

83806



Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

CHARLES A. LAUER

ACTING ADMINISTRATOR

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

THE OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

MARCH 31, 1982

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

Public Domain/OJJDP

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

NCJRS
MAY 25 1982
ACQUISITIONS

Mr. Chairman, the Office will use this opportunity to provide the Subcommittee with a report on the status of all major program activities.

Formula Grant Program:

Section 223(a)(12) through (15) of the Act contain the major deinstitutionalization, separation, jail removal and monitoring clauses of the Act. The status of state implementation of these clauses follow:

Fifty-one States and Territories currently participate in the JJDP Act. The six States not currently participating are:

Hawaii
Nevada
North Dakota

Oklahoma
South Dakota
Wyoming

December 31st of each year has been established as the date States must submit the annual monitoring report. According to the most recently submitted State monitoring reports, all States participating in the formula grant program have made progress in deinstitutionalizing status offenders. The following 49 States have evidenced, at least, a 75% reduction in the numbers of status offenders and non-offenders held in detention since participation in the Act:

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Dist. of Columbia

Missouri
Montana
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Oregon

NCJRS

MAR 6 1982

ACQUISITIONS

Florida
Georgia
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi

Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin
Puerto Rico
American Samoa
Guam
Trust Territories
Virgin Islands
No. Marianas

Of this list, 24 States have been found to be in full compliance with the status offender deinstitutionalization provision of the Act.

The nationwide baseline data for the number of status offenders and non-offenders held in secure detention and correctional facilities was determined to be 198,795. This figure was calculated from the baseline information provided in the 1979 monitoring reports. With approximately 35,089 being currently held, the number of status offenders and non-offenders held in secure facilities over the past five years has been reduced by 83.4%. This computes to a national ratio of 57.9 status offenders and non-offenders securely held per 100,000 juvenile population under age 18.

The following forty-five States have demonstrated progress in separating juveniles from adults in jails, detention facilities and correctional facilities:

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Dist. of Columbia

Montana
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Oregon

Florida
Georgia
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri

Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Puerto Rico
American Samoa
Guam
Virgin Islands

Of this list, 19 States have demonstrated full compliance with the separation provision of the Act.

In FY 81, the number of juveniles held in regular contact with adults was reduced from 58,08 to 39,041. This is a comparison of those held in regular contact as reported in the State 1979 monitoring report versus the 1980 report. This comparison results in a 32.8% reduction during the past year.

The Congress, in its 1980 reauthorization of the JJDP Act, provided for the removal of all juveniles from adult jails and lock-ups within a five-year timeframe. In addition, however, Congress required that within 18 months of the Act's reauthorization that a report be completed by OJJDP outlining the potential impact of the removal effort. Work is currently underway to collect the information needed to assess the costs and potential ramifications which may result from the removal requirement. Additionally, an analysis will be conducted to determine whether such a requirement would lead to an expansion of the residential capacity of secure detention facilities and secure correctional facilities for juveniles. Current estimates indicate that over 479,000 children are held in 8,833 adult jails and lock-ups each year. This report will be complete and will be sent to this Committee on June 8, 1982.

In addition to providing for projects which have accomplished the above, formula funds were also used to fund a number of other worthwhile projects consistent with the formula grant goal areas. These programs generally relate to serious and violent juvenile offenders, alternatives to the Juvenile Justice System, delinquency prevention, improvement of the Juvenile Justice System, and training of state or local personnel.

As of March 25, the Office has awarded Fiscal Year 1982 formula grant funds to 43 of the participating States. Guidelines for the formula grant program are contained in the December 31, 1981 Federal Register. One open issue related to the Valid Court Order Guidelines. Public Hearings on this guideline were completed last week in accord with Public Announcements contained in the February 9, 1982, Federal Register. A transcript and complete set of written submissions will be shortly available. A final regulation will be issued following our review of all testimony.

Technical Assistance:

The Juvenile Justice Technical Assistance Program is designed to make available the knowledge of juvenile justice and management experts for the successful development and implementation of juvenile delinquency programs. Needs are submitted to the Office from sources nationwide. Regular six-month cycles have been established for the planning and delivery of TA. Each cycle consists of the following: needs assessment, workplan development, delivery, documentation and follow-up (if necessary).

During Fiscal Year 1981, over 700 specific technical assistance requests were responded to by OJJDP Contractors.

Those contractors selected to deliver TA are chosen by competitive process in accordance with Federal laws and regulations governing competitive contracts. Each contractor's

statement of work sets out a specific Office goal in which the contractor concentrates its efforts. Contracts are in place for this activity in Fiscal Year 1982.

Assistance is provided in a number of ways, for example, on-site consultation, workshops, distribution of materials, or telephone assistance. One of the most effective methods of providing valuable information, however, is through the development of resource documents. During FY 81, the following documents were produced for dissemination by the contractors:

Programs for Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders,
Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies: 2nd Edition,
Improving the Quality of Youth Work; Strategy for Delinquency Prevention,
Delinquency Prevention: Selective Organizational Change in the Schools 2nd
Edition,
A Guide for Delinquency Prevention Programming Through Selective Change
in School Organizations,
A Guide for Delinquency Prevention Based on Educational Activities,
Improving the Quality of Youth Work Strategy for Delinquency Prevention
2nd Edition,

Forum on Deinstitutionalization: Selected Reading on Children in Adult
Jails and Lock-ups,
Prohibiting Secure Juvenile Detention: Assessing the Effectiveness of
National Standards Detention Criteria,
An Assessment of the National Incidence of Juvenile Suicide in Adult Jails,
Lock-ups and Juvenile Detention,
Removing Children from Adult Jails: A Guide to Action,
The Unjailing of Juveniles in America/It's Your Move,
National Assessment of Compliance Monitoring Practices for the Juvenile
Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act,
Juvenile Justice Restitution Working Papers (Volumes 1-5),
A Policy and Procedures Manual for the Violent Juvenile Offender Sites
(Draft),
Preliminary Training Manuals for Project New Pride, and
Replication of Project New Pride

Research and Program Development

Pursuant to the provisions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP) is the research, development, and information arm of OJJDP. Its research (including evaluations) is designed to provide the basis for juvenile justice and alternative system program development* and to generate the research data for carrying out the other mandated functions of NIJJDP which include training, curriculum development, standards development, and information dissemination. These services are provided to juvenile justice practitioners at the state and local levels.

Section 243 of the Act authorizes the Institute to conduct and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, to provide for program development and to conduct specific studies in the areas of prevention and treatment. Several provisions added by the 1980 amendments to the Act, suggest a program focus on serious and violent offenders, on juvenile gangs, and on the role of the family in delinquency causation and control.

NIJJDP's research and development process has been designed to follow a logical, evolutionary path. This involves: 1) research leading to problem

*NIJJDP regularly provides the background research for OJJDP Special Emphasis program development.

definition and to the identification of intervention program strategies; 2) program development and implementation; 3) testing and evaluation; and 4) dissemination of program information for state and local application.

The general areas addressed by NIJJDP's recent research and development effort include: 1) delinquent behavior and prevention; 2) the juvenile justice system; and 3) alternative programs. A significant emphasis in each area is on work related to serious and violent offenders.

NIJJDP is only about six years old. Its responsibilities include longitudinal research and program evaluations, each of which often requires three or more years to complete. Thus the Institute's work and accomplishments must be viewed from a developmental perspective; its activities (knowledge development and application) are best characterized as incremental, continuous and cumulative.

The first three to four years were devoted to developing a general picture of juvenile delinquency in the United States. This involved collection and analysis of national self-reported data, victimization data, arrest statistics, juvenile court processing data, and data on the numbers of juveniles in various types of facilities. These efforts established the first reliable national estimates of the magnitude of the delinquency problem and baseline data for monitoring trends in the volume and patterns of delinquency in the United States.

The second major thrust of the first few years was to identify the parameters and significant issues in each of the three major areas: delinquent behavior and prevention, the juvenile justice system, and alternatives to the juvenile justice system. This was accomplished through nationwide assessments of existing research

and programs. The assessments established the state-of-the-art on such topics as prevention, diversion, serious juvenile crime, juvenile court structure and operations, and alternatives to incarceration. They served to organize information and provide direction for more intensive studies of the causes of delinquency, the policies and practices of the juvenile justice system, and the operation and effectiveness of various alternatives to the system.

The knowledge base developed to date is increasingly applied to: program development, testing, and evaluation; standards development; and the training of personnel in juvenile justice.

A part of NIJJDP's research has assessed the extent and nature of delinquency in the United States. This has included national sample studies of self-reported delinquency and drug use;¹ analyses of victimization data;² analyses of official police, court and corrections data;³ cohort and other longitudinal research (local samples) pertaining to the frequency, patterns, and trends of delinquent behavior;⁴ and a national assessment of juvenile gang activity.⁵ Such research has dealt with offender and offense characteristics, with the magnitude of violent and serious juvenile crime as compared to less serious delinquency,^{6, 7} and with the measurement of relationships between juvenile and adult criminal careers.⁸

The direction of overall findings suggests that there has not been a measurable increase in delinquency over the last five years. However, the extent of the delinquency problem must be considered unacceptable, since juvenile arrests make up over forty percent of all arrests for serious offenses. Also, while violent juvenile crime constitutes a relatively small percentage of all juvenile offenses, such crime

poses a substantial threat to public safety and incurs social and economic costs that are proportionately greater than its prevalence in the total crime picture.

Particular studies show that while perhaps as many as 90% of youth under 18 years of age commit an adjudicable offense at one time or another, it is only 5-15% of youth (according to birth cohort samples which include repeat offenders) who are responsible for upwards of 80% of violent or other serious offenses. Much of this serious and violent criminality among juveniles occurs in the context of youth gangs. It is estimated that there are about 2,200 gangs with 96,000 members located in approximately 300 U.S. cities and towns.

Besides studies of the extent of delinquency, NIJJDP research has also addressed the juvenile justice system's processing of juvenile offenders. Results indicate that, in contrast with past increases, there has been a leveling off in the volume of cases handled by juvenile courts, and a marked decrease in the detention and incarceration of status offenders over the last three to five years.⁹ A major NIJJDP concern with regard to justice system processing of offenders has involved dispositions and sanctions imposed on juveniles. Specifically some Institute supported research results question the effectiveness of secure custody for most juvenile offenders, both in terms of the high cost and exalted recidivism associated with incarceration. While violent and dangerous offenders certainly require secure custody, there is indication that even some serious offenders can best be handled in community based programs,¹⁰ which link correctional measures with community reintegration efforts. Other NIJJDP-sponsored research has called into question the efficacy of adult court handling of serious and violent juvenile offenders.¹¹

In connection with the above, a third area of NIJJDP research concentration (including evaluation research) represents a focus on alternative programs to the traditional justice system approaches.¹² Study results show that general diversion programs are no less effective than regular justice system processing.¹³ Moreover, preliminary evaluation results show restitution programs, including payments to the victim and public service by the offender to be successful alternatives to traditional probation or incarceration which allow crime victims to recover an average of 84% of their net loss.

Overall, NIJJDP supported research (particularly an evaluation of the major correctional reform in Massachusetts leading to deinstitutionalization of juvenile offenders) has established the community, not the secure care institution, as the effective environment for delinquency control.¹⁴ Such research stresses the importance of reintegration of juvenile offenders and of the expansion of legitimate opportunities for youth in the community.

NIJJDP's research, in addition to providing the findings summarized above, has led to the development and improvement of prevention, justice system, and alternative programs. Their research approach has included both research and development (R&D) and evaluation.

A specific example of R&D (research utilization in the designing, implementation and testing of program interventions) is represented by NIJJDP's supported work in the area of learning disabilities (LD) and delinquency. This has resulted in a remediation program for LD afflicted children and in program information applicable to agency personnel training in the diagnosis and treatment of LD.

An example of positive evaluation results is found in the field of law related education (LRE). A national evaluation of six NIJJDP supported LRE projects has shown LRE to have a positive effect on youth behavior and the potential for delinquency prevention or reduction among students enrolled in such courses.

The overall weight of NIJJDP's work to date suggests that delinquent behavior can be controlled through a variety of program approaches, when such approaches are designed and implemented based on sound research data and when programs are rigorously tested and refined in accordance with evaluation results.

NIJJDP's Research Plan for Fiscal Year 1982

In FY 1982 NIJJDP will focus research and development work in the serious and violent juvenile offender area. This includes continuation of an already established violent juvenile offender R&D program. Part I of the program is designed to implement and test strategies for the treatment and reintegration of violent offenders. Part II of the program will test promising indigenous community approaches to the prevention of violent and serious delinquency.

NIJJDP will also continue a prevention R&D program which tests specific interventions (shown to hold promise) with families, schools, peers, and employment in the community.

Further, the Institute expects to update the current knowledge with regard to the prevalence and trends of violent/serious delinquency, and to support research on the careers of violent/serious juvenile offenders in order to improve the predictability of such behavior. It is also planned to initiate a new serious and chronic delinquent

R&D program to test and improve the certainty and efficiency of the prosecution of these offenders and to test the effectiveness of punishment and other sanctions applied to them. Public Comment on planned violent offender research efforts was solicited in the March 17, 1982 Federal Register.

In order to complete work in progress, the Institute also plans to continue support for its national evaluations of OJJDP funded demonstration programs such as the Replication of Project New Pride for serious offenders, Alternative Education, Youth Advocacy, Law Related Education and Restitution.

(Footnote references are available on request.)

TRAINING

During FY 1981, the training program was concentrated in three (3) major areas: Law-Related Education (LRE), Judges and Court Personnel and Alternative Juvenile Justice Programs Personnel.

Law-Related Education

FY 1981 marked the end of Phase I of the OJJDP's LRE program. The results of the Phase I national evaluation indicated that LRE programs had been implemented in more than 130 communities; had obtained agreements from 20 law schools for law student assistance in LRE classrooms; had encouraged participation by scores of justice professionals in delivering LRE; had operated 10 geographically dispersed centers to support LRE; had made in-service teacher training for LRE widely available; had conducted four (4) regional conferences; had staffed LRE exhibits at a dozen events sponsored by others; and had presented five workshops on law pertaining to young persons.

During FY 1981, LRE projects conducted over 109 training sessions for more than 3,876 participants. Of this number, 2,662 were teachers, 951 lawyers; 83 judicial personnel; and 70 law students. In addition, 155 awareness sessions were conducted, 56 seminars, conferences, or workshops were conducted and 91 advisory board, planning or other LRE meetings were conducted. LRE was implemented in more than 3,000 classrooms and was institutionalized on over 1,600 classes. Finally, LRE was initiated at 43 new Phi Alpha Delta chapters and two (2) alumni chapters, over 30 new sites were established in FY 1981 and one foreign country

(Canada) participated in a Moot Court at the United Nations, along with one United States high school. A conservative estimate is that LRE impacted more than 279,690 people.

Judges and Court Personnel

FY 1981 was a progressive year for judicial training efforts. This training, conducted by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ), was available to more than eight (8) categories of juvenile justice personnel. A total of 1,835 participants were trained in 24 training sessions. Of this number, 313 judges were trained, 168 attorneys; 352 probation officers; 94 law enforcement personnel; 80 correction personnel; 575 child care workers; 220 educators; and 33 court-related personnel. In addition, 500 copies of a Public Disposition Resource Manual were distributed. Participants from every state, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Samoa, and one foreign country (Scotland) received training by NCJFCJ.

Alternative Juvenile Justice Programs

The NIJJDP's FY 1981 alternative juvenile justice training program was conducted by three (3) alternative projects: Project Read, National Youth Workers Alliance and the Villages. During FY 1981, these projects trained more than 995 participants at 15 training sessions and 13 conferences, seminars or workshops. Of the participants trained, 175 were teachers; 300 students; 515 juvenile justice personnel; 3 judges; and 2 lawyers. The training covered such vital areas as literacy training; group homes; residential treatment;

shelter care, runaway facilities; counseling; diversion; youth employment; program management; youth participation; substance abuse prevention and treatment; advocacy and service coordination. More than 31 states and 63 communities were served.

Summary of Training Activities

FY 1981 ended with more than 6,800 participants being trained at 148 training sessions, 162 awareness sessions and 69 seminars, conferences or workshops. All states, plus 3 territories and 2 foreign countries were served.

Information Dissemination

The Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse operated by Aspen Systems Corporation at the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) performed most of the distribution functions of NIJJDP. As of September 1981 the requests to the Clearinghouse accounted for 18 percent of all reference requests received by NCJRS, for a total of 3,341 requests. Of this total 913 (or 27 percent) were received via the toll free user's telephone number.

The Clearinghouse also provided information support services to 19 conferences, 8 of which were attended by one of the two Juvenile Justice Specialists of the Clearinghouse. Since the award of the contract in July 1979, approximately 289,406 documents have been distributed by the Clearinghouse for the Office. Of these documents 196,350 were NIJJDP documents (or 68 percent). For FY 81, approximately 54,642 documents were distributed and of that total 50,825 (or 93 percent) were NIJJDP documents. In addition to performing distribution functions, the Clearinghouse assisted NIJJDP in the area of printing and publishing new documents. During FY 81, 3 major issue documents, 3 Assessment Center Reports, and 4 Monographs were printed. At the present time, 11 documents are in process to be published and one document will be released in microfiche.

Information Synthesis

The NIJJDP Assessment Center Program generated a total of 16 reports. Nine reports pertained to the area of serious, violent crime. During the course of the publication review process, a total of 21 Assessment Center Reports have been screened by NIJJDP staff. Additionally, 5 Assessment Center reports have been forwarded to NCJRS for publication and to date, 35 Assessment Center Reports have been determined to be inappropriate for broad dissemination but are available through NCJRS on microfiche, interlibrary loan, and/or the NCJRS Reading Room.

A total of 24 applications were received for the Exemplary Projects Program. One application was selected for a screening and one selected for validation. Currently, 5 applications are pending final evaluation.

Information Systems and Data Collection

The Juvenile Information System and Records Access (JISRA) Project is operated by the National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ). During FY 81, a merger of the JISRA system and the Child and Youth Centered Information System (CYCIS) was begun. The merger was a result of the need for cooperation between juvenile justice and child welfare agencies and from all indications will enhance the applicability of the JISRA system both individually or in concert with CYCIS. A newsletter entitled "Projections" was initiated during FY 81 and the first issue was released in June.

System transfers were completed in Middlesex County, New Jersey and Las Vegas, Nevada. Currently, the Las Vegas system is undergoing a test stage. In addition, both the Rhode Island and District of Columbia systems were modified and a conceptual design for the "Post-Dispositional Module" for the JISRA system was developed. There were a total of 3 feasibility studies performed, an additional 3 feasibility studies were negotiated and scheduled, and two system demonstrations performed for Cook County and San Bernardino County. The NCJFCJ also planned the "National Symposium for Juvenile Justice Information Systems" which was held from November 1-4, 1981.

The National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System (NUJJRS) Project is operated by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ). The Center produced a total of 6 documents of which 4 were in their "final" form at the end of FY 81. NCJJ handled an average of 4 special requests per week. These requests were made by judges, researchers, legislators, the media, and others. Examples of these special requests are the construction of a special data base to study the impact of race in court handling, a special study for the State of Alabama, and the rendering of technical assistance to NCJFCJ. The Center also developed statistical information for the President's Task Force on Violent Crime and for the OJJDP hearings. The Center has also begun work in the areas of "data standardization" and has done some development work in "computer graphics."

Under a grant to the University of Chicago, data collection for the National Surveys of Programs and Agencies Providing Residential and Non-residential Services to Children and Youth with Special Problems began in September 1981.

Approximately 6,000 residential and 2,000 non-residential (out of approximately 10,000 eligible) programs were identified for study. This research is a replication and expansion of a landmark study conducted fifteen years ago and promises to provide the most comprehensive information on programs for youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice, mental health and child welfare systems.

Analysis of the data from the 1977 and 1979 Children in Custody census of public and private juvenile detention and correctional programs was completed by the Census Bureau. The Final Report will be published in the Spring of 1982.

STANDARDS

During FY 1981 the Standards Program concentrated on three major functional areas: standards development and dissemination; program development and planning; and research (legal and social science) related to standards implementation.

Standards Development and Dissemination

FY 81 marked the end of a decade of work related to the development of juvenile justice standards. With the completion of the final revisions of the Institute of Judicial Administration/American Bar Association (IJA/ABA) Juvenile Justice Standards twenty-three volumes of standards and a summary volume of standards will be published.

In all, four major national standards-setting bodies have developed a total of thirty-one volumes dealing with virtually every aspect of the administration of juvenile justice. Recognizing the potential confusion in the field and the

difficulty of working with this amount of material, NIJJDP sought to provide a framework for the review and adoption of standards by developing "A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Justice Standards and the JJDP Act." This analysis concluded that the four sets of standards reflect a substantial agreement with the major policies of the JJDP Act even though particular approaches may vary.

Other efforts to make the standards more readily available were undertaken by the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse through development of bibliographies and information packages. Over the last year, more than 12,000 copies of the standards developed pursuant to Section 247 of the JJDP Act, Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, were distributed nationwide.

In late 1981, NIJJDP sponsored a series of three Symposia on the Judicial, Administrative and Legislative Uses of Juvenile Justice Standards. The symposia, which were attended by approximately 90 judges, court administrators, attorneys, correctional administrators, law enforcement officers and legislators from the six New England States, enabled these policy makers to become familiar with the content and the potential uses of national juvenile justice standards in their jurisdictions. Responses to the symposia were overwhelmingly favorable and many recommended that, among other things, the concept be expanded to other regions of the country. The FY 1982 Standards plan has incorporated those suggestions.

Program Development

In January 1981, uncertainties regarding FY 82 funding resulted in the postponement of plans to establish a National Juvenile Justice Standards Resource

Center (SRC), which would serve as a focal point to inform the process of adoption and implementation of standards at the State and local level. The primary approach will include intensive training of policy makers in several regions throughout the country.

In response to the Attorney General's Report on Violent Crime, The Chronic, Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender Research and Development Program design was drafted to improve the juvenile justice system response to the population.

Special Emphasis Program:

The current status of the Special Emphasis program is such that three major program efforts were to be largely completed with 1982 funds. These were not slated to receive Fiscal Year 1983 funding. These three programs, along with programs completed in prior years, have covered most of the Special Emphasis program categories authorized by Section 224(a) of the Act.

The 1980 Amendments to the Act provide an impetus to programs impacting youth who commit serious and violent crimes. The status of each program area is set out below. The proposed regulation in the March 8, 1982 Federal Register sets out our expectations on completion of existing and proposed efforts.

Violent Juvenile Offender Projects

The Violent Juvenile Offender Program is a two-part program; Part I is a Treatment and Reintegration Program, and Part II is a Prevention of Violent Juvenile Crime.

For both parts, the Office has funded a National Coordinator to survey existing approaches, develop a request for proposals and manage selected contracts. The Part I Cooperative Agreement for \$3,911,411 went to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency on September 30, 1980 (FY 1980). The Part II contract was awarded to the Small Business Administration on September 30, 1980 and to L. Miranda and Associates (an 8-A Firm) on October 6, 1980. The contract was for \$400,000. This contract was supplemented with \$2,500,000 for site awards on September 30, 1981 (FY 1981).

For Part I, approximately 17 sites were visited by OJJDP, NOSR, NCCD and URSA staff in early FY 1981. A guideline and background paper were developed by NCCD and URSA respectively and released on March 13, 1981. Fifteen applications were received. From these nine were selected to submit final applications. A bidder's conference was held in Kansas City, Missouri on June 16, 17, 1981 to clarify program requirements. Final applications were submitted on July 24, 1981 and the final selection of five sites were made and approved in 1981.

These five sites are:

- Phoenix, Arizona
- Denver, Colorado
- Memphis, Tennessee
- Newark, New Jersey
- Boston, Massachusetts

For Part II, thirty-one projects were surveyed by L. Miranda and Associates and URSA Institute staff from October 1980 through January 1981. A request for proposals and background paper have been developed and approved. It is anticipated that eight projects will be funded by mid-summer.

Youth Advocacy Projects

From April through September 1980, 22 Youth Advocacy grants were awarded throughout the United States. Grants totaled \$13,945,936.00.

The Youth Advocacy grantees are located in 18 states, including the southeast, midwest, and western part of the United States. The grantees have focused on making statutes, regulations, policies and practices of the juvenile justice system, the education system, and the social services system more supportive of the needs of youth and their families, and more accountable in expenditure of public and private funds allocated for youth services.

The grantees represent many different types of organizations including the North Carolina Governor's Advocacy Council on Children and Youth which operates under the auspices of the Governor's Office; the Parent's Union for Public Schools in Philadelphia, an independent citywide parents organization; and, the Wisconsin Youth Policy and Law Center, a statewide private, non-profit organization. In accordance with program guideline requirements, all grantees provided letters demonstrating civic and community support for their Youth Advocacy grants.

The 22 Youth Advocacy projects specified 1,338 activities to be implemented in pursuit of their sub-objectives. Some of their educational activities include newsletters, conferences, educational materials and training. Statute revision activities include drafting legislation, monitoring the legislature, and, at the request of legislators, providing expert testimony at committee hearings. Administrative negotiations are being conducted with judges, social service system administrators and school personnel.

The grant period for this program is three years with awards made in increments of 24 months and 12 months. All 22 grantees are currently in their second grant year. They are eligible to receive third year funding during April through September of FY 1982. Third year continuation awards are contingent upon satisfactory grantee performance in achieving stated objectives in the previous program year(s), availability of funds and compliance with the terms and conditions of the grants.

The OJJDP monitoring and the evaluation data from the American Institute for Research, indicate that the advocacy grantees have succeeded in starting most of the activities called for by their project.

Alternative Education Projects

The major objective of the Alternative Education Program is to prevent juvenile delinquency through the development and implementation of projects designed to keep students in schools, prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions, and reduce dropout, pushout and truancy rates.

This program was funded in late 1980. A total of \$11,544,357 has been allocated to 18 projects located in ten states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The 18th project was funded in September 1981. Seventeen of the projects funded have now been in operation for a year and are now in their second year of operation. This includes 94 sites which are mostly school based. Programmatically, most of the projects met their goals and objectives in a satisfactory manner during their first year of operation and have gotten off to a good start in the second

year. It is anticipated that all of the Alternative Education projects will apply for third year funding from OJJDP and that 10 will probably meet performance criteria at a sufficiently high level to be funded.

Additional facts of interest on these projects are as follows:

An estimated 10,000 students have successfully participated in various project related activities.

Eighty-five percent of the projects have initiated some level of systems change within the structures they are working with which are for the most part public school systems. These changes range from simply getting students, parents, teachers, and school officials talking and recognizing each other for the first time to an entire school district adopting an alternative technique to expulsions and suspensions and making these techniques school district policy.

At least 1,000 teachers and school officials have received training in techniques that will help them to better serve targeted students.

POLARIS Research and Development was awarded a contract in August 1981 to provide technical assistance to the Alternative Education projects.

Johns Hopkins University, in conjunction with the Social Action Research Center, is conducting an independent evaluation of the Alternative Education Program.

New Pride Projects

The New Pride projects moved into their second year of operation during FY 1981. Three of the ten projects experienced major problems and were terminated during FY 1981: AYUDATE, East Los Angeles; Boston, Massachusetts; Washington, D.C.

The other seven projects were on target and accomplished the following:

As of November 30, 1981, New Pride Projects had served 661 youth. A preliminary report by PIRE indicates the projects are meeting target population requirements. "The average New Pride client has 7.8 prior offenses, 4.6 of them sustained by the time of admission to the project." Other important preliminary findings by PIRE include the following:

- a) The average monthly percentage of clients committing offenses dropped 2.5 times after admission to New Pride, and the average number of offenses per month dropped 3.7 times. For counts sustained these decreases were 3.3 times and 5 times, respectively.
- b) The average percent of unexcused absences from school dropped from 58 percent before the program to 36 percent during the program, or by more than a third.
- c) Two-thirds of the New Pride clients had totally dropped out of schools by the time they entered the program.

d) With 72 clients post-tested on the Key Math, the average gain for White clients was 5.46 points, for Black clients it was 12.5 points, and for Hispanic clients it was 12.6 points. All gain score differences were highly significant statistically from pre-tests to post-tests.

All program components are in place, however, there is a need to strengthen the employment and volunteer components of many of the projects during the Third-Year. Many of the projects have begun small business ventures. For example, New Jersey has begun a food preparation and take out service, Florida has established a lawn service, and Kansas City prepares and builds soccer fields and goals. Third and final year awards have been made to all but one of the grantees from Fiscal Year 1982 funds.

Juvenile Restitution Projects

Thirty-six Restitution Projects received third-year funding and operated during FY 1981.

Of these thirty-six, eleven ended their Federal funding period as of October 30, 1981 and five more will terminate as of December 31, 1981. Of the projects for which Federal funding ceased, eleven have been picked up by local funding sources. It is expected that approximately sixty percent of the projects will be picked up by local funding.

The Restitution Program accomplishments for the first two years are as follows:

The number of youth referred for two years of project operation is 17,300.

The offenses which resulted in these referrals involved more than 18,390 victims and \$9.5 million in losses.

Judges ordered 2.5 million in monetary payments, 355,000 hours of community service and 6,052 victim service hours.

Based on data from more than 15,427 closed cases (89% of all referrals), juveniles ordered to make monetary restitution paid \$1,532,966, worked 259,092 community service hours, and performed more than 4,060 hours of community service.

Seventy-seven percent of the youth referred are successfully completing their original or adjusted Restitution orders. This successful completion rate goes to 86 percent, if project ineligibles are removed from consideration.

Eighty-three percent of the referrals have had no subsequent contact with the juvenile court after the offense that resulted in a referral to the project and prior to their case closure.

The data provided here is through two years of project operation for the original 41 projects. (36 projects continued into the third year). The data base was closed at this date because of reduced funds for the evaluation and because of the need to begin data analysis with a set data base. MIS forms are still being collected, however, they are not being coded or entered into the computer.

Capacity Building Projects

During Fiscal Year 1981, fifteen grants were awarded to youth serving agencies under The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency Through Capacity Building Program. A total of \$6,701,196 was awarded to fifteen grantees selected from a field of five hundred-forty applicants. The grants are supporting activities which will increase the capacity of state and local governments, public and private youth-serving agencies, and indigenous neighborhood organizations or community groups, to prevent delinquency, develop and utilize alternatives to the juvenile justice system, and improve the administration of juvenile justice.

Twelve of the Capacity Building projects are providing direct services to youths, while three projects are focusing on improving the juvenile justice system through youth advocacy activities. The grants were awarded for two years and it was projected that 12,000 youths would receive a variety of services under these highly individualized projects. Examples of the types of services offered include: tutoring, alternative education, peer counseling, job training and placement, recreation and crisis intervention. At the close of the 1981 Fiscal Year, over 11,000 youths had participated in the fifteen projects; nearly twice the number originally projected.

The Capacity Building awards were staggered between October 1980 and January 1981. Overall, the individual grants are meeting their stated objectives within the appointed timeframes. The projects are now beginning their second year of operation and it is anticipated that the stated goals and objectives will be attained during the approved project periods. No funds are projected beyond the original awards.

Coordinating Council

The Coordinating Council has, as statutorily required, been meeting on a quarterly basis. At the December 1981 meeting, the Council voted to hold public hearings on the adoption of its 1982-1984 Program Plan. An announcement of the public hearings were published in the Federal Register of February 9, 1982, and the hearings were held on March 15 and 16 in Washington, D.C. and March 22 and 23 in Denver. Approximately 60 persons testified at the two hearings. A summary of the testimony provided as well as its analysis will be forwarded to you for your perusal.

In addition to the hearings, the Council is engaged in activities involving the Native American Youth, the detention of youth by other Federal agencies, and development of the Sixth Analysis and Evaluation. In addition, the Office in conjunction with the Council has entered into an Interagency Agreement with the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) to hold two forums with state and local officials on how the Federal government can reduce barriers and streamline regulations pertaining to youth programming. The Office as part of its Concentration of Federal Effort mandate has, in conjunction with the Department of Labor, just completed funding of 14 projects under the Model Comprehensive Programs for High Risk Youth. These projects are designed to show that barriers to effective comprehensive programming can be reduced and eliminated and there does not need to be a total reliance on Federal funds to develop programs for high risk youth.

The Council is scheduled to meet again in May. At that time an assessment of the testimony presented at the hearings will be provided and an agenda for the next couple of years adopted.

That concludes my report on the status of the OJJDP program, Mr. Chairman.

I will be pleased to respond to any questions you or members of the Subcommittee may have.

END