

PROBLEMS OF THE JUVENILE OFFENDER

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

TO

THE GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA



HD 4, 1960

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1959

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

W. ROY SMITH, Chairman

MRS. H. STANLEY BAILEY, Vice-Chairman

ROBERT F. BALDWIN, JR.

GARNETT S. MOORE

WALTER A. PAGE

WILLIAM EARLE WHITE

ROBERT WHITEHEAD

STAFF

JOHN B. BOATWRIGHT, JR.

G. M. LAPSLEY

WILDMAN S. KINCHELOE, JR.

FLETCHER W. HARKRADER, JR.

REPORT
of the
COMMISSION ON PROBLEMS OF THE JUVENILE OFFENDER

Richmond, Virginia
August 13, 1959

To: HONORABLE J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., *Governor of Virginia*

In Virginia, as elsewhere throughout the United States, problems incident to juvenile delinquency have become one of the major governmental areas of concern. Numerous studies have been made in Virginia as elsewhere on causes of juvenile delinquency. Unlike studies which have heretofore been undertaken in Virginia, the present study was initiated not to investigate the cause of delinquent conduct, but to undertake an appraisal of the Commonwealth's facilities and system for meeting the problems occasioned by delinquent conduct as the problems pertain to the State and to the children involved while in State custody, and as they relate to the community when the child returns from custody.

The care of the delinquent child by the State while the child is in its custody is only part of the total program, and the effectiveness of the period of State care is dependent not only on the program and facilities of the State, but is also related directly to much that has transpired before a child is committed to the State and to what is done or not done after he is returned to his community.

The Juvenile Court Law provides for the State to take custody of children who have committed certain offenses and commit them to the guardianship of the State Board of Welfare and Institutions.

The offenses are described in § 16.1-158 of the Code of Virginia, providing for the commitment of a child "(g) who deserts or is a fugitive from his home, or who is habitually disobedient or beyond the control of his parents or other custodian, or is incorrigible; (h) who being required by law or his parents or custodian to attend school is a willful and habitual truant therefrom; (i) who violates any State or federal law, or any municipal or county ordinance; provided, however, that in violations of federal law jurisdiction in such cases shall be concurrent and shall be assumed only if waived by the federal court;".

In Virginia, as elsewhere, the continuing development of the Juvenile Court System and its related activities has been with the intent to advance the welfare of the child in custody of the State and to keep the child, for the duration of his minority, under such watchful care, custody, discipline, supervision, guardianship and control as may be conducive to the welfare of the child and the best interest of the State. In spite of the good intentions on which the program is based, and in spite of the expenditure of large sums of money, both in capital outlay and operations, many children committed to the State's care by juvenile courts return to their communities only to be recommitted to State custody. Appendix A, showing the number of training school returnees in the training schools and study units as of December 1, 1958, is indicative of the percentage of these children who are recommitted. Furthermore, disturbingly large numbers of children

who have been in the juvenile institutions one or more times are sentenced by the criminal courts to the penal institutions. Many of these become involved in serious crimes while still in their teens, and others after having barely reached their majority. Appendices B(1) and B(2), setting forth information concerning 209 former wards of the State committed to the penitentiary from July 1957 through June 1958, and Appendix B(3), showing the number of persons formerly in the training schools who were serving felon or misdemeanor sentences in State penal institutions as of November, 1958, furnish alarming evidence in substantiation of this statement.

These discouraging results of the State's program for rehabilitation of juvenile offenders led the General Assembly at its 1958 Regular Session to adopt House Joint Resolution No. 75 creating the Commission on Problems of the Juvenile Offender to conduct a study of the juvenile correctional facilities and programs of the State. This resolution reads as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 75

Creating a Commission on Problems of the Juvenile Offender.

Whereas, the care, treatment, and effective rehabilitation of children committed to the training schools and other facilities maintained by the State Board of Welfare and Institutions are of vital concern both to the individuals involved and to the State, both now and in the future; and

Whereas, the establishment and maintenance of training schools, foster homes, and other facilities for children who have been committed to the care of the State by the courts is based on the principle that many of these young people can be rehabilitated and redirected into lives of usefulness, and that such rehabilitation and redirection will also redound to the future benefit of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, the effectiveness of programs of treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders is of tremendous concern to all the citizens of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, recent studies have indicated that a fairly high percentage of juvenile offenders in the care of the State are returnees, and that a number of these had been committed on two previous occasions; and

Whereas, each year a number of former training school inmates, while still juveniles or young adults, are committed to the penitentiary and state farms after having been convicted of more serious violations of the law; and

Whereas, to the extent that effective rehabilitation is not accomplished when juvenile offenders are first committed to the care of the State, the benefits to the individuals involved and to the State that are the objectives for which the juvenile court system, training schools, foster homes, and other facilities and programs exist are not obtained; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, that there is hereby created a Commission of seven members to be appointed by the Governor, to be known as the Commission on Problems of the Juvenile Offender, which Commission is directed to conduct a comprehensive study of the juvenile correctional facilities and programs of the State in all their phases, with particular reference to the effectiveness of present programs for the care, treatment, evaluation, education, rehabilitation and

after-care of committed children, and to make such recommendations as it deems necessary to facilitate to the maximum extent possible the rehabilitation processes for which the aforesaid institutions and programs exist. All agencies of the State are directed to cooperate with the Commission in the conduct of its study when requested to do so. In the conduct of the study the Commission shall consider the present programs and services furnished by the various state departments and agencies concerning the youth of the Commonwealth and shall give attention to methods of coordinating the activities of the State Department of Education, the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals, the State Department of Health, and the State Department of Welfare and Institutions in those matters affecting the prevention, care and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. The Commission shall conclude its study and make its report to the Governor no later than October one, nineteen hundred fifty-nine. The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services but their necessary expenses and such secretarial and other assistance as the Commission may require shall be paid, upon approval of the Governor, from the Governor's Discretionary Fund.

Pursuant to this resolution, the Governor appointed to the Commission Mrs. H. Stanley Bailey, Roanoke; Robert F. Baldwin, Jr., a member of the Senate of Virginia, Norfolk; Garnett S. Moore, a member of the House of Delegates, Pulaski; Walter A. Page, Judge of the Corporation Court, Part II, Norfolk, and formerly Judge of the Juvenile Court of the City of Norfolk; W. Roy Smith, a member of the House of Delegates, Petersburg; William Earle White, Attorney at Law and member of the State Board of Welfare and Institutions, Petersburg; and Robert Whitehead, a member of the House of Delegates, Lovingston.

The Commission met and organized, electing W. Roy Smith as Chairman, Mrs. H. Stanley Bailey as Vice-Chairman, and John B. Boatwright, Jr., as Secretary.

In order to become thoroughly conversant with the State's efforts in this diverse field, the Commission met and consulted with the following officials: Colonel Richard W. Copeland, Director of the Department of Welfare and Institutions, David P. Beverly, Information Officer of that department, Carroll R. Minor, Director, Division of Youth Services in that department, Herbert A. Krueger, Chief, Bureau of Juvenile Probation and Detention of that division, and S. P. Hair, Chief, Child Care Bureau of that division; Dr. Hiram W. Davis, Commissioner, Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals, and Dr. James B. Funkhouser, Assistant Commissioner of that department; and Dr. Patricia Denton, Director of the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic, and Albert Goldstein, Chief Social Worker and Assistant Director of that clinic. Without the whole-hearted cooperation which each of these so graciously extended the Commission by meeting with it, furnishing information requested, and offering suggestions, it would have been impossible for the Commission to have gained the insight which was vitally necessary to the conduct of this study.

During the course of its deliberations the Commission was privileged to have appear before it the Honorable John J. Wicker, Jr., a member of the Board of Welfare and Institutions, and the Reverend Spencer R. Quick, Rector of Grace Church, Goochland, Virginia, and formerly Chaplain at Beaumont School for Boys.

The Commission received and considered a report entitled "Report on an Administrative Survey of Virginia's Training Schools" and a report entitled "Report on a Follow-up Survey of the Virginia Training Schools",

both prepared by the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Virginia, and a report to the Department of Welfare and Institutions by Richard Clendenen, Director, National Consultants on Youth Welfare, Washington, D. C.

To facilitate the Commission's study several committees were appointed from the membership of the full Commission to consider and make recommendations concerning: (1) Training School Programs and Facilities; (2) The Juvenile Court System and Related Services; and (3) Coordination of Interdepartmental Responsibilities Involving Care and Rehabilitation of Juvenile Offenders.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS

The State of Virginia maintains four Juvenile Training Schools. These are Bon Air School for Girls (White), Janie Porter Barrett School for Girls (Negro), Beaumont School for Boys (White), and Hanover School for Boys (Negro). Each of these training schools may be described as an open institution, with a minimum of security measures and no fences. They are situated on large tracts of land in Hanover, Powhatan and Chesterfield Counties, all within a thirty-five mile radius of the city of Richmond. The physical facilities include modern dormitory types of buildings or cottages, modern educational buildings, dining halls, and related facilities, such as gymnasias, occupational workshops, infirmaries and farm structures. In addition, Hanover, Barrett, and Bon Air have separate facilities that serve as study units in which the children are placed initially for a period of several weeks. During this period the child undergoes complete physical examinations and his background is studied along with current psychological and psychiatric testing by the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic. In the case of Beaumont, the Study Unit is situated at a separate location and is known as the Chesterfield Study Home for White Boys. It is as a result of these studies, taking into consideration physical, emotional, psychiatric and other factors, that recommendation is made by the Child Care Bureau as to whether the child enters the "Permanent Population" of the Training School, or whether other disposition should be made of the child. These other possible dispositions are: (1) Placement of the child in a foster home; (2) Placement in a privately operated "Children's Home" or Orphanage; (3) Returned to his community on probation; or (4) Committed to the care of the State Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals. As can be readily imagined, the decisions affecting the placement of each individual child are myriad and complex. Adding to this difficulty is the commitment to the Department of Welfare and Institutions of children from communities with little or no local facilities for care or treatment of juvenile offenders. Many of these same children, if living in communities with properly staffed juvenile courts, would be taken care of locally.

The Committee on Training School Programs and Facilities made impromptu visits to each of the training schools and to the Chesterfield Study Home. During the course of the visits, the Committee inspected the physical facilities, observed the operation of the institutions in the course of a normal day and discussed operational procedures at length with the superintendents and other administrative and instructional personnel. The splendid cooperation, the willingness to answer exhaustive questions, and the genuine interest exhibited in this study by the employees in each of the institutions were extremely helpful to the Committee members during these visits and in the preparation of its report. In addition to the visits, this Committee submitted a thirteen page questionnaire to the superin-

tendent of each of these institutions, which questionnaires were completed in full by the superintendents and returned. The information gained in this manner was very helpful in enabling the Committee to make a comparative study of the methods of operation employed in the several institutions.

The importance of a thorough and searching look at the training schools in any study concerned with the effectiveness of the State's program in the care, treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders is obvious. Approximately two-thirds of the children committed to the State by the juvenile courts are placed in these institutions.

The Commission wishes to state that all personnel of the Division of Youth Services, both within and without the training schools, with whom it or its members have come in contact are, without exception, dedicated persons interested in carrying out their respective duties to the best of their ability. However, we were struck by the almost complete lack of uniformity in many principal areas of the training schools' operations. In many respects the individual schools give the impression of being completely autonomous units, with each one functioning in whatever manner that seems best to its particular superintendent. While it is recognized that ample discretionary latitude should be given each superintendent to enable him to meet his responsibilities it is difficult to understand the existence of widely divergent practices and attitudes in institutions maintained for the same over-all purposes and responsible to the same central authority.

Perhaps the most striking example of this lack of uniformity, and perhaps responsible for it, jointly with the lack of sufficient direction, is the divergence of viewpoints among those charged with their operation as to what is the purpose of the institutions' existence. In answer to the question "Do you view your institution as primarily 'welfare' or primarily 'correctional'?", two superintendents answered "welfare", one replied "primarily correctional", and the fourth replied "primarily rehabilitation and training". The maintenance of these training schools represents a considerable expense to the State and, more important, plays a vital part in the lives of hundreds of children each year. It appears to us to be an elementary statement of fact to assert that maximum effectiveness in the operation of these schools cannot be achieved in the absence of clearly defined, well understood, and uniformly accepted goals.

Typical of the lack of uniformity, even in areas in which efficient administration and central records and statistical control would appear to demand uniformity, is the matter of academic educational offerings at the schools. The curriculum offerings differ in each of the four schools, and the beginning and ending periods of the semester are different in each of the schools. All of the academic schools do not appear to be operating on a full twelve-month program, although it is understood that such a program is the policy of the Department.

Variations in the vocational offerings appear to be just as marked. One school offers its own certificates for completion of certain courses; others issue certificates authorized by the Division of Youth Services; in other courses no certificates are given. In two of the schools it appeared that excellent tailoring instruction was being given and that the classes served, at least to a degree, an important utilitarian function as well. In both these schools it was asserted that much of the clothing worn by the children at the schools, clothing for their return to the communities, as well as drapes, bed linens, towels, etc., were made by the children in these

classes. In both the other schools, tailoring instruction appeared to be limited almost to repairing tears and sewing on buttons. In these two institutions complaints were voiced that the appropriations for clothing were insufficient and that they were dependent on federal surplus supplies. In view of the fact that tailoring and seamstress instruction would seem to be excellent vocational training that could be useful to many of the children upon their return to society, second, that the articles produced in such classes would fill a need at the institutions, and third, that substantial appropriations for clothing and related supplies are made each year, it would appear that the good experience gained in a limited way at two of the institutions could be profitably used to improve both the vocational training and the clothing situation at each of the schools.

A particularly striking example of the lack of coordination in what would appear to us to be basic policy matters is the absence of any uniform standard for the length of time children are kept in these institutions before being returned home. On one end of the scale, 54.5% of the boys committed to Beaumont stay eight months or less, only 4.5% staying 12 months or longer, while at the other end of the scale 87% of the girls committed to Janie Porter Barrett School stay over 12 months, 55% of them for periods exceeding 15 months. Appendix C shows the number of children released from the four training schools, by number of months of stay, from August 1, 1958 to January 31, 1959. It is difficult to explain such a discrepancy in any way other than that it is at least partially a result of the lack of settled policy as to whether the training schools are designed to serve primarily as correctional institutions or as welfare centers.

Variations as to procedure were observed in a number of other activities in which there would appear to be every reason for uniformity among the several schools. Among these were: (1) method of selecting and employing teachers, (2) workings of the "Progress Committees", (3) rules concerning the holding of part-time outside employment by house parents, (4) use of the "cottage monitor" system, and (5) handling of children who attempt to "run".

Some examples of the above mentioned variations follow. In three of the institutions the matter of selecting teachers is apparently decided jointly by the superintendent of the school and the assistant superintendent or the principal, while in the other institution the same decisions are apparently arrived at jointly by the superintendent and the Supervisor of Personnel in the central office of the Department of Welfare and Institutions. The composition of the progress committee varies slightly in each of the schools. Moreover, there are differences among the schools with regard to the frequency of a child's appearance before the progress committee. In one school the child is not seen by the progress committee until three months after admission to the permanent population, whereas at the other three schools the child appears before the progress committee within a week or ten days after such time. Since the children's release dates are determined by the progress committee, the wide variations in length of stay among the several institutions would strongly indicate reliance on different sets of guideposts by the several committees.

Three of the institutions have a prohibition against house parents holding outside employment, while one of the institutions has no such prohibition. Two of the institutions use the cottage monitor system, whereas the other two do not. From the information given this Commission it is evident that the policy on handling children who attempt to "run"

is not a departmental policy but is determined at each institution. In one institution no punishment is meted out for this offense, the idea apparently being to talk to the child and explain to her the difficulties she is encountering in institutional living. In one of the other institutions attempts to "run" do not automatically call for punishment, and in one of the four the length of stay at the institution is usually increased on account of this offense.

We point to the foregoing information to illustrate what we believe to be the greatest operational weakness of our Training School System, i.e., the lack of centralized uniform policies in basic administrative matters based on a uniformly accepted philosophy as to the purpose for which the institutions exist.

While we believe that increased attention to improving centralized direction of the several institutions and the adaptation in each of the schools of those programs and practices that have been proven good in one or the other of them will result in an improvement over the present status, we recognize that there are a number of handicaps inherent in the present situation over which the Director of the Division and the superintendents of the schools have no control. Among these handicaps are: (1) The wide age span among the children. The difficulties in operating institutions in which 10 year old boys are mixed with aggressive 17 year olds, or in which 9 or 10 year old girls are mixed with worldly-wise 17 or 18 year old girls, are not hard to imagine. (2) The commitment to these training schools of children with such low I.Q.'s that they cannot benefit from this type of institution and adversely affect giving proper care to the others. (3) The unavailability of any really effective disciplinary measures for the "trouble-makers". (4) In the girls' schools, the problems attendant to having pregnant girls committed to these schools. (5) Insufficient trained personnel, especially case-workers, counselors, and teachers. (6) Insufficient psychological and psychiatric services available for those children who need this type of treatment. (7) Lack of any uniform follow-up by the State and localities after discharge, resulting in high rate of recidivism. (8) Lack of sufficient dormitory space, resulting frequently in the rate of discharge being governed by the rate of intake. (9) Insufficient facilities for vocational instruction of types that could aid in making these children self-supporting in later life. (10) Insufficient resources for religious emphasis and guidance. (11) The presence in the population of young first-offender juveniles with two and three-time "repeaters".

This last handicap is particularly serious in its effect on the ability of the training schools to perform their rehabilitative function. Contrariwise, there is good reason to believe that the presence of the "experienced" juvenile delinquent in these training schools often leads, for the young minor offender, to exactly the opposite effect. Quite often these young people receive more "education" from these recidivists than the institution is able to give them. To us this points up a basic weakness in the Juvenile Court Law. It may validly be asked if, in trying to give all juveniles the benefits of the Juvenile Court Law, we are not in fact making it more difficult to help those juvenile offenders who are susceptible to rehabilitation. Under Juvenile Court Law a child may be adjudged delinquent for a variety of causes, some of which are quite minor as compared to more serious offenses which if committed by adults would be felonies. Thus, in effect, "misdemeanant juvenile offenders" are not afforded the same protection as are adult misdemeanants, who are confined in separate institutions from adult felons. It would be nice to think that all juvenile offenders could be rehabilitated. Since, however, experience has shown that

this is not true, we feel that the Commonwealth of Virginia should face squarely the question of whether the habitual juvenile offender should be allowed to jeopardize the entire program. Having done this, the State should adopt its policies accordingly for the protection of those juvenile offenders who can profit from the experience and training offered in the training schools.

Contributing to these handicaps is the existence of salary scales which make it difficult to obtain and retain well-trained, interested, mature personnel in teaching and counselor type positions. Proper results from the association between the children and the persons filling these positions is vital to the success of the institutions. Illustrative of this is the following quotation from "Report on a Follow-up Survey of the Virginia Training Schools", prepared by the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Virginia, under date of June, 1958:

"Need for High Standards. If living facilities are improved in the cottages, the Department and the Division should establish high standards for cottage parents. There appears to be little doubt that cottage parents will have a great deal of influence on the students. That this influence can be bad as easily as good is self-evident but probably needs repeating for the sake of emphasis. The parents must set standards of decorum that are above reproach. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the human frailties of normal parents cannot be permitted in institutional parents. No inference against the cottage parents now employed should be drawn from these remarks. They are made to underscore the responsibility that those holding these positions must bear."

THE MOBILE PSYCHIATRIC CLINIC

Although not directly a part of the training school, the activities of the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic play a vital part in the conduct of the program for treatment and rehabilitation within the several training schools. With a staff of only 7 full-time employees and 2 part-time employees it is almost an impossibility for the Clinic to carry out its assigned functions. The limited staff manages to give psychological testing procedures to the children while in the various study units, and psychiatric examinations are given by Dr. Patricia Denton, the Director, on referrals from the psychologists. It is on the basis of these examinations, together with other factors such as the child's offense, past history, family background, etc., that recommendations for final placement of each child are made by the Child Care Bureau.

The Clinic is severely handicapped in its other function, i.e., furnishing psychological counseling and psychiatric treatment, where indicated, to children in the permanent population, by lack of staff and facilities. The Director is the only psychiatrist in the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic and much of her time is consumed by the mechanical and paper work details incident to the operation of the Clinic. The several institutions themselves have practically no personnel who are trained in counseling or guidance work. The aim of rehabilitation and redirection of the children's lives in useful pursuits is difficult to achieve in the absence of having personnel available in whom the children can confide and look to for guidance and help with their problems. In order to do an effective job along these lines some additional trained personnel will be needed at the schools, as well as in the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic. One very obvious physical need at each of the institutions, including the Chesterfield Study Home, is the provision of suitable space in which the case workers at the institutions and the

visiting psychiatrist, psychologist and related workers assigned to the Clinic can meet with and counsel the children.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

The institutions maintained by the State for juvenile offenders represent a sizable investment in addition to the annual operating costs. Each of the four training schools gives the appearance of being generally adequate, although in each there is need for the replacement and/or addition of certain facilities.

THE CHESTERFIELD STUDY HOME

The Chesterfield Study Home for White Boys is in a different category. As previously pointed out, there are currently study units at Bon Air, Barrett and Hanover. We believe that the State should place the Study Unit for White Boys on the grounds at Beaumont, for the following reasons. The buildings there are of less permanent design and construction. Its transformation into a study permanent type institution, whether undertaken step by step, or all at once, will involve a considerable investment in capital outlay. Its separate operation calls for unnecessary duplication of facilities and staff. Operation of this unit as a separate institution also requires a "permanent cadre" of older boys who serve as kitchen and mess attendants, etc. These boys therefore never receive the instructional, counseling and rehabilitative opportunities offered in the training school, and for which they were committed to the State Board.

When the Study Unit for White Boys is transferred to the grounds at Beaumont, each of the four institutions would then be equipped with a study unit. This, coupled with the strengthening of diagnostic facilities, including personnel increases at the institutions and in the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic and the improvement of local and regional facilities for dealing with juveniles, as recommended by the Commission, should in the opinion of the Commission adequately provide for the classification of juvenile offenders.

BON AIR

The Bon Air School for Girls needs new cottages that would enable this institution to discontinue the use of a quonset hut which has been serving as a "temporary" cottage for far longer than is desirable and to abandon another older dormitory unit, known as Virginia Cottage, that cannot be used much longer with safety.

This institution has a modern gymnasium which has a stage and for a modest investment in good folding chairs and related equipment it could also serve well as an auditorium.

BARRETT

Janie Porter Barrett School for Girls has several needs. The existing Federation Cottage, a gift of the Virginia State Federation of Colored Womens Clubs, is, according to engineering reports, in such condition that necessary repairs would be prohibitive. On the basis of such reports, it is our opinion that a new structure to house the administrative offices and to provide infirmary facilities should be constructed in its place. The new structure should take the name of the old and a suitable plaque should be placed on the new building indicating that it is on the site of the old Federation Cottage. We are advised that the Federation recommends the demolition of the present Federation Cottage.

There is need at Barrett for new cottages to house forty girls. It is our opinion that these should be constructed and that a central dining hall should be erected that would accommodate the entire population. The separate dining facilities in the present cottages could then be discontinued and the space remodeled for dormitory purposes. The maintenance of separate dining facilities in each of the cottage units is much more expensive, both in terms of capital outlay and costs of operation, than a central dining hall. It might be well to retain one of the present cottages with separate dining facilities if it can be used to house the younger girls separately from the older ones. Otherwise, we see no need for maintaining such units. The other institutions all have central dining halls at present.

BEAUMONT

The Commission urges that the presently contemplated Pilot Project at Beaumont be undertaken immediately in order that remote and separate quarters for the aggressive older boys and recidivists may be provided, thereby eliminating their intermingling with the younger and less experienced boys.

Due to overcrowding, an additional cottage to house thirty boys should be promptly constructed. The removal of the Study Unit for White Boys from Chesterfield to Beaumont will require accommodations for sixty boys. The Commission therefore recommends the construction of three additional cottages for thirty boys each exclusive of the Pilot Project.

There is no auditorium at Beaumont. However, there is an excellent large gymnasium and with a relatively modest outlay for alterations and equipment this building could be utilized for both gym and auditorium purposes.

HANOVER

The Hanover School for Boys has a serious need for more cottage space in order to house the permanent population and to make it possible to house the children in the study unit separately. At the present time this institution has neither a gymnasium nor an auditorium. However, one large building situated on a hillside has a very large room on the lower level, with entrance at ground level, which is presently being used for nothing more than what appears to be storage of junk. While perhaps not ideal, this space could be converted to serve as either a gymnasium or auditorium or both.

There are undoubtedly other needs at each of the institutions but this Commission does not feel that it is in position to pass categorically on each of them. In this connection, however, we again point to the fact that the successful operation of the Juvenile Training School Program is severely handicapped by the fact that these institutions are presently having to house and care for children of widely divergent backgrounds, who are simply not amenable to profiting from the same treatment, viz., children as young as ten years and as old as eighteen years of age; children with normal intelligence, children with low I.Q.'s and children who are mentally defective; children who have been committed for minor first offenses and others who have been committed to the training schools for the second and third time; children who have been committed for truancy or other misdemeanors and others who have been committed for armed robbery, grand larceny, breaking and entering, assaults against persons, arson, rape, and other felonies.

In our adult correctional institutions we follow a program of separating young first offenders and misdemeanants from the felons and hardened criminals. Yet, in our four training schools and in pursuance of a system intended to function for the best welfare of the children committed to the State's care, we have no policy of separation comparable to that existing for adults and no facilities designed or conceived to further such a policy.

In this connection, the Commonwealth owns large tracts of lands surrounding each of the training school sites. With foresight, long-range planning, and a State policy based on recognition of the fact that the term "juvenile delinquent" encompasses children of many different types with widely varying treatment needs, it should be possible to develop, within the existing institutional structure, facilities that can provide for the separation that is clearly indicated. This objective cannot be accomplished by merely adding cottages and other facilities on the basis of "numbers". On the other hand, and in view of the fact that additional structures are contemplated at every one of the existing institutions, now would seem to be a good time to give serious consideration to an appraisal of the advantages of planning for separation versus simple enlargement of the present sites in a manner that will continue to necessitate the indiscriminate mixing of all children placed in the training schools, regardless of their offense, age, past history, mental status, aggressiveness, etc.

In either event the number of children will be largely the same and the construction costs roughly comparable. Operational costs should not be appreciably greater. There should be some ultimate savings to the State due to a lowered rate of recidivism and to the fact that younger, minor offenders would be less likely to "learn the ropes" from the older, more confirmed delinquents with whom the present system forces them into association. More important, the chances for successful rehabilitation of the children committed to the care of the State should be immeasurably increased.

THE FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

The broad scope of this study prevented a comprehensive search into the workings of the Foster Care Program. However, statistical data received by this Commission would appear to indicate that the Foster Care Program is not playing as large a part in the over-all plan for children committed to the State Board of Welfare and Institutions as was originally intended when the Juvenile Court Law was adopted.

On October 1, 1958 there were 93 white and 93 Negro children in a total of 107 foster homes. An additional 22 white and 10 Negro children were being cared for in other boarding care placements, i.e., their own homes, or private or public institutions. As of this same date there were approximately 469 white and 353 Negro children in the training schools. Thus it would appear that on an average only one out of every four children committed to the Board is presently being placed in the Foster Care Program.

We believe the State might profitably explore the possibility of placing greater emphasis on the Foster Care Program. It may well be that with an expansion in this area it would be possible to eliminate the need for sending the younger children to the training schools.

The Foster Care Program cannot presently be said to be State-wide in its application, as the great majority of available foster homes are concentrated in counties in the general area of Richmond and, to a lesser degree, Roanoke. The development of the Foster Care Program into a truly State-wide program will require substantially increased financial support and increased personnel for the Child Care Bureau.

THE JUVENILE COURT SYSTEM AND RELATED SERVICES

A. THE JUVENILE COURT SYSTEM

As previously pointed out in this report, the philosophy of Juvenile Court Law is based on the theory that the welfare of the child is of paramount concern.

The extent to which the basic purpose of this law can be fulfilled depends upon whether the judge interprets the law in a positive, remedial manner or in a negative and punitive way. Obviously the more a judge is able to specialize in this field and the greater his knowledge of existing facilities for diagnosis and treatment, the more skilled he will be in the use of his powers for rehabilitation. The Juvenile Court Law presupposes that a juvenile and domestic relations court is a special type of court, disposing of a special type of case in a special manner. To state it otherwise, such a judge can most effectively administer the laws relating to juvenile offenders only if he is a specialist in handling and disposing of cases involving offenses by juveniles. The judge of a court who has only an occasional juvenile case on his docket can hardly be expected to be or become a specialist in this field. Yet, in a vast majority of the counties and in some of the municipalities, the county courts and the police justice or municipal courts, respectively, handle juvenile cases. Furthermore, these courts do not have the necessary probation and mental hygiene clinic facilities; a majority of them do not have enough juvenile cases to justify the retention of a staff to furnish these facilities.

Secondly, in order to reach a proper decision as to the best disposition of a juvenile case, the judge needs to know not only the facts pertaining to the offense that brings the juvenile into court, but also should be able to thoroughly investigate the child's home situation, background, and past personal history. To accomplish the purpose of the law, the judge should be able to obtain a case history of the child, and when necessary this should be coupled with psychological testing or psychiatric examination. Thus juvenile and domestic relations courts must have professional probation services that are quantitatively and qualitatively adequate, and available clinical facilities, in order properly to diagnose and dispose of each case in a manner best calculated to lead to rehabilitation of the delinquent child.

Cities and counties with an adequate population should be encouraged to establish juvenile and domestic relations courts separate from municipal or county courts. The obvious solution where this is not feasible would appear to us to be the establishment by counties and municipalities of regional juvenile and domestic relations courts. This would make more feasible the establishment of regional juvenile detention and probation facilities. In such instances, the juvenile judge would be a specialist having available the assistance of necessary specialists, and thus better equipped to dispose of cases involving juvenile offenders in conformity with the philosophy on which Juvenile Court Law is based.

B. PROBATION STAFFS

Probation services vary markedly in the juvenile courts in Virginia, particularly since in a vast majority of counties, the county courts also serve as juvenile courts. Some few courts have their own probation staffs, consisting of one or more officers; others share an officer with one or more other localities. The welfare workers are called on for probation services in 105 jurisdictions and court attached probation staffs are utilized in only 24 jurisdictions.

Nineteen probation staffs with a total of 89½ probation officers serve approximately 45% of the total population. The ratio of probation officers to the population is approximately one to nineteen thousand.

One hundred and five local welfare departments with a total staff of 113 workers serve approximately 55% of the total population. (Only *eight* of these give full time to court work.) The ratio of welfare workers to population is approximately one to eighteen thousand.

Probation officers attached to courts (serving forty-five per cent of population) supervised 1,839 children on probation, while welfare workers serving the court (covering fifty-five per cent of the population) supervised 762 children on probation.

Appendix D shows a breakdown, as of October 1958, of the type of juvenile probation services available to the several counties and cities of the State.

The difference in these proportionate figures points up the disparity in the *quantity* of probation services available to courts dependant upon already overburdened welfare workers for probation services.

Each judge handling juvenile cases should have available the services of the necessary number of officers vested with the authority of a probation officer and carrying the title "probation officer," and these officers should be under the direction of such judge. They are needed to prepare case histories, which are often necessary before a judge can make a wise disposition of a child's case; to provide supervision when a child is released on probation; to relieve overburdened welfare workers of the responsibility of providing case work services to the court; and to provide after-care treatment for children who have been released from State custody.

C. DETENTION FACILITIES

When certain children come in conflict with the law, it becomes necessary to provide for their detention in custody for their own protection or the protection of the community, until disposition can be made of their cases. It has long been regarded as undesirable to house these children in jail where they can be thrown into intimate contact with older persons, dissolute persons and hardened criminals. For this reason, the Commonwealth of Virginia has for a number of years encouraged the localities to construct facilities for the separate detention of juveniles, and certain laws now operative permit and encourage the construction of regional juvenile detention facilities for use by three or more counties or cities.

At present there are seven detention facilities. Technically all are locally owned and operated. Six of these function on a regional basis serving forty-four jurisdictions. These are in the following locations: (1) Arlington, serving also Alexandria, and Fairfax and Loudoun Counties; (2) Bristol, serving also Scott and Washington Counties; (3) Newport News, serving also Hampton, Williamsburg and Poquoson, and York County; (4) Pulaski, serving also Radford, and Smyth County; (5) Richmond, serving also Amelia, Hanover, Chesterfield, Caroline, Powhatan, Louisa, Dinwiddie, Orange, King William, and Goochland Counties, and Hampton; and (6) Roanoke, serving also Botetourt, Roanoke, Rockbridge, Floyd, Bedford, Henry, Montgomery, Patrick, Tazewell, Rockingham and Franklin Counties, and Clifton Forge, Martinsville and Waynesboro. The Norfolk facility serves only Norfolk City. All the remaining jurisdictions are without either juvenile detention facilities or access to such facilities. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, 4,518 juveniles were placed in jail largely because of lack of detention facilities.

A total of 8,224 juveniles were detained in detention facilities and jails during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. The need for continuing progress in the construction of these detention facilities is evidenced by the fact that for the year ending June 30, 1958 the monthly average of children detained in juvenile detention facilities was 359, while the number detained in jails averaged 375 per month. Appendix E shows the number of juveniles held in detention facilities and in jails, from July 1, 1957 through June 30, 1958, in those localities to which detention facilities are available.

The State Board of Welfare and Institutions has designated twelve districts as areas homogeneous for the future development of regional detention facilities. Eight of these are in a planning stage. This Commission views the completion of this program at an early date as a very desirable objective, and one that the State should continue to encourage in every way possible.

D. MENTAL HYGIENE CLINICS

We believe that there is no doubt that many juvenile offenders who come to the attention of the courts do so because of emotional problems with which they are unable to cope. It is unnecessary to go into these factors fully in this report but it is well understood today that stresses of broken homes, illegitimacy, and other home situations in which the child's need for security and development are not met, play a prominent part in the production of juvenile delinquency. These same factors also immeasurably retard the State's efforts at rehabilitation, as the child goes right back to the same situation after a relatively short time with the State.

Ideally, in order to carry out the purpose of the Juvenile Court Law, each judge should be able to have before him, while considering the juvenile's offense, a complete case history of the child. In many instances a child's background or case history would be incomplete without a psychological report, and in a lesser number of instances a psychiatric study is desirable. The State is developing a network of Mental Hygiene Clinics which are staffed with psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric social workers. These clinics are a joint State-local responsibility and are regulated and supervised by the State Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals.

Two broad purposes of these clinics are to provide psychiatric care in the communities on an out-patient basis to persons who might otherwise have to ultimately be committed to one of the State Hospitals, and secondly to provide follow-up out-patient care when necessary to persons discharged from one of the State Hospitals. It is our understanding that these clinics have cooperated with the juvenile courts in those areas where the clinics are located. The Child Guidance Clinics and Mental Hygiene Clinics operated by the various localities in cooperation with the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals should be required to give first priority to cases referred to them by the juvenile and domestic relations courts in these localities.

There are now twenty-two Mental Hygiene Clinics and there are plans for additional clinics to be developed in the future. If the State is going to encourage the establishment of regional juvenile courts and regional probation and detention facilities, we feel very strongly that every effort should be made to establish such regions so that geographically the courts and detention facilities will be located in such a manner that they will have available the services of these Mental Hygiene Clinics.

E. BUREAU OF JUVENILE PROBATION AND DETENTION (After-Care)

The State Department of Welfare and Institutions is presently charged by law with the duty of devising, developing, and promulgating a State-wide plan for the establishment and maintenance of suitable local and regional detention facilities reasonably accessible to each juvenile court. The Department, under direction of the Chief of the Bureau of Juvenile Detention and Probation, has undertaken the development of such a plan, and as mentioned elsewhere in this report, a number of such facilities already exist. In other parts of the State, districts for the development of regional detention facilities have been approved by the State Board of Welfare and Institutions. Some of these facilities are in the planning stage, while nothing has been done as yet in some others of these districts. Similarly, the Department is charged by law with the development of probation and other social services for juvenile and domestic relations courts, so that all children coming within the jurisdiction of such courts throughout the State shall receive the fullest protection of the courts. The Director of the Department in accordance with law has created a Bureau of Detention and Probation.

Present law also authorizes employment of such other employees as he may find to be necessary properly to carry out the responsibilities of the Department relative to the development and supervision of probation and detention facilities as set forth in the law. At the same time, the present law of Virginia appears to us to be woefully inadequate in providing for any real means of effectively carrying out the duties with which the Department is charged pertaining to juvenile probation and detention. For example, at the present time, the judge of a juvenile and domestic relations court may (although he is not required to) appoint one or more suitable persons as probation officers; or the local Board of Public Welfare and the juvenile judge may jointly decide to utilize the services of a probation child welfare worker already employed on the staff of the local Department of Public Welfare. (In practice a majority of counties at present are utilizing welfare workers who also have many other duties in addition to their court duties.)

In addition to the above two methods, two or more counties or cities may (but are not required to) appoint joint probation officers. If it is not deemed practicable to provide probation services under any of these methods, the local Superintendent of Public Welfare serves as the probation officer, in addition to his many other duties. A fifth alternative is that an adult probation officer may be utilized for juvenile probation work under certain conditions. The difficulties inherent in molding any degree of uniformity that would be likely to assure the juvenile "the fullest protection of the court" under the circumstances outlined above would not seem to require further elaboration.

One of the most serious problems facing the State in the carrying out of an effective program of rehabilitation of its juvenile offenders is that of devising and effectively implementing a sound program of after-care. This problem is well recognized by those who work with the juvenile program and by those who have studied its results. As pointed out very cogently by the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Virginia in its "Report on a Follow-up Survey of the Virginia Training Schools", published in June, 1958, "It is most illogical to spend time, money, and effort in keeping children in an institution for nine months and then return them without adequate supervision to the same environment that produced them."

We believe that it is essential for the State of Virginia to develop a more effective State-wide system of juvenile probation and detention facilities.

COORDINATION OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

While the primary responsibility for the care of juvenile offenders committed to the State falls on the Director of the Division of Youth Services of the Department of Welfare and Institutions, activities of other State agencies are interrelated in several phases of the overall problem. The academic and vocational schools at the several training schools require the cooperation of the State Department of Education; the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic, which is intimately concerned with each child committed to the State, functions within the framework of the Division of Youth Services, but is actually an arm of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals; and matters pertaining to requisitions and specifications for food service equipment, facilities and procedures, and the furnishing of in-service training to employees working in the kitchens and dining halls of the various institutions under the Department of Welfare and Institutions, require the cooperation of the Department of Health.

Perhaps the primary area in which full cooperation is essential to the proper carrying out of the philosophy of the Juvenile Court Law is the responsibility of determining whether a child committed to the care of the State by a juvenile court should be retained in the custody of the Department of Welfare and Institutions or be committed to the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals for treatment. It goes without saying that unless this matter is properly determined in the instance of a particular child, the State has not lived up to the full measure of responsibility assumed when it takes custody of that child. A delinquent child who is primarily a mental defective cannot receive the treatment he needs in a juvenile training school.

Moreover, to a very great extent the operation of the entire juvenile training school program is adversely affected to the degree that children who cannot benefit from them are committed to the training schools, rather than to an institution in which they can be treated. Additionally, the presence of mentally defective delinquents in the training schools has a serious effect on those children who properly belong in the training schools. The presence of even a small percentage of severely mentally retarded or defective delinquent children in the population can upset the entire training school program and seriously impair the effectiveness of rehabilitative efforts for which these schools are designed. The determination of a mental defective is not an exact science. However, it is our understanding that children coming into the care of the State for reasons other than juvenile delinquency are considered for acceptance for treatment as mental defectives by the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals if they have an I.Q. of 69 or below.

In contrast to this, there were 124 mental defectives, that is children with I.Q.'s of 69 or below, in the population of the four training schools on October 31, 1958. Appendix F shows the number of mental defectives in each of the four training schools as of that date, and also furnishes a breakdown of the I. Q. range of these children. These 124 mental defectives constituted 17½% of the total population of the training schools. In fact, in one of the institutions 23.4% of the total inmate population fell into this category on that date. This Commission views the inclusion of these children in our juvenile training schools as a serious failure on the part of the State in its responsibility toward the children themselves, who

obviously require other types of institutional care, and as the single most serious impediment to the successful operation of the training schools for the purposes for which they were intended. In our opinion the foregoing represents the area in which there is a crying need for improvement in interdepartmental relations. At the same time it should be frankly stated that the situation has been brought about not by any lack of desire to cooperate on the part of any of the departments, but to a very large extent simply because there is no facility designed to house and treat the delinquent mental defective.

In 1954 the State Board of Welfare and Institutions authorized the Director of the Department of Welfare and Institutions to approach the Superintendent of Public Instruction regarding the establishment of a joint committee of education and welfare representatives to study delinquency prevention. The Committee expanded its membership to include first, representatives of the Department of Health, and later representatives of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals.

Since April, 1958, the heads of the Departments of Education, Health, Mental Hygiene and Hospitals, and Welfare and Institutions or their representatives have met to discuss matters of mutual interest in the field of interdepartmental cooperation.

The Heads of these Departments have met monthly on the afternoon of the first Monday of each month. Their discussions have greatly contributed to the development of a broad understanding, by each Department Head, of the goals and policies of the other departments.

On the basis of the foregoing findings and conclusions, and for the reasons stated therein, this Commission submits the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS

1. Present law authorizes the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Youth Services, and provides for the appointment of members thereto by the Governor. The purpose of this Committee is to act in an advisory capacity to the Director of the Department of Welfare and Institutions and the Board of Welfare and Institutions on questions and problems relating to youth services, and, when requested by the Director or the Board, to investigate such questions and consider such problems as are submitted to it, and report its findings and conclusions. The Committee may also make recommendations to the Director and Board on its own initiative. This Commission views the existence of such a committee as a very desirable adjunct to the Board of Welfare and Institutions and recommends the appointment of the Committee at an early date.

2. The Director of the Division of Youth Services, in cooperation with the superintendents of the several training schools, should complete the preparation of, and put into use a Manual of Operations clearly delineating areas of authority of the superintendents, and prescribing such regulations as may be necessary to provide for uniformity in administrative employments, and in educational treatment, and release practices at the several institutions consistent with the rehabilitation accomplished. Uniform organizational charts should be placed in effect at each school so that the personnel thereof will know the scope of their duties and authority, their relationship to each other, and the lines of communication to be followed within the several institutions and directly with personnel in the Division of Youth Services headquarters and in the other schools.

3. A uniform "Progress Committee" system should be instituted at each training school. Furthermore, a study should be made by the Division of Youth Services directed toward determining whether there is any sound reason for the wide disparity in the length of time children are usually kept in the different institutions with a view toward instituting more uniform practices based on what has proven best in the varied experience that has been gained. The date on which a ward of a training school can reenter the public school system without falling further behind in his grade level should be a factor to be considered in arriving at the date of release of such ward from the training school.

4. The vocational education program in each of the training schools should be greatly expanded, and courses should be developed in cooperation with the State Department of Education which will help the children either as wage earners or home makers in later life. Furthermore, consideration should be given to expanding certain vocational trade courses sufficiently to furnish the institutions with supplies and materials, such as clothing, bed linens, etc.; printed matter, such as letterheads, office forms, etc.; and desks, chairs, lockers, chests, benches, etc.

5. The Pilot Project at Beaumont should be undertaken immediately in order that remote and separate quarters for the aggressive older boys and recidivists may be provided, thereby eliminating their intermingling with the younger and less experienced boys.

6. The academic education offerings should be strengthened by the employment of sufficient teachers and by increased emphasis on basic remedial reading, writing, and spelling, with special classes for those children unable to meet normal requirements.

7. Attention should be given to defining the respective responsibilities and duties of house parents, project supervisors, case workers, and academic and vocational teachers, with emphasis on achieving the maximum amount of rehabilitation.

8. The number of case workers and other counseling and guidance personnel should be increased sufficiently in order that each child may have frequent and continuing contact with such a person throughout his stay at the school. Furthermore, each school should have one professionally trained case worker serving in the capacity of chief case worker.

9. Increased attention should be given to insuring the neatness of dress of the boys in the training schools.

10. Library offerings should be increased, in cooperation with the State Department of Education.

11. Authorization should be given for increasing the staff of the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic by the addition of an executive secretary or administrative assistant, a half-time psychiatrist, 2 more psychologists (Psychologist C), 2 more professionally trained social workers, and 1 more clerical worker.

12. Additional space for offices and interview rooms should be provided for the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic at its headquarters in Richmond as soon as possible. Provision should be made at each of the training schools for suitable interview rooms for the use of the visiting staff of the Mobile Psychiatric Clinic.

13. Legislation should be enacted providing that any juvenile sixteen years of age or older who has been previously committed to any juvenile training school in this State or any other State and who commits a crime

classified as a felony shall be tried as an adult, unless the juvenile and domestic relations court finds and certifies that it is in the public interest for the matter to be handled in that court.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

CHESTERFIELD STUDY HOME

1. The Chesterfield Study Home for White Boys should be discontinued and the study unit for white boys should be established on the grounds at Beaumont School for Boys.

BEAUMONT

2. Three new cottages to house thirty boys should be constructed at Beaumont School for Boys, exclusive of the Pilot Project. The recommendation for construction of two of these three cottages is predicated upon removal of the Study Unit for White Boys from Chesterfield to the grounds at Beaumont.

The gymnasium at this institution should be altered so that the facility can serve as both a gymnasium and an auditorium.

BON AIR

3. Two new cottages to serve as dormitory units should be constructed at Bon Air School for Girls, and the quonset hut and Virginia Cottage, both presently used as dormitory units by this institution, should be abandoned and demolished.

BARRETT

4. For the reasons previously noted, the Federation Cottage at Janie Porter Barrett School for Girls should be replaced by a new building designed to house the administrative officers and infirmary facilities. This new building should bear the name of the old building, and a plaque should be placed on the new building indicating that it is on the site of the old Federation Cottage.

Also, a new cottage to house forty girls, and a central dining hall should be constructed at this institution. The separate dining facilities in each cottage should then be discontinued, with the possible exception of one cottage if such cottage could be used to house the younger girls separately from the older ones.

HANOVER

5. The additional number of necessary cottages should be constructed at Hanover School for Boys in order to make it possible to house the children in the study unit separately from the permanent population.

A combination gymnasium and auditorium should be constructed at this institution, or a large junk storage room on ground floor level in a building situated on a hillside should be altered and improved to serve as such combination gymnasium and auditorium.

6. Consideration should be given to the formulation of a long-range plan leading to the construction of facilities at the four training schools looking toward the ultimate separation of the younger, minor offenders from the older, hardened offenders.

THE FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

1. Greater emphasis should be placed on the Foster Care Program in order that this program may become State-wide in scope, and to that end necessary funds as well as additional personnel in the Child Care Bureau should be made available.

THE JUVENILE COURT SYSTEM AND RELATED SERVICES

1. The Juvenile Court Law should be amended to permit counties and cities to establish and operate joint regional juvenile and domestic relations courts. The salaries of the judges and personnel of such courts should be paid by the State.

2. We urge the Department of Welfare and Institutions to encourage the establishment of regions for regional juvenile courts and regional probation staffs (for after-care as well as other probation activities) which will coincide with regions established for regional detention facilities.

3. The necessary number of probation officers should be made available to each juvenile and domestic relations court, and these officers should be under the direction of the judge of such court.

4. We recognize that Mental Hygiene Clinics are outside of the scope of this report, but since these clinics do handle court referred cases, we urge the Departments of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals, and Welfare and Institutions to cooperate to the end that regional juvenile courts, regional probation staffs and regional detention facilities can be established where they can take advantage of the services offered by Mental Hygiene Clinics.

The Child Guidance Clinics and Mental Hygiene Clinics operated by the various localities in cooperation with the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals should be required to give first priority to cases referred to them by the juvenile and domestic relations courts in these localities.

COORDINATION OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Immediate attention should be given to the problem of mental defectives in the several training schools, and procedures should be established whereby such children could be originally committed or transferred to the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals. In order for the State to fulfill its obligation to the defective delinquent, and in order to improve the opportunity of the training schools to perform the function for which they are intended, it is essential that the defective delinquent be placed elsewhere. This Commission does not believe that this objective can be accomplished by administrative regulation, but that legislation requiring defective delinquents to be cared for by the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals should be enacted. If any additions to present institutions are needed to house and treat these children, certainly such additions should logically be made to institutions under the direction of that Department.

CONCLUSION

We wish to express our appreciation for the constant and prompt co-operation given this Commission by the personnel of the Departments of Welfare and Institutions, and Mental Hygiene and Hospitals during the course of this complex study.

Drafts of legislation necessary to carry out the recommendations in this report are attached.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Roy Smith, Chairman

Mrs. H. Stanley Bailey, Vice-Chairman

Robert F. Baldwin, Jr.

Walter A. Page

William Earle White

Robert Whitehead

STATEMENT OF GARNETT S. MOORE

While I concur with most of the recommendations of the report, I wish to state my views as to several matters in connection therewith.

I do not agree that a judge must necessarily be what is termed a "specialist" to effectively administer the laws relating to juvenile offenders, or in disposing of cases involving offenses by juveniles. I feel that on the whole our county judges throughout the State do a very good job in these matters. I agree that probation officers' reports, psychiatric examinations, and other reports are of much benefit, especially in larger places where the offender and his family are not known to the court or to court officials.

I do not agree with recommendation numbered 13 of the report. It is my opinion that our present procedure accomplishes the same result as that which the Commission intends to accomplish with its suggested bill and without imposing additional burdens on our juvenile courts. If I understand the present law, the juvenile court can hold a juvenile for grand jury action or may dispose of the case if it believes that to be the proper action. In addition, the Commonwealth's Attorney can elect to take action in a court of record on those cases where juveniles are charged with serious offenses, etc. I see no necessity of having the juvenile judge, or the county judge as the case may be, set out in an order that it is for the public interest for the case to be disposed of by the juvenile court. It seems to me that if he disposes of the case, then, as a matter of fact, he is determining it to be for the best interest of the individual and in the interest of the public.

While the Commission has interpreted its directive as precluding a general consideration of the broad subject of the prevention of juvenile delinquency, I feel that in order to have an effective program in Virginia to combat this problem, an overall study must be made of the causes of juvenile delinquency. Once the causes are determined recommendations can be made to the General Assembly which, if followed, would tend to

alleviate these causes. Such a study would go beyond procedural matters and I feel sure would provide specific recommendations for improving certain economic factors through the development of a program providing work and recreational opportunities, and at the same time offer methods for educational, disciplinary, religious, and social guidance and training for the juvenile while he works and plays.

Enactment of such a program would do more than deal with the juvenile offender brought before the court; it would offer assistance to the potential delinquent and would provide a method of rehabilitating the convicted offender.

I do not feel that final solution to this problem can be found without such a study.

A BILL to amend the Code of Virginia by adding thereto a section numbered 16.1-176.1, so as to provide for trial of a juvenile sixteen years of age or over by a court of record under certain circumstances.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia be amended by adding thereto a section numbered 16.1-176.1, as follows:

§ 16.1-176.1. If a juvenile sixteen years of age or over, who has been previously committed to any juvenile training school in this State or any other state, is charged with an offense which, if committed by an adult, could be punishable by death or confinement in the penitentiary, the case shall be certified for proper criminal proceedings to the appropriate court of record having jurisdiction of such offense if committed by an adult, unless the juvenile and domestic relations court shall find and shall certify in its order that it is in the public interest for the matter to be disposed of therein.

A BILL to amend the Code of Virginia by adding thereto a section numbered 16.1-143.1, so as to permit localities to establish and operate joint regional juvenile and domestic relations courts, and to provide for payment of salaries of judges and personnel of such courts.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia be amended by adding thereto a section numbered 16.1-143.1, as follows:

§ 16.1-143.1. The governing bodies of any city or county or of any group of cities or counties or cities and counties may establish and operate a joint regional juvenile and domestic relations court. The contribution of each such locality to the expenses of maintaining and operating such court shall be in accordance with agreement between such governing bodies. The salaries of the judges, associate judges, substitute judges, clerks, deputy clerks and other employees of such courts shall be fixed by the Compensation Board, and shall be paid by the State out of the appropriations in the general appropriation act for criminal charges.

A BILL to amend the Code of Virginia by adding thereto a section numbered 16.1-178.2, so as to permit juvenile and domestic relations courts and the Department of Welfare and Institutions to commit certain juveniles to the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals under certain circumstances.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia be amended by adding thereto a section numbered 16.1-178.2, as follows:

§ 16.1-178.2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, when any juvenile and domestic relations court has adjudged as delinquent a juvenile coming within the provisions of paragraphs (g), (h) and (i) of subsection (1) of § 16.1-158, and is satisfied that he or she is a mental defective, such court may commit such juvenile to an appropriate State hospital for observation as to his or her mental condition, whereupon the proceedings shall be in accordance with the provisions of §§ 37-99 to 37-102, inclusive, of the Code of Virginia, and to that end, such juvenile and domestic relations court judge is hereby vested with the powers of commitment set forth in § 37-102. After commitment of any juvenile to the State Board of Welfare and Institutions, if the Department of Welfare and Institutions finds, as a result of psychiatric examinations and case study, that such juvenile is a mental defective, it may transfer such juvenile to an appropriate State hospital for observation as to his or her mental condition, whereupon the proceedings shall be in accordance with the provisions hereof.

APPENDIX A*

DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS TRAINING SCHOOL RETURNEES IN TRAINING SCHOOLS AND STUDY UNITS

December 1, 1958

	<u>Population</u>	<u>No. of Returnees</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White Males			
Beaumont School for Boys	265	55	20.75
Study Home for White Boys	77	0	—
Colored Males			
Hanover School for Boys	230	45	19.56
Study Unit	46	0	—
White Females			
Bon Air School for Girls	121	17	14.04
Study Unit	22	2	9.09
Colored Females			
Janie Porter Barrett School for Girls	114	14	12.28
Study Unit	22	0	—
TOTAL	897	133	14.82

* Appendices A through F supplied by Virginia Department of Welfare and Institutions.

APPENDIX B (1)

209 WARDS OF THE STATE COMMITTED TO THE PENITENTIARY JULY 1957-JUNE 1958

RACE: WHITE

ADULT RECORD					JUVENILE RECORD				
Prison Number	Age	Offense	Term	Present Classification	Juvenile Institution	Year Entered	Reason	Term	Full Scale I. Q.
72129 (F)	20	Forgery	2 yrs.	Woman's Farm	Bon Air	1955	Forgery	2 yrs.	91
72541*	24	Forgery	2 yrs.	Penitentiary	Beaumont	1948	B&E	3 yrs.	57
73677	20	Forgery	5 yrs.	Penitentiary	Beaumont	1955	B&E	2 yrs.	82
72732	27	Forgery	2 yrs.	Penitentiary	State Colony	1947	Theft	1 mo.	104
72894	35	Forgery	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Va. Court	1939	Forgery	2 yrs.	70
72141	23	Forgery	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Foster H.	1951	Forgery	1 yr.	70
71824*	26	Forgery	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1948	Delinq.	1 yr.	90
73450	21	B&E	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1953	H.B.	2 yrs.	70
73214	18	B&E	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1956	B&E	2 yrs.	87
73018	18	B&E	13 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1955	B&E	2 yrs.	94
73112	18	B&E	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Board. H.	1950	B&E	1 yr.	70
73114	18	B&E	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1953	B&E	5 yrs.	81
73092	19	B&E	2 yrs.	Penitentiary	Beaumont	1955	B&E	2 yrs.	102
73727	19	B&E	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1955	B&E	1 yr.	90
72109	20	B&E	6 yrs.	Road Camp	Foster H.	1954	B&E	2 yrs.	49
71789*	34	B&E	7 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1941	B&E	1 yr.	100
73121	22	B&E	6 yrs.	State Farm	Beaumont	1949	Larc.	5 yrs.	95
73673	21	B&E	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1952	Theft	4 yrs.	67
72827	18	B&E	5 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1956	Theft	1 yr.	90
72868	20	B&E	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Foster H.	1954	Theft	1 yr.	100
72718	20	B&E	2 yrs.	Discharged	Wel. Dept.	1953	Burg.	1 mo.	100
73093	20	B&E	2 yrs.	State Farm	Beaumont	1954	Delinq.	3 yrs.	85
72743	22	B&E	5 yrs.	Penitentiary	State Colony	1952	Assault	2 yrs.	70
71745	24	B&E	5 yrs.	Penitentiary	Beaumont	1952	B&E	3 yrs.	70
73113	18	B&E	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1955	Theft	2 yrs.	80

* RECIDIVIST

29

* RECIDIVIST

30

* RECIDIVIST

APPENDIX B (1)—Continued

ADULT RECORD

JUVENILE RECORD

Prison Number	Age	Offense	Term	Present Classification	Juvenile Institution	Year Entered	Reason	Term	Full Scale I. Q.
72037	28	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1940	Delinq.	6 yrs.	65
71938	19	Stat. B.	1 yr.	State Farm	Beaumont	1954	Theft	3 yrs.	70
72697	20	Stat. B.	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Foster H.	1954	Delinq.	3 yrs.	93
73426*	29	Stat. B.	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1958	Delinq.	3 mos.	80
72003	19	Stat. B.	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1953	Delinq.	2 yrs.	68
73007	36	Stat. B.	4 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1936	Delinq.	3 yrs.	65
73261	18	Theft	2 yrs.	Discharged	Beaumont	1955	B&E	2 yrs.	79
73035	17	Theft	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1953	Theft	1 yr.	94
73612	18	Theft	4 yrs.	State Farm	Beaumont	1957	Theft	1 yr.	101
73033	17	Theft	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1950	Theft	4 yrs.	84
71970	19	Maiming	1 yr.	Discharged	Juv. Court	1954	GL	1 yr.	60
71697	18	Robbery	1 yr.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1955	Larc.	1 yr.	80
73166	18	Robbery	5 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1953	Theft	3 yrs.	88
71781	20	Robbery	5 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1952	Theft	1 yr.	90
72137	26	Robbery	9 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1947	Arson	2 yrs.	90
73715	24	Robbery	8 yrs.	State Farm	Foster H.	1949	Assault	5 yrs.	100
73365	24	Robbery	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1948	Theft	2 yrs.	60
72290	29	Robbery	4 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1946	Theft	2 yrs.	75
73168	18	Robbery	5 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1954	Delinq.	1 yr.	79
72105	18	Robbery	8 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1955	Delinq.	3 yrs.	76
73679	17	Robbery	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1956	Truant	2 yrs.	93
73539	26	Murder	85 yrs.	Penitentiary	Beaumont	1942	Delinq.	8 yrs.	60
73729	27	Murder	15 yrs.	Penitentiary	Beaumont	1947	Delinq.	1 yr.	70
73238	20	Rape	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1956	Larc.	1 yr.	80
71840	20	Rape	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Beaumont	1953	Theft	2 yrs.	70
72238	30	Mal. Shoot	3 yrs.	State Farm	Beaumont	1940	B&E	5 yrs.	60
73524	19	Mal. Wd.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1947	B&E	4 yrs.	104
72596	19	Mal. Wd.	1 yr.	Discharged	Beaumont	1952	B&E	3 yrs.	99
73252*	29	Mfg. Whisk.	1 yr.	Lime Plant	Beaumont	1943	Delinq.	2 yrs.	67
72608	21	Narcotics	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Beaumont	1954	Theft	2 yrs.	96

* RECIDIVIST

APPENDIX B (1)—Continued

209 WARDS OF THE STATE COMMITTED TO THE PENITENTIARY JULY 1957-JUNE 1958

RACE: COLORED

ADULT RECORD

JUVENILE RECORD

Prison Number	Age	Offense	Term	Present Classification	Juvenile Institution	Year Entered	Reason	Term	Full Scale I. Q.
73050	20	Mfg. Whisk.	8 mos.	Discharged	Hanover	1955	Mfg. W.	1 yr.	51
73684	48	Perjury	1 yr.	Penitentiary	Hanover	1925	At. Rape	1 yr.	72
71720	DK	Assault	50 yrs.	Penitentiary	Hanover	1944	Assault	1 yr.	85
73765(F)	33	Murder	20 yrs.	Woman's Farm	C. S. Hosp.	1940	Mental	2 yrs.	40
72777	25	Murder	20 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1947	Theft	3 yrs.	75
72632	21	Robbery	10 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1950	Theft	3 yrs.	73
72918	23	Robbery	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Board. H.	1951	Prop. D.	1 yr.	76
73395	18	Robbery	12 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1950	Delinq.	5 yrs.	68
71719	18	Robbery	10 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1956	Burgl.	1 yr.	70
72930	22	Robbery	5 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1951	Theft	2 yrs.	87
72101	18	Robbery	8 yrs.	Penitentiary	Hanover	1955	Theft	1 yr.	70
72355	18	Robbery	15 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1953	Theft	1 yr.	57
72511	20	Robbery	10 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1953	Theft	1 yr.	105
72686	18	Robbery	15 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1955	Theft	1 yr.	90
73397	18	Robbery	10 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1951	Larc.	4 yrs.	66
72845	17	Robbery	5 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1954	Theft	2 yrs.	69
72569	17	Robbery	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	Theft	1 yr.	73
71734	21	Robbery	15 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1953	Theft	1 yr.	68
72560	21	Robbery	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1953	Larc.	1 yr.	58
73410	21	Robbery	20 yrs.	Road Camp	St. Colony	1950	Theft	Uukn.	57
73045	28	Robbery	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1944	Theft	Unkn.	62
72483	23	Robbery	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1951	B&E	1 yr.	59
72426	27	Robbery	20 yrs.	State Farm	Hanover	1941	H.B.	4 yrs.	58
73685*	34	Robbery	15 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1938	B&E	2 yrs.	60
73002	18	Robbery	5 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1954	B&E	2 yrs.	64

* RECIDIVIST

APPENDIX B (1)—Continued

ADULT RECORD

JUVENILE RECORD

Prison Number	Age	Offense	Term	Present Classification	Juvenile Institution	Year Entered	Reason	Term	Full Scale I. Q.
72392	19	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1951	Larc.	1 yr.	80
72982	19	Theft	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	Larc.	Unkn.	62
73495	18	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1953	Delinq.	3 yrs.	70
73213	17	Theft	6 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	Delinq.	4 yrs.	86
72097	18	Theft	5 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1953	Delinq.	1 yr.	99
72383	17	Theft	2 yrs.	South Farm	Hanover	1956	Forgery	2 yrs.	80
72983	19	Theft	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1956	Burgl.	1 yr.	88
72384	16	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1955	Theft	2 yrs.	72
72838	17	Theft	4 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1953	Larc.	1 yr.	96
73082	17	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1958	Larc.	1 yr.	73
72405	20	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Board. H.	1954	Theft	2 yrs.	78
73224	28	G.L.	8 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1946	B&E	2 yrs.	100
72585	17	Theft	1 yr.	Penitentiary	Hanover	1954	B&E	Unkn.	81
71981	20	Theft	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1953	B&E	5 yrs.	72
72388	25	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1957	B&E	1 yr.	80
72385	17	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1956	B&E	2 yrs.	85
73563	21	Stat. B.	18 mos.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	Contempt	4 yrs.	65
73067	28	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1946	Truant	2 yrs.	70
71920	21	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Penitentiary	Hanover	1955	B&E	1 yr.	100
73565	20	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1954	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	67
72689	25	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1950	Assault	1 yr.	66
72337	20	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1953	Assault	2 yrs.	63
72362	20	Stat. B.	6 yrs.	State Farm	Hanover	1952	Delinq.	5 yrs.	63
71756	18	Stat. B.	5 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1954	Delinq.	2 yrs.	65
72494	19	Burgl.	5 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	Assault	2 yrs.	63
73147	22	Stat. B.	1 yr.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	St. B.	2 yrs.	74
72583	43	Burgl.	4 yrs.	State Farm	Va. Court	1930	Larc.	Unkn.	60
72661	19	Stat. B.	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	Larc.	1 yr.	80
72972	19	Burgl.	22 yrs.	South. Farm.	Court	1950	Delinq.	3 yrs.	62

* RECIDIVIST

APPENDIX B (1)—Continued

ADULT RECORD

JUVENILE RECORD

Prison Number	Age	Offense	Term	Present Classification	Juvenile Institution	Year Entered	Reason	Term	Full Scale I. Q.
73719	43	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	State Farm	Foster H.	1930	Delinq.	5 yrs.	70
72701*	24	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1951	Robbery	2 yrs.	42
72177	24	Stat. B.	5 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1954	Larc.	4 yrs.	64
72576	21	Stat. B.	20 yrs.	South. Farm	St. Colony	1951	Theft	4 yrs.	50
72361	21	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Discharged	Thorps H.	1950	Theft	1 yr.	80
72688	18	Stat. B.	1 yr.	South. Farm	Foster H.	1954	Larc.	1 yr.	67
72391	18	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1955	Theft	2 yrs.	81
72613	18	Stat. B.	7 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	Larc.	6 yrs.	72
71711	18	Stat. B.	3 yrs.	Penitentiary	Hanover	1955	Larc.	2 yrs.	90
73585	20	Stat. B.	4 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	B&E	2 yrs.	60
73068	20	Stat. B.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	B&E	2 yrs.	104
73615	17	Stat. B.	7 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1956	B&E	1 yr.	56
73069*	23	Stat. B.	4 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1950	B&E	Unkn.	59
72622	21	Stat. B.	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1954	B&E	Unkn.	82
72191	20	G. L.	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1953	Truant	1 yr.	59
72175	20	G. L.	1 yr.	Discharged	St. Colony	1952	Delinq.	1 yr.	49
72751	21	G. L.	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1955	Rape	1 yr.	90
72005	20	G. L.	5 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	Robbery	2 yrs.	67
73489	33	G. L.	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Foster H.	1943	Theft	1 yr.	70
72459	33	G. L.	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1943	Theft	1 yr.	70
72356	18	G. L.	6 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1955	Theft	2 yrs.	82
72458	20	G. L.	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	Theft	3 yrs.	78
72358	21	G. L.	12 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	Theft	2 yrs.	67
72173	20	G. L.	1 yr.	Discharged	St. Colony	1952	Larc.	3 yrs.	62
72357	18	G. L.	12 yrs.	State Farm	Hanover	1955	Theft	1 yr.	70
72343	19	G. L.	4 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1956	B&E	1 yr.	90
72360	19	G. L.	2 yrs.	State Farm	Hanover	1951	B&E	2 yrs.	80
72170	19	G. L.	6 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1950	B&E	6 yrs.	71
72770	22	Theft	2 yrs.	South. Farm	Thorps H.	1954	B&E	1 yr.	83

* RECIDIVIST

APPENDIX B (1)—Continued

ADULT RECORD					JUVENILE RECORD				
Prison Number	Age	Offense	Term	Present Classification	Juvenile Institution	Year Entered	Reason	Term	Full Scale I. Q.
71763	18	G. L.	3 yrs.	Discharged	Hanover	1952	G. L.	2 yrs.	70
72925	17	G. L.	6 mos.	Discharged	Hanover	1956	G. L.	1 yr.	68
72567	25	B&E	3 yrs.	South. Farm	Thorps H.	1949	Theft	4 yrs.	53
72519	24	B&E	3 yrs.	South Farm	Hanover	1951	Theft	2 yrs.	59
72400	20	Storeb.	4 yrs.	South. Farm	Hanover	1948	Theft	7 yrs.	64
73314	22	B&E	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	Destruc.	2 yrs.	72
72066	21	B&E	20 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1952	B&E	3 yrs.	105
72271	19	B&E	3 yrs.	South Farm	Hanover	1954	Theft	4 yrs.	65
73295	19	B&E	3 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1955	B&E	3 yrs.	39
72761	20	B&E	1 yr.	South. Farm	St. Colony	1954	B&E	1 yr.	59
73770	22	Forgery	2 yrs.	State Farm	Hanover	1954	Theft	1 yr.	77
73758	21	Forgery	2 yrs.	Road Camp	Hanover	1951	Delinq.	4 yrs.	70
72393	23	G. L.	1 yr.	South. Farm	Hanover	1957	B&E	1 yr.	85
* RECIDIVIST									

It was noted that out of the 209 studied, 179 inmates were born in Virginia and thirty in bordering states. When received at the Penitentiary, 68% or 143 of the inmates were under twenty-one years of age, and fifty-five, or 26% were under eighteen.

The Full Scale I. Q., which is the sum total of verbal and non-verbal performance, is the one obtained at the various juvenile institutions.

APPENDIX B (2)

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS

TABLE I

FORMER STATE WARDS
COMMITTED TO THE PENITENTIARY
ACCORDING TO TYPE OF CARE
July 1957—June 1958

<u>Type of Care</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>WHITE</u>		<u>COLORED</u>	
		<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Training School	157	83	1	73	—
Boarding Care	28	18	—	10	—
Mental Institutions	13	3	—	9	1
Commitment Suspended	5	4	—	1	—
Receiving Home	3	2	—	1	—
Study Home (AWOL)	3	1	—	2	—
TOTAL	209	111	1	96	1

TABLE II

FORMER STATE WARDS COMMITTED TO PENITENTIARY
BY AGE, RACE AND SEX
July 1957—June 1958

<u>Age at Time of Commitment to Penitentiary</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>WHITE</u>		<u>COLORED</u>	
		<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
14	1	—	—	1	—
15	5	2	—	3	—
16	12	8	—	4	—
17	37	20	—	17	—
18	33	20	—	13	—
19	38	17	1	20	—
20	17	6	—	11	—
21-25	35	20	—	15	—
26-30	14	9	—	5	—
31-35	12	7	—	4	1
36-40	—	—	—	—	—
41-45	4	2	—	2	—
46-50	1	—	—	1	—
TOTAL	209	111	1	96	1

TABLE III
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS
FORMER STATE WARDS COMMITTED TO PENITENTIARY BY
REASON FOR COMMITMENT TO YOUTH SERVICES AND TO PENITENTIARY
JULY 1957-JUNE 1958

REASON FOR COMMITMENT TO YOUTH SERVICES	TOTAL	REASONS FOR COMMITMENT TO PENITENTIARY													
		OFFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY							OFFENSES AGAINST PERSONS				OTHER OFFENSES		
		Forgery	Break & Enter	Larceny, theft	Burglary	Unauthorized Use of Auto	Killing, Maiming Cattle	Robbery	Murder	Rape	Shooting into Auto	Malicious Assault	Perjury	Mfg. of Alcoholic Beverage	Violation Narcotic Act
<u>Offenses Against Property</u>															
Break and Enter	54	3	13	10	14	6	...	4	1	...	1	2	...	...	...
Stealing, theft and larceny.....	70	1	8	24	13	5	1	13	1	3	...	...	...	...	1
Unauthorized use of auto	3	...	...	...	1	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Burglary	7	...	1	1	3	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Forgery	4	2	...	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Trespassing	2	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Arson	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	142	6	23	37	31	14	1	21	2	3	1	2	...	...	1

TABLE III—Continued

88

		REASONS FOR COMMITMENT TO PENITENTIARY													
		OFFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY							OFFENSES AGAINST PERSONS				OTHER OFFENSES		
REASON FOR COMMITMENT TO YOUTH SERVICES	TOTAL	Forgery	Break & Enter	Larceny, Theft	Burglary	Unauthorized Use of Auto	Killing, maiming Cattle	Robbery	Murder	Rape	Shooting into Auto	Malicious Assault	Perjury	Mfg. of Alcoholic Beverage	Violation Narcotic Act
Offenses Against Persons															
Assault	5	...	1	1	2	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Robbery	3	...	1	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rape	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Threw stones at motor vehicles	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	10	...	2	3	3	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Other Offenses															
Delinquent	9	...	...	2	5	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...
Incorrigible	19	2	3	6	4	1	...	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Runaway	8	1	...	...	3	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...
Truancy	11	...	3	3	3	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Violation of Probation	8	...	...	1	3	1	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Manufacture of Alcoholic Beverage	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
Dependent Child	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	57	3	6	12	18	6	...	7	2	...	...	...	1	2	...
TOTAL	209	9	31	52	52	20	1	30	4	3	1	2	1	2	1

APPENDIX B (3)

PERSONS FORMERLY IN VIRGINIA'S TRAINING SCHOOLS NOW SERVING FELON OR MISDEMEANANT SENTENCES IN STATE INSTITUTIONS

November, 1958

Male Felons

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>No. of Former Wards</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Penitentiary (Includes Blue Ridge, Catawba, and Lime Plant)	1800	152	8.4
State Convict Road Force	2416	386	16.0
State Farm for Men	747	60	8.0
Southampton Farm	469	88	18.8
TOTAL	5432	686	12.6

Male Misdemeanants

State Convict Road Force	308	10	3.2
State Penitentiary Farm	477	67	14.0
Bland Correctional Farm	440	34	7.7
TOTAL	1225	111	9.1

Female Felons

State Farm for Women	163	5	3.1
----------------------------	-----	---	-----

Female Misdemeanants

State Farm for Women	198	14	7.1
----------------------------	-----	----	-----

Totals

Total Male Misdemeanants & Felons	6657	797	12.0
Total Female Misdemeanants & Felons	361	19	5.3
Grand Total—Male and Female Misdemeanants and Felons	7018	816	11.6

APPENDIX C

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN RELEASED FROM TRAINING SCHOOLS BY LENGTH OF STAY DURING THE SIX MONTH PERIOD

August 1, 1958 to January 31, 1959

By Months

<u>Length of Stay</u>	<u>Beaumont</u>	<u>Bon Air</u>	<u>Hanover</u>	<u>Barrett</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	2				2
2	3	1			4
3		1			1
4	4	3		1	8
5	13	3	1	1	18
6	21	11	1		33
7	94	9	9		112
8	46	19	14		79
9	16	8	26	1	51
10	3	18	20		41
11	6	10	24		40
12	2	9	23	6	40
13		6	6	7	19
14	3	1	4	4	12
15	2	1	1	4	8
16			3	6	9
17		1	4	2	7
18			1	1	2
19					
20	1			1	2
21			1	1	2
22					
23					
24	1				1
25					
26					
27	1				1
28					
29		1			1
30					
TOTAL	218	102	138	35	493

APPENDIX D

Breakdown of the type of juvenile probation services by cities and counties as of October 1958:

I. PROBATION DEPARTMENTS AND REGIONAL PROBATION DEPARTMENTS ATTACHED TO THE JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURTS.

Cities (Probation Departments)	Estimated Population ¹	No. of Proba- tion Personnel ²	Number Clerical Staff ³
Alexandria	86,976	6	1
Bristol	17,912	1	1
Danville	49,741	4	1
Hampton	80,299	3	1
Lynchburg	49,483	4	1
Newport News	104,497	5	1
Norfolk	290,982	9	2
Petersburg	35,519	3	1
Portsmouth	85,243	3	2
Richmond	237,219	23	6
Roanoke	101,116	7	2
Staunton	23,340	1	Part time
<u>Counties</u>			
Arlington	159,670	8 + 1 (half time)	2
Fairfax	193,645	6	2
Roanoke	53,354	2	1
Tazewell	49,691	1	Part time
<u>Regional Probation Departments</u>			
Pulaski, Town of Pulaski	30,207	1	Part time
Rockbridge, Lexington	25,206		
Buena Vista	6,300 31,506	1	Part time
Alleghany	11,364		
Botetourt	16,815		
Bath	5,910		
Covington	11,139		
Clifton Forge	5,626 50,854	1	Part time
TOTAL	19 1,731,254	89½	24 + 5 Part time

¹ Prepared by: Bureau of Population and Economic Research, University of Virginia, Feb. 1958.

² Probation Officers handle domestic relations cases as well as juvenile cases.

³ An approximation since other office personnel may share the clerical duties and perform court clerk functions.

The above figures show that the nineteen (19) probation staffs with a total of 89½ probation officers serve approximately 45% of the total population. The ratio of probation officers to population is approximately 1 to 19,000.

II. CHILD WELFARE WORKERS AND CHILD WELFARE WORKERS DESIGNATED AS COURT SOCIAL WORKERS SERVING JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURTS

Cities and Counties		Estimated Population	<u>Number Workers</u>
1. Court Social Workers in the Local Welfare Departments			
Charlottesville		30,018	1
Harrisonburg		12,316	1
Montgomery		33,298	1
Rockingham		40,380	1
TOTAL	4	116,012	4
2. Child Welfare Workers Devoting Approximately Full Time to Court Work			
Albemarle		28,536	1
Henrico		94,517	2
Augusta		34,995	1
TOTAL	3	158,048	4
3. Other Child Welfare Workers Devoting Less Than Full Time to Court Work			
Accomack		34,383	1
Bedford		32,119	1
Carroll		25,794	1
Chesterfield		61,791	3
Culpepper		14,338	1
Frederick		21,281	1
Grayson		17,006	1
Halifax		43,143	1
Hanover		27,357	1
Nansemond		29,992	2
Norfolk County		75,267	4
Northampton		17,481	1
Page		15,343	1
Pittsylvania		61,838	1
Princess Anne		84,515	1
Russell		28,545	1
Smyth		31,095	1
Southampton		26,921	1
Washington		38,304	2
Wise		48,598	1
Hopewell		18,967	1
South Norfolk		23,260	3
Suffolk		12,425	1
TOTAL	23	789,763	32

<u>Cities and Counties</u>	<u>Estimated Population</u>	<u>Number Workers</u>
4. Superintendents of Local Welfare Departments Devoting a Portion of Time to Court Work		
Amelia	8,302	1
Amherst	21,325	1
Appomattox	9,166	1
Bland	6,394	1
Brunswick	20,409	1
Buchanan	39,948	1
Buckingham	12,331	1
Campbell	35,950	1
Caroline	12,689	1
Charles City	4,989	1
Charlotte	15,333	1
Clarke	7,530	1
Craig	3,276	1
Cumberland	7,051	1
Dickenson	24,066	1
Dinwiddie	21,096	1
Essex	6,777	1
Fauquier	24,530	1
Floyd	11,292	1
Fluvanna	7,367	1
Franklin	27,436	1
Giles	20,186	1
Gloucester	11,264	1
Goochland	9,520	1
Greene	5,240	1
Greensville	17,744	1
Henry	37,947	1
Highland	3,738	1
Isle of Wight	16,992	1
James City	7,713	1
King and Queen	6,878	1
King George	6,360	1
King William	8,046	1
Lancaster	9,154	1
Lee	30,323	1
Loudoun	23,858	1
Louisa	13,768	1
Lunenburg	14,680	1
Madison	8,820	1
Mathews	6,741	1
Mecklenburg	34,149	1
Middlesex	6,927	1
Nelson	14,053	1
New Kent	4,360	1
Northumberland	9,797	1
Nottoway	15,259	1
Orange	13,590	1
Patrick	16,353	1
Powhatan	5,880	1
Prince Edward	15,770	1
Prince George	22,865	1
Prince William	31,446	1

<u>Cities and Counties</u>		<u>Estimated Population</u>	<u>Number Workers</u>
Rappahannock		5,774	1
Richmond County		6,235	1
Scott		28,253	1
Shenandoah		21,670	1
Spotsylvania		14,426	1
Stafford		14,374	1
Surry		6,615	1
Sussex		13,498	1
Warren		15,426	1
Westmoreland		10,645	1
Wythe		22,843	1
York		18,954	1
Colonial Heights		8,684	1
Falls Church		10,007	0
Fredericksburg		12,517	1
Galax		5,770	1
Martinsville		18,972	1
Norton		5,210	1
Radford		9,787	1
Virginia Beach		7,300	Served by Princess Anne Co.
Waynesboro		14,805	1
Williamsburg		8,068	1
Winchester		14,866	1
TOTAL	75	1,072,299	73
<u>Cities and Counties</u>		<u>Population</u>	<u>Staff</u>
Total—Welfare	105	2,136,122	113
Total—Probation Jurisdictions	24	1,731,254	89½
GRAND TOTAL	129	3,867,376	202½

The above figures show that 105 local welfare departments with a total staff of 113 workers serve approximately 55% of the total population. The ratio of welfare workers to population is approximately 1 to 18,000.

APPENDIX E

NUMBER OF JUVENILES HELD IN DETENTION AND JAIL
WHERE DETENTION FACILITIES ARE AVAILABLE *

Fiscal Year July 1, 1957—June 30, 1958

<u>Serves</u>	<u>Jail</u>	<u>Detention</u>	<u>Serves</u>	<u>Jail</u>	<u>Detention</u>
ARLINGTON FACILITY			RICHMOND		
Arlington	80	287	Richmond	187	1,301
Alexandria	75	25	Amelia	0	0
Fairfax	255	62	Chesterfield	19	52
Loudoun	17	1	Caroline	31	8
	—	—	Dinwiddie	23	0
	427	375	Goochland	0	3
			Hanover	49	34
			Henrico	72	64
BRISTOL			King William	0	0
Bristol	23	90	Louisa	6	0
Scott	51	14	Orange	14	3
Washington	50	14		—	—
	—	—		401	1,465
	124	118			
NEWPORT NEWS			ROANOKE		
Newport News			Roanoke	125	622
(Warwick)	73	309	Botetourt	17	25
Hampton	23	57	Bedford	22	6
York & Poquoson ..	17	1	Clifton Forge	9	2
	—	—	Floyd	10	1
	113	367	Franklin	24	3
			Henry	34	12
NORFOLK			Martinsville	13	3
Norfolk	38	968	Montgomery	59	18
			Patrick	17	1
PULASKI			Rockingham	96	3
Pulaski	24	152	Roanoke County	55	69
Radford	15	6	Waynesboro	6	2
Smyth	50	6		—	—
	—	—		487	765
	89	164			

* Detention facilities used by the above jurisdictions limited due to lack of space.

Appendix F

DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES MENTAL DEFECTIVES IN CARE OCTOBER 31, 1958

46	INSTITUTIONS	TOTAL POPULATION	I.Q. 49 AND BELOW		I.Q. 50 TO 59		I.Q. 60 TO 69		TOTAL WITH I.Q. 69 AND BELOW	
			Number	Percentage of Unit Population	Number	Percentage of Unit Population	Number	Percentage of Unit Population	Number	Percentage of Unit Population
	Training Schools									
	Beaumont	262	4		4		28		36	13.7
	Hanover	230	1		8		34		43	18.7
	Bon Air	110	2		7		11		20	18.2
	Janie Porter Barrett	107			4		21		25	23.4
	TOTAL	709	7	1.0	23	3.2	94	13.3	124	17.5

