

Georgia

AK

STATE CRIME COMMISSION

CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS AND GOALS STUDY

Study Group: Corrections

Date: October 23, 1975

Position Paper Title: Juvenile Intake and Detention  
CR 2-3

Issue Statement

How can juvenile intake procedures and policies concerning the pre-disposition detention of juveniles be improved in the State of Georgia?

Conclusion

Juvenile justice in Georgia is handled in a fragmented manner without sufficient standards and guidelines to ensure that juveniles across the State receive equitable quality services. In an effort to rectify these problems, procedures should be developed and enforced statewide concerning intake and detention decisions. Detention center planning should be improved by providing an accurate data base about the center's needs and by establishing plans based upon that data base. Requirements for the recruitment and training of detention center personnel should be improved and standardized across the State and efforts should be made to bring the salaries to a level which are commensurate with the skills and training required and the responsibility involved.

Research Findings

For the purposes of this paper, several basic terms related to the processing of juvenile offenders should be defined.

1. A juvenile is any individual who is
  - (a) under the age of 17; or who is
  - (b) under the age of 21 who has committed an act of delinquency before reaching the age of 17 and been placed under the supervision or probation of the court. The terms child, youth and juvenile are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

59/64

2. A delinquent child is a child who has committed a delinquent act including violations of local, state or federal laws, or violations of the terms of supervision contained in a court order which has been directed to a child who has been adjudicated delinquent or unruly.
3. An unruly child or status offender is a child who has committed one or more acts that are illegal for children but not adults, or who is considered in need of supervision.
4. Detention is the temporary care of children in physically restricted facilities pending court disposition or transfer to another jurisdiction or agency. Detention does not include shelter care or care in a foster home.
5. Probation Officer / Court Services Worker is the juvenile employee who is responsible for most of the processing juveniles receive from the juvenile system. This processing includes intake services, detention planning, the development of social histories, and probation and aftercare services. There are also responsibilities to the court such as investigation, record keeping and the preparation and filing of legal papers. The term court services worker refers only to the State employees who are responsible for all juvenile processing in 142 counties and for aftercare in 159 counties.
6. Intake is the process of screening cases prior to court appearance. The process can result in diversion from the system, detention, and/or filing of a formal petition.
7. Adjudication is the court's finding as to the validity of the allegations made in a petition relative to a child's status as a delinquent, an unruly child, or a deprived child.

#### Problem Identification

There are three major problem areas relative to juvenile court intake and detention in the State of Georgia. These problem areas are:

- 1) a general lack of specific criteria regarding intake and detention decisions;
- 2) a lack of detention center planning based on quantifiable information; and
- 3) a lack of adequate qualifications and training for detention personnel, particularly at the level of child-care and service delivery.

Although the intake process is an important part of a juvenile's experience with the juvenile justice system, the Georgia Juvenile Court Code does not address itself to this process. There are no specific criteria upon which decisions can be made relative to the 1) release of a child about whom a complaint has been made; 2) diversion of the child to some other social service agency; 3) provision of court counseling and referral services through non-judicial handling or 4) file a formal petition.<sup>1</sup> The Juvenile Code does recognize the possibility of non-judicial handling and generally describes the conditions under which an informal adjustment can be made;<sup>2</sup> however, specific criteria relative to what children should be handled in this way are lacking.<sup>3</sup> Juvenile judges, in both independent systems and non-independent systems, have made extensive use of informal adjustments and informal probation. However, there are little data available about the success or failure of such dispositions.<sup>4</sup>

Georgia's detention facilities, particularly the state-operated Regional Youth Development Centers (hereinafter referred to as RYDC), are generally overcrowded. Overcrowding might be attributed to 1) a tendency to detain children unnecessarily and 2) a lack of sufficient detention bedspace. It is difficult to determine why the detention centers are overcrowded because there are no data pertaining to the use of detention facilities. It is not known statistically what class of offenders are being detained, why they are detained, how long they are being detained, and what the final dispositions are.

Furthermore, there are only very general guidelines to use in making a decision to detain a child. The Juvenile Court Code allows the detention of a child 1) to protect the person or property of others or of the child, 2) because the child may run away or be taken from the jurisdiction of the court, 3) because the child has no person who can provide care and supervision, or 4) because the court orders that a child be detained.<sup>5</sup>

Such general guidelines can be interpreted to authorize detention of almost any child who has had contact with the juvenile justice system. Indeed, during off-hours RYDC detention workers are not authorized to release a child who has been brought to the center by a law enforcement officer.<sup>6</sup>

Such variations in interpretation of the conditions governing detention is partially shown by the wide differences in detention rates among counties. In 1974 some counties detained no children while other counties detained up to 146 per 10,000 population.<sup>7</sup> Although the information available is not conclusive and there certainly will be differences in the detention needs of various locales, the reasons for such wide disparities need to be examined.

An estimated 2000 juveniles will be held for over 24 hours in Georgia's jails during a 12-month period beginning November 1974.<sup>8</sup> This figure counts only those children who were held for longer than 24 hours. There are no data available relative to children who are held for less than 24 hours - an experience that may still be quite significant in the life of a youngster.

The Juvenile Court Code allows the jailing of children if a detention facility for delinquent children is not available and if the child is quartered in a room separate from adult inmates. A court order is necessary before a child can be jailed.<sup>9</sup> The Code makes it clear, however, that deprived or unruly children may not be detained in a jail or in a facility which also detains delinquent children.<sup>10</sup>

Current practices in Georgia violate these statutes. Data compiled by the Division of Youth Services Research Unit for 1974 indicates that 32% of all children jailed and 27% of all children held in RYDC are unruly children.<sup>11</sup>

There appears to be a significant lack of planning regarding the location of new detention centers. The Division of Youth Services reacts to demands for more detention beds without analytically examining the detention requirements for a particular area. The current projection is to increase RYDC bed capacity by 30% in Fiscal Year 1976 and that thereafter 54 beds a year will need to be provided to "keep pace" with the "current growth rate of youth needing detaining".<sup>12</sup> However, these projections are not supported by data about what type of cases are being handled by each juvenile court and what proportion of those are being detained. Law enforcement data are not available about what kinds of children are being processed through police agencies and what proportions of those children are being detained. Finally, there are no data available regarding the disposition of detained children so that an analysis of whether detention was actually required has not been done.

#### Other States' and Federal Experience

##### Federal Experience:

The federal government in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 recognized several important standards regarding the detention of juveniles.

"A juvenile alleged to be delinquent may be detained only in a juvenile facility or such other suitable place as the Attorney General may designate. Whenever possible, detention shall be in a foster home or community-based facility located in or near his home community. The Attorney General shall not cause any juvenile alleged to be delinquent to be detained or confined in any institution in which the juvenile has regular contact with adult persons convicted of a crime or awaiting trial on criminal charges. Insofar as possible, alleged delinquents shall be kept separated from adjudicated delinquents."<sup>13</sup>

The law recognizes that detention may have a significant effect on a child and that every care should be made to either avoid the experience entirely or to make the experience as harmless as possible. Detention should be in or near the child's home community so that family ties are not broken. Contact with adjudicated delinquents and/or adult criminals should be at an absolute minimum. The law, however, does not prohibit the use of jails or lockups for juveniles.<sup>14</sup>

#### Other States' Experiences:

Statistics collected by the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service show that almost 500,000 children were held in state and local detention centers during Fiscal Year 1971.<sup>15</sup> The average length of stay for that same period was 11 days.<sup>16</sup> On a single day (June 30, 1971) 11,748 children were held in 303 detention centers. Sixty-two percent (7300) were in detention pending court action; 29 percent (3449) had been adjudicated; 4 percent (489) were dependent or neglected; and 4 percent (510) were awaiting transfer to another jurisdiction.<sup>17</sup>

A study conducted by Mark Levin and Rosemary Sarri reported varying standards among the states regarding the detention of children. As of 1974, 31 states had no limits on the time a child could be held in detention without a detention hearing. The time limits that were set ranged from a minimum of 24 hours in Idaho and the District of Columbia to a maximum of 96 hours in North Dakota. In Maryland and South Dakota the detention hearing must be held "promptly."<sup>18</sup>

Levin and Sarri also reported that only 5 states prohibit jailing of juveniles under all conditions.<sup>19</sup> A court order is required in 14 states before a juvenile can be jailed.<sup>20</sup> Twelve states have varying minimum age requirements as regards possible jailing.<sup>21</sup> Four states require that the juvenile be a menace.<sup>22</sup> Eight states allow jailing juveniles in areas separate from adults if nothing else is available.<sup>23</sup> One state has no prohibitions against jailing children at all.<sup>24</sup>

Intake and detention are handled in different ways among the states. Below are brief descriptions of intake and detention systems in three states: Utah, Washington and Florida.

- Salt Lake City, Utah -

Utah's juvenile court system has been a unified system since 1909 when the legislature established a juvenile court in each judicial district of the State. The juvenile court was independent of the district court. The State paid for a judge and a chief probation officer for each district while local jurisdictions could employ additional probation staff at their own expense.<sup>25</sup>

Originally the juvenile courts were administered by a Juvenile Court Probation Commission. In 1941 the administration of the courts was transferred to the Utah State Welfare Commission. However, in 1963 the State Supreme Court ruled that it was a violation of the principle of division of power for an executive department to administer judicial activities.<sup>26</sup>

This 1963 decision led to the establishment in 1965 of a unified statewide juvenile court system under the administration of the judiciary. The State was divided into five juvenile court districts - each with a juvenile court - which are generally supervised by the State Supreme Court. A Board of Juvenile Court Judges, composed of all the juvenile court judges, act as the general supervising and policymaking body for the system.<sup>27</sup>

By a document (General Order 17) issued by the Board of Juvenile Court Judges, the judges effectively removed themselves from the administration of the court.<sup>28</sup> In an interview with the Director of Court Services of the Salt Lake City Juvenile Court, it was reported that the judges recognized that the administration of the court could operate more smoothly with only policy direction from the judges at the Board level. The judges are consulted concerning evaluation of personnel, but otherwise are removed from administrative matters.<sup>29</sup> The director of Court Services, under whom the probation staff and intake staff works, reports to the administrator of the State Juvenile Court rather than to the individual judge.<sup>30</sup>

Intake is handled by the probation staff in a two-step process. First, the probation department with the assistance of the county attorney ascertains whether the facts are legally sufficient for the filing of a petition. Second, if the facts are sufficient, the probation department makes a preliminary investigation to determine whether the interests of the public or child require further action.<sup>31</sup>

For intake purposes there are two staff subdivisions. The preliminary inquiry desk handles the preliminary work for all cases that do not involve detention. The intake officers handle all disposition studies and full social histories. They are also responsible for all the work regarding detained children.<sup>32</sup> There are no formal intake criteria.<sup>33</sup>

Intake workers are on duty 24 hours a day, and a preliminary inquiry is initiated upon referral. Although legally a child who has been referred to the court by a written complaint could be picked up and detained, it is not a normal procedure. Detention is usually considered only for children who are already in custody. No child is detained until the intake officer has conducted a preliminary inquiry which includes an interview with the parents. If a child is detained, he receives a court detention hearing at 8:45 a.m. the following morning excluding Sundays and holidays.<sup>34</sup>

Detention centers in Utah are administered by the county. Each county decides on the basis of crime rate, referral rate, and population size whether or not to operate a detention center. There are three classes of centers: Class A - long term detention; Class B - detention up to one week; and Class C - overnight detention. Counties may have facilities in any one of these classes and those counties which do not have detention centers contract with counties which do for the necessary services.<sup>35</sup>

During 1971 the Salt Lake City detention facility received 3787 detention referrals. Thirty-eight percent (1456) were released within 8 hours while 62 percent (2331) were held for more than 8 hours. The detention center provided 16,380 child care days and had an average daily population of 44.7. More than 75 percent stay at the center one week or less.<sup>36</sup> The facility has a 40-bed capacity and as of September 24, 1975, there were 60 children housed there. Employees are required to have a bachelor's degree and the beginning salary is \$8500<sup>37</sup> per year.

- Seattle, Washington -

Juvenile courts in Washington are specialized divisions of superior court. The judges who serve in juvenile court are superior court judges who are assigned on a temporary basis to the juvenile division.<sup>38</sup>

Juvenile probation staff handles the intake process in Seattle. There are three separate units that have intake functions: 1) detention intake; 2) court intake; and 3) investigations.<sup>39</sup>

Washington has no law which describes detailed criteria for when a child requires detention. These decisions are usually based on the seriousness of the offense, prior court record, and whether adequate family care is available.<sup>40</sup>

During 1971, 6791 children were presented for detention and of those 4276 (63 percent) were detained. The average daily population was 124 and the average length of stay was 10.2 days. These figures include dependent children.<sup>41</sup>

- Florida -

The Florida Division of Youth Services was created in 1967. It functions as a division of the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services which is directed by a Secretary who reports to the Governor. Prior to the creation of the Division of Youth Services, the juvenile justice system was extremely fragmented.<sup>42</sup> The system is now moving toward complete statewide control of all delinquency-oriented youth services.

In 1971 the State established a statewide system of intake and probation services. Until then, each county had had responsibility for these services, resulting in wide variations in the quality of services offered. The statewide system is an effort to minimize these inequities as well as to provide intake and probation services to counties that have not had them before.<sup>43</sup>

Intake decisions made in Florida are based on 1) the right of the community to be protected; 2) the right of the child and family to personal freedom and privacy; and 3) the right of the child and family to receive the services of the State for care, protection, and treatment.<sup>44</sup>

By a procedural handbook, Florida Division of Youth establishes a list of factors which must be considered during the intake process.<sup>45</sup> For each disposition that is available to the intake counselor, there is a list of conditions that are appropriate for that disposition. These various lists of factors and conditions help guide the intake counselor to make decisions based on established procedure rather than solely on personal judgment. Additionally, any case involving an alleged action by a child that would be considered a crime if he were an adult must be referred to the state attorney with a recommendation to file or not to file a formal petition.<sup>46</sup>

In 1974 the Division of Youth Services assumed statewide control of all juvenile detention facilities. Again this was a move to unify the juvenile justice system and assure uniform and equal services to all juveniles. Adopting many of the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, the Florida Division of Youth Services supports widespread use of diversion efforts, community treatment programs, and probation.<sup>47</sup>

Detention in Florida is permitted only for children who are alleged to be delinquent or in need of supervision 1) if it is necessary to protect the person or property of others or of the child; 2) because he has no responsible approved adult to care for him; or 3) to secure his presence at the next hearing. The intake officer must base a detention decision on the above criteria unless detention is ordered by the court.<sup>48</sup> A child cannot be held longer than 24 hours without a detention hearing in which a special order authorizing such detention is issued. Detention by special order cannot go over 14 days unless the court has issued an adjudication order.<sup>49</sup>

A study conducted by the John Howard Association in 1972 showed that Florida has been confining over 200 true dependency/ neglect cases per year in detention homes.<sup>50</sup> This was primarily caused by lack of adequate shelter care programs.<sup>51</sup>

There are 22 detention facilities in Florida. Twenty-one of these facilities have a total of 920 beds ranging from 12 beds to 112 beds per institution. The average length of stay in a detention center is 7.5 days. Such a low rate indicates that there is a high number of cases that are being released back to the community within 24 hours.<sup>53</sup> In fact, 35 percent of the detainees are released within the first day.<sup>54</sup> If a child can be released that soon, he probably should not have been detained at all.<sup>55</sup>

"The disconcerting part of the detention situation in Florida is that the rate of detention has remained relatively the same despite the formal establishment of intake services on a statewide basis and the considerable increase in field staff to work with youngsters in the community."<sup>56</sup>

The rate of detention in Florida can be seen in the following table.

Detention Care<sup>57</sup>

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972*
No. of referrals	44,515	46,889	55,775	62,067	39,991
No. of detentions	13,560	14,883	17,850	20,913	12,803
Rate of detentions	30.5%	31.7%	32.0%	33.7%	32.3%

\* January through July only.

Another factor in Florida's detention practices is that status offenders (children in need of supervision - CINS) are detained much more often than are delinquents. In 1971, 25 percent of the delinquency referrals were detained compared to 45 percent of the CINS.<sup>58</sup>

### Current Georgia Experience

#### Intake and Detention Criteria

Intake functions are not addressed specifically in the Juvenile Code of Georgia. Probation officers are given the responsibilities for this process by implication. These duties include:

- 1) making investigations, reports, and recommendations to the court;
- 2) receiving and examining complaints and charges of delinquency, unruly conduct or deprivation of a child;
- 3) taking into custody or detaining a child who is under his care or supervision as a delinquent, unruly or deprived child.

The probation officer is also empowered to make appropriate referrals of the child to other private or public agencies in the community and to handle a case non-judicially by informally adjusting or probating a case.<sup>60</sup> Both of these functions are appropriate to the intake process.

The Juvenile Court Code provides the only common basis for uniform intake processing statewide, but the Code only gives the most general guidelines. Because of the fragmentary nature of the juvenile justice system in Georgia, no other set of policies or procedures pertain to every county.

Seventeen counties in Georgia<sup>61</sup> operate independent juvenile courts; that is, they each have at least one juvenile court judge and one or more probation officers who are paid from county funds and who operate at the county level. Some of the larger independent courts have separate intake units<sup>62</sup> while other courts have smaller probation staffs which handle intake duties along with their other duties.

Fulton County Juvenile Court (as an example of an independent system) in its 1974 Annual Report reported that the intake unit processed 4223 delinquency complaints and 1908 unruly complaints for a total of 6131.<sup>63</sup> This intake unit is responsible for court screening as well as detention screening; that is, the staff

decide what cases warrant further court processing and what children require detention prior to court action.<sup>64</sup>

The remaining 142 counties do not have independent juvenile courts. The juvenile intake process is handled by state-employed court services workers who are under the administration of the Division of Youth Services in the Department of Human Resources. There are 126 court services workers<sup>65</sup> who work across the State and their duties include providing intake and detention processing, investigating, preparing a case for court and filing the petition, providing counseling and referral services to the court, and providing aftercare counseling and referral services.<sup>66</sup> In some areas there may be some differentiation of job assignment, but in most cases each court services worker has duties in all areas of intake, investigation, client services, and court services.<sup>67</sup>

Court Services intake procedures are divided into four decision areas: (1) whether a complaint is valid; (2) whether it falls within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court; (3) whether a petition should be filed for a formal court hearing; (4) where the child should be placed pending a hearing.<sup>68</sup>

The court services worker may dismiss a "frivolous" complaint or one that does not allege a violation of the Juvenile Code. A worker may informally adjust a case under certain circumstances as listed below and if it is according to the policies of the court: 1) the child and parents do not wish a formal hearing, 2) the child admits the charges, 3) restitution of any large sum of money is not involved, 4) the offense is not a serious one, 5) the child is not a habitual offender, and 6) an assessment of the child's problems and needs does not indicate long term probation or commitment services.<sup>69</sup>

The detention of children is more specifically addressed by the Juvenile Court Code than is intake.<sup>70</sup> The Code allows for detention or shelter care prior to adjudication only if it is necessary to "protect the person or property of others or of the child or because the child may abscond or be removed from the jurisdiction of the court or because he has no parent, guardian, or custodian or other person able to provide supervision and care for him and return him to the court when required, or an order for his detention or shelter care has been made by the court pursuant to the Code."<sup>71</sup>

A child that has been taken into custody may not be taken to a police station, county jail or sheriff's office prior to either releasing the child to his parent, delivering him to the juvenile court or a detention or shelter care facility, or bringing him before the superior court of the appropriate county if the alleged act is an act over which the Superior Court has concurrent jurisdiction.<sup>72</sup>

The Juvenile Code states that a child who is alleged delinquent may be detained only in certain places including:

- 1) a licensed foster home or a home approved by the court;
- 2) a facility operated by a licensed child welfare agency;
- 3) a detention home or center for delinquent children which is under the direction or supervision of the court or other public authority or of a private agency approved by the court;
- 4) any other suitable place or facility designated or operated by the court.<sup>73</sup>

A child may be detained in jail only if a detention home as described in 3) above is not available and if the juvenile court orders such detention.<sup>74</sup>

The Juvenile Court Code also authorizes that when a child is brought to the court or to a detention or shelter care facility, the intake officer or other authorized officer of the court shall immediately make an investigation and shall release the child unless it appears necessary to detain him for the reasons cited above.<sup>75</sup> A law enforcement officer therefore is not authorized to detain a child.

Four counties in Georgia operate their own detention centers.<sup>76</sup> In January 1976, however, the Clayton County facility will be transferred to State control.

Prior to 1972 court intake and detention decision-making at Fulton County Juvenile Court were standardized only in an informal manner by office get-togethers and conversation.<sup>77</sup> In 1972 Judge Dillon issued a court order that required that no more than 72 boys and 72 girls be detained at any one time. In order to obey this order, the intake unit began to assign priorities to children who were detained according to the reasons for detention. If the detention facilities are full and a child is received who requires detention, then a child with a lower detention priority is released.<sup>78</sup> This process not only helps to control the detention population but has also helped the intake staff to formally standardize detention decision making.<sup>79</sup> As a result, the average daily population in the Fulton County detention center has decreased from 142 in 1972 to 68 in 1974.<sup>80</sup>

Fulton County Detention Center has a total of 144 beds. During 1974 the detention center had an average daily population of 68 and an average length of stay of three days.<sup>81</sup> Fulton County judges occasionally use the detention facility for dispositional purposes.<sup>82</sup> Detention is also used as part of a behavior modification program used by the probation staff. If a probated child

does not earn enough points during the week, he must work them off by staying in detention for a prescribed amount of time during the weekend.<sup>83</sup>

DeKalb County Detention Center has 86 beds available; however, 9 of these beds are made available for juveniles from Rockdale, Henry, Newton, and Walton counties. During 1974 the detention center served 2769 children. The average length of stay was ten days and the average daily population reported at 54.<sup>84</sup> An average of 14 juveniles are in detention while waiting for transfer to a Youth Development Center.<sup>85</sup>

There are 11 Regional Youth Development Centers (RYDCs) which provide detention and diagnostic services to the counties that are not served by individual county facilities. It should be noted that the State contracts with Chatham, Clayton, and DeKalb counties to receive a number of children from certain neighboring counties. A 12th RYDC has just opened in Early County in Southwest Georgia, but the following discussion will not include this new center as it has not yet begun to receive children.<sup>86</sup>

Youth Services reports that the RYDCs suffer from serious overcrowding. In fiscal year 1975, 7638 juveniles were detained in RYDCs. In December 1974, Albany RYDC with a 30-bed capacity had an average daily population of 40.5, and Muscogee RYDC with an 18-bed capacity had an average daily population of 30.0. In a comparative study made in six of the RYDCs<sup>87</sup> for two periods (first six months of 1974 compared to first six months of 1975), it was shown that 31 percent more children were being detained in 1975.<sup>88</sup>

In 1974, the average length of stay for RYDCs was 17.4 days;<sup>89</sup> however, this ranges from a minimum average of 7.2 days for Muscogee to a maximum average of 27.6 days for Sandersville. A study done in 1972 indicated that the length of time a juvenile remained in a RYDC correlated with the original county of referral. For example 92 percent of the children referred from Emmanuel County were detained over three weeks while 49 percent of Daugherty County's referrals were held less than four days.<sup>90</sup>

The actual rate of detention also apparently correlates with the original county of referral (detention rates refer only to those counties served by RYDCs). Detention rates vary from a high 146 per 10,000 population to a low of zero (See Appendix). The five counties with the highest rates of detention are counties in which RYDCs are located.<sup>91</sup>

The Youth Services Manual recommends that detention should not be used for deprived or unruly children. The DHR Standards and Guides for the detention of children and youth also interprets the Juvenile Code of Georgia to exclude detention homes and jails as placements for deprived and unruly children.<sup>92</sup> However, a recent study of the population in state detention centers shows

that 27 percent of those detained in 1974 were status offenders, and 32 percent of those children held in jails were status offenders.<sup>93</sup>

During a six-month period from November 1974 to April 1975, 1102 juveniles were detained in jails for a period exceeding 24 hours. Data was not collected concerning the extent to which children were held in jails or lock-ups for periods of up to 24 hours. The frequency of children being detained in jail varies by county. Many counties did not jail any juveniles during the period while Floyd County reported jailing 78 juveniles and six other counties jailed more than 50 during a six-month period. The figure for Floyd County is particularly alarming because there is a RYDC located in that county.<sup>94</sup> (See Appendix)

Within the Division of Youth Services there is no person or unit who is responsible for planning the location of future RYDCs. Recently a new center was built in a county (according to some sources) solely because of political maneuverings.<sup>95</sup> Youth Services administrators admit that that particular location does not appreciably improve the State's ability to provide adequate detention facilities throughout the State.<sup>96</sup> However, plans are already being made for the construction of other centers without the benefit of such planning tools as:

- 1) a thorough assessment of present detention practices;
- 2) an evaluation of resources available;
- 3) an analysis of trends based on sufficient statistical information; and
- 4) an exploration of community-based alternatives to dispositions currently being made.<sup>97</sup>

In a majority of the RYDCs there are not enough employees to provide adequate staffing patterns at all times. The standard 30-bed RYDC is normally staffed with 22 persons: director, assistant director, guidance and counseling officer, administrative aide, typist, maintenance mechanic, 8 youth development workers (YDW) I's, 5 YDW II's, and 2 cooks. The YDWs are given a handbook that is used statewide. Training is provided on an in-service basis and is left to the discretion of the center's director. The workers have access to outside workshops, but the staffing coverage is spread so thin that it is difficult to be able to release a worker from his regular duties to attend one.<sup>98</sup>

The Merit System requirements for the position of youth development worker are minimal. A high school diploma is required. There are no statewide requirements relative to screening prospective workers as to their capacity to relate to youth in a positive and beneficial manner.<sup>99</sup> Each RYDC director establishes his own system for screening these workers, but it is difficult to require high standards in new employees because the salaries are

very low. The following chart shows a comparison of state detention personnel salaries with those of two locally controlled detention centers.

Detention Workers Salary\*

	Georgia <sup>100</sup> YDW	Fulton Co <sup>101</sup> Group Supervisor	DeKalb Co <sup>102</sup> Child Care Officers
I	\$444-625/mo	\$670-851/mo	\$585-784/mo
II	\$483-683/mo	\$725-922/mo	\$645-867/mo

\*Although the titles are different, the functions are the same

RYDC directors report difficulty in recruiting and maintaining quality personnel because of the low salaries.<sup>103</sup>

The Macon and Marietta Centers have a few more employees and are, therefore, somewhat more flexible in their staffing patterns. Marietta, particularly, is well-staffed primarily through the efforts of the director in getting the Department of Labor to place some persons under the CETA (Comprehensive Employment Training Act) program. Five of these persons are used in the school program and with their help the center is able to provide over four hours per day of graded education to the children in small groups.<sup>104</sup>

Authoritative Opinions

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (NAC) recommends that an intake unit be created as part of a family court and that it should have the authority to make the decision, to detain a child, to offer an opportunity to participate in diversion programs, and, in consultation with the prosecutor, to file a formal petition.<sup>105</sup> NAC further recommends that "criteria should be formulated for the placement of juveniles in detention and shelter care."<sup>106</sup>

The Advisory Council of Judges to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) also considers intake a part of the court process and the execution of all or part of these responsibilities must be in accord with policies established by the judge.<sup>107</sup>

The (NCCD) Advisory Council of Judges believe that detention is a part of the court process and, although it may not be administered by the court, the court should control admission and release.<sup>108</sup>

However, when the number of children being detained exceeds 20 percent of those referred to the court for delinquency, the appropriate judge or judges should review detention policies.<sup>109</sup>

The NCCD Model Rules for Juvenile Courts suggest that anytime a child is detained, the person who brings the child to the detention facility should be required to state in writing the reasons for such detention. It is further recommended that detention intake be manned by trained personnel on a 24-hour-a-day basis; but, if that is not possible, the person who is there should not be required to accept all children without question. That person should have the authority to release a child based on his own judgment.<sup>110</sup>

Whether or not the detention facility is operated by the court, notification of any admission should be sent to the court as soon as possible.<sup>111</sup>

The NCCD Standard Juvenile Court Act states that although detention facilities may be operated locally, regionally or state-wide, there should be state-wide standards.<sup>112</sup> The Act also addresses the need for detention planning. The size of a detention center often controls the rate of detention. When a new building is opened, the detention rate often increases. So that before a detention center is planned, careful evaluation of needs including statistical and case studies of intake procedures should be undertaken.<sup>113</sup>

In the Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth, it is suggested that post-disposition detainment should not be allowed to continue longer than 24 hours. "When it is necessary because of lack of institutional resources or other reasons, such detention should be considered expedient rather than legitimate."<sup>114</sup>

Similarly, the Standards hold that overcrowding should not be tolerated and that when a child in need of detention is brought to a center that is already full, a child who is less in need of secure custody should be released.<sup>115</sup>

Detention center personnel and programs are given high priority in NAC standards. According to NAC detention centers should be small - limited to 30 residents - and located in the community. Individual rooms should be the rule and the atmosphere should be pleasant and homelike. The centers should have a full range of supportive programs including education, library, recreation, arts and crafts, music, drama, writing, entertainment and outdoor recreation.<sup>116</sup>

Detention center personnel should be experienced, specialized professionals who should receive salaries commensurate with their education, training and experience. The salaries should be comparable to similar positions. Line personnel should be selected on the basis of their ability to relate to youth.<sup>117</sup>

### Alternatives

The following alternatives will be grouped according to the three primary problem areas identified in this paper: Intake and detention criteria; Detention center planning; and Intake and Detention personnel.

#### Area I. Intake and Detention Criteria

1. Intake and detention decisions should continue to be made as they now are based upon the current Georgia Juvenile Court Code.

#### Advantages:

- A. No additional outlay of funds will be necessary to design and implement new intake and detention criteria.
- B. No legislation will be required.

#### Disadvantages:

- A. Intake and detention decisions will continue to be based on the personal judgment of the intake worker or on the independently established policies of individual courts.
- B. Opportunities for diversion will continue to be offered to juveniles.
- C. Detention facilities will continue to receive all classes of children from minor to major offenders.
- D. There will be a continued overuse of detention with overcrowded conditions as a result.
- E. Jails will continue to be used to detain children.

2. Based upon a research study of juvenile court referrals and detention uses, new, more specific intake and detention criteria should be developed. These criteria should be included in the Georgia Juvenile Court Code.

Advantages:

- A. Intake personnel would have specific guidelines to help them make sound decisions relative to case dispositions.
- B. The kinds of cases processed by the court could become more uniform throughout the State.
- C. Children who do not need detention could be handled in other ways.
- D. Overcrowding of detention facilities might be prevented.

Disadvantages:

- A. Legislation would be required.
  - B. Additional funds would be required to conduct the research.
3. Each detention center should provide, on a 24-hour-a-day basis, an intake unit staffed with trained, professional workers. These workers should be required to conduct a preliminary investigation, including an interview with the parents, and based upon these findings the worker should have the authority to release the child to the parents or guardians or recommend detention in a secure or non-secure facility.

Advantages:

- A. Intake processing would be almost immediate.
- B. Even brief detention periods could be avoided for some classes of children.
- C. Detention populations could be more tightly controlled.
- D. The necessity for jailing children could be decreased.

Disadvantages:

Additional staff would be required.

4. Jailing of children should be prohibited unless it can be shown that the child would be a menace to other children in a juvenile detention facility.

Advantages:

Children would be kept out of jails.

Disadvantages:

Sheriffs and police officers may have to transport children who need detention at inconvenient times to an inconvenient place.

Area II. Detention Center Planning

5. Detention center planning can continue to be conducted as a response to system pressure.

Advantages:

- A. No additional planning funds would be required.
- B. No additional planner positions would be required.

Disadvantages:

- A. Detention center planning will continue to be based on personal opinion and political pressure.
- B. Detention services may not be provided on an equal basis for all areas of the state.
- C. Detention may be used unnecessarily simply because a center is in the vicinity and is convenient.

6. Detention center planning should be based on analytical research statistics. Standards should be established regarding the size, architectural design, and atmosphere of the detention centers so that the detention experience can be as harmless as possible.

Advantages:

- A. Detention centers would be located across the State according to need.
- B. Detention centers could be more homelike.

Disadvantages:

- A. Communities would not be able to locate a detention center by lobbying or political pressure.
- B. The detention center design currently in use may need reviewing and revising.

7. A study should be made to evaluate the current uses of detention. This study should cover all areas of the state including the independent detention centers and juvenile courts. Effort should be made to determine how many juveniles and what kind of cases are being referred to the juvenile courts and then what portions of these classes of juveniles are being detained.

Advantages:

- A. A reliable data base relative to juvenile court processing would be established.
- B. Juvenile court and detention center planning could be facilitated by the existence of such a data base.

Disadvantages:

- A. A large outlay of money for research purposes would be necessary.
- B. The cooperation of juvenile court judges, probation officers, court services workers, Youth Services Administrators, detention, personnel, police departments and sheriff's offices would be required.

8. The Division of Youth Services computer facilities should be expanded so that information relative to juvenile court referrals and detention admissions and releases could be maintained.

Advantages:

Accurate, updated data would be available for planning purposes and evaluation purposes.

Disadvantages:

- A. Additional funds would be required to allow for expanded computer usage.
- B. An additional financial outlay for computer costs would be required.
- C. Record-keeping procedures would need to be improved to allow computer processing.
- D. Additional records-keeping and keypunch personnel would be required.

Area III. Intake and Detention  
Personnel

9. If Juvenile probation workers are transferred to the Division of Youth Services as recommended in Paper No CR2-12, Juvenile Probation, intake workers should continue to work under the supervision of the courts.

Advantages:

The judge would have absolute control of intake.

Disadvantages:

- A. A separation of probation officers by function would be required; some would be transferred and some would not.
- B. In some cases, additional personnel would be required.
- C. Standard intake procedures could be unenforceable.

10. If juvenile probation workers are transferred to the Division of Youth Services as recommended in Paper No CR2-12, Juvenile Probation, intake and detention functions should also be transferred.

Advantages:

- A. Standardized intake procedures could be established.
- B. Current personnel would be sufficient.

Disadvantages:

- A. Intake would be removed from the immediate supervision of the judge, particularly in the 17 independent systems.
- B. Additional funds would be necessary.

11. Detention Center staffing patterns should be improved. Standards for the recruitment and screening of line personnel should be established and enforced on a statewide basis. Additional personnel should be added, so that there will be greater flexibility in staffing assignments to allow for staff meetings, inhouse training sessions, and outside workshops. Salaries also should be upgraded.

Advantages:

- A. The child/worker ratio would be improved.
- B. Illnesses and vacation periods would not force the staff to perform double duty.
- C. With more staff, better programs could be planned and implemented.

Disadvantages:

- A. Would increase the cost to the State because additional staff would be required and salaries would be higher.
- B. Additional costs to periodically inspect detention centers.

12. If any county detention facility does not meet the standards as established by the State Board of Human Resources, "Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth in the State of Georgia", it should be provided by statute that the State would assume control of that facility.

Advantages:

Detention standards could be enforced.

Disadvantages:

- A. Legislation would be required.
- B. There would be additional cost to the State if it became necessary to assume control of such centers.
- C. Non-compliance of standards might bring political pressures to bear arguing against stringent State enforcement of the standards.

Recommendation

Alternatives 2,3,4,6,7,8,10, and 11 are recommended.

Court intake and the detention of children should be controlled and standardized statewide by the establishment and enforcement of specific criteria regarding decisions to 1) dismiss a complaint against a juvenile, 2) divert the child and his family to other community resources, 3) offer the child and his family referral services and counseling on a non-judicial basis, or 4) recommend the filing of a formal petition. If a petition alleging delinquency is filed or if it appears likely that such a petition will be filed there should be clear guidelines relative to when and where a child can be detained. Detention should be recommended only 1) if it can be clearly demonstrated that the child would be better served, and 2) if it can be shown that the child would be a serious danger to the community if he were to remain at large.

So that intake and detention decision can be made as soon as possible after a child has been taken into custody and so that detention populations can be controlled, trained, professional intake staff should be located at each detention center on a 24-hour-a-day basis. The intake staff should immediately conduct a preliminary inquiry including an interview with the parents. The

intake staff should be authorized to release the child to his parents, or to detain the child in an appropriate manner.

The jailing of children should by statute be prohibited unless it can be shown that the child would be a menace to other children in a regular juvenile detention facility. Such children should only be jailed in quarters separate from adult inmates.

Planning for new detention centers should be based upon analytical research statistics. Data relative to the current use of detention and local delinquency patterns should be collected and analysed on a regular basis, so that planning can be based on current information.

If "Juvenile Probation", (CR2-12) is approved so that the administration of probation functions is transferred to the Division of Youth Services, intake functions should also be transferred. Intake duties, however, should be performed by specialized intake units and should not be simply one of many duties performed by courts services workers.

Detention center staffing patterns should be improved including the addition of youth development workers and the upgrading of salary levels based upon an analysis of skills and responsibilities required and a comparison of salaries for comparable positions in other jurisdictions. The requirements for screening and training line personnel should be included in the Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth in the State of Georgia. Statutory provision for the enforcement of the standards should be made.

#### Implementation

As soon as possible but no later than July 1977, the Department of Human Resources Division of Youth Services Research Unit or an independent research group should begin to collect data relative to law enforcement contacts with juveniles, juvenile court referrals, and the use of detention in Georgia. Every effort should be made to include data from these counties which are served by independent juvenile courts. It will be necessary to gain the support and cooperation of juvenile court judges, probation officers, court services workers, Youth Services administrators, detention personnel, police departments, and sheriff's offices.

The Division of Youth Services computer capability should be expanded to include this information, and procedures should be established to allow the continued maintenance of an intake and detention data bank. Therefore, the Director of Youth Services Division should request that the necessary additional funds for the expanded use of computer facilities be included in the budget requests for July, 1976. As soon as sufficient data is available, a working committee with advice from the Judicial Council, the State Crime Commission, the Georgia Sheriff's Association, the Georgia Chiefs of Police Association, and the Department of Human Resources should develop and establish specific intake and detention criteria. Legislation should be enacted by the 1978 Georgia General Assembly to include the intake and detention criteria in the Juvenile Court Code.

The Director of the Division of Youth Services should make an assessment of his personnel needs based upon the recommendation of this paper - including the provision of 24-hour intake services in each RYDC and the provision of additional line personnel at each center. Based on this assessment, the Director should request that the necessary additional funds be included in the budget to be submitted to the 1978 Georgia General Assembly.

Legislation should be enacted by the 1976 General Assembly to prohibit the jailing of children unless it can be clearly shown that the child constitutes a physical menace to the other children in the detention facility. Provision should be made for this act to become effective immediately.

By April, 1976 the State Board of Human Resources, in consultation with detention center directors from both RYDCs and county centers and juvenile court judges, should establish standards for the recruitment, screening, and training of detention center line personnel. These standards should then be included in the Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth in the State of Georgia. The 1977 General Assembly should enact legislation to provide for the transfer to State control of any county detention center which does not meet the standards.

Based upon the new requirements and screening procedures for detention line personnel, the director of Youth Services should request that additional funds be included in the budget to be submitted to the 1978 General Assembly to allow for an upgrade in salary to be commensurate with the education and training required, the amount of responsibility held, and comparable positions within the state and in neighboring states.

Financial Impact

	<u>In-House</u>	<u>Outside</u>
1. Research study to collect data on juvenile court referrals and detention in Georgia.118	\$40,000	\$50,000
2. Costs for expanded computer usage by the Research Unit, Division of Youth Services	\$200,000 per year	
3. An addition of 5 intake workers for each of 12 detention centers. Beginning salary \$8196	\$491,760 per year	
4. An addition of 2 YDW positions at each of 12 detention centers. Beginning salary \$5328.	\$127,872 per year	
	-----	-----
Estimated Total Cost of Implementation	\$859,632	\$869,632

### Footnotes

1. The Georgia Juvenile Court Code (as amended through 1974). Georgia Code Ann.
2. Ibid. §24A-10.
3. Ibid.
4. In 1974 Fulton County Juvenile Court did a study of 1664 sample cases involving charges of delinquency and unruly behavior that had been adjusted in 1973. The study showed that 1142 (69%) of those juveniles did not return to court during a 12-month period. Fulton County Juvenile Court, Annual Report, 1974, (Atlanta: FCJC, 1974) pp. 7-8.
5. Georgia Code Anno., §24A-14. and  

In several interviews it was indicated that presigned detention orders were sometimes used to cover times when the intake officer, the court service worker, or the judge were not available to make a detention decision. The question, of course, is whether the arresting officer or custodial personnel at the detention center are properly trained to make a considered detention decision.
6. Interview with Don Wilkinson, Program Director, Division of Youth Services, Department of Human Resources. September 23, 1975.
7. Original detention figures provided by Research Units, Division of Youth Services. Rates were calculated based on total 1970 population 0 to 16 years. Population figures provided by the Bureau of the Census.
8. Research Unit, Division of Youth Services.
9. Georgia Code Ann., §24A-1403.
10. See comment to §24A-1403 of Georgia Code Ann.
11. Research Unit.
12. Youth Services Division.
13. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, Public Law 93-415, Section 5035.
14. Ibid.
15. LEAA, Children in Custody, (National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Washington, DC 1971), p. 11.

16. Children in Custody, p. 4.
17. Ibid., p. 7.
18. Mark M. Levin and Rosemary C. Sarri, Juvenile Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Codes in the U.S., (Ann Arbor, Mich: University of Michigan, 1974), p. 30.
19. Arizona, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Maryland. Ibid., p. 33. (Utah now falls into this category).
20. Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Utah, Vermont, Ibid., p. 33.
21. Colorado, District of Columbia, Illinois, Louisiana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia. Ibid., p. 33.
22. Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Ibid., p. 33.
23. Arkansas, Georgia, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Tennessee, Wyoming. Ibid., p. 33.
24. Rhode Island, Ibid., p. 33.
25. Institute for Court Management, Three Juvenile Courts, (Denver: ICM, 1972), p. 28.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., p. 29.
28. Ibid., pp. 547-550.
29. Interview with the Director of Court Services, Salt Lake City Juvenile Court, September 24, 1975.
30. Three Juvenile Courts, p. 37.
31. Ibid., p. 272.
32. Ibid., pp. 274-276.
33. Interview with Salt Lake City Juvenile Court Director of Court Services.
34. Ibid.
35. Interview with the Director of Salt Lake County Detention Center, September 24, 1975.
36. Three Juvenile Courts, p. 268.
37. Interview with Director of Salt Lake County Detention Center.

61. The counties with independent juvenile courts are as follows: Bibb, Chatham, Clarke, Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Daugherty, Floyd, Fulton, Glynn, Hall, Muscogee, Richmond, Spalding, Troup, Upson, Whitfield.
62. Fulton and DeKalb Counties, for example.
63. Annual Report, 1974.
64. Ibid., p. 6.
65. Georgia DHR Youth Services, "Fiscal Year 1974 Youth Services Annual Report". Mimeographed paper prepared over the signature of John C. Hunsucker, Director of Youth Services, July 31, 1974.
66. Division of Youth Services, Manual, 1975.
67. Interview with Mr. John Hunsucker, Youth Services, June 1975.
68. Youth Services Manual, II.B.
69. Ibid., p. 50 of II.
70. The Department of Human Resources has developed Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth in Georgia, but these standards relate primarily to the way children are detained rather than the decisions to detain.
71. Ga. Code Ann. §24A-1406.
72. Ibid., §24A-1402.
73. Ibid., §24A-1403.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid., §24A-1404
76. Chatham, Clayton, DeKalb, and Fulton.
77. Three Juvenile Courts, p. 243.
78. Annual Report, 1974.
79. In interviews with administrators in Youth Services it was reported that one reason Judge Dillon's policy has appeared to work so well is that he has also established barriers to the detention of certain classes of juveniles based on the place of residency of the child. For instance, if a child from a neighboring county commits an offense in Fulton County and is taken into custody, Fulton County Juvenile Court refuses to handle the case and

38. Three Juvenile Courts, p. 1.
39. Ibid., pp. 289-290.
40. Ibid., pp. 286-287.
41. Ibid.
42. Florida Division of Youth Services, Comprehensive Plan, published by the Florida Division of Youth Services, p. 11.
43. John Howard Association, Comprehensive Long Range Master Plan, Department of Juvenile Services, State of Maryland, A Survey and Consultant Report (Chicago: John Howard Association, 1973), p.8.
44. Florida Division of Youth Services, "DYS Intake: A Philosophy," unpublished, undated, p. 1.
45. Florida Division of Youth Services, "Intake Manual," unpublished, undated.
46. Ibid., p. 46.
47. John Howard Association, Juvenile Detention and Alternatives in Florida, (Chicago: John Howard Association, 1973).
48. Florida Law 1973, Chapter 39.03 (3) (c)
49. Ibid., Chapter 39.03 (7) (a)&(b)
50. Juvenile Detention in Florida, p. 5.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., p. 23.
53. Ibid., p. 12.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid., p. 10.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., pp. 6-7.
59. Georgia Code Ann., §24A-602(a), (b), & (e).
60. Ibid., §24A-602(d) and 24A-10(a).

101. Fulton County Personnel Board.
102. DeKalb County Personnel Board.
103. Interview with RYDC Director.
104. Ibid.
105. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Courts (Washington: NAC, 1974), p. 296.
106. Ibid.
107. Advisory Council of Judges, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Guides for Juvenile Court Judges, (New York: NCCD, 1957), pp. 42-43.
108. Ibid.
109. Ibid.
110. Council of Judges, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Model Rules for Juvenile Courts, (New York: NCCD, 1969), p. 30.
111. Ibid.
112. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Standard Juvenile Court Act, 6th ed. (New York: NCCD, 1959), p. 45.
113. Ibid., p. 46.
114. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth, (New York: NCCD, 1961), p. 31.
115. Ibid.
116. NAC, Corrections, p. 269.
117. Ibid., p. 271.
118. Cost estimates provided by Batelle Columbus Laboratories, Regional Center Offices, 1100 Spring Street, Atlanta.

transfers it to the county of residence. He has also established a limit to the length of time a committed child remains in detention awaiting transfer. Some resentment was evident concerning these policies because it was felt that they caused heavier burdens on the State institution.

80. Annual Report 1974, p. 6, and an interview with Mr. Cutshaw of Fulton County Juvenile Court, September 11, 1975.
81. Ibid.
82. Three Juvenile Courts, p. 79.
83. Interview with Judge Roman Powell, Fulton County Juvenile Court.
84. If the figures for number of children served and average length of stay are manipulated, the average daily population is 75.
85. Interview with Mr. Williams, DeKalb County Detention Center.
86. Youth Services Division.
87. Albany, Augusta, Rome, Sandersville, Waycross, and Gainesville.
88. Youth Services Division.
89. Ibid.
90. Lamar T. Empry, Alternatives to Incarceration, (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 23.
91. Bibb (125/10,000), Cobb (146/10,000), Daugherty (114/10,000), Richmond (107/10,000), and Ware (120/10,000).
92. American Bar Association, Survey and Handbook on State Standards and Inspection Legislation for Jails and Juvenile Detention Facilities, (Washington, DC: ABA 1974), p. 737.
93. Research Unit.
94. Ibid.
95. These reasons were expressed in interviews with several persons both within Youth Services and without.
96. Youth Services.
97. Ibid.
98. Information provided by Don Wilkinson, Youth Services.
99. Interview with merit system personnel and a RYDC Director.
100. Ibid.

- Fox, Sanford J., The Law of Juvenile Courts in a Nutshell, St. Paul, West, 1971.
- Fulton County Juvenile Court. Annual Report, 1973. Atlanta, Fulton County Juv. Court, 1973.
- Fulton County Juvenile Court. Annual Report, 1974. Atlanta, Fulton County Juv. Court, 1974.
- George, B. James Jr., Gault and the Juvenile Court Revolution. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1968.
- Institute for Court Management, Three Juvenile Courts. Denver: Institute for Court Management, 1972.
- Institute of Government, University of Georgia, Regional Youth Development Center Study, Athens: Institute of Government, 1972.
- John Howard Association, Juv. Det. & Alternatives in Florida, Chicago: John Howard Association, 1973.
- Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, Public Law 93-415.
- LEAA, Children in Custody, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service, Washington, DC, 1971.
- Lement, Edwin M., Instead of Court, Chevy Chase, MD: Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, 1971.
- Levin, Mark M. and Rosemary C. Sarri, Juvenile Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Codes in the U.S., Ann Arbor Mich: University of Michigan, 1974.
- McNulty, Jill K., "The Right to Be Left Alone", American Criminal Law Review (Chicago) 11(1): 141-164, 1972.
- National Advisory Council on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Corrections. Washington, DC: NAC, 1974.
- National Advisory Council on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Courts. Washington, DC: NAC 1974.
- National Council of Jewish Women, Justice for Children: Part I - Children's Rights. New York: National Council of Jewish Women, 1973.
- National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth, New York: NCCD, 1961.

## Bibliography

- Advisory Council of Judges, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Guides for Juvenile Court Judges, New York: NCCD, 1957.
- American Bar Association, Survey and Handbook on State Standards and Inspection Legislation for Jails and Juvenile Detention Facilities. Washington, DC: ABA, 1974.
- Boches, Ralph E. and Joel Goldfarb, California Juvenile Court Practice, Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1968.
- Breed, Allen F., Standards and Guidelines for Youth Services Bureaus, Sacramento: Calif. Delinq. Prevention Commission, 1968.
- California, Department of Youth Authority. Evaluation of Youth Service Bureaus. California: California Dept. of Youth Authority, 1973.
- California, Department of the Youth Authority, Guidelines for Inspecting Juvenile Halls. Sacramento: 1969.
- Cavenagh, Winifred Elizabeth, Juvenile Courts, the Child, and the Law. Burgay Eng.: Chaucer Press, 1967.
- Colorado Dept. of Institutions, Division of Youth Services. Colorado's Children's Code. Denver, 1970.
- Council of Judges, National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Model Rules for Juvenile Courts, New York: NCCD, 1969.
- Dorsen, Norman and Daniel A. Reznick, "In Re Gault and the Future of Juvenile Law" in The Juvenile Court ed. by Robert H. Bremmer. New York: Arno Press, 1974.
- Empry, LaMar T., Alternatives to Incarceration, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Freed, Daniel J. and Patricia M. Wald, Bail in the United States: 1964, A Report to the National Conference on Bail and Criminal Justice. Washington, DC, May 27-29, 1964.
- Ferster, Elyce Z., Thomas F. Courtless, Edith N. Snethan, "Separating Official and Unofficial Delinquents: Juvenile Court Intake", Iowa Law Review 55 (1970), 873.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Standard Juvenile Court Act, 6th ed. New York: NCCD, 1959.

Olson, Jay and George H. Shepard, Improving Justice for Juveniles, Washington, DC: HEW, 1975.

Planning and Designing for Juvenile Justice, Report prepared by the Management and Behavioral Sciences Center, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Washington DC: LEAA, 1972.

Sarri, Rosemary C., Under Lock and Key: Juveniles in Jails and Detention, Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan, 1974.

Stark, H.G., "Alternatives to Institutionalization", Crime and Delinquency, 13 (April 1967).

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population: Georgia, 1970. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973.

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. State Responsibility for Juvenile Detention Care, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

APPENDIX

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	CFPENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. FOR 6 MONTHS
<u>TOTAL ALL COUNTIES</u>		1423	3868	26.9%	307	3598		
1. Appling	4765	1	5	17.0	0	6	13	9
2. Atkinson	2290	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
3. Bacon	2883	1	10	9.0	0	11	38	-
4. Baker	1483	0	1	0	0	1	7	-
5. Baldwin	9519	4	38	10.0	1	43	45	4
6. Banks	2102	0	3	0	0	3	14	-
7. Barrow	5438	7	29	19.0	1	37	68	5
8. Bartow	11081	11	20	36.0	3	34	31	4
9. Ben Hill	4192	1	9	10.0	0	10	24	2
10. Berrien	3865	0	17	0	2	19	49	8
11. Bibb	48258	126	448	22.0	31	604	125	1
12. Bleckley	3141	8	6	57.0	0	14	45	-
13. Brantley	2138	5	5	50.0	0	10	47	-
14. Brooks	4896	1	15	6.0	1	17	35	2
15. Bryan	2506	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
16. Bulloch	10791	1	3	25.0	0	4	-	10
17. Burke	7275	12	32	27.0	0	44	60	-
18. Butts	3649	0	0	0	0	0	-	3

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. FOR 6 MONTHS	
19.	Calhoun	2587	0	1	0	2	3	12	3
20.	Camden	4498	9	11	45.0	0	20	44	-
21.	Candler	2151	0	1	0	0	1	5	-
22.	Carroll	14255	6	23	21.0	0	29	20	24
23.	Catoosa	9903	9	11	45.0	1	21	21	1
24.	Charlton	2313	1	7	13.0	3	11	48	-
25.	Chatham	62982	2	0	100.0	0	2	-	7
26.	Chattahoochee	4490	2	8	20.0	0	10	22	-
27.	Chattooga	6542	2	5	29.0	3	10	43	8
28.	Cherokee	10648	9	19	32.0	2	30	28	26
29.	Clarke	17021 (M&F)	8	10	44.0	0	18	10	-
30.	Clay	1308	0	3	0	0	3	23	1
31.	Clayton	37426	0	0	0	0	0	NA	2
32.	Clinch	2544	2	2	50.0	1	5	20	7
33.	Cobb	70684	266	717	27.0	52	1035	146	2
34.	Coffee	8058	12	26	32.0	4	42	52	-
35.	Colquitt	11132	0	14	0	2	16	14	29
36.	Columbia	8637	19	31	38.0	1	51	59	-

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. OVER 6 MONTHS	
37.	Cook	4320	0	13	0	2	15	35	6
38.	Coweta	11203	14	40	26.0	6	60	54	76
39.	Crawford	2304	0	3	0	0	3	13	-
40.	Crisp	6622	11	16	41.0	6	33	50	13
41.	Dade	3397	5	12	29.0	1	18	53	-
42.	Dawson	1161	0	1	0	0	1	9	-
43.	Decatur	8038	3	22	12.0	7	32	40	30
44.	DeKalb	143197	6	12	33.0	1	19	NA	3
45.	Dodge	5331	12	3	80.0	0	15	28	-
46.	Dooly	3836	1	1	50.0	0	2	5	5
47.	Dougherty	33263	102	253	29.0	23	378	114	6
48.	Douglas	10453	7	20	26.0	1	28	27	13
49.	Early	4767	2	0	100.0	2	4	8	-
50.	Echols	737	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
51.	Effingham	5243	0	0	0	0	0	NA	-
52.	Elbert	5687	3	5	38.0	0	8	14	1
53.	Emanuel	6329	11	18	38.0	9	38	60	3
54.	Evans	2663	0	0	0	0	0	NA	-

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. OVER 6 MONTHS	
55.	Fannin	4085	1	6	14.0	0	7	17	-
56.	Fayette	4110	0	7	0	0	7		-
57.	Floyd	23563	27	48	36.0	3	78	33	78
58.	Forsyth	5848	3	14	18.0	0	17	29	6
59.	Franklin	3931	5	9	36.0	1	15	38	1
60.	Fulton	186198	10	39	20.0	3	52	NA	3
61.	Gilmer	2855	7	11	39.0	1	19	67	-
62.	GlascocK	735	0	1	0	0	1	13	-
63.	Glynn	17632	18	58	24.0	2	78	44	57
64.	Gordon	7934	14	11	56.0	0	25	32	22
65.	Grady	6214	1	4	20.0	3	8	13	5
66.	Greene	3571	0	3	0	0	3	8	-
67.	Gwinnett	26247	5	15	25.0	3	23	9	42
68.	Habersham	6376	3	11	21.0	1	15	23	2
69.	Hall	20121	15	132	10.0	2	149	74	-
70.	Hancock	3546	0	2	0	0	2	6	-
71.	Haralson	5135	3	7	30.0	0	10	19	-
72.	Harris	3981	2	2	50.0	2	6	15	-

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS FOR 6 MONTHS	
73.	Hart	5420	1	7	13.0	0	8	15	5
74.	Heard	1784	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
75.	Henry	8971	0	7	0	0	7	NA	17
76.	Houston	24069	11	23	32.0	5	39	16	58
77.	Irwin	2801	0	1	0	0	1	4	1
78.	Jackson	6846	3	11	21.0	1	15	22	3
79.	Jasper	2011	1	0	100.0	1	2	10	2
80.	Jeff Davis	3303	0	10	0	1	11	33	7
81.	Jefferson	6503	5	12	29.0	1	18	28	3
82.	Jenkins	3041	5	14	26.0	1	20	66	3
83.	Johnson	2698	2	6	25.0	0	8	30	-
84.	Jones	4581	0	1	0	0	1	2	-
85.	Lamar	3683	0	4	0	0	4	NA	5
86.	Lanier	1907	2	1	67.0	0	3	16	3
87.	Laurens	11152	25	22	53.0	2	49	44	31
88.	Lee	2707	0	5	0	2	7	26	2
89.	Liberty	5866	0	1	0	0	1	NA	62
90.	Lincoln	2131	1	14	7.0	0	15	70	-

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. FOR 6 MONTHS	
91.	Long	1387	2	3	40.0	1	6	43	-
92.	Lowndes	19354	1	26	4.0	4	31	16	52
93.	Lumpkin	6639	2	5	29.0	0	7	11	1
94.	Macon	5093	0	3	0	0	3	6	3
95.	Madison	4579	2	9	18.0	1	12	26	1
96.	Marion	1964	1	2	33.0	0	3	15	1
97.	McDuffie	5566	16	39	29.0	0	55	99	2
98.	McIntosh	2964	0	2	0	0	2	7	10
99.	Meriwether	6969	2	13	13.0	3	18	26	4
100.	Miller	2261	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
101.	Mitchell	7261	1	7	13.0	1	9	12	8
102.	Monroe	3697	0	0	0	0	0	NA	2
103.	Montgomery	1964	3	1	75.0	0	4	20	-
104.	Morgan	3625	1	2	33.0	1	4	11	4
105.	Murray	4470	3	5	38.0	0	8	18	-
106.	Muscogee	57970	109	330	25.0	42	481	83	8
107.	Newton	9356	0	1	0	0	1	NA	10
108.	Oconee	2500	1	2	33.0	0	3	12	1

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. FOR 6 MONTHS	
109.	Oglethorpe	2659	3	11	21.0	2	16	60	-
110.	Paulding	6122	9	10	47.0	2	21	34	15
111.	Peach	5603	1	5	17.0	0	6	11	-
112.	Pickens	3153	5	4	56.0	1	10	32	1
113.	Pierce	3287	11	10	52.0	2	23	70	-
114.	Pike	2574	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
115.	Polk	9863	16	25	39.0	0	41	42	-
116.	Pulaski	2739	8	12	40.0	0	20	73	-
117.	Putnam	3126	2	0	100.0	1	3	10	4
118.	Quitman	822	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
119.	Rabun	2533	0	3	0	0	3	12	7
120.	Randolph	2922	5	6	46.0	1	12	41	2
121.	Richmond	50916	148	387	28.0	9	544	107	3
122.	Rockdale	6741	0	0	0	0	0	NA	6
123.	Schley	1149	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
124.	Screven	4406	4	8	33.0	0	12	27	5
125.	Seminole	2555	0	0	0	1	1	4	-
126.	Spalding	13282	0	6	0	0	6	NA	75

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

COUNTY		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. FOR 6 MONTHS	
127.	Stephens	6335	3	16	16.0	0	19	30	1
128.	Stewart	2548	3	9	25.0	0	12	47	1
129.	Sumter	9215	0	11	0	1	12	13	28
130.	Talbot	2544	1	1	50.0	0	2	8	1
131.	Taliaferro	798	0	0	0	0	0	NA	-
132.	Tattnall	4733	5	5	50.0	2	12	25	-
133.	Taylor	2890	0	8	0	0	8	28	-
134.	Telfair	4065	14	15	48.0	2	31	76	-
135.	Terrell	4312	2	5	29.0	1	8	19	2
136.	Thomas	12375	5	47	10.0	6	58	47	26
137.	Tift	9644	6	14	30.0	1	21	22	3
138.	Toombs	6907	16	30	35.0	3	49	71	-
139.	Towns	1307	0	1	0	0	1	7	1
140.	Treutlen	1947	1	2	33.0	0	3	15	-
141.	Troup	14334	2	14	13.0	2	16	11	18
142.	Turner	3119	0	2	0	0	2	6	1
143.	Twiggs	3330	1	4	20.0	0	5	15	-
144.	Union	2156	0	2	0	0	2	9	-

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF YOUTH DETAINED IN RYDC'S IN 1974

COUNTY		# STATUS DETAINED	# NON STATUS DETAINED	% STATUS	OFFENSE UNKNOWN	TOTAL DETAINED	DETAINED PER 10,000	# DETAINED IN JAIL OVER 24 HRS. FOR 6 MONTHS
145. Upson	7494	1	1	50.0	0	2	3	8
146. Walker	16753	30	30	50.0	3	63	37	5
147. Walton	8231	6	26	19.0	0	32	38	31
148. Ware	11470	58	77	43.0	3	138	120	1
149. Warren	2528	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
150. Washington	6441	12	32	27.0	2	46	71	-
151. Wayne	6582	1	14	7.0	4	19	28	10
152. Webster	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
153. Wheeler	1513	4	1	80.0	1	6	6	4
154. White	2387	1	7	13.0	0	8	33	-
155. Whitfield	19197	20	60	25.0	1	81	42	-
156. Wilcox	2350	0	4	0	0	4	17	4
157. Wilkes	3297	1	12	8.0	0	13	.3942	-
158. Wilkinson	3457	0	2	0	0	2	.0578	-
159. Worth	5486	2	11	15.0	0	13	.2369 452	-