

Held in Room 526, at the Statehouse at 3:30 a. m./p. m., on January 25, 1979.

All members were present except:

Rep. Stites (EXCUSED)

The next meeting of the Committee will be held at 3:30 a. m./p. m., on January 29, 1979.

These minutes of the meeting held on January 24, 1979 were considered, corrected and approved.

JOSEPH J. HOAGLAND

Chairman

The conferees appearing before the Committee were:

Representative Ferguson
Representative Farrar
Representative Glover
Judge Bob Morrison, 18th Judicial District, Wichita
Michael E. Boyer, Director - Statistical Analysis Center for
the Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration
Robert C. Harder, Secretary of the Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services

Chairman Hoagland brought the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
Minutes were approved.

The Chair introduced Representative Ferguson, sponsor of
HB 2035, who briefly described the bill and indicated an
amendment he would like added on Page 3, Line 28, to
delete the period and add the phrase, "by the said child."
Chairman Hoagland asked Rep. Ferguson to provide the change
to Rep. Gillmore's sub-committee.

Judge Bob Morrison, 18th Judicial District then spoke briefly
in favor of a bill like HB 2035.

The Chairman then introduced Representative Farrar, sponsor
of HB 2053. In his statement regarding the bill, he indicated
approximately 15 counties were interested in passing this bill.

Chairman Hoagland introduced Representative Glover, sponsor of
HB 2059 and HB 2106. Rep. Glover had Michael Boyer from the
Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration, give some
statistical information to the committee and suggested the
following amendment on Page 2, Line 47, after the word,
Secretary, "in conjunction with the judicial administration
and G.C.A.A.

Rep. Glover then explained HB 2106, which he also sponsored.
The only change was the compliance date of July 1, 1980.

Robert Harder, Secretary, S.R.S. indicated he supported both HB 2059 and HB 2106.

Chairman Hoagland then asked Judge Morrison to comment on all the juvenile bills. Judge Morrison stated that HB 2053 would not really effect his judicial district. Regarding HB 2059, he would prefer to keep it to having to fill out only one report. He approves of HB 2106 and the change of compliance date. Judge Morrison said he had a few concerns with HB 2010. On HB 2012, the judge suggested getting all the definitions together in one place and giving them one determination. His comments on HB 2011 indicated he felt that something along the lines of this bill was in order, but was not sure this bill would take care of it. He suggested that an alternative proposal would be "that if a child has been in a particular foster placement for a short period of time, notice be given to the court, parents, or foster parents so that if anyone desired a review hearing, the court could schedule one, when the child was being taken from the foster placement." The judge indicated he could not support HB 2011 in its present form.

Following several questions and answers on the juvenile bills, Chairman Hoagland adjourned the committee meeting at 4:55 p.m.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Committee on Judiciary

Recommends that House Bill No. 2035

"AN ACT amending the Kansas juvenile code; providing for the criminal prosecution of juveniles for certain crimes under certain circumstances; amending K.S.A. 1978 Supp. 38-806 and 38-808 and repealing the existing sections."

Be amended:

On page 3, in line 89, following "weapon" by deleting the period and inserting the following: "by the said child."

And the bill be passed as amended

_____Chairperson

Data Collection and the Juvenile Justice
Process in the State of Kansas
July 14, 1978

Michael E. Boyer - Director
Statistical Analysis Center
Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration

In response to a request to comment on the status of data collection "systems" in the state of Kansas for the Governor's Task Force on the Problems of Youth, the following is offered for the Task Force's consideration. This paper will provide a brief view of the problems in presenting statistically valid projections and hypotheses; collecting correlated data from autonomous agencies, or simply talking about total numbers of individuals involved in the juvenile process, offenses committed, court cases, or disposition.

The Problem

Information systems are developed to record basic information, evaluate the effectiveness of programs, and plan for necessary changes, deletions or continuations of these programs. Record, evaluate, and plan. These are the three vital functions necessary to produce a viable information system. While the cry is continually directed toward the planning or evaluation functions little concern is given to recording and collecting source data from which projections or policy statements can be made. Time needs to be given to the area of data needs and collection methods to insure a data base that allows both statistically valid and reliable assumptions and conclusions without duplication of effort. While numerous state agencies collect information concerning juveniles in Kansas, little or no correlation exists between data collected by one agency and that of another agency. In most cases information is collected to satisfy "in-house" needs with little or no consideration of data resources or needs of other agencies.

To a large degree, this lack of coordination has been brought on by over-zealous concerns for security and privacy, and self-serving attitudes on the part of many agencies. The Criminal Justice community will never truly be a "system" until increased cooperation and coordination is fostered. Accepting the concept of the inviolability of juvenile records, makes statewide reporting or reporting on the effect of various programs on recidivism quite difficult. Likewise it is nearly meaningless, given the current strictures, to discuss tracking in the juvenile or adult criminal justice process without identifying offenders either across counties or across age ranges. Consideration needs to be given to the recording and reporting of data as it pertains to juveniles.

At the present time the only viable source of juvenile offense data in the state is collected by SRS in the form of the Juvenile Court Statistical Card. (Form OHD-OYD-203). This card, while imperfect in many ways, at least collects uniform demographic data as well as offense and dispositional data on court activity throughout the state. That is, if the cards are correctly filled out and submitted. Until this year, total accounting from all 105 counties has never been received and to date two counties that have given verbal assurances about submitting their card have yet to provide said cards. Many courts attempt to do all their cards at one time, in January, rather than on a continuing basis throughout the year. Hence, the workload appears much heavier than it really is. Due to the historical animosity between SRS and the juvenile courts many court

personnel are less than enthusiastic about submitting these cards. One judge annually tossed the letter reminding his court of the submission of these cards in the trash. Currently, with the unification of the courts, a further problem has been injected into the malaise. The Office of the Judicial Administrator (OJA) has produced a series of forms to be completed by the Clerks of the District Court. In many areas, the responsibility of completing the Statistical Cards is also being given to the Clerks. Suffering from a lack of manpower and wrongly assuming the data collected on the Stat Card is a duplication of the OJA forms, many Clerks have stated they will no longer complete the cards. This would prove to be quite tragic. A coordinated effort is needed to assure accurate and complete filing of these Stat Cards.

Other data relevant to the juvenile process includes institutional data stored in SRS and Health and Environment, arrest data at the KBI and the Highway Patrol, court data at the Judicial Administrators Office, education data in the Department of Education and employment data in Human Resources. Others of relevance that have been excluded are offered apologies. The primary problem here, and one that begs for a solution, is the coordination of data in these various agencies.

While not at all comprehensive, this short presentation of the problem will offer a general analysis of the sad state of juvenile reporting in Kansas. While a single agency may have a good data system, until increased cooperation and coordination exists developmental activities performed in a vacuum will prove to be only self-defeating.

Recommendations

1. Until a coordinated system can be developed, it is strongly recommended that the collection of the Juvenile Court Statistical Cards be continued. Remove the collection process from SRS or obtain legislative, judicial, or executive authorization to alleviate the problem with court personnel refusing to complete these cards. The collection process needs to be housed where adequate staff can edit these cards, such as SRS. SRS has not had these cards keypunched recently, leaving boxes of raw data to collect dust. SRS is geared to collect and edit the data, and truly needs the data. It seems odd that such essential data is not keyed for use. Hence, an investigation of available funding needs to be made, should SRS need financial assistance in completing these cards for use.
2. Assure through comprehensive instructions, training and proper authorization that these cards are uniformly completed and submitted on a timely basis. Some counties currently fail to differentiate between formal and informal cases while others only submit formal cases.
3. Attempt to alleviate the unnecessary duplication in data systems through a centralized clearinghouse agency charged with the responsibility of coordinating collection and analysis efforts for the State. At the present time in the Comprehensive Data System Plan (July 30, 1976) submitted to LEAA the Statistical Analysis Center housed in the Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration is charged with these coordination and analytic functions.

4. Investigate the possibilities for identifying juvenile offenders across counties through a unified reporting system with basic demographic data used for tracking. While not taking issue with the topics of expungement or the sealing of records, a pragmatic approach to the problems of tracking and historical record keeping is needed.

These recommendations are offered more as a personal reflection on the state of affairs in the criminal justice data field and not necessarily the position of GCCA. The concern is for a comprehensive and accurate collection and reporting system in order to aid evaluation, analysis and planning for the state of Kansas.

Developing a Coordinated Data Collection
System for Juveniles in the State of Kansas:
The Impact on Research, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.

Background

On May 8, 1972 the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, (LEAA) of the Department of Justice, established a Comprehensive Data System (CDS) Program. Jerris Leonard, Administrator of LEAA, stated:

"One of the problems facing the criminal justice system is a lack of sound, reliable data for planning, implementation, and evaluation of improvement programs in many areas."

"To improve criminal justice planning and action programs, we need better information in such vital areas as the incidence of crime, the effect of correction on recidivism, and the nature and scope of criminal justice operations and expenditures."

The objectives of the CDS Program are:

"To assist the states in establishing an integrated criminal justice information and statistics system and to encourage uniformity in the reporting of information state-to-state and on the national level."

"To collect systematically and report criminal justice information and statistics so as to provide uniform and reliable data on a year-to-year, state-to-state, agency-to-agency, and national basis. Criminal justice information collected and analyzed in this manner will provide a wider range of significant information of higher reliability to agency directors and managers, to operational personnel, to the public, to governmental decision makers, and to those charged with the responsibility of research and planning for a more effective and efficient criminal justice system. State Planning Agencies (SPA) will then have at their disposal an individual planning tool in the form of up-to-date, reliable data indicating the problems and criminal justice needs of their respective states."

"To eliminate unnecessary duplication of data collections. This is an important benefit from a single national system, while reserving significant latitude to the states in going beyond the minimum criteria."

Components of the CDS include:

Statistical Analysis Center (SAC). A professional staff to coordinate the state's criminal justice information and statistics system, to provide interpretative analysis of collected data, to assist in ensuring quality control of data collected and reported, and to produce reports on crime and the operations of criminal justice agencies in the states.

Offender Based Transaction Statistics and Computerized Criminal Histories (OBTS/CCH). A systematic collection of significant data by police, prosecution, court, and correctional agencies about every person arrested on a serious charge, from the time of arrest to final disposition.

Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) The centralization in a state agency of the collection and reporting of uniform crime report data gathered by law enforcement agencies within the state. The state agency then forwards the collected data to the FBI for inclusion in its national UCR program.

Participation in the CDS Program is voluntary on the part of the states. In order to participate in the program a state submits a CDS Action Plan describing the development and implementation of the three CDS components. Kansas submitted an Action Plan on July 30, 1976. At that time approximately 40 states had submitted Action Plans. Since that time, of the 53 states, territories (Puerto Rico and Guam) and District of Columbia, 46 have submitted Action Plans and are in some phase of operation.

Under CDS guidelines the Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) is the first component to be established. The ultimate purpose of the SAC Unit is to analyze statistical data concerning the administration of criminal justice agencies at all levels of government within the state. Results of this analysis are disseminated to the appropriate criminal justice agencies, planning units, legislative and judicial branches of the state.

The SAC Unit in Kansas is associated with the State Planning Agency (SPA), as are 36 of the 46 current participants in CDS Programs. Kansas' SPA is the Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration (GCCA). The major responsibilities of the GCCA are:

To assist the governor and the attorney general in developing, planning, and implementing a longrange statewide crime and delinquency program;

To assist the governor and the attorney general in coordinating the crime and delinquency prevention activities of all state departments and agencies;

To advise and assist local Kansas communities and citizens' groups in developing, planning, and implementing citizen action programs for local crime and delinquency prevention.

To advise and assist in establishing a clearinghouse for crime and delinquency prevention programs, methods and techniques, including all federal programs;

To conduct and supervise conferences and educational programs;

To submit an annual report of its activities to the legislature and the people of the state of Kansas;

To receive, administer, and expend all federal and other financial assistance in the form of grants available to the state for the purpose of implementing the Crime Control Act of 1973.

By placing the SAC Unit in the SPA the intent has been to remove SAC organizationally from an operational criminal justice agency, hence assuring objectivity in the analysis and presentation of data. However, the SAC needs to know what the data needs are throughout the criminal justice community. The personnel of the SAC must have a detailed knowledge of the data, how it is collected, where it is stored and how it may interface

across agencies. The role of the SAC Unit must be active and anticipatory rather than passive and reactive. At best, the SAC must not be subjected to the political pressures of the state.

As GCCA has a cross-agency and cross-branch composition so does the SAC have an advisory committee representing all segments of the criminal justice process. This committee meets on a periodic basis to hear reports on the activities of the SAC as well as to serve as a sounding board for SAC projects and as a forum for cross-agency problems and cooperation.

Returning to the SAC operation, the purpose of the unit is to provide the State of Kansas with the following:

Objective interpretive analysis of criminal justice data, including that collected by the various line operating agencies.

Generate statistical reports on crime and on the processing of criminal offenders in support of planning and operational criminal justice agencies.

Technical assistance in the development of the CDS program in the state.

Collect, analyze, and disseminate management and administrative statistics on the criminal justice resources expended in the state.

Promote the orderly development of criminal justice information and statistical systems in the state.

Uniform data on criminal justice processes for the preparation of national statistical reports.

The following represent examples of, and uses for, information disseminated by the SAC Unit:

Inform the public and responsible government officials as to the nature of the crime problem, its magnitude, and its trend over time.

Measures the effects of prevention and deterrence programs, ranging from community action to police patrol.

Find out who commits crimes, by age, sex, family status, income, ethnic and residential background, and other social attributes, in order to find the proper focus of crime prevention programs.

Measure the workload and effectiveness of the police, the courts, and other agencies of the criminal justice system, both individually and as an integrated system.

Analyze the factors contributing to success and failure of probation, parole, and other correctional alternatives for various kinds of offenders.

Provide criminal justice agencies with comparative forms of performance.

Compute the costs of crime in terms of economic injury inflicted upon communities and individuals, as well as assess the direct public expenditures by criminal justice agencies.

Project expected crime rates and their consequences into the future for more enlightened government planning.

Assess the societal and other causes of crime and develop theories of criminal behavior.

In order to perform the analytic and interpretive functions that are its charge, a primary focus of the SAC Unit is to foster cooperation and facilitate coordination of the various data collection processes in the state. The issue at the present time is the existence of, or relative lack of, a viable data base on juvenile offenders in the State of Kansas. It is to this problem, with proposed alternative solutions, that the current discussion will now turn.

Statement of the Problem

Currently there is no viable source of data on juvenile offenders available to all agencies and planners across the state. While there are numerous individual agencies that collect data for in-house usage, little or no coordination or cooperation exists among these discreet agencies. Quite often the developmental process for data collection concerns only evaluation of agency need with no attempt made at tying into existing systems or the sharing of functional systems. The point of this concern, in the area of the juvenile justice process, is to create a "system" approach whereby those agencies impacting on the overall process pool their resources to alleviate duplication of data element collection and share in the collective result of the effort. The creation of a juvenile offender data-base system is the desired goal.

Ideally, this data base system would have the facility to track an individual from the commission of a "crime", through apprehension, the court, into diversion or restitution programs, probation or placement and back around into recidivist activities should such occur. This system could not only identify an individual within a county but across county lines which is currently impossible. This data base could issue summary statistical data for research and planning purposes but have protective safeguards such that the individual's identity would be protected. The concept of a comprehensive data base contains innumerable possibilities for planning programs and evaluating activities concerning juveniles in the state of Kansas.

The current state of juvenile data in Kansas finds the Juvenile Court Statistical Card (JCSC) being collected and processed by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) from data provided by the juvenile courts of Kansas (now juvenile divisions of the district courts). This card represents the only consistent format of data which may be used to calculate the magnitude of the juvenile caseload in the state. The collection of this input document has been a cooperative effort between the courts and SRS since its inception and, given certain problems which beg for solutions, the process has been relatively successful. While in some states the public welfare agencies have statutory authority to collect and report court data, a voluntary, cooperative effort is a preferable method of operation. The hope is to continue a cooperative effort, for the benefit of the state at large, while streamlining and improving the system for all involved.

However, with the inception of a unified courts system and the Office of the Judicial Administrator (OJA), a new problem has been entered into the process. The OJA has produced a series of forms for their in-house use and with the OJA-4 is now collecting data on juvenile cases. This form is completed by the district court clerk's office and submitted on a monthly basis. Given the areas where clerical functions of the juvenile division have been shifted to the district court clerk's office, completing the JCSC and the OJA-4 represents a significant burden to this staff. The response has been that the JCSC may no longer be completed due to the work load and the priority given to the OJA-4. This move would prove fatal to the fledgling data base system on juveniles in the state. Ideally, the data on the OJA-4 and the JCSC could have been consolidated on one form. While the intent of the JCSC is to collect data on all juvenile activity the OJA-4 requires only formal case information. Similarly, while the OJA-4 collects data on cases for a judge's caseload, the JCSC collects demographic data, offense data and dispositional data on all cases which can be used to measure probation caseloads, program planning, resource allocation and judge's caseload.

Thus, the problems that beg attention are: (1) the need for a comprehensive data base on juvenile offenders in the state for program planning, personnel and resource allocation, monitoring and evaluation, as well as research applications; (2) the apparent duplicity of effort created by the OJA-4 and the JCSC; (3) the desire to develop a cooperative "system" approach to this data base is essential to the productive end of all concerned.

Proposed Solutions

It is difficult to find fault with the concept of a comprehensive data base system. Likewise, the practical need in the state for a reservoir of statistical data on which to base planning, projections and trends, resource allocation and personnel disbursement, and evaluation of program effectiveness has been demonstrated. Optimistically, this can be achieved in an atmosphere of cooperation and consolidation with agencies concerning themselves less with traditional "turf" problems and being more concerned with the welfare of the citizens of the state. With this cooperation and willingness to assist across agency boundaries a truly "systematic" approach to the juvenile justice process in the state of Kansas will develop.

While containing flaws that are receiving attention, the JCSC is a basis for collecting the necessary data to run the proposed data base system. A consolidated effort with the Judiciary is the desirable mode of operation. SRS has been responsible for collecting, editing and tabulating the JCSC for some time. The suggestion here is to continue the operation on a cooperative basis with the courts providing the input and SRS the processing effort with the SAC unit acting as a coordinating agency with other liaison organizations to assist in policy determination and in resolving conflict should such arise. The SAC would be responsible for the smooth running of the data base and the provision of data to requesting agencies.

A move toward a consolidated input document should be investigated to streamline the collection process and still provide agencies with required data. Should this proposal be implausible at this time or absolutely unrealistic, a commitment to the continuation of the data-base document (JCSC) is required. Should parallel systems be continued, retention of the JCSC operation in the juvenile division is preferable over placing the operation in the district court clerk's office.

A commitment to streamlining and codifying the requirements for input into the data base is essential and currently one of the flaws addressed earlier. Consistency needs to be developed concerning how the input document is completed especially as it relates to the court's handling of formal versus informal cases. At the present time, comparisons between jurisdictions is difficult and provides spurious data due to inconsistencies in reporting. Consolidated instructions and training sessions (supported by GCCA funds) are recommended as ways to approach this problem.

Consistent and timely reporting of the data needs to be developed with a standardized procedure adopted by participating parties. Judge Jerry Mershon has indicated his support for the collection of juvenile data and suggests submission of the data on a more regular basis rather than waiting until the end of the year as most courts now do. From this timely reporting, the courts could receive quarterly reports of disposed cases by judges and other participating agencies would receive more recent data than currently is possible.

Summary

A sincere effort is underway among the various juvenile related agencies to develop viable cross-agency juvenile data collection procedures to eliminate duplication and to promote information sharing among these various agencies. The need exists for a coordinated and consolidated plan to collect these data to achieve State purposes.

At the present time the Juvenile Court Statistical Card is the only instrument used to provide the state-wide data-base on juvenile court data. The information derived from the JCSC allows all criminal justice agencies to determine juvenile activities within a given area, and to make definitive analysis of how or why a certain type of case has been referred to court.

Recent review of the data output from these cards reveals an apparant confusion over whether or not completion of JCSC is necessary since the OJA-4 form has been implemented. Since JCSC is the only viable source available for this information at this time, support from the court is requested for either a consolidated collection form, or for the continued utilization of the JCSC until such time as a comprehensive juvenile data program can be developed.

Support from the courts in the development of this program would yield tremendous benefits to the entire state of Kansas with respect to research, planning, evaluation, and monitoring the local, state and federal programs. In the interim continued court support for the collection of data elements contained on JCSC is necessary to maintain the only source of such information currently available.

Recommendations

The following are offered as recommendations at this time:

- (1) Active support and commitment to the concept of, and development of, a juvenile statistical data base system in the state of Kansas incorporating the various agencies involved in the juvenile justice process.
- (2) The development of a consolidated input document by which to run the data base and provide cooperating agencies required data.

(3) Prior to a consolidated collection form, commitment to the continuation of the JCSC until that time when a uniform system can be achieved.

(4) Responsibility for the JCSC to remain with the juvenile divisions rather than the district court clerk's office as the stat card requests information covering the entire process from intake through disposition while the clerk's office may only have offense and dispositional data on formal cases.

(5) Support for the Statistical Analysis Center as the coordinating body and clearinghouse for the developed data base system.

(6) More timely reporting of information on a monthly basis as cases are disposed of rather than on a yearly basis.

(7) Participation of those responsible for completion of the basic input documents in training sessions to aid in the accurate recording and consistent reporting of data elements in the data base.

(8) Support for the continuation of the collection, editing, and processing of this data by SRS with policy issues being resolved through a liaison committee chaired by the SAC Director with membership coming from participating agencies in the juvenile justice process.

Data Elements Currently Collected:

JCSC:

- A. Court/County Number
- B. Name/Number - rework
- C. Address - unnecessary
- D. Date of Birth
- *E. Age
- F. Sex
- G. Race
- H. Date of Referral
- I. Referred By
- J. Prior Referrals Calendar Year
Prior Referrals Prior Years
- **K. Care Pending Disposition - rework
- *L. Reason Referred
- ***M. Manner of Handling
- *N. Date of Disposition
- *O. Disposition

OJA-4

- 1. Case Number
- 2. Date Filed
- *3. Charge
- 4. Judge's ID
- *5. Age
- **6. Temporary Custody
- *7. Disposition Date
- 8. Judge's ID
- *9. Non-Traffic Disposition
- *10. Traffic Disposition
- *11. Placement of D & N
- 12. Remarks

Coding

- * Duplicate Items
- ** K and 6 are closely related
- *** M and the OJA-4 are by default duplicate as all OJA-4 entries are formal cases.

The OJA-4 is not as viable a keypunchable document as it could possibly be as it utilizes extensive alphabetic coding rather than the more desirable numeric coding.

To highlight various problems with the JCSC the following is offered. Total collection has, in the past, been a problem. For 1976, 7 counties (Barber, Butler, Clay, Ford, Marion, Saline, and Wichita) failed to provide cards. Two counties (Memaha and Seward) reported no juvenile cases for the year?! Six counties (Chase, Gray, Meade, Ottawa, Pratt, and Riley) were lost between being received in SRS and getting keypunched. Based upon GCCA figures, these 15 counties represented approximately 10% of the state's total population.

There is great variation between counties pertaining to referral procedures, manner of handling philosophies and dispositional methods. In some counties, many of the cases are handled by the police or other community agencies and a police report never crosses the juvenile court intake desk. Elsewhere, the juvenile court may handle most of the social services for children. Varying community and parental attitudes towards the child's behavior often decides whether or not a child is referred to the court.

Differences exist in the interpretation of reporting instructions. Some jurisdictions have handled all cases officially while others tend to handle only the most serious as official. Regardless, some courts record only the official cases on the JCSC, consequently losing a great deal of data on juvenile activity in the state.

Data elements such as Race and Care Pending Disposition need to be expanded and clarified. Likewise a numbering scheme allowing identification across county lines needs to be established.

REV. 3/75

A. COURT

B. CHILD'S NAME OR NUMBER (LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)

C. ADDRESS Area Code or Census Tract

D. DATE OF BIRTH - mo. day yr.

E. AGE AT TIME OF REFERRAL -

F. SEX: 1 - Male 2 - Female

G. RACE: 1 - White 2 - Black 3 - Indian 4 - Other

ENTER ONLY ONE CODE IN THE DESIGNATED CODE BOX FOR EACH MAJOR CATEGORY FROM "H" TO "O"

<p>H. DATE OF REFERRAL <input type="text"/> mo. <input type="text"/> day <input type="text"/> yr.</p>	<p>L. REASON REFERRED <input type="text"/></p> <p>Offenses applicable to both juveniles and adults (excluding traffic)</p> <p>01 Murder and non-negligent manslaughter 02 Manslaughter by negligence 03 Forcible rape 04 Robbery: Purse snatching by force 05 Robbery: All except purse snatching 06 Assault: Aggravated 07 Assault: All except aggravated 08 Burglary - breaking or entering 09 Auto theft: Unauthorized use 10 Auto theft: All except unauthorized use 11 Larceny: Shoplifting 12 Larceny: All except shoplifting 13 Weapons - carrying, possessing, etc. 14 Sex offenses (except forcible rape) 15 Violation of drug laws: Narcotic 16 Violation of drug laws: All except narcotic 17 Drunkenness 18 Disorderly conduct 19 Vandalism 20 Other (Specify) _____ 21 Arson 22 Trespassing</p>	<p>M. MANNER OF HANDLING <input type="text"/></p> <p>1 Without Petition 2 With Petition</p>
<p>I. REFERRED BY <input type="text"/></p> <p>1 Law Enforcement Agency 2 School Department 3 Social Agency 4 Probation Officer 5 Parents or Relatives 6 Other Court 7 Other Source (Specify) _____</p>	<p>Offenses applicable to juveniles only (excluding traffic)</p> <p>31 Running away 32 Truancy 33 Violation of curfew 34 Ungovernable behavior 35 Possessing or drinking of liquor 36 Other (Specify) _____</p>	<p>N. DATE OF DISPOSITION <input type="text"/> mo. <input type="text"/> day <input type="text"/> yr.</p>
<p>J. PRIOR DELINQUENCY (Excluding Traffic) REFERRALS</p> <p>a. This Calendar Year - <input type="text"/> 0 1 2 3 4 5 or more referrals</p> <p>b. In Prior Years - <input type="text"/> 0 1 2 3 4 5 or more referrals</p>	<p>Traffic offenses</p> <p>41 Driving while intoxicated 42 Hit and run 43 Reckless driving 44 Driving without a license 45 All other traffic (Specify) _____</p>	<p>O. DISPOSITION <input type="text"/></p> <p>00 Waived to Criminal Court</p> <p>Complaint Not Substantiated 01 Dismissed: Not Proved or Found Not Involved</p>
<p>K. CARE PENDING DISPOSITION <input type="text"/></p> <p>00 No Detention or Shelter Care Overnight</p> <p>Detention or Shelter Care Overnight or Longer in: 01 Jail or Police Station 02 Detention Home 04 Foster Family Home 08 Other Place (Specify) _____</p> <p>In this category ("K") if more than one code is applicable, add the appropriate codes and enter total sum in coding box.</p>	<p>Neglect (abuse, desertion, inadequate care, etc.) 51 Abuse 52 All other neglect (Specify) _____</p> <p>Special proceedings (adoption, consent to marry, etc.) 61 Specify _____</p>	<p>Complaint Substantiated No Transfer of Legal Custody 11 Dismissed: Warned, Adjusted, Counseled 12 Held Open Without Further Action 13 Probation Officer to Supervise 14 Referred to Another Agency or Individual for Supervision or Service 15 Runaway Returned to _____ 16 Other (Specify) _____</p>
		<p>Transfer of Legal Custody to: 21 Public Institution for Delinquents 22 Other Public Institution 23 Public Agency or Department (Including Court) 24 Private Agency or Institution 25 Individual 26 Other (Specify)</p>
		<p>99 Inapplicable - Specify Proceedings</p>