



# *Annual Report*

*Office of Juvenile Justice  
and Delinquency Prevention*

*August 1998*

# *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was established by the President and Congress through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, Public Law 93-415, as amended. Located within the Office of Justice Programs of the U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP's goal is to provide national leadership in addressing the issues of juvenile delinquency and improving juvenile justice.

OJJDP sponsors a broad array of research, program, and training initiatives to improve the juvenile justice system as a whole, as well as to benefit individual youth-serving agencies. These initiatives are carried out by seven components within OJJDP, described below.

**Research and Program Development Division** develops knowledge on national trends in juvenile delinquency; supports a program for data collection and information sharing that incorporates elements of statistical and systems development; identifies how delinquency develops and the best methods for its prevention, intervention, and treatment; and analyzes practices and trends in the juvenile justice system.

**Training and Technical Assistance Division** provides juvenile justice training and technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments; law enforcement, judiciary, and corrections personnel; and private agencies, educational institutions, and community organizations.

**Special Emphasis Division** provides discretionary funds to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to replicate tested approaches to delinquency prevention, treatment, and control in such pertinent areas as chronic juvenile offenders, community-based sanctions, and the disproportionate representation of minorities in the juvenile justice system.

**State Relations and Assistance Division** supports collaborative efforts by States to carry out the mandates of the JJDP Act by providing formula grant funds to States; furnishing technical assistance to States, local governments, and private agencies; and monitoring State compliance with the JJDP Act.

**Information Dissemination Unit** informs individuals and organizations of OJJDP initiatives; disseminates information on juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and missing children; and coordinates program planning efforts within OJJDP. The unit's activities include publishing research and statistical reports, bulletins, and other documents, as well as overseeing the operations of the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse.

**Concentration of Federal Efforts Program** promotes interagency cooperation and coordination among Federal agencies with responsibilities in the area of juvenile justice. The program primarily carries out this responsibility through the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, an independent body within the executive branch that was established by Congress through the JJDP Act.

**Missing and Exploited Children's Program** seeks to promote effective policies and procedures for addressing the problem of missing and exploited children. Established by the Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984, the program provides funds for a variety of activities to support and coordinate a network of resources such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; training and technical assistance to a network of 47 State clearinghouses, nonprofit organizations, law enforcement personnel, and attorneys; and research and demonstration programs.

The mission of OJJDP is to provide national leadership, coordination, and resources to prevent juvenile victimization and respond appropriately to juvenile delinquency. This is accomplished through developing and implementing prevention programs and a juvenile justice system that protects the public safety, holds juvenile offenders accountable, and provides treatment and rehabilitative services based on the needs of each individual juvenile.

# ***QJDP Annual Report***

**Shay Bilchik, Administrator**  
**Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**

**August 1998**

---

*This report covers activities undertaken by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention during Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997.*

**U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**  
810 Seventh Street NW.  
Washington, DC 20531

**Janet Reno**  
*Attorney General*  
U.S. Department of Justice

**Raymond C. Fisher**  
*Associate Attorney General*

**Laurie Robinson**  
*Assistant Attorney General*

**Shay Bilchik**  
*Administrator*  
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.



## *Foreword*

Although the juvenile crime rate is dropping, episodes of youth violence continue to appear on the nightly news all too often. While the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) does not claim to have a magical solution to end the violence, we have developed a comprehensive strategy that is helping many communities make a difference in the fight to prevent juvenile delinquency. The concept behind the strategy is very similar to the “broken windows” strategy that cities are using to respond to street crime. Just as police in many communities now react aggressively to the first signs of deterioration, such as broken windows in a neighborhood, communities need to react aggressively to the warning signals many juveniles are sending out. Rather than ignoring these signals, we at OJJDP advocate having a plan in place to address the symptoms of trouble—a comprehensive plan that runs the gamut from prevention to intervention and treatment activities.

That is why OJJDP built much of its programming the past 2 years around the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. This Comprehensive Strategy, described more fully elsewhere in this Report, provides the Nation with a promising way, based on research, to tackle juvenile delinquency and crime. It holds offenders accountable for their actions and provides them with opportunities for rehabilitation. It also provides approaches for dealing with the small percentage of juvenile offenders who account for the most serious and violent crimes. Finally, it offers strategies for working with juveniles at risk of committing delinquent acts before they become involved with the juvenile justice system. But most important, it shows communities how to develop the coordinated, comprehensive approaches that are so necessary to help them deal with juvenile crime. “Coordinated” and “comprehensive” are the key words here. We know from past experience that piecemeal approaches will not get the job done.

To illustrate our commitment to the Comprehensive Strategy, we funded several programs in fiscal years (FY) 1996 and 1997 to help communities implement it. Because we know from our research that children who are abused or neglected often resort to delinquent or violent behavior later in life, we also funded a community-based initiative to break this cycle before it begins. We are especially excited that many of the communities participating in the Community Prevention Grants Program funded under Title V have centered their programs around the Comprehensive Strategy.

While the Comprehensive Strategy was the cornerstone of our programs in FY 1996 and 1997, we addressed many other issues as well. We worked diligently to disseminate information about programs that work to a wide variety of audiences. Our dissemination activities included a highly successful national conference, well-received publications, and numerous satellite videoconferences. We also funded programs to help communities

# OJJDP *Annual Report*

---

address juvenile gangs, youth gun violence, and juvenile sex offenders. Our Missing and Exploited Children's Program had many accomplishments as well, including a major new training center for law enforcement personnel, several highly acclaimed publications, and the release of findings from a major missing child homicide study. Finally, our Formula Grants Program, working closely with the States, continued to make significant improvements in the way these jurisdictions deal with juvenile offenders.

Although we are proud of our many accomplishments, much work remains. We must continue to help communities coordinate programs and resources and provide a continuum of care for their young people. Everyone—individuals, community leaders, law enforcement, social services agencies, parents, educators—must work together to protect our children from victimization and our Nation from delinquent and violent juvenile offenders.

This Report highlights only a selected sample of OJJDP activities. All the programs funded in 1996 and 1997 are described in greater detail in the *Comprehensive Program Plan for Fiscal Year 1996 (OJJDP Program Objectives)* and in the proposed 1998 Program Plan published in the *Federal Register* on February 6, 1998.

Even though there are no quick fixes, I believe the programs OJJDP funded are a step in the right direction and have the potential to make a tremendous impact. I hope you will find the information in this Report useful, and that you will join OJJDP in our efforts to rescue at-risk children from delinquent behavior and violent futures, and to keep our communities safe.

*Shay Bilchik*  
*Administrator*  
*Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*

# *Table of Contents*

Foreword.....	iii
<b>An Introduction to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Major Accomplishments in 1996 and 1997 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders .....	3
Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention .....	4
SafeFutures Program .....	5
Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program .....	6
Juvenile Mentoring Program .....	7
Family Strengthening Program .....	7
Model Courts Program .....	7
Hate Crime Prevention .....	8
Teens, Crime, and the Community .....	8
<b>Chapter 2: Sharing Information Is an OJJDP Priority .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse .....	9
CD-ROM .....	10
Satellite Videoconferencing .....	10
National Conference .....	10
Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act .....	11
Guide to Conflict Resolution Education .....	11
Report on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders .....	11
Causes and Correlates Research Program .....	12
Boot Camp Evaluation .....	13
<b>Chapter 3: 1996 and 1997 Program Plans .....</b>	<b>15</b>
New Programs.....	16
Continuation Programs.....	18
<b>Chapter 4: Missing and Exploited Children's Program .....</b>	<b>21</b>
The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children .....	21
Major New Publications .....	22
New Research Findings About Child Homicides.....	24
Training and Technical Assistance .....	24
New Initiative .....	24
Continuation Programs .....	24
<b>Chapter 5: State and Local Assistance Grants Programs .....</b>	<b>27</b>
Formula Grants Program .....	27
Community Prevention Grant Program .....	28
State Challenge Activities .....	39
<b>Chapter 6: Juveniles Taken Into Custody .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix: OJJDP Publications Released in 1996 and 1997 .....</b>	<b>47</b>

# *An Introduction to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was created by Congress in 1974 to help communities and States prevent delinquency and improve their juvenile justice systems. A component of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, OJJDP is the primary Federal agency responsible for addressing the issues of juvenile crime and delinquency and the problem of missing and exploited children, which Congress added to OJJDP's legislative mandate in 1984.

Although the nature and extent of delinquency and abuse have changed over the past 23 years, OJJDP has remained a steady influence, providing national leadership, coordination, and resources to help States and local communities meet the new challenges they are facing in their juvenile justice systems. These challenges include a multitude of problems: intolerably high rates of juvenile violence and delinquency, victimization, school dropout, teen pregnancy, and illegal drug use, and increasing child abuse and neglect cases. In addition, many juvenile justice and dependency court systems, already overburdened, are being

forced to address the human fallout resulting from unstable families that lack parenting skills, communities with inadequate health and mental health support networks, fragmented social service delivery systems, a shortage of constructive activities for young people, and easy access to guns and drugs.

To help juvenile justice and social service professionals meet these challenges, OJJDP funds critical research and demonstration programs, provides technical assistance and training, produces and distributes publications containing the most up-to-date juvenile justice related information available, oversees the Missing and Exploited Children's Program, and administers formula and discretionary grants programs.

This annual report describes OJJDP's major accomplishments in these areas during 1996 and 1997, discusses the philosophy that guided program plans, and summarizes the most recent data available on juveniles taken into custody. These activities reflect OJJDP's continuing commitment to address the crisis of youth violence and delinquency in this country and to help its citizens respond more effectively.



## *Chapter 1*

# *Major Accomplishments in 1996 and 1997*

This is a critical time for juvenile justice—a time of both opportunity and challenge. In 1996, for the second year in a row, the total number of juvenile arrests for Violent Crime Index offenses (murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) declined. The number of violent juvenile arrests dropped 3 percent in 1995 and 6 percent in 1996. More specifically, juvenile arrest rates for murder declined 14 percent between 1995 and 1996. While juvenile arrests for murder in 1996 were at their lowest level in the 1990's, the decrease must be kept in perspective since the total for 1997 was still 50 percent above the number of juvenile arrests for murder in 1987. The Nation continues to face unacceptably high rates of juvenile crime, with juveniles accounting for 18 percent, or 2.7 million, of all arrests. In addition, serious and violent juvenile offenders, although relatively few in number, remain a troubling concern.

Although the decline in the arrest rate signals hope for the future, there is still much work to be done. The accomplishments highlighted in this chapter illustrate OJJDP's commitment to provide national leadership to help States and communities develop policies and programs that will ensure a continuing decline in the juvenile crime rate.

The *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* was at the center of the Office's many accomplishments during the past 2 years. It reflects OJJDP's commitment to programs that have the greatest potential for reducing juvenile delinquency and improving the juvenile justice system. The *Comprehensive Strategy* and several of the other activities described in this chapter create the partnerships that OJJDP believes are necessary to turn the tide of juvenile delinquency.

In addition to implementing the *Comprehensive Strategy*, the Office also worked diligently during the past 2 years to provide mentors for troubled youth, help strengthen families, improve how courts respond to abused and neglected children, and eliminate hate crimes. Sharing information with practitioners in the field was also a priority during 1996 and 1997; dissemination activities are highlighted in chapter 2.

### *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*

The *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (Wilson and Howell, 1993) has been the foundation of OJJDP's program plans since it was published. The *Comprehensive Strategy* provides this country with a systematic way to address unacceptably high levels of juvenile crime and build upon the reductions seen during the past 2 years.

The *Comprehensive Strategy* is based on decades of research, program evaluations, and statistics about criminal and juvenile justice, public health, and youth development. It provides the juvenile justice field with a blueprint, based on a sound set of principles, for establishing a continuum of care to meet the needs of the Nation's children and protect the public from juvenile crime.

The *Comprehensive Strategy* advocates the use of local planning teams to assess the factors and influences that put youth at risk of delinquency, determine available resources, and establish prevention programs to either reduce risk factors or provide protective factors that buffer juveniles from the impact of risk factors.

To encourage more communities to use the Comprehensive Strategy, OJJDP published the *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* in 1995. The *Guide* offers a foundation and framework for communities' individualized strategies and provides a powerful tool for States, cities, counties, and neighborhoods that are mobilizing to address juvenile violence and delinquency.

In 1996, OJJDP began providing intensive training and technical assistance to help five States—Florida, Iowa, Maryland, Rhode Island, and Texas—implement the Comprehensive Strategy in up to six local jurisdictions each. OJJDP also is helping six communities that are participating in the SafeFutures program (see page 5) and San Diego County implement the Comprehensive Strategy.

The Office continued its training efforts during 1997, sponsoring 35 training events and helping almost 30 communities implement the Comprehensive Strategy. The Office also continued to disseminate information about the Comprehensive Strategy through publications and presentations at national conferences. The OJJDP grantees providing training and technical assistance are Developmental Research and Programs, Inc., of Seattle, WA, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency of San Francisco, CA.

## *Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*

The Comprehensive Strategy served as the foundation for a major document endorsed by the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Coordinating Council) in 1996. OJJDP provides support to the Coordinating Council, which coordinates all Federal juvenile delinquency prevention programs, Federal programs and activities that detain or care for unaccompanied juveniles, and Federal programs relating to missing and exploited children. This document, *Combating Violence and Delinquency: The*

*National Juvenile Justice Action Plan*, builds on the Comprehensive Strategy and the *Guide* and describes Federal activities and resources to help communities address eight critical objectives.

According to the *Action Plan*, communities must do the following to effectively combat delinquency and violence:

- ◆ Strengthen their juvenile justice systems.
- ◆ Prosecute certain serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders in the criminal justice system.
- ◆ Target youth gun, gang, and drug violence through comprehensive policing and prevention techniques.
- ◆ Create positive opportunities for youth.
- ◆ Break the cycle of violence by addressing child victimization, abuse, and neglect.
- ◆ Mobilize communities into effective partnerships for change.
- ◆ Conduct research and evaluate programs.
- ◆ Develop a public education campaign to highlight successes in addressing juvenile delinquency and violence.

The overarching goal is to rebuild community confidence in the system's ability to have an impact on this serious problem. The *Action Plan* describes Federal grants, training, technical assistance, information dissemination, and research and evaluation activities available to help States and communities address these objectives.

Several jurisdictions are using the *Action Plan* as the basis of their juvenile justice activities. For example, California based its Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program on the *Action Plan's* objectives and suggestions for State and local action. The State has invested more than \$45 million in demonstration programs related to juvenile crime reduction over a 3-year period (1995–1997). One of the program's goals is to find interventions that work and document the outcomes.

OJJDP and the other Federal agencies represented on the Coordinating Council continued to build on the *Action Plan* during 1997 by jointly funding several projects that support one or more of the eight objectives listed in the plan. For example, OJJDP and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) funded two research programs to help enhance understanding of juvenile delinquency and crime prevention. The first program, Early Alliance, was designed to help hundreds of elementary school children in economically disadvantaged sections of Columbia, SC, learn how to cope with factors that put them at risk of delinquent behavior. The intent of the program is to intervene early—in the first grade—to prevent misconduct, aggression, substance abuse, delinquency and violence, and school failure. The project will follow the children for 5 years. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) also provided funds for the program, which is being conducted by the University of South Carolina.

In a second joint research effort, OJJDP transferred funds to NIMH to add a juvenile justice component to a study examining the long-term effects of medication and behavioral and educational treatment on children with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Researchers are now examining the contacts between these children and the juvenile justice system.

*Kids give off warning signs—running away, skipping school, failing academically, acting out aggressively, or showing signs of abuse or neglect. An effective violence reduction strategy does not ignore these early symptoms but rather treats them directly—just like fixing broken windows—putting the broken pieces of children's lives back together again.*

Shay Bilchik  
OJJDP Administrator

OJJDP also provided funds to NIDA to study how public health programs address risk and protective factors and substance abuse among adolescents at the State and community levels.

Coordinating Council agencies jointly funded a number of programs designed to help reduce risk factors associated with delinquency, involve the community in prevention efforts, address mental health and juvenile justice issues, and prevent substance abuse. For example, the Ounce of Prevention Program, developed by OJJDP and the President's Crime Prevention Council, addresses youth substance abuse issues. The David Olds Nurse Home Visitation Program, funded by OJJDP, the Executive Office of Weed and Seed, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, provides prenatal and early childhood services for low-income mothers.

The Coordinating Council also encouraged collaboration at the State and local levels. Building on the Child Development–Community Policing Program initially funded in 1993, OJJDP joined the Violence Against Women Grants Office and the Office for Victims of Crime in funding a training curriculum and technical assistance program. This initiative helps law enforcement and mental health practitioners work together with schools to address the psychological burdens experienced by children and families exposed to violence.

A complete list of collaborative activities funded by Coordinating Council member agencies is included in the *1997 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs*, available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC).

## *SafeFutures Program*

OJJDP awarded six communities a total of almost \$8 million to implement SafeFutures programs, which are locally based initiatives that seek to prevent and reduce delinquency and victimization by intervening quickly when children and teens encounter problems and by holding them responsible when they commit violent or other crimes. The project helps communities coordinate their programs so that the human service and juvenile

justice systems, including health, mental health, child welfare, education, police, probation, courts, and corrections, all work together. Such coordination helps create a continuum of care to respond to the needs of youth and their families at any point along the path toward delinquency.

The six communities receiving SafeFutures grants included four urban sites (Contra Costa County, CA; Boston, MA; Seattle, WA; and St. Louis, MO); one rural community (Imperial County, CA); and one tribal community (Fort Belknap, MT). Each site is receiving grants of up to \$1.4 million for the 5-year project, which began in 1995. The following strategies are being used to help families in these communities:

- ◆ Contra Costa County is helping at-risk girls through mentoring programs.
- ◆ Boston is strengthening the links between police, the district attorney's office, the probation department, and a community organization and will create a day treatment center to serve approximately 100 youth per year.
- ◆ Seattle is expanding its Cambodian girls group, an outreach program designed for Cambodian girls ages 12 to 18 who are involved in gang activities.
- ◆ St. Louis is launching a communitywide gang task force and is expanding treatment and restitution programs for juvenile offenders.
- ◆ Imperial County is providing a variety of social, health, and employment services through its family strengthening center and is making a special effort to ensure that services are culturally relevant to the predominantly Spanish-speaking population of the county.
- ◆ Fort Belknap is using intensive probation and community service to target juvenile offenders.

In 1997, OJJDP provided funds for a full-time training and technical assistance coordinator for the SafeFutures program. In addition, Boys & Girls Clubs of America, Communities In Schools, and other public and private agencies have agreed to help implement this initiative. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development also

contributed \$100,000 for training and technical assistance to help prevent delinquency and juvenile violence in public housing areas of SafeFutures sites.

Although the SafeFutures program is relatively new, grantees have taken positive steps in their communities to improve services and create new programs. They have developed a variety of activities, including quick-response teams of police and community workers to prevent gang violence; peer courts; recreational programs that offer positive alternatives to the streets; "one-stop shopping" for health, counseling, and educational services for youth and their families; and special mental health services for families whose daughters are involved in gangs.

OJJDP also is funding a national evaluation of the program. The Office is especially interested in determining the success of each site in developing and implementing a strategic plan to establish a continuum of care and integrated services for young people in high-risk communities. The Office awarded a cooperative agreement to the Urban Institute of Washington, D.C., to conduct the evaluation, which will track the lessons learned at each site.

## *Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program*

It is no secret that children who are abused or neglected often resort to delinquent or violent behavior later in life. Recognizing the importance of breaking this cycle before it begins, OJJDP began a major new community-based initiative in 1996 known as the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program. Five communities were awarded a total of \$2.7 million in 1997 for an initial 18-month budget period to help them improve how their communities respond to abused and neglected children and their families. Each community is working to coordinate the management of abuse and neglect cases by improving the policies and practices of the criminal and juvenile justice, child welfare, family services, and related systems. Each community is also developing comprehensive communitywide, cross-agency strategies and programs to reduce abuse and neglect and the child fatalities that often result.

The five communities receiving OJJDP funds for this program are Huntsville, AL; the Sault Sainte Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians in Michigan; Kansas City, MO; Toledo, OH; and Chittenden County, VT. The large number (178) of applications OJJDP received for these grants indicates that many communities are developing coordinated, multifaceted responses to abuse and neglect. The sites are now revising or finalizing the implementation plans that will guide their efforts over the 5<sup>1/2</sup>-year project period.

In 1997, OJJDP awarded a grant to Westat, Inc., of Rockville, MD, to document and evaluate how communities implement their programs. Westat is assessing such issues as community mobilization, planning, and collaboration, and is considering the feasibility of evaluating the impact of the program.

## *Juvenile Mentoring Program*

The Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP) encompasses 93 programs across the country that provide adult mentors to thousands of young people. Mentors work one-on-one with youth who are at risk of educational failure, school dropout, and involvement in delinquent activities, including gangs and drugs. Mentors in JUMP come from all walks of life. They include law enforcement officers, college students, senior citizens, military personnel, business people, doctors, lawyers, government employees, and teachers. OJJDP originally funded 41 sites in 1995 using 1994 and 1995 funds totaling \$6.8 million. Because of the high interest in JUMP and the quality of applications, OJJDP again combined funds (from 1996 and 1997) and awarded an additional 52 sites a total of \$9.8 million. The awards are for a 3-year period.

OJJDP released a Bulletin in 1997 that examined the impact of mentoring programs run by Big Brothers Big Sisters of America. The evaluation found that youth involved in mentoring programs were less likely to experiment with alcohol and drugs, less likely to hit someone, and less likely to skip school than youth not participating in such programs. *Mentoring—A Proven Delinquency Prevention Strategy* is available from JJC.

The Office awarded a grant in 1997 to Information Technology International of Bethesda, MD, to conduct an evaluation of the JUMP program.

## *Family Strengthening Program*

Helping children grow up in strong, safe families is critical for the future of this country; many families are in need of help. Prevention, early intervention, and effective crisis intervention are crucial elements of a good family support system. However, in many communities one or more of these elements may be missing or existing programs may not be coordinated. In addition, training and technical assistance often are unavailable to community organizations and agencies providing family strengthening services.

OJJDP responded to this need by providing funds to these programs in 1995 for training and technical assistance. During the past 2 years the Office's grantee, the Department of Health Education at the University of Utah, completed a literature review, developed summaries of exemplary programs, and conducted a national search for family strengthening models. Based on a set of strict evaluation criteria, the grantee selected 11 exemplary programs and showcased them at 2 regional conferences in Salt Lake City, UT, and Washington, D.C. The grantee also conducted numerous workshops, produced training guides, and distributed videos of several family strengthening workshops.

## *Model Courts Program*

Since 1992, OJJDP has provided funds to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) in Reno, NV, to support a nationwide program to improve how courts handle child abuse and neglect cases. The Victims Model Court Project, recognizing that foster care is a last resort and temporary solution, moves abused and neglected children through the court process in a more timely manner and into safe and permanent homes. The cornerstone of this project is a widely acclaimed publication, *Resource Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases*, published by NCJFCJ in 1995. It has been endorsed by the Coordinating Council, the Conference of Chief Justices, and the American Bar Association

(ABA). Courts nationwide use it as a blueprint to assess barriers to permanency and to implement systemic change to benefit children.

The Victims Model Court Project initially focused on Hamilton County Juvenile Court in Cincinnati, OH, a program referred to by the ABA as "one court that works." In the past 3 years, 12 additional courts have been named as models for improving practice. They are located in Tucson, AZ; San Jose, CA; Miami, FL; Honolulu, HI; Chicago, IL; Louisville, KY; Newark, NJ; Reno, NV; Nashville, TN; El Paso, TX; Salt Lake City, UT; and Alexandria, VA. In addition to reengineering their own systems, these courts help other courts across the Nation by hosting site visits and providing training and written materials.

During the past 2 years, NCJFCJ has conducted many training presentations at national, State, and local conferences and seminars and also has developed a comprehensive curriculum in permanency planning. The grantee also has provided technical assistance to courts nationwide both directly and through written products, including a Technical Assistance Bulletin series that provides timely topical information to help courts improve their daily practice dependency cases. During the past 6 months, NCJFCJ responded to more than 700 requests for technical assistance.

## *Hate Crime Prevention*

Increased racial, ethnic, and religious tensions and hate crimes are a nationwide concern. With funding from OJJDP to address this critical issue, the Education Development Center (EDC) of Newton, MA, developed *Healing the Hate: A National Bias Crime Prevention Curriculum for Middle Schools*.

The curriculum has been distributed to more than 9,000 juvenile justice policymakers, practitioners, judges, schools, and law enforcement personnel. During 1997, EDC conducted regional training sessions in Boston, Chicago, and Miami that were attended by multidisciplinary teams of school officials, teachers, students, law enforcement, prosecutors, and community leaders. EDC also made several presentations at education conferences

for the U.S. Department of Education, which is a funding partner in this initiative.

## *Teens, Crime, and the Community*

At a national youth conference in Miami in 1996, young people in attendance indicated they would like to have a voice in Federal juvenile justice policy. OJJDP and the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC), which sponsored the conference as part of its OJJDP-funded Teens, Crime, and the Community Program, responded by establishing the National Youth Network (NYN). NCPC and a number of sponsoring organizations brought more than two dozen youth to Baltimore, MD, in 1997 for a planning meeting and leadership training, followed by a retreat in Columbia, SC.

Since then, NYN has evolved into an active youth-led organization. It is primarily self-governing but receives assistance from OJJDP; the Teens, Crime, and the Community Program; and approximately 20 sponsoring organizations. The group consists of 40 youth representing 20 youth-serving organizations. The mission of NYN, as defined by the youth themselves, is to serve as a catalyst for youth across the country to prevent crime and victimization and to make a difference in their communities by collaborating among youth-focused national, State, and community-based organizations; distributing information on successful programs and strategies; advocating youth perspectives to policymakers; promoting the need for positive youth activities through the media; and reaching out to nonaffiliated youth, especially those in the juvenile justice system.

NYN has established five committees that address the areas of public relations, publications, public policy, events, and sponsors/outreach. Each committee meets monthly via conference call and has established benchmarks to be achieved in 1998. Goals include developing bylaws, producing a Youth in Action publication series, establishing a Web site as part of an upcoming Department of Justice "Kidspage," sponsoring two retreats; and participating in OJJDP's 1998 National Conference. A youth leadership council oversees all NYN plans and activities.



## *Chapter 2*

# *Sharing Information Is an OJJDP Priority*

OJJDP has seen a surge in requests for information in the past decade, as communities across the Nation struggle to find programs that work. Information exists in the form of research, statistics, and demonstration programs, and OJJDP is working vigorously to get it into the hands of those who can use it. The Office is committed to disseminating information at the grassroots level and produced more than 50 publications in 1997 toward that end.

However, sharing information includes more than producing documents; the information needs to be easily accessible to wide audiences in a variety of formats. During the past 2 years, OJJDP used the following vehicles to disseminate information: publications, videos, CD-ROMs, satellite video-conferences, e-mail, and Internet sites. This chapter highlights OJJDP's key efforts to keep the juvenile justice field informed about major breakthroughs in research and promising programs.

*I use your materials constantly for training new volunteers. I also like your Web site and have started downloading documents when I'm in a hurry.*

Court Appointed Special Advocate  
Portland, OR

### *Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse*

OJJDP's major vehicle for distributing information is the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse. JJC offers toll-free telephone and online access to information, prepares specialized responses to information requests, produces and distributes OJJDP

publications, provides exhibits at national conferences, and maintains a comprehensive juvenile justice library and data base. The Clearinghouse is a component of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service and is located in Rockville, MD.

During the past 2 years, JJC redesigned the home page on OJJDP's Web site, making it easier for users to locate juvenile justice information and resources. The home page now includes subpages highlighting special OJJDP programs and initiatives.

The Clearinghouse also oversees OJJDP's popular electronic mailing list, JUVJUST, which currently has more than 2,000 subscribers. JUVJUST alerts subscribers to new documents, funding opportunities, and other OJJDP news. Subscribers received more than 90 postings in 1997.

JJC also produces many of OJJDP's publications, including the *Juvenile Justice* journal, OJJDP Bulletins and Fact Sheets, Research Reports, and the widely acclaimed Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse series. This series, produced for OJJDP's Missing and Exploited Children's Program (described on page 21), won a first-place Blue Pencil award from the National Association of Government Communicators (NAGC) in 1997. Two other JJC publications highlighting OJJDP's Youth Environmental Services initiative also were recognized by NAGC in 1997.

### *How To Access Information*

Phone: 800-638-8736

E-Mail: [askncjrs@ncjrs.org](mailto:askncjrs@ncjrs.org)

Internet: [www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm](http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm)

JJC distributed close to 3 million publications to a mailing list of almost 100,000 individuals during 1996 and 1997; another 100,000 people learned of OJJDP publications at 167 conferences attended by JJC staff. During the past 2 years, the Clearinghouse responded to more than 100,000 requests for information that were received via the toll-free number, the Internet, and fax services. JJC also maintains an extensive library collection and data base and acquired more than 2,000 new titles during 1996 and 1997.

## *CD-ROM*

For the past 2 years, OJJDP has been working on a technologically exciting new initiative—a CD-ROM titled *Reducing Youth Violence: A Comprehensive Approach*. The Office believes that this is the first use of an interactive multimedia CD-ROM in the fields of criminal and juvenile justice.

The CD-ROM showcases promising and effective programs and resources that address youth violence. It includes 126 full publications, 27,000 document files, 13,000 pages of text, 420 charts and graphs, 1,260 program documents with 6,000 pages of text, and more than 560 graphic illustrations. It also refers viewers to additional resources, training, and technical assistance.

The Office has distributed 1,000 copies of the preliminary version and is now analyzing user feedback. After making modifications based on the feedback, OJJDP hopes to have a final version of the CD-ROM completed during the summer of 1998. The CD-ROM is being produced by OJJDP's grantee, the University of California at Riverside.

## *Satellite Videoconferencing*

OJJDP is using satellite videoconferencing as a cost-effective way to provide training to individuals who live and work in areas that may limit their access to up-to-date information. It is more efficient to train individuals where they live than to transport them to another area; it also reduces travel time for trainers and allows them to deliver a consistent message simultaneously to thousands of professionals.

Videoconferencing also allows OJJDP to reach staff who otherwise might be excluded from national training opportunities. Finally, it acts as a catalyst for local, regional, and State examination of OJJDP initiatives and research findings.

During 1996 and 1997, OJJDP broadcast 9 national videoconferences to more than 3,650 jurisdictions and approximately 100,000 viewers. The telecasts covered a variety of topics—juvenile boot camps, conflict resolution for youth, reduction of youth gun violence, youth out of the education mainstream, juvenile court viability, youth gangs, drug abuse prevention programs for youth, mentoring, and drug treatment programs. Videos of all OJJDP-sponsored teleconferences are available for a fee from JJC.

Assessments of the satellite videoconferences indicate that OJJDP is doing a good job of providing timely information to juvenile justice professionals. On average, more than 90 percent of those responding to surveys said that the content of the teleconferences successfully addressed critical issues affecting their professional responsibilities; that the panelists provided useful, understandable information; and that they had used ideas presented during the teleconferences to modify or implement programs in their communities.

OJJDP has supported teleconferencing since 1992, when it funded the Juvenile Justice Telecommunications Assistance Project at Eastern Kentucky University. This technology has become an integral part of OJJDP's continuing efforts to disseminate information across the Nation in a timely manner.

## *National Conference*

In 1996, OJJDP sponsored its first national conference, *Juvenile Justice At The Crossroads*. OJJDP asked national leaders to offer strategic and programmatic solutions to help the field address the changing nature and pattern of juvenile delinquency. Attorney General Janet Reno and other OJJDP staff joined approximately 700 participants, including personnel from State juvenile justice agencies, leading researchers in the field, judges, State and local policymakers, practitioners, members

of public interest groups, and program administrators and directors.

During the 2½-day conference, speakers discussed the changing nature of juvenile offenders, the impact of “get tough” measures on combating juvenile crime, community responses to juvenile crime and violence, innovative intervention and juvenile justice system strategies, tools to support juvenile justice professionals, and promising approaches in delinquency prevention programming. The conference also included a satellite teleconference broadcast, *Has the Juvenile Court Outlived Its Usefulness?* Conference proceedings are available online from JJC.

OJJDP plans to convene a national conference every other year; the next one will be held December 10–12, 1998, in Washington, D.C.

## *Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act*

One of the publications released in 1997 helps educators and others who work with juveniles understand how they can share information while still complying with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), a Federal law that limits the disclosure of information from a student’s education records. This document was developed jointly by OJJDP and the U.S. Department of Education.

*Sharing Information: A Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and Participation in Juvenile Justice Programs* gives an overview of FERPA and uses realistic scenarios to illustrate how information can be shared legally. For example, a teacher who witnesses a student threatening a classmate can share this information with law enforcement because it is based on personal observation, not on the student’s educational record. The *Guide* also includes examples of court orders, interagency agreements, and State information-sharing statutes; FERPA regulations for reference; and information about additional resources and technical assistance. OJJDP has distributed more than 36,000 copies of the document; it is available from JJC.

## *Guide to Conflict Resolution Education*

Another new publication addresses conflict resolution programs, which schools and youth educators are using to help promote both the individual behavioral changes necessary for responsible citizenship and the systemic changes necessary to ensure a safe learning environment. *Conflict Resolution Education: A Guide to Implementing Programs in Schools, Youth-Serving Organizations, and Community and Juvenile Justice Settings* provides both basic information and the experience of experts in the field of conflict resolution education programs. It provides information needed to select and implement a conflict resolution program along with examples of quality programs.

The *Guide* also includes tools to help educators make informed decisions about conflict resolution education programs, a discussion of the principles of these programs, descriptions of four approaches, guidance on how to extend conflict resolution skills beyond the classroom and into the community, a summary of research and evaluations on effective conflict resolution programs, and a list of curriculum resources. OJJDP has distributed more than 14,000 copies of this document. In addition, the Sacramento, CA, school district, assisted by JJC and OJJDP, reprinted 10,000 copies of the manual for distribution to its schools. The *Guide* is available from JJC.

## *Report on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*

In 1997, OJJDP released information from a groundbreaking report that presents a comprehensive assessment of serious and violent juvenile (SVJ) offenders. The report contains research-based information on these offenders, programs that have been tried and how well they have performed, and lessons that policymakers and practitioners have learned.

The report is the product of OJJDP’s Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders, funded

in 1995 through the University of Pittsburgh. The study group was created to help jurisdictions implement OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy. The report provides an authoritative discussion of issues surrounding SVJ offenders, a population that poses the greatest challenge to State and local policymakers. It integrates the concept of risk and protective factors with information about intervention and prevention programs. The study group included 29 juvenile justice and criminology researchers who spent almost 2 years examining hundreds of studies from the United States, Canada, England, Scandinavia, and other countries. Some of the authors' conclusions are as follows:

- ◆ SVJ offenders are a distinct group who tend to start offending early and continue late.
- ◆ From childhood to adolescence, SVJ offenders tend to develop behavior problems, including aggression, dishonesty, property offenses, and conflict with authority figures.
- ◆ Prevention interventions for young children at risk of becoming SVJ offenders are known to be effective and should be implemented at an early age.
- ◆ Interventions and sanctions for known SVJ offenders can reduce their risk of reoffending.

An OJJDP Bulletin summarizing the report was released in March 1998. Additional products will be developed and will be available online from JJC in the near future.

## *Causes and Correlates Research Program*

OJJDP's longitudinal study, the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency, continues to contribute new information to help the field answer the question, What causes a juvenile to commit delinquent acts? Since OJJDP began funding the program in 1986, researchers at three project sites have interviewed 4,000 juveniles at regular intervals, recording their lives in detail. The program is a milestone because it is the largest shared measurement approach ever achieved in delinquency research. Research findings to date

indicate that preventing the onset of delinquency requires accurate identification of the risk factors that increase the likelihood of delinquent behavior and the protective factors that enhance positive adolescent development. Findings from this research contributed significantly to the development of the Comprehensive Strategy and other OJJDP program initiatives.

Researchers examined a number of issues during the past 2 years, including risk factors for teenage fatherhood; patterns of illegal gun carrying among young, urban males; factors associated with early sexual activity among urban adolescents; drug use; impact of family changes on adolescent development; and neighborhood, individual, and social risk factors for serious juvenile offenders.

In keeping with its commitment to disseminate information to the field, OJJDP began a publication series in 1997 that presents the most notable findings from the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency research program. *Epidemiology of Serious Violence*, the first OJJDP Bulletin in this series, answers basic questions about the varying levels

*I just received your publication In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment and I want to express to you my gratitude. I help to define 14- and 15-year-old kids who have been charged with violent felonies. In doing this work I quickly found that what these kids have done can only be properly understood in the context of their very difficult family situations, which often includes abuse and neglect. Since these kids are seen as merely "bad" by the judge and the assistant district attorney, I had been looking for a study to bolster my argument that many of them deserve to benefit from a nonjail sentence. Your study is exactly what I needed. So in a nutshell, thank you so much.*

Forensic Social Worker  
New York, NY

of involvement in violent acts according to age, sex, and ethnicity and recommends a public health model of prevention, treatment, and control.

*In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment* explores the connections between childhood maltreatment and subsequent problem behaviors. The findings are particularly valuable because they come from a population sample that allowed researchers to examine how maltreated youth differ from the general population. Both publications are available from JJC.

OJJDP's grantees for this project are the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University at Albany, State University of New York.

## *Boot Camp Evaluation*

In response to increases in the rates and costs of traditional confinement, many jurisdictions are implementing boot camps for juvenile offenders. In 1992, OJJDP funded a program to develop and evaluate three boot camps designed to address the special needs and circumstances of juveniles.

In 1997, the Office published the findings of the interim evaluation reports in a publication titled *Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders*. The interim evaluations examined such issues as whether participants in juvenile boot camps receive the services prescribed for them, the impact of juvenile boot camps on recidivism rates, the benefits juvenile offenders derive from boot camps, and the effectiveness of such camps.

## *Chapter 3*

# *1996 and 1997 Program Plans*

The positive news about the drop in juvenile violent crime should not lead to a relaxation of efforts to lower still unacceptably high rates of juvenile violence and delinquency. As the accomplishments highlighted in the previous two chapters illustrate, OJJDP built on the positive momentum of the recent decrease in juvenile crime by continuing to focus on programs and strategies that work.

The Comprehensive Strategy remained at the heart of OJJDP's program plans and guided its efforts during the past 2 years. In addition to the activities already highlighted, OJJDP developed and funded a number of other programs promoting effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention. In determining which programs to fund, the Office designed its 1996 and 1997 program plans around three goals.

The primary goal was to identify and promote programs that prevent or reduce the occurrence of juvenile offenses, both criminal and noncriminal, and that intervene immediately and effectively when delinquent or status offense conduct first occurs. Such programs operate on a broad scale, providing positive youth development or targeting juveniles at high risk of delinquency with activities designed to reduce future juvenile offending. During 1996 and 1997, OJJDP developed prevention programs that draw on the basic principles of the public health model, which encourage people to avoid or change behaviors that put them at risk of health problems and introduce behaviors that can help them lead healthy lives. OJJDP's prevention programs identify the root causes of juvenile crime by examining the factors that put children at risk, then implement a range of programs and services to prevent delinquency from occurring in the first place. They provide services to juveniles whose noncriminal misbehavior indicates that they are on a pathway to delinquency, or to first-time

nonviolent delinquent offenders or nonserious repeat offenders who do not respond to initial system interventions. They are designed to deter future misconduct and to reduce the negative or enhance the positive factors in a child's life.

OJJDP's second goal was to support programs that improve the juvenile justice system and facilitate the most effective allocation of system resources. Such programs hold delinquent juveniles accountable for their conduct, especially serious and violent offenders, and improve the way the system deals with dependent, neglected, and abused children. To meet this goal, OJJDP funded programs that assist law enforcement, courts, and the corrections system. A community policing program, for example, is helping law enforcement prevent and control delinquency and child victimization. OJJDP also developed programs to help family courts, and the prosecutors and public defenders who practice in those courts, provide a system of justice that maintains due process protections. The Office also funded programs that use juvenile detention and correctional facilities in appropriate circumstances and under conditions that maximize public safety while at the same time providing effective rehabilitation services to juveniles. Finally, the Office funded programs that provide the research and statistics necessary to understand how the juvenile justice system works in serving children and families.

OJJDP's third program goal was to support programs that keep the public safe from juvenile delinquency and crime by using a balance of secure detention and corrections along with community-based alternatives. These include community-based programs and services for juveniles who have formal contact with the juvenile justice system and programs that maintain the safety of the public, are appropriately restrictive, and promote and preserve positive ties with the youth's family, school, and community.



Underlying each of these goals was the premise that their achievement is vital to ensure public safety from increased juvenile delinquency and violence.

Before deciding which programs to fund in 1996 and 1997, the Administrator of OJJDP sought input from OJJDP staff, other Federal agencies, and juvenile justice practitioners. Feedback from the 1996 national conference was particularly helpful for developing program priorities for 1997. This combined input led OJJDP to identify a range of research and evaluation projects needed to expand knowledge about juvenile offenders; the effectiveness of prevention, intervention, and treatment programs; and the operation of the juvenile justice system.

Combined with continuation programs, the new programs OJJDP funded in 1996 and 1997 form a continuum that supports the eight objectives outlined in the Coordinating Council's *Action Plan* (see page 4). The Office also continued to support a number of programs identified by Congress for funding. This chapter provides brief summaries of the new programs OJJDP funded during the past 2 years and examples of some of the Office's continuation programs.

## *New Programs*

OJJDP provided funds for nine new programs in 1996 and 1997. These programs address school-based gang intervention and prevention, juvenile sex offenders, cost-benefit analysis of juvenile justice programs, youth courts, youth gun violence, female juvenile offenders, technical assistance for Native-Americans, mentoring activities, and community and court responses to child abuse and neglect.

A new program to examine the cost benefits of juvenile justice programs is an example of an overarching program in 1997. Jurisdictions are facing difficult questions in regard to adjudication programs: Which ones work best and how does their effectiveness compare with their costs? Should programs be continued, expanded, or discontinued? To help practitioners analyze programs in terms of cost and effectiveness, OJJDP provided funds in

1997 to develop an effective method of analysis. The University of Texas and the Dallas County Juvenile Department are performing a substantive cost-benefit analysis of juvenile adjudications in the county to determine the analytic method that can provide the most useful answers. The grantees will examine how to determine program effectiveness, estimate and allocate unit costs of different programs, identify types and monetary values of benefits, and determine the cost-benefit relationships of different programs.

In terms of prevention programs, youth courts are one approach to handling petty theft, vandalism, truancy, and other problem behaviors of youth. They emphasize accountability, positive peer pressure, competency development, and youth empowerment. These programs offer jurisdictions a way to hold young offenders accountable for problem behaviors for which they previously may have received little or no intervention. To determine how effective youth courts are, OJJDP awarded a 1997 grant to The Urban Institute of Washington, D.C., to research and evaluate programs across the country. The grantee will examine several dimensions of youth court programs, including recidivism and changes in juveniles' perceptions of justice and in their ability to make more mature judgments. To evaluate the effectiveness of youth courts, The Urban Institute will compare youth handled in at least three separate youth court programs with those processed by the traditional juvenile justice system. They also will look at the legal, administrative, and case process factors that affect the ability of youth court programs to achieve their goals.

Another new prevention program funded in 1997 addresses youth gangs, which continue to be a problem in this country. Schools have established a variety of programs to combat this problem, such as implementing a youth gang unit or promoting entrepreneurial skills through storekeeping, gardening, and similar programs. To help schools identify promising and effective programs, OJJDP funded a survey of school-based gang prevention and intervention programs. Researchers will classify and describe approaches used by a large sample of urban, suburban, and rural schools to prevent or

reduce gang involvement among students. They will also review activities that States have undertaken to identify and evaluate school-based gang prevention and intervention programs. The research is being conducted by Gottfredson Associates, Inc., of Ellicott City, MD.

OJJDP supported several new programs to help strengthen and improve the juvenile justice system. A new research program will gather data about juvenile sex offenders. A lack of information about appropriate levels of placement, potential for rehabilitation, risk assessment, and intervention needs makes it difficult for policymakers, law enforcement officials, and practitioners to determine how to deal with this troubling population. To help remedy this, OJJDP awarded a grant in 1997 to the University of Illinois at Springfield to determine which methodologies are best suited to develop and validate an empirically based typology of the juvenile sexual offender. The grantee will create a data base of current information identifying offender, offense, and treatment-linked variables considered significant in the field and will develop a Web site to disseminate findings from the research.

Another program to help strengthen the juvenile justice system addresses gender issues. It builds on training and technical assistance provided by OJJDP in 1995 to help States provide better services for female juvenile offenders. To further these efforts, OJJDP awarded a grant in 1996 to Green, Peters and Associates of Nashville, TN, to design and provide further training and technical assistance. During 1997, the grantee developed a training curriculum for policymakers, advocacy organizations, and community leaders; tested it at three pilot sites; and drafted a monograph for national dissemination.

*Janet Reno has her finger on the "pulse" of juvenile justice and reinforces that we are on the right track.*

1996 OJJDP National Conference Attendee

OJJDP is also helping Native-American programs strengthen their responses to juvenile delinquency and crime. Many reservations are experiencing the same problems that plague other communities: gang activity, violent crime, use of weapons, and increasing drug and alcohol abuse. From 1992 to 1995, OJJDP funded programs at the Gila River Indian Community in Arizona, the Jemez Pueblo in New Mexico, the Navajo Nation in Arizona, and the Red Lake Band of Chippewa in Minnesota to help them deal with juvenile crime. Although programs at these sites have been successful, each needed to expand programming options, such as gang prevention and intervention programs. In 1997, OJJDP awarded a grant to American Indian Development Associates of Albuquerque, NM, to develop a national technical assistance program to provide additional programming for the four sites and to extend support to tribes and urban tribal programs across the country. During 1997, the grantee provided training and technical assistance to 95 tribes throughout the country. The grantee assisted tribal governments in strengthening their juvenile justice systems and juvenile detention practices, especially their abilities to provide immediate intervention and appropriate sanctions for delinquent youth, assess their justice system needs, and develop partnerships with the U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Attorneys, and legal and judicial organizations. The grantee also facilitated team learning activities during a Native-American youth gang prevention conference in Arizona, coordinated the first Native-American juvenile justice summit, and provided technical assistance to Native-American tribes on behalf of several DOJ offices, including OJJDP's tribal SafeFutures site.

Two new initiatives to help strengthen and improve the juvenile justice system—the Juvenile Mentoring Program and the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program—are described in chapter 1.

The Partnerships To Reduce Juvenile Gun Violence Program is an initiative that began in 1996 to help communities and law enforcement work together to reduce youth gun violence. OJJDP awarded grants to four communities that had implemented

or were in the process of implementing programs to reduce gun violence by juveniles. Grants were awarded to Youth Alive of Oakland, CA; the city of Baton Rouge, LA; Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse of Shreveport, LA; and Center for Community Alternatives of Syracuse, NY.

OJJDP's funding is helping these communities strengthen their efforts by coordinating strategies and strengthening links among residents, law enforcement, and the juvenile justice system. The grantees are incorporating a number of strategies, including providing positive opportunities (such as mentoring) for youth; developing conflict resolution programs; using a public information strategy that communicates the consequences of gun violence; expanding neighborhood communication through community policing; encouraging grassroots community activities that engage neighborhood residents (including youth) in community improvement; reducing juvenile access to illegal guns and gun trafficking through law enforcement, prosecution, and increasing sanctions; and applying appropriate treatment interventions that respond to the needs of juvenile offenders who enter the system on gun-related charges. OJJDP awarded a grant to COSMOS Corporation of Bethesda, MD, in 1997 to conduct an evaluation of the four programs.

## *Continuation Programs*

The new grants described above work in tandem with many existing OJJDP programs. For example, the Office continued to support a range of comprehensive prevention, intervention, and suppression activities targeting youth gangs during the past 2 years. These efforts include evaluating local projects and informing communities about the nature and extent of gang activities and effective and innovative programs through OJJDP's National Youth Gang Center located at the Institute for Intergovernmental Research in Tallahassee, FL. The new program that examines school-based gang prevention and intervention efforts and evaluates the Boys & Girls Clubs gang outreach efforts, along with the program that evaluates

juvenile gun violence, complement existing law enforcement and prosecutor training programs by supporting and providing research-based information to grassroots community organizations addressing these issues. These programs also build on OJJDP's youth-focused community policing, mentoring, and conflict resolution initiatives and drug abuse prevention activities, such as those performed by the Congress of National Black Churches and the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, both of Washington, D.C.

In support of the need to break the cycle of violence, the new Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program complements OJJDP's continuing support of court appointed special advocates programs, children's advocacy centers, and prosecutor and judicial training in the dependency field.

The research and evaluation programs that OJJDP supported in 1996 and 1997 will help fill critical gaps in knowledge about the level and seriousness of juvenile crime and victimization, their causes and correlates, and effective programs that prevent delinquency and violence. At the same time, the Office geared its research toward efforts that monitor and evaluate the ways in which youth are treated by the juvenile and criminal justice systems and the trends in this response, particularly as they relate to juvenile violence and its impact.

The Office also continued to use its national perspective to disseminate information to a variety of audiences, including those who are directly responsible for planning and implementing policies and programs that have a positive impact on juvenile crime and violence.

The various contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, and interagency fund transfers that OJJDP supported in 1996 and 1997 form a continuum of activity designed to address youth violence, delinquency, and victimization. By working together, Federal, State, and local agencies; Native-American tribes; national organizations; private philanthropies; the corporate and business sectors; health, mental health, and social service agencies; schools; youth; families; and clergy can form the partnerships

necessary to ensure public safety and keep the Nation's young people from becoming involved in juvenile crime and violence.

All the continuation programs funded by OJJDP in 1996 and 1997 are described in greater detail in

the *Comprehensive Program Plan for Fiscal Year 1996: OJJDP Program Objectives*, available from JJC, and in the proposed 1998 Program Plan, published in the *Federal Register* on February 6, 1998, and available electronically from JJC on OJJDP's home page.

## *Chapter 4*

# *Missing and Exploited Children's Program*

According to the National Crime Information Center, each year in America approximately 900,000 children are reported missing. Many of them are runaways while others are taken by noncustodial parents and often used as pawns in custody battles. Some wander away and are unable to find their way home, and still others are the victims of child predators. Congress, recognizing the need for a national response to this issue, passed the Missing Children's Assistance Act in 1984 and established the Missing and Exploited Children's Program (MECP) within OJJDP. The program funds a national clearinghouse and resource center, coordinates Federal missing and exploited children activities, provides training and technical assistance, and conducts research pertaining to missing and exploited children.

The past 2 years were active for MECP, and its accomplishments were many. A major highlight was the dedication and opening of the Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center, which teaches law enforcement personnel how to investigate cases of missing children more effectively. The program also released important findings from a study of child homicides and produced numerous publications to help the Nation respond more effectively to missing and exploited children. New publications include a highly acclaimed series of Portable Guides for investigators and others and a valuable resource manual that contains detailed information about Federal programs and services available to help agencies that serve missing and exploited children and their families.

During 1996 and 1997, the Office focused on programs that increase awareness of problems relating to missing and exploited children, develop community approaches to address concerns related to these children, and provide assistance to help communities implement effective programs. These programs are described in this chapter.

## *The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children*

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), the cornerstone of MECP, is a national resource center and clearinghouse located in Arlington, VA. Since its inception in 1984, NCMEC has received more than 1 million calls to its 24-hour hotline, assisted in the recovery of more than 38,600 children, distributed millions of publications, and provided advice and technical assistance to thousands of parents, prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and child service professionals.

During 1996 and 1997, NCMEC's toll-free hotline (800-843-5678) received 235,648 calls, ranging from citizens reporting investigative leads to requests for publications and help from parents, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and other professionals working on missing children issues. The NCMEC Web site, which provides missing children posters and publications for downloading, registered more than 1 million requests for information.

One of NCMEC's earliest goals was to implement a missing children's clearinghouse in every State. This goal was reached in 1997. In 1984, only two States had clearinghouses for missing children. Today NCMEC is electronically linked with clearinghouses in all 50 States and can instantly transmit photographs and case information. During the past year NCMEC, using OJJDP funds, continued the upgrade of the State clearinghouse online communications network begun in 1996 by installing new computers, scanners, software, and printers. The upgrade substantially enhanced NCMEC's capacity to share information and disseminate missing children posters.

Through a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of State and OJJDP, NCMEC continued to handle all incoming Hague Convention cases (cases involving foreign children abducted from countries agreeing to abide by the Hague Convention). NCMEC helps locate children who are brought to the United States from other countries illegally and facilitates visitation or their return to the custodial parent. With additional OJJDP funding, NCMEC assists American parents whose children have been wrongfully removed to other countries. NCMEC helps translate documents, disseminates posters, provides legal advice about the Hague Convention, and acts as a liaison with international law enforcement organizations and missing children advocacy groups. NCMEC has handled approximately 761 Hague Convention cases from 47 countries, resulting in the return of more than 300 children to their country of habitual residence.

NCMEC also developed and implemented a major new training and technical assistance program to help law enforcement investigate cases of missing children more effectively. Authorized by Congress in 1996, the Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center, located at NCMEC, is named after the 9-year-old son of Donald and Claudine Ryce who was abducted and murdered in Florida in 1995. Developed in partnership with the FBI and Fox Valley Technical College (FVTC) of Appleton, WI, the center opened on April 15, 1997. It provides an intensive 2-day seminar for law enforcement executives and a 5-day course for law enforcement personnel working on cases of missing children. The seminars are restricted to policy-level law enforcement executives and highlight the most current research and practice related to missing children. During 1997, 242 chief executives attended the seminars. The 5-day course for investigators is held on a regional basis and helps Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel working on missing children cases strengthen their investigative techniques. During 1997, 634 law enforcement investigators received this training.

*Police in Portsmouth, MA, credit OJJDP with helping them solve the tragic case of a 10-year-old Cambridge youth who was abducted and murdered by two individuals who lured him into a car with the promise of a bicycle. Remembering that the Portsmouth police department had recently hosted an OJJDP seminar on responding to reports of missing and abducted children, the State police, who were coordinating this investigation across several States, asked for their assistance. Using the training they had received from OJJDP, the Portsmouth police department set up a command post to coordinate the search for the young boy. One of the suspects confessed that the boy had been murdered but tried to divert the search to the wrong location. Despite the suspect's efforts to divert the search, the police department used concepts learned from OJJDP's training to coordinate search teams and ultimately located the child's body.*

Portsmouth Police Department  
Portsmouth, MA

## *Major New Publications*

MECP produces many publications to help parents, social service professionals, law enforcement, and others who work with missing and exploited children. A series of Portable Guides was developed during the past 2 years to help police officers and medical and social service professionals investigate child abuse and neglect cases.

The Portable Guides were developed for personnel most immediately involved in investigating allegations of crimes against children: police officers, attorneys, social workers, physicians, and psychologists. The compact size of the guides (5 inches by 9 inches) allows them to be stored easily in the glove compartment of a police cruiser. Each guide is written in clear, concise language and includes



lists, tables, charts, and sample forms with information that can be assimilated quickly and easily. They were written by recognized experts in each subject area. OJJDP published 11 Portable Guides during the past 2 years:

- ◆ *Battered Child Syndrome: Investigating Physical Abuse and Homicide.*
- ◆ *Burn Injuries in Child Abuse.*
- ◆ *Child Neglect and Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy.*
- ◆ *Criminal Investigation of Child Sexual Abuse.*
- ◆ *Diagnostic Imaging of Child Abuse.*
- ◆ *Interviewing Child Witnesses and Victims of Sexual Abuse.*
- ◆ *Law Enforcement Response to Child Abuse.*
- ◆ *Photodocumentation in the Investigation of Child Abuse.*
- ◆ *Recognizing When a Child's Injury or Illness Is Caused by Abuse.*
- ◆ *Sexually Transmitted Diseases and Child Sexual Abuse.*
- ◆ *Understanding and Investigating Child Sexual Abuse.*

OJJDP has received many letters praising the series and numerous orders for the guides. Police and county sheriff's departments, district attorney and judicial offices, State courts, children and youth services agencies, and many others have requested multiple copies of the guides to use in

*A teacher who teaches a graduate class in classroom management says OJJDP's document Recognizing When a Child's Injury or Illness Is Caused by Abuse is "exactly what my students have been asking for. They are constantly asking how to identify when a child may be abused."*

Graduate-Level Teacher  
Greenville, SC

training. One child protective services unit, for example, requested 900 sets to be used for training. Two additional guides are currently being developed: one on a multidisciplinary team approach to investigating child abuse and another on computers and the sexual exploitation of children.

Another publication well received by the field was a resource manual released in 1996. *Federal Resources on Missing and Exploited Children: A Directory for Law Enforcement and Other Public and Private Agencies* puts a wealth of information at the fingertips of personnel who serve these children. It describes the many investigative resources, publications, training and technical assistance opportunities, and services available to law enforcement and other public and private agencies that serve missing and exploited children and their families. The resource manual contains extensive information about services available from a variety of Federal agencies. It also provides quick and easy access to the resources available during the investigation of missing and exploited children cases. The manual provides practical tools for practitioners in the areas of child sexual exploitation, child pornography, child abductions, and missing children cases. More than 18,000 copies of the manual have been distributed nationwide to law enforcement and child-serving agencies.

In 1996, OJJDP released a special report, *Special Joint Report: Federal Agency Task Force for Missing and Exploited Children*, that describes the many accomplishments of the Federal Agency Task Force for Missing and Exploited Children, established in 1995. The task force includes representatives from the U.S. Departments of Defense, Education, Health and Human Services, Justice, State, and Treasury; the U.S. Postal Service; and NCMEC. The report summarizes the agencies' individual and collective efforts and highlights steps that have been taken to better protect and support missing and exploited children and their families.

OJJDP and NCMEC also published *A Report to the Nation: Missing and Exploited Children*. It describes individual State action plans and advisory memorandums and suggests ways to improve State and local responses to missing and exploited children

cases. The report has been sent to all State governors and attorneys general. It is available from JJC.

OJJDP also provided funds to the ABA for the development of *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *Jurisdiction in Child Custody and Abduction Cases: A Judge's Guide to the UCCJA, PKPA, and the Hague Child Abduction Convention*. The publication examines the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act and the Parental Kidnapping Prevention Act.

During the past 2 years OJJDP released Fact Sheets on various topics, including parental kidnaping, Department of Justice programs for missing and exploited children, and a summary of MECP. NCMEC also produced numerous publications for parents, social services, and juvenile justice personnel who work with missing and exploited children. Publication topics ranged from advice for parents selecting babysitters to a Case in Point series for criminal justice professionals that examines case histories of convicted serial child molesters. These documents are available from NCMEC.

## *New Research Findings About Child Homicides*

MECP supports numerous research studies that address issues surrounding missing and exploited children. One of them, a 3-year research study of missing child homicides conducted by the Washington State Attorney General's Office, found valuable new data with significant implications for law enforcement. The study examined 577 child abduction murder cases from 44 States.

Researchers interviewed investigators who had successfully closed missing child homicide cases and collected information about investigative techniques; media impact; victim typology and risk assessment; offender characteristics, including postoffense behavior; evidence collection; and the various evidence sites within a homicide incident. The report is available from the Washington State Attorney General's Office Homicide Investigation Tracking Office, 800-345-2793.

## *Training and Technical Assistance*

MECP continued to provide training and technical assistance through its grantee, FVTC of Appleton, WI. In 1997, 4,100 individuals attended FVTC's training courses on a variety of topics, including investigative techniques, interview strategies, offender and victim profiles, community team investigations, and an overview of available resources to help State and local law enforcement investigate cases of missing, exploited, and abused children. During 1997, FVTC held 25 regional training courses throughout the country, conducted 10 week-long courses for local communities that requested training, and responded to 50 State and local requests for technical assistance. FVTC also implemented the Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center program (see page 22).

## *New Initiative*

MECP awarded 1997 funds to the National Center on Child Fatality Review (NCCFR) in Los Angeles for a new initiative to develop State and local uniform reporting definitions and generic child fatality review team protocols for communities interested in enhancing their child death investigations. NCCFR has developed a model for integrating data among the criminal justice, vital statistics, and social services child abuse indices.

## *Continuation Programs*

MECP funded several continuation programs during the past 2 years, including the Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association's Safe Return Program. During 1997, the program increased its registration data base to 30,000 individuals and assisted in the return of 1,700 patients who had wandered from their caregivers. The program also continued to manage a data base of more than 25,500 photographs, produced and disseminated training videos for law enforcement, and distributed Safe Return handbooks for the Alzheimer's Association.

OJJDP also continued to fund the Missing and Exploited Children's Comprehensive Action Program (M/CAP), a training program conducted by FVTC. M/CAP promotes the use of community multiagency teams to respond to missing and exploited children cases. OJJDP encouraged existing M/CAP sites to serve as regional technical assistance sites, and FVTC provided training and technical assistance to communities interested in developing M/CAP programs in their neighborhoods. To date, 27 communities have implemented this program, including a statewide effort in South Carolina.

OJJDP funding allowed NCMEC to continue its online access to the FBI National Crime Information Center's (NCIC's) wanted and missing persons files. NCMEC's ability to verify NCIC entries, communicate with law enforcement through the Interstate Law Enforcement Telecommunication System, and be notified of life-threatening cases through the NCIC flagging system is crucial to its mission of providing advice and technical assistance to law enforcement. A new flagging system that provides a place for reporting the endangered child was implemented in 1997.

Temple University Institute for Survey Research in Philadelphia continued work on OJJDP's second National Incidence Studies of Missing, Exploited, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMAART II). The project is building on the strengths and creatively addresses some of the weaknesses of the first incidence studies. Temple has assembled a team of experts who have extensive knowledge and experience with child victimization and survey research capabilities, particularly those involving sensitive topics regarding children and families. Temple is contracting

with the University of New Hampshire Survey Research Lab and Westat, Inc., to carry out specific components of the study and to provide extensive background knowledge about NISMAART I. Preliminary results are expected in early 1999.

In late 1995, OJJDP awarded the ABA an 18-month grant to study effective community-based approaches for dealing with missing and exploited children. During 1997, the grantee completed a national search for communities that had successfully implemented a multiagency response to missing and exploited children and selected five sites that hold promise for replication. After synthesizing the research findings, the ABA will develop a training curriculum to help other communities plan, implement, and evaluate a multiagency approach for handling missing and exploited children cases.

OJJDP also continued to fund the American Prosecutors Research Institute of the National District Attorneys' Association of Alexandria, VA. During 1997, the grantee trained 60 prosecutors on missing and exploited children issues, disseminated a quarterly newsletter, maintained an up-to-date parental kidnaping and child exploitation data base that included statutes and case law summaries, and provided technical assistance to more than 100 prosecutors and investigators.

The wide range of programs funded by MECP during the past 2 years—from NCMEC to the numerous publications, training, technical assistance, and research activities—have helped heighten public awareness, improve law enforcement responses, and focus national attention on ways to help missing and exploited children and their families.

## *Chapter 5*

# *State and Local Assistance Grants Programs*

A large portion of OJJDP's annual appropriation supports three programs that award funds directly to States to help communities combat juvenile crime and develop programs directed toward youth who are at risk of committing delinquent or criminal acts. Each has made significant contributions to the field of juvenile justice during the past 2 years.

The oldest of these programs, the Formula Grants Program, has fundamentally changed the way in which the juvenile justice system detains juveniles. It has been especially successful in helping States meet the needs of noncriminal juveniles—or status offenders—who were being confined in facilities where they did not belong and in removing juvenile offenders from adult jails and lockups where they were subject to abuse and influence by adult criminals. The Office is equally proud of the Title V Program, which is providing communities with the framework, tools, and initial funding needed to develop and implement delinquency prevention programs. It is especially exciting to see communities, which in the past had asked the Federal Government to help them “do something” about their growing juvenile crime problems, address these problems themselves through a methodical assessment of community needs. Early indications show that this strategy of helping communities develop programs designed to meet their specific needs is successful.

The University of Iowa, hired by the State to evaluate the planning, program implementation, and early outcomes of 20 of its Title V prevention grants programs, concluded that many programs are producing positive changes in client attitudes and behaviors.

The accomplishments of OJJDP's three formula grants programs—State Formula Grants Program, Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Program, and State Challenge Activities—are described in this chapter.

### *Formula Grants Program*

The Formula Grants Program has been operating for more than 23 years, since Congress passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act in 1974. It provides funds to help States meet four core requirements of the JJDP Act. The Act requires States to (1) deinstitutionalize status offenders and nonoffenders, (2) separate adults and juveniles held in secure institutions, (3) eliminate the practice of detaining or confining juveniles in adult jails and lockups, and (4) reduce the disproportionate representation of minority juveniles in secure facilities where such conditions exist. Most States are now in full compliance or compliance with de minimis exceptions to the first three requirements. The fourth requirement was added to the level of a full core requirement in 1992 when Congress amended the JJDP Act. States are meeting this requirement as well by documenting numbers of minority and nonminority juveniles in secure confinement, analyzing the reasons for disproportionate representation, and implementing activities to address this issue.

One of OJJDP's major accomplishments in FY 1996 was to revise the regulations that govern the Formula Grants Program. Seeking input from the field, OJJDP invited judges, public defenders, prosecutors, sheriffs, other juvenile justice practitioners, and private citizens to “listening” conferences in Idaho and New Jersey. OJJDP also met with national associations and youth-serving agencies and asked for their responses to the proposed

changes. The Office also asked for written suggestions from State agencies and State advisory groups charged with implementing the JJDP Act and met with public interest groups and youth advocacy organizations. The resulting revisions allow States to be more flexible and reduce the complexity of program administration.

During 1996 and 1997, 57 States and Territories were eligible to participate in the Formula Grants Program. Wyoming and Kentucky did not meet the requirements necessary to participate. According to 1994 and 1995 monitoring reports, which determined eligibility for FY 1996 and 1997 Formula Grant funds, the vast majority of States were in compliance with the four core requirements of the JJDP Act. (The term "States" as used throughout the remainder of this chapter includes U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia.) Each State's annual monitoring report is based on data the State collects from secure juvenile and adult facilities. Data collection includes self-reporting to a State agency, onsite data collection by a State agency, or a combination of these methods. All State agencies administering the JJDP Formula Grants Program are required to verify data that are self-reported by facilities and received from other State agencies.

During 1997, 11 States with no violations were in compliance with the deinstitutionalization of status offenders provision of the JJDP Act, which stipulates that status offenders and nonoffenders cannot be detained or confined in secure detention or correctional facilities. Forty-four States were in full compliance with de minimis exceptions, with fewer than 29.4 violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the State.

Thirty-eight States with no violations were in compliance with the separation provision of the JJDP Act, which requires that accused and adjudicated delinquent, status offender, and nonoffender juveniles not have contact with incarcerated adults. Seventeen States were in compliance with separation based on regulatory exceptions.

The jail and lockup removal provision of the JJDP Act stipulates that juveniles cannot be detained in any adult jail or lockup. Twelve States with zero violations were in full compliance with this provision. Forty-two States were in compliance with de minimis exceptions, with fewer than 9 violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the State. One State is out of compliance with this provision.

Compliance with the disproportionate minority confinement (DMC) section of the JJDP Act is based on information provided in the States' FY 1996 Formula Grants Comprehensive Three-Year Plan Update. The provision requires States to determine if minority juveniles are disproportionately confined in secure detention and correctional facilities and, if so, to identify and address any features of their system that may account for the situation. Thirty-eight States have completed the identification and assessment phases and are implementing the intervention phase of the DMC initiative.

Another four States have completed the identification and assessment phases and have submitted a time-limited plan of action for completing the intervention phase. Four States have completed the identification phase, submitted a time-limited plan of action for the assessment phase, and agreed to submit a time-limited plan for addressing the intervention phase. Nine States have completed the identification phase and determined that minority youth are not disproportionately arrested or detained in their States.

The charts on pages 29–37 provide an overview of State compliance.

## *Community Prevention Grant Program*

The Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Program provides funds to local communities to start juvenile crime prevention programs. Though only 5 years old, this program has produced promising results.

*Continued on page 38*

## 1994 and 1995 Compliance Summary Totals

	1994	1995
<b><u>Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)</u></b>		
Full compliance—zero violations	13	11
Full compliance—de minimis exceptions	43*	44
Not participating	1	2
<b><u>Separation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders</u></b>		
Full compliance—zero violations	42*	38
Full compliance—exception provision	13	17
Not in compliance	1	0
Not participating	1	2
<b><u>Jail and Lockup Removal</u></b>		
Full compliance—zero violations	14	12
Full compliance—de minimis exceptions	38	42**
Not in compliance	4*	1
Not participating	1	2
<b><u>Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC)</u></b>		
Completed identification phase, assessment phase, and now implementing the intervention phase	28	38
Completed identification phase and assessment phase, and submitted time-limited plan for intervention phase	7	4
Completed identification phase, submitted time-limited plan for assessment phase, and agreed to submit a time-limited plan for intervention phase	11	4
Completed identification phase—no DMC problem exists in State	9	9
State's 1996 Formula Grant applications under review—eligibility to be determined	1*	-
Not participating	1	2
<p>* Kentucky submitted a 1994 Compliance Monitoring Report but did not participate in the 1996 Formula Grants Program.</p> <p>** Nebraska's 1995 Monitoring Report indicated that the State was not in compliance with the jail and lockup removal requirement. However, Nebraska was able to submit newer data that established its compliance with de minimis exceptions.</p>		



**State Compliance  
Based on 1995 Reports**

Formula Grant Participants	DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF STATUS OFFENDERS (DSO) Sec. 223(a)(12)(A)		
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— de minimis exceptions (1)	Not participating
Alabama		◆	
Alaska		◆	
Arizona		◆	
Arkansas		◆	
California		◆	
Colorado		◆	
Connecticut		◆	
Delaware	◆		
D.C.	◆		
Florida		◆	
Georgia		◆	
Hawaii		◆	
Idaho		◆	
Illinois		◆	
Indiana		◆	
Iowa		◆	
Kansas		◆	
Kentucky			◆
Louisiana		◆	
Maine		◆	
Maryland		◆	
Massachusetts		◆	
Michigan		◆	
Minnesota	◆		
Mississippi		◆	
Missouri		◆	
Montana		◆	
Nebraska		◆	
Nevada		◆	
New Hampshire		◆	
New Jersey		◆	
New Mexico		◆	

Formula Grant Participants	DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF STATUS OFFENDERS (DSO) Sec. 223(a)(12)(A)		
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— de minimis exceptions (1)	Not participating
New York		◆	
North Carolina		◆	
North Dakota		◆	
Ohio		◆	
Oklahoma		◆	
Oregon	◆		
Pennsylvania		◆	
Rhode Island	◆		
South Carolina		◆	
South Dakota		◆	
Tennessee		◆	
Texas		◆	
Utah		◆	
Vermont	◆		
Virginia		◆	
Washington	◆		
West Virginia		◆	
Wisconsin		◆	
Wyoming			◆
Amer. Samoa		◆	
Guam	◆		
N. Marianas	◆		
Palau	◆		
Puerto Rico		◆	
Virgin Islands	◆		
TOTALS	11	44	2

(1) Fewer than 29.4 violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the State.

## State Compliance Based on 1995 Reports

Formula Grant Participants	SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULT OFFENDERS Sec. 223(a)(13)		
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— exception provision (2)	Not participating
Alabama	◆		
Alaska		◆	
Arizona	◆		
Arkansas	◆		
California	◆		
Colorado		◆	
Connecticut		◆	
Delaware	◆		
D.C.	◆		
Florida	◆		
Georgia		◆	
Hawaii		◆	
Idaho	◆		
Illinois	◆		
Indiana	◆		
Iowa		◆	
Kansas	◆		
Kentucky			◆
Louisiana		◆	
Maine	◆		
Maryland		◆	
Massachusetts	◆		
Michigan	◆		
Minnesota	◆		
Mississippi		◆	
Missouri	◆		
Montana	◆		
Nebraska		◆	
Nevada	◆		
New Hampshire	◆		
New Jersey		◆	
New Mexico	◆		

Formula Grant Participants	SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULT OFFENDERS Sec. 223(a)(13)		
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— exception provision (2)	Not participating
New York		◆	
North Carolina	◆		
North Dakota	◆		
Ohio	◆		
Oklahoma	◆		
Oregon	◆		
Pennsylvania	◆		
Rhode Island	◆		
South Carolina	◆		
South Dakota		◆	
Tennessee		◆	
Texas		◆	
Utah	◆		
Vermont	◆		
Virginia		◆	
Washington	◆		
West Virginia		◆	
Wisconsin	◆		
Wyoming			◆
Amer. Samoa	◆		
Guam	◆		
N. Marianas	◆		
Palau	◆		
Puerto Rico	◆		
Virgin Islands	◆		
TOTALS	38	17	2

(2) OJJDP regulatory criteria set forth in Section 31.303(f)(6)(ii) of the OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation (28 CFR 31) and published in the June 20, 1985, *Federal Register*; allow States reporting noncompliant incidents to continue in the program provided the incidents are in violation of State law and no pattern or practice exists.

### State Compliance Based on 1995 Reports

Formula Grant Participants	JAIL AND LOCKUP REMOVAL Sec. 223(a)(14)			
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— de minimis exceptions (3)	Not in compliance	Not participating
Alabama		◆		
Alaska		◆		
Arizona		◆		
Arkansas	◆			
California		◆		
Colorado		◆		
Connecticut		◆		
Delaware		◆		
D.C.	◆			
Florida		◆		
Georgia		◆		
Hawaii		◆		
Idaho	◆			
Illinois		◆		
Indiana		◆		
Iowa		◆		
Kansas		◆		
Kentucky				◆
Louisiana		◆		
Maine		◆		
Maryland		◆		
Massachusetts			◆	
Michigan		◆		
Minnesota		◆		
Mississippi		◆		
Missouri	◆			
Montana		◆		
Nebraska*		◆		
Nevada		◆		
New Hampshire		◆		
New Jersey		◆		
New Mexico		◆		

Formula Grant Participants	JAIL AND LOCKUP REMOVAL Sec. 223(a)(14)			
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— de minimis exceptions (3)	Not in compliance	Not participating
New York		◆		
North Carolina	◆			
North Dakota		◆		
Ohio		◆		
Oklahoma		◆		
Oregon	◆			
Pennsylvania		◆		
Rhode Island		◆		
South Carolina		◆		
South Dakota		◆		
Tennessee		◆		
Texas		◆		
Utah		◆		
Vermont	◆			
Virginia		◆		
Washington		◆		
West Virginia		◆		
Wisconsin		◆		
Wyoming				◆
Amer. Samoa	◆			
Guam	◆			
N. Marianas	◆			
Palau	◆			
Puerto Rico		◆		
Virgin Islands	◆			
TOTALS	12	42	1	2

(3) Fewer than 9 violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the State.

\* Nebraska's 1995 Monitoring Report indicated that the State was not in compliance with the jail and lockup removal requirement. However, Nebraska was able to submit newer data that established its compliance with de minimis exceptions.

**State Compliance**  
**Based on FY 1996 Formula Grants Program Comprehensive Plan**

Formula Grant Participants	DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONFINEMENT (DMC) Sec. 223(a)(23)				
	Completed identification and assessment/implementing intervention phase	Completed identification and assessment/agreed to submit time-limited plan for completing intervention	Completed identification/ submitted time-limited plan for assessment	Completed identification phase—no DMC problem in the State	Not participating
Alabama	◆				
Alaska	◆				
Arizona	◆				
Arkansas	◆				
California	◆				
Colorado	◆				
Connecticut	◆				
Delaware			◆		
D.C.			◆		
Florida	◆				
Georgia	◆				
Hawaii	◆				
Idaho	◆				
Illinois	◆				
Indiana		◆			
Iowa	◆				
Kansas	◆				
Kentucky					◆
Louisiana	◆				
Maine				◆	
Maryland	◆				
Massachusetts		◆			
Michigan	◆				
Minnesota	◆				
Mississippi	◆				
Missouri	◆				
Montana	◆				
Nebraska			◆		
Nevada	◆				
New Hampshire				◆	
New Jersey	◆				
New Mexico	◆				

Formula Grant Participants	DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONFINEMENT (DMC) Sec. 223(a)(23)				
	Completed identification and assessment/implementing intervention phase	Completed identification and assessment/agreed to submit time-limited plan for completing intervention	Completed identification/ submitted time-limited plan for assessment	Completed identification phase—no DMC problem in the State	Not participating
New York	◆				
North Carolina	◆				
North Dakota	◆				
Ohio	◆				
Oklahoma	◆				
Oregon	◆				
Pennsylvania	◆				
Rhode Island		◆			
South Carolina	◆				
South Dakota	◆				
Tennessee	◆				
Texas			◆		
Utah	◆				
Vermont				◆	
Virginia	◆				
Washington	◆				
West Virginia	◆				
Wisconsin		◆			
Wyoming					◆
Amer. Samoa				◆	
Guam				◆	
N. Marianas				◆	
Palau				◆	
Puerto Rico				◆	
Virgin Islands				◆	
TOTALS	38	4	4	9	2

### State Compliance Based on 1994 Reports

Formula Grant Participants	DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF STATUS OFFENDERS (DSO) Sec. 223(a)(12)(A)		
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— de minimis exceptions (1)	Not participating
Alabama		●	
Alaska	●		
Arizona		●	
Arkansas		●	
California		●	
Colorado		●	
Connecticut		●	
Delaware	●		
D.C.	●		
Florida		●	
Georgia		●	
Hawaii		●	
Idaho		●	
Illinois		●	
Indiana		●	
Iowa		●	
Kansas		●	
Kentucky*		●	
Louisiana		●	
Maine		●	
Maryland		●	
Massachusetts		●	
Michigan		●	
Minnesota	●		
Mississippi		●	
Missouri		●	
Montana	●		
Nebraska		●	
Nevada		●	
New Hampshire	●		
New Jersey		●	
New Mexico		●	

Formula Grant Participants	DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF STATUS OFFENDERS (DSO) Sec. 223(a)(12)(A)		
	Full compliance— zero violations	Full compliance— de minimis exceptions (1)	Not participating
New York	●		
North Carolina		●	
North Dakota		●	
Ohio		●	
Oklahoma		●	
Oregon		●	
Pennsylvania		●	
Rhode Island	●		
South Carolina		●	
South Dakota		●	
Tennessee		●	
Texas		●	
Utah		●	
Vermont		●	
Virginia		●	
Washington	●		
West Virginia		●	
Wisconsin		●	
Wyoming			●
Amer. Samoa		●	
Guam	●		
N. Marianas	●		
Palau	●		
Puerto Rico		●	
Virgin Islands	●		
TOTALS	13	43	1

\* Kentucky submitted a 1994 Compliance Monitoring Report but did not participate in the 1996 Formula Grants Program.

(1) Fewer than 29.4 violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the State.

## State Compliance Based on 1994 Reports

Formula Grant Participants	SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULT OFFENDERS Sec. 223(a)(13)			
	Full compliance—zero violations	Full compliance—exception provision (2)	Not in compliance	Not participating
Alabama	●			
Alaska		●		
Arizona	●			
Arkansas		●		
California	●			
Colorado		●		
Connecticut		●		
Delaware	●			
D.C.	●			
Florida	●			
Georgia		●		
Hawaii	●			
Idaho	●			
Illinois	●			
Indiana	●			
Iowa	●			
Kansas	●			
Kentucky*	●			
Louisiana		●		
Maine	●			
Maryland	●			
Massachusetts	●			
Michigan	●			
Minnesota	●			
Mississippi		●		
Missouri	●			
Montana	●			
Nebraska			●	
Nevada	●			
New Hampshire	●			
New Jersey		●		
New Mexico	●			

Formula Grant Participants	SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULT OFFENDERS Sec. 223(a)(13)			
	Full compliance—zero violations	Full compliance—exception provision (2)	Not in compliance	Not participating
New York	●			
North Carolina	●			
North Dakota	●			
Ohio	●			
Oklahoma	●			
Oregon	●			
Pennsylvania	●			
Rhode Island	●			
South Carolina	●			
South Dakota		●		
Tennessee		●		
Texas		●		
Utah	●			
Vermont	●			
Virginia		●		
Washington	●			
West Virginia		●		
Wisconsin	●			
Wyoming				●
Amer. Samoa	●			
Guam	●			
N. Marianas	●			
Palau	●			
Puerto Rico	●			
Virgin Islands	●			
TOTALS	42	13	1	1

\* Kentucky submitted a 1994 Compliance Monitoring Report but did not participate in the 1996 Formula Grants Program.

(2) OJJDP regulatory criteria set forth in Section 31.303(f)(6)(ii) of the OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation (28 CFR 31) and published in the June 20, 1985, *Federal Register*, allow States reporting non-compliant incidents to continue in the program provided the incidents are in violation of State law and no pattern or practice exists.

### State Compliance Based on 1994 Reports

Formula Grant Participants	JAIL AND LOCKUP REMOVAL Sec. 223(a)(14)			
	Full compliance—zero violations	Full compliance—de minimis exceptions (3)	Not in compliance	Not participating
Alabama	●			
Alaska		●		
Arizona		●		
Arkansas		●		
California		●		
Colorado		●		
Connecticut		●		
Delaware		●		
D.C.	●			
Florida		●		
Georgia		●		
Hawaii		●		
Idaho	●			
Illinois		●		
Indiana		●		
Iowa		●		
Kansas		●		
Kentucky*			●	
Louisiana		●		
Maine		●		
Maryland	●			
Massachusetts			●	
Michigan		●		
Minnesota		●		
Mississippi		●		
Missouri		●		
Montana		●		
Nebraska			●	
Nevada	●			
New Hampshire			●	
New Jersey		●		
New Mexico		●		

Formula Grant Participants	JAIL AND LOCKUP REMOVAL Sec. 223(a)(14)			
	Full compliance—zero violations	Full compliance—de minimis exceptions (3)	Not in compliance	Not participating
New York		●		
North Carolina	●			
North Dakota		●		
Ohio	●			
Oklahoma		●		
Oregon	●			
Pennsylvania		●		
Rhode Island		●		
South Carolina		●		
South Dakota		●		
Tennessee		●		
Texas		●		
Utah		●		
Vermont	●			
Virginia		●		
Washington		●		
West Virginia		●		
Wisconsin		●		
Wyoming				●
Amer. Samoa	●			
Guam	●			
N. Marianas	●			
Palau	●			
Puerto Rico		●		
Virgin Islands	●			
TOTALS	14	38	4	1

\* Kentucky submitted a 1994 Compliance Monitoring Report but did not participate in the 1996 Formula Grants Program.

(3) Fewer than 9 violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the State.

## State Compliance Based on FY 1995 Formula Grants Program Comprehensive Plan

Formula Grant Participants	DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONFINEMENT (DMC) Sec. 223(a)(23)					
	Completed identification and assessment/implementing intervention phase	Completed identification and assessment/agreed to submit time-limited plan for completing intervention	Completed identification/ submitted time-limited plan for assessment	Completed identification phase—no DMC problem in the State	Grant application under review	Not participating
Alabama			●			
Alaska	●					
Arizona	●					
Arkansas		●				
California	●					
Colorado	●					
Connecticut	●					
Delaware	●					
D.C.			●			
Florida	●					
Georgia			●			
Hawaii	●					
Idaho	●					
Illinois		●				
Indiana		●				
Iowa	●					
Kansas		●				
Kentucky*					●	
Louisiana			●			
Maine				●		
Maryland	●					
Massachusetts	●					
Michigan	●					
Minnesota	●					
Mississippi			●			
Missouri	●					
Montana	●					
Nebraska			●			
Nevada	●					
New Hampshire				●		
New Jersey	●					
New Mexico	●					

Formula Grant Participants	DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONFINEMENT (DMC) Sec. 223(a)(23)					
	Completed identification and assessment/implementing intervention phase	Completed identification and assessment/agreed to submit time-limited plan for completing intervention	Completed identification/ submitted time-limited plan for assessment	Completed identification phase—no DMC problem in the State	Grant application under review	Not participating
New York	●					
North Carolina	●					
North Dakota	●					
Ohio	●					
Oklahoma	●					
Oregon	●					
Pennsylvania	●					
Rhode Island		●				
South Carolina			●			
South Dakota		●				
Tennessee	●					
Texas			●			
Utah		●				
Vermont				●		
Virginia			●			
Washington	●					
West Virginia			●			
Wisconsin			●			
Wyoming						●
Amer. Samoa				●		
Guam				●		
N. Marianas				●		
Palau				●		
Puerto Rico				●		
Virgin Islands				●		
TOTALS	28	7	11	9	1	1

\* Kentucky submitted a 1994 Compliance Monitoring Report but did not participate in the 1996 Formula Grants Program.



Passed by Congress in 1992, the Title V Program, commonly known as the Community Prevention Grant Program, encourages communities to design and implement programs that prevent juveniles from entering the juvenile justice system. Communities must base their programs on an assessment of risk factors associated with the development of delinquent behavior. This risk-focused prevention strategy underscores the idea that the factors contributing to the development of a problem must be identified and addressed in order to prevent it from occurring.

Local communities participating in the Community Prevention Grant Program have designed a variety of strategies. For example, Marquette County, WI, developed a child at-risk program that provides family management skills training and parenting education.

*OJJDP's Title V Program, which provides grants for local delinquency prevention efforts, "has been instrumental in giving communities a rallying point, and has brought brand new players to the table. It is extremely powerful for our prevention efforts."*

State Juvenile Justice Specialist

Other communities have developed counseling and intervention services, health services, school-based programs that target truancy and other problems, economic development and training programs such as job readiness, law enforcement programs such as community policing, and programs that streamline available services for youth and families.

The success of the Community Prevention Grant Program is due in part to OJJDP's extensive training program, which helps local planners design and implement prevention strategies. OJJDP provides this training and technical assistance at no cost to help communities organize key leaders in their communities and help them establish a risk-assessment prevention plan.

The training includes two workshops. The first is a 1-day workshop for the community's major policymakers, business leaders, and agency executives. The second is a 3-day workshop with hands-on exercises and activities for local prevention policy board members and staff. Local policy boards are made up of various members of the community representing sectors that provide services for children, youth, and their families. The training shows them how to use research to identify and assess their community's risk factors and resources, and how to collect and analyze data to prepare a 3-year delinquency prevention plan. To date, more than 4,300 leaders representing nearly 500 communities have received OJJDP's risk-focused delinquency prevention training.

Because a State or local government is required to provide a 50-percent cash or in-kind match for each grant, the level of community ownership and investment in these programs is impressive and contributes to the programs' success. Many communities contribute more than 90 percent of the cost of their program. In 1996, the General Accounting Office found that Title V has been instrumental in uniting broad groups of community residents to design prevention programs based on their specific needs. For example, the momentum created by the risk-assessment forums in Tallahassee, FL, resulted in a core of 350 volunteers who were ready to help implement the area's community prevention initiative. Taking advantage of the skills of those who volunteered, the program plans to have professional family and marriage therapists supervise student therapists, who will provide counseling to low-income families in the community and at the same time earn the practical experience they need to graduate.

Congress appropriated \$20 million for the Title V Program in both FY 1996 and 1997; 54 States and Territories received grants each year. OJJDP awards grants to States for transmission through State advisory groups to qualified units of general local government that implement local delinquency prevention programs.

To ensure the effectiveness of the Community Prevention Grant Program, OJJDP is evaluating individual local projects in addition to the national program. The Office also published the *Community Self-Evaluation Workbook* in 1996 to help local communities assess and improve their delinquency prevention programs. The *Workbook* provides user-friendly guidance on collecting data, analyzing program progress and impact, and using evaluation information to refine plans and programs as needed. These self-evaluations are a critical way to conserve resources. In 1997, OJJDP held four regional training sessions to help juvenile justice specialists across the country learn how to use the *Workbook* to evaluate local prevention programs. The *Workbook* is available from JJC.

The success of the Community Prevention Grant Program is discussed in greater detail in the *1996 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs*, available from JJC.

## *State Challenge Activities*

The OJJDP State Challenge Activities Program provides funds to States to develop, adopt, and improve policies and programs in 1 or more of 10 program areas specified by Congress. Established in 1992, the State Challenge Activities Program is designed to promote systemic change at the State level. Only those States participating in the Formula Grants Program are eligible to receive State Challenge grants. In 1996 and 1997, 54 States participated in the program, which had an appropriation of \$10 million each year.

The 10 State Challenge Activities include basic system services, access to counsel, community-based alternatives, violent juvenile offender facilities, gender bias policies and programs, State ombudsman offices, deinstitutionalization of status offenders and nonoffenders, alternatives to suspension and expulsion, aftercare services, and State agency coordination/case review systems.

Both the level of participation in the program and the number of State Challenge Activities chosen by the States are encouraging. Nearly all of the States are addressing at least two activities; one State

addressed six activities in 1996 and four in 1997. (See the chart on page 42.)

During 1997, 24 States addressed the issue of gender bias policies and programs. The common approaches these States are taking include developing appropriate interventions to address chronic status offender behaviors; implementing comprehensive strategies to work effectively with this population, with the goal of developing the full potential of female youth; and providing specific sensitivity and cultural awareness training for professionals working with these youth. Many States also addressed the prevention of suspensions and expulsions from school (21), aftercare services (20), increased community-based alternatives to incarceration (20), and basic system services (15). Only two States selected the establishment of an ombudsman office and coordination of programs and case reviews as their State Challenge Activities.

Following is a description of the 10 State Challenge Activities and a chart showing State involvement.

### *Challenge Activity A*

Developing and adopting policies and programs to provide basic health, mental health, and appropriate education services, including special education, for youth in the juvenile justice system as specified in standards developed by the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention prior to October 12, 1984.

### *Challenge Activity B*

Developing and adopting policies and programs to provide access to counsel for all juveniles in the justice system to ensure that juveniles consult with counsel before waiving the right to counsel.

### *Challenge Activity C*

Increasing community-based alternatives to incarceration by establishing programs (such as expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, and electronic monitoring) and developing and adopting a set of objective

criteria for the appropriate placement of juveniles in detention and secure confinement.

## *Challenge Activity D*

Developing and adopting policies and programs to provide secure settings for the placement of violent juvenile offenders by closing down traditional training schools and replacing them with secure settings with capacities of no more than 50 violent juvenile offenders with ratios of staff to youth great enough to ensure adequate supervision and treatment.

## *Challenge Activity E*

Developing and adopting policies to prohibit gender bias in placement and treatment and establishing programs to ensure that female youth have access to the full range of health and mental health services, treatment for physical or sexual assault and abuse, self-defense instruction, education in parenting, education in general, and other training and vocational services.

## *Challenge Activity F*

Establishing and operating, either directly or by contract or arrangement with a public agency or other appropriate private nonprofit organization (other than an agency or organization that is responsible for licensing or certifying out-of-home care services for youth), a State ombudsman office for children, youth, and families to investigate and resolve complaints relating to action, inaction, or decisions of providers of out-of-home care to children and youth (including secure detention and correctional facilities, residential care facilities, public agencies, and social service agencies) that may adversely affect health, safety, welfare, or rights of resident children and youth.

## *Challenge Activity G*

Developing and adopting policies and programs designed to remove, where appropriate, status offenders from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court to prevent the placement in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities of juveniles who are nonoffenders or who are charged with or who have committed offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult.

## *Challenge Activity H*

Developing and adopting policies and programs designed to serve as alternatives to suspension and expulsion from school.

## *Challenge Activity I*

Increasing aftercare services for juveniles involved in the justice system by establishing programs and developing and adopting policies to provide comprehensive health, mental health, education, vocational services, and services that preserve and strengthen the families of such juveniles.

## *Challenge Activity J*

Developing and adopting policies to establish:

- (i) a State administrative structure to coordinate program and fiscal policies for children who have emotional and behavioral problems and their families among the major child-serving systems, including schools, social services, health services, and the juvenile justice system; and
- (ii) a Statewide case review system. The term "case review system" means a procedure for ensuring that—

(a) each youth has a case plan, based on the use of objective criteria for determining a youth's danger to the community or himself or herself, that is designed to achieve appropriate placement in the least restrictive and most family-like setting available in close proximity to the parents' home, consistent with the best interest and special needs of the youth;

(b) the status of each youth is reviewed periodically, but not less frequently than once every three months, by a court or by administrative review, in order to determine the continuing necessity for the appropriateness of the placement;

(c) with respect to each youth, procedural safeguards will be applied to ensure that a dispositional hearing is held to consider the future status of each youth under State supervision, in a juvenile or family court or another court (including a tribal court) of competent jurisdiction, or by an administrative body appointed or approved by the court, not later than 12 months after the original placement of the youth and periodically thereafter during the continuation of out-of-home placement; and

(d) a youth's health, mental health, and education record is reviewed and updated periodically.

### FY 1996 and 1997 Challenge Activities by State

STATE	1996 CHALLENGE ACTIVITIES	1997 CHALLENGE ACTIVITIES	STATE	1996 CHALLENGE ACTIVITIES	1997 CHALLENGE ACTIVITIES
Alabama	C,H	C,H	New Hampshire	C,G	A,H
Alaska	H,I	H,I	New Jersey	C,E	C,E
Arizona	G,H	G,H,I	New Mexico	C,G	C,G
Arkansas	B,I	C,I	New York	A,F,I	A,E,I
California	C,E,I	C,E,I	North Carolina	C,E	C,E
Colorado	E,G	B,G	North Dakota	C,I	H,I
Connecticut	E,H	E,H	Ohio	B,C,E	C,E
Delaware	E,H	E,H	Oklahoma	A,B,E,J	C,I
District of Columbia	C,E	C,E	Oregon	A,H,I	A,H,I
Florida	E,H	E,H	Pennsylvania	D,I	A,I
Georgia	A,I	C,I	Rhode Island	E,H	E,H
Hawaii	E,G,H	G,H	South Carolina	G,I	G,I
Idaho	C,I	A,E	South Dakota	A,I	A,I
Illinois	A,B,C,E,H,I	B,C,D,E	Tennessee	A,F	B,F
Indiana	B,H	B,H	Texas	A,H	A,H
Iowa	E,J	E,J	Utah	E,H	E,H
Kansas	D,C	C,I	Vermont	A,I	A,I
Louisiana	I	J	Virginia	A,O	A,C,D
Maine	C,E	C,E	Washington	G,I	A,E
Maryland	A,E,F	A,E,F	West Virginia	G,H	H,I
Massachusetts	A,C,E,I	A,C,E,I	Wisconsin	I,A	D,E
Michigan	E,H,I	C,E,I	Amer. Samoa	E	A,E
Minnesota	E,I	E,I	Guam	C,H	C,H
Mississippi	A,B	H,I	N. Marianas	—	E,H
Missouri	A,E,J	C,H	Palau	E	—
Montana	C,I	C,H	Puerto Rico	H,E	A,B
Nebraska	A,C	C,H	Virgin Islands	E	E,G
Nevada	A,I	A,I			

- A Basic System Services
- B Access to Counsel
- C Community-Based Alternatives
- D Violent Juvenile Offender Facilities
- E Gender Bias Policies and Programs
- F State Ombudsman
- G Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders
- H Alternatives to Suspension and Expulsion
- I Aftercare Services
- J State Agency Coordination/Case Review System

## *Chapter 6*

# *Juveniles Taken Into Custody*

OJJDP has been collecting information on the number of juveniles held in detention and other facilities for more than 20 years. Data were gathered through the biennial Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities, better known as the Children in Custody (CIC) Census.

Data from CIC have had an enormous impact on juvenile justice policy. Findings from CIC in the 1970's showed that States were using secure facilities—intended for serious delinquent offenders—to hold status offenders. This led Congress to mandate that States participating in OJJDP's Formula Grants Program remove status offender and nonoffender juveniles from such settings. In the 1980's, CIC data indicated that minorities were disproportionately represented in secure placement facilities. This led Congress to require States to address disproportionate minority confinement when submitting plans to OJJDP in order to receive formula grants.

After using the same type of survey for more than 20 years, OJJDP consulted with juvenile justice experts, survey methodologists, practitioners, and facility personnel to determine if CIC was meeting the needs of the field. As a result, the Office concluded that CIC was not meeting these needs. With the help of the U.S. Bureau of the Census and a technical advisory board, OJJDP has developed a new survey that more accurately measures the numbers of juveniles in residential placement and describes the reasons for their placement. This new Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) is replacing CIC. It is being implemented by the Census Bureau.

OJJDP tested the new survey in 1996, gathering data in a roster-type booklet format and by electronic means. The new method is expected to result in more accurate and useful data on the juvenile

population while lessening the reporting burden for facilities responding to the survey. The Office funded the initial implementation of the new survey in 1997, including preparation, mailing, and processing of census forms. The first survey results are expected in the fall of 1998.

This chapter summarizes information about juveniles in custody from the most recent CIC survey, which was conducted in 1995. It includes data about arrest rates, court cases, types of offenses, and admissions to custody facilities. OJJDP anticipates that CJRP information will be available for the *1998 Annual Report*.

According to the FBI, 2.1 million juveniles were arrested in the United States in 1995. This represents a 20-percent rise in juvenile arrest rates between 1985 and 1995. The largest percentage increases were for drug and weapons offenses. Males accounted for three-fourths of all juvenile arrests. However, the percentage increase in arrests for females was higher than the increase for males. White youth accounted for 69 percent of all arrests.

Juvenile courts handled approximately 1.7 million delinquency cases in 1995, a 45-percent increase from 1986. Seventy-eight percent of these cases involved males, but as in the arrest data, the percentage increase was higher for females. White youth constituted 66 percent of the delinquency court referrals while black youth were disproportionately represented; their referral rate was more than twice their representation in the general population.

Approximately 50 percent of the cases processed in juvenile courts were for property crimes and 20 percent were for violent offenses. Another 9 percent were drug cases and 18 percent were public order offenses. Two-thirds of all delinquency cases referred to the court were not adjudicated.

Of those adjudicated, one-half were for property offenses. Once adjudicated, the majority of dispositions were to probation; 31 percent of the violent offense cases resulted in out-of-home placement.

Admissions to juvenile custody facilities increased 38 percent between 1985 and 1995. Youth admitted to juvenile and adult facilities reached their highest level of 939,000 in the latest available reporting period of 1995. The largest percentage of these admissions were to juvenile detention facilities.

CIC collects the most comprehensive data available on juvenile custody facilities in the United States. The Census Bureau surveyed approximately 3,000 facilities in 1995. Of these, 65 percent were privately operated. While only 15 percent of facilities were considered overcrowded, 45 percent of all youth admitted were placed in overcrowded facilities. The largest facilities, therefore, have the biggest crowding problems.

Of the 108,000 youth held in juvenile custody facilities on a given day in 1995, 83 percent were male; in addition, 40 percent were white, 39 percent were black, 17 percent were Hispanic, and 4 percent were from other minority groups. Thus, the racial composition of the population in juvenile custody facilities is completely different from the arrest or court population (where whites accounted for 69 percent of all arrests and 64 percent of delinquency court referrals). Black youth were greatly overrepresented in the custody population.

It is important to examine juvenile detention as a point of custody because it is typically used prior to adjudication and is often the gateway to further penetration into the system. The number of juveniles held in public detention centers on any given day

increased 74 percent between 1985 and 1995, according to the latest available data. Males and minority youth were more likely to be detained across all offense categories.

Custody in a State juvenile correctional facility is the furthest penetration a youth can make into the juvenile justice system. In 1995, males constituted the vast majority of admissions (90 percent) to these facilities. Of all youth held (males and females), 44 percent were black, 39 percent were white, and the remainder were from other minority groups. Hispanic youth were admitted to State facilities at three times the rate of whites; blacks were admitted at seven times the rate of whites.

Property offenders constituted 38 percent of the population and violent offenders 28 percent, followed by public order, drug, and other offenses (each under 10 percent of the total population). A higher proportion of females than males were admitted for status offenses. Females generally were admitted for less serious offenses. On average, youth were held approximately 8 months in State facilities. Violent offenders had the longest lengths of stay.

Some youth were held in adult facilities. While they represent a relatively small proportion of all youth in custody, there was a 14-percent increase in the number of youth in adult jails between 1985 and 1995. The admission of youth to prison has also been increasing. In 1993, almost 6,000 offenders under 18 were admitted to prison; 97 percent were male and 65 percent were black. Violent offenders accounted for slightly less than one-half of youth admitted to prison.

## *Conclusion*

As the OJJDP Administrator pointed out in his Foreword to this Report, OJJDP's actions during FY 1996 and FY 1997 took place in a period that saw the juvenile crime rate drop while juvenile violence drew increasing concern from parents, schools, and the community. In this environment, OJJDP sought to provide leadership not only in responding to current problems but also in developing long-term strategies to keep today's children from falling prey to the lure of gangs, drugs, guns, and violence. It did this on many fronts.

OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders—which fostered community-based prevention programs to reduce risk factors for juvenile crime and provide buffering protective factors—provided direction for many OJJDP initiatives during 1996 and 1997. OJJDP also worked with other Federal agencies on the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to build on *Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan*, endorsed by the Coordinating Council in 1996, to help communities take actions to combat juvenile crime and provide positive opportunities for youth. In cooperation with the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institute on Drug Abuse, OJJDP funded early intervention programs with very young schoolchildren and studies that examined health-related factors that may contribute to delinquency and substance abuse.

Other OJJDP programs supported mentoring, family strengthening, improved court handling of child abuse and neglect cases, and other positive approaches to preventing delinquency. In cooperation with the Department of Education, the Office sought to heighten awareness of hate crimes, providing a curriculum and special training to help educators and law enforcement personnel respond to such crimes and prevent them in the future.

At the same time, OJJDP's Missing and Exploited Children's Program continued doing research and providing technical assistance, and it continued to fund the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, whose goal of implementing a missing children's clearinghouse in every State was reached in 1997. The center hosted seminars for policy-level law enforcement executives and distributed OJJDP's series of Portable Guides, small, practical booklets to help police officers and medical and social service professionals investigate child abuse and neglect cases.

Through its Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, OJJDP has provided a central means of disseminating information and publications. During 1996 and 1997, OJJDP took advantage of new technologies to more effectively reach juvenile justice audiences. The World Wide Web, CD-ROM, and satellite videoconferencing now supplement conferences as a means of sharing information on juvenile justice issues.

The largest share of funds went to OJJDP's Formula Grants Programs, Title V/Community Prevention Grant Program, and State Challenge Activities Program—all of them designed to give States and localities help in combating juvenile crime and keeping at-risk youth from getting into the juvenile justice system. The Formula Grants have led to steady progress in deinstitutionalizing status offenders, keeping juveniles out of adult jails and lockups, and getting States to identify the proportion of minority juveniles in secure detention. The Community Prevention Grant Program succeeded during 1996 and 1997 in bringing broad groups of community residents together to design prevention programs based on their specific needs. The State Challenge Activities Program, too, enlisted wide State participation, with nearly all States addressing at least 2 of the 10 activities for which funds are provided.



# OJJDP *Annual Report*

---

The coordinated, comprehensive approaches OJJDP has pursued in 1996 and 1997 offer States and localities flexibility to develop approaches and programs in tune with their own needs and benefiting from broad community participation. OJJDP's approaches have been coordinated and comprehensive on the Federal level as well, many of them

carried out jointly with other departments and agencies in recognition that the provision of effective and fair juvenile justice—and the prevention of delinquency—is not within the purview of a single agency but is the responsibility of society as a whole.

# Appendix

## *OJJDP Publications Released in 1996 and 1997*

### *About the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*

*An Introduction to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9643**

*Comprehensive Program Plan for Fiscal Year 1996: OJJDP Program Objectives*, **SL 000227**

*Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention* (Brochure), **NCJ 144527**

### *Corrections and Detention*

*Accountability-Based Sanctions* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9758**

*Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders* (Program Summary), **NCJ 164258**

*Detention and Delinquency Cases, 1985-1994* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9756**

*Desktop Guide to Good Juvenile Detention Practice* (Research Report), **NCJ 161408**

*Juvenile Arrests 1995* (Bulletin), **NCJ 163813**

*Juvenile Boot Camps: Lessons Learned* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9636**

*The Juvenile Delinquency Probation Caseload, 1985-1994* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9754**

*Juvenile Detention Training Needs Assessment* (Research Report), **NCJ 156833**

*Juveniles in Private Facilities, 1991-1995* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9764**

*Juvenile Probation: The Workhorse of the Juvenile Justice System* (Bulletin), **NCJ 158534**

*Juveniles Taken Into Custody: Fiscal Year 1993* (Statistics Report), **NCJ 154022**

*Training of Staff in Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9637**

### *Courts*

*A Guide for Implementing Teen Court Programs* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9645**

*Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9642**

*Delays in Juvenile Court Processing of Delinquency Cases* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9760**

*Delinquency Cases in Juvenile Courts, 1994* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9647**

*Delinquency Cases Waived to Criminal Court, 1985-1994* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9752**

*Drug Offense Cases in Juvenile Court, 1985-1994* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9753**

*Due Process Advocacy* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9749**

*Juvenile Court Processing of Delinquency Cases, 1985-1994* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9757**

*Juvenile Court Statistics 1993* (Statistics Report), **NCJ 159535**

*Juvenile Court Statistics 1994* (Statistics Report), **NCJ 163709**

*The Juvenile Drug Court Movement* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9759**

*The National Juvenile Court Data Archive: Collecting Data Since 1927* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9766**

*Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1993* (Bulletin), **NCJ 160945**

*Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1994* (Bulletin), **NCJ 162423**

*Person Offenses in Juvenile Court, 1985-1994* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9648**

## *Delinquency Prevention*

*1995 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs* (Program Report), **NCJ 160942**

*1996 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs* (Program Report), **NCJ 165694**

*Adolescent Motherhood: Implications for the Juvenile Justice System* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9750**

*Allegheny County, PA: Mobilizing To Reduce Juvenile Crime* (Bulletin), **NCJ 165693**

*Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan* (Report), **NCJ 157106**

*Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan* (Summary), **NCJ 157105**

*Creating Safe and Drug-Free Schools: An Action Guide*, **NCJ 163064**

*Curfew: An Answer to Juvenile Delinquency and Victimization?* (Bulletin), **NCJ 159533**

*Keeping Young People in School: Community Programs That Work* (Bulletin), **NCJ 162783**

*Matrix of Community-Based Initiatives* (Program Summary), **NCJ 154816**

*Mentoring—A Proven Delinquency Prevention Strategy* (Bulletin), **NCJ 164834**

*Mobilizing Communities To Prevent Juvenile Crime* (Bulletin), **NCJ 165928**

*Reaching Out to Youth Out of the Education Mainstream* (Bulletin), **NCJ 163920**

*Title V Delinquency Prevention Program Community Self-Evaluation Workbook*, **NCJ 160125**

*Treating Serious Anti-Social Behavior in Youth: The MST Approach* (Bulletin), **NCJ 165151**

*YES: Youth Environmental Service Initiative* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9530**

*Youth Environmental Service: YES in Action* (Program Summary), **NCJ 159762**

*Youth Environmental Service: YES Technical Assistance Package*, **NCJ 159763**

## *Gangs*

*A Comprehensive Response to America's Youth Gang Problem* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9640**

*Gang Members and Delinquent Behavior* (Bulletin), **NCJ 165154**

*Highlights of the 1995 National Youth Gang Survey* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9763**

*1995 National Youth Gang Survey* (Program Summary), **NCJ 164728**

## *General*

*America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being*, **NCJ 165472**

*Delinquency Development Statements for Fiscal Year 1995* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9646**

*Female Offenders in the Juvenile Justice System* (Statistics Summary), **NCJ 160941**

*The Gould-Wysinger Awards: A Tradition of Excellence* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9644**

*Information Sharing and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* (Fact Sheet), **FS-9639**

*Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1996 Update on Violence* (Statistics Summary), **NCJ 159107**

*Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence* (Statistics Summary), **NCJ 165703**

*Publications List—Spring 1996*, **BC 000115**

*Publications List—Spring 1997*, **BC 000115**

*Sharing Information: A Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and Participation in Juvenile Justice Programs* (Program Report), **NCJ 163705**

*State Challenge Activities* (Bulletin), **NCJ 163055**

*The Youngest Delinquents: Offenders Under Age 15* (Bulletin), **NCJ 165256**

## *Missing and Exploited Children*

*Court Appointed Special Advocates: A Voice for Abused and Neglected Children in Court* (Bulletin), **NCJ 164512**

*In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment* (Bulletin),  
NCJ 165257

*Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center Program*  
(Fact Sheet), FS-9762

*The Missing and Exploited Children's Program* (Fact  
Sheet), FS-9761

*Permanency Planning for Abused and Neglected Children*  
(Fact Sheet), FS-9765

*Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse: An Overview*  
(Bulletin), NCJ 165153

## **Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse:**

*Battered Child Syndrome: Investigating Physical  
Abuse and Homicide*, NCJ 161406

*Burn Injuries in Child Abuse*, NCJ 162424

*Child Neglect and Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy*,  
NCJ 161841

*Criminal Investigation of Child Sexual Abuse*,  
NCJ 162426

*Diagnostic Imaging of Child Abuse*, NCJ 161235

*Interviewing Child Witnesses and Victims of Sexual  
Abuse*, NCJ 161623

*Law Enforcement Response to Child Abuse*,  
NCJ 162425

*Photodocumentation in the Investigation of Child  
Abuse*, NCJ 160939

*Recognizing When a Child's Injury or Illness Is  
Caused by Abuse*, NCJ 160938

*Sexually Transmitted Diseases and Child Sexual  
Abuse*, NCJ 160940

*Understanding and Investigating Child Sexual  
Exploitation*, NCJ 162427

*Using Agency Records To Find Missing Children: A  
Guide for Law Enforcement* (Program Summary),  
NCJ 154633

## **Status Offenders**

*Truancy: First Step to a Lifetime of Problems* (Bulletin),  
NCJ 161958

## **Violence and Victimization**

*Child Development-Community Policing: Partnership in  
a Climate of Violence* (Bulletin), NCJ 164380

*Conflict Resolution* (Fact Sheet), FS-9755

*Conflict Resolution Education: A Guide to Implementing  
Programs in Schools, Youth-Serving Organizations, and  
Community and Juvenile Justice Settings* (Program  
Report), NCJ 160935

*Epidemiology of Serious Violence* (Bulletin),  
NCJ 165152

*Juvenile Firesetting and Arson* (Fact Sheet), FS-9751

*Reducing Youth Gun Violence: An Overview of Programs  
and Initiatives* (Program Report), NCJ 154303

*SafeFutures: Partnerships To Reduce Youth Violence and  
Delinquency* (Fact Sheet), FS-9638

*Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program*  
(Fact Sheet), FS-9635

*State Responses to Serious and Violent Juvenile Crime*  
(Fact Sheet), LT 240

*State Responses to Serious and Violent Juvenile Crime*  
(Research Report), NCJ 161565

## **Journals**

*Juvenile Justice*, Volume II, Number 2  
(Fall/Winter 1995), NCJ 152979

Offers a retrospective look at the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and a review of progress made in the deinstitutionalization of status offenders.

*Juvenile Justice*, Volume III, Number 1  
(December 1996), NCJ 161410

Describes restorative justice, the use of satellite teleconferencing to deliver training, and OJJDP's community-based aftercare initiative.

*Juvenile Justice*, Volume III, Number 2  
(September 1997), NCJ 165925

Discusses the lethal mix of kids and guns and OJJDP's National Juvenile Justice Action Plan, a comprehensive approach to responding to juvenile delinquency and crime.

# Publications From OJJDP

OJJDP produces a variety of publications—Fact Sheets, Bulletins, Summaries, Reports, and the *Juvenile Justice* journal—along with videotapes, including broadcasts from the juvenile justice telecommunications initiative. Through OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC), these publications and other resources are as close as your phone, fax, computer, or mailbox.

## Phone:

800-638-8736

(Monday–Friday, 8:30 a.m.–7:00 p.m. ET)

## Fax:

301-519-5212

## Online:

### OJJDP Home Page:

[www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm](http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm)

### E-Mail:

[puborder@ncjrs.org](mailto:puborder@ncjrs.org) (to order materials)  
[askncjrs@ncjrs.org](mailto:askncjrs@ncjrs.org) (to ask questions about materials)

## Mail:

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse/NCJRS  
P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000

Fact Sheets and Bulletins are also available through Fax-on-Demand.

## Fax-on-Demand:

800-638-8736, select option 1, select option 2, and listen for instructions

To ensure timely notice of new publications, subscribe to JUVJUST, OJJDP's electronic mailing list.

## JUVJUST Mailing List:

e-mail to [listproc@ncjrs.org](mailto:listproc@ncjrs.org)  
leave the subject line blank  
type *subscribe juvjust your name*

In addition, JJC, through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), is the repository for tens of thousands of criminal and juvenile justice publications and resources from around the world. They are abstracted and made available through a data base, which is searchable online ([www.ncjrs.org/database.htm](http://www.ncjrs.org/database.htm)). You are also welcome to submit materials to JJC for inclusion in the data base.

The following list highlights popular and recently published OJJDP documents and videotapes, grouped by topical areas.

The *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Brochure* (1996, NCJ 144527 (23 pp.)) offers more information about the agency. The *OJJDP Publications List* (BC000115) offers a complete list of OJJDP publications and is also available online.

## Corrections and Detention

*Beyond the Walls: Improving Conditions of Confinement for Youth in Custody*. 1998, NCJ 164727 (116 pp.).

*Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders*. 1997, NCJ 164258 (42 pp.).

*Conditions of Confinement Teleconference* (Video). 1993, NCJ 147531 (90 min.), \$14.00.

*Effective Programs for Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 160947 (120 min.), \$17.00.

*Juvenile Arrests 1996*. 1997, NCJ 167578 (12 pp.).

*Juvenile Boot Camps Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 160949 (120 min.), \$17.00.

*Juvenile Court Statistics 1995*. 1998, NCJ 170607 (112 pp.).

## Courts

*Has the Juvenile Court Outlived Its Usefulness? Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 163929 (120 min.), \$17.00.

*Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1995*. 1997, NCJ 167885 (12 pp.).

*RESTTA National Directory of Restitution and Community Service Programs*. 1998, NCJ 166365 (500 pp.), \$33.50.

## Delinquency Prevention

*1997 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs*. 1998, NCJ 170605 (71 pp.).

*Allegheny County, PA: Mobilizing To Reduce Juvenile Crime*. 1997, NCJ 165693 (12 pp.).

*Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan* (Report). 1996, NCJ 157106 (200 pp.).

*Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan* (Summary). 1996, NCJ 157105 (36 pp.).

*Communities Working Together Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 160946 (120 min.), \$17.00.

*Mentoring—A Proven Delinquency Prevention Strategy*. 1997, NCJ 164834 (8 pp.).

*Mentoring for Youth in Schools and Communities Teleconference* (Video). 1997, NCJ 166376 (120 min.), \$17.00

*Mobilizing Communities To Prevent Juvenile Crime*. 1997, NCJ 165928 (8 pp.).

*Reaching Out to Youth Out of the Education Mainstream*. 1997, NCJ 163920 (12 pp.).

*Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*. 1998, NCJ 170027 (8 pp.).

*Treating Serious Anti-Social Behavior in Youth: The MST Approach*. 1997, NCJ 165151 (8 pp.).

*The Youngest Delinquents: Offenders Under Age 15*. 1997, NCJ 165256 (12 pp.).

*Youth-Oriented Community Policing Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 160947 (120 min.), \$17.00.

*Youth Out of the Education Mainstream Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 163386 (120 min.), \$17.00.

## Gangs

*1995 National Youth Gang Survey*. 1997, NCJ 164728 (41 pp.).

*Gang Members and Delinquent Behavior*. 1997, NCJ 165154 (6 pp.).

*Youth Gangs: An Overview*. 1998, NCJ 167249 (20 pp.).

*Youth Gangs in America Teleconference* (Video). 1997, NCJ 164937 (120 min.), \$17.00.

## General Juvenile Justice

*Comprehensive Juvenile Justice in State Legislatures Teleconference* (Video). 1998, NCJ 169593 (120 min.), \$17.00.

*Developmental Pathways in Boys' Disruptive and Delinquent Behavior*. 1997, NCJ 165692 (20 pp.).

*Guidelines for the Screening of Persons Working With Children, the Elderly, and Individuals With Disabilities in Need of Support*. 1998, NCJ 167248 (52 pp.).

*Juvenile Justice, Volume III, Number 2*. 1997, NCJ 165925 (32 pp.).

*Juvenile Justice, Volume IV, Number 2*. 1997, NCJ 166823 (28 pp.).

*Juvenile Justice, Volume V, Number 1*. 1998, NCJ 170025 (32 pp.).

*Juvenile Justice Reform Initiatives in the States 1994–1996*. 1997, NCJ 165697 (81 pp.).

*A Juvenile Justice System for the 21st Century*. 1998, NCJ 169726 (8 pp.).

*Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence*. 1997, NCJ 165703 (32 pp.).

*Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report*. 1995, NCJ 153569 (188 pp.).

*Keeping Young People in School: Community Programs That Work*. 1997, NCJ 162783 (12 pp.).

*Sharing Information: A Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and Participation in Juvenile Justice Programs*. 1997, NCJ 163705 (52 pp.).

## Missing and Exploited Children

*Court Appointed Special Advocates: A Voice for Abused and Neglected Children in Court*. 1997, NCJ 164512 (4 pp.).

*Federal Resources on Missing and Exploited Children: A Directory for Law Enforcement and Other Public and Private Agencies*. 1997, NCJ 168962 (156 pp.).

*In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment*. 1997, NCJ 165257 (16 pp.).

*Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse: An Overview*. 1997, NCJ 165153 (8 pp.).

*When Your Child Is Missing: A Family Survival Guide*. 1998, NCJ 170022 (96 pp.).

## Substance Abuse

*Beyond the Bench: How Judges Can Help Reduce Juvenile DUI and Alcohol and Other Drug Violations* (Video and discussion guide). 1996, NCJ 162357 (16 min.), \$17.00.

*Capacity Building for Juvenile Substance Abuse Treatment*. 1997, NCJ 167251 (12 pp.).

*Drug Identification and Testing in the Juvenile Justice System*. 1998, NCJ 167889 (92 pp.).

*Juvenile Offenders and Drug Treatment: Promising Approaches Teleconference* (Video). 1997, NCJ 168617 (120 min.), \$17.00.

*Preventing Drug Abuse Among Youth Teleconference* (Video). 1997, NCJ 165583 (120 min.), \$17.00.

## Violence and Victimization

*Child Development—Community Policing: Partnership in a Climate of Violence*. 1997, NCJ 164380 (8 pp.).

*Combating Fear and Restoring Safety in Schools*. 1998, NCJ 167888 (16 pp.).

*Conflict Resolution for Youth Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 161416 (150 min.), \$17.00.

*Epidemiology of Serious Violence*. 1997, NCJ 165152 (12 pp.).

*Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. 1995, NCJ 153571 (6 pp.).

*Reducing Youth Gun Violence Teleconference* (Video). 1996, NCJ 162421 (120 min.), \$17.00.

## Youth in Action

*Planning a Successful Crime Prevention Project*. 1998, NCJ 170024 (28 pp.).

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Office of Justice Programs  
*Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*

*Washington, DC 20531*

---

Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
DOJ/OJJDP  
Permit No. G-91

**OJJDP**  
*Annual Report*

*NCJ 166597*