime is offenses of murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

2. Property Crime is offenses of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft.

x Not included in violent crime totals; but included in index crime subtotal.

Source: Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1976, p. 180.

Table 3
Arrests of All Persons and of Persons Under Age 18 (By Gender) 1960, 1975 and Percentage Increases 1960-1975
For All Persons And Persons Under Age 18 by Gender: Selected Offenses

Offense Charged	Number of Persons Arrested				Percentage Increases				
	Total 1960	All Ages 1975	Males Under 18 1960	1975	Females Under 18 1960	1975	All Ages	Under Age 18 Males	Females
Total	3,454,216	4,537,390	414,082	933,097	70,925	251,008	31.4	125.3	253.9
Criminal Homicide									
a) Murder and Nonnegligent									
Manslaughter	4,766	11,083	331	1,012	28	105	132.5	205.7	275.0
b) Manslaughter by									
Negligence *	1,855	1,855	129	168	9	39	-18.7	30.2	333.3
Forcible Rape	7,006	13,976	1,241	2,485	6	34	99.5	100.2	466.7
Robbery	30,066	96,900	7,034	32,448	355	2,651	222.3	361.3	646.8
Aggravated Assault	53,213	121,775	5,671	17,980	676	3,637	128.8	217.1	438.0
Burglary-breaking & entering	118,703	263,634	55,780	129,423	1,595	6,819	122.1	132.0	327.5
Larceny- Theft	201,780	573,555	82,949	180,589	13,661	76,128	184.2	117.7	457.3
Motor Vehicle Theft	54,354	76,227	31,936	38,174	1,268	3,047	40.2	19.5	140.3
Violent Crime ¹	95,051	243,734	14,277	53,925	1,065	6,427	166.9	277.7	503.5
Property Crime ²	374,837	913,416	170,665	348,186	16,524	85,994	143.7	104.0	420.4
Subtotal	471,743	1,158,659	185,071	402,277	17,598	92,460	145.6	117.4	425.4

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports for the United States: 1975
(Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), Table 31, p. 183

1. Violent Crime includes offenses of murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.
 2. Property crime is offenses of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft.
- * Not included in violent crime totals; but included in index crime subtotals.

From these statistics, some have inferred that officially detected crime among females is increasing in both numbers and seriousness.⁵ They have argued that male and female patterns of crime commission are becoming more similar as the social roles of the two sexes become more similar. Serious crimes by females will rise, according to this viewpoint, eventually drawing even with numbers committed by males. As a result, more young women will be processed by the juvenile justice system. Among other things, this argument might suggest that planning will have to include provision for larger populations of women in secure facilities.

Our analysis of trends in arrests of young women accordingly examines changes in the volume of arrests as well as changes in the seriousness of offenses for which young women were arrested. We have examined the number of arrests of young women (volume) over time in three ways. First, we compared the percentage of all arrests of juveniles that were female in 1960 and 1975 (Table 4). We found that young women did account for a larger percentage (21.2 percent) in 1975 than in 1960 (14.6 percent). Second, we examined the percentage increases from 1960 to 1975 in arrests of juvenile females--compared with juvenile males (Table 3). The increases for young women are quite large, and larger than those for young men. But it appears that the large percentage increases in arrests of juvenile females in Table 3 are due to computations starting from small numerical bases. (See, for example, that the percentage increase 1960-1975 in arrests of juvenile females for forcible rape was 466.7 percent but this is a numerical increase from 6 to 34.)

Table 4. Percent of Females Among Arrests of Persons Under Age 18, 1960 and 1975, By Offense

Offense	Arrests Under Age 18		Percent Female Of All Under Age 18	
	1960	1975	1960	1975
Total	485,007	1,184,105	14.6	21.2
Criminal Homicide:				
Murder and Non-negligent Manslaughter	359	1,117	7.8	9.4
Manslaughter by Negligence*	138	207	6.5	18.8
Forcible Rape	1,247	2,519	.5	1.3
Robbery	7,389	35,099	4.8	7.6
Aggravated Assault	6,347	21,617	10.7	16.8
Burglary	57,375	136,242	2.8	5.0
Larceny-Theft	96,610	256,717	14.1	29.7
Motor-Vehicle	33,204	41,221	3.8	7.4
Violent Crime 1	15,480	60,352	6.9	10.6
Property Crime 2	187,189	434,180	8.3	19.8
Subtotal for Above Offenses	202,669	494,739	8.7	18.7
Other Assaults	12,734	43,258	14.7	22.2
Forgery and Counterfeiting	1,643	4,165	22.7	29.9
Fraud and Embezzlement	890	3,222	19.2	27.7
Stolen property; buying; receiving; possessing	2,658	19,579	7.1	8.9
Weapons; carrying; possessing, etc.	6,327	13,639	2.8	6.7
Prostitution and commercialized vice	431	2,032	70.5	75.6
Sex Offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)	8,758	16,328	28.4	10.7
Narcotic drug laws	1,458	65,864	13.4	16.2
Gambling	1,570	1,379	2.7	4.9
Offenses against family and children	710	3,326	30.6	38.8
Driving under the influence	1,229	7,475	5.1	8.0
Liquor laws	16,976	88,623	13.5	11.8
Drunkenness	13,081	22,078	10.4	13.5
Disorderly Conduct	47,850	65,082	15.0	18.1
Vagrancy	8,291	452	11.0	15.2
All Other Offenses (except traffic)	157,682	103,684	22.5	27.3
Suspicion (not included in totals)	22,820	4,450	12.3	14.5

1. Violent crime is offenses of murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault.
2. Property crime is offenses of burglary, larceny and theft and motor vehicle theft.
- * Not included in violent crime totals; but included in index crime subtotals.

Source: Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1975, p. 183.

Third, we examined the percent of arrests of all persons (adults and juveniles) that were juvenile females--compared to juvenile males (Table 5). We found that as a proportion of all arrests, those of young men increased more over time (8.6 percent) than did those of young women (3.4 percent).

We have concluded that there is little evidence to support an inference that a juvenile female crime wave has been occurring. The absolute numbers of young women have increased somewhat in official crime statistics, as have the percentages of young women among all juvenile arrests. But the magnitude of young women's involvement in crime reflected in these measures is relatively slight when compared to that for young men. Arrests of young women continue to make up a small proportion of all arrests of juveniles and a much smaller proportion of arrests of all persons. We turn now to the nature of young women's participation in officially detected criminal activity.

Examination of the data does not support an inference that crime among young women has been becoming more serious, at least as far as the "traditionally male" crimes of violence are concerned. As Table 6 illustrates, the pattern of offenses committed by women under 17 years of age in 1975 remained somewhat the same as it had been in 1960. The only serious crime for which young women were arrested in notably greater proportions in 1975 was larceny. Since this is a heterogeneous classification that does not differentiate petty shoplifting from grand theft,⁶ support for the argument that there is a shift in the pattern of female arrests toward more serious offenses certainly cannot be derived from

Table 5. Arrests, By Offense, Persons of All Ages 1960 and 1975; Percent of Persons Under 18 by sex, of All Arrests, 1960 and 1975

Offense	Total Arrests All Ages, 1960	Total Arrests All Ages, 1975	Percent of All Arrests of Males Under Age 18,		Percent of All Arrests of All Females Under Age 18,		Change in Percent of All Arrests, 1960-75	
			1960	1975	1960	1975	Males Under Age 18	Females Under Age 18
TOTAL	3,454,216	4,537,390	12.0	20.6	2.1	5.5	8.6	3.4
Criminal Homicide:								
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	4,766	11,003	6.9	9.1	.6	.9	2.2	.3
Manslaughter by Negligence*	1,855	1,509	7.0	11.1	.5	2.6	4.1	2.1
Forcible Rape	7,006	13,976	17.7	17.8	.1	.2	.1	.1
Robbery	30,066	96,900	23.4	33.5	1.2	2.7	10.1	1.5
Aggravated Assault	53,213	121,775	10.7	14.8	1.3	3.0	4.1	1.7
Burglary	118,703	263,634	47.0	49.0	1.3	2.6	2.0	1.3
Larceny-Theft	201,780	573,555	41.1	31.5	6.8	13.3	-9.6	6.5
Motor-Vehicle Theft	54,354	76,277	58.8	50.0	2.3	4.0	-8.8	1.7
Violent Crime 1	95,051	243,734	15.2	21.3	1.1	2.6	6.1	1.5
Property Crime 2	374,837	913,416	45.5	38.1	4.4	9.4	-7.4	5.0
Subtotal for above offenses	471,743	1,158,659	39.2	34.7	3.7	8.0	-4.5	4.3
Other Assaults	130,689	217,242	8.3	15.5	1.4	4.1	7.2	2.7
Forgery and Counterfeiting	22,699	35,504	5.6	8.2	1.6	3.5	2.6	1.9
Fraud and Embezzlement	34,806	86,812	2.1	2.7	.5	1.0	.6	.5
Stolen Property; Buying; Receiving; Possessing	9,753	61,769	25.3	28.9	1.9	2.8	3.6	.9
Weapons: Carrying; Possessing, etc.	32,387	84,830	19.1	15.0	.6	1.1	-4.1	.5
Prostitution and Commercialized Vice	25,236	43,358	.5	1.1	1.2	3.6	.6	2.4
Sex Offenses (except Forcible Rape and Prostitution)	43,531	32,893	14.4	17.2	5.7	2.0	2.8	-3.7
Narcotic Drug Laws	25,857	291,061	4.9	19.0	.8	3.7	14.1	2.9
Gambling	113,089	39,609	1.4	3.3	.0	.2	1.9	.2
Offenses Against Family and Children	42,685	28,716	1.2	7.1	.5	4.5	5.9	4.0
Driving Under the Influence	153,726	416,719	.8	1.7	.0	.1	.9	.1
Liquor Laws	88,845	126,661	16.5	30.9	2.6	8.2	14.4	5.6
Drunkenness	1,299,140	695,720	.9	2.7	.1	.4	1.8	.3
Disorderly Conduct	387,286	346,343	10.5	15.0	1.9	3.4	4.5	2.5
Vagrancy	129,786	23,697	5.7	10.6	.7	1.9	4.9	1.2
All Other Offenses (except traffic)	442,958	847,737	27.6	32.5	8.0	12.2	4.9	4.2
Suspicion	122,033	19,142	16.4	19.9	2.3	3.4	3.5	1.1

1. Violent crime is offenses of murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

2. Property crime is offenses of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft.

* Not included in violent crime totals; but included in index crime subtotals.

Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1975, p.183.

larceny statistics alone. Further, if the patterns of crime commission by young women were becoming more similar to those of young men, during the period 1960-1975 we would expect the proportions of young women charged with serious offenses to increase relative to those of young men so charged.

The data show that, with the single exception of larceny, this has not happened. For example, while a greater proportion of young women were arrested for violent crimes in 1975 than in 1960 (from 2.4 in 1960 to 2.6 in 1975 of all juvenile female arrests) there was a greater increase in the proportion of young men arrested for violent crimes during this period (from 3.4% in 1960 to 5.8% in 1975 of all juvenile male arrests). (Table 6)

Thus, the data on arrests do not support the assertion of a trend toward convergence of male-female roles in a manner that will produce similar rates of arrest for violent offenses. There appears to be no need for criminal justice agencies to prepare for an increasing wave of serious offenses by females.

Data From Self Report Studies

Most analyses of the amount and etiology of female delinquency are based on study of young women who have been arrested, referred to court, or incarcerated. It is common knowledge that there are large numbers of youths who violate laws but do not get arrested, referred to court or incarcerated. They either do not get caught or are dealt with outside of the official system. Thus, information about them and how they differ from youths who do get processed officially may be of

Table 6. Distribution of Arrests, By Offense, for Males and Females Under Age 18, 1960 and 1975

Offense	Males Under Age 18				Females Under Age 18			
	Number of Arrests		Percent Distribution		Number of Arrests		Percent Distribution	
	1960	1975	1960	1975	1960	1975	1960	1975
Total	414,082	933,097	99.6*	99.8*	70,925	251,008	99.8*	100.1*
Criminal Homicide								
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	331	1,012	*	.1	28	105	*	*
Manslaughter by Negligence*	129	168	*	*	9	39	*	*
Forcible Rape	1,241	2,485	.3	.3	6	34	*	*
Robbery	7,034	32,448	1.7	3.5	355	2,651	.5	1.1
Aggravated Assault	5,671	17,980	1.4	1.9	676	3,637	1.0	1.4
Burglary	55,780	129,423	13.5	13.9	1,595	6,819	2.3	2.7
Larceny-Theft	82,949	180,589	20.0	19.4	13,661	76,128	19.3	30.3
Motor-Vehicle Theft	31,936	38,174	7.7	9.2	1,268	3,047	1.8	1.2
Violent Crime 1	14,277	53,925	3.4	5.8	1,074	6,427	2.4	2.6
Property Crime 2	170,665	348,186	41.2	37.3	16,524	85,994	23.3	34.3
Subtotal for above offenses	185,071	402,279	44.7	43.1	17,598	92,460	24.8	36.9
Other Assaults	10,865	33,670	2.6	3.6	1,869	9,588	2.6	3.8
Forgery and Counterfeiting	1,270	2,918	.3	.3	373	1,247	.5	.5
Fraud and embezzlement	719	2,330	.2	.2	171	892	.2	.4
Stolen Property; Buying; Receiving; Possessing	2,469	17,832	.6	1.9	189	1,747	.3	.7
Weapons; carrying; possessing, etc.	6,198	12,725	1.5	1.4	179	914	.3	.4
Prostitution and commercialized vice	127	497	*	*	304	1,540	.4	.6
Sex Offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)	6,271	5,654	1.5	.6	2,487	674	3.5	.3
Narcotic Drug Laws	1,263	55,182	.3	5.9	195	10,682	.3	4.3
Gambling	1,528	1,311	.4	.1	42	68	*	*
Offenses Against family and children	493	2,036	.1	.2	217	1,290	.3	.5
Driving Under the Influence	1,166	6,879	.3	.7	63	598	*	.2
Liquor Laws	14,687	39,095	3.5	4.2	2,289	10,433	3.2	4.2
Drunkenness	11,719	19,091	2.8	2.0	1,362	2,987	1.9	1.2
Disorderly Conduct	40,682	53,328	9.8	5.7	7,168	11,754	10.1	4.7
Vagrancy	7,379	2,520	1.8	.3	912	452	1.3	.2
All Other Offenses (except traffic)	122,175	275,750	29.5	29.6	35,507	103,684	50.1	41.3
Suspicion (not included in totals)	20,021	3,806	4.8	.4	2,799	644	4.0	.3

1. Violent Crime is offenses of murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

2. Property Crime is offenses of burglary, larceny-theft, and motor vehicle theft.

* Not included in violent crime totals; but included in index crime subtotals.

Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1975, p.183.

value to those examining alternatives to juvenile justice processing. The main source of information on the illegal behavior of youths in general--including those who do and those who do not enter the juvenile justice system--is self-report studies. In these studies young people are asked, usually with assurances of confidentiality, to report to researchers their violative behaviors during specified periods of time.

References to the self report studies we examined are footnoted.⁷ Interested readers are encouraged to analyze them. We believe the most significant finding of these studies is that the patterns of violative behavior reported by young men and young women themselves are much more similar than the patterns reflected in official statistics. Overall young women report having committed about half as many violative behaviors as young men--a ratio of 1:2. (From official statistics the ratio is 1:4).

Further, young women do not report having run away in greater numbers than young men, nor do they report more shoplifting than young men.

A distinct constellation of what is commonly seen as particularly female offenses--shoplifting, sexual misconduct, running away from home and truancy--was not evident for either girls or boys... The image of the delinquency-involved girl derived from analyses of statistics provided by law enforcement agencies corresponds poorly with the image which emerges from studies, based on self-report data.⁸

On the other hand, patterns of violent behavior in self report and official data are similar. Young women do report committing fewer violent acts than young men.

Comparisons of the profiles of officially arrested young women with those self-reporting violative behavior have suggested to some that females are arrested less frequently for delinquent acts than males, but that for status offense-type behaviors females are arrested more frequently than males.⁹ Such a difference may result from sex-related differences in patterns of referral to police, or it may result from sex-based differences in police decisions to arrest youths referred to them, or both. But to our knowledge there are no published empirical studies to confirm or disprove an argument that a double standard exists in patterns of referral to police. Findings from the few existing studies of sex-related differences in police decisions to arrest are inconclusive.¹⁰

Trends in Data From Self Report Studies

We noted earlier that assertions that the extent and seriousness of female crime are increasing dramatically find little support from official statistics on arrest. The findings of self report studies on this matter are few.

A national study found that young women had reported more offenses than those who had been interviewed five years earlier, but increases in use of alcohol and marijuana accounted for nearly all of the increase.¹¹ Additional studies¹² are too few in number and different in design to draw any conclusions other than that there is no firm support for the assertion of a dramatic increase in amount or severity of violative behavior by young women.

Court Intake and Diversion

Those advancing an argument that crimes committed by young women are increasing relative to crimes by young men have also cited national juvenile court statistics. As may be seen in Table 7, cases involving females made up 19 percent of the total number of cases referred to the nation's juvenile courts from 1958 through 1964, when the proportion began to increase. It may have peaked at 26 percent during 1972, 1973, and 1974, the percentage having declined to 24 from 1975. In that year, the most recent one for which data are available, cases of young men were estimated to number 1,001,685; those of young women were 315,265. Young women thus made up a slightly larger porportion of those referred to court (24 percent) in 1975 as they did of total juvenile arrests (21.2 percent) in that year.

A recent report by the National Center for Juvenile Justice has provided more detailed information on characteristics of youth referred to juvenile courts.¹³ The report contains national estimates based on data from 10 states. These states may or may not be representative of the entire nation. Thus, the estimates based on the data must be approached with some caution. According to the report, young women are referred to juvenile court for non-serious offenses in far greater proportions than young men (Table 8). Fifty percent of the young women were referred to juvenile courts in 1975 for status offenses; 17.6 percent of young men were referred for status offenses. Twelve percent of young men were referred to juvenile courts for crimes against persons as compared with 7.4 percent of young women. Forty percent of

Table 7. Estimated Number and Percent Distribution of Delinquency Cases Disposed of By Juvenile Courts, By Sex, United States, 1958-1975.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Boys</u>		<u>Girls</u>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1958 ...	383,000	81	87,000	19
1959 ...	393,000	81	90,000	19
1960 ...	415,000	81	99,000	19
1961 ...	408,000	81	95,000	19
1962 ...	450,000	81	104,500	19
1963 ...	485,000	81	116,000	19
1964 ...	555,000	81	131,000	19
1965 ...	555,000	80	142,000	20
1966 ...	593,000	80	152,000	20
1967 ...	640,000	79	171,000	21
1968 ...	708,000	79	191,000	21
1969 ...	760,000	77	228,000	23
1970 ...	799,500	76	252,000	24
1971 ...	845,500	75	279,500	25
1972 ...	827,300	74	285,000	26
1973 ...	845,300	74	298,400	26
1974 ...	927,000	74	325,700	26
1975 ...	1,001,685	76	315,265	24

Source: Thomas S. Vereb, Esq. and Terrence A. Finnegan. Juvenile Court Statistics: 1975. Mimeo available from the National Center for Juvenile Justice p. 13.

Table 8. Estimated Number and Percent of Juvenile Court Referrals of Males and Females Under Age 18, by Offense: 1975

	Males Under Age 18		Females Under Age 18	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	1,071,417	100	334,535	100
Murder	1,644	.2	207	*
Forcible Rape	2,891	.3	78	*
Sex Offense	8,398	.8	1,830	.5
Purse Snatching	2,351	.2	120	*
Robbery	30,357	2.8	2,507	.7
Aggravated Assault	20,703	1.9	3,699	1.1
Assault	63,387	5.9	17,195	5.1
Burglary	191,452	17.9	11,949	3.6
Auto Theft	52,112	4.9	4,605	1.4
Shoplifting	42,341	3.9	26,467	7.9
Larceny	136,352	12.7	38,394	11.5
Weapons	15,074	1.4	1,078	.3
Drugs	95,478	8.9	20,508	6.1
Drunkenness	15,560	1.4	3,450	1.0
Disorderly Conduct	31,961	3.0	7,864	2.4
Vandalism	51,368	4.8	4,702	1.4
Running Away	57,120	5.3	84,071	25.1
Truancy	23,035	2.1	16,122	4.8
Curfew Violation	16,681	1.6	5,516	1.6
Ungovernable Behavior	59,859	5.6	52,876	15.8
Possession of Liquor	27,599	2.6	7,135	2.1
Other Status	3,769	.4	1,789	.5
Other Delinquency	121,925	11.4	22,420	6.7

young men were referred for the serious property crimes of burglary, auto theft, larceny, and vandalism as compared with 17.9 percent of young women. The reader should note that these data separate shoplifting from other larceny. Shoplifting is a larger proportion of all court referrals for larceny for females (30.1 percent) than for males (23.5 percent).

Others have also concluded that females referred for status offenses may be disproportionately represented at court intake, citing evidence primarily from two sources. The first was a 1965 HEW report.¹⁴ Fifty percent of all females referred to juvenile courts were reported as having been referred for status offenses; only 20 percent of all males had been referred for similar reasons. The second and more recent study of juvenile court referrals from New York and Rockland counties reported that females...

receive a notably higher proportion of the following allegations than their 57 percent representation in the sample of petitions as a whole: truancy, 62 percent; short runaway, 74 percent; long runaway, 73 percent; bad companions, 73 percent; drug possession, 60 percent; alcohol use, 67 percent; undesirable boyfriend, 100 percent; prostitution, 100 percent; promiscuity, 100 percent; cohabitating, 100 percent; spending the night with a boy, 100 percent, general sex innuendo, 100 percent.¹⁵

One writer, citing these and other studies, concluded that...

statutes which extend juvenile court jurisdiction to persons in need of supervision (PINS) are applied far more frequently to females than to males...This phenomenon is largely attributable to the vague standards of conduct that characterize PINS statutes. Their breadth invites discretionary application of their provisions and allows parents, police, and juvenile court authorities, who ordinarily decide whether PINS proceedings should be initiated, to hold girls legally accountable for behavior--often sexual or in some way related to sex--that they would not consider serious if committed by boys.¹⁶

Some studies have examined court referrals by source of referral: either the police or youths' parents. The national estimates of referrals to juvenile courts by the National Center for Juvenile Justice indicate that a larger proportion of young women than of young men were referred to court by sources other than the police in 1975.¹⁷ Studies analyzing sex-related differences in decisions by police to refer youth to juvenile court have been inconclusive.¹⁸ Three studies of referral of youth to court by their parents have found sex-related differences: parents refer more young women than young men to court for status offenses.¹⁹ Results of studies of sex differences in pre-adjudicatory decision making (including intake screening), decisions to adjudicate, and informal dispositions vary greatly. Differences in characteristics of jurisdictions and in methodologies of the studies may account for such divergent findings.²⁰

Detention

The national data available tend to support a belief that young women are detained disproportionately to young men. On a given day in 1974, 11,190 juveniles were held in public detention and shelter facilities: 7,812 were young men; 3,378 were young women.²¹ In the same year young women made up 21 percent of those arrested and 26 percent of all those in public detention facilities.²² (The detention statistics on juvenile females are in sharp contrast to those on adult females. Women in 1974 were 15 percent of all the adults arrested; they made up only 5 percent of those in adult detention facilities.)²³

A recent review of the literature describing detention practices in twenty-three states and the District of Columbia arrived at two interrelated conclusions:

- (1) Status offenders tend to be detained at a higher rate than youths apprehended for adult-type criminal offenses and also tend to be held longer.
- (2) Females are detained at higher rates and held longer than males.²⁴

Unfortunately, national data by sex, offense, and detention status are not available. Such data would be helpful in examining the inference that female status offenders are detained at disproportionately high rates.²⁵

Three studies employing quite sophisticated methodologies found that gender did not account for variation in use of detention in the jurisdictions studied.²⁶ These studies concur that social and legal characteristics of youth are relatively insignificant factors in explaining variation in detention and that other factors such as the availability of alternatives²⁷ and characteristics of decision-makers²⁸ may be the more important elements in detention decisions.

Whether or not young women are detained disproportionately to young men does not obscure the obvious conclusion that secure detention is overused for young women. The overwhelming majority of young women who are arrested, referred to court, and probably detained are charged with non-dangerous offenses (e.g., shoplifting) and status offenses. Virtually all of the young women currently held in secure

detention could be better served--and without public risk--by being screened out at detention intake altogether or by being referred to alternative programs.

Correctional Institutions

In spite of the fact that young women are arrested much more frequently for minor offenses than are young men, young women are incarcerated in about the same proportions as young men. In 1974, 23.6 percent of all adjudicated youth in correctional facilities were young women;²⁹ they were 21.2 percent of all youths arrested during the same year.³⁰ The rate of incarceration of juvenile females was in sharp contrast to that of adult females, who were only 3.4 percent of those in state and federal institutions that year.³¹

Two recent national surveys of juvenile correctional institutions found young women incarcerated for less serious offenses than young men. Vinter, with Necomb and Kish, working with a sample design that over-represented female and co-educational institutions, stated that

the conclusion that girls are more likely than boys to receive relatively harsher disposition for similar provocation can be accepted if one accepts that institutionalization is the most drastic intervention into a youth's life. Of the sampled females in institutions, fifty percent are status offenders...as opposed to more serious offenders. But only twenty-three percent of the institutionalized males are status offenders. Similarly, proportionately more females than males in group homes are status offenders (sixty-seven percent versus fifty percent, respectively). While generalizing from our data to the juvenile justice system as a whole is inappropriate, the pattern of our findings is in agreement with general conclusions drawn from some other studies.³²

A more recent survey has reported that

Between June and August of 1976, nearly half of all the females in state training schools were status offenders. Results also show that girls have longer average confinements than their male counterparts even though the vast majority of the boys (eighty-two percent) were criminal offenders.³³

Official national data are consistent with the belief that the number of young women in institutions is disproportionately great. Children in Custody for 1977 reported sex and category of offense for nearly 20,000 young men and women who had been adjudicated and were in public and private correctional institutions or detention facilities in 1974. Unfortunately, the states were unable to report information by sex and offense on an additional 16,337 persons confined in institutions; these data must be approached with caution. Readers should note that the proportion of missing cases by region ranges from 25 to nearly eighty-three percent (See Appendix I Table 1). Because the proportions are large and not randomly distributed another analysis of 15 states with not more than fifteen percent of their cases missing was conducted. It supports the statements to follow and is reported in footnote 34 in detail.

Table 9 contains data for the nearly 20,000 cases for which complete information was reported. (Twenty-two percent of the youths for whom information is available were young women--Appendix I, Table 1.) For these cases, it is apparent that young women were incarcerated for less serious matters than were young men. Fifty-three percent of the young men had been adjudicated for felonies: only fourteen

Table 9
Adjudicated Youth In Public Juvenile Detention and Correctional
Facilities By Offense and Gender: June 30, 1974

	<u>Felonies</u>	<u>Misdemeanors and Drug Offenses</u>	<u>Status Offenses</u>	<u>Total</u>
Males	8,075	4,446	2,741	15,262
(row %)	(52.9)	(29.1)	(18.0)	(100.0)
(col %)	(93.4)	(80.1)	(51.1)	(78.0)
Females	581	1,106	2,628	4,315
(row %)	(13.5)	(25.6)	(60.9)	100.0
(col %)	(6.6)	(19.9)	(48.9)	(22.0)
Total	8,656	5,552	5,369	19,577

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Children In Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1974: (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1977,) Tables 13 and 14, pp. 48-53.

percent of the young women had. At the opposite extreme, eighteen percent of the males were adjudicated for status offenses, compared with 61 percent of the females.

The information can be rearranged to show even more dramatically the differences in the official reasons for incarcerating young men and women. Of all youth incarcerated for felonies, only seven percent were female while ninety-three percent were male. In contrast, young women were forty-nine percent of those incarcerated for status offenses. Thus, the national data, incomplete though they may be, show adjudicated young women to have been in correctional and detention facilities for less serious acts than young men were, if the distinction between a status offense and a felony can be taken at face value.

Summary

The limited information available on decisions affecting youth in the juvenile justice system suggests a cumulative bias with consequences for young women that are unfair. Young women enter the juvenile justice system for less serious offenses than do males. But they are not diverted from the system to any greater extent than are males. Young women account for 21.5 percent of juvenile arrests, 24 percent of juvenile court intake, 30 percent of all juveniles detained, and 24 percent of adjudicated juveniles in public and private detention and correctional institutions. Of all young women in public juvenile detention and correctional institutions 61 percent are incarcerated for status offenses. This is true of only 18 percent of young men in such institutions.

Available data do not support the notion that female juvenile crime is increasing dramatically in either numbers or seriousness relative to that for young men. The numbers of young women requiring placement in secure facilities do not appear to be rising substantially. The facts suggest that secure facilities continue to be used inappropriately for young women. The implications are that juvenile justice planning for young women should focus on the development of alternatives to the use of secure facilities.

Alternative Programs for Young Women

Our analysis of national data on the processing of young women in the juvenile justice system indicates that a large majority of young women placed in detention and correctional facilities have been charged with status offenses or delinquent offenses of a non-serious nature. The reasons for this misuse of incarceration for so many young women are at best speculative. Some have attributed differences in the use of incarceration for young women and young men to sexist attitudes of juvenile justice system decision makers.³⁵ Others have observed that incarcerated young women are more likely than young men to be chronic behavior or treatment problems.³⁶ And many others have noted that there are few alternative services for young women.³⁷ Finally, we have noted a lack of published information about alternative programs for those who may be interested in providing such services for young women.³⁸

Those attempting to explain why information about alternative programs for young women is so scarce have referred to studies and data that point to one or more of the following explanations: that

fewer programs serving young women exist relative to those serving young men;³⁹ that there has been little attention paid to young women in research studying alternative programs;⁴⁰ that programs for young men have been funded at levels disproportionate to those for young women;⁴¹ that target populations sometimes are defined in ways that exclude young women from intake⁴² that young women are overlooked by program planners because they are a small minority of those in the system;⁴³ and that an attitude of paternalism toward young women seems to keep them in secure facilities away from their communities.⁴⁴ Another explanation put forth is one involving diseconomies of scale in implementing programs for young women: there are too few young women in institutions from a given jurisdiction for efficient operation of community-based services planned exclusively for them. Also, some untested but persistent ideas about serving adolescents can result in a lack of services for young women. Examples are the assumptions that residential programs should be segregated by sex, that young women are not interested in recreation or job training, and that women volunteers and paraprofessionals can best work with young women and men with young men.

Nevertheless, there are many creative programs that have provided alternatives to juvenile justice processing for young women. Some of these programs are described here. The programs selected for description are not to be considered representative of the entire range of alternatives which can serve young women. Instead, these programs were selected because they provide creative and varying

approaches to service delivery which may be of use to those jurisdictions interested in planning new programs for young women. The programs were identified through telephone survey of the State Planning Agencies; through lists obtained by organizations such as the National Council of Juvenile Court and Family Judges and the Female Offender Resource Center of the American Bar Association, and through personal contact.

Our emphasis in selecting programs has been on creative intervention. We have not described efforts designed simply to remove young people from the juvenile justice system without use of intervention programs--for example, explicit intake and dispositional guidelines, intake screening specialists, and laws removing certain behaviors from court jurisdiction.⁴⁵ The planning of such strategies is straightforward, so they are not described in detail here. Our discussion focuses on programs, but we emphasize that for many young women the best alternative to juvenile justice system processing is to remove them from the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system altogether.

National Programs

The first two programs are those of two national agencies and were directed at 1) heightening awareness of the problems of the young women in trouble, 2) training personnel to work with young women, and 3) development of new programs for young women who become involved in the juvenile justice process.

The National Youthworker Education Project⁴⁶

The National Youthworker Education Project (NYEP) is

...a nationwide educational program for the staffs of organizations serving adolescent girls. It focuses on increasing the relevance and responsiveness of programs for young women in contemporary society. The project's goals are to help people in voluntary and correctional agencies to work together, develop coordinated programs, improve their understanding of girls from widely varying backgrounds, and improve services for all young women.⁴⁷

NYEP was devised by Dr. Gisela Konopka, director of the Center for Youth Development and Research at the University of Minnesota. It is sponsored by the Center and supported with funds from the Lilly Endowment and the University of Minnesota.

NYEP participants are selected from the staffs of correctional agencies nationwide as well as from the following eight voluntary agencies: Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Campfire Girls, Girls Clubs, Girl Scouts, 4-H, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Red Cross, and the Young Women's Christian Association.

NYEP conducted Phase I of its operation during calendar years 1976-1977. Phase II, now in process, began in January 1978. Both phases are described below.

During Phase I, NYEP conducted a ten day education session each month. Twenty new participants for each session were recruited from the agencies named above. Each group reconvened for a two day follow-up session after approximately three months, during which they tried to put ideas from the initial ten day seminars into practice in their own agencies.

Topics covered during the ten day sessions included: understanding the developmental tasks of adolescence and family dynamics; recruiting youths into organizations; special issues related to "girls in conflict; developing skills to improve the staff participants' interpersonal and professional effectiveness; designing, funding, and implementing programs; recruiting and training volunteer and paid staff; and managing interagency relationships. A wide variety of teaching methods were utilized.

The ten day sessions culminated in the development of an action plan by each participant. Plans formulated as a result of NYEP participation included training workshops; development of interagency services agreements; methods of recruiting and incorporating young women in trouble into programs; development of community services for use instead of adjudication by the juvenile court; an experimental education program; and a parent and community education program.

As of December 1977, over 400 participants had attended NYEP's Phase I program. These included executive directors, program directors, supervisors, and direct service workers from the participating agencies.

Phase II of the project includes short workshops for executives of the eight participating agencies on progress and problems of the Project to date. Training sessions are being conducted for both new and Phase I participants. Follow-up sessions will be conducted in eight geographic regions in order for NYEP staff and participants to reinforce service and communication networks.

NYEP has established local education projects in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota, and Indianapolis, Indiana. It also has provided consultation, technical assistance, and training materials to many organizations throughout the country.

Three characteristics of this program are of particular interest. The first is emphasis on "normalization." Participants are taught that "'girls in conflict' are simply not that different"...from other young women in their programs. [They need] "the same kinds of opportunities that all other young people need..."⁴⁸ Participants are encouraged to find ways to absorb girls who are in conflict into their programs. The appeal of this can be illustrated by the comments of one of the participants. Jean Cogburn of the National 4-H stated that the single most important outcome of NYEP participation for her was becoming convinced that a community's response to girls in conflict should be to increase its tolerance of their behavior rather than punish them.⁴⁹

The concept of normalization was also the basis of some of the action plans developed. Some participants developed plans to recruit more girls in conflict into their ongoing programs by contacting schools and officials of the juvenile justice system and by developing public relations methods that would encourage those young women to join the organizations. Other participants planned to provide roles for the young women as service providers, such as teaching skills to younger children, helping older people, and working in hospitals or offices. Others wanted to re-examine their agencies' programs and

goals to see if they were discouraging participation of some young women by not responding to their interests. For example, Jan Roberta of the Goleta, California, Girls Club secured CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) funding for an outreach worker whose primary responsibility was the recruitment of girls in conflict from public agencies and the community at large.

The second interesting aspect of this project is that the knowledge and ideas gained at the NYEP session can be shared by each participant with many other people in their communities. In fact, some participants' action plans were to conduct training sessions similar to those designed by NYEP for staff of their own and other agencies in the community. Other participants planned to share their NYEP experience with others by forming networks of agencies serving young women. For example, youth-serving coalitions of traditional and "alternative" agencies (public and private) have been formed in Rapid City, South Dakota; Indianapolis, Indiana; Denver, Colorado; Riverdale, Georgia; and Billings, Montana as a result of NYEP participation. Task forces have been organized in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Dallas, Texas, to plan programs for pregnant adolescents.

Third, the project's participants have generated creative program ideas. Some examples are:

- 1) involve youths referred to court for shoplifting in volunteer work at day care centers and at an institution for the orthopedically handicapped--as an alternative to adjudication. (Plan submitted by Cheryle Babbit of the Red Cross in Omaha.)
- 2) have high school students in trouble teach plant care to elementary school students. The older youths would receive course credits through

school, Girl Scouts, or Campfire Girls. The program would be co-sponsored by the Red Cross and a local plant shop. (Plan submitted by Susanne Harker of the Wichita Red Cross.)

- 3) have youth charged with status offenses "Adopt a Grandparent" in a convalescent hospital. (Plan submitted by Wan-Ling Louie of the Oakland Red Cross.)
- 4) have youth charged with status offenses and placed in a group home serve as Big Sisters to younger girls. (Plan submitted by Judith Shimek of Tri-House in St. Paul.)
- 5) have girls on probation evaluate existing resources for young women. (Plan submitted by Kay Carlson and Deborah Knutsen, Probation Officer, in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota.)
- 6) secure the support of local businesses and the National Alliance of Businessmen to provide job opportunities not traditionally held by young women. For example, the Goleta, California, Girl Club has placed young women in jobs in electronics, denistry, and industrial photography.

NYEP participants report mixed results in their ability to implement their plans.⁵⁰ Problems cited include lack of support from the executives of their agencies, the need for special funding, frequent turnover of staff, lack of support and cooperation from referring or co-sponsoring agencies, and a lack of interest on the part of the girls themselves.

During Phase II, NYEP plans to strengthen its support of participant agencies implementing action plans. The Phase II workshops for executives of the participating voluntary agencies are an effort to encourage organizations to support new programs developed by staff members who have participated in NYEP. The follow-up sessions, to be held in eight different geographic regions, are designed to reinforce the interagency cooperation that has been developed by NYEP participation.

NYEP has demonstrated in a preliminary way that youthworkers from voluntary and from public organizations can work together at the local, regional, and national levels.⁵¹

NYEP's progress in encouraging cooperation between voluntary agencies and juvenile justice system agencies is a promising alternative to juvenile justice processing of young people.

Voluntary youth-serving organizations such as 4-H, Girls Clubs (Girl Scouts, Camp Fire, etc.) provide essentially non-stigmatizing services to young people. As these organizations work cooperatively with juvenile court and mental health organizations, a range of alternative services and programs can be developed to help young people in trouble remain part of the mainstream.⁵²

National Board YMCA Intervention Programs⁵³

The National Board of the YWCA recently sponsored programs to assist local YWCA's in providing alternatives to juvenile justice processing for young women. The Texas Intervention Programs which included programs at YWCA/s in Corpus Christi, San Antonio, and Fort Worth were sponsored by the YWCA National Board during 1972-1974. The New England Intervention Programs (at 11 New England YWCA's) were sponsored by the Board Between 1975-1977. These Intervention Programs were designed to demonstrate the capability of an established national voluntary organization, working with and through selected member affiliates, to plan, and administer projects which use existing community-based resources to provide services for young women in varying stages of conflict with the law. These Programs received seventy-five percent funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which enabled the National Board of the YWCA to

engage project staff to carry out the pre-grant plans for overall program goals.

Responsibilities at the National level included the selection of local Associations, planning with State and local justice system agencies as well as the participating YWCAs, training of local project personnel, the administration and monitoring of the Intervention Center project units and the conduct of internal evaluative assessments. The National Board staff and volunteers also provided technical assistance and took part in negotiations with local resources--including justice system agencies--for project continuity after federal funding expired.

Funds channeled through the National organization to the local YWCAs were used for services to young women in conflict with the law. The services were made available through the employment of project personnel and establishment of new programs as well as through use of existing YWCA programs. Different programs and procedures were developed by each YWCA in response to the different needs of their respective communities; procedures were arranged with the police, courts, correction institutions, and other involved community agencies for the referral of participants to the projects or the provision of services in accordance with the locally evolved plans. Many programs were a combination of residential, nonresidential, and referral to local service resources.

Residential services typically provided shelter for young women experiencing crises. Rooms in the YWCA residences were set aside for this purpose. YWCA staff and Intervention Project personnel

supplied counseling and supervision. Non-residential services included crisis intervention services, counseling for individuals and groups, support for staying in or returning to school, and referrals to additional resources. Other organized activities were provided as well. There were education programs on topics such as drug and alcohol abuse, career choice and development, family life, consumerism, and use of leisure time. The special concerns of young women in the areas of health care and changing societal roles were included in some of the educational programs. Young women in the program had access to the full range of each Y's recreational programs and were encouraged to participate in regular camping trips. Finally, many of the programs emphasized volunteerism in two ways. They recruited and trained interested adults to be Big Sisters for young women; they also developed opportunities for young women to work as volunteers in various community agencies.

Some of these services were developed specifically for young women referred by agents of the juvenile justice system. Others are regular and ongoing services at the YWCA's.

Administrators of the local YWCA intervention programs have reported several problems which they believe hindered successful implementation of their programs. Two are noted here.

The Texas Intervention Programs had to terminate their non-residential services during the second year of operation. This was at the insistence of the state's planning agency for distributing LEAA funds. We do not know the reasons for this--only that program officials report disruption because of it.

Other local Y's were not able to implement the full range of services they had planned; a great deal of time had to be devoted to a pursuit of funding to continue the programs after federal funding ceased. This was time that could have been devoted to program implementation. A representative from the National Board of the YWCA testified to this before the U.S. Senate Committee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

There seems to be no end to the time, the procedures, the unidentified--sometimes incomprehensible--factors that make refunding a nightmarish experience.

Periods of curtailment, uncertainty, cutbacks to "stretch" the existing funds through date "extensions" and any other means all of these come together to render the seasoned operator somewhat fearful of entering into what is really a moral commitment to the youth, their families, and their communities when they know that they are powerless to assure them of a continuing operation for a reasonable period. We believe reasonable here to refer to a minimum of five years: It takes that long to imbed a program of this kind into the social fabric of a community and to permit that community to develop the resources needed to take it over when the special funding is no longer available.⁵⁴

It may be that some of the problems reported by the YWCA intervention programs could have been avoided. Indeed, some local programs were more successful than others in securing local funds to support program stability and continuity. Unfortunately, detailed information that would permit systematic examination of why some succeed and others did not is not available.

Local Programs

The next six programs are examples of various approaches taken by local agencies, either public or private, to provide community-based services for young women, many of whom would otherwise have been candidates for placement in an institution.

Career Awareness Program: Omaha, Nebraska⁵⁵

The Career Awareness Program (CAP) is administered by the Girls Club of Omaha, Nebraska. The program provides young women with

- (1) instruction in how to find out about jobs and apply for them,
- (2) advice and information on careers they might consider, and
- (3) work experience through an on-the-job training program.

CAP accepts young women referred by the courts, schools, and social agencies in Omaha. The program is supported by grants from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Department of Labor (with funds authorized by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act).

The formal objectives of the program are to

- 1) assist youths in improving the cognitive skills required to carry out those tasks needed to enter the job market,
- 2) help young women expand their knowledge of career options available to them,
- 3) provide on-the-job training experiences,
- 4) motivate youth to stay in school and improve their levels of school achievement, and,
- 5) identify each young woman's career aspirations when she begins the program and determine whether program participation changes those aspirations.

The Career Awareness Program was started by Heather Ware because she had observed that many young women served by the Girls Club lacked the basic skills and motivation needed to stay in school and get jobs. For example, she found girls who could not tell time or use public transportation and whose career aspirations were restricted to employment in unskilled labor. Ms. Ware also noted that many of these girls were truant from or had dropped out of school, were unemployed, and had had some contact with the police or courts.

Job and career oriented programs like the Career Awareness Program can be a useful resource for practitioners working in the juvenile justice system. These programs provide a realistic structure to a youth's daily life and they create opportunities for youths to focus their energies on developing skills for lifelong use. This is in contrast to the many programs which focus primarily on youths' problems and deficiencies rather than on their strengths, or which direct youths to acquire skills that only help them adjust to a particular program.

In addition, the CAP programs can expose youths to several adults who can be role models. For young women, especially, this provides exposure to a wide variety of traditional and non-traditional roles and opportunities for women.

The Career Awareness Program begins with a two week orientation period. Formal group sessions are held with individual attention provided as needed. The emphasis is on teaching basic skills needed

to get a job. This includes information on how to find out about job opportunities, obtain and complete a formal job application, secure an appointment for an interview, and use public transportation to get there. The young women gain practice in preparing a resume, writing letters using a format and style appropriate for business, and presenting themselves and their interests in the context of a job interview. Attention also is given to each young women's grooming and health care habits. Finally, a pattern of self inventory and assessment is established by requiring each girl to maintain a checklist on herself to review progress made or needed in each area. Approximately 18 hours are devoted to these sessions.

Following successful completion of the orientation period, each young woman begins a series of on-the-job-training experiences. CAP has established working arrangements with a number of employers. The employers agree to provide a job; CAP assigns a young woman to it and pays her wages out of the funds from its CETA grant. Girls and employers agree to keep daily records of observations, attendance, and progress.

On-the-job training experiences typically consist of two, three, or six week placements in public and private business for two to three hours per day after school. Jobs include the following: social work aide, veterinarian's assistant, model, bank teller, salesperson, photographer's aide, tour guide, lawyer's aide, recreational assistant, dietician aide, and keypunch operator. Girls may elect to spend the entire school year on one site or get experience at several. During

the time they are working at job sites, the girls continue to attend career orientation sessions one evening per week at the CAP center.

Since entry into most of the careers to which young women are exposed in CAP calls for specific levels of educational achievement, CAP requires that all their young women attend school of General Education Development (GED) classes regularly while in the program. Staff therefore monitor school attendance and progress by communicating regularly with school counselors.

CAP staff help expand employment opportunities for young women completing the program. They encourage employers who have provided positions for on-the-job training experiences to hire young women who have completed the Career Awareness program. They also encourage employers to participate in the summer CETA program.

For the past two years, CAP has operated with a staff of two and an annual budget of \$49,500. The Department of Labor (DOL) recently granted the program a budget increase to approximately \$200,000 to expand its services in the Omaha area. DOL also has designated CAP an Exemplary Project and plans to use this program as a model for developing similar programs throughout the country.

The Girls Coalition: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania⁵⁶

Four voluntary agencies in Philadelphia--the YWCA, Girls Clubs of Philadelphia, the Girl Scouts, and Teen-Aid (a Big Sisters program)--have formed the Girls Coalition to coordinate and improve their services for girls "at risk." The coalition has adopted a comprehensive definition of girls at risk which includes young women involved

in the juvenile justice process and others who are not. Agencies in the Coalition accept young women who have dropped out of school or been classified as truant, run away from home, become pregnant, or been victims of physical or sexual abuse. Referral sources includes the police, juvenile court, parents, schools, social agencies, clergy, and the girls themselves.

The Coalition describes itself as a juvenile delinquency prevention program for women. The Coalition is supported by a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which includes funds to develop new services. The efforts of the Girls Coalition are described here because they show how cooperation between agencies can benefit each participating agency, the youths served, and the community.

One purpose of the Coalition is to provide services and activities which the individual agencies would not have the resources to support otherwise. Examples of these are publicity for the individual agencies and the services of the Coalition, programs for providing the general public with information about special problems of adolescent girls, training youthworkers and providing needed services that are otherwise unavailable. The publicity and public education activities are designed to attract young women to the Coalition's program, recruit capable volunteers for working with young women in the programs, and develop more jobs for young women in the community.

In addition to the usual publicity techniques such as press releases and speeches, the Coalition has begun to establish relationships with organizations such as schools, police, Retired Senior

Volunteer Program, and business groups for the purposes of recruiting youth and volunteers. A newspaper about Coalition activities and people is planned. It will be written and circulated by youth representatives for all participating agencies.

The staff development and training functions of the Coalition include orientation of volunteers as well as ongoing workshops and seminars for both paid workers and volunteers. Training topics include needs and concerns of young women, techniques for working with them, special problems such as adolescent pregnancy and parental abuse of adolescents, and information about identifying and using resources. The Coalition also keeps participating agencies informed of workshops, seminars, and speeches sponsored by the Coalition. Events have included workshops on recruitment and utilization of volunteers and a seminar on adolescent childbearing.

The Coalition also sponsors special events and services for youth from all participating agencies. Examples of these are performing arts, concerts, camping trips, career fairs, and sporting events. In addition, the Coalition informs agencies about available services for young women, such as vocational training, therapists, special educational programs, and medical care. The Coalition plans to compile a resource directory of such services for use by participating agencies and other agencies in the community as well.

Another purpose of the Coalition is to coordinate youth referrals and program planning among the participating agencies so that youth can be referred to those services which best meet their needs. Through coordinated program planning, a wider variety of services have been

provided, service gaps filled, and duplication of services among agencies avoided. Coordination of referrals has been accomplished through a central referral system and through interagency staffings. (For example, a Girl Scout whose mother died was referred to Teen-Aid and matched with a Big Sister; a YWCA member who enjoyed working with young children was referred to the Girls Club to work as a volunteer.)

One outcome of coordinating planning and referrals is that the agencies can establish priorities for the Coalition in the areas of program, policy, and advocacy. The present program priority is to extend job and career opportunities for young women. Thus, emphasis has been placed on developing career information and job programs in the individual agencies and on sponsoring career fairs and developing new jobs. The Coalition has also secured special funding for a conference on the problems of unemployment among young women and on the need for counseling about non-traditional careers for women.

Advocacy activities of the Coalition have included participation in Title XX planning hearings, participation in a task force on sexism in education that reports to the Superintendent of the Philadelphia schools, and development of research reports to the Youth Services Commission on problems of young women, such as dropping out of school, unemployment, and the lack of needed services. Through the collective strength of the participating agencies, the Coalition plans to become a powerful influence in getting more services to young women that are responsive to their needs and those of their communities.

New Directions for Young Women--Tuscon, Arizona⁵⁷

New Directions for Young Women is an agency which provides a variety of programs, services, and activities for young women in the Tuscon area. It is described here because of its unusual range and flexibility in serving young women and because it has provided alternatives to the use of secure detention for young women charged with status offenses by helping integrate them into normal community life.

The program began in 1976 when Ruth Crow, formerly a probation officer with the Pima County Juvenile Court, and Carol Zimmerman, the Executive Director of New Directions, obtained funds to establish a drop-in center for use as an alternative to secure detention. These funds were made available through the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO) special emphasis project of the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Since then, New Directions has received additional private and government funding for specific activities.

New Directions operates a center with a staff of seven. They provide a variety of direct services, public advocacy and community education activities, and training programs. The Agency has developed a number of school-based services and activities as well. In some schools, New Directions staff run weekly groups for young women on such topics as assertiveness training, health and sexuality, preparing for parenthood, job seeking skills, career information, developing an appreciation of the fine arts, and promoting an awareness of each

youth's ethnic heritage. The emphasis in these groups is twofold: providing information and creating an opportunity for the youths to talk about their own feelings and experiences in each topic area. The staff also train school teachers and counselors in group leadership skills so that each school can run such groups using their own personnel.

New Directions also provides in-service training and presentations for school personnel on topics such as the equal rights amendment, rape prevention, sex role stereotyping in school curricula and career guidance, and sexism in the juvenile justice system. They have planned special school events such as a recent Women's Awareness Day in a local high school, which include exhibits, films, workshops, and speakers on topics of interest to women. For each activity described, the schools select the topics and the format based on their own interests and those of their students.

Direct services are provided by New Directions staff at the agency's center. Individual counseling and referral services are available and a General Education Development (GED) class providing a high school equivalency diploma meets there. Group services are available also. For young women the groups may focus on self-help processes; independent living skills such as budgeting, job hunting, renting an apartment, using public transportation, and applying for public assistance; or recreation activities. Groups for parents only and for parents and youths are also provided.

New Directions emphasizes interagency cooperation in its programs. It has run groups at other agencies such as the Girls' Club and has secured the participation of other agencies in some of its presentations and special events. For example, agencies involved in Women's Awareness Day included the Congress Street School, YWCA, Big Sisters, Young Women's Company, Rape Crisis, and Issue Theatre. In the fall of 1977 New Directions co-sponsored a retreat with another agency, Native American Women, which included presentations and discussions on personal awareness, sexuality, and Indian culture. New Directions and the YWCA also co-sponsored an on-going career development program, New Careers through Day Care. In this program, young women are trained to work in day care centers. One part of this program teaches carpentry skills through the renovation of day care centers.

Public education and community outreach are major agency emphases. New Directions recently co-sponsored a national conference on young women in the juvenile justice system and has secured local funding to publish the conference proceedings. The executive director and one of the staff have edited and published a book on the needs and concerns of young women; interviews with young women are the basis of the book. The agency has also provided speakers for civic organizations, prepared radio and TV spots on the needs of young women, and written articles for local newspapers.

Finally, New Directions identifies and publicizes gaps in services for young women on an on-going basis. For example, the executive director is currently surveying the availability of rape prevention services. She is also seeking funds for a national advocacy project for young women.

From its inception New Directions has accepted young women charged with status offenses who have entered the juvenile justice process as well as those who have not. While some of the former may receive special individual attention, such as referral to residential programs when needed or intensive counseling, they more typically are integrated with others in the agency's programs. In addition, through its training and public education activities, New Directions staff have discouraged parents, schools, and police from referring young women to court. Instead, staff encourage use of different approaches with these youth including referral to other community resources instead of court.

During the first year of program operation, the number of females detained for status offenses in Pima County dropped by 46.4 percent (from 209 in 1976 to 112 in 1977). While New Directions may not be solely responsible for this reduction, its direct services and public education activities have increased the use of alternatives to juvenile justice processing for many young women.

Girls Adventure Trails: Dallas, Texas⁵⁸

Girls Adventure Trails is a wilderness program for young women in trouble. Wilderness programs for youth in trouble are modeled upon the programs of Outward Bound, a physical and psychological survival skills course begun in World War II to train British seamen. Outward Bound International operates 32 schools internationally, six in the United States.⁵⁹ Outward Bound uses the challenge of wilderness training to give people a greater sense of their own strengths. It

also provides opportunities for group interaction and the development of leadership skills. Finally, Outward Bound helps people strengthen their commitment to society and explore their spirituality.⁶⁰

Many wilderness programs simply accept youths in trouble without making special arrangements for them. Others do make special adaptations. The adaptation of Outward Bound programs for youth in trouble typically consists of a brief (three to five days) orientation to wilderness camping skills, a two to three week expedition, a two to three day solo survival test, and a post-program follow-up period to transfer the skills and attitudes acquired in the woods to urban life. Other adaptations include shorter programs (such as five days) and urban as well as wilderness sites.⁶¹

Some wilderness programs are coeducational; others separate young men from young women. Until recently, most program participants have been males and published evaluations of the programs have been based only on male participants,⁶² but Kelly, one of the earliest evaluators of wilderness programs for delinquent youth, states:

...Female and more specifically female adolescent delinquents have attended Outward Bound schools. Their success in completing the Outward Bound program equals the males and, while we have no statistical data to support the speculation, it is our impression recidivism rates among female delinquents who attended Outward Bound are lower than those treated in a routine fashion.⁶³

Colorado Outward Bound School, Underway, in Southern Illinois, and Higher Horizons in New York are all wilderness programs accepting young women in trouble at the present time.⁶⁴

Girls Adventure Trails in Dallas, Texas, is unique in that it serves young women exclusively. Since its inception as a not-for-profit corporation in 1970 (it is now operated by the YWCA), the program has served over 700 young women.

Girls Adventure Trails

...provides a four week supervised therapeutic camping program together with six months of extensive followup for girls 10-15 years of age, ...referred from the Dallas area by schools, youth agencies, juvenile authorities, mental health professionals, or parents,...and who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent.⁶⁵

The four week camping trip is staffed by a married couple and a single woman. Groups are composed of ten young women of similar age but of diverse backgrounds. Therapeutically the program seeks to achieve group goals, such as the completion of a 200 mile canoe trip, and individual goals, such as the resolution of a personal problem. Groupwork techniques focus on problem resolution: campers are taught how to solve problems as they occur during the camping trip and how to use those same principles in working on problems at home.

Girls Adventure Trails emphasizes parent involvement. Parents and their daughters participate in two intake interviews and an orientation session (lack of parental commitment can exclude a young woman from intake). Parents also participate in three group meetings while their daughters are camping. At the meetings they are shown slides of their daughter's trip, learn the same problem solving skills their daughters are learning, and discuss parenting problems such as communication and discipline. (One volunteer is assigned to five

families for the purposes of maintaining parental participation while their daughters are camping and maintaining contact with families after the camping trip is completed.)

Youth, parents, staff and volunteers meet several times during the three months following the camping trip to discuss the families' progress in integrating the skills learned during the camping period. Additional follow up services provided by staff include, referral to additional resources as needed, a group reunion, and ongoing contact with volunteers. In addition, young women are encouraged to make slide presentations of their trips to their schools.

Program goals and progress toward achieving these goals include the following:

1. Improving the self-concept of each participant.
An evaluation of the first two years of the program reported that about two-thirds of those completing the program gain and retain significant improvements in self-concept. This evaluation was based on analyses of participants' self-reports and the reports of parents, school counselors, and youth workers.
2. Improvement of family functioning. This is currently being assessed by responses to questionnaires completed by parents and participants.
3. Provision of a delinquency prevention/diversion model program. Girls Adventure Trails has provided direct assistance in the establishment

of wilderness programs in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, and Wisconsin.

The program does not evaluate its impact in terms of reducing the numbers of young women referred to the juvenile court. However, referral information indicates that it is being used as an alternative to the juvenile justice system. As of December 31, 1977, Girls Adventure Trails had served 710 young women. Of these, 122 had been referred to the program by police or courts, 30 by a state training school, 191 by social service agencies, 279 by schools, and 88 by other sources.

Girls Adventure Trails is funded by a variety of public and private sources. Cost is approximately \$1,400 per youth for seven months of service provision.

Transitional Living Process: Chicago, Illinois⁶⁶

The Transitional Living Process (TLP) is a not-for-profit child care agency located on the north side of the city of Chicago. Its program is designed to help adolescents acquire the skills needed to become self reliant adults. Both residential and non-residential services are provided. TLP accepts both young men and women.

TLP was conceived and developed by Mike Plecki, Paul Carriere, and Richard Pearlman. Their prior experience serving youth in trouble led them to note that most residential programs for adolescents were either institutions or attempts to create surrogate families. Neither format appeared able to help older adolescents trying to achieve independent status as young adults. On the other hand they

observed that supervised independent living programs--although helpful for some youths--did not appear to provide the stability and structure desired by other youths.⁶⁷ This led the agency's founders to develop a new type of independent living program that could combine residential and non-residential services in ways that could vary the degree of supervision, structure, and supportive services offered. This flexibility enables the program to adjust to its youths' abilities to assume increasing responsibility for themselves over time.⁶⁸

The objective of TLP is to provide adolescents with experiences that will help prepare them for constructive lives as independent adults. The three major focuses of the program are. . .

1. To help adolescents develop management skills necessary to successful independent living (i.e., finding and maintaining an apartment, fiscal management, constructive use of free time, etc.)
2. To develop interpersonal skills and intra-personal skills and intra-personal awareness (i.e., communication skills, self-responsibility, self-appreciation, and respect for others); and
3. To initiate career orientation and develop basic skills training, or involvement in an educational process or career training program

so that program participants can be involved in a desired work or learning situation upon completion of the program.⁶⁹

The backbone of the program is the placement of youth in the homes of trained resident counselors--generally young adults.

The basis for a resident's [youth's] learning and change is the relationship that develops between the resident and resident counselor. Living together and learning to deal with the daily routine of work, school, household chores, and interpersonal relationships will help these young people develop the strength and confidence necessary for independence.⁷⁰

Youth served by TLP are referred by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services⁷¹ and the Illinois Status Offender Service.⁷² Almost all of the 12 young men and 12 young women served by TLP last year had experienced many placements and were alleged or adjudicated as Minors in Need of Supervision and/or delinquent.

Resident counselors are recruited and screened by the agency's executive staff. They then participate in a four week training session and are licensed as foster parents by the program. Once they are licensed, they are assigned to an agency staff member called a Primary Contact Worker.

Primary Contact Workers are responsible for pairing youth and resident counselors. They do this by getting to know the youths referred and the licensed residential counselors and through meetings between each resident counselor and assigned youth once the preliminary assignment of youth to counselor is made. If the youth, the resident counselor, and the Primary Contact Worker agree, the youth

moves into the resident counselor's home. For the first few weeks, the Primary Contact Worker meets frequently with the youth and resident counselor and assists them in planning the youth's daily activities. At the end of this period, the youth, resident counselor, Primary Contact Worker, and the counselor for the referring agency meet to negotiate a service agreement⁷³--a written statement of the responsibilities of the youth and the workers toward achieving the youth's goal of independent living. Typically the agreement includes provisions for attending school and finding jobs, household responsibilities, budgeting, and participation in groups and other activities sponsored by the agency. Provisions are also included for increasing privileges, and decreasing supervision as youth demonstrate their ability to act responsibly.

The Transitional Living Process supports the relationship between the resident and the resident counselor in many ways. The Primary Contact Worker is available to help resolve difficulties that may occur, to help youth receive needed medical or counseling services, and to monitor school and work progress. If the Primary Contact Worker cannot be reached, the agency provides a 24-hour phone and contact system to respond to emergencies. TLP also runs weekly groups for resident counselors and youth. Finally, special resource consultation and referral services are provided by the agency. TLP has a resource "bank" of therapists, doctors, lawyers, and employers. Some of these people will serve youth without charge while others are paid by TLP for their service.

Kaleidoscope, Inc.--Chicago, Illinois⁷⁴

Kaleidoscope is a not-for-profit child welfare agency that has developed several types of residential services for severely disturbed youth. Youth are referred to Kaleidoscope by Illinois' public child welfare agency, the Department of Children and Family Services. Virtually all of the youth served by Kaleidoscope have been adjudicated Minors in Need of Supervision (MINS), delinquent, or both; most have experienced several residential placements. In the Chicago region Kaleidoscope recently was serving 15 young women and 40 young men as well as many of their parents and siblings. Kaleidoscope's programs are described here because they provide an alternative to placing these youths in institutions and because they are able to help youth who have not succeeded in other traditional kinds of residential programs (foster homes or group homes).

Two programs sponsored by Kaleidoscope are described here.

Special Foster Family Care. A primary objective of the Special Foster Care program is to provide:

A residential treatment environment that closely approximates normal family life--Secondary goals focus on adapting to community life in the areas of education, community involvement, and personal self-control.⁷⁵

In this program one or two youths live in the home of two foster parents. The foster parents are trained and licensed by the agency. Kaleidoscope provides formal foster parent training sessions, weekly foster parent meetings, and individual consultation as needed.

Foster parents are relieved two days per week by the agency. They are paid for the services they provide to youth and reimbursed for their expenses incurred in caring for each youth.

Youth attend school or work at jobs during the day. Kaleidoscope operates a small alternative school for those youths unable to attend regular schools in the community. Kaleidoscope assigns a Resident Counselor to each foster home to assist the foster parents by monitoring the youths' performance in school and on their jobs, securing special services when needed, and resolving problems when they arise. The agency also purchases medical and dental care and psychotherapy for youths, when necessary. In addition, Kaleidoscope provides job counseling and participates in the federal Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) by developing jobs and supervising their youths working at them.

The Satellite Program. This program provides an alternative to residential placement of children by providing intensive services to the family. Satellite workers spend an average of 80 hours per month with each family, and they may spend more than 40 hours per week with families during crises. The caseload of Satellite workers averages three families. The goals of the program are to prevent the removal of children from their homes and to help the families find ways to function on their own. Satellite workers provide crisis intervention, homemaking, financial planning, family therapy, and resource referral services. They also teach families to identify and mobilize resources on their own through agencies such as the Department of Public Aid,

community health centers, and public and private employment services. They advocate for families until they can advocate for themselves with landlords, the courts, and social welfare agencies. Kaleidoscope provides additional support to both Satellite workers and families. Some of these supports include staff training and consultation; making available its clinical, medical and special educational resources; and the 24-hour crisis contact system.

Kaleidoscope is staffed by a director, program coordinator, resource coordinator, nurse, and an educational specialist in addition to the counseling staff discussed above. Consulting contracts are maintained with a physician and a psychiatrist. Strong administrative emphasis is placed upon in-service training of staff and foster parents.

As can be seen from this description, the Kaleidoscope model provides the flexibility needed to serve young women responsively and efficiently. It enables each young woman to receive as much (or as little) structure and nurturing as she needs at any given time. The model also offers a solution to the problem of diseconomies of scale. Since placements are for one or two youth, it does not require a large number of similar youth to operate efficiently. The program can serve both young men and young women of varying ages and needs. It can be used in rural and urban areas. Thus, Kaleidoscope's service delivery model is a promising alternative to the use of institutions and group homes for young women in trouble.

Neighborhood Alternative Center-- Sacramento, California⁷⁶

The Neighborhood Alternative Center is an alternative to detaining and processing youth charged with status offenses in the juvenile court of Sacramento County, California. The project, formerly located at the juvenile hall and known as the Sacramento 601 Diversion Project, began operating in 1970 with funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Ford Foundation. It was selected as an Exemplary Project by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in 1974. Additional funding was secured in 1976 to move the project out of the juvenile hall to a new location in the community and to serve more youth. The project was renamed at that time. Evaluations of the Sacramento 601 Diversion Project and of the first year of operation as the Neighborhood Alternative Center have been conducted; readers who are interested in learning more about the project are encouraged to examine them. Both projects and selected findings from their evaluations are described briefly here because they have diverted large numbers of young women charged with status offenses from court processing.

The Neighborhood Alternative Center provides crisis intervention services to the families of youths charged with status offenses. By helping families resolve conflicts that program officials believe lead to youth being referred to court, the project tries to remove the need for further official intervention. The Center provides services 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Crisis intervention

counseling with families is provided by specially trained probation officers with graduate student interns serving as co-therapists. Additional sessions are available on a voluntary basis.

Findings from both evaluations indicate that the project can serve youth at less cost than court processing can. The project also has appeared to be relatively successful in diverting youth charged with status offenses from court processing. Only 6% of the youth participating in the Sacramento 601 project during its evaluation period were placed on informal probation or had petitions filed against them. This compared with 38% of the youth in the comparison group (youth charged with status offenses and not referred to the project). For the purpose of evaluating the project, youth brought to intake were referred to the project four days per week and to traditional court processing the other three days. Only 1.3% of Neighborhood Alternatives Center participants had petitions filed against them. Data on subsequent referral to court within one year was presented in both evaluations. Forty-six percent of those participating in the Sacramento 601 Diversion Project were referred to court at least once again in the year following their participation in the counseling program, compared with 54.2% (285) of the youths in the comparison group. Only 22.9% (80) of Neighborhood Alternatives Center participants were referred to court in the year following their participation in the program.

The juvenile court reported decreases in the numbers of petitions filed, youths per day held in detention, and youths put on probation during the Sacramento 601 Diversion Project's first year. Since the total number of youth referred to court intake were virtually the same for the year preceding, the project probably contributed to the reported declines.

Of the first 675 youths served by the Sacramento 601 Division, 398 or 59 percent were young women. Young women were 54 percent of referrals to the Neighborhood Alternatives Center in its first year. Eighty-Five percent of those referred for running away were young women. Runaways accounted for about one third of referrals to the program. The researchers evaluating the Sacramento 601 Division project examined its impact for young women charged with status offenses. They compared court and detention statistics for the first year of project operation with those of the year preceding the project. Decreases were noted in the numbers of young women 1) receiving formal petitions, 2) held in detention, 3) put on probation, and 4) placed in residential programs. The numbers are presented in Table 9. Since there was only a slight decrease from the preceding year in the number of young women referred to court, the researchers concluded that the project diverted many young women who otherwise would have been formally processed by the court.

PACIFIC--Minneapolis, Minnesota⁷⁷

PACIFIC (Parents and Children Involved Family Intervention Center) is a program which provides an alternative to the detention and adjudication of young women charged with status offenses. The program

Net Change in Girls' Workload
1970 Versus 1970 Project Years

	Pre-Project Year	Project Year	Net Change
Intake	3,497	3,360	- 137
Petitions	953	647	- 306
Detention Days	17,758*	12,903*	-4,855
Supervision Cases	406	323	- 83
Placement Cases	128	92	- 36

* 10 months each year.

Source: Roger Baron and Floyd Feeney, Juvenile Diversion Through Family Counseling
(Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, February, 1976), p. 16

serves residents of Hennepin County (Minneapolis), Minnesota. It is supported by a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to Welcome Community Home, Inc., a private agency operating group homes for youths in trouble.

As an alternative to placement in secure detention, PACIFIC operates a non-secure residence called a Crisis Intervention Center. Girls live there for two weeks during which time both they and their parents receive counseling daily. The girls then return to live with their parents, and the entire family unit attends weekly family therapy sessions at the group home for a period lasting from three to six months. Successful completion of the family therapy program results in diversion of the girls' cases from official processing in juvenile court.

Up to 15 young women are in residence at PACIFIC during each two week period. Weekday mornings they attend school at the Center and receive individual tutoring as needed. They spend afternoons in group counseling sessions, drug use and sex education classes, and recreation. Individual therapy and recreational activities take place after dinner. The young women are encouraged to go home on weekends.

While the young women are in residential treatment, their parents come to the center four nights a week for group counseling. The counseling for both parents and their daughters is described as:

...both therapeutic and didactic....In order to provide a vehicle to therapy, we employ a teaching model which provides considerable food for thought on the one hand, while stimulating some personal examination on the other...this teaching model is applied in both children's and parents' group sessions; it consists of the following: communication skills, fair fight training, awareness of feelings, defense mechanisms, values clarification, movement therapy, lifestyle and family patterns....[The] material can be covered within the two week residency and can serve as a foundation upon which to proceed to family therapy.⁷⁸

After the young women complete the residential program, they and their parents participate in weekly family counseling for three to six months. If needed, the family will also be referred to other agencies such as the Department of Public Aid, the state's employment service, or mental health centers.

In order to ensure that PACIFIC functions as an alternative to detention and to juvenile justice processing, referral to and admission into the program must meet certain criteria. The program

will only consider girls who have been charged with a status offense. Referral sources are limited to agencies of the juvenile justice or social welfare system. Since the Crisis Intervention Center returns young women to their families after two weeks, its success with families relies upon the staff's ability to help the young women and their parents learn and use new communications skills within a brief period of time. Therefore, the program does not accept young women whose parents refuse to participate in the program. In addition, young women with long histories of residential placements resulting from chronic family malfunctioning are also not accepted. PACIFIC refers these young women back to the social welfare or juvenile justice authorities with recommendations for placement in programs providing longer term treatment.

PACIFIC is staffed by a full-time project director, three full-time and one half-time family counselors, four youth counselors, two overnight workers, one secretary, and one cook. In addition, the executive director and administrator of Welcome Community Homes, Inc., provide part-time administrative support to PACIFIC. First year funding of the program is approximately \$180,000.

Proctor Program: New Bedford, Massachusetts⁷⁹

The Proctor Program is a program used as an alternative to placing young women in secure detention in New Bedford, Massachusetts. It is administered by New Bedford Child and Family Services (NBCFS) and funded through a purchase of service agreement with the Massachusetts Division of Youth Services. The program began by

serving young women only in June 1974, and began accepting young men as well in June 1975.

Youth referred to the Proctor Program are placed in the homes of "proctors" who provide 24 hour care and supervision of the youth. Proctors teach youth daily living skills such as meal preparation, personal grooming, and household maintenance. They help youth develop school and work plans, and expose them to a wide variety of cultural and recreational activities. Proctors also help youth secure needed services such as therapy or medical care.

Proctors in 1976 were paid about \$9,600 each per year for 32 child care weeks. They make their own homes available to one youth at a time. The proctors are single adults between the ages of 20 and 30 who live alone and are willing to devote all their time to the youth assigned to them.

The sponsoring agency, NBCFS, provides supportive services to the proctor-youth relationship. NBCFS provides regular, formal training sessions for the proctors and consults with them when needed. NBCFS social workers counsel each youth at least weekly. The agency also works with proctors and youth in developing after-care plans.

The primary purpose of the Proctor program is to insure that youth appear in court at the scheduled-time. In addition, the long-term goal is to help youth improve their relationships with their parents and become more self-sufficient.

During the project's first two years of operation 220 youth were served. Of these, only 17 (7.7 percent) ran away from their proctors.

M.S.S.D. Home Detention: Louisville, Kentucky⁸⁰

The Metropolitan Social Service Department (M.S.S.D.) Home Detention Program in Louisville, Kentucky, provides an alternative to detention through intensive daily supervision of youths residing in their own homes. It is sponsored by the Department and supported with funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The program is described here because it--like other home detention programs around the country--provides a simple and inexpensive alternative to secure detention for many young women.

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

- a) children whose offenses were serious but who have a stable home, and
- b) those whose offenses were less serious but whose home was questionably adequate

These youths were assigned to the Home Detention Program by a Juvenile Court Judge, usually at arraignment or detention hearing. The child was then released to his own home. Intensive supervision was provided by one of four Home Detention workers. Each worker had a maximum caseload of five children.⁸¹

Through daily contact or visits with their youth, caseworkers attempt to insure that youth appear in court at their scheduled times and that they commit no further offenses during the detention period.

Results of an evaluation of the project's first 18 months of operation showed that the average daily population of the Detention Center declined during the Home Detention program's operation.

Average cost of Home Detention was \$9.05 per youth per day compared with \$35.76 per youth per day at the Detention Center. Seventy-one of the 326 youth served during the 18 month period were young women.

Young women served in the Home Detention program were, as a group, charged with less serious offenses than the young men served by the program. The young women were generally charged with status offenses (69 percent compared with 14.1 percent of the young men) and had no record of prior offenses charged (32.4 percent with no prior record compared with 12.2 percent of the young men). Only 4.2 percent of the young women had been charged previously with at least one major offense while 71.4 percent of the young men had such a prior charge.

"Females had a lower rate than males of committing a new offense during Home Detention. [5.6 percent compared with 17.6 percent of the young men]. However, females were returned to detention either on bench warrants or by the worker at a higher rate than males" [29.6 percent compares with 14.1 percent of the young men].⁸²

The evaluators did not attempt to explain these differences. Nevertheless, the success of the MSSD Home Detention program in providing an alternative to the secure detention of young women charged with status offenses is particularly encouraging. Nearly 65 percent of all young women accepted into the program completed it without being returned to the secure facility.

Statewide Programs

The final two programs are examples of efforts of two state corrections agencies to provide alternatives to incarceration of youth in training schools. They are described here because they have generated a variety of services and because they have developed models for service delivery that appear to be replicable in other jurisdictions.

Girls Service Unit, Massachusetts Division for Youth Services⁸³

In 1975 the Massachusetts Division for Youth Services (DYS)--that state's department for juvenile correction--created a Girl Services Unit to administer a grant from LEAA to develop residential services for young women. It is now the Division's centralized unit for a wide range of administrative and planning responsibilities for services for young women, including the following:

- 1.) On-going needs assessment of all young women in the Division of Youth Services and the development or coordination of resources to meet those needs.
- 2) Administering three secure detention units for young women and a new secure residential treatment program.
- 3.) The monitoring of residential care purchased by the Unit.
- 4.) Developing working relationship between DYS regional offices and between DYS and other state agencies providing services to young women.

- 5.) Educating workers in the DYS regional offices about the special problems of girls and providing training in techniques for working with them.
- 6.) Conducting public education programs about the needs of young women in the juvenile justice system.
- 7.) Evaluating services to young women in the Division's care.

Since its inception the state has assumed financial responsibility for the Unit; some of the services developed with the initial grant have become the responsibility of other state departments. The position of the Unit's director has been elevated to the status of Assistant Commissioner of DYS. Other staff include a director of secure programs and a director of community programs. Most services administered by the Unit are actually provided through purchase of service contracts or grants to private agencies. An Advisory Board to the Unit provides direction on overall police and programming.

Four kinds of programs administered by the Girls Services Unit are presented here.

Independent Living Programs. The Girls Services Unit purchases two independent living programs, one sponsored by the Boston YWCA and the other by Sojourn, Inc., a private non-profit agency in western Massachusetts. Young women in the YWCA program live in rooms at the Y. YWCA staff are available on a 24-hour basis. In addition, young women referred to DYS are assigned caseworkers who help them make

plans for attending school, working, and using leisure time and who are available for regular counseling. Most young women also participate in high school equivalency programs, job training workshops, and additional counseling at the YWCA. Young women in the Sojourn program live in pairs in apartments. Like the young women in the Y program, the participants in Sojourn's Independent Living Program have carefully planned schedules for attending school, working, and using leisure time. Life-management skills and high school equivalency education are two main activities emphasized by Sojourn. The average expected length of stay for young women in both programs is about 18 months. Neither program has been in operation long enough to conduct a formal evaluation. For their second year of operation, both programs have requested additional funds for family counseling and for purchase of educational and vocational services. In addition, the YWCA program would like to develop the capacity to work with young mothers and their babies.

Intensive Foster Care. Northeast Family Institute (NFI), a private, not-for-profit social welfare agency, provides intensive foster family care for young women from DYS. It is considered intensive because it combines the careful selection and training of foster parents with a wide range of individualized services to young women. Educational, vocational, medical, and counseling services are either purchased in the community or provided by the agency. For example, last year four young women were referred to alternative schools in the community while two others were referred to a vocational training

program sponsored by the agency. NFI staff provide group therapy for the young women and family counseling for them and their parents. NFI staff also provide services to the foster parents: initial orientation, bi-weekly training sessions, and any other assistance they request.

This year the agency plans to add a group home called a "back up house" to its intensive foster care program. This group home would house up to six young women who are not yet ready for the close relationships and freedoms of foster home living or who have been living in a foster home but are experiencing difficulties there. As proposed the back up house would be heavily staffed with both youth supervisors and professional specialists in treatment. Young women in the group home would have highly structured school, work, and leisure time activity schedules. Group home staff would work closely with other NFI foster care staff, other agency treatment specialists, and parents.

Cameron House. Cameron House is operated by Key, a private social service agency in Cambridge, Massachusetts. It provides a continuum of care for young women considered to be severely emotionally disturbed. Many of the youth served by this program are characterized as being severely depressed and/or suicidal, and have run away from other programs repeatedly.

The continuum of care provided by Cameron House begins with residence in a secure group home (capacity of five). They are assigned to "Trackers," adult women trained to work on a 24-hour

basis with only two young women at a time. The aim of their work is to help the young women in the program develop the social skills needed to live independently in their own homes. They move out of Cameron House and into a less structured setting when they are ready. Less structured settings include their own homes, non-secure group homes, foster homes and the "Tracker's" own homes. Each young woman can move through the continuum of care in any sequence and at her own pace. "Trackers" continue to remain in close contact with young women until they no longer require the special relationship and the supervision it provides.

CHINS Advocacy Center. The Massachusetts juvenile code refers to juveniles apprehended for non-criminal misbehavior as Children In Need of Services (CHINS). The Advocacy Center was established by the Girls Services Unit of DYS as an alternative to secure detention for young women so classified. The Center provides short-term family counseling which includes crisis resolution and follow-up. Average length of intervention is ten weeks. The Center served about 60 young women in 1977. While this intervention enables most young women to stay at home, the Center has a network of foster homes for those who need short term removal from their homes.

Two additional residential programs for young women referred to DYS are being planned. The Girls Services Unit is working with the Department of Mental Health to establish in-patient adolescent units. The Unit is also planning a co-educational group home.

The Girls Services Unit is beginning to examine the availability and effectiveness of non-residential services for young women in DYS. Staff have begun to compile a resource directory of non-residential services. They are also conducting a needs assessment to identify service gaps and to determine to what extent existing services can be purchased or obtained free of charge for young women referred to DYS, and to what extent DYS needs to develop new services.

As the Assistant Commissioner herself acknowledges, the long term effectiveness of the Girls Service Unit will be evidenced by its ability to put itself out of existence through effective education and training of regional staff and through the absorption of the residential programs into the regional administrative structure of the Division.

Unified Delinquency Intervention Services--Chicago, Illinois⁸⁴

Unified Delinquency Intervention Services (UDIS) is a program providing dispositional alternatives to incarceration. It is administered by the Illinois Department of Corrections and supported by state funds and a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The program was designed and initiated by Mr. Paul DeMuro who had previously participated in the development of community based alternatives to training schools in Massachusetts. The program is described here because of the purchase of service procedures it developed and used to establish community based alternatives to the incarceration of adjudicated delinquents in Illinois.

UDIS was not designed specifically for young women; it was designed to reduce commitments to juvenile correctional institutions. The program's performance in providing alternatives to incarceration has been the subject of a recent evaluation.⁸⁵ (The findings of that evaluation are not discussed here since the emphasis in this report is on program models that might be suitable for use with juvenile female offenders.) The UDIS program accepts young women who otherwise could be committed to a correctional institution. The description which follows focuses on those features of the program's design which enable it to arrange services in an individualized manner. The services themselves are provided by agencies in the community. The core staff members of UDIS are called case managers.

When a juvenile is referred to UDIS by the court a case manager meets with each youth, the parents, and a probation officer from the court. Together, they conduct a "needs assessment" to determine what services are needed to provide the care and supervision required. A service plan is developed and reviewed by the court. If approved, the case manager proceeds to arrange the needed services by purchasing them from social agencies in the community.

Some examples of the kinds of services UDIS has been able to provide through purchase are:

- 1) Secure residential care for youths who pose a threat to themselves or the community. This type of care can be purchased from a private psychiatric hospital or from an intensive care unit administered by the Illinois Department of Mental Health.

- 2) Non-secure residential care, including group home placement or intensive foster home placement. Group homes cost about

\$35 per youth per day in 1977. Intensive foster care homes (for no more than two youths per home and with 24 hour supervision) are purchased from agencies which recruit, train, supervise, and support the foster parents. Foster care rates varied from about \$400 to \$800 monthly in the same year.

- 3) Advocacy by paraprofessional workers who provide an average of 15 hours a week of service to youth in their own homes or in addition to residential treatment programs. Service include: individual counseling; monitoring youths' attendance at school, at a job, or at a job training program; providing crisis intervention; and organized group activities. Advocates are purchased from agencies who recruit, train, and support them; cost of the service in 1977 was about \$75 per youth per week.

- 4) Educational and vocational resources including career readiness courses, individual and group tutoring, alternative schools, and a personal grooming course.

- 5) Professional counseling services from individual therapists and agencies providing family treatment.

The types and costs of services delivered by each agency are specified in written service agreements or contracts negotiated between each agency and UDIS. These agreements also specify UDIS's responsibility in paying for and supporting the agencies. The flexibility of the purchase of service procedure allows the case managers to form a "service package" for each youth in the program. Several services can be provided concurrently to a single youth from two or more agencies. The composition of services can be changed

over time--the actual sequence depending on periodic re-assessment of the youth's changing needs for different services.

For example, a youth might first go to a wilderness program. Upon return to the community, he/she receives an advocate, attends an alternative school, and participates in family counseling. One of the advocate's responsibilities is to begin arranging for payment for the alternative school by the state's Department of Education. The family counseling might terminate in about three months while the advocate continues to work with the youth and his/her family one or two months longer to make sure the family group continues to function well. Finally, the services of the advocate will be terminated, and the youth will continue to attend the alternative school paid for by the Department of Education.

The UDIS program's experience with purchasing services as described has revealed some unexpected advantages. Prior to the program's inception some private social service agencies would not accept youth adjudicated delinquent because their parents were unable to pay the required fee for the service. UDIS is able to provide the fee for service and so expand the number of resources available for youth from poor families. Similarly, UDIS is able to provide youths with foster parents and advocates not otherwise available because some private agencies did not have the money to pay them. Using funds made available through the UDIS purchase of service procedures, these agencies have been able to do so.

UDIS also has found that some agencies in the community can work with delinquent youth when supplementary supervision and activities are purchased for the youth. Thus, a group home for dependent and neglected children can accept UDIS youth when advocates and alternative schools are also purchased for them.

Finally, UDIS has found the flexibility of purchase of services to be an asset in service delivery and program management. First, through purchase of services, some youth can use already existing community resources not designed for youth in trouble. Thus, UDIS youth have attended modeling school, basketball camp, and private tutoring centers. Through experiences such as these, UDIS seeks to provide opportunities for its youth to participate in normal activities without being singled out as a problem. Second, purchase of service is one solution to diseconomies of scale. Since services are purchased on a per-youth basis, youths may be served in programs receiving referrals from a number of different agencies; UDIS does not have to develop new programs for UDIS youth only. Third, purchase of services provides an incentive for agencies to be both innovative and responsive in their work with youth. Agencies receive reimbursement only for actual services delivered. Failure to provide the services as stipulated in the purchase of service agreement results in no reimbursement.

Purchase of service agreements are renegotiated annually. This provides agencies with a structured opportunity to incorporate new ideas into their programs. It also enables UDIS to terminate its working agreement with unsatisfactory programs and develop new agreements with new programs.

The purchase of service model developed by UDIS seems adaptable to jurisdictions of any size planning to develop alternatives to juvenile justice processing for young women. Smaller jurisdictions might purchase more services from individuals and fewer from agencies than UDIS does; foster care and advocacy services might be purchased from agencies serving more than one jurisdiction; and existing services might be combined to provide more supervision for a youth than they would if provided separately. The UDIS program began operation in the Chicago metropolitan area and has recently expanded to include jurisdictions in less densely populated areas throughout the state. Readers working in smaller jurisdictions may wish to contact the program directly for information on how the purchase of service model is being applied in these jurisdictions.

Summary and Conclusion

The purposes of this paper were to 1) encourage decision makers in the juvenile justice system to examine the equity and effectiveness of how young women are treated in their jurisdictions, and 2) provide information about some promising programs and models for providing services which have been used as alternatives to either court processing or placement of young women in detention and correctional facilities.

In the first section of the paper available data (aggregated nationally) on juvenile arrests, referrals to court, use of secure detention, and commitments to correctional institutions were examined. That data--even with its limitations--suggested that the cumulative effect of decisions affecting youths involved in the juvenile justice process results in a cumulative bias against young women with consequences that are unfair. The most dramatic of these was the "end result" that of all young women in juvenile correctional institutions on June 30, 1974, 61 percent were incarcerated for status offenses. Only 18 percent of young men were incarcerated for such offenses. The few studies of individual jurisdictions available suggest similar patterns of decision making can occur on that level.

These facts led to a search for information on the existence and use of alternative programs for young women--since it appeared that most young women had been referred to and processed by the "juvenile justice system" for minor violations of criminal law or for status offenses. We found that information on alternative

programs for young women was not readily available. Only a few programs had been described in the published literature, even fewer had been evaluated formally. Most of the information in the brief descriptions of programs above was obtained through mail and telephone inquiries carried out over several months time.⁸⁶

Our examination of data on young women in the juvenile justice process and search for information on alternative programs for young women have led us to the following conclusions.

1. Many local jurisdictions may be unaware of the numbers of young women who are inappropriately processed in their juvenile justice systems. They would probably divert greater numbers of young women from formal processing if they had adequate information--by sex and alleged offense--on the youth in their system.

2. A majority of young women in the juvenile justice system have not been charged with serious offenses. In fact, 61 percent of adjudicated young women in public detention and correctional facilities have not even been charged with criminal offenses. Available data on the processing of young women in specific local jurisdictions confirms this pattern. These data suggest that the numbers of young women in the juvenile justice system could be reduced considerably. Many could simply be removed from the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. Others could be served instead in non-secure community-based programs like those described in the second section of this report.

3. Readily available information about alternative programs and services for young women would be of considerable assistance to local jurisdictions. Individuals working with youth or planning new programs would find the search for information about alternative programs for young women to be both time consuming and frustrating. Such information could be used by those already operating alternative programs and by those planning such programs.

4. The availability of technical assistance on the special problems of developing programs to serve young women would help generate more alternative services. Examples are consultation with those already providing alternative programs for young women, staff training materials, program and fiscal management manuals, descriptive information on various service delivery models, and resource information of special interest to young women (legal, health, employment, etc.). These types of assistance could address many of the frequently cited problems in developing alternative services for young women.

5. Programs like those we have described appear to provide needed services for many young women who otherwise would have been formally processed and incarcerated in the juvenile justice system. Those we have described have demonstrated their feasibility in their own communities.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

FOOTNOTES

1. Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1977, Public Law 95-115, October 3, 1977, Sec. 5.
2. Uniform Crime Reports, 1976, p. 34.
3. Ibid., p. 302.
4. We analyzed official arrest data to examine whether or not crime among juvenile women is increasing relative to crime among other population groups. We remind readers that these data do not necessarily reflect the actual numbers of crimes committed. Changes in the volume of reported crime may also be the result of changes in the ability of law enforcement agencies to detect crime, changes in police policies which lead to the arrest of some persons and the release of others, and changes in the reporting practices of local agencies. For example, the FBI told us that many more agencies provided information on the age and sex of arrested persons in 1975 than in 1960. This enabled the FBI to estimate arrest totals by age and sex more accurately in 1975 than it was able to in 1960. We have examined the Uniform Crime Report data because it is official national data and because it is the basis of most of the trend analyses we have seen. The period 1960 to 1975 is the basis for our analysis because the Uniform Crime Reports present arrest information by the same reporting agencies for these years. Effects on trends in arrests that might result from different jurisdictions reporting in 1975 than in 1960 are therefore eliminated. Not eliminated, however, are effects which may have resulted from changes in reporting procedures within these jurisdictions compared. These data

are further limited by the fact that the offense categories of arson, vandalism, runaway, and curfew were not reported separately in 1960 as they were in later years. They are not listed separately in the comparison of years 1960 and 1975; they were all included in the category other offenses. (Conversation with Walter Crone, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 10/5/78.)

5. See for example, Freda Adler, Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Criminal (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975); Eugene L. Gaier and Randolph E. Sarnacki "Shifts in Delinquent Behavior: 1951-1973," *Juvenile Justice*, 27:3, (August 1976): 15-23; Laura Crites, "Women Offenders: Myth vs. Reality." The Female Offender, Laura Crites, ed. (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1976): 33-44; Rita J. Simon The Contemporary Woman and Crime (Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Mental Health, 1975).

6. Uniform Crime Reports: 1976, p. 302.

7. Stephen Andrukiewicz, "A Survey of Unrecorded Delinquency in a New England Community" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1975), p. 72; John R. Faine, "A Multidimensional Approach to Understanding Varieties of Delinquent Behavior" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1974), pp. 175-176; Joseph G. Weis, "Liberation and Crime: The Intervention of the New Female Criminal," *Crime and Social Justice* (Fall-Winter 1976): 23; Jay R. Williams, and Martin Gold, "From Delinquent Behavior to Official Delinquency," Social Problems 20:2 (Fall 1972): 213, 215; Terrence M. Brungart, "Self-reported Delinquent Behavior: An Analysis of Selected Distribution and Causal Variables" (Ph.D. dissertation, 1973), University of Kansas, pp. 82-84. Patricia Y. Miller, "Gender,

Delinquency, and Social Control," Unpublished manuscript in review, 1977, pp. 9-10. Used with permission of the author; Martin Gold, Delinquent Behavior in an American City (Belmont, California: Brookes-Cole, 1970): 60-66; Peter C. Kratcoski and John E. Kratcoski, "Changing Patterns in the Delinquent Activities of Boys and Girls: A Self-Reported Delinquency Analysis," *Adolescence* 10:37 (Spring 1975): 83-91.

8. Miller, "Gender, Delinquency, and Social Control," p. 9.

9. Patricia Y. Miller, Delinquency and Gender, 1976 (Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, 1976), pp. 35-36: William and Gold, p. 220, found that young men were 85% of those apprehended by the police but for only 70% of self-reported offenses.

10. In comparing self report data with arrest data, Miller, "Gender and Delinquency" pp. 18-22, found that males were arrested at increasingly disproportionate rates as offense severity increased. However, she cautioned that this analysis does not necessarily imply a law enforcement bias based on sex since other variables (unwillingness to victims, parents, agencies to report female crimes were not controlled.

Studies of police decision-making after apprehension show no significant differences based on sex, once intervening variables are controlled. See the following: A.W. McEachern and Riva Bauzer, "Factors Related to Disposition in Juvenile Police Contacts," Juvenile Gangs in Context: Theory, Research, and Action. Malcolm W. Klein and Barbara G. Myerhoff, eds. (Englewood Cliffs, N.Y.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 152; Robert M. Terry, "The Screening of Juvenile Offenders," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 58:2 (June, 1967): 177; Williams and Gold, "From Delinquent Behavior," p. 223.

Finally, one analysis of Philadelphia arrest data found police more likely to arrest young men than young women apprehended for serious offenses, minor assault, and incorrigibility. Young men and young women apprehended for running away were equally like to be arrested. Young women were more likely than young men to be arrested if apprehended for sexual misconduct. Thomas Monahan, "Police Dispositions of Juvenile Offenders: The Problem of Measurement and a Study of Philadelphia Data," Phylon 31:2 (Summer 1970).

11. Martin Gold and David J. Reimer, Changing Patterns of Delinquent Behavior Among Americans 13 to 16 Years Old, 1967-1972 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. Institute for Social Research, 1974).

12. Weis, "Liberation and Crime," pp. 17-27. Miller, "Gender and Delinquency," p. 11.

13. NCJJ

14. U.S. Children's Bureau statistics quoted in U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 56.

15. Hale R. Andrews, Jr. and Andrew Cohn, "Ungovernability: The Unjustifiable Jurisdiction," Yale Law Journal 83 (1974): 1385, note 26.

16. Alan Sussman, "Sex-biased Discrimination and PINS Jurisdiction," Beyond Control: Status Offenders and the Juvenile Court. Lee E. Teitelbaum and Aidan R. Gough, eds. (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1977), p. 179.

17. Source of Referral
by
Sex

	Count Row %	(1) Male	(2) Female	(3) Unknown	Row
(1) Law enforcement		905418 79.1	239266 20.9	52M	1144684 82.9
(2) School department		26947 64.2	15029 35.8	6M	41976 3.0
(3) Social agency		3718 49.6	3780 50.4	4M	7498 0.5
(4) Probation officer		20478 63.8	11609 36.2	9M	32087 2.3
(5) Parents, relatives		27042 46.0	31720 54.0	4M	58762 4.3
(6) Other court		22141 72.4	8442 27.6	5M	30583 2.2
(7) Other source		46297 70.6	19311 29.4	0M	65607 4.8
(8) Unknown		19403M	5435M	10M	24848M
Column Total		1052040 76.2	329156 23.8	90M	1381196 100.0

Daniel D. Smith, Terrence Finnegan, Howard Snyder, and Jacqueline Corbett, "Delinquency 1975: United States Estimates of Cases Processed by Courts with Juvenile Jurisdiction," National Center for Juvenile Justice, August 1979.

18. For Example, A study of Honolulu Juvenile Court intake data found that police were more likely to refer young women to court, than young men who had been arrested for the first time for a status offense. Meda Chesney-Lind, "Judicial Enforcement of the Female Sex Role: The Family Court and the Female Delinquent," Issues in Criminology, 8:2 (Fall, 1973): 55-56.

Goldman found that Allegheny County police referred a larger proportion of arrested females than arrested males to court, but concluded that the sample size was too small to conclude sex-based discrimination. Nathan Goldman, Differential Selection of Juveniles for Court Appearance, (Hackensack, New Jersey: National Council of Crime and Delinquency, 1963), pp. 44-47.

Terry Found no sex-based differences in police decision making in Racine, Wisconsin. He did not separate the arrest decision from the court referral decision.

Robert M. Terry, "The Screening of Juvenile Offenders," p. 177.

Finally, the 1976 Annual Report of the Chicago Police Department shows that young women were 23% of arrests but only 18% of police court referrals.

Chicago Police Department, Youth Division. 1976 Annual Report.

19. Kratcoski found that young women were more likely than young men to be referred to court by their parents in his study of court intake records in an unnamed Midwestern city.

Peter C. Kratcoski, "Differential Treatment of Delinquent Boys and Girls in Juvenile Court," Child Welfare, 53:1 (January 1974): 17-18.

In a study in New Castle County, Delaware, based on court records, Datesman and Scarpitti found that female status offenders were more than twice as likely as male status offenders to enter the system via parental referral to court. Susan K. Datesman and Frank R. Scarpitti, "Female Delinquency and Broken Homes: A Reassessment" Criminology 13:1 (May 1975): 33-56.

Finally, Andrew's and Cohn found that 59 percent of all PINS referrals to New York Family Court in fiscal year 1973 were initiated by parents, and that most were for females (62 percent in their sample from Rockland and New York counties). This would have had a net effect of increasing female court referrals relative to males. Andrews and Cohn, "Ungovernability," p. 1385 (note 21) and p. 1387 (note 26).

20. For example, a study of juvenile court records in Atlanta, Georgia, Seattle, Washington, and Salt Lake City, Utah, in 1971 found that young women accounted for a larger percentage of filings than referrals in Atlanta and Seattle but a smaller percentage in Salt Lake City. Particularly striking were the findings on the processing of status offenders in Atlanta; status offenses accounted for 35 percent of all male court referrals and 65 percent of female petitions filed. Institute for Court Management, "Three Juvenile Courts: A Comparative Study," U. of Denver Law Center, 1972, pp. 313-314 (Mimeographed).

Andrews' and Cohns' study of the FY 73 New York Family Court found that girls were less likely than boys to be adjudicated once referred to court, but more likely if there was a sexual misbehavior charge. Andrew and Cohn, "Ungovernability," p. 1386 (note 38) and p. 1399 (notes 101 and 102).

On the other hand, the South Dakota Judiciary's 1976 report shows that male and female CHINS are equally likely to be diverted prior to adjudication and female delinquents are more likely to be diverted than male delinquents and CHINS. South Dakota Judiciary, Juvenile Referral Statistics, January 1, 1976 thru December 31, 1976, (Mimeographed).

A report from the State of Colorado Statistical Analysis Centers shows that the proportion of females to males given informal probation (a type of preadjudicatory diversion) is smaller than that of arrests and much larger than that of formal dispositions, thus suggesting that females are more likely to be diverted from the system at preadjudicatory points than are males. Juvenile Justice in Colorado: A Statistical Report, (Statistical Analysis Center, Division of Criminal Justice, Dept. of Labor Affairs, 1976), pp. 10, 13-16.

Finally, several studies of court intake decision-making have found no significant association between sex and dispositional severity when variables such as severity of offense, number of prior arrests, age, race, formality of complaint, socio-economic status, family stability, and detention status are held constant. Lawrence Cohen, Delinquency Dispositions: An Empirical Analysis of Processing Decisions in Three Juvenile Courts (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), pp. 40-45.

Richard Kiekebush, "Juvenile Court Intake: Correlates of Dispositioning" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Notre Dame University, 1973), p. 182; Robert M. Terry, "The Screening of Juvenile Offenders," P. 177; Charles W. Thomas and Christopher M. Sieverdes, "Juvenile Court Intake: An Analysis of Discretionary Decision Making" Criminology 12:5 (February 1975): 425-429.

21. National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Services, Children in Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1974 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1977), p. 34.

22. Uniform Crime Reports: 1975, p. 187: Thomas S. Vereb and Terrence A. Finnegan, "Juvenile Court Statistics: 1975" (Pittsburgh: National Center for Juvenile Justice, 1975) Mimeographed, Table 6, p. 11, and Children in Custody, p. 34. The National Center for Juvenile Justice estimates in its report "Delinquency 1975" that young women were 29.6 percent of those detained upon referral to juvenile court in 1975 were young women (p. iv-54, Table D-47).
23. ABA Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, "Women in Detention and Statewide Jail Standards," Clearinghouse Bulletin #7 (March 1974), pp. 3, 7, and 10.
24. Donnell M. Pappenfort and Thomas M. Young, Use of Secure Detention for Juveniles and Alternatives to Its Use (Chicago: National Study of Juvenile Detention, The School of Social Service Administration, The University of Chicago, 1977), p. 62.
25. Pappenfort and Young, Use of Secure Detention, p. 62; Meda Chesney-Lind, "Judicial Paternalism and the Female Status Offender" Crime and Delinquency, 23:2 (April 1977): 124-125; Rosemary C. Sarri, Under Lock and Key: Juveniles in Jails and Detention (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, December 1974), p. 65; ABA Commission, "Women in Detention," pp. 7-8.
26. Robert B. Coates, Alden D. Miller, and Lloyd E. Ohlin, "Juvenile Detention and Its Consequences" (Cambridge: Harvard University Law School Center for Criminal Justice, January 1975) Mimeographed, p. 8: Lawrence Cohen, Preadjudicatory Detention in Three Juvenile Courts (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), pp. 17-18, 23-26: Heleh Sumner, "Locking Them UP," Crime and Delinquency, 17:2 (April 1971), p. 174.

27. Coates, Miller, and Ohlin, "Juvenile Detention," p. 8.
28. Sumner, "Locking Them Up," pp. 175-180.
29. Children in Custody, pp. 38-39, 42, 26.
30. Uniform Crime Reports: 1975, p. 187.
31. Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics: 1977 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977), p. 629. This rate of incarceration of young women also contrasts with estimates on court dispositions by the National Center for Juvenile Justice ("Delinquency 1975," iv-60, Table D-63). Specifically, while the Children in Custody report estimated that 23.6 percent of all adjudicated youth in public detention and correctional facilities were young women, the NCJJ report estimated that only 12.2 percent of all those cases committed to public institutions for delinquent youth in 1975 were females. Daniel D. Smith of the NCJJ offered the following explanations for the disparity: weakness in the methods of data collection, differences between the two reports in definitions of facilities, different units of analysis (NCJJ estimated cases; Children in Custody counted children), the possibility that young women are incarcerated for longer periods than young men, and the possibility that fewer young women were incarcerated in 1975 than in 1974. Further comparison of the two reports is currently not possible, since more recent Children in Custody data is not yet available and NCJJ's earliest estimates on dispositions were for 1975.
32. William H. Barton, "Youth in Correctional Programs," Robert D. Vinter with Theodore M. Newcomb and Rhea Kish, eds. Time Out: A National Study of Juvenile Correctional Programs (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan 1976, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections), p. 23.

33. Female Offender Resource Center, Little Sisters and the Law (Washington, D.C.: Female Offender Resource Center, American Bar Association, 1977), p. 23. The sample consisted of 107 state training schools in 50 states. "To ensure a geographic cross-section of female, male, and coeducational institutions, the largest girls' schools and the largest boys' schools were chosen from each state. In those states where there were no single sex institutions, the survey questionnaire was sent to the largest coeducational institutions. Some states operate a major boys' training school, a major girls' training school, and a major coeducational facility; questionnaires were sent to all three.

Seventy-eight percent (22 female; 30 males; 55 coed) of the institutions surveyed responded. The response rate, however, was much higher for the female (86 percent) and the male (90 percent) institutions than the coeducational (58 percent)." Ibid., p. 15.

It is not possible to know how the sampling and rates of completion of questionnaires may have affected the statistics.

34. For fifteen individual states we are able to present facts with more certainty. The number of persons for whom information on sex and offense was lacking constituted not more than 15 percent of the cases in each of the states listed in Table A below. What we have done is to try to disprove the trends just reported for the nation as a whole. That is, we have treated the cases lacking information as if they were evidence against the patterns apparent in the data.

All such cases have been added in the columns of the table listed here.

<u>Column</u>	<u>Classification</u>
a	Females
b	Female Felons
c	Cases not used
d	Cases not used
e	Male Status Offenders
f	Female Felons
g	Female Status Offenders

The percentage in some of the cells are the minimum and maximum values possible given the data. For example, the adjudicated female offenders in the correctional institutions and detention facilities of Alabama was at least 27.6 percent but cannot exceed 29.9 percent (column k). For Colorado, the percent of females who were felons was at least 11.0 percent but, if all cases with missing information had been female felons, it could have been as large as 37.8 percent (column e). If cases with unknown characteristics are considered to be male status offenders, the percentage of status offenders for Arkansas could have been as small as 68.2, compared with the percentage of 95.5 otherwise reported (column g).

Even with the above corrections that minimize the trends revealed in the incomplete data, we are able to state the following generalizations for fifteen states in 1974.

1. The proportion of all residents of juvenile correctional institutions and detention facilities who are female varies widely from state to state (see column k and Table A). However, in each state, females are in the minority. The range in percentage female is from 8.0 to 46.7. In

two states the percentage was between 10 and 19; in seven, between 20 and 29; and in four other states the percentage female was between 30 and 39.

2. The percentage of females who were felons for each state is smaller than the percent of males who were felons (compare columns l and m). The differences between the two percentages are often substantial. Georgia, Wisconsin, and Hawaii are conspicuous exceptions, but the statistics for each of the three states support the generalization as stated.
3. For each state, the percentage of institutionalized females who were status offenders is larger than the percentage of males who were status offenders (compare columns n and o). The generalization does not apply to Vermont: the percentage of incarcerated males who were status offenders in Vermont (67.5) slightly exceeds that for females 62.9). The differences in Wisconsin, Hawaii, and Alaska are small, but support the generalization.
4. Female felons in custody are in each state a minority among all adjudicated felons in custody (column p). The range is from 1.6 percent (Maine) to 30.1 percent (Hawaii). The percentages applicable to Georgia, Arkansas, and Alaska were 20.0 up to 22.3. All other percentages are smaller than 20.0.

5. With the exceptions of Vermont and Hawaii, the percentage of status offenders who were females exceeds the percentage of females in the correctional institutions and detention facilities of each state (columns n and k). This suggests that status offenders in institutions are disproportionately female.
6. The percentage of status offenders who are female exceeds the percentage male in eight states; in seven the percentage of status offenders who were male was the large of the two.

Thus, five of the above six indicators support an inference that young women who have been adjudicated are placed in correctional and detention facilities in proportions greater than young men, given the official findings against them. It should be noted that generalization number six above is not evidence against the inference.

35. For example, see Meda Chesney-Lind, "Judicial Paternalism," pp. 121-130; Elaine Selo, "The Cottage Dwellers: Boys and Girls in Training Schools," in Crites, ed., The Female Offender, pp. 149-171; Allan Conway and Carol Bogdan, "Sexual Delinquency: The Persistence of a Double Standard," Crime and Delinquency 23:2 (April 1977): 131-135; and Gail Armstrong, "Females under the Law-'Protected' but Unequal," Crime and Delinquency 23:2 (April 1977): 109-120.

36. Conversations with Aletha Turner, Illinois Department of Corrections, 3-2-78 and Earl Huch, Illinois Department of Corrections, 3-28-78; Barbara Landau, "The Adolescent Female Offender: Our Dilemma," Canadian Journal of Criminology and Correction 17:2 (April 1975): 148.

37. The National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections found relatively fewer community-based alternatives to incarceration available for girls than for boys; girls were overrepresented in institutions and underrepresented in day care programs and group homes. See Barton, "Youth in Correctional Programs," pp. 23-24.

Rutherford and McDermott, in their national evaluation of diversion programs, stated: "Data on male and female distribution within divertee populations is inconclusive...Given the greater proportion of incarcerated female status offenders and the apparent tendency for social control agents to perceive female 'waywardness' as more serious than its male counterparts, it would appear that diversion efforts are biased in favor of male clients." Robert McDermott and Andrew Rutherford, "Juvenile Diversion: Final Report" (University of Minnesota Department of Criminal Justice Studies, December 1975), p. 149.

Studies from three jurisdictions also found a lack of community based services for young women.

- a) The female Service Task Force in Michigan noted that "...the number of petitions on females has increased 66 percent in the last ten years,...[but] the level of services has remained about the same with an actual loss of private agency involvement." Female Services Task Force, "Final Report to the Advisory Commission" (Michigan: Office of Juvenile Justice Services, November 23, 1976) mimeographed, p. 18.
- b) Carol Peacock, Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Girls' Services in Massachusetts has stated that, prior to federal funding of programs for young women, Massachusetts spent more

per capita for young women than for young men because lack of community-based resources for young women had resulted in use of expensive detention and psychiatric facilities. Carol Peacock, "Program for Female Juvenile Offenders, Phase II: A Concept Paper" (Massachusetts: Division of Youth Services, August 24, 1977) mimeographed, p. 7.

- c) A survey of private social service agencies in New York City found that 800 male PINS were being served and 373 female PINS. Such a finding may indicate a lack of community based alternatives for young women relative to young men when compared with Andrew's and Cohn's finding that 62 percent of PINS referred to court from New York and Rockland counties were female. See Services to PINS and Adolescents: The Voluntary Agencies Perspective (New York: Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies, 1973), p. 42; Andrews and Cohn, "Ungovernability," p. 1387, (note #26); and Female Offender Resource Center, Little Sisters and the Law, p. 13.

38. For example, the 125 abstracts made available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service through the use of its description category "Juvenile Female Offender" includes 8 programs described as alternatives to incarceration and 3 described as alternatives to court intake or adjudication. Most of the descriptions and evaluations we found served young men almost exclusively. For example, see: Omar R. Buchwalter, "Outreach Detention Program Evaluation" (McLean, Virginia: American Technical Assistance Corporation, May 1973) mimeographed, p. 8; Paul W. Keve and Casimir S. Zantek. "Final Report and Evaluation of the

Table A
Adjudicated Youth in Public Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities, June 30, 1974:

Selected States	Total Youth With Data Available			Data Not Available		Felonies		Status Offenses		
	a M	b F	c M & F	d M & F	e M	f F	g M & F	h M	i F	j M & F
Maine	135	26	161	0	127	2	129	0	8	8
Vermont	40	35	75	0	9	1	10	27	22	50
Alabama	305 (319)	116 (130)	421 (435)	14	182	13 (27)	195 (209)	64 (78)	100	164 (178)
Georgia	922 (1023)	220 (321)	1142 (1243)	101	426	14 (115)	440 (541)	88 (189)	152	240 (341)
Kentucky	311 (312)	88 (89)	399 (400)	1	241	14 (15)	255 (256)	37 (38)	73	110 (111)
Wisconsin	499 (510)	107 (118)	506 (517)	11	329	57 (68)	386 (397)	7 (18)	11	18 (29)
Arkansas	297 (332)	112 (147)	409 (444)	35	195	21 (56)	216 (251)	5 (40)	86	91 (126)
Oklahoma	245 (247)	123 (125)	368 (370)	2	170	33 (35)	203 (205)	75 (77)	90	165 (167)
Colorado	326 (373)	109 (156)	435 (482)	47	246	12 (59)	250 (305)	54 (101)	93	147 (194)
Montana	165	56	221	0	105	6	121	29	31	60
South Dakota	80	12	92	0	54	2	56	11	7	18
Hawaii	64 (75)	20 (31)	84 (95)	11	58	14 (25)	72 (83)	6 (17)	6	12 (23)
Nevada	237	93	330	0	136	8	144	39	76	115
Alaska	49	25	74	0	32	8	40	4	4	8
New Mexico	230	20	250	34	112	-	112	66	20	86

Adjudicated Youth in Public Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities, June 30, 1974; cont.....

Selected States	Percent Female (b ÷ c)	Percent of Females who are felons (f ÷ b)	Percent of Males who are felons (e ÷ a)	Percent of Females who are Status Off. (i ÷ b)	Percent of Males who are Status Off. (h ÷ a)	Percent of Felons who are female (f ÷ g)	Percent of Status who are female (i ÷ j)
Maine	16.1	7.7	94.1	30.8	0	1.6	100.0
Vermont	46.7	2.9	22.5	62.9	67.5	10.-	44.0
Alabama	27.6 (29.9)	11.2 (20.8)	59.7	86.2	21.0 (24.5)	6.7 (12.9)	61.0 (56.2)
Georgia	19.3 (25.8)	6.4 (35.8)	46.2	69.1	9.5 (18.5)	3.2 (21.3)	63.3 (44.6)
Kentucky	22.1 (22.2)	15.9 (16.8)	77.5	82.9	11.9 (12.2)	5.5 (5.9)	66.4 (65.8)
Wisconsin	21.1 (22.8)	53.3 (57.6)	65.9	10.3	1.4 (3.5)	14.8 (17.1)	61.1 (37.9)
Arkansas	27.4 (33.1)	18.8 (38.1)	65.7	76.8	1.7 (12.0)	9.7 (22.3)	94.5 (68.2)
Oklahoma	33.4 (33.8)	26.8 (28.0)	69.4	73.2	30.6 (31.2)	16.3 (17.1)	54.5 (53.9)
Colorado	25.1 (32.4)	11.0 (37.8)	75.5	85.3	16.6 (27.1)	4.6 (19.3)	63.3 (47.9)
Montana	25.3	10.7	63.6	55.4	17.6	5.0	51.7
South Dakota	13.0	16.7	67.5	58.3	13.8	3.6	38.9
Hawaii	23.8 (32.6)	70.0 (80.6)	90.6	30.0	9.4 (22.7)	19.4 (30.1)	50.0 (26.1)
Nevada	28.2	8.6	57.4	81.7	16.5	5.6	66.1
Alaska	33.8	32.0	65.3	16.0	8.2	20.0	50.0
New Mexico	8.0	0	53.0	100	26.9	0	23.3

Source: Children in Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1974.
(Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1977), 48-53.

Home Detention Program St. Louis, Missouri, September 30, 1971-July 1, 1972" (McLean, Virginia: Research Analysis Corporation, 1972) mimeographed, p. 8; Carl Holliday Blew, Daniel McGillis, Gerald Bryant Project New Pride: An Exemplary Project (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974); and "The Philadelphia Neighborhood Youth Resources Center: An Exemplary Project," described in A Compendium of Selected Criminal Justice Programs (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975).

39. See notes 35 and 36.

40. For example, the evaluations cited above do not discuss or explain the small numbers of young women served. Two recent national evaluations of alternative programs, the Rutherford and McDermott diversion study cited above and a study of Youth Service Bureaus [Arnold Schucter and Dr. Kenneth Polk, "Summary Report: Phase I Assessment of Youth Service Bureaus" (Youth Service Bureau Research Group, Boston University, March 1975) mimeographed] were unable to analyze the use of alternative programs for young women because of a lack of data, except to say that such programs were serving young men primarily (Rutherford and McDermott, p. 149; Schucler and Polk, p. 88).

41. Two indications of this are the following: "United Ways give \$4.00 to boys' organizations for every \$1.00 for girls" (Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs described in the article "Filer Commission Report," Executive Bulletin, National Board of the YWCA, 1:3 (December 1975), p. 4.

The LEAA Task Force on Women reported that only 5 percent of LEAA justice discretionary grants and 6 percent of all block grants for juvenile

programs from 1969 to 1975 were specifically for young women. The report did not analyze grants which served both young men and women. The Report of the LEAA Task Force on Women: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration October 1, 1975 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), p. 10. Further analyses of corporate, foundation, and United Way giving to programs serving young women are found in the following reports: "Fact sheet," Financial Development, October 1977. Camp Fire Girls, Inc., 4601 Madison Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri, 64112. "Social Concerns Information Memo," Vol. IV, No. 4, November 28, 1978 and Vol. III, No. 2, December 21, 1977. Girls Clubs of America, Suite 405, 1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20009. "Survey of Ten Community Foundations Discretionary Funding," Part I, May 1979, Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy, 866 U.N. Plaza, Suite 435, New York, N.Y. 10015. All of these reports provide information supporting the argument that community based services for young women have received insufficient funding support.

42. For example, see Keve and Zantek, "St. Louis Home Detention." Blew, McGillis, and Bryant, Project New Pride.

43. For example, see Peacock, "Programs for Female Juvenile Offenders." Female Offender Resource Center, Little Sisters and the Law, pp. 12, 13.

44. For example, see the Report of LEAA Task Force on Women, pp. 8-9; and Selo, "The Cottage Dwellers," pp. 151-159.

45. See the following for examples: Lee Blenkush, "A Successful Program Failure," (mimeograph available from the author who is executive director of PORT of Olmstead County, Inc., 2112 East Center Street, Rochester, Minnesota, 55901); Orange County Probation Department Research

Division, "Detention Control: An Evaluation of the First 180 Days of Program Operation," September 1975; and "Detention Control Unit: Program Highlights and Proposed Modifications," September 1975 (mimeographs available from the Orange County Probation Department, P.O. Box 10260, Santa Ana, California 92711). Thomas M. Young and Donnell M. Pappenfort Secure Detention and Alternatives to Its Use (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 1977), p. 4. Illinois Department of Children and Family Services Court Liaison Unit, Ms. Agnes Piszczak, Director (1100 South Hamilton, Chicago, Illinois, 60612, 738-8470).

46. National Youthworker Education Project, Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 325 Haecker Hall 1364 Eckles Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55108, 612-376-1557 or 7624, Dr. Ruth Teeter, Project Coordinator

Sources:

National Youthworker Education Project. "Report to the Lilly Endowment, Inc., 1975-1977" (University of Minnesota Center for Research and Development, January 1978), mimeographed.

Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, Annual Report 1976-1977.

Brochure: National Youthworker Education Project: Phase II National Youthworker Education Project, Issues and Answers in Youthwork (University of Minnesota, Center for Youth Development and Research) mimeographed; and Creative Youthwork (University of Minnesota Center for Youth Development and Research, May 1976).

47. Issues and Answers in Youthwork, p. 3.

Program descriptions, job placement, procedures and sites, and intake criteria used by the program are available in mimeographed form through Ms. Ware.

56. Girls Coalition, 174 W. Allegheny Avenue, 3rd Floor, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19133, (214) 423-1218, Deborah Tomblyn, Project Director

Sources:

"Girls Coalition Proposal for LEAA Funds," Grant Application, June 23, 1977, mimeographed.

Press releases written by Gail Viale, Girls Coalition, mimeographed.

Telephone interviews with Gail Viale, Girls Coalition, 2-13-78 and 5-8-78.

57. New Directions for Young Women, 346 South Schott, Tucson, Arizona 85701, (602) 623-3677, Carol Zimmerman, Executive Director.

Sources:

Correspondence with Carol Zimmerman, November 10, 1977, February 14, 1978, and March 16, 1978.

Brochure: New Directions for Young Women.

Mimeo.- "New Directions for Young Women: Programs, 1977-1978"

Graphs: "Assertiveness Training" group outline

"Our Bodies, Ourselves," group outline

Monthly reports: October 1977; December 1977 and January 1978.

Debby Rosenberg and Carol Zimmerman, Are My Dreams too Much to Ask For (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977); Carol Zimmerman, "Concept Paper: Female Advocacy," mimeographed.

Telephone interview with Carol Blackman, 5-1-78.

48. Ibid., pp. 9 and 10.

49. Interview with Jean Cogburn, National 4-H Council (150 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606) March 30, 1978.

50. Follow-up telephone interviews with National Youthworker Education Project participants or their agencies during the weeks of April 3 and April 10, 1978.

51. "Report to the Lilly Endowment, Inc.," p. 67.

52. Ibid., pp. 66-67.

53. YWCA Intervention Programs. The authors give special thanks to Ms. Margaret D. Wood of Research in Actions for correcting misinformation from an earlier draft of this report. Parts of the description are her improvements verbatim. (Correspondence from March 13, 1979).

Sources: Two reports made available by Dr. Rhetta Arter, President, Research and Action, Inc., 11 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003, (212) 473-2420.

Rhetta M. Arter, New England Intervention Programs: Final Report (New York: Research and Action, Inc., 1977).

Rhetta M. Arter, Texas Intervention Programs. Comprehensive Report and Evaluation (New York: Research and Action, Inc., September 1974

54. Quoted in New England Intervention Programs, p. 36.

55. Career Awareness Programs, 2301 North 45th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68104, (402) 457-4676, Heather Ware, Executive Director

Sources:

Written correspondence with Heather Ware, 12-17-77 and 3-1-78.

Telephone interview with Ms. Ware, 5-10-78.

58. Girls Adventure Trails, 4422 Live Oak, Dallas, Texas, 75204,
(214) 821-4422, Contact: Mary Fleming

Sources:

Mimeographs available from Girls Adventure Trails:

"Program Overview," "Summary of Girls Served to December 31, 1977,"

"YWCA-Girls Adventure Trails Evaluation 1977," "Preliminary Data
on Girls Adventure Trails Evaluation 1977."

Pauline Neff, Better Tomorrows (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government
Printing Office, 1973.

59. Brochure, "Outward Bound" available from Outward Bound, Inc.,
165 Putman Avenue, Greenwich, Conn 06830.

60. Joseph Nold and Mary Wilpers, "Wilderness Training as an
Alternative to Incarceration," in Calvert R. Dodge, ed., A Nation Without
Prisons (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath & Co., 1975), p. 155.

61. See Nold and Wilpers, "Wilderness Training" and Francis J. Kelly,
"Outward Bound and Delinquency: A Ten Year Experience," Outward Bound
in Corrections: A Compilation, Gerald Golins, ed., available from The
Corrections Project, Colorado Outward Bound School, 945 Pennsylvania,
Denver Colorado 80202, pp. 1-12.

62. Kelly, "Outward Bound," p. 11 and Grancis J. Kelly and D. J.
Baer, Outward Bound as an Alternative to Institutionalization for
Adolescent Delinquent Boys (Boston: Fandel Press, 1968).

63. Kelly, "Outward Bound," p. 11.

64. Sources: Ted Wichman, Underway Program, Southern Illinois
University, Carbondale, Illinois, 62901 and William L. Rhode, "New York
State Division for Youth Tests Higher Horizons Program," reprint from

American Journal of Corrections, March-April 1973 in, Outward Bound in Corrections, Golins, ed.

65. "Program Overview," mimeograph available from Girls Adventure Trails, p. 1.

66. Transitional Living Process, 1554 West Devon Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60626, (312) 262-6300, Mike Plecki, Executive Director.

Sources:

Brochure: Transitional Living Process

Mimeographs available from Transitional Living Process: "Program Statement," "So You Want to be a Resident Counselor," and "TLP Service Agreement." Interview with Mike Plecki, February 28, 1978.

67. In Illinois, these programs offer financial assistance and case supervision for older youth who wish to, or have to, live apart from their own families or substitute families. One type of independent living program provides for housing for youth in residential YWCA's. Usually, 24-hour supervision is provided. Another type of independent living program provides subsidies to youth living in their own apartments. While receiving subsidies, youth and caseworkers make and implement plans for youths' self-support.

68. This perspective is supported by the view of adolescence in American society presented by James S. Coleman. Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

69. "TLP Program Statement."

70. "So You Want to be a Resident Counselor."

71. Illinois State Agency mandated to serve dependent and neglected youth, Minors in Need of Supervision, and delinquent youth under the age of 13.

72. Project funded by LEAA and administered by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services to provide alternatives to secure detention for status offenders statewide, and to provide special services for status offenders in the south Chicago and Decatur regions. The project's operating funds are made up from purchase of service contracts with the referring agencies. The agency has also received grants from private foundation for training and recruitment activities.

73. Also called performance contract; a case management document in which youths and caseworkers record their goals and mutual responsibilities for youths' program participation. Generally, service agreements also include agency "ground rules" for youth and target dates for completion of goals and termination from the program.

74. Kaleidoscope, 600 West Jackson Blvd., Suite 507, Chicago, Illinois 60606, (312) 648-1243, Karl Dennis, Executive Director

Sources:

Mimeographs available from Kaleidoscope:

"Program Plan: Alternative Life Style Program" (May 10, 1977);

"Program Plan: Satellite Program" (May 10, 1977; and "Program Plan: Special Foster Family Care" (May 10, 1977). Interviews with Dr. Ed. Boswell, consultant with Kaleidoscope and Karl Dennis, Executive Director, February 22, 1978.

75. "Program Plan: Special Foster Family Care."

76. Information on the Neighborhood Alternative Center is from the following:

Correspondence from Leonard Brown, Chief, Special Services Division, Sacramento County Probation Department, January 5, 1979.

"Neighborhood Alternative Center," mimeo available from the Sacramento County Probation Department, dated October 17, 1977.

"Evaluation Report: Sacramento County Neighborhood Alternative Center," Criminal Justice Research Foundation, mimeo.

All information on the Sacramento 601 Diversion Project presented here is from the following evaluation:

Roger Baron and Floyd Feeney. Juvenile Diversion through Family Counseling (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).

77. PACIFIC, 914 South 6th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55415, (612) 348-6313, Jean Taylor, Program Director

Sources:

PACIFIC brochure, Project narrative, Exhibit A to the application for funding from the Minnesota Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control, 1976.

Telephone interview with Jean Taylor, PACIFIC, February 13, 1978.

PACIFIC closed in November 1978. Jim Just, the executive director of PACIFIC's parent agency, Welcome Home, Inc., cited lack of support of the county department which was responsible for referrals to the program as the reason. He emphasized that the lack of support was because of political--rather than programmatic--reasons. Information about PACIFIC can be obtained from Mr. Just, Welcome Home, 4805 Colfax Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55409, (612) 348-3000.

78. Page 2, Exhibit A.

79. All information presented here is from the following:

John McManus "The Proctor Program for Detention of Delinquent Girls," Child Welfare, 55:5 (May 1976): 345-352; Thomas M. Young and Donnell M.

Pappenfort. Secure Detention, pp. 23-24; National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture. Proctor: Accent on the Individual, Pamphlet No. 13, December 1976, p. 4.

80. George B. Haarman and T. A. Hildenbrand, MSSD: An Evaluation of Home Detention (Louisville, Kentucky: Metropolitan Social Services Department, 1977).

81. Ibid., p. 1.

82. Ibid., p. 23.

83. Girls Service Unit, Massachusetts Department of Youth Services 294 Washington Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108, (617) 727-7224, Carol Peacock, Assistant Commissioner.

Sources:

Carol Peacock, "Program for Female Juvenile Offenders: Phase II, A Concept Paper" (August 24, 1977) mimeograph and "Program for Female Juvenile Offenders: Phase II," December 30, 1977, mimeograph

Telephone interview with Carol Peacock, 2-13-78.

Telephone interview with Arnita Browder, 5-6-78.

Telephone interview with Carol Peacock, 10-24-78.

84. Unified Delinquency Intervention Service, 1020 South Wabash, Chicago, Illinois 60608, (312) 793-3794, Earl Huch, Director.

Sources:

Interviews with Curt Dale, Program Director of UDIS, 3-3-78 and Earl Huch, Director of UDIS, 3-2-78.

85. Charles A. Murray with Douglas Thomson and Cindy B. Israel. USID: Deinstitutionalizing the Chronic Juvenile Offender: Final Report (Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research, September 1977).

86. The descriptions and lists of programs in the Female Offender Resources Center's Little Sisters and the Law were extremely useful in identifying the programs we contacted by mail and by telephone.

Ms. Marie Mildon of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges also provided us with a list of programs for young women. We contacted each program on this list.

APPENDIX I: ADJUDICATED YOUTH IN PUBLIC JUVENILE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES, BY REGION, JUNE 30, 1974

Region	Total Youth	Total Youth With Offense Data Available	Total Youth Offense Data Not Available	Percent Data Not Available
ALL REGIONS	35,914	19,577	16,337	45.5
Region 1	635	291	344	54.2
Region 2	2,143	370	1,773	82.7
Region 3	3,877	1,998	1,869	48.5
Region 4	7,163	3,192	3,971	55.4
Region 5	6,796	3,353	3,443	50.7
Region 6	3,230	2,123	1,107	34.3
Region 7	1,782	801	981	55.1
Region 8	1,230	865	365	29.7
Region 9	7,433	5,576	1,857	25.0
Region 10	1,625	1,008	617	38.0

Source: Children in Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1974 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1977), pp. 48-53.

END