

114066

Achievements and Challenges

OJJDP's

Annual

Report

NCJRS
NOV 15 1988
ACQUISITIONS

F I S C A L Y E A R 1 9 8 7

**Office of Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention**

Verne L. Speirs
Administrator

114066

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

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/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.

Foreword

For 13 years, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has confronted the changing needs and problems of juveniles across the Nation. From the deinstitutionalization of status offenders to removing juvenile offenders from adult jails, illegal drug and alcohol use, and serious juvenile crime, OJJDP has responded effectively and efficiently, always striving to reduce juvenile crime and improve the juvenile justice system.

Fiscal year 1987 was an important year for OJJDP, not only because of the diversity and magnitude of the issues facing the juvenile justice system, but also because we implemented new procedures to ensure that activities of the Office were both comprehensive and proactive. In 1987, major issues such as illegal drug use, drug trafficking, and gang violence became critical national concerns and demanded the attention of the juvenile justice system. OJJDP met these and many other challenges by supporting research and demonstration projects, and providing training and information, while at the same time helping State and local jurisdictions respond to the diverse needs and demands of their own juvenile population. OJJDP's accomplishments are many and its contributions to the betterment of our Nation's youth notable.

This FY 1987 annual report describes OJJDP's achievements in eight important areas: drugs, serious juvenile crime, missing and exploited children, schools, families, juvenile gangs, improving the juvenile justice system, and formula grants. This report goes beyond OJJDP's mandate to report research results to practitioners and policymakers. It provides the entire juvenile justice community and its constituents with a major, comprehensive examination of OJJDP's activities, programs, services, and focus.

Verne L. Speirs
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention



Table of Contents

Foreword	i
Part I: A Look at OJJDP	1
Part II: Highlights of OJJDP's FY 1987 Initiatives	3
Drugs	4
Reaching Out to At-Risk Youth	5
Research: Understanding the Relationship Between Delinquency and Drug and Alcohol Abuse	6
Community Action: Mobilizing Juvenile Courts	7
Identifying Promising Programs	8
Helping Communities Fight Drugs	9
Community Action: Coordinating Services	10
Helping Athletes Say No	11
Research: Understanding Patterns of Juvenile Drug Use	12
Prevention Strategies for Parents	13
Neighborhood Drug Prevention Strategies	14
Research: Examining Drug Use Among Ethnic and Minority Populations	15
Coordinating Federal Juvenile Drug Abuse Prevention Efforts	16
Developing a National Strategy	18
Serious Juvenile Crime	20
Intensive Prosecution	21
Community-Based Corrections	22
Research: Examining the Causes of Delinquent Behavior ...	23
Private Industry in Corrections	24

Intensive Supervision	25
Intensive Aftercare	26
Improving Law Enforcement Handling of Juvenile Offenders	27
Juvenile Arsonists	28
A Systemwide Response to Serious Juvenile Offenders	29
Private Sector Probation	31
Law Enforcement Training	33
Missing, Abused, or Exploited Youth	35
Child Abuse Prosecution	36
Expanding Services for Missing Children	37
Training Private Volunteer Organizations	38
Child Witnesses	39
Providing Comprehensive Support and Assistance	40
Police and Missing Children	42
Research: Determining the Extent of the Missing Children Problem	44
Helping Families Cope	46
Schools	48
Safe Schools	49
School Dropouts	51
Using the Law to Improve School Order and Safety	53
Law-Related Education	55
Using Juveniles as Crime Prevention Resources	57
Families	59
Finding Permanent Families	60
Volunteer Court Advocates	61
Strengthening the Family	62

Juvenile Gangs	64
Intervention Strategies	65
Improving the Juvenile Justice System	66
Juvenile Court Data	67
Responding to Information Needs of the Juvenile Justice Community	68
Training and Technical Assistance for Prosecutors	69
Improving Court Processing of Juveniles	70
Training and Technical Assistance for Juvenile Courts	71
Restitution	72
Victims and Witnesses	73
Processing Minority Youth	74
Status Offenders and DSO	75
Detention Statistics	76
AIDS and Juvenile Corrections	77
 Part III: Formula Grant Program and Activities	 79
 Part IV: 1988 Program Plan and Recommendations	 93

Part I:

A Look at OJJDP

Overview of OJJDP

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was created by Congress in 1974 in response to nationwide concern about juvenile crime. A part of the U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP is the primary Federal agency responsible for comprehensively addressing the issues of juvenile crime and delinquency and the problem of missing and exploited children.

OJJDP's Mission

OJJDP provides national leadership and resources to States and localities in implementing the mandates and goals of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act. To accomplish its mission as mandated by Congress, OJJDP:

- Conducts and supports research on juvenile delinquency and child victimization.
- Develops and demonstrates effective juvenile justice programs.
- Provides training and information about these effective programs.
- Awards formula grants to States to help them achieve compliance with the mandates and requirements of the JJDP Act, including deinstitutionalizing status offenders and nonoffenders, separating juveniles from adults within secure confinement facilities, and removing juveniles from adult jails and lockups.
- Coordinates Federal juvenile delinquency and missing and exploited children programs.

Accomplishing Its Mission in FY 1987

To accomplish its mission, OJJDP took significant steps during FY 1987 to improve the overall management of the Office and ensure that programs developed by OJJDP were technically sound and

cost effective. The Office instituted a program planning, development, and monitoring process. The approach allows OJJDP to systematically track the development of programs, to monitor financial obligations and expenditures, to ensure that the information needs of future stages or phases of the project are considered during program development, and to periodically reassess resource commitments.

As part of the program planning process, OJJDP internally reviewed existing programs and sought, for the first time in recent years, input from a variety of outside experts and professionals: juvenile justice policymakers and practitioners from the State and local levels, OJJDP grantees and contractors, State planning agencies and advisory groups, human service organizations, and professional associations with interests in juvenile justice and related issues.

The internal review process focused on the effectiveness of current programs and projects to determine whether they should be continued, expanded, reoriented to another purpose, or terminated. The external review process included:

1. A Program Development Seminar at which practitioner experts informed both the OJJDP Administrator and staff about critical juvenile justice issues as seen from the field's perspective.
2. A Program Development Workshop at which outside experts—including practitioners, researchers, policy analysts, information specialists, and planners—identified key issues and recommended specific program strategies that would address these issues.

The new program planning and development process also enabled OJJDP to fund programs that not only address issues faced by individual components of the juvenile justice system, but also those that confront the system as a whole. Programs funded by OJJDP in FY 1987 fall into three main categories: systemwide development, system coordination, and system operations. Systemwide development programs involve one or more components of the juvenile justice system. These initiatives concentrate both on developing state-of-the-art approaches for dealing with specific problems or issues, and on increasing the effectiveness of each component of the system. System coordination programs emphasize community organization and planning strategies, and promote systemwide coordination to maximize the use of resources. System operations efforts are designed to improve and enhance each component of the system.

As a result of this comprehensive program planning and development process, OJJDP funded 62 discretionary projects totalling \$28,280,970 in FY 1987. These programs address all components of the juvenile justice system, including prevention, law enforcement, adjudication, supervision, and missing and exploited children. Many of them are highlighted on the following pages of this annual report.

Part II:

Highlights of OJJDP's FY 1987 Initiatives

In FY 1987, important changes took place at OJJDP, which set the framework for well-informed management decisions and implementation of programs that respond to the most pressing needs of the juvenile justice community. OJJDP instituted a logical and structured process for identifying critical issues in the juvenile justice field, setting agency priorities, and disseminating information in a workable format. As a result, the agency made significant contributions in areas such as understanding the causes of delinquent behavior, developing innovative methods for handling juveniles in the justice system, preventing and controlling illegal drug use by high risk youth, counting our Nation's missing children, and enhancing the knowledge and skills of juvenile justice professionals through training and timely publications.

This section of the OJJDP annual report highlights major activities and accomplishments for FY 1987. Initiatives funded in seven priority areas, as well as OJJDP's formula grants program, are described, with the program title, grantee, and OJJDP monitoring office identified so that readers can pursue additional information on their own. In all, more than 50 programs are discussed. They represent the broad spectrum of important initiatives supported by OJJDP during the past year; they are by no means all inclusive of OJJDP's efforts.



Drugs

The problem of illegal drug and alcohol use by America's youth is pervasive. It is a nightmare that has torn families apart, turned some schools into drug markets, and threatened the safety of many towns and cities. Alcohol-involved driving accidents are the leading cause of death among young people ages 16 to 24. Alcohol is also implicated in many adolescent drownings, suicides, and violent injuries.

The drug and alcohol problem is present throughout the country, in small and large communities alike. It is estimated that 7 million children are raised in homes where one or both parents are substance abusers, a situation that places them at high risk for involvement in drugs or alcohol themselves. Among juveniles appearing in court for violent crimes, 40 percent reported using drugs immediately prior to committing the offense for which they were adjudicated. Drug-related crimes overwhelm our courts, social service agencies, and police.

Federal efforts, including the 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act and President Reagan's campaign against illegal drug use, have prompted the development of new programs, research projects, and initiatives to prevent the onset of drug use and to deal effectively with those already involved. OJJDP's battle against illegal drug use and trafficking by our Nation's juveniles is a top priority. OJJDP has taken the lead in coordinating all Federal drug programs for youth and is aggressively and actively working to keep Federal agencies abreast of Federal, State, and local programs in this area.

Reaching Out to At-Risk Youth

OJJDP is working with Boys Clubs of America (BCA) to offer drug prevention activities to juveniles who are at risk of using illegal drugs. Through OJJDP funds, 75 Boys Clubs in 10 major cities are reaching out to at-risk youth and first time juvenile offenders, providing them with alternative services to supplement the juvenile court and other youth serving agencies. BCA has developed a highly successful program, Targeted Outreach, to focus on drug prevention, education, and intervention for at-risk youth. Targeted Outreach, a delinquency intervention program, has already reached more than 3,750 youth nationwide. Through Targeted Outreach, juveniles receive services and support to improve self-esteem, build confidence, and avoid delinquent activities.

An expansion of Targeted Outreach, called Smart Moves, actively recruits youth for participation in a drug education program. Where added support services are needed, BCA makes referrals to local social or mental health agencies for drug counseling, intervention, or support. Because BCA provides limited intervention and relies heavily on the local network for intensive services, Smart Moves trains local Boys Clubs to establish both liaisons and networks with other community organizations and agencies involved in drug prevention and intervention.

Targeted Outreach: Drug Prevention Supplement

Boys Clubs of America, 771 First Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, John Dawson.

Research: Understanding the Relationship Between Delinquency and Drug and Alcohol Abuse

OJJDP and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) are cosponsoring a 2-year research project to determine the relationship between drug and alcohol abuse and delinquent behavior. Using a sample of 400 juveniles who entered a Hillsborough County, Florida, Juvenile Detention Center between the fall of 1986 and the spring of 1987, researchers are assessing the value and usefulness of urine testing as a basis for suggesting and developing successful intervention strategies with high risk youth offenders.

In this study, at least 40 percent of the juveniles either admitted or tested positive for drug use. Of this number, most had used cocaine and marijuana. At least 35 percent had been physically or sexually abused.

Researchers also are assessing the usefulness of drug testing for identifying youth at risk of short-term recidivism and future delinquency and drug use. The results of this research project, expected in late 1988, will offer important information for the public, practitioners, and policymakers to use in developing and providing services to at-risk youth in the juvenile justice system.

Drug Testing of High Risk Youth Offenders in a Detention Program

University of South Florida, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, Tampa, Florida 33620.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Catherine Sanders.

Community Action: Mobilizing Juvenile Courts

For several years, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) has been working with the Nation's juvenile courts to prevent and control juvenile drug and alcohol abuse. As part of this continuing effort, NCJFCJ conducted a working conference on illegal drugs and substance abuse to bring about a better understanding of appropriate judicial responses to substance abuse as a cause or correlate of delinquency. Fifty juvenile and family court judges, 12 faculty resource experts, and 10 members of the National Council attended this conference.

Several issues associated with juvenile and family substance abuse were examined during the conference. Conference participants also developed policies and procedures for handling juvenile substance abusers. A report titled, "Juvenile and Family Substance Abuse: A Judicial Response," contains their policy recommendations.

In the future, NCJFCJ will continue to broaden the awareness and understanding of substance abuse problems presented in Juvenile and Family Courts, and will develop strategies and programs to help the Nation's courts respond to the needs of those youth referred for adjudication. In addition, the NCJFCJ will develop a curriculum to educate and train judicial representatives who make decisions about youth involved in substance abuse or illegal drug use.

Juvenile Court Drug Action Agenda

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, P.O. Box 8970, Reno, Nevada 89507.
OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division,
James Gould.

Identifying Promising Programs

While significant attention has been focused on illegal drug use by juveniles, many questions still need to be answered. What types of programs are most effective in preventing and treating illegal drug use? How can early detection procedures be improved? What can be done, not only for the juveniles but for their families and communities?

To determine which strategies and programs work in preventing, intervening in, and treating drug and alcohol abuse among high risk youth, OJJDP is funding research to identify promising and successful community-based programs and develop model programs and services that address the many factors that prompt juveniles to begin or continue using illegal substances.

Once promising programs and models are identified and developed, they will be tested in various communities around the country to determine their impact. OJJDP will provide training and technical assistance to other communities to assist them in implementing these effective new programs and approaches.

Promising Approaches for the Prevention, Intervention and Treatment of Illegal Drug Use Among Juveniles

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 8521 Leesburg Pike, Suite 290, Vienna, Virginia 22180.

OJJDP Monitoring Offices: Research and Program Development Division, Douglas Thomas, and Special Emphasis Division, John Dawson.

Helping Communities Fight Drugs

Juvenile drug use is a problem that affects all segments of a community and all components of the juvenile justice system. The magnitude of the problem and its implications for the entire juvenile justice system prompted OJJDP and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to sponsor jointly a project to help communities coordinate their drug prevention activities.

Three separate yet integrated activities are being conducted. First, a conference of selected national, private, nonprofit organizations was planned for FY 1988, to define needs, explain and disseminate responses to youth drug and alcohol abuse, and foster coordination and cooperation among the organizations themselves and between them and the Federal Government.

Second, a community-based planning process to assess and respond to local drug abuse problems will be developed and demonstrated in local communities, and information about the most promising and effective systemwide responses, programs, and policies will be disseminated.

Finally, technical assistance and training will be provided to schools, civic groups, police, and courts to help them effectively work together to plan and implement community drug and alcohol abuse programs. By working collectively, communities can make a great difference in their fight against juvenile drug and alcohol abuse.

Youth Drug and Alcohol Abuse: Introduction of Effective Strategies Systemwide

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 8521 Leesburg Pike, Suite 290, Vienna, Virginia 22180.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, John Dawson.

Community Action: Coordinating Services

To best help juveniles who are at high risk of becoming involved in illegal drug use, it is imperative that community services be mobilized and coordinated. OJJDP, recognizing the importance of coordinated services, funded a project in the State of Ohio to create coordinated State and local networks of services to help substance abusing and at-risk juveniles.

Three communities—Dayton, Columbus, Toledo—and a rural tricounty area—Belmont, Harrison, and Monroe counties—are participating in this program. They have established a Coordinating Council made up of Federal, State, and local agencies that will plan and deliver services to high risk youth and coordinate the diverse fiscal resources available to address the drug problem among juveniles. The four sites will develop and demonstrate a locally based planning process to identify the problems of high risk youth, target local, State, and Federal resources, and recognize gaps in the service-delivery system. Finally, they will develop and improve services to meet the needs of high risk youth.

This project will demonstrate that by collectively planning for and providing services, communities can maximize existing and new resources and deliver more effective, comprehensive programs for high risk youth. To help other jurisdictions mobilize their resources to serve this population, the demonstration sites will document the processes that they employed and the results they achieved.

High Risk Youth Program—Ohio

Governor's Office of Criminal Justice, 65 East State Street, Suite 312, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, John Dawson

Helping Athletes Say No

Since 1985, OJJDP has funded Super Teams, a project that focuses on preventing the use of illegal drugs and alcohol by high risk youth in schools. Super Teams trains high school athletes to give them the skills to resist peer pressure and say “no” to drugs and alcohol. It teaches youth to take responsibility for their actions, and shows them how to help their peers say “no” as well. Professional athletes and members of the National Football League Players Association act as role models and trainers, teaching youth how to reach out to elementary and junior high school students to let them know that they can say “no” to illegal drugs and alcohol.

Super Teams involves two vital groups—teachers and parents—and three important phases in the fight against drugs:

- Phase I is a 1-day training seminar for school personnel, parents, and participating athletes designed to establish a support system and network for the students and the program.
- Phase II is a 5-day, intensive, residential training and motivational program for students that focuses on practical techniques for combating peer pressure and drug abuse.
- Phase III is an outreach and followup program that gives students positive reinforcement once they return to school.

Students from Spingarn High School in Washington, D.C., the first OJJDP-funded Super Teams project, have established an eight-member advisory board to set priorities and establish a plan of action for their own Super Teams program. Students targeted four feeder schools and set up “rap sessions” to help students deal with negative pressure and learn how to say “no.” Super Teams members also set up a counseling room at their own school to help students with similar problems.

Super Teams

Super Teams of the Washington Metropolitan Area, Inc., Suite 800, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20037.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Lois Brown.

Research: Understanding Patterns of Juvenile Drug Use

Through a major research program begun during FY 1987, OJJDP hopes to both increase understanding of why youth become involved in illegal drug use and identify community support systems and treatment strategies that effectively control and rehabilitate juvenile drug users.

Five research projects are reanalyzing existing data to determine the nature, extent, and patterns of drug use among juveniles. The results of these projects will help practitioners develop successful prevention programs.

- The New York City Criminal Justice Agency is studying drug abuse and delinquency among two at-risk juvenile populations—gang members and school dropouts.
- The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools, is exploring various theories about juveniles' use of drugs and alcohol and the activities related to this behavior.
- The University of Colorado is conducting yearly interviews with 11- to 13-year-olds to identify precursors of drugs (e.g., cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and hard drugs) and factors contributing to changes in their use over a 5-year period.
- The New Mexico State University, Arts and Sciences Research Center, is analyzing peer and parental influences on drug use in rural and small-town areas.
- Southwest Texas State University is studying the extent of delinquency and alcohol and drug use among Hispanic youth.

Research on Drug Use Among Juveniles

Program grantees are named above. For more information, contact the OJJDP Monitoring Office.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Catherine Sanders.

Prevention Strategies for Parents

It is widely believed that poor or inadequate parenting leads, in part, to juvenile delinquency. Until recently, however, programs and services responding to juvenile drug and alcohol problems focused primarily on the juveniles themselves. A new OJJDP program is looking at parenting programs and strategies to improve the skills of parents of high risk youth. This initiative will provide information about how parents can help prevent their children from becoming involved in drugs, alcohol, or crime.

Existing parenting programs are being identified and assessed to determine how effective they are in reducing delinquency and juvenile drug abuse. Based on these assessments, operating manuals and training materials will be developed and provided to community agencies to help them implement programs that teach parenting skills to parents of high risk youth.

Effective Parenting Strategies for Families of High Risk Youth

University of Utah, Social Research Institute, Room 130, Graduate School of Social Work, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112.

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 8521 Leesburg Pike, Suite 290, Vienna, Virginia 22180.

OJJDP Monitoring Offices: Special Emphasis Division, Lois Brown, and Research and Program Development Division, Barbara Tatem Kelley.

Neighborhood Drug Prevention Strategies

OJJDP, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention (OSAP) jointly are sponsoring a new program to mobilize neighborhoods, families, and individuals in high risk communities so they can address supply and demand issues of illegal drug use and implement neighborhood programs and initiatives to eliminate this problem.

The three agencies are working with the Congress of National Black Churches (CNBC) to establish an advisory board made up of national experts, policy decision-makers from nonprofit organizations and government agencies, businessmen, and clergy who will advise the CNBC. The model site for this program was initiated in Washington, D.C., where local black churches have established neighborhood-based planning groups to develop antidrug abuse plans of action. These local planning groups will be letting juveniles and the community know that drug abuse will not be tolerated. They will receive support and technical assistance from the Congress of National Black Churches to:

- Examine ways to support local police and drug enforcement organizations' efforts to eliminate drug use among juveniles.
- Tap into local and State resources to combat drug abuse.
- Determine ways to support existing neighborhood efforts to eliminate juvenile drug use.

Based on the experiences in Washington, D.C., an informational manual was developed to help other communities initiate similar community antidrug abuse programs.

Congress of National Black Churches' Community Anti-drug Abuse Program

Congress of National Black Churches, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, DC 20036.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Frank Smith.

Research: Examining Drug Use Among Ethnic and Minority Populations

Few facts are known about the prevalence of drug abuse among ethnic and minority populations or about the factors that may lead to their drug involvement. Although there is an increasing trend of drug abuse among ethnic and minority populations, some data indicate that specific population subgroups may be overrepresented in drug treatment programs. OJJDP and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) have cofunded five research projects to examine drug abuse among ethnic and minority populations from a variety of perspectives.

- The Center for the Improvement of Child Caring in Los Angeles is investigating the role of family attributes (such as social status, parent-child relationships, and stress) in enhancing or moderating the risk of substance abuse and juvenile delinquency in inner-city black youth.
- The Institute for Comparative Social and Cultural Studies, in Bethesda, Maryland, is determining if the way certain Hispanic population subgroups adapt to American culture contributes to juvenile substance abuse.
- The University of Maryland at Baltimore, Psychology Department, is studying the origin of substance abuse among unemployed black youth. Trained interviewers will collect information from 150 black male teenagers who are unemployed school dropouts.
- The University of Kentucky Research Foundation is analyzing the prevalence, causes, and consequences of drug use among minority populations to determine its effect on a juvenile's transition into adulthood.
- The University of Washington, Center for Social Research, is comparing the origins and patterns of drug use among black, Asian, and white urban youth. Researchers also will collect information from parents and youth about prevention strategies that are most likely to be well received by members of various ethnic groups.

Research on the Etiology of Drug Abuse Among Ethnic and Minority Populations

Program grantees are named above. For additional information, contact the OJJDP Monitoring Office listed below.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Catherine Sanders.

Coordinating Federal Juvenile Drug Abuse Prevention Efforts

As a result of President Reagan's leadership and the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, many Federal agencies are focusing their efforts on reducing and preventing illegal substance abuse by juveniles. To comprehensively and efficiently address the drug problem, programs must be coordinated with one another. They must not duplicate existing services, and they must be cost effective.

Although OJJDP received no additional funds through the 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act, the Office has taken the lead in coordinating all Federal programs dealing with illegal substance abuse and trafficking by our Nation's youth. Through the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP implemented a three-phase strategy to coordinate these programs and foster information sharing among the Council's member agencies. The Council, established by Congress, is chaired by the Attorney General and is comprised of Cabinet Secretaries and directors of various Federal agencies involved in juvenile matters. Mr. Verne L. Speirs, OJJDP Administrator, serves as Vice Chairman of the Council.

To enhance cooperation among agencies and to ensure that comprehensive services and programs target this problem, the Coordinating Council undertook several activities during FY 1987. First, the Council asked each member agency to identify its juvenile drug programs and suggest new projects for joint funding. The members identified 70 programs and shared information about them. This process not only gave each agency an opportunity to learn more about the efforts of other agencies, but also provided a forum for each agency to seek interest from the others in participating in cosponsored program activities.

The Council also developed a legislative matrix that identifies the activities required by each agency through the Anti-Drug Abuse Act, and charts program activities to ensure coordination and avoid duplication. Finally, the Council compiled an inventory of all materials and individuals available from Council member agencies to support drug and alcohol initiatives.

By serving as a catalyst to encourage Federal agencies to work together, the Council has been instrumental in encouraging collaborative research, demonstration, and training programs among Federal agencies. More than 15 joint activities have been initiated since the Council began its coordination efforts, and many other projects are being discussed for joint funding.

Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Office of the Administrator, Concentration of Federal Effort Program, Roberta Dorn.

Developing a National Strategy

In August 1986, President Reagan initiated a national crusade for a drug-free America. The President established the National Drug Policy Board, chaired by the Attorney General, to coordinate Federal efforts to control the supply and reduce the demand for illegal drugs.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has played an integral part in the achievement of the Administration's goals. Serving as the lead Federal agency on the Policy Board's Committee on High Risk Youth, OJJDP worked with 15 other Federal agencies and departments to establish a comprehensive national strategy for responding to youth who are especially vulnerable to involvement with illegal drugs, including economically disadvantaged youth, children of substance abusers, school dropouts, runaway or homeless youth, and youth who have committed a violent or delinquent act.

Because the problems of high risk youth are complex and interrelated, OJJDP and the Committee members developed an action plan that coordinates Federal, State, and local efforts among law enforcement, schools, treatment programs, courts, human service agencies, as well as the business community, and targets the participation and commitment of communities, families, and youth themselves.

Two guiding principles serve as the foundation for this national action plan: zero tolerance for illegal drug use and accountability on everyone's part for preventing and controlling illegal drug use. Four key strategies provide its framework:

- Promote a strong message that high risk youth who use illegal drugs are accountable for their behavior.
- Strengthen high risk families and promote their responsibility for preventing and intervening in illegal drug use by their children.
- Encourage communities to develop comprehensive responses to eliminate illegal drug use among high risk youth.
- Enhance the national leadership role of the Federal Government to encourage the development of comprehensive State and local responses to illegal drug use among high risk youth.

In FY 1987, the Committee on High Risk Youth identified 58 ongoing and planned Federal drug programs for high risk youth. In addition, the Committee learned about significant efforts at the State and local levels, as well as among national professional associations, grassroots organizations, and the private sector.

In November 1987, OJJDP Administrator, Verne Speirs, presented the High Risk Youth Committee's action plan to the National Drug Policy Board. The Committee is now working to implement its strategy and to continue developing its plan in light of FY 1988 and FY 1989 priorities.

National Drug Policy Board Committee on High Risk Youth

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Office of the Deputy Administrator.

Serious Juvenile Crime

Serious habitual offenders represent only a small proportion of the Nation's juvenile population. Yet, this group has the following characteristics:

- Responsible for a disproportionate amount of the crime committed by juveniles.
- Often "slip through the cracks" of the juvenile justice system.
- Histories most often include problems in school, illegal drug and alcohol use, and extensive involvement with juvenile justice agencies.
- Frequently come from families in which violence, neglect, abuse, and involvement in illegal activities are commonplace.
- Likely to become adult offenders.

Dealing with the serious habitual juvenile offender is becoming increasingly difficult. Too often, they are shuttled from one agency to another, because their behavior or problems necessitate attention beyond the authority, control, or capabilities of a particular agency. Frustration prompts many agencies to "pass the problem to someone else."

Often, serious habitual offenders move through the juvenile justice system unnoticed until some violent act forces the system to take a closer look at their past behavior. While many agencies in the system play important roles in the identification and treatment of juvenile offenders, quite often the response is fragmented.

As serious habitual juvenile offenders move through the justice system, patterns of delinquency and other problems emerge. Early identification of these problems as well as cooperative, systemwide information sharing and focusing of resources can help communities confront, apprehend, and respond to juvenile offenders before their problems become intractable. Furthermore, by working together to identify and deal with the serious juvenile offender, community agencies can help to reduce the amount of crimes these youth commit.

OJJDP is taking an active role in helping communities respond effectively to the problems associated with the serious habitual juvenile offender. New and ongoing initiatives will better define the causes of delinquent behavior, develop programs for this population, and implement systemwide responses to identify and respond to the serious habitual offender and ultimately reduce crime.

Intensive Prosecution

Four years ago, a series of demonstration projects targeting serious repeat delinquent youth for intensive prosecution and correctional intervention were funded in 13 prosecutors' offices around the country. The Habitual Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender Program focused on increasing public safety and reducing future offenses through swift and intensive prosecution and improved correctional programs for serious habitual offenders.

A national evaluation of this program is currently underway to:

- Determine how often participating district attorneys' offices targeted cases and used effective management and prosecution practices.
- Determine if the program reduced pretrial, trial, or dispositional delays.
- Evaluate consistency in case handling and management practices.
- Develop a management information system to improve identification, processing, and followup of youth who are habitual serious and violent offenders.

Preliminary findings indicate that targeting juvenile offenders for more intensive prosecution does reduce future offenses and improve public safety. Data from 2,585 program intakes of 2,233 different youth show that more than 70 percent have more than one previous formal adjudication with at least one prior adjudication for burglary or a violent offense. Additionally, 46 percent of the youth had been sentenced previously to a secure facility or to the State Department of Juvenile Corrections. Complete results of this research are expected to be released in FY 1988.

Evaluation of the Habitual Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender Program

American Institutes for Research, 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street NW., Washington, DC 20007.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Richard Sutton.

Community-Based Corrections

For many years, States and local jurisdictions have struggled with the issue of how best to deal with chronic serious juvenile offenders. What types of services are needed? What type of setting is most appropriate? How should services be delivered? To help State and local jurisdictions implement effective programs that address the problems of serious habitual juvenile offenders, OJJDP is evaluating promising innovative approaches for dealing with this population.

The evaluation, using an experimental and a control group, will determine the effectiveness of selected private sector programs in reducing recidivism among serious juvenile offenders. Four measures of postrelease criminal behavior are being considered: recidivism rates, recidivism rates controlling for risk, time to first failure, and arrest rates. Researchers also will examine management and programming techniques of private sector vendors as well as the regulatory factors that affect the quality and growth of these programs. Three programs—RCA Government Services in New Jersey, New Life Youth Services' Paint Creek Youth Center in Ohio, and the National Center for Institutions and Alternatives—are being studied. Final results of this evaluation will provide significant information to local communities on the best and most effective nontraditional approaches for handling serious habitual juvenile offenders. They are expected to be available in 1988.

An evaluation of the Vision Quest San Diego Project was recently completed. Its effectiveness was determined by comparing postarrest measures for the first 90 males graduating from the program with those of two similar groups: youth placed at the West Fork Probation Camp, and youth who refused a Vision Quest placement and were referred to other local or State programs.

More than 50 percent of all the juveniles in the study were arrested during the first 12 months following release. The Vision Quest group, however, had lower than expected recidivism rates, and a lower rearrest rate than either of the other comparison groups at the 6-, 12-, and 18-month interval. According to the study's findings, the estimated probability of an arrest during the first year for Vision Quest graduates is 39 percent, compared to 71 percent for youth released from the West Fork Probation Camp.

Evaluation of Private Sector Corrections Initiative for Serious Juvenile Offenders

The Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California 90406.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Douglas Thomas.

Research: Examining the Causes of Delinquent Behavior

Although considerable research has focused on the causes of delinquent behavior, much is still unknown about the reasons and factors behind juveniles' involvement in delinquency and illegal drugs. To answer some of the most pressing questions, OJJDP is funding three major research projects to examine the causes and correlates of delinquent behavior. This research will:

- Identify the different developmental stages and life experiences that lead either to positive socialization or to adaptation of a delinquent lifestyle.
- Identify factors that characterize at-risk children.
- Examine the etiology of delinquency and drug use in the context of the family, the community, and individual differences.
- Improve delinquency prevention efforts by enhancing professionals' ability to identify and intervene with at-risk youth.
- Improve the theoretical framework from which effective delinquency prevention programs and strategies can be developed.

In FY 1987, the three research projects worked together to develop joint strategies to ensure comprehensive coverage of research questions and to develop measures that are comparable. This cooperation represents a major advance in longitudinal research. To date, each of the research teams has refined its preliminary research design, identified samples, developed assessment instruments, and initiated data collection.

Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquent Behavior

State University of New York at Albany, Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center, 135 Western Avenue, Albany, New York 12222.

University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science, Campus Box 483, Boulder, Colorado 80309.

University of Pittsburgh, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, 3811 O'Hara Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Barbara Tatem Kelley.

Private Industry in Corrections

What are the most appropriate and effective treatment and placement options for serious habitual juvenile offenders? What services make a difference? How can juveniles be held accountable for their actions while in an institution? These are some of the important issues facing correctional programs today.

One response, pioneered by the California Youth Authority, is to develop and implement joint ventures between private companies and correctional authorities so that businesses can be established in juvenile correctional institutions. These businesses provide vocational training, general education, and paid employment experiences to incarcerated juvenile offenders. Juveniles learn to be responsible and accountable for their actions because portions of their wages go toward monetary restitution, victims funds, and the cost of their care.

Building on the California experience, OJJDP is looking at models of corrections ventures that are being implemented around the country. Following an assessment of these models, OJJDP will develop and test specific models in selected sites. Technical assistance and training will be provided to help implement these models, which will be evaluated by an independent contractor. Begun in FY 1987, this program will continue through 1990.

Juvenile Corrections/Joint Ventures

National Office for Social Responsibility, 222 South Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Frank Smith, and Research and Program Development Division, Douglas Thomas.

Intensive Supervision

Research indicates that many serious habitual juvenile offenders will become adult criminals. The more active a youth's criminal career, the more likely he is to continue his life of crime once he becomes an adult. State and local jurisdictions, as well as policymakers and researchers, have long debated the best approaches to treating juveniles so they do not become adult criminals. Certainly, the answer to this question is not an easy one. Crowding, disillusionment with traditional forms of probation and aftercare supervision, and the escalating costs of institutional care are prompting many States and communities to look for alternative ways to treat offenders that are effective, protect the public, and contain costs.

Intensive supervision programs are positive alternatives to traditional correctional placements for serious offenders who are amenable to community sentencing. Through a new initiative, OJJDP will identify promising and effective intensive supervision programs and will develop and test models in communities around the country. The first phase of this project involves an assessment of existing post-adjudication, nonresidential intensive supervision programs. Results of this assessment are anticipated in the latter part of 1988, with the total project completed toward the end of 1990.

Demonstration of Post-Adjudication Nonresidential Intensive Supervision Programs

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 77 Maiden Lane, 4th Floor, San Francisco, California 94108.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Richard Sutton, and Special Emphasis Division, Travis Cain.

Intensive Aftercare

Aftercare is one of the most important components of the juvenile justice system. However, aftercare is the most often overlooked, and sometimes forgotten, service provided to juveniles. Studies have shown that intensive aftercare programs can help juveniles successfully return to their communities. Intensive aftercare programming and services also can help to suppress further criminal activities.

OJJDP initiated a program in FY 1987 to assess existing intensive community-based aftercare services and programs and develop effective models. These models will be tested, and training and technical assistance materials will be developed and provided to local communities to help them implement the models. Results of the assessment phase are expected to be available by mid-1989.

Intensive Community-Based Aftercare

Johns Hopkins University, Charles and 34th Streets, Baltimore, Maryland 21218.

OJJDP Monitoring Offices: Special Emphasis Division, Frank Smith, and Research and Program Development Division, Daniel Bryant.

Improving Law Enforcement Handling of Juvenile Offenders

Little is known about which police processes and procedures are most effective for handling juvenile offenders who are involved with illegal drugs. To help law enforcement agencies work with this offender population, OJJDP funded a program in FY 1987 to identify, develop, and test effective police strategies for handling drug-involved delinquents.

This program will identify and develop policies and procedures to improve law enforcement's identification, screening, and referral of serious juvenile offenders, especially those involved in illegal drug activities. In addition, it will improve police strategies for diverting from the system those juveniles who are not involved in drugs or serious habitual criminal behavior.

Law Enforcement Handling of Juvenile Offenders

The Police Foundation, 1001 22nd Street NW., Room 200, Washington, DC 20037.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Benjamin Shapiro, and Research and Program Development Division, Douglas Thomas.

Juvenile Arsonists

In recent years, an increasing number of juveniles have been arrested for arson. The problem has a devastating effect on local communities, both economically and psychologically.

In FY 1987, through a cooperative agreement, OJJDP and the U.S. Fire Administration began a program to provide resources and information to communities to help them address the dangerous and difficult problem of juvenile arson. This nationwide effort will begin with a survey and assessment of promising arson prevention and intervention programs. From this assessment, prototypes will be created, followed by the development of training and technical assistance manuals. Training and technical assistance will then be provided to sites that will test the prototypes.

In addition, this project involves establishing a national public/private partnership. The partnership, made up of representatives from the insurance industry, various professional associations including corrections, probation, and firefighters, as well as Federal, State, and local government officials, will:

- Focus attention on the problem of juvenile arson.
- Provide expert advice, support, and assistance regarding ways to combat this nationwide concern.
- Identify solutions and approaches for local communities and States to consider when dealing with this issue.

National Juvenile Firesetter/Arson Control Prevention Program

Institute for Social Analysis, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20006.

OJJDP Monitoring Offices: Special Emphasis Division, Travis Cain, and Research and Program Development Division, Richard Sutton.

A Systemwide Response to Serious Juvenile Offenders

More than 3 years ago, OJJDP funded a demonstration program titled SHO/DI (Serious Habitual Offender/Drug Involved) to increase the juvenile justice system's ability to deal effectively with serious juvenile offenders who were also involved in illegal drug activities. SHO/DI implemented a successful systemwide, coordinated response to this problem population, and as a result, OJJDP developed a training and technical assistance program that replicates the program concepts of SHO/DI. This program, known as SHOCAP (Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program), helps local communities focus existing resources and attention on juveniles who repeatedly commit crimes, with particular emphasis on generating and sharing case information to make more informed placement and sentencing decisions. SHOCAP calls for the active participation and coordination of all agencies in the juvenile justice system—police, prosecution, courts, probation, corrections, aftercare, human service agencies, and schools—to develop systemwide responses and coordinated plans to deal with serious juvenile offenders.

SHOCAP is being implemented in more than 20 sites nationwide. Training and technical assistance is provided to local communities to:

- Develop and share accurate and usable information about serious habitual juvenile offenders among all components of the juvenile justice system.
- Develop systemwide standards and procedures to identify and track the serious habitual offender.
- Promote interagency coordination and cooperation to improve the flow and exchange of information throughout the juvenile justice system.
- Develop procedures to eliminate or reduce pretrial delays, case dismissals, plea bargaining, and sentencing reductions for serious habitual juvenile offenders.
- Encourage involvement and participation by all components of the system in placement and reintegration of the serious habitual juvenile offender within the community.

Many SHOCAP sites will serve as training and technical assistance resources for future SHOCAP sites. During FY 1987, the first SHOCAP site, Knoxville, Tennessee, received training. Site assessments were conducted in seven additional sites: Anne Arundel County, Maryland; Bellingham, Washington; Boise, Idaho; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Rapid City, South Dakota; Rocky Mount, North Carolina; and Toledo, Ohio. Training in these sites will take place in FY 1988.

Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program (SHOCAP)

Public Administration Service, 1497 Chain Bridge Road, McLean, Virginia 22101.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Robert Heck.

Private Sector Probation

In recent years, debate about how to improve the delivery of juvenile probation services has intensified. While some argue that only the public sector should provide probation services, others argue that the private sector can more efficiently and cost effectively deliver those services. In addition, they argue that the private sector can be held more accountable than the public sector for delivering probation services.

In response to this debate, OJJDP is exploring the feasibility of having private contractors provide selected juvenile probation services. OJJDP funded the National Office for Social Responsibility to examine this practice and provide technical assistance and training to selected jurisdictions. Five sites are currently receiving technical assistance and training to help transfer publicly operated probation services to private sector vendors. They are the City and County of San Francisco, California; Second Judicial District, Utah; Cuyahoga County, Ohio; Kenosha County, Wisconsin; and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Local public/private partnerships established in each jurisdiction help to develop strategies to "privatize" probation services. Thus far, each site has analyzed its existing probation system and established a clear set of goals and objectives for probation services.

Most of the sites identified services for status offenders as appropriate for private sector intervention. During FY 1987, the sites developed Requests for Proposals (RFP's) to contract with the private sector for probation services. One jurisdiction is contracting with the private sector to establish a community-based corrections center that will provide all court-related services. Another will be contracting portions of its detention management functions to the private sector.

The experiences, processes used, and information generated from this program will help other jurisdictions weigh the pros and cons of private sector delivery of probation services. During the next year, training will be provided to:

-
- Help other jurisdictions analyze their probation services.
 - Identify selected services that are appropriate for contracting to the private sector.
 - Develop the best mechanisms for contracting out these services.

Private Sector Probation Initiative

National Office for Social Responsibility, 222 South Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, John Dawson.

Law Enforcement Training

More than 50 percent of police contacts involve juveniles. Police officers are usually the first exposure a juvenile has to the justice system. They can, and do, exercise discretion in deciding whether to handle formally or informally a case involving a juvenile. For example, they may arrest a juvenile and take him or her to a court intake unit for formal processing, or they may call the youth's parents and let the family impose punishment.

Because of the important contribution law enforcement makes to the juvenile justice system, OJJDP provides training and technical assistance to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies that deal with juvenile-related problems. Intensive training courses, offered through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia, increase police officers' knowledge of juvenile delinquency and victimization and help them respond more effectively to juveniles who are involved in or are victims of crime and violence. Participants in the training sessions not only learn new techniques and methods for handling juveniles and managing their department's juvenile unit, but they also are able to transfer this knowledge to other law enforcement professionals at the State and local levels.

The four training courses offered through this program are:

- **POLICY I (Police Operations Leading to Improved Children and Youth Services)**, a 4-day seminar for law enforcement policymakers to discuss salient issues, develop policies, and learn management strategies to increase departmental effectiveness by integrating juvenile services with other law enforcement activities.
- **POLICY II**, a 4-day follow-up training seminar for law enforcement executives that builds upon the materials and strategies presented in POLICY I and provides step-by-step methods and procedures to implement policies and improve police productivity in juvenile justice areas.
- **Child Abuse and Exploitation Investigative Techniques Training Program (CAEITTP)**, a 4 1/2-day intensive training program in advanced law enforcement techniques and adjudicatory factors relating to child abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

-
- **SAFE POLICY**, a new offering initiated during FY 1987 to address system-wide issues pertaining to the effective handling and treatment of juveniles. This workshop, one of the first of its kind, brings together teams of local policymaking professionals, including police, probation, schools, prosecution, and youth services, to develop comprehensive plans to overcome the lack of coordination and information-sharing prevalent among agencies.

A Drug Abuse Issues component was recently added to the POLICY and SAFE POLICY seminars. This module emphasizes the importance of aggressive enforcement combined with a strong prevention program to eliminate juveniles' illegal drug use and trafficking.

Together, these four training programs have reached law enforcement and juvenile justice personnel across the country. In FY 1987, five regional SAFE POLICY training workshops were conducted. In addition, 1,599 criminal justice personnel from all 50 States and several territories participated in POLICY I and II and CAEITTP training programs.

Juvenile Justice Training for State and Local Law Enforcement Personnel

U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of State and Local Programs, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Glynco, Georgia 31524.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, Ron Laney.

Missing, Abused, or Exploited Youth

Missing and exploited children pose a major concern for our Nation. Missing children include those who run away, are pushed out or thrown out of their homes, are victims of parental abduction, or are victims of nonfamily abduction. Many missing children return home. Many of them, however, become victims of physical and sexual abuse. Some of them are murdered.

Congress passed the Missing Children's Assistance Act in 1984 to give impetus to the development and funding of research to determine the annual incidence of missing children, the psychological consequences of missing episodes on both parents and children, and effective police investigative practices in missing children cases. The Act also called for the establishment of a national resource center and clearinghouse, a toll-free telephone line for reporting information about missing children, and an Attorney General's Advisory Board on Missing Children. OJJDP's Missing Children's Program, established through this 1984 amendment to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, serves as the central coordinating mechanism for all Federal, public, and private agencies involved with missing and exploited children's issues.

In spite of the increased national emphasis on the problem of missing and exploited children, many questions remain.

- How many children are missing or exploited each year?
- What resources, effective programs, and services should be developed to meet adequately their needs and the needs of their families?
- What can the Nation do to prevent the victimization of children?

The safety of our Nation's children is an OJJDP priority. Parents and children must be secure in knowing that schools, social service agencies, law enforcement, and the courts are well-prepared both to prevent and respond to the needs of missing and exploited children.

OJJDP funds several programs and services that support the prevention, recovery, and treatment of missing and exploited children and their families. Some of these programs are described on the following pages.

Child Abuse Prosecution

Through the National Center for the Prosecution of Child Abuse, OJJDP provides the Nation's district attorneys with training, technical assistance, and information about ways to effectively prosecute cases of child sexual and physical abuse. Through more vigorous prosecution and investigation of child abuse cases and the development of model legislation, this program helps to minimize the trauma child victims experience in the justice system.

In FY 1987, the Center published "Investigation and Prosecution of Child Abuse," a detailed guide for investigators and prosecutors of child abuse cases. This manual provides specific information and guidance about how to handle juvenile victims, the role of the prosecutor in marshalling resources, and ways to improve the prosecution and processing of child abuse and sexual exploitation cases. This manual has already been distributed to more than 1,200 prosecutors nationwide.

National Center for the Prosecution of Child Abuse

American Prosecutors Research Institute, National District Attorneys Association, Suite 200,
1033 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Benjamin Shapiro.

Expanding Services for Missing Children

Many private volunteer organizations (PVO's) throughout the country provide direct services to missing children and their families. These services include toll-free hotlines, family support services, prevention and education programs and materials, and various counseling services.

To increase the range of services provided to missing children and their families, OJJDP provides grants to PVO's to establish new programs or expand existing services. In FY 87, 38 private, nonprofit, missing children's organizations nationwide received grants for programs aimed at preventing the abduction and sexual exploitation of children and assisting in the location and safe return of missing children.

Assistance to Missing Children's Private Volunteer Organizations

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division,
Sylvia Sutton.

Training Private Volunteer Organizations

Private nonprofit organizations serving missing and exploited children and their families work closely with the public. They provide valuable services, including prevention and education programs, victim counseling, photo distribution, family support, shelter, and legal services. Staff of these organizations, often volunteers who are personally committed to the issue, need training particularly in the areas of networking and fundraising.

OJJDP provides management and administrative support, training, and technical assistance to the private volunteer missing children's agencies and organizations to strengthen their operations, improve service delivery, and promote self-sufficiency. This program of technical assistance and training:

- Increases the ability of private volunteer organizations to provide services to missing children and their families.
- Disseminates information through regional and national conferences.
- Helps promote close relationships between private volunteer organizations and existing national resources such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

During FY 1987, 161 participants from 99 private volunteer agencies attended 8 regional training workshops and 1 national conference. Training, which focused on such areas as fundraising, volunteer management, advocacy, legal rights, and child safety helped administrators become better managers and stewards of their resources. In addition, 69 individuals from 49 organizations received financial assistance to help them attend these meetings and 40 private volunteer organizations received onsite technical assistance to help them improve services to missing and exploited children and their families.

Training and Technical Assistance in Organization and Administrative Management for Private Volunteer Organizations Involved with Missing and Exploited Children

Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management, 518 17th Street, Suite 388, Denver, Colorado 80202.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, J. Robert Lewis.

The testimony of the child victim often is a key element in the successful prosecution of individuals who commit crimes against them. Providing such testimony can be devastating to a young victim of abduction or sexual exploitation. In fact, parents frequently decide to drop charges rather than subject their children to the lengthy judicial process.

To reduce the trauma faced by young victims and improve the justice system's processing of child abusers, OJJDP is funding a 3-year research project to:

- Increase information and knowledge about how legal proceedings affect child witnesses.
- Develop and test effective strategies—such as avoiding direct confrontation between young witnesses and defendants, permitting special exceptions to hearsay evidence for sexually abused children, and eliminating or modifying competency criteria for child victims—to change court policies to be supportive of child victim/witnesses.
- Work with local communities to establish collaborative relationships among the courts, prosecutors, judges, law enforcement, and protective services personnel so that procedures will be implemented to reduce the trauma children experience during the legal process.

The study sites include: Polk County (Des Moines), Iowa; Ramsey County (St. Paul), Minnesota; Erie County (Buffalo), New York; and San Diego County, California. Courts in each jurisdiction selected such strategies as video taping and counseling to be tested to determine their ability to reduce children's trauma and improve the legal processing of child abusers.

Child Victim as a Witness

Education Development Center, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Catherine Sanders.

Providing Comprehensive Support and Assistance

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) was established in 1984 to initiate a nationwide effort to protect children and provide direct assistance to all professionals who handle cases involving missing, exploited, or victimized children. NCMEC is a nonprofit corporation that serves as a national resource and technical assistance center for dealing with the issues of missing and exploited children. It coordinates with agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels, and provides a wide variety of services to ensure the safety and protection of children, including the following:

Toll-free hotline. The NCMEC toll-free hotline—1-800-843-5678—receives information daily about the location of missing children and cases of child exploitation. In 1987, the Center received 55,834 calls through its hotline, including requests for information, reports of possible cases involving missing or exploited children, and possible sightings by citizens. In 1987, the number of cases of sexual exploitation reported through the hotline increased more than three times from the previous year.

Technical assistance. A staff of technical advisers at NCMEC responds to calls from parents, law enforcement, and others working on specific cases of missing children. In 1987, the Center provided 8 instances of onsite technical assistance and 5,564 instances of technical assistance to aid in the recovery of missing children. Training for law enforcement and criminal justice personnel in the areas of child abuse, exploitation, and the detection, identification, and investigation of missing child cases also was provided in 1987; 5,687 criminal justice and law enforcement personnel participated in this onsite training program.

The Center develops publications for parents and families, and training and educational materials for professionals. Since 1984, more than 2 million free publications have been distributed, including:

- Four publications focused on State legislation regarding missing children's cases.
- A series of seven publications titled, *Just in Case...*, for parents.

-
- Resource materials for individuals involved in investigating missing children and sexual abuse cases.
 - Many other publications that address such issues as child molestation, parental kidnapping, and child protection.

NCMEC also conducts a yearly national conference for professionals working with missing children cases. The 1987 conference included workshops on case investigation techniques and procedures, the psychological effects of child victimization on the family, school safety curriculum development, public awareness, legal issues, and coordination among nonprofit organizations.

National Center For Missing and Exploited Children

Suite 700, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Robert Heck.

Police and Missing Children

Law enforcement agencies play a key role in responding to cases of missing children. However, little is known about the techniques they use to investigate and manage such cases. Even less is known about their policies and practices.

OJJDP is funding a research program to improve the law enforcement response to missing children and homeless youth cases. Specifically, the research will determine the extent of the missing child and homeless youth problem as reported to law enforcement, and the scope and variety of law enforcement policies and procedures that relate to missing children. The effects of current policies and procedures on recovery of missing children also will be examined and the most promising and effective police practices will be identified. Model programs will be designed and disseminated to police and other juvenile justice agencies.

During the spring and summer of FY 1987, a mail survey was sent to 1,060 State and local law enforcement agencies to obtain information about the characteristics of each department, the numbers and types of reported missing children cases during 1986, and the departments' response to this problem. Preliminary results from the 75 percent that responded to this survey indicate that:

- More reports of missing runaways were received in 1986 than any other type of missing child case.
- Most departments complete a written report when first notified of a missing child. Rarely did departments indicate that there was a waiting period for accepting reports of missing children, an apparent change from a few years ago when many departments forced parents to wait up to 72 hours before filing a report.
- Most departments send a police officer to the home, conduct personal interviews with the parents or guardians of the missing child, and obtain a description of the child.
- Most departments report the case to State and national missing persons files.
- Investigations tend to be more active for cases of stranger abduction or unknown missing cases where the child is more vulnerable.

Preliminary findings suggest that having detailed, written policies is associated with more vigorous investigations of runaway and other missing children cases. To encourage more active investigations, research indicates that departments should develop written policies that identify specific investigative actions to be taken when children are reported missing.

Additional implications are likely to emerge from this ongoing research. During personal visits to 30 police departments around the country, a more complete understanding of the complex factors affecting the police response to cases of missing children and homeless youth will be gained to make recommendations for legal, organizational, and community change.

National Study of Law Enforcement Policies and Practices Regarding Missing Children and Homeless Youth

Research Triangle Institute, P.O. Box 12194, Research Triangle, North Carolina 27709.

The URSA Institute, China Basin Suite 6600, 185 Berry Street, San Francisco, California 94107.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Douglas Thomas.

Research: Determining the Extent of the Missing Children Problem

While the exact number of children missing each year is not known, current estimates are in the hundreds of thousands. Although most missing children eventually return home, many fall prey to physical or sexual abuse, drugs, violence, and even homicide. To better understand the nature of the problem and ensure the safety of our Nation's young people, it is essential to develop reliable information on the numbers and types of missing children. Congress mandated that OJJDP periodically conduct national incidence studies to determine, for a given year, the actual number of children reported missing, the number of children who are victims of abduction by strangers, the number of children who are victims of parental abduction, and the number of children who are recovered each year. In FY 1987, OJJDP implemented the National Studies of the Incidence of Missing Children.

To help prepare for the National Studies, several pilot studies, completed in 1987, looked at strategies and methods for estimating the incidence of missing children. Using random digit dialing, the Northwestern University Survey Lab (NUSL) conducted telephone interviews with parents and guardians. The University of Illinois' Survey Research Laboratory (SRL) tested a data collection approach relying on network samples.

The NUSL work suggests that carefully constructed and properly conducted surveys using random digit dialing can produce useful estimates of the numbers of missing children within a given period of time. This pilot study found that parents are willing to be interviewed on the telephone about their experiences with missing child incidents. Validity checks suggest that the majority of missing children's incidents were accurately reported to interviewers.

SRL measured the accuracy with which specific networks report missing children. While certain network reports do not appear to be accurate for estimation purposes, they may be useful for locating households with missing children, especially for the more serious abductions.

The pilot studies indicate that several data collection and analysis methods will be necessary to obtain valid statistics and information in the National Studies of the Incidence of Missing Children, including:

- A telephone survey of 40,000 households.
- A law enforcement records study.
- Special analyses of the existing data bases, including the Study of the National Incidence and Prevalence of Child Abuse and the FBI's Supplemental Homicide Report.

Preliminary findings from the National Incidence Study are expected to be available in the summer of 1988, with the final report completed in mid-1989. Results of this research will have far-reaching implications for better educational and prevention programs and improved agency responses.

The National Studies of the Incidence of Missing Children

Family Research Lab, Horton Social Science Center, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Barbara Allen-Hagen.

Helping Families Cope

The disappearance of a child has devastating effects on the child, his parents, and his siblings. While the immediate effects of an abduction or runaway incident are apparent, little is known about the long-term consequences of these tragedies on both the child and the family. OJJDP is funding a research project to identify and document treatment strategies that are effective in easing this trauma, both during the time of the disappearance and after the child is recovered. Five missing children's programs are working directly with the researchers on this project. They include: Illinois State Enforcement Agencies to Recover Children (ISEARCH), Chicago, Illinois; Southern California Adam Walsh Child Resource Center, Orange, California; Lost Child Network, Kansas City, Missouri; Adam Walsh Missing Children's Center, Orlando, Florida; and American Missing Children's Foundation, San Francisco, California.

This research project will explore and test the following hypotheses suggested from previous studies:

- Children and families experience significant reactions to the trauma of abduction, some of which may not appear until long after the trauma.
- There are no clear differences in trauma reactions based on age or sex of the child victim, parents, or siblings.
- Factors that may increase a child's vulnerability to trauma include prior emotional disturbances, family instability, lack of family or community support, coercion, sexual exploitation, length and source of trauma.
- Factors that may reduce a child's vulnerability to trauma include a stable family environment, absence of prior emotional disturbance, family or community support, and psychological intervention.

The study will address all categories of missing children, including family abductions, nonfamily abductions, runaways, and throwaways. Data collection will begin from the initial contact made by the parents or guardians to the missing children's program and will continue throughout the period of time that the child is missing, recovered, or during the period of nonrecovery. Researchers not only will collect data about the time prior to the child's disappearance, but also will document the types of psychological services provided to both parents and siblings.

Results of this research will benefit families of missing children and the agencies and professionals who serve them. Effective programs and approaches for reducing trauma will be identified and training materials will be developed to help communities implement these effective approaches. The data generated from this study can help to improve parent education, prevention programs for children, and the services of nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, an increased knowledge of the social and emotional consequences of child abduction and exploitation will help the judicial system more effectively adjudicate these crimes.

Families of Missing Children—Psychological Consequences and Promising Interventions

University of California, Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute, San Francisco, California
94143.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Catherine Sanders.

Schools

Schools frequently are overlooked as a complement to the juvenile justice system. In reality, schools are a critical focus for delinquency prevention efforts.

School administrators and educators, however, are challenged with a complex set of tasks. They are not only responsible for educating our children, but often must play the role of disciplinarian. Studies have shown that the most important characteristics of effective schools are strong instructional leadership, a safe and orderly climate, an emphasis on basic skills both in the classroom and throughout the school, high teacher expectations for student achievement, and a frequent review and assessment of students' progress. These standards become increasingly difficult to attain in light of high student-teacher ratios, the rate of absenteeism and dropouts, and the presence of crime, violence, and drug use and trafficking in many of our Nation's schools.

OJJDP is acutely aware of the diverse roles and problems facing school systems across the country. More importantly, OJJDP recognizes that schools are an integral component of all delinquency prevention efforts. Several OJJDP programs provide support to school administrators and educators in responding to increasing crime and violence as well as offer positive ways to return schools to safe, orderly learning centers.

For many years, OJJDP has recognized the important contribution that schools make to delinquency prevention. Since 1984, OJJDP has funded the National School Safety Center (NSSC) to bring national attention to problems that disrupt the educational process. Special emphasis is placed on ridding schools of crime, violence, and drugs, and improving school discipline, attendance, student achievement, and the learning environment.

NSSC provides technical assistance, offers legal and legislative aid, and produces publications and films for educators and juvenile justice practitioners to help them deal with crime and violence on the school campus.

NSSC activities include:

- Responding to more than 2,500 requests per month in 1987 from practitioners and the public for technical assistance or resource materials.
- Producing and distributing *School Safety*, a news journal, three times per year to communicate trends, issues, and exemplary programs. More than 55,000 school administrators, chief law officers, judges, legislators, and other education and juvenile justice personnel in all 50 States receive this publication.
- Developing and disseminating several publications, including *School Crime and Violence: Victims' Rights*, *School Discipline Notebook*, *Gangs in Schools*, and *Right to Safe Schools*. Currently, publications on schoolyard bullying, juvenile records and confidentiality, and a comprehensive school safety checkbook are being developed.
- Publishing *Resource Papers* on such school safety topics as student and staff victimization and alternative schools for disruptive youth.
- Sponsoring "America's Safe Schools Week." The third week of October has been set aside to promote exemplary schools and successful programs that prevent school crime, improve discipline, increase attendance, and suppress drug trafficking and abuse.

In 1987, NSSC sponsored the first “Schoolyard Bully Practicum,” released a new public service campaign titled, “Drug-Free Schools Campaign,” and received national exposure on ABC News “20/20” for its docudrama, “What’s Wrong With This Picture?”. The docudrama, designed to motivate classroom discussions about safety problems on school campuses, has received many awards for excellence. More than 600 copies have been distributed nationally.

National School Safety Center

National School Safety Center, Pepperdine University, 16830 Ventura Blvd., Suite 200, Encino, California 91436.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, Leonard Johnson.

Quitting school is part of a cycle that frequently includes crime, illiteracy, unemployment, teenage pregnancy, and illegal drug and alcohol use. In addition, many school dropouts live under poor economic conditions that include inadequate housing, clothing, food, and health care.

Cities in Schools (CIS) began on the lower east side of Manhattan in the 1960's to address the school dropout issue. CIS is a national program of public/private partnerships that work with potential dropouts and their families to help the students remain in school and ultimately become more productive citizens.

Because troubled youth must often seek help from agencies located in different parts of town, CIS brings existing public and private services to the schools where they can most benefit these youth and their families. In doing so, CIS helps assure that comprehensive, diverse services are provided in a timely and cost effective manner without creating new or duplicative services.

Three central principles guide CIS: A relationship must be established between a troubled youth and a caring adult, the youth and service provider must be held accountable, and fragmented services must be coordinated and made available to youth and their families.

Cities in Schools operates in 22 cities at 93 different education sites. Thirty-one additional cities are in various stages of preparation for CIS implementation. Eight States have initiated statewide programs. More than 12,000 students have participated in or received services of the CIS program. CIS has been highly successful in coordinating efforts with local Private Industry Councils (PIC), funded by the Department of Labor, to assure that job-related services are provided to at-risk youth and their families, and that social services are provided to CIS-involved PIC clients.

Students are referred to CIS because of low academic achievement, poor attendance, disruptive behavior, or family problems. Counselors, social workers, and volunteers work with the students to:

- Improve their personal, educational, and social development skills.
- Develop and provide positive and successful employment skills and attitudes.

-
- Encourage and increase the involvement of parents and families in CIS activities and services.
 - Reinforce positive behavior and avoid negative behavior such as drug and alcohol use, crime and delinquency.
 - Reduce school violence and vandalism.
 - Reduce absenteeism.
 - Reduce dropout rates.

At the cornerstone of CIS operations are local and national public/private partnerships. Business and community leaders comprise local organizing committees and governing boards of the program. Nationally, entertainment figures, including Herb Alpert, Lionel Richie, and Burt Bacharach, have been active in their support of the program.

Cities in Schools

Cities in Schools, Inc., 1023 15th Street NW., Suite 600, Washington, DC 20005.
OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Lois Brown.

Using the Law to Improve School Order and Safety

Studies show that developing and applying clear rules of conduct and a consistent disciplinary policy contribute to low misbehavior rates in school. However, complying with such rules and policies is complicated by the professional philosophies, teaching styles, and legal constraints that characterize local school systems.

Since 1986, OJJDP has funded a research and development project to assess existing school disciplinary policies and procedures, as well as develop and test new policies and procedures designed to reduce school crime and disorder. Schools with high rates of crime and violence in two cities, Chicago, Illinois, and Providence, Rhode Island, are the focus of this research.

In Providence, an analysis of relevant legislation, case law, and litigation against the schools resulted in revisions to policies and procedures in targeted schools and the implementation of new disciplinary codes. While the impact of these changes will be assessed, school administrators believe the modified codes have contributed directly to reduced school disciplinary actions.

In Chicago, researchers conducted surveys to determine the attitudes of teachers, parents, school administrators, and students toward school crime and law and their effect on disciplinary policies and practices. Interviews with teachers revealed that teachers were reluctant to exert forceful discipline because they feared lawsuits from parents and perceived the courts to rule against teachers in these matters. In fact, Illinois law provides strong protection against teacher tort liability. Understanding perceptions and facts as a result of these surveys will help in the formulation of policies and procedures that match the attitudes and needs of the local school system.

In the next phase of this study, expected to be completed during 1989, researchers will document the effect of new disciplinary and school crime control policies and practices.

By creating a better understanding of teacher, parent, student, and school roles, rights, and responsibilities, and by developing disciplinary policies and procedures that reflect the characteristics of the school and the school “family,” this project will contribute to a safer environment in our Nation’s schools.

School Crime and Discipline Research and Development Program

Education Development Center, Inc. 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts, 02160.

The Board of Trustees, University of Illinois at Chicago, Box 4343, Chicago, Illinois 60680.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Daniel Bryant.

Law-Related Education

Law-related education (LRE) helps students understand rights and responsibilities associated with everyday life. It teaches youngsters about good citizenship, helps them become more accountable for their actions, and promotes respect for the law. Youth who understand laws and their purpose are more likely to respect them and less likely to violate them.

A national study suggests that law-related education, when properly taught, can reduce students' tendency to engage in delinquent behavior, enhance their understanding of our legal system, and help them develop more constructive attitudes toward the law. Through LRE, teachers, lawyers, judges, legislators, and other law-related professionals work together to increase students' understanding about the law and the legal system.

Since 1978, OJJDP has funded a national law-related education effort. Today, 480 school districts across the country and 983,000 students participate in LRE programs. Thirty-four States have developed statewide law-related education programs in their schools. It is anticipated that by 1991, law-related education programs will be institutionalized in all States.

The five LRE grantees support a variety of activities and provide a wide range of services to local LRE projects:

- The American Bar Association, Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship (ABA/YEFC) serves as the national clearinghouse for LRE information. ABA/YEFC conducts annual seminars for program participants; publishes *LRE Report*, the *LRE Project Exchange*, and *Update on Law-Related Education*; and conducts special programs including the Youth Bicentennial Initiative and the Bar-School Partnership Program.
- The Center for Civic Education, Law in a Free Society Project (CCE/LFS) provides assistance to State and local projects, including developing and using community advisory boards to support local programs, public/private partnership conferences, train the trainer institutes, and teacher workshops. CCE/LFS has developed several instructional materials: *Authority, Privacy, Justice, and Responsibility*; *Leaders Handbook*; *Casebook: Selected Readings for Teachers*; and a curriculum guide.

- The Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF) helps school districts develop and strengthen law-related education models. CRF trains teachers, administrators, law-related professionals, and community volunteers to use LRE materials to hold statewide student mock trial competitions; to pair students with lawyers to teach them lessons about law-related education; to link professionals with youth to complete community service projects through the Youth Leadership/Mentor/Community Service Program; and to provide young people with a forum to discuss critical legal issues through the *Youth and Justice* newspaper and radio programs.
- The National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law (NICEL) helps foster understanding of the law and the legal system through several program activities, including School-Based Programs, Law School Programs, Mentor Programs, Juvenile Court Alternative Programs, and Juvenile Correction Education. NICEL is working with the National Crime Prevention Council to develop and test a lesson plan on teen crime victimization in its Teens, Crime and Community Program. NICEL produced *Street Law: A Course in Practical Education, Law and the Consumer, Education for Citizenship Series*, and *Teen Crime and the Community: Education and Action for Safer Schools and Neighborhoods*.
- Phi Alpha Delta (PAD) Public Service Center works closely with LRE programs to generate grassroots support among local bar associations, school districts, juvenile justice agencies, and other community organizations. PAD holds conferences with law school faculty, organizes mock trial competitions, and trains law enforcement officers to further law-related education. PAD publications include *State Courts and Law-Related Education, The Law Enforcement Officer—Education Partnership*, and the monograph series titled, *Crime and the Decline of Values*.

Law-Related Education

Program grantees are named above. For additional information, contact the OJJDP Monitoring Office listed below.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, Leonard Johnson.

Using Juveniles as Crime Prevention Resources

Studies have shown that teenagers, aged 12 to 19, are more frequent victims of crime than any other age group. Providing them with information about how to protect their peers and themselves from crime can be an effective tool in working against the exploitation and victimization of juveniles. Until recently, juveniles were often overlooked as participants in self-defense and crime prevention efforts.

OJJDP supports a national program to help teenagers understand how crime affects them, their families, friends, and community, and how they can prevent crime and make their schools and communities safe. Through a law-related education curriculum, teenagers learn how the legal system operates, and how they can become a vital force in protecting themselves and others through school and community involvement. Teenagers participate in many activities, including peer counseling, elderly escort services, education coalitions, and speakers' bureaus. More than 15,000 teenagers in 156 schools in 15 major metropolitan areas around the country participate in this program, including:

- Dallas, Texas, where public, private, and parochial schools take part in the program. The Teen Crime Prevention Council, also called STOP (Students Teaching Others Pride), mobilized students to "blanket" Dallas with crime prevention brochures to reduce crime around the city.
- Knoxville, Tennessee, where the Mayor, at the urging of the Teen Crime Prevention Council, declared the city's first Victims Rights Week in April 1987.
- St. Louis, Missouri, as well as many other sites, where the local Teen Crime, and Community Initiative has spurred other grants and crime prevention activities. In St. Louis, State funding was received to develop a mediation training program conducted by two schools.

"Watch Out-Help Out," the theme for Crime Prevention Month in April 1987, was designed to make citizens more aware and active in crime prevention activities.

As part of this effort, communities were urged to increase juvenile awareness and participation in crime control activities, work with juveniles to prevent victimization, and provide recreational and service opportunities for juveniles to prevent crime and delinquency.

Teen Victimization/Youth as Resources

National Crime Prevention Council, Room 540, 733 15th Street NW., Washington, DC 20005.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Benjamin Shapiro.



Families

Families contribute significantly to the socialization and development of children. Parents help children learn how to interact with others, control their behavior, differentiate between right and wrong, and get along with peers and siblings.

Although research increasingly points to the fact that family characteristics and experiences influence a child's development, many families face tremendous pressures and obstacles that prevent them from providing the necessary support and guidance to their children. Divorce and separation may affect the stability of a family. More importantly, juvenile delinquency, acting out behavior, drug abuse and alcoholism, combined with the inability of parents to handle these life traumas, can have a great impact on the family unit as well as the child's development.

Parents play an important role in teaching their children to be responsible, law abiding citizens. Teaching parents skills to shape the behavior of their children, apply appropriate discipline for negative behavior, and consistently reward positive behavior can help to reduce some forms of delinquent behavior and subsequent delinquency. Providing parents and guardians with training, support, and skills to respond effectively to the varying needs and behaviors of their children is the focus of several OJJDP-sponsored programs.

Finding Permanent Families

Research shows that youth need permanent, stable families to develop well. The foster care system of a decade ago allowed youth to drift from family to family, often bringing added trauma to children because of separation and loss of family. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) has been helping State and local jurisdictions implement changes not only to prevent the unnecessary removal of abused and neglected children from their families, but also to ensure permanent families for those children for whom separation is necessary.

The NCJFCJ is working with State Permanency Planning Task Forces to change policies, procedures, and legal and court processes that govern the removal of children from their homes and their subsequent placement in foster care. These task forces, composed of representatives from all branches of State government and the private sector, are examining ways to address legal, procedural, and social issues relating to children in foster care.

State Permanency Planning Task Forces resulted from Congress' passage of the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act (PL 96-272), which called for changes in the foster care system to provide checks and balances for children in foster care. Over the past 4 1/2 years, NCJFCJ has been providing training, technical assistance, and support to States in their development of State Permanency Planning Task Forces. Thirty-five States established these task forces to serve as a conduit for change. As a result, it is estimated that the number of children living in foster care each year has dropped by almost half.

Permanent Families for Abused and Neglected Children

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Box 8970, Reno, Nevada 89507.
OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division,
J. Robert Lewis.

Volunteer Court Advocates

It is estimated that 350,000 children live in foster care. Many of these children, who have been abused, neglected or exploited, have not been given the best possible representation in court. In many cases, they appear before the court without the benefit of adequate case preparation, support, and guidance.

More than a decade ago, a program was established to guarantee that children, whose custody decisions become the responsibility of the court because of abuse, neglect, or exploitation, receive the best possible services. The Court Appointed Special Advocates Guardian Ad Litem (CASA/GAL) program trains volunteers to work directly with children both during and after the court process. The volunteer thoroughly investigates the facts of the case, and recommends to the court a course of action that serves the best interest of the child. The volunteer appears at all court hearings, ensuring that children receive the services and resources they need.

The National CASA Association was established to serve as a national information clearinghouse for the individual CASA/GAL programs. It conducts public awareness campaigns and sponsors an annual conference for CASA/GAL programs. The Association provides videotapes, guideline manuals, and public service announcements to local communities to increase public awareness, generate local support, and improve operations and management of CASA/GAL programs.

In 1987, approximately 12,000 CASA volunteers worked directly with more than 40,000 children. CASA/GAL operates in more than 43 States. Today 271 individual programs, including eight statewide programs, exist. Of these, 95 are administered by State governments.

Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA): A National Training and Technical Assistance Project

National Court Appointed Special Advocates Association, 909 NE. 43rd Street, Suite 202, Seattle, Washington 98105-6020.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, J. Robert Lewis.

Strengthening the Family

Hispanic youth and their families are the focus of a multiyear project stressing more effective treatment of child abuse, neglect, exploitation, and runaway behavior. Through this project, OJJDP provides technical assistance and training to community-based organizations to help them:

- Accurately identify and clinically treat Hispanic youth who are runaways or who are sexually or physically abused or exploited.
- Monitor and evaluate program interventions used to prevent running away and sexual exploitation of youth.
- Mobilize concerned parents and neighborhood volunteers to monitor, supervise, and implement a “safe school” program to reduce vandalism and school crime on the local school campus.

A key feature of this project is its emphasis on networking with local resources to provide comprehensive services, support, and intervention. Families, schools, social service agencies, judicial and law enforcement departments, as well as other community-based resources participate in program activities to strengthen families and reduce potential delinquency among Hispanic youth. Several thousand youth and their families have been served by the project organizations.

Twelve Project Hope programs that have received OJJDP funds have become leaders in the field of child abuse and neglect and crisis intervention strategies for Hispanic youth and their families, offering such services as prevention programs, community education and awareness campaigns, and intervention and treatment for physical abuse clients. The projects include:

- Youth Development, Inc., in Albuquerque, New Mexico, which provides counseling services to youth and their families through its school-based “Partnership Program.” It is estimated that as a result of Project Hope, the rate of runaways among youth served by the project has dropped 45 percent.
- A parent/child goal setting and life planning program in Santurce, Puerto Rico, which encourages youth between the ages of 10 and 14 to stay in school.

-
- Centro de Amistad, Inc., in Guadalupe, Arizona, through which clinical teams provide counseling and treatment to Hispanic and Indian families suffering from physical, emotional, or sexual abuse or other family problems.

In FY 1987, Project Hope received additional funds from OJJDP to assess the results of its family training models and to identify and evaluate other family strengthening and crisis intervention methodologies nationwide. Information regarding promising approaches and programs currently in existence will be disseminated to help other jurisdictions implement similar programs and services for Hispanic families.

Proyecto Esperanza—Project Hope

The National Coalition of Hispanic Health and Human Services Organizations (COSSMHO), Suite 1053, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, DC 20005.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Special Emphasis Division, Travis Cain.

Juvenile Gangs

Youth involvement in gangs is not a new problem. As early as the 19th century, youth gangs roamed the streets of urban America. Early gangs were viewed more as a nuisance than as a problem. However, this perception changed in later years as gang violence began to emerge.

In the early part of the 20th century, gang activity and violence usually were associated with protecting territory. Gang violence was controlled by, directed toward, and limited to gang members, with rival gangs being the target.

Gang activity briefly subsided in the 1960's, but resurfaced in the 1970's with increased vengeance. Gang members no longer were directing their energies solely toward protecting their own turf—drugs and weapons had begun to play a major role in their activities. In fact, large profits from the sale of illegal drugs motivate many youth to join gangs.

Youth participation in gangs has reached dramatic proportions in some communities. In Los Angeles County, 600 gangs have more than 70,000 members. Today's gangs are more organized than in the past. Movement of gangs in and out of communities can be attributed in many instances to their well-managed organization as well as the money earned from illegal activities.

Unfortunately, innocent bystanders have fallen victim to gang violence. Many researchers believe that such violence is much more uncontrollable now than in the past. Guns, the weapon of choice of many gang members, have taken the place of fists, clubs, and knives, and have changed the character of street crime committed by gangs across America.

Youth involvement in gangs poses a threat to communities and a challenge for the juvenile justice system. As juveniles' participation in gangs increases, so does the need to develop more effective ways to prevent and suppress gang activity. In spite of the growing magnitude of the problem, until recently only limited programs and resources have been directed against juvenile gangs. Recognizing the scope and seriousness of this problem, OJJDP funded an important new program during FY 1987 to help local communities respond effectively to juvenile gangs.

OJJDP funded a new project in FY 1987 to develop new programs that intervene, suppress, and treat juvenile involvement in illegal gang activities. This important project will help researchers, policymakers, and practitioners by:

- Defining the nature and extent of the youth gang problem across the Nation.
- Identifying promising programs and resources that both suppress and control juvenile gang activity.
- Developing and testing existing and new approaches for controlling and suppressing gang activity.

Training and technical assistance materials will be developed and disseminated for practitioners and policymakers faced with an existing problem or emerging problem of youth gangs in their communities. Following the assessment phase, materials describing the nature and extent of the juvenile gang problem will be prepared and disseminated. These materials, containing the most up-to-date information and resources available, will serve as valuable tools for local communities to use in combating the problem of juvenile gangs.

Juvenile Gang Suppression and Intervention Program

University of Chicago, School of Social Services Administration, 969 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

OJJDP Monitoring Offices: Special Emphasis Division, Benjamin Shapiro; and Research and Program Development Division, Daniel Bryant.



Improving the Juvenile Justice System

Increasing the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system is the underlying goal of all programs and projects of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Quite often, programs funded by OJJDP respond to a growing problem or concern raised by the public or the juvenile justice community itself. Some also are aimed at improving the many systems that serve juveniles and at developing coordinated programs for juveniles in general.

OJJDP's programs and projects provide support, assistance, and guidance to the various components of the juvenile justice system, generate important data for a better understanding of how the system functions, and support services and resources for youth who may be at risk of becoming involved in the juvenile justice system. They are an integral part of OJJDP's mission to combat juvenile delinquency and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the juvenile justice system.

Many of OJJDP's initiatives focus on specific sectors of the juvenile justice community, such as prosecutors and courts. Still others focus on generating statistics and information for the system as a whole. More than a dozen of these specialized projects, highlighted on the following pages, show the range and depth of programs funded by OJJDP to improve the operations, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Nation's juvenile justice system.

Since 1978, the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) has been providing information about local, State, and Federal court activities to legal professionals and practitioners in the juvenile justice system. NCJJ serves as a resource to State and local jurisdictions—collecting, documenting, and disseminating data about juveniles in the court system. These data provide policymakers and court and juvenile justice personnel with a better understanding of court operations and practices around the country and are used to examine trends over time. The Center has been instrumental in increasing the number of courts that contribute data to its archives. It is now estimated that more than 79 percent of the juvenile population between the ages of 10 and 17 are represented through the data.

Any State or local jurisdiction can ask for information from the Center, which helps jurisdictions establish their own information systems, can help with the analysis of State or local issues, or can perform an analysis of the issues themselves. In FY 1987, NCJJ looked at the reliability of statistical procedures for generating national estimates from available data. In addition, NCJJ announced a program to invite scholars to use the data archive to study important policy and research topics, including:

- The impact of legal representation of juveniles in delinquency proceedings.
- Juvenile “specialization” in various delinquent offenses.
- The effect of the farm crisis on court processing in two States.
- The impact of economic and family assistance programs on delinquency cases seen by the courts.

National Juvenile Court Data Archive

National Center for Juvenile Justice, 701 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.
OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Richard Sutton.

Responding to Information Needs of the Juvenile Justice Community

Today's juvenile justice professional is faced with a wide range of critical issues, including juvenile drug use, juvenile gangs, and the need to develop strategies for preventing delinquency. To make informed, balanced decisions, juvenile justice professionals need access to current, reliable information.

OJJDP provides such information through its Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC). Besides disseminating information about OJJDP-funded projects, the Clearinghouse distributes research reports, training and technical assistance materials, evaluation studies, executive summaries, and bibliographies. In addition, juvenile justice specialists at the Clearinghouse can be contacted for information through a toll-free number (1-800-638-8736).

The Clearinghouse provides information to OJJDP grantees and contractors, State Advisory Groups, State and local legislators, researchers, and public and private Federal, State, and local agencies.

During FY 87, the Clearinghouse responded to more than 3,500 requests for information and distributed more than 100,000 publications. Clearinghouse specialists also attended 12 professional conferences to display and disseminate juvenile justice materials and inform the juvenile justice community of the services available from the Clearinghouse.

Through these activities, the Clearinghouse:

- Helps juvenile justice practitioners keep abreast of the most current information and research generated in the field.
- Provides juvenile justice agencies and programs with access to a wide range of services and technical expertise in the field.
- Publicizes results of federally funded initiatives and emerging issues in the field of juvenile justice.

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, 1600 Research Blvd., Rockville, Maryland 20850.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division,
D. Elen Grigg.

Training and Technical Assistance for Prosecutors

Changes in the administration of juvenile justice and the nature of juvenile crime have necessitated a more formal handling of cases involving juveniles. To help district attorneys recognize the important role they play in juvenile matters, OJJDP designed two training and technical assistance programs to increase prosecutor participation in the juvenile justice system.

The first of these programs is the Juvenile Justice Prosecution Project of the National District Attorneys Association (NDAA). This program helps prosecutors perform their duties more efficiently and encourages their involvement in developing juvenile justice and delinquency control policies. Information is disseminated to district attorneys on effective programs and resources available to prosecutors, results of research pertaining to the handling and treatment of juveniles in the legal system, and delinquency prevention topics.

During FY 1987, the project developed model prosecutorial policies for handling juvenile offenders. Seminars will be conducted in FY 1988 to help prosecutors establish and implement their own policies for handling these cases. A *Juvenile Offender Prosecution Manual* will be developed to serve as a guidebook for prosecutors engaged in juvenile matters.

A second OJJDP program provides training to prosecutors to improve their knowledge and skills for handling juveniles in the system. State and local prosecutors receive training from the National College of District Attorneys. Two training sessions conducted in FY 1987 focused on the issues of dispositional alternatives, waiver to adult court, substance abuse cases, juvenile trial techniques, victim-witness concerns, evidentiary problems, and juvenile records.

Juvenile Justice Prosecution Project

National District Attorneys Association, Suite 200, 1033 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination and Technical Assistance Division, Peter Freivalds.

Prosecutor Training in Juvenile Justice

National College of District Attorneys, University of Houston Law Center, Houston, Texas 77004.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, Peter Freivalds.

Improving Court Processing of Juveniles

Training and technical assistance are provided to the Nation's juvenile courts to ensure that they operate as effectively and efficiently as possible. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) provides training for all court personnel; technical assistance for Juvenile and Family Court Judges; and specialized training on chronic, serious, and violent offenders for judges in major metropolitan areas. Such topics as juvenile justice management, family violence, case management, interviewing skills, and evidentiary problems are included in curriculums for judges, court administrators, probation officers, and caseworkers. Training not only increases their knowledge and strengthens their skills, it also improves the court's handling of juveniles.

During FY 1987, NCJFCJ responded to more than 490 requests for technical assistance from around the country. More than 300 judges attended an annual conference; many attended 1 of 10 specialized courses in court administration, family law, and evidence in juvenile court.

Juvenile Court Training

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Box 8970, Reno, Nevada 89507.
OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division,
James Gould.

Training and Technical Assistance for Juvenile Courts

The way the juvenile court processes and handles juveniles is the key to its effectiveness. Because of the court's important role, two OJJDP programs provide information, training, and technical assistance to help court personnel make appropriate decisions regarding juveniles who appear before them. Improving the skills of court personnel will lead to better responses to all juveniles in court.

The National Center for Juvenile Justice provides technical assistance to juvenile court practitioners to improve court processing and handling of juveniles. Technical assistance addresses issues ranging from court administration and management to program development, court decisionmaking and legal opinions, due process requirements, case law, and management information systems.

During FY 1987, the Center handled 435 requests for information, conducted 24 onsite technical assistance consultations, and sponsored the first of a series of statewide Juvenile Justice Information Workshops. Thirty-nine individuals from 24 States participated in these workshops. In addition, the Center initiated a Juvenile Probation Officer Program that provides various resources specifically tailored to probation officers.

The National Center for State Courts, through the Institute for Court Management, also conducts training seminars for juvenile justice personnel. Topics include court management, intake and administration, court policy, and program development strategies for the serious, habitual juvenile offender. More than 150 juvenile justice professionals, including judges, probation officers, court administrators, and line workers participated in six juvenile justice training workshops in FY 1987. The workshops provide professionals with practical information and skills to improve the processing of juveniles through the justice system and help them develop programs and resources that meet the needs of juveniles.

Juvenile Court Technical Assistance

National Center for Juvenile Justice, 701 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.
OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division,
James Gould.

Juvenile Justice Training Program

National Center for State Courts/Institute for Court Management, Suite 402, 1331 17th Street,
Denver, Colorado 80202.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division,
Mary Ann Queen.

Restitution

Restitution is increasingly seen as an important and viable dispositional alternative for youth involved in the juvenile justice system. Restitution holds youth accountable for their actions, provides reparation to victims, and is an integral part of the total treatment of a juvenile offender. Since 1984, more than 1,000 jurisdictions throughout the country have received training and technical assistance to initiate or refine juvenile restitution programs. Information has been disseminated to thousands of local communities to keep program officials abreast of restitution issues and activities occurring nationwide. As a result of this national project, restitution programs have improved and increased significantly.

OJJDP's restitution training and technical assistance activities take many forms:

- National seminars directed at a cross section of juvenile court personnel and service providers.
- Small seminars presented regionally or at conferences for national and State professional organizations involved in juvenile justice.
- Intensive training offered at six host sites.
- A National Restitution Resource Center, established at the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (1-800-638-8736), to provide information on all aspects of restitution programming.

During FY 1987, approximately 60 State and local seminars were conducted through this program. The first national RESTTA conference was held in New Orleans.

RESTTA develops and disseminates public information, training tapes and publications, including *A Directory of Restitution Programs* and *A Guide to Juvenile Restitution*, to provide guidance and support to local RESTTA programs. In the coming fiscal year, seven monographs containing information on specific aspects of restitution programming will be prepared and disseminated to local jurisdictions. Five regional conferences will be organized around topics covered in five of these monographs.

Restitution Education, Specialized Training, and Technical Assistance (RESTTA)

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 8521 Leesburg Pike, Suite 290, Vienna, Virginia 22180.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, Peter Freivalds.

Victims and Witnesses

Improving the fairness of the juvenile justice system is the goal of a new research program designed to examine the effect of court policies and procedures on the treatment and handling of victims and witnesses. This program will help juvenile justice and human service agencies establish special programs and services to:

- Provide opportunities for victims to participate in the justice process.
- Increase victim satisfaction with the juvenile justice system.
- Improve juvenile court processing of juvenile offenders.
- Enhance dispositional development for juvenile offenders.

This research effort will document the needs, attitudes, and available services for victims and witnesses in the juvenile justice system; develop model victim-witness programs; and create a training and technical assistance program to help practitioners and policymakers implement the model programs.

Victims and Witnesses in the Juvenile Justice System

American Institutes for Research, 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street NW., Washington, DC 20007.

OJJDP Monitoring Offices: Research and Program Development Division, Richard Sutton; and Special Emphasis Division, Benjamin Shapiro.

Processing Minority Youth

Several studies suggest that higher incarceration rates for minority populations cannot be wholly due to higher delinquency rates among them. The extent to which minority status influences processing decisions in the juvenile justice system is the question that will be investigated through a new research project funded by OJJDP in FY 1987.

In studying the ways in which minority status affects processing decisions, researchers will examine existing data and analyses to identify gaps in information and knowledge. Based on the evaluation of the existing information and data, recommendations will be generated for future research and policy development. Results of this research effort will contribute to the formation of policies and programs to address the issue of minority representation in the juvenile justice system.

Minorities in the Juvenile Justice System

University of Wisconsin Milwaukee, Graduate School, Board of Regents, P.O. Box 340, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Daniel Bryant.

Status Offenders and DSO

A status offense is any offense which, if committed by an adult, would not be a criminal offense—for example, truancy and runaway behavior. The early 1970's witnessed a turbulent nationwide reform movement to remove status offenders from secure correctional settings. This movement, termed deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO), and its outcome have generated considerable debate over the years. Many argue that the DSO movement has resulted in a justice system that is not responsive to the needs of many troubled youth. Others argue that legal control over status offenders is a violation of youths' rights.

In response to these continuing concerns, OJJDP designed a new research project to determine the effect of deinstitutionalization on status offenders, their parents, the juvenile justice system, and youth-serving agencies. This research effort will assess the level and sources of services provided under different combinations of DSO philosophies, legislation, policies, and practices, and will identify gaps in the service delivery systems for status offenders. Products of this effort will include *Three Policies for the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders*, *Status Offender Services in Twelve Cities*, and *Local Services and State Mandates*.

Assessing the Effects of the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders

University of Southern California, Social Science Research Institute, University Park,
Los Angeles, California 90089-1111.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Richard Sutton.

Detention Statistics

In 1987, OJJDP and the Bureau of the Census entered into an interagency agreement to carry out the *Children in Custody* (CIC) data collection effort. This interagency agreement calls for the completion of a national census of public and private detention, correctional, and shelter care facilities.

During FY 1987, an analysis of *Children in Custody* data from 1975 to 1985 was conducted to obtain an historical picture of 10-year trends and changes in public and private detention and shelter care facilities. This analysis reveals that:

- The number of children held in custody, as reported in 1-day counts, increased 13 percent from 1975 to 1985. This increase was greater for private facilities (25 percent) than for public facilities (5 percent).
- The rate of confinement of juveniles per 100,000 juveniles in the population increased 30 percent. The rate of confinement in private facilities increased 44 percent, while the rate in public facilities increased 22 percent.
- The average daily population of all residents in public and private facilities increased 9 percent during this 10-year period.
- The number of public and private juvenile facilities increased 41 percent from 1975 to 1985. The number of private facilities increased almost three times faster than the number of public facilities.
- The number of halfway houses and groups homes increased 67 percent from 1975 to 1985. Private facilities increased about 86 percent, while public facilities rose 29 percent.
- There was a 134-percent increase in private facilities located in the Midwest, the greatest increase registered across the country. In contrast, there was a 12-percent decrease in the number of private facilities in the South.

Children in Custody

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Research and Program Development Division, Douglas Thomas.

AIDS and Juvenile Corrections

For more than 2 years, the American Correctional Association (ACA) has provided training and technical assistance to juvenile detention and correctional facilities to help managers and administrators improve the operations of their institutions. More than 350 management staff participate in workshops conducted by three ACA Detention Resource Centers four times a year. In FY 1987, onsite technical assistance was provided to 21 juvenile facilities.

As a part of this ongoing program of training and technical assistance, correctional administrators were asked to identify major concerns during the past year. AIDS in juvenile corrections surfaced as a key issue confronting correction and detention facilities nationwide. In October 1987, ACA conducted a survey of 91 juvenile detention facilities and correctional agencies to determine more precisely the magnitude of the AIDS problem. Of the 50 respondents, 14 (28 percent) reported that they were supervising juveniles with positive HIV tests.

To help juvenile correction and detention facilities manage the AIDS population and prevent the spread of AIDS, ACA and OJJDP conducted a Juvenile Corrections and Detention Conference on AIDS, which addressed public issues relating to juvenile corrections and helped to formulate policy direction and program alternatives. The Conference focused on:

- AIDS and the courts.
- The effects of AIDS on State and local corrections budgets.
- The rights of victims.
- The rights of care providers.
- AIDS prevention through education.

Two AIDS informational brochures were prepared by ACA both for youth in corrections and those responsible for their care and supervision. *AIDS—Playing it Safe*, and *AIDS—Prevention and Education are the Keys* offer basic facts about

AIDS and provide information to help avoid high risk behavior. ACA also established a resource library that contains sample policies and procedures of institutional management of AIDS-related issues for correction and detention facilities around the country.

Training and Technical Assistance in Residential Programs

American Correctional Association, Suite L208, 4321 Hartwick Road, College Park, Maryland 20740.

OJJDP Monitoring Office: Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division, James Gould.

Part III:

Formula Grant Program and Activities

In support of the projects described earlier in this report, OJJDP provides formula grants to States and local units of government to improve the juvenile justice system and address issues associated with preventing juvenile delinquency or juvenile crime.

Formula grant activities include planning, developing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating juvenile justice programs. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention works closely with State and local juvenile justice agencies to identify issues or problems that require national attention and provides technical assistance, training, and information to support States' efforts to comply with sections of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act calling for the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and nonoffenders, the separation of juveniles from adults in secure confinement facilities, and the removal of juveniles from adult jails.

Five major formula grant activities include Technical Assistance and Management Support to Facilitate Jail Removal, Audits of State Compliance Monitoring Systems, Training to Juvenile Justice Specialists, State Advisory Groups' (SAG) Training and Support of the National SAG Conference, and the Nonparticipating States Initiative. These activities are described on the following pages. Please note that the information reported herein is based on 1986 monitoring reports from the States. The information is subject to change based on the submission of 1987 data.

Jail Removal Initiative

To ensure that juveniles taken into custody do not suffer undue physical or psychological harm from adults during their confinement, a 1980 amendment to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act specified that juveniles must not be confined with adults in jails and lockups and requires States receiving formula grants from OJJDP to take steps to ensure timely removal of juveniles from such facilities.

To help selected States and territories achieve full compliance with this requirement, OJJDP awarded \$1 million in discretionary money to 20 jurisdictions to implement a statewide jail removal strategy and facilitate their coming into full compliance with the JJDP Act by December 8, 1988. Governments receiving up to \$50,000 include:

Alabama	Kentucky	Ohio
Arkansas	Maryland	Rhode Island
California	Minnesota	Tennessee
Colorado	Montana	Utah
Idaho	Nebraska	Virginia
Iowa	New Mexico	Wisconsin
Kansas	Northern Mariana Islands	

This program is being implemented in two phases. During Phase I in FY 1987, States and territories identified barriers to compliance and developed strategies to overcome them. In Phase II, these strategies will be implemented. Barriers to jail removal identified by the States include:

- Insufficient access both to alternative secure detention and to nonsecure community-based resources, including a lack of information and knowledge about available resources.
- Lack of information within the State about the number of compliance violations, the absence of adequate monitoring, and the inability to enforce legislative mandates.
- Inadequate intake decisionmaking or placement policies as well as a poor understanding of existing policies and procedures.

-
- Absence of 24-hour intake services.
 - Inadequate coordination and leadership, lack of commitment, and lack of guidance.

OJJDP is providing onsite consultation and technical assistance through Community Research Associates (CRA) to help States and territories design strategies to deal with and remove these barriers. CRA has established a Jail Removal Clearinghouse to distribute publications and information on jail removal legislation, public education, alternative services, pertinent case law, and intake screening procedures. Policymakers and practitioners wanting information about jail removal can contact the Clearinghouse at 1-217-398-3120.

Compliance Status

To receive formula grant funds, States must demonstrate that they are complying with sections of the JJDP Act that prescribe three specific mandates. They are:

- Deinstitutionalization of status offenders and nonoffenders.
- Separation of juveniles from adults within secure confinement facilities.
- Removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups.

Of 57 eligible States and territories, 53 are participating in the JJDP Act, which means they are making efforts to comply with the mandates of the Act and are receiving formula grant funds. The four nonparticipating States are Hawaii, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

The 1986 compliance monitoring reports from the States were used to make initial determinations of eligibility for FY 1988 formula grants. Based on these reports, 30 States are not in substantial compliance with Sections 223 (a)(14) and 223 (c) of the JJDP Act. These Sections require that participating States and territories achieve full, or at a minimum, substantial compliance with the jail removal mandate by December 1985. Thus, the States' 1986 monitoring reports were required to, at a minimum, demonstrate substantial compliance, which is defined as a 75-percent reduction in jail removal violations, and an unequivocal commitment to achieving full compliance by December 1988. While these 30 States were initially determined to be ineligible for their FY 1988 formula grants, the Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1988 (P.L. 100-202) provides that the Administrator shall not find States ineligible for FY 1988 funding for failure to comply with Section 223 (a)(14).

Determinations of compliance or noncompliance, as specified in Sections 223 (a)(14) and 223 (c) of the JJDP Act, have not been made for an additional two States due to incomplete reports or unreliable data submitted by these States. OJJDP is actively working with them to get the information needed to determine compliance status.

Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders. Based on the 1986 monitoring reports, the following States and territories were in full compliance with

Section 223 (a)(12)(A) of the JJDP Act, which calls for deinstitutionalization of status offenders and nonoffenders:

Alabama	Kentucky	Northern Mariana Islands
Alaska	Louisiana	Ohio
American Samoa	Maine	Oregon
Arizona	Maryland	Pennsylvania*
Arkansas	Massachusetts	Puerto Rico
California	Michigan	Rhode Island
Colorado	Minnesota	South Carolina
Connecticut	Mississippi	Tennessee
Delaware	Missouri	Texas
Florida	Montana	Utah
Georgia	Nebraska	Vermont
Guam	New Hampshire	Virginia
Idaho	New Jersey	Virgin Islands
Illinois	New York	Washington
Iowa	North Carolina	West Virginia
Kansas		Wisconsin

*Pennsylvania was exempted from submitting a 1986 monitoring report. Compliance finding is based on previous reports.

Oklahoma was required to demonstrate substantial compliance (began participation in 1983) and did so.

Indiana and New Mexico are not currently in compliance.

An official finding has not been made for the following States or territories, pending the resolution of disputed issues or provision of additional information from them:

District of Columbia

Trust Territories

No data are available from Nevada. The State's first monitoring report is expected to be completed by December 1988.

Separation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders. Thirty-eight of the 53 participating States and territories have demonstrated compliance with Section 223 (a)(13) of the JJDP Act, which calls for the separation of juveniles from adult offenders in institutions. Those jurisdictions found in compliance pursuant to the regulatory requirements regarding compliance are:

Alabama	Maine	Oregon
American Samoa	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Arizona	Minnesota	Puerto Rico
Arkansas	Mississippi	Rhode Island
Connecticut	Missouri	South Carolina
Delaware	New Hampshire	Tennessee
Florida	New Jersey	Texas
Georgia	New Mexico	Utah
Guam	New York	Virginia
Illinois	North Carolina	Virgin Islands
Iowa	Northern Mariana	Washington
Kentucky	Islands	West Virginia
Louisiana	Ohio	Wisconsin

The following States are making progress toward compliance. However, their designated date for achieving compliance has not been reached.

Alaska	Indiana	Montana
California	Kansas	Nebraska
Colorado	Maryland	Oklahoma
Idaho	Massachusetts	Vermont

An official finding has not been made for the following States or territories, pending the resolution of disputed issues or provision of additional information from them.

District of Columbia

Trust Territories

No data are available from Nevada. The State's first monitoring report is due in December 1988.

Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups. The following States and territories were determined to be in full compliance based on zero violations of the mandate of Section 223 (a) (14) of the JJDP Act, which calls for the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups.

American Samoa	New York	Oregon
Delaware	North Carolina	Pennsylvania
Guam		Virgin Islands

The following States achieved substantial compliance.

Alabama	Louisiana	Rhode Island
Arkansas	Missouri	Tennessee
California	Montana	Virginia
Georgia	Ohio	West Virginia

Six States or territories, while not achieving a 75-percent reduction in violations of jail removal, reported very low numbers of noncompliant incidences. It is anticipated that these States and territories will be found in full compliance with de minimis exceptions. The de minimis rate will be established by OJJDP and published in the *Federal Register*.

Arizona	New Jersey	Texas
Connecticut	Puerto Rico	Washington

The following States and territories were found not in substantial or full compliance with Section 223 (a)(14).

Alaska	Kentucky	New Hampshire
Colorado*	Maine	New Mexico
Florida	Maryland	Northern Mariana Islands
Idaho*	Massachusetts	Oklahoma
Illinois	Michigan	South Carolina
Indiana	Minnesota	Utah
Iowa	Mississippi	Vermont
Kansas	Nebraska	Wisconsin

* A 75-percent reduction was achieved but the required unequivocal commitment cannot be demonstrated.

An official finding has not been made for the following States or territories, pending resolution of disputed issues or the provision of additional information from them.

District of Columbia

Trust Territories

No data are available from Nevada. The State's first monitoring report is due in December 1988.

Each State participating in the JJDP Act must provide an adequate system for monitoring jails, detention centers, and correctional and nonsecure facilities to ensure that the JJDP Act requirements of deinstitutionalization, separation, and jail removal are met. The 1984 amendments to the JJDP Act require OJJDP to audit each State's system to determine its adequacy to monitor compliance with these mandates.

Between 1985 and August 1986, a protocol for conducting the audits was developed and subsequently field tested in Illinois. Following the field test, modifications were made to the protocol and a *Guideline Manual: Audit of Compliance Monitoring Systems* was developed. The draft *Guideline* was distributed to the State Juvenile Justice Specialists for review and comment, and a final revised version was released in January 1988. To prepare for the site visits, inservice training was conducted.

During 1987, audits were completed in 40 States. Results indicate that a majority of the States are doing an adequate to good job of monitoring juvenile detention centers and adult jails. Juvenile detention centers and adult jails in the States are cooperating voluntarily as are the agencies authorized to monitor them for compliance with State laws.

Some improvement is needed in monitoring law enforcement lockups and in applying statutory and regulatory exceptions during monitoring. Some deficiencies in State monitoring compliance systems include:

- Incomplete identification of police lockups.
- Failure to consistently verify self-reported data.
- Inconsistencies in recordkeeping.

With the exception of the Trust Territories and the State of Indiana, the remaining participating States were audited during January 1988. Audits in these two jurisdictions will be completed during 1988.

SAG Training and National Conference

State Advisory Groups (SAG's) help administer the Formula Grants Program at the State and local levels. SAG's are comprised of volunteers appointed by the Governor of each State; these volunteers have training or experience in either the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of justice. Members include elected officials, representatives of local government agencies, and representatives of private organizations that employ youth. SAG's have varied responsibilities within their States, including: (1) advising the Governor and the legislature on pertinent youth issues, (2) supervising the preparation and administration of the comprehensive State juvenile justice plan, (3) reviewing and overseeing the award of grants, and (4) reviewing the progress and accomplishments of programs under their plans. At the discretion of the Governor, SAG's serve as the Supervisory Board for agencies implementing the JJDP Act. In this capacity, SAG's are the final policymaking body for the administration of the Act.

OJJDP sponsors a national conference of State Advisory Groups once every 2 years to provide information and training to improve State juvenile justice systems. The conference focuses on issues of importance to the overall juvenile justice system as well as its individual components. The conference provides SAG's an opportunity to develop strategies for preventing delinquency and enables them to collectively develop standards and practices for the effective administration of justice. It also gives them an opportunity to learn about the discretionary programs, policies, and new initiatives of OJJDP.

In addition, OJJDP trains SAG's to increase their knowledge of juvenile justice issues and enhance their ability to fulfill their mandated responsibilities. Two seminars and five training sessions were conducted in FY 1987. They focused on:

- Improving management skills.
- Developing advocacy programs.
- Enhancing knowledge of the juvenile justice system.
- Providing insight into the mission of the JJDP Act.
- Promoting a better understanding of OJJDP, its goals, and its programs.

OJJDP staff, consultants, and SAG members served as instructors or panelists during these sessions.

Formula Grant Recommendations

During FY 1987, OJJDP evaluated the effectiveness of its Formula Grant Program in working with States to disseminate new knowledge and information. Specific products and procedures were identified to support State efforts to meet the requirements of the Formula Grant Program.

As a result of this assessment, OJJDP is standardizing the management of its Formula Grant Program by developing technical assistance and training materials for State agencies and for OJJDP's State Relations and Assistance Division that manages the formula grant program. By disseminating to all jurisdictions materials that are both comprehensive and accurate as well as easy to understand and use, OJJDP hopes to improve the responsiveness and efficiency of its Formula Grant Program. The following products are currently being developed:

- A ***Formula Grants Policy Manual*** to serve as a common desk reference for all individuals involved in implementing the Formula Grant Program.
- A ***State Relations Division Operations Handbook*** consisting of standardized policies, procedures, and processes for reviewing State comprehensive plans, annual applications, compliance monitoring reports, and performance reports.
- A ***Comprehensive Training Plan*** that includes a schedule and curriculum for SAG's, State Juvenile Justice Specialists, State Relations Division staff, and monitoring contractors for implementing the Formula Grant Program.
- An **automated information system** to support the Formula Grant Program, to improve internal controls, and to disseminate information.
- ***Evaluation Packages*** to help States evaluate and assess subgrantee performance and program effectiveness.

OJJDP is also working to improve Federal/State partnerships to implement the JJDP Act by developing strategies and procedures to market and disseminate information on innovative, successful Federal and State programs.

During FY 1988, OJJDP will implement these recommendations to strengthen the assistance it provides to States, to promote better coordination between formula grant and discretionary funds, and to ensure complete, accurate, and full compliance with the mandates of the JJDP Act.

Nonparticipating States Initiative

Public and private nonprofit agencies in States not participating in the JJDP Act receive support to establish alternative programs and services to eliminate both the use of secure facilities for status offenders and nonoffenders as well as the use of adult jails and lockups for the detention of juveniles. The four nonparticipating States are:

- Hawaii (Youth Services Inc.)
- Wyoming (Mountain Plains Youth Services Inc.)
- North Dakota (Association of Counties)
- South Dakota (Association of Counties)

During Phase I, the planning and analysis phase, agencies developed comprehensive action plans to remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups and remove status offenders and nonoffenders from secure detention facilities. During Phase II, strategies and plans are being implemented to supervise and protect status offenders and nonoffenders without secure detention and remove juvenile offenders from adult jails and lockups.

This program is expected to:

- Improve coordination between the judiciary, law enforcement, public agencies, and nonprofit public interest groups in resolving problems and issues regarding the handling and treatment of juveniles.
- Develop a network of service programs and alternatives.
- Develop crisis intervention services.
- Develop emergency foster care homes.
- Develop objective intake criteria.
- Establish 24-hour intake and emergency services.

In addition to discontinuing the practices of placing status and nonoffenders in secure detention and detaining juveniles in adult facilities, the program will motivate States to come into compliance with the JJDP Act and facilitate the revision of their juvenile codes to ensure safe treatment and handling of all juveniles.

During 1987, OJJDP provided training to nonparticipating States at the national conference of the Coalition of State Juvenile Justice Advisory Groups to assist them in developing programs that will lead to their participation in the JJDP Act. Specifically, training focused on the issues of deinstitutionalization, jail removal, establishing data collection mechanisms, understanding reporting requirements, and developing alternative programs to deal with serious juvenile crime and illegal drug use by juveniles.

Part IV:

Each year, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention prepares a program plan for the coming fiscal year to address the concerns and needs of the juvenile justice community. This plan takes into consideration ongoing issues that require continual attention and monitoring as well as new and emerging issues that must be addressed.

P 1988 Program Plan and Recom- mendations

OJJDP's comprehensive planning system, instituted in FY 1987, enables OJJDP to maximize resources, leverage funds, and carefully plan for the development of future initiatives through a well-organized, efficient process. FY 1988 will see the culmination of several months of planning to ensure that the needs of the juvenile justice community are adequately identified and addressed. More importantly, the programs planned for FY 1988 build upon the information and knowledge generated through activities begun during FY 1987.

Tapping the resources of the juvenile justice community for input and guidance, OJJDP has identified the following four priority program areas for FY 1988:

Illegal Drug Use Among High Risk Youth

Programs will be based on the concept of accountability of youth, their families, and communities to promote zero tolerance for illegal drug use. Prevention and control of drug trafficking by youth gangs will be a major program emphasis. Communitywide strategies to address illegal drug use will be designed to promote system coordination. Research will help to increase the understanding of risk factors for youths' involvement in illegal drugs to guide communities in combating this problem. Effective program models for each component of the juvenile justice system will be developed for replication around the country.

Serious Juvenile Crime

Programs will target individual components of the juvenile justice system, such as law enforcement and prosecution, as well as emphasize coordination across system components to more effectively concentrate and direct resources to respond to serious juvenile crime. Demonstration and training programs will promote implementation of communitywide strategies to affect serious juvenile crime and develop coordinated, consistent responses in all components of the juvenile justice system. Finally, research will continue to examine the patterns of delinquent and criminal careers and the implications for prevention and control to help local communities develop responsive programs.

Missing and Exploited Children

Programs will help reduce the incidence of crime against children, particularly abduction and sexual exploitation and improve agency responses for dealing with these crimes. Priority will be given to providing information, training, and technical assistance to juvenile justice and other decisionmakers about effective strategies to address the problem of missing and exploited children. A continuing emphasis will be placed on responding to missing children and their families who have been victims of abduction, sexual exploitation, or both. Efforts to develop better information on the scope and nature of this problem to guide policy and program development will continue.

Jail Removal

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, as amended, calls for the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups as a condition of receiving formula grant funds. OJJDP discretionary funds focus on developing information on appropriate alternatives to jails for different types of juveniles and on helping States and local jurisdictions to systematically plan and implement strategies to remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups.

In addition to the major categories described above, OJJDP will continue, in FY 1988, to support ongoing activities designed to improve the understanding of issues pertaining to juvenile delinquency, enhance the overall operation of the juvenile justice system, and provide safer communities for our Nation's youth and their families.

Telephone Listings for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Office of the Administrator	(202) 724-7751
Office of the Deputy Administrator	(202) 724-5911
Missing Children's Program	(202) 724-7655
Concentration of Federal Effort Program	(202) 724-7655
Research and Program Development Division	(202) 724-7560
Special Emphasis Division	(202) 724-5914
State Relations and Assistance Division	(202) 724-5921
Training, Dissemination, and Technical Assistance Division	(202) 724-5940

For more information about any of the offices or divisions listed in this report or the programs funded by OJJDP, please call or write to the division listed above at:

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Information also can be obtained by calling the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. The toll-free number is 1-800-638-8736.