12-1963

0083 Colorado Institutional Programs

Colorado Legislative Council

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STATE INSTITUTIONS

Report To The

Colorado General Assembly

Research Publication No. 83
December, 1963

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
222-9911—EXTENSION 2285

December 6, 1963

To Members of the Forty-fourth Colorado General Assembly:

As directed by H.J.R. No. 25, 1963 session, the Legislative Council submits the accompanying progress report on Colorado institutional programs prepared by the Committee on Institutions.

The Committee has recommended that recommendations one through seven be included on the Governor's list of items to be considered during the second regular session.

This report was reviewed by the Legislative Council at its meeting on December 6, 1963. At that time the report was approved for transmittal to the Forty-fourth General Assembly and to the Governor.

Respectfully submitted,

Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
222-9911—EXTENSION 2285

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

November 6, 1963

Representative C. P. Lamb
Colorado Legislative Council
341 State Capitol
Denver, Colorado

Dear Representative Lamb:

Transmitted herewith is the report of the Legislative Council Committee on Institutions, appointed pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 25 (1963). This report covers the committee's study thus far and its recommendations on the following major subjects: mental retardation, state children's home, facilities and programs for delinquents, mental health, and juvenile commitment and transfer laws. These subjects were considered by the committee in carrying out its responsibilities to study, review, and keep informed currently on state institutional facilities, services, programs, and related matters.

Respectfully yours,

/s/ Representative William O. Lennox
Chairman
Committee on Institutions

WOL:mp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWORD

House Joint Resolution No. 25 (1963) directed the Legislative Council to appoint a committee to study, review, and keep informed currently on state institutional facilities, services, programs, and related matters. Several subjects were outlined in the resolution for consideration. These included:

1) pilot program and study on community centers for the mentally retarded;

2) juvenile commitment and transfer laws;

3) juvenile parole board;

4) program and functions of the state children's home and its relationship to over-all state programs and services for children;

5) forestry camp programs for delinquents;

6) program planning and staffing for the children's psychiatric hospital at Fort Logan;

7) the state's role in the community mental health center program; and

8) any other subjects the committee may wish to consider.

The committee appointed to make this study included: Representative William O. Lennox, Colorado Springs, chairman; Representative Harold McCormick, Canon City, vice chairman; Senator Raymond W. Braiden, La Jara; Senator Richard Hobbs, Pueblo; Senator L. T. Strain, La Junta; Representative George W. Atkinson, Johnstown; Representative Joseph Calabrese, Denver; Representative Kathleen P. Littler, Greeley; Representative James O'Donnell, Denver; Representative Elizabeth Pellet, Rico; Representative H. Ted Rubin, Denver; and Representative Ruth Stockton, Lakewood. Representative C. P. Lamb, chairman of the Legislative Council, served as an ex officio member of the committee. Harry O. Lawson, senior research analyst, had the primary responsibility for the staff work on this study and was assisted by Roger M. Weber, research assistant.

Four meetings were held by the committee. The director of institutions, various Department of Institutions officials, and institutional directors were present at these meetings to discuss the subjects outlined in the committee research program, answer questions, provide additional information, and present recommendations.

In addition to the subjects outlined in House Joint Resolution No. 25 (1963), the committee gave consideration to the following matters: 1) program development at the Ridge and Grand Junction homes and training schools; 2) the Fort Logan Annex program for pseudo retardates; 3) the public school trainable program; 4) eligibility of the Lookout Mountain School for Boys and Mountview School for Girls for federal surplus property; and 5) the proposed Hesperus Youth Center. Generally, these additional subjects were considered in

relation to similar matters contained in the committee's specific research assignment.

The committee wishes to express its appreciation to Mr. David Hamil, director of institutions, and the members of his staff for their very valuable assistance in the course of the study. In particular, the committee would like to thank the following: Dr. Hans Shapire, chief of psychiatric services; Dr. Wesley P. White, chief of mental retardation; Mylton Kennedy, chief of youth services; Malcolm Geddas, director, Lookout Mountain School for Boys; Kenneth Joos, superintendent, State Children's Home; Merlin Zier, superintendent, State Home and Training School, Ridge; Robert Porter, superintendent, State Home and Training School, Grand Junction; Harold Nitzberg, coordinator, community mental health program; Marvin L. Meyers, coordinator, community mental retardation program; Matt McBride, executive assistant, Department of Institutions; and Goodrich Walton, executive assistant, Division of Youth Services.

November, 1963.

Lyle C. Kyle
Director

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

While the Legislative Council Committee on Institutions has not completed its study, the committee is making several recommendations as a result of its work during the past six months. These recommendations are set forth below, and a discussion of the subjects covered by these recommendations will be found in the research report which follows. All of the committee's recommendations require legislative action, and it is the committee's request that the Governor place these matters before the 1964 session of the General Assembly for its consideration.

1) The committee recommends that the pilot community center program for the mentally retarded, which was created by House Bill 121 (1963), be continued and expanded. The committee strongly supports the principles and philosophy embodied in this program.

2) The committee recommends renewal and expansion of the public school program for mentally retarded trainable youngsters. This program has been continued on a year-to-year basis since its creation in 1958. The classes carried on under this program are an extremely necessary and valuable adjunct to the mental retardation community center program.

3) The committee recommends that the program for pseudo retardates presently in its second year of operation at the Fort Logan Annex be continued for another year. In this connection, the committee also recommends that the Department of Institutions study the feasibility of merging this program with the present or proposed programs at the state children's home and that the department report the results of this study to the committee or to the Legislative Council prior to September 1, 1964.

4) The committee recommends that legislation be adopted and an appropriation made for the creation and development of a forestry work camp on the proposed site of Golden Gate Canyon State Park and that such camp be operated in connection with the Lookout Mountain School for Boys.

5) The committee recommends that legislation be adopted which would make it possible for the Lookout Mountain School for Boys and the Mountview School for Girls to be eligible for higher priority in consideration for federal surplus property.

6) The committee recommends that the changes necessary to straighten out present problems be made in the juvenile commitment and transfer statutes. (See pp 24-26 for outline of problems.)

7) The committee recommends that the present statutes covering financial responsibility and payment for patients in state institutions be amended to provide the following: a) Ability to pay shall be the exclusive basis for such payments. b) Legal responsibility for such payments shall be limited to parents, spouses, and legal guardians. c) The charges as established by the "ability to pay" principle shall be the maximum liability to be placed on persons legally responsible for patients in state institutions, and no further

INSTITUTIONAL AND RELATED COMMUNITY PROGRAMS:

A Progress Report on Organization, Development, and Problems

Introduction

There has been considerable change in many of the state's institutional programs and in their underlying philosophy and concepts in recent years. Several of these programs are relatively new and are still in the initial phases of development. The complexity and interrelationship of these programs require considerable study and analysis to determine long-range implications and to chart the best course for the future.

The Legislative Council Committee on Institutions has examined several aspects of the constantly changing institutional picture; some of them were covered in considerable detail, others have been given only cursory review because of time limitations and the breadth of the subject matter. The major areas studied by the committee include: mental retardation, the state children's home, facilities and programs for delinquents, mental health, and juvenile commitment and transfer laws. Several specific subjects were examined within these major areas as follows:

Mental Retardation. pilot community center program, program development at the two state homes and training schools (Ridge and Grand Junction), and program for pseudo retardates at Fort Logan.

State Children's Home. changing nature of the home's population and functions, current programs and problems, the home's relationship to other state institutions and programs, and studies and proposals concerning the home's future programs and functions.

Facilities and Programs for Delinquents. proposed forestry camp program, proposed Hesperus Youth Center, industrial schools' eligibility for federal surplus property, and composition of the juvenile parole board.

Juvenile Commitment and Transfer Laws. present problems and recommended changes.

Mental Health. state's role in the community mental health center program and proposed program and staffing at the children's psychiatric hospital at Fort Logan.

Mental Retardation

Pilot Community Center Program

The pilot community center program for the mentally retarded was created by House Bill 121 (1963). The responsibility for this program was placed in the Department of Institutions. As stated in this bill, the pilot program was established for the following reasons:

1) to determine the best method or methods of establishing and organizing community centers for the mentally retarded and for the seriously handicapped, including the respective roles of the state and local governments and communities in the administration and financing of such centers;

2) to encourage the development of preventative, habilitative, and treatment services through community programs and the improvement and expansion of existing community services;

3) to alleviate the need for constant expansion of state institutions for the mentally retarded and for the seriously handicapped and for long-term custodial care of patients in such institutions; and

4) to provide a coordinated program of state and local services for the seriously handicapped and to eliminate the duplication and overlap of such services.

There are two major facets of the pilot program: 1) establishment of pilot demonstration projects, and 2) an over-all study of the needs of the mentally retarded and seriously handicapped and the ways in which these needs may be met on the community level.

House Bill 121 (1963) required that no more than two pilot demonstration projects be established to provide an integrated program for the mentally retarded and the seriously handicapped. These projects were to be established in communities which had already shown a willingness to participate in such projects as demonstrated by existing programs, services, personnel, and facilities.

The director of institutions was given the responsibility for conducting the over-all study. This study was to include the following: 1) enumeration and location of mentally retarded and seriously handicapped persons; 2) survey and evaluation of services provided on the community level for the mentally retarded and the seriously handicapped; 3) assessment of potential community resources for the provision of services; and 4) development of both short-term and long-term programs for the establishment of community centers.

In connection with the development of short-term and long-term programs, the director of institutions was required to give special consideration to: 1) utilization and coordination of existing and potential resources, facilities, and personnel; 2) general community interest and participation; 3) organization and administration, including the extent of state coordination and participation; 4) immediate and projected costs, as well as potential savings through a reduced need for institutionalization; and 5) methods of finance.

A nine-member state coordinating advisory board was also created to advise and consult with the director of institutions on the over-all study and the pilot demonstration projects. The board is appointed by the Governor, with five members representing state agencies, institutions, health, welfare, education, and rehabilitation, and the other four, persons who have demonstrated interest and leadership in the care and treatment of the mentally retarded and the seriously handicapped.

The director of institutions is required by the provisions of

the bill to present a complete report to the General Assembly upon its convening in 1964, such report to cover the pilot demonstration projects and the comprehensive study and to set forth his recommendations concerning the planning, organization, order of priority, and estimated costs of a long-term community center program.

Study and Pilot Program Development. The organization and development of the pilot demonstration programs and the comprehensive study have been under the direction of the chief of mental retardation, Department of Institutions. A special project coordinator has been engaged to assist communities in the development of programs and services for the mentally retarded and the seriously handicapped and to be responsible for the field work in connection with the study. Considerable interest has been stimulated throughout the state. Communities which already had programs and services for the mentally retarded and seriously handicapped have taken steps to improve and expand these programs and services, and others are developing program plans.

Pilot Demonstration Projects. Boulder County and the San Juan Basin were the areas selected for the two pilot demonstration projects. Other areas providing or planning to provide services include: Pueblo (plus part of the Arkansas Valley), Colorado Springs (and surrounding area), Jefferson County, Greeley - Weld County, Fort Collins - Larimer County, Fort Morgan - Sterling (all six counties in the northeast public health district), Adams County, Arapahoe County, and Denver.

The areas selected provide both urban and rural demonstration projects. State grants of $10,000 each have been given to the two projects. These funds are not being used to provide anything that can be obtained on the community level.

In Boulder County (urban) the program is in operation in Longmont and Boulder, and both of the county's school districts have established trainable classes in conjunction with the pilot demonstration project. Much interest in the program has been stimulated, partially by the strong support of Boulder and Longmont newspapers. The University of Colorado has taken on the obligation of providing one psychological evaluation per day at no cost to the pilot project. The board of county commissioners has provided five rooms in the old county hospital for the program. Local plumbers and electricians have provided and installed electrical and plumbing fixtures at no charge; the Junior Chamber of Commerce painted the rooms, and other groups have provided assistance.

The workshops operated by Boulder's United Fund no longer have the burden of all retardation programs, so the workshop is concentrating on pre and post school retardation and the identification of retardates in the community. The net effect of the community program thus far in Boulder County is that many retardates, previously unaided, now receive or will receive services.

The Boulder County project has been able to make considerable progress for several reasons, not the least of which has been the community interest and donation of services already mentioned. Other factors include: 1) the pre existence of a local program for retardates; 2) the presence of a community mental health center as a

resource for consultation, services, and (perhaps) shared personnel; 3) the resources of and assistance from the University of Colorado; and 4) Boulder County's proximity to the Denver metropolitan area.

Progress has been slower in the development of the San Juan Basin project. In part, this is a result of delay in hiring a project coordinator, caused by the difficulty in attracting qualified people to rural areas, especially at salaries lower than those prevailing in metropolitan areas. All five San Juan Basin counties (Archuleta, Dolores, La Plata, Montezuma, and San Juan) are participating in the project. The project board is composed of 20 of the 36 members of the San Juan Basin Community Mental Health Clinic Board, and the two programs will be coordinated. Special classes for both educable and trainable children are being held in Cortez and Durango schools.

There are several problems peculiar to the San Juan Basin with respect to the pilot program. Foremost among these are problems of sub cultures, such as Spanish American and Indian. Further, a large sparsely-populated area is involved, and local resources are somewhat limited in comparison to Boulder County and other more metropolitan areas. The successful development of this project will provide guide lines for program development in other rural areas, so that its significance extends beyond the area which it is serving.

Three other areas (Pueblo, Colorado Springs, and Jefferson County) currently providing services entirely with local funds are moving forward in their program development and probably will be the next areas to be considered for state grants if the pilot projects concept is continued and expanded.

Evaluation of the Community Center Approach. While it is difficult to evaluate a program thoroughly during its initial stages, several general observations may be made concerning the community center project:

1) The community centers eventually should lessen the pressure on the state homes and training schools, both of which have sizeable waiting lists.

2) The per capita cost to the state of the community center program should be considerably less than the per capita cost of institutionalization. The annual per capita residential cost at Ridge and Grand Junction is approaching $3,000, 70 per cent of which is the cost of food, clothing, shelter and the personnel involved in their provision. In the community center program, retardates will live at home, and food, clothing and shelter will be paid for by parents or guardians. Further, a substantial part of the cost of operating the community center program will be borne at the local level.

3) Studies have shown that in most cases, retarded children are best helped if they can live at home, and most parents of retarded children, while they want the availability of professional services, would prefer to have their children living at home. Consequently, there has been strong lay, professional, and parental support for the community program.

Advisory Board. The advisory board was appointed by the

Governor in May and has been meeting regularly since that time. It has devoted its attention to coordination and communication among the various state and local agencies and other organizations and groups concerned with the pilot projects, specifically, and the community center program, generally. Representative Kathleen Littler, Greeley, is chairman of the advisory board, and Louis Rovira, Director of the Metropolitan Association for Retarded Children, is vice chairman.

Public School Trainable Program

In 1958, the General Assembly passed legislation which established a pilot program for trainable children. This legislation provided state aid on a 50-50 matching basis for those school districts which established classes for trainable children under the procedures outlined in the act. These programs had to be approved by the State Department of Education before reimbursement could be made. Originally, this program was scheduled to terminate after the 1961-1962 school year, but additional legislation was adopted, so that the present expiration date is the end of the 1963-1964 school year.

Even though only $50,000 has been appropriated annually for this program, there have been left-over funds which reverted to the general fund at the end of each year during which the program has been in operation, except the current one. (The $50,000 has been fully committed for this fiscal year.) Prior to the 1963-1964 school year, only seven school districts took advantage of the program and established trainable classes.

Current Program. During the current year, the number of districts taking advantage of the program has increased, and some of the districts already participating have expanded their programs. The creation of the community center project has been the major reason for the increased interest in the trainable class program. Classes are now being held in all four of the major communities participating in the pilot project (Boulder, Longmont, Cortez, and Durango). Only one of these communities, Cortez, previously had established a trainable class.

The trainable classes are considered as an integral part of the community center concept and are considered as the State Department of Education's and the local school districts' contribution to the over-all community program. In the past, educators have been reluctant to have local school districts establish trainable classes for several reasons:

1) The doubt has been expressed as to whether the establishment of classes for trainable retardates actually is an educational function. In this connection, there has been some fear that the whole burden for providing services for trainable retardates would be placed on the public schools.

2) There has also been some concern over the possible mixing of retardates and normal youngsters in the same facility. Not all districts so concerned and interested in the program had considered the use of facilities removed from their schools, nor were such facilities readily available in some instances.

3) Since the state aid program for educable and phsyically handicapped youngsters has never been fully implemented, the feeling has been expressed that this program should be expanded first before state aid is provided for trainable classes, so as not to diffuse available funds and specialized teachers.

With the development of the community center approach to the provision of services for mental retardates, many educators have had second thoughts regarding the trainable program. The community centers will be responsible for the total program rather than the schools and should be able to provide facilities for trainable and even educable classes, although both of these special educational programs would continue to be operated by the local school districts. There has been interest expressed in providing trainable classes in areas considered as not yet having reached the stage where a community center could be established in the opinion of Department of Institutions officials. The reasons for this interest are two-fold: First, the provision of trainable classes will add to community services for mental retardates and hasten the time when a community center can be established. Second, many educators are now willing to cooperate, because they feel that the total problem will not be their responsibility.

Program Development at Ridge and Grand Junction

Ridge. In recent years the philosophy at the Ridge State Home and Training school has changed considerably. Formerly, the institution was considered to be primarily custodial and several different kinds of restraints were used on the residents. The institution's long range goal, according to the superintendent, is to assist each resident in achieving maximum social, emotional, and intellectual maturation and, for those residents who are able, restoration to productive community living.

This change in program and philosophy has not been immediate, nor is it complete. The implementation of the new program has involved changes in residential living arrangements; admission procedures, patient diagnosis, evaluation, and programing; staff changes and additions; and the development of an in-service training program.

The new Ridge building complex, the result of recent appropriations totaling $2.5 million, has provided 10 residentail centers, including four for the profoundly retarded. There are 392 beds available in the 10 centers. This expansion has made it possible to segregate patients according to their classification.

By July of 1964, dormitories will be classified by the degree of retardation and retardates of the same class will be housed together. Such classification will be based on the various somatic, cultural, social, and psychological differences of each retardate, in addition to the severity of retardation.

There are approximately 950 residents in the school and by March of 1964, when total capacity is expected, there will be approximately 1,000 residents. At present there are approximately 500 on the institution's waiting list. Unless there is an alternative to

residential care and treatment, it would appear that not only will further additions to the present two institutions (Ridge and Grand Junction) be necessary, but perhaps additional institutions as well. The community center program appears to offer the best alternative to residential care, although custodial care will continue to be needed for the profoundly retarded (I.Q., 0-24).

In this connection, it is expected that the development of the community center program will lead to a reduction in the proportion of the residents at both schools who are classified as moderately or mildly retarded and in an increase in the number and proportion of the profoundly retarded. At the present time, 37 per cent (347 residents) of the Ridge school's population are considered to be profoundly retarded. Recent studies in other states have found that residents in this category require 40 per cent more care and attention than other classifications of retardates.

Program Results. The results of the change in program and philosophy at the Ridge school can be seen in the increases in the number of residents who have been discharged or who are taking part in the community placement program. In past years, discharges were few, and there were community placements only in isolated cases. During fiscal year 1961-1962, 55 residents were on community placement, and two were released and discharged; during 1961-1962, 71 residents were on placement, and four were discharged; during 1962-1963, 99 were working in the community, and 24 were discharged. It is expected that during the current year, 110 will be on placement, and 19 will be discharged.

Grand Junction. Several new programs have been instituted, but the school has not been able to keep all of them in operation due to difficulties in recruiting and retaining professional personnel. During the past months, the school has lost the services of a vocational counselor, who was responsible for the placement of students on training jobs, an occupational therapist, who was beginning to develop an excellent occupational therapy program, and a personnel officer, who transferred to another institution to continue his education.

Overcrowding and Shortage of Personnel. There is a considerable degree of overcrowding in several of the dormitories. Steps have been, or are being taken, to remedy this situation in some areas. An architectural firm is preparing plans for the remodeling of two dormitories. The capacity of these buildings has also been decreased slightly. As of this date, the excess students have not been transferred to other dormitories, and the school is operating over its current capacity of 847. When the two new pre-placement cottages open in the relatively near future, the capacity of the institution will become 887. The construction of two 20-bed pre-placement cottages are now 75 per cent complete. These two units will be used in conjunction with the placement program.

Both schools have requested staff increases, particularily in the number of attendants, to bring attendant-resident ratios somewhere near the national average. Both institutions have also requested additional capital construction.

Financial Responsibility. At the present time, parents,

guardians, spouses, or relatives of residents in the two schools are charged from $5 to $95 per month, depending on their ability to pay. The top payment, however, does not cover the cost of care which is approximately $185 per month. Problems have arisen over the definition of income used to determine ability to pay. The Department of Institutions has received an opinion from the Attorney General which questions the legality of the present billing and collection practices.

The institutions presently maintain two sets of books on these charges, one pertains to the monthly charge, and the other to incurred liability (difference between the amount paid and the cost of providing care). In many instances, estates are attached for the amount of the incurred liability, and such attachments might even extend to the estates of grandparents or grandchildren. This practice discourages the payment of the monthly charge in many instances, because the responsible relative or guardian knows that his estate will eventually be attached for the amount of incurred liability, whether or not he meets his monthly obligation.

Suggested revisions in the statutory provisions concerning financial liability include the following:

1) revision of the "ability to pay" formula, which would include a more equitable and precise definition of income;

2) development of an equitable basis for determining the amount of charges to be established according to an "ability to pay" formula;

3) removal of the burden of incurred liability, financial responsibility should be limited to the amount charged; and

4) a more precise definition is needed of those who shall be held financially responsible.

Fort Logan Annex Program

The Fort Logan Annex is the residential unit for an intensive program aimed at vocational placement within the community. Sixty students from the state homes and training schools at Ridge and Grand Junction make up the resident population. Selection of the residents for the annex was based upon the classification of pseudo retardation caused by social, educational, emotional, and environmental deprivation. The annex is located on the grounds of the mental health center at Fort Logan, but is a part of, and under the administration of, the Ridge School. The General Assembly appropriated funds for this program initially in 1962, and it is currently scheduled to expire at the end of the present fiscal year.

The physical plant of the Fort Logan Annex consists of four large converted duplexes which house the administrative offices, school, apartments for staff, and living quarters for the residents. Recreation is provided for in a large converted barracks building, cottage facilities, and an outside basketball court.

The annex staff consists of the director, 20 counselors, two

cooks, one driver, one commissary man, one maintenance man, four supervisors, one part-time psychiatrist, one secretary, one clinical psychologist, two psychiatric social workers, two vocational rehabilitation counselors, an academic teacher, and a recreation director.

Program Goals and Achievements. The goal of the annex program is to rehabilitate the majority of its population, by promoting social self-sufficiency and providing placement within the community, thus making each individual a cooperative and self-supporting citizen. It is estimated that over two-thirds of the 58 current residents will be rehabilitated by the close of the next fiscal year. Only two or three are within the annex grounds during the day, the majority of the residents are on community placements. Thus, it is primarily an evening program. If the project were continued as a permanent program, it is estimated that two residents per week could be admitted either as transferees from another institution, such as Ridge or Grand Junction, or from the community.

Honor cottages have been incorporated in the program to provide stimulation and acceptance of the program by the residents. The criteria for acceptance for admission into an honor cottage is based upon the individual's personal hygiene, appearance, manners, and his interest in and acceptance of the program. Student government, driver training courses, home economics courses, and arts and crafts, have also been incorporated.

The group that was chosen for this program ranged in age between 18 and 19 years and had spent an average of eight years within institutions prior to being placed in this special unit. The state had already spent approximately one million dollars on their care. If they were to remain the balance of their lives within residential facilities, the state would expend another five to ten million dollars.

Now that the original program is nearing its scheduled termination, there is some question as to what should be done with and for those pseudo retardates who will not be ready for either community placement or discharge. Further, the annex now has excess capacity and could accept additional pseudo retardates. The annex is reluctant, however, to accept any new patients without some assurance that the program will be continued long enough to allow for their successful placement and release.

Several questions have arisen in connection with the possible continuation of the annex program. These include:

1) Should the program continue to be the responsibility of the Ridge school or should it be the direct responsibility of the chief of mental retardation or the chief of youth services or some other division of the Department of Institutions?

2) What is the relationship between the annex program and present and future programs at other institutions? More specifically, should the annex program be transferred to the state children's home or placed under the supervision of that institution?

3) Should the admittance criteria be changed and/or the source of referrals enlarged? In other words, should any other type of youngster be accepted and should there be direct community referrals?

State Children's Home

Historical Background

The Colorado State Children's Home was established by the General Assembly in 1895 and was known as the State Home for Dependent and Neglected Children until 1953, at which time the name was changed to the Colorado State Children's Home.

The legislatively-stated purpose in 1895 was that the institution was to be a home for children of sound mind and body under 16 years of age who were dependent upon the public for support. For many years the home served as a temporary receiving facility for dependent, neglected, abused, and orphaned children, the majority of whom were white, normal children who were placed in adoptive or foster homes or indentured to families.

The home originally was situated a considerable distance from the main industrial, commercial, and residential sections of Denver. There was a dairy herd and horses, sheep, pigs and other farm animals, as well as a farm operation. Most of the children were committed from rural areas and placed in rural communities and on farms.

Changing Situation

Over the years the kind of children referred began to change. More and more children who had suffered abuse, neglect, and rejections and who were emotionally damaged, and more and more children who were physically handicapped, members of minority groups, and of illegitimate birth were being admitted.

During this period, other methods of serving the normal, dependent and neglected child were being developed and used, such as aid to dependent and neglected children and paid foster home programs.

Denver continued to expand and the home no longer was in the country but became surrounded by a fully developed residential area. The children began to attend the community churches, schools, and recreation activities and facilities.

The majority of children admitted now are from urban areas and will return to urban communities, are emotionally damaged, have below average I.Q.'s, have been school and community problems, have been involved in some delinquent behavior, and have failed in placements other than in their own homes.

Previous Studies and Recommendations

During the past 10 years, the programs and functions of the children's home have been a matter of concern to and study by the General Assembly, institutional officials, and others. One of the most significant studies was made by the Child Welfare League of America Inc., a private investigating, evaluating, and standard-setting organization in child care. This study was completed in February 1959,

and the resulting report included many recommendations relative to the program.

The Child Welfare League study concluded that there is a need for the state children's home to serve certain special types of children who require institutionalization, if it provided good group care, was staffed by trained social workers, and had consultant psychiatric and psychological services.

It further emphasized strongly that the major recommendations affecting the program at the children's home must be based on the assumption that an improvement in child welfare staff and funds at the county level would be made.

Present Program

As a result of this study, changes were made in the administration and program of the home. These include the following:

1) The policy direction of the home is now under the control of the Department of Institutions.

2) The ratio of cottage parents to children is one cottage parent to 10 children.

3) A social services program under the direction of a qualified social services director has been established.

4) Children in residence are provided casework service.

5) All children in residence and new children admitted are given a complete diagnostic evaluation; a treatment plan is developed and reviewed periodically.

6) Children's visits with related and non-related families are allowed on the basis of casework evaluation.

7) More adequate social and medical histories have been obtained from referring agencies and a better working relationship established with other agencies.

8) Acceptance of children under the age of seven years has been discontinued, and the infant adoption program has been terminated.

9) The size of the cottage groups has been reduced, and a maximum capacity of 127 children established.

10) The services of a consulting psychiatrist and clinical psychologist have been secured.

11) The practice of dual responsibility for adoptive services provided by the home and Catholic Charities has been discontinued.

12) A volunteer program to enrich leisure time activities

and offer tutoring to the children has been inaugurated.

13) A multi-purpose recreation center has been constructed.

Youth Services Division Study and Recommendations

To meet a need for a definition of the role of the children's home and a justification for its continuance as a part of Colorado's child-care program, the Division of Youth Services has developed a "Statement of Purpose for the Colorado State Children's Home; Residential Program; Staff and Facilities Required." It describes the types of children who can benefit as well as those who cannot benefit from placement at the state children's home. The different programs of the home, such as cottage life, social service, education, health, food, recreation, maintenance, laundry, storeroom, and power plant are outlined. The staff and facilities required to carry out an effective group care program are set forth. This study is designed to serve as a guide to future program, staff, and physical plant development.

While there are other possibilities, the Division of Youth Services feels that the purpose of the state children's home is to serve children who can benefit from group care in an open setting and to rehabilitate them so they can return to the community and function as productive members of society.

The division recommends that:

1) The Colorado State Children's Home should be maintained to serve those children whose needs cannot be properly met in the homes of their parents or relatives, in foster or adoptive home placements, or in any other existing state facility.

2) The maximum capacity of the children's home should not exceed 110 children, housed in living units of eight to ten children.

3) Referring counties should pay at least half of the per diem cost for care of a child at the children's home.

4) Local community resources such as small groups homes, therapeutically oriented foster homes, foster and adoptive homes for the hard-to-place child, and basic casework services to children and families should be developed.

5) A special education program of remedial education tutoring, and pre-vocational training should be established at the children's home.

Other possibilities for the future use of the state children's home include the following:

1) a residential treatment center for juveniles, because even when the Fort Logan Children's Psychiatric Hospital is completed, there will still not be enough beds; or

2) a research and training center for professional personnel who work with delinquent and disturbed children.

Those who advocate the latter alternative believe that such a facility could serve several purposes: service, training (primary function), and research (secondary function). The program could be a cooperative effort involving the Colorado University Medical Center (pediatrics and child psychiatry), Denver University (School of Social Work), University of Colorado (Institute of Behaviorial Sciences), and the Department of Institutions. With such cooperation, it could develop into one of the West's outstanding institutions.

No definite decision as to the future role and programs of the state children's home has been made by the Department of Institutions, and the matter is still under discussion and study.

Facilities and Programs for Delinquents

Proposed Forestry Camp Program

During the past few years the Department of Institutions, and more particularly the Division of Youth Services, has been developing a proposed forestry camp program for juvenile delinquents, such program to be operated in connection with the Lookout Mountain School for Boys. The chief of youth services has cited several reasons why a forestry camp program would be desirable:

1) It would remove the pressure of population growth at the boys' school.

2) It would remove some of the boys from the institutional setting and from the influence of some of the older boys at the school.

3) It would provide small group relationships.

4) It would provide the school with a diversification of facilities.

5) It would complement the present programs by providing a new rehabilitation program.

6) It would aid in the development of a state park system.

Other States. A number of states have established forestry camp programs. Following is a summary of these states and their programs:

California: The California Youth Authority has had 14 year's experience operating forestry camps in conjunction with the division of forestry. These camps have proved successful in the state's delinquent rehabilitation program, and the establishment of more camps has been recommended.

Illinois: In seven years, the Illinois' Youth Commission has increased the number of camps from one for 20 boys to 10 for 328 boys. The commission reports: "Long past the experimental stage, the camp program has established itself as a highly effective training facility. Eight of the 10 camps are located in state parks. Plans call for the

addition of five more camps. The camp program is a dual conservation program, conserving boys' lives and conserving public resources -- the recidivism rate is low and in the past year the boys performed work in state parks at a value of $385,876.25 at the rate of $1.25 per boy hour."

Indiana: The 1961 Indiana Legislature authorized a juvenile conservation camp where 40 to 50 boys will engage in conservation projects.

Kentucky: Kentucky has one camp for juvenile delinquents and is planning another.

Maryland: Maryland operates three camps for delinquent boys.

Massachusetts: The Division of Youth Service in Massachusetts reports: "Here in Massachusetts a lack of appropriations initially hampered any attempt to develop a youth camp program. A pilot camp was opened in 1956, and in 1959 funds were provided to operate a full-time camp program. The first camp was opened in October, 1960."

Michigan: Michigan established a "Probation Recovery Camp" in 1956. It provides a place and a program for young offenders who cannot work out their problems in the community but who do not require confinement.

Minnesota: The Minnesota Youth Conservation Commission has three camps in operation.

New York: The Division for Youth is developing a system of youth rehabilitation and youth opportunity camps. Two camps have been completed and are in operation. Four additional camps are in various phases of construction at a cost of $500,000 each. The camps will house 60 boys each; the personnel complement will be 25; the annual operational cost will be $200,000.

Ohio. The Division of Juvenile Research, Classification, and Training has two camps under its supervision. The newest camp, constructed at a cost of $400,000, opened July 1, 1959.

Washington: The Bureau of Juvenile Rehabilitation of the Department of Institutions reports: "During the 1951 Legislative Session, the Youth Protection Act was passed. This Act made it possible to establish a diversity of treatment facilities with particular emphasis on facilities with small populations and programs geared for specific diagnostic groupings. Included in this plan are Washington's youth camps, of which there are now four and which have a total capacity of 180 boys. These boys are engaged in a program that combines positive group living experiences and counseling with constructive outdoor working experience which ultimately results in both the rehabilitation of youth and the conservation of natural resources."

Wisconsin: Wisconsin has just completed a camp for boys at a construction cost of $400,000.

Recent Developments. In 1961, the Department of Institutions established an ad hoc committee on work camps. Following the first

meeting of this committee in December 1961, a cooperative relationship was developed between the Division of Youth Services and the State Parks and Recreation Board.[1] At that time, the only state park camp site ready for a continuous work program was the Harold W. Lathrop State Park, west of Walsenburg. Preliminary plans were developed for the establishment of a work camp on this site, application was made for a federal grant, and a request was made to the Joint Budget Committee for state funds. Both the federal grant and the state appropriation request were denied.

Golden Gate State Park. The Department of Institutions has not abandoned its proposal for a youth work camp at Harold W. Lathrop State Park. It now gives priority, however, to another location: Golden Gate Canyon State Park, located along State Highway 35, now a county road, between its junction with Colorado 119 and Golden. This location is within 25 miles of the Lookout Mountain School for Boys. Preliminary plans for the proposed youth camp are being worked out in cooperation with the State Game, Fish, and Parks Department. These preliminary plans contemplate a camp for 48 boys.

Work Program. The clearing and thinning of wooded areas and the removal of trash and the development of public camping and picnic sites and facilities are among the tasks to be performed by the boys assigned to the proposed forestry work camp. Aerial mapping and planning surveys are being made at present, so that the areas to be cleared and thinned have still not been determined. During the first year of the camp's operation, construction of access roads and timbering would be accomplished; during the second year, the first picnic and camp sites would be cleared, in addition to routine trash removal from these sites.

The Game, Fish, and Parks Department has had little experience working with institutional work crews -- only four years in the Buena Vista area and two years at the Cherry Creek Reservoir. Proper supervision in the department is necessary and at present is lacking. Efforts are being made to improve the quality of those department employees involved with institutional work crews and the various institutional rehabilitation programs. The department is now hiring only college graduates in those jobs that involve considerable contact and supervision of work crews, so they can be prepared under formal and on-the-job training for future teaching assignments, in addition to their regular functions. It will then be possible in the near future to provide supervision for these programs in all areas of the state. In addition, if supervisory personnel within the department are provided, some of the department functions could be classified as educational and therefore eligible for some federal surplus items.

Water Supply. After a tour of the proposed park site, some members of the Legislative Council Institutions Committee questioned whether there was sufficient water available to supply a state park. Accordingly, the committee requested that a study be made of the potential water supply by the Game, Fish, and Parks Department. Such a study was made and a report submitted to the committee. The study report estimated that an adequate water supply did exist and was of

1. Now part of the Game, Fish, and Parks Department.

sufficient quality so as not to require treatment facilities. If further developed, several springs could produce a total flow of five gallons per minute and several shallow wells, 15 to 30 feet in depth, would probably produce water at a rate of five to 15 gallons per minute. Deeper wells, 50 to 150 feet in depth could produce a discharge of two to five gallons per minute. The report recommended shallow wells as the best method of obtaining water. Although the rates of discharge might be inadequate during periods of peak demand, two shallow wells, a pump, one-fourth of a mile of pipe or less, and a small storage tank would be able to handle the needs of the expected peak demand and afford fire protection for the area. Such facilities could be installed at an estimated cost of $15,000 to $20,000.

Assignment of Delinquents. If the proposed Golden Gate Canyon State Park camp program is approved, the Division of Youth Services would assign to it those delinquent youngsters whose evaluation and diagnosis indicate they could best benefit from such a program. Some of these youngsters would be transferred from the Lookout Mountain School for Boys and others might be assigned shortly after their commitment to the Department of Institutions. Necessary custodial personnel, an academic teacher, and supplies would be provided by the boys' school, and the work program would be supervised jointly by the boys' school and the Game, Fish, and Parks Department.

Proposed Hesperus Youth Center

In 1961, the Legislative Council Children's Laws Committee, after a two-year study, recommended the establishment of a youth center at the old Fort Lewis A & M campus in Hesperus. The committee recommended that some of the campus buildings be repaired and remodeled and that a program be established for 60 children "who come or are in danger of coming in conflict with society because of emotional problems or an unfavorable home environment."[2] The establishment of such a facility had long been favored by people in the San Juan Basin, particularly by Judge James Noland of Durango.

The Governor did not place the proposed youth center before the General Assembly for its consideration in the 1962 session. In 1963, House Bill 291 was adopted which appropriated $1,000 to the Department of Institutions "for the purpose of studying the establishment of a youth center at Hesperus, Colorado, at the site formerly occupied by the Ft. Lewis School, and of formulating a program plan for such center." The department subsequently requested the Planning Division to evaluate the Ft. Lewis Campus buildings and grounds. During July, four staff members of the Planning Division's Public Works Section met for one week in Hesperus and surveyed the vacant facilities and subsequently prepared a survey report. This survey will be incorporated in the report to be made by the Department of Institutions to the General Assembly in 1964, as required by House Bill 291.

In discussing the Planning Division survey with the Legislative

2. Colorado Legislative Council, Research Publication No. 59, December 1961, p.4.

Council Committee on Institutions, the director of institutions made the following comments:[3]

> The Planning Division has used minimum acceptable construction standards in formulating its estimates. Standards are needed, especially for state-owned buildings. The report's estimate is based on the expected cost to repair the buildings to meet minimum standards. Some factors on which the estimated costs were based are still uncertain. A portion of the water supply has been shut off for years, and the Planning Division is not certain what the cost of renovating this item will be; it is possible that new water pipes and lines would be needed, and, if so, the estimates are low to that extent. One of the estimates involves the use of contract labor; the other is based on the use of penal labor, either from the penitentiary or the reformatory, or both. The Department of Institutions asked for a reasonable estimate of what it would cost to place the buildings, using minimum acceptable standards, in safe, usable condition. The library is the newest building and is still used by the State Board of Agriculture and other groups for meetings.
>
> Without necessary maintenance, any building will soon begin to deteriorate, and the state stopped maintaining these facilities in 1956, when Ft. Lewis was moved to Durango. Very little was done to protect the buildings from 1956 until recently -- about two years ago -- when local residents began to complain. Some effort was made, and windows and doors were boarded up. The location has advantages and disadvantages. It is not far from Durango and, if the center is approved, one can expect most of its employees to live in Durango. There would be much thereapeutic value, because of its location, for its residents.
>
> The chief of youth services and others have recommended that groups of 12, 24, 36, etc., boys in such a center are the most desirable units. Just what the number of boys to be eventually referred to the center is unknown, but maximum capacity would obviously result in the lowest per capita cost. The facilities at Hesperus can be renovated for a youth center if: the General Assembly agrees that such a program is needed and that this is where such a program should be located. If the General Assembly wishes to have a program under the jurisdiction of the Department of Institutions at Hesperus, it will have to transfer some of the property from the jurisdiction of the Board of Agriculture to the Department of Institutions. Colorado State University still operates an experimental agricultural program at Hesperus.

3. Legislative Council Committee on Institutions, Minutes of September 9, 1963.

As House Bill 291 (1963) requires the Department of Institutions to report to the General Assembly directly on the Hesperus proposal, the Institutions Committee has taken no action other than to review the Planning Division survey.

Assuming the feasibility of this program, careful consideration would have to be given to the relationship of the Hesperus Youth Center to the proposed Golden Gate Canyon forestry camp and the future program plans for the state children's home, and an order of priority for all of these programs would be needed. Further, consideration should be given to the place of the proposed Hesperus Youth Center in the state's long range plans for facilities and services for juveniles.

Eligibility for Federal Surplus Property

Two bills (House Bill 164 and House Bill 357) were introduced in the 1963 session of the General Assembly to make it possible for the Lookout Mountain School for Boys and the Mountview School for Girls to be eligible for federal surplus property, but no action was taken on these measures.

These bills did not change the functions of the two schools, but emphasized the educational and rehabilitation aspects of the programs at these institutions. Such emphasis is necessary, because the two schools must be considered educational in purpose by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order for them to be eligible for federal surplus property.

During the past fiscal year, the two schools (had they been eligible) could have acquired foodstuffs, surplus clothing, motor vehicles, and farm equipment valued at more than $200,000 at a cost to the state of $90,000, according to the chief of youth services.[4]

Juvenile Parole Board

For many years prior to 1959, parole of juveniles from the boys' school and the girls' school was handled by school personnel. These were two male juvenile parole officers at the boys' school and one female parole officer at the girls' school, responsible to the superintendent of the respective institutions.

Parole decisions at the girls' school were made by the superintendent with the advice and help of the school's board of control, then in existence. At the boys' school, parole decisions were made by the superintendent and certain members of the staff. The parole loads under these circumstances were so heavy that contacts with parolees were at a minimum. During this period there was also a scarcity of information concerning parolees and inadequate contact by parole agents with other state agencies.

4. Legislative Council Committee on Institutions Minutes of October 14, 1963.

In 1959, the General Assembly established a Juvenile Parole Division in the Department of Institutions, which operates independently of, but in cooperation with, both schools. At the same time, a law was passed establishing a juvenile parole board, whose membership of five consisted of representatives appointed by the Governor from the Department of Institutions, the Department of Welfare, the Department of Education, the boys' school, and the girls' school.

With this composition, board members have been able to share information regarding the functions of the different departments and to become familiar with the resources available to assist in placement and rehabilitation of parolees. Before taking action on a parole request, the board requires complete reports on health, psychological testing, family situation, commitment information, and social history, as well as academic accomplishment and adjustment in the school for each boy or girl considered. Such records, which were not previously available, have now become greatly improved and are much more complete.

In general, the juvenile parole board has operated well, but a problem has been created as far as the board's independence of action is concerned, because the boys' school and the girls' school representatives on the board have been placed in dual roles, inasmuch as they often present cases to the board and then act as members of the board in considering the cases which they have presented.

The Department of Institutions has recommended that consideration be given to legislation which would designate, as members of the juvenile parole board, representatives from the Department of Health, the Division of Rehabilitation and/or the Department of Employment, in place of the two representatives from the schools. The Department of Institutions feels that this would be advisable because: 1) It would eliminate the present ambiguous situation under which two of the board members act in dual capacity. 2) It would involve representatives from other state agencies who would make valuable contributions in the consideration of parole actions and plans.

Juvenile Commitment and Transfer Laws

Past Developments

Prior to 1962, the courts committed juveniles to specific institutions. House Bill 67 (1962) changed the commitment process by providing that delinquents and dependent children be committed to the Department of Institutions rather than to a specific institution. Juveniles so committed are analyzed and evaluated by the department and are then placed in the most appropriate institution. This legislation was recommended by the Legislative Council Children's Laws Committee in connection with its recommendation for a youth center at Hesperus. The committee wanted some assurance that youngsters would not be sent to the youth center indiscriminately by judges.

While this measure was directly related to the Hesperus proposal, the Children's Laws Committee had studied juvenile commitment

procedures in other states which have adopted the so-called "Youth Authority" concept. In these states (California, Minnesota, and Washington, for example) almost all juvenile commitments are made to a central state agency rather than to a specific institution. This agency evaluates and diagnoses each juvenile and then makes the appropriate institutional assignment.[5] The committee felt that this commitment procedure was worthy of consideration in Colorado, because its studies of juveniles before the Colorado courts showed that there are insufficient community and judicial staff resources in most counties to provide adequate analysis and evaluation of juveniles before the courts.

Diagnostic Centers. Partial recognition was given by the General Assembly to this problem, and the resulting inappropriate institutional commitments, when it established the Children's Diagnostic Center on a pilot basis at the University of Colorado Medical Center in 1955. The center was made available to the judges for the evaluation and diagnosis of juveniles before the court but whose cases were not disposed of. The center has also been used by the several juvenile institutions, and it provided a means by which transfers could be made to more appropriate institutions. The institutions have relied less on the center in the past few years because of the increase in their own professional staffs. As community mental health programs and other local recourses have been developed, the courts have also made fewer referrals to the center, but still use it to a considerable extent, especially for difficult cases.

House Bill 67 (1962) solved some problems, but also created others with respect to commitment and transfer procedures. Some of these problems are: 1) difficulty in determing which institutional transfers require court referral for a change in commitment; 2) conflict between provisions of H.B. 67 (1962) and the juvenile parole statutes concerning referral of delinquents by the Department of Institutions directly to the juvenile parole board without prior institutionalization; 3) lack of a simple procedure for temporary transfer to the state hospital for observation and diagnosis; and 4) lack of clarity concerning transfer procedures for juveniles still committed to a specific state institution.

House Bill 178 (1963)

Because of these problems, a conference was held by Department of Institutions officials with some interested legislators and a staff member of the Legislative Council early in the 1963 session of the General Assembly. House Bill 178 (1963) was drafted in accord with the decisions reached at this conference and was designed to:

1) establish the procedures to be followed in the transfer from one institution to another of a juvenile committed civilly directly

5. The same procedure as established in H.B. 67 (1962), except H.B. 67 (1962) is more limited in application.

to the Department of Institutions;

2) establish the procedures to be followed in the transfer from one institution to another of a juvenile committed civilly to a specific institution;

3) provide for short term treatment at the state hospital of any juvenile committed to another institution or directly to the Department of Institutions; and

4) specify the conditions under which a juvenile in extreme cases might be transferred from the state hospital to the penitentiary and establish the procedures to be followed in such instances.

In providing for the transfers outlined above, H.B. 178 also specified those circumstances and conditions in which an amended court order must be obtained and the procedures to be followed in obtaining such orders.

House Bill 178 (1963), however, failed to resolve the conflict (referred to above) between the transfer procedures and the juvenile parole statutes. There also was a major difference of opinion concerning the provisions of the act as they related to the possible transfer of civilly committed juveniles from the state hospital to the penitentiary. Two questions have been raised concerning such transfers:

1) Is it desirable to allow such transfers, even in extreme circumstances?

2) Is it constitutional to provide for such transfers?

House Bill 178 (1963) was reported out late in the session by the House Judiciary Committee, but no action was taken by the House Rules Committee. Consequently, the Department of Institutions is still faced with several problems concerning juvenile commitment and transfer procedures. Additional problems have resulted because some of the present statutory language is susceptible to more than one interpretation, and there is some disagreement among Department of Institutions officials as to what procedures should be followed.

On the surface it would appear that repeal of House Bill 67 (1962) might achieve the desired results. More extensive examination, however, indicates that this is not the case. Repeal of H.B. 67 (1962) would not correct some of the transfer problems which existed prior to its passage, nor would it straighten out some of the more recent difficulties, which would have occured whether or not H.B. 67 (1962) had been adopted.

Mental Health

State's Role in the Community Mental Health Program

State financial aid and professional assistance to community mental health clinics have been provided since 1957, first through the Department of Health, and, since 1962, through the Department of

Institutions. Prior to the 1963 session of the General Assembly, considerable concern had been expressed by some legislators and state administrative officials as to the legality of state grants-in-aid to community mental health clinics because:

1) Most community mental health clinics are operated by boards incorporated as non-profit corporations, and it appeared that such grants were in violation of Article II, Section 34 of the Colorado Constitution which provides as follows:

> Appropriation to private institutions forbidden. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denominational or sectarian institution or association.

2) There had never been any legislative enactment providing the authority to make such grants and establishing standards therefor (even though approprations had been made for this purpose), thus it appeared that the administering agency had no legal authority to make such grants, even if there were no question of constitutionality.

Several meetings were held on this matter by a subcommittee of the Governor's Committee on Mental Health, and the Attorney General was consulted. It was determined as a result of these meetings that the constitutional problem could be avoided if state funds were used to purchase services from the clinics rather than as direct grants. Accordingly, legislation was drafted, establishing the authority of the Department of Institutions to purchase services from community mental health clinics, providing the standards for such purchases, and making an appropriation for this purpose. This legislation, House Bill 187 (1963), was adopted by the General Assembly.

Provisions of House Bill 187 (1963). This legislation provides that the payment to community clinics for services shall be in an amount not to exceed 50 per cent of the cost for each hour of service provided to state residents nor to exceed $5 per hour, except that during the first three years of existence for newly established clinics, the limits shall be 75 per cent and $7.50 per hour. A further limitation was imposed by the provision that the total annual service purchase payments to each clinic shall not exceed $.25 per capita for the total population served by such clinic. Service hours for the purpose of state purchase are defined as including the total manpower hours involved in the total program offered by each community clinic.

The act also enumerates those standards which the director of institutions shall use in determining whether to approve a clinic for state service purchases. These standards include clinic services, personnel, and organization.

In addition, H.B. 187 (1963) authorizes:

1) the purchase of services by local units of government;

2) the acceptance of federal grants by the Department of Institutions, and the distribution of such grants by the department to

the community clinics; and

3) the provision of consultation by the department to the local clinics and the holding of institutes and training programs by the department for clinic personnel.

Number of Clinics and Areas Served. In 1962, 14 clinics were in operation. During the current year additional clinics have been established in the San Luis Valley, Fremont County, and Denver (which now has a total of three). In Colorado Springs and Boulder, the child guidance clinics have been expanded to include services for adults. Bent County is in the process of developing a clinic program and is trying to establish a joint venture with Prowers County. Northwest Colorado and the Trinidad-Walsenburg area are also developing plans for local clinics. In addition, some existing clinics are now serving a larger area. Arapahoe County is providing service for Douglas and Elbert counties, and Jefferson County is doing the same for Clear Creek and Gilpin counties. The Fremont County clinic is providing service for Chaffee County (Salida) on a once-a-month basis.

Program Expansion. Community center programs are also being expanded to include new services. In Arapahoe County, for example, clinic staff members have met with school teachers to discuss teaching problems with disturbed and/or retarded children and to provide consultation. The clinics are now asking to participate in the state hospital after care program. This is a considerable change in attitude on the part of a number of clinics, which were fearful of having the major responsibility for the after care program placed upon them by the Department of Institutions to the detriment of their community services. This fear was one of several expressed at the time the state's responsibility for the program was transferred from the Department of Health to the Department of Institutions.

Allocation Formula. While the allocation formula provided in H.B. 187 (1963) has generally been satisfactory, Department of Institution officials feel that perhaps the $.25 per capita limitation should be waived in certain circumstances. The department would like to have the authority to reallocate any funds remaining after all eligible clinics have received their maximum allowances. Such reallocation would be made to the eligible clinics on the basis of increased additional need or services. H.B. 187 (1963) has been so interpreted as to make reallocation impossible, although the department had made such use of remaining funds prior to the passage of the act.

Future Clinic Program Development. The general trend is away from institutionalization to the greatest extent possible, so that community clinics will play an ever-increasing role in the provision of mental health services. Because of this trend, several factors bear important consideration in long-range planning to meet the state's mental health needs. These include:

1) extent of control and coordination at state and local levels;

2) sources of finance for such services and the allocation of cost between state and local levels;

3) relationship of local clinics to the state institutional program;

4) availability and allocation of professional personnel; and

5) feasibility and extent of integration and coordination between community mental health centers and community centers for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped.

These matters and other related subjects will be included in the over-all state planning survey of mental health services and needs being made by the Department of Institutions, and which is being financed by a federal grant.

Specific goals for the Colorado planning study have been enumerated as follows:[6]

1) Identification of problems in all areas pertaining or relating to the mental health field, including mental and emotional disorders in adults and children, mental retardation, juvenile delinquency and adult criminal behavior.

2) Inventory and evaluation of available resources for the prevention, detection, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation of persons afflicted with the disorders mentioned above. This will also include such questions as the availability or nonavailability of special facilities or services, such as nursing homes and special classes for mentally disabled children.

3) Assessment of training programs for professionals and subprofessionals in the field, and identification of major gaps.

4) Assessment of research activities throughout the state, and ways to increase their scope.

5) Identification of legal, economic, social, cultural and religious factors which are pertinent and operational in the area of mental health services.

6) Development of recommendations for immediate and long-range plans for comprehensive community-based mental health services throughout the state.

7) Development of local support to make possible the implementation of the study recommendations through legislative and social action.

8) The establishment of a permanent data collection

6. Colorado State Plan for Utilization of Federal Planning Grant, Appendix A, Colorado Legislative Council Committee on Institutions, Minutes of May 13, 1963.

system to utilize automatic electronic equipment for storing and analyzing large quantities of demographic and movement data from agencies throughout the state.

Children's Psychiatric Hospital at Fort Logan

Construction of the Children's Psychiatric Hospital at Fort Logan was authorized by the General Assembly in 1962. Construction has been delayed because of certain revisions which had to be made in the architectural plans before they could be approved. Consequently, it is not expected that the hospital will be ready for operation until July, 1964, at the earliest. Nevertheless, the Department of Institutions has been in the process of recruiting a director for the hospital, but its efforts thus far have not been successful because of the general shortage of qualified and experienced child psychiatrists. Two or three psychiatrists had been interested, but declined the position for personal and other reasons.

The department has also given consideration to program development and staffing for the hospital, but this planning remains in the preliminary state pending the recruitment of a director.