DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 039 CG 014 419

TITLE Annual Report of NIJJDP. Fiscal Year 1979.
INSTITUTION National Inst. for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Dept. of Justice/LEAA), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 78p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (Stock No. 027-000-00902-6)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Correctional Rehabilitation; Delinquency; *Delinquency Prevention; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Federal Programs; *Intervention; Justice; *Juvenile Courts; Outreach Programs; Program Evaluation; *Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

This report includes content areas consistent with the major activities and program components of the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP). The major statutorily-established functions of NIJJDP are assessed in terms of research, evaluation, and program development, information development and dissemination, training development and implementation, and standards development and implementation. The programs described address the following areas: (1) delinquent behavior and the prevention of delinquency; (2) prevention-related projects focussing on minority youth and females; (3) the juvenile justice system and courts; (4) corrections; and (5) alternatives to juvenile justice system processing. The appendices contain lists of project titles, grant numbers, amounts awarded, project directors, and project periods. (Author/HLM)

U. S. Department of Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

# ANNUAL REPORT OF NIJJDP

*Fiscal Year 1979*

## National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

## Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

## Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

March 1980





For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock Number 027-000-00002-6

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

This report includes content areas consistent with the major activities and program components of the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP). The NIJJDP is located within the Office Of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), which is a part of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), within the U.S. Department of Justice.

The major statutorily-established functions of NIJJDP are:

I. Research, Evaluation and Program Development.
II. Information Development and Dissemination.
III. Training Development and Implementation.
IV. Standards Development and Implementation.

This structure of NIJJDP's functions corresponds to the provisions and mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended in 1977.

Specifically, this report addresses the questions proposed in the language of the Act (Section 246) which directs the Deputy Associate Administrator of LEAA (Director, NIJJDP) to issue annual reports on:

> "research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs funded under this title (Title II), including a review of the results of such programs, an assessment of the application of such results to existing and to new juvenile delinquency programs, and detailed recommendations for future research, demonstration, training and evaluation programs."

In addition to a narrative section which summarizes NIJJDP's activities since its establishment in June, 1975 through Fiscal Year (FY) 1979 (September 30, 1979) (current projects, results of previous work, application to programs, and recommendations) the report includes a section summarizing the activities and recommendations of the Institute's Advisory Committee. An appendix is provided that includes a listing of all projects funded by NIJJDP since its establishment (Appendix A), and project identification information on projects funded during FY 79 (Appendix B).

## I. RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

NIJJDP's research, evaluation and program development functions ensue from Sec. 243 of the JJDP Act, which authorizes the Institute to:

> "conduct, encourage and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, particularly with regard to new programs and methods which show promise of making a contribution toward the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency."

Since its legislative authority covers the entire field of delinquency, throughout the U.S., NIJJDP's work has been guided by use of a general framework, or perspective. This comprehensive perspective of the entire delinquency field involves viewing it as consisting of just three parts: 1) delinquent behavior and its prevention, 2) the juvenile justice system (police, courts, and corrections), and 3) community-based alternatives to juvenile justice system processing. Use of this framework has helped guide NIJJDP's data and information gathering efforts. Priority has been given to development and gathering of nationwide data with respect to the three-part framework.

In the delinquent behavior area, NIJJDP has sponsored nationwide efforts to survey delinquent behavior in the U.S., analyze national data on victimizations, and to compare these bases for estimates of the volume of delinquent behavior with estimates based on official records. A nationwide data base on prevention programs has been developed.

Similarly, in regard to the juvenile justice system, priority has been given to developing and gathering nationwide data on the flow of youth through the juvenile justice system. The FBI's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) provide national data on police handling of juveniles. NIJJDP has for the past few years maintained, and recently improved, the National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System -- which provides national data on juvenile court handling of youth, and on the flow of youth through the JJS. Nationwide information has been developed on various juvenile justice system programs.

National data on correctional system handling of juveniles has in the past been provided through an annual (recently, bi-annual) census of juvenile correctional facilities (including detention centers) sponsored by LEAA's National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service (NCJISS) -- which also sponsors a national census of jails that includes data on juveniles. (Other national data on youth in jails, police lock-ups, and Federal facilities are being gathered through another effort sponsored by OJJDP.) NIJJDP, beginning in calendar 1979, will assume responsibility for the "Children in Custody" historical series formerly sponsored by NCJISS: the bi-annual nationwide census of training schools, other secure correctional facilities, and detention centers. This census will be supplemented by a nationwide survey of juvenile residential programs — which NIJJDP is sponsoring.

Nationwide data have not been available for the community-based alternatives area. Thus NIJJDP nas launched a nationwide survey of such programs, which actually serve as alternatives to juvenile justice system processing. It will be conducted in FY 1980.

NIJJDP's program of research and evaluation studies is presented in the following section in relation to the three-part framework outlined above. In this and in each of the subsequent sections, addressing NIJJDP's three other main functions, virtually all projects funded by NIJJDP since its establishment through FY 1978 are discussed. Projects funded during FY 1979 are discussed separately.

## DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR AND PREVENTION OF DELINQUENCY

The Dynamics of Delinquency and Drug Use. This award supports a three year study designed to provide nationwide, self-reported*, information on the incidence, distribution, patterns and styles of delinquent behavior among a national sample of approximately 1,725 youth aged 11-17. The study also includes an examination of the relationships between drug use (including alcohol) and other kinds of delinquent behavior, and factors associated with changes in patterns of drug use and delinquency.

The total youth sample was selected and interviewed initially between January and March, 1977, concerning their involvement in delinquent behavior during calendar year 1976. The second survey of the same youth was completed between January and March, 1978, yielding delinquency estimates for the year 1977. The third, fourth, and fifth surveys will be conducted between January and March of 1979, 1980 and 1981. The data reported herein are taken from the first survey completed in 1977. The estimates presented are for delinquent behavior among the national sample during the calendar year 1976.

Preliminary examination of data generated through the 1977 survey has revealed several interesting and, in some cases, unexpected findings. As with most previous self-report studies, differences were found in the level of delinquency involvement among males and females. Consistent with other studies, the results indicated that male adolescents engage in significantly more delinquent activity than female adolescents. Males reported more involvement in delinquency than females in every behavioral category. More specifically, substantial sex differences were observed with respect to involvement in predatory crimes against persons, predatory crimes against property, public disorder

---

*Self-report studies involve asking youth what delinquent behaviors they have committed, rather than relying on other sources of this information — such as court or police records. This project is jointly funded by NIJJDP and NIMH's Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency.

crimes and status offenses. Among males, older youth (13-17) reported greater involvement in delinquency than the younger youth (11-12). For females, the major increase in delinquency involvement comes with entry into the 16-17 age category. No differences in the level of delinquent behavior was found for females aged 11-12 and 13-15; however; those aged 16-17 reported approximately twice the number of offenses as those 11-15 years old. For males, the major increase occurs for those entering the 13-15 age group. The oldest males (16-17) reported fewer offenses than the 13-15 year olds.

It is interesting to note that for status offenses, a different pattern emerges. While male youth involvement in classic street crimes (robbery, burglary, assault) appears to decline in later teen years, there is nearly a two-fold increase in the number status offenses reported among 13-15 and 16-17 year old males (with the latter group showing the higher level of involvement).

Youth living in large metropolitan areas (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas - SMSA) as defined by the Census Bureau, were significantly more involved in total delinquency, crimes against property, public disorder crimes and status offenses than were youth residing in non SMSA areas. For those living in SMSA areas, major increases in offenses occur in the 13-15 age groups, whereas increases occur later (ages 16-17) for those living in non-SMSA areas. Males living in SMSA areas reported a disportionately high frequency of status offenses in comparison with males living in other areas. Place of residence appeared to have little effect on the frequency of status offenses for females. In general, it would appear that being male, aged 13-15, and living in an SMSA area all contribute disproportionately to high rates of pulblic disorders and status offenses.

Preliminary findings with respect to drug use indicate that youth are increasingly beginning to use drugs at a younger age. Major findings include the following: 1) beer is the drug most frequently used; 2) a higher proportion of upper class youth use beer, wine, hard liquor, and marijuana than lower classes; 3) the reverse is true for other illicit drugs; including inhalants, angel dust, and amphetamines; and 4) use of most illicit drugs correlates positively with use of others, thus forming an "illicit drug cluster."

The results of this National Youth Survey, when compared with results from similar previous surveys, indicate that the number of youth running away from home has increased steadily since 1967, when only 2.5 percent reported running away one or more times in the prior year. By 1972, the number was 4.6 percent; and by 1977, 5.9 percent.

The subsequent analyses of data from this survey will include comparisons among the results of each of the five annual surveys (1977-81).

NIJJDP also measures self-reported delinquency in state and local areas through a number of other studies consistent with the Institute's policy to measure delinquency involvement wherever feasible through use of the self-report method. One advantage to this approach is that it makes possible the building of a cummulative knowledge base of the extent, patterns, and distribution of juvenile delinquency, through combining the results of the smaller studies with national ones.

It is also NIJJDP's policy to seek refinement of national estimates of youth involvement in juvenile delinquency through examining self-report measures along with victimization data and official records (police, court, and correctional data).

Youth Gang Violence. This project constitutes a national (major cities) pilot study of the extent of youth violence committed in the context of organized gangs and youth groups. Information was obtained from official records, interviews with juvenile justice system and youth-serving agency officials, and from other sources. The preliminary results indicate that: 1) 9 cities reported serious gang problems (New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit; San Francisco, San Antonio, Boston, and Miami); and 2) only a small proportion of the total volume of "collective youth crime" (committed in groups) is commited by groups that fit explicit criteria for constituting a "gang." The final report will be available in 1980.

The Use of Victimization Survey Data to Assess the Nature, Extent and Correlates of Serious Delinquent Behavior

LEAA has sponsored national victimization surveys since 1973. Each of these surveys has included youth respondents where appropriate. The survey also produces data on youth, both as victims and offenders. However, this survey does not contain a national sample of youth which is representative of all youth in the U.S.

The major purpose of NIJJDP-sponsored research in this area is to develop a comprehensive descriptive analysis of the involvement of juveniles in illegal behaviors in which victims come face-to-face with offenders (rape, personal and commercial robbery, assault and personal larceny) by analyzing the National Crime Survey (NCS) victimization data for the period 1973-1977. Some of the more significant areas being addressed are: changes in the rate of criminal victimization by juvenile offenders; changes in the nature of seriousness of crimes by juvenile offenders; changes in race, sex and age of juvenile offenders; and comparison of the results from analyzing the victimization data with findings from studies using self-reported measures delinquency and studies examining official records.

The first phase of the project was devoted to examining trends in the criminal behavior of juveniles, youthful offenders and adults. A major conclusion is that the total number of personal crimes attributable to juvenile offenders remained relatively stable from 1973 to 1977. Also, the overall level of juvenile crimes did not increase or become more serious over this period. It appears that juvenile offenses were less serious in terms of extent of weapon use and injury than adult crimes.

This project will be completed in 1980; however, NIJJDP expects to continue to pursue the relationship between victimization, official, and self-reported data, in order to refine national estimates of delinquency.

Since its establishment, NIJJDP has sought to develop nationwide data on the flow of youth through the juvenile justice system. Such national data did not previously exist in a form which would permit examination of the juvenile justice system experiences of individual youth or of categories of juvenile offenders. Our ultimate aim is to be able to measure nationwide results of efforts to improve the juvenile justice system. The following project has made a major contribution toward achieving this goal.

National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System (NUJJRS). Following the signing into law of the JJDP Act of 1974, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare notified NIJJDP that it would no longer continue to maintain the National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System and inquired NIJJDP would be interested in its transfer to LEAA. Of course we were interested and the transfer was immediately made. A grant was awarded to the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ), the research arm of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, for the purposes of maintaining and improving the NUJJRS. We felt the NCJJ was in a unique position to improve the level of participation among juvenile courts, which was badly needed since HEW had assigned low priority to the NUJJRS.

Since 1974, NCJJ has assumed responsibility for and greatly improved the NUJJRS through encouraging and assisting juvenile courts to participate in this reporting system. It remains the only nationwide annual source of data on juvenile court handling of youth. Thus an important historical series has been continued through NIJJDP support.

By 1975, remarkable improvements in the NUJJRS were made. NCJJ was able to obtain access to the individual case records of youth referred to juvenile courts during that year in 14 states. These cases represent over 50 percent of all youth handled by juvenile courts during 1975. These records contain data on about 25 factors, including demographic characteristics of the youth, police handling of those youth, and juvenile court method of processing and dispositions (including referral to correctional institutions).

These data are supplemented by State and local studies sponsored by NIJJDP. These projects include the follow-up to the landmark Philadelphia study of police handling of juveniles; the replication of that study in Philadelphia; the study of delinquent careers in Racine, Wisconsin; NIJJDP's national evaluations of OJJDP's major action programs; and other studies described in the Juvenile Justice System section of this report. A number of these research and evaluation efforts produce "system flow" data on youth in particular jurisdictions, which can be combined with the nationwide data resulting from the National Juvenile Court Statistical Reporting System.

Factors Associated with Delinquency

NIJJDP has sponsored, and will continue to support projects which have as their aim the development of a clearer understanding of factors related to the commission of delinquent acts, because the results of this work will help in the development of effective prevention and treatment programs.

The national survey of self-reported delinquency (described above) includes an examination of factors associated with delinquency. Other studies which are expected to make significant contributions in this area are noted below.

Delinquency in American Society. The landmark study of delinquency in Illinois was completed in 1978, at the Institute for Juvenile Research in Chicago. This three-year study involved analyzing data collected during 1972 through a statewide Illinois survey of a random sample of over 3,000 youth aged 14-18, and a field study of Illinois communities and social institutions. Delinquency involvement was measured through self-reports by the youths surveyed and correlated with such factors as family, peer group, community, and school influences. The results have shed new light on the nature of delinquency. Among the major findings were the following: 1) contrary to popular conceptions based on arrest data, kids reporting delinquent behavior (other than armed robbery) are nearly as likely to be white as black; just about as likely to be a girl as a boy, as likely to live anywhere in Illinois as in highly urbanized Chicago, and just as likely to come from an intact as a broken home; 2) peer group pressure is the single most important factor in determining the presence or absence of delinquent behavior; 3) the community context serves as an important mediating influence in delinquency—particularly in the case of violent conduct; and 4) much of delinquency arises out of youth responses to contradictions or tensions displayed by authority figures in the family, school, and juvenile justice system contexts.

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

The results of this research have been applied to the design of a research and development (R&D) project in Illinois, which is described at the end of this sub-section, in the course of reporting on NIJJDP's FY 1979 activities.

Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency. NIJJDP sponsored a systematic nationwide assessment of current knowledge regarding the relationship between juvenile delinquency and learning disabilities (LD). This research was stimulated by emergence of the increasingly popular notion that LD might be a significant cause of delinquency. It was conducted by the American Institutes for Research, resulting in the report entitled The Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency: Current Theory and Knowledge.

The major conclusion of the assessment was that the nature of the relationship between LD and delinquency is unclear. Among the recommendations made to NIJJDP were the following: that NIJJDP examine the incidence of LD among delinquent and non-delinquent youth, and that a carefully designed R&D project be undertaken which also would include a LD remediation program and an evaluation of its effectiveness. NIJJDP developed a R&D program based on the results of the assessment research, which was designed to document the relative prevalence of LD among delinquent and officially non-delinquent populations, and to evaluate the effectiveness of remediation programming for delinquent youths diagnosed as LD.

The preliminary results of the prevalence study suggest that learning disabled youth are not more delinquent than non-learning disabled juveniles (based on youths' self-reports of their behavior). However, LD youth are twice as likely to be adjudicated delinquent as non-LD youth.

Interim findings from the evaluation of the remediation program for adjudicated delinquents shows that the program appears to be modestly effective in certain skill areas after approximately ten months of program operation. We are now in the process of taking the next program development step in this area; that is, application of the results in a demonstration program. A LD component has been incorporated into the OJJDP New Pride Replication program—a community-based program for serious juvenile offenders.

Two other program development implications based on this research are important to note. First, the preliminary finding that LD youth are disproportionately referred to the juvenile justice system suggests that future programming in the LD area should include remediation in the schools; and, second provision for training in the use of procedures in the juvenile justice system for identifying and referring LD youth to remediation opportunities seems to be required.

High Risk Early School Behavior for Later Delinquency. The major purpose of this five-year study was to identify early behavioral problems which would indicate that a child is especially "high risk" for subsequent delinquent behavior in the school environment and community.

The preliminary findings also indicate that behavior patterns can be identified as early as kindergarten which contribute to youth becoming high risks for later school problems and to some extent, delinquent behavior. These patterns appear to become more defined and assume greater predictive significance as the child grows older. The data also document the relationship between problem behavior in the school and police contact. Such results suggest that there may be sequences of responses to early behavior patterns which enhance the likelihood of later delinquency. For example, there is some indication that children who are held back or placed in remedial classes in the early grades are disproportionately represented among those youth who have repeated police contacts.

Evaluation of LEAA Family Violence Program. The 1977 amendments to the JJDP Act mandated NIJJDP to examine the relationship between family violence and delinquency. The Act also requires NIJJDP to evaluate programs funded by LEAA, at the request of the Administrator of OJJDP. These two mandates resulted in NIJJDP's funding of an evaluation of the LEAA's family violence program.

This evaluation examines eleven projects of the LEAA family violence program and six LEAA victim-witness assistance projects focused on family violence. It is designed to provide information on the most effective strategies for preventing and treating family violence and sexual exploitation of juveniles. Information will also be developed regarding the most efficient methods of organizing programs to provide services aimed at preventing and/or reducing family violence. In addition, this evaluation provides an opportunity to assess the relationship of family characteristics and interactions to violence and the impact of family violence on delinquency.

A comprehensive program monitoring system, including a case management information system (CMIS) and guidelines for implementation, has been developed by the national evaluator for the LEAA programs and, generally, for most other types of programs focused on family violence.

Results of the evaluation of strategies for preventing and treating family violence are not yet available. The preliminary data from the CMIS indicate that the average age of the program clients was twenty-nine and the majority were females. Most family disputes took place in the home, and children were present in a majority of the cases. The police were called in approximately ten percent of the cases and fifteen percent of the calls resulted in an arrest. Shelter care and counseling appear to be the most frequently provided services.

Delinquent Careers. NIJJDP has sponsored several projects which have as a central aim the development of a much more precise understanding of delinquent careers. These studies also make a major contribution to better understanding of factors related to the development and maintenance of delinquent and criminal lifestyles. Descriptions and brief summaries of results from these projects follow.

In 1976, NIJJDP funded follow-up research to the original Philadelphia "birth cohort"* study, entitled "Offender Careers and Restraint: Probabilities and Policy Implications." This project consisted of studying a sample of the earlier research group about 15 years later. Specifically, the major objectives of the project were 1) to examine the relationship between juvenile and adult criminal careers, 2) to determine the amount and types of offenses attributable to chronic offenders, and 3) to assess the crime reduction effect of restraint by incarceration. The study is based on a 10% sample (975) of the original cohort of 10,000 males from the earlier study. Data on demographic characteristics, official and self-reported offense histories, dispositions, and sanctions through age 30 were analyzed. The major findings follow. 1) Approximately 15% of the total sample was responsible for 80-85 percent of serious crimes. 2) Chronic offenders (5 or more police contacts), who constituted 6 percent of the sample, accounted for 51 percent of all offenses and 60 percent of all serious personal and property offenses.

*For those unfamiliar with the technical terminology of research, a birth cohort consists of all persons born in a given year.

3) As age increases, seriousness of offense increases. Up to eighteen, the level of offense seriousness is relatively low. It increases significantly during the early adult years. 4) The deterrence-restraint potential of incarceration is greatest for chronic offenders (five or more offenses) and for young adults age 19 to 22. The study also resulted in the determination that it would be feasible and important to replicate the original study.

The replication study, entitled Delinquency in a Birth Cohort was begun in 1976. Whereas the original study involved an examination of the incidence and nature of delinquency among 10,000 males born in 1945 who resided in Philadelphia from the ages of ten through eighteen, the replication study population (approximately 35,000) includes children born in 1958 who attended school in Philadelphia between the ages of ten and seventeen. The analyses will focus on such areas as overall delinquency rates, demographic and school correlates of delinquency, patterns of delinquent careers, and the effects of various sanctions on the probabilities of subsequent offenses.

A second major study of delinquent careers under NIJJDP sponsorship began in 1977. Entitled, Predicting Adult Criminal Careers from Juvenile Careers, it is being conducted at the University of Iowa. It is designed to provide information on the relationship of juvenile delinquent careers to adult criminal careers, to determine if various alternative decisions by the authorities or the juvenile have helped to continue or discontinue delinquent careers, and to suggest at what time in juvenile careers intervention can be most effective. Three youth cohorts, born in 1942 , 1949, and in 1955 in Racine, Wisconsin, are being studied.

The major findings to date are as follow: 1) 5% of the white males studied accounted for over 70% of the felony offenses; 2) 12% of the white males accounted for all police contacts of white males for felonies; 3) concentration of serious offenses among Blacks and Chicanos was less than among Whites (however, a small proportion among each was responsible for most of their felonies); and 4) minorities (Blacks and Chicanos) were disproportionately represented (in comparison with their representation in the overall population) among those referred to court and those placed in correctional institutions. The highest frequency of police contact of males for serious offenses was at age 15. This declined steadily to age 21 and then remained stable among older age groups. It was also determined that most youth have only one police contact during their adolescence. Both environment (living in an inner city) and police contact at an early age (for either juveniles or adults) appear to be related to a longer, more serious delinquent or criminal career.

Delinquency Prevention. NIJJDP has sponsored a number of projects which have as a primary aim the development of effective approaches to delinquency prevention. It should be noted that the projects described above focused on developing a better understanding of factors related to juvenile delinquency are important in this context since their results help guide the design of effective prevention approaches.

Major projects focused on the development of effective delinquency prevention programs are described below.

In 1975 NIJJDP sponsored a nationwide assessment of delinquency prevention approaches and theories, entitled Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. Project activities undertaken included: 1) a literature search dealing with major themes and issues influencing the direction of delinquency prevention programs, and 2) field site visits of programs differentiated by intervention strategies such as counseling, recreation, opportunity enhancement, and youth advocacy. An attempt was made to visit programs having external evaluation designs.

Major findings included the following: 1) no one theory was found to be adequate for developing viable prevention programs; 2) programs were weak in areas of client identification and program evaluation; 3) intervention strategies were seldom linked to assumptions about causation; 4) parental consent requirements and program screening inhibited service delivery to large numbers of youth; 5) program personnel failed to address societal conditions from which delinquent behavior emerged; 6) external program linkage with other community agencies was marked by suspicion, mistrust and lack of cooperation; 7) projects were sometimes designed to respond to perceived needs or ideas of potential funding agencies, rather than the needs of youth; and 8) some promising delinquency prevention techniques existed in the field, but were unproven.

The results of this work, which included identification of promising delinquency prevention strategies, were used in designing OJJDP's major action program in this area and summarized in the background paper attached to the program announcement for the initiative. In addition, the results of this assessment were used in developing the design for evaluation of the overall program, described in the following paragraphs.

The National Evaluation of OJJDP's Prevention Through Youth-Serving Agencies Initiative (which includes about 50 individual projects) is designed to develop information concerning the most effective delinquency prevention strategies. It is also aimed at determining the most efficient methods for developing and expanding youth service delivery systems. Both a process and an impact component are included in the evaluation design. The study of project implementation processes is organized around five elements of program development adopted from the conceptual framework of the national assessment of delinquency prevention (described above): context, identification (of the target population), intervention, goals, and linkages (with other agencies and organizations). It involves an examination of how projects change along these five dimensions and a comparison across projects within each dimension.

Data from the management information system for the first nine to fifteen months of program operation indicate that over 13,000 youth have been served by the projects. Most of them are from low socio-economic positions. Many reside in single parent families which are dependent on public assistance. The prelimi-

nary results indicate that private youth serving agencies are more likely to develop direct service strategies rather than community development or institutional change approaches. It appears that it is difficult for these agencies to establish collaborative ties with other private and public youth-serving agencies. Final results from this evaluation will be available during 1980.

In 1976, NIJJDP sponsored a national assessment of school crime and disruption and approaches to dealing with these problems. The major aim of this project was to obtain educators' views of how delinquency can best be dealt with in the Nation's educational system. Although little hard evidence was available, many programs seemed to hold promise. The project found that most educators preferred that OJJDP provide them with technical assistance, complemented by some form of direct funding, rather than a lengthy R and D strategy. Recommended programs were: 1) a national program to design, implement, and manage operation of school crime programs; 2) Regional Centers providing technical support to local schools; and 3) local action teams as catalysts for local school improvement efforts.

In part, as a result of this assessment, OJJDP, through an interagency agreement with HEW's Office of Education, provided funding for a national school crime program which implements the first and third recommendations noted above. (In 1979, OJJDP, through its Special Emphasis Division, provided funding for a School Resource Center Network, which implemented the second recommendation.)

In 1977, NIJJDP awarded an initial grant for an evaluation of the OJJDP-OE school crime program. This evaluation was expanded under a continuation grant in 1978.

Answers to four major questions are being sought through the evaluation:

1. Outcome: Are there measurable changes in the level of crime and fear of crime in the schools participating in the Schools Initiative Program?

2. Quality Control: Were the programs funded by OJJDP through the Office of Education carried out as intended?

3. Model Development: What approaches, with what underlying rationales, appear to work best under different conditions or in different school settings?

4. Developmental Process: What is involved in bringing about specific changes in the schools (obstacles encountered, resources used, interventions which can be implemented most readily, etc.)?

Only preliminary results are indicated by this evaluation to date. These reflect that intervention programs to reduce school crime and the fear of crime involving intra and inter-school organization and training of teachers can be effective in reducing crime and the fear of crime.

The final report of the evaluation is expected to show in what settings and with what combinations of training, technical assistance and level of involvement of school administrators, students and other resources school intervention programs are the most effective. The phase I findings now available indicate that the school team approach is an effective way of dealing with crime and disruption in schools, but suggest that the approach is not equally effective in all settings.

The final evaluation results will be useful in the refinement of existing programs and in the development and potential institutionalization of such programs in schools throughout the country. Information from this evaluation will be made available to schools across the country through the School Resource Center Network.

NIJJDP's program development work in the delinquent behavior and prevention area is greatly assisted by its National Assessent Center on Delinquent Behavior and Prevention, at the University of Washington. This Assessment Center* is combining the results of OJJDP and NIJJDP-sponsored work with information resulting from related work sponsored elsewhere, and its own survey and assessment of prevention programs, in order to enhance our understanding of delinquent behavior and improve efforts to prevent delinquency. Staff of the Center are currently engaged in a unique effort in which the results of basic research on delinquency prevention causation and correlates are used in the design of a major R&D project on delinquency prevention. The Center also maintains a computerized data base of current delinquency prevention programs across the U.S. This data base is available to anyone interested in learning of delinquency prevention efforts in other States. In addition, this Center has developed a number of reports on delinquency prevention theories, strategies, and model programs which are now available.

This center will have completed by March, 1980 a brief state-of-the-art paper on delinquent behavior and delinquency prevention programs nationwide. This document will summarize what is known about the nature and extent of delinquency, the features of promising prevention programs, together with recommendations for future directions.

## FY 1979 DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR AND PREVENTION-RELATED PROJECTS

During FY 1979 NIJJDP funded several projects in the delinquent behavior and prevention area. These are in addition to several projects which continued their operations during FY 79 as continuation funding was not required in the past Fiscal Year. Among these continuation projects are the national survey of self-reported delinquency, the victimization analysis project, the National Uniform Juvenile Justice Statistical Reporting System, the Learning Disabilities R&D project, and the National Evaluation of OJJDP's Prevention Program. Continuation funding was provided during FY 79 for the Racine, Wisconsin study of the relationship of juvenile delinquent careers to adult criminal careers. (No. 79-10),** and for replication of the Philadelphia birth cohort study (No. 79-1).

The new projects funded during FY 79 focus on specific aspects of delinquent behavior and its prevention. These are as follow:

*Please see the Information Dissemination section of this report for a description of NIJJDP's Assessment Centers Program.
**The grant numbers are simplified in the body of this report.

Transition to Junior High School and the Deviance Process. (No. 79-19). This project illustrates an important feature of NIJJDP's program development process; that is, the development of R&D projects, based on previous, more basic research. This study has its basis in the earlier research on "Delinquency in Illinois" (described above). One of the key findings from the earlier research was that delinquency appears to have a significant basis in youth-authority relationships in the school context. This project is focused specifically on the latter area in an attempt to illuminate more precisely the contribution of authority in the school experience to delinquency at the point of youths' transition from elementary to junior high school. The research emphasis is on the process of delinquency development in this context. The results of this research are expected to aid in the identification of prevention strategies. We anticipate applying these strategies in other jurisdictions, should they appear to hold promise in Illinois.

Another new project focused on the school context deals specifically with the dropout phenomenon among minority youth (Choice of Non-Delinquent and Delinquent Careers Among Puerto Rican Dropouts, No. 79-24). The major purpose of this study is to identify factors which influence the decision of Puerto Rican youths to remain in school or to drop out, and to investigate the process by which non-delinquent and delinquent careers are chosen among this population. The research will be based on a sample of approximately 600 Puerto Rican male and female tenth grade students in a Philadelphia school district. Data on the youths' self-concept, family and peer relationships, family, school and community interrelationships will be obtained through interviews with the youths and their parents. Information on school status and delinquency will be obtained from official records. Specific attention will be focused on the influence of cultural factors and ethnic identity on youth. The cohort will be followed for three years (through twelfth grade) to permit an assessment of the sequence of choices between staying in or dropping out of school, and non-delinquent or delinquent behaviors. An important product of this study will be a procedure for assessing youth problems in minority communities and an indication of specific factors and social relationships in such communities which lead to either constructive or deviant adjustments.

The above project is one of three studies which represent the initiation of NIJJDP's program of research on minority issues, conducted by minority organizations. The second study is focused on American Indian youth (summarized below), and the third project, developed in FY 79, is aimed at examining the relationship between delinquency and school disciplinary procedures (pushout, suspension, expulsion etc.) among Black youth. This latter project, to be conducted by the National Urban League, has been proposed for funding early in FY 80.

American Indian Juvenile Delinquency Research Project (No. 79-35). This project consists of the first phase of a thirty-six to forty-two month study of 1) the nature and extent of juvenile delinquency among American Indians, 2) judicial

system handling of Indian status offenders, non-offenders, and juvenile delinquents, and 3) the identification of service gaps and promising approaches to the prevention and treatment of American Indian juvenile delinquency. The study will be conducted among fifteen tribes, selected based on such factors as type of judicial system, population, and the juvenile crime rate. Various methods of data collection will be used, including interviews with community officials and parents, youth surveys, reviews of official records and observation.

Two other specific delinquency research projects (described below) were funded in FY 79, one of which focuses on a particular group, and the second on a specific offense.

Female Delinquency (No. 79-30). A major purpose of this study is to test labeling and opportunity theories in reference to female delinquency. The study will focus on three basic research questions: 1) How does female delinquent behavior differ, if at all, from that of males? 2) To what extent and in what ways do the causes of female versus male delinquency differ? 3) Are girls and boys committing similar offenses treated differently by policy agencies?

Included in the areas of study are: 1) the patterns and characteristics of female delinquent behavior and its motivational patterns, and 2) patterns of police processing of girls. Comparisons with males will be made in each of these areas.

Approximately four communities in the State of Michigan (differing in median income) will be selected for study. Within these communities, a sample of 1,500 respondents between the ages of 13 and 16, selected from school enrollment lists, will be surveyed. Approximately half of the research subjects will be girls. The results of this study are expected to be useful in shaping juvenile justice intervention approaches and alternative service programs for female delinquents.

Teenager's Attitudes Toward Rape (No. 79-22). This study will involve a survey (face to face interviewing) of approximately 500 urban girls and 500 boys between the ages of 13 and 17 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The objectives of the study are: to obtain information about adolescents' knowledge and attitudes towards rape; to determine the relationship between tolerance of rape (attitudes which are typical of rapists) and other variables, particularly the degree of socialization (related to delinquency), attitudes towards women, and concepts of masculinity and sex roles. This study will have important program development implications, as the project aims to identify effective treatment models for counseling rape victims, identify effective prevention approaches, and develop a better understanding of the causes and social aspects of rape.

Special Studies. Section 243(5) of the JJDP Act was amended in 1977 to authorize NIJJDP to conduct studies of: 1) the role of family violence, 2) sexual abuse or exploitation and media violence and delinquency, 3) the improper handling of youth placed in one State by another State, 4) the possible ameliorating roles of recreation and the arts, and 5) the extent to which youth in the juvenile system are treated differently on the basis of sex and the ramifications of such practices. The following are the principal studies addressing each of these areas.

Family violence — The evaluation of LEAA's family violence program (previously described) directly addresses the legislative mandate.

Sexual abuse or exploitation and delinquency — Several studies address this area: the study of teenagers' attitudes toward rape (just described); both the Juvenile Justice System Assessment Center and the Delinquent Behavior and Prevention Assessment Center have developed reports on this topic; a new R&D project has already been funded in FY 1980 which provides treatment for youth victims of sexual abuse and exploitation in Boston; and two of the family violence programs being evaluated (above) are hospital-based and provide treatment and juvenile justice system advocacy for youth victims of sexual abuse.

Media violence and delinquency — The Assessment Center on Delinquent Behavior and Prevention is preparing an assessment of this area.

Interstate placement — A national study of this practice is being conducted by the Academy for Contemporary Problems (described below).

Recreation and the arts — The Delinquent Behavior and Prevention Assessment Center is preparing a report on this issue.

Sexual discrimination in the JJS — We have expanded this topic to include racial discrimination. Numerous studies provide information in these areas: however, a major assessment is being conducted by the Juvenile Justice System Assessment Center.

## THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

NIJJDP's program of research and evaluation focused on the juvenile justice system (JJS) is presented here according to the basic structure of the JJS: police, courts, and corrections. For purposes of this discussion, detention and jailing of juveniles are covered in the corrections section, since these JJS responses are commonly viewed as being "correctional" in nature. It is also important to note that several of NIJJDP's projects in the JJS area address alternatives to JJS processing as well. Where this overlap is considerable, such projects will be discussed (or referred to) in both sections of this report, in order to put their contributions into the proper perspective.

### POLICE

National Assessment of Police Juvenile Units. In 1977, NIJJDP funded a nationwide assessment of special units within police departments established to deal specifically and exclusively with juvenile delinquency. The primary aims of this research were to determine the structure and functions of such units; to assess, if possible (through review of available evaluations), their effectiveness; and to recommend whether or not a national evaluation of these units should be conducted.

Descriptive information on the structure and functions of police juvenile units resulted from this research. The research team was unable to assess the effectiveness of such units because little evaluation research had been conducted in this area. The study concluded that a national evaluation of police juvenile units is not warranted at this time because: 1) the organization of a police department for handling juveniles is a local matter; and 2) the central issues are the efficacy of the functions themselves (e.g., apprehension, investigation, screening and prevention programs), and the cooperation of other criminal justice system components with the police departments.

Pivotal Ingredients of Police Juvenile Diversion Programs. The objectives of this project were to determine: 1) through what methods police diversion programs for juvenile offenders are developed; 2) what proportion and types of juvenile offenders are usually referred; and 3) how evaluation components of such programs affect the programs themselves.

The first phase of the study involved interviewing diversion/referral personnel within several California police departments to gather data pertinent to the project objectives. Diversion programs were found to fit into one of two categories: 1) in-house (contain counseling services, initiated within the police department) or 2) outside referal programs (refer offenders to community agencies, initiated outside of department and supported by government funds).

The second phase of the study involved computer analysis of data collected from 3,000 case files. It was found that referral rates vary widely between departments, but overall, are very much a function of the infusion of outside -- Federal and State -- funds. In general, regardless of the type of diversion program, those "diverted" usually were juveniles who normally would have been counseled and released. Thus, results strongly suggest that the original intent of the diversion programs studied (diverting offenders away from the juvenile justice system) was not being accomplished, or that "widening of the net" occured.

Policy Making Relating to Police Handling of Juveniles. This award supported the first phase of a project in which staff of the Center for Criminal Justice (Boston University) are working with two police jurisdictions: the Charleston District in Boston, and the Stamford Police Department, in Stamford, Connecticut, to analyze the local needs, priorities and problems associated with police handling of juveniles. Based on an analysis of state and local statutes, trends in juvenile crime and non-criminal misbehavior and other juvenile related matters, processing patterns and problems associated with dealing with troublesome youth in these jurisdictions, project staff are in the process of identifying priority areas for developing police guidelines for responding to juvenile problems. A primary source of direction for drafting such guidelines is three national sets of standards for juvenile justice, developed by the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Institute of Judicial Administration/American Bar Association Joint Commission on Juvenile Justice Standards, and the Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Task forces involving citizens and police personnel have been established to assist in the process of identifying priority problem areas and solutions to those problems. Data have been collected from official police files, student interviews in schools, and interviews with youth in community service centers. Courts and key agencies involved in handling youth will also become involved. Priority areas will be identified by the Fall of 1979 and guidelines will be developed by February, 1980.

This project was designed to assist NIJJDP in determining effective ways of carrying out the process of standards review, endorsement, and adoption at the local level, within operational JJS agencies. Its results will be used to inform future standards implementation efforts.

Other projects supported by NIJJDP also contribute new knowledge in the police area. The National Juvenile Court Statistical Reporting System provides information on patterns of police referrals to juvenile courts in the U.S. In 1975, for example, 82 percent of all referrals made to juvenile courts were from law enforcement agencies. Among these, 60 percent were referrals without a formal petition, whereas 40 percent were referred with a petition.

When completed, the National Evaluation of OJJDP's Diversion Program will provide the results of projects' efforts under that action program to divert youth at the point of police handling (in comparison with diversion at the pre- and post-adjudication points in the JJS). The results of this evaluation will also include information on police handling of juveniles in selected jurisdictions, and generally, address the issue of efficacy of police diversion programs.

In the delinquent behavior section of this report, we discussed three projects which have gathered information on police handling of juveniles in Philadelphia and in Racine, Wisconsin.

Finally, NIJJDP's National Assessment Center on the Juvenile Justice System has been developing nationwide the composite picture of police handling of juveniles, through combining data from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports with other sources.

## JUVENILE COURTS

The National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System now provides the main information base for NIJJDP's effort to develop national data on the operations of juvnile courts and the flow of youth through the JJS. Other projects provide information with respect to particular aspects of juvenile court operations. These follow.

Juvenile Court Study: Due Process. We awarded a grant to the National Center for State Courts in 1978 to develop baseline data regarding the characteristics, policies and procedures of urban juvenile courts. It is focused on the relationships among court structural and operational characteristics, and due process of law, dispositional decisions and administrative efficiency. A major objective of the study is to assess the effects of the Gault* decision on juvenile court operations.

A survey of a random sample of seventy of the one hundred sixty largest metropolitan juvenile courts has been completed. This survey covered the issues noted above. Its results are presently under analysis. The remaining 90 courts will also be surveyed in order to increase the depth and reliability of the findings.

Under an "umbrella" grant to the Academy for Contemporary Problems, support was provided in 1978 for four separate research studies — all of which are nationwide in scope (covering all 50 states), and each includes detailed case studies within 6-10 States. Two of these studies address juvenile court-related issues: 1) juvenile court services, and 2) waiver of juveniles to adult court.

The juvenile court services study is focused on the issue of whether or not juvenile courts should administer the wide range of services they typically provide. This project consists of three activities: a) literature search; b) analysis of social policy issues surrounding the evolution, constitutionality, and propriety of juvenile court operation of such programs as detention, probation, counseling, prevention, diversion, and unofficial probation; and c) case studies in six States employing particularly innovative alternatives to traditional operation of such programs by juvenile courts.

The waiver of juveniles to adult courts project consists of four phases: a) literature search; b) data collection to determine the number and type of juveniles who are waived to adult court, and court policies and practices in this area; c) analysis of social policy issues surrounding the use of waivers; and d) case studies in eight to ten States with respect to relative advantages and disadvantages resulting from the use of waivers.

The Effect of Legal Process and Formal Sanctions on Juvenile Delinquents. The objectives of this grant were to measure the impact of sanctions on subsequent attitudes and behavior of juveniles who enter the juvenile justice process, and to determine whether the process is productive or counterproductive for the juveniles. Project activities include literature review, collection and analysis of data from juvenile court records, and of self-report data from a sample of 3,000 junior and senior high school students in two Virginia communities.

*This Supreme Court decision (1967) afforded juveniles similar due process rights to those available to adults.

The project concluded that, for many minor juvenile offenders, contact with the JJS seems to be counterproductive, leading to continued or intensified involvement with the system. Such juveniles were found likely to develop negative attitudes towards the law, police, and courts, and subsequently adopt self-identifications as delinquent, and confront still more sanctions as a result of continued misbehavior. Recommendations for the JJS are: 1) the development of precise operational goals to monitor whether the system's activities are effective; 2) centralization of all records so that every branch of the system has access to case files; and 3) that attention be given to the negative impact "individual justice" can have on the subsequent attitudes, values, and behavior of juveniles processed — given the broad discretion at every decision point in the system of processing.

Several other projects sponsored by NIJJDP which have a primary focus on other areas also make important contributions to better understanding the operations of juvenile courts and their impact on youth. For example the National Evaluation of OJJDP's Diversion Program includes examination of the effectiveness of juvenile court diversion efforts. The National Evaluation of OJJDP's Restitution Program includes an assessment of the results of court-ordered restitution — which may take the form of monetary payments or community service. Likewise, the National Evaluation of OJJDP's Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders Program had a significant focus on the role of juvenile courts in relation to removal of status offenders from incarceration settings. Finally, a significant amount of the JJS Assessment Center's work has focused on the juvenile court area.

## CORRECTIONS

NIJJDP has supported a wide range of research and evaluation projects in the juvenile corrections area. The initial projects in this area were begun under LEAA sponsorship prior to establishment of NIJJDP and completed under Institute support: The National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections and the Evaluation of Massachusetts' Correctional Reforms.

National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections (NAJC). This project consisted of a nationwide assessment of juvenile corrections, with intensive examination of programs in 16 States. It included a survey of a sample of over 1,500 youth in correctional facilities in the 16 States. Among these youth, 35 percent were committed for status offenses; 3 percent for probation or parole violation; 4 percent for misdemeanors, 9 percent for drug offenses; 34 percent for property crimes; and 15 percent for personal crimes (aggravated assault, rape, robbery, kidnapping, manslaughter, and murder). Thus, only about 15 percent of the youth in correctional facilities at the time of the NAJC survey were incarcerated for what typically would be considered serious/violent crimes.

The NAJC study also produced some other very interesting findings. For example, incredible variations in patterns of institutionalization were observed among the States. Some States committed about 20 times more youths to institu-

tions than others (after controlling for differences in state populations). During Fiscal Year 1974, 43 reporting States spent slightly less than $30 million to operate their community-based programs for juveniles. This sum was about one-tenth that spent in the same year on institutions, camps, and ranches.

The NAJC study found the 1974 average costs per offender-year for state institutions, camps, and ranches to be $11,657. By contrast, the 1974 average costs per offender-year for State-related community-based residential programs were $5,501 — or less than one-half the cost of incarceration. NAJC project staff estimated that, collectively, 41 States could have realized a potential total savings of over $50 million during 1974 through the achievement of a 50 percent level of deinstitutionalization.

Massachusetts Evaluation. In 1969-72 Massachusetts replaced its training schools for juveniles with community-based alternatives to traditional incarceration. This is the only State that has deinstitutionalized statewide its large training schools. Only about 10 percent of the total number of youths presently committed to the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services are determined to require secure care.

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

The results are presented in five books and numerous monographs. Diversity in a Youth Correctional System examines the short and long-run impacts of such programs as foster care, forestry, group homes, and forms of incarceration from boarding schools to adult jails. Policy issues concerning the quality of life, and the quality of linkages to the community are examined; all of which affect the youth's future relationship to society. Neutralizing Inmate Violence reports on a comparative study of alternative forms of juvenile rehabilitation in four different

types of institutional treatment settings. Findings from the study have important implications for modifying correctional settings to produce more constructive institutional experiences for inmates. A Theory of Social Reform: Correctional Change Processes in Two States draws extensively on classic, sociological literature while using events in correctional reform movements to develop a conceptual model that identifies key interest group constellations, their actual characteristics and interrelationships, and the dimensions of their impact upon correctional organization. Designing Correctional Organizations for Youths identifies four dimensions of correctional organization which, in interaction with characteristics of the inmate populations, have a significant impact on aspects of "inmate subcultures." Directing the development of "inmate subcultures" may improve the chances of rehabilitation, and also improve the lives of inmates.

The results of this research and the success of the Massachusetts experience led to two other projects that are now underway. The first of these is a research effort focused on The Problem of Secure Care in a Community-Based Correctional System. This research involves examining how the State (particularly police, court, and correctional agencies) is making decisions about those youths who require secure treatment. (The research also involves an examination of how a few other States are addressing the secure care problem.) The significance of this research is that the key to long-run success in persuading States to adopt policies of deinstitutionalization and establishment of community-based programs depends in large measure on devising means to alleviate public fears about protection in the community. The second of the two new Massachusetts projects is a training program. It is described in the Training section of this report.

A Survey of Intervention Techniques for the Dangerous Juvenile Offender. The purpose of this grant was to conduct a nationwide assessment of existing intervention techniques appropriate for the dangerous juvenile offender. Specifically, the project objectives were to: 1) identify and classify existing (and previously tried) intervention approaches: 2) determine what kind of test or demonstration each type of approach has had; 3) identify, evaluate, and synthesize relevant data concerning the effectiveness of each approach; and 4) describe what type of research or demonstration efforts should be undertaken to fill gaps in the current state of knowledge. The principal findings of the assessment were that: 1) there is a major absence of data about dangerous juvenile offenders; 2) there are few programs of concentrated assistance specifically designed for this group; and 3) far too little is known about the dangerous juvenile offender in general, and about treatment programs, to allow comparative judgments.

The Limits of Heterogeneity (A Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of Correctional Programs for Serious and Non-serious Juvenile Offenders). This project consists of a longitudinal study of nearly every juvenile who entered

the New Jersey State correctional System between October 1, 1977 and July 31, 1978. It is designed to assess the effects of mixing dangerous, violent offenders and less serious offenders in a variety of correctional programs (ranging from community-based to more traditional institutional settings). This study also involves an assessment of the effects of separating juvenile and adult offenders.

The Interstate Placement of Children. This project was designed to determine the feasibility of conducting a national assessment of interstate placement of juveniles. It concluded that a national study was possible and recommended that policy research into state and local government practices involving the use of interstate compacts, funding sources, and licensing standards be undertaken. This recommendation was implemented through providing the necessary support for a national assessment of interstate placement practices and policies — as one of four studies conducted under the umbrella grant to the Academy for Contemporary Problems. It involves an examination of all 50 States' policies and practices pertaining to interstate placement, and case studies of a few selected States. This assessment is directly in response to the 1977 amendment to the JJDP Act requiring NIJJDP to conduct such an assessment (Sec. 243). It will be completed in 1980.

State Subsidies for Juvenile Justice. Another of the four studies sponsored under the Academy grant is a national study of subsidies available to units of State and local governments for juvenile justice purposes.

This study consists of two phases: a) data collection in fifty States regarding types and sizes of State-funded subsidies and other grant and aid programs used to support local juvenile justice programs; and b) case studies in ten States with particularly innovative State subsidies programs. The impact of Federal funds, relative to State subsidies and local funds, upon juvenile justice programs at the community level will be examined. The results of this assessment will assist States in using subsidies to accomplish the specific objectives set forth in Sec. 223(a)(10)(H) of the JJDP Act, which authorizes States to use formula grant monies made available to them under the Act to use subsidies to: "1) reduce the number of commitments of juveniles to any form of juvenile facility as a percentage of the State juvenile population; 2) increase the use of non-secure community-based facilities as a percentage of total commitments to juvenile facilities; and 3) discourage the use of secure incarceration and detention."

Right to Treatment. This study involved a literature review of right to treatment litigation and an exploration of new techniques for assuring personalized accountability to children from juvenile justice and social service personnel. The major purpose of the study was to describe existing litigation strategies and techniques, and develop flexible litigation techniques that would enhance accountability to youth; and that would enable non-expert legal services practitioners and paraprofessionals to participate in law reform efforts which have been in the past reserved for legal specialists.

A major observation resulting from the literature review was that, while juvenile treatment litigation has helped to reshape attitudes towards care and commitment of children, it has also called into question the rehabilitation goals of the system and the parens patria philosophy which has guided the development and operations of the juvenile justice system. The literature review emphasized that the U.S. Supreme Court, in Donaldson vs. O'Conner (1975) disaffirmed the right to treatment and concludes that standards, in assuring a safe and humane environment and supporting least restrictive alternatives, can serve as a promising litigation vehicle for youth in the juvenile justice system.

Youth Advocacy Program Development. In FY 1978 NIJJDP awarded a grant to the University of Notre Dame for the purpose of assisting OJJDP in the development of Youth Advocacy Initiative. Under this grant the Institute for Urban Studies at Notre Dame has developed the background (state-of-the-art) paper which has been published as part of OJJDP's Youth Advocacy Program Announcement — under which action projects are to be funded during FY 1980. In addition to helping design the overall program, the Notre Dame group has been assisting OJJDP in the review of applications and will also provided technical assistance to successful applicants in the course of implementing their particular projects.

This represents a unique approach to program development which is being tried at OJJDP for the first time. The innovation lies in the concept of using the same group which has responsibility for the background work also for the provision of technical assistance to the grantees. This approach should result in a much higher degree of continuity from program design to implementation.

## COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS

During FY 1977, NIJJDP began a series of studies of statewide juvenile justice systems, which have as their primary aim examination of the implementation of new juvenile justice legislation at the State level. The first of these studies is described below; another (focused on the State of Washington) was begun in FY 1979.

Assessment of the Impact of New California Juvenile Justice Legislation. The purpose of this project is to analyze the impact of new California juvenile justice legislation* on the California juvenile justice system and its clients. Four major clusters of provisions in this legislation were selected for analysis which include: mandatory deinstitutionalization of all status offenders; encouragement of alternative program development and referral; increased involvement of the prosecutor in delinquency proceedings; and easing criteria for transferring juveniles charged with serious crimes to adult court. Preliminary findings relative to each of these areas follow.

The implementation of the deinstitutionalization of status offenders provision resulted in some significant unanticipated consequences: Statewide arrests of juveniles for status offenses dropped by fifty percent from 1976 to

*H.B. 3121

1977. A detailed examination of decision making in three Southern California Counties demonstrated trends of relabeling a portion of status offenders as dependent and neglected juveniles, as delinquent offenders, or as mentally/emotionally disabled, to enable secure treatment of this group. (Corrective legislation was subsequently passed to prohibit severe confinement of dependent and neglected juveniles.) However, the patterns of relabeling were not consistent among the counties and did not fully account for the dramatic drop in arrests. There was a distinct problem experienced by police in responding to parental complaints, which often resulted in a general "hands-off" response.

Provisions encouraging the development and use of alternative services and programs for both delinquent and status offenders resulted in very low levels of implementation. Reasons suggested for this were the lack of funding and of a clear mandate to move in this direction. (Subsequent legislation, effective in 1978, provided for funding of alternative programs.)

Provisions which increased prosecutorial involvement in the petitioning of delinquency cases contributed to more severe treatment of delinquent offenders such as increased charging at the police level, increases in sustained petitions, and a greater percentage of out-of-home placements as court dispositions.

The provisions easing standards for certification (waiver) to adult court for a specified list of criminal offenses resulted in varying responses among counties. Overall, statwide certification hearings (as mandated by law for these offenses) doubled, followed by approximately a 30% increase in the number of juveniles bound over to adult court. It should be noted that these increases appear to be most directly related to changes in processing requirements and not to increases in juvenile criminal activity as measured by arrests for these offenses. An intensive analysis of Los Angeles County data indicated that juveniles sent to criminal court faced the same probability of being convicted that they would face if they had remained in the juvenile court, but were somewhat more likely to be incarcerated (even after controlling for different types of offenses) in adult court.

A continuation grant was awarded in 1978 to further explore reactions to the original legislation, including modifications to it. The final report is expected to be completed by July, 1980.

Other Projects. Numerous other NIJJDP projects provide an opportunity for examination of local juvenile justice systems as a whole (including related police, court, and correctional agencies), or one or more of their components. These include the studies of delinquent careers, the national evaluations, and other evaluation studies (e.g., of Massachusetts' reform efforts).

The National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System (NUJJRS). As noted earlier, this information system provides the only nationwide data available on the flow of youth throughout the juvenile justice system.* There are two sources of national data which now constitute this important historical series.

The first of these represents a continuation of the reporting process used by HEW up to 1974 (aggregrate reports usually generated by State agencies through compilation of aggregrate data voluntarily submitted by individual courts). These data have been used for over 40 years in preparing the annual report, entitled Juvenile Court Statistics: 1974, etc. For the period 1975-78, 40-42 States have submitted aggregrate reports to NCJJ. Data from the reporting States are used to estimate the total number of youth appearing before juvenile courts nationwide in a given year.

The second source of national data on JJS handling of youth which are fed into the NUJJRS emanate from the individual case cards used by participating courts (which are used above in developing the aggregrate reports). Before the NUJJRS was transferred from HEW to NIJJDP, jurisdictions did not send these data to HEW. For the most part, they were unused. In 1975, NCJJ was able to get most juvenile courts in 12 States to provide NCJJ access to the individual cards on cases they handled that year. NCJJ estimates that 24 States will provide access to these data in 1979. Those cards contain data on about 25 items (such as characteristics of the youth, offense history, method of handling, police action, detention, jailing, court method of handling, waiver, and disposition, including incarceration in a correctional institution and other referrals). In other words, these data are "transactional" since that they provide a record of JJS "transactions" relevant to the individual youth. They enable tracing of individual case flow through the JJS. (Complete confidentiality regarding the identity of the youth is maintained.) NCJJ uses these data to compile a more accurate estimate** of nationwide JJS handling of youth. The tremendous advantage of this individual case-based reporting method is that it permits development of the nationwide picture of the flow of youth through the JJS, which is now done for the first time ever. In 1975, the number of youth handled by juvenile courts in the reporting States constituted over 50 percent of all youth handled nationwide by juvenile courts.

---

*This information system does not include data on youth arrested other than those referred to juvenile court.

**U.S. Census data, which NCJJ has used to extrapolate the national youth population, by year, within each jurisdiction, make possible development of refined national estimates.

We are rapidly decreasing the time lag between the reporting year and the publication of the national statistical reports based on this reporting system. NCJJ and NIJJDP are optimistic that, by the end of calendar 1980, all annual reports through 1979 will have been published.

NIJJDP's Assessment Center Program* conducts the most comprehensive examination feasible of nationwide juvenile justice system operations, through the use of the results of the above efforts and by combining them with data from other sources (e.g., the States themselves, and other studies). In addition to compiling the most comprehensive and complete national picture of JJS handling of youth, the National Juvenile Justice System Assessment Center also is attempting to assess the effectiveness of the JJS and its several components — in part through conducting assessments of JJS handling of particular types of offenders and non-offenders. For example, it has completed assessment reports on status offenders, serious offenders, and on dependent and neglected youth.

This center will have completed by March, 1980, a brief but comprehensive state-of-the-art paper on the JJS and its operations nationwide. This document will summarize what is kown about the flow of youth through the JJS and about the effectiveness of its operations, and will provide recommendations for future direction of JJS programs.

FY 1979 JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM-RELATED PROJECTS. During FY 1979, NIJJDP funded several new projects which are aimed at increasing our understanding of the operations of the juvenile justice system in the U.S. These consist of the following studies. (See the previous section in which FY 1979 studies in the delinquent behavior and prevention area are noted; since several of these projects — particularly those focused on delinquent careers and on the national study of Indian juvenile justice - also contribute to knowledge regarding the juvenile justice system, generally.)

COURTS. The following projects were funded during FY 1979 focused on juvenile courts.

A Study of Juveniles in a Suburban Court. (No. 79-34). This study seeks to develop new knowledge to improve the operation of juvenile courts in suburban and other areas characteristic of diverse clienteles. Beyond this basic objective, by applying an innovative design, the study combines examination of the overall operations of the court system with specific investigation of gifted children who come in contact with the juvenile justice system, and with an assessment of the impact of youths' family backgrounds on the nature and outcome of their court experience. The most specific theoretical base applicable to parts of this research is labeling theory - which raises the basic question: are children labeled and processed, based on types of family situations and levels of giftedness, irrespective to a certain extent of the offense background? The research approach will include data collection and analysis in reference to the above issues on all youths coming into the Arapahoe County, Colorado juvenile justice system during a 14 month period.

*Please see the Information Dissemination section of this report for a description of NIJJDP's Assessment Centers Program.

Evaluation of the Philadelphia Child Advocacy Unit (No. 79-32). This project will evaluate the Child Advocacy Unit (CAU) located in the Defender Association of Philadelphia. The CAU is based on a multi-disciplinary approach and employs staff representing legal, psychological, social investigative and related professions. A key function of the unit is representation of the rights and interests of non-delinquent children coming to the court's attention, whenever there is judicial determination of a divergence of interests between parents and their child. The evaluation will explore the extent to which the CAU has achieved its intermediate objectives (e.g., adequately representing the child's interests in court; seeing that needed social services are provided), and long range objectives (e.g., delinquency prevention, stabilization of families, and contributions to the law). It will also address the issue of the extent to which the CAU has improved the Philadelphia Juvenile Court's effectiveness in dealing with abused, dependent, and neglected youths.

Other studies directly relevant to the juvenile court area include the national evaluation of OJJDP's restitution program (for which continuation funding was provided this FY — No. 79-9).

CORRECTIONS. Two new projects have been initiated this FY focused specifically on the corrections area. Both are national studies.

A National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities for Children and Youth and Alternative Agencies and Programs Providing Non-residential Services to Children and Youth (No. 79-8). This grant to the School of Social Services Administration of the University of Chicago supports the first phase (18 months) of a national study of residential facilities and community-based alternatives to incarceration providing services to children and youth throughout the United States. The objective of the research is to describe the numbers and kinds of programs now available, and the youths being served by them, so that policy makers, planners, administrators, legislators, organizations concerned with children, and interested citizens will have available the information needed to evaluate and improve the quality of care provided to young people.

This study will, in part, replicate A Census of Children's Residential Institutions in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands: 1966. The current study will be expanded to include selected residential programs, in addition to those institutions enumerated in 1966, and certain non-residential programs as well. The 1966 effort surveyed institutions for children considered dependent and neglected, emotionally disturbed, and delinquent; such as psychaitric inpatient children's units; maternity homes; temporary shelters; and detention facilities. Institutions for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped were enumerated, but not surveyed. The new work will make possible an examination of changes that may have occurred in such facilities over a 15-year period. Organizations included in this research which were not covered in the earlier study will be surveyed to obtain comprehensive national data.

The present study will rely on data collected through two procedures. The first will be a questionnaire administered with the help of the National Opinion Research Center, located on the University of Chicago campus. The second will include site visits to a sample of organizations providing services to children and youth.

Juvenile Parole Research Project (No. 79-29). This project represents the first phase (18 months) of a comprehensive study which will examine juvenile parole decision-making throughout the country. It will examine the organization of juvenile parole authorities, the policies and criteria used to arrive at parole decisions and the effects of these decisions on the juvenile offender population. Information gathered from surveys and from on-site visits will be examined in the light of population recommendations made by various national standards setting groups which propose the elimination of indeterminate commitments of juvenile offenders in favor of determinate and proportional sentencing as a means of reducing the inequities in the juvenile parole process.

Continuation funding was also provided during this FY for completion of the Harvard University study of secure care (No. 79-23), which is described above in the corrections section.

COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS. The second assessment of statewide juvenile justice system revisions (the first of these was conducted in California — described above) was funded during this FY.

An Assessment of the Implementation and Impact of Washington State Juvenile Justice Legislation and Related Programs (No. 79-28). The purpose of this project is to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the implementation and impact of new juvenile justice legislation in the State of Washington and of related action programs supported by OJJDP (under a separate grant). A major purpose of the assessment is to assist the State in its implementation effort. The legislation, which represents a comprehensive revision of the Washington State Juvenile Code, is based on two underlying principles: 1) that children who have not committed crimes should not be handled in the same manner as criminal offenders; and 2) that children who have committed criminal acts should receive dispositions based on the seriousness of their immediate offense, their age, and their past criminal record, rather than based on the nature of their past social history.

The assessment will focus on the implementation of specific statutory provisions which reflect these principles and on supported action programs which are designed specifically to enable the implementation of provisions relating to the treatment of non-criminal children. In Phase I (18 months) of a three-year assessment effort, five separate but interrelated studies will be initiated; a study of the legislative history of the legislation (HB 371) and subsequent revisions thereto); a state-wide implementation study; an indepth study of selected court jurisdictions; and a study of the new service delivery system of the Washington Department of Social and Health Services.

Another project was funded during FY 79 which incorporates a comprehensive view of juvenile justice systems. It is a Comparative Analysis of Juvenile and Family Codes (No. 79-27). The purpose of this award was to create the capability at the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) to conduct on-going and current analyses of the juvenile and family codes of the fifty states and the D.C. The specific objectives of the project are: to create a legislative information system with capacity and expertise to respond to inquiries concerning the provisions of legislation regarding various juvenile justice topics; to establish a current federal and state legislative data base of juvenile codes or juvenile and family courts acts; and to monitor legislative changes and track trends. The products of this research will enable OJJDP, its grantees, congress, state legislatures, executives and judicial branches of government, and others to keep abreast of the rapidly changing juvenile and family codes in the U.S. The major products will include written reports analyzing the provisions of juvenile and family codes in the following topic areas: juvenile court jurisdiction, waiver of juveniles to adult court, records maintenance and disposition, and legislative compliance with the JJDP Act. In addition, other ad hoc reports on special topic areas will be developed at OJJDP's request.

## ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM PROCESSING

NIJJDP has sponsored a broad program of research and assessment work on alternatives to juvenile justice system processing. Following the Institute's overall framework, these alternatives include community-based alternatives to the use of secure detention and jails, diversion programs, and alternatives to traditional incarceration in training schools and other secure correctional facilities. While some of NIJJDP's work in the alternatives area has addressed the nature and effectiveness of social services, this focus has generally been limited to the extent that such social service programs (e.g., foster care) serve as alternatives to traditional juvenile justice system processing. The remainder of the social services area is viewed as falling largely within the domain of the research units of HEW.

ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION — Several projects sponsored by NIJJDP have examined the use of various residential and non-residential alternatives to secure detention — particularly for status and non-offenders (e.g., dependent, neglected and abused youth).

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF DETENTION OF JUVENILES AND OF ALTERNATIVES TO ITS USE — This project consists of nationwide assessments of both secure detention and alternatives to its use. Among the findings resulting from review of relevant literature in conjunction with this research were the following:

1) County jails are still used for temporary detention of juveniles, particularly in less populous States. Even in some more heavily populated jurisdictions, however, jails are still used for some juveniles, despite the existence and availability of a juvenile detention facility. In many States which are seeking to reduce

the use of jails for the detention of juveniles, the dominant alternative course is seen as the construction of a detention facility.

2) Use of secure detention for dependent and neglected children appears to be on the decline as more jurisdictions develop either shelter care facilities or short-term foster home programs. Some jurisdictions, however, are known to misclassify dependent and neglected children as youths in need of supervision who then are placed in secure detention. The extent of the latter practice is unknown.

3) Many jurisdictions still exceed the NCCD recommended maximum detention rate of 10 percent of all juveniles apprehended; the proportion of juveniles detained less than 48 hours continues to hover around 50 percent. These patterns are frequently cited as evidence of the inappropriate use of detention.

4) Many jurisdictions are unable to mobilize the resources necessary to attend to children with special (neurological and psychiatric) needs. These children are then often detained, some times for excessive lengths of time.

5) Status offenders tend to be detained at a higher rate than youths apprehended for adult type criminal offenses and also tend to be held longer.

6) Youths of racial and ethnic minorities tend to be detained at higher rates and for longer periods than others; females are detained at a higher rate and longer than males.

7) Extra-legal factors are more strongly associated with the decision to detain (versus release) than legal factors (those specified by juvenile codes). Time of apprehension (evening and weekends), proximity of a detention facility and degree of administrative control over intake procedures have all been found to be associated with the decision to detain, in addition to those factors contained in items (5) and (6) above.

The actual extent to which these patterns of misuse exist either within or between States is unknown. Many States — and jurisdictions within States — still do not collect statistics at regular intervals on the use of secure detention.

In addition to the literature review, the research team conducted brief field studies of selected programs (alternatives to detention) in 14 jurisdictions. These were not randomly selected; rather, they were purposefully selected in order to include programs in cities of varying sizes; programs for alleged status offenders or alleged delinquents, or both; residential and non-residential programs; and programs geographically representatives of the U.S. The 14 programs were classified as follows: home detention, attention homes, programs for runaways, and private residential foster homes. All were programs currently in use as alternatives to secure detention for youths awaiting adjudication in juvenile courts. The following is a summary of the conclusions the research team believed to be of immediate importance to individuals and organizations that may be considering the development of alternatives in their jurisdictions.

1) The various program formats appear to be about equal in their ability to keep those youths for whom the programs were designed trouble free and available to court. That is not to say that any group of juveniles may be placed successfully in any type of program. It refers, instead, to the fact that in most programs only a small proportion of juveniles had committed new offenses or had run away while awaiting adjudication.

2) Similar program formats can produce different rates of failure-measured in terms of youths running away or committing new offenses. The higher rates of failure appear to be due to factors outside the control of the programs' employees-e.g., excessive lengths of stay due to slow processing of court dockets or judicial misuse of the program for pre-adjudicatory testing of youths' behavior under supervision.

3) Any program format can be adapted to some degree to program goals in addition to those of keeping youths trouble free and available to the court, for example, the goals of providing treatment or concrete services.

4) Residential programs—group homes and foster-care— are being used successfully both for alleged delinquents and status offenders.

5) Home Detention Programs are successful with alleged delinquents and with some alleged status offenders. However, a residential component is required for certain juveniles whose problems or conflicts are with their own families. Substitute care in foster homes and group homes and supervision within a Home Detention format have been combined successfully.

6) The Attention Home format seems very adaptable to the needs of less populated jurisdictions, where separate programs for several special groups may not be feasible. The attention Home format has been used for youth populations made up of (a) alleged delinquents only, (b) alleged delinquents and status offenders, and (c) alleged delinquents, status offenders, and juveniles with other kinds of problems as well.

7) Thoughtfully conceived non-secure residential programs can retain, temporarily, youths who have run away from their homes. Longer term help is believed to be essential for some runaways, so programs used as alternatives to detention for these youths require the cooperation of other social agencies to which such juveniles can be referred.

8) Certain courts are unnecessarily timid in defining the kinds of youths (i.e., severity of alleged offense, past record) they are willing to refer to alternative programs. Even when alternative programs are available, many youths are being held in secure detention (or jail) who could be kept trouble free and available to the court in alternative programs, judging by the experience of jurisdictions that have tried.

9) Secure holding arrangements are essential for a small proportion of alleged delinquents who constitute a danger to others.

10) The costs per day per youth of alternative programs can be very misleading. A larger cost can result from more services and resources being made available to program participants. It can also result from geographical variations in costs of personnel and services, inclusion of administrative and office or residence expenses and under-utilization of the program.

11) A range of types of alternative programs should probably be made available in jurisdictions other than the smallest ones. No one format is suited to every youth, and a variety of options among which to choose probably will increase rates of success in each option.

12) Appropriate use of both secure detention and of alternative programs can be jeopardized by poor administrative practices. Intake decisions should be guided by clear, written criteria. Judges and court personnel should monitor the intake decisions frequently to be certain they conform to criteria.

13) Since overuse of secure detention continues in many parts of the country, the main alternative to secure detention should not be another program. A large proportion of youths should simply be released to their parents or other responsible adults to await court action.

Based on the literature review and field studies, the research team made the following recommendations to juvenile courts that may be considering the introduction of alternative programs of any kind.

1) Criteria for selecting juveniles for secure detention, for alternative programs, and for release on the recognizance of a parent or guardian while awaiting court adjudication should be in writing.

2) The decision as to whether youths are to be placed in secure detention or an alternative program should be guided, insofar as possible, by written agreements between the responsible administrative officials. These agreements should specify the criteria governing selection of youths for the programs.

3) The decision to use alternative programs should be made at initial intake where the options of refusing to accept the referral, release on the recognizance of a parent or guardian to await adjudication, and use of secure detention are also available. It should not be necessary for a youth to be detained securely before referral to an alternative program is made.

4) An information system should be created so that (a) use of secure detention, alternative programs, and release on parents' recognizance can be cross-tabulated at least by type of alleged offense, prior record, age, sex, race/ethnicity, and family composition; and (b) terminations by types of placements from secure detention, alternative programs, release on

parents' recognizance status can be cross-tabulated with tables such as type of new offense, length of stay, and disposition as well the variables listed in (a) above.

5) Courts should adjudicate cases of youths waiting in alternative programs in the same period of time applicable to those in secure detention.

Residential Alternatives to Detention of Juveniles. The main objective of this project was to develop a "how-to-do-it" manual on community-based residential alternatives to detention. This manual is based on the promising alternative program models identified in the project just discussed. It gives priority attention to administrative and management requirements for practitioners involved in planning, design, and implementation of such programs... It is designed both for developing new programs and improving existing ones by such means as coordination, expansion and revision. Priority attention is given to two levels of management: 1) the day-to-day details of managing an alternative detention program and 2) the set of problems which are involved when a community tries to organize and provide resources for such an alternative.

Several major factors were found which appear to be associated with successful programs. They are good management, a sensitivity to local needs, an involvement of community leaders, and a consistent flow of resources. The manual offers guidelines to follow in these and other areas.

An assessment of four program models for residential alternatives to detention is also included. The four models are: 1) the Grassroots Organizational Model—most successful in communities able to generate a high level of commitment and volunteerism; 2) the Publicly-Funded Community-Based Contract Network Model—most successful in metropolitan areas where a large number of service providers are available; 3) the Grant-Funded Service Clusters—best used by those communities which cannot otherwise provide for services; and 4) The Publicly-Operated Agency—most appropriate for small to medium size communities where privately operated services are not available and where the community believes that it is the responsibility of the local government to provide such services.

An appendix of current state laws indicates each state's policy regarding the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and provides information on the liscensing and zoning regulations of the individual states for child care facilities.

This manual is presently in draft form and is being prepared for publication. In addition to its general distribution to the practitioner community, this manual will be used in OJJDP's Technical Assistance activities and incorporated into the curriculum of NIJJDP's Training Center.

Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO). In FY 1976, OJJDP funded thirteen DSO projects which had as their major objective deinstitutionalization of status offenders, primarily through creation of alternatives to detention and precluding the placement of status offenders in correctional institutions (training schools). NIJJDP funded a national evaluation program of the overall program and independent evaluations of eight of the thirteen OJJDP projects.

Significant findings from the national evaluation include the following: 1) Community-based services can be provided for status offenders at about 20 percent less than the cost of juvenile justice system processing. 2) A somewhat unexpected finding was that home placement was feasible in a high proportion of all status offender cases. Fewer than 10 percent of status offenders served through the DSO project were deemed in need of any kind of alternative residential placement. 3) Foster homes were used frequently as residential alternatives to detention. These placements worked best in cases of younger children who were principally neglected and dependent, but were classified as status offenders for purposes of case dispositions. Such foster homes encountered a number of difficulties in the course of their establishment: delays in recruitment (of foster parents), difficulties in finding suitable foster parents (especially in poverty areas with high rates of foster parent turnover). 4) The most promising alternative to detention program (for those youth requiring alternative placements—primarily chronic of status offenders) was the short-term shelter-care home. 5) Numerous problems were encountered in enlisting the collaboration of private sector, community-based youth-service agencies, such as delays in completing contract arrangements and disagreements concerning client eligibility criteria. 6) Problems were also encountered in securing the necessary cooperation from juvenile courts—which were generally reluctant to share with non-court agencies their statutory responsibility for the control and welfare of status offenders. 7) All of the DSO projects succeeded in removing or diverting status offenders from secure detention and incarceration. 8) Overall, use of community-based alternatives for status offenders did not result in an increase in their recidivism—a finding which, taken together with the reduced cost of alternative placements, makes the use of secure confinement of status offenders of dubious value. 9) Six States had secured legislation supporting DSO at the end of the projects, and project efforts were clearly related to this in five of these States. Additionally, State funds were made available to continue components essential to maintaining deinstitutionalization.

By the end of FY 79, six of the eight local DSO evaluations were completed. As soon as the remaining two studies are completed (in FY 80) these results will be combined with those from the national DSO evalution.

DIVERSION. NIJJDP's initial effort in this area was a National Assessment of Diversion and Alternatives to Incarceration. With respect to diversion, the major objective of this project was to conduct a nationwide assessment of diversion programs, policies, and practices. In order to facilitate the assessment, and at the same time add clarity to confusing definitions of diversion, the term was defined as removal of youth from JJS processing between the points of initial police contact and prior to adjudication. In addition to a review of relevant literature, the assessment team conducted brief field studies of representative programs.

Results from this study indicated that the imposed definition was a useful and workable one. However, it was learned that practitioners typically viewed diversion as "minimizing penetration" into the JJS rather than as an end to further JJS processing. Little evidence of "true diversion" (actual removal from the JJS) was found. This observation was viewed as being linked to the organizational location of diversion programs, as the researchers concluded that continued funding of diversion programs under the aegis of the JJS will likely result in "widening-the-net" of JJS control (that is; the existence of diversion programs within the JJS results in a tendency for the JJS to intake youth it otherwise would not have processed, in order to make diversion program services available to them). Concerns were also raised with respect to an apparent lack of due process procedures in conjunction with diversion programs—the most notable of which was the practice of holding further JJS processing in obeyance pending the outcome of youths' participation in diversion programs.

The findings from this project were corraborated by the California study of police diversion earlier in this report (in the Section on research focused on the police component of the JJS).

Issues raised in both of these projects are being carefully studied in the NIJJDP-sponsored National Evaluation of OJJDP's Diversion Initiative. It consists of an overall (process) evaluation of all projects funded under the OJJDP initiative, and intensive (impact) evaluations of selected projects. It was designed to answer the following major questions: 1) What difference does diversion make for youth (as opposed to juvenile-justice system referral) and the juvenile justice system? 2) What difference does service delivery make (as opposed to diversion without services)? The evaluation is also addressing such issues as the impact of diversion programs on juvenile justice system processes and procedures, and the extent to which diversion programs actually reduce the level of delinquent adjudications.

This evaluation has also been designed to test "labelling theory" — which the Congress implicitly endorsed in the course of developing the JJDP Act. Labelling theory is based, in part, on the assumption that the process of labelling youth as "delinquent" or "bad" sets into motion a self-fulfilling prophecy that results in subsequent delinquency (or inappropriate behavior). Testing of this theory (and provisions of answers to the above questions) is made possible by our having designed the OJJDP Diversion Initiative to divert youth at three points in the JJS: police handling, court intake, and the pre-adjudication hearing.

An examination of the extent to which diversion programs negatively label youth is also being undertaken. Entitled Community Agencies' Responses to Youth, this research project is designed to inform the current widely promoted strategy of diverting youths from the juvenile justice system and returning them to the community for services. Two major questions are addressed: What types of services are provided to what types of youth? How are characteristics of youths and agencies related to the quality of services provided to youth? The study is being conducted in three communities which correspond to different community-types:

a "communal community characterized by strong ethnic and primary group ties; a "pluralistic" community with a mixture of racial, ethnic and socio-economic groups; and a "controlled" community characterized by a low income population whose lives are influenced considerably by public organizations. Both of the major research questions addressed in this project include a focus on the issue of community agencies' responsiveness to minority youth.

Another diversion research project consists of a study of The Children's Hearings in Scotland. This study was designed to add to our knowledge of alternative models for processing juveniles—which might inform current debates on reform of the American juvenile justice system. Specifically, it involves an examination of the philosophy, policies and procedures of the system of Scottish children's panels which consist of hearings held in lieu of court processing for juveniles. Under the hearing system, all referrals of delinquency (except homicide and other designated offenses), abuse, and neglect cases are made to a reporter who decides, based on legal and status factors, whether the case is sent to a formal hearing before members of a children's panel. If the child and his/her parents admit that a particular offense took place, they engage in informal discussions with three panel members (volunteer lay persons) who are authorized to prescribe compulsory measures of care. Each disposition is reviewed at the end of one year. This study involves the development of a detailed descriptive model of the hearings, emphasizing the decision-making process, an assessment of their effectiveness, and an evaluation of this system in terms of its appropriateness for adaptation to meet the needs of the American Juvenile Justice System.

ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION. Several NIJJDP-supported projects have made important contributions to our understanding of the nature, extent, and effectiveness of community-based alternatives to incarceration. Earlier we described the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections project and the evaluation of Massachusetts' community-based correctional system (and the follow-on study of secure-care).

Another study funded prior to the official creation of NIJJDP (described in part above) was the National Assessment of Diversion and Alternatives to Incarceration. With respect to the latter component of this assessment study, the major objective was to conduct a nationwide assessment of programs, policies, and practices in the area of community-based alternatives to incarceration. As in the diversion area, we sought to facilitate the assessment work and add clarity to the definition of such alternatives by defining them as programs which involve removal of youth from the JJS following their adjudication. The assessment team conducted brief field studies of representative programs following a review of relevant literature, which suggested issues to be examined.

Results from this study included the following. In general, community-based programs were found to be providing a supplementary appendage to juvenile corrections, rather than actual alternatives to correctional institutions. That is, programs intended as alternatives to incarceration tended not to serve those youth who otherwise would have been incarcerated. Rather, they appeared largely to be serving youth who, in the absence of such programs, probably would have been placed on probation.

In FY 77-78, OJJDP funded a national program of restitution projects. These were intended to serve as alternatives to incarceration for youth adjudicated as delinquents.

NIJJDP is sponsoring a National Evaluation of the OJJDP Restitution Initiative. Its major objectives are to develop information on the types of restitution programs that are most likely to: reduce juvenile recidivism, increase victim satisfaction and/or have the greatest impact on members of the community, in terms of their views of operations of the juvenile justice system; to develop information on the comparative cost-effectiveness of different types of restitution programs for achieving each of the above alternative goals; and to develop descriptive and analytical information on implementation processes and problems, and on changes in program operating procedures. The evaluation design includes process and impact components. The latter consists of intensive evaluations of six of the forty-four projects. A management information system (MIS) developed by the national evaluator has been implemented at all of the projects.

Data from the MIS indicate that, as of August, 1979, the projects had received 2,747 referrals. Of these, eighty-two percent (86%) were closed in full compliance with the original restitution order. Monetary restitution plans are most common (66%). The majority of the referrals are fifteen to seventeen year old white males. Approximately seventy-five percent (75%) were serious and/or repeat offenders (definded as first offenders who have committed serious property or personal crimes or youth with one or more prior offenses who have committed property crimes of at least moderate seriousness).

We have provided support for an expansion of the local Evaluation of the Unified Delinquency Intervention Services Program (UDIS) in Chicago, Illinois* in order to test the proposition that serious juvenile offenders can be handled effectively by means other than incarceration. UDIS is a deinstitutionalization program for chronic inner-city juvenile offenders who would otherwise likely be committed to the department of corrections. The basic evaluation design consists of a longitudinal, quasi-experimental, approach involving comparisons among three groups: juveniles who were committed to the department of corrections, juveniles who entered UDIS between 1974 and 1976 and a sample of juveniles selected from the general population who did not necessarily become committable.

The findings of this study as currently published, indicate an apparent, substantial impact of both the UDIS program and the Department of Corrections on the post-program arrests, court appearances, and violent offenses among the samples of chronic delinquents. The research also shows that the effects of less drastic interventions, such as arrest and release, temporary detention, supervision, etc., on this population appear to be minimal. The costs of the UDIS program and DOC programs were determined to be similar/.

These findings suggest the need for additional validation research (test of reliability) through full or partial replication of the research design.

*The main evaluation of the UDIS program was funded by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission.

The indication from the original findings that both incarceration and community-based alternatives to incarceration and correctional programs may reduce recidivism among a chronic delinquent population also suggest the need for similar research to test the impact of a wide range of intervention programs.

In FY 78, NIJJDP funded a Study of Policy Implementation Regarding Deinstitutionalization for Services for Delinquent Youth. The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the experiences of four States in deinstitutionalizing services for juvenile offenders: Ohio, Florida, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. It was designed to examine theoretical approaches to accomplishing deinstitutionalization (through case studies of each State).

The results of this study show that it is possible, but difficult, to successfully deinstitutionalize juvenile offenders and services for them. They further describe the conditions under which deinstitutionalization approaches are likely to fail or succeed.

The specific product of the research is a three volume report entitled The Politics of Incarceration. Its applicability is as an informative tool for juvenile systems' policy makers, managers and practitioners who wish to pursue or are involved in, a deinstitutionalization process. The report would also have applicability as a training tool for upper-level decision-makers with interest in this area.

FY 1979 ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

Final continuation awards were made for completion of the Delaware DSO evaluation (No. 79-17) and the Arizona DSO evaluation (No. 79-26). Continuation funding was also provided for the studies of community agencies' responses to delinquent youth (No. 79-21), and the Scottish Children's Panels (No. 79-3). All of these projects are discussed above.

During the past fiscal year, NIJJDP funded two major new projects focused on community-based alternatives to incarceration. The first of these is a National Evaluation of the OJJDP Project New Pride Replication Program (No. 79-31). The OJJDP anticipates funding ten to twelve replications of Project New Pride, a community-based treatment program in Denver, Colorado for serious juvenile offenders, at a cost of approximately $8.5 million. The program model emphasizes comprehensive, individualized treatment. (See the OJJDP guideline "Project New Pride: Replication" for more information on the program). The evaluation is designed to 1) develop information regarding client and service issues which can be used to refine the New Pride model, and 2) determine under what conditions the program can be implemented in different types of jursidictions. Each project is required to provide staff resources to develop a self-study approach to program management per the program guideline. A major task of the national evaluation is to assist all of the replication projects to develop the self-evaluation component which includes the implementation of the management information system developed by Denver Project New Pride. The local self-evaluation components will be designed to develop information on clients and services to determine what types of services appear to be most effective for what types of youth and under what conditions, and to determine the impact of the project on recidivism rates and other indicators of individual adjustment.

The second major new project in this area is the National Survey of Residential Programs and Community-based Alternatives, which was briefly described earlier. The alternatives component of the study will survey programs which actually serve as alternatives to incarceration.

Also, in the alternatives area, continuation funding was provided during FY 79 for completion of the research on Illinois' UDIS program (No. 79-20). This project is discussed above.

NIJJDP's program development work in the JJS alternatives area is assisted by its National Assessment Center on Alternatives to Juvenile Justice System Processing. This center is conducting comprehensive assessments of alternative programs across the Country.

By March 1980, this center will have completed a brief state-of-the-art paper on alternative programs nationwide. This document will summarize what is known about alternative program handling of youth and their effectiveness, together with recommendations for future directions.

## II. INFORMATION DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION

Prior to FY79, NIJJDP's information dissemination were very limited (except for the purpose of program development within OJJDP). This has been so mainly by design. We intended to establish a national Training Resource Center and a national Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse once the basic work of information collection, assessment, and synthesis; and a significant amount of research and evaluation studies had been completed.

There are two main components to NIJJDP's information dissemination program (aside from the training and standards related activities): assessment centers and a clearinghouse.

These two components of OJJDP are central to its operations, as they are key links in the Office's program development structure — for which the Congress gave NIJJDP primary responsibility within OJJDP.

Information resulting from NIJJDP/OJJDP activities is provided to the Assessment Centers, where it is combined with information from other sources nationwide. The Assessment Centers assess and synthesize information on significant aspects of juvenile justice, and prepare reports for dissemination. These reports (along with others resulting from OJJDP activities) are then forwarded to the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, where they are prepared for publication; then provided directly to OJJDP, selected audiences, and generally made available. Information available through the Clearinghouse will be used in the following aspects of NIJJDP/OJJDP activities: training, standards, research and evaluation, technical assistance, coordination of Federal efforts, formula grant program, National Advisory Committee, and action program development. In this way, the feedback loop in the program development process will have been completed. While this level of refinement has not been uniformly realized as of yet, we are prepared to make major steps toward accomplishing this in FY80.

Assessment Centers Program. The overall Assessment Centers and Clearinghouse program is in direct response to the legislative mandates of the JJDP Act of 1974, which requires OJJDP/NIJJDP to: 1) collect, 2) assess, 3) synthesize, and 4) disseminate information (through a clearinghouse) on all aspects of juvenile delinquency (Section 242 and 243(7)).

The overall purpose of the Assessment Centers Program (ACP) is to perform the first three of the four above functions. It collects, assesses, and synthesizes data and program information on delinquency and related youth problems, in order to: 1) serve program development needs of OJJDP, and, 2) provide useful information to the practitioner community and others. The dissemination function belongs to the OJJDP/NIJJDP Clearinghouse.

The ACP component of this overall program has been designed by NIJJDP as an experiment in the use of "Assessment Centers" to accomplish the data and information collection, synthesis, and assessment steps in the field. It consists of three topical centers, which as n oted earlier, are focused on the three aspects of the delinquency field, and a fourth center, which has responsibility for incorporating the products of the three topical centers in comprehensive volumes on the state-of-the-art in the field of delinquency. The four centers and their location follows: 1) Delinquent Behavior and Prevention — University of Washington, Seattle, Washington; 2) Juvenile Justice System — American Justice Institute (AJI), Scaramento, California; 3) Alternatives to Juvenile Justice System Processing — University of Chicago, Chicago Illinois; 4) Center for Integrated Data Analysis — National Council of Crime and Delinquency (NCCD), Hackensack, New Jersey.

The major objectives of the ACP are to: 1) identify and describe promising programmatic approaches for practitioners, OJJDP and others; 2) synthesize data and the results of studies for the above audiences; 3) provide information for use in OJJDP planning and design of action programs, standards development and implementation, technical assistance and training efforts; and 4) provide current information for OJJDP, as requested.

In order to accomplish these objectives, each center has responsibility for approaching their work along two tracks: 1) gathering baseline data regarding the flow of offenders, from their involvement in juvenile delinquency, through the juvenile justice system and their handling by alternative programs; 2) the preparation of reports on specific topic areas within the scope of each center's area of work. These responsibilities involve almost no original research; rather, each center gathers, assesses and syntheses available data and information for the purpose of accomplishing the above objectives.

The following is a complete list of major reports developed by the Assessment Centers through FY 1979.

National Assessment Center on Delinquent Behavior and Prevention:

1) Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs: A Review and Analysis
2) Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: A Framework for Policy Development
3) A Typology of Cause-Focused Strategies of Delinquency Prevention
4) Jurisdiction and the Elusive Status Offender: A Comparison of involvement in Delinquent Behavior and Status Offenses

5) Profile of American Youth: A Statistical Sourcebook
6) An Assessment of Evaluations of Drug Abuse Prevention Programs
7) Religion and Delinquency
8) Estimating Church-Membership Rates for Geographical Areas
9) Child Abuse: A Contributing Factor to Delinquency
10) Juvenile Prostitution and Child Pornography
11) A Profile of the Juvenile Arsonist
12) The Genetic Aspects of Psychiatric Syndromes Relating to Antisocial Problems in Youth
13) Washington State's New Juvenile Code (5 Volumes)

National Assessment Center on the Juvenile Justice System

1) A Preliminary National Assessment of the Status Offender and the Juvenile Justice System
2) A Preliminary National Assessment of Child Abuse and Neglect and the Juvenile Justice System
3) A National Assessment of Serious Juvenile Crime and the Juvenile Justice System: The Need for a Rational Response (4 Volumes)
4) A National Assessment of Case Disposition and Classification in the Juvenile Justice System (3 Volumes)

National Assessment Center on Alternatives to the Juvenile Justice System

1) Young Women and the Juvenile Justice Process: Implications for Alternative Programs
2) Legal Protections in the Diversion of Juveniles
3) Detention and Jailing of Juveniles in the U.S. in the Mid-1970's
4) Achievement Place: The Teaching-Family Treatment Model in a Group Home Setting
5) An Assessment of Police Diversion Programs
6) Self-reported Delinquency: Implications for Alternative Programs

National Center for Integrated Data Analysis

Juvenile Delinquency in America: A Comprehensive View

We noted earlier that each of the three topical Assessment Centers is developing (by March, 1980) concise state-of-the-art papers on their respective areas of focus. These papers will summarize the results of the centers' earlier work.

Clearinghouse. In the last quarter of FY 79, NIJJDP established a Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse through expansion of LEAA's National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) -- which is the main information dissemination arm for LEAA. This new component of NCJRS will serve as OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (Contract No. J-LEAA-023-77). It is jointly sponsored by NIJJDP and the Program Office of OJJDP (which includes the Special Emphasis Division, and the Technical Assistance and Formula Grants Divisions).

Prior to creation of this juvenile justice unit in NCJRS, it had provided limited information dissemination services to the juvenile justice community (mainly to the JJS itself). These services were supported under LEAA's maintenance-of-effort requirement.* In order to fully meet its legislative requirement, NIJJDP has found it necessary to establish its own clearinghouse entity.

This mandate is given to NIJJDP in Section 242 of the JJDP Act, which authorizes it to "serve as a clearinghouse and information center for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of all information regarding juvenile delinquency...." After considering other alternative ways of meeting this important mandate, NIJJDP has decided to expand, on an experimental basis, NCJRS operations.

The main objectives of this expanded NCJRS activity are: 1) expansion of the NCJRS audience in an effort to provide useful information to those most directly involved in implementing the JJDP Act (particularly practitioners involved in delinquency prevention and development of community based alternatives to traditional JJS processing; 2) enhancement of the quality and depth of NCJRS responses to information requests (through careful analysis) from those involved in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency and related youth problems; and 3) provision of direct support to OJJDP and its grantees and contractors in their program development efforts.

Specific services to be proided by NCJRS include the following:

1) information support to OJJDP;
2) detailed and personalized responses to the priority user audience identified above;
3) establishment of a toll-free telephone line (800-424-2856) for easy access by the user audience (primarily intended for the private, non-profit youth worker community);
4) assistance to NIJJDP/OJJDP in the preparation of reports for publication;
5) creation and dissemination of special publications (information packages) through re-writing and tailoring reports and information for specialized audiences (as identified above); and
6) act as a referral service in relation to other clearinghouses, thereby establishing a network of information dissemination activity.

*The JJDP Act requires (Sec. 520) that, in addition to funds appropriated under it, LEAA maintain from its total appropriation, each fiscal year, at least 19.15 percent for juvenile delinquency programs.

Information System Development. The third component of NIJJDP's program of information development and dissemination consists of developing automated information systems for the juvenile justice system. While our long-term aim is to develop a model, comprehensive, automated information system which would link police, court, correctional, and social service operations in a given jurisdiction; at this time we have only made a first step toward this aim, in that our efforts to date have focused only on the juvenile court area.

This work was begun in 1975, under a grant to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. It provided support for a national assessment of automated juvenile court information systems. The results of this survey were used to design a model system. It is now being implemented (under continuation funding) throughout Rhode Island. We are now supporting the transfer of this system to the District of Columbia Superior Court (which is funded for the most part through a separate grant to this court).

FY 1979 Activities. Continuation funding was provided for the Assessment Centers during FY 79 (No's. 79-12, 13, 14 and 18). As was noted above, support was provided this year for the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse.

## III. TRAINING DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

We are pleased to report that FY 79 marked the completion of NIJJDP's preparation for carrying out the kind of broad juvenile justice training contemplated by the Congress and set forth in Sections 244 and 248-50 of the JJDP Act.

It has been our aim to establish a Juvenile Justice Training Resource Center similar to that described in Secs. 248-50 of the Act, once we had organized a sufficient basis for effective training and curriculum development.

Before providing a description of the Training and Resource Center, training activities sponsored by NIJJDP through FY79 are briefly described.

Since its establishment, NIJJDP has provided support for a major training program conducted by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ). It is focused on improving the operations of the JJS (particularly juvenile courts) through provision of "basic training" in juvenile justice for juvenile court judges, other court-related personnel, and other juvenile justice system personnel. This is accomplished mainly by an annual series of courses provided through NCJFCJ's National College of Juvenile Justice. Continuation funding was provided for this program during FY79 (No. 79-16).

A second training program supported by NIJJDP (since FY76) is Project READ. It consists of provision of training for educators in methods of teaching youth how to read. Early in this project such training was provided for educators within juvenile correctional institutions. In FY78 the project was refocused on educators working primarily with youth in community-based alternative programs. Through its own program of research, the project has demonstrated remarkable improvement in reading ability among those youths in literacy programs it helped develop.

In FY 1978, NIJJDP funded a program of four delinquency prevention training projects which were focused on 1) development of community organization-related skills in delinquency prevention programming, 2) encouragement of youth participation in prevention program development, 3) manager-oriented evaluation, and 4) law-related education. All these projects have been successfully completed.

In FY 1978 NIJJDP sponsored a training program focused on deinstitutionalization of training schools. It was based on the results of the 7-year evaluation of the Massachusetts reform efforts. The major aims of this training effort were twofold; 1) to disseminate the results of the earlier evaluation; and 2) to assist other States either moving toward or considering deinstitutionalization of their large juvenile training schools. This latter objective involved informing interested States as to what issues and problems they might face in such an effort and informing them of how Massachusetts had dealt with these areas.

Another training project funded during FY 79 was aimed at strengthening deinstitutionalization efforts across the Country. Conducted by The Villages, the purpose of this project (No. 79-2) is to provide a series of training workshops in child care and management for professional, para-professional and non-professional personnel who work with status offender, dependent, neglected, pre-delinquent and delinquent juveniles. The focus of the training is on alternatives to incarceration. It consists of two components: workshops for child care workers in alternative facilities; and workshops for state officials having responsibility for accomplishing deinstitutionalization of status offender, delinquent, dependent, and neglected youth. There will be a total of 12 workshops, each of five days duration. A total of 184 child care workers will receive training through eight workshops (23-25 per workshop); 100 State officials will participate in the remaining four workshops. The main problem which this project will address is that of deinstitutionalization of the above types of youth. It is designed to provide the necessary training for persons directly involved in deinstitutionalization efforts, in order to facilitate accomplishing this priority mandate of the JJDP Act.

Law-Related Education. This is a somewhat new development in the field of education. The LRE concept — which most generally refers to a variety of methods of teaching youth (and adults) their rights and responsibilities under the law — is about a decade old now. It is a rapidly developing "movement" the law (in its broadest form) affects the lives of U.S. citizens, and how the formal justice system works.

In 1977, the Congress amended the JJDP Act to include the provision of LRE as an NIJJDP training activity. In FY 79 we funded a well designed and coordinated program of LRE. The American Bar Association's Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship (ABA) coordinates the overall work of the 5 other grantees with that of its own, serves as a national clearinghouse for LRE information and thereby assists others at the State and local level in implementing LRE projects, and conducts seminars and workshops across the country which help promulgate LRE (No. 79-6).

The 5 other grantees and their basic activities are as follow:

Constitutional Rights Foundation (No. 79-15) — It primarily trains public secondary teachers to teach LRE and implements LRE curricula in school districts in 10 States.

Law in a Free Society (No. 79-7) — It fosters implementation of LRE in kindergarten - 12th grade through 10 LRE program development centers across the country.

National Street Law Institute (No. 79-4) — NSLI primarily works with law schools in training law students in teaching LRE in secondary schools. It also provides LRE for youth in diversion and community based programs.

Children's Legal Rights Information and Training Center (No. 79-5). It works primarily with the child caring professions, educating them about children's rights and responsibilities under the law — as embodied in relevant statutes.

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity International (No. 79-11). This is a fraternity of law students and law school alumni. The project involves (much like NSLI) getting law students and alumni involved in teaching LRE in public and private schools in 10 metropolitan areas.

We designed the overall program in two phases. In the first phase — which consists of two years — we have awarded a separate grant to the Social Science Education Consortium (No. 79-36) for an evaluation of the overall program and intensive evaluations of each of the six projects. This evaluation is aimed at determining how LRE can best be provided, in addition to measuring the effectiveness of each of the six projects in accomplishing their specific objectives.

Juvenile Justice Training Resource Center (JJTRC). During FY 1979 NIJJDP virtually completed its plans for establishment of a JJTRC — as required by Secs. 248-50 of the JJDP Act.

These sections of the legislation call for an extremely comprehensive training activity — which includes all categories of personnel related to the administration of juvenile justice (including lay persons). We expect to launch in FY 1980 a significant effort which in a few years can be expanded to approach the level of comprehensiveness the Congress expected.

NIJJDP's national Juvenile Justice Training Resource Center (which is expected to be operational by the Fall of 1980) will serve as a clearinghouse and information center on training throughout the U.S. Its main services, following start-up in the first year, will be that of: 1) providing access to existing training opportunities across the Country for selected juvenile justice personnel; 2) development of curricula materials; and 3) provision of some support to existing training efforts in order to expand them and create a specific focus on priority mandates of the JJDP Act and OJJDP goals and objectives. Emphasis will be placed on making available descriptive information (where appropriate), including evaluative information, on existing training opportunities. A limited program of training in "advanced techniques" in juvenile justice focusd on the priority mandates of the JJDP Act (e.g., deinstitutionalization and separation) is expected to be provided for a select group of key decision-makers in the field. These will include the State Juvenile Delinquency Advisory Groups. The Center will be closely coordinated with other training-related activities sponsored by OJJDP through a consortium arrangement.

. The first step toward establishing the JJTRC will involve conducting a nationwide assessment of training resources and needs. Simultaneously, we will be developing the Center. The assessment will serve as the initial data base of training needs — which will continually be updated as new information is acquired.

## IV. STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

We are quite pleased to have reached a major milestone in FY 1979: completion of our standards development work. To date, the standards activities of NIJJDP have concentrated primarily on supporting the development and review of juvenile justice standards by national organizations concerned with improving the juvenile justice system. The standards resulting from various efforts have generated considerable interest in and intensive debate over the future direction of the juvenile justice system in the United States. The major juvenile justice standards-development efforts include those developed by the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NAC), the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals Task Force on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Task Force), the Insitute of Judicial Administration/American Bar Association Joint Commission on Standards (IJA/ABA), the American Correctional Association Commission in Accreditation for Corrections (ACA), the American Medical Association Program to Improve Medical Care and Health Services in Correctional Institutions (AMA), and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ).

FY 1980 Program Plan. The following is NIJJDP's tenative standards program for FY 1980.

### A. Prepare Summary Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Justice Standards

The preparation of this document is intended to provide clarification of the various positions adopted by the major standards development efforts vis-a-vis the major policy thrusts of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This will be the first document which provides an analysis of the degree of convergence and divergence among the various standards with respect to legislatively mandated policies and purposes contained in the JJDP Act. The NAC Standards will serve as the benchmark against which other standards will be compared. It is expected that specific, relevant standards provisions from all national sets of standards will be contained in this document. It should serve as a concise reference manual for those interested in examining the positions of major sets of standards on particular issues.

### B. Establish a Standards Resource Center

The establishment of a Standards Resource Center reflects the need for a central repository for information on the state-of-the-art of juvenile justice standards, their adoption and their implementation. The Resource Center will serve a clearinghouse function, gathering and providing information to decision-makers on the full range of

available options. It will assist them in assessing the probability of successful implementation of standards based on the experience of other, possibly similar, jurisdictions and agencies and based on research findings and other sources. Information on "what works" is essential to the process of improving the juvenile justice system through the implementation of standards.

There will be three functional components of the Standards Resource Center, organized around executive, legislative and judicial actions related to standards adoption and implementation. One will focus on identifying state and local efforts that have attempted to utilize standards in improving the effectiveness, efficiency and fairness of their juvenile justice system or programs through administrative actions such as development or modification of licensing standards using recommended national standards. The second component will focus on State juvenile code revision and implementation efforts which reflect the principles of the JJDP Act and national standards. The third component will focus on the utilization of recommended standards in litigation of cases addressing critical issues in juvenile justice.

C. Develop Standards Training Capability

The Standards Resource Center, the four National Assessment Centers, the National Assessment of Juvenile Justice Training Resources, as well as Technical Assistance Needs Assessments will identify new information on the state-of-the-art of standards as well as the need for new information and training needs at the state and local levels. A training resource, independent of the Assessment Centers and the Standards Resource Center, is necessary to develop training curricula and strategies responsive to needs related to various stages of adoption, implementation and monitoring juvenile justice standards. It is anticipated that standards training activities will be carried out through the Juvenile Justice Training Resource Center. Where existing training programs can provide the appropriate training the JJTRC will facilitate the delivery of training. Where identified needs cannot be met with existing resources, JJTRC will begin the development of a juvenile justice standards training capability.

D. Initiate a Model Legislation Development Effort.

Many of the reforms and improvements in the juvenile justice system have been the direct result of legislation. As evidenced by the JJDP Act, legislation can directly affect policy and procedures. Many states are in various stages of considering, debating and legislating juvenile justice reforms, many under the rubric of "model legislation."

The primary purpose of this effort is to develop model legislation which reflects the NAC Standards and the policy mandates of the JJDP Act. A secondary, but equally important, purpose is to encourage States' adoption of comprehensive model legislation based on the product of this effort.

E. Special Projects

The NIJJDP will continue to support research and evaluation efforts that focus on implementation of innovative state legislation, policies and programs that will provide new information which will inform the process of adoption and implementation of relevant standards.

FY 1979 Activities. In earlier sections of this report we discussed several research and evaluation projects that are closely related to the standards program work. These include the national parole study, assessments of new juveile legislation implementation in California and Washington State, and the study of police guideline development. Continuation funding was provided for the IJA/ABA standards development work (No. 79-25). Other related work has been noted above.

## V. NIJJDP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sec. 208 of the JJDP Act established a subcommittee of the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (which consists of 21 members appointed by the President of the U.S.) which serves as an Advisory Committee for NIJJDP. Sec. 245 provides that it "shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Associate Administrator concerning the overall policy and operations of the Institute."

NIJJDP enjoys an excellent relationship with its Advisory Committee. During the past year it has provided a great deal of helpful advice in a number of areas of Institute activity — particularly with respect to training and information dissemination functions.

Its current objectives are as follow.

Objective #1: To make recommendations to and monitor the development of the Institute's Training Programs and encourage the initiation of a National Training Center in accordance with the mandates of the JJDP Act.

Objective #2: Continue to monitor problems of understaffing within the Institute and to propose solutions through a staffing plan which will provide the necessary resources to carry out the Institute's mandated responsibilities.

Objective #3: To advise, consult with and make recommendations to the Institute concerning its dissemination of information and the Clearinghouse functions. The Subcommittee will examine records of NCJRS concerning the public's utilization of the Clearinghouse and evaluate its effectiveness.

Objective #4: To assess the Report of the School Crime Evaluation Team and other programs that have demonstrated a reduction of delinquent and behavior problems within the school. Further, the Subcommittee will determine how this information could best be disseminated and utilized.

Objective #5: To monitor coordination of NIJJDP with the establishment of the National Institute of Justice and to take a pro-active role in implementing previous NAC resolutions concerned with keeping the Institute function under OJJDP.

Objective #6: To coordinate with the Standards Subcommittee oversight of the implementation and evaluation of Juvenile Justice Standards. The Institute Subcommittee will focus its efforts on the Institute's ability to incorporate standards into the Clearinghouse and training functions.

Objective #7: To review the evaluation of the Law-Related Education Project and to make recommendations concerning future funding and replication.

The following are major positions taken by the Institute Advisory Committee during FY 1979.

1) That the Administrator of OJJDP formulate a position for OJJDP within six months on the issue of accreditation of juvenile justice standards.

2) That the Institute, in developing a clearinghouse as part of its future plans, avoid any duplication of efforts currently being made by the National Criminal Justice Reference Service within LEAA.

3) That the National Institute provide the State Advisory Groups with written information as to the availability of literature concerning the juvenile who has committed a violent offense. (This recommendation relates to the resolution passed by the NAC at its meeting in San Antonio which recommended that SAGs focus on this problem area as one of their primary areas of interest and that SAG members actively participate in and provide enlightened input into any code revisions being considered in their respective states which are likely to have an impact on the types of disposition of cases involving juveniles who have committed a violent offense; in addition, OJJDP was urged to intensify the level of technical assistance being provided the states in this area.)

4) That the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention remain in the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to keep the Institute function and the operations functions together. However, if the federal anticrime assistance research function is combined in a single National Institute of Justice, the following is recommended:

- that there be specific allocation of 50% of the seats of the governing board for juvenile justice experts;

- that there be a requirement for a separate division of the Institute to deal solely with juvenile justice;

- that the governing board have the power to establish policies around programs and priorities; and

- that there should be language to the effect that there is legislative intent that a primary focus be on juvenile justice research.

5) The Subcommittee to Advise the National Institute requests that the NAC adopt the topic area of the reduction of school crime as an issue of major importance to be addressed by the NAC during 1980.

6) That the National Advisory Committee support the need for additional staff to be allocated by LEAA to the National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention when the current position freeze is concluded.

Historically, the Institute lost six positions in October 1978 because of a Presidentially mandated personnel freeze. This condition will be continued if current budget allocations developed by the Department of Justice are legitimated by Congress.

The freeze has, in effect, eliminated all staff for training functions and seriously curtailed staff for project monitoring, standards development and information dissemination. Even though the total funds made available to the Institute may be reduced in fiscal year 1980, the NAC questions the ability of the Institute to carry out its statutory responsibilities within existing staff resources.

The NAC further recommends that Dr. James Howell, Director of the National Institute, develop a staffing plan which will provide the necessary resources to carry out the Act's requirements, and that this plan be used in requesting necessary position allocations.

7) That the National Institute make its training functions a greater priority and expend a greater percentage of its resources in this area of responsibility.

8) That the Director of the National Institute develop a long range workplan to implement a comprehensive training program that addresses the mandates of the Act and that this workplan be presented for comment to the Subcommittee at its May 1979 meeting; and further that this training workplan develop training on a regional and/or national basis, and that the training program emphasis be on policy development and training of trainers.

9) That the training workplan further develop the strategy already envisioned by the Director of the National Institute which focuses first year training in three areas:

a) Deinstitutionalization
b) Restitution
c) Youth Advocacy

and that these three areas be incorporated into a single comprehensive curriculum and strategy based on knowledge of the latest proven effective method in each area.

10) That the Director of the National Institute insure that the training program workplan focus on areas of greater concern as assessed in the field; such as the juvenile who has committed a violent offense and the reduction of school crime.

11) That the Administrator of OJJDP request that the Institute staff compile a report of the training needs as identified during Phase I of the Assessment Center's analysis of needs as expressed by State Advisory Group members, State Juvenile Justice Planners and Juvenile Court Judges and Probation Officers; and that this report be submitted by staff of the Institute at the May 1979 meeting of the NAC.

12) That the National Youth Work Alliance develop a questionnaire addressing training needs of youth workers and direct service staff of the juvenile justice system and that results of this assessment be presented to the Institute staff and Subcommittee at the May 1979 meeting.

13) That the Executive Committee of the NAC initiate action to communicate the NAC's position in regard to the future of the National Institute and that the Executive Committee prepare a strategy to advocate for this position through the presentation of testimony and letters to Congress.

14) The National Advisory Committee wishes to re-affirm its trong support for the need for additional staff to be allocated by LEAA to the NIJJDP. The NAC questions the ability of the Institute to carry out its statutory responsibilities within existing staff resources.

The staffing level of the Institute represents about one-third the number of permanent staff per dollar allocation currently assigned to the Institute's companion organizations (i.e., National Institute of Corrections and the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice) which have similar legislative mandates.

The NAC endorses the position that a minimum level of 18 permanent staff and an optimal level of 32 should be assigned to the Institute.

15) With specific objections to certain items on the proposed allocation of funds, the Subcommittee to Advise the National Institute endorses the FY 1980 Workplan for the National Institute as submitted by the Director and also endorses the FY 1981 projections. The Subcommittee specifically requests that the Institute allocate a greater percentage of its resources for dissemination of information (the Clearinghouse) and training development and less for research and evaluation.

16) Because of the urgency and great public interest generated in the TV film "Scared Straight," and fully recognizing the merit and value of many time tested offender/ex-offenders prevention and treatment programs for children and youth, the subcommittee for the Institute recommends that the NAC formally adopt a public position opposing any immediate legislative or programmatic replication of the highly publicized program dramatized on TV in the film "Scared Straight."

Preliminary research findings questioning the validity and the reputed success of this program raise sufficient doubts as to require the NAC to adopt a public position opposing the immediate development or replication of the specific program depicted in "Scared Straight" pending further information and inquiry regarding the violation of juvenile rights, possible psychological abuse and due process issues raised by this program.

17) The Institute Subcommittee endorses the tentative workplan of the Institute to develop a National Training Center. The subcommittee requests that the results of the Assessment Center's analysis of training needs be fully considered in the final statement of work. Further, the subcommittee requests that the final workplan avoid duplication of training already being conducted and be designed in such a manner as to not discourage current national and local training efforts and maximize a long-term training effort and strategy.

Further, that this Training Workplan develop training on a regional and/or National basis, and

Further that the training program emphasis be on policy development and training of trainers. The Subcommittee recommends that the Director of the Institute insure that the training program workplan take into account political considerations and that the training strategy focus on areas of greatest concern as assessed in the field, i.e., the juvenile who has committed a violence offense, the reduction of school crime, etc.

All of these recommendations were endorsed by the National Advisory Committee.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Numerous recommendations for future research, demonstration, training, and evaluation programs are contained in previous sections of this report. These are not reiterated here because of the mechanisms that have been put in place for development of more detailed recommendations.

During FY 1980 the results of NIJJDP-sponsored work will be shared with outside organizations and individuals for their consideration. Simultaneously, OJJDP staff will be considering the program development implications of the results of NIJJDP activities to date, in the course of developing OJJDP's tenative FY 1981 program plan.

## APPENDIX A

## NI - 75

| | PROJECT TITLE AND DESCRIPTION | GRANT NUMBER | AMOUNT AWARDED |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | University of Michigan (National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections) | 75-NI-99-0010 | $ 791,057 |
| 2. | Institute for Juvenile Research (Delinquency in American Society) | 75-NI-99-0013 | 358,342 |
| 3. | Bowling Green State University (Impact of the Legal Process and Formal Legal Sanctions on Juvenile Delinquents) | 75-NI-99-0031<br>76-NI-99-0050 | 146,710 |
| 4. | Boston University (NEP-Assessment of Youth Services Bureau - Phase I) | 75-NI-99-0041 | 245,535 |
| 5. | National Council of Juvenile Court Judges (Juvenile Information Systems Requirements Analysis - Phase I) | 75-NI-99-0072 | 124,291 |
| 6. | University of Minnesota (Phase I Assessment: Topic Areas of Diversion and Alternatives to Incarceration) | 75-NI-99-0081 | 306,178 |
| 7. | Ohio State University (Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency Phase I - NEP) | 75-NI-99-0089 | 143,387 |
| 8. | University of Southern California (Development of an Evaluation Plan For the Status Offender Project) | 75-NI-99-0092 | 57,455 |
| 9. | Institute of Judicial Administration (Juvenile Justice Standards) | 75-NI-99-0101 | 347,664 |
| 10. | Hudson Institute (Long-Range Planning and Law Enforcement Project) | 75-NI-99-0107 | 100,000 |
| 11. | University of Chicago (NEP-Assessment of Detention of Juveniles and of Alternatives to Its Use) | 75-NI-99-0112 | 157,385 |

| | PROJECT TITLE AND DESCRIPTION | GRANT NUMBER | AMOUNT AWARDED |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Portland State University (Development of an Evaluation Plan for Diversion) | 76-NI-99-0020 | $ 109,168 |
| 2. | University of Chicago (Split Funding)* (Evaluation of Illinois Status Offender Program) | 76-NI-99-0048 | 51,617 |
| 3. | The University of Delaware (Split funding) (Evaluation of the Delaware Status Offender Project) | 76-NI-99-0049 | 68,783 |
| 4. | Bowling Green State University (Impact of the Legal Process and Formal Legal Sanctions on Juvenile Delinquents) | 76-NI-99-0050 | 84,825 |
| 5. | Council for Educational Development and Research, Inc. (School Violence - Building an R&D Agenda - Conference) | 76-NI-99-0051 | 5,000 |
| 6. | President & Fellows of Harvard College (Youth Gang Violence) | 76-NI-99-0057 | 72,100 |
| 7. | Stanford Research Institute (Evaluation of Alameda County Status Offender Project) | 76-NI-99-0072 | 225,000 |
| 8. | Robert Rubel, Visiting Fellow (Historical Trends of School Crime and Violence) | 76-NI-99-0077 | 42,065 |
| 9. | Council of State Governments (Development of Compliance Criteria for Juvenile Facilities) | 76-NI-99-0080 | 49,584 |
| 10. | Oregon Research Institute (Juvenile Status Offender Proposal) | 76-NI-99-0082 | 80,000 |
| 11. | University of Arizona (Evaluation of Status Offender Project, Pima County, Arizona) | 76-NI-99-0086 | 265,000 |

*"Split funding" means two appropriation sources. Early in its history, NIJJDP was supported largely by funds from the Omnibus Crime Control Act (which created LEAA) — before appropriations were made under the JJDP Act. Then we sparingly used Crime Control Act monies in projects where identifiable data were collected, because this legislation provided immunity to researchers. The JJDP Act was amended in 1977 to incorporate the same provision. In the interim NIJJDP combined fund sources for this reason.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12. | University of Pennsylvania<br>(Offender Careers and Restraint: Probabilities and Policy Implications) | 76-NI-99-0089 | 78,875 |
| 13. | National Council of Juvenile Court Judges<br>(Juvenile Information System Requirements Analysis - Phase II) | 76-NI-99-0106 | 128,721 |
| 14. | President and Fellows, Harvard College<br>(Cohort Analysis) | 76-NI-99-0131 | 305,109 |
| 15. | Creighton University<br>(Split funding)<br>(The Link Between Learning Disabilitites and Juvenile Delinquency: An Incidence Study and Evaluation of a Remediation Program) | 76-NI-99-0133 | 298,110 |
| 16. | Rutgers University<br>(The Limits of Heterogeneity) | 76-NI-99-0134 | 193,753 |
| 17. | University of Pennsylvania<br>(Split funding)<br>(Evaluation of Youth Services Center) | 76-NI-99-0132 | 119,369 |
| 18. | ABT Associates, Inc.<br>(Assessment Report and Evaluation Feasibility Study of Pennsylvania Reintegrating Offenders Project for Youth) | Contract No. J-LEAA-029-76 | 23,163 |
| 19. | University of Michigan<br>(National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections Project) | 76-JN-99-0001 | 350,000 |
| 20. | Research for Better Schools, Inc.<br>(Planning Technical Assistance to Reduce School Violence) | 76-JN-99-0002 | 117,913 |
| 21. | President and Fellows of Harvard College (Cohort Analysis) | 76-JN-99-0003 | 244,478 |
| 22. | Institute for Juvenile Research<br>(Delinquency in American Society) | 76-JN-99-0004 | 305,885 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23. | University of Pennsylvania (Split funding) (Evaluation of Youth Services Center) | 76-JN-99-0005 | 135,576 |
| 24. | National Center for Juvenile Justice (Collection, Analysis and Dissemination of Information Relevant to Juvenile Justice) | 76-JN-99-0006 | 256,481 |
| 25. | Rand Corporation (Survey of Intervention Techniques Appropriate for the Dangerous Juvenile Offender) | 76-JN-99-0007 | 112,063 |
| 26. | University of Iowa (Predicting Adult Careers from Juvenile Careers) | 76-JN-99-0008<br>76-JN-99-1005 | 154,360 |
| 27. | American Institutes for Research (A Survey of Current Theory & Practice: Learning Disabilities as Cause of Delinquent Behavior) | 76-JN-99-0009 | 89,700 |
| 28. | Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (Evaluation of Arkansas Status Offender Project) | 76-JN-99-0010<br>76-JN-99-1001 | 169,221 |
| 29. | University of Chicago (Split funding) (Evaluation of Illinois Status Offender Program) | 76-JN-99-0011 | 174,380 |
| 30. | The University of Delaware (Split funding) (Evaluation of Delaware Status Offender Project) | 76-JN-99-0012 | 103,427 |
| 31. | Technology Institute, Inc. (Evaluation of South Carolina Status Offender Program) | 76-JN-99-0013<br>76-JN-99-1002 | 224,970 |
| 32. | University of Southern California (Evaluation of National Status Offender Program) | 76-JN-99-0014<br>76-JN-99-1004 | 445,285 |
| 33. | University of Connecticut (Evaluation of Connecticut Status Offender Program) | 76-JN-99-0015<br>76-JN-99-1003 | 211,638 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 34. | National Council of Juvenile Court Judges (Juvenile Court Judges Training Program) | 76-JN-99-0016 | 212,847 |
| 35. | American Correction Association (Project READ) | 76-JN-99-0017 | 210,303 |
| 36. | Institute of Judicial Administration (Juvenile Justice Standards Project) | 76-JN-99-0018<br>76-JN-99-0018(S-1) | 92,964<br>82,969 |
| 37. | Boy Scouts of America (Exploring Law Enforcement and Allied Careers) | 76-JN-99-0019 | 31,000 |
| 38. | Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (Research and Demonstration Program: Investigating the Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency) | 76-JN-99-0021 | 769,024 |
| 39. | Creighton University (Split funding) (The Link Between Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency: An Incidence Study and Evaluation of A Remediation Program) | 76-JN-99-0022 | 510,000 |
| 40. | Pennsylvania Governor's Justice Commission (Youth Services Center) | 76-JN-99-0023 | 351,148 |
| 41. | Hahnemann Medical College & Hospital (High Risk Early Behavior for Delinquency) | 76-JN-99-0024 | 204,117 |

FY 77

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The Police Foundation<br>(Assessing Police Juvenile Units) | 77-NI-99-0002 | 160,907 |
| 2. | Institute of Policy Analysis<br>(Juvenile Restitution Evaluation) | 77-NI-99-0005 | 472,697 |
| 3. | University of Pennsylvania<br>(Split funding)<br>(Delinquency in a Birth Cohort - II) | 77-NI-99-0006 | 110,000 |
| 4. | Allen F. Breed, Visiting Fellow<br>(Participant Observor for Coordinating Council) | 77-NI-99-0007 | 67,851 |
| 5. | National Council on Crime and Delinquency (Split funding)<br>(National Evaluation of Delinquency Prevention Projects) | 77-NI-99-0008 | 200,000 |
| 6. | American Justice Institute<br>(Split funding)<br>(Center for the Assessment of Juvenile Justice System) | 77-NI-99-0009 | 97,472 |
| 7. | Behavioral Research Institute<br>(Split funding)<br>(National Evaluation of Diversion Projects) | 77-NI-99-0011 | 200,000 |
| 8. | Social Action Research Center<br>(Umbrella Evaluation for the Schools Initiative) | 77-NI-99-0012 | 525,320 |
| 9. | Ruth Horowitz, Visiting Fellow<br>(Delinquency and the Gang) | 77-NI-99-0066 | 7,251 |
| 10. | University of Chicago<br>(Center for Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice System Processing) | 77-JN-99-0002 | 331,085 |
| 11. | National Council on Crime and Delinquency<br>(Coordinating Assessment Center) | 77-JN-99-0004 | 376,148 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12. | Institute for Juvenile Research (Delinquency in Illinois Society) | 77-JN-99-0005 | 268,629 |
| 13. | University of Pennsylvania (Split funding) (Delinquency in a Birth Cohort - II) | 77-JN-99-0006 | 290,986 |
| 14. | National Council on Crime and Delinquency (Split funding) (National Evaluation of Delinquency Prevention Projects) | 77-JN-99-0007 | 493,777 |
| 15. | American Justice Institute (Split funding) (Center for the Assessment of the Juvenile Justice System) | 77-JN-99-0008 | 502,389 |
| 16. | Behavioral Research Institute (Split funding) (National Evaluation of Diversion Projects) | 77-JN-99-0009 | 274,327 |
| 17. | National Council of Juvenile Court Judges (Juvenile Court Judges Training Program) | 77-JN-99-0010 | 248,624 |
| 18. | American Correctional Association (Project READ - II) | 77-JN-99-0011 | 218,632 |
| 19. | Institute of Policy Analysis (Juvenile Status Offender Evaluation) | 77-JN-99-0013 | 60,636 |
| 20. | Boston College Law School (Children's Hearings in Scotland) | 77-JN-99-0014 | 69,162 |
| 21. | University of Southern California (Utilization of Historical Juvenile Probation Records) | 77-JN-99-0015 | 29,910 |
| 22. | President and Fellows of Harvard College (Youth Gang Violence) | 77-JN-99-0016 | 33,697 |
| 23. | University of Washington (Center for Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention) | 77-JN-99-0017 | 499,017 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24. | University of Southern California (National Evaluation of Deinstitutionalization of Status Offender Program) | 77-JN-99-0018 | 460,000 |
| 25. | University of Iowa (Assessing the Relationship of Adult Criminal Careers to Juvenile Careers) | 77-JN-99-0019 | 128,442 |
| 26. | Council of State Governments (The Interstate Placement of Children) | 77-JN-99-0021 | 152,516 |
| 27. | American Institutes for Research (Evaluation of the Arkansas Project for the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders) | 77-JN-99-0022 | 85,979 |

FY - 78

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Stanford Research Institute<br>(Design of a Study to Assess The Impact of Income Maintenance on Delinquency) | 78-JN-AX-0001 | 155,985 |
| 2. | Institute of Judicial Administration<br>(Juvenile Justice Standards Project) | 78-JN-AX-0002 | 125,870 |
| 3. | Behavioral Research Institute<br>(The Dynamics of Delinquency and Drug Use) | 78-JN-AX-0003 | 425,204 |
| 4. | University of Chicago<br>(Illinois Status Offender Services Evaluation: Alternatives to Detention Program) | 78-JN-AX-0004 | 120,549 |
| 5. | University of Chicago<br>(Illinois Status Offender Services Evaluation: Alternatives to Detention Program) | 78-JN-AX-0004(S-1) | 68,845 |
| 6. | University of Pennyslvania<br>(Evaluation of Youth Services Center) | 78-JN-AX-0005 | 89,557 |
| 7. | Project READ<br>(Project READ II - Prevention) | 78-JN-AX-0006 | 467,760 |
| 8. | American University<br>(Study of Policy Implementation Re: Deinstitutionalization of Services for Delinquent Youth) | 78-JN-AX-0007 | 155,760 |
| 9. | Trustees of Boston University<br>(Policy-making Relating to Police Handling of Juveniles) | 78-JN-AX-0008 | 301,848 |
| 10. | The Pennsylvania Child Advocate, Inc.<br>(Systemic and Personalized Accountability to Indigent and Disenfranchised Children: A Pragmatic Litigation Vehicle for Legal Service Attorneys) | 78-JN-AX-0009 | 16,437 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11. | Associates for Youth Development (Training for Delinquency Prevention) | 78-JN-AX-0010 | 88,274 |
| 12. | University of Delaware (Evaluation of Delaware Status Offender Project) | 78-JN-AX-0011 | 52,759 |
| 13. | Center for Human Services (Manager-Oriented Evaluation Training) | 78-JN-AX-0012 | 178,542 |
| 14. | Social Action Research Center (Training for Youth Participation in Program Development) | 78-JN-AX-0013 | 192,033 |
| 15. | American Institutes for Research (A Longitudinal Study: Deinstitutionalizing the Chronic Juvenile Offender) | 78-JN-AX-0014 | 110,372 |
| 16. | Constitutional Rights Foundation (National Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Training Project) | 78-JN-AX-0015 | 175,776 |
| 17. | Social Action Research Center (Umbrella Evaluation for School Crime Program: Phase II) | 78-JN-AX-0016 | 1,372,756 |
| 18. | National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges (Juvenile Information System Requirements) | 78-JN-AX-0017 | 171,602 |
| 19. | Blackstone Institute (Community Agencies Response to Delinquent Youths) | 78-JN-AX-0018 | 192,682 |
| 20. | Harvard University (Problem of Secure Care in a Community Based Correctional System) | 78-JN-AX-0019 | 343,898 |
| 21. | University of Arizona (Evaluation of Status Offender Project Pima County) | 78-JN-AX-0020 | 49,488 |
| 22. | Marquette University (Residential Alternatives to Detention of Juveniles) | 78-JN-AX-0021 | 99,883 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23. | Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (A Research & Demonstration Project to Investigate the Link Between Learning Disabilities & Juvenile Delinquency) | 78-JN-AX-0022 | 492,060 |
| 24. | Harvard University Center for Criminal Justice (Training Program: Implications of Deinstitutionalization) | 78-JN-AX-0023 | 361,452 |
| 25. | National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges (Juvenile Court Judges Training Program) | 78-JN-AX-0024 | 242,912 |
| 26. | Institute for Criminological Research (Limits of Heterogeneity) | 78-JN-AX-0025 | 399,749 |
| 27. | National District Attorneys Association (Juvenile Justice Standards Symposium) | 78-JN-AX-0026 | 79,919 |
| 28. | National Center for Juvenile Justice (National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System) | 78-JN-AX-0027 | 443,300 |
| 29. | National Center for State Courts (Link Between Learning Disabilities & Juvenile Delinquency: An Incidence Study & Evaluation of a Remediation Program) | 78-JN-AX-0028 | 1,098,332 |
| 30. | Criminal Justice Research Center (The Use of Victimization Survey Data to Assess the Nature, Extent and Correlates of Serious Delinquent Behavior) | 78-JN-AX-0029 | 279,013 |
| 31. | D. C. Superior Court (Juvenile Justice Information & Management System) | 78-JN-AX-0030 | 202,237 |
| 32. | National Council on Crime & Delinquency (National Evaluation of Delinquency Prevention Projects) | 78-JN-AX-0032 | 999,618 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 33. | Hahneman Medical College (High Risk Behavior for Delinquency) | 78-JN-AX-0033 | 247,143 |
| 34. | University of Southern California (Implementation of New Juvenile Justice Legislation) | 78-JN-AX-0034 | 481,739 |
| 35. | University of Notre Dame (Youth Advocacy Development Program) | 78-JN-AX-0035 | 295,974 |
| 36. | National Center for State Courts (Study of Structural Characteristics, Policies & Operational Procedures in Metropolitan Juvenile Courts-Gault Revisited) | 78-JN-AX-0036 | 727,998 |
| 37. | Behavioral Research Institute (National Evaluation of Diversion Projects) | 78-JN-AX-0037 | 561,336 |
| 38. | Academy for Contemporary Problems (Major Issues in Juvenile Justice Information & Training Project) | 78-JN-AX-0038 | 2,493,241 |
| 39. | The URSA Institute (Evaluation of LEAA Family Violence Program) | 78-MU-AX-0049 (JN)<br>78-MU-AX-0049 (NI) | 897,461<br>100,000 |
| 40. | Creighton University (Link Between Learning Disabilities & Juvenile Delinquency) | 76-JN-99-0022 (S-1) | 198,605 |
| 41. | University of Chicago (Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice System Processing) | 77-JN-99-0002 (S-1) | 68,450 |
| 42. | National Council on Crime & Delinquency (The Coordinating Assessment Center) | 77-JN-99-0004 (S-1) | 81,810 |
| 43. | American Justice Institute (Center for the Assessment of the Juvenile Justice System) | 77-JN-99-0008 (S-1) | 150,238 |
| 44. | Institute of Policy Analysis (Evaluation of Washington Deinstitutionalization of Status Offender Projects) | 77-JN-99-0013 (S-1) | 28,383 |

45. University of Southern California (National Evaluation of DSO Program) 77-JN-99-0018 (S-1) 100,304

APPENDIX B

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0001
Award Amount: $667,724
Project Period: October 30, 1978 thru October 29, 1980
Grant Recipient: University of Pennsylvania
Center for Studies in Criminology
and Criminal Law
3451 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Project Director: Marvin Wolfgang
Project Title: Delinquency In A Birth Cohort Phase Two

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0002
Award Amount: $140,224
Project Period: January 1, 1979 thru December 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: The Villages Incorporated
3802 South Topeka Boulevard
P.O. Box 1695
Topeka, Kansas 66601

Project Director: Herbert G. Callison
Project Title: The Villages, Incorporated

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0003
Award Amount: $83,027
Project Period: November 2, 1978 thru November 1, 1979
Grant Recipient: Boston College Law School
885 Centre Street
Newton Centre, Massachussetts 02159

Project Director: Sanford J. Fox
Project Title: The Children's Hearings in Scotland

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0004
Award Amount: $603,412
Project Period: November 16, 1978 thru November 15, 1980
Grant Recipient: National Street Law Institute
605 G Street, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20001

Project Director: Jason Newman
Project Title: Delinquency Prevention and Youth Advocacy Through Street Law

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0005
Award Amount: $80,737
Project Period: November 16, 1978 thru November 15, 1980
Grant Recipient: Children's Legal Rights Information, Training Program
2008 Hillyer Place, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20009

Project Director: Roberta Gottesman
Project Title: Children's Legal Rights Information and Training Program

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0006
Award Amount: $742,385
Project Period: November 16, 1978 through November 15, 1980
Grant Recipient: American Bar Association
1155 East Sixtieth Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Project Director: Norman Gross
Project Title: Education In Law and Juvenile Justice

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0007
Award Amount: $567,202
Project Period: November 17, 1978 through November 16, 1980
Grant Recipient: State Bar of California
606 Wilshire Boulevard
Santa Monica, California 90401

Project Director: Charles Quigley
Project Title: Law In A Free Society

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0008
Award Amount: $994,665
Project Period: December 18, 1978 through June 17, 1980
Grant Recipient: University of Chicago
School of Social Service Administration
5801 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Project Director: Donnel M. Pappenfort
Project Title: Survey of Children's Residential Institutions and alternative Programs

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0009
Award Amount: $702,847
Project Period: January 29, 1979 through January 28, 1980
Grant Recipient: Institute of Policy Analysis
777 High Street, Room 222
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Project Director: Peter R. Schneider
Project Title: National Evaluation of Juvenile Restitution Projects

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0010
Award Amount: $78,483
Project Period: February 1, 1979 through January 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: University of Iowa
Iowa Urban Community Research Center
117 Mac Bride Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Project Director: Lyle W. Shannon
Project Title: Assess Relationship of Adult Criminal Career to Juvenile Career

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0011
Award Amount: $451,945.
Project Period: February 26, 1979 through February 25, 1981
Grant Recipient: Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity International
10722 White Oak Avenue
Granada Hills, California 91344

Project Director: Robert Redding
Project Title: National Program to Improve Juvenile Justice and Reduce Juvenile Delinquency

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0012
Award Amount: $214,288
Project Period: March 9, 1979 through March 8, 1980
Grant Recipient: National Council on Crime and Delinquency
411 Hackensack Avenue
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

Project Director: James Garofalo
Project Title: The Assessment Center for Integrated Data Analysis

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0013
Award Amount: $400,000
Project Period: January 29, 1979 through January 28, 1980
Grant Recipient: American Justice Institute
1007 Seventh Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Project Director: Charles P. Smith
Project Title: Center for the Assessment of the Juvenile Justice System

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0014
Award Amount: $325,000
Project Period: January 29, 1979 through January 28, 1980
Grant Recipient: University of Washington
Center for Law and Justice
Mail Stop JD-45
Seattle, Washington 98195

Project Director: Joseph G. Weiss
Project Title: Center for Assessment of Delinquency Behavior and Its Prevention

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0015
Award Amount: $551,509
Project Period: February 17, 1979 through October 16, 1980
Grant Recipient: Constitutional Rights Foundation
6310 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 402
Los Angeles, California 90048

Project Director: Vivian Monroe
Project Title: National Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Training Project

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0016
Award Amount: $221,113
Project Period: April 1, 1979 through March 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
P.O. Box 8978
Reno, Nevada 89507

Project Director: Louis W. McHardy
Project Title: Juvenile Court Judges Training Project

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0017
Award Amount: $31,167
Project Period: April 9, 1979 through December 8, 1979
Grant Recipient: University of Delaware
Sociology Department
Newark, Delaware 19711

Project Director: Susan K. Datesman
Project Title: Evaluation of Delaware Status Offender Project

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0018
Award Amount: $325,391
Project Period: April 1, 1979 through December 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: University of Chicago
School of Social Service Administration
5801 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Project Director: Richard Reamer
Project Title: Center for Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice System Processing

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0019
Award Amount: $257,327
Project Period: July 1, 1979 through June 30, 1980
Grant Recipient: Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities
Institute for Juvenile Research
1140 South Paulina Street
Chicago, Illinois 60626

Project Directors: Gary Schwatz & Anthony Meade
Project Title: Transition to Junior High and the Deviance Process

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0020
Award Amount: $25,434
Project Period: July 1, 1979 through December 31, 1979
Grant Recipient: American Institutes for Research
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20007

Project Director: Charles A. Murray
Project Title: Continue Follow-Up Study to the UDIS Program Evaluation

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0021
Award Amount: $136,708
Project Period: July 8, 1979 through August 7, 1980
Grant Recipient: Blackstone Institute
3408 Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20016

Project Director: Richardson White, Junior
Project Title: Community Agencies' Responses to Delinquent Youth

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0022
Award Amount: $177,700
Project Period: September 1, 1979 through February 29, 1981
Grant Recipient: University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
P.O. Box 413
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Project Director: Eleanor R. Hall
Project Title: Teenager's Attitudes Towards Rape

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0023
Award Amount: $192,777
Project Period: August 1, 1979 through July 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: President and Fellows of Harvard College
458 Holyoke Center
Cambridge, Massachussetts 02138

Project Director: Lloyd Ohlin
Project Title: Secure Care in a Community Based Correctional System

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0024
Award Amount: $162,980
Project Period: September 1, 1979 through August 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: Aspira, Incorporated of Pennsylvania
526 West Girard Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

Project Director: Israel Colon
Project Title: Choice of Non-Delinquent, Delinquent Careers Among Puerto Rican Youth

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0025
Award Amount: $142,190
Project Period: April 1, 1979 through March 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: Institute of Judicial Administration
One Washington Square Village
Suite 1-A
New York, New York 10012

Project Director: David Gilman
Project Title: Juvenile Justice Standards Project - Revisions

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0026
Award Amount: $28,208
Project Period: September 1, 1979 through August 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: University of Georgia
Institute of Government
Athens, Georgia 30602

Project Director: Dean G. Rojek
Project Title: Evaluation: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders: Pima County

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0027
Award Amount: $58,075
Project Period: September 1, 1979 through August 31, 1980
Grant Recipient: National Center for Juvenile Justice
P.O. Box 7348
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Project Director: Hunter Hurst
Project Title: Comparative Analysis of Juvenile and Family Codes

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0028
Award Amount: $299,927
Project Period: September 4, 1979 through March 3, 1981
Grant Recipient: Institute of Policy Analysis
777 High Street, Suite 222
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Project Director: Anne L. Schneider
Project Title: Assess Implementation and Impact of State Juvenile Justice Legislation, Related Programs

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0029
Award Amount: $199,985
Project Period: October 1, 1979 through March 31, 1981
Grant Recipient: The URSA Institute
Pier One and One-Half
San Francisco, California 94111
Project Director: Bruce Fisher
Project Title: Juvenile Parole Research Project

Grant Award: 79-JN-AX-0030
Award Amount: $135,352
Project Period: September 24, 1979 through September 23, 1980
Grant Recipient: Regents of the University of Michigan
Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Project Director: Rosemary C. Sarri
Project Title: Female Delinquency

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0031
Award Amount: $299,945
Project Period: September 30, 1979 through September 29, 1980
Grant Recipient: Pacific Institute for Research & Evaluation
39 Quail Court, Suite 201
Walnut Creek, California 94596
Project Director: Dr. Barbara West
Project Title: Evaluation of Denver Project New Pride Replication Program

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0032
Award Amount: $74,832
Project Period: October 1, 1979 through March 30, 1980
Grant Recipient: University City Science Center
3624 Science Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Project Director: Faris Kirkland
Project Title: Evaluation of Philadelphia Child Advocacy Unit

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0033
Award Amount: $44,249
Project Period: November 2, 1979 through April 30, 1980
Grant Recipient: Boston College Law School
885 Centre Street
Newton Center, MA 02159
Project Director: Professor Sanford Fox
Project Title: The Children's Hearing In Scotland

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0034
Award Amount: $298,947
Project Period: September 30, 1979 through September 29, 1981
Grant Recipient: University of Denver
Department of Sociology
University Park
Denver, Colorado 80208
Project Director: Anne Rankin Mahoney
Project Title: A Study of Juveniles in a Suburban Court

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0035
Award Amount: $367,178
Project Period: January 1, 1980 through June 30, 1981
Grant Recipient: Coalition of Indian
Controlled School Boards
Special Projects -
511 16th Street, Suite 500
Denver, Colorado 80202
Project Director: Charles Bleskan
Project Title: American Indian Juvenile Delinquency Research Project

Grant Number: 79-JN-AX-0036
Award Amount: $386,395
Project Period: October 1, 1979 through September 30, 1980
Grant Recipient: Social Science Foundation
Consortium, Inc.
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302
Project Director: Mary Turner & Robert Hunter
Project Title: Evaluation of Law-Related Education Programs

Grant Number: 77-JN-99-0002-S2
Award Amount: $648,718
Project Period: December 1, 1976 through March 31, 1979
Grant Recipient: University of Chicago
School of Social Service Administration
5801 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Project Director: Donnell Pappenfort
Project Title: Center for Assessment of Alternatives for Juvenile Justice System Processing

Grant Number: 77-JN-99-0004-S2
Award Amount: $565,988
Project Period: October 1, 1976 through April 30, 1978
Grant Recipient: National Council on Crime and Delinquency
411 Hackensack Avenue
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601
Project Director: Robert Emrich
Project Title: The Coordinating Assessment Center

Grant Number: 77-JN-99-0008-S2
Award Amount: $938,591
Project Period: November 11, 1976 through December 31, 1978
Grant Recipient: American Justice Institute
1007 Seventh Street
Sacramento, California 95814
Project Director: Charles P. Smith
Project Title: Center for the Assessment of the Juvenile Justice System

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1980—O-311-376 (1920)