

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 140

Expanding Facilities at Glen Lake Home School for Boys in Hennepin County

March 1962

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

APPROVED
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
DATE MAR 7 1962

(140)
February 1, 1962

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: County Budget Committee, Lester P. Wakefield, chairman

SUBJECT: A report on the question:

SHOULD THE COUNTY CONSTRUCT NEW, EXPANDED FACILITIES FOR THE
GLEN LAKE HOME SCHOOL FOR BOYS?

| <u>Contents</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Major Conclusions | 2 |
| Recommendations | 2 |
| Scope and Method of Study | 3 |
| Legal Basis and Role of the Home School for Boys | 4 |
| The Need for New, Expanded Facilities | 5 |
| The State's Responsibility in the Field of Juvenile Delinquency | 12 |
| Current Situation at Red Wing | 13 |
| CWC Comments on Possible Relationship of the County Home School to the State Correctional System | 14 |
| 1961 Proposed Legislation on State Matching Funds | 15 |
| Principles Guiding League Committee's Appraisal | 16 |
| Alternative 1: Abandon the Home School for Boys | 17 |
| Alternative 2: Turn the Home School over to the State | 17 |
| Alternative 3: Expansion by the County Without State Financial Help | 18 |
| Alternative 4: Expansion by the County, coupled with continued effort to obtain Legislation granting State Matching Funds for County and Multi-County Training School Construction and Operation. | 18 |
| Alternative 4 Recommended | 18 |
| The Type of New Facilities to be Constructed | 19 |
| The Problem of Financing | 19 |

INTRODUCTION

On June 16, 1961, the Hennepin County District Court, which has charge of the County Home School for Boys, requested the Board of County Commissioners to retain at an early date an architect "to design cottages and study and recommend to the Board and the Court a comprehensive plan for the long range development of the physical plant for the institution."

In August 1961, while the County Board was deliberating over the 1962 budget, the County Purchasing Agent and Budget Director presented a memorandum to the Board summarizing the facts and pros and cons with reference to the District Court's request.

The County Board set aside \$150,000 out of the 1962 Building and Maintenance Fund for possible use, in part, for architects' fees to make drawings for the proposed expansion of the Boys Home and construction of a new Girls' Home. The Board indicated no decision, however, on whether it would go ahead with the building plans, and to date it has made no such decision. Meanwhile, in recent weeks Juvenile Court Judge Tom Tallakson has been appointed to a District Court judgeship, and Judge Lindsay G. Arthur has been appointed to succeed him.

In the course of its study of County budgets and operations the past several years the County Budget Committee had several occasions to review the Home School budget and operations, and became convinced that the issue of the proposed expansion of the Boys School was deserving of more intensive study, from the standpoint of fiscal significance for County taxpayers as well as the program implications in caring for the County's delinquent youth. The committee therefore decided to investigate in greater depth this issue:

Should the County construct new, expanded facilities for the Home School for Boys?

During this study the committee could not avoid giving some attention to the other question raised by the District Court, namely, the construction of a County training school for girls.

While we have not gone into this issue sufficiently to make a recommendation at this time, we are impressed by the similarity between the factors affecting the need for boys' school facilities and the need for girls' school facilities.

Construction of facilities to house 200 boys is estimated to cost \$650,000 to \$700,000. To finance such construction without an increase in the mill rate, it is recommended that the County conduct the expansion by stages within the limits of the .25 mill building and maintenance levy. This should permit financing of the construction of two units each year.

SCOPE AND METHOD OF STUDY

Although the County Budget Committee is concerned with improved efficiency of organization and procedures, and although such considerations are important in the operation of the Home School, our primary concern in this investigation has been a decision on the general question: Should the Home School facilities be expanded?

As a permanent League committee, we have had several meetings with the administrators most concerned: Paul Keve, Director of Court Services, who is the Chief Administrative Officer for the divisions of Probation Officers, Juvenile Center and Home School; and Edward Sedio, superintendent of the Home School. Prior to the reorganization of the Court Services agencies in 1955, the committee also met with the superintendent then in charge, Waldron Douglas.

The committee also discussed the needs of the Home School with Stanley Cowle, County Purchasing Agent and Budget Director, District Judge Thomas Tallakson, former Juvenile Court Judge, and present Juvenile Court Judge Lindsay G. Arthur.

The Committee also met with Will Turnbladh, Minnesota Commissioner of Corrections, to get facts and his views with respect to the functions of the State Youth Conservation Commission in the field of training schools for the delinquent, and the relationship between the State's program and the Hennepin County problem.

The cooperation of all these officials is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, we acknowledge the invaluable resource material provided by the 1958 study and report of the Community Welfare Council's special committee on the Home School for Boys.

ing is set up to make further investigation of whether a delinquent act has been committed. The probation officer conducts the investigation, and the child is sent to the Juvenile Center if he is very disturbed and can not be left in his home.

The probation officer makes his recommendation to the Juvenile Center, and a hearing is held by the Juvenile Court Judge or a court-appointed referee. If the court finds the child is delinquent, one of the following dispositions deemed necessary for the rehabilitation of the child is ordered: (a) the child or his parents, guardian, or custodian are given counselling; (b) the child is placed under the supervision of a probation officer or other suitable person in his own home under conditions prescribed by the court; (c) subject to court supervision, legal custody of the child is transferred to one of the following: (1) a child placing agency, or (2) the county welfare board, or (3) a reputable individual of good moral character, or (4) a county home school; (d) legal custody is transferred to the Youth Conservation Commission by commitment; (e) the child is ordered to make restitution of property damage done; (f) specialized mental or physical treatment for the child is ordered; (g) cancellation of child's driver's license until his 18th birthday is recommended.

All orders for transfer of custody under subdivision (c) shall be for a specified length of time set by the court, but the court may change the period.

THE NEED FOR NEW, EXPANDED FACILITIES

As noted above, the present Home School structure was built in 1947 with a rated capacity of 75-80. Two basic changes have occurred since then which are the grounds for the contention that the school is inadequate and should be expanded with new facilities: (1) there has been a rapid and continuing growth in the County in the number of youth 10 to 17 years of age and the rate of delinquency; (2) there has been a change in the Juvenile Court's concept of the role of the school in treating youth.

In Table 1 are presented data on the number of commitments to the school by Juvenile Court, the County's 10 to 17 year old population, and the average monthly census at the school for the years 1950 through 1961.

These data alone would seem to point to the need for expansion, and raise the question: How is it possible to accommodate 125, and sometimes even 140, boys at an institution built for 75-80?

The answer is that it is possible only at the cost of seriously handicapping an effective rehabilitation program, by virtue of the necessity of using badly over-crowded sleeping quarters and shortening the period of stay.

Projecting the data in table 1 into the future renders the overcrowding problem more serious. The Director of Court Services estimated in August 1961 that on the basis of births already recorded at that time, the population in the 10 to 17 age range would reach 147,000 by 1968.

The matter of the desired type of program to be carried on at the Home School needs elaboration, since it is by measuring against this standard that the conclusions of the school's being overcrowded is drawn. Measuring against another standard - for example, a program which is designed only to provide custodial care and the barest kind of schooling - might not produce a conclusion of overcrowding at all.

Perhaps the declaration of purpose of the Juvenile Court Act quoted above, a declaration of State legislative policy, is a clue to the kind of training school program the Home School should conduct: ". . . . to secure for each minor under the jurisdiction of the courts the care and guidance, preferably in his own home, as will serve the spiritual, emotional, mental and physical welfare of the minor and the best interest of the state. . . ." (underlining ours).

A description of a philosophy to guide the Home School program was given in the 1958 report of the Community Welfare Council's study of the Home School for Boys. This study was requested by Judge Tallakson in 1956, who said:

"We feel the need of making a thorough evaluation of the program we are conducting at the Hennepin County Home School to determine what are the present demands upon that institution, what sort of program will best meet these demands, and what future developments may be expected that will affect the institution and which should be taken into account now."

The study committee consisted of Chairman Elio Monachesi, Chairman and Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, John Ellington, Executive Secretary, State Interim Commission on Juvenile Delinquency and Adult Crime, State Senator Daniel Feidt, Fred Gross, Chief Psychiatric Social Worker, University Hospitals, and Ruby B. Pernell, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Minnesota.

The following sentences, selected from the report's statement of "Philosophy Behind the Report and Recommendations", are pertinent (all underlining theirs):

"1. Second only to the jail in our society, the typical training school has been the most backward of our institutions for children in applying modern understanding of human behavior and how to change it."

"Though there is much talk of the training school as a treatment rather than a punitive agency, traditional patterns of suppression, of insistence upon conformity, and of 'forced feeding' of morals, behavior and skills remain dominant in such institutions. Such limited professional services for treatment as are available are often little more than window dressing for traditional regimentation.

"The fault lies primarily not with training schools or their administrations; it lies with society's emotional rejection of 'bad' children and its eagerness to get them out of sight and out of mind at minimum cost; and it lies with the newness of scientific insights into human behavior and the extreme difficulties of applying these insights in the training school setting."

* * *

Table 2

Hennepin County Home School for Boys
Number of Personnel
1955-61

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Number</u> | Following additional positions added between 1955 and 1961: | |
|-------------|---------------|--|-----------|
| 1955 | 39 | Administrative Supervisor | 1 |
| | | Psychologist | 1 |
| 1956 | 41 | Counselor | 5 |
| | | Case Aide | 1 |
| 1957 | 45 | Maintenance Supervisor | 1 |
| | | Barber | 1 |
| 1958 | 46 | Night Watchman | 2 |
| | | Maintenance Man | 1 |
| 1959 | 53 | Teacher | 5 |
| | | Detail Officer | 4 |
| 1960 | 57 | Group Supervisor | 4 |
| | | | <u>26</u> |
| 1961 | 65 | | |

Table 3

Hennepin County Home School for Boys
Expenditures 1950-1962

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Personal Service</u> | <u>Other</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1950 | \$52,166 | \$64,596 | \$116,762 |
| 1951 | 56,213 | 50,829 | 107,042 |
| 1952 | 62,617 | 54,045 | 116,662 |
| 1953 | 68,882 | 61,878 | 130,760 |
| 1954 | 79,123 | 58,470 | 137,593 |
| 1955 | 94,400 | 73,449 | 167,849 |
| 1956 | 164,623 | 71,455 | 236,078 |
| 1957 | 184,885 | 82,060 | 266,945 |
| 1958 | 217,192 | 94,359 | 311,551 |
| 1959 | 269,550 | 88,679 | 358,229 |
| 1960 | 313,545 | 91,410 | 404,955 |
| 1961 (est.) | 349,110 | 97,934 | 447,044 |
| 1962 (est.) | 395,365 | 110,577 | 505,942 |

The report recommended

"That the necessary number of cottages, each accomodating ideally not more than 12 and under no circumstances more than 20 boys, be built at the Home School to house the total population, and take the place of the present dormitory. Each cottage would contain both private rooms and a small dormitory and a combined living-recreation room.

"The building of separate cottages would solve many other problems, such as the present highly undesirable periodic herding of all boys into an inadequate 'waiting room'. The present dormitory space could be well used for additional classrooms, for arts, crafts, and shops, and, if necessary, for some indoor recreational space."

The County Budget Committee is impressed with the need for having a rehabilitation type program carried on at the Home School, and is convinced that new physical facilities, conducive to "the changes in attitude and behavior which the training school is intended to effect", are essential for carrying on this program.

CURRENT SITUATION AT RED WING

The committee met with Minnesota Commissioner of Corrections Will Turnbladh to ascertain the present state of population and program at Red Wing and the current and possible future relationship to Hennepin County's needs and programs for a boys training school.

The only boys training schools in the State are Red Wing, Glen Lake and Ramsey County's Totem Town. For all counties except Hennepin and Ramsey, Red Wing handles boys of all ages and problems, whereas it tends to get only the severest problem cases from Hennepin and Ramsey. Even so, the number of delinquents committed to Red Wing from Hennepin County is sizeable. Turnbladh said it varied from 105-125. In relation to the child population and the census at Red Wing, the situation is this for the three largest counties:

| | <u>Hennepin</u> | <u>Ramsey</u> | <u>St. Louis</u> |
|---|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Percent of 1960 child population | 21.3% | 11.8% | 6.9% |
| Percent of commitments to Red Wing (1960-61) | 27.0% | 18.8% | 7.2% |

Thus the Hennepin and Ramsey share of the Red Wing census is greater than their share of the State's child population.

On a recent day, Red Wing had a census of 449 with a rated capacity of 400 ("though it should not be called on to handle more than 350", according to the CWC report).

Turnbladh gave the following per diem costs of Red Wing and Glen Lake (including everything but plant amortization):

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Red Wing (1960-61) | \$5.70 |
| Glen Lake (2 years ago) | \$8.00 - \$8.50 |

He said the reason for the difference is the better staffing pattern at Glen Lake, particularly on individual case workers and group workers, and the higher salaries paid. He felt that the Red Wing per capita costs should be higher, rather than Hennepin's being lower.

Turnbladh said that if Hennepin County abandoned Glen Lake, the State under the law would have to take the Glen Lake boys, to the extent that the Hennepin County Juvenile Court committed them to a training school. The result, he said, would be "chaos" at Red Wing because of the overcrowding that already exists.

"Youngsters from Hennepin County would not receive the help they need, and the young would be mixed in with the more hardened older boys", he said.

The CWC's 1958 report had this to say about Red Wing:

"The training school at Red Wing is bursting at the seams. Its population in November, 1957, reached a peak of 468. It has physical space for 400, though it should not be called on to handle more than 350. It

to other State institutions, the benefits of close contact with the parents of some County children would be lost. In addition, the County would lose control of the decision to make Glen Lake School co-educational.

(2) The State could adopt a program of matching funds with any county or group of counties operating or desiring to operate a small training facility for delinquent youngsters, and for the foster and boarding home care of delinquent youngsters.

The CWC preferred this alternative because it would stimulate care in the home community of a substantial number of delinquent youngsters who are now committed to the YCC. Also the greater use of foster homes by Hennepin County would take some of the population pressure off the Glen Lake School. Finally, this system would properly leave with the YCC only the most difficult and disturbed delinquent youngsters.

With this suggestion for expanded State participation, the CWC recommended that the County go ahead and expand the Glen Lake Home School.

1961 PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON STATE MATCHING FUNDS

Along the lines suggested in the CWC's preferred alternative, Hennepin County officials drafted legislative bills for the 1961 session, one providing for State sharing in operating costs of county training schools, the other for State sharing in construction costs.

Despite strong urging by the Advisory Committee on the Home School, headed by Gerald Mullin, and the support by the Legislative Interim Commission on Juvenile Delinquency and Adult Crime, the bills made little progress in the Legislature.

Apparently there were three main reasons for the lack of success: (1) The shortage of time for public discussion. (2) Lack of study of State-wide implications, and out-State Legislators' suspicion that the bills were designed to benefit only Hennepin County. (3) Failure to enlist adequate support from Ramsey County for the bills.

ALTERNATIVE 1: ABANDON THE HOME SCHOOL FOR BOYS

Under this alternative, the County would exercise its right under the law not to maintain its own training school, with the result that all commitments would be made to Red Wing.

It could be argued that this would be the only way to bring home to the State Legislature the need for the State to assume its full responsibility for providing an adequate juvenile rehabilitation program. Whether this would have the desired effect on the out-State dominated Legislature seems doubtful, particularly in view of the fact that Hennepin County would have over one-half the commitments to Red Wing. In any case, it is likely that the Legislature would not respond quickly to the need for expanding Red Wing, and meanwhile, as Commissioner Turnbladh suggested, there would be "chaos" at Red Wing.

Considering the way in which the State has lagged behind the standards maintained by Hennepin County in establishing a rehabilitation program, it is likely that it would be some time before Hennepin County could expect its delinquents to get the kind of rehabilitative care they are now getting at Glen Lake, as handicapped by inadequate facilities as it may be. We do not believe that the citizens of the County should consider reducing the quality of program for the County's delinquents. As the CWC report indicates, on the contrary, the program should be improved.

ALTERNATIVE 2: TURN THE HOME SCHOOL OVER TO THE STATE

Essentially this is the first of two alternatives described in the CWC report (see page 12 above), and the one to which it gave second preference. Against the advantages of permitting the YCC to segregate boys of comparable ages and problems, budgetary relief for Hennepin County, and relief of population pressure at Red Wing, were placed the heavier disadvantages for the County of losing exclusive control over the institution and the loss to some extent of having children treated in their own community.

With respect to the political possibility of getting the State to take over Glen Lake Home School, it may be argued that Hennepin County was successful in getting the State to take over the Tuberculosis Sanatorium at Glen Lake. In response, it must be pointed out that Hennepin County agitated for many years for the State to take over the Sanatorium, and that that action finally came only after the number of TB patients was greatly reduced, the trend in TB incidence was continuing steadily downward, and the use of the space was an inexpensive way for the State to meet its growing problem of providing institutional facilities for old-age mental patients requiring largely custodial care.

Similar conditions do not exist in regard to the Home School and the trend in number of delinquents needing training school help, and it therefore seems doubtful to us that the State would be likely to consider this an appealing course of action.

In answer to this it may be suggested that any program of State matching aid would have to be state-wide, which would mean, as in the case of all State matching programs, that Hennepin County would probably be paying out more of the State-wide cost than it would be receiving in return in State aids. Thus Hennepin County taxpayers in the broadest sense would not be profiting by the program on a strictly cash basis. On the other hand, to the extent that the State aid program stimulated local home schools in other counties it would improve the program available for the many delinquent youth from Hennepin County now getting treatment at Red Wing.

Finally, and also in the broadest sense, if the County insists on waiting for the State program to be set up before proceeding to expand its own local facilities, the continued social and economic loss to the people of Hennepin County might well more than offset the cost of the new facilities.

Thus, even from a selfish economic standpoint, and without regard to the other advantages cited, it would seem advisable for the County to proceed with the new facilities without waiting for the adoption of the State aid program, continuing to work, however, for such adoption.

Should State aid legislation for construction be adopted after Hennepin County has begun construction of expanded facilities, the legislation should provide for retroactive reimbursement of State aid funds for such construction.

THE TYPE OF NEW FACILITIES TO BE CONSTRUCTED

In line with its conviction that the Home School program should be designed to provide greater opportunity for the delinquent youth to grow in self-respect, clarify his own identity, and establish close personal relationships with adults, the CWC committee and the Home School Advisory Committee recommended that the new construction at Glen Lake Home School consist of separate cottages, housing 12 to 20 boys (see page 11 above). Mr. Keve has estimated these would cost \$65,000 to \$70,000 each, or a total of \$650,000 to \$700,000 to house a maximum of 200 boys.

In view of the fact that separate cottages are likely to be a more expensive type of construction than one in which living quarters are not entirely detached from another, we would urge County officials to examine all possible alternative types of construction plan which would provide the separation desired without the expensive cost of separate structures. One possibility, for example, might be a wheel design, with dormitories going out from the hub like spokes, and the hub housing facilities to be used in common.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCING

Financing construction of new Boys' School facilities is complicated by several factors. The County Board has no long range program of capital needs set up on a priority basis. It also has no general borrowing authority, and would have to get special legislative authorization to issue bonds for the construction expansion.

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 140

**Hennepin County
Glen Lake Home School for Boys
Expansion**

March 1962

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

140

APPROVED
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
DATE MAR 7 1962

February 1, 1962

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: County Budget Committee, Lester P. Wakefield, chairman

SUBJECT: A report on the question:

SHOULD THE COUNTY CONSTRUCT NEW, EXPANDED FACILITIES FOR THE
GLEN LAKE HOME SCHOOL FOR BOYS?

| <u>Contents</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Major Conclusions | 2 |
| Recommendations | 2 |
| Scope and Method of Study | 3 |
| Legal Basis and Role of the Home School for Boys | 4 |
| The Need for New, Expanded Facilities | 5 |
| The State's Responsibility in the Field of Juvenile Delinquency | 12 |
| Current Situation at Red Wing | 13 |
| CWC Comments on Possible Relationship of the County Home School to the State Correctional System | 14 |
| 1961 Proposed Legislation on State Matching Funds | 15 |
| Principles Guiding League Committee's Appraisal | 16 |
| Alternative 1: Abandon the Home School for Boys | 17 |
| Alternative 2: Turn the Home School over to the State | 17 |
| Alternative 3: Expansion by the County Without State Financial Help | 18 |
| Alternative 4: Expansion by the County, coupled with continued effort to obtain Legislation granting State Matching Funds for County and Multi-County Training School Construction and Operation. | 18 |
| Alternative 4 Recommended | 18 |
| The Type of New Facilities to be Constructed | 19 |
| The Problem of Financing | 19 |

INTRODUCTION

On June 16, 1961, the Hennepin County District Court, which has charge of the County Home School for Boys, requested the Board of County Commissioners to retain at an early date an architect "to design cottages and study and recommend to the Board and the Court a comprehensive plan for the long range development of the physical plant for the institution."

In August 1961, while the County Board was deliberating over the 1962 budget, the County Purchasing Agent and Budget Director presented a memorandum to the Board summarizing the facts and pros and cons with reference to the District Court's request.

The County Board set aside \$150,000 out of the 1962 Building and Maintenance Fund for possible use, in part, for architects' fees to make drawings for the proposed expansion of the Boys Home and construction of a new Girls' Home. The Board indicated no decision, however, on whether it would go ahead with the building plans, and to date it has made no such decision. Meanwhile, in recent weeks Juvenile Court Judge Tom Tallakson has been appointed to a District Court judgeship, and Judge Lindsay G. Arthur has been appointed to succeed him.

In the course of its study of County budgets and operations the past several years the County Budget Committee had several occasions to review the Home School budget and operations, and became convinced that the issue of the proposed expansion of the Boys School was deserving of more intensive study, from the standpoint of fiscal significance for County taxpayers as well as the program implications in caring for the County's delinquent youth. The committee therefore decided to investigate in greater depth this issue:

Should the County construct new, expanded facilities for the Home School for Boys?

During this study the committee could not avoid giving some attention to the other question raised by the District Court, namely, the construction of a County training school for girls.

While we have not gone into this issue sufficiently to make a recommendation at this time, we are impressed by the similarity between the factors affecting the need for boys' school facilities and the need for girls' school facilities.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

1. The Home School for Boys is seriously overcrowded - housing 125-150 boys in a facility constructed to house 75, and providing a length of stay that is too short for its basic purpose - rehabilitation of delinquent youth.
2. The pressure toward overcrowding is likely to increase with the increase in population (estimated to go from 843,000 in Hennepin County to 1,004,200 in 1970), the increasing proportion of youth in the population, and the increasing rate of delinquency.
3. A rehabilitation program is likely to be most effective in a training school constructed so as to allow a maximum of privacy and individual treatment, consistent with economy and discipline.
4. Rehabilitation of delinquent youths can be most effective in an institution located near their home community.
5. As a general principle the committee believes each governmental function should be performed as close as possible to the local level, consistent with economy and effective performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The County should proceed to expand the physical facilities of the Glen Lake Home School for Boys.
2. The County should work for legislation granting financial aid to counties or groups of counties which provide their own local training schools. Such assistance should be given in the form of matching State funds for construction and operation of the local facilities. So that the start of construction of new facilities recommended in (1) will not be delayed any longer than necessary, the legislature should provide for State aid reimbursement to the County for any new construction that is undertaken before the new legislation takes effect.
3. Although we are not in a position to pass on the details of the expanded facilities at the Home School, we believe the new construction should permit the separation of boys into small units (no more than 20 to a group has been suggested) for living and schooling purposes, with centralization of administration, recreational, dining, and school facilities. The use of the existing plant for the latter facilities seems reasonable. We urge County officials in the interest of keeping building costs down to explore carefully the possibility of structural arrangements which will permit the desirable separation of boys without necessitating complete physical separation of the building units.
4. Since the County has no borrowing powers to finance construction of the new Boys' Home facilities, the only immediately available source of funds is the current property tax. The .25 mill building and maintenance levy, now yielding about \$155,000, or the County Revenue Fund mill levy, which has no statutory ceiling, could be tapped.

Construction of facilities to house 200 boys is estimated to cost \$650,000 to \$700,000. To finance such construction without an increase in the mill rate, it is recommended that the County conduct the expansion by stages within the limits of the .25 mill building and maintenance levy. This should permit financing of the construction of two units each year.

SCOPE AND METHOD OF STUDY

Although the County Budget Committee is concerned with improved efficiency of organization and procedures, and although such considerations are important in the operation of the Home School, our primary concern in this investigation has been a decision on the general question: Should the Home School facilities be expanded?

As a permanent League committee, we have had several meetings with the administrators most concerned: Paul Keve, Director of Court Services, who is the Chief Administrative Officer for the divisions of Probation Officers, Juvenile Center and Home School; and Edward Sedio, superintendent of the Home School. Prior to the reorganization of the Court Services agencies in 1955, the committee also met with the superintendent then in charge, Waldron Douglas.

The committee also discussed the needs of the Home School with Stanley Cowle, County Purchasing Agent and Budget Director, District Judge Thomas Tallakson, former Juvenile Court Judge, and present Juvenile Court Judge Lindsay G. Arthur.

The Committee also met with Will Turnbladh, Minnesota Commissioner of Corrections, to get facts and his views with respect to the functions of the State Youth Conservation Commission in the field of training schools for the delinquent, and the relationship between the State's program and the Hennepin County problem.

The cooperation of all these officials is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, we acknowledge the invaluable resource material provided by the 1958 study and report of the Community Welfare Council's special committee on the Home School for Boys.

LEGAL BASIS AND ROLE OF THE HOME SCHOOL FOR BOYS

Authority for the County to construct and operate the Glen Lake Home School for Boys is contained in the Minnesota Juvenile Court Act (M.S.A. 1959, C. 260). The declared purpose of this act, quoted below, covers the whole body of procedures for handling juveniles in the courts, but attention is particularly called to the underlined portion which is specifically applicable to training schools, such as the Glen Lake Home School (underlining ours):

The purpose of the laws relating to juvenile courts is to secure for each minor under the jurisdiction of the court the care and guidance, preferably in his own home, as will serve the spiritual, emotional, mental, and physical welfare of the minor and the best interest of the state; to preserve and strengthen the minor's family ties whenever possible, re-moving him from the custody of his parents only when his welfare or safety and protection of the public cannot be adequately safeguarded without removal; and, when the minor is removed from his own family, to secure for him custody, care and discipline as nearly as possible equivalent to that which should have been given by his parents. The laws relating to juvenile courts shall be liberally construed to carry out these purposes. (M.S.A. 1959, 260.011 subd. 2.).

The Juvenile Courts deal with children, defined as individuals under 18 years of age and including any minor alleged to have been delinquent prior to becoming 18 years of age.

The Juvenile Court Act authorizes a county or group of counties to "purchase, lease, erect, equip, and maintain a county home school for boys or girls, or a separate home school for boys and a separate home school for girls". The staff is appointed and removed by the District Court, and the County Board is required to provide the necessary funds to operate the school.

Hennepin County first operated a Home School for Boys around 1910. The present structure was erected in 1947 with a rated capacity of 75 to 80 boys.

In 1955 the present Department of Court Services was set up under the Hennepin County District Court, and the Home School was made one of the three divisions of the department, along with Probation Officers and Juvenile Center. All are administratively responsible to the Court through the Director of Court Services.

The place of the Home School in the functioning of the Juvenile Court and the Department of Court Services, and its role in the handling of juveniles, is apparent from the following brief description of how boys usually get to the institution.

How Boys get to the Home School

On police complaint, the boy is sent to the intake unit of the juvenile probation division. The complaint is screened and evaluated, and if warranted, the intake worker calls in the child and parents, and possibly talks to personnel at the youth's school. If the activity in question appears normal, the worker may decide to close the case at this point. If the activity does not seem normal, an arraignment hear-

ing is set up to make further investigation of whether a delinquent act has been committed. The probation officer conducts the investigation, and the child is sent to the Juvenile Center if he is very disturbed and can not be left in his home.

The probation officer makes his recommendation to the Juvenile Center, and a hearing is held by the Juvenile Court Judge or a court-appointed referee. If the court finds the child is delinquent, one of the following dispositions deemed necessary for the rehabilitation of the child is ordered: (a) the child or his parents, guardian, or custodian are given counselling; (b) the child is placed under the supervision of a probation officer or other suitable person in his own home under conditions prescribed by the court; (c) subject to court supervision, legal custody of the child is transferred to one of the following: (1) a child placing agency, or (2) the county welfare board, or (3) a reputable individual of good moral character, or (4) a county home school; (d) legal custody is transferred to the Youth Conservation Commission by commitment; (e) the child is ordered to make restitution of property damage done; (f) specialized mental or physical treatment for the child is ordered; (g) cancellation of child's driver's license until his 18th birthday is recommended.

All orders for transfer of custody under subdivision (c) shall be for a specified length of time set by the court, but the court may change the period.

THE NEED FOR NEW, EXPANDED FACILITIES

As noted above, the present Home School structure was built in 1947 with a rated capacity of 75-80. Two basic changes have occurred since then which are the grounds for the contention that the school is inadequate and should be expanded with new facilities: (1) there has been a rapid and continuing growth in the County in the number of youth 10 to 17 years of age and the rate of delinquency; (2) there has been a change in the Juvenile Court's concept of the role of the school in treating youth.

In Table 1 are presented data on the number of commitments to the school by Juvenile Court, the County's 10 to 17 year old population, and the average monthly census at the school for the years 1950 through 1961.

These data alone would seem to point to the need for expansion, and raise the question: How is it possible to accommodate 125, and sometimes even 140, boys at an institution built for 75-80?

The answer is that it is possible only at the cost of seriously handicapping an effective rehabilitation program, by virtue of the necessity of using badly over-crowded sleeping quarters and shortening the period of stay.

Projecting the data in table 1 into the future renders the overcrowding problem more serious. The Director of Court Services estimated in August 1961 that on the basis of births already recorded at that time, the population in the 10 to 17 age range would reach 147,000 by 1968.

Table 1

Hennepin County Home School for Boys
 Number of Commitments, Average Monthly Census
 1950-1961

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Number of Commitments by Court</u> | <u>Average Monthly Census*</u> | <u>Estimated County Population - 10 to 17 year age Groups**</u> |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1950 | 172 | - | 59,527 |
| 1951 | 221 | 101 | 64,185 |
| 1952 | 148 | 91 | 68,843 |
| 1953 | 197 | 89 | 73,500 |
| 1954 | 224 | 113 | 78,158 |
| 1955 | 297 | 95 | 82,816 |
| 1956 | 337 | (?) | 87,473 |
| 1957 | 294 | 95 | 92,131 |
| 1958 | 287 | 105 | 96,789 |
| 1959 | 319 | 124 | 101,447 |
| 1960 | 419 | 133.5 | 106,104 |
| 1961 | 472 | 117 | 110,762 |
| Percent increase 1950-61: | 174% | | 86% |

* = Average length of stay was about $5\frac{1}{2}$ months in 1955, about $4\frac{1}{2}$ months in 1961, according to Supt. Sedio.

**= Figures for 1950 and 1960 are from U. S. Census. Others are estimated on straight line projection.

The matter of the desired type of program to be carried on at the Home School needs elaboration, since it is by measuring against this standard that the conclusions of the school's being overcrowded is drawn. Measuring against another standard - for example, a program which is designed only to provide custodial care and the barest kind of schooling - might not produce a conclusion of overcrowding at all.

Perhaps the declaration of purpose of the Juvenile Court Act quoted above, a declaration of State legislative policy, is a clue to the kind of training school program the Home School should conduct: ". . . to secure for each minor under the jurisdiction of the courts the care and guidance, preferably in his own home, as will serve the spiritual, emotional, mental and physical welfare of the minor and the best interest of the state. . . ." (underlining ours).

A description of a philosophy to guide the Home School program was given in the 1958 report of the Community Welfare Council's study of the Home School for Boys. This study was requested by Judge Tallakson in 1956, who said:

"We feel the need of making a thorough evaluation of the program we are conducting at the Hennepin County Home School to determine what are the present demands upon that institution, what sort of program will best meet these demands, and what future developments may be expected that will affect the institution and which should be taken into account now."

The study committee consisted of Chairman Elio Monachesi, Chairman and Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, John Ellingston, Executive Secretary, State Interim Commission on Juvenile Delinquency and Adult Crime, State Senator Daniel Feidt, Fred Gross, Chief Psychiatric Social Worker, University Hospitals, and Ruby B. Pernell, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Minnesota.

The following sentences, selected from the report's statement of "Philosophy Behind the Report and Recommendations", are pertinent (all underlining theirs):

"1. Second only to the jail in our society, the typical training school has been the most backward of our institutions for children in applying modern understanding of human behavior and how to change it.

"Though there is much talk of the training school as a treatment rather than a punitive agency, traditional patterns of suppression, of insistence upon conformity, and of 'forced feeding' of morals, behavior and skills remain dominant in such institutions. Such limited professional services for treatment as are available are often little more than window dressing for traditional regimentation.

"The fault lies primarily not with training schools or their administrations; it lies with society's emotional rejection of 'bad' children and its eagerness to get them out of sight and out of mind at minimum cost; and it lies with the newness of scientific insights into human behavior and the extreme difficulties of applying these insights in the training school setting."

* * *

"2. Serious and chronic delinquency stems mainly from failures in human relationships, and the central key to correction inside the training school or out is wholesome and satisfying person-to-person relationships.

* * *

"The most logical, effective way of treating a truly delinquent child is through creating a situation in which corrective interpersonal relationships can occur. This should be the primary focus of the institutional program.

* * *

"It needs to be emphasized that treatment of delinquent behavior does not mean 'mollycoddling'. Disturbed children want and need limits and controls, but those controls must be exercised differently for each seriously delinquent child, depending on his particular emotional pathology. Moreover, back of the controls the child must sense in the staff person real warmth towards and acceptance of him as a person."

* * *

"3. The training school is but one stage on the assembly line of treatment. It cannot do the whole job of rehabilitation alone."

The desirable Home School program, in brief, is one which treats the boys in an effort to make them useful members of society, rather than merely holding them in custody. As the CWC report stated: "Treatment is more expensive than custody but the money spent on custody is a complete waste if the boy leaves the custodial institution untreated, and, therefore, more dangerous to society than when he entered."

That Glen Lake Home School has made great progress toward establishing a treatment program was acknowledged by the CWC report:

". . . the District Judges and Hennepin County Commissioners have taken the indispensable first step to increase the effectiveness of the Home School for Boys as a treatment facility by giving it more adequate financing. . . This is reflected in vast improvements in staff and program. . . "

Table 2 is a comparison of the staffing pattern in 1955 and 1961, reflecting mainly the expansion of professional personnel. Table 3 gives a picture of the Home School expenditures since 1950. The effect of the emphasis on a rehabilitation program is clearly shown. It should also be noted, however, that part of the increase in expenditures is due to salary adjustments to bring the pay up to that of similar positions under County employment, a reduction in the work week to 40 hours and normal increase in cost.

The changes between the years 1955 and 1956 mostly reflect the shift to a program of rehabilitation. This shift was touched off principally by the study made in 1954 by the National Probation and Parole Association at the request of the District Judges.

Table 2

Hennepin County Home School for Boys
Number of Personnel
1955-61

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Number</u> | Following additional positions added between 1955 and 1961: | |
|-------------|---------------|--|-----------|
| 1955 | 39 | Administrative Supervisor | 1 |
| | | Psychologist | 1 |
| 1956 | 41 | Counselor | 5 |
| | | Case Aide | 1 |
| 1957 | 45 | Maintenance Supervisor | 1 |
| | | Barber | 1 |
| 1958 | 46 | Night Watchman | 2 |
| | | Maintenance Man | 1 |
| 1959 | 53 | Teacher | 5 |
| | | Detail Officer | 4 |
| 1960 | 57 | Group Supervisor | 4 |
| | | | <u>26</u> |
| 1961 | 65 | | |

Table 3

Hennepin County Home School for Boys
Expenditures 1950-1962

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Personal Service</u> | <u>Other</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1950 | \$52,166 | \$64,596 | \$116,762 |
| 1951 | 56,213 | 50,829 | 107,042 |
| 1952 | 62,617 | 54,045 | 116,662 |
| 1953 | 68,882 | 61,878 | 130,760 |
| 1954 | 79,123 | 58,470 | 137,593 |
| 1955 | 94,400 | 73,449 | 167,849 |
| 1956 | 164,623 | 71,455 | 236,078 |
| 1957 | 184,885 | 82,060 | 266,945 |
| 1958 | 217,192 | 94,359 | 311,551 |
| 1959 | 269,550 | 88,679 | 358,229 |
| 1960 | 313,545 | 91,410 | 404,955 |
| 1961 (est.) | 349,110 | 97,934 | 447,044 |
| 1962 (est.) | 395,365 | 110,577 | 505,942 |

The CWC's study was chiefly concerned with a brief appraisal of developments at the School since the National Probation and Parole Association's 1954 report and suggestions for most needed improvements to improve the value to the community of the school as a rehabilitation agency. With respect to the physical plant, which is our immediate concern here, the report said:

"Practically all indoor activities -- sleeping, eating, teaching, recreation, diagnosis and classification, and administration -- take place in one congregate building. The most destructive aspect of this congregate living is the lodging of up to 140 boys in a single dormitory area. The administration must be given credit for transforming two adjacent recreation rooms into additional dormitories. This coupled with the fact that the large dormitory was already broken up into two rooms by glass partitions has made possible the division of the population into four age groups consisting of (1) Small Fry or "Blackhawks", age 9 - 12; (2) Juniors or "Rangers", aged 13 - 14; Intermediates or "Rebels", aged 14 - 15 - 16; and Seniors, aged 16 - 17 - 18. Each group has its own staff leader or boys' supervisor, eats at the same table, attends the same classes and so far as possible carries on all activities as a unit and in separation from the other groups.

"This group organization represents a substantial improvement over the former situation and has done much to build up school morale. Nevertheless, boys still have to sleep in double decker bunks with narrow space between bunks and no possibility of privacy for the shy withdrawn child who cannot relate to other people, or for disturbed children. The dormitories afford no room for personal possessions of any kind. Boys have to undress in the basement where each has a locker.

"Here again, the present administration has effected a real improvement by providing each boy a private locker and lock. While all lockers are in one big basement room, each group uses the room separately and at different times. Related to this development is the transformation of the former noisome toilet, wash room, and shower room into places making possible some privacy and selfrespect as well as cleanliness. The eight open toilet bowls available have been separated by partitions.

"Despite these real improvements, the dormitories, especially when the school is full, still fail to meet minimum requirements for health, let alone privacy. Universal American and European experience in the institutional care of delinquent youngsters has demonstrated that the mass dormitory creates rather than corrects, problems, and hampers the changes in attitude and behavior which the training school is intended to effect.

"It is not a question of providing a soft or even a more comfortable life for the children in the institution. It is a question of making possible the growth of self-respect, the clarification of his own identity, and the establishment of close personal relationships with adults, all of which are essential to the successful treatment of children with behavior problems."

The report recommended

"That the necessary number of cottages, each accomodating ideally not more than 12 and under no circumstances more than 20 boys, be built at the Home School to house the total population, and take the place of the present dormitory. Each cottage would contain both private rooms and a small dormitory and a combined living-recreation room.

"The building of separate cottages would solve many other problems, such as the present highly undesirable periodic herding of all boys into an inadequate 'waiting room'. The present dormitory space could be well used for additional classrooms, for arts, crafts, and shops, and, if necessary, for some indoor recreational space."

The County Budget Committee is impressed with the need for having a rehabilitation type program carried on at the Home School, and is convinced that new physical facilities, conducive to "the changes in attitude and behavior which the training school is intended to effect", are essential for carrying on this program.

THE STATE'S RESPONSIBILITY IN THE FIELD OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Before deciding, however, whether the County should go ahead and build these facilities, other questions must be resolved, the chief of which involves the issue of the State's responsibility for institutional care of delinquent youth. For a major argument against the County's expanding the Home School has been that the basic responsibility for training school care of the delinquents rests with the State, and if the County continues to assume responsibility for a training school it will merely be encouraging the State in its failure to discharge properly its responsibility.

The Minnesota Youth Conservation Commission (YCC) is set up by law to "provide a program looking toward the prevention of juvenile and youth delinquency and to provide and administer preventive and corrective training for persons committed to the commission."

The district courts of the State are required to commit to the commission every person convicted of a felony or gross misdemeanor, who is less than 21 years of age and is not sentenced to imprisonment for life, or in a county jail for 90 days or less, or to a fine only. In addition, as noted above, the juvenile court of any county may place any child whom it has adjudged delinquent into the custody of the commission.

Delinquent persons committed to the commission may be ordered committed to the State Training School for Boys at Red Wing or the Minnesota Home School for Girls at Sauk Centre, or to private schools for delinquent children.

The YCC is required "to receive, clothe, maintain, and instruct, at the expense of the state, all infants duly committed . . . to the training school and keep them in its custody until their arrival at the age of 21 years unless sooner discharged, apprenticed, paroled, placed on probation, or transferred . . ." The YCC may place any of these children, until they are 18 years old, in suitable homes, or bind them out as apprentices so as to be most conducive to their "reformation and amendment."

Summarizing the responsibility of the State, and the relationship of County action to State action:

The State must maintain training school facilities for delinquent minors up to 21 years of age, and must receive all delinquents committed from all counties, including Hennepin.

The counties are permitted to maintain their own training schools for those adjudged delinquent under 18 years of age. If they don't maintain such facilities, the only government training school to which they can commit their delinquent children is to Red Wing or Sauk Centre. But even if they do maintain their own facilities, they may still commit them to the State institutions, and the State institutions must take them.

CURRENT SITUATION AT RED WING

The committee met with Minnesota Commissioner of Corrections Will Turnbladh to ascertain the present state of population and program at Red Wing and the current and possible future relationship to Hennepin County's needs and programs for a boys training school.

The only boys training schools in the State are Red Wing, Glen Lake and Ramsey County's Totem Town. For all counties except Hennepin and Ramsey, Red Wing handles boys of all ages and problems, whereas it tends to get only the severest problem cases from Hennepin and Ramsey. Even so, the number of delinquents committed to Red Wing from Hennepin County is sizeable. Turnbladh said it varied from 105-125. In relation to the child population and the census at Red Wing, the situation is this for the three largest counties:

| | <u>Hennepin</u> | <u>Ramsey</u> | <u>St. Louis</u> |
|---|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Percent of 1960 child population | 21.3% | 11.8% | 6.9% |
| Percent of commitments to Red Wing (1960-61) | 27.0% | 18.8% | 7.2% |

Thus the Hennepin and Ramsey share of the Red Wing census is greater than their share of the State's child population.

On a recent day, Red Wing had a census of 449 with a rated capacity of 400 ("though it should not be called on to handle more than 350", according to the CWC report).

Turnbladh gave the following per diem costs of Red Wing and Glen Lake (including everything but plant amortization):

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Red Wing (1960-61) | \$5.70 |
| Glen Lake (2 years ago) | \$8.00 - \$8.50 |

He said the reason for the difference is the better staffing pattern at Glen Lake, particularly on individual case workers and group workers, and the higher salaries paid. He felt that the Red Wing per capita costs should be higher, rather than Hennepin's being lower.

Turnbladh said that if Hennepin County abandoned Glen Lake, the State under the law would have to take the Glen Lake boys, to the extent that the Hennepin County Juvenile Court committed them to a training school. The result, he said, would be "chaos" at Red Wing because of the overcrowding that already exists.

"Youngsters from Hennepin County would not receive the help they need, and the young would be mixed in with the more hardened older boys", he said.

The CWC's 1958 report had this to say about Red Wing:

"The training school at Red Wing is bursting at the seams. Its population in November, 1957, reached a peak of 468. It has physical space for 400, though it should not be called on to handle more than 350. It

is currently forced to house boys in third floor dormitories in fire-trap buildings built in 1889, and not continuously supervised at night. Current population statistics do not tell the whole story, since as we have seen, pressure forces the State School to release boys before they are ready, and a substantial number of violators on parole are being left in their communities because the training school has no room for them.

"Court commitments to Red Wing have risen from 255 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, to 488 during the 1947 fiscal year. Over the same period, boys returned because of violation of probation and parole rose from 140 to 225. On the basis of the current rate of increase and the growth in the 10 through 17 age group in the state, it is estimated that court commitments in 1962 will number 579.

"Current steps taken to meet the population emergency at Red Wing include raising the population at the YCC forestry camp at Thistledeew from 40 to 70 boys. Also action has been taken to speed the building of the YCC's new forestry camp at St. Croix Forest for 60 boys under 16 from Red Wing School. Legislative action indicates that the YCC will be given a separate diagnostic center, which will reduce the population at Red Wing by 100 boys. But this facility cannot be ready before 1961 at the earliest."

CWC COMMENTS ON POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP OF
THE COUNTY HOME SCHOOL TO THE STATE CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM

The CWC report stated:

"Both because of its large share in the Red Wing population and because of its concern that the Glen Lake School should be in a position to limit children received at Glen Lake to those who can gain the most benefit from its program, Hennepin County has a vital interest in the solution of the overcrowding problem at Red Wing and in the development of a state-wide system of institutional facilities in which committed youngsters could be segregated according to their problems and needs. In other words, whatever division of government operates the Home School at Glen Lake, the school needs to function as one of several facilities coordinated to permit segregation." (underlining theirs)

The report said that "apart from letting matters drift in their present unsatisfactory state," two possible solutions have been suggested:

(1) Let the State take over the Hennepin and Ramsey County Home Schools, expand each to a capacity of 200, and incorporate them in the YCC correctional system. This would permit the YCC to segregate boys of comparable ages and problems. It would relieve Hennepin County of the cost of operating and rebuilding the Home School, and by relieving pressure at Red Wing provide a chance for more effective treatment.

On the negative side, Hennepin County would lose the advantage of exclusive control over the Home School with the freedom to place its own children there as the Court chooses. To the extent that some Hennepin County children would be sent

to other State institutions, the benefits of close contact with the parents of some County children would be lost. In addition, the County would lose control of the decision to make Glen Lake School co-educational.

(2) The State could adopt a program of matching funds with any county or group of counties operating or desiring to operate a small training facility for delinquent youngsters, and for the foster and boarding home care of delinquent youngsters.

The CWC preferred this alternative because it would stimulate care in the home community of a substantial number of delinquent youngsters who are now committed to the YCC. Also the greater use of foster homes by Hennepin County would take some of the population pressure off the Glen Lake School. Finally, this system would properly leave with the YCC only the most difficult and disturbed delinquent youngsters.

With this suggestion for expanded State participation, the CWC recommended that the County go ahead and expand the Glen Lake Home School.

1961 PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON STATE MATCHING FUNDS

Along the lines suggested in the CWC's preferred alternative, Hennepin County officials drafted legislative bills for the 1961 session, one providing for State sharing in operating costs of county training schools, the other for State sharing in construction costs.

Despite strong urging by the Advisory Committee on the Home School, headed by Gerald Mullin, and the support by the Legislative Interim Commission on Juvenile Delinquency and Adult Crime, the bills made little progress in the Legislature.

Apparently there were three main reasons for the lack of success: (1) The shortage of time for public discussion. (2) Lack of study of State-wide implications, and out-State Legislators' suspicion that the bills were designed to benefit only Hennepin County. (3) Failure to enlist adequate support from Ramsey County for the bills.

PRINCIPLES GUIDING LEAGUE COMMITTEE'S APPRAISAL

This committee considered these major principles most important in evaluating the several alternatives facing Hennepin County with respect to the future of the Glen Lake Home School for Boys:

1. The training school should be kept close to the homes of the delinquent youth committed there.

Having the institution close to the boys' place of residence has strong therapeutic justification:

(a) Treatment of a youngster must take into account his total family situation, since most delinquency problems begin with difficulties in the family relationship. Proximity of the home facilitates the task of the probation officer, caseworker, and counsellor in working with the family, and with others, such as church and school people, who can assist in this work.

(b) The same caseworker can carry on the aftercare supervision when the boys leave the institution.

2. The training school should be kept as close as possible to the juvenile court which commits youth to it.

This follows from the court's primary, continuing responsibility for the delinquents, including their progress through the training school.

3. Governmental functions should be performed at the lowest possible level consistent with economy and effectiveness.

Generally speaking, keeping government close to home assures greater citizen interest and more responsiveness to local preferences. Economy and effectiveness are affected by the amounts and type of service involved. For example, it may be that in some, if not most, counties of the State the number of delinquent youth needing training school facilities are so few as to make prohibitive on a unit cost basis the type of structure and staff needed to provide adequate treatment. In such a case, a group of counties, or the State itself, might be the smallest size unit that is feasible from a financial and service standpoint. On the other hand, a metropolitan county like Hennepin doubtless is well able to support its own institution.

It should be noted that this principle need not conflict with the State's responsibility for seeing that all citizens of the State receive a minimum standard of service. The State can adopt and enforce such standards as it deems necessary to discharge its responsibility.

ALTERNATIVE 1: ABANDON THE HOME SCHOOL FOR BOYS

Under this alternative, the County would exercise its right under the law not to maintain its own training school, with the result that all commitments would be made to Red Wing.

It could be argued that this would be the only way to bring home to the State Legislature the need for the State to assume its full responsibility for providing an adequate juvenile rehabilitation program. Whether this would have the desired effect on the out-State dominated Legislature seems doubtful, particularly in view of the fact that Hennepin County would have over one-half the commitments to Red Wing. In any case, it is likely that the Legislature would not respond quickly to the need for expanding Red Wing, and meanwhile, as Commissioner Turnbladh suggested, there would be "chaos" at Red Wing.

Considering the way in which the State has lagged behind the standards maintained by Hennepin County in establishing a rehabilitation program, it is likely that it would be some time before Hennepin County could expect its delinquents to get the kind of rehabilitative care they are now getting at Glen Lake, as handicapped by inadequate facilities as it may be. We do not believe that the citizens of the County should consider reducing the quality of program for the County's delinquents. As the CWC report indicates, on the contrary, the program should be improved.

ALTERNATIVE 2: TURN THE HOME SCHOOL OVER TO THE STATE

Essentially this is the first of two alternatives described in the CWC report (see page 12 above), and the one to which it gave second preference. Against the advantages of permitting the YCC to segregate boys of comparable ages and problems, budgetary relief for Hennepin County, and relief of population pressure at Red Wing, were placed the heavier disadvantages for the County of losing exclusive control over the institution and the loss to some extent of having children treated in their own community.

With respect to the political possibility of getting the State to take over Glen Lake Home School, it may be argued that Hennepin County was successful in getting the State to take over the Tuberculosis Sanatorium at Glen Lake. In response, it must be pointed out that Hennepin County agitated for many years for the State to take over the Sanatorium, and that that action finally came only after the number of TB patients was greatly reduced, the trend in TB incidence was continuing steadily downward, and the use of the space was an inexpensive way for the State to meet its growing problem of providing institutional facilities for old-age mental patients requiring largely custodial care.

Similar conditions do not exist in regard to the Home School and the trend in number of delinquents needing training school help, and it therefore seems doubtful to us that the State would be likely to consider this an appealing course of action.

ALTERNATIVE 3: EXPANSION BY THE COUNTY WITHOUT STATE FINANCIAL HELP

Under this alternative, the County would finance out of its own resources the cost of an expanded Home School without seeking to get the State to assume any share of the cost. Against the disadvantage of continuing to bear the sole cost of the construction and the expanded program of treatment would be the advantages of continued local control and all this means for a sound program for Hennepin County's own delinquent youth.

ALTERNATIVE 4: EXPANSION BY THE COUNTY, COUPLED WITH CONTINUED EFFORT TO OBTAIN LEGISLATION GRANTING STATE MATCHING FUNDS FOR COUNTY AND MULTI-COUNTY TRAINING SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION.

This alternative envisions continued local control and responsibility, with the advantages cited in Alternative 3. The County would also actively seek to achieve legislation which would set up State matching funds as an incentive for counties, or groups of counties acting in concert, to establish and operate their own training schools. This would have the advantage of improving rehabilitation of the less severe cases throughout the State, for the same reasons that operating the Glen Lake Home School for delinquent youth has advantages for Hennepin County. In addition, by relieving Red Wing of the responsibility for all but the most severe cases, it would permit that institution to do a better job on those cases, a high proportion of which come from Hennepin County.

ALTERNATIVE 4 RECOMMENDED

All things considered, the committee believes that alternative 4 should be adopted: Hennepin County should proceed with needed expansion of facilities at Glen Lake Home School so as to meet the urgent physical needs generally recognized, and should do all it can to achieve adoption of legislation for State matching funds for the stimulation of county or multi-county training schools in other parts of the State.

We believe this course of action is most consistent with the principles set forth above: (1) keeping the training school close to the community from which the youth come; (2) maintaining close control by the juvenile court immediately concerned; (3) and performance of governmental functions at the lowest possible level consistent with economy and effectiveness.

With respect to the last point, it may be contended that if Hennepin County goes ahead and continues its present program, and indeed improves the program, it will lose leverage on the Legislature in obtaining State matching funds for construction and operation, and that this could not therefore be considered in the long run an economical solution to the problem.

In answer to this it may be suggested that any program of State matching aid would have to be state-wide, which would mean, as in the case of all State matching programs, that Hennepin County would probably be paying out more of the State-wide cost than it would be receiving in return in State aids. Thus Hennepin County taxpayers in the broadest sense would not be profiting by the program on a strictly cash basis. On the other hand, to the extent that the State aid program stimulated local home schools in other counties it would improve the program available for the many delinquent youth from Hennepin County now getting treatment at Red Wing.

Finally, and also in the broadest sense, if the County insists on waiting for the State program to be set up before proceeding to expand its own local facilities, the continued social and economic loss to the people of Hennepin County might well more than offset the cost of the new facilities.

Thus, even from a selfish economic standpoint, and without regard to the other advantages cited, it would seem advisable for the County to proceed with the new facilities without waiting for the adoption of the State aid program, continuing to work, however, for such adoption.

Should State aid legislation for construction be adopted after Hennepin County has begun construction of expanded facilities, the legislation should provide for retroactive reimbursement of State aid funds for such construction.

THE TYPE OF NEW FACILITIES TO BE CONSTRUCTED

In line with its conviction that the Home School program should be designed to provide greater opportunity for the delinquent youth to grow in self-respect, clarify his own identity, and establish close personal relationships with adults, the CWC committee and the Home School Advisory Committee recommended that the new construction at Glen Lake Home School consist of separate cottages, housing 12 to 20 boys (see page 11 above). Mr. Keve has estimated these would cost \$65,000 to \$70,000 each, or a total of \$650,000 to \$700,000 to house a maximum of 200 boys.

In view of the fact that separate cottages are likely to be a more expensive type of construction than one in which living quarters are not entirely detached from another, we would urge County officials to examine all possible alternative types of construction plan which would provide the separation desired without the expensive cost of separate structures. One possibility, for example, might be a wheel design, with dormitories going out from the hub like spokes, and the hub housing facilities to be used in common.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCING

Financing construction of new Boys' School facilities is complicated by several factors. The County Board has no long range program of capital needs set up on a priority basis. It also has no general borrowing authority, and would have to get special legislative authorization to issue bonds for the construction expansion.

From the standpoint of current resources the County is better off than the City of Minneapolis, since it has no statutory limit on its County Revenue Fund property tax rate. It also has a special 0.25 mill levy, the Building and Maintenance Reserve Fund, which can be tapped. This levy raises about \$155,000 currently.

Construction work for a full 200 capacity new facility, estimated to cost \$650,000 to \$700,000, could be financed by a one year increase of 1.05 to 1.15 mill in the County Revenue Fund (in 1962 one mill brings in about \$615,000), or with an increase of 0.80 or 0.90 mill in the fund if the Building and Maintenance Reserve levy is also used in combination.

A sudden one year jump of around a mill can be avoided if the new construction is carried on in stages over several years. The separate unit type of facility recommended seems to lend itself to this kind of scheduling of construction. Then, by relying solely on the Building and Maintenance Fund levy of about \$155,000 per year, and leaving the County Revenue Fund alone, the construction of two building units per year could be financed.