



# OJJP

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention



**FY 1995 Competitive Discretionary Program  
Announcements and Application Kit**

# Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Missing and Exploited Children Program** seeks to promote effective policies and procedures for addressing the problem of missing and exploited children. Established by the Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984, the program provides funds for a variety of activities to support and coordinate a network of resources such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; training and technical assistance to a network of 43 State clearinghouses, nonprofit organizations, law enforcement personnel, and attorneys; and research and demonstration programs.

OJJDP provides leadership, direction, and resources to the juvenile justice community to help prevent and control delinquency throughout the country.

# For Your Information

## **This Online Publication . . .**

The purpose of this online publication is to disseminate information about OJJDP's competitive discretionary programs as quickly as possible. Contained herein are application and administrative requirements, programs descriptions, instructions for completing an application, and contact lists. The program descriptions include such information as award amounts, application due dates, and delivery instructions. Application forms and some background regulatory material could not be included online, but are available in the paperbound publication. See below for additional information about the complete *Application Kit*.

## **The Complete Application Kit . . .**

The *FY 1995 Competitive Discretionary Program Announcements and Application Kit* is a paperbound issue that includes the same information that appears online. In addition, this issue contains copies of forms and general knowledge needed to apply for one of the grants. This information includes the following.

- Copies of Forms, including Application Form SF-424 and Certification Form 4061/6
- Instructions for Completing Forms and Sample Forms
- Peer Review Information
- Excerpts from the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

The materials listed above are not available online but can be ordered from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse.

## **To Order the *Application Kit* . . .**

Potential applicants can order the complete *FY 1995 Competitive Discretionary Program Announcements and Application Kit* (NCJ 153521) by calling the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (NCJRS) at 1-800-638-8736.

---

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

**Shay Bilchik**  
*Administrator*

---

**FY 1995 Competitive Discretionary Program  
Announcements and Application Kit**

---

---

---

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

**U.S. Department of Justice**

Janet Reno ..... Attorney General

**Office of Justice Programs**

Laurie Robinson. .... Assistant Attorney General

Noël Brennan ..... Deputy Assistant Attorney General

Reginald L. Robinson ..... Deputy Assistant Attorney General

**Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**

Shay Bilchik ..... Administrator

John J. Wilson ..... Deputy Administrator

Joan Hurley ..... Acting Director, Research and  
Program Development Division

Douglas C. Dodge ..... Director, Special Emphasis  
Division

Emily C. Martin ..... Director, Training and Technical  
Assistance Division

Roberta Dorn ..... Director, State Relations and  
Assistance Division

Ronald C. Laney ..... Director, Missing and Exploited  
Children's Program

Emily C. Martin ..... Director, Information  
Dissemination Unit

Katherine K. Deoudes ..... Acting Director, Concentration  
of Federal Efforts Program

**Office of Juvenile Justice  
and Delinquency Prevention**  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20531  
(202) 307-5911

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

---

---

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Application and Administrative Requirements</b> .....	3
General Eligibility Requirements .....	3
General Application Requirements .....	3
Application Review Process .....	4
Financial Requirements .....	5
Civil Rights Requirements .....	6
Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements .....	6
Audit Requirements .....	6
Disclosure of Federal Participation .....	6
Suspension or Termination of Funding .....	7
<b>Competitive Discretionary Program Announcements</b>	
<b>Fiscal Year 1995 Competitive Program Listing</b> .....	11
<b>Overarching Program</b> .....	13
SafeFutures: Partnerships to Reduce Youth Violence and Delinquency .....	13
National Evaluation of the SafeFutures Program: Phase I Study of Program Development and Implementation .....	52
<b>Strengthening Juvenile Justice</b>	
Interventions To Reduce Disproportionate Minority Confinement in Secure Detention and Correctional Facilities (The Deborah Ann Wysinger Memorial Program) .....	57
Technical Assistance to Juvenile Corrections and Detention (The James E. Gould Memorial Program) .....	60
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Gangs and Delinquency Research .....	63
Field Initiated Gang Research .....	64
Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court Studies .....	66
Gangs, Groups, Individuals, and Violence Intervention .....	71

---

---

## **Delinquency Prevention**

Innovative Approaches in Law-Related Education .....	75
Pathways to Success .....	77
Training and Technical Assistance for Family Strengthening Programs .....	81
Youth Centered Conflict Resolution .....	84

## **Appendix A. Application Form and Instructions**

Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) .....	89
Instructions for Completing Applications for Assistance From the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.....	90

## **Appendix B. Peer Review Information**

OJJDP Peer Review Guideline .....	109
OJJDP Competition and Peer Review Procedures .....	123

## **Appendix C. Certifications**

Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements .....	130
--	-----

## **Appendix D. Contact Lists**

State Advisory Groups and State Planning Agencies .....	135
OMB State Single Points of Contact .....	149

## **Appendix E. Excerpts from the *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance***

Excerpts from the <i>Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance</i> .....	157
---	-----

## **Appendix F. Extra Blank Forms**

Application Form SF-424	
Certificaion Form 4061/6	

---

# Introduction

---

The Nation's juvenile justice system stands at a crossroads. We face a disturbing increase in violent crimes committed by juveniles and an alarming rise in abuse, neglect, and street violence perpetrated against our children. The public's fear of youth violence is well-founded. If juvenile violent crime arrest rates continue to increase annually as in the recent past, they will more than double by the year 2010. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's *Uniform Crime Reports* show that juvenile violent crime arrests have increased 68% from 1984 to 1993. In 1992, 1.55 million violent crimes were committed against juveniles age 12 to 17 years, a 23.4% increase since 1987. Increased violence and use of weapons, especially firearms, by our youth has created great fear both for and of our children.

The Department of Justice is calling for an unprecedented national commitment of public and private resources to reverse the trends in juvenile violence and victimization. We cannot afford a narrow focus by individual disciplines to attack this problem. Participants from all community sectors, public and private, across specializations, must plan collaboratively and comprehensively if we are to reduce juvenile violence and build safer and healthier communities.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is congressionally mandated to lead the effort to address the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and victimization. Established in 1974, OJJDP provides direction and assistance to national, State, and local efforts to improve the administration of juvenile justice, combat juvenile delinquency, and aid missing, exploited, and abused children and their families. Protecting our communities and our children are the twin objectives at the heart of OJJDP's leadership of the Nation's efforts to prevent and combat juvenile delinquency.

In accordance with the provisions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended, OJJDP published, on May 3, 1995, its final comprehensive plan for fiscal year 1995, which establishes its program priorities. OJJDP's plan is based on three decades of research that shows prevention to be the most cost-effective means of reducing delinquency and points to the efficacy of a communitywide, comprehensive, multi-dimensional approach. This approach includes prevention programs, immediate and intermediate sanctions, secure facilities for the most serious offenders, and sound re-entry and aftercare services.

As a result of recent research and evaluation, we can now point to a variety of program models proven to reduce delinquency and control youth violence. In these times of limited resources, OJJDP believes that program development must be predicated on this prior knowledge and that innovative demonstration programs should be evaluated to measure their impact. Information, technical assistance, and training on the most promising programs must be provided as quickly and broadly as possible. This year's program plan strengthens our work in providing communities with this type of support.

Additionally, for fiscal year 1995 OJJDP has created a new overarching program, *SafeFutures: Partnerships To Reduce Youth Violence and Delinquency*. This collaborative program, designed to enhance the implementation of OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (Wilson and Howell, 1993), requires all community sectors to participate in the determination of local needs and the planning and implementation of programs to meet those needs through a continuum of care.



---

While this year's program announcements consist of a variety of demonstration, training, and research efforts that are of great importance to OJJDP, SafeFutures' continuum of care initiative reflects our best hope to reduce juvenile violence and delinquency. This continuum of care contemplates:

- Early and effective programming to prevent delinquency by targeting at-risk children and their families.
- Accountability and treatment through immediate and intermediate sanctions.
- Effective, sustained supervision in aftercare programs to assist juveniles in transition from residential placement back to the community.
- Secure facilities for the most serious offenders to ensure public safety and an appropriate rehabilitative setting.
- Criminal justice correctional options for the most violent or intractable juvenile offenders.

All of these components are necessary to the successful reduction of delinquency.

The *Competitive Discretionary Program Announcements and Application Kit* is designed to assist with the grant process. If you have questions, please contact the OJJDP staff member listed at the end of the appropriate announcement for clarification.

I hope OJJDP's programs will assist you and your communities. We are all participants in an historic struggle. Collectively, I believe we can make a difference in the lives of America's children. Your continuing interest, concern, and involvement in these efforts is deeply appreciated.

Shay Bilchik  
Administrator  
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

---

---

# Application and Administrative Requirements

---

## General Eligibility Requirements

Applications are invited from eligible public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions, individuals, or combinations thereof. Eligibility differs from program to program. Please consult individual program announcements for specific eligibility requirements. Where eligible for an assistance award, private for-profit organizations must agree to waive any profit or fee. Joint applications by two or more eligible applicants are welcome, provided that one organization is designated as the primary applicant and the other(s) as coapplicant(s).

Applicants must demonstrate that they have experience in the design and implementation of the type of program or program activity for which they are applying and have the management and financial capability to effectively implement a project of the size and scope delineated in the program description. Each applicant must also demonstrate the capability to manage the program in order to be eligible for funding consideration.

## General Application Requirements

All applicants must submit a completed Standard Form 424 (SF-424), Application for Federal Assistance; Standard Form 424A, Budget Information; OJP Form 4000/3, Program Narrative and Assurances; and OJP Form 4061/6, Certifications. All applications must include the information required by the specific solicitation as well as the Standard Form 424.

The SF-424 must appear as a cover sheet for the entire application. The project summary should follow the SF-424. All other forms must then follow. Applicants should be sure to sign OJP forms 4000/3 and 4061/6. Applicants are requested to submit the original signed application and five copies to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Application forms and supplementary information are provided in the appendixes of this *Application Kit*. Potential applicants should review the OJJDP Peer Review Guideline and the OJJDP Competition and Peer Review Procedures in Appendix B.

Applications that include proposed noncompetitive contracts for the provision of specific goods and services must include a sole-source justification for any procurement in excess of \$25,000.

Applicants receiving other funds in support of the proposed activity (current, recent, or expected) must include in their application: (1) information on all sources of these funds (including funding from other Federal agencies); (2) the anticipated total amount to be received; and (3) a brief description of any other program(s) receiving such funds.

---

All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the following address:

Office of the Administrator  
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention  
c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center  
1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K  
Rockville, MD 20850

**Note:** In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.

Applicants are responsible for insuring that their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on the due date. Program due dates are exclusive and can be found near the end of each program description in this *Application Kit*.

OJJDP will notify applicants in writing that their applications have been received. Subsequently, applicants will be notified by letter as to the decision made regarding whether or not their submission will be recommended for funding. Applicants should provide both a return address and a fax number, if possible.

Applicants from State and local units of government or other organizations providing services within a State must submit a copy of their application to the State Single Point of Contact, if one exists, and if the program has been selected for reviews by the State. A list of the State Single Points of Contact is provided in Appendix D.

## Application Review Process

### Selection Criteria

All applicants will be evaluated and rated by a peer review panel according to specified selection criteria. Peer review will be conducted in accordance with the OJJDP Competition and Peer Review Policy, 28 CFR Part 34, Subpart B (provided in Appendix B). When appropriate in a particular grant program, preference will be given to communities that can demonstrate broad based, interdisciplinary planning. Applicants should explain how the grant program will be integrated into the communities' overall plan. Selection criteria for each competitive program will determine applicants' responsiveness to minimum program application requirements, organizational capability, and thoroughness and innovativeness in responding to strategic issues related to project implementation. Each competitive program announcement will indicate whether there are additional program-specific review criteria and/or changes in points assigned to criteria used in the peer reviews for that particular program.

Peer reviewers will use the following criteria to rate applications unless the program announcement contains separate, program-specific selection criteria:

- 1. Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (20 points)** Applicants must concisely describe the problems to be addressed and convey a clear understanding of the purposes and work requirements of the project.
- 2. Goals and Objectives. (20 points)** Applicants must clearly define the goals and objectives of the project and describe how the objectives are clear, measurable, and attainable.

- 
- 
3. **Project Design. (20 points)** Applicants must relate the merits of the approach proposed in their application to Department of Justice goals and objectives for the project and explain why this constitutes a sound and effective approach.

The design must provide a detailed implementation plan with a timeline that indicates significant milestones in the project, due dates for products, and the nature of the products to be submitted. The design must contain program elements that are directly linked to the achievement of the project.

4. **Project Management. (15 points)** Applicants must demonstrate that the project's management structure and staffing is adequate to successfully implement and complete the project. The management structure and staffing assignments for the project should be consistent with the project goals and tasks described in the application.
5. **Organizational Capability. (15 points)** The applicant organization's potential to conduct the project successfully must be documented. Applicants must demonstrate knowledge of and experience in the juvenile justice field, particularly in the area of study the project addresses.

Applicants must demonstrate that staff members have sufficient substantive expertise and technical experience. The applications will be judged on the appropriateness of the position descriptions, required qualifications, and staff selection criteria. Staff resumes should be attached.

6. **Budget. (10 points)** Applicants must provide a proposed budget that is complete, detailed, reasonable, allowable, and cost effective for the activities proposed, and are directly related to the achievement of the program objectives. All costs must be justified in a budget narrative that explains how costs are determined.

Peer reviewers' recommendations are advisory only and the final award decision will be made by the Administrator. OJJDP will negotiate specific terms of the awards with the selected applicants.

## Evaluation

OJJDP requires that funded programs contain plans for continuous self-assessment to keep program management informed of progress and results. Many funded projects will be considered for participation in independent evaluations initiated by OJJDP. Project management will be expected to cooperate fully with designated evaluators.

## Financial Requirements

Discretionary grants are governed by the provisions of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars applicable to financial assistance. The circulars, along with additional information and guidance, are contained in the *Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants*, Office of Justice Programs, Guideline Manual, M7100.1D available from the Office of Justice Programs. This guideline manual includes information on allowable costs, methods of payment, audit requirements, accounting systems, and financial records. This manual will be provided upon request and will govern the administration of funds by all successful applicants.

---

---

## **Civil Rights Requirements**

### **Prohibition of Discrimination for Recipients of Federal Funds**

No person in any State shall on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under or denied employment in connection with any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, pursuant to the following statutes and regulations: Section 809(c), Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3789d, Section 292(b) of the JJDP Act, and Department of Justice Nondiscrimination Regulations, 28 CFR Part 42, Subparts C, D, E, and G; Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; Subtitle A, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (1990) and Department of Justice regulations on disability discrimination 28 CFR Part 35 and Part 39; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975.

In the event a Federal or State court or Federal or State administrative agency makes a finding of discrimination after a due process hearing on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability against a recipient of funds, the recipient will forward a copy of the finding to the Office for Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs.

## **Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements**

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited in OJP Form 4061/6 to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. A copy of the OJP Form 4061/6 is provided in the appendixes of this Application Kit. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, “New Restrictions on Lobbying” and 28 CFR Part 67, “Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).” The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Justice determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

## **Audit Requirements**

In October 1984, Congress passed the Single Audit Act of 1984. On April 12, 1985, the Office of Management and Budget issued Circular A-128, “Audits of State and Local Governments,” which establishes regulations to implement the Act. OMB Circular A-128, “Audits of State and Local Governments,” outlines the requirements for organizational audits which apply to OJJDP grantees.

Institutions of higher education, hospitals, and other nonprofit organizations have the responsibility to provide for an audit of their activities not less than every 2 years. The required audits are to be on an organization-wide basis rather than on a grant-by-grant basis.

---

## **Disclosure of Federal Participation**

Section 8136 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act (Stevens Amendment), enacted in October 1988, requires that, “when issuing statements, press releases for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with Federal money, all grantees receiving Federal funds, including but not limited to State and local governments, shall clearly state (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with Federal money, and (2) the dollar amount of Federal funds for the project or program.”

## **Suspension or Termination of Funding**

OJJDP may suspend, in whole or in part, or terminate funding for a grantee for failure to conform to the requirements or statutory objectives of the JJDP Act. Prior to suspension of a grant, OJJDP will provide reasonable notice to the grantee of its intent to suspend the grant and will attempt informally to resolve the problem resulting in the intended suspension. Hearing and appeal procedures for termination actions are set forth in the Department of Justice regulation at 28 CFR Part 18.

# **Competitive Discretionary Program Announcements**

---

---

# Fiscal Year 1995 Competitive Discretionary Program Listing

## Overarching Program

SafeFutures Partnerships To Reduce Youth Violence and Delinquency .....	\$7,200,000
National Evaluation of the SafeFutures Program: Phase I Study of Program Development and Implementation .....	\$150,000

## Strengthening Juvenile Justice

Interventions To Reduce Disproportionate Minority Confinement in Secure Detention and Correctional Facilities (The Deborah Ann Wysinger Memorial Program) .....	\$300,000
Technical Assistance to Juvenile Corrections and Detention (The James E. Gould Memorial Program) .....	\$200,000

## Public Safety

Gangs and Delinquency Research .....	\$500,000
Field Initiated Gang Research .....	\$300,000
Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court Studies .....	\$275,000
Gangs, Groups, Individuals, and Violence Intervention .....	\$250,000

## Delinquency Prevention

Innovative Approaches in Law-Related Education .....	\$600,000
Pathways to Success .....	\$250,000
Training and Technical Assistance for Family Strengthening Programs .....	\$250,000
Youth Centered Conflict Resolution .....	\$200,000



---

---

# Overarching Program

---

## SafeFutures: Partnerships To Reduce Youth Violence and Delinquency

### Overview

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) announces a new competitive grant program — SafeFutures: Partnerships To Reduce Youth Violence and Delinquency (SafeFutures). This *Application Kit* provides program requirements and administrative guidance for jurisdictions eligible to apply for grants under this program. Under the SafeFutures program, OJJDP will make direct grants to five communities to help them implement a comprehensive and coordinated delinquency prevention and intervention treatment program for at-risk and delinquent juveniles.

The SafeFutures program rests on three important premises. The first is that public safety can be improved by providing prevention, intervention, and treatment services to at-risk and delinquent juveniles. These elements constitute a continuum of care that is essential if we are to successfully address juvenile violence and delinquency. The second premise is that the strategy for implementing this continuum of care is found in a comprehensive, customer-focused approach that draws on the resources of service agencies at all levels of government and in the private sector. The third premise is that the juvenile justice system must be linked to the broader service delivery system. Availability of services, community responsiveness, and partnerships lie at the heart of the SafeFutures program.

To support the SafeFutures initiative, OJJDP is pooling resources available under Title II, Parts C, D, and G, and Title V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended. In this way, ongoing community efforts to develop a continuum of services focused on juveniles at risk of delinquency and a system of graduated sanctions for those juveniles who enter the juvenile justice system can be strengthened.

SafeFutures calls on the community to enhance existing partnerships to address the needs of at-risk children of all ages, including delinquent youth. These partnerships must include public and private agencies; community-based organizations, such as religious, civic, and business groups; community residents; and youth. This initiative also places a strong premium on linkages to other ongoing Federal, State, local, and tribal initiatives concerned with youth development, economic development, and public safety. Finally, SafeFutures seeks to build capacity at the local and tribal level to ensure that youth-supporting efforts are sustained over the long term.

A total of \$7,200,000 is available under this program to support first-year awards to five units of local government: three urban, one rural, and one tribal government. The program is designed to provide Federal funding for 5 years, conditioned on grantee performance and availability of future funds. Thereafter, the program should be sustained through local and tribal funding.

---

---

## Background and Rationale

In recent years, many communities have begun to recognize the power of partnerships to meet the challenges of crime and delinquency, substance abuse, family disintegration, and declining neighborhoods. Collaboration across all levels of government (Federal, State, local, and tribal), among agencies within levels of government, and between public and private sector agencies and private citizens is becoming increasingly common. These community partnerships typically share some common themes:

- Recognition that many community problems are too complex and multifaceted to be solved by any one agency.
- Belief that problem solving is most effective when it is shared among community residents, the private sector, and government.
- Commitment to finding comprehensive, long-term approaches to meeting community needs.

Community partnerships generally result in communities revising their organizational structures and policies to accommodate new approaches, creating a forum for comprehensive planning and mechanisms to ensure that there is follow through (Cronin, 1994).

OJJDP's SafeFutures program is designed to build on these partnerships by focusing on communitywide efforts to prevent delinquency, violence, and gang involvement; create community-based alternatives for troubled youth; and improve the ability of the juvenile justice system to respond appropriately and effectively to each juvenile who enters the system.

This approach is described in detail in OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (Wilson and Howell, June 1993). Under the prevention component of the strategy, and as implemented under OJJDP's Title V Prevention Incentive Grants program, a broad-based community planning board, which includes the active involvement of young people, systematically assesses risk factors that place juveniles at risk of delinquency and develops programs to reduce risk factors and increase protective factors that serve to buffer juveniles from risks. The model draws on research conducted over the past half century that has documented risk factors in five categories that contribute to juvenile delinquency:

1. Individual characteristics, such as alienation, rebelliousness, and lack of bonding to society.
2. Family influences, such as parental conflict, child abuse, poor management practices, and a history of problem behavior (substance abuse, criminality, teen pregnancy, and dropping out of school).
3. School experiences, such as early academic failure and lack of commitment to school.
4. Peer group influences, such as friends who engage in problem behavior (minor criminality, drugs, gangs, and violence).
5. Neighborhood and community factors, such as economic deprivation, high rates of substance abuse and crime, and neighborhood disorganization.

Research has also demonstrated that these risk factors can be reduced by increasing protective factors that promote healthy and productive behavior.

SafeFutures builds on and expands the *Comprehensive Strategy* by emphasizing the importance of providing a continuum of care for juveniles at all developmental stages who are at risk of delinquency. Consequently, SafeFutures targets communities that have conducted community assessments and have identified and begun implementing systemic changes to reduce youth violence and juvenile delinquency.

---

SafeFutures will target communities that have been engaged in significant planning and coordination activities as a part of the Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities (EZ/EC) program. In recognition of these significant efforts and their accomplishments, a minimum of two of the four urban and rural sites will be located in jurisdictions designated as EZ/ECs. A targeted community should be physically located in the same urban or rural area, but the community does not have to be the EZ/EC designee. To qualify for the preference, however, applicants must show that appropriate linkages have been established with the EZ/EC program and describe benefits derived from the relationship.

The SafeFutures program also seeks to provide needed programmatic support to communities in critical areas by making available a broad array of program funds and training and technical assistance resources.

## **Program Goals**

1. To prevent and control juvenile violence and delinquency in targeted communities by:
  - a. reducing risk factors for delinquency and increasing protective factors,
  - b. providing a continuum of services for juveniles at risk of delinquency with appropriate immediate interventions for juvenile offenders, and
  - c. developing a full range of graduated sanctions designed to hold delinquent youth accountable to the victim and the community, to ensure community safety, and to provide appropriate treatment and rehabilitation services.
2. To develop a more efficient, effective, and timely service delivery system for at-risk and delinquent juveniles and their families that is capable of responding to their needs at any part of entry into that system.
3. To build the community's capacity to institutionalize and sustain the service delivery system by expanding and diversifying sources of funding.
4. To determine the success of program implementation and the outcomes achieved, including whether a comprehensive strategy involving community-based efforts and program resources concentrated on providing a continuum of care has succeeded in preventing and reducing juvenile violence and delinquency.

## **Program Strategy**

### **Activities**

The SafeFutures program is directed toward communities that have already made substantial progress in reforming their systems of care for at-risk and delinquent youth. Therefore, applicants must describe the planning and implementation efforts they have undertaken to date. SafeFutures communities must have the commitment and participation of a broad cross-section of the community in developing a comprehensive juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention strategy. Although the roles of governmental agencies may vary, the community must demonstrate the existence of a diverse and representative coalition in which public officials and agencies are equal partners with private citizens and grassroots organizations.

Applicants must describe the process by which they have identified risk factors, needs, and strengths. Communities may have either conducted the assessment independently or as part of OJJDP's Title V Prevention Program.

---

Applicants must project a 5-year vision for their continuum of care program for youth, with a particular focus on their juvenile justice system. Applicants must also identify the gaps in service for at-risk youth at each stage of development, with specific attention to the need for a system of graduated sanctions. They must also clearly address how the program components composing SafeFutures will assist them in reducing or eliminating service gaps. For each program component, applicants must first identify target groups and provide a rationale for using the allocated program funds and then define specific goals and objectives with quantifiable outcomes.

Applicants must have an organizational structure that provides adequate oversight and has authority for implementing the kinds of systemic improvements required under the SafeFutures program. A number of existing organizational options and combinations of organization and service delivery may be appropriate. Examples include independent boards under direct authority of the Executive Branch, councils under auspices of nonprofit organizations, interagency consortia, youth networks, or any of these in combination with regional assessment centers, community assessment teams, colocated services, or service networks. Although these examples are offered, they in no way should be construed as the only possibilities. Applicants should present a structure and service delivery process that is appropriate to the specific resources, needs, and strengths of their community and their juvenile justice system.

Applicants should also obtain a copy of OJJDP's *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (Howell, 1995). This publication describes the rationale for comprehensive efforts, identifies key strategies and promising prevention and intervention programs for each area, suggests effective risk and needs assessment tools, and guides implementation at the community level for a continuum of care model.

## **Collaboration/Coordination**

The SafeFutures program places a premium on collaboration, coordination, and leveraging resources. Federal agencies and private organizations, such as the Boys & Girls Clubs of America, will make training and technical assistance (TA) resources available to SafeFutures sites.

At the national level, OJJDP will coordinate this program with the Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services; the Corporation for National Service; and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Communities may use these diverse Federal and private resources to supplement and improve services for at-risk and delinquent youth.

At the local level, SafeFutures sites are expected to coordinate and, where feasible, to collaborate with other Federal, State, and local agencies; national and community foundations; and private sector programs, including organizations established to promote the interest of Native Americans. Examples include HUD's EZ/ECs and HOPE 6; the Department of Health and Human Services' Family Preservation and Support Services; the Department of Education's Drug Free and Safe Schools; the Department of Labor's Youth Fair Chance; the Department of Justice's Operation Weed and Seed, Community Oriented Policing Services, and U.S. Attorneys' antiviolence strategies; programs of the Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Native Americans; HUD's Office of Native American Programs; and the National funding Collaboration of Violence Prevention. Information on these and other national public and private community-based initiatives and the jurisdictions in which they operate has been summarized in chart form in a "Community Initiatives Matrix." This document is available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at 1-800-638-8736. Applicants are strongly encouraged to use this document in facilitating their efforts of coordination and collaboration.

## **Target Population**

Sites funded under this initiative must address the multiethnic, racial, and gender needs of at-risk and delinquent children of all ages. Applicants may direct their efforts to the entire jurisdiction or to specific geographical areas of special need.

---

Applicants should justify their targeting in terms of need and appropriateness to the accomplishment of program objectives. Applicants must clearly show that targeted geographic areas represent identifiable communities or neighborhoods where the investment of SafeFutures resources will result in appreciable differences for the youth who live there. For example, the youth in one or more communities or neighborhoods within a large urban area could be targeted.

## **Evaluation of SafeFutures**

The SafeFutures program will help OJJDP determine whether concentrating resources in a continuum of program services, including graduated sanctions, reduces juvenile crime and its correlates. There will be two levels of evaluation: the first by the grantee and the second by a national evaluator funded by OJJDP.

The evaluation will be a collaborative effort among OJJDP, the five grantees, and local and national evaluators. The sites will be treated as five case studies, each testing a similar set of hypotheses about delinquency prevention and treatment based on the principles contained in the *Comprehensive Strategy*. Multiple, repeated measures will be tracked to determine whether hypotheses advocating a risk focused continuum of care model, including a system of graduated sanctions for juveniles in the juvenile justice system, are supported by the data. The evaluation will follow a developmental, open systems, or action research approach in which evaluators collaborate with grantees as part of a team seeking to systematically evaluate an experiment. The National Evaluation of the SafeFutures program will provide a framework for the local evaluations.

### **Local Evaluation Requirements**

The objectives of the local evaluation are as follows:

1. To document SafeFutures program interventions, implementation processes, and key factors affecting successful implementation, including levels of collaboration and sustainability.
2. To help document the impact of SafeFutures interventions by capturing and reporting data on risk factors, juvenile offense rates, the juvenile justice system, and system processing rates from initial custody through aftercare.

Grantees have three major evaluation responsibilities. First, they must develop logic models (Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, 1992) that document the hypothesized effects of the program interventions on stated objectives, which ultimately lead to delinquency prevention and recidivism reduction, as well as effective system reform and a safer community. Logic models should be based on the community's theory of change and specific assumptions about how its continuum of care will reduce risk factors, enhance protective factors, and lead to a decrease in negative behaviors. These models will also help determine the evaluation process and outcome data to be collected. Second, grantees must collect process evaluation data and generate process evaluation reports, following guidelines to be developed by the national evaluator. Examples of the types of information to be collected include, but are not limited to, descriptions of the following:

- Local planning mechanisms and processes and factors affecting successes and failures.
- Established programs, strategies for change, distinguishing structural features and services, budgets, staffing, target populations, screening criteria, clients served, average length of participation, and short-term results.
- Environmental factors, such as city budget crises, other major grant requirements, changing demographics, and local statutes and policies affecting the operation and outcomes of the SafeFutures project.

---

Third, grantees will establish a management information system to generate, collect, and report outcome data designated by the national evaluator. These data will be based on the following:

- Reporting of risk factors related to delinquency prevention (e.g., family conflict and other problems, peer involvement in delinquent behavior, availability of guns and drugs) using sources and formats provided by OJJDP for Title V.
- Reporting of risk factors related to recidivism and community protection for juveniles processed by the juvenile justice system.
- Reporting of juvenile justice system processing outcomes (e.g., police contacts, arrests, secure detention, alternative community service, case dispositions, and placements) by offense/risk level.
- Reporting of juvenile offense rates.

Applicants will demonstrate that they will have sufficient qualified staff to carry out these responsibilities. An independent local evaluator must be involved in the process evaluation. Applicants should consider the feasibility of working with a local university. Although total costs may be more, up to five percent of total funding allocated to the serious and violent offender, at-risk girls, mental health services, and after-school and gangs program components (Parts C and D) can be used to support the costs of the local process evaluation. Any additional costs would be met by the grantee. In addition, grantees must demonstrate an adequate management information system to collect, store, process, and report the evaluation data. OJJDP will also require that the five sites acquire the capability to communicate using the Internet.

### **Role of the National Evaluator**

Under a separate competitive award, OJJDP will fund a national evaluation with the following objectives:

1. To determine how concentrating resources to provide a continuum of care affects the following:
  - a. Juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice system efficiency and effectiveness.
  - b. Program sustainability.
  - c. Coordination.
  - d. Participant outcomes.
2. To build upon evaluations of comprehensive initiatives and to identify successes that could be adopted in other communities and incorporated in national policy.

The national evaluator will facilitate local evaluation by creating templates for local data collection and reporting. The evaluator will also provide data collection training and TA and monitor data quality. Templates will be consistent with those developed by OJJDP for the Title V program evaluation. In addition, the national evaluator will be responsible for conducting quarterly meetings and establishing other forms of ongoing communication with grantees to ensure that findings are reported continuously, common issues and concerns are addressed, and successful strategies are maximized.

### **Program Components**

The SafeFutures program combines funding from nine separate programs, referred to as *program components* in this announcement. Applicants must demonstrate how their plan will incorporate each of the program components and, more broadly, how each component, in coordination with the others, will contribute to meeting the overall goals of the SafeFutures program.

**Table 1. Summary of Program Funding and Technical Assistance (TA) Through SafeFutures**

<b>Program Component</b>	<b>Program Focus</b>	<b>Legislative Authority</b>	<b>Amount of Funds</b>
<b>Focusing on High-Risk Youth and Juvenile Offenders and Strengthening the Juvenile Justice System</b>			
Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offenders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduated Sanctions for Delinquent Offenders</li> <li>• Aftercare</li> </ul>	Part C	\$100,000
At-Risk and Delinquent Girls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Victim Restitution and Community Services</li> <li>• Education, Training, Counseling, Skill-Building, and Child Care Services</li> <li>• Intensive Case Management and Followup</li> </ul>	Part C	\$120,000
<b>Enhancing Protective Factors: Providing Opportunities and Role Models</b>			
After-School Programs (Pathways to Success)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arts, Recreation, Entrepreneurial and Vocational Training, and Other Skill-Building Programs for Nonschool Hours</li> </ul>	Part C	\$ 40,000
Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One-to-One Mentoring by Adults School Based</li> </ul>	Part G	\$200,000
Family Strengthening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuum of Family Services</li> <li>• Intensive Case Management</li> </ul>	Part C	\$200,000
Mental Health Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobile Mental Health Outreach Units</li> <li>• Improved Mental Health Linkages to the Juvenile Justice System</li> <li>• Sex Offender Focus</li> </ul>	Part C	\$150,000
<b>Preventing Delinquency and Promoting Gang-free Schools and Communities</b>			
Delinquency Prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of Delinquency Focus on Juveniles at High Risk of Delinquency</li> </ul>	Title V	\$200,000 50% Match
Gang-Free Schools and Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression for Schools</li> <li>• Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression for Public Subsidized Housing Committees</li> </ul>	Part D	\$400,000
Bethesda Day Treatment Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention/Early Intervention Services</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Intensive Case Management</li> </ul>	Part C	Up to \$ 30,000 in TA Services. 100% Match

---

It is anticipated that most communities will use the funding earmarked for the individual components to implement them or expand already existing programs similar to ones being proposed. However, OJJDP recognizes that there might be instances where a community has a strong component in place already and prefers to use the funding to supplement a different SafeFutures program component. Applicants would have to justify their action and would be restricted to programs funded under Part C legislative authority. Part C programs with this flexibility include the Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offender, At-Risk and Delinquent Girls, After-School, Family Strengthening, and Mental Health program components.

For example, if a community already had very strong programs in place for at-risk and delinquent girls and could demonstrate that fact, it could elect to use the \$120,000 to expand its after-school programs. However, applicants would not have the same flexibility for the Part G (Mentoring), Part D (Gangs), and Part V (Delinquency Prevention) programs because of legal requirements related to the purposes for which these funds can be expended.

Communities are encouraged to be creative in using the program components. Applicants can combine them with one another and with other community programs as long as care is taken to follow the guidelines for the specific component from which the funds are drawn.

Applicants should read each component carefully, noting target audiences and programmatic elements that may not be mentioned in the overview section of these guidelines. For example, Part D funds can only be used for gang prevention and intervention activities, and, within that program, the applicant must implement the gang prevention, intervention, and treatment model described in the component.

Table 1 summarizes some of the key features of each program component grouped according to broad strategy areas.

Additional guidance and specific requirements are contained in the descriptions below and in the Application Process section of this guideline.

## **Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offender Program Development**

**Purpose:** To develop and implement a comprehensive program model to address the problem of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders (SVCJOs).

**Background:** This program component implements Title II, Part C, Sections 261(a)(1), (2), (6), and (8) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. The violent crime rate among juveniles has increased sharply in the past 5 years. Juveniles account for an increasing share of all violent crime arrest in the United States. Consistent with this trend, the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent has increased, as has the number of juveniles waived or transferred to the criminal justice system (Wilson and Howell, 1993).

OJJDP has made it a priority to identify and provide effective programmatic responses to address the problem of serious, violent, and chronic delinquency.

**Goal:** To develop a comprehensive program model that addresses the problem of SVCJOs by planning and implementing graduated sanctions to respond appropriately and effectively to juveniles who commit delinquent acts.

### **Objectives:**

1. To define the target population.
2. To assess the existing continuum of intervention, treatment, and rehabilitation services in the applicant's jurisdiction.



- 
3. To improve case assessment, ensure efficient tracking and case management, and assure maximum utilization of scarce juvenile justice system resources for court-involved youth.
  4. To integrate private nonprofit community-based resource organizations into intervention, treatment, and rehabilitation services for juvenile offenders.
  5. To develop an effective aftercare program that is a formal component of all residential placements.
  6. To develop a victim component to assure services to juvenile victims of crime and integrate victim programs (e.g., restitution, community service, victim mediation) into the range of available sanctions.

**Program Strategy:** This component of the SafeFutures Program will focus on three major elements of OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy*. They are as follows:

- Intervening immediately and effectively when delinquent behavior first occurs.
- Creating a system of graduated sanctions that combines accountability with increasingly intensive treatment and rehabilitation services.
- Identifying and controlling SVCJOs, the small segment of juvenile offenders who account for a majority of delinquent acts.

A system of graduated sanctions requires a broad continuum of options, including intensive community-based public and private services (Fagan, 1990; Krisberg, 1992; Krisberg et al., 1989, 1990; Altschuler and Armstrong, 1992). The types of programs to be identified include the following:

- Immediate interventions for both nonserious first-time and repeat offenders.
- Intermediate sanctions for some first-time serious and violent offenders and reoffenders.
- Secure confinement for those who are amenable to treatment but require a secure setting, including juveniles who constitute a threat to community safety. Consideration should be given to transferring to criminal court juveniles who commit particularly violent offenses, have a history of violence, or are not amenable to treatment. In implementing a program of graduated sanctions, programs will need to use risk and needs assessment instruments that incorporate such factors as age, severity of offense, and offender history.

At each level in the continuum, the family should be involved in treatment and rehabilitation efforts. Aftercare should be included for all residential placements and should actively involve family and community support.

Applicants should incorporate the following elements in descriptions of their plans for this program component:

- A range of intervention and secure confinement programs and options that respond to the needs of each juvenile in the system, including:
  - Immediate interventions.
  - Intermediate sanctions.
  - Community-based correctional facilities.
  - Training schools, camps, and ranches.
- For each intervention strategy:
  - The target group.
  - The program elements, including the components that are the key to effectiveness.
  - Examples of existing programs, if any, on which models are or will be based.

- 
- Processing and risk needs assessment procedures to be used to assign juvenile offenders to the appropriate services and to ensure that they receive them.
  - A plan for effective use of a management information system to track youth through all program components and provide evaluation data.

It is expected that funds available for this program component will be utilized to develop and partially implement the comprehensive program model, and that existing programs, along with additional local funding, will be utilized to more fully implement the model.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$100,000 per site for the first year.

## **Program To Promote Continuum of Care Services for At-Risk and Delinquent Girls**

**Purpose:** To develop and implement an innovative community-based program that will provide comprehensive, gender-specific prevention, intervention, treatment, and rehabilitative care that includes case management and followup for at-risk and delinquent girls.

**Background:** This program component implements Title II, Part C, Sections 261(a)(1) and (4) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. For female juvenile offenders and those at risk of delinquency, services must be more finely focused on their special needs. Most discussions of juvenile delinquency programs and needs focus almost exclusively on males, ignoring their female counterparts.

Recent data indicate that because of the relatively small number of adjudicated female juvenile offenders, little attention has been focused on them or their special needs (Chesney-Lind, 1992). As a result, a wide gap exists between the services provided to females and those historically provided to males committing comparable offenses. A comparative study of 348 violent adolescent females and a similar number of boys revealed that although half the male offenders were admitted to rehabilitation programs or alternative programs, only 29.5 percent of the female offenders received some treatment alternative (Sheldon and Tracy, 1992).

According to data provided by 85 State corrections institutions, female offenders in the juvenile system face many special problems. These include the perpetuation of a cycle of generational sexual abuse, teen pregnancy, early parenthood, and emotional dysfunction. Other research supports the conclusion that when girls act out their problems, they become self-destructive more often than boys. Young females who run away, for example, more often become involved in prostitution or turn to unhealthy, exploitative, or abusive environments for attention and shelter.

Some additional evidence is available about the problems faced by special female groups. For example, one study looked closely at American Indian and Alaskan Native female youth at risk (Fleming et al., 1990). It was discovered that American Indian and Alaskan Native female youth use alcohol and illegal drugs with greater frequency than other youth. Although no single factor explains this phenomenon, it has been theorized that, for juvenile females in these populations, gender compounds the normal contributing factors such as poverty, prejudice, and lack of socioeconomic and educational opportunity. Some substance abuse prevention initiatives, including 16 demonstration grants funded by the former Office of Substance Abuse Prevention (OSAP), demonstrated promising alcohol and other drug prevention models for American Indian and Alaskan Native juvenile females (Fleming et al., 1990).

Unfortunately, commitment to an institution becomes the most viable option when no appropriate alternatives are available or existing programs have not been successful in helping girls in crisis. Programs to meet the unique needs of female delinquents are inadequate in most States. To address these problems directly, it is necessary to develop and implement effective, alternative community-based strategies that focus on the unique problems of at-risk and delinquent girls.

---

---

**Goal:** To implement a comprehensive program that will provide a continuum of services specifically designed to meet the needs of at-risk and delinquent girls and to decrease their involvement in the juvenile justice system.

**Objectives:**

1. To provide a comprehensive program that includes prevention, intervention, and treatment services for at-risk and delinquent girls.
2. To increase coordination in the design and delivery of services among social service and justice system agencies for at-risk girls and their families.
3. To implement a coordinated case management and followup system for at-risk girls and preadjudicated female juvenile offenders.

**Program Strategy:** Under the SafeFutures program, communities will develop and implement a comprehensive strategy for at-risk and delinquent girls that includes, but is not limited to:

- A strong basic education component that combines necessary academic instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics with positive social training.
- A life management component that enables participants to obtain the skills and understanding needed to take charge of their own lives.
- A personal growth component that enables participants to acquire a more positive self-image, a greater understanding of themselves and the meaningful roles they can play in the community and larger society, and a broader appreciation of their personal responsibilities as productive citizens.
- A health and counseling component that provides a wide knowledge and understanding of the value of preventive health care. Topics in this component should include prenatal care, safe sex, gynecology, and mental health.
- A parenting component that enables participants to acquire the skills and perspective necessary for raising healthy and positively motivated children.
- A job training component that enables participants to take an active, positive, and tangible role in providing meaningful service to the local community.
- Opportunities for participants to have regular interaction with positive role models.
- Opportunities for participants to return to their families; when this is not possible, establishment of an alternative plan such as therapeutic foster care or supported independent living.
- Child care services for those who are parents.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$120,000 per site for the first year.

## **After-School Programs (Pathways to Success)**

**Purpose:** To prevent juvenile delinquency and other behavior problems related to delinquency through the promotion of vocational skills, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education programs for after-school, summer, and weekend hours.

**Background:** This program component implements Title II, Part C, Section 261(b)(1) and (3) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. Studies of young adolescents' use of time show that 20 million youth spend 40 percent of their waking hours outside school (Mortimer, 1994). These out-of-school hours present both risk and opportunity. However, Mortimer points out that time spent alone is not the crucial contributor to high risk, but in fact, "it is what young people do during that time, where they do it, and with whom that leads to positive or negative consequences."

---

Vocational skills, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education programs during after-school and weekend hours offer many opportunities to address identified risk factors at all levels (community, school, family, and individual/peer) and enhance protective factors. After-school programs provide opportunities for youth to socialize with peers and adults, to develop skills that are relevant now and in the future, to contribute to the community, to belong to a valued group, and to feel competent (Mortimer, 1994).

First, these programs provide learning options to replace destructive alternatives. They also can provide alternative learning methods for youth who have difficulty learning in traditional settings and offer hands-on practice in the theories and information learned in school. Similarly, summer programs can build on learning from the school year to increase retention of knowledge.

Second, vocational skills, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education programs create a climate of high expectations, respect for quality, and a sense of how work leads to meaningful achievement. When a safe place offers meaningful activities and opportunities to spend time with adults learning a variety of job-oriented and social skills, students begin to see the potential within themselves, understand the importance of completing their education, and make connections in the community as they become productive citizens. According to Tolan and Guerra (1994):

Several studies have suggested that programs designed to change the roles of at-risk youth in the community and increase their motivation toward prosocial behavior can be at least moderately effective in reducing serious antisocial behavior. A critical aspect of the effectiveness of such interventions seems to be that they are provided as part of a larger-scale focus that promotes community development.

Third, these programs create numerous opportunities for parental involvement, linkages to other community resources, social development, and expansion of knowledge and skills.

**Goals:** To prevent juvenile delinquency and other behavior problems such as substance abuse, teen pregnancy, dropping out of school, and violence, and to strengthen families and communities.

**Objectives:**

1. To provide at-risk youth and their families with a variety of age-appropriate programs in vocational, entrepreneurial, recreational, and arts education fields that allow them to build on existing strengths and develop new skills.
2. To reduce risk factors and enhance protective factors for at-risk youth and their families.

**Program Strategy:** Applicants are requested to develop after-school, weekend, and summer programs that offer vocational training, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education. These programs can operate year round or part of the year and do not need to address a full range of activities. Examples of programs include arts education that incorporates projects such as murals or mosaic structures into community beautification efforts, performance theater focusing on conflict resolution skills, computer graphics, and youth programs to develop business plans and to market newly acquired skills such as carpentry or landscaping or products they have created. The most effective prevention programs include several types of activities and do not focus on a single activity or strategy.

Programs must serve at-risk youth (6–18) of a specific age, a range of ages, or all ages, provided that they are appropriate to the needs of the community and the existing resources.

In descriptions of their plans for this program component, applicants should include goals and objectives that focus on lasting benefits to the community and youth who participate. Activities should in some way contribute to the community or provide skills to the youth that will last beyond the program funding cycle.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$40,000 per site for the first year.

---

---

## Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP)

**Purpose:** To support one-to-one mentoring programs for youth at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in delinquent activities.

**Background:** Part G of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, authorizes OJJDP to fund a Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP).

Mentoring, as the term is currently used, can be defined as a one-to-one relationship between a pair of unrelated individuals, usually of different ages, which takes place on a regular basis over an extended period of time. It is usually characterized by a “special bond of mutual commitment” and “an emotional character of respect, loyalty and identification” (Hamilton, 1990).

The JUMP program recognizes the potential of mentoring as a tool for addressing two critical concerns: poor school performance and delinquent activity. It also recognizes the importance of collaboration between schools and community. Part G allows either local educational agencies (LEAs) or public and private nonprofit organizations to be primary applicants, provided there is formal collaboration between the two entities.

**Goals:** To match mentors with at-risk youth to achieve the following:

1. To reduce juvenile delinquency and gang participation
2. To improve academic performance.
3. To reduce the dropout rate.

**Objectives:**

1. To provide at-risk youth with the guidance and support of a positive adult role model.
2. To promote personal and social responsibility among at-risk youth.
3. To increase the participation of at-risk youth in elementary and secondary education and enhance their ability to benefit from it.
4. To discourage the use of illegal drugs and firearms, gang involvement, violence, and other delinquent activity by at-risk youth.
5. To encourage the participation of at-risk youth in service and community activity.

**Program Strategy:** Mentoring activities can support and strengthen several aspects of the continuum of care: supporting families and protecting children, encouraging education, expanding opportunities for youth, and improving the effectiveness of juvenile justice. Applicants are free to develop separate mentoring programs for this component or to combine mentoring activities with one or more of the other components. For example, the After-School Program could utilize mentors as part of its approach.

Whether proposing a combined or separate program, all applicants must address the following elements:

- **Demonstrate a partnership with a local education agency or agencies.** The program must be administered either by an LEA or a public or private nonprofit organization that can demonstrate knowledge of and/or experience with mentoring programs, as well as working with volunteers and youth. When an LEA has the primary responsibility for administering a program, it may partner with a public or private nonprofit agency. However, a public or private nonprofit agency that has lead responsibility for the program must partner with the LEA.

---

If an LEA is not the lead agency, the collaboration could involve, for example, designating a school employee to be a school coordinator. Responsibilities of this position might include assisting with the selection of mentored youth, advising on the academic needs of the mentored youth, coordinating meetings, providing academic records when needed, and notifying mentors when mentored youth are unable to meet.

- **Target population.** In keeping with the provisions of Part G, applicants must target at-risk youth in high-crime areas, youth in schools in which 60 percent of the students are eligible to receive Chapter I funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and/or youth at risk for dropping out of school or academic failure.
- **Recruitment, selection, and screening of mentors.** Only programs using adult mentors, age 21 and over, qualify. Specific efforts to recruit mentors should be described, especially if the program is new or there is already a waiting list of prospective youth.

All prospective employees and volunteers who will have contact with youth must be screened. Each program is required to have a written screening policy that will be implemented carefully and applied consistently to all mentors.

- **Evaluation methods and processes.** Because this program seeks to improve academic performance and reduce the dropout rate, the application must contain written assurance from the LEA that it will provide academic records in accordance with its own regulations for use in carrying out this program. Applicants must also agree to collect and submit data as part of a national program evaluation.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$200,000 per site for the first year. More than one mentoring program can be supported, but the total amount of funding per site cannot exceed \$200,000. Program funds cannot be used to compensate mentors except to reimburse them for reasonable incidental expenses, such as transportation, that are directly associated with the mentoring program.

## Family Strengthening and Support

**Purpose:** To integrate a system of support for families and children that will strengthen and preserve the family unit and help them live in a healthy and safe environment.

**Background:** This program component implements Title II, Part C, Section 261(a)(5) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. Strengthening and supporting families, including non-English-speaking families, is a major priority of OJJDP and a pivotal element of a comprehensive approach to juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention.

Families are the most important influence on the lives of children and can be the first line of defense against delinquency. In 1994, OJJDP published a research summary entitled *Family Life, Delinquency, and Crime: A Policymaker's Guide* (Wright and Wright, 1994) stating that families are one of the strongest socializing forces in life. Families can teach children to control unacceptable behavior, to delay gratification, and to respect the rights of others. Conversely, families can teach children aggressive, antisocial, and violent behavior. In the lives of adults, family responsibilities serve as an important stabilizing force.

The report also considers the role of early experiences with parents and family in future delinquent and criminal behavior. Children who are rejected by their parents, who grow up in homes with considerable conflict, or who are inadequately supervised are at greater risk of becoming delinquents. These negative family attributes appear to have a cumulative effect. Not all children follow the same path to delinquency; different combinations of life experiences may produce delinquent behavior. Conversely, positive parenting practices during the early years and in adolescence appear to act as buffers preventing delinquent behavior and assisting adolescents involved in such behavior to desist from delinquency. Research confirms that children raised in supportive, affectionate, and accepting homes are less likely to become deviant (Wright and Wright, 1994).

---

*Violent Families and Youth Violence* (Thornberry, 1994) also discusses the connections between negative family experiences and resulting juvenile delinquency, underscoring the relationship between family violence and youth violence. Research indicates that children exposed to multiple forms of family violence report more than twice the rate of youth violence than do children from nonviolent families.

OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (Wilson and Howell, 1993) argues that programs to strengthen the family and foster healthy growth and development of children from the prenatal period through adolescence should be widely available. These programs should encourage the maintenance of a viable family unit and bonding between parent and child, and they should provide support for families in crisis. Such programs should involve other major spheres of influence such as religious institutions, schools, and community-based organizations. By working together, these organizations will have a pronounced impact on preserving the family and preventing delinquency.

In 1988, OJJDP launched a major parenting initiative entitled *Effective Parenting Strategies for Families of High-Risk Youth*. An interdisciplinary team consisting of family researchers at the University of Utah and policy scientists at the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation conducted a nationwide assessment of approaches to strengthening families. The researchers selected a representative group of 25 programs in 6 categories as potentially the most promising, describing them in *Strengthening America's Families: Promising Parenting Strategies for Delinquency Prevention, User's Guide* (Kumpfer, 1993).

This study found that there is no "one-size-fits-all" family strategy for preventing delinquency. Several types of parenting programs are needed. Some programs are designed for parents of infants, children, and adolescents. Other programs are best suited for well-functioning families or address the needs of dysfunctional families. Features common to effective programs include a good fit between the family's needs and the content and duration of the course, careful attention to recruitment and retention of participants, and followup.

The SafeFutures initiative provides an opportunity for communities to develop family-strengthening programs in the context of a comprehensive effort to address the diverse community conditions that impact risk and protective factors for delinquency.

#### **Goals:**

1. To strengthen the family and foster healthy growth and development of children from prenatal care through adolescence.
2. To encourage maintenance of a viable family unit and bonding between parent and child.
3. To support families in crisis, particularly those with children in the juvenile justice system.

#### **Objectives:**

1. To provide the community with a resource guide to effective family strengthening programs that encompass prevention, intervention, and treatment.
2. To develop and implement promising family strengthening programs that address identified gaps in the community's continuum of services for family strengthening.
3. To establish an intensive family case management system that is integrated with family-related programs and services of other SafeFutures components.

**Program Strategy:** Programs should be initiated during the first year utilizing recommended promising programs in *Strengthening America's Families: Promising Parenting Strategies for Delinquency Prevention, User's Guide*, where applicable. The *User's Guide* (Kumpfer, 1993) contains a matrix showing major factors to consider in selecting the most appropriate family program for various age ranges of the child and levels of

---

family dysfunction. Applicants are free to develop more than one family-strengthening program for this component and to combine family-strengthening activities with other SafeFutures components. When describing the plans for this component, applicants should include the following:

- An assessment of the community's capacity to deliver culturally relevant programs that are both sensitive to diversity and capable of effectively serving non-English-speaking family members.
- An assessment of the availability of family-strengthening programs for juveniles who are parents and for the families of juveniles in the juvenile justice system.
- A detailed description (including a time/task chart) of the following first-year products:
  - a **strategic plan** for accomplishing an intense level of coordination and collaboration, including policies and procedures to enhance coordination among service providers (e.g., criminal justice agencies, health and human services providers, and educators) and to address such issues as family recruitment, case management structure, and confidentiality.
  - a **resource guide** that categorizes available family-strengthening and support programs according to the age of the child at risk and the level of identified dysfunction of the family.
  - a **report** that identifies gaps in the community's continuum of care for families and establishes priorities to be addressed, including a plan for family recruitment for program services, assessment of family needs, establishment of a case management infrastructure, and a written strategy for how individual family plans will be instituted and collaboration and coordination achieved with other SafeFutures components on behalf of families at risk, through joint case management, multi-agency teams, or other approaches.
- The programs to be implemented with first-year funding.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$200,000 per site for the first year.

## **Mental Health Services for At-Risk and Adjudicated Youth**

**Purpose:** To develop, implement, and improve mental health services in juvenile detention centers, secure juvenile correctional institutions for juveniles, and in communities, with a particular focus on services for juvenile sex offenders.

**Background:** This program component implements Title II, Part C, Section 261(a)(1), (4), (5), (6), and (8) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended.

Research on mental disorders in children and juvenile offenders is not well developed, and the quality of data varies considerably. Nonetheless, it is well known that many mental disorders begin in childhood and can impede a child's potential to become a positive and productive adult.

Family factors appear to play an important role. Juveniles who have been direct victims of child maltreatment are more likely to report involvement in youth violence than those who have not been maltreated. Adolescents growing up in families where partner violence, generalized hostility, or other child maltreatment has occurred also have higher rates of self-reported violence. Over three-quarters of the youngsters who have been exposed to multiple forms of violence self-report violent behavior — more than twice the rate of youth from nonviolent families.

The role of prior maltreatment in predisposing juveniles to become perpetrators has been discussed by a number of investigators (Becker, Kaplan, Tenker and Tartaglini, 1991). Empirical support for the association between prior victimization and emergent acting-out behavior has come principally from the high incidence of sexual victimization reported by juvenile sex offenders (ranging from 50 to 80 percent, and reaching



---

100 percent in some samples of prepubescent youth). The relationship between early maltreatment and later sexual acting-out or antisocial behavior is undoubtedly complex, and the reasons why some maltreated youth later offend and others do not have yet to be fully explained. The amenability of aggressive youthful offenders to treatment appears to vary both as a function of the severity of their psychosexual disorder and the general degree of character impairment in their personality functioning.

A key to responding effectively to mentally disordered juvenile offenders is timely identification of their disorders and appropriate treatment. These needs, however, sometimes are not met by the juvenile justice system.

Often, the quality and quantity of services are insufficient to meet the need. Social service and mental health practitioners in the field report that problems with access, including lack of transportation, often prevent disadvantaged youth and their families from receiving the services they need. In recent years, such problems have been addressed through emergency mobile outreach programs serving adults, youth, and families, including those with adolescent or young children (Bengelsdorf, 1987; Bucht, Range, and Wetzell, 1974; Everstine, Bodin, and Everstine, 1977; Kinney, Madsen, Fleming, and Hoopala, 1977). Mobile mental health outreach units, designed to provide treatment in the communities and families where the problem begins, facilitate a holistic approach to the basic physical and mental needs of children and adolescents. Studies suggest that the mobile treatment outreach approach has been a highly effective means of providing diagnosis and treatment, stabilizing the family in crisis, and reducing institutionalization.

**Goal:** To increase the accessibility, quality, and efficiency of mental health services to juveniles in the juvenile justice system, including juvenile sex offenders, as well as those at risk of delinquency.

**Objectives:**

1. To develop a mobile mental health service unit that has the capacity to bring services directly to at-risk and delinquent youth.
2. To provide mental health consultation and liaison services to police, juvenile court judges, district attorneys, and correctional staff who work with at-risk and delinquent juveniles.
3. To develop a comprehensive forensic case management system for mentally disordered youth incarcerated in juvenile justice facilities, including juvenile sex offenders.
4. To provide training programs for mental health personnel serving detained or confined juveniles and juvenile sex offenders to improve clinical skills and to enhance understanding of the role of the mental health system in the juvenile justice system.
5. To develop structures for family participation in the development of mental health services, treatment options, and individual service plans for juveniles.
6. To ensure that mental health service systems for juveniles and their families are sensitive to culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds.

**Program Strategy:** Programs may target juveniles with mental health problems and impairments (including learning disabilities), who are at risk of delinquency, and alleged and adjudicated delinquents, including juvenile sex offenders.

When describing plans for this program component, applicants should include the following:

- A description of the needs assessment and planning process to be used, which must involve lead agencies in creating a task force to promote community involvement in mental health issues for at-risk and delinquent juveniles. At least one member of the task force must be a psychiatrist or psychologist, and one must be an educator.

- 
- Identification of the assessment instrument(s) to be used for evaluation and diagnostic purposes with juvenile sex offenders, victims of child abuse, at-risk children, or other target groups.
  - A commitment to provide services based on the child's need, not on the current availability of services. If a child needs a service or placement that does not yet exist, the child should be provided with services that most closely meet his or her needs, and the appropriate services should be created and implemented as soon as possible.
  - A plan for involving families in the continuum of services.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$150,000 per site for the first year.

## **Delinquency Prevention Program**

**Purpose:** To help communities fund local delinquency prevention programs.

**Background:** One of the new programs in the 1992 Reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended, is Title V, Sections 501–506, “Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs.” Delinquency prevention has been one of the primary goals of the JJDP Act since its enactment. The premise is that preventing delinquent behavior is a much more cost-effective means of reducing juvenile crime than rehabilitating adjudicated delinquents. In addition to reducing the human and financial losses caused by crime, effective delinquency prevention also reduces the need for costly juvenile justice system processing and adjudication. Each year, juvenile courts handle approximately 1.4 million delinquency and status offense cases, resulting in nearly 130,000 out-of-home placements. On any given day, approximately 90,000 juveniles are held in juvenile detention, correctional, and shelter facilities. Nationally, nearly \$2 billion a year is spent operating these facilities. The average annual cost of confining a juvenile in a training school exceeds \$45,000 in many States. The cost for intensive, private residential treatment for a serious juvenile offender can run as high as \$100,000 per year. The cost for construction of secure facilities for juveniles is currently about \$100,000 per bed.

Congress structured the Title V Delinquency Prevention Program to support communities that have formulated a communitywide strategy to prevent delinquency. Many past delinquency prevention planning and programming efforts, while well intentioned, were unsuccessful because of their negative focus on attempting to prevent juveniles from misbehaving. Positive approaches that emphasize opportunities for healthy social, physical, and mental development and take into account individual, family, peer group, school, and community influences on a child's development have been shown to have a much greater likelihood of success.

Another weakness of past efforts has been their narrow scope. Successful delinquency prevention strategies must be integrated with other programs and activities that serve a community's at-risk and delinquent juveniles. Under SafeFutures, communities will be expected to integrate the delinquency prevention component with other SafeFutures program components as well as ongoing community efforts on behalf of children and youth.

**Goal:** To reduce delinquency and youth violence by supporting community efforts to provide children, families, neighborhoods, and institutions with the knowledge, skills, and opportunities necessary to foster a healthy and nurturing environment for the growth and development of productive and responsible citizens.

### **Objectives:**

1. To use coalitions within communities to direct delinquency prevention efforts.
2. To identify risk factors for delinquency present in communities.
3. To identify protective factors that will counteract identified risk factors and implement local comprehensive delinquency prevention plans that strengthen programs that provide these protective factors.

- 
4. To develop local comprehensive delinquency prevention strategies that use and coordinate Federal, State, local, and private resources for establishing a client-centered continuum of services for at-risk children and their families.
  5. To implement the delinquency prevention strategies, monitor their progress, and modify the strategies as needed.

**Program Strategy:** Grants under this component may be used for delinquency prevention programs and activities for juveniles who have had contact or are at risk of having contact with the juvenile justice system. Programs and activities might include tutoring and remedial education, assistance in the development of work awareness skills, child and adolescent health and mental health services, alcohol and substance abuse prevention services, leadership development activities, recreational services, and/or teaching about accountability. Funds may not be used to develop the community's delinquency prevention strategy.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$200,000 per site for the first year. All Title V funds must be matched by the unit of general local government and/or the State with 50 percent of the amount of the grant. This match may be made in cash or the value of in-kind contributions. Written statements of commitment for the match should be included in the application.

## **A Comprehensive Communitywide Approach to Gang-Free Schools and Communities and Community-Based Gang Intervention**

**Purpose:** To plan and implement a comprehensive communitywide approach to prevent gang involvement by at-risk school age youth, provide alternatives for youth already involved in gang activity, and provide an effective continuum of treatment and sanctions for youth adjudicated for gang crime involvement.

**Background:** This initiative implements Title II, Part D, Subparts I and II, of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. For this initiative, Subparts I and II have been integrated. However, the focus of this program includes both gang-free schools and communities, with particular emphasis on public housing communities.

Youth gangs are currently found in nearly all 50 States. Gang activity has extended beyond the inner cities of major population centers into smaller cities, suburbs, and rural communities. Today's gangs are characterized by their diversity in ethnic composition, geographical location, organization, and by the nature and extent of members' involvement in delinquent and/or criminal activities (Tatem-Kelly, 1994).

Throughout the country, youth crime and gang activities tend to be higher in public housing communities than in communities where public housing is not located. In some public housing areas, crime rates are 5 to 10 times the national average. When surveyed, the majority of public housing residents perceive limited problems with the housing structure or management of their units. In contrast, crime is listed as their number one concern, even when compared to inflation and unemployment (Rubushka, 1977). In both urban and rural areas, a majority of the residents of housing developments and the families living in surrounding areas fear gang violence, vandalism, drugs, and juvenile crime in their communities.

To alleviate this fear of crime and gang violence, gang prevention, intervention, and suppression programs in public and subsidized housing communities are greatly needed. Public housing authorities that have successfully implemented gang prevention programs in their communities realize that success depends upon committed community partnerships.

Since the late 1980s, OJJDP has supported the National Youth Gang Suppression and Intervention Program, which is intended to develop and test promising approaches to reduce the youth gang problem. In its first phase, this program, under the direction of Irving Spergel at the University of Chicago, assessed what is known about youth gangs, covering definitions, the nature and causes of the youth gang phenomenon, and the effectiveness of the various program strategies.

---

In phase two of this program, Spergel and his colleagues prepared a set of policies and practices to design and mobilize community efforts. These policies and practices, which designed for police, prosecutors, judges, probation and corrections officers, school personnel, community-based agencies, grassroots organizations, and other agencies, are outlined in 11 sets of community agency strategy modules and accompanying TA manuals, which serve as guides for each agency involved in development of the comprehensive program model.

Applicants for this program should obtain these materials and carefully review them. The materials define, in depth, the comprehensive community model design to be implemented under this program announcement. The initial assessment report, agency models, and TA manuals are available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (NCJRS) at 800-638-8736. These materials can also be viewed and downloaded from the Gang Reference Material section of the NCJRS\*BBS, an electronic bulletin board accessible by modem at (301) 738-8895. The BBS can also be reached by Telnet or Gopher. The addresses are:

Telnet: ncjrs.aspensys.com  
Gopher: ncjrs.aspensys.com71

Applicants will also find the recently published OJJDP publications, *Gang Suppression and Intervention Research Summaries: Community Models* and *Gang Suppression and Intervention Research Summaries: Problem and Response*, helpful when applying for this program. These publications are available from NCJRS at 800-638-8736 or on the NCJRS\*BBS under the Full Text Publications section.

In the current phase, OJJDP's Comprehensive Communitywide Approach to Gang-Free Schools and Communities is establishing the National Gang Assessment and Resource Center; implementing comprehensive program models for gang prevention, intervention, and suppression in the SafeFutures sites and five additional sites; and supporting a national evaluation of the planning and implementation efforts.

**Goal:** To prevent gang recruitment and/or reduce the incidence of illegal gang activity, particularly gang violence, in the target community.

**Objectives:**

1. To adapt the Spergel model to community requirements and implement the model through comprehensive programming for prevention, intervention, and suppression of juvenile gangs.
2. To establish a working group of representatives of community-based agencies and programs to promote collaboration and cooperation to reduce juvenile participation in illegal gang activities and promote effective intervention and treatment of gang-involved youth.
3. To establish or expand youth gang prevention and intervention programs that target elementary, middle school, and high school youth and include educational instruction, counseling and training, and substance abuse prevention and treatment.
4. To establish or expand youth gang prevention and intervention programs directed to youth living in public and subsidized housing communities where they exist in the target communities and include educational instruction, counseling and training, and substance abuse prevention and treatment.
5. To establish or expand community-based aftercare services to prevent adjudicated delinquents from further involvement with gang activity.
6. To provide information that will improve residents' awareness and understanding of the nature, significance, and implications of gang activity in public housing and low-income communities, and solicit their support for youth programs that address gang issues.

---

**Program Strategy:** In response to this component, applicants should discuss how they will develop and implement the strategy outlined in the comprehensive communitywide approach documents referenced under the background section. OJJDP considers this particular model to be essential for effective gang prevention and intervention. Although applicants should give special attention to the elements emphasized below, they may select and adapt strategies most relevant and necessary for gang prevention in their communities.

OJJDP considers community involvement in prevention, intervention, and suppression to be essential strategies community in curtailing gang activities. Although applicants may tailor their approaches to their own particular circumstances, each strategy area should involve particular sectors of the community. The prevention strategies should involve schools, law enforcement, recreation, mental health, housing programs, community social agencies, and churches. The intervention strategies should involve law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and public and private youth-serving agencies. The suppression strategies should involve law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and correctional agencies, particularly parole and probation departments. An effective comprehensive communitywide coalition/partnership to prevent gang activity and reduce youth violence must be socially and culturally sensitive in its composition.

Selection of activities to reduce youth gang violence might include the following:

1. Establishing community victim and crime prevention programs that mobilize individuals to improve their personal safety and protect others in the community.
2. Using environmental design to deter crime (e.g., increasing the lights or altering the flow of traffic in a neighborhood).
3. Increasing contact between juveniles at high risk for gang involvement and positive role models, such as trained community members, through mentor involvement.
4. Utilizing mediation as a community dispute resolution technique.

Basically, the Spergel model describes a process for mobilizing communitywide leadership through the creation of a gang task force, assessment of gang problem behavior in the target area, identification of known risk factors, and evaluation of program outcomes. In addition, the model requires participation of all 11 agencies outlined in the agency strategy modules and TA manuals. Participation of these 11 agencies is required in both model planning and model implementation.

Applicants should briefly describe any current efforts under way relating to the following critical elements and how they will accomplish or further develop the elements.

**Critical Element I — Communitywide Gang Task Force Planning.** The applicant must describe what gang planning activities and groups are currently functioning, if any; the group's accomplishments to date; the planning process; the applicant's leadership role in the group; and how this planning group will be coordinated with or encompassed in the broader SafeFutures Planning Group. It is suggested that this gang planning body be part of the larger SafeFutures body in the form of a subgroup or other integral connection to ensure collaboration, coordination, and consolidation of various interdisciplinary and interagency efforts. Applicant jurisdictions that have participated in OJJDP's Gang and Drug POLICY Training should indicate when such training was attended, by whom, and what communitywide planning and program implementation took place afterwards.

**Critical Element II — Implementation of the Spergel Model Design.** Applicants should describe how they intend to implement or further develop the Spergel model as outlined in the 11 agency strategy modules and TA manuals. The TA manuals provide detailed suggestions for gang prevention, intervention, and suppression for each of the 11 agencies. While participation of all 11 agencies is required, it is recognized that the agencies responsible for each module may not be able to implement every suggested strategy. Rather, the agencies should select program strategies that offer the greatest promise and relevance to their communities and that build on existing efforts.

---

Critical Element III — Special Focus on Providing Safe, Gang-Free Schools. OJJDP considers schools to be a critical focus area of any gang prevention effort, especially early prevention efforts. Dealing with a school’s youth gang problem requires a series of complex interrelated steps involving key people and groups, inside and outside the school. Applicants should make a concerted effort to implement the full School Based Model developed as one of the 11 agency strategy modules. As the module suggests, school-based efforts should be coordinated with community-based efforts for maximum efficiency.

Critical Element IV — Special Focus on Providing Gang-Free Public and Federally Subsidized Housing Communities. OJJDP is aware that public and subsidized housing communities often experience critically high levels of crime, disorder, victimization, and general disarray. Therefore, OJJDP considers public and federally subsidized housing to be a special focus area. Applicants should make a concerted effort to implement prevention, intervention, and suppression strategies in these areas if such areas are included in the SafeFutures designated community. Applicants should ensure and indicate that members from these housing areas are represented on the gang planning group, and that partnerships are developed with residents of the housing development and neighborhood, housing authority administration and staff, and other major groups and organizations in the community working with the housing developments. If no public or federally subsidized housing exist in the designated community, the applicant must state this in the application.

In each jurisdiction, the community-based group selected to coordinate the gang-free community effort will receive TA from providers registered in the Small Business Administration 8A program, who have documented experience in assisting and working in public housing development communities. In addition, OJJDP grantees such as the Boys & Girls Clubs of America and the National Crime Prevention Council, which have experience in working in public housing communities and in gang and violence reduction programs, will be available to provide TA to the community-based coalition group in such areas as community organization and planning, program planning, implementation, and gang prevention.

Certification of willingness of each of the 11 required participating agencies must be provided, including representation from public and federally subsidized housing. A general discussion of cooperation and collaboration is not sufficient. A strong Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is required between the applicant(s) and the leaders of the key agencies representing the 11 components. This MOU should clearly state the commitment to fully participate in the implementation and evaluation of the Comprehensive Program Model design and the overall SafeFutures the Program. To make an informed commitment, each participating agency should have an opportunity to review its respective agency model and TA manual.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$400,000 per site for the first year.

## **Bethesda Day Treatment Center Services**

**Purpose:** To provide the SafeFutures sites with TA in developing a community-based comprehensive day treatment program designed to safely reduce overcrowding in detention facilities, begin treatment prior to adjudication, provide a continuum of care approach, offer an academic environment for hard-to-reach juveniles in a community atmosphere, improve and strengthen aftercare for juveniles leaving institutional care, and provide support and treatment for the juveniles and their parents.

**Background:** This program component implements Title II, Part C, Section 261(a) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended.

Pennsylvania’s Bethesda Day Treatment Center (the Center) is a private, nonprofit agency established to provide intensive day treatment and a variety of other services that promote the social adjustment of juvenile offenders in the community. As a result of the Center’s outstanding performance, its cost-effectiveness (i.e.,

---

half the cost of secure placement), and the program's record of low-risk-to-community safety, OJJDP directly awarded a grant to the Center for training and TA to replicate the program at up to 10 sites, including the SafeFutures sites.

For 4 years, OJJDP has funded the Bethesda Day Treatment Center to develop and document intensive outpatient, community-based treatment and care centers for juveniles at risk of delinquency and juveniles who have been referred to court and are in the preadjudication or postadjudication stages of the juvenile justice system. The Center services were initially designed to help youth in rural areas and small towns who committed offenses related to lack of family supervision and control. More recently, the program has been used in larger cities, including Kalamazoo, Michigan, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and has proven its effectiveness with juveniles who commit serious delinquent acts.

Bethesda Day Treatment Center's services include intensive supervision, counseling, and coordination of a range of services necessary to develop skills that enable youth to function appropriately in the community. Services are client, group, and family focused. Client-focused services include intake, casework service and treatment planning, individual counseling, intensive supervision, and study skills. Group-focused services include group counseling, life and job skills training, cultural enrichment, and physical education. Family-focused activities include family counseling, home visits, parent counseling, and family intervention services.

**Goal:** To provide adolescents who have conduct disorders and are unable to function in existing social/academic environments with a comprehensive individual- and family-centered, values-oriented treatment program that will facilitate their reentry into mainstream society.

**Objectives:**

1. To stabilize client behavior at home, at school, and in the community by structuring the client's time in order to block and eventually eradicate destructive actions.
2. To assess the root causes of each client's antisocial behavior and hold clients accountable by requiring them to take responsibility for their actions.
3. To provide positive substitutes for each client's antisocial behavior, such as employment, life skills, and career or vocational opportunities.
4. To assess the causes of each client's family dysfunction and devise a plan of action to resolve conflict and restore order and stability in the home.
5. To provide individualized educational alternatives for clients who have failed academically or socially in mainstream education.

**Program Strategy:** The Bethesda Day Treatment Center will provide TA to SafeFutures sites in the development, oversight, monitoring, and reporting services of the Center's day treatment model.

The Center offers TA in the development of five distinct units of program service: Day Treatment services, a Prep School, Drug and Alcohol Abuse services, Foster Care, and Family Systems counseling. Initial and ongoing assessments determine which components will be used by each juvenile on an individual basis.

Day Treatment services are designed to provide intensive community-based counseling and supervision for male and female dependent and delinquent youth, both preadjudicated and postadjudicated, between 10 and 17 years of age. The program intensively penetrates the home, school, job site, and peer group to interrupt the antisocial behavior patterns that brought the youth before the court. The program uses a daily combination of 18 different modalities of treatment during nontransitional hours (evenings and weekends), often exceeding 55 hours of treatment per week, without removing the youth from his or her home.

---

The Bethesda Prep School is an educational alternative authorized under the Pennsylvania School Code and made available to local school districts, courts, and parents. The students referred are experiencing difficulty psychologically or behaviorally in the public classroom. The Bethesda Prep School specializes in educating students who exhibit poor performance in conventional classroom environments. The students may have one or more learning disabilities (e.g., dyslexia, attention deficit disorder/hyperactivity, auditory processing deficiency, obsessive-compulsive behaviors) as well as conduct disorders and chronic absenteeism.

The Center's Drug and Alcohol Abuse services model provide assessments, individual and group counseling, and education and prevention support to any client referred to Bethesda's drug and alcohol services counselor. To provide these services, the Center acquires an outpatient drug and alcohol treatment license from the authority or enters agreements with the appropriate local jurisdictional treatment agencies.

Bethesda's short-term adolescent Foster Care model is designed for crisis situations and short-term placement that will allow the continuity of treatment programming and facilitate counseling between the natural family and the youth.

Family Systems counseling, one of the most important and unique forms of treatment developed by the Center, is a highly directive form of counseling and therapy that engages the whole family.

While each of the Center's Day Treatment program components has a specific design and a fixed strategy, the program for each SafeFutures site will be developed based on jurisdictional needs and unique characteristics by the Center staff consultants, key personnel, and representatives from the site.

Under this component, applicants will be eligible to receive TA for the development of comprehensive day treatment services for youth involved in the juvenile justice system. To qualify for TA under this program component, applicants must demonstrate the following in their proposal:

- A documented need for day treatment and community-based services.
- The ability to match the cost of TA provided by the Center with an equal level of commitment (cash or in-kind services) from government, corporations, local businesses, and civic organizations or foundations.
- Agreement that the primary source of clients will be juveniles and their families who are involved with, or under the jurisdiction of, the juvenile court, family court, tribal court, or judicial entity that provides the adjudicative function in the jurisdiction. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that the court is in a position to use its authority to drive the program from preadjudication to disposition, commitment, or other sanctions, and finally, to aftercare.
- Agreement to actively assist and participate in the national evaluation.

**Award Amount:** OJJDP has awarded a grant to the Bethesda Day Treatment Center to provide TA to up to 10 sites. SafeFutures sites will receive a preference in the provision of TA. Up to \$30,000 per site will be available for Center services during the first year. Unlike the other program components, direct funding for this component is not being provided. In order to qualify for this award, SafeFutures sites (except tribal government sites) will be required to match this award with a 100 percent local cash or in-kind contribution. For preparation of the SafeFutures budget, the amount requested for replication of the Bethesda Day Treatment Center model should be included under the Contractual Category (Object Class Category 6f) on Standard Form 424.



---

---

## Technical Assistance and Other Resources

SafeFutures sites will be offered a variety of training and technical assistance (TA) opportunities through OJJDP funded programs, other Federal agencies and private sources. The assistance falls into two broad categories described below.

**Help from current OJJDP providers of training and technical assistance:** SafeFutures sites will be able to access training and TA from OJJDP and its grantees. More than 24 prosecutors OJJDP supported organizations provide services to juvenile justice professionals, educators, parents, youth, and the general public in their efforts to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency. These organizations include universities, national organizations of juvenile justice professionals, nonprofit associations, and specialized training centers. This assistance ranges from telephone consultations and educational materials to in-depth training and on-site TA.

Juvenile justice professionals at SafeFutures sites will be able to access individual training programs through OJJDP grantees, such as the National Court Appointed Special Advocates Association, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the National School Safety Center, and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. These organizations and others make available a broad range of training opportunities to juvenile justice professionals, including law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, corrections staff, and other agency personnel who work with juveniles.

OJJDP also supports training activities that will assist SafeFutures sites to implement specific programs. For example, training is available for several school-based programs, such as law-related education, dropout prevention models, truancy reduction, conflict resolution, and school safety. Some training and TA activities revolve around community mobilization activities and family strengthening programs. Others focus more directly on juveniles such as intensive aftercare, balanced and restorative justice, child advocacy centers, and gang prevention.

**Help from other Federal agencies and private partners in the SafeFutures Program:** OJJDP is also working with other Federal agencies, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), so that SafeFutures sites can access HUD training and TA opportunities for public and subsidized housing communities. Assistance from other Federal programs and private organizations, such as AmeriCorps and programs of the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and Home Builders Institute, will also be made available to SafeFutures sites. A brief description of these programs and the assistance each will offer to the SafeFutures sites follows.

In some cases, SafeFutures sites will be offered these services free of charge. In others, there may be some cost involved. Applicants are authorized to set aside \$50,000 as a line-item budget cost to provide flexibility and the resources to take advantage of these activities. This amount can be allocated among all programs funds (Title V, Parts C, D and G) proportionately. These funds will be used to pay for such items as cluster conferences, training costs, consultant fees, and related travel and per diem. A breakdown of these costs need not be provided as part of the application. After SafeFutures awards are made, OJJDP will designate staff as site coordinators to work with each site to determine the types of TA needed and to broker the services from appropriate providers.

---

---

## Resources

### Technical Assistance and Programmatic Resources

Part A lists relevant OJJDP supported programs that provide TA and training to a broad audience. In many cases the SafeFutures sites will be able to avail themselves of these activities.

Part B describes specific services offered by Federal and private partners to assist the SafeFutures sites.

#### Part A: Relevant OJJDP Supported Activities

Child Abuse Prosecution Training and Technical Assistance

Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance for State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Program

Investigation and Prosecution of Parental Abduction Cases

Juvenile Justice Prosecution Training Program

Juvenile and Family Court Training Program

Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action (SHOCAP) Training

Training for Juvenile Corrections and Detention Staff

Cities in Schools (CIS) Dropout Prevention Program

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Program Development

Missing and Exploited Children Comprehensive Action (M/CAP) Training

National Network of Children's Advocacy Centers

Training and Technical Assistance for Family Strengthening Services

Training for Juvenile Detention Center Care-Givers

Child-Centered Community Oriented Policing

Innovative Firearms Program

National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise (NCNE)

Law-Related Education (LRE) Youth for Justice

Congress of National Black Churches Anti-Drug Abuse Program

National School Safety Center

Targeted Outreach With a Gang Prevention and Intervention Component (Boys and Girls Clubs)

Training in Cultural Differences for Law Enforcement and Juvenile Justice Officers

Training in Risk-Focused Prevention Strategies

Truancy Prevention and Intervention Technical Assistance

#### Part B: Federal and Private Assistance Providers to SafeFutures Sites

**AmeriCorps.** AmeriCorps, a domestic Peace Corps, is a new national service movement that engages Americans of all ages and backgrounds to serve our Nation's urban and rural communities. AmeriCorps is a network of programs operating in every State, involving more than 350 nonprofit programs, two of which are

---

nationally operated — AmeriCorps VISTA and AmeriCorps NCCC (National Civilian Community Corps). Americorps' Learn and Serve America and National Senior Service Corps provide service opportunities for nearly a million students and senior citizens.

This year AmeriCorps is concentrating its efforts in five areas: community policing, victim assistance, early child development, school success, and neighborhood environment. Americorps will offer technical advice on available resources for service programs in these areas.

**Boys and Girls Clubs of America.** Boys and Girls Clubs of America is working to help youth from all backgrounds, giving special concern to those from disadvantaged circumstances, to develop the qualities needed to become responsible citizens and leaders. Boys and Girls Clubs help their members build self-esteem, acquire honest values, and pursue productive futures by providing a safe haven away from the negative influences of the street, guidance, discipline, modeling appropriate behavior from caring adults, and programs geared to the interests and needs of young people ages 6–18.

Boys and Girls Clubs of America has developed more than 25 national programs for 1,675 local clubs serving 2.2 million young people. Programs are categorized in six core areas: health and physical education, social recreation, outdoor and environmental education, citizenship and leadership development, cultural enrichment, and personal and educational development. In addition, other areas of specialization include delinquency and gang prevention and drug, alcohol, and pregnancy prevention. The national headquarters of Boys and Girls Clubs will support each club identified in a SafeFutures site, working to enhance the program. If there is no club, the Boys and Girls Clubs organization will work with local officials to explore the possibility of establishing one. TA will be provided to communities interested in establishing a new Club in areas where it is deemed feasible.

**Home Builders Institute (HBI).** HBI, the educational arm of the National Association of Home Builders, has been the Nation's leading source of education and training programs for the home building industry for more than 25 years. HBI provides the residential construction industry with many vital services, including comprehensive construction-trades training, job placement services, continuing education, and instructional design.

Through HBI's affiliation with local and State home builder associations, HBI can provide comprehensive construction-trades training to at-risk and delinquent youth. Under SafeFutures, program implementation and TA in vocational training, employment skills, developing partnerships with home builder associations, and job placement can be made available to grantees. HBI and participating home builder associations would collaborate with human service agencies, businesses, and the juvenile justice system to provide training, education, case management, and followup services. After participants complete training, they are placed in employment and/or two- to four-year apprentice programs.

**Teens, Crime, and Community.** With support from OJJDP, the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and the National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law will serve as a clearinghouse for information and will provide TA and training to guide the energies of young people toward constructive activities designed to reduce crime and violence. NCPC also provides training and TA in community mobilization, developing public service announcements, and using the media as a partner.

**Youth Corps.** Youth Corps is partnership programs that leverage funding from Federal, State, local, and private sources to support a comprehensive program to engage at-risk youth in activities that contribute positively to their communities. Some programs enlist mentors or focus specifically on crime prevention, juvenile justice, or community policing activities. Youth Corps also provides job/vocational training and service opportunities as well as comprehensive basic education and life-skills training. As such, Youth Corps provides an appropriate vehicle for SafeFutures sites to enhance their youth programming.

---

Youth Corps, certified by the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps (NASCC), provides participants with a 6- to 12-month, full-time, crew-based, highly structured, and adult supervised work and learning experience and promotes the development of citizenship and life and employment skills. NASCC is making training and TA available to SafeFutures sites, to assist them in launching new Youth Corps or in adapting existing youth programs to operate in a manner consistent with Youth Corps standards. This training and TA will include an on-site needs assessment by a veteran practitioner of Youth Corps, crew supervisor training, a cluster meeting of the corps program managers from all the SafeFutures sites, and optional access to other professional development and training events on issues of relevance to youth development.

**ACYF.** The Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF), a branch of the Department of Health and Human Services, encourages SafeFutures sites to acquire Family Preservation and Support planning and implementation at the State level to qualify for training and TA relevant to strengthening families. ACYF also encourages sites to apply for the Community-Based Family Resource and Early Head Start programs to receive direct support in early prevention programming.

**HUD.** The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will provide SafeFutures sites with training and TA pertaining to their efforts in public and assisted housing. HUD will make available to SafeFutures sites through their partnerships with a public housing authority training and TA opportunities. Up to 30 days per site of onsite consultant services and training can be requested to support drug problem assessments, design anti-drug practices and programs, and train public housing authority (PHA) and Indian housing authority (IHA) staff and residents in anti-drug efforts, overall agency management, operations, and programming so that staff and residents can respond to drug problems.

## **Eligibility Requirements**

1. Applicants must be chief executive offices (Mayor, County Executive, Commissioner, City Manager, tribal President or Governor, or other title) of a unit of general local government or combinations thereof that propose to establish a continuum of care for the jurisdiction's at-risk and delinquent youth and their families. A *unit of general local government* is defined as any city, county, town, township, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State or any agency of the District of Columbia performing law enforcement functions in and for the District of Columbia. A *tribal government* is defined as any federally recognized Indian or tribal government that performs law enforcement functions, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.
2. Five applicants will be selected: three urban, one rural, and one tribal government. At a minimum, two of the urban and rural sites will be selected from EZ/EC jurisdictions. Applicants must comply with one of the following definitions:
  - a. Urban: any area that lies inside a metropolitan area (MA), as designated by the Office of Management and Budget using the 1993 Census of Population and Housing data, and that has a 1993 population not less than 100,000.
  - b. Rural: any area that lies outside the boundaries of an MA, as designated by the Office of Management and Budget using the 1993 Census of Population and Housing data, and that has a 1993 population not less than 10,000 or more than 100,000.
  - c. Tribal government: federally recognized tribes or Confederated Tribes on a reservation. Confederated Tribes are two or more tribes grouped under a single government by treaty or Executive Order. Eligible tribes must have a tribal government serving a reservation population of not less than 5,000 and a tribal court.

- 
3. Applicants must have an established communitywide planning board or other planning entity that has made significant progress toward implementing a comprehensive continuum of care strategy and toward coordinating the necessary systemic changes to the service delivery system for children and youth. The planning board must be balanced in terms of public and private agencies, community organizations, residents, and youth.
  4. Under the JJDP Act, State Advisory Groups for State agencies administering the Formula Grants program are responsible for ensuring that communities receiving Title V funding meet statutorily mandated Formula Grants program eligibility requirements. Because a portion of the SafeFutures award will come from Title V, SafeFutures applicants (other than tribal governments that request Title V funds) must be certified by the State Advisory Group as being in compliance with JJDP Act Formula Grants program core requirements. Formula Grants program plan requirements require States to develop and adhere to policies, practices, and laws that deinstitutionalize status offenders and nonoffenders, separate adults and juveniles held in secure institutions, and address the practice of detaining or confining juveniles in adult jails and lockups. In addition, States must address efforts to reduce the disproportionate representation of minority juveniles in secure facilities, where such conditions exist. For information about the specific procedures for obtaining certification and approval, applicants should contact their State Juvenile Justice Specialist (see list of Juvenile Justice Specialists in Appendix D of this *Application Kit*).
  5. Applicants must have completed an assessment of the prevalence of delinquency risk factors in the community, including establishment of baseline data for the risk factors, and an assessment of the resources available to address those risks. The assessment should result in a list of preventive program priorities to be addressed, and be approved by the local planning board.
  6. Applicants must have a comprehensive and integrated delinquency prevention, intervention, and graduated sanctions plan for their jurisdiction.
  7. Applicants must have in place Federal, State, local, and private partnerships and commitments to leverage additional resources and coordinate the necessary systemic changes to both the juvenile justice and social services systems.
  8. To meet Title V requirements, the applicant jurisdiction must have a local Prevention Policy Board (PPB) that complies with Title V membership requirements. This may be an existing board, such as the established communitywide planning board listed under item 3 above, or a special board or subcommittee created to satisfy Title V requirements. The PPB will be responsible for recommendations, plan approval, and other activities with respect to Title V funds.

To meet Title V requirements, the PPB must consist of no fewer than 15 and no more than 21 members from the community, representing a balance of public agencies; private nonprofit organizations serving children, youth, and families; and business and industry. Such parties may include staff, agencies, and organizations involved with education, health and mental health, juvenile justice, child welfare, employment, parent, family, and youth associations, law enforcement, religious, recreation, child protective services, public defenders, prosecutors, and private manufacturing and service sectors. The applicant should also ensure that the PPB, to the extent possible, includes one or more members under the age of 21; includes one or more parents or guardians with children who have had contact with or are at risk of having contact with the juvenile justice system; and generally reflects the racial, ethnic, and cultural composition of the community's youth population. The applicant may convene boards or committees of more than 21 members for prevention planning, but recommendations and other actions regarding the Title V plan can be made only by a specified PPB group composed of 15 to 21 members.

Sites that have not previously participated under Title V are eligible to be selected as SafeFutures sites as long as all the eligibility requirements described above are met.

---

---

## Application Process

Application for the SafeFutures Program is a two-step process. Interested jurisdictions must submit a preapplication concept paper. Based on OJJDP's review of these papers, best demonstrating an ability to qualify for funding will be invited to compete for selection as SafeFutures Program sites. Only those jurisdictions invited to compete will be eligible to submit a full application.

OJJDP is contemplating two cluster conferences to answer questions on the SafeFutures guidelines before the submission date for full applications. For further information on the dates and locations, please contact the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at 800-638-8736.

### Preapplication Concept Paper

**Criteria:** Concept papers will be judged on the following criteria:

- Indicators of need.
- Compliance with eligibility requirements.
- Clear evidence of broad, high-level community involvement in planning a comprehensive approach to delinquency prevention.
- Extent to which planning and implementation of a continuum of services has been accomplished, including a graduated sanctions component.
- A clear vision statement that is far reaching, yet realistic.
- Presence of structures and agreements to ensure collaboration and coordination in planning and implementation of a continuum of services and the participation of all sectors of the community in the program.
- Ability and willingness on the part of key leaders to leverage existing resources, create new sources of support, and sustain the activities. Extent to which resources have been committed.

**Format:** Concept papers must not exceed 25 pages, exclusive of appendixes. Pages must be 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>- by 11-inch paper, one-sided only, double-spaced, presented in a standard 10- or 12-point font. The following format must be used.

- Part One: Problem Statement. Describe (1) the local unit of general local government or combinations thereof, (2) the target community, and (3) the at-risk youth population. Provide justification for the particular target community based on a community assessment (e.g., the size of the problem, the numbers affected) and the degree to which the SafeFutures program will be able to have an impact on the problems of the target area and population.
- Part Two: Community Readiness. Provide a history of planning and collaboration around juvenile justice and delinquency prevention issues. Include a description of the participants (public or private; Federal, State, or local), major milestones, dates, and activities, including an explanation of the community assessment process. Indicate what has been accomplished, what is in process, and what remains to be done. Describe any training and TA that has been received.
- Part Three: Community's Vision. Describe what the comprehensive and coordinated continuum of care for at-risk youth will look like in your community after 5 years. Explain the anticipated results.
- Part Four: Specific Goals and Objectives for Year One of SafeFutures. Describe your goals and objectives for the first year of the award. Objectives should be measurable.

- 
- Part Five: Community's Ability To Leverage Resources and Provide Matching Assistance. Include information on the contributions and participation of government (or tribal government), corporations or local businesses, civic organizations, and foundations. This section need not repeat information requested as part of Appendix C, Commitment of Resources (see below).
- Part Six: Description of Organizational Entity and Management Structure for Administering SafeFutures. Identify important organizational relationships and explain how the program components will be integrated and managed. Describe the staff resources.
- Part Seven: Evaluation Capability and Commitment. Describe management information systems, technical resources, and staff resources for evaluation. Describe how evaluation activities will be handled administratively and integrated within SafeFutures (one page).

**Appendixes:** Applicants must include, at a minimum, the following information in their Appendixes:

- Appendix A: Listing of individuals, their affiliations, and signatures of the persons participating in the communitywide planning process.
- Appendix B: Legislation, executive orders, memorandums of understanding, and other formal commitments of bona fide partnerships. (e.g., collapsed funding streams, wraparound services, multiservice centers, and procedures for service coordination). Provide documentation.
- Appendix C: Commitment of Resources, which lists for each organization the authorizing official, title, and signature; the amount of funds being committed; the purpose of the commitment; the duration of the commitment; and the agreement date.
- Appendix D: Signed endorsements and positions of those reviewing the program concept or application.

## **Full Application**

Applicants whose concept papers are selected to compete for funding will be notified and asked to submit full applications.

**Requirements:** Applicants must submit a program narrative describing the applicant's overall approach to the SafeFutures Program, including the conceptual and organizational framework for the individual program components. The applicant must also describe the program components that will be implemented, including its request for TA for the Bethesda Day Treatment program replication. Applicants may earn up to 100 points. The specific selection criteria and their point values are described below.

**Selection Criteria:** All applicants will be evaluated and rated based on the extent to which they meet the following weighed criteria, which are shown in italics. Applicants must use the selection criteria headings as the headings for their proposal narrative and present the information in that order.

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (20 points)***

*The applicant must demonstrate that it has been engaged in a comprehensive community assessment of risk and protective factors, that it has engaged the appropriate stakeholders in this planning process, and that there is collaboration between the juvenile justice system and the social service system, including private nonprofit programs.*

---

---

## Section One — Description of the community and target population

- a. Describe the geographic area, size of population, general population characteristics including size of juvenile population, and ethnic composition of the community participating in the SafeFutures program. Explain how the targeted community was identified and defined.
- b. Describe the governmental structure and major agencies servicing the children and youth population, particularly in relation to dependency (child abuse and neglect) and delinquency functions of the juvenile justice system. Provide a brief overview of responsibilities and the relationships that currently exist.

## Section Two — Assessment of community strengths and weaknesses

- a. Describe the community assessment process and the results of this effort.
- b. Provide data on specific delinquency risk factors, such as high rates of crime, poverty, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, child abuse and neglect, dysfunctional or single-parent families, dropping out of school, unemployment, and other factors identified in the community. Describe all baseline data being collected and analyzed. Indicate any information gaps on risk factors or difficulties in assessing them.
- c. Describe the areas of greatest need. What are the gaps in services that exist?
- d. What protective factors exist? What resources are available to the community to address risk factors?

## Section Three — Status of planning efforts

- a. Provide a brief history and describe the current status of planning efforts on behalf of delinquent and at-risk youth, with particular focus on the development of a continuum of care. Describe specific meetings and examples of activities that have occurred within at least the past year.
- b. What public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and businesses, including those that are part of or are linked to the juvenile justice system, have been involved in the collaborative planning effort described above? In addition to a brief narrative, please provide the information requested as part of Appendix A.
- c. What strategies have been proposed to meet the needs identified in Section Two?
- d. Describe organizational structures, agreements, legislation, and policies that have supported this planning process. What limitations, if any, exist or have been imposed? Include copies of any documents in Appendix B.
- e. Describe the impact of these planning efforts. What problems have been encountered?

### ✓ **Goals and Objectives. (10 points)**

*Applicants must adapt the SafeFutures goals and objectives to the needs, resources, and capabilities of this community. Objectives are measurable and attainable within 1-year time frames.*

1. Articulate a vision for children, youth, and families 5 years hence that provides a more comprehensive and better coordinated service delivery system. How will the environment, circumstances, and attitudes that put children and youth at risk of unhealthy and destructive behaviors be changed?
2. Describe how the overall goals of the SafeFutures program correspond with and match the specific needs of your community.



- 
- 
3. Describe in detail the goals and objectives of the first year with respect to building upon a delinquency prevention plan, focusing on resources of greatest need, developing effective programs in a graduated sanctions model, and building a capacity to institute and sustain a “continuum of care.” Describe goals and objectives in the ensuing years to the extent possible.

✓ **Program Design. (30 points)**

*The applicant must describe program activities that are culturally relevant and that engage community and parent participation. The applicant’s strategy must be comprehensive, addressing youth developmentally from ages 0 through 18, as well as a wide range of needs including emergency, family, education, health, community development, employment, and juvenile justice services.*

**Section One — Description of major activities to be undertaken**

- a. Describe the major program components that will be included along with an explanation of how the components fit into the applicant’s overall vision for improving the safety and well-being of youth, families, and members of their community.
- b. For each component, summarize the following: the approximate number of children and families to be served, the rationale for its inclusion in a continuum of care, its relationship to other components, including the juvenile justice system, and the methods of identifying or recruiting participants.

Each component, or combination if appropriate, must be described using the following standardized format:

- i. Current status of the activity
- ii. Goals and objectives
- iii. Implementation strategy and specific tasks for the first year
- iv. Target population and recruitment efforts
- v. Organizational entity and key staff
- vi. Evaluation process, capabilities, and outcome measure

**Section Two — Programmatic linkages with other economic development, health, education, and public safety initiatives, and other Federal, State, local, as well as community-based and privately sponsored programs**

- a. Describe the programmatic linkages currently existing and those that are planned.
- b. Provide a brief overview of activities to date and results achieved.

**Section Three — Implementation plan and significant milestones**

Provide a detailed, realistic implementation plan for the first year and a timeline that indicates significant milestones. Identify the parties responsible for accomplishing these tasks.

**Section Four — Sustainability of the continuum of care**

Describe plans for building community support for the SafeFutures program and sustaining program activities at the close of the 5-year grant period.

---

---

## Section Five — Evaluation plan

- a. Explain how the reporting requirements outlined in the National Evaluation of SafeFutures section of these guidelines will be met.
- b. Describe capacity to collect process and outcome data. Identify any anticipated problems.
- c. Identify existing data collection and management of information systems in place.

### ✓ **Project Management. (20 points)**

*The applicant must demonstrate that it has a solid infrastructure capable of carrying out the goals, objectives, and tasks it has identified. The applicant also demonstrates a strong capacity for data collection and analysis.*

1. Identify the roles and responsibilities of each agency, committee, board, or other organizational entity involved in this program. Explain the relationships.
2. Name and describe the capabilities and experience of all staff who will play lead roles in managing the overall program or its key components, whether or not they will be paid directly by the OJJDP grant. Position descriptions should be included as appendixes. Identify the key decisionmakers and the lines of authority.
3. Indicate the amount of time to be devoted to the program by the grant manager and all staff.
4. Indicate the staffing resources and management practices that will be used to evaluate the program progress and to ensure that corrective action is taken if needed.

### ✓ **Organizational Capability. (15 points)**

*The applicant must demonstrate a capacity and commitment to coordinate the necessary systemic changes to both the juvenile justice and social service delivery systems and to leverage State, local, and private resources to create a self-sustaining system of juvenile justice interventions and community support for children and youth.*

*Preference will be given to the applicants who have existing Federal partnerships such as PACT, Weed and Seed, Comprehensive Communities, U.S. Attorney Anti-Violence Initiative, Empowerment Zones, and Enterprise Communities.*

1. Provide a brief overview of knowledge and experience of juvenile justice, youth services, and communitywide planning strategies. Staff resumes should be attached.
2. Describe capacity to leverage State, local, and private resources (including staff and funds). Include as Appendix C a completed chart of commitment of resources.

### ✓ **Budget. (5 points)**

*The applicants must provide a budget that is reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective in relationship to the activities to be undertaken. The applicant demonstrates the ability to provide matching assistance from government, corporations or businesses, civic organizations, and foundations.*

1. Identify all costs under appropriate sections and provide costs per unit when appropriate.
2. Justify all costs in a budget narrative and explain how costs are determined. Costs must be appropriately allocated among the program components.

- 
- 
3. Indicate all matching assistance from government, corporations or businesses, civic organizations, and foundations. In addition, demonstrate the required in-kind or cash match for the Delinquency Prevention component (50 percent cash or in-kind match) and the Bethesda Day Treatment Service component (100 percent cash or in-kind match). (tribal government applicants are exempt from the match for the Bethesda Day Treatment Service component.)

**Appendixes:** Applicants must resubmit appendixes included in their concept paper with this full application. Appendixes may be revised or updated.

### **Application Forms, Format, and Copy and Submission Requirements**

**Forms:** All applicants must submit an Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424), Budget Information (Standard Form 424A), and a detailed budget narrative showing the allocation of all costs.

**Budget Preparation:** Using 424A, applicants must budget their costs on Section B under Budget Categories in the four columns listed there. Each source of funds (Parts C, D, and G, and Title V) should appear in a separate column. This is necessary because each source of funds has different program requirements.

For example, the first column would detail the object class categories for Part C money, the second column would detail Part D money, the third column would detail Part G funds, and the last column would detail Title V funds. A budget narrative would also be necessary for each fund source (C, D, G, and Title V) and would provide details, such as names/descriptions of personnel to be funded, annual salaries, percent of time charged to the grant, and amount. This would be defined for each fund source that is contained in the application. Fringe benefits would be detailed with a fringe benefit rate, if appropriate, or an explanation of the actual fringe benefits. Travel should be explained, including who is traveling, location(s), number of trips, and a breakdown of the various travel costs such as per diem and lodging. Any equipment must be explained by type, unit price, and total cost. Supplies may be summarized by the type of expense and the method used to determine the total cost.

It is particularly important that SafeFutures grantees have an accounting system that will enable them to accrue their incurred costs by the separate types of money contained in their award.

For preparation of the budget and budget narrative, the amount of TA services requested for Bethesda Day Treatment (up to \$30,000) should be included under Contractual (Object Class Category 6f) on Standard Form 424A.

Funds for conducting the local evaluation of SafeFutures (not to exceed 10 percent) should be allocated among all fund sources in proportion to their amount of the total budget request.

Funds in the amount of \$50,000 to support a range of TA and training activities should also be allocated among all program components in proportion to the total amount of funds requested for such activities.

**Format:** All applications must be submitted on 8<sup>1/2</sup>- by 11-inch paper, double-spaced, in a standard 10- or 12-point font printed on one side of the paper. Applicants must use the following headings when formatting the application: Statement of the Problem, Definition of Objectives, Program Design, Management Structure and Staffing, Organizational Capability, and Appendixes.

**Copy and Submission Requirements:** Application packages must include a signed unbound original and five (5) copies. Video presentations will not be accepted. Applications submitted via fax will not be accepted.

---

Executive Order 12372 requires applicants from local units of government to submit a copy of the application to the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC), if one exists, and to specify whether this program has been selected for review by the State. A list of the State Single Points of Contact is available in Appendix D of this *Application Kit*. Applicants must contact their State SPOC to determine whether the program has been selected for review by the State.

In addition to the required standard assurances that are part of the Standard Form 424, which must be signed, each applicant must include written assurances that the applicant will use funds to supplement, not supplant, other Federal, State, or local funds.

### **Award Period**

This program will be funded for a 5-year project period. Funding in the second and subsequent budget periods will be dependent upon grantee performance, availability of funds, and other criteria established at the time of award.

### **Award Amount**

First-year funding will be up to \$1,400,000 per site.

### **Delivery Instructions**

All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Blvd., Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly write SafeFutures — Special Emphasis Division.*

### **Due Dates**

The original and five copies of each concept paper must be delivered by mail or in person no later than 5 p.m. (e.d.t.) on June 20, 1995. Preapplicants will be notified whether they are eligible to submit a full application by July 10, 1995.

The original and six copies of full applications must be delivered no later than 5 p.m. (e.d.t.) on August 15, 1995. OJJDP expects to announce grant awards by September 30, 1995.

### **Contact**

For further information, please contact the project manager, Special Emphasis Division, OJJDP, at (202) 307-5914.

## **Definitions**

**aftercare:** an array of services directed toward serious, chronic and violent offenders currently or recently in secure confinement that is designed to:

- prepare youth for progressively increased responsibility and freedom in the community.
- facilitate youth–community interaction and involvement.

- 
- work with both the offender and targeted community support systems (e.g., families, peers, schools, employers) on qualities needed for constructive interaction and youth's successful community adjustment.
  - develop new resources and supports where needed.
  - monitor and test youth and the community on their ability to deal with each other progressively.

**at-risk youth:** juveniles most likely to become involved in delinquent activity; includes, but is not limited to, juveniles who exhibit one or more risk factors for delinquency or who have had contact with the social services, mental health, education, and/or juvenile justice systems as nonoffenders (neglected, abused, and dependent), status offenders (runaways, truants, alcohol offenders, and incorrigibles), or delinquent offenders.

**chronic offenders:** for this program, chronic juvenile offenders are defined as offenders who have had at least three prior findings of delinquency.

**collaboration:** a process of working jointly with others, including those with whom one is not normally or immediately connected, to develop and achieve common goals. Characteristics of collaboration include the following:

- partners establish common goals.
- partners agree to pool resources and jointly plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate new services and procedures.
- collocated services are designed to further mutually agreed-upon goals.
- collaboratives utilize input from each partner to make necessary changes to develop a comprehensive service delivery system.
- collaboratives directly negotiate policies leading to a more comprehensive service delivery system.

**community assessment:** a method of gathering and analyzing data from a defined target area and population on community strengths, needs, existing resources, gaps or lack of resources, and identified risk and protective factors for strategic planning purposes. For this solicitation, the community assessment process is considered to be broader and more comprehensive than the risk and needs assessments that are more frequently conducted.

**communitywide:** involving all major youth and family serving constituents including, but not limited to, public safety, juvenile justice, education, social services, employment and training, community-based organizations, public and private colleges/universities, parent and youth groups, religious organizations, and business/labor, that reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of the local community.

**continuum of care:** a multi-agency system of programs and services that meet the distinct, developmental, and often multiple needs of defined at-risk children and delinquent youth (ages 0–17).

**cooperation:** a process of associating and acting together for mutual benefit. Characteristics of cooperation include the following:

- partners help each other meet their respective programmatic goals.
- goals and objectives of each program are designed, staffed, funded, and evaluated autonomously.
- partners may agree to share space, information, and referrals, and/or establish collocated services while pursuing their respective goals.

---

**coordination:** a process of linking the functions of autonomous entities in an effort to achieve the most effective results and avoid duplication. Characteristics of coordination include the following:

- caseworker in a particular agency is assigned to be in communication with other agencies about their respective services to determine appropriateness for individual clients/customers and to avoid duplication of effort.
- basic agency functions and services are defined by the individual agency.
- agencies share only as much information as is necessary to avoid duplication of services and/or to direct customers to other services that may be helpful or to which they are entitled.
- the primary goal is to identify and connect clients with the variety of services that they desire or to which they may be entitled.
- cafeteria-style service delivery system is maintained.

**family-strengthening program:** any intervention that works with a child and a parent caretaker or other family member with the goal of reducing risk or increasing protective factors for problem behaviors.

**goal:** a short- or long-range statement of what is to be accomplished.

**integration:** a process by which a community determines ways to combine appropriate community-based programs along a continuum of care for maximized efficiency and program effectiveness.

**leveraged resources:** additional resources made available by private and public sources to support the SafeFutures program. Examples might include in-kind support such as office space, equipment, or shared administrative support, or actual dollars to match Federal resources.

**linkages:** firm commitments of collaboration and cooperation, including memorandums of understanding, interagency agreements, or other binding agreements supported by documented actions pursuant to these agreements.

**objective:** a specific statement of measurable progress toward goal attainment. Objectives should specify how much impact the program will have upon specific social indicators.

**plan:** a dynamic document that can serve as both a management tool and monitoring device for everyone involved with SafeFutures, both locally and at the State level. Developed by a broad-based community organization, the plan can empower and direct the activities of youth-serving activists.

**serious/violent offenders:** for this initiative, OJJDP will accept the successful applicant's documented local or State legal definitions of a serious or violent offender when defining the target population.

**sustainability:** the ability to maintain the program strategy and design at a high level of programmatic self-sufficiency beyond the Federal grant period.

**tribal government:** any federally recognized Indian or tribal government that performs law enforcement functions, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

**unit of general local government:** any city, county, town, township, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State or any agency of the District of Columbia performing law enforcement functions in and for the District of Columbia.

---

---

## References

- Atschuler, D., and T. Armstrong, "Intensive Aftercare for High Risk Juvenile Parolees: A Model Program Design." The Johns Hopkins University Institute of Policy Studies. June 1992.
- Becker, Kaplan, Tenker, and Tartaglini, "The Incidence of Depressive Symptomatology in Juvenile Sex Offenders with a History of Abuse," *Child Abuse and Neglect* 15:551–536, 1991.
- Bengelsdorf, "A Mobile Crisis Unit in the Psychiatric Emergency Room," *Hospital and Community Psychiatry* 38: 662–665, 1987.
- Bucht, Range, and Wetzel, *Characteristics of Crisis Outreach Clients* 5(4):17–24, 1974.
- Chesney-Lind, M., *Girl's Delinquency, and Services for Girls, An Overview*. From a speech before Congress, May 16, 1992.
- Cronin, R.C., *Innovative Community Partnerships: Working Together for Change*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1994.
- Everstine, Bodin, and Everstine, "Emergency Psychology," *Family Process* 16(3): 281–292, 1977.
- Fagan, J., "Social and Legal Policy Dimensions of Violent Juvenile Crime," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 17:93–133, 1990.
- Fleming et al., *Breaking New Ground for American Indians and Alaska Native Youth At-Risk: Program Summaries*. Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, Washington, DC: 1990.
- Hamilton, S.F., *Apprenticeship for Adulthood*. Free Press, New York: 1990.
- Howell, J.C., Ed., *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1995.
- Kinney, Madsen, Fleming, and Hoopala, "Keeping Families Together," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 45, 667–673, 1977.
- Krisberg, B., et al., *National Juvenile Custody Trends 1978–1989*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1992.
- Krisberg, B., et al., "Unlocking Juvenile Corrections: Evaluating the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services." National Council on Crime and Delinquency, San Francisco: 1989.
- Kumpfer, K., *Strengthening America's Families: Promising Parenting Strategies for Delinquency Prevention, User's Guide*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: September 1993.
- Mortimer, A.M., "Consultation on After-school Programs." Carnegie Corporation of New York, New York, NY: September 1994.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, "The Prevention of Youth Violence: A Framework for Community Action." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA: 1993.
- National Commission on Children, *Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC: 1991.
- Rabushka, A., *Caseworkers or Police: How Tenants See*. Hoover Institution Publications, San Francisco, CA: 1977.
- Sheldon, R.J., and Tracy, S., "Violent Female Juvenile Offender: An Ignored Minority Within the Juvenile Justice System," *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 1992.
- Spergel, I., *The Youth Gang Problem: A Community Approach*. Oxford University Press, New York: 1995 [in press].

- 
- Spergel, I., “National Youth Gang Suppression and Intervention Program.” *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1990.
  - Tatem-Kelley, B., “A *Comprehensive Strategy To Address America’s Gang Problem*.” Draft prepared for the OJJDP Inter-Office Gang Task Force, 1994.
  - Thornberry, T.P., *Violent Families and Youth Violence*. OJJDP Fact Sheet. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1994.
  - Tolan, P., and Guerra, N., “What Works in Reducing Adolescent Violence: An Empirical Review of the Field.” The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO: July 1994.
  - Vander Ploeg and Mesmer-Schultz, “Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Problem Behavior: A Proposal for Socio-Ecological Approach.” *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. Volume 20, November 3, 1992.
  - Wilson, J.J., and J.C. Howell, *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Program Summary. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1993.
  - Wright, K.N., and K.E. Wright, *Family Life, Delinquency, and Crime: A Policymaker’s Guide*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1994.

*Many of these references are available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at 1-800-638-8736.*

## **National Evaluation of the SafeFutures Program: Phase I Study of Program Development and Implementation**

**Purpose:** To document and understand the process of community mobilization, planning, and collaboration needed to build a comprehensive program offering effective prevention and intervention strategies for at-risk juveniles and juvenile offenders.

**Background:** The goal of the SafeFutures program is to develop integrated services providing a continuum of care, intervention, and graduated sanctions to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency, substance abuse, and violence. Phase I of the National Evaluation will determine the extent to which the SafeFutures program has been implemented in five communities.

During the first phase, the evaluator will produce, in collaboration with the local evaluation team, an evaluation design to determine the impact of this communitywide intervention strategy. This design should determine the impact of the SafeFutures program on the following:

- Closure of gaps in the availability and delivery of services as well as elimination of unnecessary duplication of services for at-risk youth.
- Effectiveness of individual program components.
- Overall reductions in delinquency, juvenile crime, youth gangs, substance abuse, and other high-risk behaviors for targeted areas.
- Reductions in risk factors in the community, schools, and family that contribute to juvenile violence.
- Increases in protective factors that reduce the likelihood of delinquency and criminal careers.



---

Applicants for the National Evaluation of the SafeFutures program should review the SafeFutures program announcement, paying special attention to the evaluation requirements. The evaluator chosen for the National Evaluation of the SafeFutures program will be expected to provide leadership regarding the evaluation efforts taking place at the five sites as well as bringing together data and evaluation results into a national evaluation of the basic concepts of the SafeFutures program.

One 3-year cooperative agreement will be awarded for Phase I. Applicants must develop a proposal for all activities required in Phase I, with a maximum initial budget of \$150,000 for a 6-month period. Based on the satisfactory performance of the award recipient, the project will receive supplemental funding to carry out the balance of Phase I. Phase II will be developed, based on the design work completed in Phase I. The successful applicant for Phase I will be eligible to receive continuation funding for Phase II, dependent on grantee performance, availability of funds, and OJJDP priorities.

### **Goals for Phase I:**

1. To understand the process of effective implementation of the SafeFutures program in order to strengthen and refine the program for future replication.
2. To identify factors that contribute to and/or impede the successful implementation of the program.
3. To develop or refine local management information systems required to generate basic information on program utilization and completion.
4. To formulate a strategy to build an understanding of the general effectiveness of the community program and of selected program components and to determine the impact of the SafeFutures program on the five participating communities.
5. To help develop the capacity of SafeFutures sites to evaluate what works in their communities.

### **Objectives:**

1. To develop a detailed design, including data collection instruments, for a process evaluation of the SafeFutures program for implementation in collaboration with all sites.
2. To develop templates for capturing the data necessary for the national evaluation and to make those templates available for implementation at the sites.
3. To provide training and technical assistance (TA) for and to collaborate with grantees at each of the five sites to implement a process evaluation of the development and implementation of each SafeFutures program.
4. To compile and analyze results and provide routine feedback to the sites on the planning, program development, and implementation process.
5. To develop a research design to determine outcomes and the impact of the overall strategy and individual program interventions on delinquency, violence, and related behaviors and risk factors. The design must meet scientifically rigorous standards for evaluation and acknowledge the differences in local circumstances and strategies.

**Program Strategy:** Applicants should become familiar with the OJJDP SafeFutures program and associated literature. Applicants' project design must provide a process evaluation that is inclusive of the five sites. Project designs must also include provision for simultaneously assessing appropriate strategies for a future impact evaluation.

---

Applicants should provide a discussion of research questions for the process evaluation, which will serve as a basis for the data collection plans and instruments. Depending on the five sites' experiences, the process evaluation design may focus on the following levels of activities:

- Community-level efforts in planning, policy-making, resource allocation, and guidance.
- Program-level responses, experiences, and achievements in program implementation.

Applicants should include, but are not limited to, the following issues in the evaluation:

- What factors contribute to (or inhibit) changes in the communities in the planning for and delivery of the SafeFutures program?
- What lessons can be drawn from local communities for Federal and/or State policies, program planning efforts, and local service delivery of intensive services for youth?
- What factors contribute to effective implementation and what changes occur as a result of implementation?
- What planning and implementation strategies (e.g., coordination, consultation, use of OJJDP provided TA) are used at local levels, and what is the effect of their use?

Applicants must propose a process evaluation that includes the stages of the implementation process, beginning with the selection of targeted sites in the community. Applicants must describe the planning and the implementation process to be used at local levels as well as implementation of these plans and how TA will contribute to the implementation process.

Applicants must include a discussion of their process to develop a preliminary impact evaluation research design and a description of their methods to conduct an evaluation assessment for the impact evaluation. This description must include an assessment of program goals, measurable impact objectives, data elements and sources for measuring impact, the need for sampling designs and strategies, and a clear statement of the ability of the demonstration sites to support a rigorous impact evaluation.

**Products:**

1. Final design of the process evaluation. This design will incorporate modifications recommended by OJJDP after the award process.
2. Draft comprehensive final report. This report will contain two parts: (1) a preliminary impact evaluation research design based on the evaluation assessments and (2) a detailed account of the process evaluation including overall findings and an analysis of the factors that contributed to or impeded successful implementation.
3. Final report on the process evaluation. This final report will incorporate modifications recommended by OJJDP and the project advisors, as appropriate.

**Eligibility Requirements:** OJJDP invites applications from public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, or individuals. Applicants must demonstrate that they have experience in the design and implementation of this type program. Private, for-profit organizations must agree to waive any profit or fee. Joint applications from two or more eligible applicants are welcome, as long as one is designated primary applicant and any others co-applicants.

**Selection Criteria:** Applications will be evaluated and rated by a peer review panel according to the selection criteria outlined below. Peer review will be conducted according to the OJJDP Competition and Peer Review Policy, 28 CFR Part 34, Sub-part B.

---

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (15 points)***

Applicants must include a clear and concise statement of the problem and demonstrate an understanding of the SafeFutures program. Applicants also should discuss how to apply state-of-the-art evaluation methods to achieve OJJDP evaluation objectives and overcome potential problems associated with evaluating these types of programs.

✓ ***Goals and Objectives. (10 points)***

Applicants must define goals and objectives for this evaluation program that are clearly defined, measurable, and attainable.

✓ ***Project Design. (35 points)***

Applicants must present a clear research design for the conduct of a process evaluation and the formulation of a strategy to carry out a multisite impact evaluation. The design must be sound, feasible, and capable of achieving the objectives set forth in this solicitation.

✓ ***Project Management. (20 points)***

Applicants' management structure and staffing must be adequate and appropriate for the successful implementation of the project. Applicants must present a work plan that identifies responsible individuals, their time commitment, major tasks, and milestones.

✓ ***Organizational Capability. (15 points)***

Applicants must document evidence of the organization's ability to conduct the project successfully. Organizational experience with multisite research and evaluation of youth in the juvenile justice and child welfare or criminal justice system is recommended. Key staff should have significant experience with multisite evaluation/research of juvenile or related criminal justice programs. They must demonstrate the ability to work effectively with practitioners in resolving design, definition, and data collection and analysis issues and other requirements of the project. Staff resumes should be attached.

✓ ***Budget. (5 points)***

Applicants must provide a proposed budget that is complete, detailed, reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the activities to be undertaken.

**Award Period:** The project will be funded initially for 6 months of a 3-year Phase I project period, with the possibility of 2 additional years of funding to implement Phase II.

**Award Amount:** The award amount will not exceed \$150,000 for the initial 6-month budget period of the 3-year project period.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Blvd., Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. **Note:** *In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on July 15, 1995.

**Contact:** Joan Hurley, Acting Director, Research and Program Development Division, (202) 307-5929.

---

# Strengthening Juvenile Justice

---

## Interventions To Reduce Disproportionate Minority Confinement in Secure Detention and Correctional Facilities (The Deborah Ann Wysinger Memorial Program)

**Purpose:** To assist States, local units of government, and nonprofit organizations in the development of intervention strategies to address the problem of disproportionate minority confinement.

**Background:** This program implements Section 261(a)(8) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended. National data and studies have demonstrated that minority offenders are overrepresented in secure facilities across the country. In response to this problem, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) issued regulations in 1989 requiring States participating in the Formula Grants Program to determine whether disproportionate minority confinement exists and, if so, to design strategies to address the problem.

**Goal:** To assist States, local units of government, and nonprofit organizations achieve the objectives of Section 261(a)(8), “. . . by addressing efforts to reduce the proportion of juveniles detained or confined in secure detention facilities, secure correctional facilities, jails and lockups who are members of minority groups if such proportion exceeds the proportion such groups represent in the general population.”

### Objectives:

1. To refine previous assessment findings and improve systems that collect, analyze and interpret data, and provide information.
2. To develop interventions and new techniques that will reduce disproportionate confinement in secure detention and correctional facilities.
3. To develop models that can be used by other States to address disproportionate minority confinement issues.
4. To convene an advisory committee of professional and lay community leaders engaged in various endeavors that impact juvenile justice and minority overrepresentation, including, but not limited to, representatives from social and human services; law enforcement; judges; prosecutors; public defenders; probation, detention, and corrections officials; private sector youth serving agencies; youth; mental health providers; community leaders; labor; and public school officials.

**Program Strategy:** While other program categories address the problems of disproportionate minority confinement, Section 261(a)(8) of the JJDP Act mandates special programs to address this issue. This competitive Special Emphasis program provides funds to State agencies, local units of government, including tribal governments, and nonprofit organizations to demonstrate effective interventions to eliminate the disproportionate confinement of minority juveniles in secure detention or correctional facilities, adult jails and lockups, and other secure institutional facilities.

State agencies are encouraged to use the services of neighborhood organizations, private nonprofit agencies, and local units of government to implement projects. Persons from the agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals suggested for the advisory committee should be involved in the planning.

---

States, local units of government, private nonprofit organizations, and tribal entities may apply for funding under this program. To qualify, the applicant must be able to satisfactorily show that the State has completed an analysis of the disproportionate minority confinement problem. In addition, designated State agency applicants must have submitted a Disproportionate Minority Confinement Assessment Report to OJJDP. The site and planned program must be supported by data or other valid indicators of appropriateness or need and the proposed project must be consistent with the designated State agency's established strategy for addressing disproportionate minority confinement. The applicant must demonstrate the endorsement of the State Advisory Group for the planned activity.

Applicants must establish an advisory committee. Among representatives for committee membership to be considered are: members of the State advisory and local advisory groups for juvenile justice; State and local elected officials; neighborhood and community organizations, the religious community; law enforcement; prosecutors; public defenders; judges; social and human services, and mental health groups, parents, youth, public school officials; vocational and employment organizations, and juvenile corrections.

Programs may be developed in the following areas:

- Training and education for law enforcement and juvenile justice practitioners.
- Diversion for minority youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system.
- Prevention in communities with high numbers of minority residents.
- Alternatives to detention and incarceration for minority youth.
- Aftercare to assist minority youth returning to their communities from secure institutions.
- Efforts to change or modify laws, codes, ordinances, regulations, and procedures that may contribute to reduction in disproportionate minority confinement in secure facilities.
- Other program areas include the following: case management, continuing care, daycare treatment, detention criteria, early release, home detention, juvenile justice development, management information, mentoring, restitution, risk assessment, systems improvement, and tutoring.

**Products:**

1. Quarterly progress and financial reports.
2. Program implementation plan.
3. Monitoring plan.
4. Operational system for States and local units of government to monitor disproportionate minority confinement.
5. Final report detailing activities, findings, and final products of the grantee's planning and implementation of efforts to reduce disproportionate minority confinement.

**References:**

- Bishop, D.M., and C.E. Frazier, *A Study of Race and Juvenile Processing in Florida*. A report submitted to the Florida Supreme Court Racial and Ethnic Bias Study Commission, 1990.
- Kempf, K.L., S. H. Decker, and R.L. Bing, *An Analysis of Apparent Disparities in the Handling of Black Youth Within Missouri's Juvenile Justice System*. Department of Administration of Justice, University of Missouri, St. Louis, 1990.

- 
- Lockhart, L.L., P.D. Kurtz, R. Stutphen, and K. Gauger, *Georgia's Juvenile Justice System: A Retrospective Investigation of Racial Disparity*. Research report to the Georgia Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council: Part I of the Racial Disparity Investigation. School of Social Work, University of Georgia, 1990.
  - Pope, C.E., and W. Feyerherm, "Minority Status and Juvenile Justice Processing," *Criminal Justice Abstracts*. 22(2), 327–336 (part I); 22(3), 527–542 (part II), 1990.
  - Pope, C.E., "Blacks and Juvenile Crime: A Review," in D.E. Georges-Abeyie(ed.), *The Criminal Justice System and Blacks*. Clark Boardman, 1984.
  - Pope, C.E., and W. Feyerherm, "Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System," *OJJDP Research Summary*. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1993.

**Eligibility Requirements:** State agencies, local units of government, and private nonprofit organizations with experience and expertise in the treatment of families and children are eligible for funding. Eligible organizations include tribal governments, health and mental health services, detention and corrections, aftercare and probation services, public schools, and community organizations, as well as courts, public defenders, prosecutors, judges, and law enforcement agencies. Applicants must provide written agreements from public juvenile justice agencies and human/social service agencies to collaborate in meeting the project objectives.

**Selection Criteria:** Applications will be rated by a peer review panel on the extent to which they meet the following criteria:

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (10 points)***

Applicants must clearly identify the scope of the intervention proposed in this announcement and document the problem(s) addressed as a major priority.

✓ ***Goals and Objectives. (10 points)***

Applicants must provide succinct statements demonstrating an understanding of the objectives and tasks associated with the program.

✓ ***Project Design. (30 points)***

Applicants must provide a project design that is sound and meets the goals and objectives of the program. The design must include quantitative measures reflecting the extent to which project goals and objectives will be met. Applications must clearly describe client selection criteria, treatment, and followup procedures. Program designs must detail and describe services to be provided and how they will be made available.

✓ ***Project Management. (20 points)***

Management structure, staffing, and relationships with State agencies and local entities must be adequate and appropriate to implement and complete the project successfully, efficiently, and cost-effectively. Commitments of cooperation or collaboration with other organizations must show clearly, specifically, and in writing such aspects as dollar amounts, numbers of hours, and the nature of services to be provided.

✓ ***Organizational Capability. (20 points)***

The applicant organization's ability to conduct the project must be documented in the proposed organizational experience and must be demonstrated in implementing juvenile programs. Key project staff should have significant experience in the areas addressed in this initiatives. Staff resumes should be attached.

---

✓ **Budget. (10 points)**

Applicants must provide a budget that is complete, detailed, reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the activities to be undertaken.

**Award Period:** The project period will be for 12 months.

**Award Amount:** A total of \$300,000 is available for three to six grants ranging from \$50,000 to \$100,000 each.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on June 30, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Eugene L. Rhoden, Jr., Assistant Director, Special Emphasis Division, (202) 307-1150.

## **Technical Assistance to Juvenile Corrections and Detention (The James E. Gould Memorial Program)**

**Purpose:** This program implements, in part, Section 244 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. In today's juvenile corrections and detention environment, technical assistance (TA) is of great importance in helping program and facility administrators address the critical issues facing the field. For example, the Abt Associates national study on conditions of juvenile confinement, released last year, uncovered serious problems in crowding, health care, security, and control of suicidal behavior (OJJDP, 1993). Other prevalent problems in juvenile corrections and detention facilities, such as increases in institutional population, litigation on conditions of confinement, planning and design to meet major capacity expansion, and treatment and correctional education issues can also be addressed through TA.

**Background:** In the past, OJJDP has assisted State and local jurisdictions with these issues by providing a TA capability to respond to requests for information, including experts to work with local jurisdictions to formulate responses to juvenile corrections and detention problems. OJJDP grantees have developed, conducted and provided seminars and workshops and produced monographs on the latest proven effective techniques or solutions to jurisdictions' corrections and detention problems. OJJDP grantees have also acted as a resource, offering published information on issues from managing the violent or disruptive juvenile to treatment options for correctional facilities, both institutional and community-based. These TA efforts, together with the development of formal training curricula, have been of significant benefit to the field in administering corrections and detention programs.

OJJDP has also sponsored annual forums for juvenile corrections and detention administrators. Each forum offers some 100 juvenile corrections and detention leaders an opportunity to discuss emerging national issues and problems confronting the youth service system in correctional settings and in providing detention services. Themes of past forums have included legislative action impacting State juvenile codes, results of the national conditions of confinement study, day treatment, and effective aftercare programs.

---

OJJDP will continue to offer TA to juvenile corrections and detention staff, facilities and institutions, and programs. Service providers and policymakers in these fields expect, need, and deserve continued assistance in light of continuing increases in service populations.

**Goal:** To offer a multi-year TA program to the juvenile corrections and detention field.

**Objectives:**

1. To provide TA for detention, corrections, and community residential service providers, administrators, staff, and policymakers.
2. To conduct an Annual Juvenile Corrections and Detention Forum.
3. To facilitate information exchange and increase networking among juvenile justice leaders.
4. To develop and disseminate texts, papers, monographs, and related resource materials to the juvenile justice community.
5. To develop and conduct workshops on selected topics and issues related to improving the administration of juvenile corrections and detention.

**Program Strategy:** OJJDP is soliciting innovative proposals for this competitive program. It is OJJDP's intention to fund one organization that can address the entire spectrum of objectives noted above over a 3-year project period. A mandated project design is not stated. Applicants are encouraged to submit creative proposals addressing how they would achieve program goals and objectives in a manner that offers service providers and policymakers timely information and assistance on current issues and problems confronting juvenile corrections and detention.

**Reference:**

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. *Conditions of Confinement: Juvenile Detention and Corrections Facilities*. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1993.

**Eligibility Requirements:** OJJDP invites applications from public and private agencies, institutions and organizations that can demonstrate the knowledge, experience, and capability to provide TA to the juvenile corrections and detention field. Private for-profit organizations must waive any profit or fee to be eligible for this program. Applicants must also identify a project advisory board to advise on prospective program topics and activities of importance to the field.

**Selection Criteria:** Applications will be rated on the extent to which they meet the following criteria:

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (15 Points)***

Applicants must concisely describe the problem(s) to be addressed and convey a clear understanding of the purposes, work requirements, and expected results of this project. Applicants must also demonstrate competence to deal with current problems and concerns associated with administering juvenile corrections and detention facilities, including crowding, order and safety, programming, juvenile rights, personnel, and legal issues.

✓ ***Goals and Objectives. (15 Points)***

Applicants must clearly define the goals and objectives of the project and express them in a manner consistent with the requirements described in applicant's response to the statement of the problem outlined in the previous criterion.



---

✓ ***Project Design. (25 Points)***

Applicants must relate the merits of the approach proposed in their application to the Department of Justice goals and objectives for this project and explain why this constitutes a sound and effective approach. The applicant must describe a project design that includes procedures, workplan, and tasks. Products of the project must be directly linked to the stated objectives and the issues addressed by this announcement.

✓ ***Project Management. (10 Points)***

The project's management structure and staffing must be adequate for the successful implementation and completion of the project. The management plan must describe a system whereby logistical activities are handled in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

✓ ***Organizational Capability. (20 Points)***

The applicant organization's ability to conduct the project successfully must be documented in the proposal. Organizational experience in offering TA is required. Significant experience, both in juvenile corrections and detention, is mandatory. Key project staff should have significant experience in the areas addressed in this initiative. Staff resumes should be attached.

✓ ***Budget. (15 Points)***

Applicants must provide a proposed budget that is complete, detailed, reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the activities to be undertaken.

**Award Period:** This project will be funded for 36 months, in three 12-month budget periods. Additional funding after the first budget period is dependent upon grantee performance, availability of funds, and other criteria established at the time of the award.

**Award Amount:** Up to \$200,000 is available for the first 12-month budget period of this project.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. **Note:** *In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on July 5, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Frank Porpotage II, Assistant Director, Training and Technical Assistance Division, (202) 307-5940.

---

# Public Safety

---

## Gangs and Delinquency Research

**Purpose:** To increase knowledge of how violent youth gangs contribute to serious, violent, and chronic juvenile crime.

**Background:** This program implements Part D, Sections 281, 282, and 283 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended.

In fiscal year 1994, OJJDP conducted an assessment of recent research on violent gangs to give direction to expansion of its Part D Comprehensive Gang Program. The review raised questions concerning the relationship between gang involvement and serious, violent, and chronic delinquency (Howell, 1994 and 1994a). Recent large-scale longitudinal studies of this issue in Rochester, New York and Denver, Colorado, under OJJDP's Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency indicate that, although only a small proportion of high-risk youth belong to gangs, their involvement in delinquency and violence is much higher while participating in gang activities (Esbensen and Huizinga, 1993; Thornberry et al., 1993). In both cities, youth were much more likely to be involved in violent delinquency when actively involved in a gang, but reported much lower levels of offending both before and after their gang involvement. In Denver, male gang members represented only seven percent of the sample, but accounted for 33 percent of street offenders and for over one-half of street offenses.

The 1994 Federal Bureau of Investigation *Uniform Crime Reports* indicate that 3.6 percent of all murders committed in 1992 were juvenile gang-related.

A better understanding of how gang membership contributes to serious, violent, and chronic delinquency, and especially to criminal careers, is essential to effective law enforcement and formulation of sound public policy. It is not currently known what proportion of serious and violent juvenile crime is committed by gang-involved youth versus other law-violating youth. However, it is clear that gang membership contributes significantly to the volume of serious and violent juvenile offending.

**Goal:** To develop a better understanding of the relationship of involvement in gangs to serious, violent, and chronic juvenile delinquency.

### Objectives:

1. To document the proportion of total juvenile delinquency and serious, violent, and chronic juvenile delinquency for which gang-involved youth are responsible.
2. To document the contribution of gang membership versus that of other law-violating youth groups to serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offender careers.
3. To examine the dynamics of gang membership, particularly the movement of youth in and out of gangs in relation to involvement in serious and violent delinquency.
4. To examine risk and protective factors which impact gang involvement.

**Program Strategy:** This program may initiate new studies or fund the addition of gang studies to ongoing studies of juvenile delinquency, including serious, violent, and chronic delinquency. Applicants may, therefore, take advantage of opportunities to add a gang component to existing studies.

**Products:** One final product will be developed that encompasses the three objectives of research funded by this program.

---

## References:

- Esbensen, Finn-Aage and David Huizinga, "Gangs, Drugs, and Delinquency in a Survey of Urban Youth." *Criminology* 31:565–89, 1993.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Uniform Crime Reports, 1993*. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1994.
- Howell, James C., "Recent Gang Research: Program and Policy Implications." *Crime and Delinquency* 40:495–515, 1994.
- Howell, James C., "Gangs." Fact Sheet #12. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1994a.
- Spergel, Irving. *The Youth Gang Problem*. Oxford University Press, New York: Forthcoming.
- Thornberry, Terence P., Marvin D. Krohn, Alan J. Lizotte and Deborah Chard-Wierschem, "The Role of Juvenile Gangs in Facilitating Delinquent Behavior." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30:55–87. 1993.

**Eligibility Requirements:** OJJDP invites applications from public and private agencies, institutions and organizations. Private for-profit organizations must waive any fee or profit to be eligible.

**Selection Criteria:** Applicants will be evaluated according to the selection criteria outlined in the Application and Administrative Requirements section of this publication.

**Award Period:** Up to four studies will be supported for a 12-month project period. Additional funding after the initial project period will be dependent upon grantee performance, availability of funds, and OJJDP priorities.

**Award Amount:** A total of \$500,000 is available for this program. A maximum of four awards ranging from \$100,000 to \$150,000 each will be made.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on July 20, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Elen Grigg, Research and Program Development Division, (202) 307-5929.

## Field Initiated Gang Research

**Purpose:** To encourage the development and funding of promising and innovative research programs that will contribute to our knowledge of gangs. This program offers an opportunity for support of research ideas generated in the field to address the types of issues outlined below.

**Background:** This program implements Part D, Sections 281, 282, and 283 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended.

---

OJJDP completed a review of recent gang research in order to assess current knowledge in relation to claims that gangs account for increases in juvenile violence, that they are spreading, and that they have become extensively involved in drug trafficking (Howell, 1994, 1994a). In the course of this review, a number of important research issues were identified.

Distinguishing true gangs from other collective youth groups is a research priority. Much group delinquency appears to be erroneously labeled as violent gang delinquency. Are nonviolent gangs identifiable? How are they characterized? Do youth graduate from group delinquency to gang membership? Do small groups or cliques often join gangs?

How are different types of gangs distinguished? How do they vary by geographical location? What proportion of members are juveniles or adults in the different gang types? What distinguishes juvenile from young adult gangs? How does gang formation relate to community characteristics?

Why do youth join gangs? Have the reasons changed over the decades? What factors distinguish transitory from stable members? Why do youth leave gangs after memberships as brief as 1 year? Is the recruitment stage the most propitious intervention point?

What are the major motives for gang crimes? Honor? Turf defense? Drug turf? Control? Economic gain? How are violence motives related to neighborhood characteristics, including population composition?

Why are gang problems increasing, generally? Why are we seeing increasing problems in some large cities but not in others? What factors are related to the ebb and flow of gangs and to the formation of gangs in new communities?

To what extent are gangs involved in drug trafficking? Is this involvement largely gang members acting on their own, apart from their gang membership? Does drug trafficking often involve cliques within gangs? Do former gang members often graduate from gangs to drug trafficking?

For the purposes of Part D and this research, gang members include individuals less than 22 years old (Sec. 283).

**Goal:** To increase knowledge of youth gangs in general, gang-involvement, and the relationship of gang participation to other group formations.

**Objectives:**

1. To support innovative research programs in the youth gang field.
2. To encourage research on new and emerging youth gang issues.
3. To develop knowledge that will lead to new techniques, approaches, and methods related to delinquency prevention, the juvenile justice system, and violent delinquency reduction related to gangs.

**Program Strategy:** Through the Field Initiated Research Program, OJJDP actively solicits innovative research proposals. Proposed research must address current issues and problems in the area of youth gangs. Proposals should define the problem to be addressed and describe the research design and methods to be employed. Potential benefits of the research should be described. Through a competitive process, all applications will be subjected to peer review.

**Products:** Interim products may be specified. At a minimum, a final report will be required of each project.

---

**References:**

- Howell, James C., "Recent Gang Research: Program and Policy Implications." *Crime and Delinquency*, 40:495–515, 1994.
- Howell, James C., "Gangs." Fact Sheet 12. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1994a.

**Eligibility Requirements:** Applications are invited from public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions. Private for-profit organizations must waive any fee or profit to be eligible.

**Selection Criteria:** Applicants will be evaluated according to the selection criteria outlined in the Application and Administrative Requirements section of this publication.

**Award Period:** Grant awards will be for a period of up to 18 months. Consideration will be given to longitudinal studies.

**Award Amount:** A total of \$300,000 is available for this program. A maximum of three awards ranging from \$75,000 to \$125,000 each will be made.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on June 20, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Elen Grigg, Program Manager, Research and Program Development Division, (202) 307–5929.

## Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court Studies

**Purpose:** To develop a better understanding of the processes by which juveniles are transferred to criminal court and the comparative effectiveness of criminal justice system handling of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders with juvenile justice system processing. This research is expected to provide legislatures and policymakers with empirical information on how juveniles get to criminal court and what happens to them under various transfer mechanisms in terms of court processing, case dispositions, and outcomes. The comparative effectiveness of different processing options for protecting public safety and reducing subsequent recidivism is of particular interest.

**Background:** This program implements Section 243(a)(7)(C) and (14) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended, which authorizes the Administrator to examine treatment of juveniles processed in the criminal justice system and to collect, analyze, compile, publish, and disseminate uniform national statistics concerning the processing and treatment of such juveniles who are treated as delinquents or as adults. This program will compare the results of treatment in the juvenile and criminal systems and assist OJJDP in the development of national statistics on juveniles in the criminal system by serving as pilot studies for a larger developmental effort.

---

While much activity is taking place in State legislatures to change the mechanisms (i.e., criteria and decision point [judge, prosecutor, legislature]) for the prosecution of juveniles in criminal court, very little evaluative research exists to guide such legislative change. As of 1993, 28 States had at their disposal at least two of three mechanisms for transferring juveniles to criminal court for prosecution, including judicial waiver (e.g., remand, certification), prosecutorial discretion (e.g., direct file, concurrent jurisdiction), and statutory exclusions (e.g., offenses excluded from juvenile court jurisdiction, generally for juveniles over a specified age). Three States have statutory provisions for all three methods, and at least 18 States were considering additional legislation in these areas during the 1994 legislative session.

Related statutory provisions in some States target serious, violent, or chronic juvenile offenders by creating an official record that will follow them into the criminal system and/or by making provision for enhanced commitments by the juvenile court. Pennsylvania, Kansas, Colorado, and Texas have enacted enhanced commitments. The Texas law, for example, gives the juvenile court authority to exercise criminal jurisdiction and sentence juveniles to 30 years in prison for aggravated felonies, the criminal sentence to begin once the juvenile reaches age 18.

Adding to the complexity of the matter, once new statutory provisions are enacted, considerable discretion is often left to prosecutors and judges regarding where to file and how to choose among various dispositional options. In addition, in some jurisdictions, either through legislation or agency procedures, judges and correctional officials have available a range of both juvenile and adult correctional sanctions for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders who have been adjudicated delinquent and/or convicted criminally. This blending of sanctions may be strictly age-based (e.g. when a juvenile reaches a certain age, she/he is transferred to adult prison). Another variation involves provision of a conditional sentence that offers a "last chance" for rehabilitation in the juvenile justice system, with the threat of criminal conviction being entered along with a prison sentence for failure to complete a juvenile treatment program. Other States have created separate youthful-offender institutions for juveniles adjudicated delinquent for serious or violent crimes or convicted and sentenced criminally under youthful-offender statutes. The extent to which these transfer options are being used and the effectiveness of these various policy options is not yet known.

Pursuant to the 1992 Amendments to the JJDP Act, the General Accounting Office (GAO) undertook a study of juvenile waivers to criminal court. GAO's report confirmed that very little data are currently available, even at the court level, that would be useful to policymakers and legislatures in their deliberations on the issue of waivers and transfer of juveniles.

What is known about criminal court handling of juveniles? The first issue concerns the offense characteristics of juveniles transferred to criminal court. Are these juveniles the most serious and violent offenders (i.e., the juveniles who present the most significant threat to the public safety)?

A number of studies have examined the offense characteristics of juveniles transferred to criminal court. Many of these studies show that most transferred juveniles had committed a property offense (Bishop, Frazier, and Henretta, 1989; Bortner, 1986; Champion, 1989; Fagan and Deschenes, 1990; Gillespie and Norman, 1984; Greenwood, 1986; Hamparian et al., 1982; Heuser, 1985; Houghtalin and Mays, 1991; Nimick, Szymanski and Snyder, 1986; and Thomas and Bilchik, 1985). Other studies have focused on seriousness and chronicity and dispositional outcomes of these cases. Poulos and Orchowsky (1994) found that those transferred by judicial waivers in Virginia tended to be older, more serious offenders, with a prior record and commitment history, except in metropolitan areas of the State. Eigen (1981) found that juvenile robbery offenders transferred to criminal court in Philadelphia were more likely to have used a gun in their offense than those not transferred. Rudman, Hartstone, Fagan, and Moore (1986) found that three-fourths of the transferred and convicted juveniles in Boston, Newark, and Phoenix were sentenced to prison.

---

The second issue concerns the outcome of criminal court management of juveniles. Few studies have been conducted in this area. White (1985) compared the outcomes of cases involving juveniles charged with dangerous offenses (e.g., murder, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, and burglary) in the juvenile justice system with similar cases against young defendants in the criminal justice system. He found that criminal courts were slightly more likely to find offenders guilty and more than twice as likely to incarcerate the young adults. Confined young adults served considerably more time in adult prisons than juveniles in reformatories, and the rate of recidivism among young adults was 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> times more than juveniles.

Snyder and Hutzler (1981) compared the flow of 1,000 adult felony cases through the criminal system and 1,000 serious (*Uniform Crime Reports, Part I*) juvenile offenders over 15 years old through the juvenile court system. They found that the more serious the presenting offense and the more prior delinquency referrals, the more likely a juvenile would be waived to criminal court, or, if adjudicated delinquent, subsequently institutionalized. Although the juvenile court was less likely to incarcerate, it was much more likely to impose some sanction or supervision on persons over 15 years old who had been referred for serious offenses than the criminal court on adults referred for felonies.

Fagan (1991) and his colleagues (Fagan, Forst, and Vivona, 1987; Rudman, Hartstone, Fagan, and Moore, 1986) conducted the most rigorous comparative studies to date in their examination of the severity and effectiveness of juvenile and criminal court sanctions for adolescent felony offenders arrested for robbery and burglary in matched counties of adjacent States where the offenders were transferred to the juvenile justice or adult systems because of different legislative requirements. The results showed that sanctions were more certain and about as severe in juvenile court as in criminal court. While no differences in recidivism rates for juveniles charged with burglary were found based on the court of jurisdiction, for those initially charged with robbery, recidivism rates were lower for juveniles sanctioned in the juvenile court. These youth were rearrested less often and after a longer arrest free interval.

Singer (1994) evaluated New York State's Juvenile Offender (JO) law that couples excluded offenses with transfer of some youth back to juvenile court. This designated offender law is intended to make the offense rather than the offender the main criteria in sentencing decisions. Singer found that New York's JO law fails to eliminate individualized justice. Personal characteristics, such as parental sponsorship, proved important in dispositional decisionmaking. The seriousness of the offenses for which youth were arrested, the probability of conviction in criminal court or removal to juvenile court, and the length of their sentences was directly related to the county in which they were processed. Practical fiscal considerations were also important in juvenile-versus-adult determination. Overall, the exclusion of serious offenses, combined with dismissals and transfers back to the juvenile justice system, resulted in an imprisonment rate of about seven to nine percent for serious juvenile offenders.

Thomas and Bilchik (1985) examined Dade County, Florida, cases transferred to criminal court jurisdiction in 1981 to see whether juveniles were receiving less than appropriate sanctions or exceedingly harsh adult sanctions. Sixty-five percent of the cases were direct files, 30 percent were judicial waivers, and the remainder were grand jury indictments. Formal charges were filed in 85 percent of these cases. Among these, 90 percent were found guilty. Among those found guilty, 67 were sentenced to a term of imprisonment, the median length of which was 4 years.

The studies conducted to date on transfers of juveniles to criminal courts have produced mixed results. Which transfer mechanisms best assure the public safety and reduce recidivism of young offenders are unclear. It is clear, however, from this review that we do not have research based on current data on what is happening in relation to the transfer of juveniles to criminal courts to be able to formulate policies in this area. Nevertheless, States are experimenting with a variety of methods of transfer and sentencing of juvenile offenders in the criminal court.

**Goal:** To develop an information base to assist policymakers and legislators in decisionmaking about how juvenile and criminal justice systems can better manage serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders.

---

---

## Objectives:

1. To identify gaps in current knowledge regarding criminal justice system management of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders.
2. To plan multijurisdictional studies of the transfer process and its outcomes, which allow for crossjurisdictional comparisons.
3. To identify the most cost-effective methods of managing serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders to ensure the public safety.

**Program Strategy:** Two awards will be made under this solicitation. The first will compare juvenile and criminal justice system management of juveniles. This comparison might be made, for example, among a State that allows only judicial waiver of juvenile offenders, a State that allows concurrent jurisdiction, and a State that mandates criminal court handling for specified categories of offenders. The comparison would look at variations in treatment of juveniles within those States. The second study will evaluate an innovative system of blending juvenile and criminal justice system approaches in managing dangerous juvenile offenders.

Successful applicants will provide information from their studies to the OJP collaboration team. This team, consisting of OJJDP, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), will work collaboratively with interested State and local officials to plan and implement multijurisdictional studies of the transfer process and its outcomes and will design a plan for statistical data collection regarding transfers of juveniles to the criminal justice system.

**Products:** Products will include a research report providing the first year results and recommending further research.

## References:

- Bishop, Donna M., Charles E. Frazier, and John C. Henretta, "Prosecutorial Waiver: Case Study of a Questionable Reform." *Crime and Delinquency* 35:179–201: 1989.
- Bortner, M.A., "Traditional Rhetoric, Organizational Realities: Remand of Juveniles to Adult Court." *Crime and Delinquency* 32:53–73: 1986.
- Champion, Dean J., "Teenage Felons and Waiver Hearings: Some Recent Trends, 1980–88." *Crime and Delinquency* 35:577–88: 1989.
- Eigen, Joel P., "The Determinants and Impact of Jurisdictional Transfer in Philadelphia." Cited in *Major Issues in Juvenile Justice Information and Training: Readings in Public Policy*, J.C. Hall, D.M. Hamparian, J.M. Pettibone, and J.L. White, eds. Academy for Contemporary Problems, Columbus, OH: 1981.
- Fagan, Jeffrey A. *The Comparative Impacts of Juvenile and Criminal Court Sanctions for Adolescent Felony Offenders. Certainty, Severity, and Effectiveness of Legal Intervention*. National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC: 1991.
- Fagan, Jeffrey A., Martin Forst, and T. Scott Vivona. "Racial Determinants of the Judicial Transfer Decision: Prosecuting Violent Youth in Criminal Court." *Crime and Delinquency* 33:259–86: 1990.
- Greenwood, Peter W., "Differences in Criminal Behavior and Court Responses Among Juvenile and Young Adult Defendants." Cited in *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, vol. 7, M. Tonry and N. Morris, eds. University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 1986.
- Hamparian, Donna, Linda Estep, Susan Muntean, Roamon Priestino, Robert Swisher, Paul Wallace, and Joseph White. *Youth in Adult Courts: Between Two Worlds*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1980.



- 
- Heuser, James P. *Juveniles Arrested for Serious Felony Crimes in Oregon and "Remanded" to Adult Criminal Courts: A Statistical Study*. Oregon Department of Justice Crime Analysis Center, Salem, OR: 1985.
  - Houghtalin, Marilyn and G. Larry Mays, "Criminal Dispositions of New Mexico Juveniles Transferred to Adult Court." *Crime and Delinquency* 37:393-407: 1991.
  - Nimick, Ellen H., Linda Szymanski, and Howard N. Snyder. *Juvenile Court Waiver: A Study of Juvenile Court Cases Transferred to Criminal Court*. National Center for Juvenile Justice, Pittsburgh: 1986.
  - Poulos, Tammy M. and Stan Orchowsky, "Serious Juvenile Offenders: Predicting the Probability of Transfer to Criminal Court." *Crime and Delinquency* 40:3-17: 1994.
  - Rudman, Cary, Eliot Hartstone, Jeffrey Fagan, and Melinda Moore, "Violent Youth in Adult Court: Process and Punishment." *Crime and Delinquency* 32:75-96: 1986.
  - Singer, Simon I. *The Case Processing of Juvenile Offenders in Criminal Court and Legislative Waiver in New York State*. Report to the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1994.
  - Snyder, H., and J. Hunter. *The Serious Juvenile Offender: The Scope of the Problem and the Response of the Juvenile Courts*. National Center for Juvenile Justice, Pittsburgh, PA: 1981.
  - Thomas, Charles W. and Shay Bilchik. "Prosecuting Juveniles in Criminal Courts: A Legal and Empirical Analysis." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 76:439-79: 1985.
  - White, Joseph. *The Comparative Dispositions Study*. Report to the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC: 1985.

**Eligibility Requirements:** OJJDP invites applications from public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions. Private for-profit organizations must waive any fee or profit to be eligible.

**Selection Criteria:** Applicants will be evaluated according to the selection criteria outlined in the Application and Administrative Requirements section of this publication.

**Award Period:** Two awards will be made under this program, each for a project period of 12 months. Additional funding beyond the initial project period is dependent upon grantee performance, the availability of funds, and OJJDP priorities.

**Award Amount:** A total of \$275,000 is available for this program. Two awards will be made. A maximum of \$150,000 for any one award will be made for the conduct of these studies.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. **Note:** *In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on July 20, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Barbara Allen-Hagen, Program Manager, Research and Program Development Division, (202) 307-5929.

---

---

## Gangs, Groups, Individuals, and Violence Intervention

**Purpose:** To conduct a systematic review, assessment, and synthesis of existing research and program evaluations on serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders, with a particular focus on gang-involved youth.

**Background:** This program implements Part D, Sections 281, 282, and 283 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. OJJDP has developed a *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* that outlines prevention and intervention strategies and treatment programs designed to reduce juvenile offending (Wilson and Howell, 1993). In fiscal year 1994, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and Developmental and Research Programs, Inc., began a nationwide review to identify effective and promising programs for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders consistent with the *Comprehensive Strategy*. The products of this review will be published in late May 1995 by OJJDP in a *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (Howell, forthcoming).

To further refine the *Comprehensive Strategy*, additional review of research and treatment programs is needed. Although the accumulated body of knowledge contained in the *Comprehensive Strategy* and the *Guide* provides a blueprint for successful delinquency prevention, intervention, and graduated sanctions, additional knowledge can be synthesized to guide even more effective interventions.

First, a review and synthesis of empirical research on the causes and correlates of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offending is needed to identify key points in the development of juvenile offending careers. This review would be guided by a criminal career model consisting of onset, acceleration, maintenance, and desistance elements, and would identify major age-based transitions in juvenile offending careers.

Particular attention must be given to the contribution gang participation makes to violent and chronic juvenile offending. Several studies have documented an increase in serious and violent offending by juveniles when they are members of gangs (Esbensen and Huizinga, 1993; Rand, 1987; Tracy, 1987; Thornberry et al., 1993). However, we lack a clear understanding of the relationship between gang participation and serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offending careers and adult criminal careers.

Second, further review of effective intervention and treatment programs is needed to determine the most propitious intervention points in the juvenile justice system process and the most effective intervention strategies for juveniles at varying ages. This review would be guided by a juvenile justice system model, including other systems that are pertinent to early intervention and treatment, such as the school, mental health, and child and family welfare systems.

Third, these reviews must be linked to determine which programs work best, whom they should target, and under what conditions they are most effective.

Fourth, policy and program implications for OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy* must be drawn.

**Goal:** To refine OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* by identifying which programs work best, whom they should target, and under what conditions they are most effective.

### Objectives:

1. To review and synthesize empirical research on the causes and correlates of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offending.
2. To review effective intervention and treatment programs to determine the most propitious intervention points in the juvenile justice system process, and to identify the most effective intervention strategies for juveniles at varying ages.

- 
3. To specify the target groups for whom specific program types are most effective, the intervention points in the juvenile justice system at which programs are most effective, and the intervention points in the development of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offender careers at which programs will have the greatest impact.
  4. To delineate policy and program implications for OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy*.

**Program Strategy:** A study group shall be convened by the grantee to carry out the above reviews. Members of the study group will be responsible for guiding and participating in the overall conduct of the reviews. Review papers may be commissioned, including meta-analyses, to summarize the state-of-the-art in each review area. The grantee will be responsible for the final product.

**OJP Program Coordination:** The results of this program will be of interest to other OJP agencies addressing serious, violent, and chronic offender careers. The results also will be shared with NIJ through the interagency coordination mechanism established by OJJDP and NIJ, and with the OJP Gangs Working Group.

**Products:**

1. Three interim products will be produced:
  - a. A synthesis of empirical research on the causes and correlates of juvenile offending, including a focus on serious, violent, and chronic offenders.
  - b. Advantageous intervention points in the juvenile justice system in the careers of juvenile offenders, including a focus on serious, violent and chronic offenders.
  - c. What works best for juvenile offenders, and under what conditions, including serious, violent, and chronic offenders.
2. The final product will include the interim products above as well as delineation of policy and program implications for OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy*.

**References:**

- Esbensen, Finn-Aage, and David Huizinga, "Gangs, Drugs, and Delinquency in a Survey of Urban Youth." *Criminology* 31:565–89, 1993.
- Howell, James C., Ed. *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: Forthcoming.
- Rand, Alice, "Transitional Life Events and Desistance from Delinquency and Crime." In *From Boy to Man, From Delinquency to Crime*, M.E. Wolfgang, T. Thornberry, and R. Figlio, eds. University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 1987.
- Thornberry, Terence P., Marvin D. Krohn, Alan J. Lizotte and Deborah Chard-Wierschem, "The Role of Juvenile Gangs in Facilitating Delinquent Behavior." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30:55–87, 1993.
- Tracy, Paul E., "Race and Class Differences in Official and Self-Reported Delinquency." In *From Boy to Man, From Delinquency to Crime*, M.E. Wolfgang, T. Thornberry, and R. Figlio, eds. University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 1987.
- Wilson, John J., and James C. Howell. *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC: 1993.

**Eligibility Requirements:** Applications are invited from public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions. Private for-profit organizations must waive any fee or profit to be eligible.

---

**Selection Criteria:** Applicants will be evaluated according to the selection criteria outlined in the Application and Administrative Requirements section of this publication.

**Award Period:** OJJDP will award a single grant for a period of 12 months. No additional funding is anticipated.

**Award Amount:** The amount of the award is not to exceed \$250,000.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on July 11, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Joan Hurley, Acting Director, Research and Program Development Division, (202) 307-5929.

---

---

# Delinquency Prevention

---

## Innovative Approaches in Law-Related Education

**Purpose:** To develop promising, innovative ideas for the delivery of law-related education.

**Background:** This program implements Sections 261(a)(7) and 299(e) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended. Law-related education (LRE) was originally designed as a specific curriculum for elementary and secondary schools and has been used in schools throughout the country in various forms since 1975. LRE programs have been funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) since 1984. Through LRE, students develop insights that promote social responsibility, reaffirm the fundamental values of right and wrong, and inspire a commitment to good citizenship. LRE programs have helped students develop the knowledge, skills, understanding, and attitudes necessary to function effectively in a pluralistic, democratic society that is based on the rule of law.

Although OJJDP and the U.S. Department of Education have provided substantial Federal assistance for LRE, many imaginative and innovative LRE teaching approaches have not had the opportunity to be demonstrated. Through this program, OJJDP seeks innovative proposals that address efforts to prevent delinquency through the delivery of innovative LRE services by both researchers and practitioners.

**Goal:** To support projects that advance the practices of law-related education and that support the prevention of delinquency in or out of the classroom.

### Objectives:

1. To promote and support innovative research, development, demonstration, or training programs in law-related education.
2. To develop new techniques or methods for delivery of LRE and to encourage new approaches for focusing LRE on delinquency prevention in a range of youth services settings.

**Program Strategy:** OJJDP solicits concept papers that address the goals and objectives of this competitive program. OJJDP will select the most promising concept papers submitted and invite full applications for those ideas most relevant to the delivery of LRE in support of delinquency prevention. A mandated program strategy is not stated. However, certain elements must be included in the proposal's project design to meet the objectives of this solicitation.

- Extensive interaction among students/participants.
- Realistic content that includes balanced treatment of case studies and issues.
- Use of outside resource persons.
- Strong support from educators.
- The inclusion or development of curriculums that take into account the comprehension levels of youth involved, including a range of innovative teaching aids (e.g., the curriculum may be presented using the latest technological tools).

The second mandatory element is a written statement that the grantee will work cooperatively with other LRE grantees in this program, including the five OJJDP grantees that make up the National Training and Dissemination Program, Youth for Justice. They include: American Bar Association; Center for Civic Education; Constitutional Rights Foundation; National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law; and Phi Alpha Delta national legal fraternity.

---

**Products:** Grantees must submit written products documenting their activity to OJJDP. Depending on the project activity, these products could include:

1. LRE curriculums developed under this project.
2. Research findings or assessment reports of demonstration projects.
3. Training, technical assistance, and marketing materials developed during the course of the project.
4. Quarterly progress reports regarding project activities.

**Concept Papers:** Interested, eligible parties should submit a concept paper of no more than five 8 1/2– by 11–inch double-spaced, type-written pages in standard 10 or 12 point font on one side of the paper. The concept paper must address the goals and objectives of this program, as stated above. OJJDP will select the most promising ideas submitted and invite full applications. Concept papers will be judged by the relevance of the proposed approach to delinquency prevention, a determination of their uniqueness (i.e., an innovative approach in terms of method(s), audience, and curriculum content), and the proposed project design. Parties that are not selected will be notified in writing.

**Eligibility Requirements:** Concept papers are invited from public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions and organizations that can demonstrate experience in LRE and the capability to undertake activities related to this solicitation. Pursuant to Section 299(e) of the JJDP Act, the five grantees currently awarded OJJDP funds for the Youth for Justice Program are ineligible for these funds. In addition, prior grantees awarded funds under this initiative are ineligible to receive funds to continue the same approach.

**Selection Criteria:** As noted above, OJJDP will invite full applications from those submitting the most promising concept papers. Full applications will be rated by a peer review panel on the extent to which they meet the following criteria:

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (15 Points)***

Applicants must clearly state the problem addressed by the project and the issues relevant to current LRE practices and OJJDP priorities in delinquency prevention.

✓ ***Goals and Objectives. (15 Points)***

Applicants must provide succinct statements that demonstrate an understanding of the objectives and tasks associated with the project. Objectives must be clear and measurable.

✓ ***Project Design. (25 Points)***

Applicants must present a project design that is sound and constitutes an effective approach to meeting the goals and objectives of this program. The design must include a detailed workplan with timelines for each significant goal and program elements that are directly linked to the achievement of the project.

✓ ***Project Management. (10 Points)***

The project's management structure and staffing are adequate to successfully implement and complete the project. The management plan describes a system whereby logistical activities are handled efficiently and economically. Relationships with cooperating organizations are formally established in writing.

✓ ***Organizational Capability. (20 Points)***

Applicants must document evidence of their ability to conduct the project successfully. Organizational experience with youth in the juvenile justice system and LRE is highly recommended. Key project staff must have significant experience in the subject areas addressed in this announcement. Staff resumes should be attached.

---

✓ **Budget. (15 Points)**

Applicants must provide a budget that is reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the activities proposed.

**Award Period:** Grantees selected will be funded for 12 months. No additional funding is anticipated.

**Award Amount:** A total of \$600,000 is available for up to six projects to be funded under this program. Individual applications may not exceed \$150,000.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Dates:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and four copies of their concept paper package is received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on June 20, 1995. OJJDP will review the concept papers and invite selected applicants to submit full applications for competitive award. OJJDP will notify applicants in writing within 21 days after the concept paper submission deadline date. The original and five copies of full applications must be received by mail or delivered within 45 days of the date of the written notification.

**Contact:** For further information contact Dr. Robert Lewis, Program Manager, Training and Technical Assistance Division, (202) 307-5940.

## Pathways to Success

**Purpose:** To prevent juvenile delinquency and other behavior problems related to delinquency through the implementation and promotion of vocational skills, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education programs during nonschool hours (including weekends) and in the summer.

**Background:** This program implements Section 261(a)(5) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, and is jointly funded by OJJDP, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mortimer (1994) reports that adolescents are at greater risk today, and that more adolescents are experimenting with drugs at younger ages, especially before age 15. Seventy-seven percent of eighth graders report having used alcohol, and 27 percent report having five or more drinks on one occasion within a 2-week period. Adolescents are sexually active at younger ages with about 30 percent reporting sexual intercourse by age 15 and 60 percent reporting that they did not use any contraception at first intercourse. The percentage of births to unmarried adolescent girls has risen from 14 percent in 1940 to 69 percent in 1991. Similarly, suicide rates have increased 75 percent among 10-14 year olds and 34½ percent among 15-19 year olds between 1979 and 1988. Additionally, the school dropout rate for our youth is among the highest in all industrialized nations and is particularly acute among African-Americans, Native Americans, and Latino-Americans living in poverty.

Studies about young adolescents' use of time show that 20 million youth spend 40 percent of their waking hours outside school (Mortimer, 1994). These out-of-school hours present both risk and opportunity. However, the Carnegie study points out that time spent alone is not the crucial contributor to high risk, but, in fact, it is what youth do during that time and where and with whom that leads to positive or negative consequences.

---

Vocational skills, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education programs during nonschool hours offer many opportunities for youth to socialize with peers and adults, to gain knowledge and skills that provide pathways to success, to contribute to the community, to belong to a valued group, and to feel competent (Mortimer, 1994).

These programs provide learning opportunities that replace destructive alternatives and create a climate of high expectations and respect for quality and work. These programs can also provide opportunities for parental involvement and linkages to other community resources.

Additionally, these alternative learning methods benefit youth who have difficulty learning by traditional methods and provide opportunities for them to gain hands-on practice of the theories and information learned in the school setting. Similarly, summer programs can extend learning from the school year to increase knowledge retention.

Extensive research shows that when youth are provided with safe places to engage in meaningful activities and opportunities to spend time with adults learning a variety of job oriented and social skills, students begin to see potential within themselves, understand the importance of completing their education, and make connections in the community as they become productive citizens. Several studies have suggested that programs designed to change the roles of at-risk youth in the community and increase their motivation toward prosocial behavior can be at least moderately effective in reducing serious antisocial behavior. A critical aspect of the effectiveness of such interventions seems to be that they are provided as part of a larger scale focus that promotes community development (Tolan and Guerra, 1994).

**Goal:** To prevent juvenile delinquency and other behavior problems such as substance abuse, teen pregnancy, school dropout, and violence, by providing opportunities for juveniles to gain skills that provide them with pathways to be successful academically and vocationally.

**Objectives:**

1. To provide at-risk juveniles with a variety of age-appropriate programs in the vocational, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education fields that allow them to build on existing strengths and develop new skills.
2. To provide and promote coordinated, collaborative prevention efforts that target at-risk youth.

**Program Strategy:** OJJDP invites applications from public and private nonprofit community-based agencies, institutions and organizations that have or are developing comprehensive, collaborative, and coordinated strategies for afterschool, weekend, and summer programs in vocational training, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education. Prospective applicants are not required to cover the full year or the full range of programs, but may do so if they wish. Examples of programs include arts education projects such as murals or mosaic structures as part of a community beautification effort; live theater performance focusing on conflict resolution skills; computer graphics; and working with youth to develop business plans to market products they have created or skills they have developed, such as carpentry or landscaping.

Program designs should provide an additional link to existing community services and should address as many needs and strengths as possible. When linked to existing programs and activities, the proposed activities should contribute to the development of a service continuum or continuum of care for youth at risk of delinquency. Applicants are given broad flexibility to design a program most relevant and needed for their community.

Applicants must describe their strategy for establishing or expanding an afterschool, weekend, and/or summer program for at-risk youth ages 6–18. However, the program should be age-appropriate and does not need to serve the full age-range.

- The identified target population, including age, gender, ethnicity, and characteristics that indicate risk, should be clearly defined.



- 
- A comprehensive strategy designed to reduce risks and build protective factors in the lives of at risk youth through one or more of the following areas: vocational skills training, entrepreneurship, recreation, and arts education should be identified. The strategy should also include a vision statement with identified goals and objectives. Objectives should be quantified and measurable.
  - Applicants should provide clear evidence that proposed activities are appropriate for the targeted population. The program design must be culturally relevant to the target community, and activities should be integrated into and utilize the community as much as possible, including meaningful parent involvement.
  - Commitments to collaborate by leveraging funds, in-kind services, equipment, or other resources should be described, and evidence of collaboration and commitment, particularly through the inclusion of written documentation, should be provided.
  - A lasting benefit to the community and the youth who participate should be identified and described (i.e., activities that will last beyond the program funding cycle and will contribute to the community and/or provide skills to youth).
  - Plans should be described to sustain the program beyond the funding cycle by leveraging resources, demonstrating an ability to access additional funding, and/or adoption into an existing community program that can maintain the afterschool, weekend, and summer programs' missions.
  - An evaluation should be in place, including quantitative outcomes and performance measures that will enable the applicant to measure progress toward the outcomes, and data collection mechanisms for gathering pre- and post-data, school achievement and attendance data, probation reports or other relevant indicators.

#### References:

- Development Research and Programs, Inc., "Communities That Care: Risk-Focused Prevention Using the Social Development Strategy." Seattle, WA: 1993. [Available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, 1-800-638-8736].
- Mortimer, Allyn M., "Consultation on Afterschool Programs." Carnegie Corporation, NY: 1994.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, "The Prevention of Youth Violence: A Framework for Community Action." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA: 1993.
- National Commission on Children. *Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families*. U.S Government Printing Office, Washington, DC: 1993.
- Schorr, L. *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage*. Doubleday Press, New York, NY: 1989.
- Tolan, P. and Guerra, N., "What Works in Reducing Adolescent Violence: An Empirical Review of the Field." The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO: July 1994.

**Concept Papers:** Interested, eligible parties should submit a concept paper of no more than five 8 1/2- by 11-inch double-spaced, type-written pages in a standard 10 or 12 point font on one side of the paper. Applicants may submit materials in the appendixes that demonstrate a capacity to carry out the scope of work described. The concept paper must address the goals and objectives of this program, as stated above. OJJDP will select the most promising ideas submitted and invite up to 15 full applications. Parties not selected will be notified in writing.

Concept papers will be judged on the proposed approach's relevance to delinquency prevention, uniqueness, innovativeness, and the quality of proposed project design. Concept papers will also be judged on organizational capacity, the applicant's ability to coordinate and leverage resources and existing services in the community, and sustain the project beyond the limit of this solicitation. Selection criteria for concept papers also includes the selection criteria described below for full applications. However, the level of detail should be appropriately modified to meet the page limit requirement set forth above.

---

**Eligibility Requirements:** OJJDP invites concept papers from public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals who can demonstrate the experience and capability to undertake activities related to this solicitation. Those submitting concept papers must demonstrate current coordinated and collaborative efforts related to the project or a strong written commitment to collaborate for purposes of this solicitation. Examples of this commitment and strong evidence of partnership and collaboration might include a chart of program resources listing the amount of funds being committed, the purpose of the commitment, the duration of the commitment, memorandum of understanding, or other formal partnership commitments. These materials should be submitted as appendixes.

**Selection Criteria:** As noted above, OJJDP will invite up to 15 full applications from those submitting the most promising concept papers. Full applications will be rated by a peer review panel based on the extent to which applications meet the following criteria.

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (20 points)***

Applicants must provide a clear description of a risk-focused community assessment that also addresses community strengths.

✓ ***Goals and Objectives. (20 points)***

Applicants must provide succinct statements demonstrating an understanding of the goals, objectives, and tasks associated with the project. Objectives must be quantifiable and measurable. Applicants must convey a clear understanding of the purpose, work, and expected results of the project.

✓ ***Project Design. (20 points)***

Applicants must clearly describe program activities that are culturally relevant and engage both community and parent participation. Establishment or existence of evaluation infrastructure should be clearly demonstrated, including products such as data collection tools. The project design must clearly relate to the goals and objectives for this project and contain elements that are clearly linked to the successful implementation of the project.

✓ ***Project Management. (15 points)***

In addition to the basic project management structure, applicants should specifically describe coordination and collaboration efforts related to the project. Preference points will be given to those applicants that can clearly demonstrate existing efforts through memoranda of understanding, interagency agreements, coordination meeting minutes, letters of commitment with specified arrangements, and other formal commitments of bona fide partnership (e.g., collapsed funding streams, wrap-around services, multiservice centers, and procedures for service coordination). These documents may be attached as appendixes. However, the collaborative relationship must be clearly described within the application.

✓ ***Organizational Capability. (15 points)***

In addition to describing and demonstrating organizational capability, applicants must address the capability to access additional funds as well as plans for sustaining the program beyond the funding cycle for this project. Staff resumes should be attached.

✓ ***Budget. (10 points)***

Applicants must provide a proposed budget that is complete, detailed, reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective for the activities to be undertaken. Preference points will be given to applicants who demonstrate that grant funds will be leveraged for the purpose of this project including the specification of firm dollar commitments and/or in-kind resources.

---

Applications are limited to no more than 25 doubled-spaced pages in standard 10 or 12 point font. Applicants are not required to count Federal application forms as part of the 25–page maximum. However, all six of the selection criteria must be addressed within the 25–page proposal. Applicants may submit examples, such as work products, job descriptions, and brochures, to demonstrate a capacity to carry out the scope of work described in this solicitation in appendixes. Applicants are also encouraged to submit materials in the appendixes that demonstrate active and existing collaboration activity as well as firm letters of commitment with specified in-kind and dollar amounts of contribution.

**Award Period:** The project period will be 24 months.

**Award Amount:** A total of \$250,000 is available for an initial 12–month budget period for up to five projects to be selected for grant awards under this program. At least one of the funded applications will be an arts education project. Individual application budgets may not exceed \$50,000 for each 12–month budget period. Second year funding is dependent upon grantee performance, availability of funds, and other criteria established at the time of award.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Dates:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and four copies their concept paper package is received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on June 20, 1995. OJJDP will review the concept papers and invite selected applicants to submit full applications for competitive award. OJJDP will notify applicants in writing within 21 days after the concept paper submission deadline date. The original and five copies of full applications must be received by mail or delivered within 45 days of the date of the written notification.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Kristen Kracke, Program Manager, Special Emphasis Division, (202) 307–5914.

## **Training and Technical Assistance for Family Strengthening Programs**

**Purpose:** To provide training and technical assistance (TA) to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions and organizations in order to implement or improve family strengthening program models as part of community-wide efforts to prevent delinquency and reduce violence.

**Background:** This project implements Section 244 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended, which authorizes the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to provide training and TA to support delinquency prevention programs. Current research links family malfunctioning and inadequacies to juvenile delinquency. The evidence suggests that programs with a family focus impact positively on preventive or rehabilitative efforts directed at individual youth (McMahon, 1987). An effective family strengthening program provides intervention, working with a child and parent caretaker and/or other family members, to reduce risk and/or increase protective factors for problem behaviors (Kumpfer, 1993).

A great need exists for additional and more effective family strengthening programs throughout the country. To meet this need, program expansion and improvement requires personnel training in program service skills and expert assistance with program development and operation. OJJDP seeks to develop the family strengthening program area as part of improving the juvenile justice and youth services delivery systems.

---

In order to ensure optimum success of the family strengthening programs to be developed or enhanced under this project, training and TA resources will provide local program support as a part of communitywide efforts to prevent delinquency and reduce violence. To maximize program success, training and TA will be offered in several selected, effective family strengthening program models for programs identifying unique youth/family problems. These models may encompass family preservation, family skills training, crisis intervention, family therapy, parent training, and/or other program components (see OJJDP publication, *Strengthening America's Families: Promising Parenting Strategies for Delinquency Prevention*, Kumpfer, 1993; also see, OJJDP Summary, *Family Life, Delinquency, and Crime: A Policy Maker's Guide*, Wright and Wright, 1994).

This program is a result of OJJDP's interest in advancing a comprehensive national strategy to prevent juvenile delinquency and youth violence. This strategy is characterized by cooperative efforts among government agencies to support children and families and by partnerships developed with local communities to further these endeavors.

OJJDP intends to fund an organization or collaboration of organizations with experience in family support and strengthening interventions and expertise in delivery of training and TA to culturally diverse, multi-problem families and communities.

**Goal:** To reduce juvenile delinquency through the support of programs that strengthen and support families of juveniles at-risk of violence and delinquency.

**Objectives:**

1. To examine existing research literature on family strengthening program models currently operating in the field, and to select the most effective for replication in other jurisdictions.
2. To examine family strengthening program models currently operating in the field, to review existing evaluation data regarding these models, and to select the most effective as appropriate for incorporation in other jurisdictions.
3. To prepare training and TA manuals and reference materials for family strengthening program development and improvement.
4. To provide training and TA for family strengthening program model development and improvement at selected program sites.
5. To collect and maintain necessary data for program evaluation and management purposes.

**Program Strategy:** This is a 3-year program. In accordance with the goal and objectives of this project, during the first year, the grantee will review and assess viable family strengthening program models, assist OJJDP in the selection of the most promising of these models, and make available training and TA to communities interested in enhancing or implementing one or more selected family strengthening models. Concurrently, the grantee will assess training and TA needs and prepare appropriate training curriculums and TA materials. During the second and third years, the grantee will complete and update program materials and present training and TA programs required to implement new programs or to improve existing family strengthening programs at the selected TA and training sites. The grantee will also collect and maintain data (pertaining to training and TA utilization by program personnel at the sites) geared toward production of a final project report outlining the results of the 3-year training and TA effort.

**Products:** The grantee will provide written materials as follows:

1. An assessment report, including recommendations to OJJDP, describing the most effective family strengthening program models and listing the particular models recommended for support under this project.
2. A marketing strategy and a plan for delivery of training and TA services requested under this project.

- 
3. Training and TA curriculums/manuals and reference materials required for program implementation under this project. Applicants should address the marketing of these services and a plan for selecting sites.
  4. A final project report describing the results of the 3-year training and TA program.
  5. Any additional materials agreed upon by the grantee and OJJDP as necessary for accomplishment of the goal and objectives of the project.

**Eligibility Requirements:** Applications are invited from public and private agencies, institutions and organizations that can demonstrate experience and capability in training and technical assistance methodologies in the area of family strengthening and a sensitivity to the socioeconomic factors that impact the functioning of families. Private for-profit organizations must waive any profit or fee to be eligible for this program.

**Selection Criteria:** A peer review panel will rate applications according to the following criteria:

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (20 points)***

Applicants must concisely describe the problem(s) to be addressed and convey a clear understanding of the purposes, work requirements, and expected results of the project. In particular, the applicant must indicate an understanding of specific program models, family strengthening program issues, and the training and TA appropriate for the development, implementation, or improvement of such programs.

✓ ***Goals and Objectives. (15 points)***

Applicants must clearly define the goals and objectives of the project, expressing them in operational terms consistent with the requirements described in the applicant's response to the statement of the problem in the previous section.

✓ ***Project Design. (20 points)***

Applicants must relate the merits of the approach proposed in their application to Department of Justice goals and objectives for this project and explain how theirs constitutes a sound and effective approach. The application must describe a project design, including the operating plan, staffing, time-lines, performance schedules, expected accomplishments, and products.

✓ ***Project Management. (20 points)***

The project's management structure and staffing must be adequate and appropriate for the successful implementation of the project. Key staff should have significant experience with family strengthening programs, training and TA, project management, and other requirements of the project. Staff resumes should be attached.

✓ ***Organizational Capability. (15 points)***

The applicant organization's ability to conduct the project successfully must be clearly documented in the application. The documentation must include organizational experience in family strengthening and support program models serving diverse populations living in multi-problem communities, as well as expertise in training and TA.

✓ ***Budget. (10 points)***

Applicants must provide a proposed budget that is complete, detailed, reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the activities to be undertaken.

---

**Award Period:** The initial cooperative agreement award to the competitively selected grantee in this project will be for a 12-month budget period within a 36-month project period. Subsequent awards will be made annually for each of two additional 12-month budget periods.

**Award Amount:** The award for the first 12-month budget period will be up to \$250,000. Similar amounts are projected for each of the two subsequent 12-month budget periods. Future awards will be based on grantee performance, availability of funds, and other criteria established at the time of award.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. *Note: In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on June 30, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Robin Delany-Shabazz, Program Manager, (202) 307-9963.

## Youth Centered Conflict Resolution

**Purpose:** To promote the use of conflict resolution and peer mediation in the Nation's public schools, communities, and juvenile justice institutions as a basic skill, much the same as reading and arithmetic are viewed. A primary means of achieving this will be the development and implementation of four regional technical assistance workshops on the use of *Conflict Resolution Programs in Schools: A Guide to Program Selection and Implementation*, a forthcoming collaborative publication from the U.S. Departments of Justice and Education that offers information on the benefits of conflict resolution and how it can be designed and successfully implemented in a school setting. These workshops will be followed by delivery of technical assistance (TA) to agencies and organizations interested in implementing one or more conflict resolution models.

**Background:** This program implements Section 244(3) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended.

During the past 10 years, the Nation's schools have faced increased problems affecting their responsibility to educate our youth and to guide them away from crime, violence, drug and alcohol abuse, and gang involvement. Models of physical aggression and violence are readily available to youth through television, movies, music, and literature aimed specifically at them. These models are erroneously emulated by youth as appropriate methods for resolving conflict and interpersonal problems. Increasingly, the use of weapons is also seen as a means to resolve conflict. In the absence of community expectations, orientation, and skills in appropriate approaches to resolving conflict, youth are limited with respect to making constructive behavioral choices.

Research has shown that prevention strategies involving communities, schools, parents, and youth are effective in reducing juvenile delinquency and violence. According to researchers (Hawkins and Catalano, 1992 and Werner, 1987), youth who possess certain traits are resilient to those factors or causes that promote aggressiveness and deviancy. These protective factors include empathy, effective communication skills, flexibility, ability to respond constructively to change, nonviolent problem solving skills, a positive view of the future, and, most importantly, healthy bonding to individuals and social groups in the community.

---

The Departments of Education and Justice agree that many public school curriculums do not adequately provide for the systematic development of problem-solving and conflict-resolution skills. Inclusion of problem solving skills in school curriculums and community-based child and youth development programs can provide a continuum of problem-solving skills and approaches to enhance school discipline, to reduce violence among youth in the community, and to lead youth to improved functioning as adults. It is envisioned that exposure to comprehensive school or community-based conflict resolution programs will help youth enhance resiliency factors. Very few youth are currently receiving such assistance.

The Departments of Education and Justice have collaborated to develop a national strategy for broad based education, training, and utilization of conflict resolution skills. In support of this endeavor, *Conflict Resolution Programs in Schools: A Guide to Program Selection and Implementation*, a joint publication is currently being finalized by these Federal agencies and will be available in the fall of 1995. An outline of this document is currently available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at (800) 638-8736.

**Goal:** To integrate conflict resolution principles and skills development into all levels of educational curricula in the Nation's schools in order to increase the use of youth centered conflict resolution in schools, community-based youth service organizations, and juvenile facilities.

**Objectives:**

1. To develop and implement a national dissemination and information campaign for *Conflict Resolution Programs in Schools: A Guide to Program Selection and Implementation*.
2. To develop a plan to provide broad-based participation in the proposed TA workshops among schools, community agencies, and others.
3. To conduct four regional TA workshops on the use of *Conflict Resolution Programs in Schools: A Guide to Program Selection and Implementation*.

**Program Strategy:** OJJDP is soliciting innovative proposals for this competitive program. It is OJJDP's intention to fund one project comprising a consortium of conflict resolution providers to collectively address the entire spectrum of objectives previously noted. A specific project design is not mandated. Applicants are encouraged to submit creative proposals addressing how they would achieve the goals and objectives in a manner that will attract the most interest and participation of the target groups and provide training and TA in a dynamic manner, imparting subject matter to participants effectively.

**Reference:**

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. *Conflict Resolution Programs in Schools: A Guide to Program Selection and Implementation*. U.S. Departments of Justice and Education. Washington, DC: forthcoming. [Available at no charge from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at (800) 638-8736 in the fall of 1995.]

**Eligibility Requirements:** OJJDP invites applications from public agencies and private nonprofit agencies, institutions and organizations that can demonstrate expertise and experience in conflict/dispute resolution and the capability to undertake activities related to the objectives previously noted.

**Selection Criteria:** Applications will be rated by a peer review panel on the extent to which they meet the following criteria:

✓ ***Problem(s) To Be Addressed. (15 Points)***

Applicants must clearly state the problem(s) to be addressed by the project and show a clear understanding of the nature and scope of problems and issues related to providing training and TA in conflict resolution or peer mediation to schools, community-based youth serving organizations, and juvenile justice correctional facilities.

---

✓ **Goals and Objectives. (15 Points)**

Applicants must provide succinct statements demonstrating an understanding of the objectives and tasks associated with the program.

✓ **Project Design. (25 Points)**

Applicants must provide a sound project design that constitutes an effective approach to meet the Department of Justice goals and objectives for this project. The design must include a detailed workplan with time-lines for each significant milestone in the project. The program design must contain program elements that are directly and clearly linked to successful implementation of the project.

✓ **Project Management. (10 Points)**

The project's management structure and staffing must be adequate and appropriate for the successful implementation and completion of the project. The management plan describes a system whereby logistical activities are handled in the most efficient and cost-effective way.

✓ **Organizational Capability. (20 Points)**

The applicant organization's ability to conduct the project successfully must be documented. Organization or experience with adult education and training is highly recommended. Key project staff must have significant experience in conflict resolution or peer mediation. Copies of staff resumes should be attached.

✓ **Budget. (15 Points)**

Applicants must provide a proposed budget that is complete, detailed, reasonable, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the activities to be undertaken.

**Award Period:** One award will be made under this program for a 12-month project period. Additional funding beyond the initial project period for site specific training and TA and the development and use of additional training tools is dependent upon grantee performance, the availability of funds, and OJJDP priorities.

**Award Amount:** A total of \$200,000 is available for one grant to be awarded under this solicitation.

**Delivery Instructions:** All application packages should be mailed or delivered to the Office of the Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, c/o Juvenile Justice Resource Center, 1600 Research Boulevard, Mail Stop 3K, Rockville, MD 20850. **Note:** *In the lower left hand corner of the envelope, you must clearly mark the name of the program to which you are applying and the name of the program contact person contained in this solicitation.*

**Due Date:** Applicants are responsible for insuring that the original and five copies of their application packages are received by close of business (5 p.m. e.d.t.) on July 5, 1995.

**Contact:** For further information, contact Robin Delany-Shabazz, Program Manager, (202) 307-9963.



---

---

# **Instructions for Completing Applications for Assistance From the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**

---

## **Juvenile Justice Programs FY 1995**

Applying for funds from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) can be difficult. The first or even second time filling out the forms can cause consternation and confusion among many would-be applicants. OJJDP has produced these directions and examples to help alleviate this confusion.

Of course, directions can help only if they are read. All the application forms have directions that should be studied before filling out the forms. It is recommended that applicants copy the forms for a dry run before completing the final copy.

## **Application Requirements**

OJJDP issues specific solicitations that address particular programs and policy goals of the Office. All applications sent to OJJDP should respond to a particular solicitation. Each solicitation stipulates what the application must contain and the criteria on which the application will be judged.

The major parts of the application are:

- Standard Form 424.
- Standard Form 424A (budget information).
- Detailed Budget.
- Budget Narrative.
- Program Narrative
- Assurances and Certifications.

Instructions for completing each of the major parts of the application package follow.

---

---

## Standard Form 424

The Standard Form 424 (SF-424), a one-page sheet with 18 items (see attached sample), is basically a cover sheet for the entire application. However, this form is required for every application for Federal assistance. **No application can be accepted without a completed, signed original SF-424.** Below are directions for each item on the form:

- Item 1** OJJDP funds cannot be used for construction. Applicants should check “Non-Construction.”
- Item 2** Fill in the date the application is sent to OJJDP.
- Item 3** For State organizations that must submit the application to the State Single Point of Contact, fill in the date that the application was sent to that person or organization. (Please note: the identifier boxes next to item 3 are provided for applicant use. They need not be filled in.)
- Item 4** OJJDP will complete this box.
- Item 5** The legal name of the organization refers to the primary organization such as the university or parent organization. The full legal name of the organization must be put in this box. The address of the organization should be put in the address box. The organizational unit is the specific subunit that is applying for funding. Only one person should be named as contact for the project. That person’s name and phone number must appear in the appropriate box.
- Item 6** Each employer must have an individual Employer Identification Number from the IRS.
- Item 7** The appropriate letter must be put in the box (not circled, checked, or underlined).
- Item 8** Check the appropriate box. Unless the grant is specifically referred to as a continuation in the solicitation, applicants should check “NEW.”
- Item 9** Type in “Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.”
- Item 10** Use the *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance* number and title of the program under which assistance is requested.
- Item 11** The title of the grant being applied for exactly as it appears in the solicitation.
- Item 12** Be specific in naming the areas affected.
- Item 13** Fill in the expected project dates. The specific dates can change.
- Item 14** Self-explanatory. Be specific.
- Item 15** Line (a) should contain the amount of requested Federal assistance. The remaining lines should be filled out as needed. Line (g) must be filled in.
- Item 16** Executive Order 12372 requires that each State establish a Single Point of Contact between the Federal Government and State governments. If the applicant is a State agency covered by this Executive Order, then the application must be submitted for review to the responsible State agency. Contact OJJDP if there are questions about this requirement.
- Item 17** This item applies only to the organization. Mark as appropriate.
- Item 18** Type the legal name of the individual authorized to represent the organization. This item also requests the title and phone number of this individual. Applications will not be accepted without a signed original.

To help OJJDP personnel, please indicate which copy of SF-424 is the original by stamping it “Original” or signing it in blue ink.

---

---

## **Standard Form 424A**

### **Budget Information**

All applications must include SF-424A, Budget Information (sample attached). Please submit an individual SF-424A for each project applied for. Applicants should make sure that all appropriate columns and rows balance. Full directions for this form are found on page 3 of SF-424A.

Generally, applications for new grants will require use of only lines 1 and 5 in section A. In column (a), put the project title (or an easily understandable abbreviation). In column (b), put the OJJDP catalog number. New programs require only columns (c) and (d) (if there is additional funding from other sources). Line 1 requires only the total amounts of each funding source. Column (g) requires the total of all funding sources. Line 5, of course, totals all columns.

In section B, applicants will generally need to fill out columns (1) and (5). Under column (1), fill in the amounts as specified. If no funds are to be used under that specific category, enter "0." Be sure that the columns add up correctly.

Section C is required if non-Federal funds will be used for this grant.

In section D, applicants must break down the first year of funding into quarters and indicate the appropriate source of funds for each of these quarters.

Section E should be used only if the project is expected to last beyond the period of the initial award.

### **Detailed Budget**

To understand how the grant award will be used by the applicant, OJJDP requires a Detailed Budget and a Budget Narrative in the application. The Detailed Budget must break down into more explicit terms the sources of the costs associated with the project. It must show how the applicant arrived at the total requested award amount. For example, the Detailed Budget will include:

- The salary of each staff person involved in the project and the portion of that salary to be paid from the grant award.
- The fringe benefits paid to each staff person (such as pension, health insurance, etc.).
- The travel costs to be incurred due to the project (a specific list of destinations, expected dates, per diem rates, travel fares, and lodging expenses).
- Equipment purchased with funds from the project.
- All supplies required to complete the project.
- Any indirect costs established by the Federal Government for universities or other organizations (specify rate and source).

### **Budget Narrative**

The Budget Narrative closely follows the content of the Detailed Budget. It must provide the justification for all costs. Among other things, it must explain how fringe benefits were calculated, how travel costs were arrived at, why particular items of equipment or supplies must be purchased, and how indirect costs are calculated (if applicable). The Budget Narrative should refer to specific parts of the Program Narrative in justifying items listed (particularly supplies, travel, and equipment). Finally, the applicant must show that all costs in the application are reasonable.

---

## **Program Narrative**

All applications must include a complete Program Narrative. This narrative must fully describe the expected design and implementation of the proposed program. OJJDP issues specific solicitations that contain selection criteria and/or application requirements. Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Form 4000/3 provides additional instructions for writing this narrative. Applicants should follow the structure presented in the Selection Criteria portion of the solicitation.

Although not all solicitations will make direct mention of it, applicants should include a “timeline” of the project, including major milestones and publications. It will provide reviewers with a better grasp of what the applicant hopes to accomplish and how the applicant will reach the program goal.

Applicants should also include an abstract of the project (150–200 words). This abstract should briefly present the goal(s) and objectives of the project and how the applicant intends to accomplish both. It should be placed directly behind the SF-424.

## **Assurances and Certifications**

OJP Form 4000/3, an attachment to SF-424, must be included when the application is sent to OJJDP. This form includes a list of assurances, which the applicant should read carefully and sign before submitting the application. These assurances govern the use of Federal funds for federally assisted projects.

Applications must also include OJP Form 4061/6, “Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements.” The signed original of this form must be included with the signed original SF-424.

---

## Checklist for OJJDP Applications

This checklist is provided for the applicant's convenience. Although not required, applicants are requested to send a copy of this completed checklist with the application.

Although applicants are free to compile the application in whatever order they wish, the order below is preferred by OJJDP.

- 1. Standard Form 424 (signed).
- 2. Abstract of Project (150–200 words).
- 3. Table of Contents.
- 4. Standard Form 424A.
- 5. Detailed Budget.
- 6. Budget Narrative.
- 7. Assurances (OJP Form 4000/3, signed).
- 8. Certifications (OJP Form 4061/6, signed).
- 9. Program Narrative (must address the specific selection criteria found in the solicitation).
- 10. Timeline of major milestones and publications.
- 11. Resumes of all personnel who will work on the project.
- 12. Four additional copies of the application package.

# **Appendix D.**

## **Contact Lists**

---

---

# State Advisory Groups and State Planning Agencies

---

As required under section 223(a)(1) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, States wishing to receive Formula Grants must submit a plan for carrying out the Act's purposes. To carry out this provision, each State's Governor designates a State agency to supervise the preparation and administration of the plan. In addition, section 223(a)(3) requires the designation of an advisory group, which may also serve as the supervisory board, for this State agency.

State Advisory Groups (SAGs) responsibilities include advising the Governor and legislature on juvenile justice issues (including compliance with the requirements of the Act), developing a comprehensive State juvenile justice plan, reviewing and awarding grants, and reviewing the progress and accomplishments of programs under their plans.

## State Advisory Groups

### Alabama

Joseph Thomas, Chair  
Alabama State Advisory Group  
617 Valley Trail  
Warrior, AL 35180  
(205) 785-4484 (Office)  
(205) 785-4406 (Fax)  
(205) 647-4472 (Home)

### Alaska

Thomas S. Begich, Chair  
Alaska Juvenile Justice Committee  
P.O. Box 142711  
Anchorage, AK 99514  
(907) 274-2135 (Home)  
(907) 274-6251 (Fax)

### American Samoa

The Rev. Fuaifale Faolui, Chair  
Criminal Justice Planning Agency  
American Samoa Government  
Pago Pago, AS 96799  
011-684-633-5221/2 (Office)  
011-684-633-7552 (Fax)

### Arizona

Linda Akers, Chair  
2 North Central  
Suite 1250  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
(602) 252-0002 (Office)  
(602) 252-0003 (Fax)

### Arkansas

Kathleen Bird  
P.O. Box 1317  
Hope, AR 71801  
(501) 777-5483 (Office)  
(501) 777-5499 (Fax)

### California

Janet Nicholas, Chair  
State Advisory Group on Juvenile  
Justice and Delinquency Prevention  
Nicholas Vineyards  
17500 Norr Boom Road  
Sonoma, CA 95476  
(707) 938-8303 (Office)  
(707) 935-0223 (Fax)

---

---

## Colorado

Joe Higgins, Chair  
Partners  
735 South Avenue  
Grand Junction, CO 81501  
(303) 245-5555 (Office)  
(303) 245-7411 (Fax)

## Connecticut

Peggy Perillie, Acting Chair  
Connecticut Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee  
61 Dogwood Lane  
Trumbull, CT 06611

## Delaware

Gloria Fine, Chair  
P.O. Box 4306  
One Wheelock Lane  
Wilmington, DE 19087  
(302) 428-1500 (Phone)  
(302) 428-1501 (Fax)

## District of Columbia

Thomas Lewis, Chair  
c/o The Fishing School  
P.O. Box 60674  
Washington, DC 20039  
(202) 462-8686 (Office)  
(202) 797-2198 (Fax)

## Florida

Sheldon Gusky, Chair  
Governor's Juvenile Justice and Delinquency  
Prevention Advisory Commission  
c/o Florida Public  
Defenders Coordinating Office  
P.O. Box 11057  
Tallahassee, FL 32302  
(904) 488-6850 (Office)  
(904) 488-4720 (Fax)

## Georgia

Joy Maxey, Chair  
605 Lenox Way NE.  
Atlanta, GA 30324  
(404) 261-2666 (Office)  
(404) 261-2669 (Fax)

## Guam

Patrick Wolff, Chair  
P.O. Box CE  
Agana, GU 96910  
011-671-472-4248 (Office)  
011-671-649-7502 (Fax)

## Hawaii

Judy Sakai, Chair  
Hale Kipa Youth Services  
2006 McKinley Street  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
(808) 955-2248 (Office)  
(808) 942-0125 (Fax)

## Idaho

Michael Jones, Chair  
Idaho Youth Ranch  
P.O. Box 8538  
Boise, ID 83707  
(208) 377-2613 (Voice)  
(208) 377-2819 (Fax)

## Illinois

Dallas C. Ingemunson, Chair  
226 South Bridge Street  
P.O. Box 578  
Yorkville, IL 60560  
(708) 553-4157 (Office)  
(703) 553-4204 (Fax)

## Indiana

Gaye Shula, Chair  
Indiana Juvenile State Advisory Group  
4137 North Meridian  
Indianapolis, IN 46208  
(317) 283-5392 (Office)  
(317) 232-4979 (Fax)



---

---

## **Iowa**

Allison Fleming, Chair  
Juvenile Justice Advisory Council  
5822 North Waterbury Road  
Des Moines, IA 50312  
(515) 279-5781 (Home)

## **Kansas**

Sue Lockett, Chair  
3751 Worwick Town Road  
Topeka, KS 66610  
(913) 232-2777 (Office)  
(913) 354-1570 (Fax)

## **Kentucky**

Rebecca Cleaver, Chair  
Jessamine County Middle School  
851 Wilmore Road  
Nicholasville, KY 40356  
(502) 564-4726 (Office)  
(502) 564-7952 (Fax)

## **Louisiana**

Bernardine Hall, Chair Executive Director  
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency  
Prevention Advisory Board  
c/o Youth House of Ouachita, Inc.  
101 Ludwig Street  
West Monroe, LA 71291  
(318) 323-6644 (Office)  
(318) 323-6711 (Fax)

## **Maine**

Michael E. Saucier, Chair  
Juvenile Justice Advisory Group  
c/o Thompson and Bowie  
4 Canal Plaza, Second Floor  
Portland, ME 04112  
(207) 774-2500 (Office)  
(207) 774-3591 (Fax)

## **Maryland**

George Rasin Jr., Chair  
Juvenile Justice Advisory Council  
800 Southerly Road  
Edenwald, Apartment 713  
Towson, MD 21286  
(301) 339-6473 (Home)

## **Massachusetts**

Elaine Riley, Chair  
495 Revere Beach Boulevard  
Revere, MA 02151  
(617) 284-2853 (Home)

## **Michigan**

Y. Gladys Barsamian, Chair  
12457 Woodgate Drive  
Plymouth, MI 48170  
(313) 455-2831 (Home)

## **Minnesota**

Barbara Swanson, Chair  
Youth Services Bureau  
407 South Lake Street  
Forest Lake, MN 55025  
(612) 464-3685 (Office)  
(612) 464-3687 (Fax)

## **Mississippi**

Alfred Martin, Chair  
The Greater Jackson Youth Services Corporation  
417 North Farish Street  
Jackson, MS 39202  
(601) 353-1311

## **Missouri**

Frank Burcham, Chair  
541 Hillsboro Street  
Farmington, MO 63640  
(314) 431-0344 (Office)  
(314) 431-0544 (Fax)  
(314) 756-1238 (Home)

---

---

## Montana

Randy Bellingham, Chair  
P.O. Box 2559  
Billings, MT 59103  
(406) 248-7731 (Office)  
(406) 248-7889 (Fax)

## Nebraska

Kathy B. Moore, Chair  
Voices for Children in Nebraska  
7521 Main Street, Suite 103  
Omaha, NE 68144  
(402) 597-3100 (Office)  
(402) 597-2705 (Fax)

## Nevada

Diane Mercier, Chair  
Virginia Lake Profession Center  
177 Cadillac Place  
Reno, NV 89509  
(702) 827-7501 (Office)

## New Hampshire

David Villiotti, Chair  
State Advisory Group on Juvenile Justice  
c/o Nashua Children's Association  
125 Amherst Street  
Nashua, NH 03060  
(603) 883-3851 (Office)  
(603) 883-5925 (Fax)

## New Jersey

B. Thomas Leahy, Chair  
2 East Maple Avenue  
Bound Brook, NJ 08805  
(908) 356-0001 (Home)

## New Mexico

Betty Downes, Chair  
Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee Route  
19, Box 45  
Santa Fe, NM 87505  
(505) 983-2058 (Office)  
(505) 983-6567 (Fax)

## New York

Ralph Fedullo, Chair  
Juvenile Justice Advisory Group  
c/o St. Anne Institute  
160 North Main Avenue  
Albany, NY 12206  
(518) 489-7411 (Office)  
(518) 489-1208 (Fax)

## North Carolina

Frederick Yates, Chair  
P.O. Box 5  
Winfall, NC 27985

## North Dakota

Mark Johnson, Chair  
Executive Director  
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency  
Prevention State Advisory Group  
c/o North Dakota Association of Counties  
P.O. Box 417  
425 North Fifth Street  
Bismarck, ND 58502  
(701) 258-4481 (Office)  
(701) 258-2469 (Fax)

## Northern Mariana Islands

Donald Barcinas, Chair  
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana  
Islands Youth Advisory Council  
P.O. Box 73-CHRB  
Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands  
96950 011-607-322-9350 (Direct Line)  
011-607-322-0838 (Office)  
011-607-322-6311 (Fax)

## Ohio

Donald Swain, Chair  
D.L. Swain and Associates  
1210 Westminister Drive  
Cincinnati, OH 45229  
(513) 242-7768 (Office)  
(513) 242-7768 (Fax)

---

---

## Oklahoma

Susan Morris, Chair  
Youth and Family Resource Center  
326 West 11th Street  
Shawnee, OK 74801  
(405) 275-3340 (Office)  
(405) 275-3343 (Fax)

## Oregon

Jonathan Ater, Chair  
Ater Wynn, Attorneys at Law  
222 Southwest Columbia, Suite 1800  
Portland, OR 97201  
(503) 226-1191 (Office)  
(503) 226-0079 (Fax)

## Pennsylvania

Ian Lennox, President  
Citizens Crime Commission  
of the Delaware Valley  
1518 Walnut Street, Room 507  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
(215) 546-0800 (Office)  
(215) 546-9797 (Fax)

## Puerto Rico

Victor Ramirez, Chair  
G.P.O. Box 361326  
San Juan, PR 00936  
(809) 765-5780 (Office)  
(809) 722-8615 (Fax)

## Republic of Palau

Fumio Rengiil, Chair  
P.O. Box 339  
Koror, Republic of Palau 96940  
011-680-488-1218 (Office)  
011-680-488-1662 (Fax)

## Rhode Island

VACANT

## South Carolina

Stacey Atkinson, Chair  
23 Sunrise Point  
Irmo, SC 29062  
(803) 781-3000/3400 (Office)  
(803) 732-7706/9 (Fax)  
[Address faxes to: Silver Fox Tennis Club]

## South Dakota

Richard Tieszen, Chair  
South Dakota Youth Advocacy Project  
222 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501-2564  
(605) 224-1500 (Office)  
(605) 224-1600 (Fax)

## Tennessee

Philip A. Acord, Chair  
Children's Home/Chambliss Shelter  
315 Gillespie Road  
Chattanooga, TN 37411  
(615) 698-2456 (Office)  
(615) 622-6549 (Fax)

## Texas

Raul Garcia, Chair  
Governor's Juvenile Justice and Delinquency  
Prevention Advisory Board  
3209 Rock Brooke  
San Angelo, TX 76904  
(915) 944-5437 (Office)  
(915) 944-6828 (Fax)

## Utah

Jan W. Arrington, Chair  
Utah Board of Juvenile Justice  
and Delinquency Prevention  
586 North 200 East  
Farmington, UT 84025  
(801) 626-3800 (Office)  
(801) 451-2662 (Home)

---

---

## **Vermont**

Kenneth A. Schatz, Chair  
Office of the City Attorney  
City Hall  
149 Church Street, Room 11  
Burlington, VT 05401  
(802) 865-7121 (Office)  
(802) 865-7024 (Fax)

## **Virgin Islands**

Barbara Carey, Chair  
2212 Queen Street  
Lot 38  
Christiansted, St. Croix, VI 00802  
(809) 773-6900 (Office)  
(809) 773-2900 (Home)

## **Virginia**

Christine Miller, Chair  
2220 Edward Holland  
Richmond, VA 23230  
(804) 354-2082 (Office)  
(804) 354-2399 (Fax)

## **Washington**

Margaret Martinez, Chair  
P.O. Box 45203  
Olympia, WA 98504-5203  
(206) 868-9323 (Office)  
(206) 586-9154 (Fax)

## **West Virginia**

Kristen Mendelson, Chair  
124 Morgan Drive  
Morgantown, WV 26505  
(412) 438-6055 (Office)  
(304) 599-6689 (Home)

## **Wisconsin**

Kathy M. Arthur, Chair  
Governor's Juvenile Justice Commission  
1924 Forrest Street  
Wauwatosa, WI 53213  
(414) 785-0320 (Office)  
(414) 785-1729 (Fax)

## **Wyoming**

VACANT

---

---

# State Agencies and Juvenile Justice Specialists

## Alabama

Robert E. Lunsford, Director  
Alabama Department of Economic  
and Community Affairs  
401 Adams Avenue  
P.O. Box 5690  
Montgomery, AL 36103-5690  
(334) 242-8672 (Phone)  
(334) 242-5099 (Fax)  
Doug Miller, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
Donald Lee, Juvenile Justice Planner  
(334) 242-5900 (Phone)

## Alaska

Margaret R. Lowe, Commissioner  
Department of Health and Social Services  
Division of Family and Youth Services  
P.O. Box 110630  
Juneau, AK 99811-0630  
(907) 465-3030 (Phone)  
(907) 465-3397 (Fax)  
Donna Schultz, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(907) 465-3191 (Phone)

## American Samoa

La'auli A. Filoialii,  
Director/Juvenile Justice Specialist  
Criminal Justice Planning Agency  
Government of American Samoa  
P.O. Box 3760  
Pago Pago, AS 96799  
011-684-633-5221/2 (Phone)  
011-684-633-7552 (Fax)

## Arizona

Lynne Neely Gallagher, Director  
Governor's Office for Children  
1700 West Washington, Suite 404  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
(602) 542-3191 (Phone)  
(602) 542-4644 (Fax)

## Arkansas

R.B. Friedlander, Director  
Division of Youth Services  
Department of Human Services  
450 Donaghey Plaza South  
P.O. Box 1437  
Little Rock, AR 72203-1437  
(501) 682-8654/8748 (Phone)  
(501) 682-1339 (Fax)  
Pamela Fowler, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## California

Ray Johnson, Executive Director  
Office of Criminal Justice Planning  
1130 K Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 324-9140 (Phone)  
(916) 324-9167 (Fax)  
Cherie McKone, Juvenile Justice  
Specialist/Liaison Officer  
(916) 323-7611 (Phone)

## Colorado

William Woodward, Director  
Division of Criminal Justice  
Department of Public Safety  
700 Kipling, Suite 1000  
Denver, CO 80215  
(303) 239-4449 (Phone)  
(303) 239-4491 (Fax)  
Carmen Velasquez, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Connecticut

Susan Shimelman, Undersecretary  
Office of Policy and Management  
Policy Development and Planning Division  
80 Washington Street  
Hartford, CT 06106  
(203) 566-3020 (Phone)  
(203) 566-6295 (Fax)  
Valerie Bates, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(203) 566-3023/3500 (Phone)

---

---

## **Delaware**

Thomas J. Quinn, Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Council  
State Office Building, Fourth Floor  
820 French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 577-3430 (Phone)  
(302) 577-3862 (Fax)  
Karen Blackburn, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **District of Columbia**

Douglas Carter, Acting Executive Director  
Mayor's Youth Initiative Office  
717 14th Street NW., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 727-4970 (Phone)  
(202) 727-3333 (Fax)  
Doris Howard, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Florida**

Calvin Ross, Secretary  
Department of Juvenile Justice Department  
of Health and Rehabilitative Services  
1344 Cross Creek Circle  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
(904) 488-3302 (Phone)  
(904) 922-6189 (Fax)  
Ted Tollett, Program Administrator  
Kimberly Budnick, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Georgia**

Judy Neal, Director  
Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council  
10 Park Place South, Suite 410  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
(404) 656-1725 (Phone)  
(404) 651-9354 (Fax)  
Pete Colbenson, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
Ed Fortier, Acting Director  
Department of Youth Affairs

## **Government of Guam**

P.O. Box 23672  
Guam Main Facility, GU 96921  
011-671-734-3911/4 (Phone)  
Edward B. Chargualaf, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Hawaii**

Wayne Matsuo, Executive Director  
Department of Human Services  
Office of Youth Services  
1481 South King Street, Suite 223  
Honolulu, HI 96814  
(808) 937-9494 (Phone)  
Carol Imanaka, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Idaho**

Sharon Harrigfeld-Hixon,  
Administrator/Juvenile Justice Specialist  
Idaho Juvenile Justice Commission  
1109 Main Street, Lower Level  
Boise, ID 83720-7000  
(208) 334-2672 (Phone)  
(208) 334-3267 (Fax)

## **Illinois**

Jerome E. Slomka, Deputy Director  
Department of Children and Family Services  
406 East Monroe  
Springfield, IL 62701  
(217) 785-2570 (Phone)  
Anne Studzinski, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
100 West Randolph Street, Suite 4-700  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 814-4163 (Phone)  
(312) 814-2656 (Fax)

## **Indiana**

Catherine O'Connor, Executive Director  
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute  
302 West Washington Street, Room E209  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(317) 232-1229/1223 (Phone)  
(317) 232-4979 (Fax)  
John Krause, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(317) 232-7611 (Phone)

---

---

## Iowa

Richard G. Moore, Administrator  
Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning  
Lucas State Office Building, First Floor  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
(515) 242-5816 (Phone)  
(515) 242-6119 (Fax)  
Lori Rhinehart, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(515) 281-3995 (Phone)

## Kansas

Donna L. Whiteman, Secretary  
Youth and Adult Services  
Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services  
Smith/Wilson Building, West Hall  
300 Southwest Oakely  
Topeka, KS 66606  
(913) 296-2023 (Phone)  
Mark A. Matese, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(913) 296-4649 (Phone)  
(913) 296-4649 (Fax)

## Kentucky

Paul F. Issacs, Acting Director  
Division of Grants Management  
Commonwealth of Kentucky  
Justice Cabinet Bush Building, Second Floor  
403 Wapping Street  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
(502) 564-7554 (Phone)  
(502) 564-4840 (Fax)  
Fonda Butler, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Louisiana

Michael A. Ranatza, Executive Director  
Commission on Law Enforcement and  
Administration of Criminal Justice  
1885 Wooddale Boulevard, Room 708  
Baton Rouge, LA 70806-1442  
(504) 925-4418 (Phone)  
(504) 925-1998 (Fax)  
Alyce Lappin, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(504) 925-4443

## Maine

Joseph Lehman, Director  
Department of Corrections  
State House Station 111  
Augusta, ME 04333  
(207) 624-6025 (Phone)  
(207) 624-6023 (Fax)  
Tom Godfrey, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
[correspondence should be sent to: State House 144]

## Maryland

Stephen A. Bocian, Executive Director  
Governor's Office of Justice Administration  
301 West Preston Street, Room 1501  
Baltimore, MD 21201  
(410) 225-1834 (Phone)  
(410) 333-5924 (Fax)  
Richard W. Friedman, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Massachusetts

Kevin Herrinton, Acting Director  
Executive Office of Public Safety Division  
of Programs  
100 Cambridge Street, Room 2100  
Boston, MA 02202  
(617) 727-4300/7096 (Phone)  
(617) 727-5077 (Fax)  
Lynn Wright, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(617) 727-6300, Ext. 319  
(617) 727-5356

## Michigan

David Lehman, Director  
Juvenile Justice Grant Unit  
Michigan Department of Social Services  
Grand Towers  
255 Grand Avenue  
P.O. Box 30037  
Lansing, MI 48909  
(517) 335-6315 (Phone)  
(517) 335-6323 (Fax)  
Ralph Monsma, Juvenile Justice Specialist

---

---

## Minnesota

Byron Zuidema, Assistant Commissioner  
Department of Economic Security  
390 North Robert Street, Fifth Floor  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
Jerry Ascher, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
Community Based Services Division  
390 North Robert Street, Room 125  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
(612) 296-8601/8004 (Phone)  
(612) 296-5745 (Fax)

## Mississippi

Donald O’Cain, Executive Director  
Department of Public Safety  
Division of Public Safety Planning  
401 North West Street, Eighth Floor  
Jackson, MS 39225-3039  
(601) 359-7880 (Phone)  
(601) 359-7832 (Fax)  
Anthony Gobar, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(601) 960-4261 (Phone)

## Missouri

Jerry Uhlmann, Acting Director  
Missouri Department of Public Safety  
Truman Office Building, Room 870  
P.O. Box 749  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
(314) 751-4905 (Phone)  
(314) 751-5399 (Fax)  
Randy Thomas, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Montana

Ellis E. Kiser, Executive Director  
Montana Board of Crime Control  
303 North Roberts  
Helena, MT 59620  
(406) 444-3604 (Phone)  
(406) 444-4722 (Fax)  
Candice Wimmer, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
Jim Rivard, Juvenile Justice Planner

## Nebraska

Allen Curtis, Executive Director  
Commission on Law Enforcement  
and Criminal Justice  
301 Centennial Mall  
P.O. Box 94946  
Lincoln, NE 68509-4946  
(402) 471-3687 (Phone)  
(402) 471-2837 (Fax)  
Jeff Golden, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Nevada

Scott M. Craigie, Director  
Department of Human Resources  
Division of Child and Family Services  
711 East Fifth Street  
Carson City, NV 89710-1002  
(702) 687-5982 (Phone)  
(702) 687-4722 (Fax)  
Dan Prince, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(702) 687-5911 (Phone)

## New Hampshire

Lorrie L. Lutz, Director  
Division for Children, Youth and Families  
Health and Human Services  
6 Hazen Drive  
Concord, NH 03301-6522  
(603) 271-4691 (Phone)  
B.J. Riordan, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(603) 271-4456 (Phone)  
(603) 271-4729 (Fax)

## New Jersey

Deborah T. Poritz, Attorney General  
Department of Law and Public Safety Division  
of Criminal Justice  
25 Market Street  
CN 085  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0085  
(609) 984-6500 (Phone)  
(609) 292-5942 (Fax)  
Terry Edwards, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(609) 984-2090 (Phone)



---

---

## **New Mexico**

Heather Wilson, Secretary  
Designate Children Youth and Families Department  
P.O. Drawer 5160  
Santa Fe County  
Santa Fe, NM 87502-5160  
(505) 827-7625 (Phone)  
Richard Lindahl, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **New York**

Richard Girgenti, Director  
Division of Criminal Justice Services  
Executive Park Tower  
Stuyvesant Plaza  
Albany, NY 12203-3764  
(518) 485-7919 (Phone)  
(518) 457-1186 (Fax)  
Howard Schwartz, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **North Carolina**

William Pittman, Executive Director  
Governor's Crime Commission  
Department of Crime Control and Public Safety  
3824 Barrett Drive, Suite 100  
Raleigh, NC 27609  
(919) 571-4736 (Phone)  
(919) 571-7585 (Fax)  
Donna Robinson, Juvenile Justice Delinquency  
Prevention Specialist

## **North Dakota**

Alton L. Lick, Director  
Division of Juvenile Services  
P.O. Box 1898  
Bismarck, ND 58502  
(701) 221-6390 (Phone)  
(701) 221-6158 (Fax)  
Terry Traynor, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
Box 417  
(701) 258-4481 (Phone)  
(701) 258-2469

## **Northern Mariana Islands**

Joaquin T. Ogumoro, Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 1133 CK  
Saipan, Northern Mariana  
Islands 96950  
011-670-322-5091/2/3 (Phone)  
011-670-322-5096/0838 (Fax)  
783-622 (Telex)  
Reverend Dwight Chapman, Juvenile Justice  
Specialist

## **Ohio**

Michael L. Lee, Acting Director  
Office of Criminal Justice Services  
400 East Town Street, Suite 120  
Columbus, OH 43215  
(614) 466-7782 (Phone)  
(614) 466-0308 (Fax)  
Julie Jodaeski, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Oklahoma**

Thomas S. Kemper, Director  
Commission on Children and Youth  
4545 North Lincoln, Suite 114  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
(405) 521-4016 (Phone)  
(405) 524-0417 (Fax)  
Grace Kelley, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Oregon**

Diane Walton, Acting Director  
Commission on Children and Families  
800 Northeast Oregon Street Suite 550,  
Mail Stop 13  
Portland, OR 97232  
(503) 731-4671, Ext. 23 (Phone)  
(503) 731-4227 (Fax)  
Gina Wood, Juvenile Justice Specialist

---

---

## **Pennsylvania**

James O. Thomas, Executive Director  
Commission on Crime and Delinquency  
P.O. Box 1167  
Federal Square Station  
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1167  
(717) 787-2040 (Phone)  
(717) 783-7713 (Fax)  
Ruth Williams, Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(717) 787-8559 (Phone)

## **Puerto Rico**

Pedro Rosario-Urdaz, Executive Director  
Office of Youth Affairs  
Calle San Jose, Room 252  
Viejo San Juan  
San Juan, PR 00901  
(809) 725-8920; 723-1254  
(Phone)  
(809) 722-8615 (Fax)  
Javier Burgos Melendez, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Republic of Palau**

Kuniwo Nakamura, President  
Republic of Palau  
P.O. Box 100  
Koror, Republic of Palau 96940  
680-9-488-1218 (Phone)  
680-9-488-1662 (Fax)  
728-0914 VPROPKF (Telex)  
GOVT PALAU (Cable)  
Elizabeth Oseked, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Rhode Island**

Norman Dakake, Acting Deputy Director  
Governor's Justice Commission  
275 Westminster Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
(401) 277-2620 (Phone)  
(401) 277-1294 (Fax)  
Elizabeth Gilheeny, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **South Carolina**

Burke O. Fitzpatrick, Assistant Deputy Director  
Office of Safety and Grant Programs  
1205 Pendleton Street, Suite 483B  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 734-0423 (Phone)  
(803) 734-0537 (Fax)  
Randy Grant, Primary Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(803) 734-0378 (Phone)  
Kay Anderson, Secondary Juvenile Justice Specialist  
(803) 734-0373 (Phone)

## **South Dakota**

Kevin McLain, Assistant Director  
Department of Corrections  
115 East Dakota  
Pierre, SD 57501  
(605) 773-6467 (Phone)  
(605) 773-3194 (Fax)

## **Tennessee**

Linda O'Neil, Executive Director  
Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth  
710 James Robertson Parkway  
Gateway Plaza, First Floor  
Nashville, TN 37243-0800  
(615) 741-2633 (Phone)  
(615) 741-5956 (Fax)  
William Haynes, Jr., Juvenile Justice Specialist

## **Texas**

David Cobos, Interim Co-Director  
Criminal Justice Division  
Office of the Governor  
P.O. Box 12428  
Austin, TX 78711  
(512) 463-1952 (Phone)  
(512) 475-3155 (Fax)  
Jim Kester, Juvenile Justice Specialist

---

---

## Utah

S. Camille Anthony, Executive Director  
Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice  
101 State Capitol  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
(801) 538-1031 (Phone)  
(801) 538-1024/1528 (Fax)  
Willard Malmstrom, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Vermont

Ted Mable, Director  
Agency of Human Services Planning Division  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, VT 05676  
(802) 241-2227 (Phone)  
(802) 241-8103 (Fax)  
Shirley Martin, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Virgin Islands

Gaylord A. Sprauve, Governor's Drug Policy  
Advisor  
Law Enforcement Planning Agency  
116-164 Sub Base  
Estate Nisky Number 6  
St. Thomas, VI 00802  
(809) 774-6400 (Phone)  
(809) 774-4057 (Fax)  
[call ahead to fax]

## Virginia

Bruce C. Morris, Director  
Department of Criminal Justice Services  
805 East Broad Street, 10th Floor  
Richmond, VA 23219  
(804) 786-4000 (Phone)  
(804) 371-8981 (Fax)  
Marion Kelly, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Washington

Joseph G. Bell, Director  
Department of Social and Health Services  
P.O. Box 45203  
Olympia, WA 98504-5203  
(206) 586-9157 (Phone)  
Rosalie McHale, Chief Juvenile Justice Coordinator  
(360) 753-4958 (Phone)  
(360) 586-9154 (Fax)  
Lisa Wolph, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## West Virginia

James M. Albert, Manager  
Criminal Justice and Highway Safety Division  
Governor's Office of Community and Industrial  
Development  
1204 Kanawha Boulevard East  
Charleston, WV 25301  
(304) 558-8814 (Phone)  
(304) 558-0391 (Fax)  
Martha Craig-Hinchman, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Wisconsin

Steven D. Sell, Executive Director  
Office of Justice Assistance  
222 State Street, Second Floor  
Madison, WI 53702  
(608) 266-3323 (Phone)  
(608) 266-6676 (Fax)  
Michael Derr, Juvenile Justice Specialist

## Wyoming

Gary Sherman, Director  
Department of Family Services  
2300 Capitol Avenue  
Hathaway Building, Third Floor  
Cheyenne, WY 82000  
(307) 777-5833 (Phone)  
(307) 777-7747 (Fax)  
Jim Mitchell, Juvenile Justice Specialist

---

---

# OMB State Single Points of Contact

---

In accordance with Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs," Section 4, "the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) shall maintain a list of official State entities designated by the States to review and coordinate proposed Federal financial assistance and direct Federal development." This list is the OFFICIAL OMB LISTING. This list is also published biannually in the Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance.

## Alabama

Jon C. Strickland  
Alabama Department of Economic  
and Community Affairs  
Planning and Economic Development Division  
401 Adams Avenue  
Montgomery, AL 36103-5690  
(205) 242-5483 (Phone)  
(205) 242-5515 (Fax)

## Arizona

Janice Dunn  
Arizona State Clearinghouse  
3800 North Central Avenue  
14th Floor  
Phoenix, AZ 85012  
(602) 280-1315 (Phone)  
(602) 280-1305 (Fax)

## Arkansas

Tracy L. Copeland, Manager  
State Clearinghouse  
Office of Intergovernmental Services  
Department of Finance and Administration  
1515 West Seventh Street, Room 412  
Little Rock, AR 72203  
(501) 682-1074 (Phone)  
(501) 682-5206 (Fax)

## California

Grants Coordinator  
Office of Planning and Research  
1400 10th Street, Room 121  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 323-7480 (Phone)  
(916) 323-3018 (Fax)

## Delaware

Francine Booth  
Executive Department  
Thomas Collins Building  
P.O. Box 1401  
Dover, DE 19903  
(302) 739-3326 (Phone)  
(302) 739-5661 (Fax)

## District of Columbia

Charles Nichols  
Office of Grants Management  
and Development  
717 14th Street NW., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 727-6554 (Phone)  
(202) 727-1617 (Fax)

## Florida

Suzanne Traub-Metlay  
Florida State Clearinghouse  
Intergovernmental Affairs Policy Unit  
Executive Office of the Governor  
The Capitol, Room 1603  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001  
(904) 488-8114 (Phone)  
(904) 488-9005 (Fax)

## Georgia

Charles H. Badger, Administrator  
Georgia State Clearinghouse  
254 Washington Street SW., Room 401J  
Atlanta, GA 30334  
(404) 656-3855/29 (Phone)  
(404) 656-7938 (Fax)

---

## Guam

Giovanni T. Sgambelluri, Director  
Bureau of Budget and Management Research  
Office of the Governor  
P.O. Box 2950  
Agana, GU 96910  
011-671-472-2285 (Phone)  
011-671-472-2825 (Fax)

## Illinois

Steve Klokkenga  
Office of the Governor  
107 Stratton Building  
Springfield, IL 62706  
(217) 782-1671 (Phone)  
(217) 782-6620 (Fax)

## Indiana

Frances E. Williams  
State Budget Agency  
212 State House  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(317) 232-2972 (Phone)  
(317) 233-3323 (Fax)

## Iowa

Steven R. McCann  
Division for Community Assistance  
Iowa Department of Economic Development  
200 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, IA 50309  
(515) 242-4719 (Phone)  
(515) 242-4859 (Fax)

## Kentucky

Ronald W. Cook  
Office of the Governor  
Department of Local Government  
1024 Capitol Center Drive  
Frankfort, KY 40601-8204  
(502) 573-2382 (Phone)  
(502) 573-2512 (Fax)

## Maine

Joyce Benson  
State Planning Office  
State House Station Number 38  
Augusta, ME 04333  
(207) 287-3261 (Phone)  
(207) 287-6489 (Fax)

## Maryland

Roland E. English III, Chief  
State Clearinghouse for Intergovernmental  
Assistance  
Maryland Office of Planning  
301 West Preston Street, Room 1104  
Baltimore, MD 21201-2365  
(410) 225-4490 (Phone)  
(410) 225-4480 (Fax)

## Massachusetts

Karen Arone  
State Clearinghouse  
Executive Office of Communities  
and Development  
100 Cambridge Street, Room 1803  
Boston, MA 02202  
(617) 727-7001, Ext. 443 (Phone)  
(617) 727-4259 (Fax)

## Michigan

Richard S. Pastula, Director  
Office of Federal Grants  
Michigan Department of Commerce  
P.O. Box 30225  
Lansing, MI 48909  
(517) 373-7356 (Phone)  
(517) 373-6683 (Fax)

## Mississippi

Cathy Mallette  
Clearinghouse Officer  
Department of Finance and Administration  
455 North Lamar Street  
Jackson, MS 39202  
(601) 359-6762 (Phone)  
(601) 359-6764 (Fax)

---

## Missouri

Lois Pohl  
Federal Assistance Clearinghouse  
Office of Administration  
P.O. Box 809  
Room 760, Truman Building  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
(314) 751-4834 (Phone)  
(314) 751-7819 (Fax)

## Nevada

Department of Administration  
State Clearinghouse  
Capitol Complex  
Carson City, NV 89710  
(702) 687-4065 (Phone)  
(702) 687-3983 (Fax)

## New Hampshire

Jeffrey H. Taylor, Director  
New Hampshire Office of State Planning  
Attn: Intergovernmental Review Process

Please address correspondence and questions to:  
James E. Bieber  
2 Beacon Street  
Concord, NH 03301  
(603) 271-2155 (Phone)  
(603) 271-1728 (Fax)

## New Jersey

Gregory W. Adkins, Director  
Division of Community Resources  
New Jersey Department of Community Affairs  
Please direct all correspondence and questions  
about intergovernmental review to:  
Andrew J. Jaskolka  
State Review Process  
Division of Community Resources  
CN 814, Room 609  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0814  
(609) 292-9025 (Phone)  
(609) 984-0386 (Fax)

## New Mexico

Robert Peters  
State Budget Division  
Room 190, Bataan Memorial Building  
Santa Fe, NM 87503  
(505) 827-3640 (Phone)

## New York

New York State Clearinghouse  
Division of the Budget  
State Capitol  
Albany, NY 12224  
(518) 474-1605 (Phone)

## North Carolina

Chrys Baggett, Director  
North Carolina State Clearinghouse  
Office of the Secretary of Administration  
116 West Jones Street  
Raleigh, NC 27603-8003  
(919) 733-7232 (Phone)  
(919) 733-9571 (Fax)

## North Dakota

Office of Intergovernmental Assistance  
600 East Boulevard Avenue  
Bismarck, ND 58505-0170  
(701) 224-2094 (Phone)  
(701) 224-2308 (Fax)

## Northern Mariana Islands

Planning and Budget Office  
Office of the Governor  
Saipan, CM  
Northern Mariana Islands 96950

---

## Ohio

Larry Weaver  
State Clearinghouse  
Office of Budget and Management  
30 East Broad Street, 34th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43266-0411

Please direct correspondence and questions  
about intergovernmental review to:

Linda Wise  
(614) 466-0698 (Phone)  
(614) 466-5400 (Fax)

## Puerto Rico

Norma Burgos, Chair  
Jose E. Caro, Director  
Puerto Rico Planning Board  
Federal Proposals Review Office  
Minillas Government Center  
P.O. Box 41119  
San Juan, PR 00940-1119  
(809) 727-4444; 723-6190 (Phone)  
(809) 724-3270/3103 (Fax)

## Rhode Island

Daniel W. Varin, Associate Director  
Department of Administration  
Division of Planning  
One Capitol Hill, Fourth Floor  
Providence, RI 02908-5870  
(401) 277-2656 (Phone)  
(401) 277-2083 (Fax)

Please direct correspondence and questions to:  
Review Coordinator  
Office of Strategic Planning

## South Carolina

Omeagia Burgess  
Grant Services  
Office of the Governor  
1205 Pendleton Street, Room 477  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 734-0494 (Phone)  
(803) 734-0385 (Fax)

## Tennessee

Charles Brown  
State Planning Office  
500 Charlotte Avenue  
John Sevier Building, Suite 309  
Nashville, TN 37243-0001  
(615) 741-1676 (Phone)

## Texas

Tom Adams, Director  
Intergovernmental Coordination  
P.O. Box 13005  
Austin, TX 78711  
(512) 463-1771 (Phone)  
(512) 463-1984 (Fax)

## Utah

Carolyn Wright  
Utah State Clearinghouse  
Office of Planning and Budget  
State Capitol, Room 116  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
(801) 538-1535 (Phone)  
(801) 538-1547 (Fax)

## Vermont

Nancy McAvoy  
Pavilion Office Building  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
(802) 828-3326 (Phone)  
(802) 828-3339 (Fax)

## Virgin Islands

Jose George, Director  
Office of Management and Budget  
41 Norregade Emancipation Garden Station  
Second Floor  
Saint Thomas, VI 00802

Please direct questions and correspondence  
about intergovernmental review to:

Linda Clarke  
(809) 774-0750 (Phone)  
(809) 776-0069 (Fax)

---

## **West Virginia**

Fred Cutlip, Director  
Community Development Division  
West Virginia Development Office  
Building 6, Room 553  
Charleston, WV 25305  
(304) 558-4010 (Phone)  
(304) 558-3248 (Fax)

## **Wisconsin**

Martha Kerner, Section Chief  
State/Federal Relations  
Wisconsin Department of Administration  
101 East Wilson Street, Sixth Floor  
P.O. Box 7868  
Madison, WI 53707  
(608) 266-2125 (Phone)  
(608) 267-6931 (Fax)

## **Wyoming**

Sheryl Jeffries  
Herschler Building  
Fourth Floor, East Wing  
Cheyenne, WY 82002  
(307) 777-7574 (Phone)  
(307) 638-8967 (Fax)

In accordance with Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs," this list represents the designated State Single Points of Contact. The Office of Management and Budget point of contact for updating this listing is: Donna Rivelli (202) 395-5090. The States not listed no longer participate in the process. These include: Alaska; Colorado; Connecticut; Kansas; Hawaii; Idaho; Louisiana; Minnesota; Montana; Nebraska; Oklahoma; Oregon; Pennsylvania; South Dakota; Virginia; and Washington. This list is based on the most current information provided by the States. Information on any changes or apparent errors should be provided to the Office of Management and Budget and the State in question. Changes to the list will only be made upon formal notification by the State. Also, this listing is published biannually in the Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance.



OJJDP

# JUVENILE JUSTICE CLEARINGHOUSE

---

A Service of the Office of Juvenile Justice  
and Delinquency Prevention

---

- ▶ Links the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention with juvenile justice practitioners, policymakers, and the public.
- ▶ Provides toll-free telephone access to juvenile justice information specialists.
- ▶ Maintains an electronic bulletin board for online access to current news and announcements.
- ▶ Collects, synthesizes, and disseminates information on all areas of juvenile justice.
- ▶ Produces OJJDP publications covering the broad spectrum of juvenile justice.

**800-638-8736**



# Publications From OJJDP

The following OJJDP publications are available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse. To obtain copies, call or write:

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse  
P.O. Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20850  
800-638-8736  
Internet Address:  
look@ncjrs.aspensys.com.

Most OJJDP publications are available free of charge from the Clearinghouse; requests for more than 10 documents or those from individuals outside the United States require payment for postage and handling. To obtain information on payment procedures or to speak to a juvenile justice information specialist about additional services offered, contact the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., e.t.

## Delinquency Prevention

*Education in the Law: Promoting Citizenship in the Schools.* 1990, NCJ 125548.

*Family Life, Delinquency, and Crime: A Policymaker's Guide.* 1994, NCJ 140517.

*Family Strengthening in Preventing Delinquency—A Literature Review.* 1994, NCJ 150222, \$13.00.

*Mobilizing Community Support for Law-Related Education.* 1989, NCJ 118217, \$9.75.

*OJJDP and Boys and Girls Clubs of America: Public Housing and High-Risk Youth.* 1991, NCJ 128412.

*Strengthening America's Families: Promising Parenting Strategies for Delinquency Prevention.* 1993, NCJ 140781, \$9.15.

## Missing and Exploited Children

*America's Missing and Exploited Children—Their Safety and Their Future.* 1986, NCJ 100581.

*Child Abuse: Prelude to Delinquency?* 1985, NCJ 104275, \$7.10.

*The Compendium of the North American Symposium on International Child Abduction: How To Handle International Child Abduction Cases.* 1993, NCJ 148137, \$17.50.

*Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children in America, First Report: Numbers and Characteristics, National Incidence Studies (Full Report).* 1990, NCJ 123668, \$14.40.

*Missing Children: Found Facts.* 1990, NCJ 130916.

*Obstacles to the Recovery and Return of Parentally Abducted Children.* 1994, NCJ 143458.

*Obstacles to the Recovery and Return of Parentally Abducted Children (Full Report).* 1993, NCJ 144535, \$22.80.

*Parental Abductors: Four Interviews (Video).* 1993, NCJ 147866, \$12.50.

*Stranger Abduction Homicides of Children.* 1989, NCJ 115213.

## Law Enforcement

*Drug Recognition Techniques: A Training Program for Juvenile Justice Professionals.* 1990, NCJ 128795.

*Innovative Law Enforcement Training Programs: Meeting State and Local Needs.* 1991, NCJ 131735.

*Law Enforcement Custody of Juveniles (Video).* 1992, NCJ 137387, \$13.50.

*Law Enforcement Policies and Practices Regarding Missing Children and Homeless Youth.* 1993, NCJ 145644.

*Law Enforcement Policies and Practices Regarding Missing Children and Homeless Youth (Full Report).* 1993, NCJ 143397, \$13.00.

## Courts

*The Child Victim as a Witness, Research Report.* 1994, NCJ 149172.

*Court Careers of Juvenile Offenders.* 1988, NCJ 110854, \$8.40.

*Helping Victims and Witnesses in the Juvenile Justice System: A Program Handbook.* 1991, NCJ 139731, \$15.00.

*How Juveniles Get to Criminal Court.* 1994, NCJ 150309.

*Juvenile Court Property Cases.* 1990, NCJ 125625.

*Juvenile Court Statistics, 1991.* 1994, NCJ 147487.

*Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1992.* 1994, NCJ 150039.

## Gangs

*Gang Suppression and Intervention: An Assessment (Full Report).* 1994, NCJ 146494, \$15.00.

*Gang Suppression and Intervention: Community Models.* 1994, NCJ 148202.

*Gang Suppression and Intervention: Problem and Response.* 1994, NCJ 149629.

## Restitution

*Guide to Juvenile Restitution.* 1985, NCJ 098466, \$12.50.

*Liability and Legal Issues in Juvenile Restitution.* 1990, NCJ 115405.

*Victim-Offender Mediation in the Juvenile Justice System.* 1990, NCJ 120976.

## Corrections

*American Probation and Parole Association's Drug Testing Guidelines and Practices for Juvenile Probation and Parole Agencies.* 1992, NCJ 136450.

*Conditions of Confinement: Juvenile Detention and Corrections Facilities.* 1994, NCJ 141873.

*Conditions of Confinement: Juvenile Detention and Corrections Facilities (Full Report).* 1994, NCJ 145793.

*Desktop Guide to Good Juvenile Probation Practice.* 1991, NCJ 128218.

*Effective Practices in Juvenile Correctional Education: A Study of the Literature and Research 1980-1992.* 1994, NCJ 150066, \$15.00.

*Improving Literacy Skills of Juvenile Detainees.* 1994, NCJ 150707.

*Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: An Assessment (Full Report).* 1994, NCJ 144018, \$15.00.

*Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model.* 1994, NCJ 147575.

*Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: Policies and Procedures.* 1994, NCJ 147712.

*Juvenile Correctional Education: A Time for Change.* 1994, NCJ 150309.

*Juvenile Intensive Supervision: An Assessment (Full Report).* 1994, NCJ 150064, \$13.00.

*Juvenile Intensive Supervision: Planning Guide.* 1994, NCJ 150065.

*Juveniles Taken Into Custody: Fiscal Year 1991 Report.* 1993, NCJ 145746.

*National Juvenile Custody Trends: 1978-1989.* 1992, NCJ 131649.

*National Survey of Reading Programs for Incarcerated Juvenile Offenders.* 1993, NCJ 144017, \$6.75.

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

*Privatizing Juvenile Probation Services: Five Local Experiences.* 1989, NCJ 121507.

*Public Juvenile Facilities: Children in Custody 1989.* 1991, NCJ 127189.

*Reduced Recidivism and Increased Employment Opportunity Through Research-Based Reading Instruction.* 1993, NCJ 141324, \$7.70.

## General Juvenile Justice

*Balanced and Restorative Justice.* 1994, NCJ 149727.

*Breaking the Code (Video).* 1993, NCJ 146604, \$20.65.

*Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders.* 1993, NCJ 143453.

*Gould-Wysinger Awards (1993): A Tradition of Excellence.* 1994, NCJ 146840.

*Gun Acquisition and Possession in Selected Juvenile Samples.* 1993, NCJ 145326.

*Habitual Juvenile Offenders: Guidelines for Citizen Action and Public Responses.* 1991, NCJ 141235.

*Innovative Community Partnerships: Working Together for Change.* 1994, NCJ 147483.

*Juvenile Justice. Volume 1, Number 1, Spring/Summer 1993.* NCJ 141870.

*Juvenile Justice. Volume 2, Number 1, Spring/Summer 1994.* NCJ 148407.

*Law-Related Education For Juvenile Justice Settings.* 1993, NCJ 147063, \$13.20.

*Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System.* 1993, NCJ 145849.

*Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System (Full Report).* 1993, NCJ 139556, \$11.50.

*Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Brochure.* 1993, NCJ 144527.

*Retarding America—The Imprisonment of Potential (Video).* 1993, NCJ 146605, \$12.95.

*Study of Tribal and Alaska Native Juvenile Justice Systems.* 1992, NCJ 148217, \$17.20.

*Urban Delinquency and Substance Abuse: Initial Findings.* 1994, NCJ 143454.

*Urban Delinquency and Substance Abuse: Technical Report and Appendices.* 1993, NCJ 146416, \$25.60.

*Violent Juvenile Offenders: An Anthology.* 1984, NCJ 095108, \$28.00.

**U.S. Department of Justice**

Office of Justice Programs

*Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*

*Washington, D.C. 20531*

---

Official Business

Penalty for Private Use \$300

FIRST CLASS  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
DOJ/OJJDP  
Permit No. G-91