



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children, Youth, and Families

New Directions in Youth Services: Experiences with State-Level Coordination

92927

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children, Youth, and Families

New Directions in Youth Services: Experiences with State-Level Coordination

authors

Roderick O'Connor
Project Director

Nancy Albrecht
Principal Researcher

Burton Cohen
Project Consultant

Lori Newquist-Carroll
Staff Writer

March 1984

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

92927

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Public Domain/LEAA/OJJDP
U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Prepared by SRA Corporation, Arlington, Va., under grant number J-JSIA-0006-82 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U. S. Department of Justice, supported by the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families of the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Department of Justice or the Department of Health and Human Services.

NCJ-92927

FOREWORD

This monograph documents, for the first time, the broad commitment by States to the coordination of youth services. States have undertaken innovative strategies to bring together various disciplines to improve services to their young people. The commitment of this Administration to return power to the States appears to be resulting in a flowering of individual and creative responses to local needs.

We hope that this volume will stimulate State-level practitioners to continue efforts to coordinate their program and policy efforts and to work with local governments and the private sector to improve the lives of disadvantaged citizens. The findings presented here can be used by States to help focus their thinking about different approaches or to compare their efforts to those of others embarked on coordination experiments. We pledge our continued cooperation, particularly through the Federal Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, to assist States in developing their own coordination strategies.

The Federal government can provide research and evaluation information, technical assistance, and training to States to inaugurate or improve their coordination efforts. It is essential, however, that States be free to organize services as they see fit. State control of programs can promote both creative and efficient use of funds.

We invite your comments on this monograph and your suggestions on further steps the Federal government can take to assist States. Through an open dialogue and a working partnership we can improve our service delivery and the lives of our citizens.

Alfred S. Regnery, Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention

Clarence Hodges, Commissioner
Administration for Children,
Youth and Families

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study grew out of an attempt by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to look at general State-level coordination of youth services through a series of case studies. Funding from the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) permitted its expansion to include a survey of State-level coordination mechanisms and a review of the current literature on the coordination of youth services.

We want to thank those people at OJJDP and ACYF for their advice, assistance, and, above all, patience in this effort. A fire in August 1982 that destroyed some valuable records of the project, delays from slower than expected survey returns, and methodological caution made the project a sometimes frustrating experience for all of us.

In particular, we wish to thank:

Charles A. Lauer
General Counsel, Office of Justice
Assistance, Research and Statistics

M. Warren Master
Deputy Commissioner, ACYF

William Modzeleski, Director
Concentration of Federal Effort
Program, OJJDP

Dr. Robert Radford,
Director, Youth Development
Bureau

Sheldon Lehner, JJ Specialist
OJJDP

Pamela Johnson,
Youth Development Bureau

Bonnie Halford, JJ Specialist
OJJDP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	iii
Chapter 1	
Overview.....	1
Chapter 2	
Coordination Issues and Approaches: A Review of the Literature.....	5
Chapter 3	
Survey of State-level Coordination Mechanisms: Summary of the Data.....	19
Chapter 4	
Case Studies.....	41
New York Case Study.....	43
North Carolina Case Study.....	71
Maryland Case Study.....	89
Alabama Case Study.....	109
Chapter 5	
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	131
Appendix A: Sample Questionnaire.....	137
Appendix B: List of Coordination Mechanisms.....	144
Appendix C: State Acknowledgments.....	148

CHAPTER 1 OVERVIEW

Coordination of services has been a major concern of human service providers for at least the past 20 years. The creation of integrated agencies and service approaches, the rise of interagency bodies, and the reorganization of previously autonomous agencies into single administrative structures have characterized attempts to organize service delivery more effectively to meet client needs. The impact of these organizational approaches upon actual coordination of services is unclear.

The belief that services should be organized to permit the resolution of a client's total problems is strong in human services organizations. The level of activity and the continuing dynamics of reorganization in many States testify to the commitment to find an organizational pattern that will improve services. Practitioners, researchers, advocates, and policy makers all believe that coordination of services is vital to improving services. Yet there is no consensus on what works best.

Recently, coordination of youth services at the State level has received increased attention. In part this is due to the reduction of budgets and extensive reorganization of categorical programs into block grants. These Federal actions have forced State administrators to re-examine their structures for administering youth programs to get the greatest impact from a shrinking but more flexible dollar. The impetus toward coordination has been accelerated by two recent statutory provisions. First, in 1980, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was amended to require participating States to develop "a plan for the concentration of State efforts which shall coordinate all State juvenile delinquency programs with respect to overall policy and development of objectives and priorities...including provision for regular meetings of State officials with responsibility in the area of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention...and other related programs such as education, health, and welfare...."

Additionally, the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 required that State plans for child welfare services be coordinated with Title XX plans and plans of "other State programs having a relationship to the program...with a view to provision of welfare and related services which will best promote the welfare of such children and their families."

In response to these trends and concerns, this study examines the issues involved in the coordination of youth services at the State level. It was intended as an exploratory study, designed to discover the level and nature of State coordination activity and to develop insights into how coordination mechanisms are evolving and the factors associated with success or failure. There are two primary objectives of the study:

- To provide Federal agency planners with an understanding of current trends and issues in the coordination of youth services at the State level and identify the need for further research, and

information dissemination and technical assistance activities to advance the state-of-the art and the state-of-practice in this field; and

- To provide State agency planners with information about coordination activities and lessons learned in other States that might help them in designing or refining coordination mechanisms in their own State.

Approach

The principal approach for addressing the research objectives is case studies of four State efforts to coordinate youth services. The case study is an excellent mechanism for developing and testing hypotheses about coordination models and for capturing key elements of past experience that can guide future thinking and practice.

The case studies were supplemented by two additional research components to place the four case studies in the context of theoretical and practical knowledge in the field. First, SRA Corporation conducted a comprehensive review of the coordination literature and analyzed the findings to extract key principles about the nature and success of coordination mechanisms. These principles helped to guide the areas of inquiry in the case studies and provide a broader context in which to assess the case study findings.

Second, SRA conducted a national survey of the States to identify and examine State-level coordination of youth services and juvenile delinquency programs. State-level agencies for social services, juvenile justice, mental health, and education represent some of the functional areas that were explored for coordination mechanisms for planning, administering and/or delivering services to youth. This effort began with a phone survey of State juvenile justice specialists, and State criminal justice or human services agency representatives. Phone contact was then made with each coordination mechanism identified to confirm the information obtained and to develop a mailing list. A written survey was then sent to each mechanism identified.

A coordination mechanism met the criteria for inclusion in the survey if it:

- Was formally constituted or recognized (Executive Order, legislative mandate, interagency agreement);
- Was currently in existence;
- Had a broader focus than a single issue (e.g. systemic planning, joint licensing, delinquency prevention, etc., as opposed to a task force on child abuse);

- Consisted of autonomous agencies or departments (although it could consist of autonomous units of a consolidated or integrated human services agency);
- Had a focus on:
 - Joint policy development and implementation;
 - Joint budgetary planning;
 - Information exchange and public education; and
 - Joint planning, program development, technical assistance, training, research, or evaluation.

The survey assisted in the identification of appropriate case study States and helps to place the experience in those States within the context of national trends.

Organization of the Report

The information in this monograph includes:

- A literature review of coordination issues;
- An analysis of theoretical and practical issues as they relate to State coordination of youth programs;
- Identification of States with some level of coordination of their youth services and a development of typologies for State coordination models;
- Four in-depth case studies representing diverse types of State coordination mechanisms; and
- Recommendations and identification of significant issues for those States seeking to implement coordination processes.

The information is presented in the following four chapters:

- **Chapter Two: Coordination Issues and Approaches: A Review of the Literature--** This chapter reviews the literature and past history of coordination efforts and identifies the critical issues to be considered in planning or studying State-level coordination mechanisms.
- **Chapter Three: Survey of State-Level Coordination Mechanisms: Summary of the Data--** This chapter presents the results of the national exploratory survey. It describes the types of mechanisms identified, their membership, structure, functions, activities, and successes as reported by the respondents.
- **Chapter Four: Case Studies--** This chapter explains the case study methodology and describes the experiences of four different States

(New York, North Carolina, Alabama, and Maryland) implementing major efforts to coordinate youth services.

- **Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations--** This chapter summarizes some of the key findings of the study, highlights apparent keys to success, and suggests future directions to further the state-of-the-art.

CHAPTER 2

COORDINATION ISSUES AND APPROACHES: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

WHY COORDINATE?

The current set of social, economic, and political conditions makes a better organized approach to youth services not just desirable, but mandatory.

Youth services, like human services in general, have been going through a period of no growth, if not retrenchment. The days of expanding resources are generally seen as having ended. Greater uncertainty about the future and demands for redefining and creating new uses for existing resources have increased the urgency for improved working relationships among those responsible for various parts of the youth services system.

The United States also is transferring more responsibility for priority setting and resource allocation from the Federal to the State level in the form of block grants, a sorting out of Federal and State responsibilities, and deregulation resulting in greater local discretion. In the past, "vertical linkages" between State or local agencies and their Federal counterparts often took precedence over "horizontal linkages" across programs at the same level. This is no longer the case.

Along with these conditions, there is an increasing awareness among those who are experienced in working with youth that effective service delivery requires a more holistic approach to youth and their needs. The problems to be addressed by "coordination" result from two equally powerful and opposing social phenomena. The first, as stated by Munro is the obstinate refusal by youthful offenders, children in need, and other clients of the system "to operate within only one analytical category at a time." This annoying client characteristic not only produces confusion within the juvenile justice system, "but by involving a variety of noncriminal justice agencies, creates utter administrative chaos at the action level" (p. 390). Thus, for example, the unemployed potential juvenile delinquent with a drug problem refuses to refrain from stealing until his employment and drug related problems are solved. The second phenomenon is the refusal of many professionals and youth-serving agencies to operate in anything other than one analytical category at a time. A foster care agency may refuse to serve a client who is also a delinquent or a treatment program may refuse to serve an adjudicated delinquent who is also emotionally disturbed.

This chapter reviews some of the past and present approaches to improving coordination among youth services organizations and those within the field of human services in general. First, however, it is important to indicate

1/ Munro, Jim. "Intersystem Action Planning: Criminal and Noncriminal Justice Agencies." Public Administration Review, July and August, 1976.

briefly some of the primary reasons why "coordination" has been both a major goal during the past two decades and at the same time an elusive and often frustrating one.

First, there has been enormous growth in categorical programs related to youth services, as there has been in human services as a whole. A report issued by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)² in 1981 identified 45 different Federal programs related to delinquent youth representing seven Federal departments and agencies. Most of these had been developed independently in response to a particular crisis or perceived problem; many led to independent responses on the parts of State and local governments. The various programs often have separate application procedures, guidelines, and planning processes that produce an enormous amount of work for State and local recipients.

Second, the youth services system has evolved without a clear sense of who is responsible for which programs or activities. The States vary significantly with respect to which services are State and which are local responsibilities, with respect to judicial versus executive branch responsibilities, and in the relationship between juvenile justice and child welfare programs. In most States, responsibilities remain fragmented and debates continue.

A third impetus for increased coordination is the appearance of divergent goals and objectives among various programs and agencies. This is partially explained by the complex mandate of the youth services system to assist individual juveniles and protect their rights, provide support to the family, and protect the community at large. Agencies and professions often embrace one of these objectives more than the others, exacerbating the situation. An example is the relationship between the juvenile justice and the child welfare systems. A recent study³, looking at the linkage between these two systems, concluded that:

There is no cohesive policy toward justice system handling of child abuse and neglect, either on the Federal or State level... The resultant strain of more cases of child abuse and neglect entering the social service and justice system without a clarification of their respective roles and functions has resulted in increased confusion, frustration, counterproductivity and inefficient utilization of scarce resources. In addition, attention directed toward initial intervention strategies has

^{2/} Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Fifth Analysis and Evaluation of Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

^{3/} Smith, Charles; Berkman, David; and Fraser, Warren. A Preliminary National Assessment of Child Abuse and Neglect and the Juvenile Justice System: The Shadows of Distress. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1980.

devoted energies and resources from long-term service and treatment oriented programs (pp. 62-63).

COORDINATION AND YOUTH SERVICES

The movement towards more coordination in the planning and delivery of youth services should not be viewed as an isolated phenomenon, but in the context of several other trends: (1) changes in the nature of youth services; (2) changes in the organization of responsibilities for human services in general; and (3) changes in State government organization and capabilities. These trends have helped to influence the ways in which we think about organizing services to children and youth.

Nature of Youth Services

The first of these trends--the shift in perception of how to address youth needs--has probably had the greatest impact. Since the 1950s, theoretical and treatment emphasis has shifted from a focus on individual problems to a more holistic approach that addresses interrelated problems and views individuals in relation to their environment. There has also been a shift from a reliance on formal governmental intervention to a preference for less formal interventions using the community, the family, and other local mediators (e.g., diversion programs, community arbitration, and volunteer one-on-one programs).

There has also been a corresponding shift in organizational responses to youth. There has been a movement away from single agencies toward an emphasis on loosely coupled networks, sharing of resources, and imaginative methods of tapping existing community resources. Alternative institutional arrangements have been designed around youth and their communities. Finally, planning for the sake of producing a plan has begun to be replaced by a less formal style that actively involves a related group of managers and decision-makers. These shifts in organizational response are shown in Figure 1.

Efforts to link interagency relationships to the effectiveness of services to children and youth go back at least to the mid 1950s. Reporting on a delinquency prevention demonstration project in Boston combining group work, counseling, and coordination of existing youth services and agencies, Miller⁴ concluded that "the major impediment to effectiveness in this field relates more to the nature of relations among the various concerned institutions than to a lack of knowledge as to effective procedure" (p. 23). He suggested a shift in emphasis in research from a focus on the relationships between agencies and youth (the treatment process) to the relationships between agencies and institutions themselves.

^{4/} Miller, Walter. "Interinstitutional Conflict as a Major Impediment to Delinquency Prevention." Human Organization, Vol. 17, No. 3, Fall 1958.

Figure 1. Shifts in Organizational Responses to Youth-Related Problems

FROM	TOWARD
1. A focus on single agencies acting relatively independently.	1. A focus on networks of related agencies whose relationships must be managed.
2. A tendency to seek more of the same kinds of resources that are currently possessed.	2. A desire to redefine what are considered to be resources and how they are utilized (e.g., viewing youth themselves as resources to each other).
3. Trying to reform existing institutions to make them more humane and effective.	3. Designing newer forms of "institutions" around the needs of youth and their communities.
4. Planning seen as an activity of plan-makers to meet government regulations.	4. Planning as an essential activity for managers and decision-makers who want to influence their own futures.

In 1960, the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) released a report describing the patterns of coordination at local, State, and Federal levels of government as they related to juvenile delinquency.⁵ The report did not make specific recommendations, but rather attempted to describe the deficiencies of the existing patterns to indicate where improvement was needed. In particular, the report found that coordination of efforts at the State level was confusing: "The picture today of State administration of delinquency programs is a hodge podge when viewed from a national perspective, in comparison with State administration of child welfare and public assistance" (p. 10). The report described a Children's Bureau survey of the 50 States in 1958 from which data were extracted to determine which agency in each State was responsible for each of the following six types of youth services:

1. Direct Services--Preventive (child welfare, mental health, family service);
2. Direct Services--Rehabilitative (training schools, probation, and after care);

^{5/} Romnes, Bjerne. Coordination of the National Effort for Dealing with Juvenile Delinquency. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Children's Bureau, Washington, D.C., 1960.

3. Consultation, Licensing, or Standard Setting for "Child Welfare" Agencies;
4. Consultation and Standard Setting for Juvenile Courts and Juvenile Law Enforcement;
5. Community Consultation and Planning; and
6. State-level Planning and Coordination.

The results were as follows:

1. In four States there was a comprehensive State welfare agency responsible for all six activities.
2. In eleven states there was a State welfare agency responsible for "child welfare" and a separate State agency responsible for services to delinquents.
3. In nine states there was a State welfare agency responsible for all direct services and agency consultation (types 1, 2, 3, and 4), but with no role in community consultation or overall planning and coordination.
4. In twenty-six States responsibilities for direct services and agency consultation were split between two or more agencies with no agency offering community consultation and only a few with some responsibility for planning and coordination.

Efforts to reorient and coordinate youth services were given a large push forward with the publication of the report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967.⁶ One of its recommendations was that communities establish "youth service bureaus" (YSBs) in order to direct children and youth from the juvenile justice system. Youth service bureaus "would act as central coordinators of all community services for young people and would also provide services lacking in the community or neighborhood, especially ones designed for less seriously delinquent juveniles" (p. 83). YSBs began to appear all over the country, especially as Federal and State funding became more available in the early 1970s. In 1972, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency published a comprehensive set of guidelines,⁷ laying out three major functions of YSBs:

^{6/} President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

^{7/} Norman, Sherwood. The Youth Service Bureau: A Key to Delinquency Prevention. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Paramus, N.J., 1972.

1. Service brokerage--bridging the gap between available services and youth in need of them by referral and follow-up.
2. Resource development--working with community leaders in developing new resources where they are lacking; and
3. Systems modification--seeking to modify, in established institutions, those attitudes and practices that discriminate against troublesome children and youth and thereby contribute to their antisocial behavior.

The YSBs themselves came under criticism for failing to live up to their objectives. A publication of the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration⁸ stated that "most of the Youth Services Bureau programs that have evolved to date have been concerned fundamentally with providing one or another form of clinical or counseling service to young persons 'in trouble.' That is to say, they have not placed a heavy emphasis on the development of programs of work or education which provide access to success experiences which build up a sense of legitimacy" (p. 25). YDDPA then went on to promote a model of "youth service systems" that would provide "a bridge between correctional agencies on the one hand and the 'legitimacy' agencies (school, work, politics) on the other" (p. 27). Today, both the NCCD and YDDPA models have influenced numerous youth bureaus, youth commissions, and coordinating offices.

The Organization of Responsibilities for Human Services

Attempts to introduce more coherence and rationality to the organization of services to children and youth are part of a much larger effort to rethink the organization of all human services. The rapid and fragmented growth in these programs has been widely reported.⁹ During the 1960s and 1970s the Federal government played a major role in initiating new programs through categorical grants to State and local governments. By one count, there were 290 separate categorical grant programs in HEW alone in 1976.¹⁰ Federal, State, and local officials began to express dissatisfaction at the increasing number of categorical programs and the problems caused by the way in which they were implemented. Among the problems cited were:

⁸/ Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. Delinquency Prevention Through Youth Development. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1972.

⁹/ Agranoff, Robert. Coping with the Demands of Change Within Human Services Administration. American Society for Public Administration, Washington, D.C., 1977.

¹⁰/ Project SHARE. Roles for General Purpose Government in Services Integration. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1976.

1. The tendency to create a system with stronger vertical linkages (between Federal categorical agencies, State bureaus that administered the Federal-State program, and local offices of State agencies) than horizontal linkages among different categorical programs.¹²
2. Complaints that general purpose State and local executives (e.g., governors, county commissioners, and mayors) were not given a sufficient role in planning and managing Federal funds.
3. Evidence that disparate goals within and among programs led to conflicts in their implementation.¹²

Beginning in the early 1970s, the Federal government undertook several steps to try to address these problems. These included the Partnership Program, efforts at "capacity building," and demonstration projects aimed at "services integration." These initiatives all had several common objectives, as summarized by John:¹³

- Greater consistency between the policies and plans of related programs;
- Greater control by elected officials and their appointees over the categorical agencies under their supervision;
- Greater efficiency through reduction of duplication and consolidation of common activities;
- Better services by coordinated service planning at the delivery level; and
- More simplicity and rationality in the service system (p. 1).

The Reagan Administration has sought to intensify previous movement toward a larger State and local role in the planning and delivery of human services through strategies of "deregulation." The Administration also has emphasized the need to include private agencies, businesses, and industry in the planning process. These trends probably will increase the demands for coordination at the State and local levels.

¹¹/ Ibid.

¹²/ Sundquist, J. L. Making Federalism Work. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1970.

¹³/ John, Dewitt. Managing the Human Service System: What Have We Learned from Services Integration? Project SHARE, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977.

State Government Organization and Capacities

The final influential trend is the attempt by State governments to reorganize their services delivery and to strengthen their services planning and policy-making capacities. These efforts have been in response to Federal initiatives as well as the States' own desires for more accountability, more coherent planning, and greater efficiency.

Two major studies of State coordination efforts were undertaken in the 1970s. The first, by the Council of State Governments, examined efforts at State-level administrative reorganization.¹⁴ The study divided reorganization efforts into those resulting in three types of structures:

1. A coordinated agency in which formerly autonomous program units retain most of their administrative and program authority while a new agency is established to coordinate activities and programs.
2. A consolidated agency in which all or most administrative and program authority is transferred from previously autonomous programs to a new agency.
3. An integrated agency in which all or most administrative and program authority is transferred to a new agency and, in addition, traditionally separate service delivery patterns are intermeshed into one program delivery unit.

The Council study found considerable variability among the States in terms of organizational structure and the specific groupings of programs "in part depending on the state concept of major functional groupings, and in part on politics and personalities at the time the structure is established" (p. 15). The study also concluded that it was too early to determine whether the various reorganizations had accomplished their objectives or whether any were more effective than others.

The second study looked at State and local coordination efforts, dividing them into three types:¹⁵

1. Voluntary coordination in which separate agencies are responsible for the provision of direct services and with developing linkages among other agencies or providers.
2. Mediated coordination in which an integrator has the primary mission of developing linkages between autonomous service providers rather than the provision of direct services. An

^{14/} Council of State Governments. Human Services Integration: State Families in Implementation. Lexington, Kentucky, 1974.

^{15/} Gans, Sheldon P. and Horton, Gerald T. Integration of Human Services: The State and Municipal Levels. Praeger Publishers, New York, 1975.

example would be a State children's advisory committee whose function is to integrate planning for day care, child health services, and early childhood education.

3. Directed coordination in which an integrator has authority to mandate the development of linkages between legally subordinate service providers.

The study found that "the impact of the project on accessibility, continuity, and efficiency appeared to vary according to the mode of coordination being employed" (p. 12). It recommended that support focus on mediated and directed coordination efforts because they "pursue rationalization of the service delivery system on behalf of an entire class of clients rather than the manipulation of the delivery system for specific clients" (p. 22). It found little support for developing a unitary service delivery system and concluded that it probably could not be done successfully.

APPROACHES TO COORDINATION

In recent years, States have engaged in a diverse set of activities to try to improve coordination among youth service and other human services agencies. One major variable is the scope of specific coordination efforts. Some efforts have focused on a particular issue or subset within the youth services system. For example, West Virginia developed an interagency project focused on young children and their families.¹⁶ A project in Michigan focused on ways to improve the coordination of juvenile justice services.¹⁷ Many States have developed special mechanisms for coordinating services related to child abuse and neglect. At a more general level, some projects have focused on all services to children and youth. For example, Maryland and Massachusetts have experimented with creating an Office of Children and Youth to try to develop linkages throughout the entire youth services system. Finally, in some projects the focus has been on coordinating the entire system of human services of which youth services is only a part.

Independent of the scope, State efforts to improve coordination can be grouped into four major approaches. There is a distinction between approaches that focus on changes in the service delivery system itself versus those that focus on the policy-making or administrative level. There is another distinction between those efforts that involve a fundamental redesign or reconceptualization of a system versus those that

^{16/} Himelrick, John. Comprehensive Services to Young Children and Their Families: An Interagency Approach. West Virginia Interagency Council for Child Development Service, 1976.

^{17/} Michigan Juvenile Justice System Study Committee. Juvenile Justice Services in Michigan. The Michigan Legislative Council, 1974.

attempt to improve the performance of the existing components. When combined, these two distinctions produce four separate approaches to coordination: (1) government reorganization; (2) policy management; (3) services redesign; and (4) program linkages. These correspond roughly to the four approaches discussed by Agranoff.¹⁸

Figure 2. Four Approaches to Coordination

	Policy Level	Services Level
System Redesign	Government Reorganization Approaches	Services Redesign Approaches
Improvement of Existing Systems	Policy Management Approaches	Program Linkage Approaches

Policy Management

This set of approaches includes a variety of ways by which general purpose government leaders attempt to develop a capability across independent programs and categories of service for the planning, management, and evaluation of overall policies. One strategy is to create a youth services council or subcommittee, chaired by the chief executive or his designate, to establish comprehensive youth services policies. In North Carolina, the Governor's Executive Cabinet on Juvenile Affairs serves such a function. Another approach is to create a separate planning and coordination unit outside of any of the operating agencies and attached to the Governor's Office. Maryland's Office of Children and Youth, created by the legislature in 1979, represents an example. The Office does not provide any direct services, but attempts to develop overall policy guidelines that will influence the services provided by others. The development of cross-program or inter-departmental budgeting processes can be another vehicle for policy management. In Massachusetts, the Office for Children produces an annual Budget for Children that combines the parts of the budgets of the Departments of Youth Services, Public Welfare, Public Health, Social Services, and Mental Health that relate to children. A similar type of activity can be undertaken to develop cross-program data systems or management information systems that are tied to the policy-making process.

^{18/} Agranoff, Robert. *Dimensions of Services Integration*. Project SHARE, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1979.

Policy management approaches may or may not be related to any changes in the manner in which services are actually delivered. Their objective is to provide greater policy consistency across programs, to increase efficiency, and to provide consistent data to aid in policy-making and decision-making.

Program Linkage

Coordination strategies involving interorganizational linkages are probably the most common form of coordination among youth services programs. This set of approaches attempts to bring together the individual services or programs into a multi-agency delivery system. It is similar to the policy management approach in that the impetus is on improving the existing set of programs rather than restructuring them. It is different in that the impetus for change comes from a concern with multi-problem clients whose needs go beyond a single agency. Program linkage approaches also can be enacted within the constraints of existing policies.

A common form of this approach has been the bringing together of agencies in interagency councils, primarily for the purpose of joint planning and problem-solving around issues of common concern. For example, Maine has created an Interdepartmental Children's Team with representation from the Departments of Educational and Cultural Services, Human Services, and Mental Health and Corrections.¹⁹ The Team's purpose is to coordinate and improve existing services while moving toward development of a human resource system for children and families. Some States have used subsidy programs as an incentive for creating interagency councils or forums at the local level--an example is the Community Based Alternatives Program in North Carolina. Another approach is to locate several agencies in the same facility. In Delaware, the State has been covered with multi-service centers that bring together personnel from six different departments.

Service center administrators coordinate scheduling, record keeping, and office management. A final example of coordination through program linkages is the creation of information and referral mechanisms.

The popularity of the program linkage approaches stems from the pluralistic nature of the American system. The mechanisms used are often voluntary in nature and rely on a willingness on the part of individual organizations to cooperate.

Government Reorganization

During the past two decades, many States have gone through reorganizations of their major departments to consolidate programs, avoid duplication, and facilitate program development. It is tempting to think that the easiest

^{19/}Interdepartment Children's Team. *Coordinating Services for Children and Families*. Maine Executive Department, Augusta, 1978.

way to coordinate services to children and youth is to create a cabinet-level Department of Youth Services with all youth-related activities (i.e., juvenile justice, child welfare, child health, and mental health, etc.). Unfortunately, there is no single best way to organize human services. Putting all youth services together could result in less coordination among health or mental health services. States therefore have tried many different configurations. The most in-depth study of various State organizational structures was by the Council of State Governments, as described previously.

Several States now have created cabinet-level departments that combine at least some of the major youth programs. Connecticut's Department of Youth Services, for example, combines child welfare services, community and preventive services, and juvenile justice services. In other States, all the various youth programs are in a single consolidated Department of Human Resources, but may be located in several different program offices within the Department. Louisiana has a consolidated Department, but separate Offices for Family Services, Youth Services, Mental Retardation, and Mental Health. In such situations, intra-organizational mechanisms (task forces, committees, liaison roles) must often be created to facilitate coordination.

Services Redesign

This approach redefines the categorical approach to service delivery by focusing on clients as complex individuals with multiple needs. It entails a variety of strategies for serving the whole person and for seeing that all of the relevant resources are brought together, regardless of which agencies are involved.

Services redesign (or services integration) includes such approaches as comprehensive assessment, or single intake, in which all the needs of a client are defined at one point, and case management, in which a worker is assigned to monitor and assess the whole range of services for a given client. While these methods are often expressed as an ideal, particularly by service providers, there have been few attempts to implement them on a statewide basis. One exception is in Florida, where a single intake system has been instituted for all complaints of delinquency, dependency, and ungovernability.²⁰ There has also been an attempt to create a case management system for serious multi-problem clients and families. However, the system has been able to deal with only a fraction of the clients for whom it was intended.

The four approaches described above are summarized in Figure 3.

²⁰/ National Academy of Public Administration. Reorganization in Florida. Washington, D.C., 1977.

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED?

After carefully reviewing twenty services integration projects sponsored by HEW (under the SITO Program), John²¹ reached the following conclusions:

1. Building interagency linkages is a difficult process which demands great political skills and can be approached best on an incremental basis;
2. Interagency linkages can improve service delivery but are unlikely to cut costs; and
3. Future R&D efforts in interagency coordination should be designed more carefully (pp. 67-69).

When all is said and done, there is little that has been learned definitively about the effectiveness of various coordination approaches or mechanisms in improving the planning and delivery of services. Available evidence pertains to human services in general, rather than to youth services specifically. Most researchers have concluded that there is no best approach, but that different approaches may be preferred depending on the political and economic contexts, the awareness and commitment of the major actors, the history of past coordination efforts, and the particular task at hand.

²¹/ John, 1977, cited p. 11 above.

Figure 3. Summary of Four Approaches to Coordination

Approach	Examples/Activities	Possible Advantages	Possible Disadvantages
Policy Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Policy council or subcabinet ● Planning unit attached to Governor's Office ● Cross-program budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attempts to make services more publicly accountable - Brings problems and needs to the attention of public officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Operates in a volatile political, economic, and administrative context - Requires major commitment on the part of general purpose government leaders
Program Linkages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interagency committees ● Co-location ● Information and referral networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relatively easy to implement compared to other approaches - Increases awareness of other activities and programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Often hard to sustain over a long period - May be many constraints due to regulations, funding, administrative procedures
Reorganization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cabinet level Departments ● Consolidated Departments with intra-organizational coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides greater emphasis and visibility - May provide greater potential for "managed" coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May provide the illusion of coordination with little real change - Time consuming and very difficult to create new departments
Services Redesign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Single intake ● Case management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for direct benefits to clients - Provides mechanism for advocacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extremely few working models to learn from - Probably the most expensive approach

CHAPTER 3

SURVEY OF STATE-LEVEL COORDINATION
MECHANISMS: SUMMARY OF THE DATA

The tremendous growth of Federal and State-level programs for children and youth in the 1960s and 1970s spawned numerous bureaucracies that plan, administer, and fund programs in an uncoordinated manner. Many reach the same target populations and provide related services but are planned, implemented, and evaluated autonomously.

In an era of retrenchment in funding for youth services, States face two alternatives: trim services or find ways to stretch diminished resources to cover an unchanged or growing target population base. Both alternatives present a challenge of efficient allocation of finite resources, the first by setting priorities to focus resources only on significant areas of need and the second by eliminating program duplication and by sharing information and expertise across agencies and programs serving similar populations.

Although coordination across and among social programs is never easy, it holds the key to service delivery priority setting and efficiency. It also promotes more effective treatment and prevention approaches. The delivery of services, as well as the bureaucratic arrangements to deliver services, must take into account the total service needs of the child. State-level coordination efforts are an important part of providing holistic services to youth and in helping to stretch scarce resources.

To determine the types, functions, successes, and obstacles to coordination of youth services at the State level, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) jointly funded an exploratory survey of State-level coordination mechanisms. The survey was conducted by SRA Corporation. The survey was intended to elicit information on theoretical and practical issues relating to State coordination of youth programs, and to identify a limited number of innovative or interesting models for case study. The case studies are included elsewhere in this monograph. This chapter explains the methodology of the survey, reports on its findings, and draws some implications from the data.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

In an effort to identify the mechanisms and responsible staff, SRA began by contacting the Juvenile Justice Specialists in the State Criminal Justice Councils (OJJDP State funding agencies). The Juvenile Justice Specialists identified what they considered to be the coordination mechanisms in the State or referred SRA to other sources who could identify them. Based on this information, SRA contacted by phone survey approximately 125 organizations identified as performing coordination of youth services in the States. Twenty-two of these organizations were eliminated because (1)

they reported they did not perform any coordination of policy or services or (2) they were private, nongovernment-related bodies.

SRA mailed a questionnaire, to be self administered, to the senior staff persons that were identified in the telephone survey as being responsible for administration of the State coordination mechanisms.

The surveys were mailed to 103 organizations. Five additional organizations were identified through the survey responses, and these were also contacted and mailed questionnaires, for a total mailing of 108. Of these 108, 60 sent responses for tabulation. Forty States are represented. The responses to the questionnaire represent a preliminary and incomplete inventory and description of State-level coordination mechanisms. The organizations responding were not a random sample of coordination mechanisms and the findings presented in this report are not necessarily representative of the universe of State-level coordination mechanisms.

The survey instrument itself was designed by SRA and reviewed and approved by OJJDP and ACYF. The questionnaire asked respondents to identify which of the following categories most adequately describe their coordination mechanism:

1. Juvenile Justice--State Advisory Group (Advisory groups created in response to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act to oversee and advise on expenditures of Federal grant money);
2. Council/Committee--Governor's Office (Citizen's groups, agency representatives, or other advisory groups created to provide advice and counsel to the Governor on coordination of youth services);
3. Cabinet-level Coordination Mechanism (Group of heads of agencies or their delegates responsible for individual youth service delivery);
4. State Juvenile Justice Agency Coordination Mechanism (Multidisciplinary panel or committee responsible for providing advice or counsel to the agency);
5. State Human Services Agency Coordination Mechanism (Multidisciplinary panel or committee responsible for providing advice or counsel to the agency); and
6. Integrated Department of Youth Services (Department responsible for various youth services and thus itself a coordination mechanism).

Of these, all except the last category assume a multidisciplinary board or committee structure designed to share views and to transfer expertise across program areas.

The questionnaire asked respondents to answer questions in the following 10 areas:

1. Identification (how created, number and identification of members, and organization and position in government structure);

2. Origin/Development (when created, formal and informal participation of governmental and nongovernmental agencies and individuals);
3. Administrative Structure (how membership determined, how chairperson designated, staffing levels, subcommittee structure);
4. Purpose/Functions (type of mandate, functions);
5. Powers/Authority (types of decisions authorized to make, decisionmaking process used);
6. Resources (number of staff, funding, budget authority);
7. Results (products produced, conferences held, training/technical assistance provided, etc.);
8. Relationship to Other Coordination Mechanisms (other coordinating bodies in State, overlapping membership);
9. Open-ended Questions (successes, obstacles encountered, and what has been learned); and
10. Other Comments.

FINDINGS

The mechanisms responding to this survey represent all six approaches to attempting to coordinate traditionally autonomous youth services. Table 1 shows the percentages of respondents who identified themselves in each category.* For all subsequent analyses, SRA consolidated the six categories into four. SRA combined Categories 2 and 3 and Categories 4 and 5 into two larger groups. In the case of Categories 2 and 3, the responses indicated a blurring of the distinction between these two, and some confusion on the part of respondents as to which category was appropriate. The mechanisms represented by Categories 4 and 5 serve individual State agencies and are basically similar bodies with similar goals. The difference is which agency is the lead agency for the coordination mechanism.

A surprisingly large number of respondents--21--reported a high-level mechanism at the Governor or cabinet level. This indicates considerable executive support for the benefits of youth coordination. Coupled with the eight States that reported an integrated department of youth services, almost three-fifths of the States reported executive-level coordination activities.

*All tables are included at the back of this chapter.

Many of the respondents reported having relatively new mechanisms. Only 10 percent were created before 1975; more than 50 percent were created after 1978. This suggests a new awareness of the benefits of coordination, but it is not known whether these mechanisms replaced others that were phased out for political or bureaucratic reasons, or for ineffectiveness.

Membership

Membership in the coordination mechanisms serves as a proxy indicator of the programs or services considered important to coordinate. The survey asked respondents to note participation in the mechanism by both governmental and nongovernmental officials and agencies. Respondents indicated whether participation was as a formal member, informal member, or as a group or individual to be consulted.

Table 2 shows responses regarding participation by governmental officials and agencies. Participation in some form by the Governor exceeded 50 percent, again indicating fairly strong executive commitment to coordination processes. Integrated Departments of Youth Services are not included in this table since they are single State agencies instead of committee or board mechanisms and were not required to answer these questions. As might be expected, formal participation by the Governor was highest for the category comprising councils and committees in the Governor's office and cabinet-level coordination mechanisms. Most of the coordination mechanisms also reported high formal participation by corrections, child welfare, and education agencies and low participation by State employment/training and recreation and cultural arts. Participation by public health agencies varied from an overall participation rate of 43 percent for juvenile justice agencies to a high of 81 percent for interagency councils and committees.

Reports of participation by nongovernmental agencies or individuals in the coordination mechanism showed greater diversity among types of coordination mechanisms than does governmental participation (Table 3). The juvenile justice State advisory groups had by far the largest participation by nongovernmental agencies or individuals. The other categories exhibited less distinct patterns of participation. It is notable, however, that youth members played little role in both interagency councils and committees and agency-specific coordination mechanisms.

Table 4 displays how respondents indicated their members were appointed to serve on the coordinating agency. The results reflected what might be expected intuitively. Membership--or leadership--of integrated departments of youth services was specified in the enabling legislation establishing the department. Agency-specific coordination mechanisms were primarily selected by agency personnel (the "other" appointment method category listed) with the remaining mechanisms split among appointment methods. More than 80 percent of the membership of interagency councils or committees was reported as selected by the Governor or specified in the enabling legislation. These results also reflected the degree of formal

legislative mandate enjoyed by the mechanism. Finally, as specified in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, 89 percent of the respondents from Juvenile Justice State Advisory Groups reported that membership was appointed by the Governor. Appointment methods for the lead staff person or head of agency are detailed in Table 5.

Functions and Authority

To determine the functions of the coordinating mechanisms and the authority vested in them, the survey requested responses in three major areas:

- If and how the functions were specified;
- The major purposes of the coordination mechanism; and
- The ability of the mechanism to affect decisions in certain key areas.

Table 6 details responses from the coordinating mechanisms to the question of whether, and under what instrument, their responsibilities and functions were specified. The question was intended to elicit information about the formality of the mechanism's role and responsibility as well as the existence of written goals, objectives, and workplan.

The responses indicated that a high degree of formality in role specification existed in the surveyed Juvenile Justice State Advisory Groups, the Cabinet-level and Governor's office committees and councils, and the integrated departments of youth services. With virtually all of the reporting integrated departments established by legislation, it is not surprising that 100 percent of these organizations have a formal written mandate and no constitution. The least formal were the agency-specific mechanisms: almost 75 percent of the mechanisms reported written goals and objectives, 83 percent had formal written mandates, and 58 percent reported the existence of a written workplan.

Table 7 lists the principal functions reported by the coordinating mechanisms. The overwhelming majority of the respondents, with the exception of the integrated departments, had the combined functions of policy issue coordination and information exchange. Only 3 percent viewed their missions as including service delivery. Only integrated departments of youth services provided policy guidance, information, and service delivery.

The powers and authorities of the coordination mechanisms are described in Table 8. Only the integrated departments of youth services reported that specific authority for program decisions rested with the coordinating mechanisms. In most cases, decisions about funding, budgets, staffing, regulations, and program implementation were made by an agency other than the coordinating mechanisms. The mechanisms, however, reported a significant advisory role in these decisions.

Greater autonomy was reported for decisions involving technical assistance and training, information dissemination, providing testimony on State or Federal legislation, and in monitoring program operations.

Authority seems virtually absolute in nearly all decisionmaking areas for the integrated departments of youth services. With the exception of authority to promulgate regulations, between 75 and 100 percent of the integrated departments reported that they had the authority to make binding decisions on almost every aspect of program design, implementation, and funding.

The reported fiscal authorities of the coordination mechanisms exhibit the same general trends as do the authorities described above. As Table 9 shows, the majority of the surveyed coordination mechanisms, with the exception of the integrated departments, do not act as their own fiscal agents. In contrast, all the integrated departments responding to this question indicated that they had such authority (one did not respond to this question).

Table 10 describes funding sources reported by the coordination mechanisms. In 65 percent of all cases, some funds were appropriated by the legislature. All integrated departments received funds from this source. All of the mechanisms also reported receiving funds from other sources as well. In general, integrated departments were more likely to receive funds from other sources than were the other mechanisms. Eighty-eight percent of these departments reported that they received funds through Federal grants or contracts; 75 percent reported that they received funds from other agencies.

The sources of the overhead budgets of the coordination mechanisms are shown in Table 11. With the exception of the integrated departments, the budgets of the majority of the mechanisms were absorbed by the agency in which they are housed. All of the integrated departments that provided a response to this question reported that overhead expenses were paid out of their own budgets.

Accomplishments

Table 12 summarizes responses of the coordination mechanisms to a series of questions regarding whether they produced specific products, rendered certain services, or accomplished certain tasks. Close-ended questions about successful coordination efforts were not asked because project staff believed that such information could not be quantified. Instead, respondents were asked to address coordination accomplishments in open-ended questions, responses to which are discussed later in this chapter.

Although the responses reported in the Table address specific accomplishments, the aggregated results provide an indication of the general level of activity and aggressiveness of the types of mechanisms

surveyed, as well as providing more specific information on individual activities. The Juvenile Justice State Advisory Groups showed a fairly high level of activity or accomplishment when measured against the criteria included in the survey. Eighty-four percent produced an annual report, 95 percent held a meeting or conference, 84 percent produced technical assistance or training, 100 percent disseminated information, 63 percent produced policy or legislation, and 47 percent received publicity. Interagency councils/committees and agency-specific coordination mechanisms reported less activity in all these areas. Few of these three types of agencies had major accomplishments in the areas of developing a management information system overlapping agency lines, evaluating or studying the coordination mechanism, or distributing information through a national clearinghouse. The integrated departments of youth services reported the highest overall levels of activity or accomplishment.

Successes/Obstacles/Insights

The survey asked respondents to describe successes in coordination efforts, obstacles encountered, and what has been learned in attempting cross program coordination. Answers here do not lend themselves to strict quantification but certain trends in the responses merit discussion and analysis.

The successes mentioned by respondents spanned the entire range of youth services and were specific to the State in which they were implemented. A sample of the types of successes mentioned includes:

- Development and support of alternative education projects;
- Sponsorship of a conference on "Youth Issues in the 80s";
- Development of documentation to support enactment of a new juvenile code;
- Improvement of information sharing among youth-serving agencies;
- Development of a standardized recordkeeping form for the juvenile courts;
- Development of guidelines for the creation of group homes; and
- Negotiation of a voluntary agreement to coordinate the use of existing staff training resources.

As this listing demonstrates, coordination mechanisms reported successes in (1) implementing specific program areas; (2) influencing policy changes; and (3) effecting "process" changes in the ways agencies work together.

The obstacles that respondents reported in attempting to coordinate youth services were similar for the various types of coordination mechanisms.

Responses are summarized in Table 13. As the table indicates, the most mentioned problem involved "turf" issues--the unwillingness of participating agencies to relinquish individual control over programs or policies to a coordinating body. Related to this issue was the respondent's concern over a lack of statutory authority or other clear delineation of responsibilities. Insufficient funding also was frequently mentioned as an obstacle to coordination success. The complexity of the systems and programs to be coordinated and the existence and overlapping responsibilities of other coordination mechanisms also were mentioned.

Comments from respondents on what they have learned in attempting to coordinate youth services programs grouped around three or four related themes: the need to know the purpose of the coordination mechanism; the need to focus on manageable, specific issues; the importance of staff support; and the requirement that the people involved have a commitment to the process. All of these items were mentioned by several respondents.

No respondent indicated that coordination efforts were easy. Some frustration appears to be inevitable. Some specific comments include:

- Best success appears to occur when you are able to identify critical actors and get them involved early;
- Support from the Governor is essential;
- You must know where you are going before you begin;
- You need funding and staff from the beginning of the process;
- You must set priorities; and
- You must have members who are committed to the process.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE DATA

As mentioned earlier, the mechanisms surveyed for this study are not a representative sample of the universe of existing mechanisms. The findings and their implications can truly be applied only to the organizations that actually responded. Nevertheless, this exploratory survey suggests a number of factors and issues that impact on the coordination of services.

In general, these organizations reported:

- A fairly high level of executive support. Other data and studies indicate that this is an important factor in successful coordination efforts.
- High formal participation in the coordination mechanism by corrections, child welfare, and education agencies. These appear to be the "core" services considered important to coordinate.

- With the exception of the integrated departments, most of the coordination mechanisms reported that they focus on policy coordination and information exchange. The final step of coordination of service delivery appears to be beyond the ability of the board or committee type of mechanism, beyond its authority, beyond the desires of the States' elected and appointed officials, or all three.
- The problems facing coordination mechanisms center on "turf" issues, lack of statutory authority, and insufficient funding. These complaints are echoed in almost all the existing literature on program coordination and underscore the difficulty of attempting a successful effort in this area.
- Although there are obstacles, many of the responding agencies also reported successes and expressed enthusiasm about the benefits of coordination when the pieces fall into place.

In general, the survey reflected many of the generally held perceptions about coordination efforts. It showed that coordination is difficult and frustrating and also beneficial and rewarding.

Table 1. Types of Coordination Mechanisms Responding to Survey

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group	Interagency Council/Committee	Agency-specific Council/Committee	Integrated Dept. of Youth Services	All Respondents
Number Responding	19	21	12	8	60
Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group	100%	0	0	0	32%
Cabinet/Committee Gov. Office	0	62	0	0	22
Cabinet Level Coord. Mechanism	0	38	0	0	13
Juvenile Justice Agency/Interagency	0	0	33	0	7
Human Services Agency/Interagency	0	0	67	0	13
Integrated/Department of Youth Services	0	0	0	100	13

28

Table 2. Participation by Governmental Officials/Agency in the Coordination Mechanism

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group				Interagency Council/Committee				Agency-specific Council/Committee			
	19				21				12			
Number Responding	Formal Member	Informal Member	Con-sulted	None	Formal Member	Informal Member	Con-sulted	None	Formal Member	Informal Member	Con-sulted	None
(In Percent)*												
Governor	0	5	79	16	29	5	52	14	8	8	33	50
Criminal Justice Planning Agency	32	26	16	26	29	10	24	38	25	8	8	58
Juvenile Justice Advisory Group	95	0	5	0	29	10	38	24	8	8	25	58
Corrections	79	5	0	16	76	0	10	14	67	0	25	8
Child Welfare Agency	74	5	21	0	71	5	24	0	75	0	17	8
Mental Health Agency	53	5	32	11	71	5	24	0	67	0	17	17
Dept. of Education	74	5	21	0	81	5	14	0	67	0	17	17
Public Health	11	0	32	58	57	10	14	19	17	0	25	58
State Employment/Training	5	5	37	53	14	10	29	48	8	0	25	67
Recreation/Cultural Arts	16	0	21	63	5	5	10	81	0	8	8	83

* In some cases, percentages do not sum to 100% because of rounding.

Table 3. Non-Governmental Participation in the Coordination Mechanism*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group				Interagency Council/Committee				Agency-specific Council/Committee			
Number Responding	19				21				12			
	Formal Member	Informal Member	Con-sulted	None	Formal Member	Informal Member	Con-sulted	None	Formal Member	Informal Member	Con-sulted	None
(In Percent)*												
Private Agencies or Associations	95	5	0	0	43	14	29	14	50	0	25	25
Advocacy Groups	53	5	26	16	33	5	38	24	42	0	17	42
Local Officials	79	5	11	5	29	0	29	43	33	0	25	42
Youth	84	5	0	11	14	0	0	81	25	0	17	58
Citizens	79	5	0	16	48	0	19	33	42	0	17	42

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 4. Methods of Appointment to Coordination Mechanism*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group		Interagency Council/Committee		Agency-specific Council/Committee		Integrated Dept. of Youth Services		All Respondents	
	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
Number Responding	19		21		12		8		60	
Specified in Enabling Legislation	37	63	33	62	8	92	63	25	33	63
Appointed by Governor	89	11	48	48	17	83	25	63	52	45
Set Out in Charter	11	89	14	81	25	75	0	88	13	83
Voluntary	5	95	5	90	33	67	0	88	10	87
Other	11	89	24	71	50	50	25	63	25	72

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 5. Appointment of Lead Staff Person/Head of Agency*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group		Interagency Council/Committee		Agency-specific Council/Committee		Integrated Dept. of Youth Services		All Respondents	
	Number Responding	19	21	12	8	60				
	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
Appointed by Governor	42	58	48	52	17	75	38	63	38	60
Selected by Membership Vote	5	95	0	100	0	92	0	100	2	97
Selected by Board	5	95	10	90	17	75	13	88	10	88
Appointed by Chair	0	100	24	76	0	92	0	100	8	90
Other	58	42	24	76	67	25	63	38	48	50

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 6. Specification of Functions of the Coordination Mechanism

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group		Interagency Council/Committee		Agency-specific Council/Committee		Integrated Dept. of Youth Services		All Respondents	
	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
Number Responding	19		21		12		8		60	
Formal Written Mandate	84	16	90	10	58	42	100	0	83	17
Statement of Principles	32	68	33	62	58	42	25	63	37	60
Constitution	16	84	10	86	0	100	0	100	8	90
Written Goals/Objectives	74	26	76	19	67	33	75	25	73	25
Bylaws	74	26	24	71	25	75	13	88	38	60
Written Workplan	58	42	43	52	58	42	38	63	50	48

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 7. Functions of the Coordination Mechanism*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group	Interagency Council/Committee	Agency-specific Council/Committee	Integrated Dept. of Youth Services	All Respondents
Number Responding	19	21	12	8	60
Policy Issue Coordination	11	5	8	0	7
Information Exchange	0	0	8	0	2
Both Policy Issues and Information Exchange	84	90	58	13	72
Integrated Dept/Functions	0	5	17	88	1
Service Delivery	5	0	8	0	3

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 8. Powers and Authorities of the Coordination Mechanism*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group			Interagency Council/Committee			Agency-specific Council/Committee			Integrated Dept. of Youth Services			All Respondents		
Number Responding	19			21			12			8			60		
	Yes %	No %	Advisory %	Yes %	No %	Advisory %	Yes %	No %	Advisory %	Yes %	No %	Advisory %	Yes %	No %	Advisory %
Binding Decisions on its Member	42	58	0	38	57	0	33	67	0	75	13	0	43	53	1
Funding	47	16	37	29	14	57	42	17	41	88	0	12	45	13	42
Budgets/Joint Program Development	32	16	52	29	5	66	17	25	58	88	0	12	35	12	53
Program Staffing	11	21	68	19	29	52	25	42	33	100	0	0	28	25	47
Regulations Promulgation	11	32	57	19	29	52	33	25	42	75	13	12	27	27	46
Program Implementation	21	11	68	29	14	57	42	17	41	100	0	0	38	12	50
Research and Evaluation	53	5	42	67	5	28	50	17	33	100	0	0	63	7	30
T/A and Training	53	11	36	57	5	38	42	25	33	100	0	0	58	10	32
Information Dissemination	68	0	32	86	0	14	83	8	9	100	0	0	82	2	16
Testify on State or Federal Legislation	79	0	21	76	5	19	75	17	8	100	0	0	80	5	15
Monitor Compliance/Enforcement	79	0	21	29	19	52	42	25	33	100	0	0	57	12	31

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 9. Fiscal Authorities of the Coordination Mechanism*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group		Interagency Council/Committee		Agency-specific Council/Committee		Integrated Dept. of Youth Services		All Respondents	
	Number Responding	19	21	12	8	60				
	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
Acts as own fiscal agent	21	79	19	81	25	75	88	0	30	68
Has own travel budget	68	32	43	57	50	50	100	0	60	40

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 10. Funding Sources of the Coordination Mechanism*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group		Interagency Council/Committee		Agency-specific Council/Committee		Integrated Dept. of Youth Services		All Respondents	
	Number Responding	19	21	12	8	60	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
Appropriated by Legislature	53	47	62	38	67	33	100	0	65	35
Multiple Sources of Funds	37	63	43	57	8	83	63	38	37	62
Accepts Funds Through Federal Grants/Contracts	42	58	33	67	33	67	88	0	43	55
Accepts Funds from Other Agencies	21	79	33	67	25	75	75	13	33	65
Accepts Funds from Foundations	11	89	24	76	50	50	50	38	28	70
Accepts Funds from Corporations	11	89	24	76	50	50	38	50	27	72
Accepts Funds from Charitable Organizations	11	89	24	76	50	50	25	63	25	73
Accepts Funds from Other Sources	11	89	14	86	25	75	13	75	15	83

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

37

Table 11. Source of Overhead Budget*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group	Interagency Council/ Committee	Agency-specific Council/Committee	Integrated Dept. of Youth Services	All Respondents
Number Responding	19	21	12	8	60
Paid Out of Own Budget	16	19	8	88	25
Absorbed by Agency in Which Housed	74	71	50	0	58
Other	11	10	8	0	8

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 12. Accomplishments in Past Year of the Coordination Mechanism*

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group		Interagency Council/Committee		Agency-specific Council/Committee		Integrated Dept. of Youth Services		All Respondents	
	Number Responding	19	21	12	8	60	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
Produced Annual Report or Policy Statement Report	84	16	52	48	42	58	100	0	67	33
Held Meeting/Conference	95	5	76	24	58	42	100	0	82	18
Performed Interagency Program Development	74	26	71	29	25	75	88	13	65	35
Provided TA or Training	84	16	57	43	42	58	100	0	68	32
Provided Information Dissemination	100	0	86	14	83	17	100	0	92	8
Produced Policy or Legislation	63	37	67	33	33	67	88	13	62	38
Received Publicity	47	53	71	29	50	50	88	13	62	38
Developed MIS Overlapping Agency Lines	0	100	24	71	17	83	38	38	17	78
Evaluated/Studied the Coord. Mech.	0	100	19	81	17	83	0	100	10	90
Distributed Information Through National Clearinghouse	21	74	19	81	8	92	25	75	18	80

* Where the sum of the percentages does not equal 100%, the difference is due to rounding errors (1%) or missing information (greater than 1%).

Table 13. Obstacles to Coordination

	Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group	Interagency Council/ Committee	Agency-specific Council/Committee
Number Responding	19	21	12
	%	%	%
Insufficient Funding	36	27	36
Turf Issues	28	55	18
Lack of Statutory or Other Authority	14	16	18
No Central Youth Authority	14	5	0
40 Institutional/System Complexities	7	11	0
Lack of Staff	0	0	18
Existence of Other Coordination Bodies	14	11	0

CHAPTER 4
CASE STUDIES

The four States selected for case studies (New York, North Carolina, Alabama and Maryland) represent a broad spectrum of coordination efforts in youth services.

The national survey revealed certain typologies that exist in the State structure of youth services with each State having different combinations of relevant factors. The findings from the surveys helped in developing the criteria for selecting the States.

Four basic categories of coordination mechanisms are prevalent in the States attempting to coordinate: the cabinet-level interagency mechanism, the Governor's Commission on Youth, the State Advisory Group, and the (integrated) Department of Youth Services. One of our first criteria for selecting the four States was to include one example of each type.

The focus of the different mechanisms ranges from policy-making, planning, and program development to research and development, technical assistance, and training and finally to simple information exchange and dissemination. Including examples that span this broad range of focus was another important criteria for selection.

Another factor for selection was perceived effectiveness, innovative features, cooperation among membership, and the impact of the coordination effort on the youth services system.

Lastly, selection was based on social and geographic considerations, urban-rural contrast, and socio-economic diversity.

For each three-day site visit, project staff interviewed as many youth services representatives as were available. A prepared format of discussion topics was used to gather the information. Each case study covers the following broad topics: background and history; the State youth services organizational structure; description of the State's coordination mechanisms; and a summary of the system and its effectiveness.

NEW YORK

I. INTRODUCTION

The New York service mosaic is diverse and sophisticated. Philanthropic organizations based in New York have been active since early in the last century. County, city, and town governments have continued and expanded their roles as major actors in the social services delivery system.

The role of the State government evolved as a provider of services and as a planner, funder, evaluator, and monitor. State government provides funds to local governments for many services: probation, delinquency prevention, foster care, services to runaway and homeless youth, and education, among others. In 1978-79, out of a total State-local funding of \$9.9 billion for children's services, the State share was \$4.4 billion, much of it transferred to local governments.

In addition to local governments, the State provides funding to many private service providers. Residential treatment for the mentally ill, mentally retarded, developmentally disabled, and alcohol and drug dependent persons is often provided through direct contracts with private organizations. Although the State maintains its own facilities for these populations, the trend in recent years has been to contract for services or to transfer funds to local governments.

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT FOR YOUTH SERVICES

Four principal agencies provide services to youth:

- The Department of Social Services;
- The Division for Youth;
- The Department of Mental Hygiene; and
- The Department of Education.

Department of Social Services

The Department of Social Services is the income maintenance agency for the State and the monitoring agency for an array of local government and privately administered social services. It regulates 58 local (57 counties and New York City) social service districts.

In the area of income maintenance, it is responsible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, and Food Stamps. In its capacity as regulator, monitor, and funder of programs, the Department of Social Services is the single State agency responsible for supervising day care,

foster care, homemaker services, health-related services, family planning, protective services (including a registry of child abuse reports), adoption services, child welfare programs, and Title XX Social Service programs. It has responsibility for providing permits for day care facilities and families providing day care (except in New York City). The Department regulates residential facilities for children and adults and reimburses local social service districts. The Department coordinates its program in a Consolidated Services Plan.

Division for Youth (DFY)

The Division for Youth, an autonomous State agency, is responsible for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. It has a sophisticated system of financial incentives available to county, city, and town governments to carry out programs with these goals. In addition, the Division operates a number of facilities for delinquents, including State training schools, residential centers, youth camps, and urban homes.

The Division's financial assistance programs for cities and counties, primarily aimed at delinquency prevention, provide up to \$5.50 per youth for a variety of delinquency prevention programs if the county engages in a comprehensive planning process. The program encourages counties, cities, towns, and villages with populations of more than 20,000 to develop a youth board composed of a broad cross section of the community, to organize and plan services, and to supplement the services of existing public and private child care agencies. The Division also funds local runaway and homeless youth programs and funds and monitors detention programs.

Department of Mental Hygiene (DMH)

This agency is composed of three autonomous agencies that prepare and submit their own budgets to the Governor and the legislature. Those agencies include:

- **Office of Mental Health (OMH).** OMH directly provides inpatient and outpatient/day treatment services through its psychiatric centers. Several of these psychiatric centers specialize in psychiatric care for children and youth, and there are also adolescent units in some adult psychiatric centers. OMH also funds group homes and the newly established residential treatment facility program. This office provides funds on a 50/50 matching basis to local governments to develop mental health services. State law requires a mental health planning committee for children and youth to identify needs and programmatic efforts at the local level. Cooperative efforts between local mental health agencies and social services and education agencies are required under State guidelines.
- **Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities (OMRDD).** OMRDD provides many of the same services as OMH, except

for developmentally disabled populations. It runs 20 centers for the retarded and developmentally disabled. OMRDD provides funds to local governments on a 50/50 matching basis. Its 1978 five-year plan requires local private, voluntary, and governmental agencies to coordinate their efforts to improve maternal and child health and nutrition. The Office provides funding for family care, day treatment services, community residences, and infant stimulation, among other services.

- o **Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services (OASAS).** This Office consists of two divisions, Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (DAAA) and Substance Abuse Services (DSAS). These divisions provide services to alcohol and drug abusers. DSAS funds and regulates approximately 400 community-based programs serving drug abusers. DAAA focuses on policy development and research. It funds local mental health centers and hospitals for treatment and rehabilitation services and a variety of intervention service programs. Approximately 13,000 youth receive intervention services each year.

Department of Education

The Department of Education is unique both in its scope and in the manner in which its chief administrative officer (CAO) is appointed. Appointments of CAOs for most departments in New York State rest with the Governor, with confirmation by the State Senate. In contrast, the governing authority for the Department of Education--the 15-member Board of Regents--is elected by the State Senate. The Regents in turn select a Commissioner of Education.

The Department's responsibility is unique in that it has authority for all public education institutions in the State. Included are not only public elementary and secondary schools but also the State university system and vocational technical colleges. The Department operates the State library system; the State museum; and schools for the blind, deaf, and severely physically handicapped.

II. DEVELOPMENT AND HISTORY

The New York State Council on Children and Families, like most of the recent changes in the service delivery system for children in New York, owes its creation to the Temporary State Commission on Child Welfare. The Commission was created in 1974 to address two interrelated problems affecting the child care delivery system:

- o The lack of knowledge on child care issues within the State legislature and a lack of initiative for change on the part of State agencies involved in children's services; and

- The tendency for children to become "lost" in the child care system and for the system to operate more for the benefit of child care providers than for the children.

The Commission focused its efforts in four areas:

- Examination of the adequacy of current laws, including the need for a separate child welfare code;
- Review of laws, practices, and service delivery systems for status offenders, juvenile delinquents, and other troubled youth;
- Review of laws, practices, and service delivery systems for children removed from their families with a focus on foster care, adoption, and services to children and families; and
- Development of preventive services to children and families.

Creation of the Commission occurred the same year as a gubernatorial veto of legislation that would have created a new agency by merging the Division for Youth and the Division of Family Services into the Department of Social Services and the Office of Aging. Opposition to the measure was particularly intense from interest groups representing senior citizens. The legislature was unable to override the veto. Many of the people who created the Temporary Commission and supported the legislation believed that the creation of large inclusive cross-cutting agencies would not work.

The initial Commission focus was on basic improvements in the child care service system. By the time the Commission issued its second report in October 1976, it could point to the passage of a number of significant pieces of legislation it had recommended: improved procedures for terminating parental rights, creation of a State Child Care Review Service to track the progress of individual youth in the child care system; requirements for the licensing and operation of day services for children; removal of status offenders from secure confinement; and appropriations of \$3.75 million for preventive services. The 13-member Commission, although satisfied with its results, still believed that the State-local-public-private child care system was a "poorly coordinated array of entities."

During the 1977 legislative session, Senator Joseph Pisani, Chair of the Commission, sought to create a State Office for Children. The Office would have broad powers to plan, regulate, monitor, and coordinate services for children and youth. It would facilitate interagency action, act as an advocate, and have independent rulemaking authority. This proposal met with resistance both from State agencies and the Governor's office. State agency officials believed they had authority under existing law to perform the functions called for in Pisani's proposal.

At the same time, several State agency officials sought to abolish the State Board of Social Welfare. This agency, in existence since 1867, was responsible for the visitation of State institutions for the retarded,

disabled, and mentally ill, for various public and private social service agencies, and for making recommendations for improvements. The Board had been separated from the Department of Social Services in the early 1970s.

As a compromise among the Governor's office, State department heads, and Senator Pisani, it was agreed to create the New York State Council on Children and Families. The agreement specified that the Council would be an in-house facilitator for State government--a low-key research agency offering policy recommendations to the Governor, the legislature, and State agencies. The Council was not to act as an advocate or ombudsman.

The Council came into existence at a time of great changes in the New York State child service delivery system. Those changes, initiated in large part by the Temporary State Commission on Child Welfare, reached their zenith in 1979 with the passage of the Child Welfare Reform Act (CWRA). The major provisions of the Act include:

- Increased State aid for preventive services. Both the scope of services and the use of preventive services funds are expanded. Previously funds could be used only if the child was in imminent danger of placement. The newly appropriated funds can be used prior to placement, during placement to return the child to the natural home, or after discharge to prevent return to placement. Instead of the previously required 50/50 State/local match, the State share is increased to 75 percent. This change was made to coincide with the Federal reimbursement formula of 75/25 to avoid any financial preference for foster care.
- Strengthening of State Adoption Service provisions to require a more complete listing of children freed for adoption. The only valid reason for deferral of listing under the CWRA is lack of consent to adoption by a child older than 15 years of age. An appeal procedure is created for the Department of Social Services to reconsider applications for adoptive parent status that have been denied or not acted upon. Additionally, the time for statutory preference for foster parents is reduced from 24 to 18 months.
- Development of comprehensive plans on a district-wide social service basis for children in foster care, adoption, and preventive services. Additionally, agencies must provide individual plans for children placed in foster care.
- A series of fiscal disincentives. These deny State foster care funds to local social service districts or voluntary agencies not complying with State law regarding judicial review of placement, referral of children to the State Adoption Service, or development of individual placement plans. Additionally, strong procedures are set out to deny eligibility for reimbursement based on case samplings for errors or violations of State law above 7.5 percent of the total cases sampled.

- A cap on appropriations for inappropriate foster care. The Department of Social Services allocates funds based on previous usage, denial of reimbursement experience, district caseload, and population trends. If there is substandard care, funds can be denied.
- Assurances of uniform and consistent implementation. This is accomplished by the development by the Department of Social Services of uniform case records, training of local public and private agency personnel and an evaluation of CWRA implementation by a private contractor under the auspices of the Division of the Budget.

III. ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

The Council, as created by the 1977 legislature, is an 11-member organization. It consists of the chief administrative officers of the following State agencies: Social Services; Office of Mental Health; Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities; Education; Health; Division of Criminal Justice Services; the Directors of the Division of Youth, Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse, and Substance Abuse Services; and the executive directors of the State Board of Social Welfare and Division of Probation. The Council is chaired by the Secretary to the Governor. The Chair appoints an Executive Director who serves at the pleasure of the Chair.

The Council's responsibilities as mandated by law include:


- Identify and make recommendations on problems and deficiencies in programs for children and families;
- Improve the coordination of such programs including State-local and public-private efforts;
- Undertake program and management research;
- Review regulations and resolve differences among various agencies concerning those regulations;
- Make recommendations regarding various agency budgets to ensure interagency cooperation; and
- Resolve interagency disputes regarding the placement of individual children after all appeals and grievance mechanisms have been exhausted.

The Council is organized into five units reflecting the areas of its mandate. Those five units are divided into two operating bureaus (see Figure 1):

The current staff is 50, with five managerial, 28 professional, and 17 administrative and support staff. In 1980, the Council had a direct State appropriation of \$692,000. However, the Council has broad authority to accept funds from other State agencies, foundations, and Federal grants and contracts. It has competed with consulting firms for contracts and won a number of those competitions. The Council's successful record of securing funding from diverse sources is a clear indicator of its effectiveness.

The Council has assumed the roles specified for it and has acted as a facilitator and broker rather than an advocate. The Council has undertaken tasks of dispute resolution and information dissemination. Taking issues from the Governor, the Division of the Budget, the legislature, and its member agencies, the Council has developed a reputation for impartial, accurate, and perceptive policy analysis, research, and program development.

Figure 1. Organizational Chart



IV. ACTIVITIES AND ISSUES

The Council, adhering to the agreement that led to its creation, has focused upon management processes, interagency efforts to improve the children and youth services delivery systems, and information and data gathering. Although several people interviewed for this case study expressed frustration that the Council has not adopted a more pro-active or advocate stance, Council member agencies and staff regard the avoidance of such approaches as central to whatever success the Council has enjoyed.

The Council has four official goals. These have guided the Council since 1977 in the selection of projects and activities. They include:

- Improve the coordination of the State and voluntary residential child care system and address the gaps in the systems;
- Promote effective prevention and early intervention services in order to maximize healthy individual development and minimize the long term need for public resources.
- Encourage the adoption of public and private sector policies that increase the capacity of families to provide for the developmental and supportive service needs of family members; and
- Facilitate interagency information sharing and data management to compile and disseminate the data necessary to increase the State's ability to plan for, monitor, and assess human service programs, as well as to meet the needs of clients in an efficient manner.

EARLY COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Initial Council activities set the tone for future endeavors and demonstrated the Council's potential as a coordination mechanism. The first issues the Council confronted included:

- Out-of-State placement;
- Early intervention; and
- Comprehensive adolescent services.

Out-of-State Placement

The rationale for the placement of children out of State became a source of increased dispute before the creation of the Council. As its first task, the Council convened an interagency task force to study the issue. The task force was composed of representatives from the Department of Social Services, the Department of Education, the Division of Youth, the Office of

Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and the Office of Mental Health.

The task force found that there were 786 children in 75 programs scattered throughout 20 States and the District of Columbia. The two main placement agencies, the Department of Social Services and the Department of Education, did not have accurate records about the identity or location of the children. Interagency teams were assembled to visit every placement site identified and to evaluate its appropriateness for the New York children placed there.

The site visits revealed that many of the education programs did not meet New York standards and that many youth could be served by similar programs in the State. The average cost for an out-of-State placement was \$17,000. Thirteen programs serving 158 children were substantially out of compliance with New York standards.

By the end of 1981, more than 300 children had been returned to programs in New York State. The Department of Social Services virtually stopped sending young people out of the State. The Department of Education reduced its out-of-State placements from 535 in 1977-78 to 57 in 1979-80, an 81 percent drop.

According to the sources interviewed by SRA, the Council succeeded on two important fronts: one direct, the other indirect but equally important. The direct achievement was the gain of credibility and the respect of the agencies that comprise its membership. The indirect achievement was that, for the first time, middle management staff of the various State agencies were talking to each other. As the staff of the Council perceive it now, the second point was as important as the first.

Early Intervention

In a 1978 message to the legislature, Governor Hugh Carey asked the Council to undertake an examination of the strategies human service agencies could pursue to prevent young people from having social or personal adjustment problems later in life. Particularly, the Governor asked the Council to look at ways to foster cooperation between schools and community agencies.

The Council convened four workshops around the State. Included in those workshops were teachers, parents, school administrators, service providers, youth advocates, and community leaders. A number of key points emerged as vital: parental involvement in early intervention; the need for training of parents to help them act as advocates for their children; the importance of school-based programs; the need for new interagency funding mechanisms and reporting requirements; and the need for simplification of existing programs.

The major issues that emerged were: school-community service linkages; parental involvement; processes for identifying children's needs; and

clarification of the role of youth in early intervention programs. Obstacles identified included: the focus of most programs on treatment as opposed to prevention; the categorical nature of programs with limited services; reimbursement mechanisms limiting program flexibility; lack of planning coordination limiting program impact; and the need for access to programs and parental consent.

One outgrowth of the project was the development of the Interagency Coordination Project: Alternatives for Youth At-Risk. This project had both a State and local focus. At the State level, a Task Force was established to examine conflicts among statutes, policies, procedures, planning requirements, client funding procedures, and administrative and evaluation mechanisms. The chosen target population was persons in need of supervision (PINS) and juvenile delinquents, which had been identified by the Child Welfare Reform Act as a focus for program activity.

Involved at the State level were the Department of Social Services, the Division for Youth, and the Division of Probation. Tasks included development of compatible data bases, needs assessments, and planning tools, and clarification of CWRA provisions relating to intake and after care for delinquents and PINS.

At the local level, a number of counties agreed to become demonstration sites and made commitments to develop more comprehensive approaches to delinquency prevention. Local interagency work groups, linked to the State task force, worked to separate State from local issues and to facilitate the flow of information on policy issues between the State and local level. Local programs identified the barriers to coordinated services and developed action plans to remove those barriers. Significant changes were made in county operations as a result of this project. For instance, in one county, the county executive appointed a juvenile justice task force to develop local coordinated strategies for court-related youth. In another county, a network of professionals was created to provide psychological and psychiatric evaluations for Family Court, in lieu of having youngsters placed in an out-of-county psychiatric center.

Comprehensive Adolescent Services

In another effort, the Council was awarded a competitively bid contract from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to examine various approaches for comprehensive services to adolescents. The project had four purposes:

- Identify and compare models for comprehensive services;
- Develop a method for evaluating comprehensive programs and evaluate different types of such programs;
- Explore barriers to operation and development of comprehensive programs; and

- Develop reports and technical assistance materials based on the study findings.

The three-year study, which began in September 1978, examined 153 programs nationwide. Among its significant findings were:

- School behavior, poverty, drug abuse, and family dysfunction were major problems;
- Abuse and neglect were also problems;
- 70 percent of the programs were established in the 1970s; and
- Although there were numerous service linkages, there also were gaps involving isolation from some sectors of the social service community such as health or social services and the family court.

The study identified six models for comprehensive adolescent services programs. It noted that services ameliorating basic needs such as clothing and housing are often found together as are skill building programs such as education or employment and training programs. Among the key variables to differentiate the models were: degree of youth participation; diversity of board membership; proportion of clients with multiple needs; proportion of staff with college degrees; and public or private sponsorship.

The project published a number of guides and reports that can be used by service providers to develop comprehensive strategies for adolescent programs. The publications include a planning guide, an evaluation guide, and a directory of services. In addition to the guides, there are several other project reports covering project results and findings. As a result of the project, the Council developed a program of technical assistance to support the development and evaluation of comprehensive programs.

THE COUNCIL AT MIDPASSAGE

The Council appears to have faced challenges confronting it virtually without pause. A large, complex State such as New York creates demands that will not wait for long-term public policy deliberations. The Council has examined many crucial issues for the State. It has developed a broad and continuing agenda. The range of issues the Council has addressed and continues to address reflects that complexity. They include:

- Out-of-Home Study;
- Children and Youth Interagency Management Information System;
- Interagency agreement regarding residential services for mentally disabled children;
- "Aging out" 17- to 21-year-old handicapped youth;

- Residential treatment facilities;
- Institutional Schools Bill; and
- Day treatment.

Out-of-Home Study

A study of placement of children away from their natural homes done in New York City in 1976 indicated that 40 to 50 percent of such placements were inappropriate. Placement decisions, including funding, planning, and regulating are shared among six Council member agencies: the Department of Social Services, State Education Department, Division for Youth, Office of Mental Health, Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Department of Health. The Council thus became the logical agency to conduct a statewide study. Assembling Federal, State, and private foundation funds, the Council began a three-year assessment with the following objectives:

- Development of criteria defining appropriate placements in each of the six systems;
- Development of a questionnaire to describe the characteristics of children in care in each of the six systems;
- Collection of information on a sample of approximately 3,000 children statewide;
- Analysis of the survey data to describe the characteristics, problems, and needs of children in residential placements;
- Analysis of the data to determine the extent to which children in each type of facility are appropriately placed, and to determine the appropriate placement of those children in the sample who appear to be inappropriately placed;
- Identification of factors that appear to result in inappropriate placements and identification of barriers to appropriate placement; and
- An estimate of present bed needs for children in each type of facility and a projection of future bed needs based on the results of the survey.

To date, criteria have been developed defining appropriate placements in each facility type in each of the six systems. An instrument, the Survey of Children in Placement (SCIP), has been designed and data collection has been completed on a statewide sample of approximately 3,000 children. Data have been collected on the barriers to placing children appropriately. A series of reports will be released detailing the results of this study.

Children and Youth Interagency Management Information System

Concurrent with the out-of-home placement study, the Council began development of a management information system, the Children and Youth Interagency Management Information System. The Department of Social Services developed the forerunner to this system. Its efforts resulted in the computerization of data on children in foster care. The legislature mandated that the system be expanded to include all children in residential care. Initially, the Department of Social Services transferred responsibility for maintaining and operating the system to the Council because four other Council member agencies would be included. The legislature later made that transfer a part of State law.

Implementation began early in 1982. The system will provide aggregate statistical information on numbers of children, their demographics, services provided, comparisons of populations by agency responsible, length of time in care, and other data relating to the movement of children across systems. For the first time, the State will have a duplication-free count of children in residential care.

Interagency Agreement Regarding Residential Services for Mentally Disabled Children

The Interagency Agreement was first initiated with the passage of Chapter 669 of the Laws of 1977, which transferred the certification, inspection, and supervisory authority for authorized residential child care agencies from the Board of Social Welfare to the Department of Social Services. The law mandated that the Department of Social Services and the Department of Mental Hygiene (now the Office of Mental Health, the Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities and the Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services) enter into a written cooperative agreement for the establishment of joint standards for inspection and supervision of child care agencies serving a significant number of mentally disabled children. The responsibility for certifying those facilities exclusively serving mentally disabled children was to be transferred from the Department of Social Services to the Department of Mental Hygiene.

"Board transfer" or the transfer of responsibility for certain functions from one department to another was to occur for facilities where mentally disabled children were the predominant population. Facilities containing some mentally disabled young people would remain under the Department of Social Services. The Council became involved when it was realized that the original agreement between DSS and DMH was inadequate. The separation of DMH into two autonomous agencies, OMH and OMRDD, created further problems. The original agreement was considered inadequate in light of the organizational changes and on procedural grounds. The Division of the Budget provided funds to DSS, later transferred to the Council, to conduct a study of various residential placement facilities to determine the categories of residential services required by children in care, on-site review of programs, issues relating to certification, regulatory responsibility for these programs, and the number of mentally disabled

children in care in each program. The survey included all residential facilities licensed by DSS with seven or more children, 25 percent or more of whom were mentally disabled.

At the same time the survey was conducted, the Council examined fiscal and policy issues related to transfer of programs. OMH officials believe that their department's position on key issues evolved during this process. Although there was widespread initial agreement on the need for an effective Board transfer process, there were concerns about the need to label children for them to receive services, and the need for a place for the child to live as opposed to meeting the child's mental health needs. What evolved was basically a minimalist approach. A second development, discussed later in this case study, was the creation of Residential Treatment Facilities to meet the needs of children with mental health problems who needed a less secure residential setting.

"Aging Out" 17- to 21-Year-Old Handicapped Youth

Efforts begun in the 1960s to reduce the populations of institutions for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded are having a major effect on New York service provision in the 1980s. The population placed in residential and other forms of community care in the 1960s and 1970s, today are becoming adults. There are few parallel services for developmentally disabled adults. These developments are complicated by two other events. The first, mentioned above, was the return from out of State of a large number of developmentally disabled and mentally retarded youth. The second is a consent decree signed in 1975 that reduces the population at the Staten Island Developmental Center, also known as Willowbrook.

A survey conducted by the Council of residential care schools, child care providers, and educational day care programs in New York City indicates there are 1,400 youth aged 17 to 21 in New York City who need adult community-based programs. One purpose of the study is to provide the Office of Mental Health and the Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities with information on the service needs of the "aging out" population from which the offices can develop their annual budget requests. The sources interviewed for this case study indicate that approximately 300 new "aging out" cases will occur each year for the foreseeable future. Services for people needing critical care in institutions or day care services as adults are adequate. Problems occur in servicing those adults who require community-based residential services.

The legislature responded in 1981 by providing transitional funding for one year and by permitting programs with people "aging out" between 1981 and 1982 to continue to receive care. The legislation was initiated by the Council as a Governor's Program Bill. It is limited to children placed in out-of-State facilities; these children are often those with the most serious problems. The legislation requires that the Council serve as a clearinghouse among the child service agencies, families of children placed out-of-State, and the adult services agencies. That is, children in care

out-of-State are linked to potential providers in the adult care system. The Council is now attempting to develop similar legislation for the in-State population. In 1982, the legislature passed legislation to require notifying the family of an 18-year-old youth that after age 21 the child will no longer be eligible for services and offering the resources of the Council to identify community services. The tracking systems set up as a result of the survey are in place to serve as a "tickler system" to alert various agencies of their fiscal needs in the budget process. The people interviewed in this case study expressed concern about New York's current fiscal predicament. In the spring of 1983, when this case study took place, New York faced a prospective budget deficit. In recent years the social services system has been able to create approximately 2,000 new beds for all residential care populations. The inability to continue this expansion could pose special problems for the aging out populations. The results could be a series of difficult choices about priorities for service populations.

Residential Treatment Facilities (RTF)

Another issue is how to develop intensive long-term psychiatric services for mentally ill children in facilities that are less restrictive than psychiatric hospitals.

The Council originally identified the need for residential treatment facilities. Council staff recognized the gap between psychiatric centers and day treatment programs. An analysis was performed by the Council with the cooperation of OMH, DFY, DSS, and SED. Originally OMH thought that no authorizing legislation would be necessary to implement residential treatment facilities but the legislature insisted on statutory authority before appropriating funds for the RTFs. The Council, OMH, SED, and DSS had five weeks to develop legislation and submit it to the legislature. Patient negotiation by all parties resulted in legislation that was enacted with few changes.

OMH has certification responsibility. Decisions recommending placement must be agreed to by OMH, SED, and DSS. As of March 1983, one program with 14 beds has been certified with other applications pending. It is expected that 500 beds will be operational by the end of the year. Several agencies indicated the Council role had been critical to the development of the facilities not only in the problem identification stage but in the statutory development and program implementation stages as well. The legislature viewed residential treatment facilities, as one person put it, "Not as an OMH nice idea but rather as an initiative of the Governor."

Institutional Schools Bill

The education of children in residential placement in New York State developed on an "ad hoc" basis over the years. The legislature's response was the creation of 24 "union free" school districts. These districts were

treated by the State Education Department in the same manner as other school districts: they received normal State aid to local education and had governing boards, usually composed of staff at the residential facility.

Problems arose with the often overlapping and conflicting policies of the Department of Social Services and the State Education Department with respect to rate setting, supervision, placement, evaluation, and funding. There were financial and programmatic disincentives for children living in residential facilities to attend nearby local public schools. Another problem was that local Committees on the Handicapped, established after many of the residential programs and creation of the union free school districts, had no voice in the education of children in residential placement from their districts. A final problem was the conflicts posed by Federal reimbursement policies. Specifically, some children who were foster care placements also were handicapped. They qualified for Federal foster care reimbursement and were eligible for services under P.L. 94-142 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. To resolve these problems, the legislature in 1980 passed a law with these provisions:

- o Children in residential placement are guaranteed the right to an appropriate education;
- o Local Committees on the Handicapped are given authority to review each child's placement annually and any proposed out-of-State placement before it is made;
- o Governance of education in residential facilities was changed to require that a majority of the school board is not affiliated with the facility;
- o Facility Committees on the Handicapped are abolished because local Committees are made responsible for monitoring children;
- o Funding processes were changed so that expenses are authorized by the State Education Department and paid by the Department of Social Services; the district of the child's origin pays the local share;
- o The two State departments must agree on common rate settings;
- o School districts in residential placement facilities no longer receive normal State aid but are reimbursed on a tuition basis;
- o Residential costs are paid by local social service districts but the State Department of Social Services is the single paymaster for education expenses; and
- o Joint supervision and inspection are conducted by the State Education Department and the Department of Social Services.

The Council was responsible for drafting this bill as a Governor's Program Bill and for conducting intensive negotiations with appropriate agencies so that the bill would reflect each agency's concerns. The Council also conducted public hearings across the State on this issue.

Day Treatment

Day treatment programs are less costly and often more effective than residential programs.

The Governor directed the Council to examine policy and funding patterns for these programs to lessen the burden on service providers. The Council survey revealed the ad hoc nature of these programs. Licensing, monitoring, funding, and even development of these programs had occurred with little thought to program consistency. Indeed, many day treatment programs were forced to develop complicated multiple funding sources to provide different types of services. An issue paper was developed that outlined existing types of programs, their funding mechanisms, areas of concern, and obstacles to effective service delivery.

Council member agencies are attempting to implement agreements based on the recommendations from the survey and the issue paper. The Office of Mental Health also is completing an eight-year regulatory development process for day treatment programs. The regulations have been through five sets of public hearings. OMH plans to implement the regulations on April 1, 1983, beginning first with adult programs then expanding to children's programs.

Ongoing Activities

Two activities of the Council, one mandated in its enabling legislation and the other evolving out of a perceived need for information exchange among middle managers in State government, provide the various State agencies with a neutral forum for information and dispute resolution. These two functions have brought staff from the Council member agencies together, increased the level of communication, and expanded the range of informal networks. The end result, according to a number of people interviewed, has been an increase in the Council's stature and authority.

Hard to Place

First seen as a "court of last resort" to resolve placement disputes among agencies in individual cases, the Council has used its "hard-to-place" function as a major mechanism for coordination. The purpose of hard to place is straightforward. Children with multiple problems, hence multiple service needs, often are shuttled among various programs. The Council was directed by law to be the final arbiter: to order an agency to take a child and ensure that the child received appropriate services when all other avenues of appeal were exhausted.

The Hard-To-Place Task Force provides advice, guidance, and helps to resolve interagency policy issues that emerge as a result of the Council's individual case resolution. Between 1977 and 1982, 225 cases were referred to the Hard-To-Place Task Force. The Task Force, chaired by the Council, is composed of the Department of Social Services, Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Office of Mental Health, State Education Department, and the Division for Youth. Of those, 168 were accepted and 150 resolved. Most important to this process is the fact that the Council has never had to order an agency to take a placement. Since 1977, the agencies have been able to agree on placements in every case. The Council discovered that one barrier to appropriate placement of multiple disabled youth is that various agencies--both State and local--are unfamiliar with each other and, more importantly, with each other's programs. The Council also found that case records for the child were often inadequate or incomplete, making an appropriate placement more difficult.

The Council also has convened to regional Hard-To-Place Committees. The New York City Hard-To-Place Committee was established in January 1981. It is composed of representatives from State and city agencies. Unlike the Hard-To-Place Task Force, the Committee actually provides a forum for interagency discussions of individual requests for assistance. In addition, the Committee addresses policy issues that arise from these cases. In January 1983, the Council established the Central New York Hard-To-Place Committee, which also is composed of State and local government agency representatives. The Council chairs both Committees.

A major benefit of the New York City Task Force has been the development of the New York City Access Handbook. This manual, developed by DSS, SED, OMRDD, and OMH, is a cookbook manual of placement and referral information for line service workers. The goals of the manual are the prevention of unnecessary transfers from agency to agency, elimination of unnecessary referrals, and delivery of appropriate services. The Handbook is the first of its kind in New York State. The Central New York Access Handbook is in development and will be ready for distribution soon.

Program Information Exchange

As an observer remarked during the course of an interview for this case study: "It's amazing how alike these various social services systems are and how little communication goes on among them, especially at the middle management level." The Council's Program Information Exchange (PIE), a standing committee that meets on a regular basis, was created to provide middle managers an opportunity to learn about the facilities, programs, policies, and services that each agency provides or funds. It grew out of the confusion surrounding the licensure of new residential facilities and the issue involved in the board transfer processes. At the same time, it offers voluntary provider agencies an opportunity to get answers to their questions without having to reach each agency individually.

PIE came into existence to share information about new program development, available beds, and the quality and effectiveness of programs. Senior staff from the various Council agencies with residential programs meet regularly to review issues, such as requests for change of certification or change in status. PIE has expedited such requests and given the Council a tool to monitor the implementation of policy changes for such programs.

Other Past Council Activities

As an impartial research, policy analysis, and program development agency, the Council has been called upon to perform numerous other projects and functions. It has undertaken those projects that fit within the four goal areas outlined in 1977. These other activities are not seen as distractions from the Council's main program initiatives but as complementary activities that should be used to further the improvement of children and youth services in New York.

Among a number of such activities, the following are representative:

New York State Conference on Children and Youth. The cancellation of the decennial White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1981 left to the States the responsibility for conducting their own conferences. In New York, the Council became the focal point for conference organization. The Council funded 21 community conferences, all dealing with the general themes of youth participation and youth empowerment. The Council also funded nine specialized institutes that dealt with specific topics, such as youth in jail, children of alcoholics, teenage pregnancy, and school age child care. In addition, some local communities held events that were affiliated with the general conference theme of youth participation.

Governor's Task Force on Domestic Violence. The Council provides staff support to this task force, which was created in 1979. The task force advises the Governor and the legislature on ways the State can respond more effectively to the law-related and social problems posed by abuse among family members. The task force has provided training packages for hospital emergency room personnel, training for magistrates on new domestic violence legislation, assistance to the Division of Criminal Justice Services in the revision of law enforcement training manuals, and assistance in securing passage of new legislation strengthening State law on domestic violence.

Residential Child Care Standards. In 1978 the Department of Health and Human Services created an interstate consortium for the 14 States in Federal Regions I, II, and III. The purpose was to develop commonly accepted standards for placement in residential services to facilitate interstate placements. This consortium was created at the same time the out-of-state placement project was in operation, and the Council was designated to work with the consortium. As a result of the Council's involvement in the consortium, it has undertaken a major project designed to rationalize the standards that regulate community-based residential child care agencies. The Council is systematically analyzing the existing

standards of five state agencies in each of nine regulatory areas (e.g., Administration, Client Rights and Protection, etc.) Based on this analysis, the Council is proposing the development of an interagency set of minimum regulations that would govern the operations of community-based residential child care programs. The acceptance and implementation of such core standards would eliminate cross-agency regulatory conflicts of programs that have multiple supervision, streamline the sets of regulations governing programs and will ensure consistent and fair treatment for children in care, regardless of agency jurisdiction.

Families and the Workplace. The Council was funded by the Civil Service Employees Association Joint Labor/Management Committee on the Work Environment and Productivity (CWEP) to sponsor a series of Families and the Workplace forums across the State. Five such forums were held, focusing on issues such as employer sponsored day care, alternative work schedules, and employee assistance programs. The format and program of each conference were tailored to meet the needs of each location and audience. In addition, the Council convened a task force that offered strategies for developing alternatives in the workplace to meet changing family needs.

Future Concerns

The Child Welfare Reform Act, the work of the Council, and the growing sophistication of the child and youth care services sectors have made positive accomplishments in New York in recent years. The Temporary State Commission on Child Welfare created a ripple effect still being felt in services to New York's children. Some of the issues discussed above, especially the board transfer process and services to "aging out" disabled youth, will remain important topics in the years ahead. Similarly, development of management information systems and their utilization over the next several years will produce information for policymaking and consequences for the child care system not now foreseen. However, the information systems will also permit those who plan, fund, and monitor services to have necessary information on trends and developments in service populations within months instead of years.

At the same time, newly emerging issues face the Council. Those issues break down into two categories. The first are service issues such as services to disabled youth ages zero to five years and the impact of modern society and government policies upon families. The other category involves many of the same issues that led to the Council's creation: the organizational patterns of State government. There are still strong proponents for reorganization of the service delivery patterns in State government.

Service Issues

Services to Disabled Children Birth to Age Five. The Council has been involved for the past several years in attempts to streamline Family Court

processes for accessing special services for children under the age of five. In 1980, the Council held hearings to allow advocates, constituent groups, providers, parents, and public officials to present their observations and recommendations. Legislation developed by the Council would streamline the Family Court process for mandating services, authorize the Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities to study the need for such services, reform the reimbursement processes, and redefine allowable costs. The project is committed to ensuring that families with disabled school children have access to a wide range of services, including health, rehabilitative and habilitative services. Although the legislation has not yet passed, the Council is administering a \$200,000 State appropriation designed to develop an outreach campaign for families who have been traditionally unserved or underserved in the Family Court System.

Assistance to Families. The Council's work, detailed above, has focused on assistance to families in regard to the work environment. It has worked on issues related to children of incarcerated women and factors affecting family decisions to place a developmentally disabled child in residential care. Several persons interviewed indicated a need to expand that work to include an examination of families and preventive services and to assist families in making decisions to maintain mentally retarded and developmentally disabled children at home. One proposal was to develop "respite care," permitting families with developmentally disabled children to place the children overnight or for a weekend in a safe and secure environment. Another issue is the need for after-school services for children of working parents. In the area of "respite care," the Council has received a Federal grant to establish and evaluate a demonstration project for the provision of home-based care. Conducted jointly with the Westchester Self-Help Clearinghouse, the project is focusing on low cost and volunteer respite models, provided in the family's home. The program is addressing both the developmentally disabled and families with chronically mentally ill or frail family members.

Organizational Issues

Reorganization of Services. Several respondents discussed the need to reorganize service delivery further. None mentioned creation of a superagency in the human services field. Many recommended creation of a Department of Children and Family Services that would merge services in the Division for Youth and the service bureaus of the Department of Social Services. The role of the State Education Department was also mentioned. Several persons characterized the Department as a fiefdom apart from the rest of State government. No one suggested major changes in the organizational structure of the State Education Department, but several expressed concern about its relationship with other State agencies. (NOTE: It should be stated that no interview with a representative from the Department was conducted.)

Strengthening the Council's Role. Several persons believed that the role of the Council should be strengthened. Persons involved in the process that led to the Council's creation believed that the time was now right to try the original proposal made by Senator Pisani and the Temporary State Commission on Child Welfare. Also expressed was support for the Council's assuming an advocate's role for children. There was also concern that no important legislation concerning children had been passed since enactment of the Child Welfare Reform Act. That failure was attributed to the void left by the Commission's demise and the limited powers to fill the void given to the Council.

Fiscal Accountability. The Council's success in persuading agencies to work together and to agree to joint funding and procedures could become the source of future potential conflict. Although there was widespread admiration for the work of the Council in assisting agencies to make efficient use of their funds, there were concerns that providers could take advantage of the more complex fiscal procedures to make multiple charges for the same services for the same client. There was particular concern that procedures be developed to ensure the maximum use of service monies. Other persons believed that further use of fiscal incentives and disincentives for placement should be explored.

Role of Local Government and the Private Sector. Several respondents believed that the Council should evaluate the impact of the tremendous recent changes in the child care service delivery system within the context of the funding reductions and program changes at the Federal level. Several respondents asserted that sorting out roles between public and private service providers and State and local governments is necessary to continue to ensure the delivery of high-quality services.

V. GENERAL EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The New York Council on Children and Families marks its sixth anniversary with a record of accomplishment. New York has been studying, reforming, expanding, and coordinating its children and youth services system intensively for the past nine years. The activities of the Council and the Temporary State Commission on Child Welfare constitute a vigorous record of achievement.

This case study does not constitute a rigorous evaluation of either the Council or the Commission. Indeed, most observations were gathered from the persons interviewed. However, there appears to be a consensus about the major accomplishments and the reasons for them. The Council has lived up to the intentions of its creators. Many believe, however, that the time has come to reconsider the Council's roles and authority and to make some modifications to the Council's powers and duties.

SUMMARY OF SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

A Reorientation of the Child Care System from the Benefit of Service Providers to the Benefit of the Youth Being Served. The Council has caused the service delivery system to focus more on the needs of clients by performing studies on the appropriateness of placement and by attempting to bring order and consistency to the standards, licensure, monitoring, reimbursement, and programmatic aspects of service delivery, especially in residential placements. Thus, although the secure delivery system is not free from self-interest, it now considers the needs of young people much more than it did six years ago.

A Clearer Focus on the Placement Process To Ensure an Appropriate Placement. Most of the Council's major studies have concerned the placement process. With 45,000 youth in residential placement in New York, the need for a sophisticated placement process is essential. The Council has examined this issue from the broadscale (out-of-home study) to the narrow (meeting individual placement needs in the hard-to-place program). The Council's comprehensive approach to placement decisionmaking has already had an impact. The development of management information systems during 1983 should put the State in the forefront in placement decisionmaking.

The Development of a Body of Knowledge for Policymakers, Program Planners, Service Providers, and Advocates that Improves Opportunities for Successful Programs. The Council has acquired respectable knowledge and information, organized into relevant policymaking formats. Development of the management information systems will permit the State to move from a reactive mode, based on surveys of past activities, to a proactive mode, based on trends and developments in child care populations. In this respect, New York may be several years ahead of other States.

The Encouragement of the Creation of Comprehensive Service Strategies at the Local Level. The Council has had an impact on local service delivery through its Comprehensive Adolescent Services Study; the demonstration projects in eight counties as a followup to the out-of-home study; technical assistance to various projects; and development of joint funding, licensing, and monitoring programs at the State level. The Council has focused on efforts to bring schools into the service delivery process, something national experts say is essential to working with troubled children and adolescents.

A Focus on Efforts To Strengthen Families in a Rapidly Changing Society. The Council has quietly and effectively gathered information on family needs and concerns. Staff support to the Task Force on Domestic Violence, the Council's families and workplace efforts, and its families with special projects has examined issues often ignored by government agencies in their policymaking processes. While no spectacular results have come from the Council's family efforts, these efforts have developed groundwork for future program and policy initiatives.

EXPLANATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL'S SUCCESS

A number of reasons for the Council's success were offered by the people interviewed for this case study. There was universal agreement that the Council has been successful in having an impact upon children and youth services in New York.

There are criticisms as well, discussed in the next section. The criticisms focus mainly on the Council's internal operations rather than on any specific activity it has undertaken.

There appear to be four factors for the Council's success:

- Strong, sustained support from key decisionmakers;
- Leadership style and competence of the Council staff;
- Selection of relevant issues that required attention; and
- Honest brokering among the agencies and avoiding alliances with any particular agency(ies).

Strong, Sustained Support from Key Decisionmakers

The decision to make the Secretary to the Governor (the equivalent of a Chief of Staff) the Chair of the Council had much to do with the Council's success. The individual who occupied that position during the administration of Governor Hugh Carey, Robert Murgado, was seen as a strong leader--"the second most powerful man in the State," according to one person interviewed. Many Council initiatives were perceived as coming from the Governor because of Mr. Murgado's involvement. A specific example, cited before, was the creation of Residential Treatment Facilities. These facilities became viable because of the Council's involvement and the follow through from the Governor's office in securing legislative endorsement and funding.

Strong support also came from the Division of the Budget. Several agency staff persons interviewed were frank in stating that the reason their departments had cooperated with certain actions endorsed by the Council was the support given the Council by the Budget Division. The Division of the Budget spokesperson said that his agency considered the Council as a partner in programmatic efforts because of the Council's capacity to analyze various issues and provide data for the office to use in developing budget proposals.

The legislature provided support to the Council as well. The Council provided the legislature with a research and policy arm previously lacking. Support for the creation of the Council came from influential legislators, and the Council has maintained that relationship over the years by conducting studies and other activities for the legislature. The

perception clearly exists that Council endorsement of agency initiatives increases the prospect of their success.

Leadership Style and Competence of the Council Staff

While aware of the support it enjoys from influential political figures in the State, the Council has gone about its business in a nonthreatening manner and produced high-quality, in-depth studies, reports, and evaluations of the issues it has examined. The interaction of intellect and personality that produces leadership is a complex study in itself. It does appear that the leadership style of the Council has contributed to its effectiveness. Several persons commented both on the competence and style of the Executive Director and the rest of the key staff. The Council made a point of developing rapport with the staff of all the State agencies involved in children and youth services.

A second factor has been the quality of the work performed. The core leadership of the Council has attracted a staff rich in experience, creativity, and capacity; and the work of the Council is respected. The Council's initial out-of-State and early intervention studies enhanced the Council's credibility. The Council has maintained the tradition of competent work and continues to enjoy widespread support. The Council has taken on work not directly related to its main mission by undertaking requests for small studies and data gathering. An example of this is the transfer of responsibility for research and policy functions, particularly in the case of management information systems development and the study on "aging out" populations to the Council by the legislature.

The Council also has been able to attract funding for its activities in addition to its appropriation from the legislature. The Council has competed with consulting firms and other research organizations for studies and other evaluations from various State agencies and has won many of those contracts. The Council has received funds from several foundations, notably the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation and the Foundation for Child Development, to conduct various studies. At the time of this case study only one-half of the Council's staff of 50 was funded by the agency's direct appropriation; the rest was funded by other State agency research contracts, Federal funds, or foundation grants.

Selection of Relevant Issues that Required Attention

From its inception the Council has taken on issues that had an interagency focus, were critical or unresolvable by only one agency, and had solutions that were feasible and implementable. The priorities of the Council were clearly set and understood by the agencies to be real and important problems.

The Council has also been careful about raising expectations. Council staff made it clear that the Council promises only what it can deliver to

the various agencies. This deliberate expectation setting process reinforced the Council's credibility.

Honest Brokering Among the Agencies and Avoiding Alliances with any Particular Agency(ies). No one interviewed indicated that the Council had allied itself with any of the service agencies. Indeed, several persons commented that the Council has created a "sharing mindset" that has led to a reduction in the "turf" battles that often characterize coordination efforts. The Council has served as a mediation and dispute resolution agency since its inception.

One key ingredient in that dispute resolution and mediation process has been a side benefit of the Council's formal processes. It has created an informal network of relationships that did not exist before the Council was created. The Program Information Exchange and the hard-to-place process has made State agencies more aware of each other's programs, processes, and policies. A key indicator of this brokering role has been that the Council has not had to use its authority to order a placement under the hard-to-place program but has been able to get the agencies involved to agree voluntarily on these placement decisions.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The issues the Council should examine and its authority were discussed in the interviews. Although there was general agreement that the Council has made significant contributions to the welfare of New York's children, a number of people said that further changes should be made in the Council's focus and responsibilities. As noted earlier in the section on future issues, there remains interest in reorganization of services in the State. Some believe that the Council should become more of an advocate and assume a more public profile. Another point of view is that the Council should assume an operating role in State government, as envisioned in the 1977 legislation, and that it should have authority to direct the agencies to do their jobs better. Several people expressed the concern that the Council's statutory authority was too narrowly defined and that the Council was too dependent upon the authority of others.

The comments regarding future general approaches to issues were few. There is some concern that the Council should move to a real planning process involving the anticipation of emerging issues and motivating agencies to deal with those issues. Another respondent urged the Council to move away from issues involving treatment and rehabilitation of children and youth and toward a posture that emphasizes prevention and youth development strategies.

CONCLUSIONS

The New York Council on Children and Families has compiled an enviable record. It has mixed the need for reform of the State's child care system

with a practical view about financial costs and political and bureaucratic exigencies. In a time of declining fiscal resources, the Council makes a persuasive case for funding priority services needs for children.

The Council is facing a mild pause after almost six years of hard work and it is looking for new issues that need attention. There is no lack of ideas as to what the needs are. The Council will move ahead in the coming years because it has built a strong base of support by confronting issues of pressing importance. It has survived by that combination of leadership, knowledge, information, and creativity that is the hallmark of good public policymaking.

NORTH CAROLINA

I. INTRODUCTION

Responsibility for youth services in North Carolina is divided between the judicial branch and various agencies within the executive branch of government. The executive agencies primarily fall within the Department of Human Resources, a multi-functional administrative structure created in 1971 as a part of a major reorganization of State government. Responsibilities are also divided between State and local levels, although the funding and administration of most mandated services reside with the State. Law enforcement is a local responsibility and juvenile detention is both State and locally administered. Recently there has been a major emphasis on volunteer and private sector involvement in youth services to complement the publicly administered activities.

North Carolina's system for coordinating youth services represents a multi-faceted approach that brings together key participants in a variety of different ways, without any overall attempt to redesign the way in which services are organized and delivered. Although the present set of mechanisms appears to have evolved through a series of individual efforts, the pieces seem to complement each other and interact in positive ways. At the policy level, the primary coordination mechanism is the Governor's Executive Cabinet on Juveniles, which was created in 1981 to promote cooperation and coordination among State agencies. The Cabinet is chaired by the Governor and includes: the Secretaries of Human Resources, Corrections, Crime Control, and Public Safety; the Chief Justice; the Attorney General; the Superintendent of Public Instruction; the Chairman of the Governor's Crime Commission; and the Chairman of the Courts Commission. At the program level, the Governor's Crime Commission, and particularly the Juvenile Justice Committee, play a major role in identifying and developing new interagency efforts. The Community Based Alternatives Program, through its 100 local interagency task forces, provides the mechanism for developing interagency linkages and programs at the local level. Finally the Positive Youth Development Committee provides a broad-based emphasis on community development.

II. DEVELOPMENT AND HISTORY

The current system of providing services to children and youth in North Carolina and the various means of coordinating these activities have evolved gradually over the past 10 years. Four major influences have contributed to and shaped the present system:

- Reaction to an overcrowded and highly institutionalized juvenile justice system;
- Reorganization of the executive and judicial branches of government;

- Strong commitment to citizen and youth involvement and volunteerism; and
- A new juvenile code.

REACTION TO AN OVERCROWDED AND HIGHLY INSTITUTIONALIZED JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

In the early 1970s, North Carolina had the highest per capita commitment rate to training schools of all 50 States. At that time, approximately 2,400 youth were confined in juvenile training institutions. Numerous problems of the State's juvenile justice system were identified in a 1972 report of the North Carolina Bar Association, called As a Twig is Bent. In 1974, the Knox Commission, appointed by the General Assembly, built on the Bar Association report and recommended the development of community-based alternatives and an end to the commitment of status offenders to training schools. In 1975, H.B. 456 was passed setting the stage for the Community Based Alternatives Program, which did not actually receive a legislative appropriation until 1977. Since 1977, the CBA program has enjoyed strong support and has grown from an initial funding level of \$250,000 to \$4,500,000 in 1982.

North Carolina's system of services has been dramatically affected by H.B. 456. Today there are many community-based programs at the local level designed to keep youths out of institutions and to prevent juvenile delinquency. The annual number of commitments to training schools has decreased from 2,400 to approximately 800.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

In the early 1970s North Carolina reorganized both its executive and judicial branches of government. Each had implications for the delivery of services to children and youth. Within the executive branch, the Executive Organization Act of 1971 established 19 principal departments to encompass approximately 230 existing agencies, boards, and institutions. Initially, a new Department of Corrections assumed responsibility for juvenile as well as adult corrections. However, in 1975 the General Assembly transferred responsibility for juvenile training schools to the Department of Human Resources. This Department brought together more than 30 separate agencies that had been engaged in various human services activities.

There was also a realignment of juvenile court services. These had previously been the responsibility of superior court clerks and county departments of social services. In 1973, the Juvenile Services Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts was established and assumed responsibility for juvenile intake, probation, and aftercare.

COMMITMENT TO CITIZEN AND YOUTH INVOLVEMENT AND VOLUNTEERISM

To complement the mandated services provided by public agencies and to promote greater awareness and commitment to youth-related issues, North

Carolina has placed a strong emphasis on citizen involvement and volunteerism. In 1971, the General Assembly established the Advocacy Council for Children and Youth to serve as an advocate for youth within State government and to set up local advocacy groups throughout the State. The Youth Involvement Office was created in the 1970s to provide opportunities for youth to become involved in community affairs and State government. More recently, the Governor has promoted the development of local Positive Youth Development programs and one-on-one volunteer programs. These programs provide another dimension to the more formal youth services system, while still maintaining the necessary links.

NEW JUVENILE CODE

A new juvenile code, ratified by the legislature in 1979, took effect in 1980. The stated purposes of the new code are to:

- Divert juvenile offenders from the juvenile system through intake services so that juveniles may remain in their own homes and may be treated through community-based services when this approach is consistent with the protection of the public safety;
- Provide procedures for the hearing of juvenile cases that assure fairness and equity and that protect the constitutional rights of juveniles and parents; and
- Develop a disposition for each juvenile case that reflects consideration of the facts, the needs and limitations of the child, the strengths and weaknesses of the family, and the protection of the public safety (North Carolina Juvenile Code, Sec. 7A-506).

III. ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

Current responsibilities for delivering youth services in North Carolina are shown in Table 1. Most of the mandated services are provided by State agencies, either centrally or through their local offices. Law enforcement is a local responsibility; and responsibility for detention is split, with the State operating regional detention centers and seven others being locally operated.

SERVICE AREAS

Court Services

Juvenile court intake, probation, and aftercare are all administered at the State level by the Juvenile Services Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The Juvenile Services Division develops and disseminates uniform policies and guidelines. The Director of the Division supervises the Chief Court Counselors and probation officers who are located in 32 judicial districts.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

Table 1. Division of Responsibility Within the Current Delivery System in North Carolina

	D H R			ADMIN. OFF. OF COURTS (Juv. Ser. Division)	LOCAL
	Division of Youth Services	Division of Social Services	Division of MH		
COURT SERVICES					
- Intake				X	
- Probation				X	
- Aftercare				X	
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES					
- Training Schools	X				
- Secure Detention	X				
- Non-Secure Detention		X			X
CHILD WELFARE SERVICES					
- Protective Services		X			
- Foster Care		X			
- Adoption		X			
- Day Care		X			
VOLUNTEERS	X				X
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES			X		
LAW ENFORCEMENT					X
COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES	X				X

Services are actually provided at the district level. The Chief Court Counselor is a State employee and is appointed by the Administrative Office of the Courts. However, he/she must be approved by the chief district court judge in that district. This arrangement maintains a balance between State and local control over court services. Within the district office, court intake personnel are often distinct from the probation officers, especially in the larger, more urban districts.

Residential/Custodial Services

The Division of Youth Services within DHR operates five training schools for adjudicated delinquent youth. Four of these are "open campus" regional intake facilities and one is a secure facility for moderately to severely disturbed youth. The population in training schools has declined continually since the early 1970s; the average daily population is currently around 600. DYS also operates one regional detention center that serves 11 surrounding counties. There are seven locally-operated detention centers, five of which operate as regional facilities in return for a cash subsidy administered by DYS. There are currently 45 (out of 100) counties in North Carolina that do not have access to a secure detention center. In many cases, there is no alternative to using the local jail. The new Juvenile Code requires that no juvenile be held in local jails after July 1, 1983, although it now appears that this date will be extended.

Regardless of who operates the facility, DYS provides the following services with respect to secure detention:

- Inspection and monitoring;
- Consultation;
- Technical assistance;
- Subsidy program for regional centers;
- Training for detention personnel.

Non-secure detention facilities are operated by the Division of Social Services (also within DHR), which also licenses foster and group homes.

Child Welfare Services

The mandated public child welfare services are administered by the Division of Social Services (in DHR) through the county departments of social services. The services provided include protective service, foster care, day care, adoption, and family services. Before 1973, when the Juvenile Services Division was established within the Administrative Office of the Courts, county social service departments had been responsible for providing probation services for the district courts.

Community-Based Services

Since 1975, the major effort in developing community-based youth services in North Carolina has been the Community Based Alternatives Program (CBA), administered by the Division of Youth Services. The program was a direct result of the overcrowding and other problems in the juvenile justice system that existed in the early 1970s. The CBA program provides a State cash subsidy to each of the 100 counties in North Carolina to support the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and delinquent youth who do not require institutional confinement. Although the actual development and operation of CBA projects is the responsibility of county government, the

State provides financial and technical assistance, and monitors the county projects. The types of programs funded through the subsidy have included group homes, foster care programs, counseling, school programs, recreation, and adult volunteer programs.

Volunteer Programs

The Division of Youth Services is responsible for assisting local communities in the development of one-on-one volunteer programs. These are community-based programs that match specially trained adult volunteers with youth who have been involved with the juvenile justice system. The Governor has been a strong supporter of this project, which is expected to reach 12 new communities each year for the next three years.

In addition to the Governor's One-on-One Program, there are a number of volunteer programs that have been established throughout North Carolina by private agencies or through local initiative. Wake County has a Partners program that is part of the national organization begun in Denver, Colorado. It draws on corporate support and its own fund raising efforts. Wayne County has a program, "Friends for Youth," that is administered through the Chief Court Counselor's office. The Gaston-Lincoln Mental Health Program supervises a program known as Companions that serves children from ages 6 to 17, especially children of single parents. These volunteer programs complement the other youth services programs operating in communities throughout the State.

Mental Health Services

The Division of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services is responsible for mental health services for youth. These services are delivered through the area mental health authorities, who also have case management responsibilities for children and youth with behavioral problems.

Intake Procedures

The new juvenile code, which took effect in 1980, requires that each district court provide an intake service to perform four basic functions:


- Determine from available evidence whether there are reasonable grounds to believe the facts alleged are true;
- Determine whether the facts alleged constitute a delinquent or undisciplined offense within the jurisdiction of the court;
- Determine whether the facts alleged are sufficiently serious to warrant court action; and

- Obtain assistance from community resources where court referral is necessary (North Carolina Juvenile Code, Sec. 7A-510).

The code emphasizes that informal diversion to community resources should be a basic orientation of court intake officers and law enforcement personnel.

Police contacts make up the largest source of referrals to court intake. As many as 70 percent of police contacts with juveniles result in release, counsel and release, release to parents, or referral to community resources. In the remaining cases, a petition is filed and the case moves to the intake unit. Intake is not an investigatory or "fact-finding" procedure. The intake counselor may refuse to file a complaint if the case is not within the jurisdiction of the court, if legal sufficiency has not been established, or if the alleged matter is frivolous. Those cases for which complaints are filed, fall into two categories. Certain offenses are considered "non-divertible" (serious felonies, those involving the willful infliction of serious bodily injury, or those committed with a deadly weapon). In these cases a petition must be filed once there is a finding of reasonable grounds. For all other offenses, the intake counselor can file a petition, divert the youth to a community resource, or resolve the matter without further action. (See Figure 1 below for a simplified view of the court intake process).

Figure 1. The Court Intake Process



Case Management

With one exception, there is no formal case management system for managing and coordinating the various services needed by an individual youth regardless of whether the services are administered by social services, mental health, the courts, or some other provider. The one exception is cases involving children and youth who are labelled as "behavior problems." As a result of a class action suit heard in 1980 (known as the "Willie M." suit), the area mental health authorities have overall case management responsibility for certified cases involving youth who are emotionally disturbed, assaultive, or otherwise labelled as behavior problems.

There is no general mechanism for formal case management of services across the juvenile justice/child welfare boundary. In cases where children are found to be abused or neglected, the court must appoint a guardian, but this does not ensure active case management. Several respondents indicated their desire for a more formal and widespread case management approach throughout the youth services system.

IV. COORDINATION MECHANISMS

North Carolina's approach to coordination has been to create a variety of mechanisms that support and enhance the performance of the existing agencies and providers of service. This is in contrast to an approach that seeks to redesign or reorganize the youth services system into an integrated department. The result is a number of interacting and somewhat overlapping coordinating processes, each directed towards different levels or functions within the overall system.

Four major coordinating mechanisms were examined for the purposes of this study:


1. The Governor's Executive Cabinet on Juvenile Affairs;
2. The Juvenile Justice Committee of the Governor's Crime Commission;
3. The Positive Youth Development Committee; and
4. The Community-Based Alternatives Task Forces.

The first two are directed at policymaking and program development at the State level. The latter two, while having a statewide identity and organizational structure, primarily focus on coordination activities at the local community level.

THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE CABINET ON JUVENILE AFFAIRS

The Executive Cabinet on Juvenile Affairs was created by Executive Order Number 63 effective April 9, 1981, as a means of coordinating the activities of the major State agencies involved in youth services (see Figure 2). The members of the Cabinet are:

Figure 2. State Agencies Involved in Youth Services in North Carolina



(*Indicates member of the Governor's Executive Cabinet on Juveniles)

- Governor (who serves as chairman);
- Chief Justice;
- Attorney General;
- Secretary of Human Resources;
- Secretary of Corrections;
- Secretary of Crime Control and Public Safety;
- Secretary of National Resources and Community Development;
- Superintendent of Public Instruction;
- Chairman of the Governor's Crime Commission; and
- Chairman of the Courts Commission.

The cabinet meets four times per year and is staffed by the Governor's Special Assistant on Juvenile Affairs. Meetings are chaired by the Governor. As stated in the Executive Order, the Cabinet has the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Advocate and promote a coordinated program for assistance to juveniles throughout North Carolina;
2. Monitor and assess the work of the various State agencies in the conduct of a preventive program of juvenile services and to identify strategies for increased citizen involvement;
3. Promote cooperation among agencies leading to the development of a comprehensive approach to assist communities in preventing juvenile delinquency;
4. Promote new ideas and innovative approaches to juvenile delinquency prevention;
5. Improve coordination of State and volunteer services;
6. Provide technical assistance and consultation to citizens, volunteer agencies, and other local organizations.

All respondents believe that the Executive Cabinet has been successful in focusing attention on youth issues and sending a clear message to State agencies that coordination of efforts is a high priority. The Cabinet is seen as playing a major role in the development of one-on-one volunteer programs, in providing community-wide delinquency prevention efforts, and as a forum for promoting interagency projects. Several see it as a viable alternative to the creation of a single youth services department, an approach that had been advocated by some in 1978, but was ultimately defeated.

Some respondents believe that the Cabinet meetings have served as valuable problem-solving sessions where work gets done and issues get resolved. Others said that there was not really enough time to engage in problem-solving and that the primary benefit has been information sharing, highlighting of issues, and focusing attention on priority issues.

THE JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMITTEE OF THE GOVERNOR'S CRIME COMMISSION

The Juvenile Justice Committee acts on a more specific and programmatic level than the Executive Cabinet to identify specific problem areas and propose solutions. Its members are appointed by the Governor and include representatives from the Administrative Office of the Courts, the Department of Public Instruction, the Division of Youth Services, law enforcement agencies, county government, private youth service agencies, local social service departments, and private citizens. Staff assistance is provided by the staff of the Governor's Crime Commission, which is a part of the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety.

The Committee was originally created in response to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and has been responsible for allocating Federal juvenile justice funds and developing State plans for juvenile justice. In recent years, with the decrease in available Federal funds, the Committee has begun to view planning in a new way. Rather than developing comprehensive master plans for the allocation of funds, the Committee has focused more on working to bring people together who are knowledgeable about specific issues and then selectively designing and implementing innovative projects. One current example is a statewide interagency effort directed at school discipline problems. Nine pilot counties are currently experimenting with a team approach that does not require any additional allocation of resources. Another initiative focuses on alternative ways of dealing with chronic offenders.

In addition to undertaking specific projects, the Committee also develops a legislative program as part of the overall annual package produced by the Governor's Crime Commission.

POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The most broadly focused coordination mechanism in North Carolina is the Positive Youth Development (PYD) Committee. The Committee has evolved from an initiative begun in 1980 by the Division of Youth Services to promote a greater awareness and appreciation of the need for prevention efforts throughout the State. A Prevention Committee was created to launch a media campaign and to generate local support from citizens, civic organizations, churches, and others. Following a statewide conference in 1981, the Committee adopted the "positive youth development" approach and changed its name. The PYD approach focuses on creating conditions in the home, school, and community that promote the well-being of youth.

The statewide PYD Committee currently exists as an unincorporated group. It has resisted becoming a separate agency. Although it is organized at the State level, its major focus is on local communities. The major emphasis to date has been on working with eight pilot communities to develop coordinated approaches to community development. Technical assistance is also made available to any community in the State that requests it.

While the Committee has no staff of its own, some technical assistance is provided through field consultants who work for the Division of Youth Services. A number of different agencies have also contributed staff time as well as some agency resources to help the PYD effort. The Committee itself is organized into several subcommittees: technical assistance and training; media; and three regional subcommittees. Other accomplishments have included the publication of a quarterly newsletter, the formation of several youth councils, a guide to public awareness techniques, and sponsorship of numerous regional and statewide conferences. Those represented on the PYD Committee include:

- Division of Youth Services;
- Division of Social Services;
- Division of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse;
- Department of Administration;
- Department of Public Instruction;
- Administrative Office of the Courts (Division of Juvenile Services);
- State University System;
- Governor's Office;
- professional organizations; and
- local community-based programs.

COMMUNITY-BASED ALTERNATIVES TASK FORCES

The CBA Program within the Division of Youth Services has been briefly described in the previous section. There is a statewide CBA Task Force that has guided the development of the CBA effort. However, from the point of view of coordination, the program's major accomplishment has been the creation of the local CBA task forces. Each of the 100 counties in North Carolina now has an interagency CBA task force designated by county officials. The role of each task force is to conduct a needs assessment, set priorities, and then make recommendations to the county commissioners concerning the types of programs needed for youth in that county. Each county task force is allocated an annual State appropriation through a formula based on youth population statistics. In 1980-81, these appropriations ranged from \$6,000 to \$250,000. The programs that are funded must meet three criteria:

- They must be aimed at delinquent, pre-delinquent, or status offender youth between the ages of 10 and 27;
- They must be direct service in nature; and
- Residential programs must be appropriately licensed.

Field consultants from DYS are each assigned to work with a number of local task forces to help them go through the planning process, and to develop standardized reporting procedures. There is also a certification process to help ensure that certain guidelines are met. So far approximately 60 of the 100 CBA Task Forces have met the certification requirements.

Task Forces are encouraged to develop new projects that will meet the unique needs of the county. For example, one task force designed a specialized foster care program to provide foster care placements for youth referred from juvenile court. The project was a joint effort of the district court, the Department of Social Services, and the Department of Mental Health. Another community, plagued by a high incidence of juvenile crime, developed a community enrichment program involving parents and youth to help develop community pride.

COMPLEMENTARY RELATIONSHIP OF COORDINATION MECHANISMS

The four coordination mechanisms described above are related to each other in a number of ways. First, there is enough overlap in terms of membership, philosophy, and approach that each is aware of what the other is doing. The chairperson of the PYD Committee is also a member of the Juvenile Justice Committee. The CBA Director is a former chairman of PYD. Cabinet meetings are attended by members of the other coordinating groups, even though they may not be formal Cabinet members. However, there are also differences in focus and emphasis that allow each to utilize its own expertise. Two of the mechanisms are very broadly focused (the Cabinet and PYD), while two are focused more on specific projects (CBA and the Juvenile Justice Committee). Two are oriented more to the State level (Juvenile Justice Committee and Cabinet) while two are focused more on community efforts (CBA and PYD).

In addition, the four mechanisms concentrate on different aspects of the overall coordination task. Coordinating bodies can perform three broad types of functions with respect to a complex multi-agency domain such as youth services. The first is regulation, which entails setting consistent policies, conflict resolution, evaluation and monitoring, and licensing and standard-setting. The second broad function is appreciation or the creation of a shared image of a desired future. It consists of needs assessment, joint planning or program development, and networking. The third broad function is infra-structure support, and entails the provision of people, resources, information, and training. Typically no single coordination mechanism can perform all of these functions or activities. In North Carolina's youth services system, the part that each mechanism plays is shown in Table 2.

A LOCAL PERSPECTIVE ON COORDINATION

To get a local perspective on how the pieces of the youth services system come together, project staff visited the Wilmington area in New Hanover County. As at the State level, coordination there begins with active leadership, a shared commitment to action, and a combination of formal and informal mechanisms that bring together people from different agencies and perspectives. A local evaluation committee meets regularly to recommend dispositions or referrals for youth who appear in juvenile court. It is a primary vehicle for case coordination and joint problem solving among court

Table 2. Functions Performed by Four Coordinating Mechanisms in North Carolina

	Executive Cabinet	Juvenile Justice Committee	PYD	CBA
REGULATION				
- Ensuring consistent policy across agencies	X	X		
- Conflict resolution	X			
- Evaluation and monitoring		X		X
- Licensing and standard setting				X
APPRECIATION				
- Needs assessment		X		X
- Joint planning		X		X
- Networking		X	X	
INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT				
- Information sharing	X	X		
- Resource mobilization and exchange	X		X	
- Providing training and technical assistance			X	X

counselors, Department of Social Services, schools, police, mental health, the juvenile services center, and private agencies. The CBA Task Force for New Hanover County has helped to fund a Big Buddy volunteer program, a temporary shelter, a group home, an early intervention program, and a police youth program. Much of the leadership and energy for innovative youth services programs has come from the Chief District Court Judge who, in addition to the above mentioned programs, has been instrumental in the development of a community farm program that provides a means for making restitution to victims; an alternative school that provides vocational training, personal counseling, and individualized instruction; and various other community efforts.

V. CURRENT ISSUES AND FUTURE PLANS

Each of the four major coordinating mechanisms described in the previous section has an established track record and a number of significant

accomplishments. Each also faces certain challenges as it looks toward the future and considers its role in shaping the youth services system of tomorrow. This section examines the issues facing each of the four mechanisms. The final section provides an overall assessment of North Carolina's system for coordinating services to children and youth.

GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE CABINET ON JUVENILE AFFAIRS

The Governor's Cabinet appears to have been successful in focusing attention among State agencies on matters related to juvenile justice and delinquency prevention. Through its sponsorship of statewide conferences, highlighting of inter-agency projects, and development of volunteer programs, the Cabinet has played a leading role in prevention efforts in North Carolina. One issue facing the Cabinet is whether to broaden its focus beyond a juvenile justice orientation to deal more generally with child welfare issues, mental health, and other aspects of youth services. A second issue concerns the desire of some people to see the Cabinet become more of a problem-solving mechanism. Currently the primary participants are Cabinet-level officials whose demands are tremendous and who have only a limited amount of time to focus on youth services. This can make it difficult to go beyond information sharing, problem identification, or the promotion of current efforts. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the Executive Cabinet idea is dependent on the strong enthusiasm and support for youth services on the part of the current Governor. It is likely to play a major coordinating role only when this support is obvious and well demonstrated. The future of the Cabinet is therefore more fragile than that of the other three coordinating mechanisms and its continuation beyond the current administration is the most uncertain.

JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMITTEE OF THE GOVERNOR'S CRIME COMMISSION

The Juvenile Justice Committee has been moving away from an orientation toward "master plans" and "plan-making" toward one of joint problem-solving and the selective identification of issues around which people are committed to action. The major challenge facing the Committee is finding ways to continue getting people to work together without the lure of new Federal or State funding for program development. The Committee itself faces an uncertain future as does the entire Crime Commission, and faces the possibility of staff cutbacks or changes in focus. Programmatically, the Juvenile Justice Committee is preparing to look at alternative ways of dealing with chronic status offenders in response to increasing pressure to go back to the use of training schools.

POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The strength of the PYD effort is its focus on the whole community and conditions that produce problems for youth. This focus also represents a potential source of frustration in that it is much more difficult to pinpoint specific accomplishments and measurable results that are directly

attributable to the program. One issue for PYD is finding ways to live with such a broad mandate and still maintain the conviction that something is being accomplished. Another concern is how to continue to build and develop an organizational structure without becoming over-bureaucratized. PYD does not want to become a funding agency or become tied to specific program structures, but its ability to remain fluid and adaptive depends on its continued ability to harness and utilize the resources of private citizens and existing agencies and programs.

COMMUNITY-BASED ALTERNATIVES TASK FORCES

The CBA program has grown enormously since its inception and has received widespread support. Because of economic conditions in the State, it faces little or no growth for the next few years. The local task forces will be much harder pressed in setting priorities and deciding where to allocate funds. They will also be faced with the problem of shifting some of their focus from resource allocation activities to the creation of joint efforts that utilize existing resources or can generate new resources. These latter types of activities may require some new skills and understandings on the part of task force members, DYS field consultants, and local officials.

VI. EVALUATION/ASSESSMENT

In the past decade, North Carolina's youth services system has seen major improvements in service delivery, youth and citizen involvement, and advocacy. Among the major accomplishments have been:

1. A reduction in annual admissions to training schools from 2,000 per year to approximately 800 per year.
2. A growing emphasis on community-based alternatives supported by State and local resources. State funding has increased from \$250,000 per year to \$4,500,000 per year.
3. The adoption of a new juvenile code that seeks to divert juveniles from the justice system when possible and to protect the constitutional rights of juveniles and parents.
4. A growing number of one-on-one volunteer programs that match citizen volunteers with individual youth.
5. The establishment of 40 local youth councils, made up of youth who elect representatives to a State Youth Council.
6. The establishment of 34 local youth advocacy groups made up of youth, citizens, and agency representatives.

Rather than creating a single structure for coordination, North Carolina has evolved a range of coordination mechanisms that appear to work together

well, with each maintaining a primary mission or focus. Some are more formal (the Executive Cabinet), while others are informal (the Positive Youth Development Committee). Some are more focused on overall policy and direction setting, while others are more programmatic and specific (the CBA task forces).

Several factors appear to have contributed to the effectiveness of these mechanisms individually and to their ability to work together. First is the overlapping membership and involvement that connects the various mechanisms and helps each be more aware of what the others are doing and how they can cooperate. There appears to be almost no competition among the mechanisms and a sincere interest in the others' accomplishments. A network of strong personal relationships and a shared commitment to youth helps to knit the various pieces together. Second, there is strong executive leadership and support for youth services from the Governor's office that helps to mobilize people and agencies throughout the State. The impact of this leadership is difficult to measure, but time after time it was mentioned by respondents as one of the major reasons why so many efforts have succeeded. Third, the emphasis of most of the coordination activities has been on action and intervention--on working to bring people together to make things happen, not just to produce written plans or proposals for coordination. Fourth, the coordination mechanisms that have been created have maintained and fostered a balance of responsibilities and authority among potentially competing interests--State vs. local, public vs. private, and executive vs. judicial.

As North Carolina looks toward the future, there remain several areas that appear to require attention and concern--areas where new efforts at coordination could be directed. These will pose major challenges to those committed to further improvements in the system. They include the following:

- **Going Beyond a Juvenile Justice Orientation.** The majority of the efforts to date appear to be overly oriented towards juvenile justice and juvenile delinquency. The programs, concerns, and target populations reflect less of an influence from child welfare, social service, mental health, and other parts of the larger youth services network. Now that North Carolina has accomplished so much, it may be time to expand the scope and bring other pieces into the picture.
- **Case Management and Continuity of Care.** This issue is closely related to the first. Just as the Willy M. case led to more cooperation and control in the management of cases involving "behavior problems," there appears to be a need for more effective management of cases that cut across the child welfare/juvenile justice boundary. Several respondents mentioned difficulties in the relationships between local departments of social services and court counselors. Future efforts might be directed at coordination across this interface.

- **Maintaining a System that is Responsive and Adaptive without Reorganization.** So far, North Carolina has managed a delicate balance of the needs and goals of various interests through formal and informal means that respect the existing organization of roles and responsibilities. As resources become more scarce, participants will be challenged to invent ways to maintain the spirit and commitment necessary to unite various efforts. Some will continue to believe that a single State agency with comprehensive responsibility for youth services is the only solution. Those who believe otherwise will have to be creative and determined if progress is to continue.

MARYLAND

I. INTRODUCTION

Responsibility for youth services in Maryland is shared by two agencies in the executive branch. The first, the Department of Human Resources, administers social services and public assistance programs at the State level with Federal, State, and some local funding. Local Departments of Social Services, located in 23 counties and in Baltimore, operate the programs. The second, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, one of the largest departments in Maryland's State government, administers health, mental health, retardation, crippled children, and juvenile services programs. State and local operation of institutions and treatment facilities is provided through its constituent administrations. Services for juveniles are provided by a decentralized statewide system of 10 regional offices.

Maryland has attempted to coordinate its youth services through a number of mechanisms. At the service delivery level, the Juvenile Services Administration has a broad functional responsibility for youth and delinquent youth and is also responsible for coordinating services delivered by other agencies.

At the policy or executive level, there are two coordination mechanisms, both of which report directly to the Governor.

One of the executive-level mechanisms is the Office for Children and Youth which was established by law in 1978. Its responsibility is to review and examine programs and services for youth, make recommendations on how to improve coordination of children's services, and to function as an advocate for children and youth in Maryland. The director is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the Governor. The Office has a State Advisory Committee for Children and Youth and local Children's Councils.

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC), the other executive-level mechanism, was established by executive order in 1974. It has a Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, which reviews grants funded through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and makes recommendations to the CJCC on juvenile issues.

An additional youth coordination effort is the Positive Youth Development Council housed in the Juvenile Services Administration and consisting of a voluntary membership. It places its highest priority on a positive, preventive approach to human services programming. The PYD philosophy states that coordination within State government must be part of a comprehensive and systematic statewide approach to human services. Interagency involvement, and improved coordination among agencies--from State to local to public to private--are all essential. This project was initially funded by an LEAA grant in January 1980 and was then called the Statewide Prevention Network Project.

II. HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT

The three Maryland youth services coordination mechanisms have all developed in the past decade. The major influences contributing to the development of the current system are:

- Reaction to high incarceration rates and the need for deinstitutionalization of status offenders;
- Citizen and youth advocate involvement in improving the service delivery systems; and
- Impact of a new philosophy and approach to the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Reaction to Current System

In 1975, Maryland detained 7,806 juveniles in detention centers and jails. According to the Juvenile Services Administration fiscal year 1981 Annual Report, the number of admissions to detention and holdover facilities was 6,611. Although the general trend of juvenile referrals has remained at a relatively low level during the past two years, a greater proportion of cases are being referred to the State's Attorneys Office for handling (44,260 in fiscal year 1981). Juvenile commitments to the training schools are on the increase, indicating a changing trend in public opinion toward juvenile crime. A primary consideration for JSA is to provide a program of services that fosters safety to the public. A large number of the most serious and violent types of juvenile offenders are sent directly to the adult criminal courts due to new legislation that deals directly with crime specific juvenile offenders and thus by-pass JSA's intake process.

In 1981, JSA was responsible for 3,591 of the CINS (Children In Need of Supervision) cases, a reduction from the previous year. Only 7.5 percent were referred for court action, also a reduction from 1980 figures. Higher than the 1980 figures were the 1,861 referrals involving CINAs (Children In Need of Assistance), of which 91 percent were referred for court action. Although Maryland's incarceration rate is still high, there has been a downward trend of the total number of juvenile cases disposed of by the courts since the peak number in 1976 of 58,044.

Citizen and Youth Advocate Involvement to Improve the Youth Service Delivery System

The impact from youth advocates outside State government stimulated the creation of the Office for Children and Youth. Many children receive services from more than one agency or department. State programs and services for children with multiple needs are categorized into such services as foster care, group homes, emergency shelters, mental hospitals, diagnostic centers, child protective services, compensatory or special

education, special education for the handicapped, and other services. Authorities agree that the direct services provided in Maryland are poorly organized among State agencies and result in less efficient and effective children's services. The Office for Children and Youth was established in 1978 to assist in coordinating services and to be an advocate for children and youth in the State.

Impact of a New Social Philosophy

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention funded a grant in 1980 for the "Delinquency Prevention Network Project" which was sponsored by the Juvenile Services Administration. The project later became the Maryland Positive Youth Development initiative (PYD), a primary prevention focus developed by William Lofquist, the Director of Associates for Youth Development, Inc. in Tucson, Arizona. He defines PYD as a "cooperative effort to create those conditions in the local community, encouraged by a statewide support system, which promote the well-being of young people".

The PYD philosophy equips professionals and lay people with concepts, skills and strategies whereby they can bring about positive community change.

III. ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF STATE JUVENILE SERVICES

To meet the varied needs of young persons, Maryland State and local governments provide services through a system organized and budgeted by category of service. At the State level, the Department of Human Resources provides services to 139,000 children and youth annually. The Department of Health and Mental Hygiene serves approximately 130,900. Many of these children are receiving services from more than one agency or department so multiple counting may result. In addition to the departments at the executive level, the court system provides services for juveniles and refers youth to State-administered programs and services.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE

The Department of Health and Mental Hygiene encompasses three major administrations that provide services to youth:

- Juvenile Services Administration;
- Mental Hygiene Administration; and
- Mental Retardation Administration.

Juvenile Services Administration

The Juvenile Services Administration is the central administrative agency providing screening, detention, investigation, protective supervision, parole services, and diagnostic and rehabilitation programs for delinquent

youth in Maryland. The Administration also provides services to young people categorized as "children in need of supervision" (CINS) and "children in need of assistance" (CINA). These are children whose behavior leads them into contact with law enforcement agencies but who are not necessarily delinquent. The goal of the Juvenile Services Administration is to develop and implement treatment programs for those children brought to its attention and to develop delinquency prevention programs.

The Administration provides direct services and coordinates services delivered by other agencies through a decentralized statewide system of 10 regional offices. A region may constitute a single county or contain as many as five counties. Direct services are offered through institutions. The organization of the Administration is along functional lines and reflects the categories and types of services provided. The functional divisions are:

- General Administration - Headquarters;
- Probation and Court Services;
- Community and Residential Services; and
- Institutional Services.

General Administration is responsible for program direction, policy management, planning, and support services.

Probation and Court Services provides juvenile intake, probation, and aftercare services for children referred to the State's 24 juvenile courts. Court services also include clinical and diagnostic services for children to determine their physical and behavioral needs.

Community and Residential Services develops and coordinates programs and services that provide alternatives other than placement in juvenile institutions. These alternatives include both State and private group homes, pre-trial diversion programs, and delinquency prevention units such as the Youth Service Bureaus. Also provided are such services as tutorial programs, psychiatric counseling, therapy, and vocational training. Of the 44,620 cases handled by Juvenile Services during 1981, referrals to Community Services included 2,750 children placed in either public or private residential programs.

Institutional Services is responsible for the administration of nine juvenile institutions that provide screening, evaluation, diagnostic, detention, and rehabilitation programs to children referred by the court.

When a case is referred to Maryland's Juvenile Services Administration, an inquiry is conducted by the Administration's intake units to determine whether the case should be disapproved because of legal insufficiency, closed at intake, handled informally by the intake officer, or referred for formal court action.

Of the 44,620 juvenile cases that were processed by the Juvenile Services Administration during fiscal year 1981, 17,108 (38 percent) were handled formally; 6,491 (16 percent) were handled informally; 1,995 (4 percent) were disapproved; and 18,576 (42 percent) were closed at intake. The overall number of cases decreased by 2,225 from fiscal year 1980 when 46,845 cases were processed--a reduction of 5 percent. However, the number of cases handled formally increased by 2,459 or 17 percent from fiscal year 1980 when 14,649 cases were referred for formal action.

Comments from interviews with JSA staff indicate that a greater proportion of cases are now being referred to the State's Attorneys Office for handling and that the number of commitments to the training schools continues to increase. Public opinion seems to be demanding citizen protection and greater accountability from the juvenile justice system. The public has hardened its philosophy on juvenile crime. The Governor has responded to the public pressure with a balance between "get tough" and prevention programs.

Police referrals accounted for 34,836 cases during fiscal year 1981, which is 78 percent of all referrals. This percentage of referrals is substantially the same as during fiscal year 1980 and in prior years. During fiscal year 1981, most of the remaining referrals came from the Department of Education (2,331), parents or relatives (2,213), citizens (2,061), the Social Services Administration (1,618), or Special Police (1,019).

The Maryland Juvenile Services Administration also has extensive community-based service programs. Placements in community-based programs may be either residential or non-residential. Residential admissions include emergency shelter care placements or planned placements in private group homes, foster homes, residential treatment facilities, the Maryland Youth Residence Center, the Good Shepherd Center, or three State-operated group homes. Non-residential community programs include the Arthur G. Murphy Sr. Youth Service Center in Baltimore, youth service bureaus, and youth diversion programs. Purchase of services from a variety of contractors is provided on a per child basis.

The Juvenile Services Administration has an automated juvenile information system called MAGIS that was originally funded by OJJDP. This sophisticated information retrieval system, although not fully operative, is an indication of the level of sophistication in Maryland's juvenile services.

Mental Hygiene Administration

This administration primarily provides care for mentally ill patients in State residential centers. Some new community-based programs also have been initiated as an alternative to institutionalization. The administration operates two institutions to serve emotionally disturbed children in a residential setting and out-patient basis. Referrals come from public and private agencies.

Mental Retardation Administration

This administration provides services for mentally retarded citizens and their families. Programs have expanded into the communities as an alternative to institutionalization. The Administration operates 10 residential treatment centers many of which serve both children and adults. Community residential programs for the mentally retarded include the development and operation of group homes, foster homes, and day care for children. This administration is also responsible for crippled children's services.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES, Office of Child Welfare Services

Social services to children and youth are supervised at the State level by the Department of Human Resources Child Welfare Services. The office was created in 1979 as a result of the change in administration in the State and the effect of the impending Adoption Assistance Child Welfare Act of 1980. The Office combined the programs of Protective Service for Children and Families, Foster Care, Adoption, and 24-Hour Group Care and Licensing. Each program is directed by a program manager who is responsible for program definition, development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The current Director of Child Welfare Services, who emphasizes continuity of care for children, has begun to coordinate child welfare service efforts in all programs toward family unification and reunification. Most of these programs are funded primarily through Title XX. In Maryland, services are administered and delivered through the 24 local Departments of Social Services. All planning efforts at the State level, including those for Title XX, IV-B, IV-C, and IV-A, are coordinated and directed toward common goals. Improvement in program management and supervision is an attempt to redirect services on behalf of the client to compensate for the reduction in social service dollars.

JUVENILE COURTS AND INTAKE

Juvenile justice in Maryland is the responsibility of the circuit court system, except in Montgomery County where two juvenile judges serve in the District Court. Many juvenile cases in other parts of the State are heard by hearing officers or masters rather than by judges.

All adjudicated delinquents are referred by the courts to the Juvenile Services Administration of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. The Administration provides intake, detention, probation, and aftercare services through personnel based in eight regions which correspond to the eight circuit court regions. An intake worker makes recommendations to the judge as to whether an adjudicated delinquent should be institutionalized. If probation is granted, the court's decision is carried out by probation

and aftercare workers. Court services also include clinical and diagnostic services for children in order to determine their physical and behavioral needs.

The juvenile intake officer of the courts works for the Juvenile Services Administration in the executive branch of the State government but is under direct control and supervision of the judges. Some of the many referral options available to the juvenile court judge and the intake officer are found on Figure 1. There are many county and State-funded programs as well as diversion programs for CINS cases and other youthful offenders. The intake officers no longer have discretion over felony cases. They now go to the States Attorney's Office for a decision. Intake officers cannot compel a child or his family to go to alternative or diversionary services but the court can order such placement.

IV. COORDINATION MECHANISMS

Maryland's approach to coordination has been to establish coordination mechanisms that will influence change in the present youth services system without major reorganization of the State agencies. The three major coordination efforts have overlapping membership and some overlapping of function or purpose.

The three major coordination mechanisms that were examined for the purposes of this study are:

- The Office for Children and Youth;
- The Positive Youth Development Council (PYD); and
- The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.


The first two mechanisms have a statewide approach to coordination with a strong focus on local community-level coordination efforts. The first and third mechanisms are mandated and have executive sanction. PYD is attempting to acquire that sanction. All three have youth participation and require some voluntary commitment.

OFFICE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Authorities involved in providing direct services in Maryland agreed that poor organization among State agencies resulted in shortcomings in children's services. Legislation enacted in 1978 (Chapter 426, Article 49D) established the Maryland Office for Children and Youth as part of the Executive Department to assist in coordinating services and to be an advocate for children and youth in Maryland. This law provided for the Office, its Director, and an Advisory Committee for Children and Youth, and established local Children's Councils. The Director of the Office for Children and Youth is appointed by the Governor.

Figure 2. Options of the Juvenile Court Referral System

FIGURE 2



The Office for Children and Youth, which reports directly to the Governor of Maryland, has three components:

1. Operations: four paid administrative/two paid clerical staff;
2. State Advisory Committee: 39 members (12 at-large);
3. Twenty-four local Children's Councils: 23 counties and the City of Baltimore.

Operations

The Office for Children and Youth operates primarily to provide technical support to and liaison among the local Children's Councils. The Office designates specific staff members as continuing liaison for each local Council. Other functions of the Office include the preparation of a newsletter, synopsis of relevant legislation, and maintaining information on hearing schedules and other legislative activities. The Office also undertakes other specific projects such as research on specific issues, and sponsorship of statewide conferences and workshops.

The Office prepares an annual report to the Governor and to the public and publishes monthly memoranda to the Children's Councils, including announcements of conferences, workshops, and other events of interest. The Office participates in special events and maintains relationships with advocacy groups and major State departments having primary service responsibilities for children and youth.

The law specifies that the Office is to secure and analyze departmental plans and budget requests affecting children and youth programs and services, review Federal funds utilized and available to the State, determine the Governor's budget relating to programs and services for children and youth, and formulate recommendations to the Governor and appropriate departments on planning and expenditures for children's programs and services.

The Office has also been appointed to participate in the following programs:

- Advisory Board of Protective Services for Children and Families (Social Services Administration);
- Day Care Advisory Committee (Social Services Administration);
- Governor's Task Force on Violence and Extremism;
- Governor's Task Force on Youth Employment;
- State Foster Care Review Board;
- State Advisory Council on Drug Abuse;
- Positive Youth Development Council (Juvenile Services Administration);
- Youth Advisory Committee (Mayor's Office, Baltimore City).

In addition, the Office monitors the activities of the following governmental bodies:

- Commission on Emotionally Disabled Children and Adolescents
- Day Care Work Group;
- Governor's Task Force on Educational and Related Needs of Children in Juvenile Residential Institutions;
- Title XX Advisory Commission (Department of Human Resources); and
- State Coordinating Committee on Services to Handicapped Children.

Since the Office for Children and Youth was established, the Governor, by executive order, has transferred the Governor's Youth Advisory Council to the Office for Children and Youth.

The Governor's Youth Advisory Council is a group of 115 Maryland youths, age 13 through 22, who develop and make recommendations on youth issues to the Governor. The Office for Children and Youth provides staff assistance and acts in an advisory capacity to this group. The Maryland State Committee on Adolescent Pregnancy, Parenting, and Pregnancy Prevention is a committee of concerned citizens and professionals that serves in an advisory capacity to the Maryland State Office for Children and Youth. The Committee produces a newsletter and advocates for comprehensive services to adolescents.

The Office is a general fund agency within the Governor's budget under the Executive Department. In fiscal year 1982 actual expenditures were \$128,803. In addition to the funds appropriated in the Governor's budget, local jurisdictions provide in-kind assistance and staff support to the local Children's Councils, which is estimated to be valued at \$16,000 annually.

The State Advisory Committee

The State Advisory Committee oversees the work of the Office for Children and Youth, reviews legislation, and recommends priorities for future attention. The Governor appoints the Advisory Committee, which consists of the following members:

- Secretary of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene;
- Secretary of the Department of Human Resources;
- State Superintendent of Education;
- One representative from each of the two children's councils; and
- 12 members-at-large appointed by the Governor.

The legislative mandate specifies the responsibilities of the State Advisory Committee as follows: (1) participate in the duties and functions of the Office; and (2) review biennially the operation of the Office; and (3) identify issues and priorities for the office and report its findings to the Director. In its advisory and policy-making role, the Advisory Committee relies on input from local Council representatives as well as departmental representatives. The State Advisory Committee can establish standing subcommittees and/or ad hoc committees.

The Advisory Committee has an Executive Committee composed of a chairperson, a vice chairperson, and the chairpersons of all standing subcom-

mittees. The Executive Committee meets with the Director of the Office at least once a month. The full State Advisory Committee tries to meet at least once every two months for review of policy and direction. During fiscal year 1981 the State Advisory Committee met 10 times; during fiscal year 1982 seven meetings were held. Local Children's Council representatives to the State Advisory Committee assist in communicating the concerns and activities of local councils to the full committee.

Major emphasis is placed on the review of pending legislation. The State Advisory Committee, through its legislative subcommittee and in conjunction with the Office of Children and Youth, determines key legislative issues and bills to be followed by the Office. The State Advisory Committee also recommends positions on legislation and actions to be taken. During the 1982 General Assembly session, the State Advisory Committee and the Office reviewed 340 bills dealing with children's issues and presented position statements and testimony on 93 pieces of legislation. Written communications on 10 bills passed by the legislature were also provided to the Governor.

Local Children's Councils

Local Children's Councils, which are considered part of the Maryland Office for Children and Youth, have been established in each of the 23 counties and in Baltimore City. Members of these Councils are appointed by the Chief Executive Officer of each subdivision. They include representatives of the local Departments of Health, Education, and Social Services as well as members appointed at large.

Children's Councils are intended to work to identify and communicate needs, resources, and priorities for children and youth to local officials and to the State Office for Children and Youth. Children's Councils address problems such as child abuse, teenage pregnancy, alcohol and other drugs, day care, juvenile justice, parent education, youth employment, and recreation. Children's Council membership may include parents, business people, teachers, youth, religious leaders, lawyers, media people, representatives from other child advocacy groups, and members of civic and fraternal organizations. Some Councils have created affiliate memberships for persons willing to be involved in the local Council's programs. The Councils have a chairman, vice chairman, and a recording secretary who takes minutes of meetings and forwards them to the Office for Children and Youth.

The Children's Councils also develop and maintain contact with State legislators and monitor legislators with respect to positions taken on legislation and other issues affecting children and youth. For the most part, Councils report at least annually and provide periodic statements on specific issues that affect children and youth. Most Councils meet monthly except during the summer, but two councils have not yet begun to meet. During fiscal year 1982 there were 175 meetings.

Activities and Issues

The Maryland Office for Children and Youth has established as its priority the creation and support of local Children's Councils (required by law) and the establishment of liaisons between the Office and the State Advisory Committee. A review of the Office by the Maryland Department of Fiscal Services indicates that a considerable amount of time has been required to establish the Office and to work with local groups to establish the Children's Councils (the Office made 200 technical assistance visits to Children's Councils in fiscal year 1982).

The Office also sponsored the Statewide Conference on Children and Youth, and has actively supported specific children/youth legislation.

The Office is beginning to exert influence on children/youth policy. For example, it helped develop an independent statewide group dealing with adolescent pregnancy, parenting, and pregnancy prevention, and it provides administrative and technical support for this organization, as well as participating in many other programs.

The Office is attempting to negotiate better coordination among State agencies. It has begun to work with various departmental liaisons in an attempt to contribute to and influence their process.

POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

The PYD initiative grew out of the "Delinquency Prevention Network Project," which was sponsored by the Juvenile Services Administration and funded by a Federal grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in 1980. That project focused on primary delinquency prevention, which it defined as "the optimal growth and development of children."

The scope of the original project evolved over time from prevention of delinquency to prevention of all the disorders and problems that interfere with the normal, healthy growth and development of children. The emphasis also shifted from prevention--essentially a negative approach--to an attempt to create those conditions in local communities that enhance the well-being of children and youth.

The shift in emphasis evolved as the Prevention Network project staff identified three key points:

- Almost without exception, juvenile delinquents have a history filled with personal and family problems. Behaviors like delinquency, truancy, and drug abuse are symptoms of distress that have common underlying causes.

- To prevent juvenile crime--or any of the other symptoms of distress--it is necessary to attack these underlying causes. To prevent juvenile delinquency, it is necessary to provide the conditions that foster normal, healthy growth and development--conditions like competent parenting, adequate nutrition, a safe and sanitary environment, comprehensive health care, appropriate educational experiences, and so on.
- Considering the economic recession that existed in 1980 and 1981 and the "New Federalism" philosophy of government, this group anticipated diminishing public resources (especially Federal resources) in a time of increasing human needs. It was clear that a much greater burden would fall on State and local government to meet those human needs, and that intergovernmental coordination would need to be given top priority to conserve limited resources and to target services more effectively at the child and youth population.

Network Project participants decided to restructure their activities and reorganize themselves into the Positive Youth Development Council. The purpose of the Council is to foster efforts to create conditions in the local community, encouraged by a statewide support system, to promote the well-being of young people. The Council became operational on September 1, 1982, under an informal interagency agreement.

The Maryland PYD Council is a State-level steering committee, responsible for the promotion, encouragement, and support of the statewide PYD initiative. The PYD Council includes representatives from across the State who reflect the needs of all Maryland's children and youth. Membership includes, but is not limited to, representatives from:

- Public sector service providers, State and local levels;
- Private sector service providers, State and local levels;
- Advocacy groups, State and local levels;
- Business communities;
- Youth;
- Religious organizations;
- Law enforcement community;
- Civic/fraternal organizations;
- Professional associations;
- Educational institutions; and
- Public officials.

Although membership is voluntary, members are expected to have the support of their parent agency or organization and to participate in regular meetings and interim activities. The Council is limited to no more than 40 members; the chairperson and other officers are elected by the members. The whole Council meets at least quarterly. The Executive Committee (Council Officers, PYD staff, and subcommittee chairpersons) meet monthly. Subcommittees meet as needed.

The PYD Council is housed in the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, and is supported by one full-time and two part-time JSA employees.

Activities and Issues

The mission of the PYD Council is to promote PYD philosophy, encourage development of PYD activities, and strengthen existing efforts to improve conditions in local communities to enhance the well-being of children and youth. The PYD Council initially emphasized three broad objectives:

- Provide better utilization of existing resources;
- Promote youth/adult partnership; and
- Enhance cooperation across functional and organizational lines.

These were subsequently redefined and expanded:

- Explain the PYD philosophy and approach to State and local children and youth groups;
- Encourage, support, and assist PYD efforts in local communities;
- Participate in coordination of child and youth activities at the local and State level;
- Provide professional assistance in such areas as theory and program design, management, evaluation methodology, etc., to the various communities;
- Facilitate the effective functioning of a coordinated support system at the State level;
- Demonstrate and document the process through which the PYD philosophy and approach are implemented and have an impact in the communities that participate in this initiative.

To achieve its objectives, the PYD Council hopes to perform the functions outlined below:

- Serve as an information clearinghouse to facilitate flow of information and communication among State support groups, the PYD

Council, and local children and youth interest groups including regular publication of a newsletter;

- Promote education through use of the mass media;
- Serve as a source of information to government and business leaders through communication on PYD activities between Maryland and other States, and between Maryland and national leaders;
- Market the "new technology" of PYD statewide;
- Participate in Training-of-Trainers (TOT) Workshops and continually expand the training group;
- Serve as a resource center, responding and following through on requests for information, consultation, technical assistance, and training, as well as offers of assistance to State/local PYD efforts;
- Explore non-public sources of funds within Maryland and nationally; and
- Provide other services necessary to carry out the mission of the PYD Council.

In addition, the PYD hopes to assist local communities that respond to the marketing effort by providing:

- The PYD model (philosophy and approach), through meetings, workshops, conferences;
- Training of Trainers (TOT) workshops; and
- Technical assistance through skill building workshops, consultation by technical experts, published information, and access to other resource centers in areas such as:
 - surveys of community needs/resources;
 - program and activity models;
 - problem-solving;
 - program design and implementation;
 - staff development;
 - standards;
 - monitoring and evaluation;
 - fund-raising;
 - organizational development;
 - group leaderships skills;
 - "technology transfer;" and
 - community organization.

Current subcommittees have the following responsibilities: (1) coordination of networks, (2) technical assistance, (3) development of a clearinghouse.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee is a standing committee of the Maryland Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC). The Council acts as a coordinator between the State and local aspects of the criminal and juvenile justice systems in Maryland.

Formerly known as the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, an executive order in February 1982 renamed the Council and switched its primary function from Federal grant administration under LEAA to its present coordination role. The Council accomplishes this task by providing staff and technical assistance for various task forces and commissions. Current study groups involve crime prevention, rape and sexual offenses, the judicial branch of government, arson, juvenile justice, repeat and habitual offenders, and crime and delinquency prevention.

There are currently 33 members on the Council appointed by the Governor, representing all aspects of criminal justice activities and the public. It is supported by a full-time, 19-person staff headed by an Executive Director appointed by the Governor. The operating budget for the Council (\$450,000 for fiscal year 83) is located within the Executive Department. The Council administers grants totaling \$736,000. Four grants address repeat offenders (\$30,000 each, totaling \$120,000); the remaining grants are for shelter care, a community work program, a central intake system for juveniles, and drug and alcohol intake.

Activities and Issues

The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) is not autonomous; it makes recommendations to the CJCC whose members make the final decisions. The CJCC has established four priorities:

- Crime prevention;
- Institutional conditions;
- Accountability to the public (public education and responsiveness to victims); and
- Repeat offenders (adults and juveniles).

The two primary tasks of the JJAC are grant review and the legislative alert process. The JJAC reviews and comments on all grants for juvenile justice implications. The legislative alert process is handled by weekly meetings (while the State legislature is in session) to review each piece

of legislation involving youth and to make recommendations on that legislation to the CJCC.

V. SUMMARY

The three coordination mechanisms have existed long enough to be able to evaluate their individual effectiveness and also to identify the barriers they face to effective action.

OFFICE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

There has been a significant expansion in the scope of duties and responsibilities of the Office since it was established, but its resources have only increased marginally and this has had a very real impact on its capabilities. Because of these restrictions the Office has not been able to perform other statutory functions, such as:

- Examination of programs, services, and plans for children under the age of 18 for the purpose of identifying duplication or inefficiencies, effectiveness of programs, resources and unmet needs;
- Securing and analyzing departmental plans and budget requests affecting children's programs and services; and
- Collation of items in the Governor's budget related to programs and services for children and youth, and issuance of impact statements.

The Department of Fiscal Service reports that the Office does not examine programs, plans, or budget requests and has not assessed State budget priorities or impacts.

The Director of the Office for Children and Youth believes that "there is no formal authority vested in the Office with regard to its coordination function, since the Office's legislative mandate refers only to a responsibility to 'maintain liaison with departments and local governments to coordinate services'." According to some of those interviewed, the Office's vague and overly broad mandate combined with conflicting expectations from a variety of sources both inside and outside government has been one of the principal obstacles to the success of this coordinating body.

The Director expressed concern that formal review of programs of the type specified in the law would create antagonisms between the Office and the programs reviewed. In lieu of these activities, his approach to coordination is based on a strategy of negotiation.

In spite of these limitations, the Office has achieved a remarkable degree of success, as witnessed by the accomplishments noted above. Many persons interviewed attributed this success to the talent and energy of the

Director, and to his personal negotiating skills. The Office has attained a high degree of visibility and is generally viewed in a favorable light. As mentioned earlier much of the Office's resources have been spent establishing the local Children's Councils. The Department of Fiscal Service Review, however, found that local officials did not assign particular value to the local Councils and tended to think program coordination is more a State than a local problem. Not enough information is available yet to determine whether or not this is true, but that sentiment may influence the future direction of the Office.

In fact, two of the suggestions by the Fiscal Service Department were: (1) "The General Assembly may wish to eliminate statutory language requiring the Office to maintain liaison with local Children's Councils and other child advocacy groups," and (2) "The General Assembly may wish to delete the requirement that localities maintain children's councils."

POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

As the Delinquency Prevention Network, the PYD existed long enough to identify areas and issues needing attention. Although the PYD has optimistic and well documented goals, it does not have a high profile with youth service deliverers or members of the other coordinating mechanisms. Most persons interviewed also were unable to delineate specific accomplishments of its predecessor, the Delinquency Prevention Network. More time is needed to learn what the effectiveness level of this coordinating body will be.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

The Maryland Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (under its former title) in 1976 and 1977 had a staff of 40 and administered grants worth about \$13 million from OJJDP and LEAA. Today it has a staff of 19 and administers OJJDP grants totaling \$736,000. Its present coordination role is accomplished primarily by providing staff and technical assistance for various task forces and commissions. This puts it in the position of serving as a sort of information clearinghouse. This is enhanced by the legislative alert process subcommittee, which keeps the Council abreast of all proposed legislation dealing with youth.

SUMMARY

The three coordination mechanisms discussed in this case study represent complementary diversification. One was established by executive order, one by legislation, and one through informal interagency agreement. The Office for Children and Youth has a specific and strong legislative mandate, which some respondents felt it had underplayed. The CJCC, the oldest of the three coordinating mechanisms has much broader executive order guidelines, of which coordination of youth services is only a part. And the PYD, in keeping with its informal origins is still largely an

information sharing network that is beginning to take on more specific roles.

The focus of PYD is primarily at the local level, and that of CJCC primarily at the State level. Although the Office for Youth and Children has specific mandates for both local and State coordination, its initial efforts have been directed at the formation and support of local Children's Councils. There is evidence, however, that they may begin to play a stronger role in State level coordination.

There is some overlap in terms of membership, philosophy, and approach, and each seems to be reasonably well informed about what the others are doing. For example, the Director of the Juvenile Services Administration (which houses the PYD) is on the CJCC, and the PYD may start working through local Children's Councils (part of the Office of Children and Youth) to accomplish some of its community-based goals. In the past there has been little formal cooperation between youth service providers. The existing coordination mechanisms have helped to bring the influential leaders in youth services together and have improved communication and information sharing but have not impacted on the programming and policy issues.

ALABAMA

I. BACKGROUND

Youth services in Alabama is a shared function of the judicial branch and a number of agencies in the executive branch. The Department of Youth Services (DYS) has major responsibility for providing delinquency prevention and rehabilitation services (see Figure 1). The Department of Pensions and Security is responsible for abused, dependent, and neglected youth. The Departments of Education, Mental Health, and Public Health provide services related to education, mental illness and retardation, and health.

The Department of Youth Services and the Department of Mental Health administer statewide programs and services. The Departments of Pensions and Securities and Public Health provide services through county offices, and the Department of Education through district offices. Law enforcement, probation, and juvenile detention are local responsibilities. Some detention facilities receive a State subsidy. The State's three training schools for adjudicated youth are administered by DYS.


Alabama's Department of Youth Services is the primary coordinating body for all youth services in the State and the agency created to coordinate all services for adjudicated youth. Despite this mandate, it is not a fully integrated youth services department. It is limited in its level of service responsibility and has limited funding resources for delinquency prevention programs. DYS administers programs and provides services at the State level and it also coordinates State and local services. Many of the Department's responsibilities were previously vested in the Department of Pensions and Security. DYS also has initiated many other services that did not previously exist in the State's youth services system.

A unique aspect of the Department is its Interagency Department of Youth Services Board that oversees all policy, budget, and programmatic changes that occur. Membership includes the heads of the other youth-serving agencies, elected members of the State House and Senate, representatives from all Congressional districts, and some delegates from law enforcement agencies.

The use of a Board structure with extensive decision making powers and a multifaceted membership has been a successful compromise to a fully integrated department that would have required a greater reorganization effort in the State. The Board reduces the opportunity for duplication of services, empire building, and overlap of responsibilities while leaving the existing youth serving agencies intact.

Much of Alabama's progress in the youth services area must be evaluated by the extent of change the system has experienced--where it was and how far it has come--and also in the context of being a poor and rural State not known for its progressive action, programs, or State system. The legislature and public in general has had a "lock em up" attitude toward

Figure 1. Alabama Youth Serving Agencies



*ALEPA consolidated into the new Department of Economic and Community Affairs on 3/1/83 and is now called the Law Enforcement Planning Division.

delinquent youth and criminal offenders. The youth services system has overcome significant social and racial barriers in developing the structures described in this case study.

II. POLITICAL AND LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Alabama has a long history of segregation. By 1860, Alabama had almost one million residents, half of whom were black slaves. The State remained tightly segregated until the 1950s and 60s. Tremendous changes occurred in the State when black voters became a strong political force and gained equal access to schools, universities, and public facilities.

Federal Court Suits

Youth institutions in Alabama remained unchanged by the civil rights activities until the late 1960s. The State's three training schools, the Alabama Industrial School for White Boys, the Alabama Training School for White Girls, and the Alabama Industrial School for Negro Children, were all governed by independent Boards of Trustees or directors appointed by the Governor. The Department of Pensions and Securities had responsibility for inspecting each facility and making recommendations on approved methods of child care, housing, school equipment, and recordkeeping. Examination of the actual conditions of the schools revealed a pronounced difference between the two schools for whites and the school for negro children.

Depositions from employees of the three institutions indicated that the two white schools were not over capacity and had reasonable academic programs. The Alabama Industrial School for Negro Children had:

- School capacity of 300 and an enrollment of 460 (later the capacity was dropped to 150);
- Inadequate academic programs with 14 teachers for 460 children;
- Children assigned to one of two rotating groups, one remaining in school for six days while the other group worked in the fields farming the cucumber crop;
- Almost no records of disciplinary treatment;
- A practice of administering corporal punishment without defined standards.

Up until the early 1970s probate judges sitting in juvenile court had few alternatives to sending youth to the three training schools. Two Federal court suits had a significant impact on youth institutions and services available to adjudicated youth in the State.

The first case, Crum vs. The State Training School for Girls, (1968), involved the issue of segregation. After the case was remanded from the

U.S. Court of Appeals, the district court ordered the three reform schools to desegregate totally and to coordinate their operations under one plan.

The second case, Stockton vs. the Alabama Industrial School for Negro Children, involved child abuse. The judgment ordered:

- Non-racial discrimination in acceptance of youth between the ages of 15-18;
- Maintenance of capacity at approximately 150 youth, consistent with standard recommendations by the American Psychiatric Association;
- Discontinuation, except on a limited scale, of the commercial farming program;
- Employment of full-time counselors (ratio of 1:15 students) and new staff requirements for counseling, recreational, social services, medical, and vocational teaching personnel;
- Development of regulations governing corporal punishment, with a report filed on each incident;
- Introduction of a disciplinary and incentive program;
- Introduction of a vocational program;
- Use of educational standards; and
- Requirements for counseling and a physical examination of new juveniles.

In 1970 and 1971, LEAA provided approximately \$35,000 per year for the Department of Pensions and Security's Bureau of Child Welfare to develop a statewide system of delinquency prevention and treatment. This program laid the groundwork for the legislative creation of the Department of Youth Services. Help in writing the legislation came from the school of Social Work at the University of Alabama, the Commissioner of Welfare, and the Chief Probation Officer in Montgomery.

The State Planning Agency Director agreed to provide Federal funding through LEAA to support the Department's creation. With this guarantee of funds the legislature agreed to go ahead with the new Department. The original grant was for \$1.5 million for two years.

Two groups were active in developing the legislation: the Alabama Youth Committee (AYC), made up of involved citizens appointed by the Governor, and the Alabama Law Enforcement Planning Agency (LEPA), the LEAA State Planning Agency. These two groups were divided on several major issues:

- Should the juvenile court have the authority to determine who needs treatment? Should it alone commit a child to the Department?

- Should aftercare be a responsibility of DYS or the local courts?
- Should the cut-off age for "youth" be 16 or 18?
- Should the membership of the Board include LEPA?
- Should the Department have authority for diagnosis and evaluation, placement of youth in training schools or foster care facilities, and licensing and inspection of foster care facilities?

LEPA supported the creation of a single State agency in charge of the training schools, salary subsidies for the probation officers, and coordination with the counties on delinquency prevention and treatment. However, it did not believe that the Department should have extensive powers and authority (see Table 1).

The legislation included many of the LEPA recommendations. It limited DYS authority by making aftercare a responsibility of the local probation services instead of a State-administered program and it gave localities control of detention care. Two important AYC recommendations were also included in the legislation. DYS was made responsible for licensing and inspection of foster care facilities instead of leaving these tasks to the counties and DYS was given the authority to place children in any type of foster care facility in the State rather than only in the training schools.

Changes have occurred in DYS since 1973 that have increased its powers and authority. It now has a central admissions unit for diagnosing and evaluating each youth committed to DYS. It provides services to youth up to age 18 instead of age 16 and Board membership has increased to 18, with two more members from the House and Senate. A number of persons interviewed for this case study believe that the one major responsibility that the agency still lacks is aftercare, which is now part of local probation services.

III. ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF STATE YOUTH SERVICES

The youth serving agencies in the executive branch that are responsible for providing youth services are listed in Figure 1 and described in more detail below.

The Department of Youth Services

The Department of Youth Services is an independent agency operating statewide programs for juvenile delinquency prevention and rehabilitation. DYS is responsible for operating the three training schools in the State and the Diagnostic and Evaluation Center, for licensing community-based facilities for delinquent youth, and for certifying county probation officers and subsidizing half their salary.

Table 1. Disputed Issues in the Creation of the Department

Section in 816	Recommend by LEPA	Recommend by AYC	Act No. 816 passed by Legislature 1973
1	Juvenile court with authority to determine who needs treatment.	State services for any youth who requires treatment.	LEPA version
2(a)	Release into after care a part of probation services.	State administered parole program.	LEPA version
2(d)	Only the juvenile court can commit a child to the department.	No mention of a juvenile judge.	LEPA version
2(t)	Provide services for persons under 16 yrs. of age.	Provide services for persons under 18 yrs. of age.	LEPA version
5	Raise membership of Board from 15 to 16 and include LEPA as a member.	Develop a 15 member Board.	LEPA version
7	Transfer the three training schools on Jan. 1, 1974.	Transfer the three training schools on Oct. 1, 1975.	AYC version
10	Local control of detention care.	State control of detention centers	LEPA version
13	Local inspection of child care facilities.	DYS licensing and inspection of facilities.	AYC version
23	DYS placement of youth only in a State Training School.	DYS placement in any type of foster care facility within the State.	AYC version

The DYS budget for fiscal year 1980-1981 was \$10,285,961, including some Federal funding for community-based programs. It has 355 employees to operate its institutions and administer its programs. In 1981, 8,651 youth were served by facilities licensed or operated by DYS (see Table 2). The Department has the authority, through its interagency decision-making Board, to make program, research, and funding decisions; accept funds through Federal grants and from other agencies and organizations; and obtain discretionary funds from legislative appropriations. In fiscal year 1982, a capital outlay appropriation of \$6 million was made for dormitory construction and a juvenile maximum security building. The DYS Board has 18 members appointed by the Governor. It operates as a policy-making body overseeing the Department of Youth Services, approving budgets before submission to the Governor and Legislature, and confirming policies and procedures of the agency. The Board has interagency representation with the Governor as ex-officio chairman. The Department and its relationship to its Board will be discussed in greater detail in a later section.

The Department of Pensions and Security

The Department of Pensions and Security supervises social services at the State level. Actual service delivery is carried out by the 67 county Departments of Pension and Security. The Department is responsible for foster care, adoption, licensing and payment for day care services, and licensing of child care institutions, group homes, and child placement agencies. The number of youth served by these facilities and homes in 1981 is listed in Table 3.

Alabama's Department of Pensions and Security is responsible by law for receiving and investigating reports of child abuse and neglect and for providing protective services when necessary. In fiscal year 1981, there were 18,654 reports of abused and neglected children, an increase of 11 percent over the previous year. Most of the programs of the Department of Pensions and Security are financed with a combination of State and Federal funds. State funding for these programs comes from earmarked taxes whose proceeds are put into the Welfare Trust Fund.

Departments of Health, Mental Health, and Education

The State Health Officer, the Commissioner of the State Department of Mental Health, and the State Superintendent of Education are all members of the Department of the Youth Services Board. Although few services are coordinated among these agencies, agency representatives understand the needs of DYS from participating on the Board and have been involved in the decision-making process.

Health programs for children are administered by the Department of Public Health through offices located in the counties. Profoundly mentally retarded children are the responsibility of the State Department of Mental Health; crippled children's programs are administered by the Department of Education through 13 district offices.

Table 2. Total Youth Served by Facilities Licensed or Operated by the Department of Youth Services in 1981

Facility	Total Youth Served
LICENSED BY DYS	
6 Detention Facilities	4,006
13 Attention Homes	1,571
6 Group Homes	163
8 Group Interaction Centers	1,465
Total	7,205
OPERATED BY DYS	
3 Training Schools	1,252
*5 Group Homes	194
D&E Center	777
Total	1,446**
Total for all DYS Facilities	8,651***

*There are currently only four group homes.

**This does not reflect D&E Center numbers to avoid duplication.

***The number of youth served on any given day is approximately 900.

Table 3. Total Youth Served by Facilities/Homes Licensed or Approved by the Department of Pensions and Security in 1981

Facility	Total Youth Served
Foster Care Homes	4,000
Child Care Institutions	715
Group Homes	118
Child Placing Agencies	261
Day Care Center	37,412
Day Care Homes	6,408

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee

Alabama Law Enforcement Planning Agency (LEAA State Planning Agency) was created by Executive Order in 1970 in response to the Federal Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. It is an independent agency that reports directly to the Governor. It created the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee with representation from numerous law enforcement, youth serving agencies and advocates.

The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee has 32 members representing police, probation, the DA's Office, citizens, Judges, DYS, Pensions and Security, a mayor, local representatives, county sheriffs departments, and youth. Although the full committee met only two times in the past year with its main task that of reviewing OJJDP grants, the State Advisory Group had a very active Subcommittee involved with lobbying for DYS for capital expenditures and writing of model legislation. The State Advisory Group has had a positive impact on the legislature which has generally had a "lock em up" approach to youth. The SAG is supportive of better regional coordination, diversion programs, and model legislation. Extremely limited funding and resources limit the State's ability to set up new programs. Coordination of information between the DYS Board and the SAG is accomplished informally through the overlapping membership of the two groups.

Juvenile Code and Court System

In 1975, with the passage of Act 1205 by the legislature many sections of Title 13 of the Code of Alabama of 1940 were amended and repealed. This revision of the Juvenile Code helped to establish a court intake procedure and screening process to divert youth from the courts, provide appropriate services, work toward deinstitutionalization of status offenders, reduce detention rates, and provide fair and equitable treatment of juveniles.

In January 1977 a new system of district courts replaced county and juvenile courts. There now are 66 district court systems that operate in 73 locations. At least one judge is elected per county (except in one case where two counties share one judge). Nine counties elect two or more judges who serve six-year terms. As a general rule, juveniles are adjudicated by these district courts. In the larger counties, jurisdiction is handled by circuit courts or shared by circuit and district courts.

Probation and Intake

Although the Department of Youth Services is responsible for the training and supervision of probation officers and subsidizes half their salary, the juvenile probation officer is appointed by the presiding juvenile court judge at the county (local) level. Probation is a county responsibility. Juvenile court judges hire and fire probation officers and other juvenile staff of the court.

When a child is referred to the court, intake officers (probation officers) can authorize the detention of that child or make appropriate referrals to other private or public agencies if their assistance appears to be needed.

A probation officer or representative of Pensions and Security, with the approval of the court, has the power to take into custody and place in shelter or detention care a child who is under supervision and has violated the conditions of probation or protective supervision. Any child detained is reviewed by a judicial officer within 72 hours. The judge and juvenile probation officer work hard at developing relationships with other agencies. The probation officer also has the authority to administer oaths for the purpose of verifying complaints.

Statistical data on youth crime in Alabama demonstrate the positive affects of the creation of the Department of Youth Services and the revision of the juvenile code and the judicial process. In 1976, Alabama detained 12,373 youth between the ages of 5-17 in detention centers and jails. By 1981, 4,326 youth were detained (predispositional care) in jails, detention centers, and shelters (group homes and attention homes). The development and implementation of new regulations and standards by DYS and the courts regarding the operation of institutions, deinstitutionalization of status offenders, more appropriate referrals, screening, and diversion by the courts have all been effective in the overall reduction in detention figures.

In 1981, Alabama's juvenile courts, the Department of Youth Services, and Department of Pensions and Security compiled important statistical data on juvenile delinquency and dependent and neglected cases processed by the juvenile courts (see Figure 2).

The involvement of other agencies at the court referral level is minimal. Of those cases without court appearance, fewer than 2 percent are referred to other agencies and those with court appearances commitments are less than 1 percent each for the Department of Mental Health (.55 percent), child care facilities (.52 percent), and private child care facilities (.05 percent). The Department of Mental Health requires that it be contacted before a child can be committed to it and that it can refuse inappropriate placements. Most youth placements with the Department of Mental Health are cases of severe or profound mental illness or retardation.

IV. KEY FEATURES OF COORDINATION PROCESS

The interagency Youth Services Board that oversees the Department of Youth Services is not just an advisory or information exchange mechanism but has a broad base of authority (see Figure 3). It acts as a decision-making body for all aspects of DYS including policy issues, budget requests, and programmatic and administrative changes. The existence of the Board has political implications as well as practical ones. A number of persons interviewed indicated that the creation of the new agency had a big impact on many politically powerful people and groups. Many community leaders were involved in the independent boards for the three training schools. Some of these became members on the new DYS Board. This helped alleviate misunderstandings surrounding youth services issues and brought experience to the new Board. The presence of representatives from other agencies helps to keep an interest in the operation of DYS.

The use of the Board structure for agency oversight is not new to Alabama State government. There is also a Board of Education, a Pardon and Parole Board, a LEPA Supervisory Board, and a Pensions and Security Board.

The DYS Board has 18 members with the Governor as ex-officio chairman:

- Two members of the House of Representatives (selected by the Speaker of the House);
- Two members of the Senate (selected by the presiding Officer of the Senate);
- A representative of the Alabama Council of Juvenile Court Judges (selected by the President of the ACJCJ);
- A representative of the Alabama Chief Probation Officers Association (selected by the Chairman of the ACPOA);
- Commissioner of the State Department of Pensions and Security;

Figure 2. Disposition of Cases Processed by the Alabama Juvenile Courts in 1981





Figure 3. Organization of Alabama Youth Services Board



121

- State superintendent of Education;
- Commissioner of the State Department of Mental Health;
- State health officer;
- Director of ALEPA; and
- A public representative from each of the seven Congressional Districts (appointed by the Governor);

Board members coordinate input from all youth-serving agencies and professionals and provide a geographical and political representation as well.

The Board has the following powers, duties, and functions:

- Appoint the Director of DYS and fix his salary;
- Institute and defend legal proceedings in any court of competent jurisdiction and proper venue;
- Contract with any private person, organization or entity;
- Direct and oversee the operation of the State's three training schools;
- Promulgate rules, policies, orders and regulations;
- Purchase or lease land or acquire property;
- Hold Board meetings at least annually;
- Call special meetings;
- Report to the Governor on activities of the board, the need for facilities, conditions in the State, future plans, and expenditures in the preceding year; and
- Present a request for funds and a proposed budget to the Governor.

The Board meets quarterly and votes on procedures and policies of the Department. Based on recommendations made by the Executive Director, the Board has voted recently on such issues as putting a ceiling on the number of youth that could be served at each facility to alleviate overcrowded conditions, and the creation of a new priority system of accepting students to replace the old first-come-first-served service system. A consensus is required for approval of any recommendations.

At the time of the initial development of DYS, major concerns centered on protecting the general welfare and social well-being of the youth in the

State. The major goals of DYS both at the time of its creation and today include:

- Promote a comprehensive program of preventive and rehabilitative services to delinquent youth in Alabama;
- Provide individualized treatment programs in response to the diverse and multiple problems of delinquent youth;
- Respect basic human rights and dignity;
- Prepare youth to function in society; and
- Establish standards to:
 - Provide proper care and treatment of every youth committed to DYS;
 - Incarcerate as few youth as possible; and
 - Maintain a high caliber of staff.

Since the creation of DYS some of its major accomplishments have been:

- Establishment of a central admissions facility; the D&E Center was not part of the original Department but was developed later for central admissions and to provide screening and evaluation of each individual.
- Establishment in all counties of juvenile probation service. Initially probation officers didn't exist in every county.
- Construction of a maximum security facility for 25 youth. This year six million dollars in appropriation funds are going toward this construction project.
- Establishment of a network of group homes as an alternate placement to the institutions for youth committed to DYS.
- Establishment of a wilderness program in cooperation with the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

COORDINATION WITHIN DYS

DYS has developed a comprehensive approach to meeting the needs of delinquent youth in the State.

Within DYS, separate divisions have responsibility for the different functions and services of the agency. One division operates the three juvenile institutions. Another is responsible for the central admissions unit -- the Diagnostic and Evaluation (D&E) Center. The Planning,

Research, and Development Division and the CETA Career Preparation Program Division are involved with staff and student needs, public relations, and community and Federal program development. The Legal and Child Advocacy Unit handles complaints of abuse from students and insures that the students receive the treatment recommended by the D&E Center. The Community and Regional Services Division has four regional representatives responsible for supervising State-operated group homes, certification and training of probation officers, and other regional responsibilities. The Department's comprehensive approach to delinquent youth includes the following activities: evaluation and training, standards and licensing, State and local coordination, youth services, and monitoring.

Evaluation and Training

The Diagnostic and Evaluation Center evaluates adjudicated youth who have been committed to DYS by the courts. With only a 51-bed capacity, many juveniles await admission to the D&E Center for as long as a few months in local detention centers. Youth often stay at the D&E Center for three or four weeks beyond the required three weeks for evaluation because of overcrowding and difficulty of placement into the training schools. A commitment by the courts is to the Department of Youth Services. After the first 30 days, DYS has the authority to decide in what institution to place the youth or whether to release him or her. The length of commitment is made on an achievement rather than a time basis.

In fiscal year 1981, the D&E Center evaluated 809 youth. The Center receives the social history prepared by the probation officer and the court history and recommendations. D&E will supplement the information by contacting social service agencies, schools, and other organizations. Testing and evaluations include medical, psychological, social, and educational (see Table 4). More than 65 percent of the students also have vocational evaluations and recommendations. An intake committee composed of a psychologist, a social worker, and the director of the D&E Center will evaluate specific criteria to determine who will be admitted next under the new priority system. D&E designs an individualized program for each youth and makes an assignment and treatment recommendation.

Of those youth who are tested by the D&E Center fewer than 1 percent are referred to Bryce Mental Health Hospital, the Juvenile Unit located in Tuscaloosa. Both DYS and the Department of Mental Health have mentally retarded youth in their care, although the Division of Mental Retardation is organizationally located within the Department of Mental Health. DYS has identified through its testing at the Central Admissions Unit (D&E Center) that 23 percent of the youth admitted and serviced by DYS are mentally retarded. A special unit at the Vacco Campus is responsible for the youth that are retarded unless they are severely retarded and the Department of Mental Health will accept the commitment. Eighty-one percent of the youth are below their functional educational grade level. The Department of Education has tested less than 1 percent of the DYS youth for learning disabilities prior to their commitment.

Table 4. Key Statistics from Youth Assessments in Calendar Year 1981
(Con't)

%
87% of evaluations involved males
43% white males
44% black males
18% had previous commitments to DYS
66% are in the low-average level of intelligence to retarded
23% are classified as mentally retarded
81% are below their functional educational grade level
54% are classified as emotionally conflicted

Many of those interviewed were supportive of the D&E Center and proud of its extensive and exemplary testing program. They believe that the individualized treatment programs are having a positive impact on those youth who complete their programs and are released.

Staff Training

Staff at the three training schools have the opportunity to receive training through professional workshops and training sessions provided by DYS. Orientation programs are offered for new counselor trainees and/or aides. Interns can receive course credit for in-service hours through Auburn University by working for DYS as student teachers and therapists. A system-wide professional development program has been provided primarily through a contract with Auburn University. Project "Free Bird" was funded for 3 years through the State Department of Education by Title IV-C of the Elementary and Secondary School Act. This was a DYS teacher training project and was designed to provide a continuous systematic and structured program of professional development over a period of three years.

The DYS Regional Coordinators are responsible for training and certification of probation officers and for providing workshops and training in their regions for staff of residential child care facilities and the training schools in coordination with the Staff Development Specialist assigned to the Planning, Research and Development Division.

The Board adopted minimum training requirements for all DYS staff under the direction of this specialist with input from a Training Council composed of representatives from various components of the DYS System.

Standards and Licensing

The legislation establishing the Department required DYS to establish minimum standards for juvenile probation services and juvenile probation officers. The Department is authorized to establish minimum standards for the construction and operation of detention facilities, foster care facilities, group homes, correctional institutions, and after care services. All facilities for delinquent youth throughout the State must be licensed by DYS on an annual basis.

DYS also requires all vocational instructors to qualify for certification by the State Department of Education.

State and Local Coordination

The Department of Youth Services has four regions each staffed by a regional coordinator and a placement and follow-up specialist who works with released youth and probation officers on job placement and post-release adjustment progress. The coordinators are responsible for inspection and annual licensing of DYS child care facilities located in the communities of their region. They also train and certify probation officers and train staff of the community residential child care facilities. The local court commits a youth to the State DYS where he or she is evaluated by the D&E central admissions unit. Much information is exchanged between the State DYS and the local system. Federal funds from Title XX of the Social Security Act, Title I and Title IV parts B and C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title V of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, and LEPA grants are administered through DYS's Planning, Research, and Development Division and are used for local residential programs, group homes, and youth aid bureaus.

Youth Services

The individualized program developed for each youth provides a broad range of options in placement and treatment. A variety of therapy programs are available to meet individual needs. An exceptionally good vocational training program has set an example for the southeastern United States and provides useful training to youth in such skills as automotive maintenance, construction, food service, janitorial service, welding, and printing. These skills help the institutions to reduce expenses by allowing youth to perform activities such as maintaining State automobiles, printing brochures, and working in food and janitorial services. CETA has been

funding a career preparation program that aids the youth in securing a job on leaving the institution.

The Department has also developed a number of innovative programs, including:

- **The Wilderness Program.** This is a low budget, highly successful program that teaches outdoor living and social skills. It is a voluntary program. Youth live and sleep at a wilderness camp site in groups of eight for eight weeks.
- **The Horticulture Program.** This involves youth in growing flowers to be used for the capitol grounds.
- **The Public Information and Citizen Participation Unit.** These are part of the DYS Planning, Research and Development Division and are responsible for increasing community awareness and helping to improve public opinion of the juvenile justice system.

Monitoring

The Advocacy Unit is a part of the Department of Youth Services and is responsible for monitoring the treatment of each youth in the DYS system. The unit serves as a liaison between the D&E Center and the juvenile facility. The Unit also is responsible for acting as an ombudsman for the juveniles in the DYS system. Each youth has his or her rights explained upon entering the D&E Center and learns how to file a grievance if these rights are violated.

The Advocacy Unit enforces checks and balances on the system and serves to define roles and responsibilities of staff and students. In fiscal years 1981-1982 there were 717 complaints. The Unit operates with almost no staff and has relied heavily on student volunteer help from the Cumberland School of Law. With the staff shortages, 90 percent of the Unit's time has been spent investigating complaints filed by students; the other 10 percent has been spent on monitoring treatment and enforcing the administration of policies and procedures in relation to youth. Regional Coordinators assist by investigating complaints in their regions. The Unit also acts as a liaison between the youth and the DYS system by participating in staffings at D&E and the treatment staffings at the assigned facility. A standardized grievance procedure is in place to ensure fair resolution of problems.

V. SUMMARY

The Alabama Department of Youth Services has been in existence long enough to be able to test its effectiveness, improve those areas that need change, and expand its operation to include new responsibilities. The Department was created to alleviate serious inequities and dissipate a legally volatile situation. It has developed from a position of no existing system

for handling delinquent youth to a stable State agency with a comprehensive program of delinquency prevention and rehabilitation, and has become an essential service provider.

The majority of those interviewed believe that the DYS Board has been relatively successful as a coordinating mechanism. They attribute its success to the continuity of its membership, and the dedication, consistency, and longevity of the DYS staff. Behind the scenes negotiating and the use of persuasion instead of confrontation have contributed to the success of the system. Many believe that the limitation of the Board System is the difficulty in convincing 18 different personalities and interests to support a DYS recommendation. Any issues involving "real estate" have been difficult to resolve. Each member has his or her own self-interest and "turf" to protect and often this will interfere with what might be best for the Department. More direct involvement with the Governor would help to promote the agency's image as an "insider."

Key factors identified in the interviews as contributing to the success of DYS are:

- **Promulgation of standards in the operation, care, services, treatment and intake process.** According to many of those interviewed the use of standards minimized racial discrimination, arbitrariness and inequities and helped to prevent the return of unfair and uncontrolled treatment of youth.
- **Key participants and staff have remained constant.** A core of committed, competent people has been with DYS since its inception and has maintained an historical as well as a realistic understanding of the process for change. Many of the people involved in the youth services system have worked together for many years in different capacities and have a personal as well as professional understanding of their individual perspectives.
- **Ability to negotiate for change rather than use authority.** Many of the individuals in the State government and on the DYS Board have been a part of the youth services system for many years. Negotiating individual support for an issue rather than using the mandated authority of the agency has proven effective.
- **Careful selection of issues.** The Director and staff of DYS will make recommendations to the Board only after careful consideration of all the issues involved and the impact on the individual agencies.

Alabama has accomplished a significant amount in the past 10 years and has created a coordinated system for the adjudicated youth in the State. Youth services as a whole, however, has not really followed suit. DYS has a limited amount of youth services responsibility. A more comprehensive program would include services for preadjudicated youth, abused and neglected youth, mentally retarded youth, and youth who abuse drugs and

alcohol. Inclusion of these functions is not likely to happen; the compromise rests in having members on the DYS Board that represent the agencies responsible for these youth services.

Alabama has few diversionary and alternative programs or delinquency prevention programs in the community. Shortage of Federal and State funds and few other resources and low public opinion of delinquency and youth crime has hindered the development of new programs.

The State youth services system does not have an overall Management Information System (MIS) or a centralized information exchange for the agencies or courts dealing with youth but the court intake and probation officers duties allow for inquiries with welfare, schools, and juvenile justice to develop the social history and recommendations to the courts. Although Alabama does not have a sophisticated system for information exchange it also does not have the large volume of youth found in highly urbanized States.

Highlights in Service Delivery Improvements

The impact of the Department on youth is probably the single most significant aspect of the coordination mechanism. Alabama has progressed from a decentralized system that perpetuated racial discrimination, abuse, and no standardized approach to treatment care to a highly centralized system with standards for operating and managing youth services in an equitable way. The Department's philosophy now includes:

- Testing and evaluation of each adjudicated youth and developing an individualized program of treatment;
- Reduction of incarceration rates/abuse and deinstitutionalization of the status offender;
- Racial equality in standards for intake, institutional assignment, care, and treatment as well as non-discrimination in staffing;
- Vocational training and skills development in institutions to prepare youth for useful and relevant jobs.

Issues Requiring Attention

Although much progress has been made, many of those interviewed indicated that the State faces a number of significant problems affecting youth services:

- Alabama faces serious financial problems that may jeopardize funding for innovative youth services programs. With the reduction in Federal support and the State budget crisis few dollars are committed to new programs or new ideas.

- Too many youth wait too long in detention for admission to DYS. Some youth wait four to six months in detention without receiving training or credit for the time spent.
- The State's traditional "lock em up" mentality and increased commitments by the courts are causing overcrowding, and are justifying the construction of the new maximum security facility. Youth advocates in the State do not necessarily support increasing incarceration or the use of maximum security for juveniles but recognize the need to relieve the overcrowding and "dead time" spent in detention and that youth in fact are committing more violent crimes.
- Diminished local diversion and alternative programs indicate a lack of commitment by the public and the lack of State and Federal funding. Innovative programs do not have support from the general public or the legislature. Few youth advocacy groups exist in the State except for those associated with DYS.
- A legislature unsympathetic to further reforms will require that youth advocates devote more attention to lobbying. Increased efforts are needed to inform the legislators on the importance of youth needs and to convince them of the effectiveness of alternative approaches to institutionalization and punishment as the only solution.
- The public is also unsympathetic toward youth involved in crime, and this will require more effort devoted to public relations, publicity about positive programs and rehabilitation results, and additional citizen participation.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Coordinating mechanisms have developed in the 1970s in response to the increasing complexity of program and service needs and the growth of bureaucracies, particularly at the State and local level, to manage those programs. States seem to recognize the need for cross-system management. Their responses to that need have varied depending upon the organization of the existing service systems and the support for coordination by both the bureaucratic and political leadership.

Although this study was not meant to be a firm evaluation or even an assessment of the success of these mechanisms, there is an interesting consistency of findings across the survey, the literature review, and the case studies. That information is presented here in the hope of stimulating future discussion, information gathering, and assessment about such mechanisms. Coordination mechanisms have established themselves in State government as viable entities. Certainly, there is substantial commitment on the part of the persons who participated in the survey and case studies to the goals of coordination. This study may assist in translating that commitment into substantial achievements.

SPURS TO COORDINATION

The rationale for coordination efforts is based on a number of factors and trends.

A growth in categorical programs in the past 20 years. The proliferation of Federal programs, matched by an increase in State programs, has resulted in a haphazard, crazy-quilt pattern of assistance often aimed at the same target populations. This expansion has been layered onto a service delivery system that itself evolved in an unsystematic manner. The combination of the expansion of programs and the evolution of a fragmented service delivery system has led to an increasing isolation of bureaucracies from each other.

A movement from service delivery based on individual youth problems to a system that attempts to improve the relationship between youth and their social environment. The movement that began in the 1960s to deal with youth problems in the overall context of their lives has led to a recognition of the need for comprehensive service strategies. This recognition in turn has generated interest in interdisciplinary strategies. This holistic approach of necessity requires cooperation among agencies and programs addressing education, employment, health, and related services.

A recognition of similarity of various service delivery components. Human service managers have come to recognize that many of their services have similar characteristics. Licensing, monitoring, reimbursement, outreach, intake, and referral systems are similar. Considered in the context of the previous issue, many managers, planners, and policymakers in human services areas have come to the conclusion that the development of linkages makes programmatic--and often fiscal--sense. Disagreement in the service delivery community centers on organizational arrangements for coordination. Coordinating mechanisms, consolidated agencies, and integrated agencies have been developed in the past 15 years with partisans for each approach and opponents of other approaches arguing over "what's best".

A need for horizontal linkages to complement the vertical linkages of the service delivery system. The vertical nature of our entire system, from the Federal-State-local levels of government to the hierarchical nature of bureaucracies has created a system heavy with procedural requirements and has led to a stifling of creativity. The initiatives of the Reagan administration to reduce the Federal role, the recognition by practitioners of the need to communicate ideas across disciplinary boundaries, as well as the factors mentioned above, have sparked the movement to reach across those boundaries to share ideas, approaches and information.

RESPONSES TO THE NEED TO COORDINATE

The response of many States to the need to coordinate policies and services has been the creation of coordinating bodies composed of representatives of service agencies. Many of these bodies have been formally constituted by legislation or executive order. There appear to be three reasons why this organizational structure predominates efforts to coordinate.

Coordination mechanisms developed as an alternative to more extensive reorganization. In some cases coordination mechanisms were created after more ambitious efforts to consolidate or integrate services had failed. Most of the mechanisms came into existence in the 1970s, after the movement toward integrated agencies had lost momentum. Although they appear to have been created in response to the perceived need for service delivery change, they often are the product of compromises in the executive and legislative decisionmaking processes.

There is a need for planning mechanisms that can be used as managerial tools rather than as funding roadmaps. Planning in the public sector has moved from a resource procurement process to a resource allocation process. This shift means that competing interests within the human services field must compete both among themselves and with other interests at the State level. As a result, planning has become a process to identify needs and attempt to allocate resources in a creative manner. Coordination mechanisms can provide the policy underpinnings of the policymaking process.

Coordinating mechanisms seem to focus on policy coordination and information exchange. These two functions constitute the backbone of most coordination efforts. Policy coordination is difficult because it demands the negotiation of basic interests and may change current relationships and stature. It threatens the fundamental interests of each participant and, if attempted without strong incentives and/or coercion, can result in no change. Information-sharing is usually non-threatening and can be used to delay other more important decisions.

FACTORS IN SUCCESS

Several factors appear to be influential in making a State coordination mechanism successful.

Support from political leadership, especially the Governor but also the State legislature. The backing of the political leadership in a State has a significant influence upon the effectiveness of coordination mechanisms. Most States, even the major urban States, appear to be responsive down to the middle level of a bureaucracy to gubernatorial leadership. Legislative consistency and support is also important but less vital than strong gubernatorial backing.

Membership support including processes to limit and avoid turf issues. Support from the actual formal members of the mechanisms, usually the chief administrative officers of State agencies or units of a consolidated or integrated department, are vital to coordination. They must devise ways to avoid turf battles or at least resolve those issues to mutual satisfaction. In the same way that state bureaucracies are responsive to elected political leadership, they must be responsive to their appointed leaders.

An agenda that is focused, specific and relevant. Coordination mechanisms are much more likely to be successful if they establish clear priorities for issues they will address and develop strategies to examine those issues. Further, the issues and priorities selected should be those that have a consensus of support, are manageable, and are likely to have a discernible positive impact. Although information-sharing is a comfortable activity, exclusive focus on this non-threatening function results in a loss of interest by members and an absence of truly meaningful results.

Availability of independent staff support. Staff can carry on the work of the coordination mechanisms between meetings, assist in developing an agenda for the Council, and provide the necessary policy and programmatic expertise. Those mechanisms with their own staff appear to be much more successful. Staff must also be seen as independent of any interest group or agency in order to carry out coordination efforts.

NEXT STEPS

The Federal government has made a significant investment in coordination in the past decade. This study suggests that States have also become extremely active recently in establishing formal mechanisms for coordination. It also provides detailed insights into the successes and failures of four very different states. The Federal government should now move to consolidate the knowledge it has gained, examine issues that are common to coordination efforts, and disseminate that information on State and local governments.

Suggested future activities fall into four categories:

1. **Expanded Research on Existing State Models.** As indicated earlier, this study was exploratory. It provides a picture of the universe of State coordination mechanisms and identifies key features to examine. Based on this knowledge, it would be possible to conduct a more definitive study which would capture more exhaustive information in all 50 states on key data items related to coordination mechanisms. The data categories could be greatly refined based on the insights generated from this study about what exists and what factors influence success under different models of operation. It would also be desirable to conduct more vigorous assessments of a set of coordinated, consolidated, and integrated models using a highly structured framework for analysis and comparison of results.
2. **State Assistance.** Many of the states contacted expressed strong interest in getting more information about successful coordination efforts in other states, both through written information and personal contact. It would appear that Federal sponsorship of conferences, workshops, or onsite technical assistance might be extremely well received. Workshops should include panel presentations by State personnel on different models of coordination mechanisms that were attempted, highlighting cases in each category of mechanisms which had exceptional success or failure. Workshops could also include working sessions in small groups to help participants design or strengthen mechanisms in their own states. A systematic program of information dissemination, workshops and technical assistance could lead to significant advances in our state of knowledge about how to coordinate as well as significant advances in the state of practice.
3. **Planned Experimentation.** Another possible approach to increasing knowledge and improving practice in this area would be to take the principles learned to date and experiment deliberately with designing, implementing, and evaluating new mechanisms in interested states. This process involves three components:

- **Model development,** which entails developing operational standards and measures of achievement and specifying types of strategies to be attempted. Possible structure, function, and operating strategies would be identified. Activities common across disciplines would be specified for coordination. These might include standard setting, licensing, monitoring, reimbursement, and placement. The model(s) would represent current best thinking about models most likely to succeed.
 - **Implementation with technical assistance,** which involves getting selected interested states participating in the experiment and attempting to implement the described model(s) as faithfully as practical. Funding to the states may not be necessary, but technical assistance should be made available to ensure implementation and the greatest chance for success.
 - **Evaluation, both formative and summative,** to insure an understanding of what was attempted and the changes for which the process is responsible.
4. **Local Coordination Study.** A similar study would be conducted attempting to identify potentially promising models of local coordination of youth services, and then conducting in-depth case studies of key models. While there is much greater literature on local service coordination, success has remained highly elusive.

APPENDIX A
STATE-LEVEL COORDINATION OF YOUTH SERVICES
QUESTIONNAIRE

Your Name
Your Title
Address
Street
City State Zone
Phone
(area code) Number
Name of your Coordination Mechanism

Check the category that most accurately describes the coordinating body in your State. Check only one! (i.e., the type, the location in the State government, the origin or the lead agency/department)

- Juvenile Justice-State Advisory Group
Council/Committee-Governor's Office
Cabinet-level Coordination Mechanism
State Juvenile Justice Agency
State Human Services Agency
State (integrated) Department of Youth Services
Private Agency/Association
Other (Specify)

1. Identification

1.1 Was the coordinating mechanism created by: (check one)

- Governor
Legislature
Executive Order
Formal (written)
interagency agreement
Informal interagency agreement
(Advocacy/private) citizen group
Other

Specify:
Specify:

NOTE: If you have identified a committee/council or "Board" structure answer questions 1.2 and 1.3.

- 1.2 How many members are there?
1.3 List the membership in the coordination mechanism, or attach membership list.

Table with 3 columns: Name, Title, Agency. Multiple rows for listing members.

1.4 Please diagram or provide an organization chart (if available) that shows the position of the coordination mechanism in your State governmental structure:

1.5 Was the coordination mechanism created in response to Federal legislation? (Example: The State Advisory Group for the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act)

Yes _____ No _____

1.6 Is the coordination mechanism an integrated State youth services department or part of one? (An integrated agency/department is when most of the administrative program authority or previously autonomous programs are under a single new authority.)

Yes _____ No _____

1.7 Is the coordinating body a private non-profit association that is not part of the State administrative structure?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, does the association membership have State administrative staff involved with youth services?

Yes _____ No _____

2. Origin/Development

2.1 When was your first meeting or the date of the formal creation (as in a new Department of Youth Services) of the coordination mechanism?

NOTE: If you identified a committee or "Board" structure answer 2.2 - 2.4.

2.2 How often does the coordination mechanism meet?

2.3 Is there a termination date for the coordination mechanism?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, what date? _____

2.4 Extent of involvement of the following: (check one each)

	Formal Member	Informal Member	Consulted	None
Governor				
Criminal Justice Planning Agency				
Juvenile Justice Advisory Group				
Members from State operating agencies with responsibilities for:				
Corrections				
Child Welfare				
Mental Health				
Education				
Public Health				
Employment/Training				
Recreation/Cultural Arts				
Other (Specify)				
Members from other groups:				
Private Agencies/Associations				
Advocacy Groups				
Local Elected/Appointed Officials				
Youth Membership				
Citizens				

3. Administrative Structure

3.1 How is the membership of the body determined?

Specified in enabling legislation _____
Appointed by Governor _____
Set out in mechanism's charter _____
Voluntary membership _____
Other _____
Specify: _____

NOTE: If you identified a committee or "Board" structure, answer 3.2 - 3.4.

3.2 Is there a system for designating alternates to represent members at coordinating body functions?

Yes _____ No _____

3.3 Generally speaking, do the appointed members actually attend meetings or do they send alternates?

Attend _____ Send Alternates _____ Other _____

3.4 Is there a chairperson?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, how was the chairperson designated?

Specified in mechanism's enabling legislation/order _____

Appointed by Governor _____

Membership vote _____

Other _____
Specify: _____

3.5 Is there a paid staff for the coordination body?

Yes _____ No _____

3.6 Who appoints the lead staff person or head of agency?

Governor _____
Membership vote _____
Selection by Board _____
Appointed by Chair _____
Other _____
Specify: _____

3.7 Does the coordinating body have authority to promulgate its own by-laws?

Yes _____ No _____

3.8 Is there a subcommittee structure?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, please list the standing committees:

the adhoc committees:

4. Purposes/Functions

4.1 Does the coordinating body have a written formal mandate?

Yes _____ No _____

a statement of principles?

Yes _____ No _____

constitution?

Yes _____ No _____

goals/objectives?

Yes _____ No _____

by-laws?

Yes _____ No _____

workplan?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, please attach. (Send summaries if documentation is extensive.)

4.2 Is an annual report required?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, by and for whom? _____

4.3 Is the function of the coordination mechanism purely that of coordination (policy and information) or actual service delivery and its related activities?

Explain:

140

5. Powers/Authority

5.1 Can the coordinating body make decisions that are binding on its members?

Yes _____ No _____

5.2 Can the coordinating body make the following types of decisions?

	Yes	No	Advisory Only
Funding for projects	_____	_____	_____
Budgeting for joint program development	_____	_____	_____
Staffing of programs	_____	_____	_____

Yes No Advisory Only

	Yes	No	Advisory Only
Promulgation of regulations	_____	_____	_____
Program implementation	_____	_____	_____
Research and evaluation	_____	_____	_____
T/A and training	_____	_____	_____
Information dissemination	_____	_____	_____
To testify on state or federal legislation	_____	_____	_____
To monitor compliance/enforcement	_____	_____	_____

5.3 What policy formulation/decision making process is used?

- Consensus (general agreement) _____
- Simple majority (over 50%) _____
- Extraordinary majority (3/5, 2/3, 3/4) _____
- Other _____

Specify: _____

6. Resources

6.1 What type of staff does the coordinating body have? (Check all that apply)

Paid full-time _____ How many? _____

Paid part-time _____ How many? _____

Voluntary _____ How many? _____

None _____

How many paid full-or part-time equivalents? _____

- Managerial _____
- Technical _____
- Administrative/Support _____

6.2 Is the mechanism authorized to:

	Yes	No
Act as its own fiscal agent?	_____	_____
Accept funds through Federal grants and contracts?	_____	_____
Accept funds from other agencies?	_____	_____
Accept funds from foundations?	_____	_____
Accept funds from corporations?	_____	_____
Accept funds from charitable organizations?	_____	_____
Accept funds from other sources? Please specify:	_____	_____

6.3 Does the coordination mechanism have its "own" operating budget for travel expenses, etc.?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, is the budget combined with another agency's budget?

Yes _____ No _____

6.4 Are funds legislatively appropriated?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what range does annual budget fit into?
Check one:

\$0 - 50,000 _____
50,000 - 100,000 _____
100,000 - Over _____

6.5 If source of funds is multiple, please explain.

6.6 Where is the coordinating mechanism physically located? (Example: An office in the Department of Human Resources)

Is the location within an agency?
Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what agency? _____

What is source of mechanism's overhead budget?
(rent, heat, lights, telephone) (check one)

Paid for out of own budget? _____

Absorbed by Agency in which housed? _____

Other _____

Specify: _____

7. Results

7.1 Have you produced in the past 12 months:
(check yes or no)

	Yes	No
An annual report or policy statement report	_____	_____
A meeting/conference	_____	_____
Interagency program development	_____	_____
T/A, training	_____	_____
Information dissemination	_____	_____
Policy or legislation	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____

Explain: _____

7.2 Has your coordinating body received publicity?
(If available, attach)

Yes _____ No _____

7.3 Have you developed a management information system that overlaps agency lines?

Yes _____ No _____

7.4 What is the most significant responsibility shifted to or removed from your agency this year? _____

7.5 Have any formal evaluations or studies been conducted on your coordinating mechanism? (attach a copy)

Yes _____ No _____

7.6 Has documentation of your efforts been distributed or given to a national information clearinghouse?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what clearinghouse(s)? _____

8. Relationship to Other Coordination Mechanisms

8.1 List other coordinating bodies in your State that deal with coordination of youth services at the State level:

	Name of Mechanism	Address	Phone
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____	_____

8.2 Is there overlapping membership with your agency?

Yes _____ No _____

9. Open-ended Questions

9.1 What major successes has the coordinating body had?

9.2 What two or three principal obstacles have you encountered that have impacted on the success of the coordinating body?

9.3 What are the possibilities of your coordinating body continuing to exist in the future? (Include anticipated changes, challenges, etc.)

9.4 What has been learned from your experience of working with a coordinating body? What would you do differently? (Advice to other States; TA, training needed; what worked best, least.)

10. Other Comments

APPENDIX B

State Level Coordination of Youth Services Survey Respondents

Alabama

Alabama Department of Youth Services
Peggy Goodwyn 205/832-3910

Alaska

Division of Family and Youth Services
Russell Webb 907/465-3209

Arizona

Interagency Advisory Council on Children,
Youth, and Their Families
Beth Rosenberg 602/255-3596

Interagency Advisory Council Regarding
Services
Grace Schmidt 602/255-3191

Arkansas

Division of Youth Services
Larry Meyer 501/371-2651

California

Health and Welfare Agency; Deputy Secretary
for Children and Youth
Sharrell Blakely 916/322-2862

Colorado

Colorado Commission on Children and Their
Families
Anna Jo Haynes 303/866-4586,87

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Council
Peter Simons 303/866-4984

Delaware

Advisory Committee on Mental Health Services
to Children and Youth
Margo Pollak 302/421-6717

Georgia

Governor's Advisory Council on Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention
Bette Rosenzweig 404/656-1725

Troubled Children's Committee
Robert L. Walker 404/894-4570

Liaison Committee with Division of Youth Services
Chris Perrin 404/656-5171

APEG Committee
Dr. Arthur Bilyeu 404/656-2425

Hawaii

Juvenile Justice Interagency Board
Irwin Tanaka 808/548-3800

Governor's Advisory Council for Children and
Youth
Edward K. Fyjimoto 808/548-7582

Idaho

Idaho Youth Commission
Mike Brush 208/334-2100

Illinois

Illinois State Advisory Group
Barbara McDonald 312/454-1560

Governors Youth Services Initiative
Linda Avery 217/795-2570

Indiana

Indiana Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
Prevention Advisory Board
John W. Ransbury 317/232-1232

Iowa

Juvenile Justice Advisory Council
David White 515/281-3241

Kansas

Youth Services in Department of Social
and Rehabilitative Services
David O'Brien 913/296-4649

Louisiana

Interagency Task Force on Coordination
Dolores Kozloski 504/925-4432

Maine

Juvenile Justice Advisory Group
Geraldine Brown 207/289-3361

Interdepartmental Committee
Nancy Warburton 207/289-3161

Jail Monitoring Committee
T. T. Trott 207/623-4832

Child Welfare Advisory Committee
Barbara Sparks 207/289-2971

Maryland

Positive Youth Development Council
Terry O'Tap 301/383-3773

Office for Children and Youth
Howard Bluth 301/383-2290

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
Ken Hines 301/321-3631

Massachusetts

State Department of Youth Services
Edward Kennedy 617/727-2731

Michigan

Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice
Ralph Monsma 517/373-6510

Missouri

Juvenile Justice Review Committee
Edith P. Tate 314/751-3265

Montana

Interagency Committee for Handicapped
Children
Dale Haefer 406/449-4540

Nebraska

Juvenile Justice Advisory Group
Merritt C. Green 402/471-2194

Nevada

State Department of Youth Services
Frank Carmen 702/885-5982

New Hampshire

New Hampshire Crime Commission
John Mason 603/271-3601

New Jersey

Commission on Childrens Services
Alexandra Larson 609/292-1343

State Youth Services Commission
Edward Niemiera 609/292-9634

New Mexico

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
Richard Lindahl 505/983-3317

Governors Committee on Children
John Hubbard 505/827-3010

New York

State Council on Children and Families
Joseph Cocozza 518/474-6682

North Carolina

Governors Executive Cabinet on Juvenile
Affairs
Richard Maxson 919/773-9000

Governors Crime Commission and the Juvenile
Justice Planning Committee
Gregg Stehl 919/733-5013

Ohio

State Youth Service Coordinating Council
Roger Mallory 614/466-7782

Oregon

Childrens Services Division
Thomas Moan 503/378-5095

Pennsylvania

Juvenile Advisory Committee on Crime and
Delinquency
Richard Allen 717/787-8559

Rhode Island

Department for Children and Their Families
John McManus 401/277-6525

South Carolina

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Advisory Council
Yvonne McBride 803/758-9840

Tennessee

Interdepartmental Community Liaison Committee
Marc Lavine 615/741-2633

Texas

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
Beth Arnold 512/475-3001

Texas Juvenile Probation Commission
Steve Bonnell 512/443-2001

Utah

Utah Board of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
Willard Malmstrom 801/533-5290

Virginia

Division for Children
Peter Williams 804/786-5990

Interdepartmental Licensure and Certification
Committee
Barry Craig 804/281-9025

Washington

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
Jack Ickes 206/753-4958

Childrens Services Advisory Committee
Rino Patti 206/543-5640

West Virginia

State Advisory Group for Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention
Frank Shumaker 304/348-7980

Wisconsin

Child Welfare Advisory Group
Carol Henry 608/266-9305

Positive Youth Development Initiative
Kathy Thorp 608/255-6351

APPENDIX C
STATE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following people met with SRA staff and contributed generously to the case studies:

Alabama

Peggy Goodwyn
Youth Services Planning and
Program Administrator
Alabama Department Youth Services
Mt. Meigs, AL

George Phyfer
Director of DYS
Alabama Department of Youth
Services
Mt. Meigs, AL

Eddie Davis
Deputy Director
Law Enforcement Planning Agency
Montgomery, AL

Bob Bryant
Chairman of DYS Board
District Attorney's Office
Montgomery, AL

Honorable John Davis, III
Juvenile Court Judge
15th Judicial Circuit Court
Montgomery, AL

John Moore
Legal and Child Advocacy
Department of Youth Services
Mt. Meigs, AL

Whit Armstrong
c/o the Citizens Bank
SAG Chairman
Enterprise, AL

Dr. Ira Myers
Commissioner of Health
State Health Department
Montgomery, AL

Grady Sandidge
Allie Freeman
Jack Hunter
Regional Coordinators
Community and Regional
Services Division
DYS
Mt. Meigs, AL

Wayne Booker
Vocational Programs
Department of Youth Services
Mt. Meigs, AL

James Dupree
Director of D&E Center
Department of Youth Services
Mt. Meigs, AL

Gil Jennings
Deputy Commissioner
Pensions and Security
Montgomery, AL

Maryland

Howard Bluth
Executive Director
Office for Children & Youth
Baltimore, MD

Laura Steele
Coordinator, Governor's Youth
Advisory Council
Office for Children and Youth
Baltimore, MD

Father Fred Hanna
State Advisory Committee
Office for Children & Youth
Baltimore, MD

Deborah Taylor
State Advisory Committee and
Local Children's Council
Office for Children and Youth
Baltimore, MD

Ann Wicke
Local Children's Council
Office for Children & Youth
Howard County, MD

Kenneth D. Hines
Juvenile Justice Representative
Mary Criminal Justice Coordinating
Council
Towson, MD

Constance Beim
Governor's Appointments Office
Annapolis, MD

Rex Smith
Director, Juvenile Services
Administration
Baltimore, MD

Henry Braun
Intake Officer Regional Supervisor
Juvenile Services Administration
Annapolis, MD

Desi Sapounakis & Rick Miller
State Prevention Network Project
(PYD)

Juvenile Services Administration
Baltimore, MD

Fred Chew
Office of Fiscal Management
The Department of Fiscal Services
Annapolis, MD

Rosalie Street
Youth Advocate
MD-State Committee on Adolescent
Pregnancy, Parenting,
and Pregnancy Prevention
Baltimore, MD

New York

Michael Friedman
Director of Operations
Jewish Board of Family & Children
Services
New York, NY

Carmine D'Allena
Director of Program Development
NYS Special Services for Children
NYC Human Resources Administration
New York, NY

Heidi Siegel
Program Officer
Foundation for Child Development
New York, NY

Joseph Cocozza
Deputy Director
N.Y. State Council on Children
and Families
Albany, NY

Ilene Margolin
Executive Director
N.Y. Council on Children
and Families
Albany, NY

Donna Miller
Special Assistant to
Executive Director
N.Y. State Council on Children
and Families
Albany, NY

James Purcell
Associate Commissioner
Office of Program Support
Department of Social Services
Albany, NY

Stephen Richman
Assistant Chief Budget Examiner
NYS Division of the Budget
Albany, NY

Jeffery Sachs
Assistant Secretary
to the Governor for Human Services
Albany, NY

Barbara Hawes
Associate Commissioner
Statewide Services
NYS Office of Mental Retardation
and Developmental Disabilities
Albany, NY

Jules Kerness
Executive Director
Joint Legislative
Commission on Public/Private
Cooperation
Albany, NY

Joanne Hilferty
Deputy Commissioner
NYS Office of Mental Health
Albany, NY

Howard Schwartz
Director, Juvenile Justice Unit
NYS Division of Criminal Justice
Services
New York, NY

Ellen Schall
Commissioner for Juvenile Justice
City of New York
New York, NY

Peter Lempin
Executive Assistant to the Director
of the Pupil Personnel
Services for New York City Schools
New York, NY

Marian Schwartz
Special Assistant to the Mayor
of New York City on Education
New York, NY

David Doty
Director
Bureau of Children & Youth Services
NYS Office of Mental Health
Albany, NY

Frederick Bedell
Executive Deputy Director
NYS Division for Youth
Albany, NY

Frederick Meservey
Assistant to Deputy Director
NYS Council on Children & Families
Albany, NY

North Carolina

Richard Maxson
Special Assistant to the
Governor on Juvenile Affairs
Governor's Office
Raleigh

Gordon Smith, Director
Governor's Crime Commission
Department of Crime Control and
Public Safety
Raleigh

Anne Bryan, Director of Planning
Governor's Crime Commission
Department of Crime Control and
Public Safety
Raleigh

Hon. George F. Bason
Chief District Court Judge
10th District Court
Raleigh

Steve Williams, Chief Court
Counselor
10th District Court
Raleigh

Vicky Church, Chairperson
Positive Youth Development

Carol Ann Mayor, Vice Chairperson
Positive Youth Development

John Niblock, Executive Director
Governor's Advocacy Council on
Children and Youth
Department of Administration
Raleigh

Pam Kohl, Director
Youth Involvement Office
Department of Administration
Raleigh

William Windley, Director
Division of Youth Services
Department of Human Resources
Raleigh

Kenneth Foster, Chief
Community Based Alternative Branch
Division of Youth Services
Raleigh

Dr. Thomas Danek, Administrator
Juvenile Services Division
Administrative Office of the Courts
Raleigh

Rex Yates, Chief Court Counselor
23rd District Court
Wilkesboro

Dr. Charles Petty
Governor's Office of Citizen Affairs
Raleigh

Hon. James B. Hunt, Jr.
Governor
Raleigh

Ed Carr, Chairman
Juvenile Service Department
North Carolina Justice Academy
Salemburg

END