

**CHILDREN AND YOUTH: 1989–92**

**Findings and Conclusions of the Staff of the  
Joint State Government Commission  
Pursuant to Senate Resolution 11 of 1989**

General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

August 1993

---

**The Joint State Government Commission was created by act of July 1, 1937 (P.L.2460, No.459) as amended, as a continuing agency for the development of facts and recommendations on all phases of government for the use of the General Assembly.**

---

# JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION, 1993

---

## OFFICERS

Roger A. Madigan, Chairman  
Ivan Itkin, Treasurer

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### Senate Members

Robert J. Mellow  
President Pro Tempore

J. William Lincoln  
Majority Leader

Robert C. Jubelirer  
Minority Leader

Leonard J. Bodack  
Majority Whip

F. Joseph Loeper  
Minority Whip

Michael A. O'Pake  
Chairman, Majority Caucus

D. Michael Fisher  
Chairman, Minority Caucus

### House Members

H. William DeWeese  
Speaker

Ivan Itkin  
Majority Leader

Matthew J. Ryan  
Minority Leader

Mark B. Cohen  
Majority Whip

John M. Perzel  
Minority Whip

Jeffrey W. Coy  
Chairman, Majority Caucus

Richard A. Geist  
Chairman, Minority Caucus

## MEMBER EX-OFFICIO

Roger A. Madigan, Commission Chairman

---

Conrad C. M. Arensberg, Counsel

David L. Hostetter, Assistant Counsel

---

# **TASK FORCE ON SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND YOUTH**

---

## SENATE MEMBERS

James C. Greenwood, Chairman\*

Anthony B. Andrezeski

Michael E. Bortner

John D. Hopper\*

Charles D. Lemmond Jr.

Michael A. O'Pake

Allyson Y. Schwartz

## HOUSE MEMBERS

Ted Stuban, Vice Chairman\*

Lois Sherman Hagarty\*

Ivan Itkin

Allen G. Kukovich

Kenneth E. Lee

George E. Saurman

Samuel H. Smith

Donald W. Snyder

Leona G. Telek\*

Peter C. Wambach\*

Anthony Hardy Williams

\*No longer a member of the General Assembly.

# CONTENTS

---

INTRODUCTION .....	1
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	3
Funding .....	3
Quarterly Advance Payments .....	4
Recruitment and Retention of Caseworkers .....	6
Amendments to the Child Protective Services Law .....	10
Management Information System .....	11
TESTIMONY .....	15
Coordinated Planning for Delinquent Services in Philadelphia ..	21
APPENDIX A – SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 11 .....	25
APPENDIX B – LIST OF WITNESSES .....	29
APPENDIX C – BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	37

## INTRODUCTION

---

The General Assembly of Pennsylvania on April 25, 1989, adopted Senate Resolution No. 11, Printer's No. 980, that directed the Joint State Government Commission ". . . to update the study concluded in 1975 of all services rendered to children relative to problems of abuse, delinquency, dependency, neglect and mental health." In accordance with the resolution, a task force of 18 House and Senate members chaired by Senator James C. Greenwood was appointed.

At the organizational meeting of the task force on July 19, 1989 it was noted that social service personnel have complained that State mandates for services had exceeded funding and that a review of the funding of programs was in order. Moreover, there had been an increase in child sex abuse cases and in the number of children receiving overlapping services from children and youth, mental health and probation services. All these factors had placed excessive demands on public and private agencies. A study that would result in a comprehensive approach to the needs of children was subsequently called for.

Accordingly, the task force decided to schedule a set of public hearings across the Commonwealth to hear from service providers, advocates, local and State government officials, community leaders and consumers of service. Six public hearings were subsequently conducted where witnesses provided testimony on children and family issues that pertained to dependency, delinquency, mental health and drug and alcohol services, in addition to the special problems faced by children, families and social service agencies in Philadelphia. A list of witnesses and those who submitted written comments and the organizations they represent can be found in Appendix B.

During the course of the study the task force conducted visits to programs operated by city, county, State and private service providers for dependents and delinquents in the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh metropolitan areas. St. Vincent's Home and Shelter, the Philadelphia

Youth Study Center, Bensalem Youth Development Center and Glen Mills School for Boys were visited in the Philadelphia area. In Allegheny County the task force toured Allegheny Academy, Shuman Youth Detention Center and an intensive community treatment program for delinquents.

At the beginning of the study the task force held a meeting with staff and clients from Dauphin County Children and Youth Agency in an effort to gain insight into the problems faced by caseworkers and their clients in county children and youth agencies. A workshop on the risk assessment evaluation process was held in Harrisburg in July of 1990; a meeting in Pittsburgh with juvenile court judges was held in September, 1990.

To identify major issues, the task force instructed that questionnaires be designed for local children and youth agencies, juvenile probation offices, and State agencies that serve children and their families.

Commission staff searched the literature and reviewed child protective service systems in Pennsylvania and in other states. In 1990 the task force examined child abuse laws in 10 selected states to compare definitions of abuse, statutory language regarding designated mandated reporters, and the system used to report and investigate child abuse complaints.

At the final meeting of the task force held on Wednesday, February 12, 1992 members proposed a number of recommendations regarding the children and youth dependency system in Pennsylvania.

## **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

County children and youth agencies, the local administrative agencies that manage services for dependent, at-risk, neglected and abused children and their families in each county of the Commonwealth, have been confronted with a variety of administrative and programmatic problems that have hampered their effectiveness. These considerations pertain to agency cash-flow concerns, difficulty in the recruitment and retention of a professional work force, statutory constraints imposed by the Child Protective Services Law and the lack of a standard Statewide management information system to track client, service provider, and funding data.

### **FUNDING**

Philadelphia, Allegheny County, the Pennsylvania Association of County Commissioners and the Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth brought a lawsuit<sup>1</sup> in April 1990 against the Commonwealth to compel full State funding for Act 148.<sup>2</sup> An agreement was reached out of court in May 1990 which required that beginning in fiscal year 1990-91 the Governor would request an additional \$10 million for Act 148 services, over what had already been requested. This additional funding was to be distributed based on "relative cumulative overmatch" from 1984-85 through 1989-90. An overmatch is defined as the allowable expenditure by counties that exceed their State Act 148 allocation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Philadelphia v. Department of Public Welfare, 139 M.D. 1990.

<sup>2</sup>The act of July 9, 1976 (P.L.846, No.148) amended the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as The Public Welfare Code, by establishing new funding formulas for children's services to counties from the Commonwealth to encourage the development of community programs.



Based on the terms of the settlement, beginning in fiscal year 1991-92, the Governor's budget proposal was to include full funding for the State share for Act 148 services. For overmatch incurred by counties in 1990-91, the State agreed to reimburse 50 percent of the overmatch amount, to a maximum of \$30 million. The reimbursement to counties for the 1990-91 overmatch was to be paid out over a five-year period beginning in 1991-92.

The agreement also required that, beginning in 1991-92, counties forward a needs-based budget request for children and youth services to the Department of Public Welfare. Counties were to document within their budget request certifiable expenditures to show their need for additional funding. The Department was to begin reviewing counties' needs-based budget requests and forward recommendations to the Governor and the Secretary of the Budget based on the aggregate amount of the counties' projected costs deemed reimbursable. The Governor's Office was to then forward this information to the General Assembly. Needs-based budgets were to be based on estimates of the number of abused, neglected and delinquent children. Table 1 compares 1991-92 allocations and the estimated 1992-93 needs-based budget allocations for county children and youth agencies. The State established a maximum expenditure amount per child, by category of service, for which it would begin to pay a portion of the cost.

### QUARTERLY ADVANCE PAYMENTS

Based on the testimony of numerous county children and youth administrators it became evident that there is a need to revise the current disbursement procedure used by the Department of Public Welfare to fund county children and youth agencies.

Unlike other local public social service agencies, such as county mental health and retardation agencies that receive State funding at the beginning of each quarter, county children and youth agencies receive reimbursement at the end of each quarter. According to administrators of these programs this current fiscal disbursement procedure has created cash flow problems, hampering efforts to plan and fund services. The task force recommended that the Department of Public Welfare pay the annual

Table 1

**COMPARISON OF 1991-92 ALLOCATION  
AND THE ESTIMATED 1992-93 NEEDS BASED BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR COUNTY CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS**

County	Act 148 allocations	1992-93 Act 148 needs based budget allocations	Percentage difference	County	Act 148 allocations	1992-93 Act 148 needs based budget allocations	Percentage difference
Adams	\$1,190,733	\$1,467,402	23.2%	Luzerne	\$4,261,874	\$5,424,521	27.3%
Allegheny	34,047,877	40,673,911	19.5	Lycoming	2,303,394	2,594,524	12.6
Armstrong	909,801	1,198,965	31.8	McKean	780,361	639,530	-18.1
Beaver	1,564,883	2,147,130	37.2	Mercer	1,696,950	1,615,325	-4.8
Bedford	401,507	444,909	10.8	Mifflin	368,973	353,668	-4.2
Berks	6,018,297	7,317,731	21.6	Monroe	1,825,898	2,116,048	15.9
Blair	1,642,290	1,648,132	0.4	Montgomery	10,569,727	12,200,564	15.4
Bradford	872,328	1,016,840	16.6	Montour	222,823	198,427	-11.0
Bucks	5,613,481	5,909,884	5.3	Northampton	5,101,277	5,926,856	16.2
Butler	1,344,019	1,581,732	17.7	Northumberland	869,323	1,187,443	36.6
Cambria	2,108,260	2,389,454	13.3	Perry	312,038	340,985	9.3
Cameron	137,073	128,984	-5.9	Philadelphia	100,202,903	89,833,942	-10.4
Carbon	628,579	720,074	14.6	Pike	254,002	406,315	60.0
Centre	1,237,067	1,330,986	7.6	Potter	297,158	327,812	10.3
Chester	7,066,464	8,332,772	17.9	Schuylkill	1,617,591	1,760,904	8.9
Clarion	467,541	345,536	-26.1	Snyder	448,919	525,281	17.0
Clearfield	901,168	709,549	-21.3	Somerset	1,226,423	1,378,840	12.4
Cifinton	357,103	334,764	-6.3	Sullivan	116,026	119,708	3.2
Columbia	616,077	791,292	28.4	Susquehanna	652,762	762,536	16.8
Crawford	1,291,841	1,661,387	28.6	Tioga	898,811	757,130	-15.8
Cumberland	1,148,799	1,370,551	19.3	Union	376,000	437,705	16.4
Dauphin	3,520,605	4,086,563	16.1	Venango	594,468	346,167	-41.8
Delaware	8,815,688	9,395,048	6.6	Warren	898,274	1,201,561	33.8
Elk	371,670	344,959	-7.2	Washington	1,931,799	1,885,453	-2.4
Eric	6,048,940	6,342,460	4.9	Wayne	576,045	596,980	3.6
Fayette	1,356,906	1,084,874	-20.1	Westmoreland	6,175,333	7,484,873	21.3
Forest	134,213	144,977	8.0	Wyoming	361,447	437,600	31.0
Franklin	1,094,780	1,384,727	26.5	York	6,165,838	6,814,383	10.5
Fulton	126,937	84,101	-33.8				
Greene	545,049	451,820	-17.1	Subtotal	258,799,228	269,280,392	4.1
Huntingdon	712,212	679,306	-4.6	Adjustments <sup>1</sup>	--	-3,500,000	--
Indiana	782,071	669,443	-14.4	Subtotal	258,799,288	265,780,392	2.7
Jefferson	650,574	709,984	9.1	Federal funding <sup>2</sup>	-30,859,500	-30,491,650	--
Juniata	192,941	213,954	10.9	State Total	\$227,939,728	\$235,288,742	3.2%
Lackawanna	2,479,525	2,679,003	8.1				
Lancaster	4,535,986	4,768,981	5.1				
Lawrence	1,019,838	1,010,204	-1.0				
Lebanon	954,755	531,879	-44.0				
Lehigh	4,784,913	5,462,043	14.2				

1. The Department of Welfare anticipates savings of \$2.2 million due to adjusting YDC/YFC interim to actual per diems and \$1.3 million in estimated underexpenditures.

2. Federal Title IV-B are treated as State funds for allocation purposes. The YDC/YFC funds were merged with the State allocations then the estimated local share of YDC/YFC costs are deducted to arrive at the net State total.

SOURCE: Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, November 15, 1991.

reimbursement to county institution districts or their successors in four equal quarterly advanced installments that would be reconciled at the end of the fiscal year. This change has not come to fruition.<sup>3</sup>

## RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF CASEWORKERS

A review of the responses from county children and youth administrators to a Commission questionnaire as well as testimony offered during public hearings on child welfare issues indicated that the county children and youth system has been faced with personnel problems related to recruitment and retention of qualified staff.

One administrator pointed out that on any given day 25 percent<sup>4</sup> of all approved positions in the public children and youth agencies are vacant.

A juvenile court judge expressed his concern about the high turnover rate of young inexperienced caseworkers in public children and youth agencies and the impact this situation has had on the quality of service delivery. He contrasted the children and youth system with the more stable one that exists within the juvenile probation field and attributed the burnout of caseworkers to poor training, large caseloads and demanding cases.

A witness who represented private children and youth agencies pointed out that employees working in the private sector earn less than their counterparts in public children and youth agencies and noted that private children and youth agencies have higher staff turnover and many vacancies that create high staff/client ratios.

---

<sup>3</sup>See for example 1989 SB 379, Pr.'s No. 392, which would amend the Public Welfare Code to provide for reimbursement to counties for child welfare services on a quarterly basis. The Department of Public Welfare Planning and Financial Reimbursement Requirements for County Children and Youth Social Service programs, 55 Pa. Code Ch. 3140 (Payment to Counties), now authorizes an advance payment schedule in which 12.5 percent of the money due each quarter is given out at the beginning of each quarter.

<sup>4</sup>Anecdotal evidence from the Department of Public Welfare's Personnel Office indicates that vacancies are not necessarily related to being unable to find a suitable individual to fill a position. Counties have been known to put freezes on hiring and spending monies to fill vacancies.

Table 2 examines average caseloads, salaries and turnover rates between county children and youth agencies and juvenile probation agencies in fiscal year 1988-89. Aggregate figures indicate a turnover rate among children and youth staff that is more than double that of juvenile probation staff (22.5 vs. 9.4).<sup>5</sup> This high turnover rate supports the anecdotal evidence offered by the juvenile court judge who expressed concern about the lack of continuity in many casework staffs within children and youth agencies.

While the average salary of children and youth workers is about 15 percent below that of their probation counterparts, no correlation was found to exist in agencies between average salaries and turnover rates. The figures in table 2 under children and youth caseload reflect children, not families. Department regulations refer to a 1:30 ratio of casemanagers to families. Caseworkers not only have responsibility for siblings within a family unit who may be in different placements, but also with the parents in an effort to strengthen the family unit, when possible.<sup>6</sup>

Besides the relatively low average salaries of the caseworkers and the fact that caseworkers must work with entire family units, other significant qualitative factors must also be taken into account before conclusions can be drawn about differences in turnover rates between juvenile probation officers and child welfare child care staff. The expectations for each case in the probation system are clearly defined, thus reducing any ambiguity in the minds of probation officers and the Court. Juvenile probation officers work to prevent juveniles from recommitting crimes. Juvenile probation officers' caseloads can vary, but to help them insure some success in their work the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission have reduced staff-to-client ratios for certain staff assigned to aftercare programs to ratios of 1:18 or 1:25. The same clarity of purpose cannot be found among county children and youth caseworkers who regularly encounter overwhelming workloads. Since each case in the children and

---

<sup>5</sup>According to personnel within the Department of Public Welfare, by 1993 as a result of changes within the job market in Pennsylvania the turnover rate within county children and youth agencies had fallen by 5 to 7 percent. Workers are tending to stay longer in positions and applications for employment are generally up across the Commonwealth.

<sup>6</sup>Regulations pertaining to needs-based budgeting have been promulgated to allow county children and youth agencies to reduce their caseworker to family ratios annually by one family per caseworker until the agency has reached an optimum 1:15 ratio.

Table 2

A COMPARISON OF AVERAGE CASELOAD,<sup>1</sup> AVERAGE SALARY AND TURNOVER RATES<sup>2</sup>  
BETWEEN COUNTY CHILDREN AND YOUTH AGENCIES AND JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICES  
1988-89

County	Children and youth agencies			Juvenile probation offices			County	Children and youth agencies			Juvenile probation offices		
	Average caseload	Average salary	Turnover rate	Average caseload	Average salary	Turnover rate		Average caseload	Average salary	Turnover rate	Average caseload	Average salary	Turnover rate
Adams	15	\$17,569	17.6	40	\$17,808	30.0	Lancaster	27	\$20,305	19.6	50	\$22,803	17.1
Allegheny	46	19,857	26.2	38	31,243	8.5	Lawrence	33	15,088	14.3	35	18,570	12.5
Armstrong	25	16,511	16.7	34	16,080	8.3	Lebanon	26	18,866	12.5	38	19,856	20.0
Beaver	30	15,833	21.1	64	22,323	12.5	Lehigh	30	22,899	26.1	45	28,645	5.0
Bedford	15	17,622	14.3	42	16,264	0.0	Luzerne	23	20,520	12.5	48	21,695	0.0
Berks	28	23,406	29.1	69	30,857	5.9	Lycoming	21	19,816	11.4	84	18,863	7.1
Blair	29	15,625	6.3	36	15,336	15.0	McKean	25	13,590	54.5	28	18,293	0.0
Bradford	29	19,066	0.0	30	20,643	12.5	Mercer	37	19,725	11.1	30	20,441	18.8
Bucks	24	23,932	22.4	50	25,013	4.8	Mifflin	41	12,993	16.7	21	15,720	0.0
Butler	30	17,770	14.3	35	19,388	6.2	Monroe	19	19,603	8.0	--	20,000	0.0
Cambria	24	16,890	24.1	25	20,080	22.1	Montgomery	27	19,080	25.0	33	24,588	7.8
Cameron	65	13,500	0.0	23	17,800	0.0	Montour	38	14,786	20.0	14	14,350	16.5
Carbon	30	14,874	50.0	53	14,564	25.0	Northampton	64	23,372	24.5	53	21,909	8.3
Centre	18	19,005	0.0	33	21,500	7.1	Northumberland	22	14,230	38.7	29	16,481	32.6
Chester	13	17,149	13.9	37	20,300	16.7	Perry	46	15,225	20.0	43	17,410	33.3
Clarion	15	13,425	42.9	30	22,357	50.0	Philadelphia	62	27,766	--	54	31,400	6.5
Clearfield	32	13,396	87.5	36	15,352	25.0	Pike	27	16,904	0.0	16	22,900	12.5
Clinton	16	19,511	20.0	47	16,030	10.0	Potter	56	14,760	20.0	36	16,646	25.0
Columbia	33	16,051	50.0	40	16,500	33.0	Schuylkill	33	17,536	50.0	27	18,546	6.3
Crawford	20	16,068	5.9	55	21,500	0.0	Snyder	65	15,329	50.0	45	14,018	0.0
Cumberland	32	18,344	30.0	30	21,447	5.6	Somerset	22	17,125	27.8	25	22,888	27.8
Dauphin	15	20,529	10.6	33	28,369	13.1	Sullivan	49	16,500	25.0	--	--	--
Delaware	29	22,259	13.7	38	32,872	13.8	Susquehanna	67	15,333	20.0	45	17,350	0.0
Elk	21	15,441	33.3	69	17,595	0.0	Tioga	17	18,772	51.9	13	19,831	0.0
Eric	14	22,443	9.8	32	25,911	6.3	Union	32	17,798	0.0	53	19,655	0.0
Fayette	30	15,199	46.2	83	16,265	0.0	Venango	15	18,271	87.5	--	22,000	0.0
Forest	--	--	--	21	20,600	50.0	Warren	27	16,967	32.0	24	19,368	33.0
Franklin	22	16,819	33.3	41	15,408	20.0	Washington	25	19,679	4.5	73	13,064	5.6
Fulton	26	16,321	0.0	19	15,886	25.0	Wayne	24	18,405	40.0	45	18,500	16.7
Greene	24	14,876	14.3	67	18,554	25.0	Westmoreland	13	19,765	4.7	95	32,321	5.6
Huntingdon	22	12,119	55.6	--	18,847	0.0	Wyoming	20	18,714	0.0	110	19,373	0.0
Indiana	48	15,501	25.0	47	19,041	10.0	York	24	21,470	18.0	29	22,722	0.0
Jefferson	23	15,049	10.0	88	23,201	0.0							
Juniata	59	13,605	0.0	--	16,162	0.0							
Lackawanna	19	16,723	13.9	35	18,850	0.0	Total	35	\$17,628	22.5	40	\$20,301	9.4

1. The average caseload for the county children and youth agencies is calculated by dividing the total number of children served by the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. The data on children is the number of children receiving services as reported by county children and youth agencies during a one-day count to comply with Department of Public Welfare's CY 28 requirement. FTE staff includes caseworker trainees, caseworkers, caseworker supervisors and social workers. The average caseload for the county juvenile probation offices was collected from the Joint State Government Commission Questionnaire sent to the Chief Juvenile Probation Officers.

2. The turnover rate for the county Children and Youth agencies is defined as the number of terminations divided by the number of staff at the beginning of the fiscal year. The turnover rate for the juvenile probation offices is the average of 1988 and 1989 rates.

3. Forest County is a joinder with Warren county.

4. Juvenile probation services were provided by Wyoming-Sullivan County Courts until January 1990.

SOURCE: Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Bureau of Personnel; Joint State Government Commission Questionnaire to Philadelphia; Joint State Government Commission Questionnaire to the Chief Juvenile Probation Officers; Juvenile Court Judges' Commission.

youth system represents a family, each new birth to a family in a caseload increases the work of the caseworker. A caseworker often has responsibility for all children placed in out-of-home placements in various areas of the State in addition to those children in the natural home. Duties very often require the caseworker to work with the natural parents to verify that they are complying with a plan that will reunite the family. New cases greatly outnumber those cases that are closed each year. One witness indicated that it is not unusual for caseworkers to keep open a number of easier cases indefinitely to allow time to focus on more involved family situations.

In an effort to reduce the high turnover rate at county children and youth agencies and attempt to provide more attention to the children being served, the task force recommended that maximum staff to client ratios in public agencies be cut in half from 1:30 to 1:15.<sup>7</sup>

The task force recommended a loan forgiveness program for caseworkers<sup>8</sup> as a way to draw prospective employees with newly obtained degrees in social and behavioral sciences into county children and youth agencies and private children and youth programs. Neither the maximum amount of loan forgiveness per person, nor the number of persons who could qualify for assistance, were decided upon.

The reduced staff-client ratio and loan forgiveness proposals were attempts by the task force to upgrade the level of care within the

---

<sup>7</sup>1993 HB 1001, Pr.'s No. 1207, contains language that would require the Department of Public Welfare, by regulation, to establish staff-to-family ratios for "the various activities required of the county agency . . . including reports and investigations of suspected child abuse, risk assessment and the provision or monitoring services to abused children and their families," (Section 6361) and "for the receipt and assessment of reports of children in need of protective services and for the provision of services to neglected children and their families," (Section 6375).

<sup>8</sup>See for example 1993 SB 527, Pr.'s No. 564. Effective July 23, 1992 the federal Higher Education Amendments of 1992 (P.L.102-320) include provisions that "any current student who receives a loan under the Federal Perkins Loan Program after July 23, 1992 is eligible to have that loan obligation reduced or eliminated if that student later becomes a full-time employee of an agency serving high-risk children and families from low-income communities.

children and youth agency by attracting new personnel and maintaining existing professional staff.<sup>9</sup>

## AMENDMENTS TO THE CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES LAW

The task force reviewed the implications of amending the definition of child abuse in the Child Protective Services Law (23 Pa.C.S. Ch. 63) (hereafter CPSL). In formulating its recommendations the task force concluded that broadening the definition of abuse to bring Pennsylvania's statutes into conformity with the definition of "abuse and neglect" in the Federal Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974, would place added pressure on an already overwhelmed child welfare system.

Those opposed to expanding the definition of abuse pointed to the steady increase in reported child abuse cases in Pennsylvania under the current definition of abuse. In 1976 in Philadelphia, caseworkers received and investigated 1,738 ChildLine reports; by 1989 the figure had grown to 4,500 reports.

The task force proposed an amendment to address "imminent risk," when a child is in great risk of injury and only through chance has not been harmed. The definition of child abuse would be amended to include "any nonaccidental act or failure to act that presents or presented an imminent risk of serious physical injury."

The second change would modify the definition of sexual abuse as it pertains to child pornography. The CPSL defines sexual abuse, in part, as "the obscene or pornographic filming or depiction of children for commercial purposes." According to a study by the Attorney General, Violence Against Children, "Most child pornography available in the United States is the homemade handiwork of child molesters, produced not for sale, but for collection, seduction, blackmail or exchange."<sup>10</sup> The task force proposed that language in the statute be changed to reflect this emphasis

---

<sup>9</sup>Department of Public Welfare staff have reported that there has been a recent decline in staff turnover within county children and youth agencies and an increase in the number of applicants for casework positions. Anecdotal evidence points to changes in the employment market to support such trends.

<sup>10</sup>Violence Against Children, Attorney General's Family Violence Task Force, January 1987, p. 31.

on the exploitation of children instead of on the commercial sale of the pornography. The current language in 23 Pa.C.S. § 6303 relating to "the obscene or pornographic photographing, filming or depiction of children for commercial purposes" would be deleted to bring about this change.<sup>11</sup>

## MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

The Commission staff obtained data from county children and youth agencies, juvenile probation offices and State agencies that serve children. The response to the survey revealed that: 1) data is not maintained in a uniform fashion; 2) the level of sophistication in information retrieval varies from county to county; 3) there is no data on the total number of children served; 4) there is no way to determine if a client is in more than one service at a time; and 5) there is no way to determine from the data if clients have benefited from programs.

A review of the reporting procedures used by the Department indicated that it has failed to obtain the following types of information from counties:

1. The numbers of juveniles in placement in the State Youth Development Centers and Forestry Camps (YDCs/YFCs) as well as days in placement for each youth. The State YDCs and YFCs count the number of juveniles by an annual census on a given day, by using an average daily attendance procedure.
2. For contracts where an annual sum is paid to an institution, the number of children and the units of service (hours, sessions and days).
3. In reasonable fee entries, detailed completion of the fee for service schedule.
4. When legal services are provided, the hours of service and number of children served, cost per child served and total cost.

---

<sup>11</sup>See 1993 HB 1001, Pr.'s No. 955, which contains these two amendments to the CPSL.



5. When medical services are provided, the number of children served and amount of medical services provided, cost per child served and total cost.
6. An accurate count of the number of children served.
7. Information that shows each time a juvenile is placed in delinquency and dependency programs.
8. An accurate daily count of all juvenile delinquency and dependency placements.

In fiscal year 1991–92, the Department received an allocation of \$800,000 under the act of August 4, 1991 (P.L.484, No.7A), known as the General Appropriation Act of 1991 to update its management information system in order to begin to comply with new Federal reporting requirements. The process of developing a request for proposal and screening vendors has delayed the implementation of these changes. Subsequently, the funds were rolled over into fiscal year 1992–93. According to the Department of Public Welfare a vendor has been tentatively selected to install equipment and software within the State system. Title IV–B<sup>12</sup> funds are to be used by county children and youth agencies to purchase the necessary equipment and modify existing systems to link up with the new State system.

Once the new system is in place, 20 counties are to participate in a one–year pilot program using the new database. Until this comes about, the Department and counties will continue to collect data in the same manner as when the task force began its study in 1989. This process has hampered the Department's efforts to adequately evaluate needs–based budgets submitted by county children and youth agencies.

Essentially, a data system should be designed to easily retrieve information. Each child served should have an identity number, preferably a social security number, so that a child's total treatment and placement history would be available along with additional information, such as age, sex and current status, i.e., dependent or delinquent, along with some indication of condition such as mentally retarded, mentally ill, alcohol or drug dependent and so forth, so that an accurate assessment of children

---

<sup>12</sup>Social Security Act, 1935 c. 531, Title IV–B, § 420 et seq.

with several ailments could be made and treatment funds could be allocated from the mental retardation, mental health or drug and alcohol budgets.

A senior policy analyst for the Center for the Study of Social Policy who testified in 1990 noted that Pennsylvania had already lost \$70 million of Title IV-E<sup>13</sup> funds during the 1980s because of poor accounting practices which failed to document certain reimbursable expenditures.

The task force recommended that the Department of Public Welfare gain control over how State dollars are being used to insure that taxpayers are not overpaying for services and that clients are receiving the care they need.

---

<sup>13</sup>Social Security Act, 1935 c. 531, Title IV-E, § 470 et seq.

## TESTIMONY

---

During the two hearings on juvenile delinquency the task force was presented with proposals from witnesses regarding juvenile probation, community treatment alternatives, public and private institutions, juvenile detention centers and accountability.

A number of witnesses proposed that the State should provide 80 percent of the funding of the staff salaries of juvenile probation officers.<sup>14</sup> The level of reimbursement would be commensurate to what is included by statute for State reimbursement for adult probation officers. Juvenile probation officers have about 14 percent of their salaries reimbursed by the State. Witnesses differed as to what agency should administer these funds and which funding stream should be used to cover the added State responsibility.

Proponents of this change suggested that with more State funding being funneled to cover the cost of juvenile probation officers, additional probation officers would be hired and used to establish new diversionary programs, thus reducing the number of youth in expensive residential placements.

Task force members were to take into account statutory provisions which require the State to reimburse counties 80 percent of the cost of adult probation officers' salaries. The actual percentage the State has reimbursed counties has consistently gone down over the years. Currently, the reimbursement is less than 50 percent of the cost of adult probation officer's salaries. Funding for juvenile probation services has been reduced as well in recent years.

Court officials and advocates for troubled youth also proposed the creation of more specialized community residential alternative programs to serve recalcitrant juveniles who have a history of drug and alcohol abuse,

---

<sup>14</sup>See HB 24, Pr.'s No. 14, Session 1991.

mental illness, retardation or sexual offenses. These programs would attempt to place juveniles closer to their own communities whenever possible. Advocates for change proposed the development and implementation of a comprehensive aftercare and reintegration process for juvenile offenders involving counseling, life skills, education and intensive probation services.

Critics of the current shortage of privately operated smaller specialized programs pointed to the Report of the Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice Task Force which called for "the Department of Public Welfare and Juvenile Court Judges' Commission to study the feasibility of a 'certification of need—like' system for the allocation of private sector treatment beds."<sup>15</sup> Private agencies operating under this system would be required to accept juveniles committed by the court.

Witnesses who endorsed transition services for those youth released from residential placement back into their communities, have explained to the task force there is a significant decrease in the recidivism rates in those counties that have implemented aftercare transition programs.

While aftercare programs vary from county to county, most are in place for six months following the youth's release and involve a probation officer visiting with the juvenile, his parents or guardian and, when appropriate, school officials and employers.

In reviewing the State operated juvenile institutional system, task force members heard witnesses testify as to how the system should be modified. Witnesses concluded that many juveniles can be served in either privately operated, community or institutional programs. In 1991 approximately 50 percent of the youth placed in the Youth Development/Youth Forestry Camp (YDC/YFC) system had not been designated for security units and were possible candidates for privately operated programs. Some critics argued that from one—third to half of the juveniles in secure care could be served in the private sector in less restrictive programs.

The advantage of such private placements could include lower per diem costs, placements closer to a youth's home and in smaller programs where a juvenile could get more individualized attention. It was noted that

---

<sup>15</sup>Towards the Year 2000: A Blueprint for Excellence, the Report of the Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice Task Force, October 1, 1991.

those juveniles placed in a private nonprofit facility who meet income eligibility standards are eligible for Federal Title IV-E and medical assistance reimbursement. Federal reimbursement is not available for juveniles placed in State facilities or in profit making programs.

Table 3 compares the number of juvenile delinquency dispositions resulting in placement in Philadelphia and in the other counties of the State from 1981 to 1991. There was a significant increase in placement for Philadelphia and downward trend in placements for other counties of the State. Total placements increased by 71 percent from 1,324 to 2,267 for Philadelphia from 1981 to 1991. For the same period of time, placements fell 6 percent from 3,083 to 2,896 for the rest of the State.

There appears to be a trend toward the use of community-based placements and private institutional placements.<sup>16</sup> This has been reflected by the drop in institutional placements, particularly to the YDC/YFC system. A 33 percent decrease occurred in YDC/YFC placements by Philadelphia into nonsecure units from 1981 to 1991. A 57 percent reduction of similar YDC/YFC placements occurred in the other counties of the State during the same time period. The reason the YDCs/YFCs are at capacity even though placements are down may be attributed to a reduction of beds in the State system and the longer length of stays particularly for juveniles from Philadelphia and for juveniles given determinate sentences of three or four years by other counties.

Witnesses expressed their support for a longer school year for residents of YDCs/YFCs and juvenile detention centers.

Testimony pointed to a need for closer oversight of wilderness programs which could involve the development of programmatic regulations that would address issues specific to outward bound experiences. Regulations should include a provision for periodic visits by

---

<sup>16</sup>In 1990 as a result of Commonwealth Court's "Castille Decision," Philadelphia v. Department of Public Welfare, 2533 C.D. 1988, which resulted in a decrease in the population of the Philadelphia Youth Study Center and increased emphasis on getting adjudicated juveniles placed in care as soon as possible, the Department of Public Welfare saw the need to contract with private providers of service to divert referrals from the city to other residential programs. Six hundred to 650 slots have been arranged in programs to accommodate these referrals. The decrease in referrals from Philadelphia to the YDC/YFC system came about as a result of this action.

Table 3

**JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PLACEMENTS<sup>1</sup> IN PHILADELPHIA AND OTHER COUNTIES  
1981 TO 1991**

	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1991	Percentage change 1981-91
<b>Total placement,</b>							
Philadelphia	1,324	1,041	1,230	1,641	1,962	2,267	71.2%
Rest of State	3,083	2,450	2,471	2,560	2,627	2,896	-6.1
Total	4,407	3,491	3,701	4,201	4,589	5,163	17.2
<b>Institutional placement,<sup>2</sup></b>							
Philadelphia	1,108	na	771	1,018	1,209	1,220	10.1
Rest of State	1,645	1,133	977	833	1,146	1,187	-27.8
Total	2,753	1,133	1,748	1,851	2,355	2,407	-12.6
<b>Public placement,</b>							
Philadelphia	393	na	205	263	217	263	-33.1
Rest of State	852	352	330	252	331	363	-57.4
Total	1,245	352	535	515	548	626	-49.7
<b>Private placement,</b>							
Philadelphia	715	na	566	755	992	957	33.8
Rest of State	793	781	647	581	815	824	3.9
Total	1,508	781	1,213	1,336	1,807	1,781	18.1
<b>Community-based placement<sup>3</sup></b>							
Philadelphia	216	na	459	623	753	1,047	384.7
Rest of State	1,438	1,317	1,494	1,727	1,481	1,709	18.8
Total	1,654	2,358	1,953	2,350	2,234	2,756	66.6

1. The number of placements is the total number of juvenile delinquency dispositions resulting in placements. A disposition is defined by the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission as a referral disposed by the probation department and/or the court.

2. Institutional placements include juveniles in nonsecure beds.

3. Community-based placements include juveniles in group homes, foster care, drug and alcohol programs, independent living, security programs, wilderness programs and other programs.

na. Not applicable.

SOURCE: Juvenile Court Judges Commission, Juvenile Statistics Division, Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Dispositions, various years.

probation staff, since juveniles in these programs are often kept in isolated areas of Pennsylvania or taken outside of the State and placed in situations and settings that can be both physically and emotionally demanding. In these programs juveniles are often away from probation officers and families for extended periods of time. Since Pennsylvania began sending juveniles to these adventure experiences, six youths have died while in placement.

The issue of accountability repeatedly arose as task force members heard testimony calling for the issuance of annual reports by the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission and the Department of Public Welfare regarding persons served and the effectiveness of family preservation, intensive probation and aftercare services. These critics expressed their frustration at the lack of a viable management information system within the Department. Another proposal that would insure oversight of juveniles in programs called for the amendment of the interstate compact to require monthly visits of probation personnel to out-of-state programs serving Pennsylvania residents. No proposal was forthcoming requiring other states that use Pennsylvania facilities to visit their placements on a regular basis.

A number of parents recounted having to relinquish custody of their children to the court in an effort to obtain treatment within a residential setting.<sup>17</sup> Public administrators addressed the problem of finding suitable alternatives to residential placements for children with mental health problems. They discussed where the State could obtain additional funding for children's mental health services and which State agency should administer these services for children. Much of the testimony contained calls for a comprehensive system of care for children with mental health problems that would take into account their specific concerns which are often different from those faced by adults in the mental health system.

---

<sup>17</sup>According to the director of the Bureau of Children's Services of the Department of Public Welfare's Office of Mental Health, no parent since January 1993 has had to relinquish custody of a child who has been determined to have only mental health problems. Medical assistance is now being used by the Office of Mental Health to insure that children can be served in the mental health system instead of the children and youth system where relinquishment of custody must occur if a child is to receive residential services outside of his home. Medical assistance reimbursement is being used to supplement State funding in certain instances for treatment, room and board and for intensive case management services within the community.

The Department of Public Welfare proposed that more funding could conceivably be provided to the mental health system to allow it to provide or purchase specialized residential services for children. Placements within the mental health system would not be based on parental incapacity, abuse or neglect but rather on the mental health criteria of the child.

One witness recommended that mental health placements still be made to the children and youth system, but that the Juvenile Act be amended to add a new category covering the "MH only" child. This would cover the approximately 500 children each year placed in the children and youth residential system diagnosed only with mental health problems. The children come from families where they have not been abused or neglected. Under this new category parents would not relinquish legal custody.

Other witnesses who were aware of the lack of services for children with a mental illness within the mental health system and of parental custody problems within the children and youth system proposed the creation of less restrictive services where custody would not become an issue. These included the creation of 25 family-based programs in each county/joinder in the State, respite care services and intensive case management services.

Testimony called for the closure of the children's units within the State mental hospitals and the subsequent transfer of these institutional funds to community services. Since the hearings, the children's unit at Allentown State hospital has been closed.

A number of witnesses discussed the general shortage of funding for mental health services for children. Proposals were made at the hearing that would attempt to maximize federal funding. Witnesses suggested financing strategies to maximize Medicaid funding for residential treatment facilities as family-based mental health services and mobile crisis intervention teams. The Department of Public Welfare proposed coordinated programming using federal funding wherever possible to create flexible, noncategorical funding pools. It also proposed shifting of dollars from inpatient to community-based services. There was no consensus as to who should operate these programs--children and youth or mental health services.

General agreement did exist on the need to develop a comprehensive service delivery system for children with mental illness separate from the service system for adults with mental health problems.



In an effort to establish such an integrated system, various witnesses had a number of suggestions that included consolidating regulations for all children's services; creating a single noncategorical funding system; and designating one coordinator or "gatekeeper" to assess and assign services for each client entering the children's mental health system. Other witnesses saw the importance of maintaining separate funding streams which offer diverse services which would operate independently of mental health services, but would be accessible to the gatekeeper to purchase care for certain children and adolescents who have serious mental health problems.

The hearing on drug and alcohol issues that pertained to children and youth focused on two main areas. The first addressed managed care programs, focusing on the issues of whom they should be required to serve, and what services should be provided.

Witnesses called for these programs to make public to consumers of service their specific criteria for admission to inpatient or outpatient services and their discharge policies. Witnesses endorsed the requirement that managed care programs provide a full continuum of licensed care in services.

The second major area addressed by witnesses had to do with working out administrative mechanisms to insure the best treatment for juveniles with drug and alcohol problems. These included getting cooperation between licensing agencies and mental health and drug and alcohol service providers in order to reduce failed placements. Another witness proposed the development of confidentiality standards between mental health and drug and alcohol programs.

Because a number of agencies are involved with juveniles with drug and alcohol problems, witnesses proposed that one agency be designated as a lead agency to assume responsibility for service and discharge planning.

#### COORDINATED PLANNING FOR DELINQUENT SERVICES IN PHILADELPHIA

As a result of mediation between the original parties in the Philadelphia Department of Human Services and Philadelphia Family Court, in Santiago v. City of Philadelphia that occurred January 31, February 1 and 2, 1990, it was agreed they "are part of one system of

service delivery for youth offenders" along with the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare.<sup>18</sup>

In this case, the plaintiffs, represented by the Juvenile Law Center agreed to drop their action against the Philadelphia Youth Study Center, the city's detention center, "if the Youth Study Center's population is reduced to 105 which is the licensed capacity of the facility, and maintained at 105 for a period of 6 months. This shall also mean that the population shall never be above 115 which is 110 percent of approved capacity and does not exceed 105 for more than 5 consecutive days or for 30 days out of any 40-day period during the 6-month period."<sup>19</sup>

The pressure placed on the city and the court to keep the population of the Philadelphia juvenile detention center reduced resulted in the city's District Attorney, Ron Castille, bringing a suit against the State in Commonwealth Court in the Fall of 1988, arguing that the Department of Public Welfare was in violation of that portion of Section 6353(c) which states "If the population at a particular institution or program exceeds 110 percent of capacity, the Department shall notify the courts and the General Assembly that intake to that institution or program is temporarily closed and shall make available equivalent facilities."<sup>20</sup>

The intent of the Castille suit was to reduce the population at the Youth Study Center by focusing on the number of Philadelphia youth committed to a Youth Development Center who were waiting long periods of time for a vacancy in a State treatment program. As a result of the court order, placement in the custody of the Department of Public Welfare was to take place within 10 days of commitment. Moreover, if the population at all juvenile institutions operated by the Department exceeds 110 percent of capacity, the Department was to then make equivalent services available to children in equivalent facilities within the 10-day period.

---

<sup>18</sup>Santiago v. City of Philadelphia Civil Action #74-2589 (E.D. Pa.) (3rd Amended Stipulation of Settlement filed January 21, 1988).

<sup>19</sup>The average daily attendance in fiscal year 1991-92 in the Youth Study Center: males - 102.78, females - 9.04. These compare to fiscal year 1990-91: males - 116, and females - 7. In fiscal year 1989-90 the average daily attendance was males - 129, females - 10. Source: Youth Study Center.

<sup>20</sup>Castille v. Pa. Department of Public Welfare, No. 2533 Cmmth. Ct. 1988 (D.Pa. filed December 27, 1989).

The order indicated that "the cost of these equivalent services at equivalent facilities were to be borne by the Department of Public Welfare in an identical fashion to the manner in which the Department provides funding for existing juvenile facilities."

If the Department did not comply it was to be fined \$5,000 per day for each juvenile remaining in the Youth Study Center for over 10 days after an adjudication of delinquency and a commitment to the care, custody and control of the Department of Public Welfare by a Family Court Judge of Philadelphia.

As one way to comply with the Santiago decision's goal to keep the population at the Youth Study Center down to 105 juveniles, Family Court judges have been aggressive in referring youth to the State system. Once referred to the Department of Public Welfare, the youth become the responsibility of the State to place in either Youth Development Centers, Forestry Camps or equivalent facilities that the State has contracted with to serve juveniles assigned to filled State facilities.<sup>21</sup>

In 1991 when arranging for slots in these equivalent programs for Philadelphia juveniles, the State negotiated a per diem rate that was about 4 percent higher than Philadelphia was willing to pay even though Philadelphia still has to match these higher costs. One of the two largest contractors with the State for over 350 equivalency slots, Glen Mills now has refused to contract with the city's Department of Human Services since the city will not agree to pay the same amount as the State. The other major contractor, VisionQuest, while not agreeing to a lower per diem for the city, has agreed to give the city a certain number of "scholarships" if it would agree to pay the same fee the State had negotiated. Subsequently, the city did enter into an agreement with VisionQuest under this arrangement.

A number of persons familiar with the ramifications of the Castille decision contend that the new role of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare has become that of a youth service authority. A youth service authority assumes the placement responsibility that the court has traditionally held. Persons who feel this is true point to examples of the court wanting a youth in a private program, and only being able to gain

---

<sup>21</sup>The rush to placement in State facilities or their equivalent services can be attributed to a lack of available private alternatives since private providers have been reluctant to contract with a city that is slow in paying its bills.

admittance by having the juvenile first assigned to the Department of Public Welfare. The court then has been known to inquire informally if the Department of Public Welfare would assign the juvenile to the private equivalency placement it had originally wanted. The final decision maker has become the Department of Public Welfare.

One of the benefits that was to be gained by contracting with private nonprofit programs for services was additional Federal reimbursement for these youth. Nonprofit placements, unlike State facilities, are eligible for Federal Title IV–E funding and medical assistance reimbursement for eligible youth. Due to a lack of coordinated services between the State and Philadelphia Department of Human Services, claims have not been filed for the reimbursement. Critics contend this has resulted in the loss of millions of Federal dollars.

Interestingly, one of the two largest private contractors with the State for equivalency services for Philadelphia youth is VisionQuest, a profit making program that does not qualify for Federal reimbursement for its services or for medical assistance reimbursement.

An argument can be made that the Castille decision has taken placement responsibility from the city of Philadelphia, giving it to the State, while still requiring the city to pick up its share of the costs— which are not higher.

While the Philadelphia Department of Human Services, the Philadelphia Family Court, and the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare have considerable interaction as a result of the Santiago and Castille court cases, there is some question whether they are operating in a synchronized fashion to best serve Philadelphia's delinquent youth.

# APPENDIX A

PRIOR PRINTER'S NO. 421

PRINTER'S NO. 980

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

## SENATE RESOLUTION

No. 11

Session of  
1989

INTRODUCED BY O'PAKE, MELLOW, STAPLETON, AFFLERBACH, BODACK,  
REGOLI, JONES, MUSTO, LYNCH, REIBMAN, ROSS, SHAFFER, BELAN,  
BAKER AND HOPPER, FEBRUARY 3, 1989

AMENDED, APRIL 25, 1989

### A RESOLUTION

- 1 Directing the Joint State Government Commission to update the  
2 study concluded in 1975 of all services rendered to children  
3 relative to problems of abuse, delinquency, dependency,  
4 neglect and mental health.
- 5 WHEREAS, Many changes have occurred in the children's  
6 services delivery system and in the dynamics of children's  
7 issues since issuance of the 1975 Report of the Task Force on  
8 Services to Delinquent, Dependent and Neglected Children; and
- 9 WHEREAS, The county offices of children and youth services  
10 are the primary service providers for at-risk, abused,  
11 dependent, neglected and delinquent children; and
- 12 WHEREAS, The Child Protective Services Law was enacted in  
13 1975 to establish a separate system for the reporting and  
14 investigating of child abuse, and to mandate that the counties  
15 provide services to victims and their families, without  
16 providing funding mechanisms; and
- 17 WHEREAS, The General Assembly passed Act 148 of 1976 to  
18 provide a formula for the reimbursement to counties of costs

1 incurred in the provision of mandated services to children,  
2 which formula was designed to provide incentives to development  
3 of deinstitutionalized services; and

4 WHEREAS, The General Assembly reacted to escalating costs of  
5 children's services by taking action in 1980-1981 to limit the  
6 State's liability under Act 148 to the amount of funds  
7 appropriated; and

8 WHEREAS, Many counties have since had to provide a financial  
9 "overmatch" to pay annually for the costs of mandated children's  
10 services, thus creating a hardship for county governments and  
11 the taxpayers they serve, and placing at jeopardy the quality of  
12 services provided to children; and

13 WHEREAS, The funding problem is exacerbated by the increasing  
14 severity of child abuse cases, by the escalating incidence of  
15 child sexual abuse cases, and by the liberal referral practices  
16 of the juvenile courts and the county mental health offices to  
17 the offices of children and youth services; and

18 WHEREAS, The mission of children and youth services, to serve  
19 first those children most at-risk as abused, neglected and  
20 delinquent, is diluted by unpredictable caseloads which include  
21 truants, chronic runaways and adoptions; and

22 WHEREAS, There appears to be a need for a projected specific  
23 program, including services and funding, for mentally ill  
24 children which could be accessed by county children and youth  
25 services; and

26 WHEREAS, All reasonable estimates indicate that the funding  
27 crisis will continue to grow worse and thereby further  
28 jeopardize the quality of children's services, if not the  
29 children themselves; therefore be it

30 RESOLVED, That the Joint State Government Commission be

- 2 -

1 directed to study all of the various dynamics impacting on the  
2 county offices of children and youth services to determine how  
3 the competing interests of problem children can best be served;  
4 and be it further

5 RESOLVED, That the commission is directed to study the  
6 funding of those services and propose a funding mechanism which  
7 will insure that State-mandated services are appropriately  
8 delivered with quality assurance; and be it further

9 RESOLVED, That appropriate reorganization of services and  
10 needed mandates be recommended, specifically as they relate to  
11 the needs of mentally ill children; and be it further

12 RESOLVED, THAT, TO ACCOMPLISH THE GOAL OF MAKING A <—  
13 REORGANIZATION RECOMMENDATION, THE COMMISSION SHALL CREATE A  
14 BIPARTISAN, BICAMERAL TASK FORCE; AND BE IT FURTHER

15 RESOLVED, THAT THE TASK FORCE MAY HOLD HEARINGS, TAKE  
16 TESTIMONY AND MAKE ITS INVESTIGATIONS AT SUCH PLACES AS IT DEEMS  
17 NECESSARY THROUGHOUT THIS COMMONWEALTH. EACH MEMBER OF THE TASK  
18 FORCE SHALL HAVE POWER TO ADMINISTER OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS TO  
19 WITNESSES APPEARING BEFORE IT; AND BE IT FURTHER

20 RESOLVED, That the ~~commission~~ TASK FORCE report its findings <—  
21 and recommendations, together with drafts of legislation  
22 recommended by it, to the General Assembly as soon as possible.

## **APPENDIX B**

---

### **LIST OF WITNESSES**

#### **Public Hearing, Harrisburg, January 9, 1990**

**GEORGE B. TAYLOR, Deputy Secretary, Office of Children, Youth and Families, Department of Public Welfare**

**LEON WILKINS, Special Assistant to John F. White, Jr., Secretary, Department of Public Welfare**

**THOMAS JENKINS, Director, Bureau of County Children and Youth Programs**

**GERY YOH, Director, Bureau of Program Support**

**LEE MILLER, Director, Division of Program Planning and Development**

**DONNA GORITY, Commissioner, Blair County; Chairperson of Human Services Committee; Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania State Association of County Commissioners**

**NANCY ROREM, Deputy Director, Pennsylvania State Association of County Commissioners**

**RONALD HEINLEN, Children and Youth Specialist**

**JANET SKIBA, Administrator, Bucks County Children and Youth Agency**

**ROBERT COSNER, Bucks County Child Protective Services Supervisor**



**LARRY BREITENSTEIN, Administrator, Westmoreland County  
Children and Youth Services**

**JOSEPH LOFTUS–VERGARI, Director, Luzerne County Children and  
Youth Services**

**JOHN M. PIERCE, Ph.D., J. D., Executive Director, Pennsylvania  
Council of Children's Services**

**ALVIN J. LUSCHAS, ESQUIRE, Solicitor, Columbia County**

**ROBERT SCHWARTZ, ESQUIRE, Executive Director, Juvenile Law  
Center, Philadelphia**

**PAUL DILORENZO, A.C.S.W., L.S.W., Executive Director, Support  
Center For Child Advocates**

**THOMAS CARROS, Director of Personnel and Planning, Pressley Ridge  
Schools, Pittsburgh**

**BERT ARNOLD, A.C.S.W., Child Advocate, Philadelphia**

**BARBARA TREMITIERE, Victims of Child Abuse Legislation (VOCAL),  
York**

**JOHN PETULLA, Pennsylvania State Chapter of the National  
Association of Social Workers (NASW)**

**CHARLES GERSHENSON, Ph.D., Senior Policy Analyst, The Center for  
the Study of Social Policy, Washington, D.C.**

**DOUGLAS WALSH, M.D., Pennsylvania Chapter, American Academy of  
Pediatrics**

**PATRICK J. WARDELL, Ph.D., A.C.S.W., L.S.W, Executive Director,  
Family Intervention Crisis Services, Centre County**

**SUSAN CAMERON, Executive Director, Pennsylvania Coalition  
Against Rape**

**DR. DAVID DOTY, Director of Residential Services, Friendship  
House, Scranton**

**ANNE STRONG–REISS, President, Children's Rights Initiative,  
Philadelphia**

**Public Hearing, Philadelphia, March 6, 1990**

**JUDGE EDWARD R. SUMMERS, Family Division, Court of Common  
Pleas, Philadelphia**

**JUDGE ESTHER R. SYLVESTER, Family Division, Court of Common  
Pleas, Philadelphia**

**ANGEL ORTIZ, Chairman, Committee on Health, Human Services and  
Recreation, Philadelphia**

**JOHN STREET, Chairman of the City Council Appropriations  
Committee, Philadelphia**

**JOAN REEVES, Interim Deputy Commissioner, Children and Youth  
Division of the Department of Human Services, Philadelphia**

**MAXINE TUCKER, Acting Deputy Commissioner for Children and  
Youth, Office of Human Services, Philadelphia**

**SHELLY YANOFF, Executive Director, Philadelphia Citizens for  
Children and Youth**

**REINALDO GALINDO, Southern Homes, Executive Director and  
President of the Children and Youth Family Council of the Delaware  
Valley**

**PETER WILSON, M.D., Ph.D., Director, Supportive Children and Adult  
Network (SCAN), Philadelphia**

**TED LEVINE, Director, Youth Services, Inc., Philadelphia**

**VIVIAN DRAYTON, Director, Family Resource Center, Philadelphia**

**ANNE WHITE, Director, Women's Christian Alliance, Philadelphia**

**CHARLES SEITH, Assistant Director, Bethanna, Southampton**

LEE ANNE MURPHY, M.S.W., Department of Social Work,  
Hahnemann University Hospital, Philadelphia

Public Hearing, Pittsburgh, September 11, 1990

THOMAS FOERSTER, Chairman of the Allegheny County  
Commissioners

HONORABLE R. STANTON WETTICK JR., former chairman of the  
Juvenile Court Judges' Commission

JAMES E. ANDERSON, Executive Director, Juvenile Court Judges'  
Commission

JOSEPH DAUGERDAS, Director of Court Services, Allegheny County

JOSEPH CHRISTY, Ph.D., Director, Shuman Center Juvenile Detention  
Facility, Allegheny County (also chairman of the State  
Juvenile Detention Association)

JOHN PIERCE, Ph.D., J.D., Director, Pennsylvania Council of  
Children's Services, Harrisburg

ARDEN MELTZER, Ph.D., Professor, University of Pittsburgh School  
of Social Work

HUNTER HURST, Director, National Center for Juvenile Justice,  
Pittsburgh

KENTON SCOTT, Chief, Jefferson County Juvenile Service Center  
(also chairman of the State Juvenile Probation Officers  
Association)

LOUISE BECKER, Representative of Concerned Citizens of Sandycreek  
Township, Venango County

ROBERT SOBOLEVITCH, Regional Administrative Director,  
Visionquest, Exton

LAWRENCE MASON, Director, Juvenile Probation and Detention  
Services of Westmoreland County

**JOHN BETTERS, Director, Juvenile Probation and Child Welfare Services of Somerset County**

**JAMES LEAKE, Vice-President and Chief Operating Officer, Abraxas Foundation, Pittsburgh**

**JOHN BUKOVAC, Executive Director, Adelphoi Village, Latrobe**

**ROBERT POLENEK, Executive Director, Specialized Treatment Services, Mercer**

**Public Hearing, Philadelphia, December 11, 1990**

**HONORABLE RONALD D. CASTILLE, District Attorney of Philadelphia accompanied by JOHN DELANEY, Deputy District Attorney in charge of Juvenile Division**

**COMMISSIONER JOAN M. REEVES, Philadelphia Department of Human Services accompanied by JESSE E. WILLIAMS JR., Executive Director of Juvenile Justice Services.**

**HONORABLE KATHRYN STREETER LEWIS, Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Family Court Division, City of Philadelphia**

**HONORABLE SHELDON C. JELIN, Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Family Court Division, City of Philadelphia**

**COUNCILMAN-AT-LARGE ANGEL ORTIZ, Chairman of City Council Committee on Public Health, Human Services and Recreation**

**ROBERT WOLF, ESQ., State Master, Philadelphia Youth Study Center**

**GEORGE TAYLOR, Deputy Secretary for Children, Youth and Families, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare accompanied by TALMADGE OWENS JR., Director, Bureau of State Children and Youth Programs**

**GERALD STANSHINE, ESQ., Chief, Juvenile Division, Defenders Association of Philadelphia accompanied by MINGO STROEBER, ESQ., Assistant Chief, Juvenile Division and HARVEY ELLIS, M.ED., Director, Social and Psychiatric Services**

DANIEL ELBY, Director, Alternative Rehabilitation Communities

SAMUEL FERRAINOLA, Director, Glen Mills Schools

ANTHONY A. GUARNA, Chief, Montgomery County Juvenile  
Probation Services

WILLIAM D. FORD, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Bucks County  
Juvenile Probation Services and THEODORE WACHTEL, Executive  
Director, Community Service Foundation

PAUL E. GESREGAN, Director, Delaware County Juvenile Court  
Services

AARON FINESTONE, ESQ., Chairman, Juvenile Court Committee,  
Criminal Justice Section, Philadelphia Bar Association

BARBARA FRUCHTER, Executive Director, Juvenile Justice Center

ROBERT SCHWARTZ, ESQ., Director, Juvenile Law Center

SHELLY YANOFF, Executive Director, Philadelphia Citizens for  
Children and Youth

Public Hearing, Harrisburg, June 6, 1991

KAREN SNIDER, Deputy Secretary for Mental Health, Pennsylvania  
Department of Welfare

SUSAN REIDER, Executive Director, Mental Health Association of  
Pennsylvania

ROBERT WILBERT, Consumer of Services, member of Alliance for the  
Mentally Ill

GLENDA FINE, President, Parents' Involved Network of Pennsylvania  
(PIN of PA)

CHRISTINE CORP, Coordinator, Parents' Involved Network of  
Pennsylvania (PIN of PA)

NORMAN R. DANZIK, Executive Director, York County Children  
and Youth Services

**EUGENE CAPRIO, Social Service Coordinator, Luzerne Children and Youth Services**

**JOHN PIERCE, ESQ., Executive Director, Pennsylvania Council of Children's Services**

**MARILYN MENNIS, Vice President of Service Administration of the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic and Professional Co-Chair of the State Advisory Committee of the Child and Adolescent Service System Program**

**ILENE SHANE, ESQ., Executive Director, Disability Law Project, Philadelphia**

**MICHAEL CHAMBERS, Executive Director, MH/MR Program Administrators Association of Pennsylvania**

**LYNN ALMS, Director of Children's Program, United Mental Health of Pittsburgh**

**DAVID DOTY, Ph.D., Director of Admissions/Residential Services, Friendship House, Scranton**

**JOHN PAUL PETER, President, Wiley House, Bethlehem**

**LYNE HARMON, Psy.D., Chairman of Pennsylvania Association of Community MH/MR Providers Children's Committee and Executive Director of Child Psychiatry Center, Philadelphia**

**GRAHAM I. MULLHOLLAND, Executive Director, Early Intervention Program, Harrisburg**

**SAMUEL MAGDOVITZ, ESQ., Associate Director, Juvenile Law Center, Philadelphia**

Public Hearing, Doylestown, September 25, 1991

**GENE BOYLE, Drug and Alcohol Programs Administrator, Pennsylvania Department of Health**

**MARK BENCIVENGO, Assistant Health Commissioner, Coordinating Office for Drug and Alcohol Abuse Program, Philadelphia**

**SANDRA BLOOM, M.D., Alliance for Creative Development,  
Quakertown**

**JOHN CONAHAN, Executive Director of Adolescent Treatment Center  
Caron Foundation, Wernersville**

**PASCHAL La RUFFA, M.D., Yardley**

**JAMES DALZELL, CEO, Horsham Clinic, Ambler**

**SYLVESTER PACE, Director of Court Services, Abraxas, Pittsburgh**

**WILLIAM BISHOP, Senior Supervisor, General Protective Services  
Bucks County Children and Youth Agency**

**THERESA WALSH, Executive Director, Renewal Centers, Quakertown**

**MARGARET HANNA, Executive Director, Bucks County Drug &  
Alcohol Commission, Inc.**

**BERNARD HOFFMAN, Deputy Superintendent, Neshaminy School  
District**

**SEAN CASSIDY, Juvenile Probation Officer, Bucks County Juvenile  
Probation Service**

**JEANNE PERANTEAU, Coordinator, Special Projects, Family Service  
Association of Bucks County, Langhorne**

**Individuals who Submitted Written Comments**

**SHELLY YANOFF, Executive Director, Philadelphia Citizens for  
Children and Youth**

**JOAN RUPP, President, Pennsylvania Foster Parent Association**

**RENEE LEVINE, President, Pennsylvania Association of School Social  
Work Personnel**

**KENDELL A. TeSELLE, A.C.S.W., Executive Director, The Children's  
Home of Reading**

## APPENDIX C

---

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Public Welfare Association. "APWA Child Welfare and Family Preservation Project." Undated. Photocopied.
- Besharov, Douglas J. "'Doing Something' About Child Abuse: The Need to Narrow the Grounds for State Intervention." Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy 8 (Summer 1985): 539–589.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Right versus Rights: The Dilemma of Child Protection." Public Welfare (Spring 1985): 19–46.
- Blank, Helen, Savage, Jennifer and Wilkins, Amy. State Child Care Fact Book 1988. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, 1988.
- Breslin, Michael J. "Children's Clinic of Northumberland County." Sunbury, Pennsylvania: undated. Photocopied.
- Bruner, Charles, Senator. "Decategorization of Child Welfare Services." Excerpt from material prepared for annual meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures, July 1988. Photocopied.
- The Center for the Study of Social Policy. "Claiming Available Federal Funds Under Title IV–E of the Social Security Act." Financing Strategies for Children and Family Services Working Paper Series Working Paper FIN–2. Washington, D.C.: The Center for the Study of Social Policy, undated.



The Center for the Study of Social Policy. "Recognizing and Realizing the Potential of 'Family Preservation'." Development and Implementation of Family Preservation Services Working Paper Series Working Paper FP-2. Washington, D.C.: The Center for the Study of Social Policy, undated.

The Center for the Study of Social Policy. "The Use of Medicaid to Support Community-Based Services to Children and Families." Financing Strategies for Children and Family Services Working Paper Series Working Paper FIN-1. Washington, D.C.: The Center for the Study of Social Policy, undated.

Chandler, Betsy. How Are Kentucky's Children Stacking Up?: A County By County Analysis. Louisville, Kentucky: Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc., December 1987.

Children's Clinic of Northumberland County. Working Together. Produced by the Children's Clinic of Northumberland County. 1989. Videocassette.

Children's Defense Fund. A Vision For America's Future. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, 1989.

Children, Youth, and Families Program and Health and Mental Health Program. "Coordinating Child Welfare, Mental Health, and Juvenile Justice Systems." Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, July 1988. Photocopied.

Child Welfare League of America, Inc. "State Efforts to Coordinate Services for Children and Youth." Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America, Inc., undated. (Draft.)

Child Welfare League of America, Inc. The Youth Americans Act: The First Step Toward A National Youth Policy. Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America, Inc., July 1988.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Department of Education. Pennsylvania's Children: A View of Health, Nutrition and Program Participation. County Data Profile. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Education, 1988.

- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Department of Justice. Governor's Justice Commission. Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics. Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Dispositions. Pennsylvania Criminal Information System (PACIS) Series J-2 No. 1. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Justice, 1971-1987.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Department of Public Welfare. Child Welfare Services Plan 1986-1988. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare, December 1986.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Department of Public Welfare. Office of Children, Youth, and Families--Operational Audit, I.D. No. N5003-Y99. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Office of Operations Review, 14 January 1986.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Department of Public Welfare. Overview of 1989-1990 Governor's Recommended Budget. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare, February 1989.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Department of Public Welfare. Report of the Act 148 Analysis Committee: Recommendations for Children and Youth Programs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare, December 1986.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Interdepartmental Human Services Planning Committee. County Planning Data Kit. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Interdepartmental Human Services Planning Committee, 1987 Supplement.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Interdepartmental Human Services Planning Committee. County Planning Data Kit. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: 1988 Supplement. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Interdepartmental Human Services Planning Committee, 1988 Supplement.

- Craig, Rebecca. "Mental Health Services for Children and Youth: Strengthening the Promise of the Future." State Legislative Report 11, no. 7. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, June 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mental Health Services for Children and Youth: Strengthening the Promise of the Future." State Legislative Report 13, no. 25. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, Updated September 1988.
- Criminal Justice Program. "Legal Dispositions and Confinement Policies for Delinquent Youth." State Legislative Report 13, no. 23. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, July 1988.
- Criminal Justice Program. "Youth Corrections in Utah: Remaking A System." State Legislative Report 12, no. 11. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, December 1987.
- Farrow, Frank. Testimony presented at Field Hearing on Preventing Unnecessary Foster Care Placement before the U.S. House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources. Lindenhurst, New York, 5 June 1989. Photocopied.
- Friend, Shelley A. "Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth." State Legislative Report 8, no. 6. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, October 1983.
- Framework for Children's Mental Health Service. 21 September 1988. Draft.
- Garner, Les. "Making Family Preservation Happen: An Optimistic Case for Institutional Change." Supplied by National Conference of State Legislatures, 15 April 1988. Photocopied.
- George, Rosemary. Youth Policies and Programs in Selected Countries. Washington, D.C.: Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, August 1987.
- Gonick, Jeffrey, Esq. Perceived and Actual Barriers to Delivery of Services to Children and Adolescents With Serious Emotional Disorders. Lancaster County MH/MR Program, 1987/88 CASSP Special Project.

Greenberg–Lake: The Analysis Group. California's Children Today: A Survey of Public Attitudes Toward California's Children. A Children Now Poll. Los Angeles: Children Now, June 1989.

Howard, Judy, M.D. et al. "The Development of Young Children of Substance–Abusing Parents: Insights from Seven Years of Intervention and Research." Zero to Three IX (June 1989): 8–12.

Hughes, Dana et al. The Health of America's Children: Maternal and Child Health Data Book. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund, 1989.

Jarboe, Mary and Tuley, Sandra. Too Little, Too Late: A Study of Services for Kentucky's Children With Emotional Problems. Louisville, Kentucky: Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc., December 1983.

The Kentucky Juvenile Justice Commission. "Removing Youth from Adult Jails: A Preliminary Plan for Assigning Youth to Appropriate Placements." Testimony presented to The House Resolution (HR) 46 Task Force on Jails. Louisville, Kentucky: 30 March 1983.

Levy, Bette. Delinquency Prevention: A Description of Model Programs in Kentucky, vol. II. The Kentucky Juvenile Justice Commission, 30 September 1986.

Magri, Michele R. "Adolescent Abuse and Neglect." State Legislative Report 8, no. 1. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, January 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Runaway Youth: Government Response to a National Problem." State Legislative Report 7, no. 2. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, February 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Status Offenders: Issues in Juvenile Justice." State Legislative Report 7, no. 6. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, May 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Youth Alcohol Abuse." State Legislative Report 7, no. 8. Denver: national Conference of State Legislatures, July 1982.

Miller, George, Congressman. "Addicted Infants and Their Mothers."  
Zero to Three IX (June 1989): 20–28.

Ohio Department of Mental Health. Program Development  
Sub-Committee. State Interdepartmental Cluster.  
"Interdepartmental Cluster for Services to Youth Program  
Development Issues & Options Executive Summary." Columbus,  
Ohio: 13 June 1988. Photocopied.

Pennsylvania Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies. State  
Silhouette: A Profile of Pennsylvania's Children. Harrisburg,  
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Council of Voluntary Child Care  
Agencies, July 1986.

Pennsylvania General Assembly. Legislative Budget and Finance  
Committee. A Report on Special State Grants to Counties for  
New Services for Children and Youth Under Act 148 of 1976.  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: July 1980.

Pennsylvania General Assembly. Legislative Budget and Finance  
Committee. A Sunset Performance Audit of the Pennsylvania  
Commission on Crime and Delinquency Pursuant to Act  
1981–142. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: June 1985.

Pennsylvania General Assembly. Legislative Budget and Finance  
Committee. Fourth Interim Report on Study of Pennsylvania  
Delinquent Youth Service System: Results of Survey of County  
Probation Departments. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: January  
1978.

Pennsylvania General Assembly. Legislative Budget and Finance  
Committee. Interim Report on Study of Pennsylvania  
Delinquent Youth Service System. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania:  
September 1976.

Pennsylvania General Assembly. Legislative Budget and Finance  
Committee. Second Interim Report on Study of Pennsylvania  
Delinquent Youth Service System: Results of Survey of Judges.  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: August 1977.

- Pennsylvania General Assembly. Legislative Budget and Finance Committee. Third Interim Report on Study of Pennsylvania Delinquent Youth Service System: Results of Survey of Police Departments. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: October 1977.
- Pennsylvania State Association of County Commissioners. "PSACC 1988–1989 Budget Issue Paper No. 1: County Children and Youth Services." Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: undated. Photocopied.
- Pennsylvania State Association of County Commissioners. "Position Paper: Children and Youth Services Reform." Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: April 1989. Photocopied.
- Pennsylvania State Association of County Commissioners. Report of the Committee on the Future of Counties. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: October 1986.
- Pennsylvania State Association of County Commissioners. "Testimony on House Bill 900 and Amendments, and Amendments to Act 148." Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: undated. Photocopied.
- Pennsylvania State Police. Bureau of Research and Development. Uniform Crime Report, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Annual Report. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State Police, 1974–1988.
- J. R. Reingold and Associates, Inc. Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth. Washington, D.C.: Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, June 1987.
- Report of the Attorney General's Family Violence Task Force. Violence Against Children. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Office of Attorney General, January 1987.
- Richart, David W. and Gall–Clayton, Nancy. Children and Dollars: Budget Trends Affecting Kentucky's Children and Their Families. Louisville, Kentucky: Kentucky Youth Advocates, December 1985.

Ross, E. Clarke, D.P.A. and Hyde, Pamela, J. D. Child Mental Health and P.L. 99-660 State Mental Health Planning: A Summary of A Meeting of Five States in Columbus, Ohio Under NIMH Contract: Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia. NASMHPD Report Federal Agencies. Alexandria, Virginia: National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, 21 March 1989. Photocopied.

Safe Kids Initiative Report. By Judge Emanuel Cassimatis, Chairman. York, Pennsylvania: 1989. Photocopied.

State of California. Department of Social Services. "Social Services Allocations for FY 1988/89 for the Child Welfare Services and County Services Block Grant Programs." All-County Letter No. 88-101. Sacramento, California: 11 August 1988. Photocopied.

Stroul, Beth A., M.Ed. and Friedman, Robert M., Ph.D. A System of Care for Severely Emotionally Disturbed Children and Youth. Washington, D.C.: CASSP Technical Assistance Center, July 1986.

Tittle, Barbara, M.D., and St. Claire, Nika, M. S. "Promoting the Health and Development of Drug-Exposed Infants through a Comprehensive Clinical Model." Zero to Three IX (June 1989): 18-20.

U.S. Congress. House. A Bill to Provide Assistance in the Development of New or Improved Programs to Help Younger Persons Through Grants to the States for Community Planning, Services, and Training; to Establish Within the Department of Health and Human Services an Operating Agency to be Designated as the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families; and to Provide for a White House Conference on Young Americans. H.R. 1492, 101st Cong., 1st sess., 1989.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Children and Families: Key Trends in the 1980s. Committee Print. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989.

- U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Children, Youth, and Families: Beginning the Assessment. Hearing before the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, 98th Cong., 1st sess., 1983.
- U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Federal Programs Affecting Children, 1987. Committee Print. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987.
- U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Opportunities for Success: Cost Effective Programs for Children Update, 1988. Committee Print. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1988.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Public Health Service. Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. National Institute of Mental Health. Toward a Model Plan for a Comprehensive, Community-Based Mental Health System. Rockville, Maryland: October 1987.
- Weber, Michael. Testimony presented at Hearings on Child Welfare, Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Programs before the U.S. House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources. Washington, D.C., 1 June 1989. Photocopied.
- Weston, Donna R., Ph.D. et al. "Drug Exposed Babies: Research and Clinical Issues." Zero to Three IX (June 1989): 1-7.
- Woodruff, Geneva, Ph.D., Sterzin, Elaine Durkot, LICSW and Hanson, Christopher, Ph.D. "Serving Drug-Involved Families with HIV Infection in the Community: A Case Report." Zero to Three IX (June 1989): 12-17.
- Wetzel, James T. American Youth: A Statistical Snapshot. Washington, D.C.: Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, June 1987.



Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation  
Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. The Forgotten  
Half: Non-College Youth in America. Washington, D.C.:  
Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation  
Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, January 1988.

Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation  
Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. The Forgotten  
Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young  
Families (Final Report). Washington, D.C.: Youth and  
America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation  
Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, November 1988.