

69510

**JUVENILE
DETENTION
IN
WISCONSIN**

Brief Report



1976

JUVENILE DETENTION
IN
WISCONSIN
1976

BRIEF REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
MANUEL CARBALLO, SECRETARY

Division of Family Services
Frank Newgent, Administrator

Division of Corrections
Fred W. Hinickle, Acting Administrator

This project was financially aided by a grant (Number 75-05-03-02) approved by the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice, Governor Patrick J. Lucey, Chairman, using State of Wisconsin block funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, under authorizing legislation of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

JUVENILE DETENTION PRACTICES IN WISCONSIN

Report of
Juvenile Detention Study Steering Committee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

ROBERT GANSER, CO-CHAIRPERSON
Division of Family Services

PERRY BAKER
Division of Corrections

ROBERT BATES
Wisconsin Juvenile Officers
Association

MICHAEL BECKER
Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice

*HONORABLE JAMES W. BYERS
Wisconsin Board of Juvenile Court
Judges

DUANE CAMPBELL
Division of Family Services

*ESMERALDA CRUZ
Governor's Advocacy Committee on
Children and Youth

GEORGE FROHMADER
Milwaukee Children's Court Center

LINDA HAMMONDS
Northern Wisconsin Juvenile Workers
Association

GERALD HEERINGA
Division of Corrections

CARL F. HERRMANN
Department of Social Services -
Social Workers

FRANCES SCHEIDEL, CO-CHAIRPERSON
League of Women Voters of Wisconsin

MELVIN H. JONES
Wisconsin Chiefs of Police
Association

PAUL KUSUDA
Division of Corrections

MICHAEL MANOWSKI
Governor's Advocacy Committee on
Children and Youth

*ROBERT MORTENSON
Wisconsin County Boards Association

HONORABLE JOSEPH E. SCHULTZ
Wisconsin Board of Juvenile Court
Judges

*ANN SONSTHAGEN SCHULTZ
Youth Representative

*TAMMY TODD
Youth Representative

HONORABLE PETER J. TROPMAN
Legislative Representative

RAMON TURKOSKI
Wisconsin Sheriffs and Deputy
Sheriffs Association

DAVID W. YOUNG
Division of Family Services

*Inactive or resigned

PROJECT STAFF

Clifford O. McCoy, Director

Research Analysts: Melanie McIntosh
Timothy Toepe

Secretaries: Linda Bollig
Linda Ozanne
Carol Stolarzyk

Research Assistants: Daniel Schroeder
Rosemary Dykman
Michelle Spear
James Harper

1976

FOREWORD

This report contains the results of a two-year study of juvenile detention in Wisconsin. The study involved a state-wide survey of agency resources available to cope with the problems attendant to juvenile detention.

The recommendations provide the framework for a concerted effort on the part of the state to improve juvenile detention practices and reduce jail detention. To accomplish this, the recommendations call for commitment and leadership from state and local agencies, support from the legislature, and citizen awareness; all must assume a share of responsibility.

The report has been designed with the Brief Report providing the project history, general findings and recommendations formulated by the Project Steering Committee. The full report includes the above, in addition to staff findings, supportive data, and analysis.

Special recognition is given to Duane Campbell, Division of Family Services, who initiated the effort that resulted in financial assistance from the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice to the Division of Corrections and the Division of Family Services for implementation of this study. Frances Scheidel, League of Women Voters of Wisconsin, and Robert Ganser, Division of Family Services, served as co-chairpersons of the Project Steering Committee.

We wish to thank the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice, Department of Health and Social Services Secretary, Division of Corrections and Division of Family Services Administrators for lending their support to the project, along with all the judges, law enforcement personnel, county board chairmen, social workers, youth, citizens, probation and parole agents, social service and detention administrators, who participated in the study.

Special acknowledgment is given Dr. Patricia W. Cautley, whose consultation contributed immeasurably to the project. Her interest and knowledge provided the project valuable assistance. Thanks is given Dr. Irving Piliavin, Dr. Richard M. Grinnell, Jr., Dr. Gerald P. Fisher, Attorney Peter J. Rubin, and Charles L. Brassington, for their help in constructing questionnaires and processing data. Special thanks is given Frances Scheidel for editing the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STAFF.....	i
FOREWORD.....	ii
HISTORY OF THE WISCONSIN JUVENILE DETENTION STUDY.....	1
Formation of the Interdivisional Ad Hoc Detention Committee.....	1
Formation of a Steering Committee.....	1
Project Staff Composition.....	2
Consultants.....	2
Goals.....	2
GENERAL FINDINGS.....	3
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
Detention Intake.....	5
Due Process.....	6
Facilities and Programs.....	7
Financing.....	10
Administration.....	10

HISTORY OF THE WISCONSIN JUVENILE DETENTION STUDY

FORMATION OF THE INTERDIVISIONAL AD HOC DETENTION COMMITTEE

In the summer of 1972, a staff member of the Division of Family Services approached administrators from the Division of Corrections with a concern over an area of mutual interest: the detention of juveniles in Wisconsin. As a result of discussions between these two divisions, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Social Services approved the formation of an Interdivisional Ad Hoc Committee to review juvenile detention practices in the state. This Committee was composed of ten members, five from each of the divisions.

At its first meeting, in September of 1972, the following needs were identified as key factors which required attention:

1. A state-wide plan for detention, as specified in the Wisconsin Children's Code (s. 48.32) had not been developed.
2. Detention standards of the Department of Health and Social Services had not been revised since 1955.
3. Communication and coordination between the Division of Family Services and Division of Corrections was insufficient for meeting responsibilities for the administration of the juvenile detention standards (Administrative Order 1.19).

The initial efforts of this Committee were directed at reviewing and assessing juvenile detention issues. Literature and legislation was reviewed on local, state, and national levels. Policy makers and direct service personnel were invited to further clarify issues that demanded attention. Philosophical statements were formulated to reflect the concerns of the Committee.

At the close of the first year of the Committee's work, recognition was given to the magnitude and urgency of the problem at hand. Therefore, a decision was made to work towards the goal of a state-wide study project which would examine detention programs and practices.

FORMATION OF A STEERING COMMITTEE

A Steering Committee was formed with representation from a variety of public agencies and professional and public interest organizations. Efforts were made to include persons from different geographic areas in the state. The resulting membership and the agencies or organizations they represent are on the first page of this report. In February, 1974, a proposal was submitted by the Committee to the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice. The grant was awarded in March, 1974, with matching funds provided by the Division of Corrections and the Division of Family Services. Administrative supervision of the project director was assigned to the Director, Bureau of Planning, Development and Research, Division of Corrections.

The Steering Committee decided on the roles they would assume in relation to the project and its staff. Their primary responsibilities were to provide policy direction related to study design, goal setting and progress, and final study recommendations. They decided that the product of the study would be twofold: a set of recommendations based on data and public hearings and a final study report which would include all data analysis and conclusions as well as information directed at the implementation stage.

PROJECT STAFF COMPOSITION

In the summer of 1974, two people were hired as temporary staff to assist the Committee in preliminary background research for the study. In July of 1974, a project director was hired who had an extensive background in the juvenile justice system. Two research analysts and three research assistants were employed to collect and analyze data and provide staff services to the Steering Committee. The data collection process began in April and was completed in August, 1975.

CONSULTANTS

Dr. Irving Piliavin, University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Social Work, assisted in constructing the questionnaire. The due process questions were reviewed by Attorney Peter J. Rubin, Dane County Legal Services. Dr. Gerald P. Fisher and Dr. Richard M. Grinnell, University of Texas, Arlington, aided in preparing the questionnaire data for computerization. Charles L. Brasington and Perry Baker, Bureau of Planning, Development and Research, Division of Corrections, provided assistance in data analysis, processing jail and detention center data, and preparation of tables. Dr. Patricia W. Cautley, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, provided interview training, data analysis, consultation in computerizing and programming questionnaire data and assisted with editing of the report.

GOALS

The broad goal of the Steering Committee was to develop recommendations for a state-wide plan for the detention of persons under the age of eighteen. These recommendations would be prepared for presentation to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Social Services.

Short term goals of the Committee were to (1) assess current detention facilities and practices, (2) develop a plan which would reduce inappropriate use of detention, and (3) address the lack of standardization in policies and practices across the state.

The project objectives were defined by the Committee in terms of their assessment of the problem areas which needed a focused study. Recommendations were developed to address these objectives and were based on preliminary study findings and public hearings.

GENERAL FINDINGS

The Juvenile Detention Study Project staff visited and gathered data from every detention center and county jail in the state. More than three hundred people in the juvenile justice system, including youth, completed questionnaires and were interviewed. The analysis of the data led to the following general findings:

1. The county jail is the facility most frequently used to hold youth awaiting court action. The eight counties with the highest rates of detention use county jails exclusively for secure detention of youth.
2. Jailed youth are held in solitary confinement in most counties. The conditions they are subjected to before any determination of guilt are, in general, much more restrictive and punitive than those faced by the youth following the finding of guilt.
3. Secure detention is not being used only for delinquents (those who have been charged with criminal acts). Well over one-third of secure detentions are for status offenses, such as curfew, truancy, and running away. Additional juveniles are detained for breaking rules of supervision imposed by juvenile court.
4. Some children who are alleged to be dependent and/or neglected due to family problems are still being sheltered and cared for in county jails.
5. Secure detention is frequently used in some jurisdictions for "therapeutic punishment" and not primarily for the protection of the community or to insure appearance of the child in court.
6. For those youth apprehended for status offenses, the rate of detention is three times greater than for those apprehended for criminal acts.
7. Minority youth (black and Native American) are detained disproportionately more than whites in relation to their numbers in the total population.
8. Female youths are detained at higher rates than males following apprehension. They are also detained more frequently for status offenses than are males (61% compared to 32% for males).
9. Over one-half of the juveniles who are held in secure detention are released within twenty-four hours.
10. Over two-thirds of the young people released from secure detention go back to the community.
11. Only five percent of all juveniles held in jail are alleged to have committed an offense against another person.

12. Screening of initial detention admissions is either perfunctory or nonexistent in most counties.
13. Criteria and procedures for placement of a youth in detention lack uniformity within most counties. In addition, criteria and procedures vary widely from county to county.
14. There are no alternatives to secure detention in most counties. Foster care and/or receiving homes are too few in number to provide effective alternatives.
15. Many young people are never given a detention hearing. Many others are not given hearings until well after twenty-four hours following confinement.
16. Youth are seldom represented by attorneys at detention hearings. When they are represented, their attorneys often do not act as advocates.
17. The type of detention information available varies from county to county, making it difficult to assess actual detention practice.
18. Youth make up fifty percent of law enforcement apprehensions, yet only a small part of law enforcement training is youth-related.
19. Decision makers in counties with high detention rates hold stricter attitudes regarding detention than those in counties with low detention rates.
20. The twelve counties comprising the northwest portion of the state contain 45% (5 of 11) of the low detention rate counties and 62.5% (5 of 8) of the high detention rate counties, demonstrating extreme variability.
21. Both the attitude and the availability of a youth's parents significantly affect the decision to detain.
22. Fingerprinting and photographing are usual practices when admitting youth to jail.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Juvenile Detention Study Steering Committee, after meeting numerous times to review and discuss recommendations, and to consider study findings and input from open meetings, proposes recommendations for improvement of juvenile detention practices in Wisconsin. Definitions are presented, followed by recommendations in five areas: detention intake, due process, facilities and programs, financing and administration.

SECURE DETENTION: Temporary care of children, excluding those who are dependent or neglected, in a physically secure facility pending court action.

NONSECURE DETENTION: Temporary care of children in an unlocked facility pending juvenile court action.

DETENTION INTAKE: The screening procedure following a request for detention and ending with a decision to detain or not to detain.

DETENTION INTAKE

1. NO CHILD SHOULD BE DETAINED IN ANY FACILITY WITHOUT SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION FROM A JUVENILE COURT JUDGE, JUVENILE COURT COMMISSIONER, OR DETENTION INTAKE WORKER(S) DELEGATED THIS AUTHORITY. SUCH AUTHORIZATION SHOULD NOT BE DELEGATED TO ANY OTHER FUNCTIONARY IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

Commentary: It is important that detention authority be vested only in those specially qualified and trained to make such a decision.

2. SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED INTAKE WORKER(S) SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TWENTY-FOUR HOURS A DAY, SEVEN DAYS A WEEK, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SCREENING ADMISSIONS TO DETENTION.
3. DECISIONS TO DETAIN SHOULD BE MADE AS A RESULT OF FACE-TO-FACE INTERVIEWS WITH THE CHILD AND CONCERNED PARTIES.
4. THE DETENTION INTAKE WORKER SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE TO THE JUVENILE COURT JUDGE.

Commentary: Persons making the decision to deprive someone of their liberty should be under judicial supervision.

5. THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OF THE INTAKE WORKER SHOULD INCLUDE THREE YEARS EXPERIENCE WITH JUVENILES IN A DIRECT WORKING RELATIONSHIP AND EXPERTISE IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM, OR THE REQUIREMENTS OF A COUNTY SOCIAL WORKER II.
6. WRITTEN INTAKE POLICIES SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND UTILIZED BY THE COURT IN CONSULTATION WITH INTAKE WORKERS, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT. THESE POLICIES SHOULD BE REVIEWED AT LEAST EVERY TWO YEARS.
7. CHILDREN NOT TO BE DETAINED MAY BE RELEASED TO PARENT, ADULT RELATIVE, LEGAL CUSTODIAN, GUARDIAN OR OTHER RESPONSIBLE ADULT. CHILDREN FIFTEEN (15) YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER MAY BE RELEASED WITHOUT IMMEDIATE ADULT SUPERVISION.

Commentary: Children fifteen years of age or older should not be detained solely because adult supervision is not immediately available.
8. CRISIS COUNSELING SHOULD BE AVAILABLE DURING THE INTAKE PROCESS.

Commentary: When one is deprived of his/her liberty, a potential crisis situation exists which may necessitate the need for crisis counseling.
9. EACH LAW ENFORCEMENT JURISDICTION SHOULD HAVE BOTH MALE AND FEMALE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AVAILABLE WHO HAVE BEEN TRAINED TO WORK WITH JUVENILES.

DUE PROCESS

1. IF A CHILD IS DETAINED, THE PERSON MAKING THE DECISION SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING THE PARENTS OR LEGAL GUARDIAN, AND THE DETENTION HEARING SHOULD BE HELD WITHIN TWENTY-FOUR HOURS, OR THE NEXT WORKING DAY FOLLOWING A WEEKEND OR HOLIDAY.
2. CHILDREN MAY BE FINGERPRINTED OR PHOTOGRAPHED ONLY IF THEY ARE ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED A SERIOUS OFFENSE AND WITH PERMISSION OF THE JUVENILE COURT JUDGE.
3. A PETITION SHOULD BE FILED PRIOR TO THE DETENTION HEARING AND THE CHILD SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO REVIEW THE PETITION PRIOR TO THE DETENTION HEARING.
4. PRIOR TO THE DETENTION HEARING THE JUDGE SHOULD DETERMINE THAT PROBABLE CAUSE EXISTS ON THE FACE OF THE PETITION.

5. A CHILD SHOULD BE ADVISED OF HIS/HER RIGHT TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION AT THE DETENTION HEARING. THE ATTORNEY REPRESENTING A CHILD SHOULD ACT IN THE CAPACITY OF AN ADVOCATE.
6. IF THE DECISION IS MADE AT THE DETENTION HEARING TO CONTINUE DETENTION, AN ADJUDICATORY HEARING SHOULD BE HELD WITHIN TWENTY DAYS.
7. THE JUVENILE COURT JUDGE SHOULD REVIEW CONTINUED DETENTION EVERY FIVE WORKING DAYS. ALL INTERESTED PARTIES SHOULD BE NOTIFIED OF THE TIME AND PLACE OF THE REVIEW AND HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE PRESENT.
8. FOLLOWING ADJUDICATION, A DAILY, WRITTEN REPORT SHOULD BE MADE TO THE JUVENILE COURT JUDGE REGARDING THE PLAN FOR REMOVAL OF EACH CHILD HELD IN SECURE DETENTION.

Commentary: Such report should be made by the agency responsible for planning the removal of the child.
9. WHEN A PETITION FOR WAIVER TO ADULT COURT IS FILED THE CHILD SHOULD IMMEDIATELY BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR BAIL.
10. THE DISPOSITIONAL HEARING FOR CHILDREN HELD IN SECURE DETENTION SHOULD BE HELD WITHIN TEN WORKING DAYS AFTER ADJUDICATION.
11. THE DISPOSITIONAL HEARING FOR CHILDREN HELD IN NONSECURE DETENTION SHOULD BE HELD WITHIN FIFTEEN WORKING DAYS AFTER ADJUDICATION.
12. ANY LIQUOR LAW OR TRAFFIC LAW PERMITTING SENTENCING OF JUVENILES TO JAIL SHOULD BE RESCINDED.
13. JUVENILES SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO ANY RECORDS RELATING TO THEIR DETENTION.
14. NO CHILD SHOULD BE GIVEN INEQUITABLE TREATMENT DUE TO RACE, COLOR, SEX OR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE COMMENCE PROPER LEGAL ACTION AGAINST LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES FOUND TO BE IN VIOLATION OF THE WISCONSIN STATUTES WHICH PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION.

FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS

1. IN ORDER TO BE CONSIDERED FOR ADMISSION TO A SECURE DETENTION FACILITY OTHER THAN JAIL, A CHILD MUST BE TEN (10) YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER, ALLEGED TO BE DELINQUENT OR IN NEED OF SUPERVISION, AND PRESENT AN IMMINENT

PHYSICAL THREAT TO PERSONS; OR, BE A FUGITIVE FROM A CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION OR ANOTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT JURISDICTION; OR, BECAUSE OF PREVIOUS BEHAVIOR, IS BELIEVED LIKELY TO ABSCOND.

2. IN ORDER TO BE CONSIDERED FOR ADMISSION TO JAIL, A CHILD MUST BE FOURTEEN (14) YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER, PRESENT AN IMMINENT PHYSICAL THREAT TO PERSONS AND ALLEGEDLY HAVE COMMITTED A DELINQUENT ACT AGAINST PERSONS; OR BE WAIVED TO CRIMINAL COURT.
3. FOR A CHILD ALLEGED TO BE DELINQUENT OR IN NEED OF SUPERVISION TO BE CONSIDERED FOR ADMISSION TO NONSECURE DETENTION, THAT CHILD MUST BE TEN (10) YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.
4. CHILDREN WHO ARE SUICIDAL, EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED, OR UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF DRUGS OR ALCOHOL SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR DETENTION; MEDICAL CARE SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR THESE CHILDREN.

Commentary: Under present law, adult drunkenness is not considered an offense, but rather an illness. Children, however, may still be taken into custody for drinking and placed in jail.

5. NO CHILD SHOULD BE PLACED IN A FACILITY WHO DOES NOT MEET THE CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO THAT FACILITY AS DEFINED BY REGULATION. ANY PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR AN IMPROPER PLACEMENT MAY BE FINED NOT MORE THAN \$100, OR IMPRISONED NOT MORE THAN THREE (3) MONTHS, OR BOTH.
6. CHILDREN HELD IN DETENTION FOR THREE (3) DAYS OR LESS SHOULD AT LEAST BE PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING SERVICES:
 - A. STAFF AVAILABLE TWENTY-FOUR (24) HOURS TO RECEIVE NEW ADMISSIONS.
 - B. UPON ADMISSION, MEDICAL INFORMATION SHOULD BE GATHERED FROM THE CHILD, OR OTHERS AVAILABLE, REGARDING THE GENERAL HEALTH OF THE CHILD AND ANY SPECIAL HEALTH NEEDS.
 - C. EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES AVAILABLE TWENTY-FOUR (24) HOURS A DAY, AND THERE SHOULD BE WRITTEN PROCEDURES FOR THESE SERVICES.
 - D. RADIOS AND CONTEMPORARY READING MATERIALS.
 - E. COUNSELING (SOCIAL, BEHAVIORAL OR RELIGIOUS) ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS.
 - F. THERE SHOULD BE VISITATION DURING REASONABLE HOURS. PARENTS, GUARDIANS, SIBLINGS, AND SIGNIFICANT OTHERS (PEOPLE WHO DEMONSTRATE SOME CONSTRUCTIVE INVOLVEMENT IN THE LIFE OF THE CHILD), MAY VISIT AND HAVE THE RIGHT TO A PRIVATE CONVERSATION. VISUAL MONITORING, WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE CHILD AND VISITORS, MAY OCCUR, BUT THERE SHOULD NOT BE SOUND MONITORING OR RECORDING OF THE CONVERSATION.

7. CHILDREN HELD FOR MORE THAN THREE (3) DAYS SHOULD AT LEAST BE PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL SERVICES:

- A. A GENERAL PHYSICAL EXAMINATION.
- B. EXERCISE OPPORTUNITIES IN AN INDOOR AND/OR OUTDOOR AREA, RADIO, TELEVISION SET AND CONTEMPORARY READING MATERIALS.
- C. PROGRAMS WITH TRAINED COMMUNITY VOLUNTEERS.
- D. EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED IN COOPERATION WITH LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS UNDER PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 115, WISCONSIN STATUTES.

8. A CHILD SHOULD NOT BE ISOLATED IN SUCH A WAY AS TO PROHIBIT ALL SOCIAL INTERACTION.

9. A CHILD SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO PERSONAL PRIVACY.

10. WHENEVER POSSIBLE, PROGRAMS SHOULD BE COEDUCATIONAL.

11. ALL DETENTION STAFF SHOULD RECEIVE AT LEAST FORTY (40) HOURS OF ORIENTATION TRAINING PRIOR TO WORKING WITH CLIENTS. ADDITIONAL TRAINING SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES.

12. WHENEVER POSSIBLE, STAFF SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN FORMAL EDUCATION COURSES DESIGNED TO IMPROVE THEIR JOB EFFECTIVENESS. WHERE SUCH COURSEWORK IS TAKEN AND SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED, THE EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE REIMBURSED BY THEIR EMPLOYING AGENCY.

13. JUVENILES HELD IN JAIL BECAUSE THEY ARE WAIVED TO CRIMINAL COURT SHOULD BE HELD IN THE JUVENILE SECTION OF THE JAIL.

14. "HOME DETENTION" PROGRAMS SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO SECURE DETENTION. JUVENILES WHO WOULD OTHERWISE BE DETAINED WOULD BE PLACED IN THEIR OWN HOMES OR IN HOMES DESIGNATED BY THE COURT AND UNDER SUPERVISION AWAITING COURT ACTION.

Commentary: Juveniles committing serious violent crimes such as murder or rape are excluded from the program. After eligibility for the program is determined by the judge at the detention hearing, a caseworker is assigned to the juvenile. Counseling and supervision are provided by the assigned worker who sees the youth at least once each day and makes additional daily contacts with parents and teachers. The potential benefits of this program are numerous. First, it enables the child to live at home and participate in family and community affairs rather than isolating him from

his environment. It also helps the youth deal directly with problems which may arise in the family or community. Such a program can be provided at less cost to the county because unnecessary detention costs are eliminated. The goals of the program include insuring that each juvenile will appear for his court hearing and refrain from misbehavior in the interim.

FINANCING

1. STATE REIMBURSEMENT SHOULD BE MADE TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF DETENTION AND SHELTER FACILITIES. REIMBURSEMENT FOR CARE SHOULD BE CONTINGENT UPON MEETING STANDARDS FOR DETENTION AS RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE UNDER FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS. THE REIMBURSEMENT FOR CARE SHOULD BE FOR NO MORE THAN FIFTEEN (15) CONSECUTIVE DAYS OF CARE PER CHILD PER EPISODE.
2. COSTS RELATING TO INTAKE WORKERS SHOULD BE REIMBURSED BY STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS AT THE USUAL SOCIAL WORKER RATE.

ADMINISTRATION

1. THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES SHOULD REORGANIZE IN SUCH A WAY AS TO PROTECT THE NEEDS OF CHILDREN THROUGH SPECIALIZED UNITS HAVING RESPONSIBILITY FOR STANDARDS, FACILITIES, AND PROGRAMS. WITHIN THIS STRUCTURE A JUVENILE DETENTION SPECIALIST POSITION SHOULD BE CREATED.
Commentary: Regulations and standards for juvenile detention facilities and programs, inspection and evaluation of facilities and programs, and uniform state-wide reporting should be developed and carried out by staff. Efforts should be directed toward establishing and maintaining uniform standards and enabling continued resource development.
2. THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES SHOULD ASSIST LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES TO SECURE DETENTION, INCLUDING LEGAL ASSISTANCE REGARDING ZONING ORDINANCES.
3. THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES SHOULD ESTABLISH A STATE-WIDE UNIFORM JUVENILE DETENTION INFORMATION REPORTING SYSTEM TO BE USED FOR BOTH LOCAL AND STATE-WIDE PLANNING. PERSONAL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED.
4. THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES SHOULD IMMEDIATELY ESTABLISH UNIFORM LICENSING PROCEDURES FOR SHELTER CARE.

Commentary: Any facility intended for the care of eight children or less as an alternative to secure detention should be licensed as a special type of foster home. The Division of Family Services should regularly solicit input from counties and local communities regarding detention standards, facilities and programs, and alternatives to detention.

5. EACH COUNTY WITH A JUVENILE POPULATION OVER 10,000 (AGE 12-17) SHOULD ESTABLISH CRISIS INTERVENTION UNITS.
6. LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEES SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN EACH COUNTY, WITH SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING IN PART TO THE DETENTION OF JUVENILES.