

# Recommendations of the Alternatives to Detention Committee

## Summary of Recommendations

### Guiding Principles:

1. Secure detention should be reserved for children who are likely to commit a serious offense before their court hearing or are likely to fail to appear in court.
2. Children who violate community detention or fail to appear for court hearings should receive immediate sanctions.
3. Sanctions should promote accountability, be graduated to the number of violations, and do not necessarily require secure detention.
4. Certainty and immediacy of sanctions is more important than severity of sanctions.
5. Services that engage and support families can play a major role in reducing secure detention.
6. An effective juvenile justice system requires a broad array of alternatives to detention.
7. Secure detention can be reduced without jeopardizing public safety.
8. Children with significant mental health problems should not be held in secure detention.

### Specific Recommendations:

1. The Court, DJS, and the Police Department should implement procedures to assure immediate apprehension of children who violate CD. If additional personnel are required to implement such procedures, the agencies should request additional funds in their budgets.
2. The Court and DJS should utilize a system of graduated consequences for children who violate CD or fail to appear in court, and should adopt appropriate policies to implement such a system.
3. DJS should utilize family conferencing and similar family support services for youth who violate CD or fail to appear, or whose parents are unable or unwilling to pick them up after they have been arrested. DJS should obtain new funding or reallocate existing funding for new family support personnel.
4. DJS should open three new Evening Reporting Centers in Baltimore City by 2006, in addition to the one ERC currently planned. One of the new ERCs must be for girls. DJS should obtain new funding or reallocate existing funding for the new centers.
5. DJS should open a Day Reporting Center in Baltimore City during 2005. DJS should obtain new funding or reallocate existing funding for education staff for the DRC. No other funding is needed for personnel for the DRC.
6. During 2005, DJS should open the shelter care facility it has planned with DSS. DJS should obtain funds to open an additional shelter care facility in

2006.

7. Homeless children, children whose parents are unable or unwilling to pick them up when they are arrested, young children (under age 12), and children charged with minor offenses should be placed in foster homes or shelters such as the one being started by the Family League. These alternatives must be put in place as soon as possible. Once they are in place, the Maryland Youth Residential Center should not be used for these children, but should be reserved for children who require a high level of supervision but do not require secure detention.
8. DJS should make full use of all available funding options to support alternatives to detention, including specific alternatives for youth with mental health problems.

## **A. Introduction**

The Alternatives To Detention (ATD) Committee is a subcommittee of the Executive Committee of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) in Baltimore City. The ATD Committee includes representatives of the Juvenile Court, Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), State's Attorney's Office, Office of the Public Defender, Baltimore Police Department, and community organizations. The goal of the ATD Committee is to reduce the use of secure detention in Baltimore City without jeopardizing public safety.

The detention population in the Baltimore City Juvenile Justice Center rose steadily from December, 2003, until September, 2004. In the last two months the population has decreased, but there is a continuing need for detention reform. Baltimore has pioneered the development and implementation of a detention Risk Assessment Instrument, and the Baltimore RAI is now being used as a model for the rest of the state. Nevertheless, the RAI cannot be fully effective without a broader array of alternatives to detention.

Research by the Community Detention and Research divisions of DJS and the University of Maryland Bureau of Government Research indicates that there are several groups of children held in secure detention who could be released to their families or community programs without jeopardizing public safety. The following discussion and recommendations focus on (1) children who violate community detention (CD) orders, particularly by running away from home or from placements, (2) children who fail to appear (FTA) in court, and (3) children who are held in secure detention because their parents are unable or unwilling to pick them up from DJS after they have been arrested.

Each day ten to thirty children who have been charged with a delinquent offense come into Baltimore's Juvenile Court to face an emergency detention hearing. Twenty years ago, this would have been a yes/no decision. The court could allow the child to return home while awaiting an adjudicatory hearing or the court could detain the child in a locked facility until the time of the hearing. Since then, the Department of Juvenile Services has provided some options which allow children to return home under supervision, notably through community detention and community detention with electronic monitoring.

Community Detention is very effective for many youth. Those Respondents who stay in the community detention program have few violations and are charged with few new offenses. That statistic provides little comfort, however. Twenty percent of the Respondents in the program cut off their monitoring devices and run from home. A writ is issued for those Respondents, but they often get into trouble before they are picked up. This group may believe that they will not be held accountable for violating their CD orders, and their behavior creates a bad impression of the whole program with the public and the police. Once they are apprehended, they go into secure detention for the balance of time to their adjudication, often 3-4 weeks.

Detaining more Respondents who violate CD is not an option. The existing facility has been overcrowded and understaffed. We need to find a way to better enforce community detention orders without increasing the population at the Juvenile Justice Center.

Similarly, we need a better way to address failures to appear (FTAs). There is concern that some youth repeatedly fail to appear in court, but are not held accountable. Many of these youth are not charged with serious or violent offenses which warrant secure detention, prompting us to consider alternative means of imposing meaningful consequences without resorting to weeks of lockup.

In addition, everyone agrees that children should not be held in secure detention solely because their parent is unable or unwilling to pick them up after they are arrested. We need to develop services and programs to eliminate this unnecessary use of detention.

Finally, in many of these situations there would be a substantial benefit to providing some form of short-term family support services. This has been utilized successfully in other locations, such as the JDAI sites in Chicago and Santa Cruz, CA.

## **B. Philosophy, Premises, and Research Underlying the Committee's Recommendations**

Children behave within rules if the rules are enforced quickly and efficiently. Delayed enforcement or inconsistent enforcement of rules leads to more rule violations. Anyone who has taught school or coached a team – or been a parent -- understands the need for immediacy and consistency. The certainty of a consequence and the immediacy of the sanction are so important that they outweigh the severity of the sanction.

We all have experience with the certainty of the sanction. If a child is reprimanded each time the child takes a snack without permission, that child will rarely take a snack without permission. On the other hand if a child is able to sneak snacks without being caught 75% of the time, but on those occasions when he is caught he is spanked and sent to his room, that child will sneak food without permission more often than the first child.

The immediacy of the sanction is similarly important. It is more effective to tell a child to shut off the television and go to her room right after she hits her brother than it is to tell her that

she will lose a trip to the zoo which is planned for two weeks from now.

We know that children in Community Detention respond in the same way. Despite this knowledge, our enforcement of court orders is often haphazard. Long delays between the violation of the order and the resultant sanction are sometimes the rule and not the exception<sup>1</sup>. Worse, we dole out severe sanctions for violations which come to our attention, while many other violations receive no sanction.

These recommendations are based on several premises:

1. Secure detention should be reserved for children who are likely to commit a serious offense before their court hearing or are likely to fail to appear in court.
2. Children who violate community detention or fail to appear for court hearings should receive immediate sanctions.
3. Sanctions should promote accountability, be graduated to the number of violations, and do not necessarily require secure detention.
4. Certainty and immediacy of sanctions is more important than severity of sanctions.
5. Services that engage and support families can play a major role in reducing secure detention.
6. An effective juvenile justice system requires a broad array of alternatives to detention.
7. Secure detention can be reduced without jeopardizing public safety.
8. Youth with significant mental health problems should not be held in secure detention.

There is abundant research to support these premises. See, e.g., The Annie E. Casey Foundation, *Juvenile Justice at a Crossroads*, AdvoCasey, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Spring, 2003); Richard A. Mendel, *Less Hype, More Help: Reducing Juvenile Crime, What Works – and What Doesn't* (American Youth Policy Forum, 2000); Richard A. Mendel, *Less Cost, More Safety: Guiding Lights for Reform in Juvenile Justice* (American Youth Policy Forum, 2001); *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. A Report to the United States Congress* (Sherman et al, 1997); Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (Howell, 1995); U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General* (2001); Paul DeMuro, *Consider the Alternatives: Planning and Implementing Detention Alternatives* (Annie E. Casey Foundation).

---

<sup>1</sup>This observation is not meant as a criticism of the current community detention program. They want the authority to make sure, swift sanctions. Too often, they have not been given that authority by the court.

## C. Recommendations

### 1. Certainty and Immediacy of Sanctions

**Recommendation 1:** The Court, DJS, and the Police Department should implement procedures to assure immediate apprehension of children who violate CD. If additional personnel are required to implement such procedures, the agencies should request additional funds in their budgets.

One of our primary goals is to reduce the number of youth in Community Detention who leave home by quickly finding and sanctioning them. The Department of Juvenile Services and the Baltimore City Police have already begun to address this problem. They have a writ/warrant task force which has made a priority of finding Community Detention violators. However, more must be done.

Officers who specialize in this assignment have had better results thus far than officers who are occasionally assigned this duty. Department of Juvenile Services workers who work with the task force often have good information about locating the child. We need to expand on the current efforts of the Police and the Department of Juvenile Services.

If a child cuts off an electronic monitoring device, that child should be pursued immediately. When the word gets out that children who leave get caught quickly and sanctioned immediately, fewer children will leave, and fewer new offenses may be committed.

This recommendation involves expense because it requires additional manpower. The Committee believes that this is money well spent. The public will be safer if these children are found quickly. The children will also be safer. They are often injured or abused when they are on the run.

We should have a similar approach with lesser infractions of the Community Detention program. Every violation should receive an immediate sanction, although the sanctions may be mild. The Community Detention program should be given authority to impose sanctions immediately without seeking permission from the courts or others outside the program. Nothing kills immediacy quicker than having to get authorization.

There is already a variety of sanctions available. These include moving a child to a more restrictive form of community detention, adding additional calls or visits to those already in place and giving a bad report to the court. By definition, all these children are awaiting another hearing. Workers also have the ability to impose other sanctions with the cooperation of parents. These include restricting telephone and television use, taking away game devices and music devices and losing treats. Workers also have incentives at their disposal. These include moving the child to a less restrictive level of supervision and giving a good report to the court. The family conference will often result in a written agreement which may include additional requirements for the child and agreed upon sanctions.

One criticism of the immediacy discussed here is that supervision of workers requires review of their decisions. Where immediacy is compromised by the need for prior authorization, supervision practices need to change. Line worker decision can be reviewed and evaluated after the fact. This will provide quality assurance without impacting on immediacy. Line workers need authority to do their jobs. Supervisors can teach and evaluate without compromising immediacy. The Courts need to cooperate as well. The Department has asked that the courts give the Department the authority to determine the kind and level of community detention. That procedure has succeeded in Chicago and we should adopt it. As in Chicago, the individual judge or master should have the ability to grant or withhold this authority on a case by case basis. Short of removing the child from the community, the court should also give the Department of Juvenile Services authority to impose sanctions for violation of detention program rules. Similarly, where an agreement is made as part of a family conference, the Department should be given the authority to enforce that agreement. Again, removal from the community must be reviewed by the court if the child wants judicial review.

## **2. Graduated Consequences**

**Recommendation 2:** The Court and DJS should utilize a system of graduated consequences for children who violate CD or fail to appear in court, and should adopt appropriate policies to implement such a system.

### **Violations of Community Detention**

For children who run, and children who are arrested for a new offense, the only sanction now available is secure detention of the child until her court hearing. We think that sanction should be available, but it should be used rarely, and we propose a program that allows a wide variety of sanctions. If the child is placed in a secure detention bed, it should be for a short period, usually 24 hours.

Any child in Community Detention who cuts off the electronic monitor or otherwise violates CD by leaving home without permission should face a sanction: secure detention, structured shelter care, Evening Reporting Center, Day Reporting Center, or other shelter care. Eventually, when there is a broader array of services available, the immediate sanction will rarely be secure detention. The Department does not need additional judicial authority to exercise discretion in determining the appropriate sanction. As a matter of law, the child has already been detained by the court. If a child wishes to have the court review the decision, the case should be set in as an emergency detention hearing. Such hearings are scheduled on the same day if the child enters the sanction bed prior to 1:00 P.M. on a court day. Otherwise, the case will be heard on the next court day. A review hearing will be scheduled only if the child wants one. Many may decide not to have a hearing since the sanction is so short.

There may be longer sanctions for repeated violations, taking into account the severity of the violations, though these are not mandatory. Indeed, placement in secure detention is not required as a sanction. The Committee recommends the following as guidelines. In addition,

family conferencing and support services should be provided immediately, as discussed in the next Recommendation.

**Table 1**

<u>Number of violations</u>	<u>Length of sanction</u>
1	24 hours
2	36 hours
3	48 hours
4	96 hours
5	1 week
6+	Balance of detention

There is a related problem of what to do about violations from detentions for prior offenses, violations which did not occur during the current detention. In using the second chart, we recommend that no Respondent should receive a lower sanction than the sanctions contained in the first chart. In considering all offenses, not just offenses from the current detention, the following chart should be followed:

**Table 2**

<u>Violations (current detention)</u>	<u>Violations (all detentions)</u>	<u>Length of sanction</u>
1	any number	24 hours
2+	2	36 hours
2+	3	48 hours
2+	4	72 hours
2+	5	96 hours
2+	6	120 hours
2+	7	144 hours
2+	8	1 week

2+	9	2 weeks
2+	10+	Balance of detention

This is deliberately a very gradual escalation. It is in keeping with the principle that consistency and immediacy is more important than severity.

### **Failures to Appear**

The same principle and sanctions should apply to failures to appear. Thus, for failures to appear on the current charge, the sanction should be as in Table 1. For failures to appear on previous charges, the sanction should be as in Table 2.

At the Executive Committee meeting on September 28, Secretary Montague asked about a separate facility for sanction beds which would not mingle sanctioned children with those in the Juvenile Justice Center. This approach has some major advantages. A separate facility could be designed for frequent turnover and could have programs for this specific population. There would be a greater reduction in the number of children in the Juvenile Justice Center. One suggestion was to use some beds at the Maryland Youth Residential Center. That facility currently houses most of the structured shelter care beds available to the Baltimore City region of the Department of Juvenile Services. The Committee supports the use of MYRC as a graduated consequence and alternative to secure detention. However, since MYRC beds are so important to the overall array of placements, the Committee recommends that any reduction in the number of currently available structured shelter care beds (i.e., through use as sanctions beds) be made up elsewhere. There are too few such beds as it is. There should be secure beds, staff secure beds and shelter beds available as sanction beds. The Community Detention program should have the discretion to determine which type of sanction is appropriate for each child.

### **3. Family Conferencing and Support**

**Recommendation 3:** DJS should utilize family conferencing and similar family support services for youth who violate CD or fail to appear, or whose parents are unable or unwilling to pick them up after they have been arrested. DJS should obtain new funding or reallocate existing funding for new family support personnel.

The Committee recommends that family conferencing become an integral part of the detention program. This approach has had great success in other jurisdictions.

Family conferencing is an old idea, but it could prove a valuable tool in improving all phases of detention and alternatives to detention. In other jurisdictions, state or local government agencies contract with private service providers to provide family conferencing services. In Maryland, DJS already provides such services in aftercare through “family intervention

specialists.” The Committee proposes that DJS provide such services, or contract with private services providers to provide such services, at the front end of the system as well.

Family conferences are organized by trained family counselors. All family members, except those who would be destructive to the process are invited to meet and discuss the young person who has been arrested. “Family members” is a loosely-defined term and may include unrelated members of the household, influential extended family members who are not part of the household, and other persons who have an influence on the child who is the subject of the conference. The family counselor elicits what problems led to the arrest, what problems need to be addressed (even if unrelated to the arrest) and what actions could be initiated which would prevent a new arrest. There may be other agenda items. If the child is in secure detention, the question may be what is needed to address the child’s problems without removing the child from his or her house. If the parents or others are frustrated by the child’s poor performance on community detention, the question may be what is needed to prevent the family from requesting that the child be placed in secure detention. If a household member has been a victim of the arrested child’s aggression, the question may be how the victim may be protected without removing the child.

The theory of this approach is that the family understands the child better than any of the professionals assigned to the case and the family knows its own values and the culture the child lives in. As a result the collected wisdom of the family members often results in plans for the child and agreements between the child and other family members which are far more effective than any an agency could produce. The family counselor is needed to keep the meeting to the agenda, to lay down ground rules and remind participants of those rules as needed, to prevent the meetings from degenerating into arguments, and to inform the family about available resources. The role isn’t strictly mediation, facilitation, or arbitration although elements of each may be present. The counselor also informs the family as to what may or may not be acceptable to the court and what may or may not be available in the way of services. While this approach doesn’t always produce agreements, and not all of the agreements which are produced are successful, it has a very good track record.

DJS should provide short-term intensive family services as well as family conferencing. For instance, a counselor may be on call 24 hours a day during the detention period for a child who has mental health issues in addition to facing a delinquency charge. A counselor may seek help on behalf of a sibling, not the detained child, if the sibling is a disruptive force on the family. Similarly, children and adults may all need substance abuse treatment. The family counselor helps the family develop a plan and then to implement that plan, at least during the short time the child is detained.

The most common reason that children are placed in secure detention when their offenses do not warrant incarceration is that families refuse to allow the child to return home. A trained family counselor can meet with the family, find out why the family is refusing to allow the child to return home, and address the problems immediately. For instance, a parent who is afraid that the child may assault a family member may be more willing to accept the child if the counselor agrees that someone will respond immediately, 24 hours a day, if a problem arises.

Family conferencing may also be used for children already placed in secure detention. If the family and the child reach an agreement through the family conferencing process on how the child will behave, and consequences for violating the agreement, the child may be placed in community detention with the agreement formulating part of the conditions for release.

Family conferencing may also be used for children already in the community detention program. By addressing the problems which led to the alleged offense, family conferencing may reduce the number of children who run from the program. It may also facilitate agreements at adjudicatory hearings.

Family conferencing may have another effect which, in the long run, will be more important. It provides direct service to parents who are often discouraged by the lack of help they receive from the juvenile justice system until after their child is in deep trouble. By helping parents deal with the problems of their children early, family conferencing may reduce the number of children who are charged in the first place.

#### **4. Evening Reporting Centers**

**Recommendation 4:** DJS should open three new Evening Reporting Centers in Baltimore City by 2006, in addition to the one ERC currently planned. At least one of the new ERCs should be for girls. DJS should obtain new funding or reallocate existing funding for the new centers.

We are fortunate because the Chicago evening reporting centers provide a wealth of ideas which can help when developing Baltimore's reporting centers. Chicago uses a mixed model. Private providers run the center, but at least one employee of Chicago's probation department is present at all times an evening reporting center is open. The first reporting centers in Maryland will be run by the Department of Juvenile Services. The committee recommends that the centers proposed for fiscal year 2006 use a private provider model, to see which model is most cost effective and is most successful at attaining the stated goals.

In Chicago, each reporting center can be run by a different provider. One provider may run more than one evening reporting center, but that isn't necessary. The Request for Proposal process, the training, and the quality assurance process are handled by a private umbrella agency. In Baltimore, the Family League of Baltimore City is willing to fill the role of the umbrella agency and to develop Requests for Proposals for private provider-run evening reporting centers.

Evening Reporting Centers, whether operated by DJS or private providers, should have the following features:

- Utilize local community facilities, staff, volunteers, advocates and boards;
- Utilize ex-juvenile offenders;
- Focus on building relationships;
- Focus on families and parent involvement;

Target appropriate target populations; and,  
Operate as part of a continuum of detention alternative services.

Chicago uses data analysis to determine problem areas. It may be that many new offenses are committed by drug dealers, or by children with mental health problems, or by girls. Once probation officials in Chicago identify a problem area, they target those children for programs. This is a wise course which Baltimore and Maryland should follow. We should not think we can develop "one size fits all" programming.

The Committee endorses the creation of the two Evening Reporting Centers funded in the fiscal year 2005 budget of the Department of Juvenile Services. DJS should create three additional Evening Reporting Centers in fiscal year 2006 in Baltimore City. The reporting centers funded for 2005 are designed to serve all of Baltimore City. This is a major step forward in providing a spectrum of alternatives to detention in Baltimore. In order for the reporting centers to achieve their full potential, however, they should be based in neighborhoods and should primarily serve children from the neighborhoods in which they are based. The Department of Juvenile Services should situate the new ERCs in those neighborhoods with the highest rates of juvenile arrest and detention. The long term goal should be to establish enough evening reporting centers that all of Baltimore's neighborhoods can be served.

One of the reporting centers in the fiscal year 2006 budget must be dedicated to girls. The need to create better services for girls has been well documented. These programs, which rely on a group process model, have had better success in other locations when segregated by sex.

These programs should be run by a non-profit community organization. That will enable evaluation of the relative benefits and disadvantages of ERCs operated by DJS and by private providers.

## **5. Day Reporting Center**

**Recommendation 5:** DJS should open a Day Reporting Center in Baltimore City during 2005. DJS should obtain new funding or reallocate existing funding for education staff for the DRC. No other funding is needed for personnel for the DRC.

A Day Reporting Center was part of the original plan to develop an Evening Reporting Center. A Day Reporting Center is an important component of an effective array of alternatives to secure detention. DJS wisely planned to utilize its staff in both programs, at different times of the day. The original DJS plan did not include sufficient educational staff to provide an adequate educational program at the DRC. DJS should obtain the funding to provide adequate educational staff so that the DRC can go forward. The funding already approved for the Evening Reporting Center is sufficient to provide DJS staff for the Day Reporting Center: no additional funding is needed for DJS staff.

The Evening Reporting Centers and Day Reporting Centers should be separate from Community Detention, i.e., youth should not be placed in an Evening Reporting Center or Day Reporting Center and also be on Community Detention or Community Detention with electronic monitoring. The new spaces that DJS creates in these ATD programs should be used to reduce the number of children in secure detention, not as an add-on to ongoing community detention.

## **6. Shelter Care Facility**

**Recommendation 6:** During 2005, DJS should open the shelter care facility it has planned with DSS. DJS should obtain funds to open an additional shelter care facility in 2006.

DJS and DSS have planned a new shelter care facility since 2003. That facility should open in 2005. Shelter care is another important component of a full array of alternatives to detention. The Committee recommends that DJS open an additional shelter care facility in 2006. Shelter care can be an appropriate alternative to detention for children who have been charged with a delinquent act but who also have significant mental health needs, for children awaiting drug treatment beds, for children whose parents need a respite option as part of the family counseling program, and for children facing sanctions for violating CD or for failing to appear in court.

## **7. Maryland Youth Residential Center**

**Recommendation 7:** DJS should stop holding homeless children, children whose parents are unable or unwilling to pick them up when they are arrested, young children (under age 12), and children charged with minor offenses, in the Maryland Youth Residential Center. MYRC should be used for children who require a high level of supervision but do not require secure detention.

MYRC is a 24-bed, self-contained, staff secure, structured shelter care facility. It is less restrictive than secure detention, but more restrictive than other alternatives to detention such as Community Detention, Community Detention with electronic monitoring, Evening Reporting Center, Day Reporting Center, or shelter care.

Research by DJS indicates that a substantial number of youth are placed in MYRC for less serious offenses such as misdemeanor theft, trespassing, disturbing the peace, and violation of probation. Youth charged with such offenses should certainly be held accountable for their behavior, but they can be placed in less restrictive alternatives to detention. MYRC has also been used for placement of homeless children, very young children, and children whose parents refuse to pick them up. Those children should be in shelter care.

Structured shelter care is a critical component of an effective array of alternatives to detention. It is especially valuable as a "step-down" facility for youth who require a high level of supervision but do not require secure detention in the Juvenile Justice Center.

The Committee recommends that DJS stop holding homeless children, children whose parents are unable or unwilling to pick them up when they are arrested, young children (under age 12), and children charged with minor offenses in MYRC. MYRC is a valuable resource that should be reserved for children who require a high level of supervision but do not require secure detention.

## **8. Making Full Use of Available Funding Options**

**Recommendation 8:** DJS should make full use of all available funding options to support alternatives to detention.

Some sites in the Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, as well as other cities, counties, and states, have successfully captured new funds through sources such as Title IV-E of the Social Security Act. For example, the family conferencing and family support services discussed above under Recommendation 3 are the kinds of activities for which sites such as Santa Cruz, California, have utilized IV-E funds. IV-E funding is a particularly attractive funding option because it is an uncapped federal entitlement program. Although there are limitations to the use of IV-E funds, and requirements for their availability (e.g., case plans), the Committee recommends that DJS explore IV-E and other sources of funding in order to make full use of all available funding options.

The implementation of the Committee's recommendations should not, however, be completely dependent upon new funding from the legislature or opening up of new federal funding options. If neither of those sources of funding is adequate to address the recommendations, DJS should reallocate funds from other parts of its budget.

## **D. Data Collection and Evaluation**

DJS will need to collect various types of data to enable an evaluation of the effectiveness of these proposals. The types of data to be collected include the following. For all of these, data collected should include gender and race/ethnicity.

1. Number of youth per month who cut off electronic monitors or otherwise violate CD
2. Number of youth who violate CD who are apprehended by the police, and the amount of time from the violation of CD to the apprehension of the youth
3. Types of sanctions imposed on youth who violate CD or fail to appear, and the length of time each type of sanction is imposed
4. Number of youth and families who utilize family conferencing and family support services
5. Number of new offenses committed by youth on community detention
6. Number of new offenses committed by youth who have had graduated sanctions for violating CD or for FTA
7. Number of youth detained at the Juvenile Justice Center
8. Number of youth admitted to the Evening Reporting Center(s), Day Reporting Center, shelter care, and MYRC, and the most serious offenses charged for each youth admitted

- to each type of placement
9. Number of youth who commit new offenses before their adjudication
  10. Number of youth who fail to appear for court hearings.

DJS will need to establish baseline data for all of these measures, and will need to establish measures for the effectiveness of the recommendations made by the Committee. The Family League of Baltimore City has volunteered to evaluate the evening reporting centers, both those run by the Department of Juvenile Services and those run by private providers. The data collection and evaluation are critical to the credibility of these efforts with the public, the General Assembly, all stakeholder agencies, and the advocacy community.

## **E. Conclusion**

There is a better way. The Committee believes that implementation of these recommendations will enable DJS to reduce the population of the Juvenile Justice Center by 50% to 75%. This would be an enormous benefit to the children, the public, and the agencies in the juvenile justice system.

Implementing these recommendations won't be easy. There is nothing easy about chasing down kids who don't want to be found, or imposing immediate sanctions when the violations occur at the most inconvenient times. There is nothing easy about finding qualified professionals who are willing to work with families in their homes at any hour of the day or night. Dedicated police officers and Juvenile Services employees are already doing this difficult work. We need to give them the tools and resources to assure success. It isn't good enough to say that a program works well except for the 20% of the participants who run. We need programs that offer a wide array of effective alternatives to detention, and the will to implement these recommendations in a way that serves all of the children and families of our community.