You enter the building through what is called a sally port—literally, “a gate or passage in a fortified place”—and once inside you’re searched and sorted according to size and shape. For clothes you’re issued baggy, convict-style scrubs. There are security cameras everywhere you’re led, and no doors that will open at your touch. “Your” room—a toilet, a table, a metal bed—is as barren as any cell.

And yet, this is not a bad place. The Shuman Juvenile Detention Center, which occupies a forested hilltop overlooking the Allegheny River in Pittsburgh’s East End, was opened in 1974 at a cost of $8 million, following a public campaign led by pioneering Pittsburgh newspaperwoman Anna Jane Shuman. It is the state’s largest, and a vast improvement on the crowded urban facility it replaced. Even now its public areas seem surprisingly sunny and open, with lots of windows and skylights, exposed brick and carpeting, and a large interior courtyard at its center—invariably reminding visitors, as one local press account put it, of “a middle-class suburban high school.”

However unwillingly they arrive here, many juvenile residents of Shuman are favorably impressed with the facility as well: nearly three-quarters of them reported in a 1983 survey that the Center was better than they thought it would be. Apart from meals and supervision, a stay at Shuman means a medical examination, much-needed dental care, access to a walk-in mental health clinic, basic classes at an onsite school operated by the county’s intermediate education unit. Whatever they may be going through, wherever they may be headed, this is a safe place in the meantime—considerably safer than the streets from which many of them come.

Providing safety, secure care, and services to young people who are stuck, for the moment, “in the meantime”—that’s the difficult but necessary job that Shuman and the 22 other juvenile detention facilities scattered across the state have been asked to do. This issue of Pennsylvania Progress will take a look at the Pennsylvania Juvenile Detention Assessment Project—a statewide study of the condition and needs of the field, commissioned by the Detention Steering Committee of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency and recently completed by the National Center for Juvenile Justice—focusing on what it reveals about the current state of this vital but too-often neglected part of the juvenile justice continuum.
The profile of detention that emerges from existing data is a complex one, varying considerably from place to place, and shifting according to your angle of view:

Admissions. There were just over 20,000 admissions to Pennsylvania’s juvenile detention centers in 2001—with Philadelphia’s Youth Study Center, Allegheny County’s Shuman Center, and Dauphin County’s Schaffner Youth Center together accounting for over half (54%) of the state’s total, while smaller facilities in Blair, Cambria, Tioga and Centre Counties accounted for less than one-half percent combined. Generally, detention admissions rose steadily statewide throughout the 1990s, but have begun to level off in recent years.

Are 20,000 annual detention admissions a lot? Not compared with some states, such as Florida—which, with an under-18 population only about 25% larger than Pennsylvania’s, admitted 50,000 youths to secure detention in one recent year, meaning that its per capita admissions rate was about twice Pennsylvania’s. But a lot compared to Vermont, which makes do with a single 14-bed secure detention unit for the whole state; with total admissions of only 384 last year, Vermont’s per capita admissions rate was hardly more than one-third of Pennsylvania’s.

The Pennsylvania Juvenile Detention Assessment Project was a broad attempt—through detailed analyses of detention admissions, population, utilization and other data, a survey of chief juvenile probation officers across the state, and on-site interviews with detention professionals in selected jurisdictions—to get a handle on the current uses of secure detention in Pennsylvania. The immediate occasion for the assessment was a strategic planning debate within the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Committee, over how to give adequate state funding support to local detention on the one hand, without encouraging its overuse on the other. (See “The Funding Conundrum,” p.7.) To inform that discussion, the Committee needed answers to some basic questions: Who is being detained now, for what reasons, and for how long? How is the decision to detain arrived at? Is the process fair? Are cheaper, less restrictive ways to protect the community and ensure attendance at hearings available? Are they adequately considered?

Here in Pennsylvania, a Juvenile Act provision—42 Pa.C.S.§6325—lays out the basic ground rules for securely detaining juveniles. In general, the Juvenile Act authorizes the secure detention of juveniles only for a few limited purposes:

♦ Public protection. A juvenile in custody may be detained pending a hearing on a delinquency petition if such detention “is required to protect the person or property of others ….”

♦ The juvenile’s own protection. Detention may also be permitted if “required to protect the person or property…of the child.” (However, such detention is permissible under JCJC Detention Standards only at the written request of the juvenile or his or her attorney.)

♦ Ensuring attendance. The law authorizes detention involving an accused or adjudicated delinquent when it is “required…because the child may abscond or be removed from the jurisdiction of the court or because he has no parent, guardian, or custodian or other person able to provide supervision and care for him and return him to the court when required…."

♦ Court-ordered exceptions. A juvenile may also be detained if “an order for his detention…has been made by the court….” (But JCJC Detention Standards indicate that such detention will be justified only by “extraordinary and exceptional circumstances.”)
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DETENTION REFORM: THE NATIONAL BACKGROUND

There has been a nationwide debate in recent years over the purpose, place, and future of juvenile detention. Critics of “business as usual”—both inside and outside of the field—have begun to argue that secure detention is overused in the juvenile justice system; that detention admissions decisions are too often arbitrary, inconsistent, and subject to pernicious racial and other biases; that juvenile detainees are held far too long, primarily due to inefficiencies elsewhere in the juvenile justice system; and that non-secure, community-based programs are capable of offering effective and humane alternatives to detention without any sacrifice of community safety.

Detention reform efforts have generally sought to “control the gates” of detention with clear and objective admissions criteria and protocols; find ways to eliminate the need for detention to ensure attendance, such as more effective notification procedures that cut failure-to-appear rates; expedite case processing and placement in order to reduce lengths of stay for juveniles who must be detained; and expand the range and variety of alternatives to detention.

The best-known of these efforts is the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, launched in 1992 with funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the long-term participation of a number of counties across the country. Concrete results and insights emerging from the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative were published in 1999 in the 13-part Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform series, which is available free from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, 701 Paul Street, Baltimore, MD 21202, (410) 547-6600, www.aecf.org.


Capacity and Utilization. Pennsylvania’s 23 secure detention centers had a combined licensed capacity of 712 beds in 2001. The state’s total bed capacity increased 31% over the decade from 1991 to 2001. However, beds weren’t always available where they were most likely to be used. Eight detention facilities—practically all in the populous southeastern part of the state—operated over capacity in 2001. Most of these facilities are in fact chronically over-utilized, with average daily populations that exceed the number of beds they are licensed to provide year in and year out. On an average day in 2001, 334 juvenile detainees—about 48% of Pennsylvania’s total—were being held in such facilities.

Crowding in detention is not a problem unique to Pennsylvania, of course. In 1995, for example, a nationwide survey found that nearly three-quarters of all juveniles in detention were being held in facilities operating above their design capacity.7

Population. A demographic profile of admissions to secure detention centers turns up a few surprises. The typical detention admission involves an older youth, as you might expect—well over half of those in 2001 involved juveniles 16 or over. But more than 10% involved children between 10 and 13. Which means that, in a typical facility of median size (20), two of the beds on any given night were likely to be occupied by middle or even elementary school students! Likewise, while girls accounted for less than 17% of all admissions to detention in 2001, and that proportion has not changed radically in recent years, the raw numbers have—with female admissions increasing 38% from 1997 to 2001. Racially, most detention admissions in Philadelphia involved non-Hispanic black youth. In the rest of the state, most detention admissions involved non-Hispanic whites.

Charges. Here again, the Detention Assessment Project’s analysis of available data on allegations against detainees reveals some
surprises. Although secure detention is popularly thought of as a measure required to safeguard the public against violent offenders, in 2001 only about a third of all detention admissions outside of Philadelphia involved cases in which any sort of violence was alleged (homicide, simple or aggravated assault, robbery, violent sexual offenses, and other sexual or person offenses). A quarter of all admissions involved property offenses (burglary, theft, being in possession of stolen property, arson, and even vandalism and trespass). Ten percent involved drug offenses, and another 10 percent probation violations. In some admittedly rare cases, the most serious charges recorded against detainees were public order, traffic, and disorderly conduct infractions.

**Length of Stay.** Overall, the average length of stay in juvenile detention was 12.5 days in 2001, and the median length of stay was 5 days. Of course, numbers like these mask large variations, even within individual facilities. Detention is supposed to be a relatively brief experience, and for many juveniles it is. But some linger in detention for long periods. Perhaps they have already been adjudicated, and are awaiting scarce openings in residential facilities that are capable of meeting their needs. This is quite often the case with juveniles who have mental health problems—and especially those who need both residential mental health treatment and secure care.

But the main story here was the startling difference between average/median stays in Philadelphia and elsewhere in the state. Outside of Philadelphia, the median detention stay lasted 9 days, and the average was 15 days. Philadelphia’s Youth Study Center, on the other hand, achieved the state’s quickest turnarounds, with a median stay of just 2 days and an average of 8 days.8 Two-thirds of juveniles detained in Philadelphia were released within 3 days, while in the rest of the state the proportion released in that time was only one-fourth. (See sidebar, “The Philadelphia Story.”)

---

**THE PHILADELPHIA STORY**

By far the most interesting and suggestive findings of the Detention Assessment Project involved the state’s largest city. There is clearly a great deal about Philadelphia’s approach to juvenile detention that is unique, if not startling. Start with the ratio of secure detention beds to local population under 18 (about 1 for every 3,400), which is radically lower than in many other parts of the state. (Dauphin County’s ratio, for instance, is about 1 to 1,200.) Add in the eye-opening length-of-stay differences discovered—66% of all Philadelphia juveniles released within 3 days, versus 25% for the rest of the state. And the very heavy, day-to-day reliance on an unusually broad array of innovative detention alternatives—including lots of community-based shelters, lots of intensive supervision slots, and the intriguing (but still relatively new) Detention Diversion Advocacy Project, which blends supervision, mentoring, and case management services to keep juveniles (including many facing very serious charges) out of detention.

All of these efforts merit a closer look. Accordingly, the next issue of Pennsylvania Progress will explore all that Philadelphia has attempted and accomplished in this area.
A MISSION FOR DETENTION IN PENNSYLVANIA

As part of the Detention Assessment Project, members of the Detention Steering Committee of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Committee convened in January of 2002 to participate in a strategic planning workshop, facilitated by staff from the National Center for Juvenile Justice. Its purpose was to articulate a mission and core beliefs for juvenile detention in Pennsylvania. Here is what they came up with:

The mission of juvenile detention is to provide a continuum of short-term supervision alternatives, up to and including secure residential care, and quality services for youths pending adjudication and awaiting placement or other disposition through multi-system collaboration with balanced attention to community protection, holding offenders accountable, and developing individual competencies.

The mission is based on the following core beliefs: Secure detention and non-secure detention alternatives...

♦ are essential components of the juvenile justice system and must be developed in collaboration with the juvenile court and other key system partners;
♦ must be short-term, and appropriate to the level of risk posed by the youth;
♦ must help provide appropriate services of consistently high quality to all involved youth;
♦ must assure safe and secure environments for youth;
♦ must be consistent with the principles of balanced and restorative justice;
♦ must demonstrate respect for the individual rights and dignity of court-involved youth; and
♦ must be integral components in a seamless continuum of positive services and interventions for court-involved youths.

Source: Pennsylvania Detention Steering Committee. (January 2002). Results of Strategic Planning Workshop.

Pennsylvania, to learn what mechanisms and procedures are used at the local level to ensure that detention decision-making is objective, consistent and fair. The results of the assessment survey and in-depth interviews in this area were a mixed bag, however. Virtually all local jurisdictions reported consulting and adhering to statewide standards spelling out threshold criteria for secure detention. But in most places, the admissions process itself—the procedure for determining which detention-eligible juveniles actually will be detained—proved to be relatively unstructured.

Pennsylvania’s statewide detention standards trace their origin to federal class action litigation filed in 1981 and settled in 1986. Originally embodied in a statewide consent decree that resolved the case of Coleman v. Stanziani, they eventually became the basis for the Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission’s (JCJC) Standards Governing the Use of Secure Detention Under the Juvenile Act. (While the standards have now outlived the consent decree on which they were based, compliance with them is a mandatory condition of county participation in the JCJC’s grant-in-aid program.) For each type of detention authorized under the Juvenile Act—that is, detention “required to protect the person or property of others,” detention “required…because the child may abscond or be removed from the jurisdiction,” and so on—the Detention Standards specify minimum criteria that must be met.

In cases in which secure detention is being considered on public safety grounds, for example, the Detention Standards impose a minimum offense/offense history threshold—a list of 17 specific, mostly violent offenses or offense categories (including homicide, rape,
robbery, kidnapping, aggravated assault, and any offense involving the use or possession of a deadly weapon) that must be alleged; if a less serious charge is involved, it must be coupled with a specified court involvement history. In order even to reach the issue of whether detention is necessary to protect persons or property, in other words, the decision-maker must first determine that the alleged offense—or the offense in combination with the juvenile’s past history—qualifies the case for public safety detention consideration.

Likewise, in any case in which secure detention is being considered in order to ensure attendance at hearings, the Detention Standards require a showing that the juvenile actually is an absconder or fugitive, has a documented history of absconding or failing to appear for hearings, or else presents extraordinary circumstances that make absconding likely.10

Nevertheless, the Detention Standards were never meant to dictate detention decisions. The purpose of setting eligibility thresholds was to eliminate the possibility of secure detention in cases that don’t meet the thresholds—not to make detention automatic in cases that do. Unfortunately, the findings of the Detention Assessment Project suggest that there is very little else to guide admissions decision-makers. Virtually all local jurisdictions reported that detention intake decisions were initially made by juvenile probation officers (98%). Their decisions were said to be based on the charges in the complaint (92%), the Detention Standards (90%), and the officer’s discretion (77%). And even though detention decisions invariably involve calculations of risk, very few jurisdictions (16%) reported using a formal detention risk assessment instrument.

In one fairly typical, medium-sized detention facility, for example, a senior juvenile probation officer in charge of detention intake decisions told Detention Assessment Project interviewers that he didn’t “agree with” risk assessment instruments, and considered that it would be “ridiculous” to refrain from detaining a youth merely because of his or her score on such an instrument.

The danger of this kind of resistance to structure is compounded by the fact that decision-makers in many jurisdictions are not necessarily focusing on the need to protect the community or ensure hearing attendance, but are considering the use of secure detention for completely unrelated purposes. Over half (54%) of survey respondents reported “sometimes” or “frequently” using detention as
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a sanction for probation violations, for instance, and more than a quarter (28%) said offenders in their jurisdictions were sometimes simply sentenced to detention. (See sidebar, “Detention as Punishment.”) Likewise, substantial percentages effectively admitted detaining for convenience, at least on occasion, in order to make it easier to get pre-hearing clinical assessments (36%) or conduct pre-hearing investigations (26%).

**WHAT’S THE ALTERNATIVE?**

If detention decision-makers are forced to make a straight, yes-no, detain-or-release choice in every case—if there are no alternative options that lie between unrestricted freedom and the lock-up—they are likely to detain many juveniles for whom community-based supervision, monitoring and services might have done the job just as well, at a fraction of the cost, and without separating them from their families and support networks. That’s one reason JCJC Detention Standards require detention decision-makers to give “preference...to non-secure alternatives which could reduce the risk of flight or danger to the child or community.” An important purpose of the Detention Assessment Project was to gauge the availability of these alternatives to secure detention in Pennsylvania, and the extent to which they receive appropriate consideration in the detention decision-making process.

Here again, results were mixed. The good news is that nearly all the officials surveyed agreed on the need for a continuum of non-secure alternatives to detention, and that some kinds of detention alternatives are widely available—including electronic monitoring (87%), in-home detention (84%), and shelter care (84%). Survey respondents estimated that on an average day in their jurisdictions, more juveniles were in non-secure alternatives to detention than were in detention facilities.

The not-so-good news is that there appears to be no way to confirm this—little or no data being available regarding actual use of alternatives to detention in Pennsylvania. And some forms of detention alternatives do not seem to be very common. Only 57% of survey respondents said they were able to use foster care as an alternative to detention, and only 13% reported having day/evening reporting centers available as detention alternatives in appropriate cases. Moreover, site visits suggested that, even when alternative options are available, they are not necessarily given systematic consideration as part of the admissions decision-making process. In one county, for example, although there were a number of programs that could serve as alternatives to secure detention, it appeared that the probation officers who performed detention screening were given no standard, department-wide checklist of alternatives to consult; they simply created their own.

There is clearly a great deal of variation with regard to alternative program development across the state. Detention Assessment Project staff did visit some jurisdictions that are strongly committed to detention alternatives—most notably Philadelphia, which uses shelter care, in-home detention and house arrest, electronic monitoring, voice-tracking, pre-hearing intensive supervision, and a unique program called the Detention Diversion Advocacy Project to reduce reliance on the Youth Study Center, and in fact keeps five juveniles in alternative programs for every one juvenile it detains! (See sidebar, “The Philadelphia Story.”)

**THE FUNDING CONUNDRUM**

As was noted above, the Detention Assessment Project was launched against the background of a spirited debate over the best way to fund juvenile detention in Pennsylvania. Under the current system, the state partially reimburses counties for many of the costs of county-purchased services for juveniles, including day treatment, counseling, foster and institutional care, and detention. (You will often hear these
reimbursements referred to around the state as “Act 148 payments,” because they are authorized under 62 P.S. §704.1 of the Public Welfare Code as amended by Act 148 of 1976 as well as other laws.) But not all county-purchased services are reimbursed at the same levels. For instance, in-home and community-based services that the state wishes to encourage are generally 80%-reimbursed, while reimbursement rates are deliberately set lower for secure detention (50%), secure residential (60%), and non-community-based residential services (60%).

The 50% reimbursement rate applicable to detention, which is the lowest for any state-reimbursed youth service, has been in place from the beginning, and was deliberately intended to serve as a fiscal deterrent to unnecessary and inappropriate detention usage. But has “fiscal deterrence” worked in this case? And if it has effectively starved the detention system of resources, are juvenile detainees being deprived of needed services as a result? On the other hand, if the reimbursement structure were changed now, would it only serve to encourage reliance on detention—or, even worse, stimulate new investment in secure detention beds—at a time when promising detention alternatives still appear to be underutilized and underdeveloped?

On-site interviews with key detention actors made these findings a bit easier to understand. One message consistently conveyed in interviews was that those who actually make initial detention decisions—juvenile probation officers, for the most part—do not even know what the reimbursement rates are, and are unlikely to be influenced by them in any immediate sense.

The recent history of detention usage in Pennsylvania seems to bear this out as well. The detention reimbursement rate remained stable throughout the 1990s, and yet secure detention admissions overall rose steadily—presumably for reasons unrelated to the reimbursement rate—throughout the better part of that decade. Conversely, in what might be thought of as a kind of rough natural experiment, total admissions stabilized for three consecutive years from 1999 through 2001, despite the fact that during that period federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families funds happened to become available to cover counties’ detention costs—at 100%. But the conclusion that state reimbursement rates have no effect on local detention usage may not be warranted either. Even if individual detention decisions are unaffected by reimbursement rates, local juvenile justice planners and policy-makers may be significantly influenced by them. If you are weighing program development investments, the current reimbursement scheme unquestionably makes alternative programming somewhat more inviting—and new secure beds somewhat less inviting—than they would otherwise be. It is useful to remember that, especially in areas of the state that must contend with crowding in detention, the temptation to consider expanding detention space is more or less constant. (To take the best known example, in Philadelphia, three consecutive mayors have pledged to replace the Youth Study Center with a more modern—and presumably bigger—facility.) And once you’ve invested in a new or expanded detention facility, there’s not much you can do with it—except fill it up.

The Detention Assessment Project uncovered a good deal of information that could help state leaders answer these questions. First, the assessment found widespread local dissatisfaction among chief juvenile probation officers with the current structure of reimbursement for detention. A total of 85% of survey respondents believed that the Act 148 reimbursement rate for detention should be increased, with most of them suggesting a considerably higher rate—75 or 80%. They decisively rejected (by 89% to 8%) the suggestion that increasing the reimbursement rate would increase secure detention usage in their counties. But at the same time, they were skeptical of the notion that higher rates would translate into better detention services, with nearly as many disagreeing (48%) as agreeing (49%) with the proposition.
THE DETENTION CONTINUUM

As the Detention Steering Committee’s Mission Statement indicates (see previous sidebar), secure detention can be thought of as one end of a continuum of short-term supervision alternatives for juveniles, beginning with outright, unrestricted release to the family and progressing through the following options:

♦ **House arrest.** House arrest involves a kind of restricted release of a juvenile to the care and supervision of the family—on condition that he or she remain confined in the home, and subject to surveillance by juvenile probation officers.

♦ **Home detention.** Even more strict conditions are imposed as part of home detention, with unannounced visits and random telephone calls to check compliance. The intensity of supervision and levels of restriction can be adjusted in response to the youth’s record of compliance. Under the JCJC’s Advisory Standards Governing the Use of Alternatives to Secure Detention, in-home detention pending adjudication may not last longer than 30 days. The Standards also provide that in-home detention cases are entitled to scheduling priority over cases in which juveniles have been released pending hearings.

♦ **Supervision programs.** This set of alternative programs also allows juveniles to live at home and work or attend school while awaiting hearings, but subject to intensive face-to-face supervision, curfews and other restrictions.

♦ **Electronic monitoring.** Electronic devices that monitor a juvenile’s movements can be used by themselves or in conjunction with other approaches.

♦ **Day/evening reporting centers.** Reporting centers can provide safe, structured, staff-supervised activities on a daily basis—typically during high-crime after-school and evening hours.

♦ **Foster care.** In some areas, specialized foster care in a single-family setting is available for (usually younger) juveniles.

♦ **Shelter care/licensed facilities.** In appropriate cases, other alternatives to detention might include placement with relatives or in facilities designed primarily for dependent children. And staff-secure residential facilities provide 24-hour supervision—and often structured activity and services, as in a reporting center—in a home setting that is more wholesome than that of a secure detention center.

♦ **Secure detention.** A locked facility may be necessary for some juveniles, but only on a temporary basis—with release to any of the other short-term supervision options in the detention continuum as circumstances permit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the Detention Assessment Project was intended to gather useful information for planning purposes rather than to suggest policy courses, the project’s forthcoming report takes no final position on the issue of future state detention funding. But it does contain some interesting recommendations for action in other areas:

♦ **Mission dissemination.** The site visit interviews uncovered what may be a basic disconnect between the broad, balanced mission of juvenile detention as articulated by members of the Detention Steering Committee (see sidebar, “The Mission of Juvenile Detention”), and the narrower views of local juvenile probation chiefs — who tended to emphasize their role in protecting the public safety to the exclusion of other possible roles. If juvenile detention facilities in Pennsylvania are to serve as something more than mere holding tanks—if, for example, they are to do all they can to contribute to efforts to assess and develop the skills and strengths of juvenile detainees—it will only be after consensus has developed that this too is part of their mission. That will require articulating and disseminating the broader vision, along with model policies and procedures to implement it.
Standard admissions criteria. Local detention admissions processes rarely feature objective assessment instruments or decision-making protocols, and that is a problem. Promoting standard criteria for admissions could increase consistency, reduce inappropriate admissions, and help to alleviate minority overrepresentation in detention.

Enhanced services. The average length of stay in secure detention—more than two weeks in most of the state—affords an opportunity to accomplish something. The opportunity is too often wasted. Individual needs assessments and modular, individually focused, short-term services—including education, life and job skills, victim awareness, and drug and alcohol awareness—ought to be available in every detention facility.

Community-based alternatives. A standard model continuum of detention alternatives should be promoted statewide, along with information about program development, funding, implementation strategies, and performance measures.

Detention data. The report outlines specific shortcomings and inconsistencies in detention data currently gathered from local jurisdictions, and suggests some strategies for improvement.

The complete Final Report of the Pennsylvania Juvenile Detention Assessment Project will be available to the public soon. (Look for it online some time this spring at the website of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, http://www.pccd.state.pa.us/). In the meantime, the next issue of Pennsylvania Progress will take a closer look at community-based detention alternatives and other innovative programs operating in Philadelphia.
2 Ibid.
3 Although the fact is seldom acknowledged, death rates for youth in custody tend to be much lower than for those in the general population. For example, juvenile custody facilities responding to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention’s first Juvenile Residential Facility Census in October of 2000 reported a total of 1 death for every 3,990 beds occupied during the year 1999. However, during the same year there was 1 death for every 2,230 youths aged 13 to 17 in the general population. Sickmund, Melissa. (December 2002). “Juvenile Residential Facility Census, 2000: Selected Findings.” Juvenile Offenders and Victims National Report Series Bulletin. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
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10 However, note that the Detention Standards only authorize secure detention to ensure attendance in cases involving adjudicated or accused delinquents. Secure detention can never be used to guarantee a juvenile’s appearance in connection with status offense or dependency matters, for example.
12 A portion of Pennsylvania’s block grant under the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program established by Title IV-A of the Social Security Act is allocated to the state Office of Children, Youth and Families to support county services for means-eligible youth, including (among many other things) emergency placement services (such as emergency shelter and secure juvenile detention center services). Reimbursement under TANF is for 100% of the county’s covered costs.
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