Criminal Justice Program Proposal-Part I-VI

Juvenile Justice Correctional Facilities

Tracy VanNatta

AJS/595

Program Development and Evaluation

Donald Munday

7 July 2014

Juvenile Justice Correctional Facilities

The issues surrounding juvenile justice and the extent to which juvenile detention centers rehabilitate youth. Researchers examined previous literature on the subject and used that background as a basis to develop research concerns about the treatment and services provided in juvenile detention centers. Researchers focused specifically on Oak Hill Youth Center in Laurel, Maryland as a case study (Whole, Hatry, and Newcomer, 2010). Researchers analyzed archival data and interview transcripts with key stakeholders to generate a summary of problems surrounding effective rehabilitative services at Oak Hill. In their analysis, repeated themes arose such as poor facilities, abuse by staff, lack of security, unqualified staff, and inadequate health and educational services. From these themes, theoretical constructs were formed regarding what is necessary for successful rehabilitation of youth. Researchers recognized that punitive detention centers are inadequate to rehabilitate youth and discovered the importance for more rehabilitative approaches and services.

The Statement of the Problem and Sub-problem

Juvenile delinquency is a persistent and pervasive social problem in America. Juvenile crime represents over 40% of the total arrests for major crimes, including murder, rape, and burglary, and the increasing rate of juvenile incarceration mirrors that of adult incarceration. This predominantly disadvantaged population, which has been largely ignored by both the written law and society, creates great social and economic costs for the United States (Whole, Hatry, and Newcomer, 2010). The root causes of juvenile delinquency need to be addressed, the funds need to be made available to devise an effective approach to rehabilitation, and provide these programs to a severely underserved youth population.

In the United states there is a high rate of juvenile delinquency and, not surprisingly,

there are far more crimes committed in minority and low-income neighborhoods than in the wealthy ones. With that said, in much of the larger cities; consists of largely urban and disadvantaged areas. With high rates of unemployment and poverty, and without family and neighborhood support, many juveniles turn to crime simply as a way to survive (Abram, Choe, Washburn, Teplin, King, and Dulcan, 2010). It is ironic to note that prison time provides street credibility to juvenile defenders instead of alienating them from society.

The juvenile justice system has responded to legislative decisions that have made a transition from an emphasis on rehabilitation to a more punitive focus, marked by stricter laws and harsher punishments. In the late 1860s, during the Progressive Era, there was a separate juvenile justice system that was created in the United States (Abram, Choe, Washburn, Teplin, King, and Dulcan, 2010). This system encouraged rehabilitation based on the specific needs of individual youth. As juvenile crime and violent crime increased over time, with a dramatic rise in the 1980s and 1990s, courts adopted a more punitive approach. Recently, this has shifted back to a rehabilitative stance focused on community based resources, counseling, and other mental health services. This shift is primarily due to the increased application of research on juvenile crime in the court system, in addition to a greater awareness of the problems in the juvenile justice system among community members and advocates.

Various factors have influenced these transitions in the juvenile justice system. For example, media coverage highlights specific issues and influences public opinion; policy implementation determines the role of the court in juvenile justice; public opinion influences legislative decisions; and the level of funding and resources dictates the amount of rehabilitative treatment (AAP, 2013). In order to better understand the underlying reasons for this transformation and evolution, the specific factors, outlined above, were researched and analyzed.

The problems faced by Oak Hill Detention Center in Laurel, Maryland represent many of the larger issues that plague the juvenile justice system, not just in Washington DC but across the country.

Statement

Using an exploratory and qualitative approach, and focusing on the history of the Oak Hill Youth Detention Center, this research project generated a summary of the transitions in the juvenile justice system. The researchers believed that factors such as the media perception, policy implementation, and accessible funding and resources, play an influential role in how the system is implemented (AAP, 2013). Through interviews and archival research, theoretical constructs, public policy, media, public opinion, funding and resources, administration and staff, and community alternatives surfaced and proved to be significant in our study.

The Need of the Community Being Addressed in this Research

The majority of youth offenders in Washington live in minority, low-income neighborhoods. They attend poor schools, and have few educational or recreational resources. They come from disadvantaged communities that need to have their experiences, voices, and opinions heard by the government and the public, but rarely do. The communities that seem to foster juvenile crime and delinquency do not have the resources to provide for their youth in constructive ways (Abram, Choe, Washburn, Teplin, King, and Dulcan, 2010). The juvenile justice system in the United States has been through several stages of development. In recent years, it has undergone substantial transitions that has occurred due to the result's from reforms made to revive the original purpose of Juvenile Justice Detention Facilities were to bringing individual justice and rehabilitation to the core of the system. While there is much historical literature outlining this evolution, there is very little research on the reasons behind this

transformation. This review of relevant literature looks specifically at the available research on

juvenile detention centers in order to show the negative effects of taking a punitive approach in

juvenile justice. It begins with an historical review in order to put the rise of detention centers in

context. The aim is to use the available data on detention centers to demonstrate the

transformation of juvenile justice, from a rehabilitative to a punitive approach, and call attention

to specific factors that have hindered the rehabilitation process.

The changes that have been made in the juvenile justice system was a reflection from

national trends from juvenile delinquencies and from the responses from the American people

because of these trends. In the past three decades, rates of juvenile delinquency have increased

and, as a result, policymakers have established more severe punishments for juvenile offenders

that reflect both a more conservative political environment and a lack of financial resources to

promote a rehabilitative approach. With the rise in juvenile delinquency, confinement of

juveniles in detention centers increased; during a 10 year period between 1977 and 1987, the

number of juveniles in detention centers increased 5 times the size (Holman and Ziedenberg,

2014). The role of juvenile detention facilities is to provide temporary housing that is safe for

juvenile delinquents that are accused of criminal conduct that is subject to be under the

jurisdiction of the court's; juveniles that are required by law to serve in a restricted environment

for their own protection or the protection of the community while pending legal action; is one of

the issues that causes the most conflict because it is not at all clear that juvenile detention centers

are contributing in any way to the rehabilitation of America's youth.

Research on juvenile detention centers, while scarce, provides information on the

common problems of injustice within these centers. Multiple studies have identified the issue of

unsafe facilities and overcrowding (Whole, Hatry, and Newcomer, 2010). Research has also

recognized minority overrepresentation of the inadequate healthcare and lack of education services as central concerns of the juvenile justice system. Finally, literature on the juvenile justice system often focuses on program implementation and effectiveness at addressing rehabilitation, as well as diversion techniques within the system. This review examines these issues in greater detail and locates them within the larger struggle in the juvenile justice system to rehabilitate juvenile offenders. Each facility does things very differently; some centers keep their juveniles confined in their rooms for hours every day, while other use this tactic for disciplinary purposes only. I do not feel that juveniles should be kept locked in their rooms because that is what jails and prisons are for. Detention centers must be used help and rehabilitate the juvenile offender before they are sent to lockup facilities where they are required to stay in their cells for hours every day.

Many detention facilities have some type of level system, which encourage positive behavior by providing rewards for reaching the higher levels. Usually the juveniles have to work their way down the scale which means that they are close to being released. Other rewards can include later bedtimes, TV or video game privileges, and longer family visits (Whole, Hatry, and Newcomer, 2010). Juveniles also have the opportunity to participate in work programs offered at some detention centers. The work programs include working in the kitchen, laundry services, gardening and landscaping, and auto mobile repairs. Some detention centers also are affiliated with small businesses around their community that give the children a chance to leave the detention center and learn to hold a real job in the outside world. Increased youths are being detained do to the new get tough policy of the juvenile justice system.

In some states the county probation departments run the juvenile detention centers. The American Correctional Association (ACA) was established as the national standards and guidelines for these facilities, but at the same time the established guidelines are voluntary for detention facilities that choose to be (ACA) accredited (AAP, 2013). The majority of juveniles in

detention centers in the mid-1990s were being held for delinquent offenses. More than half of the juveniles were detained in six states alone: California, Ohio, Texas, New York, Florida, and Illinois (Holman and Ziedenberg, 2014). Each jurisdiction has their own programming within their detention centers. Some form of educational programming is required within every detention center, although many jurisdictions have no standards for schooling. Other programs that may be provided but not required include; anger management, cognitive behavior therapy, drug and alcohol groups, and female offender programs. Some form of exercise program is usually included in the youth's daily activities.

Treatment of Juveniles

As the treatment of juveniles detained switches back and forth from punishment to treatment, the use of detention centers will continue to change. Through evidence presented, race is considered in the decision making processes regarding youths in detention centers. Females who are detained display significantly higher rates of mental health problems and have more harsh victimization histories (Holman and Ziedenberg, 2014). I feel detention centers are still more helpful to today's youth than hurtful. If detention centers continue to focus on treating the youth rather than punishing them, detention would have a positive impact on juvenile.

Reactive and Proactive

Juvenile justice has proved to be as reactive as it is proactive. In early 1825, there was a significant push to establish a separate juvenile justice system focused on rehabilitation and treatment. The process continued to remain focused on individual rehabilitation, although funding and resources continued to hinder its success (CJCJ, 2014). In the 1980's, in response to rising juvenile crime rates, more punitive laws were passed. In the 1990's, the United States legal system took further steps regarding transfer provisions that lowered the threshold at which

juveniles could be tried in criminal court and sentenced to adult prison.

Furthermore, laws were enacted that allowed prosecutors and judges more discretion in their sentencing options; and confidentiality standards, which made juvenile court proceedings and records more available to the public, were reduced (CJCJ, 2014). It was found that other recent reforms, such as increased procedural protections and disposal of cases without judicial review, transformed the juvenile system to afford the youth offenders more legal rights along with rehabilitative treatment. The separate system was created to help decrease recidivism rates among juveniles, and instill them with the necessary values and education to advance in society. Without effective treatment options, juvenile merge, adult punishments merge, the need for separate and different legal systems ceases to exist.

Kent v. United States (1966), *In re Gault* (1967), and *McKeiver vs. Pennsylvania* (1971) are landmark Supreme Court decisions that addressed the role of due process and procedural rights in the juvenile system as they correspond to those in adult criminal court (Fortas, 1966). If the system is unable, or unwilling, to provide proper and significant treatment to the juveniles, the entire premise of rehabilitation will cease to exist. While the legal implications of these decisions create a foundation for juvenile justice practices, it is important to understand the reality and consequent effects of their implementation (Fortas, 1967). With the stricter guidelines for adult transfers, enforced basic constitutional rights, reaffirmed the right to innocence with proof of a reasonable doubt, and made it so that trials by jury were not required in juvenile court. These cases made the juvenile court more similar to the adult criminal court in some important ways while still keeping their procedures and intent separate (FindLaw, 2014).

When the concept of juvenile justice was first introduced in America, the popular view was a liberal one, in which people believed rehabilitation could be achieved by the state. This

attitude guided the approach of juvenile justice reformers and created the idea of the state as the

protector of juveniles (CJCJ, 2014). This was a time when detention centers were homes and the

juvenile court took on a mentoring approach to guiding at risk youth. In the 1960's, a push for

deinstitutionalization was initiated, as evidenced by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency

Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 that created the community based alternatives to juvenile

detention facilities. With the combination of a Conservative and Fundamentalist perspective on

juvenile justice, which is one that still carries weight today. This conservative view mirrored a

belief that juveniles should be held accountable to their criminal behavior. The Fundamentalist

approach was popular during Reagan's years in office and focused on promoting family values.

These four distinct viewpoints are parallel with the changes seen in juvenile justice over

time. Where juveniles were once sent to homes, they are now housed in large detention facilities,

which is a result of taking a more punitive approach toward youthful offenders.

The issues regarding juvenile detention centers today are an outgrowth of increased

incarceration in response to a Conservative approach. This conservative approach came about as

a response to the increase in juvenile delinquency in the 1970's and 1980's, which increased with

the rise of gang affiliation and the crack epidemic (CJCJ, 2014). Conservatives in Congress

claimed prevention programs were ineffective and called for more strict punishment of

juveniles. There was also a lack of financial resources available for use by the juvenile justice

system and those with a conservative mindset were unwilling to dedicate funds to preventative

programs. This approach became the predominant view, and new policies were created to punish

juveniles and make them accountable of their criminal behavior (Posavac, 2011).

Overcrowding

The increased incarceration rates within juvenile detention facilities led to overcrowding

had found that 40% of public facilities were overpopulated in 1995. In addition, in 1991 one-third of all public detention centers were housing populations that exceeded their design capacity. The trend of overcrowding has been apparent for a while and has appeared to grow even worse over the last two decades. Many researchers feel that overcrowding is the most dangerous component of the overall ineffectiveness of America's juvenile detention facilities. Overcrowding contributes to other problems, such as a greater lack of individualized services and the increased risk of violent behavior, and takes away from a rehabilitative environment that it has caused neglect of individual juveniles (Pajer, Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner, 2007). When facilities become overcrowded, juveniles are housed in increasingly smaller rooms, violent and non-violent offenders are housed together, and injury rates increase. There are several possible remedies to address overcrowding, such as changing policies that regulate juvenile confinement, the duration of confinement, and eliminating the use of large dormitories.

Minority Overrepresentation

Along with overcrowding, data collected from detention facilities showed issues of overrepresentation, disparity, and discrimination. Disparity is the probability of one population receiving an outcome that consistently differs from that of another population. For example, females represent one out of every 17 juveniles in residential placement as compared with males who represent 16 out of every 17 juveniles in residential placement (Pajer, Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner, 2007). Judges and prosecutors seem to divert girls from the system and, although their crimes may be far less frequent and of a less violent nature, it is possible that their gender is considered in the sentencing procedures. Lastly, discrimination occurs when the juvenile justice system treats a population differently based on their race, gender, ethnicity or socioeconomic status. It is important to note that overrepresentation and disparity are not forms

of discrimination. Research has shown that there is a higher prevalence of youth crime in low

socioeconomic urban minority neighborhoods but there is no evidence that discrimination is a

significant contributor to this data (Shirk, 2014).

Overrepresentation of minorities in the juvenile justice system, and felt that it was

necessary to have comprehensive treatment programs to serve the minority youth in the

community and thereby reduce the over reliance on state ran institutions. It has been found that

minorities were also overrepresented in areas of personal health problems that comprised of 84%

of the youth sample with untreated tooth decay in their oral hygiene study. Much of the literature

surrounding juvenile justice acknowledges the high proportion of minority youth in the system;

detention facilities and rehabilitation programs need to create programs that focus specifically on

the needs of minority youth (Pajer, Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner, 2007).

Minority youth constitute the largest population of detained youth. As the juvenile justice

system has evolved, and more juveniles have been detained in secure facilities, the number of

incarcerated minority youth has risen (Shirk, 2014). In order for the juvenile justice system to

return to a rehabilitative stance, there needs to be an increased awareness of the experiences and

needs of these minority delinquents (Pajer, Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner, 2007).

The juvenile justice system has not had the resources to focus on this group within the larger

population of detained youth. The juvenile justice system cannot move forward, and cannot

provide rehabilitative resources to its youth, until individual and group needs are met within the

system.

Healthcare

Healthcare services are affected with insufficient in juvenile detention centers. Studies

have been done about adolescents in large urban detention facility in order to assess oral health

needs (Shirk, 2014). They found that untreated decay plagued 87% of the juveniles being

detained, in comparison to a 20% national average. In addition, one study found that only 43% of

youth get health screening within their first hour of confinement. Many of the youth who enter

detention facilities come from impoverished or disadvantaged backgrounds, and therefore have

never received proper healthcare. Having healthcare in detention centers creates an opportunity

to improve the conditions of at risk youth and teach them how to maintain their health (Pajer,

Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner, 2007). Therefore, as a rehabilitative service,

healthcare is necessary in detention centers, although the studies show these services are

inadequate.

Other studies that have explored mental health and psychiatric care in detention centers

have found the same distressing (Pajer, Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner,

2007). Psychological disabilities are highly prevalent in detention centers and suicide rates for

incarcerated youth are 2 to 4 times higher than in large communities. Conditions associated with

confinement, such as solitary confinement, crowding, and separation from friends and family can

increase the risk of suicidal behavior. In general, literature shows that detained youth have a

greater risk of suicidal behavior, and are plagued by mental and emotional disorders. A study of

conditions in juvenile detention facilities, has found that only half of confined juveniles are in a

facility that monitors suicidal behavior at a rate compliant to national standards (Shirk,

2014). While few large-scale studies have examined mental healthcare in juvenile detention

centers, the trends show an inadequate amount of mental health services by trained individuals.

Multiple recommendations on how to improve healthcare services for detained youth

have been proposed by researchers and policymakers. The first recommendation is to increase

the amount of research on healthcare in juvenile detention centers as a way to assess the needs of

detained youth and discover what is missing in the healthcare programs. Recommendation have been made that psychiatric services in detention centers need to be increased and staff needs to be trained in how to deal with suicidal behavior (Shirk, 2014). There has been information that had found that over one-third of the health screenings being conducted on intake at detention centers are by untrained staff, which again shows the importance of properly training staff of juvenile facilities.

Healthcare is a major problem in juvenile detention centers and the lack of adequate services prevents successful rehabilitation (Pajer, Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner, 2007). As the evolution to a more punitive approach has occurred, more youth have experienced the injustice of a failing healthcare system within detention centers, mainly as a result from lack of funding for these services (Shirk, 2014). If youth are not given adequate healthcare services, then their most basic needs are not being met. They will continue to have health and mental issues upon their release, and it is unlikely that they will be successfully rehabilitated.

Education

In addition to the problems of overcrowding and insufficient healthcare, education within juvenile detention centers is unsatisfactory. The intellectual functioning of youth in detention facilities is in the range of low to low average. In regards to special education, the services provided are not up to date and detained youth do not receive the services to which they are entitled (Shirk, 2014). The idea of learning disabled youth being warehoused in detention facilities as a result of insufficient educational services. They examined three case studies of individuals who have repeatedly been detained; each of these juvenile offenders had a documented history of learning disabilities and no access to the appropriate educational services they needed to succeed. Education is considered one of the main solutions to juvenile

delinquency, but it does not receive the attention it warrants in detention centers. Instead, because of the multiple issues that face juvenile detention centers, academic growth is often ignored (Pajer, Kelleher, Gupta, Rolls, and William Gardner, 2007).

In order to successfully rehabilitate youth in America's juvenile justice system, those who are detained need to receive educational services that improve their academics. While it is difficult to focus delinquents on schoolwork, as they have often failed in school curriculum in juvenile detention facilities must incorporate basic subjects of reading and writing, with electives juveniles have strengths to address (Wholey , Hatry , Newcomer, 2010). There has been a report on a successful reading program that was implemented at a juvenile detention. The program resulted in quantitatively higher literacy rates and qualitatively greater affinity for reading. This program recognized the learning disabilities of juveniles in the detention center, and designed a program to address those disabilities, which is an approach all juvenile detention centers should take.

Continuous Education

Education continues to be a controversial issue within the juvenile justice system. Juvenile delinquents should not be warehoused as some have suggested, but instead rehabilitated. The very center of rehabilitation rests in education because this youth population must learn how to navigate and succeed in the world without resorting to crime. However, like healthcare, funding is needed to have successful programs in education. If the juvenile justice system does not have the necessary funding or does not feel that education programs are necessary, no changes can be made to the current programs (Wholey , Hatry , Newcomer, 2010). As the juvenile justice system moves back towards rehabilitation, it will be interesting to see the impact of this shift on educational opportunities and resources afforded this detained population.

Education is the foundation of rehabilitation.

Juvenile Delinquency

Juvenile delinquency is the misdemeanors or the breach of law that is committed by an American or a person living in America but still under the age of eighteen years old. This is the common age limit that exists across most states except in Wyoming where the age is nineteen years or younger (CJCJ, 2014). It is worth noting that by 2006, there were 92,854 juvenile delinquents living in the detention centers and a significant seventy percent were teenagers who were between fifteen years and seventeen years old, a smaller fifteen percent were eighteen years and another fifteen percent being the age of fourteen years.

In order to fully understand the current Juvenile Justice System, it is of great significance research the historical data of the juvenile system from the early years till now. Children above five years old were taken as either small adults or property in the colonial times in America. They were sentenced in criminal courts for offences like cursing parents, petty theft and other such lots of cases. This continued for a long time till 1825; when the Society for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency pushed for the separation of the juvenile from the adults in terms of justice administration (CJCJ, 2014). There after numerous cities built juvenile facilities which were majorly aimed at reforming the delinquents through hard work, prayers, whipping and even studies. However, by mid of the century these facilities were accused of child abuse hence the state took over the management of the juvenile facilities.

In the late 1800's the 1st juvenile court was established in Chicago for handling children offenders or delinquents of sixteen years and below. This was also focused on rehabilitation rather than pure punishment (Posavac, 2011). With the precedence set, by 1952 almost all states, with exception of two, had set up juvenile courts where warning, confinement, probation were

some of the methods employed to help turn possible criminal in the future into useful citizens to

the US. There are, therefore, significant differences that exist between the adult courts and the

juvenile courts that help set them apart. In the adult courts, there is usually what is referred to as

bail hearings conducted against the suspects that are presented before the courts. This is quite

different in the juvenile court system. In the juvenile court system this is referred to as the

detention hearing which involves basically what is happening in the bail hearing but applied in

the scope of the juveniles (Wholey, Hatry, Newcomer, 2010). The adult court system also carries

out full trial with the attorneys availed to defend both arguments for the two sides of the cases,

while the juvenile court is a fact finding hearing that is formatted to find out the hard facts about

the misdemeanor of the juvenile as indicated by the community officer or the parents.

Congress passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in 1974 in hopes of

reducing the use of juvenile detention and to provide alternatives to secure detention (Wholey,

Hatry, Newcomer, 2010). Despite the acts invasive detention abuse still continued throughout the

country. Another issue at hand was that the freedom each jurisdiction had in making detention

decisions led to immense differences in detention use, this was a big problem because some

jurisdictions were changing for the better while others stayed the same.

Program Implementation and Effectiveness

There has been research aimed at understanding the success and failures of rehabilitation

in juvenile detention centers and, more specifically, the prevention and intervention programs

that are practiced and offered to at risk youth and juvenile offenders (Posavac, 2011). The

delinquency prevention programs and explored the problems that these programs face, such as

the inaccuracy of measurement and inconsistency of analysis that affects the data. He also

examined the solutions to improve the effectiveness of these institutional programs, which are

aimed at reducing delinquency and recidivism and promoting positive and social development as a contributing member of society. The reason that research on these issues is so scarce is because there are differences in the methods used to evaluate them, which makes comparing the effectiveness of these programs impossible. Studies involving random assignment are difficult within the criminal justice system because research cannot determine where an offender is placed. Instead of using statistical significance to report effectiveness, researchers compare outcomes that can be highly subjective and inaccurate.

Greenwood also wrote about the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado. This study created the Blueprints for Violence Prevention that certifies programs based on their effectiveness at addressing problem behaviors; addressing the development of long-term skills to be used after an individual's time in the program; and demonstrating its ability to be replicated across detention facilities and staff. Other organizations and individuals have also attempted to perform statistical meta-analysis evaluations in order to predict the level of effectiveness within a given program (Bayer and Pozen, 2004). Specific programs attempted to identify strategies and methods for successfully implementing programs. Campbell Corporation also tried to be the clearinghouse of program effectiveness but has been unable to make any significant gains given the limited number of studies and programs.

The reason that these programs, and their accurate measurements of effectiveness, are so important is because they are the future of rehabilitation. In order for rehabilitation to be achieved within the juvenile justice system; there 3 crucial improvements that has to be implemented. First, there needs to be an increased focus on dynamic or changeable risk factors; which includes improving a juvenile's skill set and deterring them from substance abuse. Most importantly, incarcerated juveniles need to learn to manage their behavior and form positive

relationships with friends and family through counseling and skills training. Next, Greenwood

urges rehabilitation focused detention centers to focus on the individual needs of each youth

offender (Bayer and Pozen, 2004). Lastly, high risk youth should be the focus of rehabilitative

treatment. Rehabilitation has to be about protecting all juveniles, not just the ones who can save

themselves. The increased family bonds through counseling, introduction to the job market, and

participation in school related activities. The understanding of these goals face significant

challenges when there is a widespread lack of accountability throughout the system, there is a

lack of sufficient funds for these programs to survive, there is a lack of any standardized system,

as explained above, to compare and rate the programs, and there is often a lack of support and

motivation from detention staff.

These programs, and others like them, are crucial to the tenets of rehabilitative treatment

for juvenile offenders. As the juvenile justice system became more punitive, these programs

failed to achieve their original aims. In order to assure rehabilitation for youth offenders, these

programs need the attention and resources to allow this delinquent population to succeed (Bayer

and Pozen, 2004). These programs are controversial because they are under researched and

underfunded, but they are important because they lay the foundation for the transition back to

rehabilitation within the juvenile justice system.

Diversion Techniques

Rehabilitation would not succeed if given the present system and resources, because

juvenile detention centers carry stigmas that brand this youth population as offenders. In

addition, the informal and seemingly subjective judicial process promotes self-labeling. In

addition, there are inadequate resources such as personnel, facilities, and psychiatrists to create a

treatment oriented setting for incarcerated juveniles. Simpson found that the current system

labels the offender, and not the offending behavior (State of California, 2013). When it comes to decriminalization, diversion, due process, and deinstitutionalization; it found that diversion helped programs like shelter care, educational alternatives, counseling, and medical treatment to help protect the youth but are only helpful if they decrease the rates of recidivism within the juvenile system, include a large community wide referral and support network, and ensure lowered recidivism rates and improved social behavior. These diversion programs proved to be any more or less effective than traditional detention facilities. Instead, they saw them as a means of transferring juveniles to alternate programs which do not have any significant effect given the lack of resources provided to them. The increase in community based programs may have brought more juveniles into the system, but it has not proven to have any long term effects on this juvenile delinquent population. While community programs can be very helpful, the legislature has to ensure that these programs have the resources to rehabilitate the juvenile instead of bringing them back into the community that likely contributed to their initial crime.

Diversionary rationale explained that the juvenile court would help children by doing less harm than the adult criminal court and even if diversionary techniques do not decrease recidivism rates, the programs help by keeping youth out of the adult system, and providing them with a safe place to spend their free time (State of California, 2013). The interventionist rationale believes that the diversion programs could help protect the community and cure the child. While these two rationales have different beliefs about the effectiveness of rehabilitating the child, the blending seems to be the basis of the juvenile justice system's rehabilitation efforts. Diversionary rationale more closely mirrors institutional reality but interventionist techniques remain important as a preventative measure.

Diversion programs have become increasingly popular as the atrocities of detention

centers became more apparent to judges and probation officers. These programs will become less vital if the detention centers are able to rehabilitate offending youth but they are still important for community involvement. The control theory helped explain why juveniles commit crimes; since they often have little to no attachment to their neighborhoods or commitment to their families, there is no deterrence. The juveniles in the system need to feel connected and, in part, responsible for their communities, and programs that promote this connection often empower them in ways the detention center cannot, by giving them the opportunity to have positive experiences in their communities instead of being detained at a secure facility (Welsh, 2013). It will be interesting to see if the number of diversion programs decrease as the rehabilitative focus of the detention center increases and delinquent youth are provided with the educational and emotional support that they need.

Juvenile Boot Camps

Boot camps have emerged as a popular replacement for juvenile detention centers. Boot camp facilities were perceived by the detained youth to be much more therapeutic, structured, active, controlled, just, safe, suited to preparing them for release, and likely to provide and demonstrate a better quality of life. As a more transitional option, supporters feel that the boot camp environment is more suited to rehabilitation (Welsh, 2013). Critics, however, feel that the military style that pervades a 'boot camp' facility could negatively impact the youth and return them back to their communities with anger and resentment. However, the perception did not show how the actual situation in regards to quality correctional programming, because the recidivism rates are not lower for youth detained in boot camps. It is important to understand that those conditions, despite their results, felt more constructive to the offending youth and therefore, some boot camp policies should be incorporated into more traditional detentions. It is

also important to note that boot camps are a relatively new rehabilitation tactic, with newer staff and more accessible facilities. Better trained staff and more modern facilities might be the reason why these programs are perceived as being more constructive, as opposed to the methodology they promote.

While boot camps may not be the ideal rehabilitative means for detained youth, there are aspects of it that are crucial to the success of detention centers. The most important focus of any detention facility had to be rehabilitation, but that youthful offenders also needed a safe environment for therapy, access to family and friends to ease their reintegration into the community, and access to individualized treatment (Welsh, 2013). Rehabilitation is the most contested, and yet central, part of juvenile justice. While some diversion techniques are successful, there needs to be a more uniform response to an increase in juvenile crime. This youth population needs to engage with their communities and families. There has not been much research conducted on intervention programs, and the methods of analysis are weak, but alternate programs could be very useful for many delinquent youth as long as there is funding and resources allocated to them. Researchers need to demonstrate that these programs are effective, in order to justify additional funding, but they lack the research that could document an appropriate level of effectiveness.

Inadequacies

It is apparent that there are many inadequacies in America's juvenile detention centers. There is a struggle for detention centers to find a balance between protecting the safety of the public and addressing the individual rights of youth by providing rehabilitative services (Posavac, 2011). The recent trends seem to show an increase in punishment and a diversion from rehabilitative services, a trend that is especially evident in the significant increase of detained

juveniles. In addition to not providing rehabilitative services, detention as a warehouse can have further negative impacts on juveniles.

Young Offenders

When it comes to young offenders they are referred by the children's courts for the most serious indictable offences, such as 1st degree murder, manslaughter, sexual offences, domestic violence, drug trafficking and any other criminal offences that result in the death of a person. The court has limited sentencing options, set out in a hierarchy of available penalties in order of severity (CJCJ, 2014). Sentencing hierarchies were developed to help guide the children's court's in selecting the right penalty and to give a higher degree of consistency when sentencing juveniles. Such requirements have been designed to require magistrates to justify the use of more severe penalties, to justify the use of non-custodial options, and to reinforce the use of detention as a sentence of last resort.

Sanctions

The sanctions available to the children's court in order of decreasing severity, include the following: detention in a juvenile justice centre or juvenile correction facility suspended detention community service order, attendance centre order probation for usually up to two years or other supervised order fine or compensation and good behavior bond fine or compensation referral to a youth conferencing scheme good behavior bond undertaking to observe certain conditions dismissal of charges with or without either a reprimand or a conviction recorded The objectives of sentencing, defined as, retribution, deterrence, rehabilitation and incapacitation have a certain difficulty in being met when sentencing juveniles (CJCJ, 2014).

Instead, sentencing aims to meet the following objectives: Responsibility; intent, excuse, impairment, motive. This mitigating factor of responsibility is changed when applied to young

offenders, due to the notion of reduced responsibility because of age proportionality; sanction

applied by the court needs to take account of the seriousness of the crime and responsibility of

the offender equality; consistency in punishment frugality; sentence imposed should be the least

restrictive that is appropriate rehabilitation; the court must take into account the chances of

rehabilitation for the offender as well as an outline of the options available when sentencing and

the objectives that must be achieved when sentencing, the key issue that remains to be examined

is the actual use of these sentencing options (Posavac, 2011).

Deterrence

Deterrence was designed to putting fear into people and that the costs of the

consequences imposed on them; would be greater than the benefits of actually committing the

crime it's self. There are two types of people that deterrence is supposed to scare people who

might think of committing a crime and those who have already committed a crime but might do

it again. Deterrence can also be subdivided into two categories general deterrence and specific

deterrence. General deterrence is where the offender is punished so that other people do not

commit a crime. So the offender is being an example of so that others in society can see that

crime does not pay. On the other hand since general deterrence is general in nature it can be very

efficient and cost effective ideally by punishing a small number of offenders a larger portion of

possible offenders will be persuaded not to break the law. The other category of deterrence,

specific deterrence, focuses on punishing the offender so that they will not re-offend.

Ideally if specific deterrence were effective offenders would be less likely to re-offend if

sentenced to prison then those given probation, if given longer prison sentences, or placed in

programs with close supervision and the threat of their probation or parole being taking away

(Posavac, 2011). So the heart of the deterrence theory is the greater the certainty of punishment

and the greater the severity of the punishment the less likely offenders will re-offend or a crime would occur. Recidivism offenders who receive more incarceration rather than less incarceration have a higher recidivism, and offenders who are incarcerated do not have lower recidivism rates compared to those sentenced to the community. Also an issue is that how can the effect of deterrence be measured because some of the crime saved could be due to the fact that the offender was incarcerated and therefore off the streets and not committing crime. Deterrence also does not take into account causes for crime except that it is free will and choice that the offender commits a crime so it is likely to have minimal effects on the control of crime.

Incapacitation

Incapacitation is the use of prisons to physically prevent crime from happening by the offender by locking them away from society. Incapacitation can be broken down into two different types: collective incapacitation and selective incapacitation. So collective incapacitation is when you take everyone collectively in a category and put them in prison. For example the three strikes rule where you take an offender that has three felonies they get a mandatory life sentence, which may prevent a lot of crime because high rate offenders would be off the street (Posavac, 2011). By collectively incapacitating offenders for long period makes the cost worth it because all high rate offenders in a group are incarcerated, but the low rate offenders are also incarcerated.

For selective incapacitation to work it requires, the ability to identify offenders who will commit serious crimes at high rates in the future. The main issue with selective incapacitation is that it relies on prediction. The tools used to make the predictions are fallible as well and can lead to false positives. Incapacitation in general is hard to quantify the effects it has on reducing crime rates because it is hard differentiate between whether the crime rate went down due to

offenders being deterred by being incarcerated, potential offenders being deterred by the possibility of being incarcerated or by offenders being rehabilitated while being incarcerated (Posavac, 2011).

Restorative

The third option that correctional facilities have is restorative justice. Restorative justice is centralized on three central principles which are crime causes harm to victims, the community and to the offender; the goal of sentencing should be to reverse the harm that has been caused by the criminal act; and using practices that seek to restore victims, the community, and offender to their original state before the crime happened. Restorative justice ideally works by letting the victim have a voice during conferences with the offender. During the conferences the victim voices how the crime has affected them first-hand and then the offender has the chance to apologize and devise a plan on how they will compensate the victim. Restorative justice relies on the restorative actions of the offender (Posavac, 2011).

The benefits to Restorative justice is that everyone seems to benefit, conservatives support it because it extends rights to victims, liberals support it because it benefits the offenders, it insists on offenders being accountable for their actions and are held responsible for the harm that they have caused. In contrast restorative justice does not deal with serious crimes. Restorative justice reduces recidivism by approximately ten percent, restorative justice programs ordered by the court seemed to have no effect on recidivism and restorative justice programs have little effects on serious offenders but appears to be more effective with low risk offenders (Posavac, 2011). Also it is hard to measure the accurate reduction in recidivism because the program relies on offenders volunteering, so the offenders maybe more likely not to recidivate.

Restorative justice also embraces the ideology that common folks with no expertise or scientific knowledge can help figure out how to solve the crime problems of the offender.

Rehabilitation and Reform

Correctional institutions were founded on the concept of rehabilitation and reform of the offenders. The main purpose of correctional institutions was to save or reform the offenders not just punish offenders which dates back all the way to the 1820's. The naming of prisons to correctional institutions suggested that the core premise of the facility was to work with offenders to change them or correct them. The definition of rehabilitation is the restoration of someone to a useful place in society. The concept of rehabilitation in correctional institutions is that criminal behavior is caused or influenced by some factor such as a person's social surroundings, psychological development or biological make-up; it does not though refute the concept that offenders make choices out of free will. These individual factors shape how people behave. There are some factors that are considered risk factors that can make someone more susceptible to be involved with crime (Szalavitz, 2009).

So, logically if offenders committing crime is caused by various factors, re-offending can be reduced by correctional interventions to help alter these factors and how they have influenced the offenders (Szalavitz, 2009). For example if troubled youth are associating with other delinquent peers and gaining the beliefs that it is okay to commit crimes, then diverting the troubled youth to other peer groups and help change these beliefs can help keep the youth from criminal beliefs and behaviors. It would seem that the logical step would be to intervene in the lives with at-risk children when they first start to manifest conduct problems, which brings in the idea of early intervention programs.

Early Intervention Programs

Early intervention programs are based on the principles that crime has roots that extend to an offenders childhood, that at-risk youths with a possible future of committing crime can be identified, and that once at-risk youths are identified an intervention with programs can help prevent them from going down the road of becoming criminals later in life (Szalavitz, 2009). Early intervention programs can entail many different types of programs such as Head Start to give at-risk children pre-school programs to help academically, programs to work with parents to help give advice on supervision and training of their children, school-based programs for youths, mentoring programs such as big brothers and juvenile rehabilitation programs for youth that have already been brought into the juvenile justice system.

Now rehabilitation of adult offenders is based on the key concept of individualized treatment of offenders. The premise of individualized treatment is that each offender should be treated on a case-by-case basis because each offender is different and so a single treatment would not work for all law-breakers. Though treatment should be individualized it has been shown through a plethora of studies that one type of intervention was most reliable in achieving high reduction rates in recidivism, cognitive-behavioral programs (Szalavitz, 2009). So we can see that rehabilitation differs from the other three theories of deterrence, incapacitation, and restorative justice, because it makes an attempt to change and improve the offenders instead of inflicting only punishment. Rehabilitation assists not only the offender but society as well by treating offenders and shaping their attitudes and behaviors away from crime and into the direction of living productive lives in society.

Research had showed people new evidence against rehabilitation but because it told them what they wanted to hear that rehabilitation did not work and so the state could not be trusted in helping offenders. There is mounting empirical evidence that shows the effectiveness of offender

treatment that opposes that nothing works (Szalavitz, 2009). It was found that approximately

forty to 78 percent of the studies reviewed found that treatment worked, so they key is to figure

out which programs worked and then use these principles when implementing other correctional

treatment programs. In doing so then progress can be made in developing programs that more

consistently reduce recidivism.

Revivification of Rehabilitation

Evidence from the 1980's" that uncovered a plethora of examples of treatment

interventions that were successful in reducing recidivism. It revealed that behaviorally oriented

programs such as incentive programs or behavioral contracts showed signs of being especially

effective. Also it had presented evidence that the effectiveness of treatment programs depended

on the extent of how the offender's individual differences are measured and the delivery of

services. Finally it found that correctional programs lacked therapeutic integrity because they

often had no theory of crime, targeted factors in offenders that were unrelated to recidivism, used

interventions that were too short or not intensive enough, and employed staff that was under

trained in the intervention being used (Welsh, 2013). Yet when rehabilitation is correctly

instrumented meta-analyses conclude that the overall effect size for rehabilitation across all

interventions is approximately +0.10, which means that the recidivism rate for the control group

would be ten percent higher than that for the treatment group. It was also concluded in meta-

analyses that some individual intervention programs had an effect size of +0.25 or higher, which

means that the treatment group would have a 25 percent lower recidivism rate then the control

group. So it has been shown that rehabilitation does work when the right principles are

implemented with trained staff conducting the treatments.

Americans tend to be that they consider the harsh punishments of offenders to be

appropriate according to putting kids to Death: Specifying Public Support for Juvenile Capital

Punishment 79.6 percent of respondents believe in life without parole and restitution to victim's

family, but when probed more deeply the attitude shifts to a more flexible one that wants a

balanced approach between punishing offenders and improving and rehabilitating them. Public

support for rehabilitation with 63.3 percent of respondents stating that rehabilitation should be an

important goal of imprisonment and 64.5 percent stating that it is a very important goal (Welsh,

2013). Also in 2003 83.2 percent to 89.9 percent of respondents supported a range of early

intervention programs that targeted at-risk youths.

Evidence-Based Corrections

Evidence- based corrections are important because policies and practices should be based

on the best research evidence available. From research presented it would seem that

rehabilitation of offenders should be the basis of correctional institutions because we should not

just lock up all offenders just because a chronic group of offenders exist instead we should

identify the root causes that perpetuate the chronic crime behaviors (Welsh, 2013). The

correctional institutions should reorganize how the rehabilitation process is done by having a set

core base of knowledge for programs that are delivered and making sure that staff working with

the offenders have appropriate licensing and continued education and setting aside appropriate

resources for implementing the programs.

Juvenile Violations

When it comes to the juvenile justice system; it has struggled with the tension with the

role of handing out punishments to juvenile violations and the role that they play as an authority

of force for constructive behavior change in the youth that commit the violations. The overall

view of the juvenile justice is the goals of juvenile justice system is safety of the communities

and the public from any more harm that is caused by juvenile offenders and to reduce the

criminal behavior of the juveniles, but also to help improve the juvenile offenders so that they

can prosper and be a productive citizen of their community (Phipps, Barnoski, and Lieb, 2001).

In order to Attain these goals it will require the capability to be able to control the behavior of

our youth in the beginning; as well induce self-sustaining behavior change that could persist even

after the juvenile offenders are no longer under supervision of the courts.

Recent Policy Developments

With the new changes to juvenile justice system it was driven by several different factors,

to also include the economy. Due to the extremely huge budget deficits; it has caused some states

to take another look at the high juvenile confinement rates throughout their state. Along with that

there are some states that have found that it was necessary to reduce the funding for most of their

community policing programs so that they will be able to still maintain the juvenile confinement

infrastructure (Phipps, Barnoski, and Lieb, 2001). Both Texas and Ohio have developed a new

legislation form that does not allow the confinement of juveniles that have been convicted of a

misdemeanor; while there are other states that has struggled to meet the requirement for to

release juvenile offenders from a correctional institution for placement and care in the

community. With the new policy reforms over the most recent years has been the drive for

evidence-based practice that clearly focuses on making sure of the effectiveness of the

treatments, services that are provided, support for the children and their families. As well as the

effort to be able to establish a system of care that will address the infrastructure of funding for

juvenile justice programs.

Evidence-Based Practice

There are three different approaches that could be implemented to help research evidence; when putting effective programs into. The first approach is a more direct approch of each individual program that is being used in evaluation to help confirm the effectiveness of a program and, if the program is found ineffective, that evidence could be used to either improve or terminate the program. The second approach is to implement the fidelity of a program by list of different model programs that were certified by an authoritative source that has acceptable evidence of its effectiveness (Barnoski, 2002). The last approach is to implement a specific program that has been proven to be effective on an average of as many studies of that particular program.

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) is the main tool that is used to compare the juvenile justice programs and how effective the research is. Even though the SPEP does focused mainly on recidivism, the programs are found to be effective enough for reducing recidivism and also have had a positive effect on other outcomes. The SPEP will only cover's program that has a therapeutic approach (Barnoski, 2002). The effectiveness of the programs is to reduce recidivism that has been found in the statistical analysis that was used to categorize the programs on an average, high, medium, or low effect of recidivism.

Amount of Treatment

The amount of treatment will be divided into a duration and total hours of contact and the treatment that is coming close to its end will receive more points because of its slightly stronger relationship to the outcome (Barnoski, 2004). Duration is assessed by the time between the time that the treatment has started and the day that the treatment has come to an end for each juvenile

that was participated in the treatment program. The total contact hours are assessed by how many

hours of direct exposure that each juvenile has had while in the treatment program.

The Challenge of Evidence-Based Practice

Even though the SPEP can be used by administrators of the juvenile justice system they

have to be able to assess the effectiveness of the treatment program; they can also use it to guide

the improvements of the programs. It is the providers of the programs that must be the first

responders of the evidence that is embedded in the SPEP to help influence the treatment

program. If the providers of the juvenile offenders use a therapeutic program it has been shown

to help reduce recidivism, and implementation of the programs (Giegerich, 2007). The

difficulties that are associated with the quality of implementation, providers that has adopted

these kind of programs has found that their efforts poorly supported.

Risk Assessment

There are four simple approaches when it comes to risk assessment: judgments of the

staff, clinical assessment, and consensus based assessment, and empirical derived assessment

that is based on statistical data. Out of the four there are two that is not reliable at all and that is

the informal staff judgment results and the clinical assessments. On the other hand when it comes

to consensus-based risk assessments they are even less accurate than empirical derived

instruments. In order to have a valid risk assessment it has to do what it was meant to do

(Giegerich, 2007).

Case Management

The risk and needs assessments of juveniles; must be the primary tool that needs to be

used while assigning juvenile cases to a certain level of supervisory control and for identifying

what treatment intervention that the juvenile will need for the case management plan. Juvenile

risk and treatment plans are developed for individual case plans to help reduce recidivism. Case plans are the intention of the provider to deliver future intervention and what other treatment the juvenile will need (Posavac, 2011) .

Recommendations

1. Juvenile Justice System

   a. Build a modeled system that is organized around risk management and it helps to support the development of individual plans for juvenile offenders.

   b. Ensure the treatment plans match the needs of the juvenile offender.

   c. Ensure to target offenders that are higher risk.

   d. Continuously make improvements to prevention programs, juvenile justice court system, and correctional programs across the entire continuum.

2. Legislators

   a. Make it mandatory to have an evidence-based program for all juvenile services.

   b. Make it mandatory that only evidence-based program is to be implemented nationwide.

3. Juvenile Justice Advisor Groups

   a. Make improvements in the coordination and collaboration of the juvenile justice reform; by making sure that the components of risk assessment are implemented as part of the platform for evidence-based programs.

   b. Make sure that the over use of confinement is strictly addressed.

4. Judges

   a. Be the driving force that will bring all the different agencies of the juvenile justice system together.

b. Continuously make Improvements to the Court Practice when it comes to

juvenile cases.

c. Be the positive influence when it comes to the providers that will be

administering the treatment programs.

5. Treatment Providers

a. Ensure that you're knowledgeable when it comes to risk assessments and risk

reduction when it is comes to juvenile justice.

b. Pay strict attention to juveniles that are at a higher risk level by using risk

assessment tools.

Juvenile Justice System

In the juvenile justice system some arguments for punishment seem legitimate, such as

removing a criminal's ability to create victims by imprisonment; the advantages to a focus on

rehabilitation far outweigh the advantages to punishment. While sending gang members, rapist,

and homicidal juveniles to prison for long periods of time is a fair response to providing justice

for victims, imprisonment at a young age will one day provide the community with an adult gang

member, rapist or homicidal parolee and continued tax hikes to pay for housing more juvenile

offenders for longer periods of time. In addition, with the proven higher recidivism rate, tax

payers will be paying even more when the parolee reoffends and ends up back in prison due to a

lack of rehabilitation. That is a bill or society cannot afford to pay (Posavac, 2011). With

overwhelming evidence, the debate on whether to punish or rehabilitate juvenile offenders

should be long over. The cost to the community to provide more extreme punishments is far

greater than the cost of rehabilitative services. The proof of more successful juveniles

reintegrated into their community, with their mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters due to a

rehabilitative focus cannot, and should not be ignored. Adopting a focus on rehabilitation in the juvenile justice system and will continue to be the most effective avenue to provide correctional services to America's youth.

Funding Juvenile Corrections

The programs in the juvenile correction facilities will allow juveniles to get involved, but will also allow the youth to take control of his or her future. With the proper support and guidance the youth have better success at achieving these goals and without the programs the chance is reduced significantly. Various studies have shown rehabilitation works better with youth than adults, so that has become the court's focus (Sparling, 2012). Juveniles in correction facilities do not cure the problem and once released can increase crime rates, and housing these juveniles is costly. With correction facilities at max capacity, these programs should be a top priority for all states to implement.

Objectives and methods need to be shown for the grant budget proposal to be effective. With the $100,000 grant, the department will prove to the philanthropist the money will be well spent and is a worthy cause. With the $100,000 grant, the department can meet certain objectives established from the beginning, such as trying to meet the demands and accommodations of Community Orientated Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS). This is required because of the type of model the police department follows (Sparling, 2012). Another objective would be the funding could be used to meet the needs and requirements of certain areas of the department to function properly.

The areas in need are homicide, traffic, juvenile, and other specialized units and are better identified as the functional areas. These areas are considered functional areas because they are broken down tasks put into certain areas and organized. This also allows for cooperation of the

tasks or the departments in charge of these tasks. With the $100,000 grant these tasks or various

functions would be able to have support that could be identified as financial and physical in the

form of supporting the employees for those sections. The grant would allow for the tasks to be

completed, deadlines to be met, and objectives accomplished (Mochal, n.d.). Thus, allowing the

police department to complete its mission of protecting and serving the community. This would

be meeting the goals and objectives of the police department and of the $100,000 grant (Mochal,

n.d.).

COMMUNICATION PROCESS

When it comes to organizational communication in corrections it can be very diverse. In

juvenile corrections it is struggling to develop and convey some sense of coherency across

these many areas. Communication is an extremely important method by which a

supervisor's personality, social identity, status and power are portrayed. In some supervisor

interactions with an employee, the relationship may be mostly interpersonal, and not in

others (Anderson, 2013). A key factor for supervisors to remember is that the more a person

identifies with his or her in-group, more likely they will feel more distinct from out-group

individuals.

Research indicates that employee's perceptions of their supervisors' trustworthiness are

based on features such as the supervisor's appreciation towards their employee's and their

worth has manifested to a day-to-day basis. A trusted supervisor has also can been compared

to a person that will take on a mentoring approach (Anderson, 2013). Supervisors are more

likely to be trusted if they show that they care and by using a mentoring approach in order to

communicate to the employee's; while still being seen as a competent and respected. On the

other hand, there are managers are seen to be untrustworthy because they are self-serving,

do not give recognition to their employee's, and always put blame and criticize the

employee's under them. This gives them the image as incompetent. A review of the literature

suggests that a good supervisor manages the relationship and power differences positively

simultaneously.

Today organizations are more of a communication-based, because there has been more

attention to improving their interpersonal communication skills of all the members of the

organization. Organizations have realized that high level managers need to communicate

directly with their supervisors and supervisors should be communicating with their direct

reports (Soliz and Howard Giles, 2014). The Communication Accommodation Theory

proposes uses several different styles communication strategies; to include approximation,

interpersonal control, discourse management and relational strategies in order to achieve

approval of the other person. Research indicates that an effective communication is to

communicate orally, then follow up in writing, or downward communication.

Evaluation Designs

Some experiments are fairly accurate and others are not accurate and other forms of

evaluations are necessary to sufficiently to evaluate. Experiments require dedication, time, and

effort and accuracy varies depending on the type of experiment being conducted. Which certain

experiments are interpreted and the advantages of certain experiments. Success in conducting

experiments depend on the monitoring of the subjects or other testing materials, how the

program or experiment is conducted, how data is gathered, and implementation of the program

(Posavac & Carey, 2011).

Qualitative Evaluation Methods

Qualitative evaluation methods are according to an online source, processes which answer the question how well a program has done. The evaluation process usually attempts to find out, what was learned, are the subjects using their knowledge, attitudes of the subjects, were the teachers in a program supportive or communicating information well to the subjects, is the program accepted through the community, and the cost in relation to what was achieved. Qualitative evaluation methods consists of questionnaire's, impressions, reactions, data, notes, records, recordings of conversations, observation, and counts of artifacts (Posavac & Carey, 2011). By discussing the disadvantages of qualitative evaluation methods.

The procedures are: vague, predicting future successes unreliable and program context is complicated (Posavac & Carey, 2011). This form of evaluating can be subjective and rigorous. The process can also be more intimate as at times the researcher conducts the actual study of the individuals or program. The goal of researchers is to understand how a program operates. Qualitative interviews differ from other forms of interviews. The interview process is open ended, questions are not simple yes or no answers, and the interviewer tries to form a bond with the subject and probes for a lot of information. The interviews and other forms of qualitative evaluation methods are useful but other forms of evaluations should be combined with qualitative evaluation methods before drawing a conclusion to fairly depict the program.

Those conducting evaluations must be ethical and unbiased. The results of evaluations must not be twisted to fit the need of the evaluator or program (Posavac & Carey, 2011). In order to effectively decide if a program or service is adequate the results from single group, non-experimental outcome evaluations, and quasi experimental approaches to outcome evaluations, experiments, and qualitative evaluations should all be considered. The individual studying a drug rehabilitation program should use many forms of evaluations and the results of other studies

before making a concrete decision about the program. Proper evaluation methods require open

minded individuals conducting the research, use of extensive research methods, and the

combination of different methods. Effective evaluations can be found in all mentioned forms but

one form of evaluating is usually not sufficient enough to make decisions which effect

individuals, programs, or communities.

Effective Performance Appraisal Program

A fast-paced working environment might rely on quicker methods to produce

evaluations, while an informal and casual workplace might use employee self-evaluations as part

of the appraisal process (Heathfield, 2014). Leadership training for both newly promoted or hired

and seasoned supervisors and managers provides instruction on how to facilitate performance

management within the department. Supervisors and managers have two primary functions:

managing departmental functions and managing people. Striking a balance between the two can

be challenging for some leaders whose focus usually leaves managing the workforce a lesser

priority.

Performance standards indicate what level of effort is required for an employee to meet

or exceed her job expectations. For instance, a performance standard for an accountant might

state: Conduct two audits every 30 days (Heathfield, 2014). Accountants who conduct four

audits every month are exceeding the company's expectations, and accountants who conduct two

audits every month receive evaluations that indicate they are meeting expectations. Performance

standards are simple measurements used in the performance appraisal process. Discipline and

recognition appear to be opposite ends of the performance management spectrum. Nevertheless,

both are integral parts of a performance management system.

Effective performance appraisals consist of constructive feedback for improvement as well as recognition for strong performance. The ability to address both within the performance appraisal enables a balanced employee assessment. In addition, both constructive feedback and recognition are requirements for determining employee skills and aptitude, training and development needs (Heathfield, 2014). However, when performance appraisals fail to address whether employees will receive monetary recognition for their efforts, it calls into question the effectiveness of a performance management system. For many employers, tying compensation to employee performance significantly improves their performance management system.

Review your records and notes on the performance of the employee before the appraisal. Take time to develop any questions that you may have for the employee. You may also find it helpful to identify priorities for the employee appraisal, such as discussing areas of noticeable improvement and possible goals. Follow an agenda or outline during the appraisal. Your agenda should allow time for any necessary discussion between you and the employee. You may find it helpful, as well, to designate approximate time limits, such as 10 or 20 minutes, for the different parts of the appraisal. For example, you may schedule 15 minutes for the goal-setting process (Heathfield, 2014). Create a comfortable, collaborative environment during the appraisal. Maintain strong eye contact with the employee and listen respectfully to her or his questions and concerns. Ask open-ended questions, ones that cannot be answered with yes or no, to draw out the employee's thoughts on and responses to the issues that you raise during your appraisal. Balance corrective and supportive feedback. Communicate corrective feedback in concrete, non-judgmental ways, identifying distinct problems that need to be addressed.

Include concrete and supportive feedback in your appraisal. Clearly identify specific ways that the employee has performed well and contributed to the overall company. Engage in

proactive goal setting with the employee. Discuss areas in need of improvement, and mutually

decide on concrete, measurable goals for these areas. Involving the employee in decision-making

will help her or him to be more invested in realizing these goals. When appropriate, you may

collaborate on specific steps toward meeting the identified goals (Heathfield, 2014). Encouraging

and recognizing employee achievements during an appraisal can help affirm and strengthen an

employee's commitment to and investment in an organization. Supportive feedback is an

opportunity for you to thank an employee for outstanding work. Setting agenda or preparing an

outline for an employee appraisal, allow additional time for unexpected issues or concerns. This

way, you can ensure that you cover all the necessary information during the appraisal.

In conclusion, Each facility does things very differently; some centers keep their

juveniles confined in their rooms for hours every day, while other use this tactic for disciplinary

purposes only. The juveniles should be kept locked in their rooms because that is what jails and

prisons are for. Detention centers must be used help and rehabilitate the juvenile offender before

they are sent to lock-up facilities where they are required to stay in their cells for hours every day

(Posavac & Carey, 2011). Usually the juveniles have to work their way down the scale which

means that they are close to being released. Juveniles also have the opportunity to participate in

work programs offered at some detention centers. The work programs include working in the

kitchen, laundry services, gardening and landscaping, and auto mobile repairs. Some detention

centers also are affiliated with small businesses around their community that give the children a

chance to leave the detention center and learn to hold a real job in the outside world. Increased

youths are being detained do to the new get-tough policy in the juvenile justice process.

Reference

American academy of Pediatrics (AAP), (2013). Health Care for Children and Adolescents in

the Juvenile Correctional Care System. Retrieved from

http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/107/4/799.full

Amy Anderson, (2013). Successful Business Communication: It Starts At The Beginning.

Retrieved from

http://www.forbes.com/sites/amyanderson/2013/05/28/successful-business-

communication-it-starts-at-the-beginning/

Aos, S., Phipps, P., Barnoski, R., and Lieb, R., (2001). The comparative costs and benefits of

programs to reduce crime. Retrieved from

http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/

Barnoski, R., (2002). Washington State's implementation of Functional Family Therapy for

juvenile offenders: Preliminary results. Retrieved From

http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/

Barnoski, R., (2004). Outcome evaluation of Washington State's research-based programs for

juvenile offenders. Retrieved from

http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/

Barnoski, R., (2004). Assessing risk for re-offense: Validating the Washington State Juvenile

Court Assessment. Olympia. Retrieved from

http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/

Barry Holman and Jason Ziedenberg, (2014). The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of

Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities. Retrieved from

http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/06-11_rep_dangersofdetention_jj.pdf

Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ), (2014). Juvenile Justice History. Retrieved from

http://www.cjcj.org/Education1/Juvenile-Justice-History.html

Emil J. Posavac, (2011). Program Evaluation. Methods and Case Studies, 8th Edition, Ch. 2:

Planning an Evaluation. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/152a17f9-3b0f-4a64-a4bf-94245331d106/expanded/False

Emil J. Posavac, (2011). Program Evaluation. Methods and Case Studies, 8th Edition

Ch 4: Developing Measures of Implementation and Outcomes. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/238f9a4c-8bfa-4872-a51b-dfc21578303e/expanded/False

Emil J. Posavac, (2011). Program Evaluation. Methods and Case Studies, 8th Edition

Ch 7: Monitoring the Implementation and the Operation of Programs. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/b5866f34-d44b-48fd-a849-b3a53eeaae30/expanded/False

Emil J. Posavac, (2011). Program Evaluation. Methods and Case Studies, 8th Edition, Ch. 9:

Outcome Evaluations of One Group. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/d12b4f8f-8ae0-4974-b483-6c2bb731a3d0/expanded/False

Emil J. Posavac, (2011). Program Evaluation. Methods and Case Studies, 8th Edition, Ch. 10:

Quasi-Experimental Approaches to Outcome Evaluation. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/04ee7370-2b0a-4baa-bea6-551da5b0224f/expanded/False

Emil J. Posavac, (2011). Program Evaluation. Methods and Case Studies, Eighth Edition

Ch. 11: Using Experiments to Evaluate Programs. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/17ab8662-0b8a-43b4-898b-dd0055ba0eec/expanded/False

Emil J. Possavec and Raynond, (2011). Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies. 8th

Edition, Ch 13: Evaluation Reports: Interpreting and Communicating Finding. Retrieved

from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/157999b4-4eb3-4b18-aae3-4382a1038836/expanded/False

FindLaw, (2014). *McKeiver v. Pennsylvania, 403 U.S. 528*. Retrieved from

http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cgi-bin/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=us&vol=403&

invol=528

Jordan Soliz and Howard Giles, (2014). Relational and Identity Processes in Communication: A

Contextual and Meta-Analytical. Retrieved from

http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=6&ved=0

CDgQFjAF&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.researchgate.net%2Fprofile%2FHoward_Giles

%2Fpublication%2F242371336_Speech_accommodation_theory_the_first_decade_and_

beyond%2Ffile%2Fe0b4952842e38b8592.pdf&ei=SkW4U8eSC9bAoATU0IBo&usg=A

FQjCNGb-S9qEVUj97lEGDCwv2Xl6daTKg

Joseph S. Wholey , Harry P. Hatry , Kathryn E. Newcomer, (2010). Handbook of Practical

Program Evaluation, 3rd Edition, Ch. 1: Exploratory Evaluation. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/e7f01f69-83f8-47e7-9a26-9df999246787/expanded/False

Joseph S. Wholey , Harry P. Hatry , Kathryn E. Newcomer, (2010). Handbook of Practical

> Program Evaluation, 3rd Edition, Ch. 4: Exploratory Evaluation. Retrieved from

> https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

> view/activityDetails/activity/146a1cf6-f8e6-4af9-8abb-1feb3440fe9d/expanded/False

Joseph S. Whole, Harry P. Hatry, and Kathryn E. Newcomer, (2010). Handbook of Practical

> Program Evaluation, 3rd Edition. Retrieved from

> https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

> view/activityDetails/activity/a983c18b-365a-4c1e-8870-99b4e5f19928/expanded/False

Joseph S. Wholey , Harry P. Hatry , Kathryn E. Newcomer, (2010). Handbook of Practical

> Program Evaluation, 3rd Edition, Ch. 3: Using Logic Models. Retrieved from

> https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

> view/activityDetails/activity/31c13966-c4b4-400b-a148-9154d58898ec/expanded/False

Karen M. Abram, Jeanne Y. Choe, Jason Washburn, Linda Teplin, Devon King and Mina

> Dulcan, (2010). Suicidal Ideation and Behaviors Among Youth in Juvenile Detention.

> Retrieved from

> http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2945393/

Kathleen A. Pajer, Kelly Kelleher, Ravindra A. Gupta, Jennifer Rolls, and William Gardner,

> (2007). Psychiatric and Medical Health Care Policies in Juvenile Detention Facilities.

> Retrieved from

> https://www.nationwidechildrens.org/document/get/45371

Maia Szalavitz, (2009). Why Juvenile Detection Makes Teens Worse. Retrieved from

> http://content.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1914837,00.html

Martha Shirk, (2014). Health Care in Juvenile Detention Centers. Retrieved from

http://www.reportingonhealth.org/fellowships/projects/health-care-juvenile-detention-

centers

Mochal, T. (n.d.). Defining Project Goals and Objectives. Retrieved from

http://www.kidasa.com/information/articles/goals/index.html

Mr. Justice Fortas, (1966). *Kent v. United States, 383 U.S. 541*. Retrieved from

http://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/CJ/JJustice/CaseFiles/KENT-v-

United%20States.pdf

Mr. Justice Fortas, (1967). *In Re Gault, 387 U.S.1*. Retrieved from

http://cjdc.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/In-re-Gault.pdf

Patrick Bayer and David E. Pozen, (2004). The Effectiveness of Juvenile Correctional Facilities:

Public Versus Private Management. Retrieved from

http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth_pdf/cdp863.pdf

Sparling, H. (2012, July 1). Juvenile justice: Courts turn focus to rehabilitation. Retrieved on

from

http://www.coshoctontribune.com/article/20120701/NEWS01/207010304/Juvenile-

justice-Courts-turn-focus-rehabilitation?odyssey=nav|head

State of California, (2013). California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation: Division of

Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from

http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Juvenile_Justice/

Steve Giegerich, (2007). Amid Anger, Tears, State Takes Control New Leader Developed gets

Job, Pledges to Listen Protests He Takes Over District Teeming With Outrage. Retrieved

from

http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.apollolibrary.com/docview/403075212?pq-

origsite=summon

Susan Heathfield, (2014). Performance Development Planning. Retrieved from

http://humanresources.about.com/cs/perfmeasurement/a/pdp.htm

Susan Heathfield, (2014). Take Those Numeric Ratings and - Make Them Motivational.

Retrieved from

http://humanresources.about.com/od/perfmeasurement/a/numericratings.htm

Wayne N. Welsh, (2013). Criminal Justice Policy and Planning, Ch 3: Criminal Justice Policy

and Planning. Retrieved from

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/3f0728d6-9a1a-4c40-8895-42ee2740375f/expanded/False

Wayne N. Welsh, (2013). Criminal Justice Policy and Planning, Ch.4. Retrieved From

https://newclassroom3.phoenix.edu/Classroom/#/contextid/OSIRIS:46903102/context/co/

view/activityDetails/activity/1b8a581f-ef9a-4806-984f-20c53bff7e1c/expanded/False