

PARTICIPANT PACKET

Crowding in Juvenile Detention: A Problem Solving Approach



A Live National Satellite Broadcast

Produced by the
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
and the
Juvenile Justice Telecommunications Assistance Project
Eastern Kentucky University—Training Resource Center
in cooperation with the
National Juvenile Detention Association

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agenda.....	3
Broadcast Overview.....	4
A Snapshot of Three Promising Practices.....	8
Resources.....	12
Program Panelists.....	16
Previous Satellite Videoconferences.....	20
Evaluation.....	22

This document was prepared by the Eastern Kentucky University Training Resource Center under grant #98-MU-MU-0005 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Dept. of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Dept. of Justice.

AGENDA

Crowding in Juvenile Detention: A Problem Solving Approach

April 27, 2000

***All times listed are EDT and approximate**

- 1:00-1:30 PM Pre-conference Site Activities; Test Slate
- 1:30-1:35 PM Overview Video
- 1:35-1:47 PM Welcome/Introduction/Overview
- 1:47-1:55 PM Video *Detention as a Process, Not a Place*
- 1:55-2:25 PM Panel Discussion/Participant Call-in
- 2:25-2:33 PM Video *An Action Plan to Reduce Unnecessary Detention*
- 2:33-2:58 PM Panel Discussion/Participant Call-in
- 2:58-3:05 PM Video *Partnerships and a Policymakers Role in Reducing Crowded Facilities*
- 3:05-3:25 PM Panel Discussion/Participant Call-in
- 3:25-3:30 PM OJJDP Coming Events/Closing

Broadcast Overview

Crowding in Juvenile Detention: A Problem Solving Approach

Introduction

Despite a drop in juvenile crime rates, hundreds of thousand of youth charged with delinquent acts are locked up each year in juvenile detention facilities. Between 1987 and 1996, the number of delinquency cases involving pretrial detention increased by 38 percent. As a result, nearly 70 percent of children in public detention centers are in facilities operating above their design capacity.

According to a recent article in *ADVOCASEY*, a publication of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, in 1996, secure detention was nearly twice as likely for cases involving black youth as for cases involving whites, even after offenses were taken into account. Once detained, minorities were confined for longer periods of time than whites, creating a serious inequity within the justice system.

Impact of Crowding

The effects of crowding are detrimental for youth, staff and the community. Crowding results in a higher incidence of disciplinary infractions; escapes; violence; staff burnout; reduced opportunities for programming, recreation and education; and poor sanitation, all of which increases the risk of litigation.

Crowding intensifies the worst aspect of institutional living. In an atmosphere where no one has enough space, and food and tangible goods are at a premium, life becomes a struggle in which older, more aggressive youth intimidate others for anything of value. Classification becomes almost impossible and staff are less able to separate younger, smaller youth, rival gang members, youth with known mental health problems and aggressive or violent youth

Personal privacy is virtually nonexistent, and this increases irritability and tension. Daily group activities such as watching television, eating snacks, getting clean laundry, or receiving packages from home become the catalyst for fights and exploitation. Sexual exploitation and gang attacks abound in this atmosphere, and youth not previously in gangs may affiliate for self-protection. It should not be surprising that the residents' perception of safety decreases significantly in crowded institutional conditions.

Responses to crowding

Responses to addressing the problem of crowded juvenile detention facilities vary by community. They include adding beds, constructing larger facilities, instituting population caps, and attempting to reduce the number of youths entering the facility and their length of stay. Each of these options has serious short and long-term policy and financial implications for the local community. Decisions as to the best strategy to reduce crowding should be made with care and deliberation, taking into account all the available options and developing a comprehensive response.

When detention populations soar, one obvious response is simply to construct additional beds. However, few, if any jurisdictions can afford to build themselves out of the problem.

Construction costs for a single bed meeting even minimal accepted professional standards range from \$100,000 to \$150,000 and, once built, annual operating costs average \$36, 487 per resident.

Expenditures for construction and operation of detention centers invariably divert funding from programs and services that stand a greater chance of assisting youth become successful members of the community. In addition, many jurisdictions have been sorely disappointed to find that their newly constructed beds were quickly filled and that crowding continued unabated.

Need to Clarify the Purpose of Detention

The underlying purpose of juvenile detention is to assure the safe, secure confinement of juveniles pending resolution of their delinquency cases. This purpose limits eligibility for detention to those youth who need secure confinement to assure their appearance in court or to protect public safety. Unfortunately, many jurisdictions have lost sight of this important principle. In many parts of the country, detention centers are viewed as treatment centers in which it is easy to justify holding more juveniles for longer periods of time on the theory that they will get help or avoid bad family situations. Detention facilities have become a repository for all kinds of troubled youth, many of whom do not require secure confinement.

While the intentions of those who detain youth for assessment and treatment purposes are well-meaning, the realities are quite different. Research indicates that detention does not deter future offending, but it does increase the likelihood that children will be placed out of their homes in the future. Even when controlling for offense, prior history, and other factors, youth who are detained are statistically much more likely to be incarcerated at the end of the process rather than be returned to their parents or placed in a program.

Each jurisdiction will need to reach consensus as to the purpose of its juvenile detention facility. An important first step in reforming the system is limiting detention to those youth who pose a risk to public safety or to those who are unlikely to appear in court.

The Role of Core Working Group in Reform Efforts

To institute comprehensive system reform, a core working group must be created and include stakeholders and policymakers in the juvenile justice system. This step recognizes the reality that most admission and release decisions are made by persons outside of the detention center. Therefore, representation must be broad-based and include, at a minimum, judges, prosecutors, public defenders, probation officials, social services and other youth-serving agencies, key detention staff, the state agency responsible for adjudicated youth and the law enforcement agencies who arrest the majority of youth.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation in its series *Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform* identifies five key responsibilities of the core working group:

1. Describe the current detention system accurately.
2. Clarify values and principles that should guide the reformed system;
3. Identify desired changes in policy, procedure, and programming based on information developed and on outside models for reform.
4. Identify costs of reform and barriers to implementation
5. Draft an action plan

Successful Strategies

The core group can consider several strategies which have been identified as effective in reducing crowding in juvenile detention centers. These would include:

- Development of a risk assessment instrument can insure that detention decisions are made objectively and in conformity with the purpose of detention as defined by the core working group. The instrument should identify youth who are at risk for failure to appear in court or who pose a threat to the community as well as those who can be diverted from detention and placed in a community based or staff secure programs.
- A wide range of alternative programs offering varying levels of supervision should be created for youth who do not need secure detention. Typical programs in a detention continuum will include: home detention, case management, electronic monitoring, day and evening reporting centers, shelter care, youth attendant, and foster care. The more the jurisdiction learns to view detention as only one of many available options, the less likely the detention facility will be used as the repository for all youth needing pre-adjudication supervision.
- The use of expeditors has been one of the most effective strategies for reform in the Casey Foundation's efforts. The expeditor's role is to work through formal and informal networks to ensure that cases move through the detention process as efficiently as possible. This may be accomplished by ensuring that a youth's testing appointments are scheduled and held in a timely manner, that attorneys and parents receive notice of all hearing, and that the youth are not "lost" because of errors in communications.
- Another successful strategy is to accelerate the transfer of youth who have been committed to a state facility. This is usually accomplished by improved communications and regular monitoring conferences with representatives of the state agency.
- Increasing the likelihood of an attorney at the initial hearing is also likely to reduce time in detention. The assistance of counsel at initial hearings is essential in protecting youth against unnecessary detention. In some cases, counsel may be able to demonstrate that there is no probable cause to believe the youth committed an offense, and, thus, that the proceedings should be dismissed at the initial hearing. Similarly, counsel may be able to correct false or incomplete information that otherwise might tip the balance toward detention.

These are just some of the successful strategies that jurisdictions have used to reduce crowding. The resource material listed in your packet will include a more thorough discussion of the reforms which can be implemented. It should be noted that there is no single strategy that will solve the problem of crowding and jurisdictions need to identify solutions based on the particular practices and policies in their communities.

Sustaining the Reform Efforts

Care must be taken to institutionalize the policies, practices and programs which the core working group has implemented so that despite personnel turnover, political changes or other factors, the reforms remain intact.

One way to address turnover in the membership of the core working group is having the group convened through the presiding judge or court administrator with the expectation that the designated agencies will always be represented, even when representatives change.

The core group should remain intact even after it achieves initial success and reduces the detention population. Although the crisis may be perceived as being resolved, the only way to insure that the changes are sustained over time is to maintain an ongoing group to assure a prompt response when new population pressures or political challenges arise.

The reforms which have been implemented should be incorporated into policies and procedures by the stakeholders and detention staff. This insures that staff, new and existing, are operating under a common philosophy and continuing to follow practices which prevent crowding and unnecessary

Crowding in Juvenile Detention: A Problem Solving Approach

A Snapshot of Three Promising Practices

The following brief summaries are provided to give you a conceptual understanding of how some jurisdictions are implementing strategies to reduce crowding in their juvenile detention centers. Each of the promising practices discussed below will be highlighted in the videoconference. For more information on a specific approach, you are encouraged to contact the site directly (contact information is provided after each summary). While there is no correct approach to strategizing a plan to reduce crowded juvenile detention facilities, there are many innovative and cost-effective models to consider in lieu of building more beds. We hope the resource material contained herein along with the videoconference broadcast will energize your jurisdiction to explore promising alternatives. For technical assistance on crowding issues, please contact the National Juvenile Detention Association at 859-622-6259.

Cook County (IL)

Evening Reporting Centers: A True Alternative to Detention

In the mid –1990’s, Cook County had few of the characteristics necessary to reform its detention system. It did not have a history of collaboration, alternatives to detention did not exist, and the admission process to the center was arbitrary. The result was that their facility, although large in size, was overcrowded on a regular basis. However, within two years, many of these characteristics was fundamentally altered.

Cook County created a detention screening unit in its Juvenile Probation Department and began using a screening instrument that clarified, for police officers, the basis upon which admissions decisions would be made. The process ended several years of law enforcement frustration with what was considered to be an arbitrary approach to detention screening.

Cook County has also developed an impressive continuum of seven alternatives to detention programs where none had previously existed. One of the most interesting programmatic innovations was the development of Evening Reporting Centers (ERC) in neighborhoods where youth live. ERC’s were established to provide community-based alternatives to detention for a target group of youthful offenders who would otherwise have been confined in the Detention Center. ERC’s, operated by community-based organizations, have two goals: (1) to provide highly structured and well-supervised group activities during high-risk time periods and (2) to ensure that minors make court appearances and are not re-arrested while their cases are pending.

Probation officers identify youth who are eligible for conditional release and make recommendations to the Court for placement in an ERC program. Eligible youths are those awaiting a hearing of disposition on charges of a probation violation, and youth apprehended on a warrant and presented to the Court of disposition on the warrant. Previously, youth charged under these circumstances were held at the Juvenile Temporary Detention Center. Youthful offenders are court ordered to participate in an ERC program from five to 21 days in lieu of placement in a temporary juvenile detention center. Currently, of the more than 2000 youth who have participated in an ERC, 90 percent remained arrest free pending their court dates.

As further evidence of the effectiveness of the evening reporting concept, the original ERC's received The Civic Foundation's 1998 "Urban Innovations Award". The award is given annually to agencies that implement innovative programming to improve the quality of life in the community.

Santa Cruz (CA)

The Core Group Drives the Reform Process

Santa Cruz County, California, with a population of 250,200 people and 26,818 juvenile court aged youth, operates one juvenile detention center (19,403 square feet). The service area of the facility is mixed urban/rural. While the rated capacity of the center is 42, average daily population ranged from 51 to 61 during the mid-to late 1990's with average length of stay peaking at 13.2.

Typical of most juvenile detention centers, Santa Cruz county is experiencing a significant increase in the proportion of violent and serious/chronic offenders and the probability of such offenders being detained for extended period of time. Responding to current facility limitations, the detention center has been working consistently at peak workload levels, with its physical and programmatic capabilities extended to the limits.

To address their increasingly overcrowded conditions, Santa Cruz, under the capable leadership of the Chief Probation Officer and his assistant, convened a core group of representatives from key agencies in the juvenile justice system and service providers in the community, including a juvenile court liaison, court probation officers, district attorney, contract defender, detention superintendent, intake supervisor, placement officer, mental health representative, and community-based program providers operating home supervision, community work programs, and other alternatives to detention.

Ideally, a core group, as conceptualized in the in the *Crowding in Juvenile Detention: A Problem Solving Manual*, would provide the leadership and vigilance to drive the reform process of a local juvenile justice system. The Santa Cruz core group epitomizes the aforementioned concept by taking their mutually agreed upon action plan and systemically achieving their goals and objectives realizing that the process, while time-consuming, is the best approach to comprehensive, long-term, grassroots success.

The Santa Cruz core group's workplan over the past several months is focusing on the following five needs:

- 1. Educating law enforcement on the appropriate use of detention**

The Core group is coordinating a training initiative to educate local law enforcement on detention criteria. It is believed that the training will be well-received as law enforcement officers do not really want to bring juveniles the long distances if they are going to be turned away as inappropriate for detention. It is also felt that education for law enforcement about how filing decisions are made will enhance their understanding of front-end decision making.

- 2. Increase use of the risk assessment instrument to drive decisions about detention**

The core group is exploring training initiatives for detention staff and probation officers on the importance of risk assessment instruments and their proper utilization. Reinforcement is needed in relation to the concepts that (a) low risk juveniles should not be detained at all; (b) medium risk juveniles may be appropriately supervised through home supervision, electronic monitoring, and/or other services during the period between arrest and disposition; and (c) high risk juveniles may need to be detained, but risk should still be viewed as dynamic.

3. **Institutionalization of an expediter**

The core group is evaluating the role of expediter. Increased utilization of the expediter position is being examined in relation to the work on risk assessment and detention criteria. The expediter is really a “utility player” whose job it is to be the “burr in the saddle”, constantly asking questions of everyone in the system that may result in the release or reduced time in detention in conformity with the risk assessment instrument. Expediting should be viewed as an ongoing process that never ends.

4. **Research on court processing**

The core group is exploring methods of collecting better data to inform decisionmakers about ways to improve court processing (i.e., how long it takes various types of cases to move through the system; how oral disposition works; how often parents appear in court for detained juveniles; what correlation, if any, exists between parental attendance and detention; how to strengthen intake reports and information available to court officers; and, looking closely at what the system does that contributes to overrepresentation of minority youth in detention).

5. **Handling probation violations**

Although Santa Cruz has a good continuum of services, the core group agreed that it would be beneficial to focus on ways to handle probation violators. Typically, there are 4 to 6 juveniles a day in custody on violations, most of who would not otherwise qualify for detention based on risk.

In lieu of reinventing the wheel, the core group, which brings a wealth of viewpoints and knowledge of other national initiatives, is pursuing feedback and input from jurisdictions that have already made positive progress in addressing crowding concerns. Recently, the Santa Cruz group met with representatives from Portland, Oregon, who had participated in the Annie E. Casey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, to learn more about their risk assessment instruments and population management system. In addition, the group recently has begun examining the possibilities of implementing evening reporting centers based on their success in Cook County, Illinois.

While the Santa Cruz core group is still in its infancy stages, positive strides are being made in managing the facility crowding problem. Average daily attendance for the past several months has been at or slightly below rated bed capacity. As the group becomes more vested in achieving the goals and objectives of their workplan, the entire system will be reformed.

For more information on the Santa Cruz Initiative, please contact: John Rhoads, Chief Probation Officer, County of Santa Cruz Probation Department, 303 Water St., 2nd Floor, P.O. Box 1812, Santa Cruz, CA 95061; Phone 831-454-3451; Fax 831-454-3827

Detroit (MI)

Supporting the Concept of Detention as a Process

Wayne County, Michigan, which encompasses the Detroit metropolitan area, serves as an excellent example of a jurisdiction that transformed their juvenile detention system into an effective and efficient operation. This was done without comprising public safety or the integrity of the court process. By adopting a philosophy that detention represents a process rather than a place, Wayne County recently opened a new state-of-the-art juvenile detention facility that is SMALLER than the one it replaced. This occurred at a time when political pressures and public sentiment were demanding that more juveniles be locked up in response to perceived increases in juvenile crime.

County officials and stakeholders realized that detention was only one options in dealing with juveniles who required supervision during the pretrial stage. They were able to create a continuum of detention services which allowed them to resist pressures to build a larger facility. It is notable that the new facility has not reached population capacity and this is attributed to the fact that the detention option was supplemented with a full range of alternative sanctions

Leaders in reforming the county's system agreed on three core principles including: 1) reducing inappropriate or unnecessary reliance on secure detention; 2) maintaining and/or reducing failure to appear rates and arrests during the pretrial period; and 3) ensuring quality programming and conditions of youth who required confinement in the detention facility.

The alternative to detentions were designed to represent a continuum of options ranging from the least restrictive, such a evening reporting centers, to the most restrictive, secure detention confinement. These options allowed many juveniles to remain in their homes during the pretrial period without compromising public safety.

Wayne County is unique in that it has been granted broad authority to manage its detention population. While the judicial branch sentences a youth into the juvenile justice system, the executive branch has the discretion to decide where detention will occur. The decisions are based largely on a risk assessment instrument as well as other criteria which have been put into place.

For more information on the Wayne County detention system, please contact Leonard Dixon, Executive Director, Wayne County Juvenile Detention Center, 1326 St. Antoine, Detroit, MI 48226; Telephone (313) 967-2011; Fax (313) 967-2032

Crowding in Juvenile Detention: A Problem Solving Approach

RESOURCES

Publications

Available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse

Desktop Guide to Good Juvenile Detention Practice (October 1996). Compiled by the National Juvenile Detention Association and published by the U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC.

This publication is intended to serve as a useful aid in enhancing the quality and effectiveness of juvenile detention by stimulating the personal growth and professional development of the dedicated practitioners who provide detention services. The publication's assigned order number is NCJ161408.

Disproportionate Minority Confinement: Lessons Learned From Five States (Bulletin)

December 1998. Explains OJJDP's Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) initiative.

Describes how five pilot States (Arizona, Florida, Iowa, North Carolina, and Oregon) assessed the extent to which minority juveniles were disproportionately confined by their juvenile justice systems, designed comprehensive DMC strategies, and implemented interventions to address identified problems. The DMC initiative also included a national evaluation, one objective of which was to document the lessons learned and key factors in successful State and local efforts. The Bulletin summarizes lessons learned from the national evaluation, drawing on findings from related research and current State DMC practices as reported in OJJDP policy and management reports. The publication's order number is NCJ173420.

Conditions of Confinement in Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities FACT SHEET #1 April 1993

The first nationwide investigation of conditions in secure juvenile detention and correctional facilities. Using nationally recognized correctional standards as a gauge, researchers assessed how juvenile offenders' basic needs were met, how institutional security and resident safety were maintained, what treatment programming was provided, and how juveniles' rights were protected.

Detention Diversion Advocacy: An Evaluation (Bulletin). September 1999. 16 pp. NCJ 171155. FREE.

Released: September 29, 1999.

Provides an overview of diversion programs and evaluation findings from the Detention Diversion Advocacy Project (DDAP), a disposition case advocacy program operating in San Francisco, CA, and sponsored by the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ). The major goals of the DDAP program are to reduce the number of youth in court-ordered detention and provide youth with culturally relevant community-based services and with supervision. The findings show that if recidivism is used as the key measure of success, youth referred to DDAP were more successful than those not referred. These findings support the goals mentioned above and demonstrate that the program enabled DDAP youth to lead relatively normal lives, while

reducing the likelihood of further contact with the juvenile justice system. This OJJDP Bulletin also offers several reasons for DDAP's success.

To order these documents, contact the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at 1-800-638-8736 or download online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org.

Available from the National Juvenile Detention Association

Crowding in Juvenile Detention Centers: A Problem-Solving Manual (December 1998). Compiled by the National Juvenile Detention Association and Youth Law Center. Copyrite Printers, Richmond, KY.

This manual offers practical solutions to relieve crowding in juvenile detention centers through systemic attention to detention practices. The document examines trends in juvenile detention that have contributed to an increase in population, and describes the dangers associated with attempting to manage chronically crowded detention facilities. The material also outlines an action plan and twenty strategies for jurisdictions to implement a systemwide plan to reduce unnecessary detention use. \$20/copy.

Crowding in Juvenile Detention Centers: Practitioners Perspectives on What to Do About It (December 1999). Compiled by the National Juvenile Detention Association. Copyrite Printers, Richmond, KY.

A companion document to *Crowding in Juvenile Detention Centers: A Problem-Solving Manual* with more detailed examination of various components of the reform process and detention population management. \$20/copy

Journal for Juvenile Justice and Detention Services; Special Edition (Spring 1998); *Crowding in Detention and Correctional Facilities*; Volume 13, No. 1.

A series of articles highlighting the social and economic costs of overcrowding, the development of jurisdictional core groups and other strategic measures to address overcrowding, and a case study of Ohio's efforts at systemic reform. \$10/copy

Juvenile Detention as Process and Place (Spring 1995). Dunlap, Earl & Roush, David W. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*. Compiled and published by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

This article outlines the concept of juvenile detention being more than bricks and mortar, but rather a systemic process with a range of alternatives on a continuum from least restrictive to most restrictive. This conceptualization is the cornerstone to appropriately and effectively addressing overcrowding. No cost.

Position Statement on Overcrowding. National Juvenile Detention Association (October 1995). NJDA's official position on the issue of overcrowding and its underlying dangers. No cost.

To order these publications contact Michael Jones of the National Juvenile Detention Association at 859-622-6259 or via e-mail at NJDAEKU@aol.com.

Available from the Annie E. Casey Foundation

Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform-Monograph Series

1. Overview: Building a Better Juvenile Detention System: The JDAI Story
2. Planning for Juvenile Detention Reform: A Structured Approach
3. Collaboration and Leadership in Juvenile Detention Reform
4. Controlling the Front Gates: Effective Admissions Policies and Practices
5. Consider the Alternatives: Planning and Implementing Detention Alternatives
6. Reducing Unnecessary Delay: Innovations in Case Processing
7. Improving Conditions of Confinement in Secure Juvenile Detention Centers
8. By the Numbers: The Role of Data and Information in Detention Reforms
9. Ideas and Ideals to Reduce Disproportionate Detention of Minority Youth
10. Special Detention Cases: Strategies for Handling Difficult Populations
11. Changing Roles and Relationships in Detention Reform
12. Promoting and Sustaining Detention Reforms
13. Replicating Detention Reform: Lessons from the Florida Detention Initiative

Juvenile Jailhouse Rocked: Reforming Detention in Chicago, Portland and Sacramento

From the Fall/Winter 1999 issue of *AdvoCasey*, outlines the successful efforts of three urban counties-Cook, Multnomah, and Sacramento to reduce inappropriate and unnecessary detention without compromising public safety.

These publications may be ordered through the Annie E. Casey Foundation at 410-547-6600 or online at www.aecf.org/publications.

Resources on the web

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org

Annie E. Casey Foundation
www.aecf.org

National Juvenile Detention Association
www.njda.com

Youth Law Center
www.youthlawcenter.com

Program Panelists

James Bell, Staff Attorney

Youth Law Center, 417 Montgomery Street, Suite 900, San Francisco, Ca. 94104-1129; Phone 415-543-3379; Fax 415-956-9022

James Bell has been a Staff Attorney at the Youth Law Center since 19080, representing children confined in adult jails, juvenile detention centers and training schools. He is currently involved in litigation in San Francisco, New Orleans and Kentucky. He has also provided technical assistance for County Commissioners, Sheriffs, Judges, Police Departments, Probation Officers, Line Workers and Administrators in over 35 states on liability, conditions of confinement and other juvenile justice issues. Additionally, he has worked closely with Indian Tribal courts in over 15 jurisdictions to assist in making tribal courts more proficient in handling juvenile justice issues. He has written articles analyzing the death penalty for children and testified before Congress on the provisions of the Crime Bill that impact adolescents. He has also worked closely on the issues of children and violence with policymakers and community based organizations. He has just finished a monograph profiling programs working successfully with delinquent youth of color. On the international front, he assisted the African National Congress in drafting juvenile laws for South Africa. Similarly, he worked with Palestinians and Israelis on alternatives to juvenile incarceration. Also, he is working with the Brazilian government on deinstitutionalization of juveniles held in large and violent facilities.

Paul DeMuro, Consultant

82 Essex Avenue, Montclair, NJ 07042; Phone 973-746-9525; Fax 973-783-0798

Paul DeMuro has been responsible for operations of statewide juvenile justice and corrections agencies and programs in Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. He has been in direct charge of a facility, the Youth Guidance Center in Philadelphia. He has been appointed a monitor by the federal courts in Florida and Oklahoma, responsible for implementing decrees that closed institutions and established alternative programs. He has undertaken an extraordinary amount of technical assistance in the last fifteen years, working throughout the country with public officials at every level of government, usually on projects to reduce incarceration and develop effective alternative programs. He has also been a consultant and expert witness for the U.S. Department of Justice, the Youth Law Center, and other organizations investigating and litigating issues of over-incarceration and dangerous conditions of confinement. In addition, he has been instrumental on two national efforts with the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the National Juvenile Detention Association to reduce crowding in juvenile facilities. He has written extensively on juvenile justice and related issues, including publishing the first comprehensive listing of program alternatives to incarceration almost twenty years ago.

Leonard Dixon, Director

Wayne County Juvenile Detention Center, 1333 East Forest, Detroit, MI 48207; Phone 313-967-2014; Fax 313-967-2026

Leonard Dixon was appointed Division Director for the Dept. of Community Justice, Wayne Co. Juvenile Detention Facility in Detroit, Mi. in June 1995 and is responsible for formulating and administrating policies, procedures and supervision of juvenile services. These services include detention, detention alternatives, contacts and service to approximately 4,500 children annually from ages 10-17. He served for over 15 years with the Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services in the Children, Youth and Family delinquency component of the agency. Mr. Dixon's career in Juvenile Justice is recognized nationally. As superintendent of Better Outlook Center, he developed the first halfway house in the state to provide cross country training to children and achieved national accreditation of 3 residential programs. As Division Director, Mr. Dixon was the first Director in 17 years to license a Wayne Co. Juvenile detention facility. Mr. Dixon is recognized as an authority on delinquent residential care, case management and detention.

Earl L. Dunlap, Executive Director

National Juvenile Detention Association, Eastern Kentucky University, 301 Perkins Building, 521 Lancaster Ave., Richmond, Ky. 40475-3102; Phone 606-622-6259; Fax 606-622-2333

Earl L. Dunlap has served as NJDA's Executive Director since 1985. Under Mr. Dunlap's guidance, NJDA has experienced tremendous growth and is now one of the premier leadership organizations in the field of juvenile justice and detention services. NJDA is currently working on a series of state and federal grants targeting the improvement of training and professional development for detention car givers; the reduction of facility crowding issues; and the overall improvement of quality of life in juvenile detention. Mr. Dunlap has worked extensively with local officials nationwide who are interested in-or already are-operating juvenile justice programs at the local level. In this capacity, Mr. Dunlap has assisted in developing alternatives to detention and diversion programs throughout the United States. He has also assisted in the review of architectural plans for many secure juvenile detention centers. In addition, he has advised local and state officials on the programmatic aspects of constructing juvenile detention centers.

Honorable Lee Forrester, Presiding Judge

Family Court, Civil Courts Building, 175 South Broad Street, P.O. Box 8068, Trenton, NJ 08650-0068; Phone 609-989-6456; Fax 609-989-6091

Judge Forrester was appointed to the Superior Court in November of 1992. After one year of service in the Criminal Division, his next assignment was to the Family Part where he continues to serve. In 1997 he became the Presiding Judge of the Family Part in the Mercer County Vicinage. Prior to his appointment to the bench, Judge Forrester held several positions with the New Jersey Dept. of the Public Defender/Public Advocate. Earlier in his career, he was a staff attorney for the Mercer County Law Guardian Program where he represented the rights and legal interests of abused and neglected children. Since his appointment, Judge Forrester has continued to actively participate in organizations and causes which impact the lives of children

John Rhoads, Director

County of Santa Cruz Probation Department, 303 Water Street, 2nd Floor, P.O. Box 1812, Santa Cruz, CA 95061; Phone 831-454-3451; Fax 831-454-3827

John Rhoads has been the Chief Probation Officer of Santa Cruz County since April, 1997. Prior to coming to Santa Cruz, he worked for Sacramento County Probation for almost 29 years. Mr. Rhoads currently is Chairperson of the Bay Region of the Chief Probation Officers of California. He serves on the Judicial Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Council. He previously has served on statewide committees, including the Blue Ribbon Commission on Out-of-State Probation Placement, and the California State Board of Corrections Standard Review Executive Steering Committee. Mr. Rhoads has been affiliated with the Annie E. Casey Foundation Juvenile Detention Reform Initiative since its inception in 1992.

David W. Roush, Ph.D., Director

Center for Research and Professional Development, Michigan State University, School of Criminal Justice, 1407 south Harrison, Nesbit Suite 350, Lansing, MI 48824; Phone 517-432-1242; Fax 517-432-0727

David Roush has provided leadership in institutional programs and services for juveniles and staff since 1971. Currently the director of the NJDA Center for Research and Professional Development, Roush is a faculty member in the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State

University. He was the lead consultant to the NJDA/OJJDP Juvenile Justice Personnel Improvement Project and served as the director of the Calhoun County Juvenile Home, where he developed the nationally acclaimed Intensive Learning Program (ILP) and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation-sponsored Holistic Environmental Life-skills Project (HELP). These programs received the OJJDP Certificate of Merit and the OJJDP Gould/Wysinger Award, respectively. Dave is also the past president of both the Michigan and National Juvenile Detention Associations, a board member of the National Commission on Correctional Health Care, and a former member of the Board of Governors of the American Correctional Association.

Jason Smith, Peer Counselor

Westside Association for Community Action, Chicago, IL, 773-277-4400

Jason Smith joined a gang at the age of 12 and was first arrested at 13. After a number of subsequent arrests on assault, weapons and drug offenses related to his gang membership he was in jeopardy of being held in custody pending trial. He qualified, however, for a new alternative to detention program offered by the court as part of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative. He was assigned to Pre-Trial Services and his case was referred to the Westside Association for Community Action (WACA), a community-based program run by Ernie Jenkins, a longtime community organizer on Chicago's Westside. With the help of WACA, Smith was able to leave gang life and continue his education. He has completed his first two years of college and works as a peer counselor at WACA. Smith's experiences at WACA have led him to want a career working with troubled youth.

John Wilson, Acting Administrator

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street NW, Washington, DC 20531; Phone 202-307-5911; Fax 202-514-6382

John J. Wilson is the Acting Administrator for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) within the U. S. Department of Justice, Office for Justice Programs. Mr. Wilson joined the Department in 1974 as an attorney advisor in the office of the General Counsel for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. He served as Senior Counsel to OJJDP from the program's inception in 1974 until 1992, when he joined the Office as its full-time Legal Counsel. He is now in his second stint as Acting Administrator for the Office. He also serves as a member of the U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Gina E. Wood, Director

South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice, P.O. Box 21069, Columbia, SC 29221-1069; Phone 803-896-9791; Fax 803-896-6932

Gina Wood was appointed Director of the South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice by Governor Jim Hodges in 1999. Prior to her appointment she served with the U.S. Department of Justice as Director of both the Concentration of Federal Efforts Program and the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. In this capacity she developed a national plan to address child victimization and juvenile delinquency. Entitled *Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan*, her work resulted in federal agencies launching signature initiatives linked to her plan. She has also been active in reform efforts in Oregon and New York. Director Wood is a member of the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Substance Abuse. She has been a member of the Program Advisory Committee for Volunteers of America and has served as chair of the Urban League of Portland.

Previous Satellite Videoconferences

Produced by the
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Conditions of Confinement in Juvenile Corrections and Detention Facilities

September 1993

Community Collaboration

June 1995

Effective Programs for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders

October 1995

Youth-Oriented Community Policing

December 1995
Juvenile Boot Camps
February 1996
Conflict Resolution for Youth
May 1996
Reducing Youth Gun Violence
August 1996
Youth Out of the Education Mainstream
October 1996
Has the Juvenile Court Outlived Its Usefulness?
December 1996
Youth Gangs in America
March 1997
Preventing Drug Abuse Among Youth
June 1997
Mentoring for Youth in Schools and Communities
September 1997
***Juvenile Offenders and Drug Treatment:
Promising Approaches***
December 1997
Comprehensive Juvenile Justice in State Legislatures
February 1998
Protecting Children Online
March 1998
Youth Courts: A National Movement
May 1998
***Risk Factors and Successful Interventions for
Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders***
September 1998

***White House Conference on School Safety:
Causes and Prevention of Youth Violence***
October 1998
Juveniles and the Criminal Justice System
December 1998
Females and the Juvenile Justice System
May 1999
Promising Practices for Safe and Effective Schools
September 1999

Online Safety for Children: A Primer for Parents and Teachers
November 1999
Model Court Practices in Abuse and Neglect Cases
February, 2000

For Further Information

For videos of previous OJJDP videoconferences, please contact the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, PO Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000; call 800-638-8736; fax 301-251-5212; or e-mail askncjrs@ncjrs.org.

For information on future OJJDP programs, contact Jenny McWilliams, Juvenile Justice Telecommunications Assistance Project, Eastern Kentucky University, 301 Perkins Building, 521 Lancaster Avenue, Richmond, KY 40475-3102; call 859-622-6671; fax 859-622-4397; or e-mail ekujitap@aol.com