

Evaluation of  
Florida's  
Family  
Group Home  
Program  
1975 - 76



DEPARTMENT  
OF  
HEALTH  
AND  
REHABILITATIVE  
SERVICES

Youth  
Services  
Program

PLANNING  
COORDINATION  
UNIT



54424

NCJRS

FEB 9 1979

ACQUISITIONS

EVALUATION OF FAMILY GROUP HOME PROGRAM

FY 1975 - 76

GENERAL REPORT

State of Florida  
Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services  
Youth Services Program Office  
Planning Coordination Unit

Prepared  
March 1977

## Table of Contents

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
Program Description . . . . .	1
Purpose of Study . . . . .	1
Methodology . . . . .	3
Sample Characteristics: A Family Group Home Profile . . . . .	4
School: Enrollment, Behavior, Academic Progress, Extracurricular Involvement . . . . .	7
Behavior Problems . . . . .	8
Interpersonal Adjustment . . . . .	11
Parents . . . . .	12
Child's Attitude About the Family Group Home . . . . .	13
The Nature of Family Group Home "Treatment" Process . . . . .	13
Immediate Post-Program Measures: Exit Categories, Status Changes, and Length of Stay . . . . .	14
Post-Program Success or Failure: Follow-Up Data . . . . .	18
Transferred Youth . . . . .	19
Non-Transferred Youth . . . . .	19
Summaries and Conclusions . . . . .	24
Appendix A: Evaluation Forms . . . . .	26
Appendix B: Offense Codes . . . . .	33

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Family Group Home Sample Profile . . . . .	5
Table 2. Percentage of Family Group Home Children Who Had School Problems at Entry and Exit. . . . .	9
Table 3. Percentage of Family Group Home Children Who Engaged in Problem Behavior. . . . .	9
Table 4. Index of Behavior Problems; at Entry and Exit. . . . .	10
Table 5. In-Program Results: Circumstances of Exit by Placement After Family Group Home Departure . . . . .	16
Table 6. Length of Stay in Family Group Home by In- Program Results. . . . .	17
Table 7. Youth Who Were Transferred from Family Group Homes: Follow-Up Cases. . . . .	20
Table 8. Relationship to Post-Program Success for Non- Transferred Youths . . . . .	22
Table 9. In-Program Experience and Change Measures: Relationship to Post-Program Success for Non- Transferred Youths . . . . .	23

## Program Description

The Family Group Home (FGH) Program constitutes a sizeable component among the diverse community-based treatment programs for delinquents offered by Youth Services (YS) of Florida's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. The FGH concept involves contracting a series of private homes in communities throughout the state to provide both a foster family residence and supportive supervision for adjudicated youths whose families cannot meet this need. The program began in 1972 with its focus on youths assigned to probation or aftercare supervision, but made the transition to being largely a commitment program starting in July 1974. For fiscal year 1975-76, 245 FGH beds were authorized, of which 190 were designated for committed youth, and 55 for non-committed. Throughout the year, the number of beds available fluctuated near this number. At the end of the year, there were 63 homes contracted, providing 205 slots, a reduction in capacity having been necessitated by cost increases and a projected deficit.

The Group Home prototype calls for five YS youth to live with the Group Home Parents (and their own family). This model has been diversified, and current guidelines allow the number of YS children served to range from one to nine. The divergence was permitted in order to capitalize maximally on the variation in both: 1) physical size of private homes; and, 2) the number of children with whom potential GH parents are willing to cope. The latter factor is key because GH parents are basically volunteers who are paid a fairly minimal subsidy for expenses. An experienced Field Services Counselor is assigned to work with the YS children in each facility, serving as a treatment leader and family liaison as well as the representative of the juvenile justice system to the children. The cost of the program including administrative expenses is about \$10.40 per day per child; GH parents receive \$8.00 per child per day.

The role of the Group Homes within the Youth Services treatment and rehabilitation system is to provide temporarily for needful young offenders, a family and community living situation within which they can be helped to develop acceptable, legal patterns of behavior. The children attend school and/or work in the community, take part in school and extra-curricular activities, and are subject to the family discipline code, just as the own children of the Group Home parents. The Youth Services counselor provides group and/or individual counseling and refers to community resources as needed for additional evaluation or services, programs for specialized needs, etc. The child's parents (or guardian) are encouraged to be involved, through visits to the child, discussions with the Group Home parents and, sometimes, parent meetings or family counseling. The goal of the program is to foster social adjustment in the child and to develop patterns of behavior and relationships which will forestall further involvement with the juvenile justice system.

## Purpose of the Study

This report constitutes the fourth annual evaluation of the Family Group Home Program and covers the fiscal year July 1975 through June 1976. One of the purposes served by this study is that of updating the population profile of the program, thus providing informational input for the study of

trends in client characteristics. The assessment of differences in the population over time must take into consideration how policy and organizational changes have effected the nature of the program and thus the criteria for selection. Comparisons of profiles from this and other Youth Services' programs depict the outcome of the selection/placement process by which adjudicated youths are sorted for program options.

A second purpose of the study is to assess the effects of the program on its participants in terms of measured change in behaviors and attitudes occurring during their stay. Is the program accomplishing its stated goals, effecting positive changes in the crucial areas? The change data, especially when related to the reports on treatment, provide useful management information.

Program completion rate is a third focus of the study, due to its implications and costs for the juvenile justice system as a whole as well as for the program itself. How many (and what type) youths fail to "complete the program" and are transferred to another program? By examining the in-program failures in contrast to successful completers, ways to improve the selection criteria are sought in order to optimize each child's potential for success by proper placement. Children who are transferred from one program to another typically have a longer total commitment time than do those who complete the first program in which they are placed. This means additional costs in terms of the personal freedom of the child, and also a larger dollar outlay for the Youth Services' system (and therefore, the taxpayer), equal to the cost per child/day in the program where the extra time is spent.

The final purpose of the study is the examination of the recidivism rate of the Family Group Home Program and the relationship of recidivism to variables posited by various theories as the causes of crime and delinquency. Recidivism is traditionally the principal outcome measure used for evaluating the success of correctional programs. This is largely due to the fact that reincarceration is costly, which means that recidivism data provide program accountability in cost-effectiveness terms.

## Methodology

Previous evaluations have used the total population of the Family Group Home Program as their data base; however, the growth of the program has made this practice no longer feasible. Therefore, starting in July 1975, a procedure was instituted whereby a one-third sample of the youths placed in each home was selected. The Family Group Home counselors maintained an "Entry Log" for each separate Family Group Home. On this log were entered the names of all admissions during the year, listed chronologically by entrance date. Every third entry on the log was designated a sample child, with evaluation forms required.

The study design utilizes "before" and "after" questionnaire forms completed by the Group Home counselors at the time of each child's entry to and exit from a Family Group Home, and a brief form requesting the Group Home Parents' evaluation of the child at exit. (See Appendix A for copies of the forms.) These instruments provide background data such as age, sex and race, as well as offense history, school performance, behavioral evaluations, and attitudinal information on how the child and their parents seem to feel about Family Group Home placement.<sup>1</sup>

The sample analyzed for this evaluation includes one-third of all youths who exited group homes between July 1, 1975 and June 30, 1976. These data do not include youngsters who entered during this period but were still in residence at the end of June.

The Family Group Home Program is the only Youth Services program which provides residential care for both committed and non-committed youths. In the current sample of 190 children, 163 (86%) were committed and only 27 (14%) were non-committed; i.e., on probation or aftercare, or adjudicated dependent. In the 1974-75 evaluation, there was a 49% to 51% split between committed and non-committed youths, so that data were analyzed separately for each group and compared. In the current sample, since the proportion of non-committed youths is so small and since few significant differences were found between the two groups in the previous study, committed and non-committed youths were combined for analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> There is clearly a subjective element in these measures, since most information is provided by the counselors, and since many of the items require a judgment as well as an observation. The measurements are also affected by the fact that counselors have only limited written records plus a short acquaintance period to get to know a child and his behavior problems prior to providing the Entrance data, a factor which may lead to underestimation of problems. Exit data should be more informed due to extensive counselor-child and Group Home Parent-child contact during the stay. Aside from these considerations, there is also the possibility of bias in counselor's and Group Home Parents' responses as they might attempt to make themselves and the program appear more effective by overestimating problems at entrance and down-playing them at the time of exit. Such distortion is felt by the evaluator to be minimal largely because of the manner in which the administrators of the program view the evaluation and present it to counseling staff and Group Home Parents as a tool rather than a threat.

## Sample Characteristics: A Family Group Home Profile

Descriptive information on background variables and juvenile justice system experience is contained in Table 1.<sup>2</sup> The sex distribution showed that 37% of the cases were female, and 63% male. Blacks made up 36% of the sample; whites, 64%. As compared to the committed child population of the 1974-75 evaluation, the current sample had significantly fewer females (girls were 52% of that population) and the same racial composition. The average age of the sample was 14.7 years, only slightly older than the 14.3 year average for 1974-75.

Only a third of the sample youths came from homes with intact natural families. More than a third came from homes where the mother was the only parent present. The mean number of siblings (including step-) living in the home was 2.7, and many children came from quite large families. Family incomes tended to be low (average, \$7,900; one-third made \$5,000 or less), especially considering family size. Most families (65%) derive all their income from the work of parent(s)/step-parent(s), with small minorities receiving either public assistance (Aid to Families with Dependent Children, etc.) or income from Social Security, retirement, etc., often as a supplement to parents' work. Homes of the majority of sample children are located in urban or suburban areas.

Eighty-six percent of the youths sampled were on Youth Services commitment status when placed in the Family Group Home. A quarter of all placements were transferred to the Family Group Home from another Youth Services residential program. The youths averaged 4.3 previous referrals to Youth Services (not including the one immediately leading to their placement there.) This average is slightly lower than for the 1974-75 committed population which averaged 4.7 previous referrals. Of these prior referrals, there was a mean of 2.0 prior status offenses (52% had previous adjudications for a status offense), and 2.4 prior delinquent offenses. Only 2% of the sample were placed after their first referral.

Eighty-two percent had been on probation at some time prior to placement, indicating a Youth Services' attempt to deal with their problems without removal from home.

---

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted that in this table and throughout the analyses, the totals displayed vary due to missing data. Percentages are consistently based on the known observations (the "N" shown), rather than the total number of cases.

Table I. Family Group Home Sample Profile

A. Demographic Data

1. Sex

Female 37%  
Male 63%  
(N = 190)

2. Race

Black 36%  
White 64%  
(N = 190)

3. Age at Entry

10-13 years 25%  
14 years 20%  
15 years 22%  
16 years 19%  
17-19 years 14%  
(N = 187)

4. Home Living Arrangement

Both Natural Parents 33%  
Mother Only 37%  
Mother and Stepfather 11%  
Father Only or w/Stepmother 6%  
Other (relative, non-relation, institution, etc.) 13%  
(N = 159)

5. Number of Siblings

None 13%  
1-2 42%  
3-4 27%  
5-9 18%  
(N = 149)

6. Area Child's Home Is In.

Rural or Small Town 38%  
Urban or Suburban 62%  
(N = 161)

7. Family Income

\$1,000 - \$5,000 34%  
\$6,000 - \$10,000 40%  
\$11,000 - \$25,000 26%  
(N = 89)

8. Source(s) of Income

1 or Both Parents Work 65%  
Public Assistance (AFDC, etc.) 16%  
Social Security, Retirement, and other 19%  
(N = 162 Responses; on 131 cases)\*

B. Juvenile Justice History

9. Child's Status\*\* at Entry

Committed 86%  
Non-committed 14%  
(N = 190)

10. Last Previous Residence

Another YS Program\*\*\* 26%  
Home (Own, Relatives, Foster) 74%  
(N = 156)

\* Coding allowed 2 sources of income to be reported. There were responses for 131 cases, with more than one source of income reported for 49 cases. The percentages given are based on the total responses.

\*\* Committed includes 156 "committed delinquents" and 7 children who were "adjudicated dependent and committed." The latter were probably children who had been twice adjudicated for ungovernable behavior and therefore could be legally committed as delinquents. The non-committed category is comprised of probationers (17), after-care cases (5) and adjudicated dependents (5). Placement of dependents in the FGH Program is technically inappropriate, but frequently the borderline between these cases and delinquents is unclear.

\*\*\* Thirty-eight of 40 who came from another program were transfers, still committed; only two were furloughed to the FGH or Aftercare.

Table 1. (continued)

11. <u>Offense * Leading to FGH Placement</u>		12. <u>Number of Previous Referrals</u>	
Against Persons	9%	0-2 Referrals	26%
Against Property	42%	3-5 Referrals	42%
Victimless Offense	6%	6-9+ Referrals	32%
Technical Offense	26%	(N = 182)	
Status Offense	17%		
(N = 184)			

\* See Appendix B for list of offenses included in each category.

---

The offense leading to Family Group Home placement was most often a property crime (42%) with technical violations of probation or aftercare being second most frequent (26%). Status offenses were cited for 17% of the placements.<sup>3,4</sup> Nine percent of all placement offenses were for "violent" crimes against persons, yet volunteer families readily opened their homes to these youths for a very small monetary subsidy. The ability of an inexpensive family-centered community-based program to place and cope with this range of offenders offers substantial indication that institutionalization is not necessary for many juvenile delinquents.

The committed population of the 1974-75 study had a significantly different distribution of offenses, with 71% of these children having been committed and placed in the FGH for status offenses. While the change in law accounts for the difference rather than placement policies, the different composition must be kept in mind in comparing and interpreting differences in program results and post-program outcome.

#### School: Enrollment, Behavior, Academic Progress, Extracurricular Involvement

Eighty-eight percent of the sample youths were enrolled in school at the time of FGH placement. Seven percent had dropped out of school. Seventeen percent of the sample was employed, at part-time or full-time jobs. While school enrollment was about the same for the 1974-75 study population, more youths from the current sample were working.

---

<sup>3</sup>This occurred despite the fact that legislation went into effect on July 1, 1975 which decriminalized status offenses (runaway, truancy, and ungovernable behavior) and renamed them as dependency charges. This nominal change removed these as legitimate charges for delinquency adjudication, with the exception of a second adjudication for ungovernable behavior. Some of these are probably first-time status offenders who were adjudicated and placed in FGH's prior to the law change (and appeared in the sample because of their exit date). The remainder would be second-time ungovernables.

<sup>4</sup>It might be noted that there was a higher proportion of youths whose placement charges were status offenses among the group of children who stayed in the program 30 days or less. The link between short stays and status offenses occurs largely through the runaway category. Runners are notorious as repeat offenders, and running is both the charge that caused these children to be placed in the FGH (10 of the 11 status offenders in this group were runaways), and the reason for their rapid exit (46% of all exits in less than 30 days were runaways).

Before/after measures of three school-related problem areas are reported in Table 2,<sup>5</sup> which shows that there was a significant decline in the number of children who were truant or suspended during their FGH stay. The increase in school "behavior problems" is accounted for largely by the short-exit youngsters who stayed less than 30 days in the FGH, 100% of whom displayed such problems during their brief stays. Overall, the indication is that the experience in the FGH stimulated and reinforced more positive school behavior. Comparison of the 1974-75 commitment population and the current sample revealed that there was a significantly higher incidence of these problems (at both entry and exit) in this year's sample.

Children who are placed in FGH's are often weak in academic skills and performance. A fifth of the current sample had failed a grade and a majority was rated below average for their age on reading level and overall academic rating. The proportions rated below average dropped (although nonsignificantly) on these two measures at time of FGH exit.<sup>6</sup> Thus, both academic as well as behavioral performances improved. This change is surely due in part to reduced truancy, although the interest and emphasis of GH Parents in this area also makes an important contribution.

One program objective is to get the children involved in appropriate activities and organizations within the school and community, in order to direct their interests and utilize their time in socially acceptable ways. Sample children had extremely limited involvement in such activities at entry. Only 8% were members of school organizations: 19% participated in some other extracurricular activity (athletics, church, etc.). By exit, there were significant increases in both school and extracurricular activities, to 17% and 41% respectively.

### Behavior Problems

Counselors were asked to indicate, from a list of five, what problem behaviors were engaged in by Family Group Home Children prior to entrance and at time of exit. Table 3 shows the before/after measures on each problem. The improvement in behavior was statistically significant on all measures.

---

<sup>5</sup>In these as well as later comparisons, a variation of the Chi Square test which compares frequencies for a first set versus a second set of responses from the same individuals was used to determine the significance of differences between the entrance and exit data. (The tests were done on a cross-tabulation of the two responses, although only the frequencies are presented in the tables here). (Ref: Quinn McNemar, Psychological Statistics, 1969, pp 260-263)

<sup>6</sup>Neither difference is statistically significant. Comparisons on the academic rating item were made between the 1974-75 and current samples, on both entry and exit measures, and the distributions did not differ significantly at either point. Thus, the two year's samples were similar with regard to these variables.

Table 2. Percentage of Family Group Home Children who had School Problems at Entry and Exit

<u>School Problem</u>	<u>Entry</u>	<u>Exit</u>
1. Behavior Problems +	59% ns	67%
2. Truant ++	87% *	50%
3. Suspended	50% *	32%

(N = 154 to 178 on individual items.)

+ Includes: disrupt classes, create disturbances on school grounds, disobey rules, etc.

++ Includes: skip days and/or individual classes.

ns Not a statistically significant difference. (Chi-Square equals 3.94; df=1)

\* Significant at .01 level. (Chi-Squares = 37.70 and 9.93 respectively.)

Table 3. Percentage of Family Group Home Children Who Engaged in Problem Behavior

<u>Problem Behavior</u>	<u>Entry</u>	<u>Exit</u>
1) Runaway	69%	35%
2) Use of alcohol	34%	17%
3) Use of drugs	43%	29%
4) Abusive actions toward others (Fighting, starting arguments, etc.)	54%	39%
5) Destruction of property (own or others)	36%	15%

The modified Chi Square tests showed all of these differences to be statistically significant at .05 or better. The  $X^2$  values were: 36.76; 8.35; 6.08; 6.23; and 14.70.

Comparison of the incidence of these problems among the 1974-75 committed population and the current sample revealed that all of the behaviors except runaway were more frequent (at both entry and exit) in this sample. These data seem to indicate that the FGH clientele is considerably "tougher" in terms of behavior problems than was the case during the first year that committed children were being placed in the program.

A summed index of Behavior Problems was created by assigning a value of one to each behavior engaged in, and zero to each behavior not displayed.<sup>7</sup> Each child would thus have a score from 0 to 5 on the index at each time, entry and exit. The average score on the entry index was 2.2; at exit, the mean index score was 1.4. The scores were divided into Low (0 and 1), and High (2-5) categories, based on the data distributions. Crosstabulating the entry scores by exit scores provides a parsimonious overview of the significant behavior change, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Index of Behavior Problems; at Entry and Exit.

		Exit Problems Index		% of Total in Each Entry Category
		Low (0-1)	High (2-5)	
Entry Problems Index	Low (0-1)	27%	9%	36%
	High (2-5)	37%	27%	64%
% of Total in Each Exit Category		64%	36%	(N = 121) 100%

$\chi^2 = 20.61$ : Significant at .001

The right-to-left diagonal cells show the amount of change in behavior problems within the high and low categories, respectively. Thirty-seven percent of the sample are shown to have made positive changes (from a high score at entry to low at exit) and only 9% made negative changes. Comparison of entry and exit

<sup>7</sup>Assigning an equal weight to all of the behaviors ignores qualitative differences between them. This procedure admittedly oversimplifies, but does create an efficient summary measure.

total percentages in the high score category summarized the drop in the proportion of extremely problemmed children at each time (from 64% of the sample at entry to only 36% at exit).

An additional measure of change in behavior comes from the evaluation form completed by the GH Parents. Only 15% of the children were rated as showing positive behavior at entry, with a significant increase to 53% behaving positively at exit.

### Interpersonal Adjustment

In order to measure one aspect of adjustment, counselors and Group Home parents were asked to assess the children's interpersonal skills. The counselor's rated each child at entry on how well she/he related to peers. Both the counselors and the Group Home parents rated the children at exit on how well they got along with other children while in the Group Home. There was relatively little change reflected by the counselor's two ratings on this item. Three percent of the children became more positive between entry (50%) and exit (53%). On the other hand, 4% became more negative (31% vs. 35%). Neither difference was statistically significant.

GH Parents rated peer relationships as somewhat more positive than did counselors. Only 26% were rated as negative and 62% were said to relate positively.

Self-concept, the evaluative view of oneself, is often a direct reflection on one's ability to deal comfortably and competently with one's world and other people in it. Thus, all of the above-mentioned entry measures of interpersonal, scholastic and legal difficulties would lead to a prediction that FGH youngsters would not think very highly of themselves. Indeed, at entry counselors reported 47% of the total sample as having negative self-feelings, and another 35% as "neutral" rather than positive. The sub-group of children who stayed in the program 30 days or less were seen as having significantly more negative self-concepts at entry than those who stayed longer (77% to 61%, respectively).

As interpersonal abilities improve and failure experiences are replaced with some successes, confidence and self-concept should also increase. This did, in fact, occur for youngsters who were in the FGH program for normal stays.<sup>8,9</sup> Among the regular-exit group, counselors judged 60% to have positive views of themselves after their FGH experience, as compared to only 39% at entry. For the short-exit group, counselors reported "no information" on the child's self-concept at exit for all but 6 children, all of whom were said to have very negative self-views.

---

<sup>8</sup> The difference between entry and exit self-concept ratings was tested with the modified Chi Square and found to be significant at the .01 level.

<sup>9</sup> The 1974-75 study also found major improvement in self-concept as a result of the Family Group Home stay. The data for that conclusion, however, was based on a one-point-in-time assessment; i.e., "better", "worse", than at entry and is not comparable to the current measures.

GH Parents, who also rated the children's self-concept at exit, had the advantage of daily contact with all children, so there were only 5 cases of "no information" even on the short-exit group. The GH Parents also saw this group as thinking significantly more negatively of themselves; only 26% were seen to have positive self-concepts as compared to 67% of the regular-exit group. Again, comparing the counselor and GH Parent ratings, the latter saw the children in a slightly more positive light.<sup>10</sup> This was generally the case on all items where both counselors and Parents responded to similar items.

A further question which addressed interpersonal competence considered how well each child related to her/his GH Parents. While no pre-program measure on this item was possible, both counselors and the GH Parents themselves were asked for exit evaluations. Both respondent groups reported a majority of positive relationships, but GH Parents indicated positive relationships somewhat (but insignificantly) more frequently than did counselors (67% vs. 62%).

### Parents

At the time of entry, counselors were asked what feeling the child's own parents/guardian had expressed about the FGH placement. Forty percent of the responses saw parents as quite positive toward the FGH placement, feeling that it would be helpful for their child. The only negative attitudes toward FGH placement were measured in terms of doubt as to whether the placement would help (14%) or whether the child in fact needed help (8%). The remaining responses tapped parents' feelings about having their child away from home: 18% were seen as sorry, 11% were glad, and 9% were indifferent. The counselors' exit report of parental evaluations regarding the effect of the child's stay at the FGH on her/his behavior, attitudes, problems, etc., showed 72% of the parents thought the effect positive, and 38% negative (N = 120). The 1974-75 study results were not significantly different on either of these items.

Parent/child visits are important as a part of the FGH Program, both to provide the child needed contact with and support from home, and to give the counselor opportunities to diagnose and try to deal with the family aspects of the child's behavior problems. Despite the emphasis on this, however, 40% of the children had no visits from their parents while in the FGH, and another 19% had one or fewer parental visits per 2 - 3 months in the FGH. Monthly visits occurred for 12%, and 39% had visits more frequently than once a month (N = 126).<sup>11</sup> Seventy-nine percent of the sample children went home for visits during their FGH stay.<sup>12</sup> Counselors saw the impact on the child of home visits--in terms of readjustment to the FGH upon return--as positive in 64% of the cases. For the most part, the same families accounted for both types of visits (parents to the Family Group Home and children to home).

---

<sup>10</sup>This difference was not significant. ( $\chi^2 = 1.96$ )

<sup>11</sup>Questions about parent/child visits (and parent cooperation/involvement with the program) were omitted from the exit form for children who stayed 30 days or less. This exclusion accounts for the reduced sample size.

<sup>12</sup>In the 1974-75 study, parent/child visits were not differentiated by who visited where, so comparisons between the two year's data cannot be made.

A significant inverse relationship was found between distance and frequency of visits; the further the family lived from the FGH, the less frequently parents visited the FGH, and the less the child went home to visit. However, the majority (60%) of parents lived within 50 miles. Program policy is to keep children as close to home as possible in order to increase family involvement.

Parents were rated as being cooperative with the program in two-thirds of the cases. The kind of cooperation/involvement varied considerably. Parents' meetings and family counseling were not always offered, but participation was limited to 21% for parents' meetings and 56% for family counseling when available (N's = 75 and 71 respectively). On an item inquiring about attempts by the child's parents to talk to and learn from the GH Parents, 55% were said by counselors to make a limited effort, while 20% actively utilized these contacts as an important resource. Nineteen percent had no contact, and 16% had only negative (critical and/or disruptive) contact with the Group Home Parents.

The evaluation forms defined a good parent/child relationship as "entailing mutual communication, concern and affection" and asked both counselors and GH Parents to rate the quality of the child's relationship with her/his parents at entry and again at exit. Both sets of raters reported a minority of strong, positive parent/child relationships at entry. Both also indicated there was some positive change by time of exit, with parent/child relationships improving during the child's FGH stay.

The relatively low proportion of strong, positive parent/child relationships is seen as a key explanatory factor in a casual discussion of behavior problems and delinquency. Children need acceptable and accepted role models in order to develop appropriate patterns themselves. The limited efforts by parents to take advantage of program resources to try to learn how to strengthen their relationships and help their children are discouraging in this regard. The gains toward positive behavior and relationships which occur during the short average stays in the FGH Program indicate the potential for improvement among problem children when strong family support is provided.

#### Child's Attitude About the Family Group Home

Counselors reported the feelings which children expressed about their placement and stay in the FGH at the time of entry and again at exit. Categories of response allowed for "indifference" to the FGH to be expressed at entry but not at exit. A significant shift toward a more positive attitude at exit was found, but came entirely from the "indifferent" group. Children who were very negative when they came to the Group Homes did not alter their attitudes. Comparison of the data with the 1974-75 committed population results reveals that the earlier group had significantly fewer children who had a positive attitude about their FGH stay at time of exit (59%).

#### The Nature of Family Group Home "Treatment" Process

While all aspects of the living experience in a FGH are part of the rehabilitation process, the FGH counselors provide somewhat more structured

"treatment" elements, by way of their contacts with the child and her/his family (the latter, directly or through the referring counselor).<sup>13</sup>

Group therapy sessions, utilizing reality-based peer group interaction with a trained adult leader to prevent excesses and provide some problem-oriented direction to the discussions, are the major mode of treatment utilized in all YS commitment programs. The allowance of small-capacity, even single-bed, homes under the auspices of the FGH program has made group-work non-applicable to some FGH youths, but it still serves as an important resource for many participants. Thirty-six percent of the sample youths had no group therapy during their stay, 19% participated less than once a week, and 45% had group discussion weekly or more frequently. Individual counseling sessions often supplemented (or replaced) group therapy: only 27% of the sample had no individual counseling, 29% had less than once a week sessions, and 44% had weekly or more frequent sessions. Both of these measures show a less intensive counseling emphasis than did the 1974-75 evaluation data, where it was found that of the committed children, 74% experienced group counseling, and 87% individual counseling, more than once a week.

Thirty-seven percent of the sample youths were referred or taken "to some source outside YS for additional counseling, testing, psychological evaluation or help, etc." during their stay in the FGH. School guidance counselors topped the list of most used resources, followed by community mental health centers.

Contacts with a child's parents, either by phone or personal visits, were one aspect of the family-oriented treatment. Parents of only 15% of the children were never contacted, with weekly or more frequent contacts being made with 44% and less than weekly contacts with the remaining 41%.

During the FGH stay, contacts with the referring counselor about the child or her/his parents provided another way of getting further treatment information and maintaining a liaison to the child's family and community in preparation for return home. In only 6% of the cases were no such contacts made; 1-4 contacts occurred for 45% and 5-8 contacts were made on the behalf of 49%.

#### Immediate Post-Program Measures: Exit Categories, Status Changes, and Length of Stay

Exits from FGH's occur under more diverse circumstances than is the case for most YS residential treatment programs. In more structured and formally staffed facilities like halfway houses, nearly all exits can be readily categorized as either in-program success (furloughs to aftercare) or failures (transfers to other commitment programs or unreturned absconders). In the FGH program, such classification of exits is often obscured due to characteristics of the population, the program or both. First, since both committed and non-committed youths are included, successful completion of the program is not always equivalent to furlough. Secondly, due to the essentially volunteer,

---

<sup>13</sup>Information on the treatment process was collected only for children who were in the FGH for more than 30 days; therefore, the data presented here are based on a reduced N (128 or fewer, depending on missing data and "not applicable" responses).

(i.e., non-staff) nature of the GH Parents' role and the fact that their family home constitutes the facility, they have the prerogative to request immediate removal of a child who offends or disrupts according to their standards, whereas a paid facility staff might be able to and/or have to tolerate more. Also, the termination of their contract on short notice, either by the agency or on their own volition, not infrequently means the loss of a facility and necessity of relocating resident children. Thirdly, the relatively loose, open-community nature of the program means that the return home or movement into some other loosely structured program situation from the FGH is not seen as a difficult transition, or a likely threat to the community.

All of these factors effect both the nature of FGH releases and the placement of youngsters after their exit. Therefore, a combination of two items, "circumstances of exit"<sup>14</sup> and "placement after FGH departure",<sup>15</sup> is utilized in this study in order to assess the completion rate of program participants and thus the immediate results of program involvement. Table 5 depicts a cross-classification of these two variables, and the in-cell labels indicate what joint outcomes are to be considered successful (S) (program completion), less than successful (LS), and failure (F). The figures in each cell are the number of cases represented by that combination of circumstances and placement.

The result of this joint-outcome classification is a new trichotomous variable which can be used as a simple one-item measure of "in-program results". (This label will be used hereafter.) Following are the distributions of the total sample, and its breakdown into the short-exit (less than 30 days stay) and regular-exit sub-groups, on this item. Just over a third of the total exits are program completers.

<u>In-Program Results</u>	<u>Total Sample</u>	<u>Short-Exit</u>	<u>Regular-Exit</u>
Successful	37%	4%	51%
Less-Than-Successful	31%	42%	26%
Failure	32%	54%	23%
	(N = 179)	(N = 54)	(N = 125)

<sup>14</sup>A similar item utilized in the 1974-75 evaluation produced a nearly identical distribution of committed youths among the categories of this item. (See the percentages on the far right of Table 5, for the distribution of the 1975-76 sample.)

<sup>15</sup>There was no item similar to this in the 1974-75 study.

Table 5. In-Program Results:\* Circumstances of Exit by Placement After Family Group Home Departure

Placement After Family Group Home

Circumstance of Exit	Home	Neither Home Nor YS Program	YS Program	% of Total In Each Circumstance
Successful completion	65 S	1 S	1 F	38%
Adjustment problem	12 LS	1 LS	9 F	12%
New offense	2 LS	1 LS	25 F	16%
Runaway	9 LS	10 LS	14 F	18%
Home terminated	3 LS	-- LS	2 F	3%
Other	12 LS	5 LS	7 F	13%

% of Total in Each Placement                      58%                      10%                      32%                      100%  
(N = 179)

\* Cell values are numbers rather than percentages.                      S = Successful  
LS = Less Than Successful  
F = Failure

This new variable can be related to other relevant items such as length of stay in the program and post-program recidivism in order to determine its management utility and predictive power.

Length of stay in the FGH was calculated from entry to exit. Stays ranged from less than one to 13 months, with a mean of 3 months.<sup>16</sup> Average stays for the 1974-75 FGH population were calculated separately for committed youths, who stayed 2.8 months, and non-committed children who stayed 3.9 months. If these sub-groups are weighted to match their proportions in the 1975-76 sample (86% committed, 14% non-committed), the average length of stay for 1974-75 would be 3.3 months, very similar to the results for the current sample.

<sup>16</sup>When the short-exit group was separated out, their average stay was 24 days, as compared to 124 days (4.1 months) for the regular-exit group.

Length of stay was cross-tabulated within in-program results in order to allow consideration of what length of time in the program was most frequently associated with exit as a "success", and when failures and other departures occurred. Table 6 displays these relationships: The row percentages (top figure in each cell) show what proportion of those children who exited during each time interval were successful, less than successful, and failures. The percentage of successful program results increases with each increment of time in the program up to the 5-6 month stays, which appear optimal. The column percentages (in lower right corner of each cell) show how many children in each exit category left during each period of time. Thus, the largest

Table 6. Length of Stay in Family Group Home by In-Program Results

		<u>In-Program Results</u>			Total in Each Length of Stay Category
		Successful	Less-Than-Successful	Failure (Transfer)	
Length Of Stay	0-2 mo.	14% (12)	40% (34)	46% (39)	100% (85)
		18%	64%	67%	
	3-4 mo.	46% (23)	28% (14)	26% (13)	100% (50)
		35%	26%	22%	
	5-6 mo.	75% (24)	9% (3)	16% (5)	100% (32)
		36%	6%	9%	
	7-13 mo.	70% (7)	20% (2)	10% (1)	100% (10)
		11%	4%	2%	
Total in Each In-Program Results Category		100% (66)	100% (53)	100% (58)	N = 177

$\chi^2 = 45.728$   
 $df = 6$   
 Significant at .001

proportion of successful completions (36%) occurred with 5-6 month stays, closely followed by the 3-4 month stays (35%). Two-thirds of all "less than successful" releases (64%) and failures (67%) occurred in the first two-month period.

These data cannot prove that longer stays are the cause of success, but by showing that most failures and "less than successful" releases occur early in the stay it does indicate that those children still in the FGH after 4 months have a very high probability of successful exit. The average length of stay in the FGH for children who were successful program completers was 158 days; the average stay for unsuccessful youths was 75 days.

#### Post-Program Success or Failure: Follow-up Data

In order to determine the post-program success or failure of FGH children, YS commitment files were examined for evidence of commitment/recommitment to the juvenile justice system. In order to have a reasonable follow-up period, only the 86 children who exited during the first half of the evaluation period (July - December 31, 1975) were included in this follow-up. This allowed a minimum follow-up of 10 months (maximum of 16 months). It was found that of these 86 cases, only 71 could be assessed as successes or failures.<sup>17</sup> Other studies of YS commitments have found that recidivism rates vary markedly according to the length of the follow-up period, since many juveniles manage to stay out of trouble for more than a year, only to recidivate later.

The recommended professional standard for recidivism studies is a three-year follow-up. Because of the extreme limitations imposed for this study by: 1) the small population; 2) the very short follow-up period, as well as; 3) the inclusion of 14% non-committed children (largely probationers who have higher success rates than do committed children; and, 4) inclusion of non-furloughed youths in the exit group, the post-program results reported here should be considered at best tentative. Only when longer-range data have been collected on a large enough number of cases to permit separate consideration of committed youths who were furloughed from the FGH Program will the information from follow-up be legitimately comparable with the "success-failure" data of other YS programs. In order to maximize comparability now, the analyses that follow separate those who transferred to another facility (the failure category of the in-program results variable) from the other exits.<sup>18</sup> This still leaves a more mixed group than the furloughs sampled from other programs for study, but it is an improvement.

The definitions of post-program success or failure center around further

---

<sup>17</sup>Of the 15 youths dropped from the follow-up group, no file could be found for 8 cases, even though all were reported by their counselors to be committed at one time. Another 6 children were still serving the same commitment for which they had been placed in the FGH. The remaining youth had been waived to adult court, but no disposition of this case was available.

<sup>18</sup>In this process of separating transfers and non-transfers, another 2 cases are lost from the analysis; there was no information as to their post-FGH placement, so they could not be assigned to either group.

involvement in the juvenile justice system. Post-program "failure" is thus characterized by placement on commitment status, whether by way of administrative revocation of supervision, or commitment/recommitment by the court. Post-program success means that the youngster has not been (re)committed after FGH exit. Use of this single absolute criterion is necessitated by the lack of uniform availability of referral/arrest records. All follow-up data came from YS commitment files, and these files are updated with subsequent referral information only if the child returns to committed status. Thus, there are no comparable data available on those who are re-referred but not committed or revoked, and no data on the FGH probationary cases unless they "fail" after leaving the FGH.

### Transferred Youth

Of the 69 youths in the follow-up study, a third (23 children) were transferred to another commitment program when they left the FGH. The majority of transfers occurred during the first 2 months of stay; the average FGH stay for these cases was 80 days. Eight children were moved to another FGH, two went to halfway houses, thirteen went to training schools. The categories for "circumstance of leaving the Group Home" provide some understanding of why each youngster was moved; they show that 9 children committed new offenses, 8 ran away, 2 proved to be "adjustment problems in the Group Homes", and 4 were listed simply as "other".

The transferred youngsters did not differ significantly from the non-transferred group in terms of background or offense, although they were slightly more likely to be whites and males. (The 1974-75 study found whites and females more likely to be transferred.) Table 7 shows the characteristics of the group of transferred children and indicates that their recidivism rate was 52%.

### Non-Transferred Youth

For the 46 non-transferred youths in the follow-up sample, the average stay in the FGH was 95 days; the largest proportion (44%) exited within two months. The children in this group represented the full range of possible circumstances of exit; 56% successfully completed the program; 7% ran away; 7% were removed because of adjustment problems; 4% committed new offenses; 4% were moved because the FGH terminated; and 22% were "other" circumstances. In each case, however, the child was returned to the community (usually to her/his home) rather than being transferred to another commitment program, even though some continued on commitment status for a time.

---

<sup>19</sup>A more thorough follow-up would include checking adult records through the Florida Department of Criminal Law Enforcement, thus expanding the definition of failure to include reinvolvement with the adult criminal justice system as well. For the short follow-up period used in this study, this additional effort was not considered worthwhile, since few of the youths would have turned 18 and become liable to adult prosecution. If the YS record showed an adult system commitment, this information would have classed the youth as a failure, but the only case of a waiver was not yet disposed and so was omitted.

Table 7. Youth Who Were Transferred From Family Group Homes: Follow-up Cases (N = 23)

A. Population Characteristics  
 B. Post-Family Group Home Outcome

A. Population Characteristics

Sex: Female 30% (7)	Race: Black 43% (10)
Male 70% (16)	White 57% (13)
Age: 14 or younger 43% (10)	Placement
15 30% (7)	Offense: Persons: 4% (1)
16 or older 27% (6)	Property: 57% (13)
	Victimless: 4% (1)
	Technical: 26% (6)
	Status: 9% (2)

B. Post-Family Group Home Outcome

Length of Stay in Family Group Home Pre-Transfer :	1-2 mo. 61% (14)
	3-4 mo. 22% (5)
	5+ mo. 17% (4)
Post-Program Outcome:	Success 48% (11)
	Recidivism 52% (12)
Time from Family Group Home Exit to Recidivism:	0-60 days 46% (5)
	61-180 days 27% (3)
	181+ days 27% (3)

Seventy-two percent (33) of the non-transferred children were successful in remaining free of further involvement in the juvenile justice system after leaving the FGH. The remaining 13 non-transferred children who were revoked or recommitted to Youth Services represent a 28% recidivism rate. This compares favorably with the 45% recidivism rate found for non-transferred committed children (N = 22) who were followed up in the 1974-75 study, but the difference between the two rates is not statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 1.96$ ).

Table 8 presents distributions on some background variables and shows how these variables relate to post-program success. None of these items appear to predict success. The differences between the categories are not significant, although usually in the expected direction, and very similar to those found in the 1974-75 study, where similar measures were available.

Table 9 presents some selected in-program experience and change measures thought likely to be related to success. The number of cases is too small for the findings to be tested or considered very reliable, still, it is interesting to see that not all items tend to relate in the expected direction. Both very long and very short stays produced higher success rates than the moderate category. (This is a contrast to the 1974-75 data, where 2-4 month stays were found to have much superior outcomes.) Positive changes in self-concept<sup>20</sup> and ability to relate to peers do not necessarily improve probability of success, nor is frequency of counseling (either group or individual) differentially predictive of success.<sup>21</sup> Only change on the behavior index and measures of parent-child contact and its immediate effects produced the expected changes. (Similar measures in the 1974-75 data were also found to have this expected relationship to success.)

---

<sup>20</sup>In the 1974-75 study, children said to have improved in self-concept had a 71% success rate as compared to only 29% for those who showed no change or a worsened self-view.

<sup>21</sup>It is notable, in regard to this lack of relationship found between frequency of counseling and post-program success, that in the 1974-75 study, significantly more youths had very frequent groups and individual counseling, and there was a somewhat higher failure rate for that year's population than for this study. No direct test for relationship between these items was calculated on those data (and, at any rate, the follow-up sample was extremely small), but certainly the evidence points in the direction that it is the living experience, and not the talk-therapy that makes the FGH succeed.

Table 8. Relationship to Post-Program Success\* For Non-Transferred Youths (N = 46)

	<u>% of Total**</u>		<u>% Successful</u>		
Race:	Black:	30% (14)	71%	(10)	NS
	White	70% (32)	72%	(23)	
Sex:	Female:	39% (18)	83%	(15)	NS
	Male	61% (28)	64%	(18)	
Age:	14 or younger:	38% (17)	65%	(11)	NS
	15	20% (9)	89%	(8)	
	16 or older:	42% (19)	74%	(14)	
Home Living Arrangement:	Both Natural Parents:	41% (13)	62%	(8)	NS
	Mother Only:	34% (11)	73%	(8)	
	Any Other Arrangement:	25% (8)	88%	(7)	
Area Child's Home Is In:	Rural or Small Town:	41% (13)	85%	(11)	NS
	Urban or Suburban:	59% (19)	63%	(12)	
Family Income:	\$1-5,000:	24% (5)	60%	(3)	NS
	\$6-10,000:	38% (8)	75%	(6)	
	\$11-25,000:	38% (8)	75%	(6)	
Placement Offense:	Persons	9% (4)	50%	(2)	NS
	Property	33% (14)	71%	(10)	
	Victimless	7% (3)	67%	(2)	
	Technical	26% (11)	91%	(10)	
	Status	26% (11)	64%	(7)	
Previous Referrals:	0-3	51% (23)	78%	(18)	NS
	4-9+	49% (22)	64%	(14)	

Total Success: 72%

\* Chi Square tests of the differences were computed, but all were non-significant.  
 \*\* The N for each item varies, due to missing data, from 21 to 46 cases.

Table 9. In-Program Experience and Change Measures: Relationship to Post-Program Success\* for Non-Transferred Youths (N = 46)

		Total: 72% successful				
				% of Total**	% Successful*	
Length of Stay In Family Group Home	0-2 months	44%	(20)	75%	(15)	NS
	3-4 months	31%	(14)	64%	(9)	
	5-13 months	24%	(11)	82%	(9)	
Change in Behavior Index	Negative change	3%	(1)	--	(0)	NS
	No change	59%	(20)	70%	(14)	
	Positive change	38%	(13)	92%	(12)	
Change in Child's Self-Concept	Negative change	--	(0)	--	(0)	NS
	No change	67%	(16)	75%	(12)	
	Positive change	33%	(8)	75%	(6)	
Change in Child's Ability to Relate to Peers	Negative change	5%	(2)	50%	(1)	NS
	No change	49%	(19)	84%	(16)	
	Positive change	46%	(18)	61%	(11)	
Frequency of Parent Visits to Family Group Home	Less than 1 per month (includes never)	50%	(18)	67%	(12)	NS
	1 or more per month	50%	(18)	83%	(15)	
Child's Readjustment to Family Group Home After Home Visits	Negative	31%	(9)	67%	(6)	NS
	Positive	69%	(20)	85%	(17)	
Frequency of Group Therapy in Family Group Home	None	30%	(14)	71%	(10)	NS
	1 or less per week	33%	(15)	67%	(10)	
	More than 1 per week	37%	(17)	77%	(13)	
Frequency of Individual Counseling in Family Group Home	None	19%	(9)	67%	(6)	NS
	1 or less per week	46%	(21)	76%	(16)	
	More than 1 per week	35%	(16)	69%	(11)	

\* Cell sizes were generally too small for statistical tests to be appropriate; therefore, all items are labeled not significant (NS) to make the point that no conclusions should be based on these slight differences.

\*\* The N for each item varies, due to missing data, from 24 to 46 cases.

## Summary and Conclusions

This is the fourth annual evaluation of the Family Group Home Program, and the second study since the program began to serve as a commitment resource to the Youth Services system. Given the recent shift in nature of the program, from 100% non-committed (1972-73) to 49% committed during 1974-75 and 85% committed during 1975-76, comparisons between the current data and those on committed youth from the previous year are crucial. They serve to allow contrast between how the program operated during its transition year and how it functions as a "mature" commitment program. The 1975-76 study was also the first to use a sample (1 out of every 3 exits), rather than the total population, as its data base. Since this procedure yielded 190 cases, the number was more than sufficient for valid analysis.

The profile of the 1975-76 sample varied significantly from that of 1974-75 only in having a smaller proportion of females, and considerably fewer youngsters whose placement charge was a status offense. While the latter difference was due largely to a legislative change, its impact was to weight the current FGH sample with youths charged with more serious offenses.

As in the previous study, FGH children were found to have poor school records in terms of attendance, behavior and academic performance, and to improve somewhat on all of these measures during their stay. Notably, the 1975-76 sample displayed significantly more serious behavior and attendance problems at both entry and exit than did the 1974-75 population; also, fewer improvements in school measures were statistically significant for this current group. Still the program produced favorable outcomes with this more difficult group of youngsters.

Measures of behavior problems outside the realm of school also found the 1975-76 youths to have significantly more serious problem patterns than the earlier group, although major reductions were achieved during the program stay on all measures except running away.

Small gains were made for FGH children on measures of interpersonal adjustment: ability to relate to peers; relationships to the Group Home Parents; and self-concept. Direct comparisons to the previous year's data were not possible, although this positive direction of change was similar in both samples.

Information on the parents of FGH children was more extensive in the current study. As was previously found, the indication is that these families are less than optimally involved with, and concerned about their children, with the implication that these poor relationships, and consequent lack of strong positive role models, are an important factor in the children's delinquent behavior. The majority of parents do seem to accept the FGH placement and see its effect as positive, even though their involvement in the treatment process is often more minimal than the program would desire.

FGH children were found to become significantly more positive from entry to exit in their expressed attitudes about the program. And, the 1975-76 sample had significantly more positive feelings at exit, as well as a higher post-program success rate, than did the 1974-75 group.

Counseling, both individual and in group sessions, was central to the more structured aspect of the treatment offered by the FGH Program, although the frequency of both types was reported to be lower in the 1975-76 data than in the previous year. Since the post-program success rate was higher for the later year, this does not appear to be a loss.

At the time of their exit from the Family Group Home, the 1975-76 sample was assessed as roughly one-third successful, one-third less-than-successful, and one-third failures, based on the circumstances of exit and subsequent placement. The 1974-75 committed population had an essentially similar distribution. Average lengths of stay in the program were likewise similar for the two years, 3 months for the 1975-76 group and 3.3 months for the 1974-75 group. In both studies, most in-program failures and non-successes left early (in the first two months) and 5-6 and 3-4 month stays, respectively, produced the highest proportions of successful program completion.

Post-program outcome (success vs. recidivism) is the major measure utilized by juvenile justice program evaluations for an overall assessment of program effectiveness. The FGH Program not only shone on this measure but slightly outdid its previous year's performance. The 72% success rate (and reciprocally, 28% recidivism), based on a short follow-up time of only 10-16 months, however, is not significantly different from the 55% success of the 1974-75 sample. Still, with indications that the later sample was more seriously delinquent (in terms of offense) and more difficult in terms of behavior problems, as well as having fewer females and not being significantly older (both females and older youth tend to have higher success rates), this comparison speaks well for the program.

It would appear that FGH's provide a relatively inexpensive and effective way to deal with quite a wide range of committed delinquent children, in small, humane, non-institutional, community settings. The sample sizes and follow-up times of the children from this program still restrict the comparability of FGH results with those from other studies. Still, the economic and humanitarian aspects of this program, combined with the preliminary evidence of effectiveness, substantiate the judgment that the Family Group Home Program has made the transition to being a key commitment resource.

Based on the findings of this study, one recommendation as to program and data management is tendered, regarding the status of participating youths and the paperwork of processing their cases. It would appear that many committed children leave FGH's still on committed status and yet are not transferred to any other commitment program. They simply go home, or to some other placement or program where the continuation of Youth Services commitment status has no real meaning. It is recommended that, if no further Youth Services program involvement is to ensue immediately, children exiting a Family Group Home should be furloughed to aftercare.

APPENDIX A  
EVALUATION FORMS

# ENTRY FORM FOR FAMILY GROUP HOMES

Instructions: Write the number of the appropriate response in the blank (s) to the left of the question number.

1) GH Parents Name \_\_\_\_\_

2) Location of GH \_\_\_\_\_

3) Counselor \_\_\_\_\_

4) Child's name \_\_\_\_\_

last			first			(middle initial)
<input type="text"/>						

5) YS number \_\_\_\_\_

6) Date of Birth \_\_\_\_\_  
mo. day year

7) Race: 1. Black  
2. White  
3. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8) Sex: 1. Female  
2. Male

9) Child's Home Living Arrangement:  
1. Both natural parents  
2. Mother only  
3. Mother and Stepfather  
4. Father only  
5. Father and Stepmother  
6. Other relative  
7. Non related person  
8. Institution (orphanage)  
9. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

10) Number of siblings child has (Include step and/or half-brothers/sisters) living at home: \_\_\_\_\_

11) Child's home is in what kind of area:  
1. rural  
2. small town  
3. suburban  
4. urban

12) How many miles is child's home from Family Group Home? \_\_\_\_\_

13) Yearly family income in thousands of dollars. (Estimate if you have some idea of the amount; write in '99' if you have no information on which to base an estimate.) \_\_\_\_\_

14) Source(s) of family income. (Indicate more than one, if applicable.)  
1. Work of father/stepfather  
2. Work of mother/stepmother  
3. Work of both father and mother  
4. Child support and/or alimony from divorced parent  
5. Public assistance (AFDC, AABD)  
6. Social Security  
7. Retirement income  
8. Other (specify)  
9. No information

### YS DATA

15) Date child arrived at Family Group Home: \_\_\_\_\_  
mo. day year

16) Child's status at time of entry to FGH:  
1. Consent supervision  
2. Probation  
3. Aftercare  
4. Committed Delinquent  
5. Adjudicated dependent

17) Where child came from (exclude Detention; code last residence prior to FGH)  
1. Own home (with parents or guardian)  
2. Home of relative  
3. Foster home, volunteer placement, etc.  
4. Training School: transferred-still committed  
5. Training School: furloughed  
6. Group Treatment: transferred-still committed  
7. Group Treatment: furloughed  
8. From another Family Group Home (Name of GH parents)  
9. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

# ENTRY FORM FOR FAMILY GROUP HOMES

18) Indicate the nature of the offenses which led to the child's placement in the FGH (or to incarceration if child is on Aftercare in FGH). What was the date of the petition? \_\_\_\_\_

19) How many previous referrals to YS had the child had? (Do not include one(s) listed above as leading the FGH placement.)

a) How many of these were for status offenses (runaway truant, or ungovernability) ?  
b) How many of these were for delinquent offenses ?

20) Has the child been committed to YS prior to this placement?  
1. yes  
2. no

21) Has child been on YS probation prior to this placement?  
1. yes  
2. no

22) Has child been adjudicated for a status offense prior to this?  
1. yes  
2. no

### SCHOOL, WORK, AND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Did child have any of the following school problems in the year prior to entering the FGH?  
1. yes  
2. no  
3. Not applicable: not in school previous year

23) Behavior problems (disrupt classes, create disturbances on school grounds, disobey rules)  
24) Truancy (skipping days or individual classes)  
25) Suspended from school  
26) Employment status at time of entering FGH:  
1. not employed  
2. employed: full-time (job: \_\_\_\_\_)  
3. employed: part-time (job: \_\_\_\_\_)

27) School status at time of entering FGH:  
1. In school, or will enter soon after entering FGH  
2. School not in session, but child will enroll for next session  
3. Has dropped out  
4. Other (please explain) \_\_\_\_\_

28) Has child ever failed a grade?  
0. Never failed  
If yes, indicate which grade was failed: 1-12.

### IF CHILD IS NOT IN SCHOOL NOW (OR SOON) SKIP TO ITEM 33

29) What grade is child in?  
30) Reading level:  
1. Below average for age  
2. Above average for age  
3. Average for age

31) Overall academic rating (your estimate-based on grades, etc.)  
1. Below average for age  
2. Average for age  
3. Above average for age





27) How well does the child seem to relate to the FGH parents?

- |               |   |   |         |   |   |               |
|---------------|---|---|---------|---|---|---------------|
| 1             | 2 | 3 | 4       | 5 | 6 | 7             |
| very negative |   |   | neutral |   |   | very positive |

PARENTS AND CHILD

28) How often did the child's parents come to visit her/him at the FGH?

- 0. never
- 1. once or more a week
- 2. two-three times a month
- 3. monthly
- 4. once in two-three months
- 5. less than one visit per three months

29) How many times did the child go home for a visit while at the FGH? Code '0' for never.

30) How did the child readjust to the FGH when returning from home visits; were the results of these visits positive or negative in terms of the child's behavior and attitude in the FGH?

- 0. not applicable; no home visits
- 1. home visits had a very negative effect
- 2. home visits had somewhat negative effect
- 3. home visits had a somewhat positive effect
- 4. home visits had a very positive effect

31) Overall, how cooperative were the child's own parents with the FGH program?

- 1. very cooperative
- 2. fairly cooperative
- 3. not very cooperative
- 4. very uncooperative
- 5. not applicable; parents dead or not involved with child at all

a. Did they attend parent's meetings

- 1. no
- 2. yes but infrequently
- 3. yes, fairly often
- 8. not applicable; parents dead or not involved w/child at all
- 9. not applicable; parent's meetings not used

b. Did they accept family counseling from you as FGH counselor?

- 1. no
- 2. yes, but limited involvement
- 3. yes, worked positively with counselor
- 8. not applicable; parents dead or not involved w/child at all
- 9. not applicable; family counseling not used

c. Did they talk with FGH parents to try and learn how to deal with their child better?

- 1. yes, to limited extent
- 2. yes, actually tried to learn from them
- 3. no; no contact
- 4. no; some contact but it was negative (critical and/or disruptive); not trying to learn from them
- 8. not applicable; parents dead or not involved w/child at all

If we define a good parent child relationship as entailing mutual communication, concern and affection, rate this child's relationship with each of his/her parents (or parent figure) AT TIME OF EXIT according to the following scale:

- 1. very good
- 2. fairly good
- 3. fairly poor
- 4. very poor

32) Mother/Step-mother/\_\_\_\_\_ (Indicate appropriate one and rate.)

33) Father/Step father/\_\_\_\_\_ (Indicate appropriate one and rate.)

34) What feelings did this child express about her/his stay in the FGH, at the time of exit?

- 1. very positive
- 2. somewhat positive
- 3. somewhat negative
- 4. very negative

35) What is the general evaluation of the child's parents as to the affect of the stay at the FGH on their child's behavior, attitudes, problems, etc.?

- 1. very positive
- 2. somewhat positive
- 3. somewhat negative
- 4. very negative

REPORT ON TREATMENT

36) How frequently were you in contact with this child's parents during her/his stay in the FGH? (Count phone calls as well as personal visits).

- 1. once or more a week
- 2. two-three times a month
- 3. once a month
- 4. less than once a month
- 5. never
- 8. not applicable; parents dead or not involved with child at all

37) How many times did you contact the referring counselor about this child or her/his parents during the child's FGH stay?

- 0. never
- 1-8. record actual number of contacts up to 8; record 8 for any number larger than that
- 9. not applicable; child was on counselor's own caseload prior to FGH placement

38) On the average, how many group therapy sessions\* was this child involved in, PER MONTH, during her/his stay in the FGH? (\*problem-oriented discussions-not just casual "rap-session".)

- 0. none (explain why) \_\_\_\_\_
- 1-8. record average number of session per month up to 8; record 8 for any number larger than that

39) On the average how many individual counseling sessions\* did you have with child, PER MONTH, during her/his stay? (\*relationship-and/or problem-oriented discussions, generally goal-oriented-not just casual comments or conversation)

- 0. none
- 1-8. record average number of sessions up to 8; record 8 for any number larger than that

40) Did you ever refer or take this child to some source outside YS for additional counseling, testing, psychological evaluation or help, etc., during her/his stay in the FGH? If 'yes', where?

- 1. no
- 2. yes, community mental health center
- 3. yes, school guidance counselor
- 4. yes, other school official
- 5. yes, drug clinic or program
- 6. yes, private psychologist, psychiatrist, etc.
- 7. yes, other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

# SHORT EXIT FORM FOR FAMILY GROUP HOMES TO USE FOR CHILDREN WHO STAY 30 DAYS OR LESS

- 1) GH PARENTS NAME \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) LOCATION OF GH \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) COUNSELOR \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTION: Write the number of the appropriate response in the blank (s) to the left of the question number.

4) Child's name \_\_\_\_\_  
                                     LAST NAME                                      FIRST                                      MIDDLE INITIAL

5) YS number

6) Date of exit from FGH \_\_\_\_\_  
                                     mo.                      day                      year

- 7) Circumstances of exit:
- 1) Successfully completed program; counselor and GH parents think child ready to return home
  - 2) Adjustment problem in FGH. (Explain who initiated the move, who problem was with, etc.) Could additional information at referral have avoided this problem? If so, what?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) New offense charged (specify), \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) Runaway
  - 5) Home terminated
  - 6) Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- 8) Where child went upon leaving FGH:
- 1) Own home (with parent, guardian, etc.)
  - 2) Home of relative
  - 3) Foster home, volunteer placement, etc.
  - 4) To Job Corp., Armed Services, etc. (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5) To a non-YS program (e.g. drug program, etc.) (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
  - 6) To another FGH: (name of GH parents \_\_\_\_\_)
  - 7) Group Treatment facility
  - 8) Training School
  - 9) Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- 9) YS status at exit:
- 1) Consent supervision
  - 2) Probation
  - 3) Aftercare
  - 4) Committed
  - 5) In custody of adult legal system: jail, probation or corrections
  - 6) Dependent

- 10) Did child have any new offenses while in the GH?
- 1) yes            If 'yes' list new charges and give date(s)
  - 2) no            and disposition \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## SCHOOL

- 11) Was child in school while in the FGH?
- 1) Yes
  - 2) no (If 'no', skip to item 15)

Estimate the number of occurrences of each of the following school problems during the child's stay in the FGH.

- 12) Behavior problems (disrupting classes, creating disturbances on school grounds, disobeying rules, etc.)
- 13) Truancy (skipping days OR individual classes)
- 14) Suspension from school.

## INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR AND ADJUSTMENT

Indicate the number of occurrences of each of the following five behaviors during the child's stay in the FGH. (Give only one figure for each, even if you must estimate.) Code 0 for none

- 15) Runaway (number of nights missed from program): \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) Use of alcohol
- 17) Use of drugs
- 18) Abusive actions toward others (fighting, starting arguments, etc.)
- 19) Destruction of property (own or others)
- 20) How well does the youngster seem to relate to the other youngsters at the time of exit? Choose a number on the scale below, where the numbers range from '1' (very negative; poor relationships) to '7' (very positive; good relationships). '4' is a neutral point.

----	--	--	0	+	++	+++
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very negative		neutral			very positive	

- 21) What is your evaluation of this child's self-concept at the time of exit? Choose a number on the scale below.

Positive: thinks of self as worthy, capable, likeable  
 Negative: thinks of self as unworthy, not capable, not liked

----	--	--	0	+	++	+++
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very negative		neutral			very positive	

- 22) How well does this child seem to relate to the Family Group Home Parents? Choose a number from the scale below.

----	--	--	0	+	++	+++
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very negative		neutral			very positive	

## PARENTS AND CHILD

- 23) What feelings did this child express about his/her stay in the FGH, at the time of exit?

1. very positive            3. somewhat negative  
 2. somewhat positive    4. very negative

- 24) What is the general evaluation of the child's parents as to the effect of the stay at the FGH on their child's behavior, attitudes, problems, etc?

1. very positive            3. somewhat negative  
 2. somewhat positive    4. very negative

## COUNSELOR CONTACTS

- 30) How many times did you (counselor) see this child in group sessions during his/her FGH stay?
- 31) How many times did you counsel this child individually during his/her FGH stay?
- 32) How many times did you have contact with this child's parents during his/her FGH stay? (Include contact by phone as well as in person.)

# FGH PARENT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS: Write the number of the appropriate response in the blank (s) to the left of the question number.

1) GH PARENTS NAME \_\_\_\_\_

2) LOCATION OF GH \_\_\_\_\_

3) COUNSELOR \_\_\_\_\_

4) CHILD'S NAME  
 LAST NAME \_\_\_\_\_ FIRST NAME \_\_\_\_\_ MIDDLE INITIAL \_\_\_\_\_

5) YS NUMBER 

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**INSTRUCTION:** On most of the questions that follow, we want your judgement of the child's feelings or behavior. To measure this we will use a scale from negative to positive. For each judgement, when you assign a number:

THE LOWER THE NUMBER, the more NEGATIVE the behavior or feeling  
 THE HIGHER THE NUMBER, the more POSITIVE the behavior or feeling  
 The number '4' represents a NEUTRAL evaluation--not really either positive or negative

6) How well did this child seem to relate to the other youngsters during his/her stay in the FGH?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	-	0	+	++	+++
very negative			neutral			very positive

7) How well did this child seem to relate to YOU as the GH Parents during his/her stay?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	-	0	+	++	+++
very negative			neutral			very positive

8) What is your evaluation of this child's self-concept now?

Positive: thinks of self as worthy, capable, likeable  
 Negative: thinks of self as unworthy, a failure, not liked

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	-	0	+	++	+++
very negative			neutral			very positive

We want to get an idea of some changes during this child's stay in the FGH. To measure this will ask you to make judgements about two points in time: when the child ENTERED the FGH and when she/he LEFT the FGH.

9) How would you rate this child's behavior when she/he first entered the FGH? (Write in a number from 1 to 7 to indicate how positive or negative the behavior was then.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	-	0	+	++	+++
very negative			neutral			very positive

10) How would you rate this child's behavior now--at the end of his/her stay at the FGH?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	-	0	+	++	+++
very negative			neutral			very positive

We also want to measure whether and how you think this child's relationship to his/her OWN PARENTS, or parent figure, changed while the child was in the FGH. Using the same type of scale, show your evaluation of the child's relationship to his/her own parents at the times of ENTERING and LEAVING the FGH?

11) How would you rate this child's relationship with his/her parents at the time of entering the FGH?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	-	0	+	++	+++
very negative			neutral			very positive

9  
parents  
dead or not  
involved  
with child.

12) How would you rate this child's relationship with his/her own parents at the time of leaving the FGH?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	-	0	+	++	+++
very negative			neutral			very positive

13) How much contact did you have with this child's own parents? Estimate the average number of HOURS you have spent talking with them PER MONTH.

14) What kind of contact or relationship have you had with this child's own parents?

1. They wanted to learn more about parenting and about their child from you.
2. They were not unfriendly, but did not seem to want to discuss problems of parenting or the child with you.
3. They were argumentative and critical about the way you deal with the child; not willing to really listen and discuss.
4. They did not talk much to you directly, but seemed to try and undermine your effect with the child.
5. They were disruptive. (e.g., came to GH drunk, tried to take child away, etc.)
6. Other (specify)

APPENDIX B: OFFENSE CODES

Offenses against persons:

1. Murder
2. Manslaughter
3. Sexual Battery
4. Armed Robbery
5. Other Robbery
6. Aggravated Assault
7. Assault (except aggravated)

Offenses against property:

8. Arson
9. Burglary (and Breaking and Entering)
10. Grand Larceny (except Auto)
11. Auto Theft
12. Receiving Stolen Property
13. Other Felony
14. Unauthorized Use of Motor Vehicle
15. Petit Larceny (except Shoplifting)
16. Shoplifting

Victimless Offenses:

17. Concealed Firearm
18. Narcotic Drug Law Violation
19. Marijuana Offense
20. Alcoholic Beverage Possession
21. Other Drug Law Violation
22. Concealed Weapon (except firearm)
23. Criminal Mischief (Vandalism)
24. Trespassing
25. Prostitution
26. Misdemeanor Sex Offense
27. Disorderly Intoxication
28. Loitering and Prowling
29. Traffic (delinquency)
30. Other Misdemeanor

Technical Violations:

31. Violation of Probation (technical)
32. Violation of Aftercare (technical)
33. Violation of Court Order (technical)

CINS (Child in Need of Supervision) Offenses:

34. Runaway
35. Truancy
36. Incurrigible, Beyond Control
37. CINS (unspecified)



**END**