

defined as a "client-level strategy for promoting the coordination of human services, opportunities, or benefits." Case management seeks to achieve two major outcomes: 1) "the integration of services across a cluster of organizations" and 2) continuity of care (Moxley, 1989: 11). The main focus of case management is to develop a network of human services that integrates the development of client skills and the involvement of different social networks and multiple service providers (Moxley, 1989: 21).

The goals the program is designed to accomplish include the following: 1) Provide multilevel interventions to divert youth from secure detention facilities; 2) demonstrate that community-based interventions are an effective alternative to secure custody and that the needs of both the youths and the community can be met at a cost savings to the public; and 3) reduce disproportionate minority incarceration.⁹

The DDAP program involves two primary components:

- *Detention Advocacy*—This component involves identifying youth likely to be detained pending their adjudication. After a potential client is identified, DDAP case managers present a release plan to the judge. The plan includes a list of appropriate community services that will be accessed on the youth's behalf. Additionally, the plan includes specified objectives as a means to evaluate the youth's progress while in the program. Emphasis is placed on maintaining the youth at home, and if the home is not a viable option, the project staff will identify and secure a suitable alternative. If the plan is deemed acceptable by a judge, the youth is released to DDAP's supervision.

- *Case Management*—The case management model provides frequent and consistent support and supervision to youth and their families. The purpose of case management is to link youths to community-based services and closely monitor their progress. Case management services are field oriented, requiring the case manager to have daily contact with the youth, his or her family, and significant others. Contact includes a minimum of three in-person meetings a week. Additional services are provided to the youth's family members, particularly parents and guardians, in areas such as securing employment, day care, drug treatment services, and income support.

Clients are identified primarily through referrals from the public defender's office, the probation department, community agencies, and parents. Admission to DDAP is restricted to youths currently held, or likely to be held, in secure detention. The youths selected are those deemed to be "high risk" in terms of their chance of engaging in subsequent criminal activity. The selection is based on a risk-assessment instrument developed by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. The target population consists of those whose risk-assessment scores indicate that they would ordinarily be detained. This is what Jerome Miller has termed the "deep-end" approach (1998). This is very important, for by focusing on *detained* youths, the project ensures that it remains a true diversion

rather than "net widening." Youths are screened by DDAP staff to determine whether they are likely to be detained and whether they present an acceptable risk to the community.

Client screening involves gathering background information from probation reports, psychological evaluations, police reports, school reports, and other pertinent documents. Interviews are conducted with youths, family members, and adult professionals to determine the types of services required. After a potential client is evaluated, a DDAP staff member presents a comprehensive community service plan at the detention hearing and requests that the judge release the youth to DDAP custody.

Because the project deals only with youths who are awaiting adjudication or final disposition, their appropriateness for the project is based on whether they can reside in the community under supervision without unreasonable risk and their likelihood of attending their court hearings. This is similar in principle to what often occurs in the adult system when someone is released on bail pending their court hearings (e.g., arraignments, trial).

The primary goal of the project is to design and implement individualized community service plans that address a wide range of personal and social needs. Services that address specific linguistic or medical needs are located by case managers. Along with the youth's participation, the quality and level of services are monitored by DDAP staff. It should be noted that the purpose of multiple collaborators is to ensure that the project is able to represent and address the needs of the various communities within San Francisco in the most culturally appropriate manner. Because youth services in San Francisco have been historically fragmented by ethnicity, race, and community, a more unified approach is being tried with DDAP in that it has become a neutral site within the city and staffed by representatives from CJCJ and several other community-based service agencies (e.g., Horizon's Unlimited, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House, Vietnamese Youth Development Center).

More specific goals include 1) ensuring that a high proportion of the program clients are not rearrested while participating in the program, 2) achieving high court reappearance rate, 3) reducing the population of the Youth Guidance Center, and 4) reducing the proportion of minority youths in detention. Currently, the Youth Guidance Center is the only place of detention in the city. The average length of stay is around 11 to 12 days.

The evaluation consisted of comparing a group of youths referred to DDAP with a similarly matched control group that remained within the juvenile justice system (for a complete overview of the evaluation, see Sheldon, 1999b). The results showed that after a three-year follow-up, the recidivism rate for DDAP group was 34 percent, compared to a 60 percent rate for the control group. Detailed comparisons holding several variables constant (e.g., prior recidivism rate, age, gender, etc.) and examining several different measures of recidivism (e.g., subsequent commitments, referrals for violent offenses) showed that DDAP youths still had a significantly lower recidivism rate.