

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

Chapter 1 : JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

Joint Hearing on H.R. , the Youth Development Block Grant Act. Joint Hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights and the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Education and Labor.

See text of House Appropriations bill section for details. As was the case for FY, provisions regarding federal child care were initially included in FY Treasury, Postal Service and General Government appropriations legislation. Ultimately, however, these provisions were rolled into the Consolidated Appropriations Act, , as described above. The following describes the House and Senate activity leading up to that point. On July 20, , the House passed H. These funds would be used to improve the affordability of child care for lower income federal employees using or seeking to use the child care services offered by the agency facility or contractor. The bill stipulated that amounts paid to licensed or regulated child care providers may be paid in advance of child care services rendered, covering agreed upon periods as appropriate. The House also agreed to an amendment H. On July 26, the Senate voted to invoke cloture to proceed with debate on H. On July 26, a third bill, H. This bill included all of the same federal child care provisions Sections and as those in H. This was the language included in the final law P. The House version of the budget resolution H. Although the motion passed by a vote of , indicating bipartisan support for new funding in child care, the final conference report included only a portion of the amount originally proposed by Senator Dodd. The signing of the consolidated appropriations bill H. The Senate bill S. On September 29, , the President signed P. Both House and Senate bills included a provision allowing executive branch federal agencies to use agency funds to provide child care services for employees of the agency, in a facility owned or leased by the agency, provided these funds are used to improve the affordability of child care for low-income federal employees. In addition, the Senate bill would have required regulations establishing health and safety standards for federal agency child care programs and required that facilities meet state or local licensing standards and comply with standards set by a state or nationally recognized¹ accreditation entity. The conference report, H. The conference agreement did not include all of the child care provisions from the House bill and Senate amendment. Action in the th Congress Although none of the major authorizing committees acted on a comprehensive proposal in the th Congress, some action on child care did occur. For example, the Head Start program was reauthorized for 5 years P. The Higher Education Act also was reauthorized P. Also during the th Congress, both the House and Senate passed resolutions recognizing parents who stay home with their children. These assumptions required additional legislative action, however, which did not occur. The th Congress acted on several child care-related bills that did not become law. For example, the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee approved legislation that would have mandated standards for child care provided to federal employees. The House eventually passed a bill allowing federal agencies to use funds for child care, but not mandating standards for such care. No further action occurred on these proposals. Several bills would have earmarked tobacco revenues for child care. The Senate debated legislation that would have provided grants to states from a National Tobacco Trust Fund, and approved an amendment that would have required states to use part of these trust fund grants for child care, after defeating an effort to table this amendment by a vote of 33 to . However, the Senate ultimately stopped consideration of this bill and returned it to the Commerce Committee, where no further action took place. More than 50 child care bills were introduced in the th Congress, and severalth dozen, many with similar provisions, were introduced again in the Congress. In general, these bills addressed one or more of the traditional elements in child care policy debates: The following sections briefly describe the legislative approaches that have been proposed in each of these areas. Availability of Child Care Proposals in the th Congress would have increased the supply of child care in several ways, including through tax incentives or grants for employers to provide child care for their employees, and through expanded federal grants to increase the supply of child care for low-income families. Other proposals would have increased the availability of specific types of child care, such as after-school care.

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

The bills differed somewhat regarding the size of the tax credit and the types of expenditures that could be covered. Under some proposals, the credit would have been available only for start-up costs, such as buying, building, rehabilitating or expanding properties, while others would have also allowed the credit to apply to operating costs, including the costs of training and scholarships for caregivers, allowing higher pay for caregivers with higher levels of training, and resource and referral services. Some bills would have allowed the credit to be used for the costs of accreditation or credentialing. As an alternative to tax credits, some proposals would have encouraged private employers, especially small businesses, to provide child care for their employees through federal grants. In some cases, grants would go directly to businesses or consortia of employers; in others, grants would go through states and then to private employers. In general, HHS would administer these grants, which would help employers set up and operate child care programs. Several bills would have limited participating employers to those with fewer than 50 or employees. Numerous bills were introduced in the 113th Congress to increase funding for the CCDBG, either by increasing its discretionary authorization level or by directly appropriating additional funds for its entitlement component. In some cases, these additional funds would have been specifically earmarked for services to non-welfare, low-income working families. Some bills also would have earmarked a certain amount of funding for families with very young children. Several bills would have created new, free-standing grant programs, independent of the CCDBG, to provide quality child care and related services, especially focusing on very young children in some cases, children under age 6; in others, children under age 3. Some proposals would have authorized formula grants to states, while others would have awarded funds directly to local grantees. Under some proposals, HHS would have been the federal administering agency; others would have established the program within the Department of Education and provided grants to local education agencies. One proposal would have authorized grants to states for school-based child care programs for children under age 7. As described earlier, this proposal was successful for FY 2015. In addition, several bills would have authorized or directly appropriated funding for after-school programs, either through grants to states or to local education agencies, administered either by HHS or the Department of Education. Primarily as a delinquency prevention measure, after-school programs also were proposed to be administered by the Department of Justice. To enable low-income parents to pursue higher education, several bills proposed to authorize funds for the Education Department to make grants for campus-based child care. In addition, bills were introduced that would have increased the dependent care allowance that is considered in determining Pell Grant awards. Under the new Temporary Assistance for Needy Families TANF welfare program, states may not withhold benefits to single custodial parents with children under age 6 for failure to work, if they cannot find appropriate and affordable child care. One proposal would have extended this exemption to parents with children under age 12. One proposal would have required the General Accounting Office to study whether legal liability concerns are a barrier to the establishment and operation of child care programs by businesses, schools, community centers, or individuals in their own homes. Numerous bills proposed to make child care more affordable for parents through the tax code, and some of these proposals included provisions for families with an at-home parent. In addition, most proposals to increase federal funds for child care were specifically intended to help provide affordable care for low-income families. Moreover, the existing tax credit is non-refundable, which means that it can be used only by families with tax liabilities. Several bills proposed to make the DCTC refundable as did the President in his State of the Union Address , so that families without tax liability could actually receive a payment equal to the credit. Many bills would have done a combination of the following: Some bills would have denied the credit altogether for higher income taxpayers. One proposal would have connected the credit rate to the status of the provider, with a higher credit rate available for taxpayers who use accredited or credentialed child care. Several proposals would allow the DCTC to be used by families where a parent is not employed and stays home to care for the children. Most of these proposals would have limited such benefits to families with very young children. Other measures would have amended the Dependent Care Assistance Program DCAP to enable its use by families with an at-home spouse, and a related proposal would have increased the number of

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

years to 5 of little or no earnings that are disregarded in calculating Social Security benefits, for individuals who did not work in those years to care for a dependent child under age 6. Some of the employer tax credit proposals, described in the previous section on availability of child care, also would have required that any tax credit claimed by an employer must be passed on to employees in the form of reduced child care costs. As described earlier, numerous bills would have increased CCDBG funding, which is designed to increase the supply of affordable child care for low-income families. Moreover, one proposal would have required states, as a condition of receiving CCDBG funds, to base their child care payment rates on market rate surveys that are no more than 2 years old. Also as described in the previous section, several new, free-standing grant programs were proposed in the 111th Congress, largely focused on providing quality services for young children. Improving the affordability of care also was a goal of many of these proposals. Quality of Child Care

Numerous bills would have attempted to upgrade child care quality, primarily through voluntary incentives. None would have mandated federal standards for child care, which has led to contentious debates when proposed in the past. However, several would have provided incentives for use of nationally accredited child care providers or credentialed child caregivers. Several bills proposed to award competitive or challenge grants to states that comply with certain conditions related to quality. Other proposals would have awarded grants to states that require criminal background checks for child care workers, conduct frequent health and safety inspections, require first aid training for workers, maintain certain child-staff ratios, and require a minimum level of training for caregivers. States that adopted quality components of the military child care system or other successful models would have received incentive funds, under another measure. In general, these incentive grant proposals would have targeted the funds toward quality related activities, such as subsidies for credentialed providers, parent education, scholarships for education or training needed to obtain accreditation or credentialing for providers, training and technical assistance, development of criteria for accreditation and credentialing, higher payments for accredited or credentialed providers or for special needs child care, or equipment for special needs children. Some proposals would have allowed states to use funds to upgrade their licensing standards and enforcement of standards, and for higher caregiver salaries and other incentives for caregivers to pursue more advanced training. As already stated, several bills would have created free-standing grant programs for services to young children, and most of these bills emphasized improvement of quality as a primary goal. Under this proposal, funds would be used for one or more of the following: To receive these funds, states would be required to set quality benchmarks and provide grants to local cooperatives for quality improvement activities. Although training and education for child care providers was included in many proposals, several bills focused specifically on this issue. Proposals included development by HHS of a model training program for caregivers, based on the military program; grants for technology-based training programs; a national child care provider scholarship program, as proposed by the Administration; and cancellation of student loans for child care workers who have a degree in early childhood education or development, as ultimately included in the higher education reauthorization. Other proposals would have established various incentives for caregivers to pursue accreditation or credentialing, and one bill would have authorized grants to local counties to provide early childhood training for welfare recipients. As mentioned earlier, numerous bills would have made child care more affordable through expansion of the Dependent Care Tax Credit, and one proposal would have allowed a larger credit for accredited or credentialed care. Some proposals also would have increased the amount of tax-free dependent care assistance allowable, if taxpayers used accredited or credentialed child care, and another measure would have required child care facilities supported by a proposed business tax credit to become accredited after 3 years. Legislation also was proposed that would have allowed a tax deduction to providers for the costs of pursuing accreditation or credentialing. Finally, one proposal would have authorized funding for HHS to operate a national, toll-free telephone hotline to provide information and assistance to families seeking quality early childhood education services. Other proposals would have required HHS to disseminate information on the importance of quality child care. Population Division Working Paper 21, March - Fall 2009, by Lynne M. Current Population Reports, P,

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

November Fall , by Kristin Smith. Current Population Reports, P, October

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

Chapter 2 : H.R. , "Save Local Business Act" | Education & the Workforce Committee

Joint hearing on H.R. , the Youth Development Block Grant Act: joint hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights and the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, One Hundred Third Congress, second session, joint hearing held in Washington, DC, August 4,

Mike Castle [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding. Let me personally apologize to the witnesses and anybody else who is here for my tardiness. I, along with Mr. Kildee, and maybe others here, were in attendance at the speech that Bishop Tutu was giving, and since I was not more than 10 feet from him, I did not think it was appropriate to leave. Besides, I did not want to leave. It just went a little longer than we had expected. We are better for it, at least. This will be the second and final hearing on this Act prior to the committee markup. Last Congress, we had a strong bipartisan bill, H. We are currently working to develop the same bipartisan support for H. Each year, far too many young people enter the juvenile justice system. If we do not make an effort to work with these children now and provide them with the support they need to turn their lives around, we will be supporting them financially when they enter the adult prison system years from now. While there are some children, those committing the most violent acts, which we cannot help, I believe that most children will respond favorably to appropriate interventions. Today, we will hear from those individuals who administer the key Federal programs that address problems of juvenile delinquency and runaway and homeless youths. I would be very interested to learn of their activities in this area and how we can all work together to give each and every child an opportunity to become a productive citizen. Let me turn to Mr. Kildee for any opening statement he wishes to make. I am pleased to join you and my colleagues in welcoming Shay Bilchik and Patricia Montoya before the committee today. The service which both of you have provided to this administration and to the children of our country has been very, very valuable. I know that Chairman Castle and I are looking forward to your testimony. I would like, also, to rise to a point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, and recognize a dear friend, and probably my first great expert and resource person in this area, Mary Ann Mattingly. Mattingly] When I first came down here, I think 23 years ago, she became one of my real mentors, and I appreciate your presence here today. And, key to this effort to combat delinquency has been a two-prong focus aimed at both prevention of juvenile delinquency and protecting juveniles who, unfortunately, encounter the justice system. This two-prong focus has been a vital blueprint for our local communities to combat juvenile delinquency and invest in their youth. As we look to re-authorize the Juvenile Justice Act, I believe we need to strengthen its prevention and protection focuses. Chairman, I believe that H. Again, I want to thank the witnesses for appearing today, and I look forward to your testimony. Thank you very much, Mr. It is our practice here just to have the opening statements by the subcommittee Chair and the ranking member. With that, we will go to the introduction and your testimony. Shay Bilchik will be our first witness. At the Department of Justice, he had supervisory authority over juvenile prosecution programs, established a child advocacy center, which is a multi-disciplinary intake unit for cases involving victims of child abuse, and served on a number of multi-disciplinary task forces. Bilchik has focused the priorities of the office on developing policies that support a comprehensive approach toward reducing juvenile offenses and victimization. Our other witness here today on the same panel, is Mrs. As Commissioner, she oversees the implementation of Federal programs that assist vulnerable children and youth. Before joining the administration, Mrs. Montoya was practice manager for Presbyterian Family Healthcare, a hospital-based primary and urgent care center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. From , she served as the executive director of New Mexico Health Resources, also in Albuquerque. For two years, she served as assistant director for the American Nurses Association. We are delighted to have you both with us. Bilchik, if you are ready to make your opening statement, we will start with you. It is important to note, I think, at the very beginning of my testimony, that the context for this testimony is very different than in past years. For in those years, we had

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

either been experiencing large increases in violent juvenile crime or were just beginning to see a decrease. I am pleased, therefore, to report to you that the juvenile arrest for part one violent crimes has now dropped for three straight years, falling 23 percent from to This positive trend is due, in part, to a movement for the balanced approach to juvenile crime, one that combines prevention programs for at-risk youths with early intervention and sanctions and strong law enforcement efforts that hold offenders accountable at every stage of the juvenile justice system. In my written statement, I have outlined many of the programs undertaken by OJJDP, in partnership with States, communities, and tribal governments, to implement this balanced approach to juvenile crime. I recommend that you review those programs, but, most importantly, that when you have time, that you visit those programs. It is the most meaningful opportunity to understand how this balanced approach is taking hold in communities across the country. Chairman, I would now like to turn to consideration of legislative initiatives that will affect how the Federal Government continues to support State and local efforts to drive down violent juvenile crime. We are at critical point in our efforts to address the problems of juvenile crime. Too often we turn away from a problem after initial signs of success and move on to the next issue that has risen to a crisis proportion. We cannot let that happen in this instance. Instead, we must build on the good work that has been done to date, continue to build our knowledge about what works, and sustain our support for the balanced approach communities have adopted in attacking juvenile crime. Although that bill was not actively considered, some elements were integrated into H. Greenwood and others introduced last week. For that reason, I praise the direction that this committee is taking. You have chartered the course which will help to sustain those local and State efforts I just spoke about. There are, however, several areas of legislation that we would like to see addressed as this committee addresses H. As modeled by the very successful Title 5, Community Prevention Grant Programs, it is my belief that any new block grant program should provide for direct State awards to units of local governments, which would, in turn, contract with eligible service providers to carry out local prevention and early intervention programs. As a result of this current structure under the Community Prevention Grants Program, we have now seen more than awards made to local communities that have worked through local policy prevention boards to establish comprehensive plans for the prevention of delinquency, and, with Federal support in that program, have filled in some of the gaps in services they have determined to be most critical for their individual communities. This approach has resulted in added investment at the local level. We believe that the flexibility and its provisions related to de-institutionalization of status offenders, separation of juveniles from adults, and jail and lock-up removal requirements is appropriate. Instead, it should address the over-representation that results from factors and circumstances that take place both prior to the juvenile entry into the system and those that occur after the juvenile has entered the system. The research that has been compiled to date in this area clearly supports this position. As you are aware, the core requirements represent minimum protections for juveniles in the juvenile justice system. We believe that tying eligibility for funds to compliance with these requirements is an important incentive for State and local governments to operate their juvenile justice systems in a manner that keeps children safe from physical and psychological harm. While we agree with the House bill that some portion of the formula grants allocation should be available to a State, regardless of its compliance with the core requirements, we believe that non-compliance with any one or more of these core requirements should result in a loss of eligibility or 50 percent of the total allocation to a State rather than Chairman, as I visit communities and listen to policymakers and practitioners about the kind of Federal support that is needed for them to sustain their efforts, I hear two main themes: It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that it is critical to maintain a strong Federal role in all of these areas of activity. I look forward to working with you and the subcommittee to formulate legislation that will provide the statutory framework to continue the significant and substantial progress that State and local governments have made, with Federal support, in addressing the prevention and control of delinquency and the improvement of the juvenile justice system. We look forward to having a dialogue with you in a couple of minutes. We will go to Mrs. I would particularly like to thank Chairman Castle, Mr. Greenwood, and other members of the subcommittee, for the leadership you have

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

provided on this very important issue. Time ran out before a final bill could be enacted during the last Congress, but I am hopeful that this year, marking the 25th anniversary of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program, we will be able to continue a tradition of bipartisan support and enact final re-authorizing legislation. It is estimated that between , and 1., children and youth run away from home each year. Many youths are leaving homes because they have been affected by abuse, neglect, substance abuse, mental illness, or other family problems. The programs and support systems authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act serve as a critical life line to these youths and their families. They provide a safe place to turn in times of crisis, and they offer the services, training, skills, and, most importantly, the positive support youth need to help make the transition to healthy, productive lives as adults. I would like to share a story that illustrates the importance of youth programs. A young woman ran away from home at the age of 14 due to physical and sexual abuse. She said she owed her life to the agency. If it had not been for their shelter and the caring staff, she probably would be dead. This proposal, along with several initiatives to expand supports to youths aging out of the foster care system, is part of our overall effort to assist vulnerable youth in making a successful passage to adulthood. Assuring swift re-authorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act is yet another step in fulfilling our commitment to youth. To help meet the needs of these very vulnerable youths, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes three grant programs. In my written statement, I have provided a more in-depth description these programs. The Basic Center Program, which provides temporary emergency shelter to runaway and homeless youth, while working to reunite with their families, when possible; the Transitional Living Programs, which provides longer-term residential, educational, and vocational services to homeless youth, to enable them to develop the skills they need to become self-sufficient as young adults; and, the Street Outreach Program, which reaches out to young people on the streets, to protect them from sexual abuse or exploitation, and, to help connect them to the needed services and community supports. In Fiscal Year , these three programs together served about 75, youth. In addition to the three grant programs, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act authorizes funds for a number of support activities, such as the National Runaway Switchboard. The Switchboard is a national communication system that assists runaway youths and their families by linking them to crisis counseling, programs and resources, and each other, as appropriate. The Switchboard typically responds to more 12, calls a month. The program also support the National Clearinghouse on Families and Youths, the Regional Training and Technical Assistance Network, and support for much needed data collection, evaluation, research, and demonstration activities. These activities and the programs authorized by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act assure that, for some of the youth, most at-risk, those who have runaway or have been pushed out of their homes, there will be a safe place to go, with a caring adult. In closing, we look forward to working with you to enact bipartisan legislation to re-authorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, so that we may insure that these programs continue to help youths, across the country, grow and flourish. I would be pleased answer any questions you may have.

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

Chapter 3 : Browse subject: Juvenile delinquency -- Great Britain | The Online Books Page

A hearing was held on H.R. , the Youth Development Block Grant of , a bipartisan bill introduced by Representatives Constance A. Morella (Maryland) and Donald M. Payne (New Jersey). The purpose of the initiative was to expand community-based youth development programs for youth aged 6 to 19 years.

Scott of Virginia for himself, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Connolly of Virginia, Mr. Corrine Brown of Florida, Ms. Markey of Massachusetts, Mr. Hastings of Florida, Mr. Nadler of New York, Ms. Kilpatrick of Michigan, Ms. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Ms. Meeks of New York, Mr. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Davis of Alabama, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mrs. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Ms. Moore of Wisconsin, Mr. Scott of Georgia, Mr. Miller of North Carolina, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Mr. Murphy of Connecticut, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Ms. George Miller of California, Mr. Meek of Florida, Ms. Edwards of Maryland, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Pastor of Arizona, Ms. Bishop of New York, Ms. Rothman of New Jersey, Ms. Tim Murphy of Pennsylvania, Mr. Moore of Kansas, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Braley of Iowa, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Klein of Florida, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Wilson of Ohio, Mr. Gordon of Tennessee, Ms. Pingree of Maine, Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Mrs. Edwards of Texas, Ms. Neal of Massachusetts, Ms. Markey of Colorado, Mr. Hall of New York, Mr. Herseth Sandlin, and Mr. Garamendi December 22, The Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services discharged; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed For text of introduced bill, see copy of bill as introduced on February 13, A BILL To provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives.

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

Chapter 4 : Browse subject: Block grants -- United States | The Online Books Page

A hearing was held on H.R. , the Youth Development Block Grant of , a bipartisan bill introduced by Representatives Constance A. Morella (Maryland) and Donald M. Payne.

Photograph by Dick DeMarsico. In time, the entire spectrum of domestic social programs actively participated in national law enforcement, thereby pushing the boundaries of the carceral state beyond penal institutions. In response to rioting, however, these programs had shifted in purpose toward controlling the violent symptoms of socioeconomic problems. Yet the threat the uprisings posed to American law and institutions also needs to be understood as the central catalyst behind the punitive turn in twentieth-century domestic policy. Nixon is usually credited for spearheading the War on Crime, even though he inherited an already-vibrant law enforcement infrastructure created by the Johnson administration. Far from being ambivalent about crime control as a major aim of domestic policy, Johnson and his radical domestic programs laid the foundation of the carceral state, opening an entirely new plane of domestic social programs centered on crime control, surveillance, and incarceration. To the policy makers reshaping American law enforcement, crime was an innate problem of black urban America, and “like a Soviet nuclear strike” something that might be targeted before it began if policy makers and foot soldiers possessed the proper tools. The earliest olea grants went to the Washington, D. African American men between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four constituted the single largest group of residents arrested during the national uprisings, and growing numbers of policy makers and law enforcement officials came to view this demographic as prone to rioting and, by extension, to criminality. Evoking race in race-neutral terms, Johnson pledged: First and foremost on the agenda was putting more officers with better equipment on the streets of black neighborhoods in the city. The substantial olea grant bought local law enforcement sixteen new station wagons, three patrol wagons, twenty-five motor scooters for a roving neighborhood patrol squad, thirty-six scout cars, walkie-talkie radios for patrolmen on foot, eighty new detectives, and additional police officers. Federal policy makers and law enforcement officials were generally unwilling to challenge the widely held belief that only increased patrol in segregated urban areas could prevent crime, assuming that disorder could be contained simply by increasing the presence of law enforcement on the streets. The Johnson administration was committed to assisting local police departments in modernizing their data-gathering capabilities, which would allow them to build criminal profiles of residents and therefore target street patrols more effectively. Similarly, the Philadelphia police department received computerized crime prediction programs to target street patrols based on anticipated crime. By treating urban crime as a scientific phenomenon that could be predicted and contained, these and other programs further rationalized the concentrated deployment of police officers in black communities. Katzenbach and his staff focused on supplying urban police departments with bulletproof vests, machine guns, and armored vehicles as riot-prevention measures. Much of this military-grade equipment had been introduced in overseas interventions and urban uprisings at home. By the early s, the federal government had purchased helicopters for departments in fifty other cities. During the first half of the s, antipoverty programs expanded the degree of federal influence in the everyday lives of black urban Americans. By fashioning a new liberal synthesis that brought crime-control strategies under the fold of social welfare programs, federal policy makers eased the shift toward national punitive programs in the second half of the decade. To do so, federal policy makers and officials linked new law enforcement measures to existing urban social institutions. Policy makers imagined that the program would redevelop vulnerable areas by creating communities in which living quarters, health clinics, education facilities, and recreation centers, all in close proximity to one another, would function as a cohesive system. The program enlarged the scope of federal urban intervention from public housing projects to entire communities. Instead of funding autonomous grassroots organizations, Model Cities institutionalized community-based antipoverty efforts and put local service professionals in charge of general administration. In conjunction with job counseling and after-school programs, the sixty-three Model Cities communities

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

would include new precincts, police-training centers, service bureaus for adjudicated youth, probation and legal services, and police-community relations programs. A forerunner to the community policing methods that many departments serving low-income areas embraced in the mids, team policing decentralized authority and empowered officers to exercise greater discretion in segregated urban neighborhoods. On foot, beat police could prevent future crime by ingratiating themselves into community life, and, in doing so, identify and arrest suspects with greater ease. As with Model Cities, even when agencies did not explicitly limit their programming to delinquent youth, they still worked toward the goal of combating and treating juvenile delinquency. The Johnson administration inherited that goal from the hew and Labor Departments of the Kennedy administration, which originally developed federal youth employment and community mobilization programs. One center moved into a space in a first-floor suite of the housing project that had previously housed a health clinic serving residents. Open eight hours a day and five days a week, the new recreational center gave youth access to a pool table, a record player, and a library filled with police pamphlets and medical literature left behind by the previous occupants. In addition to assigning police patrols to public schools during this period, law enforcement officials provided additional supervision in after-school programs and during the summer months. Shortly after the Watts uprising, the Los Angeles Police Department sponsored grand outings for some twenty-five thousand disadvantaged youth to sporting, professional, and entertainment venues. The program offered bowling, golf, punching bags, tetherball, dome climbers, and horseshoes to low-income children and teenagers. By providing urban youth with such opportunities, law enforcement programs created a space where police could, in a wholly benevolent manner, monitor young people who seemed vulnerable to disorder and delinquency. Yet, in the end, shifting the trajectory of postwar liberal reform toward surveillance had the opposite effect: When urban police forces became militarized and police officers increasingly assumed the role of social service providers during the first two years of the War on Crime, black residents and activists responded by becoming more confrontational. Police brutality and law enforcement practices had long shaped black urban life, but the formation of the Black Panther party in and other organizations calling for community control and armed self-defense were, in no small part, a response to the Great Society and the law enforcement programs that arose within it. Urban civil disorder only escalated during the War on Crime era, culminating in the unprecedented destruction and black civilian casualties in Newark and Detroit during the summer of and the riots in cities following the murder of Martin Luther King Jr. From left to right are President Lyndon B. Photograph by Yoichi Okamoto. View large Download slide An emergency meeting in the Oval Office is held as news of the Detroit uprising arrives on July 24, In response, and with federal policy makers still operating under the assumption that black urban poverty was endemic and preventable with a sufficient show of force, Johnson passed his final piece of major domestic legislation. The capstone of his Great Society, the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act , accelerated the expansion of the carceral state by financially incentivizing and at times specifically requiring state and local authorities to increase surveillance and patrols in already-targeted black urban neighborhoods. Whereas the Office of Economic Opportunity at the center of the War on Poverty never grew into a larger, more permanent agency, the act expanded the olea into the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration leaa. Whereas federal-local partnerships had steered postwar social policies, Congress introduced the block-grant system into domestic programs via the leaa, which granted the vast majority of crime-control funds to states, effectively restoring to them a degree of autonomy that was threatened by the dismantling of Jim Crow. And whereas the American criminal justice and law enforcement systems had previously focused on punishing offenders and preventing crime, following the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act the underlying principle of these systems shifted to management and control within isolated and marginalized communities.

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

Chapter 5 : Legislation proposed to fight chronic absenteeism

Youth Development Block Grant Act of - Establishes a youth development block grant program. Authorizes appropriations. Sets forth formulas for allocation of funds to States and for distribution of funds through State commissions to local boards for community-based youth development services.

Resources Thank you for reading This Week in Washington. The ICPC enables states and counties to exchange data and documents across state jurisdictions so that children in need of foster care may be placed in locations other than the state in which they currently reside. The increased displacement of kids due to parental substance abuse, including opioid abuse, makes this cause especially important. Grassley thanking him for introducing the bill in the Senate and offering our full support of his efforts as the bill moves forward. The affiliate also identified the following overarching principles that guided the recommendations: NASCCA members identified changes that require action by state legislature; request for temporary relief from requirements; child eligibility; graduated phase-out; reporting changes in circumstances; parental complaint hotline; consumer education website; provider monitoring, components of criminal background checks; setting payment rates, parent fees; provider payment practices; and program integrity as top priorities with specific comments and recommendations provided for each. The recommendations balanced the need for guidance and clarification from the Office of Child Care on specific provisions in the reauthorization law and options for states to develop customized approaches that promotes Lead Agency flexibility noted throughout the NPRM. The comments letter can be found [here](#). The troubling age and time limitations do not appear in the pending Family First Act. The primary witness was Kevin Concannon, U. In his opening remarks, Subcommittee Chairman Robert Aderholt R-AL cited the budget increases requested in spite of decreasing national unemployment rate and declining numbers of nutrition program recipients. He seeks reductions in expenditures and has made increased oversight of FNCS programs a priority. He spoke of misunderstanding or misinterpretation as the cause of many of the errors, but said that some states may have added elements that corrupted their QC samples, and that states found to have knowingly done so would be "in trouble. Drug testing of SNAP applicants was another recurring focus of discussion. Concannon stood strongly behind current policy prohibiting drug testing as a condition of eligibility, but supported the availability of such programs through avenues like Medicaid. He was concerned that the requirements may become so burdensome that they will drive small retailers from the program in areas with limited food availability. The hearing can be viewed on the House Appropriations Committee website: The major content areas of the State Plan include strategic and operation planning elements. The Operational Planning Elements deal with implementation strategy, operating systems and policies, assurances, and program-specific requirements. States must identify and describe specific strategies for joint planning and coordination across core and partner programs, and provide clear descriptions of how it will target services for priority populations. The deadline for State Plan submission was recently extended from March 3, to April 1, The departments have indicated that the final regulations for WIOA implementation will be released in June The memorandum reminded states of the deadlines in the rule, elaborated on its requirements through a series of questions and answers, and included a form for state use in documenting each reporting item required by FNS. The new reporting requirements apply to all changes considered to be major according to the rule, if state implementation will begin after March 21, While expecting notification days in advance of implementation, FNS reinforces in the guidance that the rule does not provide it with approval authority, so state planning should not be interrupted. The memo can be found at: The hearing will begin at Members will discuss how the human services system, including programs such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families TANF , can be improved in order to better meet the needs of job seekers and employers, spur economic growth, and help more families achieve self-sufficiency and mobility. Only invited witnesses will give oral testimony at the hearing, but others may submit written comments for the record and consideration of the committee. Written comments are due on

DOWNLOAD PDF JOINT HEARING ON H.R. 4086, THE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

Tuesday, March 15, The hearing advisory and instructions for submitting written comments can be viewed here. The task force is one of five task forces addressing the areas of national security, jobs and the economy, health care, poverty, opportunity, and upward mobility, and restoring constitutional authority. Details are posted in the November 24, Federal Register. Prior to the first round of pilots, The Forum for Youth Investment generated a list of ideas that a jurisdiction can potentially use as a P3 site. Though the current application encourages broader, bolder ideas, the original list that follows provides concepts that can be built on to create a pilot.

Chapter 6 : CHILD CARE ISSUES IN THE TH CONGRESS

Joint hearing on H.R. , the Youth Development Block Grant Act., Volume 4 joint hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights and the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, One Hundred.

Chapter 7 : NEICE Bill Introduced in Senate

Hearing PDF (Serial No.) The Committee on the Judiciary has been called the lawyer for the House of Representatives because of its jurisdiction over matters relating to the administration of justice in federal courts, administrative bodies, and law enforcement agencies.

Chapter 8 : House Judiciary Committee

WASHINGTON, DC -- Congresswoman Linda SÃ¡nchez, Chairwoman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law (CAL), issued the following opening statement today at the CAL Subcommittee and Subcommittee on Courts, Internet and Intellectual Property joint legislative hearing on H.R. , the "False Claims Act Correction Act of ".