



Challenge Activities Program Areas



Challenge to the States

The 1992 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 added Part E, State Challenge Activities, to the programs funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The purpose of Part E is to provide initiatives for States participating in the Formula Grants Program to develop, adopt, and improve policies and programs in 1 or more of 10 specified Challenge areas.

Challenge Activity C

Increasing community-based alternatives to incarceration by establishing programs (such as expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, and electronic monitoring) and developing and adopting a set of objective criteria for the appropriate placement of juveniles in detention and secure confinement.

Background

A basic tenet of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended, is the development of community-based alternatives to incarceration in lieu of large congregate institutions. The Act states that “it is the declared policy of Congress to provide the necessary resources, leadership, and coordination . . . to develop and conduct effective programs to prevent delinquency, to divert juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system, and to provide critically needed alternatives to institutionalization” (42 U.S.C. 5602, sec. 102 (b)(2)).

The Act defines a community-based facility, program, or service as “a small, open group home or other suitable place located near the juvenile’s home or family and programs of community supervision and service which maintain community and consumer participation in the planning, operation, and evaluation of their program which may include, but not be

limited to, medical, educational, vocational, social, and psychological guidance, training, special education, counseling, alcohol treatment, and other rehabilitative services” (42 U.S.C. 5603, sec. 103 (1)).

The national reliance on large congregate institutions for juveniles should be replaced, at least in part, by a system of community-based programs and services that provides a flexible continuum of responses to meet the individual needs and risks of juvenile offenders. Section 223 (12)(A) requires the deinstitutionalization of status and nonstatus offenders; section 223 (12)(B) urges the use of the least restrictive community-based alternatives appropriate to the needs of the child and community; and section 223 (14) requires the removal of juveniles from adult jails and backups. Congress has also required in Section 223 (23) that States reduce disproportionate confinement of minority youth in secure facilities.

These requirements challenge States and local jurisdictions to provide a comprehensive system of community-based programs and services for juvenile offenders while protecting the public and the integrity of the court process. The 1992 amendments to the JJDP Act strengthened this purpose by establishing Part E State Challenge Activity to provide grants to States to increase community-based alternatives to incarceration and to develop and adopt objective criteria for the appropriate placement of juveniles in detention and secure confinement (42 U.S.C. 5667c., sec. 285 (b)(2)(c)).



Congressional interest in community-based alternatives to incarceration is reflected in the national standards and practices of many professional organizations, including the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, American Bar Association, American Correctional Association, National Association of Counties, National Juvenile Detention Association, National Association of State Juvenile Correctional Administrators, National Conference of State Legislatures, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, among others, championed a “balanced approach” to juvenile justice. The Council recommended a community-based approach to youth crime and a juvenile justice system that emphasizes offender accountability, community protection, and enhanced competency of the youthful offender.

Community-based alternatives to incarceration are better than secure confinement for several reasons. First, juveniles suffer from an inordinately high risk of self-destruction and physical and sexual abuse in secure confinement, particularly in facilities that also confine adult offenders. While secure confinement may be required for serious juvenile offenders, it has inappropriately become the prevailing sanction for many youth who present no danger to the community or the court process. Second, the capacity for secure confinement is finite. Each new bed can cost \$50,000 to \$200,000 to build.¹ Third, confining juveniles in secure facilities is costly. In 1986, the 50 States spent almost \$1.5 billion to operate secure juvenile facilities, with annual per capita costs ranging from \$23,000 to \$45,300.² Fourth, studies of State training schools and local detention centers have shown that more than half of the juveniles in such facilities do not need to be there. For example, a 1987 study found that less than 40 percent of the youth in Florida’s institutions qualified for training school placement; 50 percent of the juveniles in the California Youth Authority system could have been diverted if community-based alternatives had been available; and 65 percent of the residents of Delaware’s only training school were found to pose little or no risk to the community.³

Central to the successful implementation of this State Challenge Activity will be: (1) local implementation within a statewide framework; (2) a representative planning process; (3) a specific and objective criteria for placement related to the needs and risk of each youth; and (4) a flexible continuum of programs and services that provides effective options for each youth coming into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Local Implementation Within a Statewide Framework

To provide community-based alternatives to incarceration, local programs and services must be organized in a flexible continuum that provides local practitioners with a menu of options that meets the needs of each youth who comes into contact with the juvenile justice system. This requires State and local

action on several fronts. The State must provide a legislative framework for the provision of community-based services and high-quality care and custody; objective and specific criteria for placement in the continuum; a process for the efficient delivery of services; training to avoid local duplication; and, in some cases, funding support to ensure comprehensive coverage in all counties.

For example, in 1983 Illinois legislation established a statewide public/private partnership that authorized the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) to set standards, administer funds, and provide guidance to local crisis units to operate community-based programs throughout the State. The local crisis unit assists youth who are status offenders, delinquents, teen parents, substance abusers, and victims of emotional and behavioral disorders.⁴

The program emphasizes the formation of partnerships among agencies involved in youth services to provide more extensive services than one agency could provide alone. Interagency network panels meet on a regular basis to share program information, establish linkages, and staff cases as needed. The program also relies on volunteers from the community who provide administrative support to the agency or work directly with youth as advocates or tutors. The program also offers services for pregnant youth and teen parents; services for delinquent youth; community development programs in high-risk, low-income areas; and followup and advocacy services that include long-term counseling designed to reunify and preserve families.

Representative Planning Process

Because the juvenile justice system is so complex, local officials must make hard choices about juvenile justice programs in their communities. Limited resources, conflicting placement philosophies, residential facility overcrowding, and a lack of viable alternatives to incarceration all contribute to the difficulties decisionmakers face. A representative planning process will make the decisionmaking process manageable and help avoid costly planning mistakes. It can be adapted to almost any situation, whether the task is planning for a statewide or regional network of alternative services or improving conditions of confinement in a local detention center. The method is also useful in evaluating programs after changes have been implemented.

A representative planning process reflects three basic principles.⁵ First, planners must be committed to the use of objective criteria. Accurate projections about the type and size of services should be made by first collecting accurate data about needs. Court officials often make detention decisions based on vague guidelines concerning the youth’s potential for reoffending if released. When the basis for a detention decision is poorly articulated, placement officials may be unable to justify their decisions. Illegal biases, such as the reputation of the family; the youth’s personal appearance; or his or her race, gender, or socioeconomic status in the community, might enter into the decisionmaking process. If detention criteria are based

on a measurable set of factors, they will provide an accurate information base from which to begin planning. Officials will also reach a consensus more quickly and understand the service needs of juveniles more clearly.

Both the American Bar Association Juvenile Justice Standards Project and the National Advisory Committee Report to the Administrator on Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice recommended that individual jurisdictions adopt specific and objective intake criteria in all facilities where youth may be detained.⁶ In addition, numerous demonstration projects and independent studies have recommended the use of detention criteria because of the economic benefits. Research also indicates that when intake workers base placement decisions on objective criteria, the need for secure detention drops substantially without compromising public safety or the integrity of the court process.⁷

Second, a representative planning process fosters a greater commitment to choosing the least restrictive placement for each youth. Until recently juvenile justice workers have operated on a one-facility-for-all basis (usually secure residential detention), where serious offenders, runaways, truants, and misdemeanants were placed in the same program, regardless of their needs. A range of service options, such as temporary shelter care, emergency foster care, and home detention programs, that do not demand an irreversible commitment from the offender increases program flexibility and enhances the ability of local officials to devise innovative solutions to problems and to respond to an individual's changing needs.⁸

A third principle of the representative planning process is that program planners should look at proposed services from the perspectives of both youth advocacy and administration. The JJDP Act requires that decisionmakers in the juvenile justice system consider juveniles' welfare and accountability and address effectiveness, cost efficiency, and community protection. Because the needs of juvenile offenders are different from those of adult offenders, the planning process must allow for the participation of concerned citizens, youth advocacy groups, and youth caught in the system, so that their interests are represented in plans for new programs and facilities.⁹

To ensure the incorporation of these principles into the planning process, planners should follow six steps:¹⁰

- Organize the plan by identifying the problems, establishing criteria, and gathering data.
- Assess the needs of the entire juvenile justice system and the juvenile offenders it serves.
- Obtain public input and support.
- Establish policy and develop plan.

- Implement the plan by developing programs, revising policy, and training staff.
- Monitor outcomes.

A Flexible Continuum of Community-Based Services

State and local efforts to deinstitutionalize status and nonstatus offenders, remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups, and address the disproportionate confinement of minority youth provide the criteria for developing and assessing the continuum of community-based alternatives to incarceration. The following eight criteria are essential in developing a successful continuum of community-based services to meet the individual needs of youth entering the juvenile justice system. These criteria are drawn from the experience of the Jail Removal Initiative, a project sponsored by OJJDP in 1980. Although the initiative did not address alternatives to State institutions, it did incorporate local policies and practices that now characterize successful community-based alternatives to predispositional and postdispositional incarceration.¹¹

1. Nonsecure Alternatives

A separate secure juvenile detention facility is inappropriate for many youth. Communities that recognize this and develop a network of alternatives to secure detention are better equipped to find alternatives to juvenile incarceration. In addition, sites with nonsecure alternatives are able to make better use of available resources and rely less on secure detention, which is two to three times more expensive than nonsecure alternatives.¹²

2. Access to Secure Juvenile Detention

It may be impossible to eliminate secure detention, but if adult jails and lockups are the only secure settings available, then jailings will most likely continue. Communities that cannot afford to build a secure facility can usually avoid incarcerating serious offenders by arranging purchase-of-care agreements with other counties. For many rural areas, purchase-of-care agreements are the most important components of their systems.

3. Specific and Objective Detention Criteria

At the heart of any plan to provide community-based alternatives to incarceration is a set of detention criteria that local officials have approved and adopted. These criteria should provide specific and objective guidelines for each placement referral. These guidelines should emphasize verifiable information such as offense and court history, so that each case is handled equitably, with only youth who require it placed in secure detention.

4. Around-the-Clock Intake

Centralized intake services must be available on a 24-hour basis and be staffed by trained personnel. For most communities 24-hour services can be provided economically through on-call staffing arrangements. Communities that are able to set up central intake units are more successful at placing juvenile offenders appropriately. Police can bring juveniles to the unit where intake staff make placement decisions according to specific and objective detention criteria. If intake staff fail to control these decisions, chances are greater that there will be a large number of unscreened jailings.

5. Commitment From the Community

Local officials need to make an active commitment to the goals of community-based alternatives to incarceration if the program is to succeed. Whenever youth are taken into custody, they come in contact with law enforcement officials, juvenile judges, probation officers, detention center directors, and intake personnel. Law enforcement participation is especially critical because it is the responsibility of the referring officer to notify intake personnel when a youth is taken into custody and may be placed in jail. Any breakdown in intake services increases the likelihood of juvenile incarceration.

6. Written Policies and Procedures

Carefully written policies and procedures do not prevent juvenile jailings, since formal guidelines can be ignored. But written policies and procedures represent a commitment to an efficient and consistent program that is effectively administered. Written guidelines also convey a commitment to a philosophy and articulate the program's methodology. With specific guidelines to follow, personnel can avoid problems that would otherwise arise.

7. An Effective Monitoring System

Removal strategies have to be modified periodically as problems occur and circumstances change. Communities that actively monitor their programs from the start can identify problem areas more quickly and adjust their policies on an as-needed basis, while sites without effective monitoring programs may realize they have problems after it is too late to solve them.

8. Local Sponsorship and Funding

Using local funds and personnel to administer community-based alternatives to incarceration ensures that those most directly affected by the program will understand and support it, which will contribute to the program's success. Local funding also increases the community's incentive to support the program and to provide seed money, without which the program could not begin. An overdependence on nonlocal funding may lead to the failure of the program.

While these elements are important factors in building a continuum of community-based alternatives to incarceration, the most significant is the development of a specific and objective set of criteria for placement.

The Essential Role of Specific and Objective Criteria for Placement

Expanding the use of alternatives to incarceration requires that key players in the juvenile justice system agree to a viable mix of programs. They must also agree on which juveniles are suited for which options, based on specific and objective placement criteria. All parts of the juvenile justice system must work together to produce the desired results.

The failure of the juvenile justice system to achieve these goals stems from three causes. First, key players in the justice system do not agree on which juvenile offenders are best suited for a particular placement option. Second, agency personnel do not understand how the various components of the system work and do not have adequate information about the juvenile offenders who go through the system. Third, agency personnel fail to communicate clearly with each other about organizational capabilities or about the limitations of specific programs and placement options.¹³

These problems can be corrected if key personnel in the juvenile justice system are willing to make fundamental changes in the way they do business. The Intermediate Sanctions Project of the National Institute of Corrections developed a process to address such problems:¹⁴

- Establish an organized work group of key players in the system who agree to communicate regularly about placement of juvenile offenders.
- Establish quality baseline information about how the system works, including structure, decision points, and authority and influence.
- Continually clarify goals and outcomes.
- Gather and analyze data on an ongoing basis to monitor and evaluate proposals and programs.
- Review the policies and practices of individual agencies to ensure that each is producing the desired outcomes.
- Change policy to guide the development and use of juvenile offender program options.

Specific and objective criteria are of two types: *pre-dispositional*, used to determine the juvenile offender's risk of re-offending and flight from the jurisdiction, and *post-dispositional*, used to determine the risk presented by the offender and his or her needs.

The use of predispositional criteria in the decisionmaking process ensures that the goals of public safety and timely court processing are met while maintaining the principle of least restrictive placement. In 1985 the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention established the following guidelines concerning eligibility for secure detention. Juveniles should not be securely detained unless they:¹⁵

- Are fugitives from another jurisdiction; or
- Request protection in writing in circumstances that present an immediate threat of serious physical injury; or
- Are charged with a crime of violence (criminal homicide, forcible rape, kidnaping, robbery, mayhem, aggravated assault, and extortion accompanied by threats of violence), which, if committed by an adult, would be a felony; or
- Are charged with a serious property crime or personal crime other than a crime of violence, which, if committed by an adult, would be a felony, and
- Are already detained or on conditioned release in connection with another delinquency proceeding; or
- Have a demonstrable recent record of willful failures to appear at family court proceedings; or
- Have a demonstrable recent record of violent conduct resulting in physical injury to others; or
- Have a demonstrable recent record of adjudications for serious property offenses.

The probation officer's professional judgment should play a role in deciding whether to detain a juvenile. Some youth who are "eligible" will not be referred to secure detention, while others "not eligible" may present an unforeseen risk or have an active warrant that may require their detention.

Jurisdictions that have implemented similar criteria have consistently reduced the number of admissions to secure detention without increasing the failure to appear or reoffense rates. Predispositional criteria should reflect community values and promote community protection, the integrity of the court process, and the principle of the least restrictive alternative.

The use of postdispositional criteria, on the other hand, combines objective risk assessment with an assessment of family and individual needs, which not only ensures public safety but assists in the development of flexible, individualized plans for supervision and treatment of each offender. Objective postdispositional criteria form the basis for an offender classification and case management system.

The system should provide a thorough assessment process that documents a youth's criminal history, current needs, and potential risk to the community. It should also offer a wide range of

service programs, ranging from secure institutional confinement to minimum community-based supervision. The goals of the assessment process are to minimize risk to the community, identify needs of youth, determine appropriate placement, assist in the development of a plan that offers a continuum of care, and link youth to needed services.

All elements of the process should be incorporated at an early stage:

- Scoring procedures should be simple to ensure proper completion of the scale.
- The classification rationale must be readily apparent and accepted by probation staff.
- The subjective judgments of the probation officer should, to some extent, be maintained.
- Periodic reassessments should be an integral part of the classification process.
- Classification should be incorporated into the agency's recordkeeping system. Automation will provide rapid access to information and ease the classification process.
- Representatives from each level of the organization should be involved in all aspects of the assessment process—from the design of the classification instruments through staff training. This fosters a sense of "ownership" of the process and prevents line staff from concluding that changes are only management's attempt to increase accountability.
- A variety of options within each supervision level should be developed. The service delivery system should offer options as diverse as its client population.
- A process for reassessment should be established for youth already in supervision programs. The progress of the youth, the program, and the classification system should constantly be reassessed.

Promising Approaches for Community-Based Alternatives to Incarceration

While programs will be as different as the youth they serve, a number of research studies and programs offer useful insights into increasing the number and success of community-based alternatives to incarceration. The RAND Corporation, in *One More Chance: The Pursuit of Promising Intervention Strategies for Chronic Juvenile Offenders*, identified seven elements that should be present in successful programs. The program must:¹⁶

- Provide opportunities for each youth to overcome adversity and experience success, thus encouraging a positive self-image.

- Facilitate bonds of affection and mutual respect between juveniles and their guardians, and promote involvement in conventional family and community activities.
- Provide frequent, timely, and accurate feedback for both positive and negative behavior.
- Reduce or eliminate negative role models and peer support for negative attitudes or behavior.
- Require juveniles to recognize and understand thought processes that rationalize negative behavior.
- Create opportunities for juveniles to discuss family matters and early experiences in a relaxed, nonjudgmental atmosphere.
- Vary the sequence and amount of exposure to program components to adapt to the needs and capabilities of each participating youth.

Community Research Associates, in their report *Assessment of Model Programs for Chronic Status Offenders and Their Families*, offer nine characteristics of effective community-based programming:¹⁷

- The program must foster bonding between youth and staff (e.g., teacher, counselor, volunteer).
- The program must recognize that, with this population, one must expect a reasonable degree of attrition.
- Administrators must be prepared to continue providing services until youth can function autonomously. (There should be no 2-week limit on stay.)
- The program must be well organized; have good working relationships with other sectors of the child welfare/juvenile justice community, schools, and other youth service agencies (i.e., be able to resolve turf battles); and be professional.
- The program must have good leadership.
- The program must show a willingness to deal with the entire spectrum of youth problems, stemming from health, family, and finances.

- The program must be committed to dealing with the youth's family when possible and appropriate.
- The program must be founded upon the philosophy that a community-based, noncoercive approach yields the best results.
- There must be a process for reacceptance into the program.

Program models for *alternatives to secure detention pending court disposition* include, but are not limited to: (1) summons or citation; (2) 24-hour intake services; (3) home detention; (4) emergency shelter care; (5) runaway programs; (6) hold-over facilities; and (7) staff secure facilities. Brief descriptions of these community-based alternatives are described in Chart 1.¹⁸

Postdispositional alternatives to incarceration include, but are not limited to: (1) intensive supervision programs; (2) electronic monitoring; (3) restitution and community service; (4) mediation; (5) mentors; (6) outreach and tracking; (7) community programming; and (8) group homes and therapeutic communities.

Conclusion

Developing and expanding community-based alternatives to incarceration is a challenging goal that many States and local jurisdictions may decide to adopt because of the staggering costs and litigious nature of building and maintaining secure detention facilities. The ingredients of successful programs include adopting a representative planning process to secure the support of the public and all levels of the juvenile justice system; developing a flexible continuum of community-based services; and establishing objective criteria for appropriately placing juveniles. There is a range of community-based services to choose from, depending on the jurisdiction's needs. States and local jurisdictions have successfully used intensive supervision programs, electronic monitoring, restitution, mediation, mentoring, and outreach and tracking, all of which offer new directions in community-based alternatives to juvenile incarceration.

Chart 1 – Pre-Dispositional Alternatives

Summons or Citations:

When the police arrest a youth, instead of taking him or her to detention, they may issue a ticket/summons/citation. The youth is released to his or her home and notified when and where to appear in court.

Program Emphasis:

Youth charged with offenses who, based on specific criteria, can be released with a summons to appear in court.

Suitable Location:

Any police department/juvenile court.

Program Characteristics:

- Simplifies and expedites court process.
- Eliminates the need for taking a youth into temporary custody.

Cost Factors:

Minimal administrative costs.

Twenty-four Hour Intake Services

Detentions and jailings can be reduced substantially through the availability of 24-hour detention intake screening services. At intake, fundamental decisions are made that may have profound consequences on youth and their communities.

Program Emphasis:

Capability to accept cases on a 24-hour basis from all sources feeding youth into juvenile justice system—police, courts, schools, families, individuals, child care agencies.

Suitable Location:

- Any juvenile court.
- Any county or city offices.

Program Characteristics:

- Provide immediate problem assessment and evaluation screening.
- Provide crisis intervention and counseling.
- Provide referrals to services or nonsecure alternatives.
- Make case-by-case release or detention decision.

Cost Factors:

- Staff training.
- Staff salary.

Detention intake services go hand-in hand with the use of objective release and detention criteria in determining who of the juveniles referred to court needs to be detained and who ought to be released or referred to nonsecure detention or to other services.

Home Detention

Home detention programs permit youth to reside in their homes pending their appearance in court. They meet with home detention caseworkers daily.

Project Emphasis:

Youth who can remain in their own or a surrogate home during the court process but who require some supervision or assistance in order to insure their court appearance.

Suitable Location:

Cities and counties of any size.

Program Characteristics:

- No facility.
- Short-term home crisis intervention.
- Added supervision for youth during the court process.
- Design of individualized programs during the court process.
- Limited caseloads, intensive contact.
- Provide courts with information.

Cost Factors:

- No capital investment.
- Staff salaries.
- Considerable less costly than residential detention.

Home detention programs can be run for less than \$15 per client per day. The annual budget can be as low as \$30,000 for an eight to ten client average daily population.

Chart 1 – Pre-Dispositional Alternatives (continued)

Emergency Shelter Services

Emergency shelter care services provide temporary residential placement for youth who do not require locked security but who are unable to stay in their homes or who do not have homes.

Project Emphasis:

Provide immediate shelter in a crisis for youths who need a place to stay—overnight or longer.

Suitable Location:

- Shelter homes
- Individual homes
- Group homes
- Runaway shelters

Program Characteristics:

- Utilize existing resources
- Focus on crisis resolution
- Personal attention to and close supervision of youth

Cost Factors:

- Administrative support costs and salaries.
- Ongoing training for volunteers or paid attendants.
- Private services may need facility purchase or lease.

As a residential program, annual costs are exceeded only by those for secure detention. Expect to pay \$80 to \$110 per day for full service shelters.

Staff Secure Facilities

Studies have shown that many youths currently detained do not require secure detention to protect the public as much as to ensure the youth appear in court or for his/her safety. For these large numbers of youths, staff secure facilities, rather than architecturally restrictive programs, may be more appropriate.

Program Emphasis

Youth who must be supervised to prevent them from running away, but who should not be placed in a secure detention facility.

Suitable Location

Rural or urban settings, In a rural area, it may be the primary custodial program, while in an urban jurisdiction it may be designed to complement a secure detention facility.

Program Characteristics

- Full time continuous staff supervision.
- Use of detention criteria to prevent overuse of program.
- High staff-to-resident ratios.
- All programming (e.g., education, recreation, etc.) provided onsite.

Costs

- Facility construction and maintenance.
- Staff salaries.
- Program services.

Costs for staff secure residential programming is very high compared to other alternatives. The actual cost of full-service, fully programmed detention can be as high as \$140 per youth per day.

Holdover Facilities

The problem of juveniles going to custody often results from a crisis situation and the need to maintain supervision over a young person for a short period of time. Holdover facilities are excellent options for immediate detention needs, particularly in rural areas, where few other options exist.

Program Emphasis:

Immediate crisis supervision of young people who cannot be safely released right away.

Suitable Location:

- Existing public buildings, such as police or sheriff's department, hospitals, community mental health centers, etc.
- Juvenile residential alternatives, such as shelter or group homes.
- Other usable space.

Program Characteristics:

Provide custody and individualized, intensive supervision for up to 24 hours.

Cost Factors:

- Staff training.
- Staff salaries paid on an as-used basis.
- Food services.

Costs for the part-time staff are usually about \$8 per hour of supervision, with the annual training budget (\$5,000 or more) factored on as well.

Recently, urban jurisdictions have been developing holdovers in police lockups, using cadets to provide supervision in a nonsecure program area.

Appendix: Descriptions of and Contacts for Promising Programs

The programs listed in this section contain one or more of the elements associated with effective graduated sanctions programs and have been judged to be effective by officials in the jurisdictions where they have been implemented.

However, these programs do not yet have evaluation results. Some of them are currently undergoing evaluations and more information on their effectiveness will soon be available. The following section contains brief descriptions of these promising programs and identifies the specific target population that each one serves.

Immediate Sanction

First Offenders Program

Target Population: First-time offenders

In this program first-time offenders and their parents attend a 7-week program that addresses family communication, peer pressure, the juvenile justice system, substance abuse, pregnancy prevention, AIDS education, and how to access other youth service support systems.

Contact: *Lydia Ashanin*
Communications Specialist
Youth Development, Inc.
66301 Central NW.
Albuquerque, NM 87105
(505) 831-6038

Y-Cap

Target Population: Juvenile offenders ages 9-16

This program provides intensive services and treatment to high-risk offenders and families referred by the school system and the juvenile court. The program includes group counseling, tutoring, parent skills, recreation, and a big brother program. Primary interventions include individual/family counseling, mentoring, and academic education.

Contact: *Mark Dickerson*
Family Intervention Coordinator
Y-CAP: Metro Juvenile Court
802 Second Avenue
Nashville, TN 37210
(615) 862-8068

Partners

Target Population: Delinquent and at-risk youth

This mentorship program matches adult volunteers with youth ages 8 to 18. The mentoring relationship promotes positive change by allowing youth to observe an alternative way of living. The program provides training, counseling, and support groups for youth and parents; recreational/educational activities; health and dental care; and community service projects.

Contact: *Tina Shaffer*
Marketing Coordinator
Partners
910 16th Street, Suite 426
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 595-4400

Peer Jury Program

Target Population: First-time, nonviolent offenders

This program is a joint community effort that seeks to foster change in the lives of young offenders by offering them the option of participating in community service. The program recognizes that community service provides an offender with appropriate role models for socially acceptable behavior and helps to prevent the youth from having a police record.

Contact: *Donald Cundriff*
Chief of Police
Police Department
1200 Gannon Drive
Hoffman Estates, IL 60194
(708) 882-1818

Earn-It

Target Population: Nonviolent, low-risk offenders

This sentencing alternative program arranges work opportunities for young offenders to enable them to pay for damages they have caused. Youth allocate two-thirds of their earnings to restitution and keep one-third as an incentive. The program has an 80 to 85 percent success rate for keeping youth out of court and from becoming repeat offenders.

Contact: *Judith Sadoski*
Earn-It Program Manager
City Hall
3 Washington Street
Keene, NH 03431
(603) 357-9811

PACE Center for Girls

Target Population: Delinquent and otherwise troubled girls ages 12–18

This program provides comprehensive education and treatment services, including individual and family counseling, accredited education, career planning, pregnancy prevention, cultural awareness, life skills, and volunteer opportunities.

Contact: *Gail Henson*
Program Development Manager
PACE Center for Girls
9250 Cypress Green Drive, Suite 106
Jacksonville, FL 32256
(904) 737–3275

Intermediate Sanction

Alternative Rehabilitation Communities (ARC), Inc., Day Treatment

Target Population: Adjudicated offenders ages 13–18

This treatment program is for serious and chronic juvenile offenders in need of supervision, counseling, and education. Youth receive services in a community-based setting as an alternative to placement in a remote facility.

Contact: *Daniel Elby*

Executive Director
Alternative Rehabilitation Communities, Inc.
2743 North Front Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110
(717) 238–7101

Pinnellas Marine Institute (PMI)

Target Population: Delinquents ages 15–18

This program provides treatment and aftercare services to youth adjudicated delinquent by juvenile courts. It focuses on individualized education and marine activities, such as scuba diving and sailing. A 12-week aftercare program is provided following completion of the 6-month PMI program.

Contact: *Bob Weaver*
President
Associated Marine Institutes
5915 Benjamin Center Drive
Tampa, FL 33634
(813) 887–3300

Adolescent Sex Offender Treatment Program

Target Population: Low-risk youth adjudicated for a sex offense

This program, an alternative to institutional treatment, provides assessment and treatment services to youth charged with sex-related offenses. It encourages offenders to accept responsibility for their actions and to acquire skills for healthier ways of coping with emotional needs. Primary interventions include group therapy, individual and family counseling, and skill development.

Contact: *Ginny Vanderzee*
Therapist
Adolescent Sex Offender Treatment Program
Kent County Juvenile Court
1501 Cedar Street NE.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
(616) 336–3700

Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP)

Target Population: Incarcerated youth returning to the community

This program targets a select group of juvenile offenders posing a minimal risk to the public. Applicants earn the privilege of entering and remaining in the program by continuous adherence to a series of short-term goals and to obligations, such as education, employment, and personal accountability.

Contact: *Philip Hill*
Director
Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program
Administrative Office of the Courts
CN–987
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 633–6547

New Start Program

Target Population: Chronic property offenders

During this 6-month program, residents spend the first 12 weeks at the Lloyd E. Rader Center, where they are assigned in groups of eight. There, physical training, recreational therapy, and communication activities build self-esteem. Group interactions provide real-life material for group counseling. The next 12 weeks of the program include closely supervised community tracking.

Contact: *Larry Dobbs*
Program Director
New Start Program
Lloyd Rader Center
Route 4, Box 9
Sand Springs, OK 74063
(918) 245–2541

Paint Creek Youth Center

Target Population: Serious felony offenders ages 15–18

This program draws on such treatment philosophies as positive peer culture, reality therapy, and critical thinking processes. By adhering to well-defined behavior goals, residents move through successive phases characterized by increased privileges and responsibilities. Security is achieved through structure and constant staff presence.

Contact: Elizabeth Baldwin
Ohio DYS
51 North High Street
Columbus, OH 43266
(614) 466-4314

Bibliography

- Armstrong, T.L. (ed.). 1994. *Intensive Interventions with High-Risk Youths: Promising Approaches in Juvenile Probation and Parole*. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Bureau of Justice Assistance. 1988 (June). "Restitution by Juveniles: Information and Operating Guide for Restitution Programs." *Program Brief*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Butts, J.A., and H.N. Snyder. 1992 (September). "Restitution and Juvenile Recidivism." *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, p. 4.
- Community Research Associates. 1987 (April). *Assessment of Model Programs for Chronic Status Offenders and Their Families*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Community Research Associates. N.d. *Total Systems Planning: A Process for Solving Detention System Problems*. Champaign, Illinois.
- Freed, D.J., and T.P. Terrell. 1980. *Standards Relating To Interim Status: The Release, Control, and Detention of Accused Juvenile Offenders Between Arrest and Disposition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Greenwood, P., and F. Zimring. 1985. *One More Chance: The Pursuit of Promising Intervention Strategies For Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Krisberg, B., D. Neuenfeldt, and A. Bakke. 1991 (February). "Juvenile Intensive Supervision Programs: The State of the Art." *NCCD Focus*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- McGary, P., and M.M. Carter. 1993. *The Intermediate Sanctions Handbook: Experiences and Tools for Policymakers*. Washington, D.C.: State Justice Institute, National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice.
- National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1980 (July). *Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. 1989 (June). "Juvenile Justice Reform: State Experiences." *Criminal Justice Paper #4*. Denver, Colorado: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Schneider, A.L. 1986. "Restitution and Recidivism Rates of Juvenile Offenders: Results from Four Experimental Studies." *Criminology* 224, pp. 533–522.
- Smith, M. 1991 (Spring/Summer). "Mediation and the Juvenile Offender." *Update on Law-Related Education*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: New Mexico Center for Dispute Resolution.
- Vaughn, J.B. 1989. "A Survey of Juvenile Electronic Monitoring and Home Confinement Programs." *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* 40(4), p. 33.

Endnotes

¹ Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. 1983. Community Youth Services State Plan. Springfield, Illinois, p. 1.

² Community Research Associates. 1984 (September). *National Jail Removal Initiative: Summary of Findings*. Champaign, Illinois, p. 24–33.

³ *Ibid*, p. 28.

⁴ National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1980 (July). *Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, p. 297.

⁵ National Coalition on Jail Reform. 1983.

⁶ Freed, D.J., and T.P. Terrell. 1980. *Standards Relating to Interim Status: The Release, Control, and Detention of Accused Juvenile Offenders Between Arrest and Detention*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, p. 10. See also: National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1980 (July). *Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, p. 521.

⁷ Community Research Associates, *Total Systems Planning*, pp. 1–2.

⁸ *Ibid*, p. 2.

⁹ *Ibid*.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 3–9.

¹¹ Community Research Associates. 1984 (September). *National Jail Removal Initiative: Summary of Findings*. Champaign, Illinois, pp. 24–33.

¹² *Ibid*, p. 28.

¹³ McGary, P., and M.M. Carter. 1993. *The Intermediate Sanctions Handbook: Experiences and Tools for Policymakers*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, and the State Justice Institute, pp. 4–11.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 12–13.

¹⁵ National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1980 (July). *Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, p. 297.

¹⁶ Greenwood, P.W., and F.E. Zimring. 1985 (May). *One More Chance: The Pursuit of Promising Intervention Strategies for Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation, pp. ix–x.

¹⁷ Community Research Associates. 1987 (April). *Assessment of Model Programs for Chronic Status Offenders and Their Families*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.

¹⁸ National Coalition on Jail Reform. 1983. *Juveniles and Jail: The Wrong Combination*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention acknowledges the outstanding contribution made by, Mr. James Brown, Director, Community Research Associates, Inc., and Mr. James Shine, independent consultant, in the development of this paper.

This document was prepared under contract number OJP-94-C-004 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of OJJDP or the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.