



FCI

EVALUATION OF THE GROUP HOME PROGRAM
FROM
JULY 1, 1975, THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 1977

Prepared by:

Office of Research and Statistics
With the assistance of the
Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court
Fairfax County, Virginia

January 1978

NCJRS

MAY 25 1979

Handwritten signature

ACQUISITIONS

58376

PREFACE

The purpose of this evaluation is to examine the function of the Group Home Program and compare the observed results to the program's objectives. The Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court has administered the current Group Home Program since July 1975 and the program has been funded through Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) grants during that period. The primary goal of the program is to reduce the number and frequency of repeat offenses by the youth placed in a group home. Objectives leading to attaining this goal are the establishment of four group homes for the Court and the provision of twice monthly family counseling services designed to facilitate the youth's return to his family.

This evaluation was performed by the Office of Research and Statistics (ORS) as a joint effort with the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court and reviews the operation of the program during the period July 1, 1975, through October 31, 1977. The data collection task was performed by the Court; the analysis of the data was performed by the Office of Research and Statistics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	ii
I. SUMMARY	1
A. Brief History	1
B. Summary of Results	2
C. Conclusions	4
II. BACKGROUND	5
A. Program Description	5
B. Context	7
C. Fiscal Impact	9
III. ANALYSIS	10
A. Methodologies	10
B. Conclusions	10
1. Establishment of Group Homes Objective	10
2. Recidivism-Related Objective	11
3. Family Systems Counseling Objective	12
C. Qualifiers	13
D. Cost and Benefits	13
APPENDIX A--Tables	A-1

I. SUMMARY

A. Brief History

From 1972 to 1975, volunteer group homes for juvenile offenders were in existence to accept court placements. However, as no funding was available, other than the \$4.25 per diem payment made by the State for pre-dispositional placements, the number of volunteer group homes had decreased to one by July 1975. To meet the need for juvenile pre- and post-dispositional placement, the Group Home Program was initially funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in July 1975.

The initial LEAA grant and the two subsequent grants were matched with five percent County funding. The fourth and final LEAA grant application will provide 50 percent funding for the period July 1978 through June 1979, the County match would increase to 50 percent at that time.

The goal of the Group Home Program is to reduce the number and frequency of new offenses by juveniles placed in a group home environment.

The objectives associated with this goal are:

1. to provide three group homes, two for boys, and one for girls, as post-dispositional placements for court cases;¹
2. to provide one group home as an emergency pre-dispositional placement for court cases;
3. to make available twice monthly family counseling services with the intent of reintegrating the youth into his/her family after four to nine months for the post-dispositional homes, and to prevent unnecessary out-of-home placements after disposition for those in the pre-dispositional home.

¹Each group home can accommodate a maximum of four juveniles.

The program seeks to accomplish the first two objectives through extensive recruitment efforts to attract qualified house parents to establish and operate the four group homes. The final objective is accomplished through discussions with the youth's family to ensure that they are made aware of the availability of counseling services.

The program has served 50 youths during the period July 1975 through October 1977 through placements in the 5 post-dispositional and 1 pre-dispositional group homes included in this evaluation.

B. Summary of Results

The Group Home Program has achieved all of its stated objectives, although the level of achievement varies among the objectives. During the 28 month period covered by this evaluation, three post-dispositional group homes were available for 19 of these months, two homes were active for 6 months, and for the initial three months of the program one home was available for placements. Funds from the FY1977 grant were requested to establish one pre-dispositional group home. House parents were recruited for this home in April 1977. The pre-dispositional home has been accepting placements since that time.

The number of new offenses committed both during and after placement in a group home was significantly reduced.² The 50 youths placed in the homes had committed a combined total of 165 offenses prior to their placement.³ The number of new offenses committed by the juveniles while residing in a group home totaled 28. After discharge from the home, the number of new offenses was 37, a slight

²Juvenile offense histories are detailed by post-dispositional home in Tables A-1 through A-5 and summarized in Table A-6. Table A-7 presents the offense histories for juveniles in the pre-dispositional group home.

³Offense histories for juveniles placed in a post-dispositional home covered an average of 15 months prior to placement, 5 months during placement, and 6 months after placement.

increase over the offenses committed during the program. The youths placed in a group home averaged 3.3 offenses each prior to placement, .6 offenses per youth during group home residence, and .7 offenses per youth after discharge from the program. Of the 50 juveniles, 22 had committed a new offense during their placement and 17 committed a new offense after their discharge. The total number of youths committing offenses both during and after placement was 8. Thus, 19 committed no new offenses during or after placement.

In addition, the frequency of new offenses was also decreased. In post-dispositional homes the frequency of new offenses dropped to .15 offenses per month per youth after placement from a rate of 1.5 offenses per month per youth prior to placement. Similarly, pre-dispositional offense rate declined from 5.1 offenses per month per youth to .12 offenses per month per youth.

While Family Systems counseling⁴ was available to the families of youths placed in a group home, the overall rate of participation for these families was 24 percent or 12 families out of 50. Families choosing not to take advantage of counseling numbered 23 or 46 percent. Data was not available for the remaining 15 families. Families are referred to the Family Systems Program by the Group Home coordinator. Counseling is provided by the staff of the Family Systems Program at no cost to the Group Home Program.

The Group Home Program has historically operated on an annual budget of approximately \$100,000. However, the amount of funds actually expended has been significantly less due to the difficulties in recruiting and maintaining the desired number of homes. Actual costs per youth per placement day in FY1976 and FY1977 were \$20 and \$19, respectively, as compared to an estimated \$40 per day placement cost in the Northern Virginia Juvenile Detention Center. The Group Home Program provides the court with its only court-supervised long-term non-secure placement alternative for juvenile status offenders.

⁴Family Systems is a program developed for and sponsored by the Court which emphasizes the parents role and responsibilities in bringing about a positive change in the juvenile behavior.

C. Conclusions

The Group Home Program has been effective in reducing the number and frequency of new offenses committed by the juveniles placed in the program. The number of new offenses declined by 80 percent and the frequency of new offenses was reduced by 90 percent. These results compare favorably to those of other court programs with a recidivism goal, such as the Work Training Program and the Family Systems Program.

The program has also achieved its objective of providing a dependable supply of bed spaces for youths requiring a temporary out-of-home non-secure placement. However, as a record of all youths referred to the program, both placed and not placed, was not available, it was not possible to accurately determine if the number of bed spaces was excessive, adequate, or inadequate. The Court should revise the record-keeping procedures of the Group Home Program to ensure that this information will be maintained for future program evaluations. Indeed, continued funding of the program beyond FY1979 should be contingent on the availability of this data.

Although other Court and County programs are available to provide a non-secure temporary placement, the Group Home Program can provide the most cost-effective placement alternative for juveniles requiring removal from their homes.

While all families of youths placed in a group home have been encouraged to attend the Family Systems Program sponsored by the Court, attendance has been minimal. In addition, family participation in the counseling services did not appear to affect the conditions under which a juvenile was discharged from the group home. This would indicate that future referrals to the Family Systems Program should be made on a case-by-case basis, in contrast to the current policy of referring all families to the Program.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Program Description

The Group Home Program allows the Court to make temporary out-of-home placements in a non-secure facility as a disposition for cases and to continue court supervision of the youth during this period. As shown in Table A-9, Appendix A, the average length of stay in a post-dispositional group home was 117 days; the average stay in the pre-dispositional home was 29 days (see Table A-7, Appendix A).

The criteria for placement in the Group Home Program include:

- a demonstrated need for the youths to be placed outside their home temporarily,
- a current absence of drug/alcohol/mental problems of a severe nature, and
- a plan for resolving the original conditions which necessitated out-of-home placement.

Although actual placement in a group home is court ordered, the majority of juveniles have been consulted prior to that decision and have agreed to placement in the program. The placement procedure is initiated when the probation counselor contacts the group home coordinator. The juvenile's background and current family relationships are discussed to determine the appropriateness of a placement in a group home. If, as a result of this discussion, a decision is reached to place the youth, the group home coordinator evaluates the characteristics of the juveniles in each home in order to place the youth in the most compatible environment.

The group home coordinator then confers with the house parents to reach a final decision on the appropriateness of the placement and determine if a trial placement would be desirable. Prior to the actual placement, a placement plan is developed by the group home coordinator, the probation counselor, and the house parents which defines the rules and procedures that should be adhered to.

The Court then awards temporary custody of the juvenile to the group home house parents. The juvenile retains the same probation counselor before, during, and after placement to ensure consistency in services. Once placed, the juvenile will continue to have available all other court and community services. Coordination with other programs and services is performed by the group home coordinator or the probation counselor. The juveniles may attend school, work, or both. They may receive counseling from alcohol/drug abuse programs or mental health agencies. They may also participate in other Court programs such as the Work Training Program.

The progress of each juvenile is closely monitored by the house parents, group home coordinator and probation counselor. The probation counselor, acting on the information provided, will determine if the youth is responding to the placement program in a positive manner and recommend to the Court the action that should be taken.

During the placement period, the juvenile's family is encouraged to participate voluntarily in the Family Systems counseling services. The number of families, as shown in Table A-8, Appendix A, involved in the counseling program is 12, or approximately 24 percent of the families with children in a group home. The group home coordinator plans to place more emphasis on the Family Systems services to attract a greater number of families to the program in the future.

For those parents choosing to participate in the program, counseling is directed toward the ultimate re-entry of the juvenile into the home/family environment.

The daily administration of the Group Home Program is the responsibility of the group home coordinator. The numerous duties of the coordinator include:

- recruiting, screening, and recommending the approval of potential group home parents and relief parents,⁵

⁵Group home house parents are allowed leave at the rate of 2 days per month during which time the relief parents supervise the home.

- evaluating the performance of the group home parents,
- coordinating efforts to provide volunteer services to each home, such as encouraging civic groups to establish ongoing projects with group home residents.
- monitoring the bed space available, the types of youths in each home, and the emotional stability of each home,
- defining and establishing the training requirements for house parents,
- maintaining the program statistics including the financial records for each home, and
- functioning as a channel of communication between the house parents and the probation counselor and other court staff.

The most important of these activities in terms of program success is monitoring the daily conditions in each home so that new placements are coordinated to result in the most favorable group home environment.

B. Context

The Group Home Program is the only court-administered program available for the temporary placement of juvenile status offenders for an extended period of time. A revision to the State Code, effective July 1, 1977, prohibits the confinement of juvenile status offenders in a detention facility, such as the Northern Virginia Regional Detention Facility, for more than 48 hours (72 hours over a holiday weekend). The Group Home Program is the primary alternative for placement of status offenders. Other placement alternatives are the Emergency Foster Home Program (court-sponsored), Foster Home Program, and the Department of Social Services (DSS) group home placement service.

The Emergency Foster Homes are limited in number (5) and were designed to serve as short-term emergency placement facilities for juveniles awaiting disposition of the complaints filed against them. Emergency foster home parents are

reimbursed \$4.25 per day per child for each placement. The per diem is normally paid by the youth's parents, but payment could be made by the Department of Corrections for that service. Each placement funded by the Department of Corrections must be authorized at 30-day intervals and is not allowed to extend past 90 days. The Foster Home program and DSS Group Home are available for long-term placements. However, by placing a juvenile in a DSS-operated or associated program, the Court relinquishes its authority to continue treatment of the youth in other court-sponsored programs.

The number of emergency foster homes fluctuates frequently thus the available bed space is not dependable. In contrast, the group home program seeks to stabilize the number of bed spaces available by maintaining a consistent number of operational homes. The program can achieve this goal by providing for salaried house parents and paying a percentage of the rent, utilities, and food costs in proportion to the number of placements they will accept. Due to the costs of maintaining additional bed spaces, this approach seems to be the most successful in attracting and maintaining a stable supply of emergency bed spaces. Also, as shown in Table A-9, the average length of placement in a post-dispositional home was 117 days, exceeding the 90-day limit for emergency foster homes by 27 days. In addition, Table A-10 shows that 83 percent of the juveniles who were separated from the home under satisfactory conditions resided in a group home for more than 90 days.

The Group Home Program thus allows the Court to provide a relatively constant supply of bed spaces, maintain control of the juvenile placed in the home, and place a youth in a non-secure home-like environment for an extended period of time.

The Group Home concept is being promoted as a community based treatment alternative. Three Virginia localities, Charlottesville, Richmond, and Winchester, have established group homes utilizing Department of Corrections funding. Statistics on these programs were not available as the homes had just been recently established.

C. Fiscal Impact

The Group Home Program budget for the nine-month period October 1, 1977 through June 30, 1978 totals \$72,344. LEAA grant funds provided 90 percent of this amount; the State and County each contributed five percent. In FY1979, the program will only be eligible for 50 percent grant funding. The County share would increase from \$3,637 in the FY1978 grant to \$54,477 in the FY1979 grant budget, an incremental cost to the County of \$50,840. At the current operating level, the annual cost to the County to continue the program in FY1980 and beyond would be approximately \$100,000.

III. ANALYSES

A. Methodologies

A total of six group homes, five post-dispositional and one pre-dispositional, provided placements for 50 juveniles during the period July 1975 through October 1977. This analysis examined the behavioral history of those juveniles, the relationship of their parents with the Family Systems counseling offered, and the availability of group homes and their utilization over that period.

The principal data items collected to measure the achievement of the objectives stated in the grant applications were:

- number of offenses committed prior, during, and after group home placement,
- Family Systems counseling involvement, and
- the number and availability of group homes during the study period.

Other data collected by the Juvenile Court staff on each juvenile included the date of birth, sex, type of program separation (discharge), school attendance, and prior involvement with other programs. The data was primarily extracted from the case files. Information not available at the time of data collection was recorded as NA.

B. Conclusions

1. Establishment of Group Homes Objective

During the 28 months studied, three post-dispositional group homes were operational concurrently for 19 of those months or 68 percent of the time. At least two homes were available 89 percent of that time (see Table A-13, Appendix A). Given the difficulties in recruiting and keeping enthusiastic

and qualified house parents, it was improbable that three homes could be functioning continually over that period.

Four of the five post-dispositional homes investigated ceased operation during the study period. The reasons for the closures were as follows:

- Two homes closed as a result of the house parents inability to adjust to group home living.
- One home closed because the house parents purchased a home outside Fairfax County.
- One home closed because the house parents moved out-of-state.

As shown in Table A-12, post-dispositional group homes have been operational for as few as 4 months and as many as 26 months.

The sixth home to participate in the program opened in August 1977 and currently has three placements. The seventh home to participate was scheduled to open in November 1977, bringing the number of operational post-dispositional group homes to three.

Application for one pre-dispositional group home was submitted in the FY1977 grant. The pre-dispositional home was established in April 1977 and is still operational. Overall, the program has been successful 68 percent of the time in maintaining the desired number of post-dispositional homes. In November 1977, three post-dispositional and one pre-dispositional home were operational, achieving the establishment of group homes objective.

2. Recidivism-Related Objective

The available information indicates that this objective has been achieved. Prior to placement in a group home, the 50 juveniles had committed 164 offenses (35 felonies, 29 misdemeanors, and 100 status offenses).

The same group committed 25 offenses during placement and 32 offenses after discharge from a group home (see Appendix A, Tables A-6, A-7).

These figures show that prior to group home placement each juvenile had committed 3.3 offenses. That figure drops to .5 offenses during placement and .6 offenses after discharge.

As shown in Tables A-6, A-7, Appendix A, the reduction in offenses occurred over all three categories. Status offenses declined from 100 to 32 during placement to 18 after discharge. Similarly, misdemeanors dropped from 29 to 2 and then rose to 10; felonies decreased from 35 to 2 and then increased slightly to 4. These results were observed over an average time span of six months following discharge from the program.

Comparison of these offense histories demonstrates that the number and frequency of new offenses declined 80 and 90 percent, respectively.

3. Family Systems Counseling Objective

As observed in Table A-8, Appendix A, 24 percent of the families of juveniles placed in pre- and post-dispositional homes participated in Family Systems counseling. While the juvenile may not participate directly in the counseling sessions, they may have contacts with their families during placement and thus the condition of discharge may be used to measure the impact of the program. The 12 children of those families were discharged from the program under the following circumstances:

<u>Condition of Discharge</u>	<u>Number</u>
Satisfactory adjustment	4
Unsatisfactory behavior	5
Runaway	<u>3</u>
Total	12

These results seem to indicate that Family Systems counseling was effective in about one-third of the cases. However, from the total distribution (excluding the pre-dispositional placements) it is seen that approximately the same number of juveniles adjust satisfactorily regardless of the Family Systems involvement. Although the group home program has realized the objective of making family counseling services available through referrals to the Family Systems program, the current blanket referral policy should be discontinued and future referrals should be made on a case-by-case basis.

C. Qualifiers

Operating capacities of the post-dispositional group homes average approximately 60 percent. Several factors influence the utilization of any one home at any particular time. The group home coordinator must assess the emotional stress evident in the home and relate the characteristics of the youth to be placed to those of the juveniles already in the home. As a result, homes are frequently underutilized not because there is a lack of demand for bed space, but because conditions existing in the home would be detrimental to a satisfactory placement. However, a comprehensive list of referrals to the program is not available; the counselors did not make referrals when they were aware of placement limitations. To correct this deficiency, the Court should revise the administrative procedures of the program to require that all referrals to the program be recorded in order that the demand for this service can be accurately determined.

D. Cost and Benefits

The cost to provide one bed space in a group is a function of several variables including the house rent, the monthly utilities, and a prorated share of the administrative costs.

As shown in Table A-11, Appendix A, the average cost to maintain one bed space in a group home is \$16.75 compared to \$33 per day for a placement in a group

home through DSS.⁶ This figure represents the cost to make one bed space available; however, it may increase once a youth is placed. Per diem costs per youth are estimated at \$5.25. This cost, or a portion thereof, is normally recoverable as the family of the youth is required, if financially able, to pay the per diem costs of placement.

Actual costs to place a juvenile in a group home in FY1976 and FY1977 are shown below:

	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Juveniles Placed</u>	<u>Placement Days Available</u>	<u>Placement Days Utilized</u>	<u>Average Length of Placement</u>	<u>Cost per Placement Day</u>
FY1976	\$35,534	23	3,256	1,762	77	\$20
FY1977	\$46,866	21	4,448	2,505	118	\$19

The annual cost to house one juvenile in a group home is approximately \$6,100. This compares favorably to the estimated annual costs to house a juvenile in one of the following facilities.⁷

Northern Virginia Juvenile Detention Home	\$14,900
State operated residential placement institutions	\$ 8,000
Fairfax House	\$17,700
Girls Probation House	\$10,000

These expenditures allow the Court to establish an effective community-based treatment alternative for juveniles requiring temporary out-of-home placement, thus relieving the pressure for increased capacities at State learning centers, correctional facilities, and specialized residential schools.

⁶DSS has contracted with a private organization for group home placements at an average cost of \$990 per month per placement.

⁷Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Criminal Justice System Requirements for Fairfax County: Juvenile Justice System, June 1977, Chapter 12.

APPENDIX A

Tables

TABLE A-1
Placement History
Post-Dispositional Group Home #1

Sex	Days	Age	Discharge						Family Systems			Prior			Offense Histories							
			CC	S	U	NC	R	NA	Yes	No	NA	Fel	Mis	Sts	During			After				
															Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts		
M	621	15		1					1			2	2	3						4		
M	97	13									1	2	1	3						1		
M	246	14		1					1			5	1	1								
M	358	16									1	1	3	1								1
M	14	16				1						8		4								
M	121	16				1					1	1	3									1
M	282	15		1							1	5	1	2								2
M	5	15			1																	
M	NA	NA							1					1								
M	6	17			1							1		1								
M	67	13		1							1	1		1								
TOTAL	11	1,817	150	0	5	2	2	1	1	2	3	6	26	9	21	0	0	4	0	5	0	0
Average		182	15																			

Home Opened 7/75
 Home Closed 7/77

Maximum Child Days 2,920
 Actual Child Days 1,817
 Operating Capacity 62 percent

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

CC = Case Closed
 S = Satisfactory
 U = Unsatisfactory
 NC = New Charges
 R = Runaway

2. Offense History

Fel = Felony
 Mis = Misdemeanor
 Sts = Status

TABLE A-2
Placement History
Post-Dispositional Home #2

Sex	Days	Age	Discharge						Family Systems			Offense Histories									
			CC	S	U	NC	R	NA	Yes	No	NA	Prior			During			After			
											Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts		
F	27	14											1						1	1	
F	13	15			1								1							2	
F	2	13			1															2	
F	16	15																		2	
F*	67	NA																			
F*	52	15																			
F*	47	NA																			
TOTAL	7	224	72	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5
Average		32	14																		

Home Opened 10/75
 Home Closed 1/76

Maximum Child Days 492
 Actual Child Days 224
 Operating Capacity 46 percent

*Placed in Group Home #3 when this home closed.

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

CC = Case Closed
 S = Satisfactory
 U = Unsatisfactory
 NC = New Charges
 R = Runaway

2. Offense History

Fel = Felony
 Mis = Misdemeanor
 Sts = Status

TABLE A-3

Placement History
Post-Dispositional Group Home #3

Sex	Days	Age	Discharge					Family Systems			Offense Histories									
			CC	S	U	NC	R	Yes	No	NA	Prior			During			After			
										Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts		
F	180	16			1			1				3			1			2		
F	35	16					1	1							1			3		
F	38	NA					1	1			3			1				1		
F	15	14					1	1			1									
F	72	15			1			1	1			2			2		1	1		
F	50	14					1	1			1	3			2			1		
F	55	NA			1			1				1			1					
F	25	16				1			1		2	9			2					
F	254	16		1				1	1			5								
F	73	16			1			1				6						2		
F	289	14		1					1			3								
F	36	16				1						2			1					
F	90	16		1								3								
F	564	15	1						1			2								
TOTAL	14	1,776	184	1	3	4	2	4	7	4	3	0	3	43			11		1	10
Average		127	15																	

Home Opened 1/76
Home Closed 7/77

Maximum Child Days 2,300
Actual Child Days 1,776
Operating Capacity 77 percent

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

- CC = Case Closed
- S = Satisfactory
- U = Unsatisfactory
- NC = New Charges
- R = Runaway

2. Offense History

- Fel = Felony
- Mis = Misdemeanor
- Sts = Status

A-3

TABLE A-4

Placement History

Post-Dispositional Home #4

Sex	Days	Age	Discharge					Family Systems			Offense Histories												
			CC	S			R	Yes	No	NA	Prior			During			After						
				S	U	NC					Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts				
M	95	16		1				1				2	2			1							
M	41	16			1			1					2										
M	103	15	1						1			3	2			1			3	1		1	
M	181	15		1							1		3		1								
M	33	13				1				1		1		2		1			1				
M	45	15				1				1		1		2		1			1				
M	102	--			1				1								1						
TOTAL	7	600	1	2	2	2	0	2	4	1	0	7	13		2	1	4		4	2		1	
Average		86																					

Home Opened 2/76
Home Closed 12/76

Maximum Child Days 936
Actual Child Days 600
Operating Capacity 64 percent

LEGEND

- Discharge type
 - CC = Case Closed
 - S = Satisfactory
 - U = Unsatisfactory
 - NC = New Charges
 - R = Runaway
- Offense History
 - Fel = Felony
 - Mis = Misdemeanor
 - Sts = Status

A-4

TABLE A-5

Placement History

Post-Dispositional Home #5

	Sex	Days	Age	Discharge					Family Systems			Offense Histories												
				CC	Discharge			R	Yes	No	NA	Prior			During			After						
					S	U	NC					Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts				
	M	218	12		1				1															
	M	232	13		1					1			1	3										
	M	25	15			1				1			2	2										
TOTAL	3	475	40		2	1			1	2	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average		158	13																					

Home Opened 3/77
Home Closed, Still Operational

Maximum Child Days 980
Actual Child Days 475
Operating Capacity 48 percent

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

CC = Case Closed
S = Satisfactory
U = Unsatisfactory
NC = New Charges
R = Runaway

2. Offense History

Fel = Felony
Mis = Misdemeanor
Sts = Status

TABLE A-6

Placement History

Post-Dispositional Group Home Summary

Group Home	Sex		Days	Avg. Age	Discharge						Family Systems			Prior			Offense Histories					
	M	F			CC	S	U	NC	R	NA	Yes	No	NA	Fel	Mis	Sts	During			After		
																	Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts
1	11	0	1,817	15		5	2	2	1	1	2	3	6	26	9	21			4		5	
2	0	7	224	14			2			2		4			1	7					1	5
3	0	14	1,776	15	1	3	4	2	4		7	4	3		3	43			11		1	10
4	7	0	600	15	1	2	2	2			2	4	1		7	13	2	1	4	4	2	1
5	3	0	475	13		2	1				1	2		6	5	3						
TOTAL	21	21	4,892	72	2	12	11	6	5	3	12	13	14	32	25	87	2	1	19	4	9	16
Average			978	14.5																		

Maximum Child Days 7,628
 Actual Child Days 4,892
 Operating Capacity 64 percent

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

CC = Case Closed
 S = Satisfactory
 U = Unsatisfactory
 NC = New Charges
 R = Runaway

2. Offense History

Fel = Felony
 Mis = Misdemeanor
 Sts = Status

TABLE A-7
Placement History
Pre-Dispositional Home #1

Sex	Days	Age When Placed	Discharge					Family Systems			Offense Histories															
			CC	S	U	NC	R	Yes	No	NA	Prior			During			After									
											Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts	Fel	Mis	Sts							
F	17	16																								
F	24	14																								
F	40	17																								
F	55	16																								
F	41	16																								
F	20	12																								
F	51	16																								
M	21	16																								
F	12	14																								
F	39	16																								
M	1	16																								
TOTAL	11	321	169	0	9	1	0	1	0	10	1	3	4	13	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2			
Average		29	13																							

Home Opened 4/77
 Home Closed, still operational

Maximum Child Days 856
 Actual Child Days 321
 Operating Capacity 38 percent

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

CC = Case Closed
 S = Satisfactory
 U = Unsatisfactory
 NC = New Charges
 R = Runaway

2. Offense History

Fel = Felony
 Mis = Misdemeanor
 Sts = Status

TABLE A-8

**Family Systems Participation
Pre and Post-Dispositional Group Homes**

Family In Family Systems	CC	S	U	Discharge NC	R	NA	TOTAL
Yes		4	5		3		12
No	2	12	4	3	2		23
N/A		5	3	3	1	3	15
TOTAL	2	21	12	6	6	3	50

A-8

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

CC = Case Closed
S = Satisfactory
U = Unsatisfactory
NC = New Charges
R = Runaway

2. Offense History

Fel = Felony
Mis = Misdemeanor
Sts = Status

TABLE A-9

Duration of Placement
 Post-Dispositional Group Homes

<u>Home #</u>	<u>Average Length of Placements</u>	<u>Number of Placements</u>
1	182	11
2	32	7
3	127	14
4	86	7
5	<u>158</u>	<u>3</u>
	585	42
Average	117	9

TABLE A-10
Frequency of Discharge by Length of Placement
Post-Dispositional Group Homes

Length of Placement in Days	Discharge						Offense Histories								
							Prior			During			After		
	<u>CC</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>Fel</u>	<u>Mis</u>	<u>Sts</u>	<u>Fel</u>	<u>Mis</u>	<u>Sts</u>	<u>Fel</u>	<u>Mis</u>	<u>Sts</u>
1-30			5	2	1	2	12	6	24			5		1	5
31-60			2	3	3			3	14	1		8		1	5
61-90		2	2		1		1	7	12		1	2		1	3
91-120	1	1	1	1			2	9	7			2		5	1
121-180							8	6	6	1		1		1	2
181-240		3					8	5	12			—		—	—
241-360		5					—	1	3			—		—	—
361	1	1	—	—	—	—			3			—		—	—
TOTAL	2	12	11	6	5	2	32	25	87	2	1	19	4	9	16

A-10

LEGEND

1. Discharge type

- CC = Case Closed
- S = Satisfactory
- U = Unsatisfactory
- NC = New Charges
- R = Runaway

2. Offense History

- Fel = Felony
- Mis = Misdemeanor
- Sts = Status

TABLE A-11

Group Home Bed Space Average Cost

<u>Daily Expenditures</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Houseparents salary	\$25.00
Rent, utilities, and other operating costs ¹	29.25
<u>Administrative expenses</u>	<u>12.74</u>
Cost per home per day (4 beds)	\$66.99
Cost per bed space per day	\$16.75

¹Rent and utilities computed on maximum monthly allowance of \$510.

TABLE A-12

Post-Dispositional Group Home Availability

Home	'75					'76					'77					
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT
#1	_____															
#2	_____															
#3	_____															
#4	_____															
#5	_____															
#6	_____															

	Maximum Homes Available	Number of Months	Percent of total time Available
	1	3	11
	2	6	21
	3	19	68
TOTAL		28	100

Pre-Dispositional Group Home Availability

Home	'76					'77										
	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT
#1	_____															

	Maximum Homes Available	Number of Months	Percent of total time Available
	0	9	56
	1	7	44
TOTAL		16	100

A-12

END