



SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, LIMITED

• MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN 53211 •

A NONPROFIT SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION CORPORATION

86000

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/Nat'l Inst. of
Juvenile Justice & Delinquency
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

NCJRS

OCT 12 1982

ACQUISITIONS

RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE DETENTION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nicholas F. Dussault
Richard D. Knudten
Lee H. Bowker
Mary S. Knudten
Wallace J. Gingerich
David R. Buchkholdt

November, 1979

A Publication of the
Socio-Environmental Research Center, Limited
Suite 310, 1200 E. Capitol Drive
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Prepared under Grant Number 78-JN-AX-0021 from the National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. 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 U.S. Department of Justice.

PREFACE

Over the past months the Socio-Environmental Research Center, Limited has had the opportunity to examine many of the management issues relating to residential alternatives to juvenile detention. This Executive Summary is a condensation of such issues and responses. As a work it touches on the theoretical and the practical, the organizational and the managerial. It probes the alternative residential forms in order to assist individuals, groups, associations, communities, or states in developing alternatives to long-term institutionalization of juveniles.

Sixteen existing projects, which will remain unidentified, were visited by SERCL members who met as appropriate with executive or project directors, directors of finance or bookkeepers, board members, treatment staff, consultants or other staffers to gain insight into their special problems and their experienced responses. RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE DETENTION: AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY is a reduction of their wisdom as seen through the eyes of the Socio-Environmental Research Center, Ltd., of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. What follows then is a condensed examination of issues and a discussion of practical solutions to management concerns. As a shortened version of this knowledge, the reader is urged to examine the full report to use available sample documents relating to by-laws, personnel policies, and a wide range of other helpful information.

Now that the task has come to an end, many persons should be recognized. First are the residential alternatives project staffs and their associates, located from coast to coast, who shared so freely of their time and experiences. Second are the SERCL professional staff in the persons of Lee Bowker, David Buckholdt, Jon Bushnell, Nicholas Dussault, Wallace Gingerich, Mary S. Knudten, Sharon Noltz McLean, and Sam Stern, who shared, wrote, or helped to develop this project. Third are the research assistants/associates who responsibly accomplished their assigned duties. They included Joan Curseen, Yvonne Johnson, Stephen Knudten, John McLaughlin, Mary Novak, John Novak, Tom Riek, Mary Stefanec, Cathy Stamps, and Marcia Wright. Fourth are the secretarial and production staff which membered Beth Brockmann, Cindy Glover, the late Carolyn Metoxen, Karen Nolting, and Alice Ormson.

Others should also be acknowledged. SERCL's Advisory Panel included Thomas M. Young, Catharine Gilson, and Yitzhak Bakal, who critiqued all phases of the project. David Steenson and Gilbert Geis served as final readers and offered their insights at various project points. The final editors, Mark Sachner and Mary Lee Knowlton, added substantially to the flow of ideas. Special mention should also be made of the contribution of the staff of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Peter Freivaldes, Phyllis Modley and Deborah Wysinger, the latter who has served well as SERCL's Project Monitor. In addition, SERCL's Richard D. Knudten and Nicholas Dussault served as Project Director and as Project Manager, respectively.

Richard D. Knudten
Project Director

November, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTERS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
PART ONE: MANAGEMENT ISSUES	
II. THE FRAMEWORK FOR RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE DETENTION: COORDINATING THE PUBLIC AND PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES	1
III. MAJOR MANAGEMENT ISSUES	4
PART TWO: MANAGING CLIENT SERVICES	
IV. RECRUITING AND TRAINING STAFF	6
V. PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	9
VI. CLIENT MANAGEMENT	10
VII. OPERATIONAL ISSUES	12
VIII. MANAGING RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES	14
IX. COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS AND RESOURCES	17
X. SURVIVAL ISSUES FOR PROGRAMS	18
PART THREE: ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS	
XI. MODELS OF MANAGEMENT IN VARIOUS COMMUNITY SETTINGS	20
APPENDIX: SAMPLE RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVE PROJECT MODELS	24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE DETENTION, a monograph focusing on day-to-day management problems and community attempts to organize and provide resources for a juvenile residential alternative, has its origin in the original and amended versions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, 1976, and 1977. This legislation encourages the creation of community-based programs and services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency apart from traditional institutional care. Because the Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention recognized that the most well-intentioned policy goals may remain unrealized unless the services are implemented with sound management techniques, the Socio-Environmental Research Center, Ltd., of Milwaukee, WI, was given the assignment to examine the many varieties of existing and developing juvenile residential alternatives to detention in order to describe managerial procedures and pitfalls which may affect interested public and private parties or organizations. Most site data suggest that successful program elements include sound management, a sensitivity of the program to local needs, and a consistent flow of resources.

Over 2,353 current or formerly existing projects were contacted by letter by SERCL in an effort to identify the various forms of residential alternatives in operation. Of that group, 496 returned responses that were examined in more detail, with 40 programs finally selected for telephone contact and detailed investigation. Of that group, 16 were eventually visited by members of SERCL staff from January through April, 1979. While on site, SERCL members interviewed representative members of each project, including executive directors, directors of finance/or administration, treatment staff, members of the Board of Directors, volunteers, food and lodging administrators, and a wide variety of other personnel, usually selected in relation to the type of program in operation and the range of skills/tasks represented. Personal interviews commonly ranged from an hour to more than four hours. Throughout these discussions, every effort was made to probe the exact scope of the management issues underlying the operation of their alternative to juvenile detention project. Emphasis was placed upon what works as well as what does not work. Upon completion of these interviews, SERCL visitors completed site reports, which were then organized into a draft report for staff review and critique. More than twelve professionals in the field examined this report in depth before the fifth version, represented here, was presented to LEAA for publication. RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE DETENTION is addressed to managers of alternatives to detention programs, public policy makers, and the academic community.

PART ONE: MANAGEMENT ISSUES

CHAPTER II - THE FRAMEWORK FOR RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE DETENTION: COORDINATING THE PUBLIC AND PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES

The use of residential alternatives to juvenile detention should rest on a careful determination of community needs for such a program, and on such

issues of public policy as the creation of a network of residential alternative services in the community, the role of government in creating such services, and the relationship between public and non-public sectors.

Because the creation of an alternative system of services for juveniles is a long and sometimes difficult process, the need for community juvenile residential alternatives should be considered within the current framework of national and state legislation pertaining to the subject. In the years since the passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, many communities have begun to implement its provisions. Typically, this progression has been: First, removing juveniles from all contact with adults while in local jails or lockups; second, eliminating contact between convicted juveniles and pre-adjudicated juveniles who may be in the same detention center; and third, removing juveniles who do not need to be detained from jails and detention centers and developing alternative service systems.

Central to this movement is the recognition that juveniles who are now placed in existing facilities may safely and more appropriately be placed under supervision in other housing alternatives where benefits may be greater for them as well as the State. Many juveniles currently placed in a detention center do not need punishment but rather stand in need of preventive action to divert them from more serious delinquent activity. In many instances this support can be better provided in the community at less cost than in the juvenile detention facility.

An alternative service network is designed to give juveniles individualized attention, respectable role models, improved peer relationships, access to trained counselors, and an opportunity to involve both a juvenile and his/her immediate family in problem solving. Residential alternatives to detention not only offer a better outlet for many first-time offenders, but may also be used to avoid placing a label or stigma on juveniles who have not committed a serious delinquent act. In any effort to develop alternative service systems, each community must decide on the types of juveniles it will detain and those that it will refer to residential alternatives. Of necessity, this means the defining of criteria for the assignment of juveniles to detention or alternative programs.

Many juvenile justice systems have developed haphazardly as a result of hundreds of uncoordinated, often idiosyncratic decisions. A result of such uncoordinated development is a fragmented system of conflicting services. Groups with different philosophies may offer similar services to the community. Many difficulties can be avoided if programs communicate during the incipient stages of programming. All components of the community should be actively involved in planning, implementing, and operating a system of alternative services. However, this is not an easy task because those planning new services must overcome a number of conflicting demands and interests expressed by those determined to protect their "turf."

Another problem to be anticipated is that the expansion of alternative services may in effect expand the delinquency web, bringing more youth into the juvenile justice system and causing an increase in public outlays of tax money to support such a system. While there is a need for coordination, any

system adopted must have the flexibility and variability that is necessary to address the wide range of problems encountered by juveniles. Two general conditions usually underlie the beginning of an alternative system. The first is the need to create a system of alternative placement to relieve overcrowded or expensive detention facilities and to provide a less secure placement for juveniles who are not security risks. The second is the existence of a security system to aid the institutionalization of status offenders and to provide other delinquency prevention services.

The impetus and funding of beginning services commonly comes from public and non-public sources within and outside the community. Federal, State, and local governmental groups have provided many resources to local communities and organizations. Because the Federal sources are historically short-term (2 - 3 years), the competent Executive Director must begin to plan for future funding alternatives and programs as soon as, if not before, first year funding is secured. The degree of support by State government varies widely.

Because the State's service delivery system and political system tend to be more homogeneous, State government is in a better position than most local governments to overcome parochial interest and to allot financial resources to a wide variety of programs. The State supported system may serve status offenders, pre-adjudicated accused delinquents who do not need detention, post-adjudicated delinquents on probation, children in need of supervision, and other juveniles whose family situation does not encourage trouble-free behavior.

On the local level, some communities have been known to build an alternative system as an extension of its own traditional functions. A police department may extend its diversion program to serve juveniles; a juvenile court may extend its court referral system to divert juveniles from the adjudication process. Local community activity in creating and providing services to juveniles generally seems to make for the most cost-effective, caring, and effective residential alternative support system. When services are organized in a community, a juvenile may remain in that community, where efforts can be made to stabilize the family situation and where the support system is known.

Systems of alternative services arising in the non-public sector appear to be better coordinated than those created by other agencies. However, the development of a non-public alternative program is a much more difficult task because of the need to secure funding. An organizational "seed", such as a church, other religious organization, or even a group of citizens concerned about the plight of juveniles within their community, is often necessary to provide the legal base for the group to secure funding. Once such groups are organized, they may secure both non-governmental as well as governmental funding through purchase of service agreements.

SERCL's investigation of management issues relating to residential alternatives suggests that the provision of services for juveniles should involve a mix of non-public and public resources, organization, and effort. A community, therefore, should develop a close working relationship between public and non-public agencies. For such a working relationship to be

developed, each agency or program must define a specific role, and the various agencies must develop a sense of trust. The relationship between this mix of agencies may be predominantly public managed, predominantly managed by non-public organizations, or involve cooperative efforts by public and non-public agencies.

Residential alternative program options range from non-restrictive, informal treatment to more structured treatment modes. Larger communities and communities that are attractive to youth who have run away from home may want to consider residential facilities where youth can stay till they resolve their problems. Smaller communities may want to consider constructing a system of foster homes. Other communities may decide that residential facilities are not needed and a system of one day services and short-range diversion programs may be more appropriate. The level of structure or control of such programs is another variable in their adoption. In communities where the delinquency problem is serious, a structured facility approach may be more appropriate than in a community where the issue is less important, and where a less structured system may be built.

The first program option is to expand the services of the juvenile court probation program as a pre-adjudicated option. Another option is the delivery of day services (or in some cases night services) where the youth may go for two or three hours a day (or night) for counseling, recreation, tutoring, or other forms of assistance. Several residential options for communities include the foster home, which typically involves a family which has room to take in a juvenile awaiting adjudication; a proctor program, which generally utilizes a younger single adult to relate to the juvenile in trouble; a home for runaways, which commonly serves youth who have left their usual family situations; the small group home, which consists of 6 - 12 youth; and the structured group home, which is not a secure facility but allows youth to come and go as they please. The appropriate use of these residential and non-residential alternatives to detention are issues of community policy and should be decided early, before the program has been well defined.

CHAPTER III - MAJOR MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Among the major management issues facing those considering the development of residential alternatives to detention are the need to identify support and opposition, the need to analyze the needs of the community, the need to define program goals, the need to make early judgments, and the need to write an appropriate proposal to secure funding. For the successful development of any alternative program, support must be secured from the juvenile justice community, the social service community, and the neighborhood in which the program will be located. Probably the most important tie is with the juvenile justice community, although the others should not be neglected. If opposition arises from any of these sources, it is important that a clear effort be made to neutralize this opposition and secure appropriate support.

The analysis of the needs of the community should include an examination of the number and type of youth needing alternative services, the potential

setting or location of such services, and the resources existing to support the operations of such a program. Program managers should anticipate that program needs will change over time. For example, in the late 1960's a number of programs developed for runaway youth. However, with the decrease in the number of runaways served by such programs, those having this emphasis had to change direction in order to survive. In general, the best advice is to start small and evolve into the larger program which is desired as the need defines and the resources allow.

Special care should be given to the selection of the residential location. Ideally, a juvenile program should be housed in a neighborhood close to the youth it serves. At times, movement to a new conspicuous, middle of nowhere site may work well for a facility. Administrative offices should be centrally located so they are easily accessible to all staff members and service providers.

The analysis of community needs should include the identification of sources for funding. Although purchase of service monies may become a viable funding support once a program is established, it may not be available to those desiring to provide services to juveniles at the initial stage. Private sources of funding include grants and private foundations, United Way funds, and private donations. One key principle applies: Do not open the program until sufficient funds have been accumulated to make a credible beginning. Program development and continuation cost may be reduced by the use of volunteers in service delivery.

Programs seldom originate without someone perceiving a need. This should lead to a statement of program goals and objectives. It is not enough to say that the program wishes to assist youth in trouble. A statement of program goals should include a discussion of the particular problems of youth that will be dealt with, how those problems will be dealt with, and under what circumstances youth will be included or excluded from the program.

Among the initial considerations in the development of a residential alternative program are the needs to identify new funding support sources, recruit an Executive Director and other staff, select treatment modes, and identify obstacles for program implementation. If funds are sought through a grant, a concept paper or proposal must be written delineating the proposed programs as well as the uses to which the grant money will be put. The person selected for the position of Executive Director should possess a commitment to youth, a philosophy which allows the handling of personal stress, fiscal knowledge, multi-cultural understanding, the ability to listen to staff needs and follow through on them, an understanding of the political or bureaucratic system within which the program must operate, writing and other communication skills, the ability to handle public relations and community organizing, and a willingness to expend energy and enthusiasm. Ultimately, the treatment mode selected depends in part on the type of youth to be served. In some instances such youth are perceived as threats to the community, with the result that the neighborhood and community express opposition. Every effort must be made by program developers to be tactful and to represent their goals honestly to the community. A wide variety of means may be utilized to defuse hostility.

Once a evolving program has made a decision to proceed with the proposal, a proposal for funding should be clearly written. The program should be described so that its purpose, goals, and objectives are fully delineated. However, this must be done in relationship to the expectations of the granting agency. If a funding unit has stated that certain items are expected in a proposal, they should be included. Do not complete a proposal in haste, rather expect to spend time writing it.

PART TWO: MANAGING CLIENT SERVICES

CHAPTER IV - RECRUITING AND TRAINING STAFF

Responsibility for hiring all staff usually belongs to the Board of Directors, although most Boards have to select the Executive Director, who in turn hires other staff. Before the Executive Director is selected, the Board must reach consensus about the future of the program and the skills needed in that position. A selection committee should represent the various constituencies of the program, if they are appropriate. The top three to five candidates are commonly screened from vitae and interviewed in the selection process. Most established programs have a written description of the hiring procedure and of the criteria used to fill each job opening, a statement promising non-discriminatory hiring, and a rationale for the qualifications specifying the needs of the clients served. The policy manual protects the program from arbitrary abuse of power and instructs both members of the program and outsiders of the procedure to be followed to fill vacancies. In order to satisfy all critics, a program should search for candidates who have all the skills and experience needed for a particular job as well as the credentials needed to legitimate their activities.

Common management roles in the organizational structure of a residential alternative program are those of an Executive Director, who has overall responsibilities for all aspects of the program and who is accountable to the Board of Directors; the Associate Director, who is called upon to manage the internal operations of large programs for the Executive Director; unit coordinators and/or supervisors, who operate and oversee subunits of the operative program; service delivery staffers, who daily work directly with the clients; and an administrative assistant, who handles many of the jobs which often fall through the cracks due to time constraints. Each of these roles have particular requisites and expected expertise of those occupying them.

Once staff is selected, most are given a basic orientation for the program. Attention is commonly given to the history of the program, its overarching design, and its functional importance and position within the total service network for youths in difficulty. General training programs are similarly maintained by many programs. Although SERCL found mixed success where such programs were offered, common skills to be stressed within the training program are individual and group counseling, interpersonal empathy, case management, case advocacy, interviewing techniques, needs analysis, family counseling and small group relationships, crises intervention, behavioral change, and a knowledge of other source providers to whom clients may be referred. For employees not directly involved with clients, skill development and grant writing, supervising, recordkeeping, and budget management are important training areas. In order

to continue training beyond the initial orientation or in service levels, many programs provide paid educational leave to staff members who wish to attend relevant workshops or university courses. Other training systems include periodic staff retreats, frequent staff meetings where problems are shared and new ideas are invited, and direct participation by all staff members in decision making.

A set of personnel policies should be adopted by any program as it emerges. Those which have been established need to review their policies at least once each year. Included in the personnel policies should be a description of the agency and its philosophy in treatment and service; an organizational chart and responsibility flowchart for the agency; a job description for each position within the program; the educational qualifications and experience required for each position; a statement of training that will be provided by the program for each position; delineation of methods and procedures to be used in the evaluating of staff and administrators within the program; a statement covering grievance and appeal procedures; a specification of employee benefits, holidays, and vacation policies; a discussion of sick leave allotments and reporting procedures; a presentation of disciplinary and termination procedures and procedures for resigning from a position; a definition of procedures or methods to be followed when requesting maternity, emergency, and professional or educational leaves; a statement regarding affirmative action; and a specification of the procedure or methods to be used for revising and updating the personnel policies.

Many grievances arising in residential alternative programs are related to scheduling difficulties. One issue relates to the handling of compensatory time while another is related to shift placement and work scheduling. Solutions to these dilemmas have included the use of overlapping work schedules so that information may be passed on from one shift to another, and a continuing modification of shifts so that an employee does not draw the least favored work schedule on a daily basis. In any work assignment, consideration should be given to the staff member's personal needs. Some programs permit staff members to work four 10 hour days rather than the ordinary five 8 hour days.

The evaluation of employees commonly occurs at two or more points. The first is the probationary evaluation which occurs three to six months after the employment begins. Some programs have a second level of probationary evaluation which may occur after six to nine months. A second type of staff evaluation is a periodic evaluation of all permanent employees. This is commonly done once a year, although some organizations do it twice a year or even more frequently. Commonly, the annual evaluation is conducted by an employee's supervisor. On the whole, a written evaluation is preferable. The employee should be given the chance to defend him/herself against the criticism offered. Every evaluation should be made as fair as possible so that it does not become a bone of contention within the organization.

SERCL staff were not able to secure a general agreement about the usefulness or desirability of utilizing volunteers for service delivery. While some projects claimed that volunteers gave them greater outreach, others argued that they take up too much time in recruitment, supervision,

and training to make the effort worthwhile. Those programs that do use volunteers carefully organize and supervise this activity and assign very specific, tightly organized activities. Volunteers commonly work 5 - 15 hours per week and must report their activities to their supervisor. In many cases volunteers are asked to sign a contract with the program specifying the type of activity they will be involved in and the amount of time they will be able to devote. Volunteers should not be accepted simply because they volunteer. Rather, they should be carefully evaluated as to the qualifications for the position and their degree of emotional stability. The use of ex-offenders as volunteers or staff employees is supported by some programs, although there is disagreement on this matter as well. Some volunteers have been used to tutor clients, provide motivation and aspirational support, and befriend youth in need. Volunteers have been useful in the improvement of community relations. Their apparent value appears to be closely related to their degree of integration into the total workings of the program and the closeness of their cooperation with the staff Director of Volunteers.

Programs with foster home components need state licenses which are given only after state officials have had experience with the program and have confidence in its professional ability to oversee the operations of foster homes. Having a license to certify foster home care implies that a program has the necessary skills and facilities to recruit families for foster care, train them to provide successful foster home care, and provide continuing program resources and advise to ensure the placement is satisfactory, both for the foster parents and for the clients.

Foster homes frequently exist in two types. The short-term home generally houses youth who are in need of limited assistance, commonly for a period of 3-4 weeks to 2 months. The second type provides a longer term involvement, with the youth remaining in the foster home for a year or two or even longer. In both types of foster home care, careful selection, training, supervision, and support are required. Solicitation for foster home parents is done through radio and television announcements and flyers. Programs may also work closely with churches or other service-oriented organizations. Once potential foster parents are identified, the screening process begins. Initial attention must be given to conditions that may disqualify the candidate. If initial checks are satisfactory, a second interview is usually arranged with candidates. Once the candidates are accepted as foster parents, they must participate in a period of training, which may proceed for 6 months or longer. One problem that foster parents frequently encounter is the need to get away from their home occasionally. Many programs have found it helpful to use volunteers as temporary foster parents to spell the normal foster parent.

Staff burnout is a frequently mentioned management and service delivery problem, especially for those individuals who develop intense commitments to changing the lives of their clients. In order to avoid staff burnout, programs have utilized frequent shift rotations, allowance for four 10-hour days with three days off, and extended leaves for those who suffer from lack of energy and enthusiasm. Other approaches include the use of a variable work schedule, job sharing by husband and wife, a greater participation of staff members in the total management of a program, and the use of the

therapeutic community to reduce stress for staff members.

CHAPTER V - PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Professional services to clients are often by members of the agency's own staff and by outside providers. The modes of services have a variety of management problems. Two major problems associated with providing medical care to clients in an alternative program from the outside are the extremely high cost of medical care and legal liability. One way of reducing cost is to utilize the services of a nearby free clinic or secure the volunteer services of a physician. Legal liability can be lessened, if not completely reduced, by having a parent or guardian of the youth sign a medical release during intake. If a release cannot be obtained from the parent, the project may have the client declared a temporary ward of the State in order to reduce its medical-legal exposure. Few of the agencies visited by SERCL had any significant difficulties associated with the delivery of medical services to their clients.

A variety of general and special services, including psychological evaluation, psychological counseling and therapy, vocational training, vocational and employment placement, academic upgrading, recreational activities, and legal services are also frequently provided to residential alternatives" clients. The most common types of services provided are non-professional counseling, family counseling, and foster care or group shelter care. Family counseling is offered by nearly all alternative programs visited. Specialized service, sometimes provided, is a 24-hour crises telephone hotline. A few of the alternative programs offered sex and pregnancy counseling. In keeping with their emphasis on preventive intervention, some alternative programs provide a variety of services to the parents of their clients.

The provision of services is usually based on sometype of written or oral agreement made between the directors of the program and the individual or agency providing the service. They commonly take the form of formal purchase of service agreements and informal pooling of resources, concurrent provision for services, or an informal purchase of service arrangement. The formal purchase of service agreement usually takes the form of a formal contract that specifies the type, quantity, and quality of services to be delivered, as well as the payments to be received for the services. They are binding on both the alternative program and the outside service providers. While it helps to fix costs, such an approach is relatively inflexible. The pooling of resources approach involves a form of service bartering and service exchange. It works fairly well when each agency benefits to a near equal degree. The concurrent service provision approach frees the alternative program from expenditure because the service provider receives payment from its own budgets. In such an arrangement, a third party, often a government agency, is billed and pays for such services. The informal purchase of service approach does not depend upon a written contract but simply upon the use of the services for which the agency is billed.

Some services may be provided in-house. This is especially true in relationship to first aid and some counseling services. Professional

psychological evaluation services and some types of psychological care, often undertaken by psychiatrists, are commonly provided to clients through external sources. Many of these services may be offered by volunteers, who are either recruited to the Board or are asked to serve in an advisory capacity.

Special management problems sometimes exist in relationship to the modes of service delivery. In the supervised independent living alternative approach, the client is allowed to live away from the family or institutional setting, with only limited external supervision. The major management problem is associated with the dispersal of such individual clients throughout the city or community, making it difficult to supervise their total activity. Service delivery to such people is largely done through a referral through medical, vocational, academic or other agencies. Because each client is supervised in independent living over a short period of time, intensive services are not necessary, and most needs may be handled through a referral process. Under the home detention approach, the client remains with his/her parents until (or after) the court appearance. While regular supervision is provided by the agency, services are usually provided through the family structure, community outlets, or other more "normal" agencies. The intensive day services approach are commonly home detention programs which are grafted with eight hours of direct service delivery per client per week. Service delivery in this setting is usually provided by a central facility to which clients report and at which a variety of services is provided.

Under the foster home model, foster parents are paid by the state or have volunteered to "take in" clients for a limited period of time. Service delivery in such a setting is often oriented to the foster parents normal routine and is dependent upon the quality of the foster parent-client relationship. Youth in foster care are commonly referred to a wide variety of collateral community agencies. Residential alternatives in the form of temporary shelter and short-term group homes frequently use local services, although the larger facilities sometimes hire specialists, such as full-time teachers and clinical psychologists. Crisis-oriented programs may have service delivery personnel employed on their staffs. Long term group homes follow a similar pattern although they are more likely to serve the youth over a longer time span.

In larger communities, a multifaceted provision of service is needed. Where large numbers of youth in need of a particular skill or service exists, a community may have the option of focusing on that particular form of service delivery. Typically, organizational growth follows the same pattern of increased specialization creating increasingly specialized needs. If the organization is successful, the once simple organization becomes a complex web of different service providers operating under the same administrative umbrella.

CHAPTER VI - CLIENT MANAGEMENT

Alternative programs, which are more flexible and responsive to adolescent needs than to traditional institutional programs, can serve clients with different backgrounds and needs. Because youth requesting

service from alternative programs represent a variety of legal statuses, ranging from alleged to adjudicated for delinquent or non-delinquent misbehavior, client management is a special problem in each case. The majority of clients currently served by many alternative programs are in effect "pre-delinquent" or status offenders. Clients served by alternative programs include runaways, uncontrollables, alcohol or other drug problem youth, truants, family problem clients, or sex acting out juveniles. In many of these categories there may be subtypes. Most residential alternative programs are not prepared to provide the intensively specialized care and supervision that the seriously emotionally disturbed require. Youth that are actively psychotic (delusional, hallucinational, irrational, disoriented, and communicative), suicidal, or potentially violent are commonly referred to a mental health facility and are not permitted entrance into the residential program. Many programs similarly screen out youths with a history of violent crimes, sex crimes, or drug - or alcohol - related crimes. Most alternative programs screen out older teenage youth who have run away repeatedly and lived on the street, and who are looking for a place to "crash" to obtain food and lodging overnight. In order to manage clients adequately, each program should define the types of clients it will and will not accept.

Alternative programs provide a wide range of services ranging from non-professional counseling, family counseling, and foster care or group shelter care. Programs with limited resources must decide which services are most important for the program to provide. In making this determination, the alternative program should ask: "What are the most prevailing and immediate needs of the clients?" "What is their need for medical or counseling services?" "What is their need for positive personal relationships?" A further question is: "Are these services relatively available in the community?" If so, the alternative program may elect to use available resources rather than provide its own.

Commonly, alternative programs have partial or complete intake control over their particular clientele. Intake commonly involves the initial screening of the client, usually done in consideration of the referral from a referring agency or person. If the applicant is suitable for the program, a face to face interview is held prior to the actual decision to admit. After this meeting an intake decision is commonly made. Unless the decision to admit is made by the referring agency, program staff usually retain the final authority on an intake decision. The authority for the intake decision rests upon one of three sources of legal authority: Parents, the courts, and the Welfare (social service) Department. The interaction of parents, police, courts, the Welfare Department, and the alternative program, therefore, is crucial. Because legal authority in such cases never resides in the alternative program, the only way to facilitate this process is to have good relations with criminal justice agencies in general and judges in particular. The essence of program success is to have good rapport with each of these units.

Youth typically eligible for youth alternative programs range in age between 12 - 18 years. Nearly all programs surveyed admitted clients of both sexes. Most residential programs have a defined geographical and/or jurisdictional area, an area which has implications for payment of

services. Eligibility also focus on the offense history of the youth. In most instances this is not a major issue, except in cases of violent behavior or sexual crime. An intake decision, however, may include a determination of whether the youth would be compatible with current residents of the program.

Alternative's clients are commonly referred from courts, police, school, parents, Welfare agencies, self, or other sources. In many established residential alternatives, self-referrals are common. Welfare agencies are not a major source of referral for alternative programs, except in states such as Florida, where the State Welfare agency acts as an intake and referral unit for all public human services and many private human services. Churches, private social agencies, and medical personnel may also be sources of referrals for alternative programs. Referral sources are likely to be determined by the purpose of the program and the clientele it is designed to serve. Communication with referring agencies and individuals, therefore, should be maintained with a clear delineation of the kind of clients the program serves, the services it provides, the criteria it uses to accept or reject clients. Because a residential alternative is dependent upon referral sources, it is important that it provides regular feedback on client progress in the program to the original referring person or agency. Many alternative programs ask the referring agency to evaluate the services that the alternative has provided its client. Programs that depend upon a significant number of self- and parental referrals must inform potential clients and parents of the existence of the program, the services it provides, and its requirement for providing services.

Services are commonly terminated when the youth is asked to leave the program, a suitable plan of treatment has not been agreed upon, or the initial problem has been resolved. Most frequently, termination comes about as a consequence of the misbehavior of the youth, usually related to destruction of property, violent behavior, or use of drugs. On the other hand, clients may be discharged when the youth leaves the program as a result of a mutual decision between the client and the program staff. Sometimes the parents of the youth and the referring agency personnel are also involved in this decision. Discharge should be based on one of two criteria: The problem that necessitated the admission has been resolved, or a suitable plan for problem solution has been agreed upon to treat the initial problem.

Residential alternative programs can secure valuable information concerning the effectiveness of their program and treatment plan through follow up on clients successes and failures through face to face interviews at the program or in the client's home, phone calls to the clients and/or parents, or through the use of mail questionnaires and forms. Follow-up contacts are most important during the first weeks after discharge but have been known to continue for up to five years. Follow-up contacts with youths served by alternative programs are an important part of services provided.

CHAPTER VII - OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The operational issues facing each new residential alternative to juvenile detention relate to financial management, legal regulation and

legal assistance, client recordkeeping, and transportation of clients. Directors should anticipate from the date of their project origination that they will be audited. Therefore, all financial activities should proceed on that assumption. Necessary financial documents include copies of invoices, separate vouchers for cash payouts, payroll stubs, check stubs detailing amounts spent and other information, deposit slips, monthly check statements, and other important financial items. Once an organization has been funded, it should maintain accurate figures and anticipate budget requirements for the ensuing year. All financial disbursements should be accounted in financial ledgers which are posted on a monthly basis. An effective way of managing expenditures is to utilize a fund accounting system which permits financial personnel to designate particular accounts and particular funding sources for their charges. A sample of such an approach is included in the main body of this report.

Because a grantee may be audited at any time, financial personnel should have available the previously mentioned financial documents, as well as other types of financial reports, internal and external, for each project. Internal reports include monthly reports of expenditures and quarterly reports of expenditures. External reports include a statement of income and expenditures, a certified financial audit, and special reports required by granting agencies.

Each project should maintain insurance coverage which may cover liability and casualty, homeowner's, employee health, Workman's Compensation, State and Federal employment, group life and/or group disability, and, in a few instances, professional malpractice liability insurance. If a project borrows, leases, or otherwise secures a van or other transportation vehicle, motor vehicle insurance is similarly needed. In order to protect those who handle agency funds, fidelity bonding is advised. This is especially necessary for the treasurer, comptroller, or others authorized to sign agency checks. Fidelity bonding is used to protect the agency against embezzlement or misuse of funds and the individuals against charges of mismanagement of resources or unauthorized use of funds.

Projects employing up to six staff members usually do their payrolls by hand. However, as projects become more complex a manual system is commonly replaced by computerized check producing systems. The key to any computerized operation is accurate time reporting by employees. As payroll expands, general agency expenditures similarly tend to increase. As a general rule, one part-time person may be able to handle one grant involving \$100,000 - \$200,000, but a fulltime financial employee will be needed when income reaches \$300,000 or so. Other plateaus appear to be two financial employees at \$500,000, three at \$750,000, and four at \$1,000,000 or more.

The need for legal services by management appears at several times during the life of any residential alternative project. The first two needs involve the incorporation of the agency and the development of its bylaws. In addition, projects need periodical legal advice. Such needs usually revolve around the acquisition of property, the defense of the project's name or reputation, the need to deal with issues related to labor relations, questions related to staff maintenance or representation in cases of

malpractice or liability exposure.

In order to protect its interests and have secure information pertaining to client activity, all projects should maintain extensive records. Among such recorded data are the client identifying records, the referral person/agency report, case history data, diagnostic information, reports on problems and goals, reports of referrals to other agencies, evaluation of progress reports, case correspondence, significant incidents reports, release of information forms, discharge reports, and other information important to the client profile. Some agencies have even added special forms to protect them against legal exposure in the treatment of clients. While certain of these forms are needed by all organizations or agencies, this specific needs will have to be determined by each unit.

Not all projects maintain a means of transportation for their clients. Many utilize volunteers to drive clients to the places they must go. Others are located close to public transportation and have no need for a car or van. If an agency secures a motor vehicle, it should be certain that it has a licensed driver, who may be required to have a chauffeur's license, and that it has the appropriate level of liability insurance (usually in the \$300,000 range or so). Each project should be aware of the legal ramifications of any accidents or liability that ownership or rental of such a transportation vehicle will involve.

CHAPTER VIII - MANAGING RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

Management problems relating to residential facilities include such matters as site selection, facility acquisition and maintenance, authority and techniques for the control of juveniles, zoning, licensing, and public relations with neighbors and community organizations. Among the factors to consider in site selection are accessibility to public transportation, clients, service providers and volunteers; the travel pattern of citizens within the area; and the kinds of people frequenting the area. The availability of public transportation may be a major ingredient in controlling costs of the alternative program. The closeness of recreational outlets, too, will be of major importance. Whether the facility should be located near its clients is of less importance if its clients are residential or are referred from other social agencies. It is more important if a program expects to serve self-referrals and drop-ins.

The search for a suitable location and facility can be eased by having a real estate agent on the Board or in a support capacity to the project. Board members not only have personal connections, but they may have lines into persons who may donate downpayment funds or possibly secure the building for the agency at a reduced rate. If costs of renting and/or purchasing property are high, it may be possible for the alternative program to occupy a property at less than a market rate. Churches with a social action philosophy may be willing to provide assistance in such a form. Sometimes unused city or government facilities are available at a minimal cost.

Small programs usually look for rentals in the community they plan to serve, while larger programs may be serving many communities and can locate

their administrative offices in a wider area. Special care should be taken to be certain that the facilities do not require excessive remodeling or tie up precious cash. Office space, recreation rooms, quiet rooms, group meeting rooms, bathrooms, visiting areas, school and vocational training areas, kitchens, storage space, and bedrooms are commonly needed by residential alternative programs. Sometimes administrative office space is located outside a facility. State codes should be examined for minimum requirements of floor space per youth in a projected facility or bedroom. Storage space is necessary for food, supplies, and valuables. Lockable areas must also be included, especially for client records. In general, the alternative facility should look as little like an institution as possible.

Because of the cost factors, most alternative programs buy or rent an aging home or some other location that is in need of repair. Ultimately, maintenance problems are generally handled by counselors or house parents although a part-time handyperson may be hired. Most clients appear to use client labor to do the bulk of the housecleaning, sometimes in exchange for a few cents to purchase personal sundries or other effects.

The degree of control over program clients depends in part upon the nature of the program. Control, when exercised, usually is related to time, movement, visits, or leaves. Scheduled events usually relate to therapy sessions, meals, recreational activities, bedtime, clean-up time, or other therapeutic activities. Movement control includes access to the facility as well as within it. Some facilities are completely closed while others are open 24 hours a day. Special areas within the alternative facility are frequently off limits, and they take the form of staff areas, bathrooms and bedrooms used by the opposite sex. Visits by parents and friends are permitted at designated times in order to minimize disruption and are usually prohibited during the first week or two of a client's participation in a residential alternative program. Residential rules tend to restrict overt sexual behavior, violence, use of dangerous weapons, and alcohol and drug use. SERCL found that program staff members usually set as few rules as possible for the maintenance of their programs in order to maximize the growth potential of the residents. In a therapeutic community, many of the rules are defined by the clients themselves. Most rules are communicated to clients when they are admitted to a program. The rule sheet is not only handed to them but is also posted on the walls throughout the facility. In cases of rule violation the incident's participants may be called into a disciplinary meeting in order to reach a decision on matters both of substance and of discipline.

Confrontation counseling between the suspected rule breaker and a staff member is usually the first line of rule enforcement. Sanctions may include the banning of the violator from desirable activities, confiscation, token penalties, and personal embarrassment. Punishments must be fair, not arbitrary, and non-punitive to be valuable. In order to maintain continuity of rule enforcement, communication between staff members on different shifts is required. Most programs strive to keep the police from being involved in any disciplinary program. This is done so that the programs may be perceived as a sanctuary by its clients. Only in rare instances will police be called to assist the program in client management. If all else fails, the client will be terminated. Some programs automatically terminate

clients for serious violations while others strive to work with such youth.

Special problems in maintaining order exist for those who are prone to violence, sexual misbehavior, use of drugs and alcohol, engage in theft, or misuse of weapons. Most programs exclude violence-prone clients at intake although a few discriminate between pathological violence and condition response violence. The violence appears to be rare in residential alternative programs, possibly due to the intake screening process. Sexual misbehavior is usually considered to be the least serious of the major rule infractions. Common responses are a talk with the staff members about the necessity for avoiding sexual misbehavior, or some form of counseling rather than expulsion. The use of alcohol and drugs is regarded by all programs as an extremely serious matter. A number of programs immediately terminate a client without a discussion, while others warn the client, impose a number of unpleasant sanctions and threaten termination if there is a second occurrence. Thieves are difficult to deal with because they are not quickly found out. However, when they are detected, the application of peer pressure usually results in the return of the missing items. Most alternative programs ask clients to turn in their weapons at intake and almost all of them do so. Of the sites visited, few had any problems with weapons violations.

The zoning issue has posed some problems for several programs, although few alternative programs had difficulty finding a suitable location. Most choose to locate in an area that is already properly zoned rather than attempt to obtain a variance from a Zoning Board to locate in a community which would not normally permit their existence there. The level of opposition to a zoning variance for an alternative facility tends to be less in a lower-class neighborhood than it is in a middle-class neighborhood. By canvassing the neighborhood, contacting local leaders and officials, and explaining the need for a program, leaders can mitigate much of the potential opposition before the variance process reaches the hearing stage. One way to avoid zoning problems is to occupy a facility that was previously used by another social agency. Some of the negative social response can be lessened by dispersing the youth to scattered units throughout the city.

In most states residential facilities must secure a license to operate. Many states regulate the size of a facility, qualifications of staff, length of stay, and ages of youth to be served. Licensing procedures generally vary from state to state. Regulation and inspection are generally undertaken by a bureau in the state Welfare or Social Services Department. The most common license required is for residential facilities, whether they are called child caring facilities, group homes, boarding homes, child welfare agencies, or boarding care facilities. In most states foster homes are similarly licensed. Another form of licensing involves the issuance of a license for a "child placing agency," which has the authority to license foster homes under the powers given it by the states.

States also vary in the stringency of regulation and the enforcement of licensing programs. Some states require extensive inspection of health, safety, fire, and food servicing operations before a license may be issued. Some states may examine the experiences and qualifications of key staff, while other states may only be interested in examining physical facilities.

Because the variance is wide in state licensing procedures, individuals or groups interested in starting residential alternatives to detention should check early with state social service officials to determine what expectations exist. Fire prevention and client safety standards must also be considered.

The relationship of the project to the neighbors and the neighborhood are similarly important issues to consider. In general a project should "be together" before contacting neighbors. All possible questions should be anticipated and answers formulated in brainstorming sessions before contacts with neighbors are made outside the program. Any approach to neighbors should be professional and informal at the same time. Those dealing with neighbors should be the Executive Director of the facility and the Chairman of the Board rather than lower level staff members. The facility should make every effort to avoid needless involvement in controversial issues. Special efforts should be made to reduce noise, vandalism, deterioration of facilities, parking congestion, excess garbage, and excessive hanging around or misbehavior by clients or their friends. Project organizers should be aware that problems may be caused by person in the neighborhood who may attempt to lure clients into their houses and apartments. Every effort should be made to make certain that male and female clients are not exploited by undesirables in the area.

On the whole, the entire community rarely resists the establishment of an alternative program. Rather, resistance is located in the surrounding neighborhood. If resistance to the project is strong, it is probably better to look for another site for the facility. However, members of the community may also participate and provide support to the alternative program. People may volunteer to serve as tutors, counselors, trip leaders, bookkeepers, or other suitable roles. Because the community has the potential of providing many resources to the project, a wise project executive will make every attempt to secure support from the community rather than to minimize its potential contribution at the outset.

CHAPTER IX - COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS AND RESOURCES

Residential alternatives have many available resources in the community - the juvenile system, the welfare system, social service networks, and community management resources. Their relationships in each community may be positive, negative, or potentially mixed. The primary management concerns with the juvenile justice system are to prevent potential conflict because of philosophical differences between the program and the juvenile court system, and to foster cooperation between the program and the system. Potential problem areas with the courts and the probation system are largely related to the legal limitations of sharing supervision responsibility with non-court organizations and about the appropriateness of the youth's placement in a program. As a government agency, the courts may be reluctant at times to recognize that a privately organized program can provide legitimate services for youths over whom the court has legal responsibility. Care must be taken not to "overstep the bounds" in dealing with youth. Occasionally, the police may want to use a program as a convenient place to drop youth. Then too, police may sometimes give agencies or parents information about the youth which the program feels is

inappropriate. Conflicts with the welfare system may occur when the system and the program disagree philosophically over what constitutes an appropriate client for acceptance into a particular program. These conflicts may be avoided if people communicate programmatic goals, confront the issues, and avoid personality clashes between staff and welfare workers.

Because residential alternative programs exist in a system of service providers who offer assistance to juveniles as well as the community as a whole, it is important that residential alternatives develop alliances to provide adequate services to clients. This may be done through coalition building or the development of service linkages, especially in areas of medical care, legal services, and services to individuals with acute psychological and emotional problems. Regardless of these linkages, a question may arise about who is responsible to youth under what circumstances. The utilization of citizens to provide services as either volunteers or as Board or Advisory Committee members may help establish relationships with powerful individuals as well as with agencies and programs.

The Board of Directors and the Advisory Committee often provide management resources of special value. Among the responsibilities of a Board of Directors are serving as a liaison with the leadership of the community; providing legal advice; providing financial advice; developing and assisting with fund raising; serving as liaison with the Juvenile Justice Service System of the community; serving in a public relations role; and providing direct services as needed by the program. The Advisory Committee, usually composed of people with more interest in providing residential alternatives for juveniles than in the financial, administrative, and management issues, is often composed of community members, collateral service providers, or members of the Juvenile Justice System who can provide input and direction to the program. An Advisory Committee usually serves as a sounding board where the staff of the program can try out new ideas and plans. Because various skills are needed on an efficient Board of Directors or Advisory Committee, every effort should be made by project directors to secure the participation of representative skills needed to effectively maintain a residential alternative operation.

CHAPTER X - SURVIVAL ISSUES FOR PROGRAMS

There are three areas that are of major consequence for program survival. They include: The evaluation of programs, the planning for new services, and the development of new and continuing funding sources. Program evaluation should be structured into program development at the outset. Reasons for engaging in evaluation are that they may be required by a funding agency, the use of the results of the research may be used to bolster future grant submissions, such evaluations tell staff personnel what is happening in the program, evaluation allows staff to find out more about their clients, such evaluation allows for a refinement in treatment, and evaluation data is helpful in planning future programs. The primary purpose of program evaluation is not to make judgments about the program as a whole but rather to meet the needs of program administrators, funding agencies, or other interested parties through a flexible and more objective process than is usually followed. An evaluation effort tends to focus on an evaluation

of management, of the process of service provision, and/or of the program's impact on the clients. Some evaluations are routine in-house, while others are conducted by governmental agencies in the form of site visits for the purpose of licensing or for the purpose of auditing expended funds. Sometimes consulting firms or academic institutions will be hired as objective evaluators.

Management evaluations focus on the procedures or systems used by the agency Director and his/her staff in administering the agency. A process evaluation determines whether services are being delivered according to accepted professional standards. A program impact evaluation involves the calculation of pre-test/post-test differences and client attitudes and/or behavior that can be attributed to the services delivered to the clients.

The planning of new services may evolve without any previous planning or may emerge out of an evaluation conducted of the program. Where planning was important, the planning process consisted largely of the formulation of a good idea by the Program Administrator or Board member, followed by informational consultation with other key staff members, Board members, and interested community members. If funds for the new program could be found, the new services were added to the program's existing package of services.

The planning process in many residential alternative programs is rather poor, largely due to the fact that program administrators have not performed the necessary monitoring and evaluating functions in the past. In planning for new services three things should be done: First, an on-going evaluation and monitoring system should be instituted so that it can produce information that will be useful in planning for new services as well as continuing and modifying present services; second, new services planning should occur as the need arises rather than on an emergency basis just before applications for funding renewal are to be submitted; and third, the planning process should involve as many knowledgeable staff and Board members as possible, and should also include representatives from significant private and public community agencies.

Most alternative programs begin with a single source of major funds, a source which may be terminated by the end of the third year. Therefore, it is important that the Board and the Executive Director understand that the securing of continuing funds be made a major priority. If residential alternative programs are able to grow, they tend to add additional functions and find that single funding agencies are not likely to support a multitude of service delivery functions. Therefore, they are obligated to seek multiple funding sources, often as many as eight or ten for a single residential alternative program. This, of course, causes major bookkeeping and reporting problems. Contributions from private citizens and businesses may be sought on a local, regional, or state-wide basis. From all evidence available to SERCL members, it appears wise for programs to seek multiple sources of funding as early as possible. Programs that have survived for several years find that they must learn to tap multiple funding sources. This can only be done successfully if the program has the support of community and government leaders. While politics cannot be ignored, politics alone may not insure survival. Good evaluative data of management processes and outcomes is at least as important to the long term life of a program.

PART THREE: ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS

CHAPTER XI - MODELS OF MANAGEMENT IN VARIOUS COMMUNITY SETTINGS

Once a community has decided how committed it is to the institutionalization of juveniles who do not need to be detained in secure facilities, several policy issues regarding implementation need to be addressed. First, the community must determine the type and level of resources that are available in the community and elsewhere. Next, it must evaluate the existing service system and judge how the system will relate to any new components, and if and how it should change any system philosophy or operations. The community must also decide who is to take responsibility for beginning and continuing residential alternative programs. The first step in creating residential alternative services is to determine the level of resources available in the community. The most obvious resource is the amount of money available in both the private and public sectors to fund an alternative to detention program. (Samples of existing programs are described in the Appendix.)

Four types of residential alternatives, based upon the variables in the local community which seem to be crucial for the management of alternatives, commonly exist. They include the Grassroots Organization, the Publicly-Funded-Community-Base-Network, the Grant-Service-Cluster, and the Publicly-Operated-Agency. The Grassroots Organizational model depends primarily on a high level of commitment and volunteerism in the community. It consists of a small group of community leaders and organizers who reach out to mobilize greater numbers of people in the community. Because it is limited in its support base, it seeks participation with public and non-public agencies through a growing coalition. The Grassroots Organization has a central core of administrators, volunteer coordinators, and program coordinators. The program usually arises out of a perceived need by limited number of community members who then extend outreach to engage the participation of others. Such a model is advantageous because of its low cost due to the high level of volunteer commitment and its ability to show that it is strongly linked with other service organizations in the community. The major disadvantage is that this type of program relies on volunteer commitment and extensive communication with agencies within the community. This commitment is difficult to secure and is even more difficult to sustain. Nevertheless, the organization does serve as analyzing structure, linking the existing service providers and public agencies in the community with the needs of the clients. The central management acts more as an administrator and less in a service delivery capacity.

The Publicly-Funded-Community-Base Contract Network model consists of a publicly-managed agency (e.g., police department or juvenile court system) which contracts with various providers for services through a system of purchase of service contracts. Typically, the referring agency annually announces that it will accept proposals for service delivery to juveniles from local service providers. Under a competitive bidding process, the best offer(s) of cost and quality of service are then selected. Payments are made according to a per diem or per hour rate, depending on the type of service offered. Service arrangements under this model tend to be flexible in order to meet the needs of the juvenile. The

Publicly-Funded-Community-Base Contract Network appears to work best in metropolitan areas where a large number of service providers are available and where the tax base is large enough to support such a multi-faceted network. A modified version of this model, however, will work in rural areas where there is a single outlet or a limited number of service outlets. This model is advantageous because it allows the publicly-funded agencies to maintain some control over quality of services delivered, and permits the court or police system to have some control over their clients, particularly if the court is the referral agent. Another distinct advantage is that it tends to provide service at a lower cost than is available to individuals generally. A potential disadvantage is that it requires a commitment of public funds. The management tasks for a central referring agency, as depicted in this model, center around the development of the annual proposal and contracting procedure, staff needs to refer clients to the appropriate service provider, review of claims for reimbursement, and the disbursement of funds. Perhaps the most difficult task is to monitor the provided services.

The Grant-Funded-Service Cluster, the third model, is commonly used throughout the United States. Under this form an agency, which provides a multiplicity of services, is supported by multiple funding sources. The building of a grant-funded-service cluster is accomplished by a small group of people who pool their efforts to write a proposal. Once a proposal is funded and the services are provided, the group begins to realize that many more services are needed in the area. They then begin to write additional grants, utilizing the same administrative structure. As they diversify they may secure funding from 3 to 12 external funding sources, offering a wide variety of services where local support is low or non-existent. Occasionally, a grant-funded-service cluster will stimulate local interest and provide more services. Within each of the components of this cluster, service provision is much like that in single mode agencies. This model is common because communities are often financially ill equipped to provide these services, leading those concerned for service delivery to outside granting sources for support. The grant-funded-service cluster in some communities provides the only source of funding. As an existing body, it can channel the Nation's resources to the areas of greatest need. Because it often has access to state and Federal funds, it is often free of local political power struggles. A major disadvantage of this approach is that it relies on external funding for service provision. Further, it does not encourage local political groups to assume responsibility for alternative services. Nevertheless, in the grant-funded-service cluster, the principal management effort must be to organize its resources and proposal writing and in the management tasks necessary to coordinate various grants. The financial system may become cumbersome due to the varied reporting requirements and fund accounting necessary to maintain this system.

The Publicly-Operated Agency, a fourth model, is likewise common in many small and medium-sized cities throughout the United States. Consisting of local community funding and a publicly-operated alternative to detention program, it is sponsored and funded by a city, town, or county government. In some cases the alternative is associated with a detention facility. Because this type of unit meets the needs of a particular small community, there is often little demand for a wider range of services or a more complex

organizational type. The publicly-operated agency is most appropriate in small to medium-sized communities where privately-operated services are not available and where the local community believes that it is the responsibility of the local government to provide such services. A major advantage of this approach is that it is able to secure a stable funding base in the community. However, a disadvantage is its dependence on tax funds from local tax revenues. In times of difficulty, an alternative program may be forced to suspend a portion or all its population. If an alternative program is associated directly with a needed detention program, the two organizations may grow close and guarantee the continuance of the alternative program.

Community size is a major ingredient in determining what type of alternative service to provide. Smaller communities, due to limitations on financial aid and number of clients to be served, must select and prioritize the services which they intend to deliver. Medium size communities, which have greater flexibility, also need to confront monetary barriers to the development of extensive service networks. Larger communities, on the other hand, must sometimes overcome problems of fragmentation of services and size of the environment in order to deliver services effectively.

Some general guidelines should be considered by communities of all sizes and levels as they examine the question of offering alternatives to detention. These suggestions are: 1) Meet the most pressing needs first; 2) develop simple programs first; 3) work with short term before long term options; 4) develop flexible options in smaller and previously served communities; 5) develop wide range over narrow range alternatives; 6) develop a longer term (over one week) facility as the need arises; 7) find out what needs are already being met; 8) determine community support for kinds of treatment modes; and 9) determine the demand for specialized services.

Small communities of less than 25,000-30,000 can generally afford to address only the basic needs of juveniles within their territory. For very small communities, the most plausible residential alternative to detention is a short-term group home, an emergency shelter where youth can go if they have difficulties with their families or they need housing for a few days. The length of stay permitted in such a home should be no more than one month, because longer stays are incompatible with the short range services provided by an emergency shelter facility. Once this program is established, the next logical step is to create a longer term foster home network. For small communities, or rural areas, this need may be met by locating five or six families with only two or three families actively housing juveniles at a time. Possibly, one or two of these families may serve children who need a longer term place to stay. Most smaller communities or rural areas cannot support a more sophisticated network; thus, specialized forms of treatment should be provided on a regional basis. Small communities and rural areas generally have an advantage in being able to work very closely with the families involved and with the staff of a regional detention center.

In communities above 30,000-40,000 residents, an alternative service network will probably generate a demand for more sophisticated services. In

communities of this size it may be possible to separate the short-term crises centers (overnight to one week) from the short-term group home (one week to one month). This differentiation is necessary because the intensive needs of youth in crises require different services than juveniles who have stabilized their lives and need some longer term work toward resolving the problems which brought about their situation.

When a community reaches 70,000 - 80,000 people, even more specialized services can be provided. At this point, two or three crises centers, serving different communities, and both short-term and long-term groups homes can be supported. When this size is reached the needs of juveniles can justify the creation of more specialized services, such as alcohol and other drug counseling, job training programs, alternative education programs, or day treatment facilities.

Communities with a population over 100,000 persons can generally afford most of the specialized services necessary for the provision of all juvenile needs. In addition to the earlier mentioned services, larger communities can afford to set up independent living skills, adolescent child care programs, alternative schools, learning disabilities and other special education schools and psychological treatment centers. These specialized centers may be independent agencies or may be components to a large multi-component agency.

Alternative service networks in large urban areas over 100,000 population are in many respects like those for cities around the 100,000 figure. What generally occurs in large urban areas is that a number of systems, similar to those in a medium sized or larger community, develop in different sections of the metropolitan area. Each of these service systems may then serve a particular part of the city or a particular racial or ethnic community, although it may do so independently and not as part of an administrative super-structure providing services to an entire city. Once an agency has four to five treatment components it tends to reach a natural treatment growth limit. At this time it must limit its expansion and depend upon someone else to begin other organizations in other areas of the city or risk the cost incurred because of expansion. The complexity of large cities requires a professional administrative super-structure to deal with the external demands upon the organization. Large publicly-funded bureaucracies, unresponsive business and government organizations, and a variety of communities and cultures to be served demand specialized administrative effort. Thus, a separation of administrative and treatment matters becomes a necessity for organizations service large urban areas.

CONCLUSION

Persons who wish to start an alternative to detention in a community of any size should survey services already provided in the area by other agencies. This examination should focus on the treatment modes currently being provided as well as the areas of the city and the types of cultures presently being served. Thus, in situations where there are already alternative service networks, new providers must carefully determine that the needs they are addressing are real. Only then can the potential residential alternative to detention be realized.

APPENDIX

SAMPLE RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVES PROJECT MODELS

The following sheets summarize the general content, scope, costs, and other characteristics of some operating models of residential alternatives programs. They are intended to stimulate the reader's mind rather than to be definitive statements of program operations. Persons interested in creating a particular type of residential alternative should consult with persons operating similar units elsewhere in the United States.

MODEL 1

COMMUNITY SIZE: 39,000

PROJECT TYPE: Supervised Independent Living; Foster Home; Temporary Shelter House; Short-Term Group Home; Long-Term Group Home

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Males and females served
Ages 12-17 years
Two-thirds come from project county
Maximum stay = 2 months
Crisis line
Living unit = converted home

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 3 weeks

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 8

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 12
(Includes those non-residential)

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, truants, alcohol/drugs, delinquents, mental problems, family problems, violence prone

SERVICES OFFERED:

Room and board; Guided group interaction; Foster care; Interpersonal skills; Non-professional/professional counseling; Family counseling; Legal information
Employment assistance

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

13 Professionals
2 Administrative
1 Support and Clerical
3 Interns
4 Peer Counselors

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 3
 No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Federal Source #1	\$ 46,500	\$3.25
#2	12,200	
#3	16,500	
#4	25,000	
Local Sources	3,000	
Service Contracts	30,000	
	<u>\$ 133,200</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

1) Immediate crisis stabilization
2) Transfer of skills to community

REFERRING SOURCES:

Other facilities; Police; Parents; Juvenile Court officials; Clergy; School officials; Volunteers; Social service agencies

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Facility holds 8 in residence.

MODEL 2

COMMUNITY SIZE: 43,000

PROJECT TYPE: Youth Services Program, including Crisis Intervention Hotline

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Project does not deal with intense emotional/psychological problems
Serves entire county, heavily rural area surrounding
No residential unit with the program
Largely white clientele

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: NA

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: NA

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: NA

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, truants, uncontrollables, alcohol/drugs, sexually acting out, misdemeanants, mentally disturbed, family problems, youth in need of supervision

SERVICES OFFERED:

Non-professional counseling; Sexual/Pregnancy and family counseling; Foster care; Employment counseling; Interpersonal skills; Crisis intervention hotline; Truancy prevention

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

1 Executive Director
4 Professional Staff
1 Clerical Staff

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 29
 No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Title XX (State Welfare Dept.)	Unstated (Minimal)	\$7.00/hour or \$56.00/day
Local Contributions		

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

1) Youth in need county-wide

REFERRING SOURCES:

Schools/Teachers; Parents; Juvenile Courts/Probation Department; Self; Police

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Has parent support association and training.

MODEL 3

COMMUNITY SIZE:

Suburb of community with population of 54,000

PROJECT TYPE:

Supervised Independent Living/Temporary Homes in Community

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Ages 10-17 years
1,000 juveniles counseled annually
400 juveniles housed yearly
Males and females served
County-wide services
Maximum stay = 30 days

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 7 days

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 1-4 per home

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: Varies

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants, alcohol/drugs, misdemeanor delinquents, mental health problems, family problems

SERVICES OFFERED:

Room and board; Foster care; Non-professional/professional counseling; Employment evaluation; Family counseling

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

15 Professionals
4 Administrative
4-5 Support and Clerical (2 Full)
15 Paraprofessionals (Cool Home Families)

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 100
 No 15 Cool Home Families

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Federal Source	\$ 75,000	\$24/Cool Home Placement
State Source #1	12,000	\$16/Crisis Outreach/
#2	60,000	Counseling
#3	7,500	
#4	15,000	
General Funding	14,000	
United Way	3,000	
CETA	84,000	
	<u>\$ 270,500</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Crisis intervention/counseling (family)
- 2) Temporary Shelter
- 3) Resource referral

REFERRING SOURCES:

Other facilities; Police; Parents; Juvenile Court officials; Clergy; School officials; Volunteers; Social service agencies

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

95% pre-adjudication; 10-15% served are out-of-state runaways; 85% of clients referred to other agencies; served 350 youth for average stay of 4-5 days.

MODEL 4

COMMUNITY SIZE: 67,000

PROJECT TYPE: Temporary Short-Term Shelter Home (Runaway Shelter)

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Age range: 12-17 years
Maximum length of stay = 2-4 weeks
Provides shelter for runaways around the clock
Part of a larger program
Majority youth served = pre-adjudicated delinquents who are not serious offenders or discipline problems

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 3 days

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 12

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 4-6

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants, alcohol/drug, sexually deviant, delinquents (not charged or appropriate for detention), mental disorders, family problems, in need of supervision

SERVICES OFFERED:

Room and board; Recreation; Family and professional counseling; Medical services (by contract); 24 hour shelter

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

4-5 Professional and Administrative
3 Support and Clerical

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 30
 No

For youth outings, arts & crafts, house supervision, interaction with youth

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Federal Source	\$ 69,000	\$4.00
Division of Youth Services	3,000	
Miscellaneous	1,000	
	<u>\$ 73,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Youth in catchment area
- 2) Other youth coming to attention

REFERRING SOURCES:

Dept. of Health & Rehabilitation; Police; Self/Walk-ins

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Most referrals come from Department of Health and Rehabilitation; screen out "streetwise" youth; males = 55%, females = 45%; serves 16 county areas.

MODEL 5

COMMUNITY SIZE: 82,000

PROJECT TYPE:

Intensive Day Services

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Intensive day services
No age eligibility criteria
Males and females served
Rules of behavior defined
No living unit
Pre-adjudication clients = 90%

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 6 months

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 300 new clients

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 50

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants, alcohol/drugs, sexually deviant, misdemeanor delinquents, probationers, parolees, mentally disturbed, family problems, GED, violence prone, tutoring, in need of supervision

SERVICES OFFERED:

Non-professional/professional counseling; Family counseling; Employment evaluation; Vocational training; Recreation; Guided group interaction; Interpersonal skills; GED; Tutoring

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

17 Professionals
4 Administrative
4 Support and Clerical

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 7
 No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
State Funds	\$ 200,000	\$1.00
City Funds	66,000	
CETA	53,000	
	<u>\$ 319,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Counseling
- 2) Related Social Services
- 3) Educational Assistance

REFERRING SOURCES:

Other facilities; Police; Parents; Juvenile Court officials; Clergy; Social service agencies; Volunteers

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Minimum referrals are made.

MODEL 6

COMMUNITY SIZE: 87,000

PROJECT TYPE: Short-Term Group Home/
Temporary Shelter House; Attention Home

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Four group homes served
#1 - 9 youth
#2 - emotional problems
#3 - hardcore youth
#4 - independent living
Extensive full treatment
Religious group oriented
Independent living preparation
Pre-adjudication = 55% - 60%

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY:

Home #1 - 2 weeks to 3 months
Home #2 - 3 months
Home #3 - 3 to 6 months
Home #4 - 6 months to year

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: NA

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 120
served in Attention Homes per year/
150 receive family counseling per year

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants, alcohol/drugs, sexual misbehavior delinquents, mental disorders, in need of supervision; family problems, severely emotionally disturbed

SERVICES OFFERED:

Non-professional counseling (psychological & educational); Recreation; Family counseling; Interpersonal skills; Diagnostic evaluations; Psychological evaluations; Aftercare

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

Professional staff
Houseparent couple
Relief Houseparents

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 3
 No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Dept. of Social Service	\$ 116,000	\$24.00
Public Donations	24,000	
Public Sale	5,000	
Radiothon	9,000	
Per Diem Payments	10,000	
City Funds	10,000	
County Funds	1,500	
Other	26,500	
	<u>\$ 202,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Youth in need

REFERRING SOURCES:

Juvenile Court/Probation officers; Board members; Public agencies; Welfare Dept.

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Strong Board involvement; fees paid for 40-75% of costs - rest is made up by contributions from individuals, businesses, civic groups, churches, CETA, and other sources.

MODEL 7

COMMUNITY SIZE: 177,000

PROJECT TYPE:

Home Detention
Shelter Care

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Under auspices of County Detention Court
Shelter care provided by subcontract
Police bring youth to project or
other alternative
Shelter care = 100% pre-adjudicated
delinquents
Must be under 18 years
Serves males and females
County-wide service area

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 14 days; no
maximum length of stay (although
generally less than 6 weeks

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: NA

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 22
youth on home detention daily

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants,
alcohol/drugs, sexually deviant,
delinquents, mentally disordered,
family problems, violence prone
in need of supervision

SERVICES OFFERED:

Daily supervision

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

Home Detention - 2 Counselors
Young Boys Unit - 8 Counselors
Shelter - Director, Asst. Director,
2 Zone Leaders, Aide, and Secretary

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: _____
 No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Title XX	\$ 26,000 - \$ 34,000	\$6.00

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Close supervision of youth to prevent further difficulty with the law
- 2) Make certain youth attends court hearing

REFERRING SOURCES:

Police; Juvenile Court

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Youth are placed in their home or surrogate home.

MODEL 8

COMMUNITY SIZE: 191,000

PROJECT TYPE: Shelter Care Facility/
Short-Term Group Home

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Reject persons dangerous to self or
others (violent, mentally disordered)
Runaways must be willing to contact
parents and/or deal with the police
Ages 12-17 years; average 14.5 years
Sex = female 50%, males 50%
80% from the city
Works in cooperation with detention facility

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 7 days

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 10

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 8

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, youth having family
crisis, or are charged with
delinquent act

SERVICES OFFERED:

Emergency social work; Educational
component; Recreation; Shelter care
and food; Crisis intervention counseling;
Sexual/pregnancy counseling; Medical
services; Guided group interaction;
Behavior management

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

1 Director
1 Supervisor
1 Social Worker
4 Bookkeeper/Secretarial
10 House Staff

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: Unstated
 No

Used for tutoring & providing services

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Purchase of services (Dept. of Social Services)		\$49.00
County Sources		Per diem reimbursement rate = \$44/day
Federal Sources	\$ 330,000	Unit cost at Shelter = \$56.00
CETA		
Title XX		
Miscellaneous		

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Youth in need of short-term care

REFERRING SOURCES:

Police; Social workers/Welfare Dept.;
Self; Juvenile Court/Probation Dept.;
Churches; Schools

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Desires to create a pre-independent living program; maximum length of stay =
30 days (sometimes waived); have 8-12% runaway rate at facility.

MODEL 9

COMMUNITY SIZE: 204,000

PROJECT TYPE:

Foster Home; Long-Term Group Home

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Pre-adjudication clients = 60%
Males and females served
Ages 0-17, within commutable range
Basic family orientation
Sponsored by religious group

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 6-9 months

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 40

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 30

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants,
drug/alcohol problems, sexually
deviant, misdemeanants, mentally
disturbed, probationers, family
problems, in need of supervision,
abandoned/neglected youth

SERVICES OFFERED:

Foster care; Family counseling; Guided
group interaction; Interpersonal skills;
Professional counseling-psychological,
religious, sexual/pregnancy

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

4 Professionals
1 Administrator
1 Support and Clerical

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 24 sets
 No of foster
parents

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

SOURCE	AMOUNT	AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE
State Funds	\$ 60,000	\$22.00
Sponsoring Churches	36,000	
Interested Individuals & Others	25,000	
	\$ 121,000	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Foster Care
- 2) Adoption
- 3) Maternity

REFERRING SOURCES:

Other facilities; Juvenile Court
officials; School officials; Parents;
Clergy; Social service agencies;
Volunteers

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

4 family group homes (maximum of 8 persons) and private foster homes.

MODEL 10

COMMUNITY SIZE: 372,000

PROJECT TYPE: Temporary Shelter Home/
Short-Term Group Home; Adoptive
Services; Foster Home Program/Services
for Unwed Mothers; Emergency Sheltercare

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Ages 13 - 18
Males and females served
No residential restrictions
No maximum length of stay

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 2 months

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 12

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 10

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants,
alcohol/drugs, misdemeanor delin-
quents, mental health problems,
family problems, in need of super-
vision

SERVICES OFFERED:

Room and board; Foster care; Family
counseling; Professional counseling;
Medical services; Interpersonal skills;
Group living

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

2 Professionals
1 Administrator
3 Support and Clerical
5 Paraprofessionals (houseparents)

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 5
 No (Houseparents)

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

SOURCE	AMOUNT	AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE
Private Donations	\$ 71,000	\$30.00

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

None given

REFERRING SOURCES:

Other facilities; Juvenile Court
officials; School officials; Parents;
Clergy; Social service agencies

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

None suggested.

MODEL 11

COMMUNITY SIZE: 472,000

PROJECT TYPE:

Temporary Shelter Home/Short-Term
Group Home

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Temporary assistance/counseling/shelter
Maximum 6 week stay

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: 2-6 weeks

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 10

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 7-9

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, sexual
misbehavior, truants, alcohol/drugs,
delinquents, probationers, parolees,
mentally disturbed, family problems,
in need of supervision

SERVICES OFFERED:

Professional counseling; Family
counseling; Tutor/school work;
Recreation; Guided group interaction;

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

15 Professionals

VOLUNTEERS? NA Yes Number: _____
No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
County Funds (Mental Health)	\$ 80,000	Not Available
Federal Source (Youth Develop.)	60,000	
County Per Diem	90,000	
	<u>\$ 230,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

Unstated

REFERRING SOURCES:

General community public and non-public

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

80% pre-adjudication.

MODEL 12

COMMUNITY SIZE: 497,000

PROJECT TYPE:

County Juvenile Court Department

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Uses purchase of services with large
number of private agencies
Status offenders = 70% female; 30% male
Refer many youth to short-term
residential alternatives
Serve youth 10-17 years of age
Delinquent offenders = 80% male;
20% female
Diversionary program

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: NA

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: NA

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: NA
Served over 5,000 youth in 1977
Detention has 60 in daily average
occupancy

CLIENTS SERVED:

Status and delinquent offenders
of all types, family problems re-
lated to above, neglected or abused
youth, unpredictable youth, chronic
runaways

SERVICES OFFERED:

Non-professional counseling; Crisis
and family counseling; Medical services;
Probation and detention services; Crisis
counseling

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

2 Judges
2 Referees
4 Mental Health Clinicians
70 Detention Staff
50 Probation Staff plus Clerical

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: _____
X No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Funded by County and other public sources	Unstated	\$26.00 (in 1976)

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

1) Youth before the Juvenile Court

REFERRING SOURCES:

Parents; Relatives; Self/Walk-ins;
Police; Victim; Courts; School;
Social Agencies

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Refer clients to other area agencies as needed; status offenders often filed
as delinquent offenders as well (can file either delinquent or status charge
as needed); competitive services contracted.

MODEL 13

COMMUNITY SIZE: 538,000

PROJECT TYPE: 24-Hour Residential Facility; Educational Center/Work Assistance Program

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Serves youth 12-21 years of age
Alternative place for 12-16 yr. olds
Serves 35 youths
Average age = 14.8 years
Black clients = 97%
Serves 34 boys in Group Home
Serves 52 in Educational Center

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: Variable

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: Group Home -
20 Units

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: Variable

CLIENTS SERVED:

Youth with little or no home support, or in need of temporary removal from environmental influence

SERVICES OFFERED:

Shelter care; Educational support; Drug counseling; Vocational training; Counseling

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

26 - Educational Center

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: _____
No

No information

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
City Board of Education	\$ 115,000	Residential facility - average cost per client = \$4,085
City Training & Employment Agency	142,000	
Special Grant #1	55,000	Educational Center - = \$4,778
#2	17,000	
#3	10,000	
Manpower Planning	40,000	
Other	141,000	
	<u>\$ 540,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

1) Youth in need

REFERRING SOURCES:

City Juvenile Court; County Juvenile Court; Dept. of Youth Services

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Works closely with Educational Center; began under religious sponsorship; twenty units in the group home.

MODEL 14

COMMUNITY SIZE: 715,000

PROJECT TYPE:

Short-Term Group Home (part of a broader service cluster); Crisis Shelter Home

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Fifteen member Board
Multiple components
Admission agreement between client and staff
Ages between 12-17, with parental permission
Male/female ratio = 50%/50%

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: Variable

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: Variable

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: Variable

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, sexual minorities

SERVICES OFFERED:

Counseling; Housing; Sexual/Pregnancy and crisis counseling; Youth advocacy; Drug counseling

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

2 Co-Directors of overall agency
1 Administrative Coordinator
3 Administrative Workers
3 Financial Workers
Miscellaneous treatment and house staff

VOLUNTEERS? X Yes Number: _____
No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Placement Fee	\$ 300,000	No figure given
City and County	140,000	
Fee for Service Contracts	90,000	
State Dept. of Health	64,000	
County Office of Criminal Justice	60,000	
Federal Source #1	130,000	
#2	24,000	
Other	192,000	
	<u>\$1,000,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

1) Youth they feel they can serve

REFERRING SOURCES:

Juvenile Court/Probation Officer; Self; Other agencies; Parents; Police

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

No mental illness - only emotionally disturbed.

MODEL 15

COMMUNITY SIZE: 757,000

PROJECT TYPE: Short-Term Group Home;
Alternative to Juvenile Justice System;
Foster Care

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Works with 60 youths
Has two buildings
Serves males and females
One bldg. has 3 rooms for girls;
3 rooms for boys
Licensed for 10 beds; looking to 12
No minimum/maximum age restrictions

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY: House #1 =
5 weeks

MAXIMUM CAPACITY: 10

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: 7-8

CLIENTS SERVED:

Runaways, uncontrollables, truants,
emotionally disturbed, alcohol/drug,
sexual misbehavior, misdemeanor and
probationary delinquents, mental
health problems, family problems,
youth in need of supervision

SERVICES OFFERED:

Foster care; Nonprofessional counseling;
Educational and employment counseling;
Sexual/pregnancy and family counseling
Interpersonal skills; Guided group
interaction

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

Executive Director
3 Coordinators
House Staff

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: 32
 No

Interns are utilized

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
Federal Source #1	\$ 133,000	Not identified
#2	64,500	
United Way	20,000	
Private Funds	70,000	
Other Sources	92,500	
	<u>\$ 380,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Youth on the streets
- 2) Youth in need of home (foster)
- 3) Youth needing advocate

REFERRING SOURCES:

Juvenile Court/Probation Dept.;
Defense and prosecuting attorneys;
Self; Police

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Began as outreach effort but changed to current basis; major benefactor gave large amount of money for building; foster parents paid \$10/day.

MODEL 16

COMMUNITY SIZE: 1,500,000

PROJECT TYPE:

Short-Term Group Home; Crisis Center

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS:

Crisis Center serves intake
function for system
Clients = 60% female; 40% male
90% youth come from area
Serves 12-18 year olds
(sometimes 19 years)

AVERAGE CLIENT STAY:
Crisis Home = 3-4 weeks

MAXIMUM CAPACITY:
Crisis Center licensed for 8

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE: Variable

CLIENTS SERVED:

Youth in need of supervision,
neglected or abused, runaways
or abandoned youth, truants,
alcohol/drugs, sexual misbehavior,
probationers, mental disorders,
emotionally disturbed (but not
heavily medicated), family problems

SERVICES OFFERED:

Temporary care; Personal, peer, group,
and family counseling; Professional
counseling; Employment and educational
assistance; Sexual/pregnancy counseling

STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS:

Executive Director, Asst. Executive
Director and diverse staff according
to complex functions of project.

VOLUNTEERS? Yes Number: Variable
 No

FINANCIAL SUPPORT:

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>AVERAGE COST OF SERVICE PER DAY PER JUVENILE</u>
County Social Services	\$ 580,000	\$37.00/night per youth
Parents/Foundations	40,000	
State (Mental Retard.)	305,000	
Federal Sources (HEW)	65,000	
Special Programs	35,000	
	<u>\$1,025,000</u>	

SERVICE PRIORITIES:

- 1) Youth in the area

REFERRING SOURCES:

Parents; Self; Police; Courts; Welfare
Department

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS/ISSUES:

Costs of service not covered by city monies; clients given a weekly allowance for recreational/personal needs.

END