

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections



National Institute of Corrections

Office of Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention

A Common Vision and Mission

**A Report of the
Juvenile Justice
Detention and Corrections
Executive Assembly**



1992

141355

A Common Vision and Mission

A Report of the
Juvenile Justice
Detention and Corrections
Executive Assembly

Longmont, Colorado
June 15-18, 1992

APR 5 1993

141355

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIC/OJP/OJJDP

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

National Institute of Corrections

M. Wayne Huggins, Director

Dianne Carter, Ed.D., President

NIC Academy

Peggy Ritchie-Matsumoto, Project Manager
Correctional Program Specialist, NIC Academy

1960 Industrial Circle, Suite A
Longmont, Colorado 80501

Telephone: 303-682-0382
Toll Free: 1-800-995-NIC-W
FAX: 303-682-0469
TDD: 202-307-3156

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Gerald P. Regier, Acting Administrator

633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531

Telephone: 202-307-5940
FAX: 202-307-0091

Prepared under IAA number 91JNCXA012 from the
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention,
Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice

**NIC/OJJD
Training Committee**

Orlando L. Martinez
Associate Director for Family
and Children Services
Division of Corrections
Denver, CO

Rose Washington
Commissioner
New York City Department of
Juvenile Justice
365 Broadway
New York, NY

Gwen Chunn
Director
North Carolina Division
of Youth Services
Raleigh, NC

Charles Kehoe
Director
Department of Youth and
Family Services
Richmond, VA

Fred Jordan
Juvenile Probation Department
San Francisco, CA

Dennis Shumate
Superintendent
Youth Center at Beloit
Beloit, KS

Earl Dunlap
Executive Director
National Juvenile Detention
Association
Richmond, KY

Betty Adams
Commissioner
Tennessee Department of
Youth Development
Nashville, TN

Jesse Williams
Juvenile Justice
Allentown, PA

Federal Staff:

Dianne Carter
President
NIC Academy
Longmont, CO

Steve Swisher
Correctional Program Specialist
NIC Academy
Longmont, CO

Emily Martin
Director
Training Development and
Technical Assistance Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
Washington, DC

Frank Porpotage
Assistant Director
Training Development and
Technical Assistance Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
Washington, DC

Executive Summary

Juvenile Justice Detention and Corrections Executive Assembly

A group of 22 leaders representing a cross-section of the field of juvenile corrections and detention met in mid-1992 to consider the field's future and draft vision and mission statements to help shape it. Composing vision and mission statements has become a familiar practice for enterprises that are beset by intensifying internal and external pressures. It gives them the opportunity to pause, regroup, and align around a common direction. A vision statement seeks to capture in a few words the essence of what an organization or occupation should and could become. A mission statement provides a blueprint to realize that vision.

The officials were convened as the Juvenile Justice Detention and Corrections Executive Assembly. They met at the offices of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Academy in Longmont, Colorado, June 15-18, 1992. Participating were representatives of the assembly's sponsoring organizations, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and NIC and its Academy.

Developing a Shared Vision

The assembly was held in response to the National Juvenile Justice Needs Assessment Forum. The forum's proceedings a year earlier called for a national assembly "to develop a shared vision of the critical issues in juvenile corrections and detention in order to develop strategies for impacting them."

The process of composing the statements was in several stages. It began with a review of the past and present of juvenile corrections and detention and an unsettling forecast of what the future holds as the 21st century approaches. A futurist told assembly members that although they once "could assume a good share of tomorrow was going to be like yesterday," that was no longer the case and the path of the future would force them to change their "ways of thinking, mindsets, perceptions."

Coming Full Circle

The historical perspective was provided by the chairman of the Department of Criminal Justice at Temple University. He interprets the evolution of the nation's system of juvenile justice as a process that has come full circle. Before the inception of the juvenile justice system in the mid-19th century, no formal distinction was made between adult and juvenile offenders, he said. Now the circle is complete and "we've come back to looking at kids as criminals," he said.

The OJJDP administrator designate told the assembly that OJJDP plans to accelerate its efforts to help the juvenile justice system deal with violent crime, but suggested that improving the system was not enough. The family unit must also be strengthened, he said. He asked assembly members for their viewpoints. Several focused on families. Said one: "For so many ... kids, there's no family there." Said another: "Give families the support they need to give children what they need."

The Drafting Process

A consultant specializing in individual and organizational development directed the step-by-step drafting of the two statements. To create a vision statement, members first cataloged their nightmares and dreams for the juvenile justice system. Many of them envisioned the same nightmare, that of a growing number of Americans left behind in the wake of a rapidly changing society. Next, the assembly was asked to envision what the field must do to avoid its nightmares and realize its dreams. From their replies, which ranged from "give up control" to "empower the community," members were asked to identify common themes. The consultant next had the assembly propose the elements that should be included in its vision statement.

In this manner, she elicited lists of dreams and nightmares, replies, themes, and elements that disclosed in detail the wide range of members' concerns, problems, solutions, hopes, and ideals. From the lists, she had six groups of participants prepare first drafts of a vision statement. Then a small team distilled the six versions into a single draft that was the focus of a good deal of discussion. Should the statement mention violence? Why didn't the statement invoke justice and equality? Perhaps these were terms for which there were so many conflicting meanings and which had been so misused in debates over juvenile justice that they shouldn't be in the statement. Eventually, members agreed on a final version.

Vision Statement

Our vision is that every child experience success in caring families and nurturing communities that cherish children and teach them to value family and community. Our vision is guided by the fact that our decisions and actions affecting children today determine the quality of our life tomorrow.

Drafting the mission statement focused on these questions: Whom do we serve? What are the needs of those we serve? What are your proudest accomplishments after five years? What is the seed core of the juvenile justice system?

Mission Statement

The mission of the juvenile corrections and detention system is to provide leadership for change for youth, family units, and communities. It operates by creating legitimate, alternative pathways to adulthood through equal access to services that are least intrusive, culturally sensitive, and consistent with the highest professional standards.

Assembly members also developed strategies to enlist widespread support and adoption of the two statements. At the assembly's close, the participants formed working groups to refine and implement these strategies in the days ahead.

**Members of the
Juvenile Justice Detention and Corrections Executive Assembly**

Linda E. Albrecht, Facility Director, Lansing Residential Center, New York State
Division for Youth

Joseph T. Christy, Director, Washington County, Oregon Juvenile Department

H. Christian DeBruyn, Deputy Commissioner, Juvenile and Field Services, Indiana

Dr. Barbara C. Dooley, Director, Madison County, Tennessee, Juvenile Court Services

Earl L. Dunlap, Executive Director, National Juvenile Detention Association

Ron Jackson, Executive Director, Texas Youth Commission

Steven P. Kossman, Director of Juvenile Services and Chief Probation Officer, Dallas
County Juvenile Department

Wayne Matsuo, Executive Director, Office of Youth Services, Hawaii Department of
Human Services

Lloyd W. Mixdorf, Projects Director for Juvenile Programs, American Correctional
Association

Anne M. Nelsen, Assistant Director, Utah Division of Youth Corrections

Nervy Oliver, Director, Ingham County, Michigan, Youth Center

George M. Phyfer, Executive Director, Alabama Department of Youth Services

Richard D. Quick, Executive Officer of Juvenile Services, St. Paul, Minnesota

David W. Roush, Director, Calhoun County, Michigan, Juvenile Home

John J. Sheridan, Administrator, Bureau of Residential Services, Concord, New
Hampshire

Denis J. Shumate, Superintendent, Youth Center at Beloit, Kansas

Charles M. Skaggs, Director, Williamson County, Texas, Juvenile Services

Thomas K. Stokes, Administrator, Gloucester County, New Jersey, Juvenile Detention
Center

Larry A. Tewes, Acting Assistant Director, Division of Juvenile Services, Lincoln,
Nebraska

James P. Trast, Manager of Field Support, Topeka, Kansas

Jesse E. Williams Jr., Deputy Commissioner, Philadelphia Department of Human
Services, Division of Juvenile Justice Services

Marjorie H. Young, Division Director, Georgia Division of Youth Services

Introduction

In June 1992, leaders in the field of juvenile corrections and detention joined in a process that is becoming a popular method for dealing with the accelerating pace of change. They drafted vision and mission statements. A vision statement seeks to capture in a few words the essence of what an organization or occupation should and could become. A mission statement provides a blueprint to realize that vision.

The process of fashioning vision and mission statements grants endeavors that are beset by intensifying internal and external pressures the opportunity to pause and regroup, "to retune and reset...to get clear about where they are headed so they can align around a common direction," according to consultant Debra Brazee. Once "you could assume a good share of tomorrow was going to be like yesterday," but no longer, says futurist Ed Barlow. Thus, he says, it's vital that enterprises acquire a future view of themselves so they can adapt to the era's rapid-fire changes.

Brazee and Barlow helped guide the work of the 22 corrections and detention officials who were convened as the Juvenile Justice Detention and Corrections Executive Assembly. The officials met at the offices of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Academy in Longmont, Colorado, June 15-18, 1992. Participating with them were representatives of the assembly's sponsoring organizations, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the Institute and its Academy.

The assembly was held in response to the National Juvenile Justice Needs Assessment Forum that convened a year earlier. The forum's proceedings called for a national assembly "to develop a shared vision of the critical issues in juvenile corrections in order to develop strategies for impacting them." In effect, the forum called on the juvenile justice community to create its own national agenda, "to say who we are and what we are about," according to Dianne Carter, the NIC Academy's president.

That community's needs are important to the operations of the Institute, M. Wayne Huggins, NIC's director, told assembly participants. "Everything we do is dictated by the field."

This is a report of how leaders from the field came to compose these two statements.

Vision Statement

Our vision is that every child experience success in caring families and nurturing communities that cherish children and teach them to value family and community. Our vision is guided by the fact that our decisions and actions affecting children today determine the quality of our life tomorrow.

Mission Statement

The mission of the juvenile corrections and detention system is to provide leadership for change for youth, family units, and communities. It operates by creating legitimate, alternative pathways to adulthood through equal access to services that are least intrusive, culturally sensitive, and consistent with the highest professional standards.

Rattling Paradigms

Before drafting the statements, the assembly received a brief refresher course on the past and present of juvenile corrections and an unsettling forecast of what is in store for the nation, the juvenile justice system included, as it approaches the 21st century. Barlow told the assembly members that to accomplish their work, "You may have to rattle some of your old paradigms."

At a dinner that opened the assembly and in a presentation the next morning, Barlow activated the paradigm-rattling process. "We are in a journey toward the next millennium," Barlow said, and that journey will challenge many of the paradigms, "ways of thinking, mindsets, perceptions," that currently comfort us. In engaging his audience, Barlow's technique was to mix cautionary aphorisms with often foreboding predictions and deliver them in a challenging style that kept listeners alert to his message.

Some Cautionary Aphorisms

"If you ever get comfortable in the '90s, you'll be out of business."

"In the '90s, we're going to have to work harder and smarter."

"Reform and reshape on a constant basis."

"Success comes to those who are able to develop a 'connectedness' with paradigms which are forming."

"Things that cause success in one decade can cause disaster in the next."

"Most of our time is spent on past issues."

"Seventy-five percent of what affects the future is already going on and most people don't know it."

"People have got to start thinking beyond traditional approaches because traditional approaches apparently aren't cutting it."

And, quoting another futurist, "Get beyond what you know."

Some Foreboding Predictions

"Man [soon] will have powers that historically were left to the gods, to forces outside of ourselves." For example, "\$100 billion is going to be spent on genetic engineering research between now and the year 2000. In our future, it will be very probable that people will be able to select the color of hair and eyes and sex of their offspring."

"That also does open up the door to being able to identify and put in place people who may not have inclinations that would lead them to crime....It also opens the door to potentially looking at individuals who have certain behavioral characteristics that lead them to trouble and changing hormonal makeup or whatever, so it may be possible to see that there aren't people who operate inappropriately. That really gets into a zone that's scary."

Another god-like power: "The information-connectedness through electronics of people being real time in their ability to communicate with people all over the planet. That brings a sense of power...a sense of being able to mobilize that is god-like...."

Still another power: "The extraplanetary capacity to go beyond ourselves in space stations."

And a dread power already with us: "The ability to eliminate life on the planet through destructive nuclear capacities...that accidentally could be unleashed."

With these observations, Barlow sought to "start people thinking about the power and nature of existence that would be part and parcel of the future."

By the Year 2000

He had other, less cosmic predictions that were pegged to the turn of the century. By the year 2000:

The world's population will increase from five billion to more than six billion people; 92 percent of this growth will take place in developing countries.

Ninety-five percent of all U.S. jobs will be in information and service industries and will require workers who are familiar with computers and other information-processing technologies.

Eighty-five percent of the labor force will be working for companies that employ 200 people or less.

Expert systems (able to replicate simple thinking processes) will be in universal use in areas such as agriculture, manufacturing, automotive diagnostics, health care, energy development, insurance underwriting, law enforcement, and education.

Less Disposable Income

Other changes, he noted, would not require waiting until the year 2000:

The United States achieved its prosperity and place in the world through creativity, entrepreneurship, and hard work, but there is now "a global workforce willing to work far cheaper and harder than we in the U.S."

One third of Americans working in the 1990s will have less disposable income than they had in the 1980s.

Eighty-five percent of the new entrants into the workforce between now and the year 2000 will be women, minorities, and immigrants.

"If you haven't thought about these things, maybe you should," Barlow told his audience. "What are their implications for what you do?"

Organizations and other enterprises confronted with crises prompted by the kinds of changes Barlow forecasts had three options: become extinct, survive on a bare minimum basis, or reorganize efforts and purpose, "which means going back to the future, building on core values," developing visions, missions, and strategies that accommodate the future.

Coming Full Circle

Going back to prepare for the future--providing a historical perspective of the juvenile justice system--was the job of Professor Philip W. Harris, chair of the Department of Criminal Justice at Temple University. Harris interprets the evolution of the

nation's system of juvenile justice as a process that has come full circle. Before the inception of the juvenile justice system in the mid-19th century, no formal distinction was made between adult and juvenile offenders. The approach was to punish criminal behavior regardless of age, although punishments often took into account the age of young offenders.

With the establishment of juvenile courts came the notion of delinquency, which was a general characterization of a young person's behavior rather than an accusation of a single offense. Environment was blamed for delinquent behavior. The remedy was to put young people in foster homes and institutions. The middle class, in effect, decided what was best in reforming the errant children of the lower classes, according to Harris. A renowned court decision (Fisher 1905) contained the statement, "The right of parental control is a natural right but not an inalienable one." The decision emphasized "the salvation of kids, not how they first got into the juvenile justice system," Harris said.

By the 1920s, the sentiment had developed that it was important not only to remove young offenders from harmful environments but also prepare them for adulthood. Later, the widespread development of psychological studies during World War II helped guide the post-war treatment of young offenders. The juvenile justice system attempted to look inside individual young people rather than to outside environmental factors for the explanation and remediation of behavior. Indeterminate dispositions became common; there was often no limit on how long young people were held in programs meant to rehabilitate them.

Starting in the 1960s, several Supreme Court decisions underscored the rights of accused youths. Gault (1967) extended due process rights to them; Winship (1970) moved the juvenile justice system from a fairly loose standard of proof to the adult standard of proof of a crime beyond a reasonable doubt; Breed (1975) held that a young person cannot be tried as an adult if earlier tried as a juvenile for the same crime.

By the 1980s, juvenile offenders often were perceived as victims. But the same decade brought a series of new court decisions that tended to circumscribe their rights. For example, Fare (1981) did not extend the rights of juveniles undergoing interrogation beyond those accorded adults in the landmark Miranda (1966) decision. Schall (1984) ruled it was permissible to hold juveniles in pre-trial detention for their own protection.

The following chart, presented by Harris, shows how the perception of juvenile offenders had changed by the 1990s.

20th Century Approaches to Juvenile Offenders

<u>Thru</u>	<u>Perception of Offender</u>	<u>Intervention Approach</u>	<u>Goal of Approach</u>
1920s	Deprived	Train	Reform
1960s	Sick	Cure	Rehabilitation
1980s	Victim	Restore	Reintegration
1990s	Corrupt	Punish	Retribution

The circle is complete and "we've come back to looking at kids as criminals," Harris said. An influential study of corrections research in the 1970s severely undermined the notion that offenders could be rehabilitated. Rehabilitation programs seemed not to work. Moreover, proponents of the rights of juvenile offenders saw abuses of rights to liberty and privacy in many treatment programs. "So," Harris said, "both the rights-oriented camp and the 'nothing works' camp were saying...let's just punish them or warehouse them or whatever we need to do to incapacitate them for a length of time."

In the 1980s, "the number of kids incarcerated grew dramatically while the number of arrests for delinquent offenses dropped dramatically." He noted that the trend toward incarceration was occurring simultaneously in both the juvenile and adult systems and that, indeed, an increased number of juvenile offenders were being waived for trial to adult courts.

"So punishment now is banishment from the juvenile justice system," according to Edward J. Loughran, commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services and a consultant to the assembly.

And what are the current perceptions within the juvenile justice system? Harris summed them up: There are "two outlooks now at hand. One, lock 'em up. Two, that doesn't work. We need a new answer."

Nightmares and Dreams

Presentations by Barlow and Harris were meant to prepare the seed ground for drafting the vision and mission statements. They established where we have been, where we are now, and what we likely will face in the future.

The first step in the drafting process began when Barlow asked assembly members, seated at several tables, to catalog their nightmares and dreams for the juvenile justice system. Their replies, like replies they would make in subsequent sessions, were abbreviated on large sheets of paper that remained on view.

Three of the tables envisioned the same nightmare, that of a growing number of Americans left behind in the wake of a rapidly changing, increasingly technological society. The nightmares included:

- People left behind.
- Very large group left behind.
- People left behind cause chaos and violence to the system.
- Vacuum of future knowledge--filled with public safety/juvenile justice system being used for social control.
- Always in battle with status quo, forces of resistance.
- Breakdown of U.S. society, denial.
- Lack of time, energy and resources to cope.
- What happens when U.S. no longer No. 1?

The dreams included:

- Communities take on responsibility.
- The field learns to think and plan across professional fields and paradigms to impact on the future.

- Seeing kids as future leaders, as part of the solution.
- More sophisticated use of privatization and coordination.
- Government giving over to communities to facilitate community experiments.
- Cooperation will replace competition.
- Faster decisionmaking processes.

The next step in the drafting process was an outdoor juggling exercise, which, according to Debra Brazee, was meant to reinforce what had been said about creating "paradigm shifts" and "demonstrate the necessity for a different way of doing things." The exercise involved reducing the amount of time it took teams to pass tennis balls around the entire group.

Indoors, Brazee, a specialist in individual and organizational development, began directing the assembly step by step toward its goal. First, she played a videotape of what may be the 20th century's most stirring and notable vision statement, the "I Have a Dream" speech of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in which King "subpoenaed the conscience of the nation before the judgment seat of morality." Here was an exemplary vision statement, one which dealt with reality, contained a positive approach, linked all involved to the basic issue at hand, and was grounded in core values and commitments--those of the nation.

Replies to Visioning

Next, Brazee asked the assembly, "What must the profession do to avoid its nightmares and realize its dreams?" In a first attempt at "visioning," the assembly formulated these replies:

- Assume a leadership position.
- Challenge the organization, the traditional government apparatus.
- Facilitate and encourage the family, community, friends, and significant others into the system.
- Give up control.
- Focus on dreams and reframe the nightmares.
- Educate the public about what we do and what we perceive the community needs.
- Empower the community...by becoming part of the community and giving up some control.
- Make decisions based on facts.
- Make certain that the process is a dynamic, continuing one.
- Identify and state the problem.
- Establish a leadership core based on principles of guidance, facilitation, support, two-way communication.
- Power means *someone* listens to me.
- Look at communities as a resource.

- Reestablish myths and heroes.
- Salability and marketability of vision.

Then, Brazee asked members to identify the common themes among their many replies. They listed:

- Listening.
- Passion/commitment.
- Democracy.
- Innovation.
- Risk/daring.
- Ongoing.
- Delivery of message.
- Flexibility.
- Leadership.
- Educational.
- Community.
- Inclusiveness.
- Examine.
- Community empowerment.
- Do it/action.

Vision Statement Ingredients

At this point, Brazee paused to review in detail the ingredients of a successful vision statement. She said a vision statement contains the essence of what an organization or profession should and could become in the future, often the distant future. It is specific enough to provide real guidance and vague enough to encourage initiative and remain relevant. It is desirable--serving the interests and real needs of stakeholders--and feasible--achievement is possible, though not guaranteed. A vision statement is...capable of fulfillment but not a goal and, finally, a force in people's hearts that compels courage.

Composing a vision statement, then, is a tall order.

Brazee's next step was to ask the assembly to propose the elements that should be included in its vision statement. The members offered these:

- Equality.
- Kids are important to the future.
- Violence-free society.
- Justice as fairness, equality.
- Reasonableness.
- Change can occur.
- Persons should be better off after contact with the system.
- Childhood is unique time of life.
- The definition of childhood has changed.
- Every kid assured a family.
- Alternative family structure.

- Kids deserve a home.
- Opportunities to succeed.
- Community ownership of responsibility.
- Family involvement.
- Develop self-esteem.
- Opportunity to reach potential.
- Hope and optimism.
- Legitimate alternative path to maturation.
- Kids have a right to a high quality of life.
- Concept of leadership.
- Long term.
- Temporary.
- Singularity of purpose among juvenile agencies.
- Pride in profession.
- Expand professional boundaries.
- Establish professional identity.
- Community education.
- Young people as part of solution.
- Service.
- Process.
- Life long.
- Least restrictive.
- Approachable.
- Creative.
- People power.

Solutions, Hopes, and Ideals

Now came the process of distillation. Brazee's approach to drafting the vision statement was to have assembly members submit inclusive laundry lists of dreams and nightmares, replies, themes, and elements that disclosed in detail the wide range of concerns, problems, solutions, hopes, and ideals of this group of leaders in the field of juvenile corrections and detention. From these lists, particularly the "elements" one, Brazee now asked the assembly to prepare first drafts of a vision statement. Members were divided into six new groups that produced these versions.

1. We workers in juvenile justice see a country in which all children and their families are treated with the appropriate dignity and respect due to all citizens of this country. We will provide our services and expertise in the least-restrictive manner which protects the public, the child, and the family. We will work with all aspects of the community to insure our children are raised in a violence-free society which nurtures their individual needs and motivates them toward excellence and self-esteem.

2. Recognizing the future lies with our children and that adolescence is a very special and short period of life, it is imperative that communities assume responsibility for their children.
3. Development of a systematic approach to the elimination of the need for a juvenile justice system through a community-based process which includes:
 - preventive education,
 - temporary and long-term solution building,
 - strengthening and providing family-based programming.All program designs are youth- and family-centered and culturally sensitive, which assures equality of treatment and opportunity.
4. Every child has the right to succeed in a violence-free society that recognizes the uniqueness and contributions of that child in a supportive and contributing community. [Alternatively] Our vision is a violence-free society, a safe community, and children with opportunities to learn and grow, and enjoy quality of life.
5. While recognizing the future value of kids, the juvenile justice system will be more approachable and human to facilitate change in kids, families, friends, and communities to re-enfranchise the disenfranchised [and] to empower and enable communities to accept responsibility for their environs, which will result in a safe, more harmonious society.
6. Juvenile *justice* ensures "true justice," as envisioned by the framers of the American Dream for all children, all people (country/world), by advocating for and serving the special needs of those children and families in our JJ (juvenile justice) systems, recognizing their right to the pursuit of happiness (via education, career, self-esteem, health, etc.) and the reality that they will determine the destiny of the society and the world.

The distillation process continued with Brazee's last assignment of the day. She asked a small team of assembly members led by Nervy Johnson, director of the Ingham County, Michigan, Youth Center, to boil down overnight the six versions into a single draft of a vision statement that the group could consider the next day.

The Assembly Hears Regier

The second day of the Juvenile Justice Assembly began with an interlude from statement-drafting. The assembly heard from Gerald P. Regier, head of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Regier said his appointment as administrator designate of OJJDP provided "an opportunity to come home." As administrator of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, his last post, "I learned a great deal about the criminal justice system," he said, but the new job at OJJDP more directly addresses his principal, enduring concerns, which are with the welfare of children and youth and the vitality of families. He noted that he served in the Reagan Administration

with the Administration of Children, Youth, and Families, an agency of the Department of Health and Human Services. Later, he established the Family Research Council, a think tank that examined family issues.

Regier's initial remarks assessed youth and crime today. He characterized many young people as seeming to have "seen it all and done it all." For many, "childhood isn't there any more," he said, and "kids are adrift...angry at the world and their parents." He recalled that he joined fellow members of the National Commission on Children in visiting with 75 poor and middle-class young people in Pittsburgh. With "tremendous anger," the young people tore into the adults present and each other, Regier said, adding that their "anger was out of proportion to what it used to be."

Noting FBI figures showing there were 2.2 million arrests of young people in 1990, Regier also cited evidence that youth account for a greater share of violent crime than has been the case and that there is growing fear of young people by adults. He pointed to a recent speech by Attorney General William P. Barr in which Barr called for an improved juvenile justice system that is successful in intervening earlier and more effectively to deter young violent offenders.

Meaningful, Swift Intervention

Regier said OJJDP plans to accelerate its efforts to help the juvenile justice system deal with violent crime. "There is a need to strengthen the juvenile justice system and the capacity of the system to deal with the rising trend of violent and other serious offenders," he said. From a draft OJJDP study paper, he enumerated four levels of graduated sanctions, ranging from community-based and mediation programs for first offenders to severe confinement and waiver to the adult criminal justice system for the most serious offenders. At all levels, there is a need "for meaningful, swift intervention," Regier said.

Improving the juvenile justice system, however, is not enough, Regier suggested. The family unit must also be strengthened. He posed this question to the assembly: "How can public policy affect the family, which is the primary way we transmit moral values to young people? If we could reinvigorate families, we could give young people a sense of rootedness."

Regier had other questions that he said were not only for his immediate audience, but for the entire youth detention and corrections community.

1. At what point should juvenile offenders be waived to the adult criminal justice system? How serious should an offense be to prompt waiver?
2. What is the appropriate role of the prosecutor in the juvenile justice system?
3. Should juvenile records be available to the adult system?
4. Where should the limited resources available to the juvenile justice system be focused? Prevention? Detention? Corrections?

5. How can we restore in youth a sense of moral equilibrium "if parents don't tell them and teachers can't tell them?"

Bringing the Hammer Down

Regier asked for candid responses and got them. Ron Jackson, executive director of the Texas Youth Commission, said much of what he heard Regier suggest "was 10 years old," sanctions and programs tried and implemented in the adult system that now would be replicated in the juvenile system. But the adult system has become "a system that brings the hammer down and does not work." Besides, he said, the nation cannot afford to pay for the prisons it has now.

Regier responded by citing the Bush Administration's "Weed and Seed" program as a new system to address crime. "Weeding" is routing criminals from their neighborhoods, and "seeding" is putting in place social programs that strengthen community institutions. "If we were just 'weeding,' then perhaps your point about this being 10 years old would be correct," Regier said. "But we're not. The tie between the 'weed' and the 'seed' is critical and innovative."

"The biggest issue is what happens to kids when they come out (of confinement) and go back into their neighborhoods," Jackson said. He added later: "We know how to lock kids up, we know how to supervise them 24 hours a day, but the issue is being able to successfully place them in communities where they can succeed....Many are not properly prepared to handle the old neighborhood environment." The result, Jackson said, is that the recidivism rate for the best institutions for juvenile offenders is about the same as for average and poor ones.

"We have to start in another direction," Jackson said. He suggested that OJJDP urge and help states to examine and change as necessary master plans for juvenile corrections that first were developed and refined in the mid-1970s.

Wayne Matsuo, executive director of the Hawaii Office of Youth Services, Department of Human Services, said he agreed with the proposal to reassess and revamp state master plans.

Bolster Families

George M. Phyfer, executive director of the Alabama Department of Youth Services, and Jesse Williams, Jr., deputy commissioner of the Philadelphia Department of Human Services, Division of Juvenile Justice Services, responded to Regier's remarks about the family. "For so many of these kids, there's no family there," Phyfer said. "Give families the support they need to give children what they need," Williams said. "Bolster families." He added that increased investment should be made in preventing juveniles from taking pathways to crime and in "aftercare," helping them once they are out of institutions.

"When you seed, seed jobs," said James P. Trast, manager of field support, Topeka, Kansas. "Be realistic...Real prevention is giving people positive alternatives."

Earl L. Dunlap, executive director of the National Juvenile Detention Association, said fragmentation of efforts among federal agencies weakened the national govern-

ment's contribution to assisting juvenile justice. Regier responded by saying he recognized the problem and added that again the Weed and Seed program represented a successful attempt by Barr, him, and others "to facilitate better coordination" among various federal agencies.

H. Christian DeBruyn, deputy director of Juvenile and Field Services, Indianapolis, called on Regier to "take a strong stand" in championing prevention rather than detention and corrections. He encouraged "all dollars" to prevention.

Steven P. Kossman, director of juvenile services and chief probation officer, Dallas County Juvenile Department, said he was worried that "we don't know what prevention is" and that "we may be abandoning a whole generation" of young people. As for waiver, it "puts into the adult system young people who never had a childhood" and "that is wrong." Matsuo and Lloyd W. Mixdorf, juvenile programs project director for the American Correctional Association, joined in criticism of waiver.

Regier thanked his audience for their comments and concluded by saying that under his stewardship at OJJDP, "Our office should and will provide the necessary moral leadership to help kids."

Distilling a Vision Statement

The drafting process resumed. During a long session the night before, Oliver's team produced the following distillation from the initial six drafts of a vision statement.

Our quality of life tomorrow is determined by the decisions we make and the actions we take with children today. Our vision is of a safe, harmonious, and violence-free society. We have the unique position of offering leadership which challenges the system in concert with the communities to provide environments in which every child is assured the opportunity to succeed in families and communities which value children and teach children to value family and community.

A good deal of informal discussion followed. Should the statement mention violence? Why didn't the statement invoke justice and equality? Perhaps these were terms for which there were so many conflicting meanings and which had been so misused in debates over juvenile justice that they shouldn't be in the statement. Did the first sentence more properly belong in the mission statement rather than the vision statement? Should the statement be shorter?

From the Oliver group's version emerged these variations prepared by three newly formed groups:

Our vision is of a safe, harmonious, and violence-free (or nonviolent) society in which every child experiences success in families and communities which, in turn, value children and teach children to value family and community.

We are committed to children experiencing success in families and communities which value children and teach children to value family and community in order to create a safe, harmonious, and violence-free society.

In order to create a safe, harmonious, and violence-free society, every child must experience success in families and communities which value children and teach children to value family and community.

The discussion continued, as did the process of condensing the field's vision into a brief statement. Eventually, the assembly agreed on this final version:

Our vision is that every child experience success in caring families and nurturing communities that cherish children and teach them to value family and community. Our vision is guided by the fact that our decisions and actions affecting children today determine the quality of our life tomorrow.

Drafting a Mission Statement

In addition to drafting a final vision statement on the second day of the assembly, the group prepared a mission statement, which provides the roadmap for realizing the vision statement.

Brazee described the criteria for an organization's mission statement. It must be clear, understandable, and brief; specify the needs the organization fills; describe the organization's primary customers; and say how the organization plans to go about its business. According to Brazee, a successful mission statement is "broad enough to be flexible but narrow enough to permit focus; reflects values, beliefs, and the philosophy of operations and culture of an organization; offers obtainable goals; and is worded in a way that serves as an energy source and rallying point for the organization."

To begin the process of drafting the mission statement, Brazee used an exercise she said was designed "to get at the elements that make up a mission statement...to draw on more creative and deeper levels." She asked assembly members seated at four tables to close their eyes, relax, inhale and exhale deeply, and seek to capture images that responded to the following questions.

Whom do we serve?

What are the needs of those we serve?

What are your proudest accomplishments after five years?

What is the seed core of the juvenile justice system?

Participants at each table then drew on large sheets of paper assigned to each question pictographs of the images they summoned. One drew stick figures holding hands that represented community; another drew a map of the United States encompassing a house; a third drew a triangle bounded by the words "community, family, children;" another drew a circle encompassing the phrase "total child;" still another drew a "wellness wheel."

Brazee then asked for shorthand replies to the four questions.

Whom do we serve?

Answers from the assembly:

- Kids.
- Families.
- Communities.
- The system.
- Self.
- Universe.
- Those outside the norm.
- Staff.
- Practitioners.

What are the needs of those we serve?

Answers:

- Holistic-total child.
- Individualized.
- Comprehensive.
- Pride, self-esteem.
- Connection with family, community (education, jobs, opportunity).
- Training needs of staff.
- Need to be loved.

What are your proudest accomplishments after five years?

Answers:

- State plan-cooperation.
- Total community working together.
- Small institutions.
- Staff development.
- Coalition with community.
- Helping kids.
- Coalition among leadership.
- Positive irritation to system.
- Preservation of system.
- Advancement of system.
- Success with kids we serve.
- Identification of national groups and the leadership role they have played.
- Developing strategies for change.
- Create national agenda for juvenile justice that focuses on kids.

- Death of occupying army.
- System linkage.

What is the seed core of the juvenile justice system?

Answers:

- Balance public safety/kids' needs.
- Build success in kids, family.
- Change can happen.
- Overcome barriers.
- Understanding.
- Kids and their universe.
- Hope.
- Community.
- Oppressive.
- Kids--last stop to salvage kids and family.

From this raw material, each of the four groups composed a mission statement. As with the vision statement drafting process, there was a good deal of informal conversation and, again, the replies to Brazee's questions provided insight into the disposition of the field. The versions:

1. The juvenile justice system consists of public and private agencies and organizations whose mission is to respond to the needs of at-risk youth, their families, and the community. The system operates by providing the appropriate services, least-intrusive interventions, and graduated sanctions to meet the range of needs in a manner consistent with the highest level of professional standards.
2. The mission of the juvenile justice system is to provide, as well as collaborate and advocate with other systems, for an integrated continuum of individualized rehabilitative services to youth and families identified by the juvenile court and delivered in a way that is culturally sensitive, ensures equal access, and results in successful youth and safe, harmonious communities.
3. The mission of the juvenile justice system is to create legitimate pathways to maturity. It operates by providing troubled children with services, designed in cooperation with community members, to reinforce and preserve family units. The system's goal is to equip children for the enjoyment of productive lives and positive contributions to their communities.
4. The juvenile justice mission is to provide a continuum of services for children, their families, and communities to enable children to identify and achieve their potential and develop a sense of self-worth.

From these versions, the assembly extracted this final mission statement:

The mission of the juvenile corrections and detention system is to provide leadership for change for youth, family units, and communities. It operates by creating legitimate, alternative pathways to adulthood through equal access to services that are least intrusive, culturally sensitive, and consistent with the highest professional standards.

Enrollment and Commitment

The last halfday of the assembly was devoted principally to developing strategies to enlist widespread support and adoption of the vision and mission statements throughout the juvenile justice system.

Brazee listed the levels of response the assembly members could expect to the statements. Among subordinates and peers, there could be: 1) hostility and no compliance with the statements, 2) grudging compliance, 3) formal compliance, 4) genuine compliance where committed followers and good team players signed on, or 5) genuine enrollment and commitment to the new statements. The goal, obviously, was to elicit genuine enrollment and commitment among the many elements that make up the juvenile justice system, but particularly within the juvenile corrections and detention community.

To develop strategies and tactics to achieve the goal, the assembly once again was divided into groups. Each was asked to come up with suggestions to market the statements. Participants divided their shorthand suggestions into several strategic categories. Following, by category, is a sampling of suggestions.

Professional Associations--Present to fellow juvenile workers at this year's ACA meeting in San Antonio; conduct a session with field services staff at annual meeting of MAPCO (professional) association; use vision/mission statements as backdrop for rewriting program philosophy and other program refinement and development activities; use Western Conference of Juvenile Training Schools in October 1992 (Topeka) to promote vision and mission regionally; print letter- and poster-size mission and vision statements in a form suitable for framing; build team through shared needs.

Leadership--Send vision/mission statements to state legislature and governor and national elected officials; ensure policymakers, legislators, judges, and OMB people are well aware of mission and vision; make vision and mission part of conferences and training seminars; after explaining to staff and colleagues first, repeat same process to outside groups (civic organizations, other associations, etc.); create linkages with other agencies for shared values and goals in our respective missions to advocate for implementation, funding, etc.

Media, Public Relations, Publications, and Newsletters--Organize national campaign to be carried out by NIC to train all juvenile justice administrators and practitioners...in vision, mission, and technology; national juvenile justice system conference to brainstorm strategies; use NACJA newsletter to inform and promote vision/mission; solicit media interviews (print, radio, TV) to educate general public; TV commercials/public service announcements; publish the products of this group in journals,

newsletters, etc.; take this concept of future vision to Bill Moyers, CBS, NBC, ABC, and Maury Povich.

Stakeholders' Vision--Do training session with juvenile training school staff; share mission with union and ask it to develop its role/strategies in the implementation of its mission; share concepts developed here with judges and other key leaders in state/local jurisdictions; survey prisoners as to what might have made a difference in their lives; include copy of vision/mission statements with orientation or admission packets for all youth in facilities/programs.

Group Participants and the Assembly--Have T-shirts printed with vision/mission statements; create structured communications system with others in this group to maintain contact regarding efforts, progress, successes, failures, learnings; plan consistent, regular follow-up with this group to continuously review what started here.

A New Answer

At the assembly's close, the participants formed working groups to refine and implement the strategies they identified. In three days, leaders in juvenile corrections and detention had rattled their paradigms, at least a bit, and formulated a vision and mission for themselves that they were gratified to carry home. Their statements may contribute to devising the new answer Philip Harris said was needed. To recall his observation:

There are "two outlooks now at hand. One, lock 'em up. Two, that doesn't work. We need a new answer."

**Participants at the
Juvenile Justice Detention
and Corrections Executive Assembly**

Linda E. Albrecht
Facility Director
Lansing Residential Center
New York State Division for Youth

Joseph T. Christy
Director
Juvenile Department
Washington County, Oregon

Christian DeBruyn
Deputy Commissioner
Juvenile and Field Services
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dr. Barbara C. Dooley
Director
Juvenile Court Services
Madison County, Tennessee

Earl L. Dunlap
Executive Director
National Juvenile Detention Association

Ron Jackson
Executive Director
Texas Youth Commission

Steven P. Kossman
Director of Juvenile Services
and Chief Probation Officer
Dallas County Juvenile Department
Dallas, Texas

Wayne Matsuo
Executive Director
Office of Youth Services
Hawaii Department of Human Services

Lloyd W. Mixdorf
Projects Director
for Juvenile Programs
American Correctional Association

Anne M. Nelsen
Assistant Director
Utah Division of Youth Corrections

Nervy Oliver
Director
Youth Center
Ingham County, Michigan

George M. Phyfer
Executive Director
Alabama Department of Youth Services

Richard D. Quick
Executive Officer of Juvenile Services
St. Paul, Minnesota

David W. Roush
Director
Juvenile Home
Calhoun County, Michigan

John J. Sheridan
Administrator
Bureau of Residential Services
Concord, New Hampshire

Denis J. Shumate
Superintendent
Youth Center
Beloit, Kansas

Charles M. Skaggs
Director
Juvenile Services
Williamson County, Texas

Thomas K. Stokes
Administrator
Juvenile Detention Center
Gloucester County, New Jersey

Larry A. Tewes
Acting Assistant Director
Division of Juvenile Services
Lincoln, Nebraska

James P. Trast
Manager of Field Support
Topeka, Kansas

Jesse E. Williams, Jr.
Deputy Commissioner
Department of Human Services
Division of Juvenile Justice Services
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Marjorie H. Young
Division Director
Georgia Division of Youth Services