

VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS IN PREVENTION AND DIVERSION

a directory prepared by the
National Information Center on Volunteerism, Inc.
Timothy F. Fautsko, M.A., Research Associate
and
van H. Scheier, Ph.D., Director

7.32
0911
1160

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Human Development

Office of Youth Development

(SRS) 73-26031

August, 1973

CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | ii |
| 1. INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS REPORT ... | 1 |
| 2. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY | 4 |
| 3. SELECTED PROGRAM ABSTRACTS | 6 |
| 4. VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS IN PREVENTION AND DIVERSION: A FIRST DIRECTORY | 36 |
| 5. CURRENT TRENDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE | 43 |
| 6. RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS | 48 |
| 7. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY | 51 |

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This following report was prepared under Contract /SRS-73-8 for the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare during the period September 11, 1972 through February 12, 1973.

The National Information Center on Volunteerism wishes to express its appreciation to OYD for its support of this project and to Robert J. Rosenberg, the OYD program monitor. We are also grateful to the 101 program directors who took the trouble to respond to the Center's inquiries for purposes of this study. Finally, our thanks to Kathy Kimberlin, Sigrid Strecker, and Kathy Blackwelder for the typing and preparation of this manuscript.

Timothy F. Fautsko, M.A.
Research Associate

Ivan H. Scheier, Ph.D.
Director

National Information Center
on Volunteerism, Inc.
P.O. Box 4179
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS REPORT

INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS REPORT

Scope of This Report and Basic Definitions

This report is a first directory and locator of volunteer programs and resources involved specifically in the arena of prevention of juvenile delinquency and the diversion of children from the criminal justice system. It does not represent any of the individual programs presented as a sole means toward deterring delinquency. It merely describes such programs and their use of volunteers as a set of prototype models in this rapidly developing field.

The term "volunteer" is here defined as any person or group of persons who offer their services without pay or profit, although reimbursement of work-related expenses is permissible within the definition. Contribution of materials and facilities as well as services are secondarily acceptable within our definition of the term volunteer, although its latter usage is not emphasized in the present report.

The term "volunteer program" is defined here as any organized effort to involve a group of volunteers. This is perhaps clearest in what it excludes: the individual person working informally and not primarily in affiliation with a volunteer group and/or agency. In the latter sense, non-program volunteers working in prevention or diversion, broadly defined, would presumably include just about everyone at one time or another in his life.

The term "prevention" can have two distinct meanings: prevention *within* the criminal justice

system, and prevention *from* the system. Prevention *within* the criminal justice system targets on an adjudicated person on probation or parole or in an institution or detention center. A prime example would be preventing a youth on probation from being sent to a correctional institution, or a youth on parole from being sent back to an institution, or a child in an institution being sent to a higher-security institution and/or given a longer term of institutionalization.

Volunteer programs within the criminal justice system are widely established today, and there is strong evidence that well-run programs are effective in this regard in reducing recidivism, institutionalization rates, and parole failure rates,¹ which is to say, they are effective in prevention within the system. However, though this "prevention within" the system is certainly important, it will not be the primary focus of this report because, relatively speaking, a great deal is already known and published concerning planning, programming, and evaluation of volunteer programs in this area. (See Bibliography, Chapter 7.)

Therefore, our primary concern in this report will be volunteer programs for prevention *from* the system, about which far less is known. We define this as either (1) the prevention of any formal or informal contact with the criminal justice system in the future in cases where this is likely unless more positive action is taken, or (2) where actual informal contact with the system has occurred,

¹Ernest L. V. Shelley, *Volunteers in the Correctional Spectrum: An Overview of Evaluation, Research, and Surveys: Frontier 8* (National Information Center on Volunteerism, Boulder, September, 1971).

the prevention of the fuller adjudicatory process in the future. The latter is exemplified by court or police referrals to other services, without further processing by them, e.g. warning and release or even a suspended sentence on the part of the juvenile court. This process may also be referred to as a form of diversion. The first-named or "pure prevention" is more difficult to define precisely. Theoretically it could comprise, from cradle to grave, any procedure or contact with any person which reduces the probability of his future contact with the criminal justice system. However, for purposes of reasonable focus we have defined age range as what is commonly considered the reference of the term "juvenile", e.g. no lower than 8-10 years old, continuing upward to 17-18 years old. Within that age range, we further focus on children for whom the future probability of criminal justice system contact is relatively high. To be sure, any volunteer working with any child can contribute materially to his growth and development, even where the risk of future criminal justice system contact is low, e.g. traditional Scouting, summer camps, Little League and similar community recreational programs, programs for church youth, and the like. Such programs are to be applauded and encouraged. However, our interest here is what might be called close-in prevention from the criminal justice system, that is, volunteer programs which work with relatively high-risk children, in terms of the probability of future system contact.

This population is admittedly difficult to define precisely, though most of us know what we mean. Describing the agencies with whom these children have come in contact, or by whom they are referred, seems the best available approach to definition at present. Thus, we would include volunteer programs which work with children who have come to the attention, formally or informally, of school disciplinary authorities, police, or courts, and/or who have a known record of behavior or actual offenses which the conventional wisdom currently accepts as "trouble heading for trouble," even if not formally filed upon. Examples here would be truancy, runaway, petty theft, destruction of property, and the like. The meaning of close-in prevention care certainly includes the known commission of offenses for which other children are being prosecuted in the juvenile court in that community,

e.g. "lucky" children in the respect of not being caught or filed on.

Finally, contact with a Youth Service Bureau or an organization with similar purpose should be considered presumptive evidence of belonging in the population with which we are concerned, as would family or self-referral for behavioral, environmental, or adjustment problems which are normally considered non-trivial.

The above definition is useful only in establishing broad boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. Beyond this, for the present at least, we define volunteer programs in prevention and diversion only as the set of programs chosen for inclusion in the present directory. The programs who responded to our request to tell us about their volunteer program and if it functioned in prevention and diversion presumably defined themselves as working within the meaning of these concepts. The set of programs selected therefore represents a field sampling of self-defined prevention and diversion volunteer programs.

Purpose in Relation to a National Strategy

The major purpose of this report is to help prepare for the extra challenges to prevention-diversion resources, which the years ahead seem likely to provide. All agree that some children currently within the criminal justice system need to be dealt with within this system. However, a national consensus is developing today to the effect that many youth currently within the criminal justice system do not need to be cited. Both effectiveness of treatment and humanity dictate that children be dealt with prior to their entry into this system.

In this respect the Office of Youth Development has presented as a national goal the diversion of 25 per cent of the caseload in the juvenile justice system within the next five years. Such a projection requires the immediate coordination of the existing youth serving agencies in the country as well as changes in institutions dealing directly or indirectly with youth development. Thus, the provision to youth of access to desirable social roles, the reduction of youth-adult alienation, and the avoidance of inappropriate and prema-

ture labeling (e.g. calling him "delinquent") are some of the major steps toward the reduction of delinquency which can be provided by these institutions themselves. Institutions dealing with the juvenile justice system, health, education, and welfare through the use of early spotting counseling programs, work programs, alternatives to high school, and especially, as this report delineates, the effective and viable use of volunteer programs can indeed alter the course of rising delinquency problems in the country. Such a tack is expected to reduce delinquent behavior and directly decrease the rate of police contact, arrest, adjudication, probation, and ultimately institutionalization of children.²

Within this framework, the present report makes two fundamental assumptions:

- (1) National prevention-diversion goals require an all-out effort to augment paid professional resources and their coordination in work with children. Nothing in this report is to be construed as advocating volunteer programs as a substitute for paid professional resources. Rather they are regarded as a supplement and amplification of these services.
- (2) Even given maximum effort in the development of additional paid services, these will never be sufficient to cope with the scores of thousands of additional children expected to be diverted or prevented from the criminal justice system, especially since this will occur in a relatively brief time period.

Therefore, the crucial question for the immediate future: "Divert to what?" The process has to be more than a "dumping" of children from one overloaded service system to one at least equally overloaded non-system. Otherwise, we are merely playing musical chairs with the youth services system, a game in which children are the ultimate losers.

Presumably, the inadequacy of prevention-diversion resources accounts in the first place for

many children unnecessarily progressing toward the criminal justice system. It does not appear that these resources are markedly better now, when prevention-diversion services are being asked to take back essentially the same children they did not help before. Nor—to repeat—does it seem likely that current increases in purely paid professionals can deal with the anticipated dramatic increase in prevention caseloads. *We therefore assume that volunteer services must be developed effectively and quite rapidly as an important supplement to paid services in prevention-diversion.*

This report is a beginning in that regard. It seeks to identify a sampling of existing volunteer programs in prevention and diversion, describe and to some extent analyze them, and suggest some needed future directions in development.

Assumptions as to Effectiveness

Implicit in all the above is the belief that volunteer programs can impact positively in prevention and diversion. Admittedly, we have little in the way of direct research to support this belief. We do, however, have a set of reasonable and hopeful assumptions. Thus, as mentioned previously in this chapter, we know that well-managed volunteer programs within the criminal justice system are effective in reducing the probability of further penetration within that system. We assume they have potential for the same general effect in prevention and diversion. We further assume this effect will occur for the same general reasons, notably that volunteers, working in cooperation with professionals, are capable of providing an amplification and diversification of services, to children, plus an informal voice to educate the community to the needs of children and help change community atmospheres positively for children. We do not assume that volunteers will do exactly the same kinds of things in prevention-diversion that they have done within the criminal justice system. Indeed, this is one question this report is designed to explore.³

³Indeed this is one question this report is designed to explore. However, perhaps the same sort of question could be raised in regard to the impact of paid professional services in the same area.

²Annual Report of Federal Activities—Juvenile Delinquency, Youth Development and Related Fields (DHEW, SRS, YDD-PA, Publication 1(SRS) 73-26016)

Chapter 2 METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Time Frame Limitations

Only five months were available for the completion of this exploratory study. Because of this, a relatively restricted focus was necessary according to the definition of prevention-diversion presented in Chapter 1. Nor was there opportunity for more than a sampling of follow-ups on information received from the field.

Developing the Sample of Potential Volunteer Programs

Neither budget nor time frame permitted a large random sampling of all agencies or ad hoc groups in the United States who might possibly have volunteer programs in prevention or diversion. Accordingly, we attempted to secure at least some meaningful representation in known geographical, conceptual, community-size, and program variety spheres. The following procedures were adopted to that end: (1) Staff scanned the National Information Center on Volunteerism's national and state files on over two thousand volunteer programs in the country in order to identify those who reported themselves as planning or having prevention-diversion volunteer programs. (2) An active search was undertaken for identification of other volunteer programs referred to in available likely reference works. Among the publications scanned were *Central Resource Summaries of Pre-Official Court Delinquency Prevention Programs* by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, the *Annual Report of Federal Activities in Juvenile Delinquency, Youth Development, and Related Fields* by the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, and the *Directory of College Student Volunteer Programs—1970-71* (see Bibliography). (3) During the project the staff of our Center were alerted

actively to seek, during site consultations and in correspondence, any "leads" on actual or potential volunteer programs in prevention or diversion. Similarly, through participation in and sponsorship of several national conferences a few additional programs were isolated and identified for possible use in the study. (4) A letter of inquiry was sent to nearly one hundred statewide coordinators of volunteers, related administrators in the field of criminal justice, or similarly knowledgeable people with whom the Center previously had contact in over forty states. The inquiry asked these people, after explaining the project, to identify three ongoing and effective model volunteer programs working in prevention or diversion in their own state or region. Sixty "leads" were generated in this way.

In sum, the four approaches above generated a total mailing list of 293 programs.

The Information Desired and the Packet Mailed

Concurrently we had to decide the crucial items of information needed from our respondents in an exploratory study such as this, without reducing response rate by requiring lengthy write-ups from them. Accordingly, in addition to basic program demographic data, the categories of inquiry were reduced to the following: (1) geographical area served, (2) purpose, (3) mode of organization, (4) program status, (5) funding patterns, (6) type of clients, (7) type and number of volunteers, (8) general description, (9) evaluation, (10) transposability of program, (11) further reading materials available. The actual organization of responses received to these questions is shown in Chapter 3.

Along with the above set of questions, the packet mailed to the 293 potential respondents included (1) a personally signed letter from the authors, briefly explaining the significance of the project and requesting their support, and (2) a sample of a complete and exact set of answers to our questions as a model to use in their reply.

Chronology of Mailing and Tabulation

The above packets were mailed to the potential respondents during the time period September 30 to October 15. Of the total 293 mailing, 101 responses or a 34 percent return was achieved by December 28, 1972. One usually expects a somewhat higher percentage return in field surveys of this type. The somewhat lower return rate here may be because of the relatively brief time frame for return and follow-up, and also because this was an exploratory study in which, from the first, we had less than average certainty that the addresses actually had a program of the type we were interested in.

Incoming returns were regularly tabulated as to geographic or program type gap areas and to the absence of responses from programs which on previous evidence we believed were outstanding. Efforts were made, especially in December, to send follow-up reminders to these gap area programs. As Chapter 5 indicates, a reasonably good balance of program responses was thereby achieved, at least in terms of present expectations of the nature of the situation in the field.

Periodically, and especially toward the end of the study period, we also reviewed returns in regard to their basic relevance to the purposes of the study. We found that of the respondents, thirteen gave no clear evidence either of having any volunteer program or else their volunteer program appeared to be completely within the criminal justice system, for adjudicated offenders. This left 88 program responses usable as a sample within the defined purpose of the present study.

It is not claimed that the above strategy produced a fully representative sampling of existing programs. Indeed, the final tabulation of program responses in Chapter 5 suggests some presumable omissions. However, we believe that the returned surveys do represent a significant proportion of the major categories of prevention-diversion volunteer programs currently in existence. This is particularly so because almost all the 88 respondents have multiple programs or modes of volunteer involvement. Thus, the 88 respondents collectively represent at least 150 types of volunteer service, though frequently these types of service are similar between one program and another.

It is hoped that the present directory and locator will itself stimulate more widespread identification of current programs with subsequent development of more comprehensive directories.

Chapter 3 SELECTED PROGRAM ABSTRACTS

Program abstracts are presented here for 33 of the respondents to our survey; then Chapter 4 goes on to provide addresses for all 88 of them.

Programs were selected for inclusion here on four main criteria. The first was relative completeness in the information respondents gave in reply to our questions about the program (Chapter 2). Moreover, other things being equal, we chose programs with which we had some direct acquaintance in addition to the present survey process. All this information is relatively recent, having been gathered in the time period September 30 to December 29, 1972.

Secondly, programs were selected to show a range of different kinds of volunteer involvement within Chapter 2's general definition of "volunteer program in prevention or diversion". Thus, there are projects which use volunteers in the schools for counseling, in storefront type settings, working with the child's family, in tutoring, in crisis intervention, in pre-trial intervention, in diversion from courts, with police and fire departments. Chapter 4 will summarize some of the main job types involved.

A third criterion of selection was a relatively significant number of volunteers involved in proportion to the number of clients served.

Finally, some attention was given to procuring a range of geographic representation, but this was a distinctly secondary criterion, only after the first three had been best met. More important here was the attempt to represent a range in size of community from rural to urban.

Many of the programs not selected here, but listed in the Chapter 4 directory, are nevertheless

significant. They may just happen to have overlapped programs abstracted here in type of volunteer usage, geographic region, etc.

The program abstracts are presented exactly in the respondents' own words, replying to our basic questions as described in Chapter 2. This includes philosophy, interpretation, and opinion as well as factual material. Whenever any of our own comments are added, this is clearly indicated as "Ed-note". Finally, when further unpublished background reading material is mentioned by the program as "enclosed", this material can best be obtained by writing directly to the address at the top of that abstract.

Programs are presented alphabetically by state as follows:

- Volunteer Friends, Anniston, Alabama
- SCAN Volunteer Service, Inc., Little Rock, Arkansas
- Operational Intercept, Russellville, Arkansas
- Los Compadres Program, East Los Angeles, California
- Fireman Counselor Program, Los Angeles, California
- Youth Community Resource Project, Pleasant Hill, California
- A Community Based Alternative to Probation and Parole and A Community Based Diversion Project for Pre-Delinquent Girls, San Francisco, California
- Attention Homes, Inc., Boulder, Colorado
- Headwaters: Social Advocates for Youth, Colorado Springs, Colorado
- Partners, Inc., Denver, Colorado

Florida Ocean Sciences Institute, Deerfield Beach, Florida

Listener's Program, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

Youth Programs, Inc., Orlando, Florida

Elkhart Youth Services Bureau, Inc., Elkhart, Indiana

Volunteer Probation Officer Aide Program, Waterloo, Iowa

Junior League Programs, Wichita, Kansas

College Park Youth Service Bureau, College Park, Maryland

Companion Counseling Program, Detroit, Michigan
Oakland County Youth Assistance Program, Pontiac, Michigan

Youth Development Project, St. Paul, Minnesota

Tri-County Community Center: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Program, Jackson, Mississippi

YMCA Fals Program, Kansas City, Missouri

Y-Pals, Lincoln, Nebraska

YMCA of Reno: Amigos, Talk, Y-Riders, and Alternatives Programs, Reno, Nevada

Youth Services of Tulsa, Inc., Tulsa, Oklahoma

Christian Youth Services, Inc. (Teen Haven), Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Youth Services, Rapid City, South Dakota

Student Volunteer Services, Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Youth Service Bureau, Bay City, Texas

Lower Valley Youth Service Bureau, McAllen, Texas

Shaker Mountain School, Inc., Burlington, Vermont

Rafters, Spokane, Washington

Keep a Child in School, Inc., South Charleston, West Virginia

VOLUNTEER FRIENDS

L. Michael Winship
Calhoun County Juvenile Court
Anniston, Alabama 36201
(205) 236-3418

Geographical Area Served (size): Calhoun County (about 120,000 population)

Purpose: To bring worthy people of good character, motivation, and ability into contact with youths who have been or are likely to be referred to juvenile court. Believing it takes people to change people, the ensuing associations tend to bring about influences that can manifestly improve the course of erring youths' lives.

Mode of Organization and Program Status: First we formed a board to support the chief probation officer in his efforts. Material was mimeographed describing the intended program which was devised with reliance on materials and the background of the chief probation officer's attendance in the VIP Conference in Detroit, 1970. Afterwards we hand-picked prospects, interviewed them, and put them through two orientation sessions designed to inform them of the nature of juvenile court, the context kids in court find themselves, about youth today and their problems, and about being a "friend" in the likely situations with youths they will face. Then once a month, the group meets for 90-minute feedback sessions. We have two groups in the county—about thirty Friends. This is enough for now; our major task is to use them well. The program is continuing after one and one half years and is considered successful.

Funding Patterns: The program requires very little money. Post cards, some material that is mimeographed, and occasional refreshments are all we have had to spend money for. This money comes from the "Friends of the Court Fund" which is used for other services besides the Volunteer Friend Program. This fund is a recipient of United Fund and individual gifts.

Type of Clients: Mainly kids (about twelve to fifteen years) who have been or are about to be referred to juvenile court. Some in latter category are headed off.

Type and Number of Volunteers: We have about thirty Volunteer Friends. They are black and white, from twenty to about 55 in age, from ninth grade level to master's degree level. They have all been referred by competent people we

know and then screened through interview, orientation, and time.

General Description: Three main roles that Friends play: (1) The one-to-one Friend who is like a big brother or sister. (2) The case-aide who "trouble-shoots" a newly referred case and through whose contact some kids are headed off from having to become an official court case. Often a one-to-one relationship develops from this case-aide role. (3) The jail visitor who, with a partner, visits the juvenile wing for ninety minutes one day a week, rapping, playing cards, etc., and being a friend.

Evaluation: The program is successful although some enthusiasm has diminished when some newness has worn off. Part of the problem is getting the probation officers (PO) to keep up with Friends who are assigned to their kids and getting them to make new assignments. Although the benefits are many, it takes a certain extra amount of work by the PO to get a new Friend started.

Further Reading/Materials Available.

SCAN VOLUNTEER SERVICE, INC. (Suspected Child Abuse & Neglect)

Ms. Sharon Pallone, Director
Fullerton Hall: Arkansas State Hospital
4313 West Markham
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 666-0181, Ext. 246

Geographical Area Served (size): Presently, Pulaski County (340,000). Future plans to include entire state.

Purpose: To provide intensive support to abusive parents in a non-critical, non-judgmental way, that: "To mother the mother so that she can mother her child." Also, to encourage the mother to accept community services to help relieve family stress. *Ed. note:* It is commonly believed that a considerable proportion of abused children end up in court, hence we have considered this a prevention program in ameliorating such abuse.

Mode of Organization: A private, non-profit agency, governed by a citizen board of directors. Close working relationship with Community Mental Health Center, Arkansas Social Services, local school systems, and University of Arkansas Medical Center. Referrals are received from all of these agencies and from the general public. The SCAN office is staffed with a director and a secretary.

Program Status: Began operation August 15, 1972. Between August 15, 1972 and November 15, 1972, 110 children have been served and 45 families.

Funding Patterns: Funded through Arkansas Social Services on Title IV A money (75% federal money; 25% donor money—quorum courts) and small private and church donations.

Type of Clients: Families reported to the above agencies who are suspected or proven to have abused or neglected their children. These persons are isolated, non-trusting people who have been abused as children.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Concerned citizens, mostly mothers, who have compassion for these distressed families. Volunteers are trained by psychiatrists, nurses, social workers, and experienced volunteers. Projected plans call for the use of twenty to thirty volunteers in the course of a year, with each volunteer serving at least two cases. Some volunteers are assigned more than two families only when stability has been attained in their original cases. Each volunteer serves on a "partially paid" basis to recover costs involved in serving these families. Presently all volunteers are college educated, and we find this to be an asset.

General Description: Volunteers have the time needed to give intensive treatment to these abusive parents and are not representing "authority" as do agency personnel. Parents learn to relate more appropriately to adults in relating to the volunteer, learn a sense of trust, and then can use this way of relating with their families.

Evaluation: Monthly evaluation reports are submitted to Arkansas Social Services for Program evaluation. Case evaluation of each volunteer's work is heard weekly by consultant psychiatrist and social workers.

Transposability Information: This program would work in any community where professional supervision is available to the volunteer from those professionals who are familiar with the dynamics of child abuse.

Further Reading/Materials Available: *The Battered Child* by Dr. Helfer and Dr. Kempe, and *The Battered Child and His Family* by Dr. Helfer and Dr. Kempe.

OPERATIONAL INTERCEPT (YAK Youth Action Kore) (GAB Educational TASK Force)

Mrs. Juliette Gosnell
2301 West Main
Russellville, Arkansas 72801
(501) 967-4644

Geographical Area Served (size): Pope County - 20,000

Purpose: Volunteer and community supported program facility.

1. Encourage and coordinate a drug information program in the public schools through:
 - (a) Pre-school workshops, resource materials
 - (b) Speakers to community through seminars; talks to civic, church and community organizations
2. Provide and support a facility called the "Open House" which has the following functions:
 - (a) Counseling service
 - (b) Adult education programs and communication
 - (c) Interdenominational weekly religious rap session, hotlines for emergencies, and a listening post for those in need of counseling and help.

Mode of Organization: Private and non-profit organizations under a board of directors consisting of concerned community volunteers and community agencies such as:

1. law enforcement
2. social services
3. mental health

4. medical profession
5. education
6. churches are represented as volunteer programs

Program Status: Since 1970 when the first drug education program was established; at the present time a drug education curriculum has been introduced into public schools, grades kindergarten through twelve. A drop-in facility and hotlines are in operation.

Funding Patterns: Contributions through private enterprise, individual donations, and the Community Chest.

Type of Clients: High school and college age students (primarily). Plans are in the making to have separate programs for younger groups.

Type and Number of Volunteers: We have had ministers, doctors, teachers, nurses, pharmacists, law enforcement officials, and other individuals who gave of their time. There are twenty-five trained counselors who passed the MMPT test and received a course of instruction from psychology instructors from Arkansas Tech.

General Description: A place for communication, counseling, preventative measures against drug usage, or help if there is involvement with drugs.

Evaluation: The school program is in its first year with no accountability studies completed. The "Open House" facility is in operation with trained volunteer counselors; the next step will be a staffing grant through NMHA to provide a full-time director and two part-time staff members.

Transposability Information: Program originated in middle class community of 12,000 in a county of 40,000. Variations of it currently exist in Jonesboro, El Dorado, Ft. Smith, Little Rock, all in the state of Arkansas.

LOS COMPADRES PROGRAM - Los Angeles County Probation

Mike Lindsey, Assistant Director
3626 East 5th
East Los Angeles, California 90063
(213) 269-3164

Geographical Area Served (size): East Los Angeles City area

Purpose: To keep minors who appear to be heading toward delinquency from entering the juvenile justice system by early intervention on a voluntary basis with the minor and his family.

Mode of Organization: An experimental program of "early intervention"—family treatment, group and individual, is offered on a voluntary basis. Operated by Los Angeles County Probation.

Program Status: Partially activated—no federal money as yet.

Funding Patterns: Model Cities, CCCJ (California LEAA), and County of Los Angeles joint partnership.

Type of Clients: Pre-delinquent, ages 8-18

Type and Number of Volunteers: 25—mostly students

General Description: Volunteers work in several ways—group activities, big brother-sister types, tutorial, and providing transportation.

Evaluation: Very new program—much enthusiasm thus far and good community involvement.

Transposability Information: We definitely need a local residence for short-term treatment such as the Attention Homes, Inc. Program designed for Spanish speaking community, but easily transposed.

Further Reading/Materials Available: Program brochures, project proposal, *Shop Talk* (September issue), all from Los Angeles County Probation.

FIREMAN COUNSELOR PROGRAM

Kenneth R. Long, Deputy Chief
217 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 485-6005

Geographical Area Served (size): 464 square miles (City of Los Angeles)

Purpose: To provide volunteer counseling to boys who have been arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department.

Mode of Organization: Full-time, paid, uniformed Fire Department of the City of Los Angeles. Program is administered by designated personnel. We take boys from Los Angeles Police only and maintain a close working liaison with their investigators and administrators.

Program Status: Began experimental program in 1968. Expanded to about one quarter of the city in January of 1972, and we are preparing for complete city coverage by January of 1973.

Funding Patterns: Tax supported fire protection organization. No private funding or assistance.

Type of Clients: Boys nine to fifteen years of age all referred by the police department investigator. Boys are arrested for a wide variety of offenses but are not hard core problems. We do not take boys who have been entered into the court system or who are on probation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: 1200 uniformed firemen. All are volunteers. Provide counseling service only.

General Description: Counseling is done in the fire stations by on-duty personnel. An attempt is made by counselors to establish a warm, friendly relationship so that a good communication climate is developed. The fireman becomes a resource to the boy that he can depend on in a time of need.

Evaluation: The program has not been formally evaluated.

Transposability Information: Program began on a small scale in one locality in the city and will expand to the entire city with a total population of 2,800,000.

YOUTH COMMUNITY RESOURCE PROJECT

Lt. James R. Nunes, Director
Youth Services Bureau
1900 Pleasant Hill Road
Pleasant Hill, California 94523
(415) 933-7770, Ext. 39

Geographical Area Served (size): City of Pleasant Hill, 7.5 square miles, population 27,500, student population 20,000.

Purpose: To divert youthful offenders from the formal justice system and to direct them instead toward alternative avenues of assistance. Both preventative and rehabilitative programs are provided.

Mode of Organization: The project was developed and is operative as a division of the Pleasant Hill Police Department.

Program Status: The program began operation on July 1, 1971. Steps are now being taken to expand our function to include supplemental youth programs and an activity and counseling center.

Funding Patterns: Federally funded through the California Council on Criminal Justice (LEAA) on a "60-40" matching funds basis with the City of Pleasant Hill. Total budget for the 1972-73 fiscal year: \$92,000.

Type of Clients: Delinquent and pre-delinquent youths who are referred to us by themselves, the patrol division, schools, parents, or other agencies. Approximately 353 formal referrals were handled in the first year of operation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Professional volunteers: psychologists, social workers, police officers, etc. Student volunteers: to be

expanded this fall; aid in clerical work, etc. Community volunteers: parents and other community members; to be organized along with Activities Center.

General Description: Youth Services Bureau was developed by the Pleasant Hill Police Department with the aid of a federal grant. Replacing the traditional juvenile bureau, this new division provides both preventative and rehabilitative programs.

Since the inception of the program on July 1, 1971, the Bureau has maintained that juvenile delinquency cannot be reduced to or dealt with as, a single problem. It must instead be viewed as the result of the individual problems of each child. Youth Services focuses not on the symptoms of delinquency but on the root causes.

In order to implement this philosophy, a counseling and referral service has been established. Together, these two programs constitute our major service. In addition to this, numerous programs are handled through this department which are aimed toward preventative delinquency and community education.

The majority of the juveniles we serve are referred to us by the patrol division through our citation system, or by the schools. An increasing number of clients are contacting this Bureau of their own volition.

Our staff includes both police and civilian counselors as well as a consulting psychiatrist. Supplementary personnel are "borrowed" from Probation, Social Services, Public Health, and Mental Health. This arrangement provides not only a varied pool of resources and perspectives, but also a broader spectrum of personnel to relate to the variety of problems and needs of the community.

Evaluation: Formal evaluation is done yearly in connection with the grant requirements. A team of evaluators is chosen from the community including students from local colleges.

Transposability Information: Although the "Youth Services Bureau" concept—as developed within the President's Crime Commission Report, 1968—was designed as a community

center operated program for inner-city youths, it has worked exceptionally well as a police function in this predominately middle-class suburban city. Many other police departments have visited this program and plan to develop their own Youth Services Bureau.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

Articles prepared by staff members:

Edward S. Kreins, "Community Resource Program for Youth," *Police Chief Magazine*, March 1972.

Thomas J. Cain, "Youth Services: A Police Alternative to the Juvenile Justice System," *California Peace Officers Association*, October 1972.

A brochure describing the project is available as of December 1, 1972.

Resource Material:

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

Sherwood Norman, *The Youth Service Bureau. A Key to Delinquency Prevention* (Paramus, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

A COMMUNITY-BASED ALTERNATIVE TO PROBATION AND PAROLE, AND A COMMUNITY-BASED DIVERSION PROJECT FOR PRE-DELINQUENT GIRLS

Jack Harrington, Administrative Director
Community Streetwork Center
66 Third Street
San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 398-7737

Geographical Area Served (size): Poor and minority communities of San Francisco, no population estimate.

Purpose: (1) To prevent forty young men on probation and parole from the juvenile court from engaging in behavior which would result in their re-involvement in the juvenile justice system and commitment or re-commitment to the

California Youth Authority (boys' program). (2) To take a caseload of girls from their point of initial contact with the intake facility at Youth Guidance Center and, through streetwork techniques and involvement in a program, prevent their further contact or involvement with the juvenile justice system. Both these objectives are to be achieved through the use of indigenous, community youth workers (streetworkers) and the techniques and methods of streetwork, job development, tutoring, and educational and recreational activities.

Mode of Organization: Private, non-profit corporation, board of directors drawing from business, community, professional, educational, and other areas; seeks to be a community link between the young people "on the streets" and the official institutions which affect their daily lives—the juvenile court, the probation department, the Youth Authority, the schools, the welfare department, etc.

Program Status: Program is in its second funding year (boys' program) with the California Council on Criminal Justice (LEAA) and will be refunded for a third year beginning on May 1, 1973; girls' program has just been funded (September 1, 1972) as a pilot project by the San Francisco Foundation.

Funding Patterns: Main grants from the California Council on Criminal Justice (\$87,000 this year, \$78,000 next year) and San Francisco Foundation (\$25,000); also have received a small summer grant from the San Francisco Citizens League (\$1,500) and several private contributions ranging from \$5 to \$100.

Type of Clients: Boys' program: mostly poor and minority youths between fourteen and nineteen years of age, in school but doing poorly, in good health generally, and committing some sort of delinquent behavior fairly regularly. Girls' program: poor and minority girls between thirteen and sixteen years of age coming into contact with the authorities for the first time, mainly for family problems.

Type and Number of Volunteers: We have a Mothers' Club of 25 volunteers who are mainly mothers of caseload members and Youth

Council members; they fix dinners for the Youth Council, prepare special activities, handle publicity, etc. The Board of Directors comprises some twenty volunteers, many of whom are actual participants in the Center activities. We have a core of some fifteen to twenty community residents and other friends of the Center to provide specialized services (carpentry, entertainment for events, etc.).

General Description: The Center consists of the young people on the caseloads (approximately sixty) and the youths who are members of the Youth Council, who are drop-ins, friends of caseload members, family of caseload members, etc. (a total of 350 members). The purpose is to serve all youths in San Francisco who need assistance, jobs, counseling, or help in dealing with the juvenile court, the police, the welfare department, the schools, etc.

Evaluation: Evaluation of the boys' program and other agency programs is done by Dr. Carl Werthman of the Sociology Department of the University of California, Berkeley.

Transposability Information: The Community Streetwork Center serves the entire city of San Francisco—that is, its services are available to anyone in the city (obviously we are not equipped to handle every youth in San Francisco). It serves generally the minority communities, including Black, Chicano, American Indian, Phillipino. We have not yet worked in Chinatown.

ATTENTION HOMES, INC.

Mrs. Susan Boulding
P.O. Box 907
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(303) 447-1206

Geographical Area Served (size): Boulder County, Population 131,000.

Purpose: To provide a volunteer-supported group shelter home which serves (1) as complete diversion from the criminal justice system for some juveniles, and/or (2) as diversion

from incarceration, pre-trial or probation, for other youngsters.

Mode of Organization: A private, not-for-profit organization operated by a citizen board of directors. Close working relations with juvenile court, which mainly controls intake.

Program Status: In operation since 1966 when the first home was established. There are now three Attention Homes in this community of 70,000.

Funding Patterns: Mainly, relatively small private contributions from individuals and local groups—money, materials, and facilities. Approximately 41% private contributions, 5% from non-indigent parents of children in home, 16% from County Board of Commissioners, 14% from Boulder City Council, 14% from welfare. Total budget is approximately \$60,000 per annum.

Type of Clients: About 250 children per year, ages ten to eighteen, usually referred by court, sometimes self-referred or parent-referred. Most frequent background is runaway, incorrigible, truancy. About half of the children are not formally on probation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Mainly concerned middle class citizens, about one hundred in all serving during the course of a year. Thirty are on the Board of Directors or its various task forces, e.g. fund-raising, house maintenance, personnel, court liaison, public relations, etc. The Board and others also serve children directly as group discussion leaders, relief houseparents, transportation, recreation, etc. Many other individuals or groups regularly and voluntarily contribute food, equipment, etc., and there are also three sets of semi-paid houseparent couples, usually younger people. These receive essentially maintenance and pin money. There is also a full-time paid administrator-secretary.

General Description: Attention (vs. Detention) Homes are relatively structured settings but still primarily group shelter homes for juveniles, in lieu of incarceration or premature return to an unsuitable home situation. They are

in regular houses: non-institutional, with no locks, limited to no more than eight to ten children each. One of the homes is temporary for boys and girls (three to fifteen days) creating a suitable environment while careful planning decisions can be made about the child's future. Another home is long-term for boys, and the third is long-term for girls.

Professional treatment is secured as necessary, but seriously emotionally disturbed children are not normally admitted. The object is simply a natural milieu in which the children can continue their normal school and other interactions in the community.

Evaluation: The administrative organization of Attention, Inc. was evaluated by an outside consultant in the autumn of 1971, and there have been relatively informal follow-up interviews of graduates of the home. Court statistics tend strongly to confirm that the home saves at least five hundred child-days in jail yearly. However, no formal broad-scale evaluation has been made.

Transposability Information: The program originated in a middle class community of approximately 55,000 in a county of 100,000. Variations of it, clearly in the same basic format currently exist in about 25 U.S. communities ranging in size and nature from Cleveland, Ohio to Deadwood, South Dakota.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

1. Chapter on Attention Homes in OYD book *Volunteer Programs in Courts*, available from the U.S. Government Printing Office for \$1.25 per copy.
2. Article reprint in *Juvenile Judges Journal*
3. Tape of foster parents (National Information Center on Volunteerism tape directory)
4. *Attention Home Newsletter* (above address)
5. Program Locator #1 (National Information Center on Volunteerism with addresses of other homes in the U.S.)

HEADWATERS: SOCIAL ADVOCATES FOR YOUTH

Tod Bacigalupi, III
521 North Wahsatch
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903
(303) 634-5531

Geographical Area Served (size): El Paso County, population 750,000

Purpose: Preventative treatment and crisis intervention program for children six to sixteen by using volunteers in one-to-one relationships as child advocates. Also to provide for the needs of children, whatever they are, if not provided by other organizations, through the use of volunteers.

Mode of Organization: Private, non-profit, operated by a board of directors. Working closely with schools, welfare, and juvenile courts.

Program Status: Operating since September, 1970, in Colorado Springs.

Funding Patterns: Private foundations, i.e. Haigh-Scatena, and some small private contributions.

Type of Clients: 150 children per year, any and all types of problems that the referring agency feels a volunteer can help in.

Type and Number of Volunteers: 150-plus per year volunteers work in one-to-one, tutoring, the learning center, crafts, creative drama, discussion groups. Volunteers are mainly college students and young adults. *Ed. note:* The volunteers are advocates for the child, stand up for him as necessary.

General Description: The main idea is to place children in one-to-one relationships with volunteers who try to find out what the child's real problem is and then work to solve the problem with back-up help from the staff who are available as resources.

Evaluation: No formal evaluation has been done.

Transposability Information: Programs like Headwaters exist in seven other places throughout western United States. *Ed. note:* See Social Advocates for Youth under "National Organizations", Chapter 6.

Further Reading/Materials Available: Contact Social Advocates for Youth Central, 3300 Bank of America Center, 555 California Street, San Francisco, California 94104.

PARTNERS, INC.

Mr. Bob Moffitt
326 West 12th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204
(303) 893-1400

Geographical Area Served (size): Metropolitan Denver area, population approximately 500,000.

Purpose: To provide volunteer adult supervision to court related youth in order to assist them in coping with society.

Mode of Organization: A private, non-profit corporation operated by a citizen board of directors with fifteen full-time staff. Close relations maintained with the juvenile court, police department, and other sister agencies.

Program Status: Currently 350 Partner units (volunteer and child). Began in 1967 with ten Senior Partners and ten Junior Partners.

Funding Patterns: Historically private and government funding—currently under a model cities grant (September, 1972 to January 1, 1973) and private contributions (many small donors) 25%. 1973 projected budget—two thirds private and one third public.

Type of Clients: 99% referred from Denver Juvenile Court (70% diversion or non-adjudicated, 30% probation or adjudicated) almost all misdemeanor offenders. 1% referred by welfare, schools, other agencies.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Mainly concerned middle class people in the Denver area (average age is 28). Presently 350 who serve as Senior Partners and 170 United Bank of Denver employees (Involvement Corps Task Force) who offer assistance to staff and social service resources to Senior Partners.

General Description: Volunteers matched to probationers or non-adjusted court related juvenile in consultation with counselor and court personnel. Junior Partners recruited on basis of invitation to membership in exclusive club with membership benefits including free, unusual recreational opportunities and a big-brother (or sister) type who will share in these activities.

Evaluation: Dr. John Forward, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Colorado, is currently administering a three year comprehensive evaluation of the program.

Transposability Information: Program began in Denver (500,000 population) in conjunction with the Denver Juvenile Court; similar programs exist all over the country.

Further Reading/Materials Available: Partners Administrative Seminar Notebook; Partners Newsletter.

FLORIDA OCEAN SCIENCES INSTITUTE

Robert A. Rosof, President
1605 SE Third Court
Deerfield Beach, Florida 33441
(305) 399-8445

Geographical Area Served (size): Primarily Broward and Palm Beach County, Florida, population 960,753 (total).

Purpose:

1. To provide a motivating context for behavior modification and attitude development amongst adjudicated youngsters ages fifteen to twenty.
2. To provide vocational training and a broad range of manual skills and employability skills within the marine career cluster.

3. To provide remedial and academic instruction using modern methods to encourage high school dropouts to complete their high school education.

Mode of Organization: A private, non-profit corporation with a citizen board of trustees and a paid administrative, training, and counseling staff. Referrals and working relations with juvenile courts, Division of Youth Services, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the county school system.

Program Status: Formerly a marine research institute; the Marine Technician Training Program has been in operation since September, 1969. Two additional programs are in operation in Tampa and St. Petersburg, Florida, with eight more due to open within the next two years in the state of Florida.

Funding Patterns: Primary funding Title IV-A federal funds through the State Division of Family Services and the State Division of Youth Services, supplemental funding through the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and a substantial amount of support via private donations; total budget approximately \$130,000 per program per year.

Type of Clients: About fifty children per program per year, ages fifteen to twenty, most high school dropouts, most adjudicated, and most are on formal probation with the Division of Youth Services.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Volunteer services provided by interested citizens and civic organizations include providing foster homes, providing tutoring services, providing activities, camping trips, and involvement on weekends, and providing job training opportunities for trainees during and following the program. Formal training and counseling within the program is provided by a paid and well trained staff.

General Description: Florida Ocean Sciences Institute, a non-profit, tax exempt education and research organization, is presently conducting a training program for youngsters who have dropped out of school or gone away of the

law. The main objectives of the program are to develop in these youngsters the attitudes which are necessary to successfully live and work in our society and to help them to recognize and meet their responsibilities toward themselves and others.

We are concerned not only with their intellectual and academic growth but also with their emotional and occupational development. Training covers a variety of academic and vocational skills including water safety, first aid, marine construction, marine biology, chemical oceanography, navigation, basic small boat handling, diving techniques, photography, mathematics, communication skills, and career planning. In order to enter the program a youngster must have a personal desire to work in, on, and under the water, be of average intelligence, and possess at least a sixth grade reading and math ability.

Evaluation: Evaluation is extensive. Initial diagnostic testing is provided by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the county school system. Evaluation and progress records are maintained on individual trainees as well as over-all program progress on a continuing basis. Upon completion of the program, a follow-up program is initiated which is designed to follow the progress of a former trainee for a period extending to five years. Statistics are compiled on a routine basis, and a copy of a recent compilation is enclosed. Evaluation is also being conducted on a continuing basis by the State Division of Youth Services which is primarily responsible for program funds.

Transposability Information: As previously stated, the state of Florida has provided federal funds for the establishment of a total of eleven marine institutes throughout the state of Florida. In addition, Florida Ocean Sciences Institute management is providing technical assistance toward the establishment of similar programs in other areas of the country. Obviously, the program is most suitable for urban areas near the water, however, similar non-water oriented concepts are being evaluated for use in inland regions.

Further Reading/Materials Available.

LISTENER'S PROGRAM

David C. Mills, Director
Division of Youth Services
303 SE 17th Street, Room 302
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(305) 523-6468

or
Mrs. Ruth C. Wedden
1351 NW 12th Street, Room 429
Miami, Florida 33126
(305) 261-8456 (home)
(305) 371-5386 (office)

Geographical Area Served (size): 650,000 (population)

Purpose: To provide adult "Listeners" to the child who has shown a tendency to act out in a small way that is perhaps indicative of future delinquency; to provide him with the attention he may hope to gain from acting out behavior before the behavior becomes offensive; to meet the needs of the child with wholesome activities, warm friendship and a listening ear, offering diversion and alternatives to the delinquent behavior.

Mode of Organization: Community based, outreach oriented. Parent referrals, clinic referrals, school referrals, received from Division of Vocational Rehabilitation referrals, handled under the county, Division of Youth Services, supervised by the Director of Volunteer Services.

Program Status: Since May, 1970, can be referred to volunteer foster home.

Funding Patterns: Director of Volunteer Services, secretary, office supplies are funded by the Board of County Commissioners. Total budget is \$16,108.00. The Board of County Commissioners does not allow any material solicitation.

Type of Clients: No children formerly on probation. Director of Volunteer Services acts as counselor with back up by group treatment staff and community resources.

Type and Number of Volunteers: There are currently seventeen involved in the program.

Ongoing in-service training after initial six hour training.

General Description: Strictly a diversion program, from delinquency, as awareness of problem arises. This does not include mentally retarded or physically handicapped children, except in rare instances. There is no minimum age, but the maximum age is sixteen years.

Evaluation: This program has not been formally evaluated. The program operates in a mixed community by race and income.

Further Reading/Materials Available: *Ed. note:* Mrs. Wedden has recently prepared an excellent "Listener's Manual". Information on availability is from her or from our Center.

YOUTH PROGRAMS, INC.

Director Eugene D. Minietta, Colonel, USAF (Ret.)
1 North Orange Building, Suite 412
Orlando, Florida 32801
(305) 423-8541

Geographical Area Served (size): Central Florida, population 800,000.

Purpose: To provide society and the juvenile courts a graded series of alternatives to the traditional disposition of probation or incarceration of youthful offenders. Programs offered: (1) volunteer counselors (for offenders); (2) volunteer tutors (pre-delinquents); (3) community youth clubs; (4) summer camp programs at military bases; (5) vocational training programs; (6) on the job training.

Mode of Organization: Private, not-for-profit organization, operated by a community board of directors; close working relationship with juvenile court, State Division of Youth Services (which controls intake), junior high and high schools for pre-delinquent referrals, law enforcement agencies, and military bases who provide camp sites and vocational training facilities.

Program Status: incorporated September, 1970. Operational staff employed June, 1971. Volunteer program started October, 1971. Still growing.

Funding Patterns: Total budget approximately \$75,000 per annum; 60% Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 25% United Appeal, 10% Orange County Community Action Agency, and 5% private contributions.

Type of Clients: We work with about 500 children per year in the eleven to seventeen age group, boys and girls. Referrals come from juvenile courts, schools, law enforcement agencies, Division of Youth Services, and parents, and occasionally from other community social agencies. Most frequent background is low income family groups, incorrigible, truancy, breaking and entering, larceny, broken homes. *Most of the children have been diverted from judicial hearings.*

Type and Number of Volunteers: 340 volunteers are now enrolled. Volunteers range in age from eighteen to 81, mostly from middle class strata from college students to business executives, housewives, teachers, retired citizens. About 290 are involved with offenders, assigned on a one-to-one basis; about fifty are involved with "pre-delinquents" assigned as tutors on a one-to-one basis and in our outreach program identifying troubled children in the community. Twelve of our volunteers are district supervisors, responsible for the work of other volunteers within their geographical district. These volunteers receive reimbursement for travel. All other volunteers are not reimbursed.

General Description: Youth Programs, Inc. is a community oriented organization founded on the concept that the first and best place for a child in trouble to receive help is in his own community. Community resources are used to the maximum extent in solving juvenile problems. The complete facilities of the local Air Force and Navy bases are used on a non-interference basis to provide a summer camp for over 200 boys and girls each summer; a local service station and grill are donated to serve as a work experience center, local community

service centers are used as meeting places for youth clubs, etc

Evaluation: Evaluation takes the form of an annual audit of children processed and their progress documented. Primary evaluation factors include recidivism rates, social interaction examination at the beginning and end of the period, evaluation forms filled out by counselors, school performance, and medical examination. Our first full year evaluation is scheduled for December, 1972.

Transposability Information: The program originated in a middle class community of about 400,000. Variations of this program currently exist in about one hundred U.S. communities adjacent to military bases, ranging in size and nature from Orlando, Florida to Presque Island, Maine.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

1. 1972 LEAA grant application (Florida)
2. Youth Programs Brochure

ELKHART YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU, INC.

Keith Harder, Coordinator
501 South 4th Street
Elkhart, Indiana 46514
(219) 294-3549

Geographical Area Served (size): Elkhart County, 120,000 population (Elkhart City, 46,000).

Purpose:

1. Divert youth from criminal justice system through:
 - (a) Crisis Intervention services
 - (b) Short-term family counseling
 - (c) Referral to professional counseling agency for longer-term therapy
 - (d) Systematic follow-up of referrals
2. Promote changes in community systems and attitudes adversely affecting youth
3. Help coordinate existing programs for youth and promote new ones

Mode of Organization: A private, not-for-profit organization operated by volunteer board of

directors. Close working relationship with probation department, area schools, and youth serving community agencies.

Program Status: In operation with paid staff since August, 1970. Staff now includes six full-time paid employees and fifty volunteers.

Funding Patterns: Mainly through LEAA funds. Approximately 20% of funds have come from private contributions—individuals, clubs corporations; our budget for the current fiscal year is \$53,243.34.

Type of Clients: 221 referrals made to the YSB last year, ages six to eighteen, referred by schools (40%) and parents (25%); probation, other agencies, and self-referrals made up the balance. Reasons for referral are runaway (15%), other home problems (17%), truancy (39%), other school problems (15%), drugs/alcohol (6%). The target population is youth who are just beginning to show delinquency tendencies.

Type and Number of Volunteers: About sixty volunteers served last year (Board of Directors - 10, Planning and Research Committee - 10, Hotline telephone service - 40). Board and Planning and Research Committee are typically involved, solid, respected, middle-aged, middle class citizens (e.g. judge, lawyer, social workers, businessmen, union leaders). Board is responsible for fund raising, policy decision. The Hotline operators are a more mixed bag of youth, professionals, housewives. Average age about 23. Hotline operators give a minimum of eighteen hours per month to the operation. Hotline is directed by a half-time paid employee.

General Description: Referrals of youth who show delinquent tendencies come to YSB from schools, police, probation, parents, youth, and other agencies. After conferences with the youth and his parents as soon after referral as possible, referral to the appropriate community resource (if available) is made. Crisis intervention services through a 24-hour answering service are also available. The YSB coordinator and the Planning and Research Committee are the main avenues for achieving the "sys-

tems modification" goal. The coordinator is given time for research, promoting inter-agency coordination, advisory committee participation, etc. The committee works on long-range planning for youth related needs, e.g. detention facilities, foster home needs, etc.

Evaluation: No formal broad-scale evaluation has been made. One is urgently needed. There are, however, several random evaluatory indices in the community that can be pointed out. (1) There was a decline for the first time in five years in the number of juveniles apprehended by city police during the first full year of the YSB's operation. (2) There has been a noticeable increase in the community awareness of the YSB evidenced by a three-fold increase in referrals during the second year. (3) There has been some improvement in relations between some agencies and awareness of each other's problems. (4) Two-thirds of the cases the YSB worked with for the first one and one half years were linked with some community resource.

Transposability Information: There are by now many projects with similar goals and programs, some called YSB's, others not. It would seem that much of what has been learned in Elkhart would be transferrable to others with similar problems and demographic features.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

Sherwood Norman, *The Youth Service Bureau, A Key to Delinquency Prevention* (Paramus, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

Delinquency Prevention Through Youth Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Publication No. (SRS) 72-26013, 1972.

Elkhart Yb, inc., *Annual Report*, 172.

Center on Administration of Criminal Justice, *Preventing Delinquency Through Diversion* (Davis, California, 1972).

VOLUNTEER PROBATION OFFICER AIDE PROGRAM

Mrs. Delight TePaske
Juvenile Probation Officer
Court House, Lafayette Street Entrance
Waterloo, Iowa 50703
(319) 291-2506

Geographical Area Served (size): Black Hawk County

Purpose: To improve the effectiveness of the juvenile court through the use of volunteers by providing a more adequate experience for probationers. The program is directed toward reducing the rate of recidivism, with the long range goal of enabling probationers to lead productive lives in society.

Mode of Organization: The program operates in the Black Hawk County Juvenile Probation Office under the direction of the Juvenile Court System of Black Hawk County and the leadership of the chief probation officer and a half-time coordinator.

Program Status: Has been in operation since May, 1969. Two hundred ninety-five (295) people have completed the required twelve-hour training course; of that number 223 have applied for active status.

Funding Patterns: Part of the District Court Fund, budgeted for the county probation office.

Type of Clients: Juveniles, ages six to eighteen years, neglected, dependent, or delinquent, who have been referred to the juvenile probation office by law enforcement officers, public agencies, parents, private citizens, schools, and by self-referral.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Concerned, mature (patient, dependable, sensible, and sensitive) adults. About 120 are on the active list at a given time.

General Description: The volunteer is to develop a relationship with the probationer which is

based on confidence and trust. He will work on a one-to-one basis with the probationer, provide a positive adult model for the youngster, and give concrete assistance when the need for such assistance is indicated (i.e. finding a job, locating recreational facilities, etc.). He always works under the direction of a probation officer. The amount of time that he spends with the probationer varies from two to six hours per week.

This office provides for a ninety day informal probationary period without adjudication. Volunteers are used for these cases as well as for formal probation cases. This effort is directed toward prevention.

Evaluation: A statistical analysis was performed to evaluate the effectiveness of volunteer probation officer aides (VPOA) in reducing recidivism among juveniles for the year 1970. An addendum was added to the study for the year 1971

Transposability Information: The program originated in a midwestern middle class metropolitan area of about 132,916 population. It is the pilot program of its sort in the state of Iowa and has since served as the model for eight additional probation offices in the state, which have utilized the basic philosophy as well as many of the training and functional features of the program. Minor alterations have been made in programs which function in a more rural environment than ours, but the basic format has been retained in each case.

JUNIOR LEAGUE PROGRAMS

Mrs. Jackie Gossard
148 North Fountain
Wichita, Kansas 67208
(316) 682-7473

Purpose: Due to the diverse and sophisticated nature of volunteer programs involved in the Wichita area, a capsulization of some of them is presented here. All of these programs are involved with the Junior League in some manner.

1. STOREFRONT PROBATION DEPARTMENTS: At the present time the juvenile court has two storefront probation departments that are operated by probation officers and volunteers. They not only work with delinquent youth from their areas, but are doing a great deal of work with pre-delinquents in various types of programs and in counseling with parents of pre-delinquents. Both centers are located in target areas of Wichita. Mr. Lewis Hearne directs the operation. He has a great deal of experience both in prisons and as a probation officer and feels prevention is the key. **CONTACT:** The Store Front, 1907 East 21st Street, Wichita, Kansas 67202.

2. GIRLS' RESIDENTIAL HOMES: Monca House, under the leadership of Mrs. Gene Reynolds, has been having a great deal of success. Presently they are about to open a second. **CONTACT:** Monca House, 155 Hillside, Wichita, Kansas 67202.

3. FAMILY PREVENTION PROGRAM: This program started under the leadership of Dr. Harold Vogt. They have just applied for a joint grant between the school system, welfare department, and court to set up a program for the school system working with families whose children are having difficulties in the school system. Dr. Vogt is presently the president of the American Psychologist Association. He can be reached at the following address. **CONTACT:** 220 West Douglas, Page Court, Suite 425, Wichita, Kansas 67202.

4. POLICE DETERRENT PROGRAMS: The police department has recently received funding for several more prevention programs, one of which utilizes ex-cons as volunteers. **CONTACT:** Major R. C. Jones, 115 East William, Wichita, Kansas 67202.

COLLEGE PARK YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

Miss Linda Ford
4500 Knox Road
College Park, Maryland 20740
(301) 474-1210

Geographical Area Served (size): 26,000

Purpose: The goals of the College Park Youth Service Bureau are basically personality development with emphasis on the individual and his relationship to parents, peers, and community in a positive, constructive, and responsible manner. By this we feel that we will simultaneously be diverting youth from criminal justice agencies by the causes of their anti-social behavior.

Mode of Organization: A non-profit organization administered and partially funded by the City of College Park.

Program Status: In operation since November, 1971. In process of purchasing own building with community support.

Funding Patterns: 25% City of College Park, 75% LEAA; total budget for 1972 is \$68,000.

Type of Clients: About 250 children a year, from eight to 21. Until present all were self-referred. Now will receive referrals from Juvenile Services and schools. Problems expressed by clients run whole gamut: broken home, drugs, alcohol, school, pregnancy, etc. Approximately three-fourths of kids are not on probation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Mainly students from nearby University of Maryland or other interested young people in the area.

General Description: A community agency designed to deal principally with two types of clients: (1) those referred from criminal justice agencies, and (2) those who walk in expressing a need for the services offered by the Bureau. As defined by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "a youth service bureau is a public agency usually functioning in high delinquency neighborhoods to divert children and youth from the juvenile justice system before they get into serious trouble, to coordinate community resources on their behalf, to strengthen existing agencies by purchasing services from them, to see that new resources are developed when appropriate services cannot be otherwise obtained, and to modify

community attitudes and practices which create delinquency breeding situations.

Evaluation: Although no formal statistics exist, there has been a percentage drop in reported juvenile offenses during a three month period when we were open as compared with the previous year. Vandalism rate to schools dropped 50% during the same two periods. No formal evaluation has been undertaken.

Transposability Information: The program exists in a lower middle to upper middle class town in the Washington Metro area. There is a national system of YSB's created by the Safe Streets Act.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

Sherwood Norman, *The Youth Service Bureau, A Key to Delinquency Prevention* (Paramus, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

Grendel's Grave Newsletters

The College Park Youth Service Bureau pamphlet

COMPANION COUNSELING PROGRAM

Thomas M. Kelley, Ph.D.
102 East Forest Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48208
(313) 224-1768

Geographical Area Served (size): 3,000,000

PURPOSE: One-to-one counseling relationships with apprehended juveniles as an alternative to official adjudication.

Mode of Organization: Presently federally funded under \$30,000 grant from LEAA. Director, full-time volunteer coordinator, part-time research coordinator, and nine group leaders paid hourly.

Program Status: Began in fall of 1971. Expanded under grant in fall of 1972.

Funding Patterns: 56% LEAA funds, 44% county match. total budget \$55,000 per year.

Type of Clients: (1) Ten to sixteen years; (2) no previous court hearings; (3) have not been on probation; (4) no more than three previous offenses; (5) have committed felony or misdemeanor; (6) small percentage of truancy or incorrigibles.

Type and Number of Volunteers: 150 student volunteers from local universities and community courses. Students get academic credit for entire school year. Courses taught or supervised by court staff. Average age is 28 years. Students recruited personally by staff at class sessions or registration. Training modules enclosed. Students must remain in program at least six months. Must see juvenile each week for at least three hours.

Evaluation: Pre- and post-control group design. recidivism, grades, attendance, home and school behavior, student ratings, personality changes, correlations between relevant background variables.

Further Reading/Materials Available: "Delinquency Prevention and College Student Paraprofessionals: A New Approach for Our Juvenile Court", by Thomas M. Kelley and Daniel B. Kennedy.

OAKLAND COUNTY YOUTH ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Edgar W. Flood, ACSW, Director
1200 North Telegraph
Pontiac, Michigan 48053
(313) 338-4751, Ext. 276

Geographical Area Served (size): Approximately 900 square miles

Purpose: The purpose of the Oakland County Youth Assistance Program is the prevention of delinquency and neglect through the involvement of local citizens. The emphasis is on primary prevention, which is before the "fact". The purpose is to identify social, psychological, and environmental variables productive of anti-social behavior and to employ intervention methods which produce satisfying experiences and thus lower the risk of deviancy or prevent anti-social behavior.

Mode of Organization: Delinquency and neglect are the products of society, and it is most important that the local community, where incidents of anti-social behavior occur, become concerned. Prevention of anti-social behavior can be effective if local citizens are involved and motivated to a sense of community responsibility and a desire to provide local community services which children and youth can use in their growth and development. The program is organized on a decentralized school district basis. The central office is within the Juvenile Court Department on the county level. There are local offices (and local citizens' committees) in each area where there is an organized program. Concern should be shown at the beginning so that the future growth will minimize overlapping districts and provide complete coverage of the area without islands where no coverage exists.

Juvenile delinquency will continue to flourish only when responsible citizens become complacent and permit such human waste.

Program Status: The Oakland County Youth Assistant Program is a tri-sponsorship citizen program involving three of Oakland County's institutions which have direct responsibilities for children and youth, the local municipalities, the local boards of education, and the juvenile court. The program originated in 1953 in Hazel Park, Michigan. However, the program did not expand on a county wide basis until around 1958. Presently there are 25 decentralized Youth Assistance Programs in Oakland County.

Funding Patterns: The program is organized on a dual financial arrangement. The county, through the juvenile division of the probate court, pays staff salaries, fringe benefits, etc. The local community (municipality and school district) provides funds for secretarial services, telephone, office space, program costs, and all expenses related to the operation of the local office. Funds for the local community program may be secured through the local municipalities, school districts, federal grants, or local fund-raising efforts.

There are 25 decentralized Youth Assistance Programs in Oakland County. The total cost for the entire program is about \$300,000 per year.

with the local communities paying about one-third.

Type of Clients: Referrals for Youth Assistance service come from schools, parents, police, juvenile court, churches, community services, businesses, and citizens. Service contact to clients referred is provided within a 48-hour period. Rights, self-determination, confidentiality, and the volunteer nature of the program are explained on the initial contact with the client. The usual social study is made to determine social factors causing the behavior. The social worker's service is short-term. Long-term treatment service is referred to the appropriate community agency. Continuous contacts are maintained with referring sources within the framework of confidentiality and the best interest of the family and child.

Type and Number of Volunteers: The members of the 25 Youth Assistance Committees make up the active core of our volunteers. Over 700 volunteers are active during any stage of the program. Volunteers are recruited around a cross-section of the local community, such as clergy, police, laity, and professionals. Emphasis is placed on the General Citizens' Committee to be representative of all interests, agencies, and professions.

General Description: The Youth Assistance Program is a citizen group of the local municipality and school district working cooperatively with the Oakland County Juvenile Court to develop more effective, coordinated preventative services for children and their families in the areas of anti-social behavior (pre-delinquency and neglect). It is volunteer in nature and has no legal or judicial function. The program offers a professional social work service to youth and families designed to help them resolve their individual problems and to prevent, if possible, any contact with the juvenile court.

Evaluation: Evaluation has been related primarily to the quantity aspects of our program, i.e. increases in referrals and reduction of official juvenile court referrals. The following statistical data is representative in part of continuing evaluation efforts: (1) over the past twelve

years 15,804 new pre-delinquent and pre-neglect clients have been referred to Youth Assistance for services. It can be documented that during any one-year period there is more than 85% adequate adjustment to society and clients are saved from involvement in the judicial system. This gives less than 15% of cases served by Youth Assistance going on to the official court. This figure is significant when records show about 40% recidivism on the Oakland County level and 70% on the state level. (2) Child population in Oakland County, according to the federal census of 1970, was 371,665. When we review the 1970 child population figure against the 1970 juvenile court figure of delinquent behavior, Oakland County is in a very favorable position in comparison with the national figures on delinquency rates.

Financially, it costs about \$60.00 to process and handle a client within the Youth Assistance Program. However, to handle and process a client within the county judicial system costs over \$350.00, and the estimated cost on the state level is over \$6,000.00.

Transposability Information: The program originated in middle-upper middle class community; present population figures reveal over one million population in Oakland County. Several other counties in Michigan have been assisted to develop similar programs. Requests are received from all parts of the United States for program material. Transposability seems easily related to any community willing to assume responsibilities for its youth. Several counties within Michigan have started similar Youth Assistance Programs based on the Oakland County plan.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

1. Delinquency Prevention in Focus
2. *Reader's Digest* (June, 1970 issue), *Children in Trouble*, Howard James
3. General Citizens' Committees and Their Operational Relationships, Oakland County Youth Assistance
4. Judicature—Youth Service Bureau—Local Community Action Program Prevents Delinquency, October 1969, Vol. 52, No. 3, page 117.

5. Sherwood Norman, *The Youth Service Bureau, A Key to Delinquency Prevention* (Paramus, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Paul Ramseth, Administrative Director
2750 Victoria Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55113
(612) 484-3317

Geographical Area Served (size): School population: 13,000; Roseville community 45,000.

Purpose: The purpose of the Youth Development Project is to identify causes of disaffection in the school community, to pilot strategies to reduce disaffection, and to disseminate successful strategies throughout the state of Minnesota. Delinquency is prevented and students are diverted from the juvenile justice system through the provision of meaningful social roles for students which negate the feelings of alienation, rejection, and powerlessness felt by students, parents, and school staff members.

Mode of Organization: The project is directed by the Minnesota State Department of Education in conjunction with the Roseville Schools. An advisory board of police, court, and community agencies is maintained.

Program Status: The program consists of ten projects which began to be implemented in the fall of 1971.

Funding Patterns: 43% of the funds are provided by YDDPA and the remainder by the Roseville Schools. Grants from other funding sources are sought to fund specific projects.

Type of Clients: Five hundred children with various learning and/or behavioral problems are presently being served. The program covers grades K-12. About 60% of the students have or will have contact with the juvenile justice system.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Forty adults serve as volunteer probation officers with more being recruited; 100 tutor-advocates, 50 advisors.

General Description: Students with special needs may have an adult advocate assigned to them. The curriculum is organized and the instruction is conducted in ways that promote student success, immediate feedback, and positive reinforcement. Students are moved gradually from a structured educational climate to an open, independent learning environment. As students demonstrate more responsibility, they gain more independence. Students meet daily in small groups with an adult advocate to solve personal difficulties in school and community. YDP is a program to turn on the turned off student.

Evaluation: A full-time evaluation staff constantly monitor the program. External evaluation is provided by OYD and the State Department of Education.

Transposability Information: The programs are designed to be implemented in any suburban school community district without additional funding.

Further Reading/Materials Available: Research data and program description are available upon request.

TRI-COUNTY COMMUNITY CENTER, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM

Bennie G. Thompson
323 Rose
Jackson, Mississippi 39203
(601) 352-0262

Geographical Area Served (size): Hinds, Madison, and Rankin Counties, Mississippi.

Purpose: To provide a community based program for the prevention of delinquency by providing the following services: counseling service center, crisis center, hotline, intake referral center, college service workers, recre-

ational and cultural activities. Also volunteer counseling.

Mode of Organization: A private, non-profit corporation operated by a board of directors and a youth advisory board.

Program Status: In operation since 1967 when the first program was established. Presently there are three offices in operation, one in each county served.

Funding Patterns: Approximately 40% federal funds, 25% from local individuals and fund raising efforts, 25% foundation and church groups, 10% from sponsoring organizations, 5% volunteer time. Total budget is approximately \$200,000.

Type of Clients: About 600 children per year age eight to eighteen, usually referred by court officials, social workers, school principals, counselors, and community leaders. About 95% of youth served are Black.

Type and Number of Volunteers: College students compose most of the volunteers used by the agency. During the past year over 200 students served as volunteer counselors. Other volunteers served as volunteer office help, public relations persons, fund raisers, and canvassers.

General Description: Tri-County Community Center provides counseling for delinquents as well as the following services: Halfway House, Counseling Center, Youth Employment Training Program, Day Care Center, tutorial, Crisis Center, Hotline, medical and legal assistance, Intake Referral Center, drug abuse education, program development, college service workers, recreational activities, and other services to be instituted as the need and resources occur.

Evaluation: Tri-County Community Center maintains a three level evaluation system:

1. Internal evaluation developed by project director
2. Annual board evaluation
3. Contract service with a local college professor

Transposability Information: The program originated in a rural setting with the population of about 200,000. This is the only program funded in the region.

YMCA/PALS PROGRAM

Daniel A. Logan, ACSW
404 East 10th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
(816) 842-8920

Geographical Area Served (size): Metropolitan county (Jackson), 750,000

Purpose: (1) To provide an intensive outreach style of support to adolescent youth who are identified as being in danger of (further) conflict with the law or community.

(2) To serve as a training and motivational center for a stable and steadily expanding work force of volunteers committed to serving this type of youth population.

Mode of Organization: A program of the Department of Urban Services of Greater Kansas City YMCA. Program has a volunteer board of directors and maintains close working relations with juvenile court which makes three-fourths of the referrals.

Program Status: In operation since 1969, when the program was begun at the request of the juvenile judge and the director of Court Services.

Funding Patterns: Current budgets in excess of \$40,000. This includes \$10,500 from United Fund, \$24,000 of state LEAA funds, and approximately \$6,000 from individuals and company contributions raised by the Board of Directors.

Type of Clients: About 150 referrals per year, age ten to seventeen, referred by court, school, private agencies, police, and welfare, in that order. Most youths have had at least one juvenile court contact including such matters as truancy, running away, petty larceny, and fami-

ly instability. Many of these youths are on consent (informal) probation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: More than 200 on an annual basis with 100 currently working on a weekly one-to-one basis. Most are middle class; about 25% are Black. Volunteers serve in administrated roles such as fund raising, recruitment, publicity, training, and coordinating the work of other volunteers.

General Description: New volunteers participate in a twelve-hour pre-service orientation and commit themselves to weekly contact with a referred youth for at least six months. Volunteers and youths are individually matched after interviews with each. The volunteer usually contacts the youth at his home, and their contacts are generally of an informal nature. Group activities such as camping, cultural, social, and educational programs are planned on a regular basis. Volunteers meet in small groups each month for inservice training and supervision.

Evaluation: Last year twenty persons completed the National Information Center on Volunteerism's "Scorecard". The mean score was 67.1 with the strongest sections being those dealing with recruitment, screening, orientation, and assignment processes of volunteers. (*Ed. note:* This is distinctly above the national average in volunteer program administration effectiveness, which is about 40-45.) Another study of police records indicates that 70% of the youth have no further police contact following assignment with a volunteer. No formal evaluation study has yet been made.

Transposability Information: The program serves principally the central city area in a city of 500,000 in a county of 750,000. The program is similar to Partners of Denver. (*Ed. note:* See also Y-Pals of Lincoln, Nebraska abstract immediately following.)

Further Reading/Materials Available:

1. "Community-Based Treatment for Juveniles Using Volunteers"
2. Recruitment brochure
3. Training outline (available upon request)
4. Training notebook (available upon request)

5. Annual Report (available upon request)
6. *Partnership* (monthly publication mailed to the National Information Center on Volunteerism, Boulder, Colorado)

Y-PALS

Judy Seward
139 North 11th
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
(402) 432-1251

Geographical Area Served (size): Lancaster County and Lincoln (approximately 150,000 to 175,000).

Purpose: Y-Pals is a juvenile delinquency prevention-diversion program utilizing volunteers who are Big-Brothers and Big-Sisters to problem prone youth.

Mode of Organization: Y-Pals is one program of the Youth Service System (YSS) of Lincoln. The Youth Service System is a branch of the YMCA.

Program Status: Y-Pals has been operating since November, 1970.

Funding Patterns: Y-Pals is funded through the Nebraska State Crime Commission by LEAA. The program is funded on a yearly basis on a 75%-25% grant. The YMCA provides for 25% of the funding through in-kind and cash services. Y-Pals also receives unsolicited monies from Lincoln Community Services.

Type of Clients: The youth in Y-Pals are ages six to fourteen and are identified by the referring agency (schools, juvenile court, police, county welfare, etc.) as being deprived—socially, culturally, economically. Many youth are from broken and disadvantaged homes, other have trouble relating to peers.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Volunteers are sixteen or older. The majority are college age students. Y-Pals is a recognized student activity at the University of Nebraska. Seven students manage the campus office and coordinate with the main Y-Pals office.

The Youth Service System Board of Management, composed of 24 laymen, is the main advisory board for Y-Pals. Other volunteers include school teachers and counselors who agree to meet regularly with the volunteers who have youth who attend the teacher's school.

General Description: Y-Pals' volunteers and youth meet weekly for an hour or more. The main objective for Y-Pals is that a close and trusting friendship develops between the youth and the volunteer. The volunteer sets an example of accepted behavior for the youth showing him/her an alternative way of behaving. Occasionally Y-Pal group functions are arranged such as swimming parties, etc.

Evaluation: An evaluation was made in August, 1971 by a graduate student, University of Nebraska. Y-Pals as well as the YSS will undergo an evaluation in September and October, 1972. Dr. Delbert Elliot of Boulder, Colorado will be doing the evaluation.

Transposability Information: Y-Pals, being a one-one program, could be implemented in almost any size of community. (*Ed note:* See preceding abstract on Y-Pals of Kansas City, Missouri.)

Further Reading/Materials Available: Y-Pals newsletter

YMCA OF RENO: AMIGOS, TALK, Y-RIDERS, AND ALTERNATIVES PROGRAMS

Dave Austin
1300 Foster Drive
Reno, Nevada 89502
(702) 329-1311

Geographical Area Served (size): Washoe County, population 120,000

Purpose: To provide youth in need with "constructive companionship". To use volunteers as crisis intervention contacts. To provide "in-

community" delinquency prevention programs.

Mode of Organization: Program efforts of YMCA of Reno, a private, non-profit organization. Referrals from school district, police, juvenile probation, parents, and youth themselves.

Program Status: Presently all programs in operation. Limited funds. Growing demand for services.

Funding Patterns: Local support: YMCA resources, United Way, donations.

Type of Clients: Pre-delinquents and delinquents; also youth in crises.

Type and Number of Volunteers: 140 volunteers, ages fifteen to forty, all backgrounds.

General Description: Amigos and Y-Riders: constructive activities, development of strong trust relationships, involvement of youth in all Y activities. Talk is a youth crisis line, 24 hours a day.

Evaluation: Good

Transposability Information: Examples of similar programs throughout United States.

YOUTH SERVICES OF TULSA, INC.

J. Richard Galusha
222 East 5th
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103
(918) 582-0061

Geographical Area Served (size): Tulsa Metropolitan Area, 500,000.

Purpose: Delinquency prevention. Youth Services of Tulsa (YST) seeks to divert young people from the juvenile justice system through a one-to-one volunteer program working with youth in trouble. YST seeks to coordinate community services on behalf of troubled youth.

Mode of Organization: Private, non-profit organization operated by a citizen board of directors. A management committee from the Tulsa Metropolitan Ministry cares for its daily operation.

Program Status: Created in 1969, through the Tulsa Metropolitan Ministry; is now privately incorporated and has a staff of six plus interns.

Funding Patterns: Now in third year 75% grant (41,250) from Oklahoma Crime Commission for LEAA funds. Additional funds (\$15,000) are from the State Welfare Department and \$14,750 local sources. Total budget is \$71,000.

Type of Clients: About 500 youth between the ages of seven and nineteen are each year referred from the juvenile court, public schools, state welfare, other agencies, parents, and youth themselves. Most frequent problems are related to home and school.

Type and Number of Volunteers: About 235 serving through the course of one year (October, 1971 through September, 1972). There are currently 170 active volunteers. Average age is 32. (Oldest 65, youngest 16.) Volunteer counselors are requested to spend a minimum of three hours per week on their assignment. In addition to these volunteer counselors there are 25 board members and management committee members.

General Description: YST is a delinquency prevention program created to deter young people from the juvenile justice system. Adult volunteers are trained and screened to work in a one-to-one relationship with young people for the purpose of assisting youth in preventing minor behavioral problems from reaching more serious proportions and leading to delinquency. The unique person to person approach as well as the use of existing community resources makes this possible.

Evaluation: There have been two formal evaluations by the University of Tulsa, which confirm the thesis that concerned adults can and do make a difference in the lives of children of the community. The evaluation further show that Youth Services of Tulsa is performing in the

capacity of a Youth Service Bureau and should move more in this direction.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

1. Volunteer monthly newsletter (above address)
2. Sherwood Norman, *The Qh Service Bureau, A Key to Delinquency Prevention* (Paramus, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

CHRISTIAN YOUTH SERVICES, INC. (TEEN HAVEN)

Reverend William A. Drury, Director
1811 Willow Street Pike
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17602
(717) 299-2061

Purpose: To reach with the Christian message, the hard core, underprivileged, deprived, and depressed inner city young person and to provide for that individual the purpose, guidance, direction, and motivation that is so desperately needed.

Mode of Organization: Religious, non-profit corporation. Close working relationship with all other youth agencies, juvenile courts, juvenile holding institutions and penal system.

Program Status: Founded 1964 by the Reverend William A. Drury. There are now five centers in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania with other centers in Washington, D.C., Buffalo, New York, and more recently in the Seventh Ward of Lancaster, Pennsylvania; there is also a year round camp and farm in southern York County.

Funding Patterns: Teen Haven, Christian Youth Services, Inc. does not receive city, state, or federal funds. The majority of contributions come from individuals, churches, and service clubs who are concerned about inner city youth. We have received some support from industry and foundations. Total budget for 1971: \$250,000.

Type of Clients: We serve thousands of young people each year—teens and pre-teens alike, both male and female. Many of the young people that we serve in Philadelphia would be involved in the organized teenage gang problem that permeates Philadelphia. All would come from a slum, ghetto situation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: We have many, many volunteers who help in different capacities serving as counselors, tutoring, manual labor, and some of which conduct Bible studies.

General Description: All Teen Haven centers are staffed by competent, resident full-time staff personnel who work with young people in the community on a round-the-clock basis if need be. Teen Haven is a diversified, multi-purpose ministry. Some of the young people live within the facilities. Our ministry is one of love and discipline, both of which inner city young people, who have been brought up in hopelessness and despair, have been deprived of.

Evaluation: We are greatly encouraged with the results that we have seen in countless numbers of changed lives over the last eight years. Some of these young people are now in schools of higher learning, and we are hoping that the day will soon come when they will return to Teen Haven to invest their lives in the lives of others who are trapped in the "asphalt jungle".

Transposability Information: References: Senator Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania; Congressman Jack Kemp, Hamburg, Buffalo, New York; Congressman John Buchanan, Birmingham, Alabama; Police Commissioner Joseph O'Neill, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Captain Yancy Garner, Police Force, Capitol Building, U.S. Capitol.

Further Reading/Material Available: Program brochures available.

YOUTH SERVICES

Kathleen Pell, Director
16th Judicial District Court
Pennington County Court House
Rapid City, South Dakota 57701
(605) 348-2330 or 342-2980

Geographical Area Served (size): Pennington County; planned expansion to ten county (three courts) area of Black Hills region of western South Dakota.

Purpose: To divert "status crime" offenders from the court process by providing family casework services, testing, tutoring, and recreational activities.

Mode of Organization: Funding by HEW (OYD) with local match from court and other social service agencies; direction by staff member of court, one assistant, twelve VISTA people.

Program Status: Began October 10, 1972. Seventy referrals handled to date. Also beginning work to set up college volunteer bureau, tutoring volunteers, youth employment bureau (to be operated by youth themselves).

Funding Patterns: See "Mode of Organization" above.

Type of Clients: Youthful "status offenders" (truant, runaway, out-of-control).

Type and Number of Volunteers: Currently twelve VISTA volunteers. Community volunteers now being recruited.

General Description: See "Purpose" above.

Evaluation: *Ed. note:* Not available at this time.

STUDENT VOLUNTEER SERVICES

Jerry Larson
Box 802, Augustana College
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57102
(605) 336-5321

Geographical Area Served (size): Sioux Falls S.M.S.A. (70,000)

Purpose: Student Volunteer Services (SVS) is an organization which coordinates the activities of a number of volunteer projects. Many of these projects can be classified as prevention-diversion. For example, we presently staff two teen centers in areas where delinquency rates have been high, and we are starting a third. We provide tutoring services to public school students who are having difficulty "making it" in the public school program, etc.

Mode of Organization: A student directed organization attached to Augustana College. Two paid student project assistants coordinate the various programs.

Program Status: Growing; two years old; new programs are being added; the program has recently been extended to Sioux Falls College; 300-plus volunteers are in the field.

Funding Patterns: The Sociology Department at Augustana College has allotted one "work-study" position to be used for SVS. This year we received a \$5,700 Title I grant for staff and materials and a convention on student volunteerism.

Type of Clients: Ten to eighty years of age—all types; each of our programs has a target client population, e.g. teen centers for teenagers (for prevention), etc.

Type and Number of Volunteers: College undergraduates—300-plus.

General Description: Again the many programs are so varied that a general description is impossible.

Evaluation: Continual evaluation: inservice evaluation weekly; biweekly evaluation of all program coordinators; quarterly evaluation for granting agency.

YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU

Don Larick, Director
P.O. Box 1728
3202 Avenue F
Bay City, Texas 77414
(713) 245-6311

Geographical Area Served (size): Matagorda County, Texas, about 28,000.

Purpose: To meet the young people of Matagorda County, Texas at the point of demonstrated need by:

1. Coordinating all existing youth resources for Matagorda County.
2. Finding or creating necessary resources for the local rehabilitation of those who have demonstrated consistent socially unacceptable behavior patterns.
3. Offering short-term counseling for dropins.
4. Supplying short-term counseling services for each referral and his parents.
5. Providing psycho-educational evaluation in cooperation with school system.
6. Screening, training, and assigning volunteer workers as follows:
 - a. Father image
 - b. Mother image
 - c. High school buddy
 - d. Tutoring friend
7. Coordinate court volunteers for those referred from juvenile probation.
8. Coordinating referral transportation for necessary medical assistance.
9. Providing opportunities for interest field trips.

Mode of Organization: A public, non-profit organization operated by a citizen board of directors which represents a cross-section of the community. Close working relations with the public school system, juvenile probation, and law enforcement officers.

Program Status: In operation since August 1, 1971.

Funding Patterns: Project director owns land and building and has leased same to YSB. Community contributions have paid for all furniture and equipment (\$5,000.00), provided two vehicles plus monthly gasoline expenses and have sustained all monthly operating expenses (\$400.00 per month) from the beginning. Texas Criminal Justice Council has provided three years seed money (\$54,000 total) to pay partial salaries of director, two caseworkers, and one secretary-bookkeeper. Anticipate living endowment trust fund to sustain project indefinitely and provide seed money and/or assistance money for other youth service projects in Matagorda County.

Type of Clients: About 160 referrals per year, ages six to eighteen, usually referred by schools, juvenile probation, or parents. Sometimes there is self-referral. Most frequent background is incorrigibility, truancy, runaway. Only about 15% of those referred have had direct contact with juvenile probation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Concerned citizens and professional people who are serving in the following capacities:

5 doctors
3 lawyers
3 dentists
2 ophthalmologists
6 secretarial volunteers
1 bookkeeper
35 one-to-one
55

General Description: Youth Services Bureau is a delinquency prevention project which diverts young people from the criminal justice system

by meeting them at the point of demonstrated needs with all available resources. Referrals are sheltered in a context of understanding and genuine concern and are given numerous opportunities to examine and/or alter their own priorities.

Evaluation: There is a constant internal evaluation of services rendered. Necessary adjustments are made if rendered services do not have a quality impact on the referral's life style. A yearly external evaluation is made by the Texas Criminal Justice Council.

Transposability Information: Youth Services Bureau emerged as a concept from Task Force Report: *Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (1967)*. Variations of it exist in almost every state. There are nine in Texas.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

Task Force Report: *Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (1967)*

Sherwood Norman, *The Youth Service Bureau, A Key to Delinquency Prevention* (Paramus, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972).

LOWER VALLEY YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

Jack Nester, Executive Director
1920-D North 10th
McAllen, Texas 78501
(512) 686-5421

Geographical Area Served (size): Counties of Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy. Population of 355,000.

Purpose: Under the auspices of the Youth Service Bureau the "Volunteers for Youth" has two distinct areas of service: (1) to provide volunteers for varied assignments within the Youth Service Bureau, and (2) to provide volunteers for varied assignments with the Juvenile Probation Department of the three counties.

Mode of Organization: A public, non-profit organization governed by a board of directors.

Program Status: Began services January 1, 1972 with a three year grant through the Council of Governments from the Texas Criminal Justice Council (LEAA). One central office providing a core of community consultants for research, program development, statistical data, records keeping, and business office. Six outreach branch offices for direct case services and diversionary programs.

Funding Patterns: First year is 75% cash budget from Criminal Justice Council at \$78,329 and 25% local contributions with \$5,000 to be cash and \$20,000 in-kind. Second year is 75% Criminal Justice Council cash budget with total funds available not yet known; local participation 25% with about \$10,000 to be in case. Third year is 50% Criminal Justice Council match primarily on cash basis.

Type of Clients: There were 210 youth referred the first nine months of the program (January 1 to September 30, 1972), age eight to eighteen. Referrals from juvenile probation, local police, schools, and either self or parents. Income and ethnic background seem proportionate to the general population. Type of referral is glue and paint sniffing, liquor violations, running away, ungovernable, disorderly conduct, loitering, truancy, parent-child conflict. Most are not on probation.

Type and Number of Volunteers: In our nine months of operation we have had about sixty volunteers:

- 45 - serving in a one-to-one relationship with youth who are on probation to the juvenile courts or youth served by YSB on a pre-delinquent basis
- 10 - serving on the Volunteers Citizens Committee with task of recruiting volunteers, screening, training, assignments, and continued training
- 5 - serving as clerical aides

There is a broad spectrum in citizen representation: university students, high school students, middle class Anglo, Mexican-American of all strata; a number of new programs being planned for fund raising, six branch

offices, Helpline and youth center will greatly increase volunteer participation.

General Description: The Lower Valley Youth Service Bureau is an operating agency that prevents delinquency through youth development by community involvement in Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy Counties.

The staff of the Lower Valley Youth Service Bureau has created and implemented a non-court, non-coercive agency responsible for providing services to youths so styled as to prevent entry, or reentry, into the criminal justice system. The Lower Valley Youth Service Bureau acts as a central counseling/referral/resource for courts, schools, and other community agencies working with youths between the ages of eight and 21, where young people with behavioral problems can be referred for necessary services.

The Bureau provides diversionary counseling for child and family by short-term counseling; volunteer services by volunteer assignments; coordination of existing services by agency and community involvement; consultant services by personal consultation with individuals and agencies; research into causes of delinquency in the region by demographic data gathering; community awareness by publicity and presentations; and referral services by coordination with agencies and individuals.

Evaluation: The Youth Service Bureau has been in operation since January 1, 1972, and there will be a comprehensive evaluation by an outside professional organization at the end of the year. Results of the evaluation will be made available upon request. In addition the Bureau will develop an internal annual report.

Transposability Information: This program is in a geographical area that borders Mexico and has a population of approximately 85% Mexican American. It is highly productive agricultural area with at least 25 distinct communities, none in excess of 65,000 population. Programs implemented in this area could be transposed to other areas of Texas, the Southwest, and California.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

Raymond T. Nimmer, *Two Million Unnecessary Arrests* (Chicago, American Bar Foundation, 1971).

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Using Volunteers in Court Settings* (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., (SRS) 73-26008).

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Volunteer Programs in Courts* (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., (SRS) 73-26007).

SHAKER MOUNTAIN SCHOOL, INC.

Jerome A. Mintz
545 South Prospect Street
Burlington, Vermont 05401
(802) 862-5970 or 453-3080

Geographical Area Served (size): Northern Vermont

Purpose: An alternative school available to any student, regardless of income, between the ages of seven and seventeen.

Mode of Organization: Private, non-profit corporation operated by a board of trustees consisting of five adults and five students. Decisions within the school are made by a democratic meeting.

Program Status: School is five years old, with eleven staff and 32 students.

Funding Patterns: Fund raising projects, private donations, and tuition based upon ability to pay, plus the school lunch program.

Type of Clients: Thirty-two full time students, mostly low income, ages seven to seventeen, plus hundreds who attend summer camp and part-time programs.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Staff, mostly with degrees, from all over the country. They

are full-time, working for room, board, expenses. Others contribute materials and supplies, part-time work as volunteers. Ed. note: Staff work full-time for an average salary of \$10 per week, and thus may be considered principally volunteers.

General Description: Shaker Mountain is a community based alternative school, serving its community in many ways. It has a school building in Burlington, Vermont, a farm in Starksboro where some staff and students live, and where a camp is operated in the summer.

Evaluation: The school has been remarkably successful in preventing or changing delinquent behaviors, as well as reinteresting other students in learning. One vocabulary-reading test (Peabody) showed an average improvement three times the national rate. All students returning to public school have received full credit, and none has subsequently failed a grade.

Transposability Information: We have helped others start similar schools, suited to their environments, the most recent being the Indian Way School on the Mohawk Reservation at Akwesasne.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

Saturday Review, Cover story, April 18, 1969
Burlington Free Press
Vermont Freeman

RAFTERS

Ms. Barbara Hanson
YWCA
West 829 Broadway
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 328-0571

Geographical Area Served (size): 185,000 population of Spokane

Purpose: Program is working primarily toward reducing recidivism in Spokane County among delinquent youth fourteen to eighteen years old. Also working to reduce the frequency of

delinquent behavior among pre-delinquent youth in order to prevent them from entering the correctional system.

Mode of Organization: A program within the YWCA. Responsible to YWCA Board of Directors and Y's Program Planning Committee. Have a community based committee, the Rafters Evaluative Advisory Committee.

Program Status: We are at the end of the second year of operation. Started as a drop-in center. Focus changed slowly as needs became apparent.

Funding Patterns: Funded by Law and Justice (LEAA), end of second year now. Have had additional summer staff made possible by local private foundation. Other local funds made building additional rooms possible.

Type of Clients: Referrals from juvenile court, juvenile parole services, social and health services, etc. Also kids who drop in. Ages fourteen to eighteen.

Type and Number of Volunteers: Six college volunteers operate program on weekends. Also there are volunteers during the week for groups, athletic programs, etc.

General Description: Program is designed to be a positive experience for delinquent, pre-delinquent, and troubled youth. Youth-oriented agencies are encouraged to refer youth fourteen to eighteen years of age to overall program and/or specific activities. Program includes recreational activities, and both individual counseling and group experience. Everything is designed to promote positive peer group relations.

Evaluations: Continual evaluation necessary. Progress reports due for every three month period. Spokane Resource Advocates analyzed the program and helped us with statistics for next year's proposal.

Transposability Information: Program started out of a YWCA Y-Teen program in a very conservative community. Saw the need of working in greater depth with kids. They developed the

program with a youth board giving direction and focus.

KEEP A CHILD IN SCHOOL, INC.

Mrs. Jon M. Gaston
1216 Crown Drive
South Charlestown, West Virginia 25309
(304) 768-7031

Geographical Area Served (size): County of about 250,000

Purpose: To provide volunteer sponsors on a one-to-one basis for students identified by public school personnel as needing such a service. Sponsors serve as friends and advocates for students, and try to provide understanding, encouragement, motivation, and wider experiences. An effort is made to provide experiences that will help a child remain in school and find a satisfying vocation.

Mode of Organization: A private, non-profit corporation with a citizen board of directors, all of whom are sponsors. Works closely with school system (Kanawha County Board of Education). School system social workers refer students to program.

Program Status: Program began in August, 1966. There are now about 150 sponsors for as many students, grades one through twelve.

Funding Patterns: Mainly small contributions from area individuals and organizations. Annual expenditures of \$2,000 to \$3,000 for school-related expenses of sponsored students. Sponsors are reimbursed for school-related expenses incurred for students.

Type of Clients: Students referred to the program are often, but not always, from low income families. All are considered potential

drop-outs because of truancy, hostility, or expressions of discouragement or depression.

Type and Number of Volunteers: About 150 adults who serve as individual sponsors for the same number of children. About thirty of these sponsors, and a few non-sponsors, serve on committees to recruit sponsors, coordinate program with individual schools, and follow up on student-sponsor relationships. Professionals (psychologist and social worker) are available as volunteer consultants for sponsors who wish to discuss special problems.

General Description: Examples of student-sponsor activities include taking child to local events (craft fair, movie, concert, ball game), including child in family outings (picnic, swimming, dairy bar, hike), exposing child to people at work in various jobs, and, if student is older, visiting local college, vocational school, business school, etc.

Evaluation: No large-scale formal evaluation has been made. A study of the first 100 sponsored students indicated that the majority finished school, some went on to school, and several who dropped out were helped by sponsors to training and employment.

Transposability Information: The program originated in Charleston; numerous inquiries have been received from all over the country, and it is assumed there are numerous similar programs.

Further Reading/Materials Available:

1. *Keep a Child in School Handbook* (available from above address)
2. Intercom, bi-monthly newsletter (available from above address)
3. *National Observer*, October 16, 1971
4. *Parade* magazine, March 21, 1971
5. "Volunteers Help Youth" U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Bulletin No. (SRS) 72-26002.

Chapter 4

VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS IN PREVENTION AND DIVERSION: A FIRST DIRECTORY

Below is presented a first national directory of volunteer programs in prevention and diversion. They constitute the responses of our definition and survey process as described in Chapter 2. We have also added the addresses of several programs in the states of California and Wisconsin. These programs have come highly recommended to us from knowledgeable people in those areas.

Those programs for which abstracts were reported in Chapter 3 are asterisked. Often the reasons for not describing a program more fully there were the happenstances of duplication of pro-

gram type or of geographical region, the lack of direct knowledge of the program authors, or being outside the survey process, all of which were conditioned by lack of space. In other words all the programs listed below merit your further consideration.

Listings are alphabetical by state and alphabetical by community within each state.

It is to be agreed that the next directory of this type will be far larger, not only because more programs will have been identified, but also because more good programs will have begun.

ALABAMA

- * VOLUNTEER FRIENDS
L. Michael Winship
Calhoun County Court
Anniston, Alabama 36201
(205) 236-3418

VOLUNTEERS IN PROBATION

Ann Muscari
Montgomery County Youth Facility
Box 9242
Montgomery, Alabama 36108
(205) 262-3881

ARKANSAS

- scan volunteer service, inc.
Sharon Pallone
Fullerton Hall: Arkansas State Hospital
4313 West Markham
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 666-0181, Ext. 246
- * OPERATIONAL INTERCEPT
Juliette Gosnell
2301 West Main
Russellville Arkansas 72801
(501) 967-4644

CALIFORNIA

- * LOS COMPADRES PROGRAM
Mike Lindsay
3626 East 5th
East Los Angeles, California 90063
(213) 269-3164
- COMMUNITY YOUTH RESPONSIBILITY PROGRAM
Robert B. Evans
2220 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, California 94303
(415) 369-1441, Ext. 4177
- VOICE, INC.
Jerry Collins
Box 969
Fairfield, California 94533
(707) 422-2010
- SOCIAL ADVOCATES FOR YOUTH
Rick De Francisco
5973 Encina Road

Goleta, California 93017
(805) 967-2343

BASSET YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU
Howard Jackson
915 North Orange Avenue
La Puente, California 91745
(213) 330-7428

BIG BROTHER DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROJECT
Milton L. Goldberg
590 North Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90004
(213) 663-8484

- * FIREMAN COUNSELOR PROGRAM
Kenneth R. Long
217 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 485-6005

LOS BANOS EARLY INTERVENTION PROJECT
Richard McCutchan
665 Pacheco Boulevard
Los Banos, California 93635
(209) 826-0500

THE BUDGE - COMMUNITY YOUTH CRISIS AND DRUG COUNSELING
John M. Gallagher
Box 2068
Merced, California 95340
(209) 723-7710

- * YOUTH COMMUNITY RESOURCE PROJECT
James R. Nunes
1900 Pleasant Hill Road
Pleasant Hill, California 94523
(415) 933-7770, Ext. 39

RICHMOND YOUTH SERVICES PROGRAM
Rudolph N. Webbe
320 13th Street
Richmond, California 94801
(415) 235-0758

COMPREHENSIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM
Richard Tillson
2401 American River Drive
Sacramento, California 95825
(916) 322-2190

SOCIAL ADVOCATES FOR YOUTH

Richard A. Scherer
2187 Ulric, Suite C
San Diego, California 92111
(714) 277-4463

A COMMUNITY BASED ALTERNATIVE TO PROBATION AND PAROLE, AND A COMMUNITY BASED DIVERSION PROJECT FOR PRE-DELINQUENT GIRLS

Jack Harrington
66 Third Street
San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 398-7737

NEW HORIZONS

Sheryl Barnard
241 North San Pedro Road
San Rafael, California 94903
(415) 472-1301

VISTA - VOLUNTEERS INFLUENCING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Betty Delaney
Box 10260
Santa Ana, California 92711
(714) 993-0260

COLORADO

ARVADA YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU

Ken Montag
7404 Grant Place
Arvada, Colorado 80002
(303) 423-2966

ATTENTION HOMES, INC.

Susan Boulding
Box 907
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(303) 447-1206

BOULDER YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

Melba Shepard
Box 791
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(303) 442-2020, Ext. 252

HEADWATERS: SOCIAL ADVOCATES FOR YOUTH

Tod Bacigalupi, III
521 North Wahsatch
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903
(303) 634-5531

PARTNERS, INC.

Bob Moffitt
326 West 12th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204
(303) 893-1400

JUVENILE AND YOUTH SERVICES

Bart Givens
124 West Main Street
Trinidad, Colorado 81082
(303) 846-9231

CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES

Fred Balet
2 King Court
East Hartford, Connecticut 06118
(203) 568-0181

FLORIDA

FLORIDA OCEAN SCIENCES INSTITUTE

Robert A. Rosof
1605 SE Third Court
Deerfield Beach, Florida 33441
(305) 399-8445

LISTENER'S PROGRAM

David C. Mills
Division of Youth Services
313 SE 17th Street, Room 302
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(305) 523-6468

or

Ruth C. Wedden
1351 NW 12th Street, Room 429
Miami, Florida 33126
(305) 371-5386 (office)
(305) 261-8456 (home)

YOUTH PROGRAM, INC.

Eugene Miniotta
#1 North Orange Building, Suite 412
Orlando, Florida 32801
(305) 423-8541

GROUP HOME VOLUNTEER

Corinne Coryell
4809 North Armenia
Tampa, Florida 33603
(813) 872-8551

GEORGIA

AUXILIARY PROBATION PROGRAM

Dwayne M. Spitzer
4415 Memorial Drive
Decatur, Georgia 30030
(404) 284-4411

HAWAII

YMCA YOUTH OUTREACH PROJECT

Bill Luttrell
1441 Pali Highway
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

INDIANA

CRIME CONTROL FUND: VOLUNTEERS IN PROBATION AND EXPANDED REHABILITATION SERVICES

Orley K. Holzwarth
315 South 2nd Street
Elkhart, Indiana 46514
(219) 294-1688

ELKHART YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU, INC.

Keith Harder
501 South 4th Street
Elkhart, Indiana 46514
(219) 294-3549

TIPPECANOE COUNTY YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU, INC.

842 Main Street
Lafayette, Indiana 97901
(317) 742-8539

VOLUNTEER PROBATION OFFICER AIDE PROGRAM

Delight TePaske
Juvenile Probation Office
Court House, Lafayette Street Entrance
Waterloo, Iowa 50703
(319) 291-2506

KANSAS

JUNIOR LEAGUE PROGRAMS

Jackie Gossard
148 North Fountain
Wichita, Kansas 67208
(316) 682-7473

WICHITA YOUTH HOME

Don Slawson
330 North Belmont
Wichita, Kansas 67208

MARYLAND

COLLEGE PARK YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

Linda Ford
4500 Knox Road
College Park, Maryland 20740
(301) 474-1210

CAROLINE COUNTY YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU

Ed Fisher
Box 207, Court House
Denton, Maryland 21629
(301) 479-2230

MASSACHUSETTS

WORCESTER YOUTH RESOURCES BUREAU

Geraldine M. Smith
9 Walnut Street
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608
(617) 753-1471

MICHIGAN

COMPANION COUNSELING PROGRAM

Thomas M. Kelley
1025 East Forest Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48208
(313) 224-1786

YOUTH SERVICES CENTER OF EAST DETROIT

Edgar Krattli
16600 Stephens
East Detroit, Michigan 48021
(313) 779-4490

BIG BROTHERS OF GREATER FLINT

Robert Flanders
923 East Kearsley Street
Flint, Michigan 48502
(313) 238-1631, Ext. 391

OAKLAND COUNTY YOUTH ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Edgar W. Flood

1200 North Telegraph
Pontiac, Michigan 48053
(313) 338-4751, Ext. 276

MINNESOTA

GIVE AND TAKE

David Balley
Youth Service Bureau
17 Excelsior Boulevard
Hopkins, Minnesota 55343
(612) 920-2535

FRONTIER FARM GROUP HOME

James L. Cherry
2301 Oliver Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411
(612) 522-4417

MOUNDS VIEW YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

Ric Rosow
803 5th Avenue NW
New Brighton, Minnesota 55112
(612) 633-1533

URBAN YOUTH REFERRAL CENTER

Sarah Swyningan
1215 Arcade
St. Paul, Minnesota 55106
(612) 772-3407

* YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Paul Ramseth
2750 Victoria Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55113
(612) 484-3317

WHITE BEAR LAKE YOUTH RESOURCE BUREAU

Jon M. Penton
615 4th Street
White Bear Lake, Minnesota 55110
(612) 429-7733

MISSISSIPPI

* TRI-COUNTY COMMUNITY CENTER: JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAM

Bennie G. Thompson
323 Rose
Jackson, Mississippi 39203
(601) 352-0262

MISSOURI

* YMCA/PALS PROGRAM

Daniel L. Logan
404 East 10th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
(816) 842-8920

MONTANA

BIG BROTHERS & SISTERS OF LEWISTON, AND MINI GROUP HOME

LeRoy McKinnon
Fergus County Court House
Lewiston, Montana 59457
(406) 538-8028

NEBRASKA

* Y-PALS

Judy Seward
139 North 11th
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
(402) 432-1251 or 432-1111

YMCA YOUTH SERVICE SYSTEM

Jim Arnot
139 North 11th
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
(402) 432-1251 or 432-1111

OMAHA AWARENESS & ACTION, INC.

Gordon Helberg
4412 Capitol
Omaha, Nebraska 68131
(402) 558-5013

NEVADA

FOCUS

Steve Nicholas
1916 Goldring Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89105
(702) 384-2914

* RENO YMCA: AMIGOS, TALK, Y- RIDERS AND ALTERNATIVES

Dave Austin
1300 Foster Drive
Reno, Nevada 89502
(702) 329-1311

NEW JERSEY

NEW JERSEY GUIDANCE COUNCILS

Tess Lewis
363 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-3933

NEW MEXICO

VOLUNTEER PROBATION OFFICER PROGRAM

Diane Wellborn
Bernalillo County Court House,
Room 230
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87101
(505) 842-3017

NEW YORK

ERIE COUNTY YOUTH BOARD

Robert V. Gorman
Old County Hall
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 846-7797

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH DIVERSION PROGRAM

Vera Institute of Justice
30 East 39th Street
New York City, New York 10016

YOUTHFUL COUNSELING PROGRAM

James C. Pratt
4614 Dewey Avenue
Rochester, New York 14612
(315) 621-8370

LITERACY VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA, INC.

Joseph A. Gray
222 West Onondaga Street
Syracuse, New York 13202
(315) 478-2113

NORTH CAROLINA

JANUS HOUSE, INC.

Peter L. Steinke
Box 2287
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
(919) 929-4337

YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU OF WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

John M. Freas
110 North Hawthorne Road
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27104
(919) 725-2956

NORTH DAKOTA

WARD COUNTY VOLUNTEER PROBATION OFFICER PROGRAM

William H. Biore
Box 340
Minot, North Dakota 58701
(701) 839-5014

OKLAHOMA

* YOUTH SERVICES OF TULSA, INC.

J. Richard Galusha
222 East 5th
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103
(918) 582-0061

PENNSYLVANIA

* CHRISTIAN YOUTH SERVICES, INC.

(TEEN HAVEN)
William A. Drury
1811 Willow Street Pike
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17602
(717) 299-2061

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

Michael L. Johnston
520 North Rock
Shamokin, Pennsylvania 17872
(717) 644-0851

SOUTH CAROLINA

PRE-TRIAL INTERVENTION PROJECT

Camille L. Amaker
1311 Marion Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 253-5301

SOUTH DAKOTA

* YOUTH SERVICES

Kathleen Peil
Pennington County Court House

Rapid City, South Dakota 57701
(605) 348-2330

* STUDENT VOLUNTEER SERVICES
Jerry Larson
Box 802, Augustana College
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57102
(605) 336-5321

TEXAS

* YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU
Don Larick
Box 1728
3203 Avenue F
Bay City, Texas 77414
(713) 245-6311

KEY-LINK
Charles Schroeder
4711 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75235
(214) 631-4010

YOUTH SERVICES BUREAU
Ken Flynn
118 South Campbell
El Paso, Texas 79901
(915) 543-2968

YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU OF
TARRANT COUNTY, INC.
Donald H. Weiss
1622 Rogers Road
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(817) 336-8667

CENTRAL TEXAS YOUTH SERVICE
BUREAU
Alice Pinson
502 Sutton
Killeen, Texas 76541
(817) 526-4040

* LOWER VALLEY YOUTH SERVICE
BUREAU
Jack Nester
1920-D North 10th
McAllen, Texas 78501
(512) 686-5421

VERMONT

* SHAKER MOUNTAIN SCHOOL, INC.
Jerome A. Mintz
545 South Prospect Street
Burlington, Vermont 05401
(802) 862-5970

WASHINGTON COUNTY PRE-DELINQUENT
DIVERSION PROGRAM
Robert E. Voorhees, Jr.
Department of Corrections
State Office Building
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

WASHINGTON

* RAFTERS
Barbara Hanson
YWCA
West 829 Broadway
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 328-0571

WEST VIRGINIA

* KEEP A CHILD IN SCHOOL, INC.
J. M. Gaston
1216 Crown Drive
South Charleston, West Virginia
25309
(304) 768-7031

WISCONSIN

CROSSROADS
Bruce Cook
5016 West Burleigh
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53125

INDEPENDENT LEARNING CENTER
Arm Stewart
1437 West Lincoln Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53215

MIDTOWN YOUTH SERVICES
Lee Beitzel
3216 North 37th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53215

Chapter 5

CURRENT TRENDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Current Trends

The attempt to ascertain current trends is as difficult as it is important. It is difficult because this is an exploratory study of a relatively new era in which trends are not yet clear. It is important for the same reasons.

Our basic data on current trends is a tabulation of major categories of interest in the responses of all 88 programs who answered our questions and whose programs fit within our definition of "volunteer programs in prevention or diversion" (Chapter 2).

Comment and interpretation beyond that is clearly marked as such. It derives largely from study of each of the 88 returned abstracts, usually in terms of responses which could not easily be categorized. It derives further from the Center's comparative knowledge of volunteer programs within the criminal justice system, based on much more intensive experience, and referenced in some of the publications cited in the bibliography of this report (Chapter 6).

A. Geographical and Population Variables

Response by areas

| | |
|-------------|----------|
| West | 25 |
| Midwest | 19 |
| South | 18 |
| Far West | 11 |
| East | 10 |
| New England | 5 |
| | <hr/> 88 |

Response by area

| | |
|--------------------------|----------|
| Cities 400,000 or more | 25 |
| Cities 30,000 to 400,000 | 45 |
| Towns 30,000 or less | 18 |
| | <hr/> 88 |

COMMENT: Within the limits of the present survey process, volunteer programs in prevention and diversion appear to be reasonably evenly distributed according to regions of the United States and size of community.

B. Number of Volunteers

1. Range through all programs
2. Average number per program
3. Volunteer-to-client ratio

From 5 to 900
Approximately 50
Approximately 1 to 15

COMMENT: Both the range and average number of volunteers per program approximates quite closely to volunteer programs within the criminal justice system, according to a recent national survey. The volunteer-to-client ratio similarly parallels within-system programs as does the fact that only 15 of 88 programs gave numerical estimates both for volunteers and clients. In

other words, record-keeping could be better in both types of programs.

C. What Volunteers Are Doing in Prevention and Diversion

COMMENT: We did not ask respondents to provide distinct and precise job descriptions for each different job their volunteers were doing. In the first place we doubted the ability of many of them to do it, based on our experience with presumably more sophisticated within-system volunteer programs. Secondly, the amount of time required in attempting to do so would notably have discouraged return responses. We did, however, carefully read returned program abstracts, especially the answers to questions regarding type and number of volunteers and program purpose. From this, broad outlines of trends were discerned, though nowhere can we claim any exactness as to detail:

1) Almost all volunteer programs in prevention and diversion have multiple involvement of volunteers, i.e. at least two different types of volunteer jobs per program and sometimes as many as six or seven.

2) The one-to-one volunteer, as friend or counselor is clearly predominant, just as it is in volunteer programs within the criminal justice system. In both types of programs the one-to-one friend-counselor position may constitute up to seventy to eighty per cent of the volunteers involved.

3) A significant, though far smaller, proportion of volunteers is involved in administration and special services (e.g. office, transportation, as board

or committee members, vocational-job assistance, and professional services contributed as volunteers). The proportions here appear to approximate those in within-system volunteer programs.

4) Significant numbers of volunteers are also involved in certain general job categories which appear to be more frequent in prevention-diversion volunteer programs: volunteer tutors; recreational activities; working with the family or parents; crisis intervention and "hotline"; advocacy or environmental troubleshooting roles; and volunteer programs organized around a storefront type or open-house facility.

The emergence of more emphasis on the advocacy role, alone, is at least consistent with OYD's national strategy which emphasizes the need for institutional changes in preventing delinquency.

5) It appears that a somewhat higher percentage of college-age volunteers are involved in prevention-diversion as contrasted with within-system volunteer programs. However, the present report does not indicate a significant self-help involvement of potentially delinquent youth themselves, as volunteers, of the type that would be called for by OYD's national strategy.

D. Age of Programs

The majority of respondents provided dates for the inception of their programs. The conclusion is clear. These programs are relatively new. Approximately sixty per cent of the programs are two years old or less. Only about a quarter of the programs began earlier than 1969. The oldest

program we could find was the Oakland County, Michigan Youth Assistance Program (1953).

E. Clients and Referral Sources

In approximately descending order of magnitude, but with clear differences between extremes, referrals to the programs come from courts, police, schools, parents, and self-referral. In terms of status in relation to the criminal justice system, 42 of the programs' clientele are a prevention-diversion mix, 23 are "pure" prevention (no known system contact), and six are solely diversion. (This was not identifiable in every abstract.)

COMMENT: It appears that the programs in this study are working principally with "close-in" prevention cases, as defined in Chapter 2, and with rather close referral or other organizational relationships with criminal justice agencies.

F. Organizational Basis

All of the respondents fit the category "organized groups". Perhaps the nature of the survey process itself gave rise to this classification. Where possible programs were placed in certain organizational classifications as they were identifiable from information provided on the abstracts. Programs not providing complete data for a particular category represented here were not tabulated in that classification. Thus all categories will not always total out the same.

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Organizational base (as identifiable) | |
| Predominantly private (always incorporated) | 34 |
| Predominantly public | 33 |
| 2. Primary sponsors (as identifiable) of organizational base | |
| Youth service systems (public or private)* | 34 |
| Court or probation department | 21 |
| Y.M.C.A. related | 6 |
| S.A.Y. (Social Advocates for Youth) | 3 |
| School System | 3 |

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Church related | 2 |
| Big brother | 1 |
| | <u>70</u> |

COMMENT: As is evidenced here, the majority of volunteer prevention programs are being started in youth service system settings, whether public or private. Such organizations as Youth Service Bureaus have been responsible for the formation and continuance of solid prevention programs. Other programs are working both directly or indirectly with the courts in an effort to deal with youth before they are adjudicated and granted probation.

G. Funding of Programs (as identifiable)

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. General types of sources predominating | |
| Public-government, federal state, or local | 57 |
| Private organization (e.g. United Way, etc.) | 21 |
| Mainly nickel-dime operations | 8 |
| No apparent funding | <u>2</u> |
| | 88 |
| 2. Kinds of mixtures of funding (usually 2, sometimes 3 or more) | |
| All government-public mix | 31 |
| Government-private mix | 18 |
| Single source, all government | 12 |
| All private mix | 8 |
| Single source, all private | <u>7</u> |
| | 76 |
| 3. Government-public mixed sources (as identifiable) | |
| Federal-local | 26 |
| Federal only | 6 |
| State-local | 6 |
| Local only | <u>1</u> |
| | 39 |

Note: Of the 26 federal-local mixes, 16 were funded by LEAA and a local unit of government, usually in the 75-25 match category.

| | |
|---|----|
| 4. Individual funding sources (as identifiable part or whole) | |
| City/county government | 34 |
| LEAA | 29 |
| Private organizations | 9 |
| Individuals | 6 |
| United Way or similar | 6 |
| Federal (other) | 5 |
| DHEW or OYD | 5 |
| Private foundation | 5 |
| Model cities programs | 4 |
| State government | 4 |
| YMCA | 2 |
| Banks | 1 |
| Schools | 1 |
| Department of Labor | 1 |

Note: Figure exceeds total due to many funding mixes (see paragraphs 2 and 3 above).

COMMENT: (1) Almost all the programs have some significant regular funding source. (2) In the majority of cases this is a mixture of two or more sources, one of which could help support the program if the other source gives out. (3) This is a high proportion of public relative to private sources. Within the public sectors the federal contribution is also substantial. Given current federal policy of phased withdrawal in many of the other sources, usually within a one-to-three year period, the survival of many programs may depend on finding these other funding sources within a relatively short time.

H. Program Evaluation

A reading of the answers to the questions on "evaluation" indicates that a fairly good proportion of programs have a program evaluation process which could be considered formalized and/or intensive. This proportion, subject always to the reader's interpretation, might be as high as one-third of the programs. This healthy development may be, at least in part, related to the frequency of federal sponsorship which tends to require such evaluation as a condition of funding and refunding.

Recommendations for the Future

The following opinions are based on the authors' experience in this study and do not necessarily reflect the views of OYD or any of the programs represented in this report.

A. Improved Communication Among Programs

The relative newness of the programs makes better inter-program communication of ideas and information especially desirable. Suggestion:

1. Sponsorship of a series of workshops and conferences specifically for volunteer programs in prevention and diversion.
2. An ongoing clearinghouse for information and idea exchange among these programs, including a national newsletter specifically for them.

B. Surveys, Evaluation, and Research

1. Draw together, summarize, and analyze collectively existing evaluation studies. At least fifteen programs in the present study reported such evaluation in progress.
2. Launch research in crucial gap areas revealed by the above analysis. As an example, the authors could detect no research or analysis designed to determine the proper place and role of volunteer programs in a youth service delivery system.
3. Repeat the present survey in an intensified manner in approximately one year, e.g. autumn, 1973. By intensification it is meant, first of all, the resources to survey a much larger population of potentially relevant programs. Secondly, follow-up procedures and some site observation and interviews should be employed to reach the

kind of ad hoc, informal, and less nationally visible programs, which might nevertheless be important. Such programs were notably lacking in the returns of the present study. A special effort should be made to recontact, with the same questions, the 88 programs which responded to the present survey, in order to determine growth or changes over the one year period. However, some areas should also be probed in more detail and with more precision, for example, volunteer job descriptions, volunteer to client ratio, nature and number of any paid professional leadership, etc.

C. Model Program Projects

OYD's predecessor (Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development) performed a highly significant service to the within-system volunteer movement in its formative years by sponsoring a model demonstration project, the

Boulder County Juvenile Delinquency Project. The goal was to develop a creative variety of meaningful volunteer involvements in the juvenile court setting, along with a basic body of program management knowledge.

We suggest that a parallel developmental project is equally appropriate now for volunteer programs in prevention-diversion. This model demonstration project effort would seek to refine procedures and strategies in currently promising programs. It would also explore, developmentally, areas consistent with OYD's national strategy for delinquency prevention which, nevertheless, appear to be neglected at present. Three examples here would be the volunteer advocate role in institutional change, the involvement of potentially delinquent youth as volunteers, and the improved integration of volunteer programs with other elements in a youth service delivery system.

Chapter 6

RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS

Our list is by no means complete. Moreover, with the possible exception of Social Advocates for Youth, none of these organizations is exclusively concerned with volunteer programs in prevention and diversion.

A. National Governmental Organizations Generally Concerned with Youth

1. **Office of Youth Development (OYD)**, Office of Human Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201

This organization has focused on prevention and diversion in terms of national strategy in the development of youth services systems. It has also sponsored many projects on volunteers, including the present study.

2. **The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)**, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530

LEAA's primary concentration has been within the criminal justice system where it has, among other things, funded a number of volunteer programs and projects. Moreover, as Chapter 3 indicates, it has also been a frequent funding source for volunteer programs in prevention and diversion.

B. National Volunteer-Oriented Organizations (Private)

1. **Social Advocates for Youth (SAY)**, Mr. Tadini Bacigalupi, Jr., President, and Mr. Robert Donoghue, Director, 3300 Bank of

America Center, 555 California Street, San Francisco, California 94104

SAY is one of the few, perhaps the only, organization we know of organized specifically for the purpose of involving volunteers in prevention and diversion work. The volunteers are principally college age, working in a social advocacy framework with children usually ages eight or ten to seventeen.

Local SAY programs currently exist in California, Washington, and Colorado (see SAY program abstract in Chapter 3: Headwaters, Colorado Springs). Expansion is contemplated in Texas, Puerto Rico, and other areas. SAY is also planning to develop a problem solving, information retrieval system for volunteers working in prevention and diversion.

2. **The National Information Center on Volunteerism**, Suite 717, Colorado Building, Boulder, Colorado 80302

Formerly concentrated on volunteer programs within the criminal justice system, the Center is currently expanding its emphasis toward volunteer programs in prevention and diversion. Current projects in that regard include (1) preparation of the present report under OYD sponsorship, (2) continued building of program files in the area, currently numbering 125, (3) sponsorship of the first national conference on volunteers in prevention and diversion in May, 1973, (4) concern with legal questions and the preparation of a "model code" for the facilitation of volunteer programs in prevention and diversion (technical assistance monies provided through Region 8

of OYD), and (5) contacts through the Center's state desk operation with the groups most likely to have knowledge of prevention-diversion volunteer programs in each state, the state coordinator of or information center on volunteers.

3. **Clearinghouse, The National Center for Voluntary Action (NCVA)**, 1735 Eye Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

The Clearinghouse provides introductory packets or at least addresses in a number of different volunteer service areas such as mental health, education, public welfare, etc. Since any of these areas may have prevention significance, the NCVA Clearinghouse becomes a significant resource.

4. **The Center for a Voluntary Society**, John Dixon, Director, 1507 M Street, NW, Room 300, Washington, D.C. 20005

A very creative and vital organization.

5. **The International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.**, Mr. Richard W. Kobetz, Assistant Director, Eleven Firstfield Road, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

This organization, in conjunction with the National Conference of Christian and Jews, recently completed a major delinquency prevention project. The Association intends to keep active in this area and is doing a great deal to help youth today.

6. **Howard James Associates**, Mr. Howard James, Box J, Gorham, New Hampshire 03581

If any individual could be singled out as having had a primary role in alerting the conscience of a nation to the plight of children over the past decade, that person would be Howard James. With his own organization now he is continuing his investigative reporting on the problems of children, broadening it to areas

other than the criminal justice system. He is also producing films and is available on consultantship in terms of organizing communities to provide the maximum services to children.

C. Organizations Traditionally Concerned with Youth

Fortunately there are a multitude of these, and the list below is only a representative selection of some significant ones.

1. **Boys Clubs of America**, 771 1st Avenue, New York, New York 10017

Boys Clubs have always depended predominantly on volunteers, and they have traditionally worked with the kinds of boys who, as a group, might otherwise be considered delinquency prone. Moreover, they have gathered some statistics on the role of Boys Clubs in delinquency prevention.

2. **Big Brothers of America**, 341 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Since its inception Big Brothers has served a useful purpose in the community. By using volunteers Big Brothers has been able to provide fatherless boys an image of an adult role model and friend that is so greatly needed at this juncture of a child's life. With this approach the nationally known program has been responsible for spin-off as well as supporting other non-affiliated Big Brother programs across the county that not only work with fatherless boys, but also with their sadder and more "homeless" counterpart, the delinquent youth. Big Sisters is, of course, the counterpart for girls.

3. **Boy Scouts of America**, National Council, North Brunswick, New Jersey 08902

One of the oldest nationally known volunteer programs in the country, Boy Scouts of America may not be considered a prevention program by some. However, it is

certainly one of the most volunteer oriented organizations in the world, and is also developing an outreach component. Thus, Boy Scouts of America has programs working with drug addiction, education, ecology, and other community oriented projects all of which combine to create an avenue of diversion or new access to socially desirable roles by the participant. Naturally, Girl Scouts has a similar role for girls.

Key Link of Dallas, Texas directed by Charles Schroeder (see Chapter 4) is an example of a prevention program that is working with explorer scouting as well as prevention of delinquency within the community.

4. The Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), National Board, 291 Broadway, New York, New York 10007

The YMCA has one of the most exciting outreach efforts in existence today. For example, the national YMCA is currently operating all "National Youth Project Using Mini-Bikes" (NYPUM) test programs in cities around the United States. Honda Corporation supplies the bikes and the YMCA supplies the program support, staff, and expertise. Currently there are over 100 NYPUM test programs operating in cities across the country. The pilot projects, many of which use volunteers, are in collaboration with the police, courts, probation authorities, and schools. For further information write to NYPUM, 714 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 1000, Los Angeles, California 90015.

YMCA outreach to potentially troubled

children has taken other forms, too, including the excellent Y-PALS programs of Kansas City, Missouri and Lincoln, Nebraska, as well as other YMCA sponsored programs in Reno, Nevada and Spokane, Washington (refer to citations in Chapter 3). Also occurring is the use of YMCA residential facilities for delinquency-prone youth, sometimes including recreational and rehabilitation programs. One outstanding centralized information source on such programs is Mr. Richard V. Pryor, Executive Vice-President, Action Planning Associates, Inc., 903 N. Washington Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801.

5. Youth Life Campaign, Inc., 720 W. Monument, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80904

Many national church groups have programs particularly addressed to youth. An example is Young Life Campaign, Inc., an international, nonsectarian organization which attempts to communicate the Christian faith to the adolescent. Young Life has a full-time paid staff and many hundreds of volunteers who are presently working with troubled youth throughout the U.S., as well as in Canada, Mexico, Bermuda, Germany, France, and Brazil.

For further references to prevention-diversion programs sponsored by church related organizations refer to Christian Youth Services of Lancaster, Pennsylvania (Chapter 3). Also, Partners, Inc., before becoming a quasi-public organization, began with eleven volunteers as a program of the Young Life Campaign (refer to Partners, Inc. in Chapter 3).

Chapter 7 ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography is presented in three sections. References are presented in the following areas:

- A. GENERAL CONCEPTS IN PREVENTION AND DIVERSION
- B. VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS IN PREVENTION AND DIVERSION
- C. GUIDELINES FOR THE EFFECTIVE PLANNING AND OPERATION OF VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

A. GENERAL CONCEPTS IN PREVENTION AND DIVERSION

Annual Report of Federal Activities - Juvenile Delinquency, Youth Development and Related Fields. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. 267 pages.

The Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration's mission, strategy, goals, and objectives in terms of an overview of YDDPA funded projects in 1971 as well as a summary of federal program activities relating to the youth services system. To obtain copies write the DHEW, OYD, Washington, D.C. 20201, requesting by full title and *Publication/(SRS) 73-26016*.

Delinquency Prevention Through Youth Development. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service,

Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. 32 pages.

A fresh look at the problem of delinquency based on a reassessment of present public policies for dealing with youthful deviance; a development of new linkages between an understanding of what causes deviant activities and what should be done about them. To obtain copies write the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, requesting by full title and *Publication / (SRS) 72-26013*. Price 30¢.

Hotline for Youth. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. 28 pages.

A concise plan for the development, implementation, and maintenance of a crisis telephone center or hotline for youth. To obtain copies write the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, requesting by full title and *Publication / (SRS) 72-26006*. Price 50¢.

Legislative Guide for Drafting State-Local Programs on Juvenile Delinquency. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration. 40 pages.

Suggestions for the development of legislation for programs concerning delinquency prevention and treatment administered by state and local public agencies. To obtain copies write the DHEW, OYD, Washington, D.C. 20201, requesting by full title and *Publication/(SRS) 73-26004*.

Lemert, Edwin M. *Instead of Court - Diversion in Juvenile Justice*. Public Health Service, 1971. 95 pages.

A systematic study of diversion in the juvenile justice system highlighting schools, welfare, law enforcement, and community organization as models for prevention/diversion programming. To obtain copies write the National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015, requesting by full title and Public Health Service Publication #2127. Price 50¢.

National Strategy for Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention and Conceptual Issues. Bureau of Sociological Research, University of Colorado, October, 1971. 100 pages.

Conceptual framework for the development of juvenile delinquency prevention programs in relation to the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration's national strategy. To obtain copies write the Bureau of Sociological Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302, requesting by full title and Document #34.

A Selected Bibliography: Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention. Bureau of Sociological Research, University of Colorado, October, 1971. 9 pages.

Review of contemporary as well as historically important views on delinquency theory and practice. To obtain copies write the Bureau of Sociological Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302, requesting by full title and Document #35.

B. VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS IN PREVENTION AND DIVERSION

Note: Most references in this section have substantial relevance in this area, but are not exclusively devoted to it.

Central Resource Summaries of Pre-Official Court Delinquency Prevention Programs. National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. 50 pages.

A series of court-sponsored prevention program abstracts, most of which deal directly with the offender while he is on probation, and some of which are directly involved with volunteers in prevention and diversion programming. To obtain copies write the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Box 8978, Reno, Nevada 89507.

Directory of College Student Volunteer Programs - Academic Year 1970-71. ACTION. 281 pages.

Information on and location of college volunteer programs throughout the country; a good resource guidebook when working with local student volunteer programs, some of which are clearly in the prevention-diversion area. To obtain copies write ACTION, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20525

Scheier, I.H., and J.L. Berry. **Serving Youth As Volunteers.** National Information Center on Volunteerism, February, 1972. 36 pages.

Strategies for getting connected as volunteers with youth in trouble or heading for trouble; particular attention is given to the range of alternative modes of volunteer service likely to be open to volunteer individuals or groups in a local community. To obtain copies write the National Information Center on Volunteerism, 717 Colorado Building, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

C. GUIDELINES FOR THE EFFECTIVE PLANNING AND OPERATION OF VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS.

Note: Three of the four references below refer to volunteer programs within the criminal justice system. The analysis in Chapter 5 indicated similarities between prevention-diversion and within-system volunteer programs. Since we lack management manuals for prevention volunteer programs, we have included major recent ones for within-system programs as the closest analogy at the present time.

Guidelines and Standards for the Use of Volunteers in Correctional Programs. U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, August, 1972. 269 pages.

Planning and management guidelines geared to a recent national survey on the state of the art and the nature of its major problems. To obtain copies write the U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Washington, D.C. 20530.

A Manual for Students - Volunteering. The National Student Volunteer Program, Volunteers in Service to America, ACTION. 73 pages.

A comprehensive look into volunteerism with special reference to college students: what it is, what it's doing, principal projects, programs and pitfalls; relevant because college students comprise a significant proportion of the volunteer work force in prevention and diversion. To obtain copies write the National Student Volunteer Program, Volunteers in Service to America, ACTION, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20525.

Using Volunteers in Court Settings, A Manual for Volunteer Probation Programs. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service. Office of Juvenile Delin-

quency and Youth Development, 1969. 227 pages.

A program management guidebook focussing largely on the use of the one-to-one volunteer within the criminal justice system, especially in regard to probation; relevant because the one-to-one model is also a frequent one in prevention and diversion volunteer programs. To obtain copies write the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, requesting by full title and Publication / (SRS) 72-26008. Price \$1.00.

Volunteer Programs in Courts, Collected Papers on Productive Programs. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1969. 268 pages.

A how-to-do-it review of five major types of program models in within-system volunteer programs; this includes at least two models which the present report indicates as also important in volunteer prevention-diversion programs: volunteer tutors and Attention Homes. To obtain copies write the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. requesting by full title and Publication / (SRS) 72-26007. Price \$1.25.

END

7 11/25/1961