

68806

September 1974

---

OUTREACH DETENTION PROGRAM EVALUATION

---

by

Harold L. Drummond

Superintendent

of

Detention

---

NEWPORT NEWS JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

---

## A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

This report on the second year evaluation of the Outreach Detention Program in Newport News would not be possible without the kind assistance and the enthusiasm from the staff's of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts of the Cities of Newport News and Hampton. We also wish to acknowledge the staff of the Newport News Detention Home, particularly, the members of the Outreach Detention Staff, who deserve special recognition for without their splendid work and dedication, Outreach Detention would have been deemed a hopeless dream.

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
Summary	1
Introduction	3
Background - Objectives	
Program Description	5
Program Results	7
General - Characteristics of Youths	
Conclusion	31
Tables	
1. Total Number of Children Supervised in Outreach Detention Program, by Age, Sex and Race	8
2. Number of Youths Assigned to Outreach Detention by Offenses	10
3. Success-Failure Terminations	12
4. Normal Court Dispositions by Sex and Race	14
5. Cases Terminated by Court Dismissal of Petition	16
6. Youths Returned to Detention Prior to Court Disposition	20
7. New Offenses While on Outreach Detention Supervision	22
8. Total Detentions with Numbers and Percentages of Newport News Youths	24
9. Total Detention; Newport News Detention and Hampton Detention; Assignment to Outreach Detention by Locality - April 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974	26
10. Child Care Days in Outreach Detention	28
11. Juveniles in Jail April 1, 1971 - June 30, 1974	30

## S U M M A R Y

The Outreach Detention Program in the Newport News Detention Home has continued to demonstrate both its operational and economic feasibility during its second year of operation.

The second year program was extended for a 15 month period, beginning April 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974. During this time, 24 of a total of 204 youths who were terminated failed to successfully complete the program, in that 18 youths were charged with new offenses and 6 ran from supervision and did not show up for their court hearing.

Altogether 223 youths were assigned to the Outreach Detention Program during the 15 month period, 19 of those were still active cases at the end of the program year.

Throughout the year, Outreach Detention operated at 56.43 per cent of its potential capacity. This takes into consideration the fact that service was granted to Hampton on November 1, 1973. Prior to granting service to Hampton, our program capacity was less than 50%.

The cost per day for childcare in the Outreach Detention Program was computed to be \$8.23 as compared to approximately \$28.00 per day in the parent detention center, also the latter figure does not include expenses for building depreciation and maintenance.

The Community at large, and agencies with which we have frequent contact, appear to hold Outreach Detention in high esteem. Other youth service agencies are quick to contact the worker of a youth on the program with whom they are having minor difficulties with.

OUTREACH  
DETENTION PROGRAM  
EVALUATION

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

### BACKGROUND

The Newport News Detention Home is presently serving in a regional capacity on the lower Peninsula. We are attempting to provide detention needs for the Cities of Hampton, Newport News and Williamsburg, and the Counties of James City and York. Detention has continued to experience serious overcrowdedness in recent years, and expansion in some way needs to be given serious consideration. While Detention Outreach was originally looked upon as an alternative to expansion, it now appears as though Outreach Detention has not decreased the in-house population to such a substantial degree that an additional wing would not be necessary.

Outreach Detention was first begun in March, 1972, and has continued to operate to the present time. The project was financed by a LEAA Grant through the Division of Justice and Crime Prevention of the Commonwealth of Virginia. The research firm of American Technical Assistance Corporation of McLean, Virginia was retained in order to help develop the program concept. Dr. Omar Buckwalter and Paul Keve both served as on-site consultants to Outreach Detention.

### OBJECTIVES

The major thrust of the Outreach Detention Program was an attempt to demonstrate that it was both operationally and economically feasible to supervise certain portions of the detention home population successfully outside of the secure facility. Such a demonstration was necessary to prove that a large detention facility would not be necessary and perhaps not required for future needs.

To demonstrate the operational and economical feasibility of the detention diversion idea, it is necessary to prove that a large number of youths who otherwise would have been locked up, could be maintained trouble free and be available to the court at less cost per day of child care than the cost of institutional maintenance. If it could be shown that these objectives could be achieved under intensive supervision conducted outside the detention facility then the basic purpose for detaining children would have been realized and the necessity of additional secure facilities obviated, thus realizing a considerable savings of capital expenditures. The operational economy could be shown by comparing the cost per day for child care in the institutional setting with the cost of non-institutional child care.

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Outreach Detention Program of the Newport News Detention Home is continuing as an experimental alternative to secure detention. The program is designed to provide very close supervision to a selected portion of the detention home population, who are allowed to live in their own or a surrogate home pending a disposition by a court of charges that have been placed against them.

When a youth appears before the court on the detention hearing, usually then, the court will determine that youth's eligibility for Outreach Detention. However, eligibility maybe authorized at some later date by the court, or by the Director of Court Services. Particularly if the youth is picked up over the weekend, or in the early evening. This would possibly prohibit youths with lesser charges from having to wait until the next court date in the detention center.

After eligibility for outreach has been determined, the Superintendent of Detention, or his designee, assigns the youth to one of four outreach workers. The assignment is usually based on the geographic location of the youths home and the size of the caseload of the worker. The worker normally contacts the parents or guardian of the youth to schedule an appointment; at which time the program is fully explained to the parents and to secure written permission in order that the child might be placed on the program. The worker then meets with the child and explains the program and also seeks the cooperation of all persons involved (parents and child). Upon the successful completion of these formalities, the youth is then released to his/her parents under the supervision of a worker.

The original design of the program was to have each Outreach Worker with a maximum desirable caseload of no more than five youths at one time. However,

deviations from this design have been necessary on rare occasions. The ratio of five youths to one worker concept was designed in the hopes of giving very close supervision to the youths. It also has the added advantage of allowing each worker to pick up his/her entire caseload in the worker's car and seek out a wide variety of activities in which to engage themselves. This is possible since the workers have neither an office nor formal hours to work, and the paper work is kept to a minimum.

The worker is supplied with an activities allowance (\$5.00 per child per week). Coupled with his own initiative, he should be encouraged to develop a wide variety of activities. This would include camping, football, baseball, ice skating, movies, and special events that are within reasonable proximity.

## PROGRAM RESULTS

### GENERAL

The basic operational objectives of the outreach detention program were to (1) keep youths out of trouble and (2) available to the court. In this section, program results are analyzed in terms of the characteristics of youth by age, sex and race categories as well as their admitting offenses, and the success and failure terminations are examined. Then the program's impact on the detention population is assessed, followed by a discussion of the program's acceptance by the community. Finally, the program's costs are compared with the costs of institutional detention.

### Characteristics of Youths

The second program year was extended to 15 months due to funding difficulties. This may be significant in comparing the statistics against those of the first program year. However, we have observed a significant increase in the total number of females assigned and a slight increase in the males. On a percentage basis, the total number of males are decreased from 80.5% in the first year to 65.74% in the second, and the females show a marked increase from 19.5% to 34.53%. Table 1 shows a distribution of the youths by age, race and sex. There has been a noted change in total age groupings. In program year I, the fourteen year olds comprised 21.3%, compared to 16.59% for the second year. The fifteen year olds remained relatively unchanged. However, there was an increase in the sixteen year old grouping from 17.2% to 29.60%. The other age groups remained relatively unchanged.

The other distinguishing characteristic of this table is the decrease in black males 56.8% to 30.94%, and the increase in white females from 11.2% to 27.35%.

Table 1

TOTAL NUMBER CHILDREN SUPERVISED IN OUTREACH DETENTION PROGRAM BY

Age, Sex and Race

April 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974

Age	WM	BM	Total Male	WF	BF	Total Female	Total	Percentage
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.00
11	0	3	3	0	1	1	4	1.79
12	1	6	7	1	1	2	9	4.04
13	3	8	11	4	2	6	17	7.62
14	9	15	24	9	4	13	37	16.59
15	20	14	34	21	4	25	59	26.46
16	26	15	41	22	3	25	66	29.60
17	18	8	26	4	1	5	31	13.90
Total	77	69	146	61	16	77	223	100.00
Percent- age	34.53	30.94	65.74	27.35	7.17	34.53	100.00	

Table 2 is a breakdown of youths assigned by committing offenses. Of the total of 223 youths assigned to outreach, 53 were charged as being runaways. Burglary was the second highest with 43; and Beyond Parental Control was third with a total of 34 youths. Perhaps it is worth noting that the status offenders comprised 39% of the total youths assigned during the second year, compared to 24% for the first year. It may be that the courts are gaining more confidence in the outreach workers ability to cope with the home-life problems centered around the status offender. Those youths charged with burglary and drug related offenses remain high, and the other offenses are relatively unchanged in their order of priority.

Table 2

NUMBER OF YOUTHS ASSIGNED TO OUTREACH DETENTION

BY OFFENSES

	OFFENSE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1.	Runaway	53	23.77
2.	Burglary	43	19.28
3.	Beyond Parental Control	34	15.25
4.	Vio.of Drug Control Act	21	9.41
5.	Disorderly Conduct	14	6.28
6.	Larceny	13	5.83
7.	Grand Larceny (auto)	8	3.59
8.	Assault	7	3.14
9.	Concealment of Merchandise	6	2.69
10.	Trespassing	4	1.79
11.	Possession of Stolen Property	3	1.35
12.	Concealed Weapons	2	.90
13.	Other	15	6.73
	Totals	223	100.0

## SUCSESSES AND FAILURES

The big question that this program has sought to answer is whether youths assigned to outreach detention can successfully remain trouble free and available to the court, under supervision, without having to stay in a secure facility. Table 3 shows that 164 youths (80.40%) had their cases routinely disposed of in court, while 16 (7.85%) were returned to detention prior to their court date. This gives us an 88.25% success factor; a slight decrease from last years figure of 93.9%. There was a marked increase in the number of youths charged with new offenses from four (2.7%) to eighteen (8.83%). However, the number of youths who ran from supervision and failed to show up for court remained almost unchanged from five (3.3%) to six (2.95%). From the total of 223 youths assigned to Outreach in the second year, nineteen were still under supervision June 30, 1974. 180 (88.25%) youths of the remaining 204, who were terminated, would be classified as program successes, and 24 (11.75%) would be considered program failures. The ratio of success to failure shows a decrease from the first year from 15.4 to 1, to 7.5 to 1.

Table 3

SUCCESS ---FAILURE TERMINATIONS

<u>Successful</u>	No.	%
Normal Court Disposition of Cases	164	80.40
Returned to Detention	16	7.85
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>88.25</b>
<u>Failures</u>		
New Offenses (Law Violation)	18	8.83
Absconding from Supervision	6	2.95
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>11.78</b>
Active Cases - June 30, 1974	19	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>100.00</b>

There were 164 youths whose termination from Outreach Detention resulted from normal court disposition. An examination of Table 4 reveals that 106 (64.64%) of those youths were placed on probation, while 46 (28.05%) had charges dismissed from court. A comparison of these statistics with those of program year I, reveals an increase in those placed on probation by 38 youths, and an increase of 27 in the youths whose charges were dismissed. Also of note is the fact that one youth was sent to a Court of Record. The other type of dispositions, such as commitment to the State Department of Corrections; those placed on the City Farm and etc., generally remained the same. There were no significant changes.

Table 4

## NORMAL COURT DISPOSITIONS

By Sex and Race

Type	Male			Female			Overall Total	Percentages
	WM	BM	Total	WF	BF	Total		
Probation	36	26	62	39	5	44	106	64.64
Department of Corrections	3	6	9	0	0	0	9	5.49
City Farm	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	.61
Dismissed from Court	19	16	35	6	5	11	46	28.05
Hospital	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	.61
Court of Record	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	.61
Totals	60	48	108	45	11	56	164	100.01

Table 5 shows the charge, the number of days on the program, and race and sex of the 46 youths whose charges were dismissed in court. The youth with longest stay on outreach was a black-male charged with burglary and larceny. He spent 148 days on the program. There were other youths whose stay on the program were high above average length of stay on outreach detention. Several youths were on for 50 or more days. The total number of child days on outreach for the 46 youths amounted to 1590 days. The range of offenses ran the gamut from runaway and simple assault to sex crimes.

Table 5

## CASES TERMINATED BY COURT DISMISSION OF PETITION

Case Number	Offense	Number of Days on Program	Sex/Race
162	Grand Larceny Auto	16	WM
165	Burglary & Larceny	7	WM
144	Sex Crime	63	WF
151	Burglary & Larceny	14	BF
152	Drug Violation	41	BF
169	Larceny	25	BM
176	Larceny	19	BM
200	Burglary & Larceny	35	WM
201	Beyond Parental Control	8	WM
155	Runaway	74	WM
177	Disorderly Conduct	22	WF
178	Disorderly Conduct	22	WF
180	Burglary & Larceny	27	WM
187	Drug Violation	32	WM
241	Assault	24	WF
243	Assault	24	WF
228	Burglary & Larceny	9	BM
234	Burglary & Larceny	18	BM
219	Other	58	BM

Table 5 Cont'd.

Case Number	Offense	Number of Days on Program	Sex/Race
231	Drug Violation	46	WM
232	Drug Violation	46	WM
237	Burglary & Larceny	45	BF
240	Drug Violation	39	BM
247	Runaway	11	BM
273	Trespass & Destroying Public Property	30	WM
248	Drug Violation	49	WM
253	Beyond Parental Control	26	WM
257	Disorderly Conduct	15	BM
254	Drug Violation	48	WM
260	Burglary	36	BM
264	Assault	22	BM
292	Assault	24	BM
255	Beyond Parental Control	92	BF
313	Runaway	20	WF
308	Beyond Parental Control	31	WM
310	Runaway	15	WM
312	Grand Larceny Auto & Stolen Property	8	BM
325	Burglary	8	BM
285	Runaway	74	WM
297	Other	71	WM
342	Burglary & Larceny	12	BM
301	Drug Violation	79	WM
327	Beyond Parental Control	30	EM

Table 5 Cont'd.

Case Number	Offense	Number of Days on Program	Sex/Race
298	Burglary & Larceny	148	BM
357	Beyond Parental Control	13	BM
320	Burglary & Larceny	14	BM
Total 46		1590	

There were 16 youths returned to detention during the year for a variety of reasons. Table 6 shows a distribution of those returned by race and sex. There is little change from the 22 returned the first year to a total of 16 in the second year. There does not appear to be any predictable pattern of those returned based on race or sex. The majority of those returned to detention were due to worker request. This request would normally be made because the worker was convinced that the youth was not being cooperative and was unreceptive of supervision, or because of parental request that the youth be returned.

The one youth returned by the court was due to the youth not being available on his scheduled court date. That youth was allowed to go on the program again, and was successfully terminated later in the program year.

Table 6

YOUTHS RETURNED TO DETENTION PRIOR TO COURT DISPOSITION

By Whom	WM	BM	Total	WF	BF	Total	Overall Total	Percent
By Court	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	.50
By Worker	8	4	12	1	2	3	15	7.50
							16	8.00

There was an increase in the number of new offenses during the second year. The numbers rose from four (2.7%) to 18 (8.83%). While the number of offenses have increased, the type of offenses committed has not made any substantial changes. There does not appear to be any predictable pattern to the offenses. The most serious of the offenses committed was Case #244; maiming. The charge was reduced in court to that of assault.

It might be suggested that the increase might be attributeable to a reduction in the quality of supervision rendered by the staff. However, there is no clear cut evidence that poorer supervision is being given. This point will be worthy of note during Program Year III.

Table 7

## NEW OFFENSES WHILE ON OUTREACH DETENTION SUPERVISION

Case No.	New Offense
175	Larceny
215	Disorderly Conduct
217	Burglary 2 cts. & Larceny
221	Runaway
244	Maiming
258	Runaway
265	Unauthorized Use Auto
269	Assault & Battery
291	Breaking & Entering; Grand Larceny 3 cts.
303	Breaking & Entering
314	Trespassing
328	Breaking & Entering
329	Runaway
334	Burglary; Grand Larceny
336	Violation of Supervision
344	Runaway
349	Burglary & Larceny
363	Beyond Parental Control

Table 8 shows the yearly detention home populations. The significance of this table is the steady increase in the yearly population, and the decrease in the percentage of usage by Newport News. Even though the second year program extended for a fifteen month period, the table shows a steady year by year increase from 642 in FY-71 to 1224 the past program year.

The decrease in the percentage of usage by Newport News is probably attributable to the inception of outreach detention and the increased demand for more space by the other localities that we serve.

Table 8

## TOTAL DETENTIONS

WITH NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF NEWPORT NEWS

Year	Total Yearly Detentions	Total Newport News Detentions	Percentage of Total
July 1, 1970 - June 30, 1971	642	465	72.4
July 1, 1971 - June 30, 1972	641	447	69.7
April 1, 1972 - March 31, 1973	738	477	64.6
*April 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974	1224	604	49.4

\*Fifteen month period.

Table 9 shows the total detention population and the numbers from Newport News and Hampton. It also includes the percentages of the population by locality and the numbers assigned to outreach. As previously shown in another table, the total population has increased, however the percentage of those youths assigned to outreach as decreased slightly. The notable area in this table is the usage of the program by Hampton. Almost one-third of the youths placed in detention were assigned to the program. This is significant since outreach service was available to Hampton about one-half of the program year.

Table 9

TOTAL DETENTION: NEWPORT NEWS DETENTION AND

HAMPTON DETENTION: ASSIGNMENT TO OUTREACH

DETENTION BY LOCALITY

April 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974

Newport News

Hampton

Total New Detentions	Total New Detentions for Newport News	Percentage of Total for Newport News	Total Assigned to O/R	Percentage of Total Assigned O/R	Total New Detentions for Hampton	Percentage of Total from Hampton	Total Assigned to O/R	Percentage of Total Assigned to O/R	Total % Assigned to O/R from both Newport News & Hampton
1224	604	49.35	163	26.99	194	15.85	60	30.93	18.22

The program could have had a much greater impact upon the detention population if more youths had been assigned. Table 10 shows that the potential number of child care days to be 9,120 and that the actual number during the program year was 5,146 days. This means that the program operated at 56.43% of its capacity during the year. Compared with the 48.3% during the first year, outreach detention usage has slightly increased by 8.13%. The average length of stay on the program has also increased from 21 days to 24 days.

There are some questions to be raised at this point:

- 1.) Why has the average length of stay increased by three days?
- 2.) Have the Courts' confidence in outreach detention increased?

Table 10

CHILD CARE DAYS IN OUTREACH DETENTION

Potential - Actual

Total possible child care days at 100 percent capacity	9,120 days
Total possible child care days at 90 percent capacity	8,208 days
Total number of child care days for terminated cases	4,929 days
Total number of child care days for active cases as of June 30, 1974	217 days
Total child care days from April 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974	5,146 days
Percentage of actual number of child care days to capacity	56.43
Average number of days each child was supervised	24 days

### IMPACT ON JAIL

The impact of outreach detention on jail population is still very difficult to determine. Table 11 shows the number of juveniles placed in the Newport News Jail from April 1, 1971 to June 30, 1974. The population decreased slightly in the second year from 69 to 65, however, there was an increase in the last program year to 92 youths.

Dr. Buckwalter stated in the first year evaluation that a larger period of time would be needed in order to get a clearer picture of the impact on the jail population. At this point, there does not appear to be any predictability on how outreach will affect that segment of the delinquent youth.

Another fact to be considered in the impact on the jail population is the possible reduction in the jail figure because of the numbers that outreach handled. If those on outreach had to remain in detention than some of those youths in detention would have had to be housed in jail.

TABLE XI

Juveniles In Jail

April 1, 1971 - June 30, 1974

	Black Males				White Males				Black Females			Overall Total
	15	16	17	Total	15	16	17	Total	16	17	Total	
	Apr. 1, 1971 - Mar. 31, 1972	2	8	28	38	0	8	23	31	0	0	
Apr. 1, 1972 - Mar. 31, 1973	1	5	35	41	0	5	19	24	0	0	0	65
Apr. 1, 1973 - Jun. 30, 1974	2	14	26	42	1	3	43	48	0	2	2	92

## C O N C L U S I O N

The operation of the Outreach Detention Program of the Newport News Juvenile Detention Home has continued to successfully demonstrate that it is both practical and economical.

It has also shown that youths are just as accessible to the court while on the program as those in secure detention, and also that those youths are remaining relatively trouble-free. The percentage of those youths who absconded and those who had additional charges placed against them do not represent any larger proportion than those in secure detention who manage to escape or have additional charges placed against them.

The operational cost of the program could certainly justify the continuance at this time. The cost of \$8.23 as compared to \$28.00 per day per child is a substantial difference in residential care and custody.

Even though outreach is considered an operational success, we should not completely disregard the idea of expansion in the secure facility. As the population continues to grow, and the courts emphasis changes, we are still faced with the ever present thought of providing the best quality of service for our youths.

**END**