

**PROGRAM AREA  
COMMUNITY YOUTH  
SERVICE PROGRAMS**



**Prepared by:**

**The Evaluation Unit of the New Jersey  
State Law Enforcement Planning Agency**

**April, 1979**

66286

PROGRAM AREA

✓ COMMUNITY YOUTH

SERVICE PROGRAMS

Prepared by: /

The Evaluation Unit of the New Jersey  
State Law Enforcement Planning Agency

April, 1979

This report is based on research supported by Grant Number 78-NI-AX-0004 awarded to the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions it contains are those of the authors and are not necessarily shared by the U.S. Department of Justice.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Executive Summary.....	1
II. Project and Community Characteristics.....	5
III. Data Analysis.....	10
Appendix.....	20

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Demographic Information.....	9
Table 2: Source of Referral by Jurisdiction.....	11
Table 3: Sex of Youth Service Bureau Clients.....	12
Table 4: Ethnic Background of Youth Service Bureau Clients.....	13
Table 5: Age of Youth Service Bureau Clients.....	14
Table 6: Known Prior Juvenile Justice System Involvement.....	15
Table 7: Client Services by Jurisdiction.....	17 & 17a
Table 8: Service Plans Developed.....	18
Table 9: Reason for Termination of Service.....	19

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

The emergence of youth service bureaus was prompted by concern with juvenile crime. Their distinctive character arose out of the twofold recognition that:

1. delinquency is provoked by the social and psychological strains which confront juveniles;
2. and that juveniles are often stigmatized by their involvement with the juvenile justice system and thereby confirmed in careers of delinquency.<sup>1</sup>

Hence, it is the intent of youth service bureaus to provide juveniles with services that mitigate the strains which provoke delinquency, and to do so outside the formal structures of the juvenile justice system so that the recipients of those services are not defined as delinquent.

Youth service bureaus are community agencies. Their responsibility is to coordinate available community resources for juveniles, appropriately refer their clients to community agencies and to urge the development of new community resources with which to address the problems of juveniles. It

---

<sup>1</sup>The process by which involvement with the juvenile justice system stigmatizes juveniles and generates delinquency is examined by R. M. Carter and M. W. Klein, Back on the Streets: The Diversion of Juvenile Offenders, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

is their charge not to function as distant and alien institutions that intrude on the life of a community. Rather, they are to become organic parts of the communities they serve.

This report examines these youth service bureaus funded by the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency:

1. Atlantic County Youth Service Bureau
2. Bayshore Youth Services Bureau
3. East Brunswick Youth Needs and Services Program
4. Youth Services Project of the Neptune Family and Youth  
Services Center
5. Northeast Morris Youth Service Bureau
6. North Hudson Youth Service Bureau
7. North Ward Community Youth Enrichment Project

It is based on data gathered between May 8, 1978, and July 1, 1978. Each of the participating youth service bureaus was responsible for gathering data about its own clients and the services they were provided. The youth service bureaus also participated in the design of the data collection instruments on which the data was recorded.

#### Principal Findings

1. There was dramatic variation among the youth service bureaus-- from two per cent at one to 57% at another--in the proportion of clients referred from sources located within the juvenile

justice system. (10-11)\*

2. Youth service bureau clients were more often male than female and most often between 13 and 17 years old--though one youth service bureau received clients typically older than the clients received by the other youth service bureaus. (14)
3. There was dramatic variation among the youth service bureaus--from 13% at one youth service bureau to 54% at another--in the extent to which their clients had had prior involvement with the juvenile justice system.\*\* (15)
4. There were differences, too, among the youth service bureaus--from 36% at one to seven per cent at another--in the proportion of clients for whom formal diagnostic assessments were conducted. (16-17)
5. The principal services provided by six of the youth service bureaus were individual counseling and family counseling. (16-17)
6. Few clients were referred to other community agencies. (16-17a)
7. Some youth service bureaus were more diligent than others in establishing follow-up contact with their clients. (16-17a)

---

\*The numbers following each of the findings refer to the pages wherein supportive data and discussion are presented.

\*\*This data captures only juvenile justice system involvement of which the youth service bureaus became aware.

Recommendations

The data seems to provide a basis for recommending that the youth service bureaus:

1. take fuller advantage of community resources through appropriate community referrals;
2. more routinely conduct formal diagnostic assessments;
3. broaden the scope of the services they offer to address the employment and educational needs of their clients;
4. and more diligently maintain follow-up contact with their clients.

Investigation of the youth service bureaus suggested, too, that expectations of proper performance are not sufficiently clear. It, therefore, seems to be particularly important that program development address these issues:

1. Whether it is the mandate of the youth service bureau to emphasize the referral of clients to community agencies: whether it is, therefore, an abnegation of responsibility for a youth service bureau to emphasize the direct delivery of services rather than service brokerage.
2. Whether it is the proper role of the youth service bureau to recruit clients from within the juvenile justice system: whether resources, therefore, have been inappropriately deployed when most youth service bureau clients have not had prior juvenile justice system involvement.



## II. PROJECT AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

The cogent characteristics of the seven youth service bureaus that participated in the research enterprise are described below:

1. Atlantic County Youth Service Bureau (initial year of funding, 1975)

The Atlantic County Youth Service Bureau functions under the auspices of the Division of Youth Services within the Department of Social Services. The Bureau addresses the needs of youth throughout Atlantic County by the coordination of community services for youth and the provision of counseling (individual, family and group) and referral services to youth and their families. Special attention is given to servicing the needs of delinquent-prone youth referred from various segments of the juvenile justice system through intervention and to youth housed at the JINS shelter and detention center. Specific Bureau activities include: a) a high school growth project that is an alternative to traditional school discipline procedures, b) a local garden project, c) a special project for expectant juvenile mothers, d) a project to provide counseling to JINS and detention center youth, and e) a project to provide individual and family counseling to children of broken marriages.

2. Bayshore Youth Services Bureau (initial year of funding, 1975)

The Bayshore Youth Service Bureau serves Keyport, Union Beach, Hazlet, Matawan Borough and Aberdeen Township. It provides counseling, outreach and referral services primarily to youth who have had previous

contact with the juvenile justice system. The operation of the Bayshore Youth Services Bureau is divided into two major components: 1) a clinical service program that provides short and long-term individual counseling (including in-school counseling), group counseling, positive parenting counseling, and drug and employment counseling to the client population; and 2) a youth development program that provides recreational, social and cultural activities to youth groups. Additional specific programs of the Bureau include: a) tutoring, b) Big Brothers/Big Sisters, c) special vocational training, and d) support of Volunteers in Probation.

3. East Brunswick Youth Needs and Services (initial year of funding, 1975)

The East Brunswick Youth Needs and Services project offers services to delinquent and pre-delinquent youth that include counseling (individual, group and family), vocational and employment assistance, educational counseling and referral services. Specific resources/activities such as: a) a youth employment service, b) communication workshops, c) yoga and meditation, d) writing and videotape self-awareness workshops, e) tutoring, and f) recreational and cultural trips are offered by the Bureau. A comprehensive outreach program located at the junior high school has also been developed.

4. Neptune Family and Youth Services Center (initial year of funding, 1977)

The Neptune Family and Youth Services Center serves Neptune

City, Bradley Beach and Neptune Township. It also places an emphasis on addressing the problems of delinquent and delinquency-prone youth through the provision of direct social services and the coordination of community youth services to this particular client population. As direct services, the project provides counseling (individual, family and group), social and recreational activities, vocational counseling, and community activities groups to juveniles within these communities. Additionally, the project offers crisis intervention training to police officers and juvenile delinquency training seminars to school guidance faculties from the three communities. Positive parenting seminars are also offered by the Bureau.

5. Northeast Morris Youth Service Bureau (initial year of funding, 1977)

The Northeast Morris Youth Service Bureau serves the communities of Boonton, Boonton Township, Butler, East Hanover, Kinnelon, Lincoln Park, Montville, Mountain Lakes, Pequannock and Riverdale. It provides counseling (individual, group and family), recreational programs and activities and referral services to juveniles referred from the juvenile justice system. The project also offers psychological testing services, vocational and educational services to Bureau participants.

6. North Hudson Youth Services Bureau (initial year of funding, 1975)

The North Hudson Youth Services Bureau serves the communities of Union City, North Bergen, West New York, Weehawken, Hoboken, Kearny, Secaucus, Guttenberg, Bayonne, East Newark and Harrison. It provides youth services to juveniles referred primarily from the

juvenile justice system. Programs offered by the project to the juvenile population include: a) counseling (individual, group and family), b) recreational and social activities (trips, arts and crafts, group sports), c) special positive parenting counseling, d) psychiatric, vocational and educational testing services, and e) referral services to meet emergency and on-going client needs for psychological/medical care, shelter and detoxification.

7. North Ward Community Youth Enrichment Project (initial year of funding, 1976)

The North Ward Community Youth Enrichment Project serves the city of Newark through the provision of educational programs, vocational counseling and training, recreational programs and counseling programs to delinquency-prone and adjudicated juveniles. Specific programs of the Bureau include: a) a Big Brother/Big Sister Program, b) a tutoring program, c) vocational counseling and vocational placement programs (including vocational testing) and d) physical education activities. The Bureau also acts as a referral service to other community service programs.

Community Characteristics

It is also worth noting that there are significant differences among the communities served by the projects. By the measure of per capita income, for example, the North Ward Youth Service Bureau serves the least affluent community and the Northeast Morris Youth Service Bureau serves the most affluent community. Such differences are especially pertinent in view of the expectation that youth service bureaus be responsive to the distinctive needs of the communities in which they are located.

Table 1 :

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Project	1976 Estimated Population <sup>1</sup>	1976 Estimated Density/ Sq. Miles	1975 Average Income <sup>2</sup>	Crime Rate/ 100,000 <sup>3</sup>	Dominant Community Character <sup>4</sup>
1. Atlantic County	178,850	315.5	\$4,623	6,432.2	Rural/Suburban
2. Bayshore	65,995	3,997.3	4,832	4,029.0	Suburban
3. East Brunswick	37,035	1,668.2	6,147	5,025.0	Suburban
4. Neptune	38,265	3,985.9	4,576	9,337.7	Suburban
5. Northeast Morris	81,095	1,050.4	6,384	4,485.5	Suburban
6. North Hudson	349,955	11,015.3	4,879	4,244.6	Urban/Suburban
7. North Ward- Newark	373,025	15,452.6	3,517	9,258.9	Urban

New Jersey 7,431,751 989.6 5,514 5,334.5

1. State of New Jersey, Uniform Crime Reports: 1976, pp. 10-25.
2. State of New Jersey, Office of Demographic & Economic Analysis, Division of Planning & Research, Per Capita Income for New Jersey, May 17, 1978.
3. State of New Jersey, Uniform Crime Reports: 1976, pp. 108-135.
4. State of New Jersey, Uniform Crime Reports: 1976, pp. 10-25.

### III. DATA ANALYSIS

This discussion is concerned with the performance of the seven youth service bureaus. It examines the characteristics of the youth service bureau clients, the sources from which they were referred and the nature of the services they received. In order to measure the impact of the youth service bureaus' intervention, data concerning involvement with the juvenile justice system before and after becoming youth service bureau clients was also gathered. However, the ten weeks of project activities upon which this analysis is based were deemed too brief for meaningful inferences about impact.

#### Sources of Referral

There were differences among the youth service bureaus in the sources from which they received their clients.<sup>1</sup> For example, sources within the juvenile justice system accounted for two percent of the referrals to the East Brunswick Youth Service Bureau yet 57% of the referrals to the North Hudson Youth Service Bureau. The extent to which the youth service bureaus have established cooperative and intimate relations with formal components of the juvenile justice system thus seems to be variable.

---

<sup>1</sup>It is notable that the referral source identified here may have been the last link in a chain of referrals that began elsewhere.

Table 2 :

## SOURCE OF REFERRAL BY JURISDICTION

Source of Referral	Atlantic Co.		Bayshore		E. Brunswick		Neptune		N.Ward-Newark		N.E. Morris		N. Hudson		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Criminal Justice System</b>																
Juvenile Court	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	12	2
Juvenile Court Intake	5	5	2	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	5	8	81	40	95	13
Juvenile Conference Committee	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	6	15	2
Police	3	3	9	15	1	2	16	23	2	1	10	16	16	8	57	8
Probation	3	3	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	11	18	2	1	22	3
Subtotal	21	21	12	20	1	2	19	28	6	3	27	44	115	57	201	28
<b>Schools/Community Agency</b>																
School	46	47	26	42	0	0	27	40	16	10	15	24	35	18	165	23
Social Service Agency	4	4	3	5	0	0	3	4	2	1	7	11	3	1	22	3
Subtotal	50	51	29	47	0	0	30	44	18	11	22	35	38	19	187	26
<b>Family</b>																
Parents/Relatives	27	27	9	15	4	7	5	7	35	21	6	10	10	5	96	13
<b>Self/Friends</b>																
Self	1	1	3	5	49	89	3	4	15	9	4	6	35	17	110	16
Friends	0	0	2	3	1	2	9	13	90	54	1	2	4	2	107	15
Subtotal	28	28	14	23	54	98	17	24	140	84	11	18	49	24	313	44
<b>Other</b>																
Other	0	0	6	10	0	0	2	3	4	2	2	3	0	0	14	2
<b>Total</b>	99	100	61	100	55	100	68	100	168	100	62	100	202	100	715	100

Client Characteristics

Of the 715 clients received by the seven youth service bureaus, 70% were male. This is not substantially different than the proportion of male and female juveniles arrested in New Jersey.

Table \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ :

SEX OF YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU CLIENTS

Project	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Atlantic County	66	67	33	33	99	100
Bayshore	40	66	21	34	61	100
East Brunswick	44	80	11	20	55	100
Neptune	35	52	33	48	68	100
Northeast Morris	31	50	31	50	62	100
North Hudson	161	79	41	21	202	100
North Ward-Newark	127	75	41	25	168	100
Total	504	70	211	30	715	100



The ethnicity of the clients was not significantly different from the general population of the areas served.

Table 4 :

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU CLIENTS

Project	White		Black		Hispanic		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Atlantic County	48	48	47	48	3	3	1	1	99	100
Bayshore	52	85	7	11	1	2	1	2	61	100
East Brunswick	55	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	100
Neptune	41	60	27	40	0	0	0	0	68	100
Northeast Morris	62	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	100
North Hudson	128	63	9	4	62	31	3	2	202	100
North Ward-Newark	105	62	23	14	38	23	2	1	168	100
Total	491	69	113	16	104	14	7	1	715	100

The largest portion of youth service bureau clients were between 13 and 17 years old. However, the North Ward Youth Service Bureau received a significant portion of clients who were 18 years old and older.

Table 5 :

AGE OF YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU CLIENTS

Project	6-9		10-12		13-14		15		16		17		18		19-20		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Atlantic County	6	8	9	11	22	27	21	26	14	17	8	10	1	1	0	0	81	100
Bayshore	3	5	14	23	17	28	8	13	15	24	1	2	3	5	0	0	61	100
East Brunswick	0	0	8	15	11	20	16	29	9	17	3	6	7	13	0	0	54	100
Neptune	1	2	8	13	19	32	5	8	13	22	11	18	3	5	0	0	60	100
Northeast Morris	1	2	4	7	11	20	9	16	14	25	10	18	6	10	1	2	56	100
North Hudson	3	2	25	12	47	23	39	20	42	21	33	16	11	6	0	0	200	100
North Ward-Newark	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	40	24	48	29	40	24	37	22	166	100
Total	14	2	68	10	127	19	99	14	147	22	114	17	71	10	38	6	678	100

Prior Juvenile Justice System Involvement

There was variation from 13% at one youth service bureau to 54% at another in the proportion of clients who had prior juvenile justice system involvement of which the youth service bureaus became aware. However, it is important to note that the youth service bureaus do not have access to police files. Hence, much of the juvenile justice system involvement of their clients may not reach their attention.

Table \_\_\_\_\_ 6 \_\_\_\_\_ :

KNOWN PRIOR JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

Project	Known Contact		No Known Contact		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Atlantic County	16	16	82	84	98	100
Bayshore	14	23	47	77	61	100
East Brunswick	8	14	47	86	55	100
Neptune	20	29	48	71	68	100
Northeast Morris	41	24	127	76	168	100
North Hudson	27	13	174	87	201	100
North Ward-Newark	33	54	28	46	61	100
Total	159	22	553	78	712	100

Services Provided

The services provided most frequently by all but one of the youth service bureaus were individual and family counseling. Indeed, the East Brunswick Youth Service Bureau provided counseling to each of its clients. However, the North Ward Youth Service Bureau had a unique service orientation. It concentrated exclusively on placing its clients in jobs and in vocational programs. It is worth recalling that the clients of the North Ward Youth Service Bureau were older than the clients of the other youth service bureaus; thus, they presumably had greater need of employment and vocational assistance.

The youth service bureaus prepared service plans for a large majority of their clients. Yet it seems that service plans were usually developed without the benefit of formal diagnostic assessments.

Table 7:

## CLIENT SERVICES BY JURISDICTION\*

Project	Formal Diagnostic Assessment		Individual Counseling		Family Counseling		Group Counseling		Educational Assistance		Employment Assistance	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	Atlantic Co. (N=99)	27	27	71	72	51	52	18	18	6	6	11
Bayshore (N=62)	17	27	38	61	38	61	1	2	1	2	4	6
East Brunswick (N=55)	20	36	55	100	3	6	50	91	3	6	0	0
Neptune (N=68)	13	19	22	32	12	18	9	13	2	3	0	0
North Ward - Newark (N=169)	12	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	8	0	0
Northeast Morris (N=62)	4	6	39	63	22	36	14	23	0	0	0	0
North Hudson (N=203)	38	19	150	74	7	3	1	1	10	5	8	4

\*Each cell shows the number and percentage of the total population in each jurisdiction receiving a particular service.

Table 7 Continued :

## CLIENT SERVICES BY JURISDICTION\*

Project	Job		Vocational		Referral to a Community Agency		Follow-up Activity		Other	
	Placement		Placement							
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Atlantic Co. (N=99)	0	0	1	1	4	4	51	52	4	4
Bayshore (N=62)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Brunswick (N=55)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neptune (N=68)	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	29	11	16
North Ward - Newark (N=169)	157	93	160	95	0	0	3	2	0	0
Northeast Morris (N=62)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10
North Hudson (N=203)	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	54	51	25

\*Each cell shows the number and percentage of the total population in each jurisdiction receiving a particular service.

Table 8 :

SERVICE PLANS DEVELOPED

Project	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Atlantic County	84	87	13	13	97	100
Bayshore	61	100	0	0	61	100
East Brunswick	37	67	18	33	55	100
Neptune	68	100	0	0	68	100
Northeast Morris	61	98	1	2	62	100
North Hudson	189	94	12	6	201	100
North Ward-Newark	168	100	0	0	168	100
Total	668	94	44	6	712	100

Referral Services

It is striking that so few of the clients received by the youth service bureaus were referred to other social service agencies. This may suggest a failure to take advantage of available community resources. However, it should be noted that the data may not capture many of the client referrals which the youth service bureaus have, in fact, completed.

Reason for Termination of Service

Services were most often terminated when the youth service bureau felt they were no longer required. Yet it was frequently a parent or client who decided that they be terminated. From the point of view of the youth service bureaus, it thus appears that services were often terminated prematurely.

Table 8 :

REASON FOR TERMINATION OF SERVICE

Reason For Service Termination	Atlantic County		Bayshore		East Brunswick		Neptune		N.E. Morris		North Hudson		N. Ward-Newark		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Services No Longer Required	12	92	3	23	0	0	0	0	3	33	5	83	0	0	23	55
Referral To Community Agency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	17	0	0	2	5
Parent Or Client Termination	1	8	8	62	0	0	0	0	6	67	0	0	0	0	15	35
Further Criminal Involvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Services Unavailable/Other	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5
Total	13	100	13	100	0	0	1	100	9	100	6	100	0	0	42	100



APPENDIX  
DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

NEW JERSEY STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY  
YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU EVALUATION

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS ON THE COMPLETION OF DATA COLLECTION FORMS:**

1. Information is to be recorded for:
  - a. all new formal clients whose Youth Service Bureau involvement begins after the first day of data collection;
  - b. all continuing clients who receive formal service after the first day of data collection.
2. Each form is to include the specific jurisdiction identification number assigned by the evaluation staff. These jurisdiction numbers are:

<u>JURISDICTION NUMBER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
200	ATLANTIC COUNTY
210	BAYSHORE
220	DOVER TOWNSHIP
230	EAST BRUNSWICK
240	GLOUCESTER
250	NEPTUNE
260	NEWARK NORTH WARD
270	NEWARK VAILSBURG
280	PEQUANNOCK
290	UNION CITY

3. Each form is also to include a unique four digit client identification number that may range from 0001 to 9999. The client identification number is to be assigned by the Youth Service Bureau.

**SPECIFIC DATA COLLECTION FORM INSTRUCTIONS:**

**A. NO. 181 CLIENT INTAKE FORM**

- 1) Information is to be recorded on the 181 form at the time of the first meeting with a client and as additional information becomes available.
- 2) A copy of the 181 form should be placed in a permanent file. The original will be collected by the evaluation staff.

**B. NO. 182 CLIENT SERVICE WORKSHEET**

- 1) The 182 form is a worksheet on which to record the services provided to a client. It is to be kept in the client's permanent file folder and updated each time a service is provided.
- 2) Information is to be recorded on one horizontal line each time a service is provided.
- 3) Question No. 4 is to be answered only when services to the client are terminated.

**C. NO. 183 CLIENT SERVICE SUMMARY**

- 1) The 183 form elicits a summary of the services received by the client. It is not to be completed until requested by the evaluation staff. The summary information for the 183 form is to be derived by tabulating information from the 182 form.

**D. NO. 184 QUARTERLY SERVICE SUMMARY**

- 1) The 184 form is to be submitted along with the quarterly narrative reports. It is to be completed by tabulating the information recorded on the 181 and 182 forms.
- 2) Four copies of the Quarterly Service Summary are enclosed. One is to be completed per quarter. The four quarters are as follows:

QUARTER 1 ..... JANUARY - MARCH  
 QUARTER 2 ..... APRIL - JUNE  
 QUARTER 3 ..... JULY - SEPTEMBER  
 QUARTER 4 ..... OCTOBER - DECEMBER







NEW JERSEY STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY  
YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU EVALUATION

TO BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE QUARTERLY NARRATIVE REPORT.

1 | 8 | 4 | QUARTERLY SERVICE SUMMARY

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1. QUARTER (PLEASE CIRCLE) 1 2 3 4 _____</p> <p>2. JURISDICTION _____</p> <p>3. TOTAL NUMBER CLIENTS PROVIDED SERVICE DURING QUARTERLY PERIOD. _____</p> <p>4. TOTAL NUMBER CLIENTS WITH KNOWN PRIOR JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM CONTACT _____</p> <p>5. SOURCE OF INITIAL REFERRAL</p> <p>_____ JUVENILE COURT</p> <p>_____ JUVENILE COURT INTAKE UNIT</p> <p>_____ JUVENILE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE</p> <p>_____ POLICE</p> <p>_____ SCHOOL</p> <p>_____ SELF</p> <p>_____ PARENTS, RELATIVES</p> <p>_____ FRIENDS</p> <p>_____ OTHER SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY</p> <p>_____ OTHER</p> <p>_____ PROBATION</p> | <p>6. TOTAL NUMBER CLIENTS FOR WHOM A SERVICE PLAN WAS DEVELOPED _____</p> <p>7. TOTAL NUMBER CLIENTS TERMINATED FROM SERVICE _____</p> <p>8. REASON FOR SERVICE TERMINATION</p> <p>_____ SERVICE NO LONGER REQUIRED</p> <p>_____ REFER TO ANOTHER COMMUNITY AGENCY</p> <p>_____ PARENT OR CLIENT TERMINATION</p> <p>_____ FURTHER CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT</p> <p>_____ SERVICES UNAVAILABLE</p> <p>_____ OTHER</p> <p>9. TOTAL NUMBER CLIENTS WITH KNOWN REINVOLVEMENT WITH JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM SUBSEQUENT TO PROJECT INTAKE _____</p> |
|---|--|

SUMMARY OF SERVICES PROVIDED

CLIENTS PROVIDED SERVICE	NUMBER SESSIONS/ CONTACTS	
_____	_____	INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING
_____	_____	FAMILY COUNSELING
_____	_____	GROUP COUNSELING
_____	_____	FORMAL DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT
_____	_____	EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE
_____	_____	EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE
_____	_____	JOB PLACEMENT
_____	_____	VOCATIONAL TRAINING
_____	_____	REFERRAL TO ANOTHER COMMUNITY AGENCY
_____	_____	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITY
_____	_____	OTHER

**END**