

A COMPARISON OF RECIDIVISM RATES OF
JUVENILE REVIEW BOARDS AND
THE JUVENILE COURT

John G. Reddick, Jr.

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Central Connecticut State College
New Britain, Connecticut

Thesis Advisor: Marc Goldstein, PhD.

April 1982

Abstract

This study compared Juvenile Review Boards (community-level, informal, diversionary mechanisms) with the Juvenile Court system, by examining one measure of their effectiveness, recidivism rate. Two hundred and ninety-eight delinquent youths in three towns with Review Boards were compared with two hundred and twenty-four delinquents referred to Juvenile Court in three towns, over a three-year period. The two groups of towns were statistically similar on selected demographic variables. The hypothesis that youth appearing before Review Boards would have a significantly lower recidivism rate was confirmed. The Review Board recidivism rate was 33%; that of the Juvenile Court was 58%. This study supports the position that Review Boards are an effective tool in combating delinquency on a community level.

Comparison of Recidivism Rates of Juvenile
Review Boards and the Juvenile Court

This study compares two different ways communities can handle delinquent youth. The Juvenile Court is the traditional forum to which delinquents are referred, whereas Juvenile Review Boards provide non-traditional methods, including diversion, of handling delinquents. The hypothesis of this study is that Juvenile Review Boards are more effective, as measured by amount of recidivism, than the Juvenile Court. Following is a brief history of the Juvenile Court and a description of Juvenile Review Boards. Based upon these descriptions, one can see how they differ and how they are similar.

Prior to 1899, there was no distinctive way of dealing with juveniles who broke the law; they were handled similarly to adults in adult courts. However in 1899, in Chicago, the first court specifically designed to handle juveniles was created, and the Juvenile Court was born. It was predicated upon the concept that children are different from adults-- they are not "mini-adults"--and that treatment, rather than punishment, is the most appropriate modality. Founded on these same principles, the Juvenile Court in Connecticut was created in 1942.

In recent years, however, the Juvenile Court has undergone a number of changes which have shifted its emphasis back

toward an adult court orientation. In 1967 the U.S. Supreme Court in its Gault decision (1967) held that juveniles have the same constitutional rights as adults. Furthermore, in 1978, the Juvenile Court in Connecticut merged with Superior court, inheriting both the judges and administration of the adult Superior Court. The next year, 1979, saw the hiring of full-time prosecutors and defense attorneys for the Juvenile Court. Finally, the Serious Offender Bill (Connecticut General Statutes 46b-126, 46b-127) which enables 14 and 15 year-old children who commit certain serious offenses to be transferred to the adult court, and the Families With Service Needs Act (Connecticut General Statutes 46b-149) which limits the Juvenile Court's authority over status offenders (runaways, truants, and incorrigibles) have effectively served to lower the age at which the "child becomes the man" and delimited the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court.

Coterminously with the changes in the Juvenile Court's philosophical undergirdings, the concept of diversion, as embodied in Juvenile Review Boards, began to be implemented by many communities. The concept of diversion is based on the assumption that there are alternate methods of handling delinquents which are in some cases more effective than Juvenile Court. For example, a first-time shoplifter with family problems might better be handled with a referral to a family counseling agency than by the Juvenile Court.

A Juvenile Review Board is a community based, formalized screening body generally consisting of professional youth workers who meet on a regular basis, review police referrals, and advise the police department where to refer the child. Options include referral back to parents, individual or family counseling, work restitution, referral to Protective Services, or referral to Juvenile Court. At present, there are approximately thirty Juvenile Review Boards in Connecticut, and new ones are being formed continuously.

Although the goal of Juvenile Court and Juvenile Review Boards is similar--to help children who have committed a crime stay out of further trouble--their methods can be different. Review Boards operate in a voluntary manner, offering various choices to the child, whereas the Court often mandates a specific plan for the child. Review Boards operate on a community level, staffed voluntarily by local youth workers. By contrast, the Juvenile Court is a state agency which is usually located in a different town from where the child lives, so the staff may not be as familiar with local resources. Finally, the Court does convey the label "delinquent" to children referred to it, whereas the Review Board does not.

Now that a basic description of the Juvenile Court and the Juvenile Review Board has been given, the next section will review studies that have examined the relative effectiveness of alternative approaches.

Lundman and Scarpitti (1978) critiqued past delinquency prevention projects. In general, they felt these projects failed by:

1. Using the wrong modality, i.e., group or individual casework;
2. Using preexperimental rather than quasi-experimental designs; and
3. using subjective rather than objective outcome measures.

As a consequence of their criticisms, they proposed nine recommendations for future projects, four of which are relevant to this study:

1. Future delinquency prevention programs should focus primary attention on preventing delinquent behavior--that is showing a declining delinquency rate, rather than just measuring a change in self-image, or family unity.
2. All indicators of prevention effect should be objectively measured--rather than relying on the subjective judgments of the project administrators or subjects.
3. Researchers involved in future delinquency prevention programs should consider using a social cross section of subjects in the projects--in contrast to most projects, which focus on male, lower class urban youth.
4. All future projects should be experimental in design--past projects traditionally used one group of subjects who were exposed to the treatment and then evaluated.

Rowe (1978) attempted to correlate self-reported (SR) delinquency with variables such as I.Q., reading achievement, family conflict, and associations with delinquent peers. The subjects were 58 male high school students, and they were questioned concerning delinquent activity in which they had participated (but for which they had not been caught) and then tested concerning measurement of the variables.

There were a number of inter-correlations. Greater SR delinquency was negatively associated with good grades, family harmony and school commitment, and were positively associated with emotionality and impulsivity. Social class was not correlated with SR delinquency. Also, no relationship was found between associations with delinquent peers and SR delinquency. These last two findings indicate that delinquents are not found in one social strata but are spread throughout the teenage subculture.

Sorenson (1978) compared the outcome, measured by recidivism, of apprehended youth referred to court with a similar group referred to service agencies. In general, he found that diversion works best for multiple offenders, since first offenders tend to remain out of trouble even without the diversion program. He also felt that the referral program did not adequately match clients with service agencies.

Sorenson acknowledged that his study was flawed by comparing court cases from one year (1972) with diverted cases from another (1973). Intervening variables (staff changes,

political, economic, or even weather factors) may have affected the outcome. Also, Sorenson used a 6 month period to measure recidivism, which is considered too short for an accurate assessment.

Palmer and Lewis (1980) surveyed 15 California diversion projects to determine whether recidivism was being reduced. A 6 month follow-up from point of arrest showed that diverted youngsters had a 17.3% reduction in recidivism compared to a non-diverted matched sample. Interestingly, this reduction occurred in just three of the projects, with the remaining showing no difference. The total rate was 17.3%, but the reduction for the three "successful" projects ranged from 33% to 56%.

The youths most likely to remain trouble free had one prior arrest, and the three successful projects generally dealt with youths with two prior arrests. It was felt that kids with "good" records had little room for improvement. The authors add that this fact does not negate the appropriateness of diversion for this type of youth.

These studies show there is room in the juvenile justice system for both approaches of Review Boards and Juvenile Court, and in fact they can exist side by side in harmony. But the implications for comparison are just as obvious. If Review Boards show themselves to be more effective than Juvenile Court, as measured by recidivism, then it would behoove communities to establish them. If, on the other hand, they

are less effective than Juvenile Court, then they are doing a disservice to the children of communities where they exist. It is the hypothesis of this study that delinquents handled by Review Boards will have a lower recidivism rate than those handled by Juvenile Court. This hypothesis will be tested by comparing individual Review Board and Juvenile Court statistics in several communities.

Existing data on recidivism rates from Juvenile Court and Review Boards in Connecticut suggest the efficacy of the Review Board (Appendix A). However, because of sampling differences, such comparisons are not statistically meaningful. This study will therefore employ a nonequivalent design in which the recidivism rates of a selected Review Board sample will be compared with a matched Juvenile Court sample. The outcome criteria will be the recidivism rate of the two groups.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 298 juveniles processed by the Juvenile Review Boards in the towns of Bristol, East Hartford, and Windsor, Connecticut, and 224 juveniles from the towns of Meriden, Milford, and North Haven, who appeared in Juvenile court (Total N = 522). All subjects were referred for the first time in 1978, and were tracked through the end of 1980 to check for recidivism. The three Juvenile Review Boards were chosen because the author was permitted access to the

files. Each Review Board town was matched with a selected Juvenile court town on the basis of similarities on a number of demographic variables (See Table 1) taken from census data (1973).

Insert Table 1 about here

In terms of process, the Bristol and Windsor Review Boards are similar in that a family background investigation is done prior to the board making its recommendation to the police department. By contrast, the East Hartford Review Board reaches its decision immediately, basing its recommendation on the seriousness of the offense and also on any information that board members may contribute concerning the child.

Procedure

Data on youths appearing in Juvenile Court were taken from existing computer files, while Juvenile Review Board data were transcribed into computer format with a specially devised coding sheet (Appendix B). Clearance for data gathering was obtained from the chairman of each Review Board and the statewide director of the Juvenile court. Code numbers were assigned each juvenile for computer identification purposes, but no record of names was maintained. This procedure assured total anonymity for all individuals whose records were examined.

Data on the following variables were collected for each youth: date of birth, sex, race, date of referral, age at

referral, source of referral, number and name of statute violated, statute type (misdemeanor, felony, or status offense), degree of seriousness of statute, disposition of referral, and date of disposition. A complete set of data was gathered for every referral, the term used when police apprehend a juvenile and turn the report over to the Juvenile Court or Review Board. By determining the number of referrals for each child during the three year period, the amount of recidivism can be computed.

Results

Table 2 presents a comparison, by town, of certain background characteristics of the youths. Chi square and t-tests were used to explore the similarity of the Juvenile Court-Juvenile Review Board matches.

Insert Table 2 about here

Several significant differences were found. The age of juveniles referred to the Juvenile Review Board was significantly lower ($p < .01$) than that of youths referred to the Juvenile Court in the Bristol-Meriden and East Hartford-Milford matches. Significantly fewer ($p < .05$) minorities were referred to the Juvenile Court in North Haven than were referred to the Juvenile Review Board in the matched town of Windsor. Also, a significantly lower percentage of females were referred to Juvenile Court in Milford than were referred to the Review Board in East Hartford.

Table 3 presents two indices of recidivism both by town and an overall comparison.

Insert Table 3 about here

In every match, the mean number of referrals per juvenile (over the 3 year period) is lower for the Review Board town than the corresponding Juvenile court town, and the Review Board total, 1.71, is significantly lower than the Juvenile Court figure of 2.76.

The second measure of recidivism is the proportion of youths with more than one referral. A Z test on the proportion reveals that each Juvenile Review Board has a significantly lower proportion of repeat offenders than its Juvenile Court match. The total figure, 0.33 for the Review Boards, was significantly lower than the .58 proportion for the Juvenile Courts.

Discussion

This study compared two different ways of handling delinquents, Juvenile Review Boards and Juvenile Court, with the hypothesis that Review Boards are more effective, as measured by recidivism. Three towns with Review Boards were individually compared with three Juvenile Court towns, which were chosen on the basis of certain census data being as similar as possible to the corresponding Review Board towns (Table 1).

The comparison of the backgrounds shows differences on several items (Table 2). Also, in every match, the Juvenile

Review Board age at first referral was lower than the same Juvenile Court category, and in two comparisons this was significant. One interpretation of this is that police apprehend younger youths in towns with Juvenile Review Boards, perhaps because they feel the boards will be more lenient with these youths. The fact that Review Boards deal with younger youth would actually serve to increase the time frame for recidivism to occur, and it is by contrast, lower.

Regarding the actual recidivism rate, the hypothesis of the study has been confirmed. In both measures of recidivism, mean referrals per juvenile and proportion of youths with more than one referral, the Review Board figure was significantly lower in each match, including the overall review Board and Juvenile Court figures. These findings agree with those of Palmer and Lewis (1980).

Although the scope of this study is limited to a comparison of recidivism rates of Review Boards and the Juvenile Court, one is tempted to ask why Review Boards appear to be more effective. What is their special ingredient? This author believes that the primary reason for the success of the Review Boards is that the Review Boards do not impart the label of "delinquent" to the youths they process. The diverted youths are kept conspicuously outside of the bounds of Juvenile Court. It is felt that the label inherent in the Court can become a self-fulfilling prophesy. It is generally understood that police are able to apprehend only a

a small fraction of juveniles who actually commit crimes, so one must assume that most juveniles stop committing crimes on their own. This would agree with Rowe's findings (1978). This group of youths lack the label "delinquent" much as Review Board youths do.

This study, while confirming its hypothesis, leaves a number of unanswered questions. Are Review Boards effective in urban, as well as suburban, areas? Are Review Boards as effective with serious, as well as minor, offenders? What kinds of diversionary programs are most effective? What makes a Review Board effective? What could be done to make the Juvenile Court more effective? All these questions could be examined in future studies.

In conclusion, the hypothesis of this study has been confirmed; Review Boards are demonstrably effective. This finding bodes well for communities who wish to heed it. By establishing Review Boards and referring delinquent youth to local resources, a community is performing a valuable service for all its citizens.

Bibliography

- In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).
- Lundman, Richard J., and Scarpitti, Frank. Delinquency Prevention: recommendations for future projects. Crime and Delinquency, April 1978, 24(2), 207-220.
- 1970 Census of Population. Characteristics of the population. Washington: United States Department of Commerce Publication, Issued March 1973.
- Palmer, Ted B., and Lewis, Roy V. A differentiated approach to juvenile diversion. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1980, 17(2), 209-229.
- Rowe, David C. Temperament, school adjustment, and peers: a study of self-reported delinquency in high school students. Dissertation Abstracts International, June 1978, 38(12-B), 6249.
- Sorenson, James L. Outcome evaluation of a referral system for juvenile offenders. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1978, 6(4), 381-388.

Table 1

Demographic Information on Matched Juvenile
Review Board and Juvenile Court Towns

Variable	Towns					
	Bristol J.R.B.	Meriden J.C.	East Hartford J.R.B.	Milford J.C.	Windsor J.R.B.	North Haven J.C.
Population	55,487	55,959	57,583	50,858	22,502	22,194
Median School Years Completed						
Male	11.5	11.3	12.2	12.3	12.3	12.5
Female	11.9	11.6	12.2	12.3	12.3	12.4
Median Income						
Male	8723	8117	8864	9336	9426	9493
Female	4113	4152	4427	4041	4242	3903
Percent of Fami- lies Less than Poverty Level	3.7	4.8	3.4	3.4	1.9	3.3
Percent of Popula- tion under 18	35.9	33.8	32.8	36.7	35.1	35.7
Percent Minority	1.3	2.9	1.3	1.1	3.0	1.5

Table 2

Comparison of Demographic Information on Youths
 Referred to Juvenile Review Boards
 and Juvenile Court by Town

Variable	Towns					
	Bristol J.R.B.	Meriden J.C.	East Hartford J.R.B.	Milford J.C.	Windsor J.R.B.	North Haven J.C.
Number of Youths	50	99	193	92	55	33
Number of Referrals By Year						
1978	51	180	173	155	58	62
1979	6	45	49	41	4	12
1980	12	24	51	18	7	12
Sex (%)						
Male	84%	63%	76%	80%	84%	76%
Female	16	14	23	7	16	21
Unknown	0	23	1	13	0	3
	$\chi^2 = 0.12$		$\chi^2 = 9.41^1$		$\chi^2 = 0.41$	
Race (%)						
White	96%	64%	84%	91%	80%	91%
Black	2	6	2	2	16	0
Hispanic	0	1	2	0	2	0
Unknown	2	28	12	7	2	9
	$\chi^2 = 3.41$		$\chi^2 = 0.00$		$\chi^2 = 5.49^1$	
Age at First Referral						
Mean	12.4 ^a	13.3 ^b	13.0 ^c	13.6	13.3	13.8
Standard Deviation	4.1	2.5	1.8	1.4	3.8	1.4
	$t_{(140)} = 2.56^2$		$t_{(260)} = 2.84^2$		$t_{(86)} = 1.57$	

a. Mean based on 48 youths
 b. Mean based on 98 youths
 c. Mean based on 159 youths

¹ p < .05
² p < .01

Table 3

Comparison of Recidivism Rates Among

Juvenile Review Board and

Juvenile Court Towns

Recidivism Index	Towns					Total		
	Bristol J.R.B.	Meriden J.C.	East Hartford J.R.B.	Milford J.C.	Windsor J.R.B.		North Haven J.C.	Juvenile Review Board
Mean Referrals Per Juvenile	1.38	2.52	1.57	2.33	1.25	2.61	1.71	2.76
Proportion of Youths With More than one Referral	0.36 $Z = -3.08^2$	0.63	0.36 $Z = 13.49^3$	0.58	0.22 $Z = 2.05^1$	0.42	0.33	0.58
								$t(335) = 5.43^2$

¹ p < .05

² p < .01

³ p < .001

APPENDIX A

~~WINDSOR~~
WINDSOR JUVENILE REVIEW BOARD
Advisory Committee Meeting

September 29, 1977

Present: Fred Dorfman, Gene Marchand, John J. Bernardini, Terri Zersky,
Father Bock, Joceyn Watrous, Bob Ertl, John Reddick, Nadine
Nichols, Chief Darman

Meeting started at 3:15

I. STATISTICAL REPORT

A. Hypothesis

1. Higher incident of crime in one parent families
2. Higher incident of crime in Wilson area
3. More males than females are being arrested
4. Greater incidents of crime occur during unsupervised times
5. More incidents of crime from LP Wilson School
6. Lower rate of recidivism within Windsor for youth that have been kept out of Court by the Juvenile Review Board.
 - a. Lower rate recidivism for Juvenile Review Board cases vs non Juvenile Review Board cases.
 - b. That Juvenile Review Board dispositions handled out of Court vs in Juvenile Court will show lower recidivism.
 - c. Out of Town youngsters handled by Juvenile Review Board vs non Juvenile Review Board will show lower recidivism (within Windsor)
7. Most Juvenile crime consists of shoplifting possession of marijuana and bike theft

B. Frequencies

1. Number from each area (3)
2. Number in each age group
3. Number of each sex
4. Number of each race
5. Number from each sized family
6. Number from one parent family
7. Number from each school
8. Number committing each offense
9. Number of out of town kids and disposition of their cases
10. Number contacted each year
11. Number contacted each month
12. Number contacted each day of week
13. Number committing each type of offense
14. Number in each disposition category
15. Number during specific time of day

C. AGE

206 cases (offenses) handled since November 1974 (2½ years)

APPENDIX A

10 - 2.9%
11 - 6.8%
12 - 14.1%
13 - 14.1%
14 - 26.8%
15 - 30.7%

The fourteen and fifteen age groups are the most significant.

D. Sex

Male - 79%
Female - 21%

E. Race

31% - Black
66% - White
3% - Hispanic

A considerable number of Hartford youth were dealt with.

F. Parent

One parent - 42%
Two parent - 58%

Possibly one parent families try harder to try to make up for the missing parent.

G. School

26.7% - L.P. Wilson
15.4% - Windsor High School
16.4% - Sage Park

Remaining percentages from elementary schools, Hartford, etc.

H. Types of Offenses

78.8% - Misdemeanors
12.8% - Felony
4.8% - Status Offenders
3.6% - Motor Vehicle

I. Percentage by Year

1974 - 8.3%
1975 - 59.8%
1976 - 19.6%
1977 - 12.3%

Needs to be prorated.

APPENDIX A

J. Arrests by Month

Hypothesis - More crime during summer months (Shoplifting)

12.2% - April
11.7% - August
11.7% - September
10.2% - March
9.8% - June

The beginning and end of school has more stress involved which could be why the incidencies of crime are higher during these months.

K. Arrest by Day

15.3% - Monday
8.9% - Tuesday
18.7% - Wednesday
16.7% - Thursday
11.8% - Friday
14.3% - Saturday
14.3% - Sunday

L. Disposition

43.9 Court
56.1 Out of Court

Court automatic (denial) 10.2%
Court Discretion 33.7

Out of Court (Youth Services Bureau 52.9

M. Arrest by Time of Day

12 - 3 a.m.	3.7%
3 - 6 a.m.	1.0%
6 - 9 a.m.	3.1%
9 - 12	18.3%
12 - 3 p.m.	17.8%
3 - 6 p.m.	29.3%
6 - 9 p.m.	20.8%
9 - 12	5.8%

The high percentage of arrests between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. could possibly be due to truancy or suspension.

N. Arrest by Section of Town

26.5% Windsor (Center)
28.4% Wilson
16.2% Poquonock
22.5% Hartford

There has been a steady decrease in crime in the Wilson area.

APPENDIX ▲

Wilson

- 41 - 1974
- 30 - 1975
- 27 - 1976
- 12 - 1977

Possible reasons for decrease is the Juvenile Review Board and Youth Services Bureau programs (Youth Awareness Council, plays, etc.)

O. Cross tabulation by age

No significant change

P. Cross tabulation by Sex

79.8% Male
21.1% Female

Q. Cross by Race

White - 65.5%
Black - 31 %
Hisp - 3.4%

R. Cross by Parent

Increase in two parent family arrests. Economics could be a cause of this.
Both parents working?

S. Cross - Recidivism

Cases sent to Court (by JRB) - 16.7%
Cases handled locally - 6.1%

T. Recidivism by area

Windsor (Center) - 7%
Wilson - 27%
Poquonock - 9%

U. Male vs Female Recidivism

Male - 13.5%
Female - 2.3%

V. Recidivism by Race

Black - 6.3%
White - 12.5%

W. Recidivism by one and two parent families

Two - 6.2%
One - 20.0%

Possibly because one parent has to take all the stress and may tend to give up since they don't have the support of the other parent.

APPENDIX A

X. Recidivism by disposition

- 9.5% of Auto (Denial) sent to Court were re-arrested
- 19.8% description to Court
- 6.9% referral to Youth Services Bureau
- 0% cases referred to parents (cases are usually insignificant)

II. REFERRAL SOURCES

A. NYPUM - recently instituted at Youth Services Bureau. Cosponsored by YMCA. Reinforcement for positive behavior. Involves alot of school, home, and community involvement. Has a nationwide average 3.8% recidivism rate. 80% of participants must be criminal justice referrals. They ride 1 to 1½ hours per week. They must go to school on time, stay out of trouble with the law, and be good at home.

B. Big Friend

A response to a need that was shown by the Juvenile Review Board statistics. Kids acting out for attention. Program was started with college students. Recently opened townwide. Program is for children needing another positive adult relationship.

C. Wilderness School

Is a 19 day experience in the wilderness. Windsor Youth Services basic criteria--unresponsive to counseling and other programs, lacking in school.

D. Restitution Program

- a. Billing procedure for false alarms
 - 1. \$300 per false alarm
 - 2. Review Board recommends whether parents be charged or not
- b. others--sanding, scrubbing floors, etc.

III. Designated Members

Schools - 2 - principals having difficulty attending. Trying to get two representatives from the school system.

IV. Erasurē Procedure

Trying to use same procedure as Juvenile Court.

V. Comments or Suggestions

Statistics show effectiveness of Youth Services Bureau working in Wilson.

APPENDIX A

~~EAST HARTFORD~~
EAST HARTFORD CASE CONFERENCE GROUP REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 1974-75

The East Hartford Case Conference Group heard a total of 243 juvenile cases involving 187 youth during FY 1974-75. Of these the most numerous categorically were:

Shoplifting	41
Burglary	29
Larceny	28
Vandalism	27
Runaways	18
Assault	14
Misc.	86

The Case Conference Group referred a total of 116 cases to Juvenile Court (48%) and diverted 127 (52%). Diversionary agencies receiving referrals were:

East Hartford Youth Services	63
East Hartford Youth Services Clinic	46
Department of Children and Youth Services	11
Misc.	7

During the one year period, the rate of recidivism in East Hartford was approximately 11% - well below the national Juvenile Court average of 50%. (Remember - this is only a first year statistic.)

20 juvenile offenders accounted for the recidivism with a total responsibility for 56 separate cases.

Broken down:	<u># of cases</u>	<u># of youth</u>
	7	1
	4	1
	3	9
	2	9
Total	<u>56</u>	<u>20</u>

APPENDIX A

CONNECTICUT SUPERIOR COURT - JUVENILE MATTERS

TABLE I: NUMBER OF JUVENILES REFERRED BY SEX & RACE; 7/1/78-6/30/79

<u>RACE</u>	<u>SEX</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>	
WHITE	5061	1494	6555
BLACK	1603	511	2114
SPANISH	709	186	895
OTHER	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>15</u>
TOTAL	7382	2197	9579

TABLE II: NUMBER OF JUVENILES REFERRED BY SEX AND AGE; 7/1/78-6/30/79

<u>AGE</u>	<u>SEX</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>	
Under 9 years	83	8	91
9 years	83	20	103
10 years	176	29	205
11 years	311	57	368
12 years	607	161	768
13 years	1098	353	1451
14 years	1912	650	2562
15 years	2980	896	3876
16 years	<u>132</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>155</u>
TOTAL	7382	2197	9579

TABLE III: NUMBER OF JUVENILES REFERRED BY SEX & PRIOR REFERRALS;
7/1/78-6/30/79

<u>PRIOR REFERRALS</u>	<u>SEX</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>	
0	5192	1715	6907

APPENDIX A

<u>PRIOR REFERRALS</u>	<u>SEX</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>	
1	1074	268	1342
2	440	86	526
3	238	48	286
4	126	30	156
5 or more	<u>312</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>362</u>
TOTAL	7382	2197	9579

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

I. LEGISLATION

The 1979 General Assembly enacted several statutes which will have a significant impact on the operations and responsibilities of the Division of Juvenile Probation and Detention Services during the coming year:

- P.A. 79-397 Emancipation of Minors
- P.A. 79-511 Commitment of Mentally Ill Children
- P.A. 79-567 Families With Service Needs
- P.A. 79-579 Mandatory Judicial Review of Children Committed to the Department of Children and Youth Services
- P.A. 79-581 Serious Juvenile Offenders

a) Public Act 79-397 provides that a child more than sixteen years of age but less than eighteen years of age, or the parents of a child of such age, may petition the Court, given certain circumstances, for a decree emancipating the child. The Court may, prior to final hearing, order an investigation into the circumstances of the family which may be conducted by a Juvenile Probation Officer or other social service professional.

This legislation creates a new cause of action in the Juvenile Matters Part of the Superior Court and, as such, will create the need for development of procedures, guidelines and new forms to assist the Clerks for Juvenile Matters in processing these matters.