
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Hon. Edward G. Rendell, Governor

JUVENILE COURT JUDGES' COMMISSION

Hon. Carol K. McGinley, Chairman

James E. Anderson, Executive Director

CENTER FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE TRAINING AND RESEARCH

SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY

Michael W. McCalpin, Director

Greg Young, Research Analyst

Seth Bloomquist, Director of Detention Monitoring

INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY DIVISION

Linda Bender, Director

Heather Armstrong-Shughart

Marlene Benedict

Julie Byers

Sharon Chamberlin

Susan Conner

Robert Diehl

Randy Fisher

Lanette Hutchison

Linda Miller

Marie Ocker

Donna Reasner

Jack Rentzel

Christy Spickler

Sherry Varner

Steve Varner

Tim Wright

P E N N S Y L V A N I A
Juvenile Court
DISPOSITIONS
2 0 0 2

Foreword


This report provides an overview of juvenile court dispositions in Pennsylvania during 2002 and preceding years, and summarizes juvenile court statistical data provided by county juvenile probation departments. Without the support of the courts and juvenile probation departments, this report would not be possible.

Although the report focuses primarily on delinquency dispositions, information has again been included on dependency cases that have been referred to juvenile probation departments. While county children and youth agencies handle the overwhelming majority of cases involving dependent children in the Commonwealth, some juvenile probation departments provide services to children who are alleged to be dependent on the basis of ungovernability or chronic truancy.


The information contained in this report is of value to all individuals, agencies and organizations having an interest in the Pennsylvania juvenile justice system. However, it is not intended to reflect the total workload of juvenile courts or juvenile probation departments.

It is with great pleasure that we dedicate this report to the judges, probation officers, victim advocates, district attorneys, service treatment providers, and other professionals who work on a daily basis in the Pennsylvania juvenile court system.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Anderson
Executive Director



Honorable Carol K. McGinley
Chairman

Preface

This report is a compilation of the data collected from the juvenile probation departments in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A copy of the statistical card used to collect the information can be found in the appendix.

As in the past, to avoid confusion regarding the unit of count used in tabulating juvenile court statistics and to improve the understanding of how data can be interpreted please note:

1. The primary unit of count is the *disposition*. A *disposition* is defined as a referral disposed of by the juvenile probation department and/or the court. Within a single delinquency referral, a youth may be charged with a number of offenses that may result in multiple petitions. Any one youth may be involved in a number of dispositions within a calendar year. In addition, a youth may be referred on more than one occasion and receive only one disposition. Dependency dispositions include only those referrals to probation departments alleging dependency that are not accompanied by allegations of delinquency. Therefore, one is cautioned NOT to attempt to interpret dispositions as:
 - a) the number of youth who are processed by the court;
 - b) the number of offenses charged to juveniles.
2. There are times when you will see the word *case* used to describe the data. In this report, the word *case* is used interchangeably with the word *disposition*;
3. The *unit of count* refers to a case disposed of by a juvenile court and/or juvenile probation department. The term *disposed* means that a definite action/decision has been implemented or that a treatment plan has been decided upon or begun;
4. The statistical system is constructed to collect up to the seven (7) most serious offenses per delinquency disposition;
5. The Commission collects additional information on *placement reviews*, *disposition reviews*, and selected special conditions attached to a disposition. A *disposition review* is a hearing conducted before the court regarding a previous disposition which *did not* result in out-of-home placement. A *placement review* is a hearing conducted before the court regarding a previous disposition which did involve out-of-home placement. The outcome of reviews are reported only in the review section of this report and are NOT included in any of the other tables.
6. The data in the secure detention section of this report were collected in conjunction with the JCJC Standards Governing the Use of Secure Detention. This information should not be compared with detention data collected and reported prior to 1989.
7. The reader is cautioned that in the tables containing rows with percent of total, the row may not total 100 percent due to rounding.

Custom reports, including any information contained in tables included in previous reports that have been deleted from this report, can be obtained by contacting the Director of Juvenile Justice Information and Technology at Shippensburg University, 717-477-1412.

Table of Contents

Delinquency Dispositions

Delinquency Dispositions, 2002 (Map)	1
Highlights of the 2002 Disposition Report	2
Delinquency Dispositions, 1998-2002 (Chart)	3
Frequency of Statewide Delinquency Dispositions, 2002	4
Delinquency Dispositions, 1998-2002 (Table)	5
Delinquency Dispositions as a Percent of Juvenile Population, 2002	7
Delinquency Dispositions by Type, 2002	9
Type of Attorney Representation in Delinquency Proceedings, 2002	13
Delinquency Dispositions by Source of Referral, 2002	15
Time Lapse from Referral to Disposition for Delinquency Cases, 2002	17
Median Time Lapse for Formal Cases by Type of Disposition, 2002	19
Median Time Lapse for Informal Cases by Type of Disposition, 2002	19

Delinquency Placements

Delinquency Placements, 1998-2002 (Charts)	20
Delinquency Placements, 1998-2002	21
Delinquency Placements by Type, 2002 (Table)	23
Delinquency Placements by Type, 2002 (Charts)	25

Delinquency Offenses

Alleged Offenses by Type, 2002	27
Selected Alleged Charges, 1998-2002	29
Selected Substantiated Charges, 1998-2002	30
Substantiated Offenses by Type, 2002	31

Detention

Secure Detention	33
Length of Stay in Secure Detention, 2002	34
Secure Detention Admissions by Standard Section Codes, 2002	35
Utilization Rates for Pennsylvania Juvenile Detention Centers, 2002	37
Detention Admissions, 1998-2002	38

Table of Contents

Demographics

Selected Dispositions by Gender, 2002	39
Total Dispositions by Age, 2002	40
Delinquency Dispositions by Race and Gender, 2002	41
Delinquency Dispositions by Race and Ethnicity, 2002	43
Selected Dispositions by Race and Ethnicity, 2002	45
Race and Ethnicity of Juveniles in Selected Placements, 2002	46
Delinquency Dispositions by Age, 2002	47
Delinquency Dispositions by School Status, 2002	51
Delinquency Dispositions by Highest Grade Completed, 2002	53
Delinquency Dispositions by Family Status, 2002	55
Delinquency Dispositions by Living Arrangement of Youth, 2002	57

Dependency Dispositions

Dependency Dispositions, 2002	59
Dependency Dispositions by Age, 2002	60
Dependency Dispositions Demographics, 2002	61
Dependency Dispositions by Race and Gender, 2002	62

Disposition and Placement Reviews

Outcomes of Delinquency Disposition Reviews, 2002	63
Type of Placement Resulting from Delinquency Disposition Reviews, 2002	65
Outcomes of Delinquency Placement Reviews, 2002	67
Delinquency Placement Review Transfers by Type of Placement, 2002	69


Summary of all Dispositional Activity

Summary of all Delinquency and Dependency Dispositions, 2002	71
--	----

Appendix

County Class & Population	73
Juvenile Court Statistical Card	74

Delinquency Dispositions, 2002



Highlights

of the 2002 Disposition Report

- The 39,333 delinquency dispositions in Pennsylvania in 2002 represent a 7.4 percent decrease from 2001 and a 1.1 percent decrease since 1998. (See page 3)
- The two largest counties in the Commonwealth, Allegheny and Philadelphia, went in opposite directions from 2001 to 2002. Allegheny County increased from 3,179 “new” dispositions in 2001 to 4,334 in 2002; while Philadelphia decreased from 10,201 “new” dispositions in 2001 to 6,642 in 2002. (See pages 3 and 6).
- Probation continues to be the most frequently utilized disposition (22.3%) followed in descending order by Consent Decree (15.1%), Informal Adjustment (13.3%), Placement (10.4%), Complaint Withdrawn (8.9%), Dismissed/Not Substantiated (7.8%), Warned/Counseled/Case Closed (5.8%), and Fines/Costs (4.2%). (See page 4)
- Public defenders handled 16,614 (65.1%) of the 25,523 delinquency proceedings in 2002. Private attorneys handled 3,815 (14.9%) of the delinquency proceedings, while court appointed attorneys handled 3,212 (12.6%). In 2002, juveniles waived their right to counsel in 7.4% (1,882) of the delinquency proceedings. (See pages 13 and 14)
- Delinquency placements in private institutions comprise 30.9 percent (1,266) of the 4,099 total delinquency placements in 2002. This is nearly double the frequency in which group homes (16%) and Wilderness-based placements (13.9%) were utilized in 2002. (See page 23)
- Juvenile court dispositions in Pennsylvania continue to primarily involve males. In 2002, males accounted for 78.4 percent of all juvenile court dispositions, 82.7 percent of probation dispositions, 88.2 percent of dispositions involving placement, and 95.9 percent of transfers to criminal court. (See page 39)
- The majority of juvenile court dispositions in 2002 continued to involve White youth (56.4%), followed by Black youth (32.3%), Hispanic youth (6.4%), and Asian youth (.6%). (See page 45)
- Of those receiving “new” dispositions, there are a substantially higher percentage of dispositions involving Black youth that are transferred to criminal court (42.6%) compared to the percentage (32.4%) processed through juvenile courts. In addition, a significantly lower percentage of Black youth received a Consent Decree (24.1%). (See page 45)


Delinquency Dispositions, 1998 - 2002

The graph below represents the number of juvenile delinquency dispositions from 1998 to 2002, excluding disposition reviews, placement reviews, and dependency dispositions. The 39,333 delinquency dispositions in 2002 represent a 7.4 percent decrease from 2001, and a 1.1 percent decrease since 1998.

Dispositions of new charges in Philadelphia County decreased 34.9 percent between 2001 and 2002, and by 8 percent between 1998 and 2002. Dispositions of new charges in Allegheny County increased 36.3 percent between 2001 and 2002, and by 3 percent between 1998 and 2002.

The statewide decrease of 7.4 percent in delinquency dispositions from 2001 to 2002 is primarily attributable to the decrease in the number of dispositions in Philadelphia County. In counties other than Philadelphia and Allegheny, the number of new delinquency cases has remained relatively unchanged since 1998.

DELINQUENCY DISPOSITIONS




Frequency of Statewide Delinquency Dispositions, 2002

There were 39,333 delinquency-related dispositions in Pennsylvania during 2002.

Probation was the most frequently utilized disposition (8,784, 22.3%) followed in descending order by Consent Decree (5,939, 15.1%), Informal Adjustment (5,242, 13.3%), Placement (4,099, 10.4%), Complaint Withdrawn (3,501, 8.9%), Dismissed, Not Substantiated (3,077, 7.8%), Warned, Counseled, Case Closed (2,275, 5.8%), Fines/Costs (1,667, 4.2%). All remaining dispositions totaled 12.1%. Probation with Day Treatment is listed as a separate disposition rather than being included in Probation.

PERCENT OF TOTAL DISPOSITIONS

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.



Delinquency Dispositions, 1998 - 2002

The information in this section includes those cases referred to juvenile probation with alleged delinquent offenses. Disposition and Placement reviews, and dispositions involving children alleged to be dependent, are not included.

COUNTY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	% CHANGE 01-02
Adams	249	353	446	451	452	0.2%
Allegheny	4,207	4,060	3,981	3,179	4,334	36.3%
Armstrong	339	344	294	296	234	-20.9%
Beaver	699	661	607	610	626	2.6%
Bedford	106	82	50	54	62	14.8%
Berks	942	995	1,095	997	1,047	5.0%
Blair	401	446	477	430	418	-2.8%
Bradford	135	164	111	127	134	5.5%
Bucks	1,758	1,585	1,658	1,778	1,259	-29.2%
Butler	398	364	347	361	302	-16.3%
Cambria	536	547	640	554	570	2.9%
Cameron	27	24	22	31	20	-35.5%
Carbon	176	255	173	196	163	-16.8%
Centre	199	172	190	166	154	-7.2%
Chester	568	706	912	977	1,002	2.6%
Clarion	61	68	94	82	132	61.0%
Clearfield	441	324	328	248	213	-14.1%
Clinton	92	86	114	73	79	8.2%
Columbia	311	228	188	213	153	-28.2%
Crawford	350	395	270	332	293	-11.7%
Cumberland	566	614	568	531	441	-16.9%
Dauphin	1,349	1,423	1,577	1,507	1,350	-10.4%
Delaware	1,460	1,573	1,524	1,460	1,381	-5.4%
Elk	80	67	72	66	45	-31.8%
Erie	1,145	1,297	1,158	1,019	1,033	1.4%
Fayette	500	432	526	605	749	23.8%
Forest	11	20	29	28	12	-57.1%
Franklin	480	335	505	527	453	-14.0%
Fulton	13	26	26	33	25	-24.2%
Greene	102	49	52	68	37	-45.6%
Huntingdon	112	87	96	85	95	11.8%
Indiana	210	216	244	264	243	-8.0%
Jefferson	187	153	147	140	210	50.0%
Juniata	42	24	62	67	61	-9.0%

continued

Delinquency Dispositions, 1998 - 2002

COUNTY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	% CHANGE 01-02
Lackawanna	381	360	501	471	416	-11.7%
Lancaster	1,359	1,640	1,553	1,530	1,445	-5.6%
Lawrence	281	263	193	261	447	71.3%
Lebanon	423	386	366	578	450	-22.1%
Lehigh	619	871	1,104	1,046	1,123	7.4%
Luzerne	1,476	1,396	999	1,017	1,484	45.9%
Lycoming	645	579	638	517	583	12.8%
McKean	148	121	109	111	102	-8.1%
Mercer	312	282	271	334	305	-8.7%
Mifflin	45	63	30	62	86	38.7%
Monroe	413	398	383	360	426	18.3%
Montgomery	1,653	2,029	1,995	2,450	2,076	-15.3%
Montour	66	69	52	62	51	-17.7%
Northampton	765	755	725	819	744	-9.2%
Northumberland	618	665	674	621	589	-5.2%
Perry	118	118	105	77	106	37.7%
Philadelphia	7,233	7,860	8,737	10,201	6,642	-34.9%
Pike	70	80	114	118	108	-8.5%
Potter	65	26	52	77	85	10.4%
Schuylkill	396	389	376	396	366	-7.6%
Snyder	98	115	110	129	87	-32.6%
Somerset	194	245	172	196	152	-22.4%
Sullivan	27	7	17	7	19	171.4%
Susquehanna	76	118	102	126	109	-13.5%
Tioga	163	147	132	216	141	-34.7%
Union	56	66	55	57	54	-5.3%
Venango	138	125	97	119	149	25.2%
Warren	136	133	141	105	103	-1.9%
Washington	354	402	455	376	336	-10.6%
Wayne	67	55	63	92	81	-12.0%
Westmoreland	914	871	861	653	845	29.4%
Wyoming	139	121	154	134	120	-10.4%
York	2,069	1,894	1,979	1,613	1,721	6.7%
Total	39,769	40,824	41,898	42,486	39,333	-7.4%

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

Delinquency Dispositions as a Percent of Juvenile Population, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	% OF STATEWIDE DISPOSITIONS	AGE 10-17 POPULATION	JUVENILE POPULATION RANK	DISPOSITION RANK PER 100,000	DISPOSITIONS AS A % OF JUV. POP.
Adams	452	1.1%	11,120	31	8	4.1%
Allegheny	4,334	11.0%	131,389	2	15	3.3%
Armstrong	234	0.6%	7,778	38	22	3.0%
Beaver	626	1.6%	19,424	20	16	3.2%
Bedford	62	0.2%	5,515	44	65	1.1%
Berks	1,047	2.7%	43,639	9	34	2.4%
Blair	418	1.1%	13,875	26	21	3.0%
Bradford	134	0.3%	7,705	39	57	1.7%
Bucks	1,259	3.2%	70,764	4	54	1.8%
Butler	302	0.8%	19,869	19	60	1.5%
Cambria	570	1.4%	15,377	23	12	3.7%
Cameron	20	0.1%	712	66	24	2.8%
Carbon	163	0.4%	6,307	42	27	2.6%
Centre	154	0.4%	11,513	30	64	1.3%
Chester	1,002	2.5%	53,311	7	52	1.9%
Clarion	132	0.3%	4,341	55	20	3.0%
Clearfield	213	0.5%	8,991	36	35	2.4%
Clinton	79	0.2%	3,876	59	44	2.0%
Columbia	153	0.4%	6,532	41	37	2.3%
Crawford	293	0.7%	10,727	32	25	2.7%
Cumberland	441	1.1%	22,452	17	51	2.0%
Dauphin	1,350	3.4%	27,995	15	2	4.8%
Delaware	1,381	3.5%	65,097	5	42	2.1%
Elk	45	0.1%	4,073	57	66	1.1%
Erie	1,033	2.6%	32,628	12	19	3.2%
Fayette	749	1.9%	15,765	22	3	4.8%
Forest	12	0.0%	593	67	46	2.0%
Franklin	453	1.2%	14,222	25	18	3.2%
Fulton	25	0.1%	1,651	64	61	1.5%
Greene	37	0.1%	4,344	54	67	0.9%
Huntingdon	95	0.2%	4,749	53	49	2.0%
Indiana	243	0.6	9,250	35	26	2.6%
Jefferson	210	0.5%	5,145	49	7	4.1%
Juniata	61	0.2%	2,589	61	36	2.4%

continued

Delinquency Dispositions as a Percent of Juvenile Population, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	% OF STATEWIDE DISPOSITIONS	AGE 10-17 POPULATION	JUVENILE POPULATION RANK	DISPOSITION RANK PER 100,000	DISPOSITIONS AS A % OF JUV. POP.
Lackawanna	416	1.1%	22,503	16	53	1.8%
Lancaster	1,445	3.7%	57,188	6	28	2.5%
Lawrence	447	1.1%	10,332	33	5	4.3%
Lebanon	450	1.1%	13,244	29	14	3.4%
Lehigh	1,123	2.9%	34,961	11	17	3.2%
Luzerne	1,484	3.8%	32,556	13	4	4.6%
Lycoming	583	1.5%	13,584	28	6	4.3%
McKean	102	0.3%	5,141	51	50	2.0%
Mercer	305	0.8%	13,602	27	38	2.2%
Mifflin	86	0.2%	5,332	47	58	1.6%
Monroe	426	1.1%	19,062	21	39	2.2%
Montgomery	2076	5.3%	82,678	3	29	2.5%
Montour	51	0.1%	2,080	63	32	2.5%
Northampton	744	1.9%	30,113	14	31	2.5%
Northumberland	589	1.5%	10,242	34	1	5.8%
Perry	106	0.3%	5,183	48	43	2.0%
Philadelphia	6,642	16.9%	176,310	1	11	3.8%
Pike	108	0.3%	6,198	43	56	1.7%
Potter	85	0.2%	2,240	62	10	3.8%
Schuylkill	366	0.9%	15,070	24	33	2.4%
Snyder	87	0.2%	4,331	56	47	2.0%
Somerset	152	0.4%	8,622	37	55	1.8%
Sullivan	19	0.0%	768	65	30	2.5%
Susquehanna	109	0.3%	5,349	46	45	2.0%
Tioga	141	0.4%	4,965	52	23	2.8%
Union	54	0.1%	3,963	58	63	1.4%
Venango	149	0.4%	6,799	40	40	2.2%
Warren	103	0.3%	5,141	50	48	2.0%
Washington	336	0.9%	21,131	18	59	1.6%
Wayne	81	0.2%	5,364	45	62	1.5%
Westmoreland	845	2.1%	39,160	10	41	2.2%
Wyoming	120	0.3%	3,514	60	13	3.4%
York	1,721	4.4%	43,995	8	9	3.9%
TOTAL	39,333	100.0%	1,374,039			2.9%

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

Delinquency Dispositions by Type, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOS.	TRANSFER TO CRIMINAL COURT	TRANSFER TO OTHER COURT	COMPLAINT WITHDRAWN	WARNED, CASE CLOSED	INFORMAL ADJUSTMENT	FINES/COSTS ORDERED	DISMISSED, NOT SUBSTANTIATED
Adams	452	2	15	27	10	39	17	15
Allegheny	4,334	4	35	749	290	929	0	434
Armstrong	234	0	5	23	10	54	52	3
Beaver	626	1	6	54	4	179	0	46
Bedford	62	0	0	0	0	9	1	4
Berks	1,047	7	60	26	3	172	14	13
Blair	418	0	8	81	0	74	68	20
Bradford	134	3	3	5	0	1	0	4
Bucks	1,259	1	73	79	45	331	2	12
Butler	302	0	29	11	8	10	0	6
Cambria	570	10	14	50	0	0	58	116
Cameron	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Carbon	163	0	24	1	0	31	0	0
Centre	154	0	20	6	6	1	10	3
Chester	1,002	1	37	1	8	412	0	74
Clarion	132	6	18	2	5	4	12	3
Clearfield	213	2	20	0	0	66	1	0
Clinton	79	0	6	5	9	4	7	3
Columbia	153	0	12	14	5	48	0	3
Crawford	293	3	19	23	1	23	0	6
Cumberland	441	3	41	21	39	80	2	5
Dauphin	1,350	23	58	66	112	56	66	87
Delaware	1,381	15	72	84	12	0	0	50
Elk	45	0	0	2	0	6	4	1
Erie	1,033	2	33	43	102	206	1	16
Fayette	749	0	8	0	302	70	1	1
Forest	12	0	1	0	1	2	0	0
Franklin	453	5	9	38	4	43	38	1
Fulton	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Greene	37	0	0	5	0	1	0	0
Huntingdon	95	0	7	4	8	1	0	4
Indiana	243	0	19	6	47	4	24	6
Jefferson	210	0	17	56	7	0	1	0
Juniata	61	0	3	4	4	2	1	2

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

continued

Delinquency Dispositions by Type, 2002

COUNTY	PROTECTIVE SUPERVISION	REFERRAL TO AGENCY/INDIVIDUAL	CONSENT DECREE*	PROBATION	PROBATION W/DAY TREATMENT	CONTINUED PREVIOUS DISPOSITION	OTHER DISPOSITIONS	PLACEMENT
Adams	0	1	156	119	0	4	15	32
Allegheny	0	0	859	371	256	1	35	371
Armstrong	0	22	27	23	0	4	6	5
Beaver	3	0	157	116	0	4	12	44
Bedford	0	0	22	21	0	1	0	4
Berks	0	7	226	249	14	48	25	183
Blair	0	14	114	13	0	18	0	8
Bradford	0	0	66	36	1	0	12	3
Bucks	0	0	199	306	19	0	26	166
Butler	0	0	77	132	0	0	10	19
Cambria	7	5	113	140	0	0	26	31
Cameron	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	4
Carbon	0	4	44	30	0	0	13	16
Centre	0	0	59	38	0	0	1	10
Chester	0	0	108	277	13	0	0	71
Clarion	0	2	36	25	0	0	12	7
Clearfield	0	0	37	74	1	1	4	7
Clinton	0	0	5	28	0	0	1	11
Columbia	0	1	3	46	0	1	9	11
Crawford	0	1	38	152	0	1	5	21
Cumberland	0	0	169	42	0	7	9	23
Dauphin	0	10	232	324	27	64	60	165
Delaware	0	0	263	709	0	3	0	173
Elk	0	0	23	3	0	0	2	4
Erie	0	0	201	184	39	42	16	148
Fayette	0	0	120	58	1	145	15	28
Forest	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	1
Franklin	2	1	193	49	1	20	13	36
Fulton	0	0	6	14	0	0	0	2
Greene	0	0	14	11	0	2	4	0
Huntingdon	0	1	52	8	0	0	4	6
Indiana	0	8	79	41	0	0	3	6
Jefferson	0	1	47	53	0	18	0	10
Juniata	0	1	18	17	0	1	2	6

continued

Delinquency Dispositions by Type, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOS.	TRANSFER TO CRIMINAL COURT	TRANSFER TO OTHER COURT	COMPLAINT WITHDRAWN	WARNED, CASE CLOSED	INFORMAL ADJUSTMENT	FINES/COSTS ORDERED	DISMISSED, NOT SUBSTANTIATED
Lackawanna	416	0	43	10	0	13	1	7
Lancaster	1,445	1	46	127	181	298	10	31
Lawrence	447	0	7	90	0	160	29	14
Lebanon	450	10	24	6	57	5	14	6
Lehigh	1,123	4	64	41	67	156	8	25
Luzerne	1,484	8	27	26	515	115	2	36
Lycoming	583	8	24	29	0	136	22	4
McKean	102	0	8	1	2	5	0	0
Mercer	305	1	13	29	27	38	3	6
Mifflin	86	5	4	0	0	0	0	5
Monroe	426	4	25	88	1	46	11	27
Montgomery	2,076	3	83	114	13	286	468	66
Montour	51	0	11	1	0	9	3	4
Northampton	744	8	40	20	47	179	14	8
Northumberland	589	6	27	6	19	130	116	7
Perry	106	1	6	0	9	51	1	0
Philadelphia	6,642	20	83	1,262	12	98	9	1,785
Pike	108	0	11	7	0	0	9	1
Potter	85	4	10	6	0	1	3	6
Schuylkill	366	1	10	13	29	71	60	13
Snyder	87	3	16	6	0	1	10	0
Somerset	152	2	6	17	19	2	0	4
Sullivan	19	0	6	0	0	0	1	0
Susquehanna	109	7	4	12	5	11	7	2
Tioga	141	1	9	7	1	1	0	0
Union	54	0	6	1	2	1	10	0
Venango	149	1	12	17	1	10	0	5
Warren	103	0	2	0	1	17	4	3
Washington	336	1	4	18	34	58	1	8
Wayne	81	0	11	3	0	6	0	3
Westmoreland	845	3	48	23	80	49	29	33
Wyoming	120	1	29	7	0	27	2	0
York	1,721	5	43	27	111	404	439	28
TOTAL	39,333	197	1,434	3,501	2,275	5,242	1,667	3,077
% of Total	100.0%	0.5%	3.6%	8.9%	5.8%	13.3%	4.2%	7.8%

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

continued

Delinquency Dispositions by Type, 2002

COUNTY	PROTECTIVE SUPERVISION	REFERRAL TO AGENCY/INDIVIDUAL	CONSENT DECREE*	PROBATION	PROBATION W/DAY TREATMENT	CONTINUED PREVIOUS DISPOSITION	OTHER DISPOSITIONS	PLACEMENT
Lackawanna	0	6	42	220	0	0	1	73
Lancaster	0	1	0	513	3	11	74	149
Lawrence	0	0	61	74	0	0	4	8
Lebanon	0	0	125	67	0	3	89	44
Lehigh	0	0	140	378	0	70	12	158
Luzerne	0	5	9	166	0	19	243	313
Lycoming	0	11	98	142	0	0	32	77
McKean	0	1	19	58	0	0	0	8
Mercer	0	13	27	78	0	0	15	55
Mifflin	0	0	10	49	0	3	2	8
Monroe	0	1	26	109	0	0	2	86
Montgomery	8	11	155	341	0	16	282	230
Montour	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	5
Northampton	0	6	74	261	0	16	15	56
Northumberland	0	1	86	91	3	52	20	25
Perry	0	0	11	22	0	0	4	1
Philadelphia	0	5	741	1,502	1	266	80	778
Pike	0	0	9	53	1	0	0	17
Potter	0	0	21	30	0	0	4	0
Schuylkill	0	2	9	57	0	11	42	48
Snyder	0	0	14	22	0	1	6	8
Somerset	0	0	35	62	0	1	0	4
Sullivan	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	3
Susquehanna	0	0	13	28	0	3	14	3
Tioga	0	0	47	29	0	0	36	10
Union	0	0	9	18	0	1	0	6
Venango	0	0	12	75	1	2	5	8
Warren	0	0	34	25	0	1	6	10
Washington	0	2	35	96	0	0	42	37
Wayne	0	0	23	23	0	0	0	12
Westmoreland	16	32	201	158	22	39	30	82
Wyoming	0	0	3	42	0	0	7	2
York	0	6	67	258	1	140	49	143
TOTAL	36	182	5,939	8,784	404	1,040	1,456	4,099
% of Total	0.1%	0.5%	15.1%	22.3%	1.0%	2.6%	3.7%	10.4%

* The following counties had a total of 172 deferred adjudications and placements with no reported adjudication of delinquency at the time of disposition. These dispositions have been included with the disposition of Consent Decree. (Allegheny - 1, Blair - 44, Chester - 17, Daupin - 1, Erie - 9, Fulton - 1, Lackawanna - 20, Lebanon - 74, Lehigh - 1, Lycoming - 2, Montgomery - 1, Northampton - 1).


Type of Attorney Representation in Delinquency Proceedings, 2002

This chart presents a summary of the data included in the table found on page 14. The “Court Appointed” column of the table includes those cases where counsel, other than the public defender, is appointed by the court. Attorney representation at the court hearing may be waived.

The data on attorney representation include only the 25,523 dispositions made as a result of a hearing before a master or a judge. Disposition reviews, placement reviews, and dependency cases are not included.

Legal representation in delinquency proceedings, during 2002, was most often provided by public defenders who were involved in 65.1 percent of the delinquency dispositions involving hearings. Private attorneys provided legal representation in 14.9 percent of delinquency dispositions involving hearings, followed by court appointed attorneys (12.6%). Legal representation was waived in 7.4 percent of delinquency dispositions involving hearings.

ATTORNEY REPRESENTATION: DELINQUENCY DISPOSITIONS



continued

Type of Attorney Representation in Delinquency Proceedings, 2002

TYPE OF DISPOSITION	NUMBER OF PROCEEDINGS	PUBLIC DEFENDER	%	PRIVATE	%	COURT APPOINTED	%	WAIVED	%
Transfer to Criminal Court	197	135	68.5%	22	11.2%	36	18.3%	4	2.0%
Transfer to Other Juvenile Court	1,289	899	69.7%	157	12.2%	147	11.4%	86	6.7%
Complaint Withdrawn	778	444	57.1%	141	18.1%	122	15.7%	71	9.1%
Warned, Case Closed	527	283	53.7%	107	20.3%	62	11.8%	75	14.2%
Informal Adjustment	590	217	36.8%	347	58.8%	4	0.7%	22	3.7%
Fines/Costs Ordered	338	199	58.9%	40	11.8%	30	8.9%	69	20.4%
Dismissed, Not Substantiated	3,077	1,817	59.0%	443	14.4%	571	18.6%	246	8.0%
Referred to Agency/Individual	112	67	59.8%	4	3.6%	5	4.5%	36	32.1%
Consent Decree	4,285	2,760	64.4%	640	14.9%	587	13.7%	298	6.9%
Probation	8,673	5,856	67.5%	1,223	14.1%	1,019	11.8%	575	6.6%
Continued Previous Dispo.	610	489	80.2%	41	6.7%	58	9.5%	22	3.6%
Other Disposition	522	327	62.6%	51	9.8%	35	6.7%	109	20.9%
Placement	4,089	2,858	69.9%	548	13.4%	433	10.6%	250	6.1%
Protective Supervision	32	32	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Probation w/Day Treatment	404	231	57.2%	51	12.6%	103	25.5%	19	4.7%
TOTAL	25,523	16,614	65.1%	3,815	14.9%	3,212	12.6%	1,882	7.4%

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

Delinquency Dispositions by Source of Referral, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOS.	POLICE		DISTRICT JUSTICE		OTHER JUVENILE COURT		PROBATION		NOT REPORTED/ OTHER	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adams	452	283	62.6	147	32.5	20	4.4	0	0.0	2	0.4
Allegheny	4,334	3,657	84.4	420	9.7	122	2.8	1	0.0	134	3.1
Armstrong	234	113	48.3	110	47.0	11	4.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Beaver	626	406	64.9	102	16.3	21	3.4	43	6.9	54	8.6
Bedford	62	60	96.8	0	0.0	1	1.6	1	1.6	0	0.0
Berks	1,047	883	84.3	26	2.5	64	6.1	64	6.1	10	1.0
Blair	418	236	56.5	130	31.1	19	4.6	2	0.5	31	7.4
Bradford	134	129	96.3	0	0.0	5	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Bucks	1,259	1,027	81.6	71	5.6	45	3.6	109	8.7	7	0.6
Butler	302	287	95.0	12	4.0	1	0.3	2	0.7	0	0.0
Cambria	570	462	81.1	98	17.2	6	1.1	0	0.0	4	0.7
Cameron	20	20	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Carbon	163	146	89.6	5	3.1	11	6.8	0	0.0	1	0.6
Centre	154	143	92.9	6	3.9	3	2.0	1	0.7	1	0.7
Chester	1,002	897	89.5	91	9.1	14	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Clarion	132	102	77.3	22	16.7	8	6.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Clearfield	213	145	68.1	63	29.6	3	1.4	2	0.9	0	0.0
Clinton	79	65	82.3	7	8.9	2	2.5	1	1.3	4	5.1
Columbia	153	104	68.0	39	25.5	10	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Crawford	293	263	89.8	0	0.0	21	7.2	1	0.3	8	2.7
Cumberland	441	375	85.0	30	6.8	26	5.9	2	0.5	8	1.8
Dauphin	1,350	1,077	79.8	185	13.7	38	2.8	50	3.7	0	0.0
Delaware	1,381	1,352	97.9	1	0.1	24	1.7	0	0.0	4	0.3
Elk	45	37	82.2	5	11.1	3	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Erie	1,033	832	80.5	159	15.4	29	2.8	13	1.3	0	0.0
Fayette	749	374	49.9	249	33.2	24	3.2	72	9.6	30	4.0
Forest	12	8	66.7	3	25.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Franklin	453	351	77.5	85	18.8	13	2.9	1	0.2	3	0.7
Fulton	25	25	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Greene	37	36	97.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.7
Huntingdon	95	88	92.6	0	0.0	7	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Indiana	243	145	59.7	76	31.3	22	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Jefferson	210	83	39.5	62	29.5	8	3.8	56	26.7	1	0.5
Juniata	61	44	72.1	5	8.2	12	19.7	0	0.0	0	0.0

continued

Delinquency Dispositions by Source of Referral, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOS.	POLICE		DISTRICT JUSTICE		OTHER JUVENILE COURT		PROBATION		NOT REPORTED/ OTHER	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lackawanna	416	392	94.2	0	0.0	13	3.1	7	1.7	4	1.0
Lancaster	1,445	1,038	71.8	356	24.6	38	2.6	11	0.8	2	0.1
Lawrence	447	283	63.3	162	36.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.5
Lebanon	450	332	73.8	106	23.6	6	1.3	6	1.3	0	0.0
Lehigh	1,123	1,018	90.7	16	1.4	40	3.6	44	3.9	5	0.4
Luzerne	1,484	643	43.3	726	48.9	39	2.6	12	0.8	64	4.3
Lycoming	583	383	65.7	184	31.6	9	1.5	0	0.0	7	1.2
McKean	102	97	95.1	0	0.0	5	4.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mercer	305	249	81.6	30	9.8	5	1.6	18	5.9	3	1.0
Mifflin	86	83	96.5	0	0.0	3	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Monroe	426	309	72.5	96	22.5	12	2.8	0	0.0	9	2.1
Montgomery	2,076	1,146	55.2	712	34.3	60	2.9	147	7.1	11	0.5
Montour	51	45	88.2	1	2.0	3	5.9	1	2.0	1	2.0
Northampton	744	654	87.9	16	2.2	71	9.5	0	0.0	3	0.4
Northumberland	589	337	57.2	218	37.0	24	4.1	7	1.2	3	0.5
Perry	106	100	94.3	0	0.0	5	4.7	0	0.0	1	0.9
Philadelphia	6,642	6,438	96.9	0	0.0	186	2.8	0	0.0	18	0.3
Pike	108	98	90.7	0	0.0	8	7.4	0	0.0	2	1.9
Potter	85	72	84.7	11	12.9	2	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Schuylkill	366	261	71.3	66	18.0	34	9.3	5	1.4	0	0.0
Snyder	87	59	67.8	19	21.8	6	6.9	1	1.2	2	2.3
Somerset	152	123	80.9	23	15.1	6	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sullivan	19	16	84.2	0	0.0	3	15.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Susquehanna	109	71	65.1	18	16.5	20	18.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Tioga	141	101	71.6	31	22.0	7	5.0	0	0.0	2	1.4
Union	54	40	74.1	4	7.4	6	11.1	1	1.9	3	5.6
Venango	149	134	89.9	12	8.1	3	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Warren	103	80	77.7	17	16.5	6	5.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Washington	336	263	78.3	2	0.6	12	3.6	23	6.8	36	10.7
Wayne	81	76	93.8	0	0.0	5	6.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Westmoreland	845	588	69.6	131	15.5	42	5.0	33	3.9	51	6.0
Wyoming	120	76	63.3	36	30.0	4	3.3	0	0.0	4	3.3
York	1,721	949	55.1	696	40.4	67	3.9	5	0.3	4	0.2
TOTAL	39,333	30,809	78.3	5,898	15.0	1,344	3.4	742	1.9	540	1.4

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

Time Lapse from Referral to Disposition for Delinquency Cases, 2002

Time lapse information is calculated from the date of referral to the date of disposition. Disposition reviews, placement reviews, and dependency cases are not included. Dispositions are grouped into one of two categories: formal or informal. A disposition is counted in the formal category if a date was located in the Date of Hearing field on the statistical card (an example of the card is included in the appendix) indicating that a hearing before a judge or master was conducted.

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	FORMAL DISPOSITIONS		INFORMAL DISPOSITIONS	
		TOTAL	MEDIAN IN DAYS	TOTAL	MEDIAN IN DAYS
Adams	452	259	85.0	193	31.0
Allegheny	4,334	2,868	70.0	1,466	117.0
Armstrong	234	66	114.5	168	35.0
Beaver	626	219	61.0	407	31.0
Bedford	62	49	101.0	13	92.0
Berks	1,047	821	105.0	226	45.0
Blair	418	254	70.0	164	81.5
Bradford	134	60	67.5	74	39.5
Bucks	1,259	1,251	60.0	8	73.0
Butler	302	198	52.0	104	38.0
Cambria	570	475	35.5	95	88.0
Cameron	20	11	108.0	9	31.0
Carbon	163	62	134.5	101	77.0
Centre	154	154	74.0	0	0.0
Chester	1,002	597	135.0	405	213.0
Clarion	132	96	78.0	36	45.0
Clearfield	213	117	84.0	96	133.0
Clinton	79	60	58.0	19	15.5
Columbia	153	61	103.0	92	32.5
Crawford	293	204	63.5	89	60.0
Cumberland	441	118	52.0	323	38.0
Dauphin	1,350	1,035	75.0	315	78.0
Delaware	1,381	1,295	106.0	86	97.5
Elk	45	27	51.0	18	39.0
Erie	1,033	631	92.0	402	58.0
Fayette	749	97	71.0	652	24.0
Forest	12	10	47.0	2	36.5
Franklin	453	103	66.0	350	55.0
Fulton	25	19	84.0	6	33.5
Greene	37	18	98.0	19	82.0
Huntingdon	95	76	90.5	19	79.5
Indiana	243	71	69.0	172	35.0
Jefferson	210	83	30.0	127	41.5
Juniata	61	47	49.0	14	50.5

Time Lapse from Referral to Disposition for Delinquency Cases, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	FORMAL DISPOSITIONS		INFORMAL DISPOSITIONS	
		TOTAL	MEDIAN IN DAYS	TOTAL	MEDIAN IN DAYS
Lackawanna	416	406	57.0	10	50.5
Lancaster	1,445	780	75.5	665	38.0
Lawrence	447	105	76.0	342	106.0
Lebanon	450	250	57.0	200	61.5
Lehigh	1,123	1,079	49.0	44	47.0
Luzerne	1,484	663	60.5	821	132.0
Lycoming	583	393	43.0	190	49.0
McKean	102	94	57.0	8	42.0
Mercer	305	194	84.0	111	48.0
Mifflin	86	86	52.0	0	0.0
Monroe	426	302	136.0	124	88.0
Montgomery	2,076	998	63.0	1,078	26.5
Montour	51	39	56.0	12	20.0
Northampton	744	433	95.0	311	57.0
Northumberland	589	157	84.0	432	54.0
Perry	106	46	58.5	60	22.0
Philadelphia	6,642	5,454	78.0	1,188	71.0
Pike	108	104	72.5	4	28.0
Potter	85	83	63.0	2	318.5
Schuylkill	366	150	105.0	216	21.0
Snyder	87	58	50.0	29	32.5
Somerset	152	100	106.0	52	88.0
Sullivan	19	17	90.0	2	86.5
Susquehanna	109	64	64.5	45	56.0
Tioga	141	80	41.0	61	60.5
Union	54	42	49.0	12	102.0
Venango	149	120	166.0	29	265.5
Warren	103	54	43.0	49	17.0
Washington	336	187	72.0	149	22.0
Wayne	81	74	110.0	7	128.0
Westmoreland	845	748	71.5	97	22.0
Wyoming	120	95	54.0	25	6.0
York	1,721	556	97.0	1,165	27.0
TOTAL	39,333	25,523	75.0	13,810	53.0

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

Median Time Lapse for Formal Cases by Type of Disposition, 2002

Date of Referral to
Date of Disposition

Type of Disposition	Number of Dispositions	Median Days
Protective Supervision	32	42.0
Transfer to Criminal Court	197	46.0
Placement	4,089	52.0
Informal Adjustment	590	53.0
Probation w/Day Treatment	404	54.0
Referred to Agency/Individual	112	55.0
Continued Previous Disposition	610	56.0
Transfer to Other Court	1,289	63.0
Complaint Withdrawn	778	70.0
Warned, Case Closed	527	71.0
Consent Decree	4,285	75.0
Fines/Costs	338	78.0
Probation	8,673	81.0
Other Disposition	522	86.5
Dismissed, Not Substantiated	3,077	99.0
Total	25,523	75.0

NOTE:
Does not include
disposition and
placement reviews.

Median Time Lapse for Informal Cases by Type of Disposition, 2002


Date of Referral to
Date of Disposition

Type of Disposition	Number of Dispositions	Median Days
Placement	10	18.5
Fines/Costs	1,329	21.0
Continued Previous Disposition	430	22.0
Referred to Agency/Individual	70	25.5
Protective Supervision	4	28.5
Transfer to Other Court	145	37.0
Probation	111	42.0
Informal Adjustment	4,652	49.0
Consent Decree	1,654	50.0
Warned, Case Closed	1,748	64.0
Complaint Withdrawn	2,723	69.0
Other Disposition	934	76.0
Total	13,810	53.0

NOTE:
Does not include
disposition and
placement reviews.


Delinquency Placements, 1998 - 2002

DELINQUENCY PLACEMENTS



Placements represented 10.4 percent of statewide delinquency dispositions in 2002. This remained relatively unchanged since 1998. In Philadelphia County, placements as a percentage of delinquency dispositions have decreased from 16.4 percent in 1999, to 11.7 percent in 2002. Placements as a percentage of delinquency dispositions in the rest of the state have remained relatively unchanged since 1998.

PLACEMENTS AS A PERCENT OF DISPOSITIONS



Delinquency Placements, 1998 - 2002

COUNTY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	PERCENT CHANGE 01-02	PLACEMENTS AS A % OF DISPOSITIONS
Adams	26	22	43	26	32	23.1%	7.1%
Allegheny	423	359	340	299	371	24.1%	8.6%
Armstrong	10	7	16	6	5	-16.7%	2.1%
Beaver	51	34	48	46	44	-4.3%	7.0%
Bedford	5	8	11	4	4	0.0%	6.5%
Berks	141	178	167	173	183	5.8%	17.5%
Blair	18	11	18	12	8	-33.3%	1.9%
Bradford	8	9	7	12	3	-75.0%	2.2%
Bucks	274	272	287	258	166	-35.7%	13.2%
Butler	41	24	25	30	19	-36.7%	6.3%
Cambria	26	35	29	27	31	14.8%	5.4%
Cameron	5	4	4	3	4	33.3%	20.0%
Carbon	10	18	11	12	16	33.3%	9.8%
Centre	20	18	14	13	10	-23.1%	6.5%
Chester	58	102	79	92	71	-22.8%	7.1%
Clarion	0	0	0	3	7	133.3	5.3%
Clearfield	22	17	11	8	7	-12.5%	3.3%
Clinton	5	10	9	11	11	0.0%	13.9%
Columbia	14	14	23	11	11	0.0%	7.2%
Crawford	23	24	11	23	21	-8.7%	7.2%
Cumberland	10	7	22	18	23	27.8%	5.2%
Dauphin	218	192	172	167	165	-1.2%	12.2%
Delaware	143	155	141	188	173	-8.0%	12.5%
Elk	13	3	6	8	4	-50.0%	8.9%
Erie	207	183	184	180	148	-17.8%	14.3%
Fayette	17	19	15	23	28	21.7%	3.7%
Forest	3	2	2	0	1	*	8.3%
Franklin	54	40	42	38	36	-5.3%	7.9%
Fulton	3	1	1	4	2	-50.0%	8.0%
Greene	0	3	1	3	0	*	0.0%
Huntingdon	8	4	2	11	6	-45.5%	6.3%
Indiana	2	6	10	13	6	-53.8%	2.5%
Jefferson	11	14	9	10	10	0.0%	4.8%
Juniata	4	3	6	3	6	100.0%	9.8%

continued

Delinquency Placements, 1998 - 2002

COUNTY	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	PERCENT CHANGE 01-02	PLACEMENTS AS A % OF DISPOSITIONS
Lackawanna	74	66	81	72	73	1.4%	17.5%
Lancaster	104	162	163	159	149	-6.3%	10.3%
Lawrence	6	21	15	9	8	-11.1%	1.8%
Lebanon	21	23	26	40	44	10.0%	9.8%
Lehigh	105	136	134	147	158	7.5%	14.1%
Luzerne	83	192	152	135	313	131.9%	21.1%
Lycoming	72	52	75	63	77	22.2%	13.2%
McKean	8	6	5	11	8	-27.3%	7.8%
Mercer	53	49	31	62	55	-11.3%	18.0%
Mifflin	2	5	2	7	8	14.3%	9.3%
Monroe	51	56	69	69	86	24.6%	20.2%
Montgomery	102	144	133	197	230	16.8%	11.1%
Montour	5	3	6	14	5	-64.3%	9.8%
Northampton	47	26	47	38	56	47.4%	7.5%
Northumberland	19	27	27	19	25	31.6%	4.2%
Perry	10	11	8	8	1	-87.5%	0.9%
Philadelphia	1,161	1,287	1,233	1,141	778	-31.8%	11.7%
Pike	11	14	18	20	17	-15.0%	15.7%
Potter	0	0	1	2	0	*	0.0%
Schuylkill	44	45	34	38	48	26.3%	13.1%
Snyder	4	3	6	5	8	60.0%	9.2%
Somerset	3	6	3	1	4	300.0%	2.6%
Sullivan	3	1	1	2	3	50.0%	15.8%
Susquehanna	5	12	8	5	3	-40.0%	2.8%
Tioga	3	7	5	30	10	-66.7%	7.1%
Union	8	3	6	7	6	-14.3%	11.1%
Venango	12	21	22	8	8	0.0%	5.4%
Warren	14	10	9	8	10	25.0%	9.7%
Washington	31	25	33	34	37	8.8%	11.0%
Wayne	14	12	8	25	12	-52.0%	14.8%
Westmoreland	71	110	98	65	82	26.2%	9.7%
Wyoming	2	9	5	3	2	-33.3%	1.7%
York	126	145	154	117	143	22.2%	8.3%
TOTAL	4,147	4,487	4,384	4,296	4,099	-4.6%	10.4%

*Not mathematically a percent change.

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.

Delinquency Placements by Type, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL PLACEMENTS	PRIVATE INSTITUTION	DPW OPEN YDC	GROUP HOME	FOSTER CARE	SECURITY	DRUG & ALCOHOL	WILDERNESS BASED [†]	BOOT CAMP	INDEP. LIVING	OTHER TYPE
Adams	32	12	0	9	0	0	3	3	4	0	1
Allegheny	371	111	19	80	0	23	64	21	47	4	2
Armstrong	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Beaver	44	18	0	10	4	3	2	4	3	0	0
Bedford	4	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Berks	183	57	6	3	0	29	39	38	3	2	6
Blair	8	1	1	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0
Bradford	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bucks	166	31	0	37	9	3	33	23	9	0	21
Butler	19	3	1	3	0	0	2	1	8	0	1
Cambria	31	12	0	7	1	0	4	7	0	0	0
Cameron	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Carbon	16	4	0	5	0	3	0	2	2	0	0
Centre	10	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Chester	71	40	0	12	0	6	6	3	1	2	1
Clarion	7	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0
Clearfield	7	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
Clinton	11	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Columbia	11	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	3	0	0
Crawford	21	4	2	11	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
Cumberland	23	7	0	1	0	0	2	12	1	0	0
Dauphin	165	39	1	23	6	32	33	17	4	9	1
Delaware	173	48	3	18	1	26	25	17	35	0	0
Elk	4	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Erie	148	35	0	45	0	15	22	3	28	0	0
Fayette	28	12	0	5	0	0	3	0	6	0	2
Forest	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	36	13	0	3	0	0	0	9	7	0	4
Fulton	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Greene	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huntingdon	6	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	0
Jefferson	10	1	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
Juniata	6	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0

† Department of Public Welfare Youth Forestry Camps are included in the Wilderness-Based category for this table.

Delinquency Placements by Type, 2002

COUNTY	TOTAL PLACEMENTS	PRIVATE INSTITUTION	DPW OPEN YDC	GROUP HOME	FOSTER CARE	SECURITY	DRUG & ALCOHOL	WILDERNESS BASED [†]	BOOT CAMP	INDEP. LIVING	OTHER TYPE
Lackawanna	73	29	0	2	4	4	16	6	12	0	0
Lancaster	149	25	18	18	1	39	22	7	14	2	3
Lawrence	8	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	0	0
Lebanon	44	13	0	0	1	3	4	1	20	0	2
Lehigh	158	36	25	7	3	19	15	25	25	3	0
Luzerne	313	26	1	10	0	16	22	211	25	0	2
Lycoming	77	26	1	3	13	0	2	18	13	0	1
McKean	8	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	0
Mercer	55	8	2	22	0	0	0	8	14	1	0
Mifflin	8	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	1
Monroe	86	27	0	1	0	5	6	18	29	0	0
Montgomery	230	81	12	98	5	8	12	12	2	0	0
Montour	5	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Northampton	56	8	2	32	0	6	3	3	1	0	1
Northumberland	25	1	0	3	7	2	0	10	0	0	2
Perry	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Philadelphia*	778	407	27	82	0	48	21	53	121	2	17
Pike	17	8	0	1	0	1	2	4	1	0	0
Potter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schuylkill	48	13	4	5	0	7	5	5	3	2	4
Snyder	8	4	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0
Somerset	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Sullivan	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Susquehanna	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Tioga	10	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0
Union	6	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0
Venango	8	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Warren	10	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1
Washington	37	6	2	8	0	1	6	4	6	1	3
Wayne	12	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	4	1	0
Westmoreland	82	21	2	14	4	9	21	6	0	4	1
Wyoming	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
York	143	30	8	40	3	8	11	8	22	1	12
TOTAL	4,099	1,266	139	657	72	333	427	570	506	36	93
% of Total	100.0%	30.9%	3.4%	16.0%	1.8%	8.1%	10.4%	13.9%	12.3%	0.9%	2.3%

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.


* Of the 778 placements in Philadelphia, 134 were not initially committed directly to a specific placement facility, but were committed to the custody of the Department of Public Welfare (DPW). With the court's approval, DPW arranged for the eventual placement. Those 134 are included in the totals listed for Philadelphia and were distributed as follows: Private Institution (of 407/26); DPW Open YDC (of 27/22); Group Home (of 82/1); Security (of 48/44); Wilderness (of 53/37); Boot Camp (of 121/1); Other (of 17/3).

Delinquency Placements by Type, 2002

Placements to private institutions were the most common type of delinquency placement in 2002, comprising 30.9 percent of all placements, followed by group homes (16.0%), boot camps (12.3%), wilderness-based placements (11.3%), and drug and alcohol placements (10.4%).

PLACEMENT TYPE AS A PERCENT OF PLACEMENTS

NOTE: Does not include disposition and placement reviews.




Total Delinquency Placements by Type, 2002

This chart depicts the type of placement as a percent of total delinquency placements, including those resulting from disposition reviews. In general, these data correspond to the types of placement utilized in the disposition of new cases (see page 25).

The reader is directed to pages 65 and 66 for a breakdown, by county, of the type of service ordered by courts following disposition reviews. In order to calculate the total delinquency placements for an individual county, or statewide, in 2002, combine the information found on pages 23 and 24 with those found on pages 65 and 66.

PLACEMENT TYPE AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL PLACEMENTS

NOTE: Includes disposition reviews.



Alleged Offenses by Type, 2002

Beginning with the 1997 juvenile court dispositions, the seven most serious charges per disposition were collected. This is an increase from four charges per disposition in previous years. For this reason, the reader is cautioned not to compare the 2002 charge information shown on pages 27, 28, 31 and 32 to reports prior to 1997.

Property offenses represented 31.5 percent of all alleged offenses in 2002. Offenses against persons comprised 24.6 percent of all alleged offenses, while drug offenses accounted for 13.5 percent. Other offenses accounted for 30.5 percent of all alleged offenses.

COUNTY	PERSON	PROPERTY	DRUG	OTHER	TOTAL
Adams	179	353	227	399	1,158
Allegheny	3,172	4,066	1,571	3,449	12,258
Armstrong	71	151	51	291	564
Beaver	367	629	117	489	1,602
Bedford	22	98	41	36	197
Berks	456	718	293	519	1,986
Blair	255	378	101	450	1,184
Bradford	84	217	48	93	442
Bucks	272	501	306	429	1,508
Butler	113	322	118	299	852
Cambria	457	608	129	532	1,726
Cameron	6	23	6	1	36
Carbon	107	343	48	119	617
Centre	95	238	96	102	531
Chester	924	1,240	583	1,196	3,943
Clarion	78	113	63	153	407
Clearfield	78	241	58	173	550
Clinton	35	147	94	60	336
Columbia	55	142	54	127	378
Crawford	128	538	65	234	965
Cumberland	218	435	159	564	1,376
Dauphin	818	848	557	1,221	3,444
Delaware	2,667	2,203	1,033	1,801	7,704
Elk	12	30	37	62	141
Erie	549	1,205	244	702	2,700
Fayette	200	670	90	824	1,784
Forest	0	12	6	3	21
Franklin	182	381	148	377	1,088
Fulton	20	35	9	28	92
Greene	37	36	13	18	104
Huntingdon	75	60	30	53	218
Indiana	89	193	60	223	565
Jefferson	66	189	76	227	558
Juniata	27	109	20	63	219

continued

Alleged Offenses by Type, 2002

COUNTY	PERSON	PROPERTY	DRUG	OTHER	TOTAL
Lackawanna	378	300	117	274	1,069
Lancaster	498	1,243	462	1,229	3,432
Lawrence	289	280	55	454	1,078
Lebanon	205	285	143	476	1,109
Lehigh	973	1,229	479	1,316	3,997
Luzerne	577	1,198	374	1,741	3,890
Lycoming	375	592	193	730	1,890
McKean	84	104	54	56	298
Mercer	192	345	94	276	907
Mifflin	29	127	32	28	216
Monroe	419	732	156	464	1,771
Montgomery	1,097	1,699	700	2,354	5,850
Montour	28	44	10	26	108
Northampton	411	728	235	817	2,191
Northumberland	237	522	196	710	1,665
Perry	137	81	42	25	285
Philadelphia	10,126	7,102	5,448	6,896	29,572
Pike	84	185	52	59	380
Potter	85	92	13	146	336
Schuylkill	201	481	77	420	1,179
Snyder	77	109	14	89	289
Somerset	177	168	93	149	587
Sullivan	10	44	8	12	74
Susquehanna	50	150	32	90	322
Tioga	75	180	39	141	435
Union	28	71	9	68	176
Venango	106	178	41	141	466
Warren	31	114	43	72	260
Washington	193	406	89	203	891
Wayne	64	72	53	75	264
Westmoreland	700	800	312	1,070	2,882
Wyoming	48	48	47	99	242
York	527	1,746	379	1,705	4,357
TOTAL	30,425	38,927	16,642	37,728	123,722
% of Total	24.6%	31.5%	13.5%	30.5%	100.0%


NOTE: Includes all offenses and counts reported on each case.

Selected Alleged Charges, 1998-2002

The line chart below shows a selection of alleged charges. A disposition with an alleged drug charge and none of the other listed alleged charges (rape, robbery, aggravated assault) was counted in the drug category. A disposition with an alleged aggravated assault charge, and no alleged rape or robbery charges was counted in the aggravated assault category. A disposition with an alleged robbery charge and no alleged rape charge was counted in the robbery category. Any disposition with an alleged rape charge was counted in the rape category. For the reasons explained on page 27, the reader is again cautioned not to compare these figures to those in reports prior to 1997.

Of particular interest, is that there were 6,894 alleged drug charges in 2002, representing an 11.3 percent decrease from 2001, and an 18.7 percent increase since 1998. Noteworthy as well, were the 303 alleged rape charges in 2002, representing a 25.7 percent decrease from 2001, and a 16.5 percent increase since 1999.

SELECTED ALLEGED CHARGES




Selected Substantiated Charges, 1998-2002

The line chart below shows a selection of substantiated charges. A disposition with a substantiated drug charge and none of the other listed substantiated charges (rape, robbery, aggravated assault) was counted in the drug category. A disposition with a substantiated aggravated assault charge, and no substantiated rape or robbery charges was counted in the aggravated assault category. A disposition with a substantiated robbery charge and no substantiated rape charge was counted in the robbery category. Any disposition with a substantiated rape charge was counted in the rape category. For the reasons explained on page 27, the reader is again cautioned not to compare these figures to those in reports prior to 1997.

There were 3,670 substantiated drug charges in 2002, representing a 10.9 percent decrease from 2001, and a 22 percent increase since 1998. There were 588 substantiated aggravated assault charges in 2002, representing a 3.1 percent increase from 2001, and a 28 percent decrease since 1998. There were 78 substantiated rape charges in 2002, representing a 22 percent decrease from 2001, and a 36.8 percent increase since 1999. The 358 substantiated robbery charges in 2002 represent a 26.5 percent decrease from 2001, but is 35.4 percent less than the 554 substantiated robbery charges in 1998.

SELECTED SUBSTANTIATED CHARGES



Substantiated Offenses by Type, 2002

Substantiated property offenses represented 35.8 percent of all substantiated offenses in 2002, followed by substantiated person offenses (22.0%), and substantiated drug offenses (15.9%). All other substantiated offenses accounted for 26.3 percent of the total substantiated offenses.

COUNTY	PERSON	PROPERTY	DRUG	OTHER	TOTAL
Adams	38	75	48	38	199
Allegheny	1,185	1,880	835	1,480	5,380
Armstrong	13	25	7	10	55
Beaver	60	111	16	52	239
Bedford	6	22	13	6	47
Berks	281	423	178	375	1,257
Blair	40	85	22	45	192
Bradford	9	32	12	13	66
Bucks	263	487	301	417	1,468
Butler	52	112	58	95	317
Cambria	152	205	46	183	586
Cameron	5	6	1	1	13
Carbon	22	91	9	20	142
Centre	55	160	80	71	366
Chester	275	372	205	197	1,049
Clarion	25	41	37	37	140
Clearfield	40	111	32	49	232
Clinton	15	67	14	14	110
Columbia	16	39	14	20	89
Crawford	36	174	29	79	318
Cumberland	50	60	35	40	185
Dauphin	412	522	350	657	1,941
Delaware	560	466	346	268	1,640
Elk	4	13	9	5	31
Erie	344	891	135	352	1,722
Fayette	44	301	12	111	468
Forest	0	9	5	0	14
Franklin	39	56	8	15	118
Fulton	10	8	4	11	33
Greene	5	22	2	8	37
Huntingdon	20	21	2	6	49
Indiana	29	82	8	17	136
Jefferson	20	41	34	58	153
Juniata	20	48	14	11	93

continued

Substantiated Offenses by Type, 2002

COUNTY	PERSON	PROPERTY	DRUG	OTHER	TOTAL
Lackawanna	223	242	103	193	761
Lancaster	342	746	277	538	1,903
Lawrence	56	50	9	28	143
Lebanon	148	178	85	204	615
Lehigh	345	388	197	548	1,478
Luzerne	315	814	243	594	1,966
Lycoming	148	265	114	160	687
McKean	59	66	49	49	223
Mercer	76	90	53	66	285
Mifflin	14	59	16	13	102
Monroe	72	137	48	84	341
Montgomery	297	368	223	363	1,251
Montour	14	16	6	2	38
Northampton	196	357	103	301	957
Northumberland	82	174	79	108	443
Perry	82	31	16	10	139
Philadelphia	1,107	1,107	1,181	1,020	4,415
Pike	31	72	23	23	149
Potter	39	47	10	41	137
Schuylkill	59	121	14	72	266
Snyder	23	16	6	16	61
Somerset	81	108	41	67	297
Sullivan	3	13	3	5	24
Susquehanna	7	16	4	6	33
Tioga	33	83	16	43	175
Union	17	22	5	11	55
Venango	49	85	22	44	200
Warren	12	46	15	33	106
Washington	68	183	36	93	380
Wayne	25	33	29	37	124
Westmoreland	203	299	80	361	943
Wyoming	15	29	29	23	96
York	203	631	151	323	1,308
TOTAL	8,589	13,950	6,207	10,240	38,986
% of Total	22.0%	35.8%	15.9%	26.3%	100.0%

NOTE: Includes all offenses and counts reported on each case.

Secure Detention

The Juvenile Court Judges' Commission's "Standards Governing the Use of Secure Detention Under the Juvenile Act" were developed to guide decision making regarding juvenile detention usage in Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system. Compliance with these standards is required for counties participating in the Commission's Grant-in-Aid Program, with the exception of Philadelphia.

Detention information appearing in this Disposition Report was extracted from the secure detention database at the Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research. In accordance with the Standards Governing Secure Detention, all counties, except Philadelphia, report their secure detention use to the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission. This is accomplished statewide through the detention centers. Each month, all juvenile detention centers, with the exception of the Youth Study Center in Philadelphia, report their detention admissions along with the Statement of Facts and Reasons that must accompany every probation-authorized admission to secure detention. Philadelphia County is not included in this reporting system.

When interpreting the data contained in these tables, the reader should note the following:

1. The unit of count is the admission of a juvenile to a secure detention center;
2. A juvenile who is admitted to a secure detention center and subsequently transferred to another secure detention center without release is counted as two admissions.

Codes Related to *Standards Governing the Use of Secure Detention Under The Juvenile Act*

100 Codes	Circumstances under which secure detention may be authorized on the basis of an alleged offense or on the basis of an alleged offense and the child's current status with the court or prior record.
200 Codes	Circumstances under which secure detention may be authorized on the basis of a child's status as an absconder or fugitive; on the basis of a child's record of failing to appear at previous juvenile proceedings; or because of extraordinary circumstances which require secure detention to prevent a child from absconding.
300 Codes	Circumstances under which secure detention may be authorized on the written request of the child or child's attorney.
400 Codes	Circumstances under which secure detention may be ordered pending disposition, subsequent to a finding that a child committed a delinquent act or is a delinquent child.
500 Codes	Circumstances under which secure detention may be ordered following disposition pending transfer to placement.
600 Codes	Circumstances under which secure detention may be authorized on the basis of the child's status, pending or subsequent to a disposition review proceeding.
Code 701	Circumstances under which secure detention may be authorized on the basis of extraordinary and exceptional circumstances.