

JUVENILE GROUP HOMES
IN
THE CITY OF NORFOLK, VIRGINIA

A State Report



College of William and Mary

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

54077

READING ROOM

JUVENILE GROUP HOMES
IN
THE CITY OF NORFOLK, VIRGINIA

A Status Report

Prepared by

The College of William and Mary
Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center
Pilot City Program

February 15, 1974

The Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center operates the Pilot City program in Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Virginia Beach, Virginia. Established in September, 1971, the Center is a research and program planning and development component of the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia. The Center's Pilot City program is one of eight throughout the nation funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U. S. Department of Justice. The basic purpose of each Pilot City project is to assist local jurisdictions in the design and establishment of various programs, often highly innovative and experimental in nature, which will contribute over a period of years to the development of a model criminal justice system. Each Pilot City team is also responsible for assuring comprehensive evaluation of such programs, for assisting the development of improved criminal justice planning ability within the host jurisdictions, and for providing technical assistance to various local agencies when requested.

73-EO-03-0002

The Pilot City Program of the Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center is funded under Grant No. 73-NI-03-0002 of the National Institute on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Financial support by NILE and CJ does not necessarily indicate the concurrence of the Institute in the statements or conclusions contained in this publication.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

On July 31, 1973, the City of Norfolk, Virginia, requested the Pilot City Program of the College of William and Mary's Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center to evaluate the City's need for additional juvenile group homes at the present time and through 1980. This report is submitted in response to that request.

The preparation of this report included the following steps:

1. A review of the available literature on the planning, operation, and evaluation of group homes throughout the nation;
2. Inspection of the one juvenile group probation home currently operating in the City on a number of occasions;
3. Structured interviews with City, regional, and State personnel connected with the development or operation of juvenile group probation homes;
4. Analysis of statistical data provided by the Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court and the State Department of Welfare and Institutions; and,
5. Distribution of a preliminary draft of this report for review and comment by the personnel referred to in paragraph three, supra, and other concerned officials.

This procedure was adopted in order to provide a range of viewpoints--City, regional, State, national, judicial, social services, planning, administrative, statistical--which the City might want to consider, to synthesize data which the City might want to utilize, and to identify issues which the City may want to address in its planning, policy development, and decision-making regarding group homes between the present and 1980.

Effecting this purpose has been complicated by two factors. First, relevant and currently available data is not as complete as desirable. Data on the same topics provided by the Juvenile Court and by the Department of Welfare and Institutions do not always correspond exactly; these discrepancies, however, do not appear to affect any of the basic findings or trends identified in this report. More seriously, data on rates of recidivism of juvenile offenders either in general terms or by type of child, type of offense, previous record, home situation, or juvenile court disposition is not yet available.*

The second and even more fundamental factor complicating the preparation of this report is the lack of any definite consensus or precise policy which the authors of this report could identify among various officials regarding what purpose or what types of children group homes in this City are intended to serve.

These two factors, together with the policy of the Pilot City Program--a research, planning, and technical assistance organization--not to affect the decision-making of City officials by recommending one policy over another, have determined the form and the content of the "Conclusions and Policy Issues" section of this report. That section briefly states the factual conclusions which can be reliably drawn from the data presented at

* The Pilot City Program has collected and is currently analyzing recidivism data covering the past eight years. This report will be completed in the Spring of 1974.

greater length in the body of the report and identifies areas for which data is not available. Then, instead of proceeding to make recommendations (which inevitably entail assumptions and value judgements which are not properly the province of Pilot City Program staff members), the report sets out a range of alternatives from which the City might choose, together with the assumptions underlying each of those alternatives and the likely resource requirements of each alternative. Thus, this report does not attempt to resolve or suggest the resolution of policy issues which are properly the province of City officials. Instead, this report attempts to provide as complete data as possible and to identify underlying assumptions and issues which must play a large role in the ultimate decisions which the City makes.

II. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY ISSUES

1. Experience with group homes in other jurisdictions which has been reported in the professional literature tentatively indicates that these facilities are much less disruptive of family and community ties, no less effective, and no more and often less expensive than commitment of children to large institutions. Unfortunately, evaluation of the effectiveness or the cost-effectiveness of residential group home programs for juvenile offenders has not been methodologically adequate. The City Council may want to consider, therefore, whether the City's group homes for juvenile offenders should be subjected to comprehensive, independent, long-term, reliable, and valid evaluation. This kind of comprehensive evaluation would be greatly facilitated by the new automated information management system but would nevertheless be demanding in terms of control groups, cost monitoring and specification, follow-up studies, etc. Such evaluation, if properly conducted, would be of national importance; thus, it should be possible to interest professional evaluators from Norfolk State University, Old Dominion University, or the College of William and Mary to conduct such an evaluation at little or no expense. (The Pilot City Program would be happy, of course, as part of its responsibilities to the City, to provide such an evaluation or to work with others on such an undertaking.)

2. Stanhope House, the current group home for boys, is located in a building constructed especially for use as a group home. The group home for girls will be located in a purchased facility. The City Council may wish to consider adopting a policy of only renting locations for any additional group home until such time as the relative capital and operating expense of renting, purchasing, or constructing group home facilities is determined and/or until evaluations, if conducted, indicate the degree of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of various group home sizes, organization, clientel, programs, and facilities.

3. If the City Council decides that group homes should house some or all children who would otherwise be committed to the State Department of Welfare and Institutions, it and the Juvenile Court may want to decide which of this group of children should be served in City residential group homes. For example, (assuming a six month average period of residence and based on projected fiscal 1973 figures):

- (a) If the City and the Court wish to totally avoid commitment to SDWI, facilities to serve at least 56 children at any one time will be required.

(b) If the City and the Court wish to provide City residential care for children who would be committed to SDWI for their involvement in offenses against decency, morality, and good order (primarily the status offenses of incorrigibility and running away) it would need to provide facilities to serve at least 28 children at any one time.

(c) If either of the preceding two policies were adopted, the City and the Court would need to determine how many required beds can be eliminated by the diversion of children from adjudication by the Court's Family Crisis Intervention Unit.

4. If the City Council decides that group homes should house some children who would otherwise be sentenced to the City Jail, it and the Juvenile Court may want to decide which of this group of children should be served in City residential group homes. For example (assuming a six-month average period of residence and based on fiscal 1973 figures):

(a) If the City and the Court wish to totally avoid the placement of juveniles in the City Jail as a dispositional alternative, group home facilities to serve 48 children at any one time would be required.

(b) If the City and the Court wish to avoid the commitment of certain types of children to the City Jail, planning efforts for alternative group home facilities would seem to have to await the development of more specific data regarding the number of various types of children (age, sex, offense) now being sentenced to the Jail.

5. If the City Council decides that group homes should serve as an alternative or supplement to probation and, therefore, serve some of the children who are now being placed on probation, it and the Juvenile Court may want to decide:

(a) Whether it is appropriate to increase the restrictions on the liberty of individuals solely for reasons of rehabilitative treatment (as opposed to punishment or deterrence).

(b) Which of this large group of children should be served in City residential group homes. Again, planning for this alternative would seem to require more specific data regarding the types of children being placed on probation than is now available and consideration of the impact of the Court's Family Crisis Intervention Unit on the number of adjudicated status offenders and the size and, therefore, effectiveness of probation officer caseloads.

6. If the City Council decides that policy questions such as those raised in paragraphs 3,4, and 5, should not be finally resolved until actual operating experience with group homes is obtained, it would seem to need to decide whether the requisite experience and evaluation can be gained from the two homes for which funds have been appropriated or from three or four age-specific homes. This would seem to be a determination on which recommendations should be solicited from the responsible Juvenile Court officials.

7. If the City wishes, the Pilot City Program will be happy to provide more detailed analysis and other planning assistance as additional data becomes available and on the basis of whatever policy decisions the City may reach.

III. GROUP HOMES: A BRIEF SUMMARY

The term "group home" has been applied to a variety of pre-trial and post-trial, community-based, treatment-and non-treatment-oriented facilities and methods, including group foster homes, residential or non-residential pre-release guidance centers, half-way houses, non-residential community centers, residential facilities utilized as alternatives to incarceration in much larger, usually non-local institutions, and residential facilities utilized as an alternative to or supplement to placement on probation. The various types of group homes have also varied tremendously in their intake criteria, clientel, treatment methods, treatment goals, physical features, and financial arrangements.

The broad variety of approaches included under the "group home" rubric is attributable to four interrelated developments to which it appears the group home concept is intended to respond. First, the past decade has seen overwhelming criticism of the debilitating--and, it is claimed, the inherently debilitating--effects of large institutions on their inhabitants, whether those residents are children, adult offenders, or mental patients. The result of these criticisms, usually based on more or less well documented exposés of institutional conditions and abuses, has been, quite naturally, a strong call for a movement to much smaller, locally controlled facilities for residential care and treatment.

A second trend, closely related to the concern with allegedly inhumane conditions in large institutions, has been a documented realization that large institutions are not successfully rehabilitating their inmates. The stubbornly and consistently high recidivism rates have also contributed to the demand for and movement toward small facilities in urban areas serving citizens from the given locality.

In all institutions, large and small, there has been substantial emphasis on what has been called "milieu therapy," under which, in theory, all staff members and all institutional rules and procedures contribute positively to the improvement of the resident population. In large institutions, with their heavy overlay of security and administrative personnel, this theory has proven illusory at best. A genuine "total treatment milieu" seems more easily achievable in very small facilities.

Fourth, the expense of large institutional care has skyrocketed. It is not uncommon for annual expenditures to average \$5,000 to \$15,000 per inmate. Even more troubling to many observers has been the fact that it has proven impossible to assure that every resident does indeed have allocated to him the average amount of resources, whatever that average may be. Thus, many persons in institutions consume a much higher amount of these scarce treatment resources while others will be virtually ignored. Much smaller facilities, it is felt, offer potential cost savings per patient; even if the savings do not materialize fully or at all, there should, it is felt, be almost no likelihood of residents simply being ignored.

Conversations with various City, regional, and State officials during the preparation of this report and during the past two and one-half years indicate that these same considerations underlie the movement toward group homes in Norfolk (and in the surrounding jurisdictions, as discussed later in this report). It is also possible to state that the term "group homes" means in Norfolk small, post-adjudication residential facilities for juveniles who have been found delinquent by the Juvenile Court and, further, that each group home is intended to serve, at any one time, somewhat fewer than twenty juveniles. Definitions beyond this level of specificity entail policy assumptions or positions which are the province not of this report but of City decision-makers and on which subsequent determinations will turn.

In order to assist the readers of this report in the making of these decisions, it was thought proper to summarily describe various group home efforts throughout the country and the results of those efforts. Such a survey is included in the Juvenile Facilities Study prepared for the Southeastern Virginia Planning District Commission by the Old Dominion University Center for Metropolitan Studies in September, 1970. Our research indicates both that this summary of group home programs in other jurisdictions is quite complete and that, with the exceptions discussed in the remainder of this section, subsequent programs and experiments have added very little to the state of the knowledge as of late 1970. Thus, the summary of other group home programs found in the 1970 Old Dominion University report is included in this report as Appendix A for those readers interested in the

experiences of other jurisdictions.

The Old Dominion University report concludes:

"Unfortunately as one writer has observed, the only outstandingly successful juvenile treatment projects appear to be those that haven't been objectively and systematically evaluated.

....No single sure-fire technique has been developed which will guarantee the rehabilitation of a delinquent youth.

Despite the lack of rigorously adhered-to research designs, several conclusions can be drawn from the experience of other programs. First, 'experimentation' with non-punitive treatment techniques has not exposed the community to dangers. Almost without exception, youths selected to participate in community treatment projects have been 'better risks'. This selective assignment may have satisfied the immediate political considerations, but it has raised havoc with attempts to adhere to tight research designs. The selectivity of assignments has made hazardous the attribution to the treatment process of successful post-release experiences. Nonetheless, the findings in California, Kentucky, and New Jersey suggest that youths who would otherwise have gone to reformatories, can be very successfully (and often quite inexpensively) treated in the community."*

Our review of the literature surveyed by the Old Dominion University staff and our review also of the post-1970 professional literature confirms the accuracy of these observations.

In the words of an October, 1973, study which was prepared by another Pilot City Program for a city approximately Norfolk's size,

"The studies (of eight treatment programs, including group homes as well as other approaches) reviewed above presented little evidence that the juvenile offender treatment programs succeeded in reducing

* Old Dominion University Center for Metropolitan Studies, Juvenile Facilities Study (1970), pages 32, 62, 63-64 (emphasis in original).

delinquency, and much evidence that they failed. Only three of eight programs (Youth Center Research Project, Street Corner Research Project, and Achievement Place, a group home) showed evidence of success, and there is a very real possibility that the apparent success is an artifact of the three evaluations, which are the three weakest, methodologically, of the eight.

....We do know that the three successful programs served boys all of whom had quite extensive delinquency histories, whereas the unsuccessful programs (with the exception of the Silver Lake Program) had target groups that included many non-offenders and youths with only minor records, or target groups from which juveniles with certain serious prior offenses had been excluded (e.g., the Community Delinquency Control Project excluded boys committed to training school for any violent crime). This suggests the very tentative conclusion that it is easier to achieve a reduction in delinquent behavior with serious juvenile offenders than with non-serious juvenile offenders.*

Neither the difficulty of defining precisely what a "group home" is nor the mixed results of group home and other delinquency treatment programs reported in the literature (which itself is of very mixed quality) necessarily constitute, in the professional opinion of the staff members preparing this report, grounds in and of themselves for dismissing the group home approach to problems of juvenile delinquency. Rather, both situations--the variety of "group home" modalities and the uncertain results of this and all other treatment programs--may merely caution that any jurisdiction concerned for its troubled children and interested in exploring the group home

* Clarke, The Contribution of Juvenile Offender Treatment and Service Programs to the Reduction of Juvenile Delinquency (Mecklenburg Criminal Justice Pilot Project, Institute of Government, University of N. Carolina at Chapel Hill, Oct., 1973, pages 20-21.

approach must define its goals, chart its course, and monitor its efforts more carefully than others have in the past. The remainder of this report attempts to provide data which will be of at least some assistance in answering questions which the City's decision-makers may consider relevant to their deliberations.



IV. DELINQUENCY CASELOADS IN THE
NORFOLK JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT

The Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court heard 7,886 delinquency cases between July 1, 1970, and March 31, 1973.* Of that total, 2,673 of the delinquency cases were adjudicated in fiscal 1971, 2,966 of these cases were heard in fiscal 1972, and 2,207 were heard during the first nine months of fiscal 1973, (yielding a twelve-month projection for fiscal 1973 of 2,944 cases).** Thus, the delinquency case load of the Court, which increased by 11% in fiscal 1972, apparently will have stabilized in fiscal 1973.

Status Offenses

During fiscal 1971, 649 cases involving status offenses were adjudicated by the Juvenile Court. This total consisted of 272 cases of incorrigibility, 325 runaway cases, and 52 cases of truancy. (Of the 325 runaway cases, 195 of these juveniles were local residents, while 130 were residents of some other jurisdiction. In regard to out-of-town runaway juveniles, the Norfolk Juvenile Court usually serves only as custodian until proper custody and transportation arrangements can be made by

* This figure excludes traffic cases and custody adjudications.

** At the present time, data for the last three months of fiscal 1973, is not available. To provide a comparison of the three fiscal year periods, twelve-month figures are projected for fiscal 1973 at points during this discussion where they are necessary.

parents, guardians or authorities of that particular area.)
 Status offenses accounted for 24% of the delinquency cases
 heard in fiscal 1971.

TABLE 1 - FISCAL YEAR 1971 - STATUS OFFENSES

	Boys	Girls	Total	% of category	% of delinquency cases
Incorrigibility	153	119	272	42	10
Truancy	30	22	52	8	2
Runaway L/O	87/69	108/61	325	50	12
Totals	339	310	649	100	24
*L-Local					
0-Out of town					

Of the 3,045 cases adjudicated in fiscal 1972, 752 (or 25%) involved status offenses. This was an increase of 103 cases in comparison to the previous fiscal year, an increase of 15.9%. Seventy-one (71) cases of truancy were heard during fiscal year 1972, an increase of 36.5% over the number of truancy cases heard in fiscal 1971. Four hundred twenty (420) runaway cases were adjudicated in fiscal 1972, an increase of 29%. Incorrigibility cases totaled 261 in fiscal year 1972, a decrease of about 4% in comparison with the previous year. The following table summarizes fiscal 1972 status offenses.

TABLE 2 - FISCAL YEAR 1972 - STATUS OFFENSES

	Boys	Girls	Total	% of category	% of delinquency cases
Incorrigibility	160	101	261	35	9
Truancy	45	26	71	9	2
Runaways L/O	96/65	169/90	420	56	14
Totals	366	386	752	100	25
*L-Local					
0-Out of town					

Four hundred, eight-six cases involving status offenses were heard by the Juvenile Court during the first nine months of fiscal 1973. This translates into a twelve-month projection of 648 cases, 22% of the Court's total delinquency caseload. Thus, total status offenses during fiscal 1973 will have dropped off by approximately 100 from fiscal 1972, returning to approximately the fiscal 1971 level.

One hundred, ninety-two cases of incorrigibility were heard during the first nine months of fiscal 1973. A projected twelve-month figure would be 256 cases. This compares to 272 in fiscal 1971 and 261 cases in fiscal 1972. Thus, cases involving alleged incorrigibility appear to be stabilizing.

Forty-three truancy cases were heard during first nine months of fiscal 1973; the twelve-month projection indicates a total of 57 such cases in fiscal 1973. This projection shows an increase of only five cases over fiscal 1971, and a decrease of 14 cases from fiscal 1972.

TABLE 3

FISCAL YEAR - 1973 (JULY, 1972 - MARCH, 1973) STATUS OFFENSES

	Boys	Girls	Total	Projected total for 12 months	% of category	% of delin- quency cases
Incorrigibility	111	81	192	256	39	9
Truancy	28	15	43	57	9	2
Runaways L/O	47/34	128/42	251	335	52	11
Totals	220	266	486	648	100	22
*L-Local						
O-Out of Town						

Thus, status offenses account for almost 1/4 (23.6%) of all delinquency cases heard in the Juvenile Court. The number of such offense cases increased significantly in fiscal 1972 and apparently decreased significantly in fiscal 1973, suggesting that these cases are at least stabilizing in number. There is also no indication that the relative proportions of the various types of status offenses--incorrigibility, runaway, truancy--have appreciably changed in recent years, (although runaways have fluctuated).

Drugs

Court records indicate that during fiscal 1971, 68 cases of drug offenses--the use or sale of various drugs (hallucinogenics, barbituates, and inhalation of toxic vapors)--were heard by the

Court. These cases represented 2.5% of the total number of delinquency cases heard before the Juvenile Court during fiscal 1971.

Drug offense cases heard by the Court decreased during fiscal 1972; 63 such cases were adjudicated.

In fiscal 1973, drug offenses increased substantially; 171 drug-related cases were heard by the Court in the first-nine months of that period. A twelve-month projection of 228 drug offenses constitutes a 235% increase over fiscal 1971, and a 262% increase over fiscal 1972. Two hundred, twenty-eight cases would represent 7.7% of the projected fiscal 1973 caseload of 2,944.

TABLE 4
DRUG OFFENSES

	Boys	Girls	Total	% of delinquency cases
Fiscal Yr. 1971	53	15	68	2.5
Fiscal Yr. 1972	60	3	63	2.1
Fiscal Yr. 1973	83	48	171	7.7
Proj. FY 1973	111	64	228	7.7
(Actual) Totals	196	66	368	4.7
Projected Totals	224	82	425	4.7

Offenses Against Property

In fiscal 1971, the Court heard 1,195 cases involving offenses by juveniles against property.* These crimes increased by 204 cases in fiscal 1972, to a total of 1,399. During the first nine months of fiscal 1973, the Court adjudicated 918 cases involving juvenile offenses against property. Projected to a twelve-month figure, the Court will have heard, in fiscal 1973, 1,224 cases involving juvenile offenses against property. This represents a decrease of 175 from the fiscal 1972 caseload and a slight increase from the fiscal 1971 caseload. Thus, if any conclusions are possible, it appears that cases involving juvenile offenses against property are not increasing and may be decreasing.

Offenses Against Other Persons

In fiscal 1971, the Juvenile Court adjudicated 761 cases involving offenses by juveniles against other persons.** Seven hundred, fifty-two such cases were adjudicated in fiscal 1972, a statistically insignificant decrease of nine from the previous fiscal year. The first nine months alone of fiscal 1973, saw the adjudication of 632 cases involving offenses by juveniles against other persons. This figure yields a twelve-month projection of

* This category includes such offenses as automobile theft, burglary, larceny, trespassing, (approximately 17% of this category) and disorderly conduct (approximately 22% of this category).

** This category includes such offenses as robberies, homicides, rape, assaults (approximately 1/3 of the cases in this category), and threats.

844 juvenile cases involving offenses against other persons, an increase of 10% over fiscal 1971, and 12% over fiscal 1972. Thus, along with drug offenses, this category, if projected 1973 figures are accurate, will show a substantial increase over previous years.

Table 5 summarizes the findings regarding juvenile offenses against other persons and against property for the three-year period under consideration.

TABLE 5
OFFENSES AGAINST PERSONS AND PROPERTY

Year	Persons	% of cases delinquent	Property	% of cases delinquent	Total
F.Y. 1971	761	28.1	1,195	40.9	1,956
F.Y. 1972	752	24.7	1,399	45.9	2,230
F.Y. 1973	632	29.2	918	42.3	1,550

Dispositions: Probation

Seven hundred, fifty-four children were placed on probation during fiscal 1971. In fiscal 1972, the number of juveniles placed on probation increased by 6% to 803 cases. A twelve-month projection for fiscal 1973 indicates that 784 children will have been placed on probation, a decrease of 2.3% from fiscal 1972. Table six summarizes these findings. (Data breaking down the probation caseload by type of case are not available.)

TABLE 6
DISPOSITIONS: PROBATION

YEAR	BOYS	GIRLS	TOTAL
F.Y. 1971	550 (73%)	204 (27%)	754
F.Y. 1972	572 (71%)	231 (29%)	803
(12 mos.)			
F.Y. 1973	543 (69%)	241 (31%)	784
TOTALS	1,665 (71%)	676 (29%)	2,341

Dispositions: Jail

Seventy-seven juveniles were sentenced to jail after adjudication in fiscal 1971; 135 juveniles were so sentenced in fiscal 1972, an increase of 58 cases or 75%. Ninety-five children were sentenced to jail in fiscal 1973, an increase of 23% over fiscal 1971, but a decrease of 41 cases or 30% from fiscal 1972. Of the ninety-five juveniles sentenced to jail in fiscal 1973, two were girls and the remaining 93 were boys; as can be seen from Table 7, this continued a significant decrease in the number of girls sentenced to jail after adjudication.

TABLE 7
DISPOSITIONS: SENTENCED TO JAIL

YEAR	BOYS	GIRLS	TOTAL
F.Y. 1971	55 (71%)	22 (29%)	77
F.Y. 1972	128 (94%)	8 (6%)	136
F.Y. 1973	93 (98%)	2 (2%)	95
TOTALS	276 (90%)	32 (10%)	308

Dispositions: Commitment to SDWI

Between July 1, 1970 and March 31, 1973, 484 children were committed by the Norfolk Juvenile Court to the Department of Welfare and Institutions.* Projecting a twelve-month total for fiscal 1973 yields a three-year total of 514.

In this three-year period, about three times as many boys as girls were committed. (430 boys, 142 girls.)

Assuming the accuracy of the fiscal 1973 commitment projection, substantially fewer children will have been committed in fiscal 1973 than in either of the previous years. One hundred twelve commitments in fiscal 1973 would represent decreases of 45% from the 196 commitments in fiscal 1972 and 42% from commitments in fiscal 1971, respectively.

* The statistics here represent the actual number of commitments made by the Juvenile Court judges. According to the court statistician, this data is prior to appeal or any other action by the Court.

Commitments for the past three years have been further broken down into four offense categories in Table 8 on the following page.



TABLE 8
COMMITMENTS TO SDWI

	1971	1972	1973-9 mos.	1973-Projs.
PERSONS				
1. Assault simple	11	11	6	
2. Assault with weapon	1	2		
3. Offenses as persons-all other	1	4	3	
4. Murder	1			
5. Manslaughter				
6. Rape (by force)				
7. Threatening bodily harm		4		
8. Robbery attempted all kinds				
Subtotal	14 (7.1%)	21(10.2%)	9 (10.7%)	12
PROPERTY				
1. Auto tampering	8	3	5	
2. Auto theft	5		3	
3. Burglary (break & enter)	14	24	8	
4. Concealment: MDSE	1	7	3	
5. Destroy or damage property		4	1	
6. Grand larceny	14	10		
7. Petit larceny	14	22	5	
8. Trespassing	9	16	3	
9. All others	2	11		
Subtotal	67 (34.2%)	97(47.1%)	28(33.3%)	37
DECENCY, MORALITY, GOOD ORDER				
1. Alcohol abuse/violations	1			
2. Curse & above	3			
3. Disorderly conduct	5	7	3	
4. Drug abuse	4	1	3	
5. Incorrigibles	49	34	22	
6. Runaways	44	41	11	
7. Truancy	4	1	1	
8. Gambling		1		
9. Immoral conduct	3		1	
Subtotal	113(57.6%)	85(41.3%)	41(48.8%)	55
PUBLIC JUSTICE & ADMIN.				
1. Escape from custody	2	3	6	
2. Failure to appear				
3. Failure to comply				
Subtotal	2 (1%)	3 (1.4%)	6 (7.1%)	8
TOTAL COMMITMENTS	196	206	84	112

Offenses Against Persons

A total of 44 children were committed to SDWI as a result of offenses against persons during the 2 1/2 fiscal years. Nine of the commitments were during the nine-month reporting period of fiscal 1973. A projection from nine months to a year would mean 12 commitments in this category during fiscal 1973. There were 21 such commitments in fiscal 1972 and 14 in fiscal 1971. Thus, the number of children involved in offenses against other persons who are committed appears to fluctuate, but the total number remains quite small. Within this category simple assault resulted in the greatest number of cases being committed during the three-year period (28 or 44 cases). (Children allegedly involved in more serious crimes against other persons were probably tried as adults.)

Offenses Against Property

During fiscal year 1972, nearly 50% of all committed children were involved in crimes against property. Such crimes accounted for only one-third of total commitments in fiscal 1971. and the first half of fiscal 1973. Within this category, larceny and burglary offenses account for approximately half of all commitments each year. Like offenses against other persons, this category of commitments will apparently have decreased significantly in fiscal 1973.

Offenses Against Decency, Morality and Good Order

The cases primarily resulting in commitment in this category are status offenses. There were 45 (projected) status cases committed during fiscal 1973. Seventy-six status offenders were committed during fiscal 1972 and 97 during fiscal 1971. As a result of the yearly decline in commitment of status offenders, this entire category has decreased steadily and substantially over the two and one-half year period. The commencement of the Juvenile Court Family Crisis Intervention Program discussed elsewhere in this report should further substantially decrease or even eliminate these children from commitment.

Public Justice and Administration

A total of 11 persons were committed to SDWI during the two and one-half year period for offenses in this category. All of the commitments in this category are a result of cases that were finally heard before the Court on charges of escape from custody.

V. THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE RESIDENTIAL
GROUP HOME PROGRAM IN NORFOLK

A. Stanhope House

Physical Structure

Stanhope House is a new building constructed as a residential group home for boys. Parking space is available on one side of the building, and the other two sides can be used for recreational activities. The house is located in a residential area where it is the last house on the left side of a dead-end street. It is close to a bus line, thus increasing its accessibility to schools, churches, and other resources.

Admission Criteria

Stanhope House serves as a residence for and provides services to boys between the ages of 14 and 16. Only those boys who have been adjudicated delinquent by the Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court may be admitted. Boys are usually committed to the house either in accordance with Section 16.1-178 (5) of the Virginia Code for an indefinite period of not less than three nor more than six months, or as a condition of the suspension of their commitment to the State Department of Welfare and Institutions. (Under this latter procedure, the applicant is also placed on twelve months probation by the Juvenile Court.) Every boy who enters Stanhope House does so voluntarily and, together with his family, enters into a written contract in

which he and his family agree to abide by the rules and regulations of Stanhope House and to participate fully in the facility's programs.

To qualify for admission to residence in Stanhope House, a boy must meet certain other criteria:

1. He must have the potential to benefit from participation in a short term (3-6 months) program, as contrasted to a long-term, residential counseling program.
2. The applicant must not have any history of active homosexual activity.
3. The boy must be in good physical health. (A physically handicapped applicant is not automatically barred from the program; in such cases, an evaluation is made to determine whether the applicant is capable of taking care of himself and of benefiting from the program.)
4. The applicant may not be emotionally disturbed, retarded, impulsive, or aggressive, or lacking in sufficient mental or intellectual ability to participate in community educational, vocational, or employment programs and in programs operated within the home.
5. The applicant must be enrolled in school or in some other educational or vocational training program, or employed on a full-time basis during daylight hours.
6. The applicant's police record or court record may not be such as to indicate that he will pose a criminal threat to the citizens residing in the surrounding community.
7. Priority is given to applicants with a history of primarily status or misdemeanor offenses.
8. The applicant may not have any court cases pending against him at the time of his admission to the home.
9. The applicant may not have been previously committed to the State Department of Welfare and Institutions, to an Adult Correctional Facility (unless incarcerated in the City Jail awaiting trial due solely to lack of space in a juvenile detention home), or to a State Mental Institution for purposes other than testing and diagnosis.

10. The applicant may not be presently addicted to any drug and may not have a history of heavy drug usage.

Admission Procedures

The Court has established a comprehensive diagnostic and screening procedure for the admission of boys to Stanhope House. The boys and his parents or guardians are "worked up" by both the Court's Diagnostic and Evaluation Team and by the Casework Coordinator for Stanhope House. In addition, probation officers who have worked with the various applicants are also interviewed by the Casework Coordinator, the treatment program is explained in detail to the applicant and his parents, and the applicant and parents are required to personally visit the home for a pre-residence tour. Final admission selections are made by the Home's staff on a consensus basis. Assuming that a boy is found suitable for admission to the home, a recommendation for such placement is referred to the Juvenile Court which makes the final disposition decision.

Group Home Staff

Seven full-time professionals (the group home manager, the field probation officer or assistant group home manager, and five child supervisors), a clerk-typist, and a part-time cook comprise the Stanhope House staff.

Current Operations of Stanhope House

Stanhope House commenced operation on November 1, 1973, and has since had eleven residents (with one boy being admitted twice). Two boys who could not adjust to the home had to be

referred to Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court and were subsequently committed to the State Department of Welfare and Institutions. As of mid-January, there were six residents in the home: one fourteen-year-old, four fifteen-year-olds, and one sixteen-year-old boy. Four of the boys had been found by the Juvenile Court to be incorrigible, one had been found involved in breaking and entering, and one had been found involved in burglary. All of the boys have appeared before the Juvenile Court at least once before and one boy has been before the Court more than half a dozen times. The boys' previous records included involvement in petty larceny, assault, truancy, and tampering. On February 15, 1974, nine boys were in residence at the house.

Evaluation

Stanhope House's short, four-month period of operation has not provide sufficient time for an evaluation of its impact.

Operating Budget

The operating budget for the full fiscal year between July 1, 1973 and June 30, 1974 was estimated at \$116,000. Approximately \$70,000 was allocated for personnel; \$23,000 for materials, supplies and repairs; and approximately \$5,000 for general operations and fixed charges. In addition, \$17,000 was allocated in the first-year budget for equipment. Construction cost of the home was in excess of \$200,000, a higher figure than encountered in reports on the establishment of group homes in other jurisdictions. Pursuant to statutory requirements, the State reimburses

the City for part of the construction costs, two-thirds of salaries and wages, and one hundred percent of many other expenses.

B. Current Plans and Projections of Concerned Officials

During the preparation of this report, interviews with several local officials closely concerned with the establishment and utilization of group homes were conducted. The views of these officials were solicited in order to provide the authors of this report and City officials with as complete information as possible on the current views, plans, and projections of the officials most expert and most experienced in the development of group homes.

In the course of these interviews, five basic topics were addressed. These were:

1. The need for and the effectiveness of group homes;
2. The reaction of the public to the establishment of group homes;
3. The appropriate size of a group home;
4. The appropriate structure of a system of group homes; and,
5. The purpose of group homes, or, expressed another way, the type of child which should be served by group homes.

Judge Henry, Judge Martin and Mr. Jablonski all emphasized the need in Norfolk for local residential treatment facilities. Mr. Jablonski pointed out that this need in Norfolk has existed for years and that the concepts underlying local residential group homes can be found in the professional literature as long as 35

or 40 years ago. Similarly, Judge Martin stressed that small group probation homes are a successful rehabilitative measure in programs dealing with juvenile delinquency. Judge Henry pointed out the need, which group homes serve, of working with children who can effectively utilize and respond to community resources and opportunities but cannot, for various reasons, remain in their own home. Judge Martin added that local residential alternatives provide much safer and much less debasing and criminogenic environments than the SDWI facilities.

Mr. Jablonski addressed the second basic issue encountered in these interviews, the question of the public's reaction to the establishment of group homes. He observed that, overall, winning public acceptance of group homes has been difficult. He attributes this to the fact that most people do not, apparently for reasons of security, want group homes in their neighborhood, but feels that this problem will lessen as the need for and concept of residential treatment facilities becomes better understood by the public.

Mr. Jablonski also expressed misgivings about the population capacity of the Stanhope House, an eighteen-bed facility. It is his professional opinion that an overall resident staff ratio of two to one is necessary if a residential treatment facility or group home is to provide effective services to and supervision over the residents of the house. Operating the Stanhope House at its maximum capacity would prevent the maintenance of this two to one resident-staff ratio. Thus, he hopes that any future group homes which the Court is able to establish will be smaller facilities designed to house ten to twelve

juveniles, with an absolute maximum capacity of fourteen. Judge Martin also suggested that eight to twelve children should reside in a group home at any given time.

Both Judge Martin and Mr. Jablonski discussed at some length the question of the proper structure or basis of organization of a system of group homes. Mr. Jablonski believes that for the immediate future, group homes should be established on an age-specific basis. Boys between the ages of 12 and 14 years should be grouped together as should boys between 15 and 17; a similar age structure should be provided for girls under the supervision of the Juvenile Court. This basic structure of four homes, he believes, will in all likelihood meet the needs of the Court through 1980. It should also allow, once the homes are firmly established and operating, the development of a comprehensive variety of treatment modalities in the homes which will facilitate some evaluation of the possibility and effectiveness of easing the age-specific structure and relying more upon a treatment-specific mode of organization. Judge Martin also believes that at least initially a local group home system should consist of two homes for boys and two homes for girls divided by age groups. Subsequently, he believes, experience may indicate that one home will be sufficient for girls because age differences are not so serious with girls as with boys, thus allowing the operation of three group homes for boys.

On the fifth issue, the purpose of the group homes or the type of child to be served by the group home, Judge Henry, Judge Martin, and Mr. Jablonski all stated that group homes should be

utilized for those children who are basically capable of successfully and responsibly functioning in and benefiting from life in the community and who are not "serious offenders" or "felons". Judge Martin emphasized that the residents should be "hand picked" and Mr. Jablonski agreed that, particularly during the first few months of a group home (especially the first Stanhope House), a home's entry standards should be relatively restrictive, with the criteria for acceptance being broadened as the staff becomes more experienced and able to provide a broader and more intensive range of services. Judge Henry commented that he had at first conceived of group probation homes as alternatives to be utilized in lieu of commitment of children to the State Department of Welfare and Institutions. He believes now that the SDWI and the Stanhope House staff consider group homes, instead, as a supplement to or reinforcement of probation. He concurs that group homes should be used currently for non-serious offenders. Judge Henry further pointed out that the number of drug-related cases, especially for girls, is continuing to increase, and suggested, therefore, that some provision with the group home system should be made for these drug offenders, since residential treatment is thought to be effective for children involved with drugs.

C. Related Developments In The Tidewater Area

Just as the City of Norfolk is at the present time commencing the operation of its group home, the Cities of Chesapeake, Portsmouth, Virginia Beach, Franklin, and Suffolk, and the coun-

ties of Southampton and Isle of Wight are developing a Regional Group Home System. This system, as originally designed, was intended to consist of nine residential facilities established between 1972 and 1976 and providing pre-adjudication as well as post-adjudication services. The Tidewater Detention Home in Chesapeake, a pre-adjudication detention facility, was the initial facility in the system; the less-secure (pre-adjudication) detention unit in Virginia Beach, the second component in the system, was opened in 1972.

Establishment of a Regional Group Home System qualifies the participating jurisdictions, pursuant to Virginia Code 16.1-201, for reimbursement by the State of a large part of the capital and operating expenses of group homes. As in Norfolk, the Regional Group Home System seems to have as its two basic goals the establishment of a more comprehensive, more flexible program of treatment alternatives and the provision of services at less expense than care in large institutions now entails. According to Mr. Robert Dunsmore, Financial and Planning Administrator of the Regional Group Home System, the regional approach should offer several advantages.

First, a large number and variety of community services are needed to develop a comprehensive system. Financing of these services by any one locality, especially localities with less than 250,000 to 300,000 citizens, would at the least place considerable strain on municipal budgets and, in many instances, would not be feasible. Second, the regional approach not only increases the range of already available resources but also

should result in the more rapid development of additional resources than any one jurisdiction could manage by itself. Third, the regional approach, with its advantages of a greater number and variety of resources and more rapid development of new resources, should result in adequate evaluations of a fully operating group home system being conducted much sooner than would otherwise be possible, thereby reducing the period of experimentation before hard evaluative data is available for consideration by City or County policy-makers. Fourth, it is expected that experience and evaluations will demonstrate that a regional approach reduces duplication of services, lowers administrative costs, and increases opportunities for financial support from state and federal sources.

Representation on the policy-making Board of the group home system is determined by the number of facilities sponsored by and located in each jurisdiction. Similarly, at the operational level an intake committee is responsible for the screening of applicants for residence at the various facilities; among the responsibilities of the intake committee is the maintenance of an equitable distribution of area children receiving services from the system. Participating jurisdictions are assessed operating costs in proportion to the degree of their utilization of the system.

At the present time, the regional group home system is about to open its first group home for girls. This facility will be located in one part of the former Florence Crittenden Home in Norfolk. The Crittenden facility is much larger than

the group homes which are visualized for the regional group home system and it is hoped that eventually the Crittenden facility will be converted to a diagnostic center providing sophisticated screening and intake services for the entire group home system. The administration of the regional group home is presently attempting to locate a site for a second group home; it appears at this time that this facility may be located in the City of Portsmouth.

D. Other Relevant Developments

Three other developments whose ultimate effects cannot be determined at this time by the authors of this report must also be considered by the City in its decision-making and planning regarding group homes for juvenile offenders. These developments, discussed immediately below, cannot be evaluated in this report because the first two depend upon results of projects still in the implementation or planning stages and the third turns largely on policy decisions to be made by others.

First, the Court has recently established a Family Crisis Intervention Unit which is intended to divert from adjudication in the Juvenile Court at least a substantial proportion of those children who are alleged to be status offenders. This elimination of most or all of approximately 25% of the Court's caseload should, logically, reduce or even eliminate the need for commitment of status offenders to the Department of Welfare and Institutions and the need for group home facilities for such children.

Second, the number of children transferred to the Circuit Court for trial as adults may be affected in two ways. The amendment of the statute authorizing such transfers is thought by several officials to make such transfers from the Juvenile Court more difficult; if this proves to be the case, more serious offenders will be tried in Juvenile Court. On the other hand, the commencement of full-time service by the office of the Commonwealth Attorney is likely, in the opinion of some observers, to result in an increase in the number of children transferred from the Juvenile Court. It may not be unreasonable in planning efforts in the immediate future, until pertinent data is available, to assume that these two trends will have no net effect.

Finally, the Juvenile Court is currently operating the Community Adjustment Services and Treatment Program in the Model Cities Areas of the City. This program provides informal counseling services for children who might otherwise come within the purview of the Juvenile Court, thereby diverting a number of such children from formal adjudication and subsequent probation supervision or SDWI commitment. Staffing levels in this unit will apparently be maintained after the assumption of responsibility for Juvenile Court Services by the State Department of Welfare and Institutions. It is unclear at this time what changes, if any, will be made in the scope of CAST's diversion activities.

APPENDIX A

Excerpt from
Juvenile Facilities Study

by

Center for Metropolitan Studies
Old Dominion University
September, 1970

SMALL SCALE TREATMENT ENVIRONMENTS: THE GROUP HOME

Introduction

Two very pervasive characteristics of new treatment approaches have been: (1) The use of smaller scale treatment environments and (2) wider use of "milieu therapy" in which all staff and facilities are visualized as a significant part of a treatment environment. These are very compatible with the use of group homes and partially explain the growing use of the group home.

The label "group home" covers a variety of facilities and programs. Some group homes are "contract" homes which are owned and run by a church, a private organization, or a husband and wife team. The state or county contracts with the owners to run the home. This arrangement is similar to the foster home utilized by the State Department of Welfare and Institutions. An "agency" home is a facility leased or owned by the governmental agency and run by its own staff. The homes range in size from a capacity of 4 to 6 youths in a private residence to an agency home housing as many as 20 youths.

The treatment provided within a group home similarly varies quite widely. Some homes, particularly those run by a married couple on a contract basis, have no formal rehabilitative or recreation program. They merely serve as substitute domiciles for troubled youths whose problem source may be an unhealthy home environment. The group home serves as a more stable or supportive base of operations while the youth learns or re-learns how to function effectively within the community. Other group homes include a moderate amount of counseling - individual or group while still

others have intensive therapy programs taking up each afternoon and evening. As the programs become more complex the group facility begins to appear more like a miniature total institution and less like a "home".

Group homes also vary according to whether they are residential (the Highfields model) or day-care (the Essexfield model). Because the residential homes require "living-in" (at least 5 days a week) they permit greater control over the youth. Operating expenses are higher and fewer youths can be treated than is the case with a day-care facility. In a day-care facility youths live at home, and report daily to the center. From the center, they are transported to work and/or school. Afternoons and evenings are spent at the center in counseling in therapy sessions. Each evening the youths return home.

Residential Facilities are more costly (per bed) to build or acquire. They are more costly to operate since supervisory, food service, and maintenance staff must be retained as well as counseling and treatment personnel. Residential facilities do offer the following advantages over day-care centers.

- (1) Provide facility for youth from unwholesome family environment.
- (2) Provide facility for youth whose condition or offenses necessitates some form of control and restraint.
- (3) Provide for more intensive treatment than is possible in a day-care facility.

The experience of other states and localities with group homes indicates that neither a residential nor day-care center "is better than" the other. Each has its usefulness - depending upon the types of youth involved and the treatment that is necessary. Some residential homes start out in pure form, develop after-care programs for releasees and subsequently find they do as

much "out-patient" work as residential treatment. Fairfax House in Virginia may be moving in this direction. Other programs begin as diagnostic facilities, develop day-care services and eventually also establish residential programs for those youths whose needs are beyond out-patient capability.

Following is a brief description of group homes and group home programs which currently exist. A primary purpose in gathering information on existing group home experiences has been to determine whether or not they "work". Unfortunately as one writer has observed, the only outstandingly successful juvenile treatment projects appear to be those that haven't been objectively and systematically evaluated. In the following, evaluations of success or failure are included wherever such evaluations have been made. They are included here to provide readers with some idea as to available alternatives.

Residential Care - Case Studies and Comments

A large number of states either already have or are initiating residential group homes for treatment of delinquent and pre-delinquent youth. Briefly described below are several that are widely known. Also included are some lesser known facilities. Intent here is to illustrate the variety of approaches used. Where systematic evaluations of programs have been made, they will be included. However, as was the case with non-residential facilities, systematic evaluation has been infrequent. Where attempted, it has encountered difficulties which tend to diminish the quality of the findings.

New Jersey - Highfields

New Jersey has a number of residential group homes for delinquents. The best known is Highfields. Others are located at Warren, Ocean, and Turrel. The core of treatment at these residential centers is three-fold:

(1) Work or school; (2) Guided group interaction meetings; and (3) Contacts with the community. Work/School provide the basic routine and a source of experiential data for discussion in group meetings. The residential centers are usually situated near institutions which provide work sites for the youth. Group home youths are transported to these institutions where they are turned over to regular supervisory staff. They receive a token payment of 50¢ per day. The purpose is not to earn money or develop job skills, but to develop work habits and meaningful interactions with adults. Group meetings conducted five evenings per week are intended to help an individual understand his problems and methods of coping with them. Emphasis in treatment is in the group approach. Contacts with the community are largely in the form of furloughs, town visits, and trips.¹⁰

Wards were youths, both male and female aged 14 to 18 about to be first commitments to a state correctional institution. Severely handicapped delinquents were not eligible.

Each group home has six staff persons. The superintendent and assistant superintendent conduct the daily interaction sessions and maintain liason with the youth's family and relevant community agencies. The counselor usually serves as a work supervisor and a liason person with school officials. A secretary handles office and clerical work. Staff also includes a cook and a maintenance man.

A comparison was made of the post-release experience of Highfields with youths released from a traditional institution (Ammandale). The purpose was to determine the relative effectiveness of group home treatment in preventing recidivism. The results were encouraging. (See next page).

¹⁰Albert Elias, "Group Treatment Program for Juvenile Delinquents," Child Welfare, Volume XLVII, Number 5, May 1968, pp. 281-290.

Relative Distributions of Boys Sent to Highlands and Annandale Who Completed Their Stay and Have Had No Further Custodial Care, and Boys Who Have Not Completed Their Stay and/or Have Had Further Custodial Care:¹¹

ALL BOYS	COMPLETED STAY-NO FURTHER CUSTODIAL CARE		DID NOT COMPLETE STAY AND/OR FURTHER CUSTODIAL CARE	
	PERCENT	PERCENT	PERCENT	No. Cases
Highfields	63	37		229
Annandale	47	53		116*
WHITE BOYS				
Highfields	64	36		190
Annandale	59	41		64
NEGRO BOYS				
Highfields	59	41		39
Annandale	33	67		52*

*The differences between the percentages for all boys in Highfields and Annandale would occur by chance about twice in one hundred times. The differences between the percentages for Negro boys would also occur by chance about twice in one hundred times.

¹¹ H. Ashley Weeks, Youthful Offenders at Highfields, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press 1958, p. 43.

Of the 229 boys sent to Highfields, 63% completed their treatment and had not been recommitted. The success rate was particularly notable for Negroes (59% success at Highfields against 33% at Annandale).

The intent of the study was to compare the effectiveness of two treatment approaches. In order to attribute to treatment any differences in post-release behavior, however, it would be necessary to hold all other conditions constant. Unfortunately (from a researcher's viewpoint) other variables were not held constant.

Youths were not randomly assigned. Juvenile judges committed boys either to Highfields or Annandale whichever seemed most appropriate. The two groups were significantly different. Highfield boys tended to be younger and better educated: Bergen County, which is suburban, sent most of its boys to Highfields. Racially the two groups differed. Forty three percent of the youths in Annandale were black. In Highfields only 17% were black. The youths at Annandale were not guilty of more serious crimes although they appear to have had longer and more intense delinquent careers than did those at Highfields.

Thus it is quite possible that preferential selection was given the Highfield youth, i.e. better parole risks were sent to Highfields. Even if this accounts for the entire difference in parole success, the study has powerful implications. Through careful diagnosis and placement better risk youths can be placed in less incarcerative (and less costly) facilities and have equal if not better chances at rehabilitation.

Boulder, Colorado

Boulder's juvenile court has achieved national prominence in its successful use of volunteers and volunteer-based programs. Although Boulder County had a 1960 population of less than 75,000 persons, its welfare department in

the late 1960's had sixty foster homes. Moreover, it had three group homes, each with a capacity of fourteen children. One group home has been in operation for 12 years, another for 6, and the third for 3 years.

In the private field, Boulder is the best known of these "Attention Homes." These short term homes are volunteer supported. They are ordinary residences in their neighborhoods. Youths are placed in the home either because: (a) difficulties at home require a temporary removal of the youth; or (b) the youth is awaiting commitment to a foster home or institution. The homes are run by young houseparents - often married college students - who are paid \$200 a month plus room and board.¹²

Minnesota Group Homes for Juveniles

In 1965 the Minnesota Department of Corrections began its Group Home program for delinquent youths. The purpose was to provide residential care in the community for male and female youths who: (1) were being released from correctional institutions to parole, and (2) newly adjudicated delinquents needing residential care short of institutionalization.

The project consisted of a network of contract group homes each of which was a private residence caring for four to eight youths. Each home was supervised by a married couple who had children of their own. The majority of home parents were in their forties and had over four children. Most families were in the "middle income" level. Educational level of parents varied from a 9th grade education or less to a Ph.D. (No correlation was found between success (or failure) of a home and the educational level of parents.¹³ As of

¹²Howard James, Children in Trouble: A National Scandal, David McKay Company, Inc. New York: 1969-1970.

¹³N. Christiansen and W. Nelson, "A Study of Minnesota Department of Corrections Juveniles in Group Homes." Division of Research and Planning, Minnesota State Department of Corrections, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1969. 33 pp.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

1970, Minnesota has 14 group homes accommodating 74 children. These are run by private couples, churches, or civic organizations.¹⁴

The program is administered by a Group Home Supervisor responsible for recruitment, selection, and placement of new parents, as well as administrative and financial matters. Field agents have caseload responsibility of treatment of youths. The usual stay is 6 to 18 months. Home parents receive a basic guaranteed sum plus a per-ward allowance. In 1966, the state agency paid the group home \$30.00 per month per licensed bed; when occupied, the home received \$85.00 per-youth-per-month for room and board. By 1970, costs had gone up to \$190.00 per month.¹⁵

\$ 50.00	Subsidy (room)
95.00	Board (food)
12.00	Personal allowance
13.00	Medical-dental
<u>20.00</u>	Clothing

\$190.00 Total per month

In 1969, the Minnesota Department of Corrections undertook a study to learn the outcomes of group homes youths. Researchers examined the case records and histories of 129 juveniles who had been placed in the group homes from September 1965 to July 1969. The bulk of the youths (84%) were white, the remainder being of Indian, Oriental or Mexican descent. No Negro youths were involved.

Over half of the wards (55.8%) were placed in group homes in lieu of institutionalization. Thirty percent were parolees from institutions. A substantial portion of the offenses precipitating placement were non-criminal (incorrigibility, liquor, runaways, truancy). Eighty-five percent of female

¹⁴Letter from W. Nelson, Group Home Supervisor, State of Minnesota Department of Corrections dated July 23, 1970.

¹⁵Ibid

and thirty-five percent of male commitment offenses were non-criminal).

Eighteen percent of the youths successfully completed their residence in their group home and were either discharged from Youth Correction Commission supervision or were released to parents. Twenty-nine percent of the wards committed new offenses while in the homes and were separated from them. Twenty-two percent of the wards were not able to adjust to group home life. The remainder left the group homes for violation of technical rules (2%) or for unknown reasons (28%).

More meaningful than over-all "success" rates were the outcomes for specific classes of youth. Overall, those boys and girls who were placed directly from the community were more successful than those being paroled to the group home from a correctional institution. In particular those girls whose brief delinquent careers consisted mostly of non-criminal offenses appeared to have benefitted most from the program. The opposite seemed to be true for boys. Boys who had committed property offenses were more successful in the group homes than were the boys placed in the homes for reasons of truancy or being runaways (i.e. the boy who committed a criminal act responded more satisfactorily than the boy committed for a non-criminal offense).

It should be kept in mind "success" in the program, was measured in terms of "adjustment" to the group home, satisfactory release from the home, and forbearance from delinquent acts while in the home. No measures of post-release recidivism were taken.

Ramsey County, Minnesota

At least one county in Minnesota has a very active county-sponsored group home program. During the years 1968-1969, the Ramsey County (St. Paul) Minnesota juvenile court and the Probation Department have developed eighteen

foster homes with a capacity of 65 persons. Youths in the homes average between 15 and 16 years of age. Placement of girls exceeds that of boys. The cost of care is \$75 per month per child. Funds are provided by the Welfare Board.

No systematic evaluation of the program has been reported. It has been noted however, that the county now provides a disproportionately low share of commitments to state institutions. Also, runaway rates for the group homes has not exceeded 4% at any one time.¹⁶

The Fremont Experiment, California

The Fremont Experiment grew out of voluntary efforts of several social workers and clinical psychologists at California's Southern Reception Center Clinic. The Staff had been providing individual and group therapy and half-day work assignments to "holdovers" at the Reception Center. The youths lived in a single unit known as Fremont. These activities were later formalized into a program in order to systematically evaluate therapeutic effectiveness.

What finally emerged was a five-month residential program emphasizing work, intensive counseling, remedial education, self government, and pre-release contact with parole agent and community. Virtually all boys took part in individual and group therapy. All boys worked at the reception center on a half-day basis. All boys had to undergo a brief school experience after which they could continue or slack off depending on how they felt. Boys also participated in weekly community meetings which were largely run by the boys themselves. Meetings usually took up problems bothering the boys

¹⁶Robert F. Nelson, "Ramsey County Group Home Program," American Journal of Correction, 31(4): pp. 20-21, 1967.

and often served as gripe sessions. In an attempt to cushion the release of boys back to the community, a system of pre-release passes was utilized. During their final weeks, boys were permitted a series of four 4-hour passes and one 12-hour pass.

To be eligible for Fremont, boys had to be at least 16 years old and able to meet minimum grade placement of 7.0. Moreover, they had to evidence willingness to accept work responsibility; show capacity to participate in group living; and demonstrate a desire to establish constructive relationships with adult figures. Ineligible were: runaways, drug dependents, sexual deviants, assault-prone youths. After selection, eligible youths were assigned on random basis to either Fremont or a control group.

In order to determine the effectiveness of a Fremont type of program, the post release behavior of 75 Fremont graduates was compared to 54 control subjects. Boys had been assigned randomly to either the Fremont program or institutional care. The intent had been to avoid any bias in selecting experimental boys.

In comparison to "average" youth authority wards, Fremont study youths (both controls and experimentals) were "good parole risks" in terms of the standard base expectancy scores.

The experimental and control groups show no statistically significant difference in recidivism rates after 24 months of follow up. Moreover, the two groups did not differ significantly on the seriousness of the first post-release offense as measured in a severity scale (see next page).

Contract Group Home - Wisconsin

As of 1966, Wisconsin had 33 group homes for delinquent youth. The homes were run by private couples on contract with the Welfare Department's Division of Corrections. The number of wards per home varied from four to eight.

RECIDIVISM RATES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS,
AT 15 MONTHS AND 24 MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE EXPOSURE¹⁷
(in Percent)

Recidivism Category	Experimental		Control	
	15 Mos.	24 Mos.	15 Mos.	24 Mos.
Success	68.0	53.3	61.1	51.8
Partial Success	—	2.7	7.4	9.3
Failure	32.0	44.0	31.5	38.9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(N=75)		(N=54)	
Median Length of Stay in Treatment Program	5.0 months		8.8 months	

¹⁷Based on Research Report #50, The Fremont Experiment: Assessment of Residential Treatment at a Youth Authority Reception Center by Joachim P. Seckel, State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, January 1967.

Three-fourths of the youths were placed in homes in lieu of institutionalization. The other one-fourth were youths released from institutions. A state probation and parole agent assigned to community supervision of youth has responsibility for homes within his territory. Youths attend school or hold down jobs much as they might if they were living at their own homes.

Group home parents in most cases have successful prior histories as foster parents. Parents receive a state subsidy for each bed they maintain. For each youth placed, the parents receive \$80/month for board. To the best knowledge of this writer, no systematic evaluation of the program has been published.

Santa Barbara County, California

La Morada is a group home operated by Santa Barbara County probation department. The home is an attractive residence especially built for the program and located in a suburb of Santa Barbara. Capacity is fifteen. The home is for girls aged 13 to 17 years who are referred for placement by their probation officer. Placement is by court order.

Girls attend the local high school and have a regular schedule of activities after school and weekends. The program includes individual and group counseling, study, household chores and housekeeping training. Average stay is nine months.

Staff consists of a group home director (who carries the caseload responsibility for each girl and her family) and four female supervisors. One woman each works during the morning and night shifts and two women work during the afternoon shift.

Considerable support and assistance is provided by volunteers - particularly

a local women's club which has helped the house from its inception.¹⁸

Rochester, New York

A residential facility developed by the New York State Division of Youth for boys ages 15-17 is located in a residential area of Rochester, N. Y. Boys can enter either voluntarily, by referral from a public or private agency, or as a condition of probation.

The program is designed to provide supervision up to two years. The average stay is 8-12 months. Life of the resident is similar to home life. Boys continue school, have chores and varying home responsibilities, or hold down part-time jobs. The core of "treatment" is intensive group counseling. Group sessions are held one hour per day. Purpose: to help boys examine themselves, their goals, society's expectations and how they can relate successfully to society.

The New York State Division of Youth feels the program has been successful. No systematic study of success or failure has been reported.

Seattle, Washington

Woodenville Group Home is an agency-operated residential group home for boys. Unlike the homes previously described, Woodenville is designed primarily for boys released from institutions or camps. Residence at Woodenville for these boys is a condition of parole.

One of several group homes in Washington, Woodenville is a specially designed structure resembling an attractive residence and situated in suburban Seattle. The facility accommodates 16 boys in one 8-bed dormitory and four 2-bed rooms. Length of stay varies from 5 to 6 months. After this, most releasees return to their homes to complete their parole.

¹⁸National Council on Crime & Delinquency, A Report of the Juvenile Institutions Project, op. cit. pp. 180-182.

The staff consists of 7 persons. One of these, the director, has administrative responsibility for the unit. He also has prime responsibility for parole case management for each of the youths while the youth is in the group home. Other staff consist of four full-time (8-hour shift) supervisors, a half-time supervisor, and a cook.¹⁹

Southfields - Jefferson County, Kentucky

Southfields is a replication of the Highfields (New Jersey) program. Physical facilities were designed and built to the specifications of Albert Elias, director of Highfields in 1952 and 1953. The Southfields program began in 1961. It was evaluated annually for four successive years to determine its effectiveness in combating recidivism.

The Treatment Program - As in Highfields, all activities at Southfields were visualized as part of an overall therapeutic community. Emphasis was on resocialization of boys committed to delinquent norms and values through the use of peer group pressures. Design of the program was to infuse initial group of boys, "the old boys", with the values of the larger non-delinquent society. These boys in turn would act as therapeutic agents in their peer group relationships. A key part of the work-treatment program was the "group interaction" session held nightly.

To determine treatment effectiveness the records of all 191 boys released from Southfields between July 1, 1963 and June 30, 1966 were examined annually. The same was done with a group of 162 boys released from Kentucky Village (a reformatory) and 157 boys placed on probation during this period.

Boys from the three groups were compared in terms of whether within a year of release they had committed a serious offense or had been recommitted

¹⁹National Council on Crime & Delinquency, A Report of the Juvenile Institutions Project op. cit., pp. 195-197.

to an institution. These were called recidivists or "failures". "Successes" were boys with no serious violations or commitments within one year after release from treatment. Southfield's graduates were more "successful" than were boys who had gone to Kentucky Village. Seventy percent of Southfield's graduates experienced uneventful first years. Only 53% of Kentucky Village releasees were so fortunate. However, probationers were even more successful. Seventy-seven percent of them went through their first post-treatment year without commitment or a serious offense.

Southfield's non-graduates fared much more poorly than either the Kentucky Village boys or the probationers. Only 46% of the Southfields drop-outs were successful. (See Table on next page).

In order to compare the effectiveness of the Southfield model with other treatment approaches, a boy was to have been assigned randomly to either probation or Southfields (if he were a "moderate" case); and to either Kentucky Village or Southfields if he were a "severe" case. This assignment design was never used. Subsequent to the beginning of construction and prior to its completion, a new county administration came into office, bringing with it a new county judge and four new juvenile court judges. Instead of random assignment, a pattern seemed to emerge in which the least serious cases were put on probation, the most serious in Kentucky Village, and those in between placed in Southfields. Researchers attempted to compensate for this placement bias by using as controls only those boys who met admissions criteria to Southfields.²⁰

In addition to selective placement of offenders into probation, Southfields,

²⁰Admissions Requirements: Males between ages of 15 and 17 with no prior correctional commitment. Also had to be free of "obvious psychosis, severe mental retardation, and sexual perversion."

21 TOTAL SUCCESS RATES AND POPULATION FOR FOUR SUCCESSIVE ONE-YEAR
POST-TREATMENT FOLLOW-UPS FOR THREE TREATMENT CONDITIONS
(Decimals Dropped)

Group	Success A	Success B	Failure	Total Popu- lation
Southfields Total	115	34	42	191
Southfields Graduates	80	22	13	115
Southfields Non-Graduates	35	12	29	76
Kentucky Village	86	22	54	162
Probation	120	13	24	157
	77%	8%	15%	

21. Lovick C. Miller, "Southfields: Evaluation of a Short Term Inpatient Treatment Center for Delinquents", Crime and Delinquency, Volume 16, No. 3, July 1970, pp. 305-316.

or Kentucky Village authorities appeared to treat Southfields and probation boys more leniently than Kentucky Village releasees during the post release year. There was a tendency for reformatory releasees to be turned back over to the state for a subsequent offense whereas probation or Southfields boys would probably be put on probation again.

Researchers conclude that despite the imperfections of the experiment, the Southfield type of treatment is an effective alternative to traditional institutionalization. In addition, Southfields appears to serve as an excellent screening device for sorting out those youths who will make it from those who will need more intensive care. The excellent post-release performance of probationers demonstrates the efficacy of that treatment approach. Researchers suggest that probation be considered the first stage of the juvenile rehabilitation process and Southfields type treatment a second phase, and traditional institutionalization a third phase.

Differential Treatment Environment (Specialized Group Homes) - California

The Differential Treatment Environments for Delinquents Project was jointly sponsored by NIMH and the California Youth Authority. It began in April 1966 and continued through September 1969. It was a Group Home Project whose purpose was to study the differential use of group homes within California Youth Authorities' Community Treatment Project in Sacramento and Stockton.

One phase of the Differential Treatment Center Program attempted to provide different types of group home environments for youth based on their "I" (Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification) measurements. Thirty seven (39%) of the CT youths who were placed out-of-home during the period August 1967 - July 1968 were placed in project group homes. Three types of permanent homes (protective, containment, and boarding) were operated;

and three types of temporary facilities (supportive, restrictive, and individualized) were attempted. Each home was intended for the type of "I" level youngster identified in the chart below... Since then the costs have increased. The fees paid to group home parents in 1968 were:

Stipend to Group Home Parents

Type I	PROTECTIVE	\$300/mo retainer + \$160 per ward per month (Includes \$25 for clothing & incidentals)
Type II	CONTAINMENT	\$500/mo retainer + \$110 per ward per month (Includes \$14 for clothing & incidentals)
Type III	BOARDING	\$200/mo retainer + \$125 per ward per month (Includes \$14 for clothing & incidentals)

The chart also describes the organization, staffing, and costs of the different group homes.

As the next chart indicates, each group home had a couple who served as home parents. The group home parents were accountable to the group home coordinator for housekeeping, general administrative, budgeting and related activities. The group home parents had to work in cooperation with the community agent for treatment. A home containing four boys might well have four different community agents since agents were attached to boys individually and not to a particular home.

Type I (Protective) Group Home (For extremely immature and dependent youngsters with family background of neglect or brutality).

One youngster was placed for two and a half months. Group home parents were sincere but their interaction with the youngster and subsequent placements was ineffective. Group home was terminated in six months (Parents' ages were 41 and 44). A second attempt was made with younger parents (ages

CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY
Differential Treatment Centers-Group Home Project

Group Home Coordinator
(Group Home Parents Supervisor c/o
Administration Procedures, Budgeting)

Treatment Supervisor

Group Home Parents
"Permanent Home"

Containment
For: Manipulators
Cultural Conformist
Cost: \$240/mo.

Group Home Parents
"Permanent Home"

Projective
For: Passive Unsocialized
Immature Conformists
Cost: \$240/mo.

Group Home Parents
"Permanent Home"

Boarding
For: More Mature "I" types
Cost: \$180/mo.

Group Home Parents
Temporary Detention Center

Supportive
Cost: \$240/mo.

Group Home Parents
Temporary Detention Center

Restrictive
Cost: \$300/mo.

Group Home Parents

Individualized

Community Agent
(Primary Vehicle for diagnosing training and placement needs)

Lines of Authority

- Housekeeping-Oriented Supervision
- Treatment-Oriented Supervision

27 and 24). This worked satisfactorily even though the home was taking in several "I" types. The home remained open 21 months and handled seven wards.

Type II (Containment) Home

This was the first group home established. It was started in November, 1966 and terminated on the first of July, 1968. A total of 10 wards had been placed in home. The basic problem seemed to be the house parents (ages 58 and 53) and conflicts between the group home parents and the treatment agents. Parents had had their own children who were now grown up. Parents had previously worked in mental hygiene homes for adults and provided a high degree of structure, control, and supervision. They were unable however to provide adequate flexibility, "professional" (objective) behavior, and develop personal and meaningful relationships with youths. Parents were control-oriented. Agents felt a greater need was for meaningful, trusting, and accepting relationships with the youths.

A second containment home was established in Sacramento in September, 1968 and terminated March, 1969. Six wards had been placed in the home.

Type III (Boarding) Homes (For wards who are relatively mature interpersonally and who need a non-threatening environment to develop wholesome independence).

Begun in February 1967, this facility is still operating. Parents (age 50 and 47) are very effective, being able to "tune in", and being capable of setting rules and limits without being too coercive or rejecting. Fifteen persons have been placed, six of whom were in residence at the time of the report (July 1969).

Type IV Temporary Community Care

This attempt initially ran for 3½ months. It was terminated because of inadequate group home parents, lack of supervision of the youngster, and poor communication with agents. The home had handled seven wards.

A second home was started with older childless parents (age 74 and 53) who had previous experience with delinquent boys. The group home coordinator meets frequently with group home parents for training purposes. This program is working satisfactorily except that the group home mother is reluctant to "let go" of youngsters. It was still in operation in July 1969, and has handled 20 separate placements.

Type V Temporary Restriction Home

The home never opened because of lack of "qualified candidates." It was to be a unique model but parole staff is not convinced this type of facility would be useful. Pearson and Palmer conclude that this is the only type of home that has not proven "feasible".²²

Type VI Individualized (primarily for I₄s (Na's and Nx's) who need a "family-like" environment or healthy adult relationship while working out internal and family conflicts).

This home began operation in August 1968. It was still operating, July 1969. Eight wards had been placed as of July 1969.

Comments on the Differential Treatment Environments Project:

Unlike Provo, Highfields, Essexfields and Southfields experiments which concentrate on the delinquent social system and treat the youths as a part of that system, the DTE approach was less sociologically oriented. The DTE group home program attempted to match up home environment and home parents' natural styles that complemented the personality development needs of the troubled youth.

Two problems emerged. The problem described by the California Youth

²²Pearson, J.W. and Palmer, T.B. "The Use of Group Homes for Delinquents in a Differential Treatment Setting." Group Home Project Interim Progress Report, July, 1968.

researchers was that of group home parents. The key to the group home projects appears to be the attitudes and behavior of group home parents. Four of the seven sets of group home parents "hired" had been terminated as of July 1969. The group home parents were non-professionals. In the selection process attempts were made to secure persons who were appropriate to a particular type of home. Parents had to be willing to move or to modify their own home if it was not adequate. Persons were selected and assigned on the basis of their "natural style" of relating and dealing with youngsters.

Group home parents are hard to distinguish from the "average" population. Four out of five happen to have had prior foster-care experience. None had college training in social sciences. Pearson and Palmer conclude that the group home parents appeared to have been drawn from the same population as most agencies drew on for foster parents.²³

The California researchers stressed the difficulties in finding and supervising capable home parents. They seem to imply that non-professionals are not suitable. The DTE experience proves nothing in this respect except that there were differences in expectations among the staff that were involved.

The second problem the DTE experience reveals is organizational. House parents were responsible to a group home coordinator for administrative matters, a treatment supervisor, and several treatment agents - depending on the number of wards in the home. It is safe to assume that the administrative expectations were different from (and perhaps incongruent with) the individualized expectations of each of the treatment agents. This structural inter-relationship would be very stressful for a professional as well as a lay person. The experience would suggest too many bosses and the vesting of both the administrative and treatment responsibilities in a single superior.

²³ Ibid.

Summary and Conclusions

Any regional or municipal body seeking to develop community or area-wide facilities for treatment of youths would be well advised to consider the experiences of other states and localities. Despite the spate of break-throughs and discoveries publicized by the popular media, no single sure-fire technique has been developed which will guarantee the rehabilitation of a delinquent youth.

In his evaluation of California's eight year Community Treatment Project, Ted Palmer notes that corrections administrators, professionals, and researchers are experiencing a change in thinking. Long accustomed to working under undesirable conditions with inadequate resources, the inducements to grope for panaceas have been strong. Similarly there has been a tendency to think in terms of "one best way" i.e., the "right" way, if only adequate funds were available. However, research and experiences with varieties of treatment approaches indicates there is not one best way, no universal technique for treating delinquency.

More money for additional facilities is not enough. There is substantial evidence that "treatment" facilities of the past have become breeders of crime and not rehabilitators.

In the words of Milton Luger, recent Director of New York State's Division for Youth, "I do not mean to imply that the secret missing ingredient needed to resolve all of our adolescent treatment problems is money. Millions of tax dollars are poured into the rehabilitation hopper, and the results are not very

T. Palmer, "California's Community Treatment Project in 1969: An Assessment of its Relevance and Utility to the Field of Corrections." California, Department of the Youth Authority, March 1969, p. 67.

encouraging. If we had limitless funds, we would still have limited success, because of the state of our present knowledge and the techniques which we utilize. There is much we do not understand about delinquency and there are many factors in our complicated human interrelationship endeavors that are beyond the control of youth workers."

This first problem - lack of sure-fire tested treatment techniques - is compounded by several others. One of these is that offenders do not respond to modern humane therapy-oriented treatment approaches with gratitude. The other is that the self interests of reformers may become confused in the minds of the reformers with the needs of offenders. Milton Luger recalls New York State's difficulties when remodeling its youth program in the early 60's. "Adequate facilities had to be found to house the new operations. It was amazing to discover how many people wanted to have something specific done in the war against juvenile delinquency - as long as it was done in someone else's backyard. Some rushed forth to enlist in the fray, clutching tattered deeds to their family's dilapidated white elephant resorts which could be sold to the state for the welfare of youth."

Despite the lack of rigorously adhered-to research designs, several conclusions can be drawn from the experiences of other programs. First, "experimentation" with non-punitive treatment techniques has not exposed the community to dangers. Almost without exception, youths selected to participate in community treatment projects have been "better risks." This selective assignment may have satisfied the immediate political considerations, but it has raised havoc with attempts to adhere to tight research designs.

Milton Luger, "Launching A New Program: Problems and Progress,"
Syracuse Law Review, Volume 15, No. 4, Summer 1964, pp. 693-703.

Ibid

The selectivity of assignment has made hazardous the attributes to the treatment process of successful post release experiences. Nonetheless, the findings in California, Kentucky, and New Jersey suggest that youths who would otherwise have gone to reformatories, can be very successfully (and often quite inexpensively) treated in the community. Experience with both residential group homes (Highfields, Southfields) and non-residential group treatment (Essexfields, Provo) shows that they function quite well as screening as well as treatment programs. A key feature of the therapeutic design of many current residential, non-residential, and even institutional program (where the latter emphasize cottage life) has been the group interaction process. Not all youths are equally responsive to peer group pressures or influence attempts, however. Consequently, it would be far too restrictive to build a regional treatment program based exclusively on a group-treatment design. It could be argued, however, that, in view of the scarcity of resources, this would be a good place to begin.

The current state of the art, as well as the political realities of regional programming among provincially-oriented localities, necessitates an eclectic approach. Since there is no "one best" treatment approach but several offer considerable promise; and since juvenile authorities within the region differ as to program preferences, a multi-faceted regional juvenile treatment program is indicated. The following sections of this report are devoted to a description of Southeastern Virginia's needs for the treatment and control of delinquency. Information was obtained through a series of interviews and on-site observation.

END

7 ables/annu