

# **GOOD NEWS FROM TOLEDO: REAL IMPROVEMENTS IN DETENTION**

**by**

**Paul DeMuro**

*Our work to improve the detention system in Lucas County was motivated by our concern for the safety of the public, the safety of our staff, and the safety of the children and youth in our system.*

-Judge James A. Ray

*We first began to make significant progress in improving our detention system when we started to envision the detention system we would want if our own children were to be arrested and brought to our detention center.*

-A Senior Court Administrator, Lucas County Juvenile Court

## **INTRODUCTION**

This paper documents the process by which Lucas County (Ohio) Juvenile Court achieved substantial reform of its juvenile detention system in a relatively brief period of time – from late 1999 to 2004. The Court oversees the operation of detention in Lucas County. During that period, the Court’s detention system dramatically changed for the better. Although the Lucas County Juvenile Court enjoys a solid reputation for enlightened leadership, by the spring and summer of 1999, it was widely acknowledged that there were serious problems in the Court’s detention center (The Child Study Institute):

- Staff morale was poor; the facility itself was in disrepair and not adequately maintained. Non-serious offenders were often mixed with more serious cases. There was no formal risk assessment instrument to guide detention intake decisions. There was a lack of detention alternatives.
- Within the facility, programming was weak. There were not enough structured activities and no positive behavior management system in place. Youth often spent too much time locked in their rooms. There was little consistency among staff from unit to unit and shift to shift regarding how staff disciplined youth.
- Some staff depended on the use of isolation and other harsh disciplinary practices “to control” the population. To make matters worse, the facility was often overcrowded and, at times, understaffed. In short, the detention center was often an unsafe place for both staff and youth.

Although the Court was in the process of building a new detention facility, it was clear that the problems in the Child Study Institute would not be corrected by simply trading an old, outdated detention facility for a new, modern one.<sup>1</sup>

In 1999 Lucas County Juvenile Court applied for and received a Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block (JAIB) grant that enabled them to retain a team of nationally recognized consultants to conduct a complete review of the Court’s detention system.<sup>2</sup> In the summer of 1999, the consultant team reviewed the Court’s

detention intake process; the need for a continuum of detention alternatives; and the policies, practices, staffing patterns, and conditions of confinement within the secure detention facility.

Judge James Ray, the Presiding Juvenile Court Judge, and Dan Pompa, the Juvenile Court Administrator, were extremely supportive of the consultant team's work. The consultant team had unfettered access to all aspects of the Court's detention system. Members of the team made several trips to Toledo, Ohio and conducted a thorough review of all aspects of detention, observing the operation of the secure detention center, reviewing critical documentation, interviewing at length all the major stakeholders and many detention staff at all levels of the organization as well as administering formal staff surveys to a number of supervisory staff. In addition, the consultant team interviewed children and youth held in the detention center, and also used a detailed, formal questionnaire of youth in secure detention regarding conditions within the facility.

The team completed its work by late summer of 1999 and submitted its report<sup>3</sup> to Court officials in September of 1999. The report itself contained numerous recommendations that covered all aspects of detention. Part One of the report dealt with the internal workings and operation of the detention center – the programming, training, staffing patterns, policies and the living conditions within the secure detention facility. Part Two of the report dealt with the detention intake process and the need for the development of detention alternatives.

## **CHANGING THE CULTURE WITHIN SECURE DETENTION**

To their credit, rather than arguing with and resisting the recommendations contained in the consultant team's report, Lucas County Juvenile Court officials began the tough work of addressing the concerns raised by the report. Part One of the report contained twenty-six detailed recommendations concerning the management and operations of the secure institution.<sup>4</sup> These recommendations covered almost every aspect of facility management, particularly organizational issues, staffing and training issues, program concerns, and leadership issues. By the summer of 2003, almost every one of the 1999 report's recommendations concerning the management of the secure facility had been implemented. The few that had not been fully implemented were in the process of being implemented.

More importantly, the culture and living conditions within the detention center dramatically improved. By the summer of 2003, youth spent most of their time out of their rooms engaged in healthy program activities. The use of isolation to "punish" youth has been dramatically reduced. The facility rarely used any form of mechanical restraints. Staff morale improved dramatically. Staff at all levels of the organization participate in the decision making process. Staffing ratios exceed the state's guidelines. And by October 2000, the facility average population has been reduced to 55-75 youth. In short, by 2003, the facility provided a safe and healthy environment for youth and for staff. These dramatic changes came about for the following reasons.

### **Owning the Problem**

The Juvenile Justice Leadership in Lucas County was willing to own and address the issues raised by the report. The Judge held weekly administrative team meetings of key court, probation, and detention staff. The need to improve the operation of the detention center was given a high priority. Specific remedies were developed, debated, implemented, fine-tuned, and, if successful, incorporated

into the on-going operation of the facility. The Detention Administrator, Antonio Garrett, was given support and encouragement by other key Court staff – the problems in the detention center were thus “owned” by the entire system. Previously, the problems in detention were seen as something unique to the detention building; detention staff felt under-appreciated and, consequently, key detention staff acted as if they were un-empowered to improve the culture within the center. In addition, the fact that the Court was building a new facility provided a powerful “window of opportunity” for change.

While things did not change over-night, concrete positive steps were taken. For example, as the report recommended, a new management position was created that had much of the day-to-day operational responsibility for the facility, thus freeing up the Detention Administrator to work on larger change/system/leadership issues. A talented, motivated, and experienced detention staff member filled this position.

In turn, the Detention Administrator began meeting formally and informally with his detention supervisors and other key staff. Staff committees were formed to address systematically the report’s recommendations (e.g., the need to improve the food at the facility). Some senior staff (but not all) felt empowered to be “problem solvers” rather than complainers. The Detention Administrator and other key detention supervisors began encouraging and complementing staff for doing a good job. “Business as usual” would not be tolerated – old and flawed detention traditions and practices were changed. Slowly staff morale began to improve.

### **Examination and, When Appropriate, Adoption of National Best Practices in Detention**

The Detention Administrator visited and was visited by Leonard Dixon, the Superintendent of Wayne County (Detroit), who had just been through a successful major detention reform effort, including the building and occupancy of a new facility. Key Lucas County detention staff also visited other jurisdictions that had accomplished major systemic detention reform (i.e., Multnomah, Portland, Oregon, a model Annie E. Casey detention reform site). National experts were consulted; Tarrant County, Fort Worth, Texas, successful experience with graduated sanctions was examined.

Most importantly, this examination of best practices included staff at all levels of the detention center. At the suggestion of David Roush, a number of Lucas County Juvenile Court detention staff and supervisors visited the detention center in DuPage County in Wheaton, Illinois. DuPage County had totally revamped its detention program and had piloted and implemented a very successful positive behavior management system in its detention center.

The message was clear – Lucas County Juvenile Court could positively change its detention practices – staff had seen first hand viable positive models. Although there continued to be some staff “nay-sayers,” more and more line and supervisory staff became energized and excited by the potential for change. In the fall of 2003, Lucas County Juvenile Court’s detention staff began to “roll-out” its own, newly developed behavior management system.

### **Commitment to Training and Quality Improvement**

A commitment to training and quality improvement has been stressed. The Court, through a separate JAIB grant to the NJDA, completely revamped and improved the pre and in-service training it offers to detention staff. Specific training

curriculum and tools that are aimed at implementing the newly designed behavior management system (partly patterned on the DuPage experience) were developed and offered to staff at all levels of the facility by the end of 2003.

### **Emphasis on Supervisory Accountability – Unit Management**

Specific supervisors have been identified for each of the living units within the center. These supervisors are responsible for the programming in their units. There is a growing sense of pride and “ownership” of these supervisors and the line staff in their unit’s performance.

#### **Improved Staffing Ratios**

Without adding additional positions, the staffing ratios within the facility have improved dramatically, exceeding state standards. Often there are two direct staff in a unit of 12-15 youth. At a minimum, a ratio of one staff to 10 youth is maintained. This improvement has come about through a substantial reduction in the detention population (the center presently averages 55-75 youth). Three of the living units in the new facility are not even occupied.

#### **Improved Intake Process/Use of Technology**

As discussed in the next section of this paper, soon after the 1999 report was submitted, the Court developed, field-tested, and implemented a detention risk assessment instrument (RAI) to help guide detention intake decisions. At the same time, a true continuum of detention alternatives was developed, and many non-violent offenders began to be diverted to non-secure detention alternatives. The intake staff of the detention center were trained to administer the risk assessment instrument and to enter each youth’s risk scores in a computerized database. In short, in 2000 the Court began to make data driven decisions regarding who to hold in secure detention or who to release. Thus, population management has become much more efficient.

In summary, there has been a culture shift within the secure detention center. In less than three years, the Lucas County Juvenile Court’s secure detention center has become a safe place for youth and staff.<sup>5</sup> Most staff are truly concerned about the well-being of the youth held in the facility.

## **CONTROLLING THE NUMBERS OF YOUTH IN DETENTION**

As has been noted, Part Two of the consultant’s 1999 report dealt with the need to reduce the population within the secure detention center. The 1999 report recommended that the Court develop and implement a detention risk assessment instrument as well as develop a continuum of non-secure detention alternatives. The work done to implement both of these recommendations began shortly after the consultants filed their report. In addition, the Court planned and implemented a multi-level strategy in order to assure that the population in secure detention would be limited to the more serious cases and that all youth held in secure detention remained in secure detention for the shortest amount of time consistent with public safety.

### **The Development of a Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI)**

Detention risk screening instruments attempt to objectify the formal system’s decision-making process regarding two specific issues: the likelihood that a youth will abscond and the youth’s relative risk to public safety. Risk assessment instruments record and objectively score current and prior offense history, the frequency of past offenses and the history of failure to appear for

hearings, of runaways and escapees. Other variables may also be noted (e.g., placement and/or probation history). Most RAIs also allow for “over-rides” — cases in which for case-specific reasons, the intake screener can override the instrument by admitting low risk youths into secure detention.

In late 1999, Lucas County Juvenile Court began to develop an RAI that matched the needs and practices of its jurisdiction. The Court began the development of its RAI by starting with an example of an instrument used in another jurisdiction and then modified it so that it was applicable to its own jurisdiction. The Court developed a variety of scoring scenarios for the instrument (to determine how to construct the point scale) and decided the appropriate cut-off points for low, medium, and high-risk youths. It then conducted a study, applying its draft RAI to a retrospective sample of cases to see how in practice the risk assessment would score youth who were actually held in secure detention. By July of 2000, Lucas County Juvenile Court had developed its own RAI. The adoption of the RAI helped guide decision-making about which youth would be eligible for placement into one of the newly created detention alternatives. The Judge and/or the magistrates retained the final decision-making authority about which youths remained in secure detention and which youth could be considered for placement into a detention alternative.<sup>6</sup>

The adoption of an effective RAI helped ensure that cases that have a demonstrable record of failure to appear for court hearings and cases which present a clear risk to public safety (alleged violent and serious offenders) were admitted to secure detention while at the same time ensuring that low risk and appropriate medium risk offenders were diverted from secure detention. Thus by adopting the RAI, Lucas County Juvenile Court:

- Improved structure and consistency in the detention assessment and decision making process.
- Ensured a more effective use of secure care beds by placing youth in the appropriate level of supervision based on an objective assessment.
- Helped ensure the placement of appropriate low-risk youth in the new alternative detention programs that the Court was developing.

## **Development of a Continuum of Detention Alternatives**

At about the same time that the Court was developing its risk assessment instrument, local juvenile justice staff gathered information about effective detention alternatives implemented in other jurisdictions. The consultant team shared with the Court a variety of written materials regarding viable detention alternatives, particularly, the experience of the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s effective detention reform initiative, the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) in Portland, Oregon and Cook County, Illinois. Staff from Lucas County Juvenile Court visited the JDAI site in Portland, Oregon and also became aware of Tarrant County’s (Texas) effective county-based continuum of alternatives.

By May of 2000, less than nine months after receiving the 1999 report, the Court issued a Request for Proposal for its own set of detention alternatives. By September of 2000, the RAI had been developed, and the contracted detention alternatives began to operate, with lower risk youth being placed into them.

As of 2003, the Court operated three levels of court-ordered detention:

- Level one, the secure detention center. Capacity, 125 beds; average daily population, 55-75 youth.
- Level two, a detention reporting center, run by the East Toledo Family Center. Youth are supervised in their homes and at school through daily contacts with staff; and they report daily, six-days-a-week, to a reporting center run by the community organization. The hours of the reporting center are 3:00 pm to 9:00 pm during the school year and noon to 6:00 pm during school vacation. Older youth, who are not enrolled in school, must have a job and/or participate in longer hours at the reporting center. Services include tutoring, counseling, job readiness, structured recreation, as well as drug testing.
- Level three, home detention. Youth are supervised in their homes and at school and receive a minimum of two "surveillance" contacts per day by East Toledo Family Center staff. Youth also participate in six hours of weekly programming at the East Toledo Family Center. The total capacity of level two and three detention alternatives is 55 youth. The daily unit cost is slightly more than \$30/day. Average length of stay in the detention alternatives is 14-21 days.

These alternatives constitute a continuum of detention supervision. The community detention interventions (levels two and three) are targeted for low and moderate risk pre-adjudicated youth.

Youth are court-ordered into these alternatives; the scored risk assessment instrument is used to help identify appropriate candidates for placement into community detention. A youth's non-compliance in community detention can mean that a youth will be placed into secure detention. It is clear that these programs have helped to substantially reduce the population within the secure detention facility.

These alternatives have been effective at protecting public safety. From August of 2000 when the alternatives began until June 30, 2003 a total of 2,213 youth were placed into community detention; of these, 80% (1,766 youth) were safely and successfully supervised in the community (i.e., youth remained arrest free while participating in the detention alternative, and they attended all their court hearings). Youth who did not comply and/or who were arrested while under the supervision of the detention alternative were placed into secure detention.

### **The Implementation of a Multi-Level "Population Management" Strategy**

Perhaps the most innovative steps that Lucas County Juvenile Court took to ensure the effective implementation of its detention reform strategy was the "multi-level" administrative practices it evolved and put into place to ensure that the population of the secure detention center remain at a safe level (with reasonable staffing levels) and that all youth placed into secure detention center move through the system in a timely fashion. In essence, the Court developed three, effective administrative practices aimed at managing the population level in secure detention.

1. Once the alternatives, and risk assessment instrument were in place, the Court's senior juvenile justice team decided to establish a "working" daily target for the population of the secure detention center. After much thought and discussion, a target of 55 youth in secure detention was established for the close of each business day. This number was picked to ensure that even if the center received

a substantial number of over-night (or weekend) admissions, the secure center would remain able to operate within safe staffing patterns. Although the new center had a larger capacity than the old facility, no new line positions were added to the operational budget of the detention center. In addition, this target was established after the Court had established its alternative programs with a capacity of 55 additional non-secure detention slots.

Daily, near the end of the court-day (i.e. later in the afternoon), administrative staff review the total number of youth held in the center; particular emphasis is placed on youth with lower risk scores. A magistrate and senior Court staff then review cases of youth deemed appropriate for consideration for placement into community detention. The magistrate then makes the decision to place appropriate youth into a detention alternative.

It is important to note that the number of 55 youth placed into secure detention at the end of the day is a target. It is not a population cap. Staff do not initially recommend higher risk youth for placement into an alternative; however, youth who have been initially placed into secure detention can be subsequently transferred into community detention when it is appropriate. And there are times when, at the close of business, more than 55 youth (56 youth to the low sixties) may remain in secure detention; but the reality is that in most instances, this administrative practice ensures that the over-night and weekend population of the secure facility is well within safe limits and that the detention alternatives actually handle youth who would have been detained if it were not for the existence of the alternative program. Thus, there is little chance of net widening.

2. The second administrative practice has been put into place to ensure the operation of a safe detention center during weekends and holidays. When the population of the secure center approaches 75 youth over a weekend or holiday, the Detention Administrator is authorized to place selected, new admissions who score in the low risk category on the risk assessment instrument on home detention, in effective, house arrest, as long as a responsible parent or other responsible adult is willing to ensure that the youth will attend his or her first hearing, which is scheduled for the very next court day. At that time, a judge or magistrate will decide to place the youth in secure detention or to place the youth into a detention alternative.

3. The third administrative practice is aimed at ensuring that all youth held in secure detention move through the system in as timely a fashion as possible, consistent with public safety. Weekly, there is a high level "expediting" meeting. This is a lunch meeting that runs for approximately one and half to two hours. The Presiding Judge, the other sitting Judge, the Magistrates, Court Administrative staff, Probation staff, staff from the County's post-dispositional alternatives, local child welfare staff as well as a representative from the state's juvenile correctional agency attend. The Detention Administrator reviews the entire detention population, with particular attention paid to youth who have remained in detention for a considerable time (more than 21 days). The Detention Administrator presents the facts about these cases. Barriers to placement (and/or adjudication) are identified; plans are developed, monitored, and reviewed by the entire group. It is particularly noteworthy that representatives of the post-dispositional options attend this meeting and are supportive of helping to move youth out of detention in a timely fashion. It is also noteworthy that a representative of the local public child welfare agency and the state juvenile correctional agency attends these meetings. Thus, cases involving youth who need to access child welfare

interventions as well as cases involving youth who are committed to the state agency can be addressed and moved out of detention in a timely fashion.

Working in combination, these three administrative practices help to ensure the safe and effective management of the secure facility.

## **LESSONS LEARNED**

The Lucas County Juvenile Court's experience clearly documents that real change is possible. Concrete improvements in our juvenile justice detention systems can be achieved if:

- The need to improve our systems is motivated by a sense of values. Youth and staff in our facilities should be safe, and our juvenile systems and facilities should be managed as if the youth committed to our care were our own youth.
- Change/Improvements in our systems are everybody's business and responsibility; however, it often requires the hands-on support of a jurisdiction's key juvenile justice leaders – e.g., the Administrative Judge and Court Administrator.
- As a jurisdiction contemplates the need to improve its system, it is often best to do a complete, objective assessment of the system's strengths and weaknesses.
- There is no need to "re-invent the wheel"; there are readily available national approaches and consultants that can be instructive – but models cannot be simply transplanted from one jurisdiction to another. Staff at all levels need to be involved in developing a jurisdiction's own approach to improving its own system. Change needs to be "owned" by staff at all levels of a jurisdiction's detention system.
- The work is never done. There should be an ongoing commitment to staff training, program development, and Quality Improvement.

## **CONCLUSION**

No one associated with the Lucas County Juvenile Court's experience would claim that the Lucas County system is perfect. Detention staff acknowledge that there is much more work to be done.

Within the secure detention facility, there is a need to improve the educational program and the need to implement fully the new behavior management system. As this paper goes to press, Lucas County Juvenile Court officials are working to ensure that there is a full time, quality educational program available within the detention center, and they intend to implement fully the new behavior management system. No doubt, this process will take time and will include a variety of "bumps along the road."

In addition Lucas County Juvenile Court officials know that more can and should be done to assure that only appropriate youth are held in the detention center for the shortest amount of time as possible consistent with public safety. Moreover, staff knows that the Court needs to continue its work to develop a quality set of interventions for both pre and post dispositional youth, and to continue to monitor closely their existing alternative programs.

As most juvenile justice practitioners know, the work of improving a juvenile justice system is never completed. However, what is important about the Lucas County Juvenile Court experience is that it is clear that jurisdictions can

achieve substantial improvements in their detention systems. This paper is offered in the hope that other jurisdictions might find the experiences of Lucas County Juvenile Court helpful as they contemplate the need to improve their own system of detention services.

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The old facility that existed in 1999 had a capacity of seventy-two youth; it was often overcrowded with the population reaching 100 or more youth. The new facility was designed for 125 youth.
- <sup>2</sup> The consultant team was assembled and led by Earl Dunlap and included Paul DeMuro, Reggie LaGrand and David Roush.
- <sup>3</sup> DeMuro, P., Dunlap, E., LaGrand, R. & Roush, D. (1999, September 30). An assessment of the Child Study Institute, Lucas County Juvenile Court, Toledo, Ohio: Report of findings. Indianapolis, IN: Earl L. Dunlap, Inc.
- <sup>4</sup> It is not the purpose of this paper to rehash every recommendation contained in the 1999 report. This paper focuses on *how the Court responded to the 1999 report.*
- <sup>5</sup> In point of fact, the work discussed in Part Two of this report (developing a risk assessment instrument and developing detention alternatives) occurred *before* much of the work discussed in Part One of this report. Clearly, the court's ability to reduce the daily population in secure detention (as discussed in Part Two of this report) significantly helped the detention center's leadership staff go about the task of improving the living conditions in the secure facility – and, as importantly, it demonstrated that positive changes could be accomplished.
- <sup>6</sup> See Attachment 1 for a copy of Lucas County Juvenile Court's Risk Assessment Instrument

**Table 1: Calendar of Changes/Improvements Achieved by the Lucas County Juvenile Court**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>
<b>Fall 1999</b>	Consultant team report with detailed recommendations issued.
<b>March 2000</b>	Court begins developing detention Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI).
<b>May-August 2000</b>	RFP issued for detention alternatives; alternatives begin by August; RAI used to guide decision-making process.
<b>September 2000</b>	Staff visited Portland Oregon (Multnomah County) to observe reforms there.
<b>October 2000</b>	Detention Population Controls implemented; target population at the end of the workday set at 55. Population begins to decline.
<b>April 2001</b>	New facility opened. As of summer of 2003, average population 55-75. Three units of new facility unused.
<b>August 2001</b>	One local provider assumes contracted responsibility for local detention alternatives.
<b>December 2001</b>	Staff committee formed to improve food services within center.
<b>January 2002</b>	JAIBG grant received aimed at improving safety and programming within the center.
<b>September 2002</b>	Group of detention staff serve on committee aimed at improving programs within the center: NJDA consultants help staff committee.
<b>January - March 2003</b>	Administrative restructuring of Detention; supervisors and staff given additional support. Three groups of detention officers visit DuPage County to observe programs there. Staff committees work with NJDA consultants who help identify "What works."
<b>May- October 2003</b>	Emphasis on curriculum development for new behavior management system. Staff trained.
<b>November 2003</b>	Begin roll out of new behavior management system.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORM

- Juveniles Name:** Please print first name, middle initial and last name
- DOB:** Youth's date of Birth
- Date:** Date youth booked
- Offense(s)** List all the offenses for which the youth is being booked. If the youth is being booked on a warrant indicate what type of warrant it is (i.e. FTA Felony warrant, FTA Misd. Warrant, VOP warrant, F&CC warrant) Use the reverse side of the intake form if you need more room.
- Gender:** Enter M for Male or F for Female
- Race:** Enter one of the following options  
A = Asian                      B = Black  
W = White                     H = of Hispanic or Latino ethnic origin  
O = Other
- Age:** Enter reported age at date of booking

### A. Current Offenses

#### ***First score line***

Current offenses include the charges the youth is currently being held on only!

CIRCLE all offenses that apply, however only score the offense which receives the most points. For example, if a youth has an F5 theft and a FTA misdemeanor warrant circle both items but only give the youth 6 points (b/c FTA misdemeanor scores 6 points whereas an F5 theft only scores 4).

#### ***At the second score line***

ADD 2 points for each additional warrant AND each additional felony charge. In the example above 2 points would be added for the F5

### B. Weapons

#### ***Only one score line***

Select the most serious option and score the assigned points. Only select one item in this category. For example if a youth used a firearm but had a knife in his/her pocket he/she would only score 8 points. List the other type of weapons used besides a firearm.

BB guns should not be counted as firearms. Score them as "other weapon".

### C. Aggravating Factors

Many different charges can accrue points in this category. You can determine if a youth should be scored in this area through police reports, the youth's verbal actions or self reports from a verbal report from a police officer.

**First score line**

If a juvenile resides with the victim OR if sex OR violence was present in the current offense score 5 points. Only one of these factors must exist for the youth to receive 5 points. A youth cannot receive more than five points in this section if more than one applies (do not multiply the score).

Types of charges that may score under this section:

- Domestic Violence where the youth lives in the home with the victim
- Safe School Ordinance that was assaultive in nature (not all SSOs are)
- Assault

**Second score line**

If the victim was 65 years of age or older OR the victim was 6 years of age or younger score 2 points

**Third score line**

If there is a likelihood that the youth may retaliate score two points. (This may be determined by the police’s written or verbal reports or by the youth’s actions and statements.

**D. Current Status**

**First score line**

If the youth is an interstate case, fugitive, illegal alien, or needs to be held for safekeeping or as a material witness score a maximum of 8 points (do not multiply points if he/she meets more than one of the above factors).

**Second score line – COMMUNITY CONTROL**

Circle all the programs the youth is **currently** in but only score the assigned points for the most restrictive program. For instance, if the youth is on Standard Probation and Electronic Monitoring, circle both programs but only give the youth 6 points (for the most restrictive program, Electronic Monitoring). Do not score youth in a program if the youth has been terminated from the program.

To determine if the youth is in a level of Community Control at this point look it up in JIS. If you do not currently have a password contact Chris Veitch for one.

**Third score line – DETENTION STATUS – PRIOR ADMISSIONS**

Number of prior admissions within the past 24 months – add one point for each admission. Admission means that the youth was booked and then processed and was placed in a cell “upstairs”. Only count admissions, NOT bookings. A youth may be booked without being admitted, i.e. youth on Unruly charges are booked and released.

Administration understands that this data will be difficult to collect until detention receives its computer system. Until that time, the intake officer must refer to the detention cards to calculate prior admissions. Once the detention computer system is installed information to answer this question will be readily available.



**Fourth score line – DETENTION STATUS – COMMUNITY DETENTION**

If the youth is involved in the Detention Reporting Center or Home Detention score 6 points. The names of youth involved in either of these programs will appear on the POP sheet beginning 8/29/00. JIS will also indicate if the youth is in Community Detention.

Again, once the computer system is installed this info should be readily available.

**E. Other factors**

If you, as the intake officer, are aware of the circumstances which you believe should increase or decrease the score by two points (for reasons not in one of the above categories) you may add one or two points in this section. **If you add or subtract one or two points in the section, state the reason why.**

**TOTAL SCORE**

**Add the score and enter on the line.**

**Check released or admitted.**

**Place in the intake folder which will be picked up each morning Monday through Friday by Margaret Williams, Detention Placement Coordinator. Margaret will utilize the scores as a guide to determine which youth are eligible for Community Detention.**

---

**Paul DeMuro** has more than thirty years experience working on children, youth and family issues. Mr. DeMuro has managed secure facilities and has designed and managed systems of model community programs. In the mid-1970's, he served as Pennsylvania's Commissioner of Children and Youth. In that capacity he supervised the Pennsylvania's county-delivered, state regulated, child welfare system. He was responsible for all child welfare policies and regulations and statewide budget issues. As Commissioner, he helped to implement a number of child welfare funding and program reforms. He also directed the state's juvenile justice institutional and community programs.

Paul DeMuro presently serves as a senior consultant to the Annie E. Casey Foundation and with the National Juvenile Detention Association (NJDA). He has been involved in a number of the Foundation's child welfare and juvenile justice initiatives. In addition, he has been instrumental in the development and evolution of NJDA's jurisdictional planning assistance initiatives.

Mr. DeMuro often helps to mediate pending court litigation and regularly consults with a variety of county, state and federal agencies regarding improving services for court-involved youths. He is an expert on conditions of confinement in secure facilities and is often retained by the United States Justice Department. He has held appointments as a Federal Court Monitor for child welfare and juvenile justice consent decrees in Oklahoma and in Florida.

Among a variety of reports and studies regarding improving services for child welfare children and juvenile justice youths developed by Mr. DeMuro, he has written a book on the California juvenile justice system (*Reforming the CYA*), has edited a book on violent juvenile offenders (*Violent Juvenile Offenders: An Anthology*), and recently authored *Consider the Alternatives: Planning and Implementing Detention Alternatives* as part of the Casey Foundation's 13-part series on its Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI).