



GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION  
ON CRIME PREVENTION  
AND CONTROL

**GROUP RESIDENCE FOR GIRLS**

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY  
STATE OF MINNESOTA

**PROJECT EVALUATION**

HV  
9105  
.M6  
M56  
1973x

An Evaluation of  
GROUP RESIDENCE FOR JUVENILE GIRLS

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY  
STATE OF MINNESOTA

prepared by

Project Evaluation Unit

Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control

June, 1973

4

5

6

7

8

9

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Summary of Evaluation Report

Project Summary . . . . .	i
Program Services. . . . .	iii
Followup Summary. . . . .	iv

### Evaluation Report

A. Background Information . . . . .	1
B. The Project . . . . .	2
C. Drop-In Counseling. . . . .	7
D. Crisis Placement. . . . .	10
E. Regular Residential Program . . . . .	13
F. Group Residence Staff . . . . .	24
G. Evaluation Plan . . . . .	26
H. Follow-up Analysis. . . . .	27
I. Conclusions . . . . .	38

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

## Summary of Evaluation Report

### 1. Project Summary

The Group Residence for Juvenile Girls is a residential facility located in Minneapolis for girls who have been discharged or paroled from the Minnesota Home School in Sauk Centre. (However, under the new regionalization plan of the Department of Corrections, most of the girls who will use the facility in the future will come from the Minnesota Reception and Diagnostic Center in Lino Lakes.)

The Group Residence was set up to provide three types of services for its clients. First, it would be a residential facility for girls who need much support and counseling as well as a place to live after leaving the Minnesota Home School. This type of service, which we have called the "regular residential program," serves those girls who need a "halfway house" between the correctional institution and non-institutional society. Second, the facility would provide a temporary residence for girls who have been released from the Home School but have yet to find a placement in the community. Third, the facility would provide a temporary placement, in addition to support and counseling, for girls who have already been placed in the community but were having serious problems adjusting to a non-institutional society. Through this service of providing "crisis placements," the Group Residence would accept girls who would otherwise be returned to a correctional institution.

In addition to these three types of services, the Group Residence has become a "drop-in" center for a number of former clients of the Minnesota Home School. While many of the girls who have dropped-in at the facility simply came to visit, a number of girls were seeking help with problems. Thus, "drop-in counseling" has become an integral part of the project.

The main focus of the Group Residence is the regular residential program for those girls who are placed at the facility following their releases from the Minnesota Home School. While these girls are not ready to move into the community, the staff feels they will benefit more from the Group Residence program than from continued institutional confinement.

When a girl enters the Group Residence program, she and the staff negotiate a contract which details the girl's program while she is a resident. The use of the contract approach allows the staff to deal with each girl individually. The basic methodological approach is an individualized program in which the staff counselors deal with the problems and goals of each girl, as set forth in her contract. The girls are also encouraged to attend weekly group sessions which normally concentrate on the problems and activities of the house, not problems of individual residents.

In addition to the individualized counseling of clients, an integral part of the rehabilitation program of the Group Residence involves enrolling the girls in educational or training programs, helping girls find employment, and helping girls contact existing social agencies which may help them with their problems. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation has provided a \$5000 grant to the Group Residence for on-the-job training of residents.

To provide these counseling services, the staff of the Group Residence consists of a Project Director who may provide counseling to clients as well as administer the project, a senior counselor, four counselors, and a community services worker who is also the parole agent for the regular residents.

## 2. Program Services

The services provided by the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls may be summarized under three headings: crisis placement, drop-in counseling, and the regular residential program.

A number of girls come to the Group Residence because they are having serious problems which may lead to their return to the institution. If these girls stay at the Group Residence for one or more nights while they work on their problems with the staff, they are considered "crisis placements." During the first eight months of operation, the Group Residence had thirty-one girls on crisis placement. (The actual number of different girls is twenty, but eight girls were on crisis placement two or more times.) Thus, approximately four girls per month were at the Group Residence because they had problems which included needing a temporary residence.

Twenty-five girls received counseling for particular problems on a drop-in basis during the first eight months of operation. These girls received counseling from the staff even though they were not regular residents. As with some of the crisis placements, many of the girls who dropped-in at the Group Residence came for counseling more than one time. Indeed the twenty-five girls received counseling on a total of sixty-seven occasions. Hence, drop-in counseling has become an important service provided by the Group Residence.

The regular residential program served forty-one girls during its first eight months. Over 50.0 percent of these girls had spent a year or more of their lives in correctional institutions. Less than 10.0 percent had finished high school. During their residencies, training and employment activities involved more girls than any other type of activity. Educational activities and counseling from outside agencies were also sought by residents.



Thirty-one of the regular residents have been terminated from the program. Of these, only 29.1 percent can be considered successful terminations, while 70.9 percent were terminated for unsuccessful reasons. This indicates that most of the residents leave the program before the staff feels they are ready to live successfully in society. However, only 19.4 percent were placed in correctional institutions when they left the program.

### 3. Followup Summary

A followup study of twenty-six former Group Residence clients and thirty-one girls released directly into the community from the Minnesota Home School was conducted by the Department of Corrections. The data from this study was made available to the Project Evaluation Unit. We compared these two groups with respect to ten variables: age, number of total months in correctional institutions, number of total months in the Minnesota Home School, school grade completed, age at first commitment to a correctional institution, number of times placed on state parole or MRDC probation, ethnic background, types of offense for last commitment, marital status of natural parents, and intelligence estimate. The two groups showed significant differences with respect to age, type of commitment offense, and intelligence estimate. Clients of the Group Residence tended to be older and have lower intelligence estimates. A greater proportion of Group Residence clients were committed for juvenile offenses than of the regular parole group.

We then compared the two groups with respect to the types of activities the girls pursued and their placements following release from the Group Residence or from the Minnesota Home School. Our findings show that more girls who were paroled directly into the community were involved in academic programs than girls from the Group Residence. We also found that more girls from the Group

Residence were employed or in training programs than from the other group.

With respect to placement, 46.2 percent of the girls in the experimental group took placements on their own, while only 12.9 percent of the control group did. Thus, we have found major differences between the two groups with respect to the types of activities they pursued and the types of placements they found after release.

Finally, we compared the two groups with respect to their offenses following release from the Minnesota Home School. Fifty percent of the Group Residence girls committed new offenses while they were in the program or after they were released from the program. Fifty percent of the girls paroled directly into the community had also committed new offenses. Thus, with respect to whether the girls committed new offenses, there is no difference between those who went through the Group Residence and those who did not.

However, the fact that the experimental and control groups differ with respect to three variables is most important. The followup data show that there is no difference with respect to new offenses between the group of girls who were exposed to the Group Residence program and a younger, more intelligent group of girls who were less likely to have been committed for juvenile offenses. What we cannot say is whether the experimental group did better or worse than a similar set of girls who were not exposed to the Group Residence program.



## GROUP RESIDENCE FOR JUVENILE GIRLS

### A. Background Information

The Department of Corrections applied to the Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control for a grant to operate a group residence for girls. The clientele for this project is composed of juvenile girls who are returning to society from correctional institutions but who have no alternative placement (or have placements which are considered too unstable to help the girls readjust to non-institutional society). The grant would allow the Department of Corrections to initiate a residential program for girls returning to the metropolitan area from the Minnesota Home School at Sauk Centre,<sup>1</sup> which would operate the grant. The new program would provide a residential facility for girls similar to the Group Residence for Hard-to-Place Delinquent Juvenile Boys.

In early 1972, the Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control allocated \$71,000.00 of LEAA monies for this project to cover the period of April 1, 1972 through March 31, 1973. In November of 1972, the Governor's Commission allocated an additional \$28,617.00 of LEAA funds to continue the project through June 30, 1973. It was hoped that at that time the Legislature

---

<sup>1</sup>Under the new regionalization plan for the Department of Corrections, the Group Residence will operate in conjunction with the Minnesota Reception & Diagnostic Center at Lino Lakes, instead of Sauk Centre.

would appropriate funds to continue the operation of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls independently of LEAA funding. However, the Legislature did not appropriate such funds, and the project has again returned to the Governor's Commission for funds to operate through June 30, 1974.

When the initial grant was awarded, the Department of Corrections leased a house at 2303 Pleasant Avenue South in Minneapolis. The facility has fifteen bedrooms with a potential capacity of twenty-five girls. The first floor of the building contains office space for the staff, kitchen and dining facilities, and recreation room, as well as sleeping quarters for some of the residents.

#### B. The Project

The original grant application, on which the funds were allocated, called for the implementation of a new residential program for juvenile girls who were clients of the Department of Corrections. This community corrections center for girls would include the following program components: first, it would provide pre-release guidance for juvenile girls in need of assistance in working out parole plans. It would provide a residential center which would allow the girls to ease into normal community life by giving them support and the opportunity to find jobs, make housing arrangements,

work out financial arrangements, and so on. Second, the residential center would provide preventive return facilities by providing bed space and support for girls who might otherwise be returned to jail or a correctional institution. The project planners felt that some girls needed support and counseling, which would be provided at the residential facility, but did not need to be returned to institutional settings, even though they were not able to function on their own in society. Third, the residential facility would provide Department of Corrections clients with needed support and counseling. The counseling efforts would be centered on the problems of the individual clients. No particular forms or programs of counseling were built into the program, although it was planned that counseling services would include marital counseling, psychological counseling, legal aid and employment assistance. Fourth, the new facility would provide "family-based" treatment, i.e., treatment of the individual client in her family environment.

According to the first "Progress Report" from the project, the purposes of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls are as follows:

- A. To provide an opportunity for difficult-to-place females, committed to the Minnesota Home School and/or on parole from the Home School, to live in a normal home environment. The home will be provided for them until the girls can appropriately begin independent living in the community in a

responsible manner. Eight beds will be available for this purpose.

- B. To provide room and board and counseling for female students who need a temporary residence while making the transition into a community placement from the institution. The concept would be that of a halfway house and to provide the students some support and assistance during the transitional period. Two beds will be available for this purpose.
- C. To provide an accessible place in the community for former Minnesota Home School students to go to in time of crisis. Two additional beds will be available for this purpose.

Thus, the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls would provide three types of services according to the needs of their clients: (a) A residential facility for girls who need much support and counseling, as well as a place to live after leaving the Minnesota Home School. (b) A temporary residence for girls who have been released from the Home School but have yet to find a placement. (c) A temporary residence for girls who have previously been released from the Home School but are having problems in the community and need a place to stay and work out the problems.

The original grant application provided the following justification for the approach to be taken by the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls:

- (1) The transition from the regimented institutional life to the freedom of the community is a drastic break for many parolees. Nationwide statistics indicate that the greatest proportion of new offenses committed by parolees occur within the

first 90 days after release from prison. Much of this is due to the pressures the individual must immediately face in securing employment and housing, often arranging for family support and payment of debts, and the psychological adjustment to accepting responsibility for making simple decisions which the prison regime has, for some time, made for her. There is need for a transitional phase from total incarceration to total freedom in which selected inmates assume responsibility for self-direction, with supportive guidance and control. Prison and other correctional institutions have attempted to eradicate maladaptive behavior. But socially approved behavior has yet to be reality tested. Present institutional programs approximate neither community stress nor responsibilities. A transitional step during which the client gradually assumes responsibility for self-direction but is buttressed by professional guidance and control seems a logical step in furthering the dual responsibility of community protection and rehabilitation.

For the majority of the Group Residence clients, the residential facility would provide the transitional phase between the institution and the community. While at the Group Residence, clients would gradually accept responsibilities for their actions while under supervision and guidance from the staff. This would allow the girls to gradually adjust to non-institutional society. Eight of the twelve beds planned for the residence were to be for girls in the transitional phase.

- (2) Too often parolees must be returned to the correctional institution because there is no place else to put them. A step between regular parole and return to the institution is needed where the client can be controlled, counseled, and disciplined but where she can also continue to maintain the good aspects of her parole adjustment, such as employment. Here control and assistance may be given on



a preventive return basis rather than waiting until a new offense has been committed against the community.

Two beds at the Group Residence were set aside for former clients of the Minnesota Home School who had been placed directly on parole but who were having difficulty maintaining their parole status. The Group Residence would provide a place where these girls could live during difficult periods without breaking their ties to the community. In this sense, the Group Residence would serve as a crisis center for girls on parole.

- (3) A better system of getting the correctional client to the potential community services is needed. Legal aid, employment service, marital counseling, psychological assistance, and financial counseling are, to name a few, resources which existing agencies have to offer. These services could be concentrated at a Community Corrections Center by the agencies involved and be focused on the parolee at the time she needs them most.

In addition to providing counseling services by the staff, the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls would also help its clients contact existing social agencies which may help them solve their problems. Thus, one of the tasks for the Group Residence was to develop community resources which could help its clients.

- (4) Oft times the individual's surroundings (family included) are ignored rendering treatment of the individual per se ineffective. The program will involve the family and others, as appropriate, in planned change to facilitate the client's gradual return to an improved environment.

This aspect of the program was to involve two parts of the treat-

ment process. First, the Group Residence was to have had a family atmosphere centered in house parents who would reside at the facility. Second, the counseling of clients would involve the girls' families in an attempt to solve their adjustment problems.

Thus, the program was set up to serve girls who were released from the Minnesota Home School but had not yet developed their parole plans and were not ready to live in the community, or who had parole plans but needed temporary placements while an alternative placement was developed, or who (having been previously released) were having trouble on parole and faced return to an institution. Once the program began functioning, a number of former clients of the Minnesota Home School began to "drop-in" at the Group Residence for counseling. Although this aspect of the program was not planned, it has developed into an integral part of the services the Group Residence provides to former clients of the Minnesota Home School. Thus, we may divide the program of the Group Residence into three parts: drop-in counseling, crisis placement, and the regular residential program.

#### C. Drop-In Counseling

In addition to the regular residential program, the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls has become a center for former residents of the Minnesota Home School who are in the metropolitan area and are having problems. Many former clients of the Home

School have visited the Group Residence to see friends living there and to talk to the staff. While many of these girls simply drop in to talk to the people at the Group Residence and (sometimes) to receive a meal, by March 1, 1973, twenty-five girls had visited the Group Residence to talk to staff members about particular problems they were having.

The importance of this service might be emphasized by the following data: As of March 1, 1973, only 8 percent of the girls who dropped in for counseling had been residents of the program, while 80 percent had not been residents (and 12 percent had data missing on this point). Thus, of the 22 girls on whom we have data, 20 were girls who had not been residents in the program. Furthermore, only one of these girls had ever stayed at the Group Residence on crisis placement. Thus, most of the girls who made use of the drop-in counseling service were not girls who were regularly served by the Group Residence.

If these girls were not regular clients of the Group Residence, we wanted to know how they learned of the counseling service. Table 1 shows the distribution of referral sources for drop-in clients. From the data in the Table, we see that 20 percent were self-referrals who had heard about the project, 40 percent were referred to the project by friends who know of the project, and 12 percent were referred to the Group Residence by field services

personnel. These data indicate that the project had become well known among girls on the streets, even though these girls may never have been in the Group Residence program.

<u>TABLE 1</u>	
<u>Referral Sources of Drop-In Clients</u>	
<u>Source</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Self-referral	20.0
Resident in project	8.0
Friend	40.0
Parole agent	12.0
School official	4.0
Employer/co-worker	4.0
Other	4.0
Missing data	8.0
	100.0
	(N=25)

These girls were able to receive counseling at the Group Residence even though they were not residents of the project. The fact that 25 girls did drop-in on the project for counseling indicates a need for a drop-in center for girls in the metropolitan area. The importance of this service is also indicated by the fact that of the 25 girls who had dropped-in at the Group Residence by March 1, 1973, 14 (or 56 percent) had come to the facility for drop-in counseling more than once. In fact, these clients sought counseling a total of 67 times between June 1, 1972, when the pro-

ject opened, and March 1, 1973. This has put an added burden on the counseling staff at the Group Residence in that the time spent with drop-in clients must come from time which could have been spent with residents of the program. We must also keep in mind that this number does not include those who dropped-in simply to chat, although they had no particular problems for the counseling staff. The Progress Reports indicate that 75 girls dropped-in on the project during the first six months of operation, although not all of these girls were in need of counseling. Yet, just this number of visitors would put a strain on the program.

#### D. Crisis Placement

The Group Residence for Juvenile Girls has set aside two beds for "crisis placements," i.e., for girls who are having problems in the community and would otherwise be returned to correctional institutions. We have defined a "crisis placement" as any girl who is not a regular resident of the project but who has stayed over night at the facility for at least one night, but not more than fourteen nights. As a facility for crisis placement, the Group Residence serves as a program for preventing the return of girls to correctional institutions. Most of the girls who are crisis placements at the Group Residence would have been placed in correctional institutions had the facility not been in operation.

From June 1, 1972, through March 1, 1973, the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls had served 20 girls as crisis placements. However, by March 1, 40 percent of these girls had been on crisis placement more than once. If we count each placement, then the Group Residence had 31 crisis placements during this period.

As might be expected, the girls who came to the Group Residence in times of crisis tended to have more contact with the project than those who dropped-in with problems. Indeed, 65 percent of the girls who have been placed on crisis have been residents of the project, or have been in crisis placement more than once, or have received counseling from the staff on a drop-in basis. For some of the girls who came on crisis status, the Group Residence was their only placement in the community. In fact, 20 percent of the girls who entered the Group Residence for crisis placement remained in the Group Residence as regular clients when no alternative placements were found during their first two weeks at the facility.

Again, we were interested in where these girls learned of the crisis placement at the Group Residence. The data in Table 2 shows that fifty percent of the girls were self-referrals when they came to the Group Residence, while 15 percent were referred to the facility by their parole or probation agents. Again, we have evidence that the existence of the Group Residence and the services it provides are well known among girls who have been released from

the Minnesota Home School.

<u>TABLE 2</u>	
<u>Referral Sources for Crisis Placements</u>	
<u>Source</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Self-referral	50.0
Resident of Group Residence	5.0
Family member	5.0
Friend	10.0
Parole/probation agent	15.0
Home School official	5.0
Other	5.0
Missing Data	5.0
TOTAL	100.0
	(N=20)

Another interesting feature of this project is that three of the girls who were self-referrals for crisis placement were on run from the Minnesota Home School at the time they made contact with the program. This would seem to indicate respect on the part of these girls for the staff and the project. (Two of these girls were placed back at the Home School, while an alternative placement with a relative was found for the third.)

Forty-five percent of the girls on crisis placement were on parole or probation at the time they entered the Group Residence, while 45 percent were on neither at that time but were having trouble in the community. (Data on the legal status of the other 10 percent was missing.)

#### E. Regular Residential Program

The main focus of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls is the program for those girls who are placed at the facility following their releases from the Minnesota Home School. Some of the girls are placed at the Group Residence directly from the Home School. While these girls are not ready to move into the community, the staff feels they will benefit more from the Group Residence program than from continued institutional confinement. Other girls who have been previously released from the Home School are placed in the Group Residence when they have trouble adjusting to the community.

From June 1, 1972 through March 15, 1973, the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls has admitted forty-one girls as residents in their regular program (i.e., this number does not include those who stayed at the facility during crisis placements). Of these forty-one, 75.6 percent had been released from the program by March 15, while 24.4 percent were still active in the program as residents. The girls admitted to the program ranged in age from fourteen years to twenty-one years old. (See Table 3.) Table 4 shows the distribution of ethnic backgrounds among the regular residents.



<u>TABLE 3</u>	
<u>Age Distribution of Regular Residents</u>	
<u>Age in Years</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
14 years	2.4
15 years	19.5
16 years	26.8
17 years	26.8
18 years	9.8
19 years	7.3
20 years	2.4
21 years	2.4
No information	2.4
TOTAL	100% (N=41)

<u>TABLE 4</u>	
<u>Ethnic Backgrounds of Regular Residents</u>	
<u>Ethnic Background</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
White	63.4
Black	9.8
American Indian	22.0
Mexican American	2.4
Other	2.4
TOTAL	100% (N=41)

Table 5 shows the distribution of total time spent in correctional institutions by these girls (in six month intervals). From the data on which this table was based, we find that the residents averaged 16.5 months per girl in correctional institutions. Table 6 shows that less than 10 percent of the residents had completed high

school or received a high school equivalency diploma. These data show that the residents of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls have extensive correctional histories and deficient educational backgrounds which will make their adjustments to non-institutional society difficult.

<u>TABLE 5</u>	
<u>Total Months in Correctional Institutions</u>	
<u>Number of Months</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
1 - 6 months	17.1
7 - 12 months	22.0
13 - 18 months	22.0
19 - 24 months	14.6
25 - 30 months	12.2
31 - 36 months	2.4
61 - 66 months	2.4
No information	7.3
TOTAL	100% (N=41)

<u>TABLE 6</u>	
<u>Highest Grade Completed Prior to Admission</u>	
<u>Grade</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
07	9.8
08	17.0
09	26.8
10	7.3
11	7.3
12	4.9
GED	4.9
No information	22.0
TOTAL	100% (N=41)

While the girls are residents of the facility, staff counselors try to help them solve their problems by providing counseling

for particular problems and by helping the girls develop programs which will lead to successful adjustment in the community. In preparation for this role, the staff of the Group Residence spent the month of May, 1972, training for their counseling responsibilities and "exploring" the neighboring community to familiarize themselves with available resources for the project.

When a girl enters the Group Residence program, she and the staff negotiate a contract which details the girl's program while she is a resident. The Group Residence has no curfew hours, so one of the details of the contract is the hours the girl will keep while in the program. The contract also elaborates her plans for education and employment, her duties as a resident, and her program goals. These goals include those set by the staff and the goals set by the girl herself. All of these matters are negotiated as the contract is developed. Each section of the contract also contains a statement of the consequences for violating that section of the contract - such as the consequences for missing the curfew set by the contract. The consequences are also negotiable during the development of the contract. When the staff and the girl agree on the details of the contract, both parties sign the document and it is kept on file at the Group Residence.

The use of the contract approach allows the staff to deal with each girl individually. The counselors try to help each girl

reach the goals set forth in the contract. Periodically, the girl and the counselors may review the contract to determine whether she is making progress toward her goals. The contract allows the girl to know what is expected of her when she is in the program and to have a role in determining what she will do in the program.

For older girls in the program, the staff is responsible for doing everything possible to help the resident meet the goals in the contract, as long as she fulfills her part of the contract. If a girl continually fails to live up to her contract, she faces these options: (i) she may choose to leave the Group Residence; (ii) the staff may ask her to leave; or (iii) the staff may insist that a new contract be negotiated which will be workable for both parties. For younger girls who fail to fulfill contractual agreements, the staff has the option of putting her back into the institution or she herself has the option of choosing to return to the institution. She does not have the option of staying in the community because of her age and inability to live successfully in the community. She may stay at the Group Residence if she and the staff can develop a new contract.

Most of the counseling at the Group Residence is done on a one-to-one basis. Ordinarily, when problems arise among the residents

the problems are dealt with by the staff and the residents immediately involved. However, if problems might affect all the residents, then they are raised in group sessions. While group counseling is not a formal part of the program, the residents and staff do meet once a week to discuss in-house problems and activities. No formal counseling methodology is used in these sessions.

We may summarize the basic methodological approach as an individualized program in which the staff counselors deal with the problems and goals of each girl. The focus of the program for each girl is the contents of the contract she has signed with the staff. Group sessions are held weekly but concentrate on the problems of the house, not the individual problems of residents.

In addition to the individual counseling of clients, an integral part of the rehabilitation program of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls is involving the girls in educational or training programs, employment programs, and other social agencies which may help them with their problems. We found that 46.3 percent of the girls has contacted outside agencies, while 24.4 percent had no involvement. But the data was missing on 29.3 percent of the girls, all but one of whom had been in the program for less than a month. Whether any of these latter girls were involved with outside agencies we do not know. These figures may be somewhat misleading because

all the girls who were residents on March 15, 1973, had been involved with outside agencies with the exception of one girl who had been at the Group Residence for only two days. This might indicate either more emphasis on outside agencies now than in the earlier phases of the program or better record keeping.

Of the twenty-nine girls for whom there are data, 65.6 percent (19 of 29) had contact with outside agencies, while 34.5 percent (10) had no contacts. While the girls contacted twenty-five different agencies, two agencies had significant numbers of girls involved in their programs. 55.2 percent of the twenty-nine residents were involved in programs with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and 24.1 percent were involved in programs with the Work Opportunity Center, an education and training agency.

The nineteen girls who did contact outside agencies worked with an average of three agencies per girl. These girls made a total of 58 agency contacts, where an "agency contact" is counted for each agency which a girl contacts, not each time a girl contacts an agency. We have grouped the agency contacts into five groups: training and employment; educational programs; counseling services; health services; and other services. Table 7 shows the distribution of agency contacts among these groups.

TABLE 7

Agency Contacts by Regular Residents\*

Type of Services	Per Cent of All Contacts
Training & employment	44.8
Educational programs	17.2
Counseling services	17.2
Health services	10.3
Other services	10.3
TOTAL	100%
	(N=58)

\*The data counts an "agency contact" for each agency that each girl contacted. Thus, while only 19 girls did contact outside agencies, they made a total of 58 agency contacts, an average of 3 agency contacts per girl.

Of all the agency contacts which the nineteen girls made, 44.8 percent of the contacts were with programs which involved training and employment. From the data in Table 6, we see that 68.2 percent of these girls lack a high school diploma or its equivalent. Many of these girls will not finish high school before they must live in the community. Their success in the community will depend to a large extent on their success in employment. The project obtained a \$5,000 grant from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation for an employment program. With these funds, the Group Residence can approach potential employers with an offer to pay a girl's salary for up to three months. The three month period gives the employer a chance to evaluate the girl's abilities and performance and the girl has an opportunity to determine whether

she likes the job. Girls are placed in jobs in which they are interested and for which they have skills. The D.V.R. grant provides an opportunity for the girls to find out if they really are interested in the jobs that initially appeal to them.

While training and employment programs are sought more than other types of programs by the clients of the Group Residence, Table 7 indicates that 17.2 percent of the agency contacts were with educational programs. We have already noted that the educational backgrounds of most Group Residence clients are deficient. Through discussions of the Group Residence program with the Minneapolis Board of Education and the principals of public schools, the staff has made arrangements to enroll their clients in any school in the city. In addition to regular academic programs, girls have enrolled in G.E.D. preparation courses and alternative educational programs.

Another 17.2 percent of the agency contacts were with social agencies which offer counseling services for particular types of problems, such as planned parenthood, family counseling, and drug counseling. 10.3 percent of the contacts with outside agencies were with health services, including hospitals. The remaining 10.3 percent of the contacts were with a number of different agencies which do not fall into the above groups.



While the numbers with which we are working are quite small, these data do show that the two most important kinds of problems that the girls work on while they are at the Group Residence are employment and educational problems.

Thirty-one of the clients of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls have been terminated from the program. Table 8 divides this set of clients according to their reasons for termination from the program. The data show that 29 percent of the girls were successful in the program, while 71 percent were not successful in the program. By "successful in the program" we mean those girls who were released because they had made satisfactory adjustments in the program or because they had been able to stabilize their situations to the point where they could be placed independently in the community or because they had been able to stabilize their situations to the point where they could be returned to their home. Those who were terminated from the program for any other reason are counted as "unsuccessful".

Of those thirty-one who had been terminated from the program, only 64.5 percent (20 girls) had been in the program for one month or more. All of the girls who were successful in the program are in this set of clients who had been in the program for at least one month. Thus, if we designate one month as the minimum period of time a girl needs to gain program exposure, 45 percent of those

clients with program exposure were successful in the program, while 55 percent were not successful in the program. Table 8 shows the distribution of former residents according to their reasons for termination.

<u>TABLE 8</u>	
<u>Distribution of Reasons for Termination Among Former Residents</u>	
<u>Reason for Termination</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
a. Unsuccessful in Program	
New Offense	6.5
Unable to adjust during trial period	12.9
Unable to adjust after trial period	3.2
Runaway	38.7
Other	9.7
b. Successful in Program	
Satisfactory adjustment	3.2
Independent placement	19.4
Home trial	6.5
TOTAL	100% (N=31)

While the data on program success or failure does not appear to be encouraging, we must keep in mind that the purpose of this project is to help the girls stay in the community without being returned to correctional institutions. While the majority of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls clients cannot be counted as successful in the program, only 19.4% of the thirty-one girls were placed back in correctional institutions when they were terminated from the program.

#### F. Group Residence Staff

When the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls opened in 1972, Mr. Donald Engeldinger was the Project Director. Mr. Engeldinger has had ten years of experience with the Department of Corrections prior to becoming the Project Director. His background includes three years at the State Training School at Red Wing and six years at the Minnesota Home School, which administers the project.

As Project Director, Mr. Engeldinger was responsible for hiring staff members, planning the opening of the Group Residence, arranging training sessions for the staff, and planning the operation of the project. Before the project opened for clients, the plan to hire house parents was abandoned after consultations with Department of Corrections personnel and staff members of other residential programs indicated that house parents would not work out with the clientele planned for the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls. Thus, this aspect of the family-based orientation of the project was never undertaken.

Mr. Engeldinger resigned from the position of Project Director in April, 1973. Ms. Rochelle Graves was appointed the new Project Director. Ms. Graves had been hired as a counselor for the Group

Residence prior to the opening of the house. Before she joined the Group Residence staff, she had spent 18 months with the grants administration unit of the Department of Corrections. In addition to her normal counseling duties, Ms. Graves had been in charge of the research and data collection program for the Group Residence.

Ms. Barbara Colliander was hired as a counselor when the project began and has since been promoted to Senior Counselor. Her prior experience includes group work and community organization with the Girl Scouts. She holds a B.A. degree in Sociology. Ms. Colliander's responsibilities include directing the counseling efforts of the program and acting as a liaison between the project and the Minnesota Home School.

Three women and one man fill the four counselor positions. In addition to their duties as counselors, each is assigned responsibility for at least one of the following tasks: outside and inside maintenance of the house, developing and directing an arts and crafts program, ordering supplies and food, seeing that the housework gets done and the the house is clean. A Community Services Worker has been assigned to the project by the Minneapolis Parole Office. This person is the parole agent for the girls in the house and is responsible for all welfare, clothing and medical requests and assists the girls in obtaining jobs or enrolling in educational programs.

Thus, each of the staff members of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls has specific responsibilities for the operation of the house and its program in addition to the normal duties of counselors. The staff for this project is racially integrated, including one Indian and two blacks. Two of the staff members are ex-offenders.

#### G. Evaluation Plan

The Group Residence for Juvenile Girls is one of a number of residential programs for juveniles which have received LEAA monies through the Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control. While it is still too early to conduct a full evaluation of the project, we can outline what the evaluation will include. First, the Group Residence was funded because it presented a methodology which should achieve the project's goals and objectives. So one aspect of the evaluation will be to determine the extent to which this project has attained its stated goals. Second, this project is similar to a number of other residential programs, including the Group Residence for Hard-to-Place Delinquent Boys and the Big House projects. We will compare these projects with each other in terms of their success in reaching their goals and in terms of the general goals of all residential projects of this type, e.g., reducing recidivism. Each of these projects is collecting the

same kinds of data on their clients, so we will be able to compare them in terms of the clients they serve. Third, this project is one of a number of residential programs being developed as alternatives to traditional correctional programs. One question about all of these programs is what they cost. Thus, we will also present a cost analysis of the project.

#### H. Follow-up Analysis

Follow-up information was sought on twenty-seven former clients of the regular program of the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls. The follow-up was conducted by Ms. Sally Kennedy of the research staff of the Department of Corrections. A standardized follow-up form for each girl was sent to the girl's parole agent. Twenty-six of the forms were completed and returned to Ms. Kennedy. Using the same form and method of collection, follow-up data were obtained on thirty-one girls who were paroled directly into the community from the Minnesota Home School. Copies of the data were made available for analysis by the Project Evaluation Unit.

The data we analyzed include demographic variables on the girls as well as information on their status and activities since release from the institution or from the program. We began our analysis of the data by comparing the experimental and control

groups with respect to a number of demographic variables which are independent of the Group Residence program. The results of these comparisons show the extent to which the experimental and control groups are composed of comparable girls. For some variables, we used a test for significance of the differences between the mean values for the two groups. For other variables, we tested for the significance of differences between the proportions of a given value for a variable in each group.

As Table 9 shows, we tested for significant differences between the mean values of the experimental and control groups for (1) age in years (as of May 1, 1973), (2) the total number of months the girls have spent in correctional institutions, (3) the total number of months the girls have spent in the Minnesota Home School, (4) the highest school grade completed, (5) the age at which the girls were first committed to correctional institutions, and (6) the number of times the girls have been placed on state parole or MRDC probation. These tests allow us to compare the experimental and control groups with respect to age, educational background, and some aspects of their correctional histories. As noted in Table 9, the only variable which shows a significant difference between the means is that of age in years (at a .05 level of significance). Thus, with the exception of age in years, the experimental and control groups are similar with respect to these variables.

TABLE 9

Summary of Tests for Differences of Means

Between the Experimental and Control Groups

Independent Variable	Mean Value for Experimental Group	Mean Value for Control Group	Is Difference Significant?
Age in Years	17.50 years	16.55 years	Yes
Total no. months in correctional inst.	15.7 months	13.1 months	No
Total no. months in Minn. Home School	12.0 months	9.9 months	No
Mean School Grade completed	9.50 grade	9.33 grade	No
Age at First Commitment to correctional inst.	14.84 years	14.48 years	No
No. of times on state parole or probation	1.92 times	1.81 times	No

We also compared the experimental and control groups with respect to the following variables: (7) ethnic background, (8) types of offense prior to last commitment to a correctional institution, (9) marital status of natural parents, and (10) intelligence estimate. A measure of significant differences for these variables is obtained for the proportion of each group that has a given value of a variable, such as the proportion of the experimental and control groups that are white with respect to ethnic background.

The results of the tests for variables (7) - (10) show that there are no significant differences between the experimental and control groups with respect to the variables for ethnic background



and marital status of natural parents. The variable for intelligence estimate was tested because we thought the "hard-to-place" girls who went through the Group Residence might show a greater proportion of below average estimates than the girls in the control group. The results of the test confirm this view; the girls who went through the Group Residence program as a group show lower intelligence estimates than those in the control group.

We also tested the proportion of juvenile offenses in each group. Offenses committed by juveniles are classed as offenses against persons, against property, against self, automobile offenses, juvenile or status offenses, and others. Since juvenile offenses are status offenses, we thought the "hard-to-place" girls of the experimental group would be more likely to have committed more serious offenses than status offenses. The results of our test do show a significant difference between the two groups. However, the difference is opposite to what we had thought. Girls who go through the Group Residence are more likely to have been committed to correctional institutions for juvenile offenses than those in the control group.

Thus, we have compared the two groups with respect to ten variables which are independent of the program. Of these variables, five are concerned with basic demographic characteristics of the girls and five are concerned with their correctional histories. Of the ten, we found differences between the two

groups for age in years, intelligence estimate, and type of offense for which the girls were committed to the institution. It is interesting to note that the number of months a girl has been in correctional institutions, the number of times she has been placed on parole or probation by the YCC, and the length of time she has been involved with correctional systems (indicated by the age at first commitment) are not relevant to whether she might go through the Group Residence program. None of these factors enter into placement in the program versus placement in the community. Despite these findings, it may be that the "hard-to-place" label is descriptive of the Group Residence clients in that they simply lack placement alternatives. Unfortunately, we do not have data to test this hypothesis.\*

We can compare the experimental and control groups with respect to their activities following release, their placements following release, and whether they committed new offenses after they were released from the Minnesota Home School.

When the girls were in the Group Residence, there were two basic types of program activities which they could pursue:

- (1) employment or work-education and training programs, and
  - (2) academic programs, including regular, remedial, and G.E.D. programs.
- Of the twenty-six girls in the follow-up group who were

---

\*Criteria for referral to the project limit referrals to girls who (a) are chronic runaways, or (b) have been involved in prostitution, or (c) have histories of drug/alcohol problems. These criteria also make the girls "hard-to-place."

in the program, 42.3 percent (11) were involved in employment or work-education and training programs, 30.8 percent (8) were involved in academic programs, and 26.9 percent (7) were not involved in either. Thus, while in the Group Residence program, 73.1 percent (19) of the girls were involved in positive programs. Following release from the Group Residence, only 46.2 percent (12) of these girls were involved in either type of activity.

Moreover, we find a number of changes in the distribution of these activities among the girls who went through the Group Residence. While 11 girls were involved in employment or work-education and training programs while they were in the Group Residence, only 4 continued in this type of activity after they were released. One of these girls was involved in an academic program following release, while six were not involved in either type of activity. Similarly, only one of the eight girls who were in academic programs continued in this type of activity following release. However, four of the seven girls who had no activity in the program were employed, in training programs, or in academic programs since they were released.

From Table 10, we see that members of the experimental group are more likely to be in employment-related activities, while members of the control group are more likely to be in academic programs. This difference may be accounted for by two of the

differences we have seen between the two groups: the members of the experimental group are older and have lower intelligence estimates. We should also note from the data in Table 10 that while 46.2 percent (12) of the experimental group is engaged in "positive" activities, 61.3% of the control group is involved in "positive" activities. This difference may be accounted for by the two differences just noted, but it also indicates that the Group Residence program is not very effective in getting its clients involved in long-term programs. (This conclusion is also supported by the fact that only five of the nineteen girls in positive activities in the program continued with the same type of activity after they left the program.)

<u>TABLE 10</u>					
<u>Activity Following Release from Institution or Program</u>					
<u>Activity</u>	<u>Experimental Group</u>		<u>Control Group</u>		
Employment, Work-Education & Training Programs	8	30.8%	6	19.4%	
Academic Programs	4	15.4	13	41.9	
Marriage or Pregnancy	4	15.4	4	12.9	
Other, None or Unknown	5	19.2	6	19.4	
On run or in Correctional Institution	<u>5</u>	<u>19.2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6.5</u>	
TOTALS	26	100.0% (N=26)	31	100.0% (N=31)	

<u>TABLE 11</u>				
<u>Placements after Group Residence or Institution</u>				
Placement	Experimental Group		Control Group	
Independent	12	46.2%	4	12.9%
One or Both Parents	5	19.2	18	58.1
Friends or Relatives	2	7.7	2	6.4
Group Home, Maternity Home	0	---	5	16.2
Foster Home	0	---	2	6.4
On Run	4	15.4	0	---
Correctional Institution	<u>3</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>---</u>
TOTAL	26	100.0%	31	100.0%
	(N=26)		(N=31)	

Table 11 shows that there are differences between the experimental and control groups with respect to their placements following release from the program or from the institution. While 46.2 percent of the experimental group found independent placements on their own, only 12.9% of the control group took independent placements. While we found no significant differences between the two groups with respect to the marital status of the natural parents of the girls, we see here that only 19.2 percent of the experimental group returned to live with their parents (or with at least one of them) and 58.1 percent of the control group returned to the home of at least one parent. This may be due to the older age of the girls in the experimental group or it may be due to

girls in the experimental group having no placement alternatives to the Group Residence. This, of course, could also be due to the influence of the program which might lead the girls toward living situations on their own.

We noted earlier that there is a significant difference between the groups with respect to the type of offense for which the girls were committed to correctional institutions. We noted then that girls in the experimental group were more likely to have been committed for juvenile offenses. Table 12 shows the distribution of types of commitment offenses for both groups. Actually, both groups show high proportions of juvenile offenses. Indeed, 61.4 percent (35) of the 57 girls (experimental and control) were committed for juvenile offenses.

<u>TABLE 12</u>				
<u>Type of Offense Leading to Commitment</u>				
<u>Offense Type</u>	<u>Experimental Group</u>		<u>Control Group</u>	
Juvenile	19	73.1%	16	51.6%
Against Self	4	15.4	10	32.3
Against Person	0	--	2	6.5
Against Property	2	7.7	2	6.5
Automobile	<u>1</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.2</u>
TOTAL	26	100.0%	31	100.0%
	(N=26)		(N=31)	

Perhaps the most important variable for the follow-up is whether the girls committed new offenses since their release from the correctional institutions. Our findings are not encouraging. Of the twenty-six girls in the experimental group, 50.0 percent (13) have committed offenses either while they were in the program or since their release from the Group Residence. Among the thirty-one members of the control group, we have information on thirty. Of these thirty, 50.0 percent (15) have committed new offenses. Thus, for both groups, 50.0 percent of the girls have committed new offenses.

These results show that with respect to new offenses (and, consequently, further involvement with the criminal justice system) there is no difference between the experimental and control groups. Thus, the evidence we have on the results of the program show that the Group Residence is no better (and no worse) than parole directly into the community from the Minnesota Home School.

By May 1, 1973, 26.9 percent (7) of the experimental group had been discharged from parole, while only 6.4 percent (2) of the control group had been discharged. In this respect, the experimental group is better than the control group. (However, 7.6 percent (2) of the experimental group were back in correctional institutions while none of the control group were in

institutions.) Interestingly, there is no correlation between employment or academic activities and discharge from parole. So we cannot attribute discharge from parole to the types of programs the girls pursued following release from the program. Indeed, discharge from parole is directly related to the number of months since release from the correctional institution and no illegal activity. The girls in the experimental group who have been discharged from parole average 11.2 months since release from the correctional institution while the experimental group average is 8.1 months. The two girls who have been discharged from parole in the control have been out of the institution for 11.8 months, while the control group average is 7.2 months.

The two variables which probably tell us most about the rehabilitation of these girls are whether they have committed new offenses and what their present legal status is. With both of these variables, we find no differences between the experimental and control groups. The same proportions of each group have committed offenses since they were released from correctional institutions, so there is no difference with this measure of recidivism. While a higher proportion of girls in the experimental group have been discharged from parole, we find that all girls who have been discharged from parole were released from correctional institutions over eleven months ago.



## I. Conclusions

As we noted in Section B, the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls had three general goals:

- (1) To provide an opportunity for difficult-to-place females, committed to the Minnesota Home School and/or on parole from the Home School, to live in a normal home environment. The home will be provided for them until the girls can appropriately begin independent living in the community in a responsible manner.
- (2) To provide room and board and counseling for female students who need a temporary residence while making the transition into a community placement from the institution. The concept would be that of a halfway house and to provide the students some support and assistance during the transitional period.
- (3) To provide an accessible place in the community for former Minnesota Home School students to go to in a time of crisis.

In this section, we will report our findings with respect to these goals.

The third goal of providing a community location to which girls may turn in times of crisis appears to be fully attainable by the Group Residence. This goal was planned so the facility would function for preventive return by providing a temporary residence to girls who might be returned to correctional institutions. However, we may also include drop-in counseling as a part of the services provided to girls in crisis. As was reported in Sections C and D, twenty-five girls sought counseling at the Group Residence on a drop-in basis a total of sixty-seven times, while twenty girls used the facility for crisis placement a total of thirty-one times. Thus, during the first eight months of the program, a total of ninety-eight contacts were made with clients who were having problems in the community. This shows that the Group Residence has become a center for former students of the Minnesota Home School.

However, we must seriously examine the impact of drop-in counseling on the Group Residence program. While the twenty-five girls sought counseling a total of sixty-seven times, we have information that these twenty-five were a

minority of all the girls who dropped-in at the facility. The Progress Reports indicate that a total of seventy-five girls dropped-in during the first six months. Although the majority of these girls may not have had any particular problems for which they sought counseling, we may assume (on the basis of staff reports) that most of them have talked to staff members while they were visiting the facility. Thus, these girls are consuming staff time. The Progress Reports also indicate that when the facility is running at capacity, the counselors are hard-pressed to fulfill their responsibilities to the residents. We may conclude, therefore, that when the facility is operating at or near capacity, the drop-ins have a significant impact on staff time at the Group Residence. Given the number of crisis placements and drop-ins, we may also conclude that there is a definite need for these services by former students of the Minnesota Home School.

At the present time, no formal organization within the staff is set up to handle crisis cases and drop-in counseling. We recommend that the Group Residence seriously consider the feasibility of assigning one counseling position to handle both crisis placements and drop-in counseling. If this counselor was not assigned any of the regular residents, the project could continue to offer counseling on a crisis or drop-in basis without affecting the counseling commitment to regular residents.

A major programmatic change occurred prior to the opening of the Group Residence. The regular residential program was originally designed to provide a "normal home environment" for the girls placed in the program. The project had planned to hire a live-in couple as house parents. However, this aspect of the project was dropped before the facility opened and was replaced with twenty-four hour staff coverage. Thus, the provision of a normal home environment

never became a reality.

The Group Residence for Juvenile Girls was designed to serve hard-to-place girls from the Minnesota Home School. A similar project for boys had been in operation at the Group Residence for Hard-to-Place Delinquent Juvenile Boys. The latter project had used house parents but had abandoned the concept when it was determined that the hard-to-place clientele put a great burden on the house parents. The Group Residence for Hard-to-Place Delinquent Juvenile Boys changed to twenty-four hour staff coverage and found it more satisfactory than the house parents concept. Because the girls in the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls are "hard-to-place," we think this programmatic change was well thought through and a good decision based on the experiences of similar programs.

The goal of the regular residential program was to provide a residence for the girls until they could "appropriately begin independent living in the community in a responsible manner." Our findings indicate that this goal, which must be considered the major goal of the project, is not being fulfilled as was planned. This conclusion is reached by approaching the problem from a number of directions.

First, we looked at the "reasons for termination" of residence. We considered as successful in the program those girls who had made satisfactory adjustments, had found independent placements, or had returned home. Only 29.1 percent of the thirty-one girls who had terminated their residencies left the program for these reasons. On the other hand, 61.3 percent of the girls were terminated from the program because they had run away from the program, had committed new offenses, or were unable to adjust to the program. Using the reason for leaving as a criterion for whether - in the judgment of the staff - a girl could "appropriately begin independent living in the community in a

responsible manner," we found that only 29.1 percent of the girls met this criterion.

Second, a major focus of the program was to enroll residents in programs which would help them adjust to the community after leaving the Group Residence. While they were in the program, there were two major types of activities which the girls could pursue: (i) academic programs, and (ii) employment or work-education and training activities. To form a judgment of the effectiveness of this aspect of the project we examined the activities former residents have pursued since they were terminated from the program. We have followup information on twenty-six former residents and their activities both during and after the program.

Given this information, we found that while 73.1 percent of the twenty-six girls were involved in "positive" activities while they were in the program, only 46.2 percent of the twenty-six were pursuing "positive" activities after the program. This indicated a significant drop in the number of girls in "positive" activities. But these percentages do not give a complete picture of before-and-after activities. We also compared the type of activity a girl had in the program with what she had after the program. We found that only 19.2 percent of the twenty-six girls were involved in the same activities (employment-training or academic) that they pursued while in the program. This indicates that there is a low correlation between what a girl does in the program and what she does after it. On the assumption that the program should get girls involved in activities which they will pursue after termination, we find that only 19.2 percent of the former clients fulfill this assumption.

We then examined those who had "positive" activities in the program with

respect to whether they had "positive" activities after the program. Of the nineteen girls who had "positive" activities in the program, only 42.1 percent continued to pursue "positive" activities after the program, while 57.9 percent had no activities after the program. Again we found that there is little correlation between what one does in the program and what one does after the program.

The effectiveness of this aspect of the program was judged, finally, in relation to the activities of the control group. We found that 61.3 percent of the members of the control group were engaged in "positive" activities following release from the correctional institution, while only 46.2 percent of the Group Residence girls were involved in "positive" activities following termination from the program. We have noted that this difference may be accounted for because the control group is younger and has higher intelligence estimates. The younger girls may be more inclined to pursue academic programs and we did find that 41.9 percent of these girls were in academic programs. But we must also keep in mind that Group Residence counselors actively advise and encourage their clients to engage in "positive" activities. Yet we find that Group Residence clients are not as successful in this respect as the girls directly released from the Home School into the community.

We must conclude, therefore, that while the Group Residence does involve girls in "positive" activities while they are in the program, long-term effectiveness of this phase of the program is not supported by the data. We have found (i) that only 19.2 percent of the girls pursue the same activity after they leave the program, (ii) that only 46.2 percent engage in "positive" activities after the program, and (iii) that - on this criterion - the girls who have been in the Group Residence program do not do as well as those girls

who are paroled directly into the community.

Third, we looked at the followup information relative to new offenses by the Group Residence clients and compared this with the information on the control group. We found that 50.0 percent of each group had committed new offenses since the girls were released from the correctional institution. Thus, there is no difference between the Group Residence program and regular parole with respect to commitment of new offenses. We also found no difference between the two groups with respect to replacement in an institution: 38.5 percent of the Group Residence girls have been in correctional institutions since they were terminated from the program, while 38.7 percent of the control group have been in institutions since they were paroled. Thus, we must conclude that on two measures of recidivism - new offenses and returns to the institution - there is no difference between the experimental group which was exposed to the Group Residence program and the control group.

We have examined the goal of providing a residence for girls until they could "appropriately begin independent living in the community in a responsible manner." Using the "reasons for termination" from the Group Residence as a criterion, we found that the majority of residents had "reasons for termination" which were unsatisfactory. Using the criterion of "positive" activities, we found that enrolling girls in "positive" activities is not very effective in terms of whether the girls pursue "positive" activities after they leave the program. Finally, we found that, in terms of the criterion of new offenses, there is no difference between the experimental and control groups. We must conclude that the Group Residence has not been very effective in providing a residence for girls until they can begin living in the community in a responsible manner.

We recommend that the staff of the Group Residence re-examine the phase of the program which involves enrolling girls in "positive" activities. Since only 19.2 percent of the girls in the followup group continued in the same type of activity, we must ask whether girls simply enroll in a program with no intention of pursuing it once they are released from the facility. The relationship between what a girl does in the program and what she does after it should be stronger than present evidence indicates.

We also recommend that the staff of the Group Residence try to determine why such a high percentage of girls (38.7 percent with N=31) leave the program as runaways. Our findings show that more girls have run away from the program than have succeeded in the program. Finding out why these girls ran away and taking steps to correct this situation may lead to significant improvements in program success.

#### Comments on our analysis:

Perhaps the most interesting aspects of our analysis were those in which we compared the experimental and control groups. Some comments on this comparison are necessary. First, the two groups were composed of girls who were on parole. The followup methodology involved solicitation of information from the girls' parole officers. While in this respect - parole status at release from the institution or from the program - the two groups are comparable, it is not true that all the girls who were residents in the Group Residence were on parole. Thus, the followup group may not be wholly representative of the Group Residence clientele.

Second, as was noted in our analysis of the follow-up, we compared the experimental and control groups on ten variables which are independent of the

Group Residence program. We found statistically significant differences between the two groups with respect to (i) age, (ii) intelligence estimate, and (iii) type of commitment offense. Specifically, we found that the girls in the experimental group were older, had lower intelligence estimates, and were likely to have been committed for juvenile offenses. We did not find any difference between the two groups with respect to mean grade level. However, if mean grade level is a function of age and intelligence, this variable might also show a significant difference between the two groups. In any case, the experimental and control groups had significant differences with respect to 30 percent (and possibly 40 percent) of the independent variables used to compare them. Thus, we must conclude that the given group of girls paroled directly into the community is not a control group representative of girls in the experimental program.

This fact is extremely important. While we found no differences between the experimental and control groups with respect to new offenses and returns to institutions, we must admit that we were comparing two different groups. This problem illustrates the importance of having a representative control group. What we can conclude from the information we have is that those who went through the Group Residence program did no better and no worse than a group of younger, more intelligent girls who were less likely to be committed for juvenile offenses. What we cannot say is whether the girls in the experimental group did better or worse than a similar set of girls who did not go through the program.

Finally, we should point out that most of this report deals with the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls during the first eight months of operation. Since that time there has been a major change in the operation of the program with the resignation of the original director and hiring of a new director. This report does not deal with any changes which have or will be made under Ms.



Graves. However, we may expect some changes because each project director will do some things in different ways than others might and because the project is now a year old in operation and experience. What changes have occurred for these two reasons will be considered in our final report on the Group Residence for Juvenile Girls.