

NATIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM

YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS--

PHASE I ASSESSMENT

by

Arnold Schuchter
Project Director

and

Kenneth Polk
Principal Investigator

Revised and Rewritten by

Catharine B. Gilson

January 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Institute of Law Enforcement
and Criminal Justice

LOAN DOCUMENT

RETURN TO:
NCJRS
P. O. BOX 24036 S. W. POST OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024

41038
C. H.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The principal research staff involved in the preparation of this report were as follows:

Kenneth Beck; Gerald Blake; Mary Blake; Denis Flanagan; James Galvin; Donald Gropman; Leonard Jackson; Bruce Ledgerwood; Toye Lewis; Pat Kostreva; Ardice Mick; Steven Newbert; Bonnie Powell; Cheryl Ruby; Patricia Winfrey; Karen Woldman; and Gail Younger.

The research staff also included:

Paul Adams; Joseph Akintola; Judy Amazaki; Walter Backstrom; Jerald Fireman; John Foito; Ronica Jackson; Steven Kornstein; Michael O'Reilly; George Rendle; Helen Rhodes; and Rhonda Silberberg.

Mary Berger was the project manager. Mary Blake and Charlene Simpson, in the Oregon office, substantially helped with project management activities.

We appreciate the assistance of the following consultants on the project:

Troy Duster; Delbert Elliott; Douglas Grant; Fred Howlett; Harold Kramer; Sheldon Krantz; Josephine Lambert; and Arthur Pearl.

NCJRS

MAY 4 - 1977

ACQUISITIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	1
I. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	3
A. Research Objectives	3
B. Methodology of the Phase I Assessment of YSB	3
1. Literature Review	4
2. Analysis of Selected Provisions of Juvenile Codes	4
3. GMIS Data Analysis	5
4. Telephone Interviews with SPA Staff	5
5. Telephone Interviews with YSBs	5
6. YSB Site Visits	5
7. Synthesis of a Conceptual Framework	6
II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF YSBs	8
A. Early Studies, Theories and History	8
B. Impetus for the Creation of YSBs	9
1. Amount of Delinquency	9
2. The Dilemma of "Status Offenders"	10
3. Community Alternatives to Incarceration	10
4. Labeling of Problem Youth	10
C. Youth Service Bureaus - The Crime Commission and Subsequent Developments	11
III. INTRODUCTION TO ISSUES RELATED TO YSBs	16
A. Factors Intrinsic to a YSB	16
1. YSB Origins	16
2. Purpose of YSBs	16
3. YSB Services and Functions	18
B. YSBs and Their Service Environment	19

	<u>Page</u>
1. YSBs and Youth	20
2. YSBs and the Juvenile Justice Community	20
3. YSBs and Their Relationship with Schools	20
4. YSBs and Their Relationship to Other Agencies	20
IV. SUMMARY OF STUDY FINDINGS	21
A. Overview of Study Findings and Conclusions	21
B. Highlights of YSB Telephone Survey Findings	21
1. Project Scale	21
2. Client Characteristics	22
3. Program Orientation	22
4. Sources of Funds	22
5. Sources of Referral	23
6. Diversion	23
C. Lessons from the Site Visits	23
1. Differences Among Seven YSBs	24
2. Issues from the Site Visits	24
a. Project Scale	24
b. Target Group	26
c. Program Orientation	26
d. Sources of Funds	27
e. Sources of Referral	27
f. Diversion	27
g. Relationship with the Juvenile Justice System	29
h. Institutionalization	30
V. THE ISSUES AND UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS	31
A. Characteristics of a YSB	31
1. Juvenile Justice and Non-Juvenile Justice Origins of a YSB	31

	<u>Page</u>
a. YSBs as Juvenile Justice System Divestment	32
b. YSB Origins Outside the Juvenile Justice System	32
2. YSBs and the Diversion Mandate	33
3. Dynamics of the Direct Service Model of YSBs	37
4. Referral Brokerage Activities	40
5. Limitations on Systems Development and Youth Advocacy	40
B. YSBs and Their Relationship to Client and Community	43
1. YSBs, Youth, and Their Legal Status	43
2. The YSB and the Juvenile Justice System	47
a. The Effects of Direct Services in the Context of the Juvenile Justice System	47
b. Consequences of Information Feedback by YSBs to the Juvenile Justice System and Other Referral Agencies	48
c. Perceptions of Diversion Among Justice System Officials	49
3. YSBs and Schools	52
4. YSBs and Other Community Agencies	53
VI. EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION RESEARCH	56
A. Planning and Evaluation Activities of YSBs and SPAs	56
1. Planning and Evaluation by YSBs	56
2. SPA Involvement with YSBs	57
3. Suggestions for Improving YSB Planning and Evaluation	59
4. Suggested Measures of YSB Outcome	61

	<u>Page</u>
B. Review of the YSB Evaluation Literature	62
1. A California Study	63
2. A Massachusetts Study	64
3. The 1973 Elliott Study: A National Survey	64
4. A National Evaluation, the 1974 Elliott Study	66
5. The HEW/YDDPA National Study of Youth Service Bureaus	66
6. "Diversion from the Juvenile Justice System"	67
7. The King County Youth Service Bureau Preliminary Evaluation Report	67
8. The Minnesota Study of Seven Youth Service Bureaus in the Twin Cities Region	68
Footnotes	70

LIST OF EXHIBITS AND TABLES

<u>Exhibit Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	
1	Significant Program Differences Among Seven YSBs	25
2	Table of Referral Sources for 12 YSBs	28
3	YSBs as Diversionary Programs	34
4	Program Function Orientation	38
5	Target Groups of Twenty-Seven YSBs	44
6	Consequences of Client Non-Participation	46
7	Client Information Feedback	50

SUMMARY

The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILECJ) awarded a grant to Boston University's Metropolitan College to study programs and services offered by Youth Service Bureaus (YSBs) throughout the country. This project--a Phase I Assessment under the National Evaluation Program (NEP)--was intended to gather sufficient data on existing YSBs to assess what is known about them and identify national evaluation issues for possible use under a full-scale, Phase II evaluation.

The study team approached the YSB Assessment from many angles--a comprehensive literature search, an analysis of selected juvenile codes, an analysis of data in the LEAA Grants Management Information System, telephone interviews with staff of 372 YSBs and forty-five SPAs, and site visits to twenty-seven YSBs. The study analyzed both the internal workings of individual YSBs and the relationships which YSBs have with the larger network of social, educational and juvenile justice services. The result of these efforts was to amass considerable information on goals of YSBs, operational procedures followed, and service linkages developed. Very detailed information was collected from the YSBs for which site visits were made.

The study uncovered a number of interesting findings. For example, while it was the original intention of many policy-makers that the YSBs serve to coordinate other, existing services, we found that most YSBs have moved into the provision of direct services as their primary function. It was also interesting to note that the youth advocacy function of YSBs was extremely limited if not non-existent. Also, YSBs appeared to do little in the way of promoting system's change, contrary to our initial expectations. Despite these and other interesting findings, the study is limited in the extent to which it can make generalizations about YSBs. Under the charter of the grant, the Phase I Assessment was to review the universe of projects called YSBs. As a result, very diverse YSBs with different program configurations were studied. While this had the advantage of breadth, it hampered the study team in accomplishing another objective, which was to suggest a set of evaluation issues germane to a Phase II, full-scale evaluation. What we have concluded is that the "youth service bureau", as a single topic area, is not suitable for national evaluation. Given the great disparity among programs, the topic area is unevaluable. While all the YSBs investigated are geared to helping youth in trouble, the similarities effectively end there. Some YSBs seek to help youth through delinquency prevention activities; others only intervene after a youth has had contact with the justice

system. The target populations are not consistent across programs either--in some cases potential lawbreakers are the focus, in other cases, confirmed delinquents. How the YSB serves its clients is also subject to variation. One project visited engaged in a variety of activities--counseling, running an alternative school, coordination of community services and referring youth to other direct service programs. Another program visited served no clients at all but developed grant applications for the state's local service providers. Attempting a national evaluation that encompasses these kinds of differences would be a recipe for failure.

The study was further impaired by a lack of adequate monitoring and evaluation at most of the YSBs studied. While one project was able to show that the recidivism rate for YSB participants was 30% less than it was for the youthful offender population as a whole, this kind of finding was rare. While most YSBs were gathering some kinds of information, the quality and reliability of such data varied too much for the study team to be able to draw confident conclusions about the success of such projects.

The fact that this Phase I Assessment has failed to develop a single evaluation framework is perhaps regrettable, but still useful to the Federal evaluator. It suggests that YSBs should not be studied as a single group of projects. Rather, YSBs should be studied as individual projects within more clearly defined topic areas. Also, it may suggest that projects like YSBs which are defined and determined by their local circumstances--political, institutional, and procedural, might best be left to the local evaluator. If this notion is accepted, Federal evaluation dollars might more profitably be spent helping local projects develop the information from which useful rational conclusions might later be drawn.

The intensive telephone and field interviews conducted under this NEP study did produce a wealth of information on YSBs. Much of that information is presented in this report including a discussion of issues relevant to YSBs, a description of what many YSBs do, and a preliminary discussion of some evaluation questions raised by the study.

I. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. Research Objectives

The Youth Service Bureau is a multi-purpose agency which has been viewed as a major instrument in the diversion of youth from the juvenile justice system. Since the YSB concept first received national attention as a result of the President's Crime Commission Report in 1967, hundreds of such organizations have sprung up around the country. As an alternative to the traditional handling of youth in trouble, YSBs seemed a good and logical first topic area for the National Evaluation Program.

The selection of YSBs for study under the NEP was further warranted by the dearth of information on them. Neither national or state data on these programs was adequate to determine whether the substantial investment of state and local governments was paying off. The Phase I Assessment was designed to study YSBs--their goals, operational procedures and, hopefully, their success and failures. The results of that study could help evaluators at all levels of government assess the programs and make more informal judgments as to their usefulness. The Phase I Assessment of YSBs was also aimed at describing conditions which lead to variation among programs. In the process, evaluation issues compatible with the realities of these diverse agencies and their complex and shifting environments were to be developed.

B. Methodology of the Phase I Assessment of YSBs

Each phase and activity of the study served many purposes and many of the steps described below were undertaken concurrently. The purpose of steps (1) "Literature Review" and (2) "Analysis of Selected Provisions of Juvenile Codes" was to become as familiar as possible with the objectives and concepts guiding YSBs. Steps (3), (4), and (5) were undertaken to identify the universe of projects falling in the YSB topic area and gather some basic information on their form and function. Step (6) describes the site selection process and (7) discusses problems in developing a single evaluation framework for YSBs.

1. Literature Review

Six types of documents were reviewed to trace the development of YSBs and the YSB concepts (1) research and descriptive literature on juvenile delinquency, juvenile justice system operations, "diversion" theory and practice, and YSBs; (2) state, regional and local plans and evaluations relevant to YSBs; (3) YSB grant proposals and evaluation reports; (4) reports of the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections and other related NILECJ-funded research projects; (5) delinquency research studies funded by HEW and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH); and (6) all draft materials funded by the Juvenile Justice Standards Project. The objective of this survey was to synthesize the literature to aid in the creation of a comprehensive framework for the survey and analysis of YSBs.

2. Analysis of Selected Provisions of Juvenile Codes

The juvenile codes in seventeen states were studied to obtain information on status offenses, diversion, intake, juvenile justice system processes, police powers, and other issues relevant to a YSB assessment. The areas of concern in analyzing the statutes were as follows:

- To what extent do the codes include status offenses within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court,
- To what extent do the codes provide for "true diversion"--that is, completely voluntary on the part of the youth,
- To what extent do the codes define the purposes, functions, procedures, and monitoring practices for court intake, and
- To what extent do the codes define police adjustment powers and procedures.

The code analysis was to be used in conjunction with the results obtained from the site visits to develop a taxonomy of YSBs. More fundamentally, the code analysis enabled researchers to understand the legal environment in which YSBs operated.

3. GMIS Data Analysis

The LEAA Grants Management Information System (GMIS) was searched, using key word selections, to obtain a listing of YSBs for the period 1969-1974. The GMIS printout, arranged by fiscal year (FY) and by state, includes each LEAA project grant award with sponsoring agency, date of award, location, and a summary of project activities and purposes. This GMIS catalog was supplemented by other means cited below.

4. Telephone Interviews with SPA Staff

Telephone interviews were conducted in forty-five states with SPA staff working in the areas of juvenile delinquency, program planning and/or evaluation and grants management. The SPA interviews--lasting from one to five hours--sought extensive information on objectives and methods for serving juveniles throughout the states. Information gathered from these interviews was used extensively during site selection. The material was valuable in providing a state-level perspective of program types, goals, and methods.

5. Telephone Interviews with YSBs

Telephone interviews were completed with 372 YSBs. This telephone survey was intended to obtain a preliminary overview of YSB objectives, functions, sponsorship, and general programmatic strategies. This information was also used in the selection of YSBs for on-site assessment.

6. YSB Site Visits

The site selection process began with a review of existing evaluation studies of LEAA and HEW funded projects. At the same time, the GMIS data was analyzed for geographic distribution of projects, sponsoring agency characteristics, primary objective, target population, program orientation, functions, and services. The purpose of this data review was to make an initial assessment of what constituted "typical" and "atypical" YSBs in the universe known at that time. To ensure that a broad representation of YSBs were included, the following program types were identified:

- police-based YSBs

- court-based YSBs
- YSB in a High Impact City
- YSB in a Model Cities area
- YSB in a state undergoing de-institutionalization
- community with two YSBs based on different premises
- community with both HEW and LEAA funded programs
- YSB based on systems improvement/coordination model
- community with large minority population
- YSBs serving high percentage of status offenders
- YSBs with good data bases.

7. Synthesis of a Conceptual Framework

The study of YSBs undertaken in this assessment yielded a major finding--that the tremendous variation in program objectives, forms, and functions defies articulation in a single or a set of conceptual frameworks. What did emerge was a list of major strategies which can be found in most YSBs. The principal YSB strategies are:

- 1) the direct service agency
- 2) the referral/brokerage agency
- 3) the funding mechanism.

Most YSBs are in the business of delivering direct services--even those that can be labeled referral/brokerage almost always offer some services directly to clients. Those few that serve as conduits for funds are generally supporting direct-service YSBs.

Still, these distinctions do not form the basis for a conceptual framework with which to study YSBs. Direct services for example, can run the gamut from traditional diagnosis and assessment (such as intake screening) to the operation of a summer camp as an adjunct to the educational system.

The relationship of the YSB to the juvenile justice system similarly did not prove a valid basis for development of a conceptual framework. Some YSBs are fully integrated with an arm of the justice system (e.g., police or probation departments). Others are completely distinct and refuse to accept referrals from the justice system. Rather than oversimplifying what was found in the real world, the question of a conceptual framework was held in abeyance.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF YSBs

A. Early Studies, Theories and History

In the 1930's, the Chicago Area Project studies of Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay attempted to develop causal theories on delinquency and crime arguing that most crime has its roots in community breakdown rather than in personal deviance. Work in this field was furthered by Albert Cohen's classic study, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. In the late 1950's Lloyd Ohlin and Richard Cloward carried the sociological analysis of crime and delinquency even further with their studies of how a community's lack of financial or social opportunity encourages delinquent behavior. All of these scholarly studies focused on community-oriented preventive measures which were designed to change the values of delinquent gangs and/or peer groups, or, less radically, to provide viable non-criminal opportunities.

During this growth in academic interest in the causes and cures of juvenile delinquency there was scant official Federal government concern. Apart from the limited studies on delinquency and neglect by the Children's Bureau, starting after 1912, and a Department of Justice Commission on Delinquency in the late 1930's, there was little formal concern with delinquency at the Federal level until the 1950's and early 1960's. In 1953 Senator Estes Kefauver spearheaded the creation of a Senate subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency. A variety of bills to establish delinquency programs were introduced in both houses of Congress during the late 1950's but none passed. In 1961 President Kennedy established the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime by Executive Order and called on the Congress to provide grants for demonstration and evaluation projects in the delinquency field. This was accomplished when President Kennedy signed into law P.L. 87-274, the first Federal delinquency legislation.

The program goals of P.L. 87-274 were broadly interpreted to embrace the correction of all social problems which caused delinquency. The Kennedy administration suggested that day-to-day administration of the delinquency program be placed in HEW and that a series of juvenile delinquency projects focus on a broad attack on poverty. By so doing the implementation of the P.L. 87-274 was in keeping with the theories of Shaw, McKay, Cohen, and Ohlin (who was appointed by the Kennedy staff to devise the administration's delinquency prevention strategy reflected in the 1961 Executive Order).

The watershed for the delinquency program came when the Bureau of the Budget turned down a funding request for programs under P.L. 87-274 for FY '66 citing overlap with newly created OEO. Efforts at HEW were then concentrated in the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. But soon, even the HEW work was closed down. Significantly, one of the final activities undertaken by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development was the preparation of papers for the President's Crime Commission.

B. Impetus for the Creation of YSBs

While the YSB concept has roots in these early years of Federal and scholarly concern, its development was spurred and conditioned by several concurrent trends in the 1960's and 1970's.

1. Amount of Delinquency

Almost any call for reform in the justice system can be traced to statistics relating to the amount of crime. The YSB is no exception. No matter how the concept of delinquency is defined, it appears that large numbers of young persons have violated juvenile codes or local ordinances. In fact, studies reveal that as many as 90% of adolescents may have committed an act or acts that could have led to their being labelled "juvenile delinquent." While a large proportion of such juveniles are never arrested or referred to the juvenile justice system, there is an enormous number of youth who are. And, official government statistics indicate that there has been a rise in both numbers and rates of delinquency.¹ The total number of juveniles arrested in 1973 for all offenses reported by the FBI was 1,717,366--more than one-fourth of the total for all age groups.

Over one million young people are referred to juvenile court each year. This number represents approximately 3% of all youths between the ages of 10 to 18.² In the period from 1957 to 1970, the number of delinquency cases handled by the juvenile court more than doubled (going from 440,000 to 1,052,000). The rates of delinquency (per 1,000 child population) during the same period rose from 19.8 to 32.3.³ While this rise may be, in large measure, due to the increase in population in the age group, the numbers did have serious consequences for a justice system which had to accommodate the increase.

This large and apparently increasing amount of delinquent behavior also built pressures for experimentation, with new kinds of programs, cast from a different mold than those of the traditional

juvenile justice system. YSBs were increasingly viewed as one possible answer.

2. The Dilemma of "Status Offenders"

The data on youth in trouble with the law indicated that large numbers of young persons were being processed in the justice system for relatively minor status offenses--that is, acts which are illegal only because the persons involved are under age (such as drinking or curfew violations). Approximately half of all arrests of young people in a typical year will be for such minor "offenses" as incorrigible truancy, waywardness, or running away from home. Since the early 1960's, there has been growing pressures to develop alternatives to formal juvenile justice system processing of status offenders. The YSB concept was presented rationally as one such alternative.

3. Community Alternatives to Incarceration

In the late 1960's, incarceration in closed, secure institutions and training schools was increasingly questioned as a rehabilitative technique for juveniles and adults. In 1967 the President's Crime Commission repudiated imprisonment and isolation of the offender in custodial settings as totally non-rehabilitative. The Commission unequivocally endorsed the goal of "reintegration" of offenders into civilian-like settings.⁴ Numerous official planning and policy bodies across the nation reaffirmed the Commission's conviction that rehabilitation is best accomplished in community settings.⁵ Along with endorsement of efforts to develop community-based alternatives to incarceration of adult and, especially, juvenile offenders, planning and policy bodies also were urging the phasing out of existing institutions and abandonment of plans for future construction of custodial institutions.⁶

4. Labeling of Problem Youth

A major factor contributing to the disenchantment with the juvenile correctional system was the development of theories concerning "labeling" and thereby stigmatizing of youth who had been brought into the system.⁷ From this theoretical perspective, it was the burden of social reactions to such specific labels as "delinquent" and "incorrigible" which contributed to further deviance and the maintenance of deviant roles. Some contended that the experience of being caught and publicly labeled

as a delinquent propelled one into a criminal career. YSBs, therefore, came to be viewed as one non-justice system strategy which might avoid the stigma of negative labeling inherent in justice system processing.

Perhaps the most direct statements tying this labeling theory to diversion are found in the National Strategy for Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention⁸ prepared by the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration of HEW. The original statement identified three factors which operate to block youth from developing acceptable behavior and which weaken their ties to the conventional social order. These are: 1) entrapment of negative labeling, (2) limited access to models of acceptable social behavior, and (3) resulting reciprocal processes of rejection, alienation and estrangement. Thus, to the extent that YSBs were conceived to engage in diversion activities, the National Strategy contended that they should work to rectify these three conditions to reduce delinquent behavior.

C. Youth Service Bureaus - The Crime Commission and Subsequent Developments

In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (The Crime Commission) gave national attention to the concept of the youth service bureau. First, the Commission voiced strong criticism of the traditional juvenile justice system, concluding that:

The formal sanctioning system and pronouncement of delinquency should be used only as a last resort. In place of the formal system, disposition alternatives to adjudication must be developed for dealing with juveniles, including agencies to provide and coordinate services and procedures to achieve necessary control without unnecessary stigma.⁹

According to the Commission, the key to this new approach would be the establishment of neighborhood youth-serving agencies--termed "youth service bureaus"--to work with delinquents outside the traditional judicial system. As seen by the Commission, these agencies were to act as a central location for referrals of youth for treatment or prevention programs in lieu of further juvenile justice processing.

Specifically the Commission observed:

There should be expanded use of community agencies for dealing with delinquents non-judicially and

close to where they live. Use of community agencies has several advantages. It avoids the stigma of being processed by an official agency regarded by the public as an arm of crime control. It substitutes for official agencies, organizations better suited for redirecting conduct. The use of locally sponsored or operated organizations heightens the community's awareness of the need for recreational, employment, tutoring, and other youth development services. Involvement of local residents brings greater appreciation of the complexity of delinquents' problems, thereby engendering the sense of public responsibility that financial support of programs requires.

The Commission then recommended that:

An essential objective in the community's delinquency control and prevention plan should therefore be the establishment of a neighborhood youth-servicing agency, a Youth Service Bureau, with a broad range of services and certain mandatory functions. Such an agency ideally would be located in a comprehensive community center and would serve both delinquent and non-delinquent youths. While some referrals to the Youth Service Bureau would normally originate with parents, schools, and other sources, the bulk of the referrals could be expected to come from the police and the juvenile court intake staff in that the Youth Service Bureau would be required to accept them all.¹⁰

The Commission's Juvenile Delinquency Task Force (1967) further recommended that these agencies become comprehensive community centers that focused on working with delinquents non-judicially and close to home. The Crime Commission was especially clear in its statement of the diversion goal of YSBs. The goal is to create an alternative to and substitute for court intake and an alternative (but not substitute) for the adjudication phase of the court process. Further, the YSB concept proposed by the Commission aimed at creating an alternative and substitute for police referral to court and the pre-judicial dispositional function of probation intake. Thus, the name "YSB" and the goals of those agencies were given national exposure. Guidelines for their implementation, however, were never spelled out.

The work of the President's Commission had a major impact on the form of the federal response to the problems of crime and juvenile delinquency in the 1960's. Shortly after publication of the report, Congress passed two major pieces of legislation which were based upon the Commission's findings--the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (the Safe Streets Act), and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 (the JDPC Act).

The emphasis of the Safe Streets Act was on improving existing law enforcement systems. The program was to be administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), a newly created agency within the Department of Justice. The JDPC Act, administered by HEW, was designed to help states and local communities develop and improve agencies and systems dealing with youth. Congress specifically intended to mobilize community resources and encourage the development of community-based youth programs to provide necessary diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention services to delinquent and pre-delinquent youth.

It soon became clear that the HEW/LEAA division of responsibility for directing the federal effort for youth programs was not working. Before a comprehensive federal program could be fashioned interim measures were instituted. The JDPC Act was amended in 1971 creating an Interdepartmental Council to facilitate coordination between HEW and LEAA. The Council, because of lack of resources, was not effective and an interagency "agreement" was developed which gave HEW responsibility for prevention and rehabilitation programs outside the juvenile correctional system while LEAA was to focus on programs within the system. This arrangement was continued in the 1972 extension of the JDPC Act.

The comprehensive measure to restructure the entire juvenile delinquency effort was signed into law in 1974. The new Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415) provided for a one-year phase-out of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Control Act administered by HEW and created a new Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in LEAA. It required that LEAA maintain its fiscal year 1972 level of support for juvenile programs and authorized a new set of programs for delinquency prevention, diversion from the juvenile justice system, and community-based alternatives to traditional disposition. This Act confirmed the Congressional commitment the concepts embodied in the YSB idea and provided funds for their development and/or continuation.

In summary, the YSB has had a checkered history. The YSB concept has been fed by new academic theories regarding youth (such as "labeling" theory), new operational approaches to corrections (such as community-based corrections), and the need of the government to respond to the unprecedented rise in juvenile crime. While the President's Crime Commission report remains a principal source on YSBs, it does not alone provide a framework for assessing their development as individual YSBs have been implemented in quite different forms. Indeed, the President's Crime Commission and subsequent YSB developments (YDDPA strategy, ongoing standards and goals effort, and the proliferation of projects) have contributed to a continuing lack of consensus on the major goals of YSBs.

Despite this lack of consensus on YSB goals, three principal issues emerge which have relevance to almost every YSB. Formulated as questions, they are:

- Do YSBs lead to a reduction in juvenile crime?
- Do YSBs reduce the burden on the juvenile justice system and maximize the use of other community resources?
- Do YSBs offer youth a more constructive and less stigmatizing environment in which to work out problems relating to adjustment to society?

In attempting to answer these questions two related issues must be considered--the dynamics of the direct service model of YSBs and the complex matter of diversion. A list of selected points relating to these latter issues, and discussed throughout this report, include the following:

- Direct Service
 - (1) Definition of direct service
 - (2) Why YSBs deliver direct services
 - (3) Effects of direct services within the context of the juvenile justice system
 - (4) Dynamics working for integration of YSBs with other community agencies (development of service networks)
 - (5) limitations on youth advocacy and systems change

• Diversion

- (1) Perception of diversion among justice system officials
- (2) Dynamics of the diversion process
- (3) Diversion to YSBs and the rights of youth.

The items above are only suggestive of the important issues relevant to any study of YSBs. The limits on this Phase I Assessment preclude a full examination of every relevant area of concern. Still, these matters are important to note at the outset as they are central to the YSB phenomenon.

III. INTRODUCTION TO ISSUES RELATED TO YSBs

The issues relevant to YSBs are extremely diverse and complex. This section introduces some of the principal concerns which are explored in more depth later in this report. For simplicity, YSB issues can be organized first in relation to the YSB itself and second, to the YSB as it relates to other service elements in the community--both justice-oriented and youth-oriented. While the issues contained in these two perspectives are not mutually exclusive, they are useful organizing devices.

A. Factors Intrinsic to a YSB

To understand YSBs as organizational entities, three areas of concern are particularly relevant.

- (1) how YSBs are developed, their origins and sponsors
- (2) the purpose of YSBs, and
- (3) what YSBs do to achieve their purpose, i.e., what services are provided or functions are performed.

In undertaking this study it became apparent that issues of origin, purpose, and function had to be studied on a case-by-case basis, as variation from project to project appeared significant.

1. YSB Origins

How a YSB comes to be created in a community appears to have an enormous impact on what it is able to do. Program origins affect target group definition, the links to other agencies, the tie-in to city and other government programs, and the viability of the program over the long range, especially with respect to receiving federal, state, and local funding. Issues relating to program inception were surveyed in the study to help determine which environments were congenial to a successful YSB and which were not.

2. Purpose of YSBs

YSBs were designed with many purposes in mind, among them crime reduction, systems improvement, and improvement in the treatment of youth in trouble. While all these objectives were

to surface in the YSB Assessment, one overriding purpose merits special concern--diversion. Site visits confirmed the centrality of this issue.

Diversion refers to the removal of a person from the justice system so that his or her case might be handled informally, primarily through community-based services.* Beyond this limited understanding of the concept, there is little agreement among either scholars or practitioners as to what constitutes diversion. It was not the purpose of this study on YSBs to solve the diversion dilemma. However, some general discussion on how diversion has been defined and is operationalized will help to set the stage for a discussion of YSB diversionary activity.

Diversion has been defined in various ways. In some cases it has come to mean (1) prevention of delinquent or unacceptable behavior in youth before that behavior is manifested, (2) removal of youth from formal juvenile justice system proceedings once a youth has come in contact with that system, and (3) minimizing penetration of the youth--that is, limiting the extent to which he must deal with the formal elements of the justice system. While these practices are not necessarily mutually exclusive, they do imply differences which appear to be operative. The various ways in which diversion has been interpreted also help to illustrate how the original understanding of the concept as (1) removal from the juvenile justice system and (2) handling by an agency outside that system has been obfuscated.

Implied in the concept of diversion is that the receiving agency should lie outside the formal jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. Diversion should represent a referral to a community-based program or agency which is independent of the justice system. By this definition, for example, an informal probation program operated by a county probation department would not constitute a diversion program.

* For a full discussion of diversion see the NEP Phase I report on Juvenile Diversion (by Andrew Rutherford and Robert McDermott).

Many people believe the decision to divert a youth from the juvenile justice system should not be coercive. The President's Commission urged that acceptance of the YSB's services be voluntary; otherwise the potential dangers and disadvantages of coercive power would simply be transferred from the juvenile court to the diversion program. Thus, once a youth is referred to a community youth service agency, it is felt by some that he should no longer be subject to court action unless he commits a subsequent offense which warrants arrest and referral to the court.

Given the complexity of the concept of diversion, it is not surprising to find a lack of similarity in the structure and operation of projects, such as YSBs, which consider themselves to be diversionary. While the President's Commission specifically recommended the establishment of independent YSBs as diversion programs, there still was in 1974 no common agreement on (1) what a youth service bureau is, (2) what services, if any, it should provide, and (3) under whose auspices it should be operated.¹¹

3. YSB Services and Functions

In the President's Crime Commission report, YSBs were charged with an enormous task of relieving the justice system of problems emanating from the handling of some of its youthful law violators. To accomplish this the YSBs were directed to use any means--direct services, referral for services purchased or provided voluntarily, etc.--to provide the services needed to prevent unnecessary penetration of the justice system by youth in trouble. This open-ended mandate from the Crime Commission is probably one factor which accounts for the great diversity in program functions in YSBs throughout the country.

From references in the President's Crime Commission report, the literature on delinquency and delinquency prevention, and the experiences of project staff, a list of five different strategies or activities in which a YSB might conceivably be engaged was developed. The listing formed the basis for querying existing YSBs to determine the activities in which they are actually involved.

1) Direct Service

Provision of counselling or other service to the client. This may include referral, but only if it is part of a package of direct services provided by the agency. Referral may also be a consequence of direct service. Other examples of direct service include tutoring, legal representation, medical or dental services, employment counselling or placement, recreation programs.

2) Referral/Brokerage

This includes immediate referral of clients to another agency without provision of any intermediary service. Brokerage of services includes actively obtaining services for an individual client from other agencies. The agency performs the role of matching youth needs with the resources of existing service agencies.

3) Service Development

Development of existing service elements, and temporary filling of gaps in the existing service system through provision of direct services in order to facilitate development of new youth services. Oriented toward individual client needs in relation to the service system.

4) Youth Advocacy

A case- or class-centered program performing an ombudsman role for youth in relation to existing institutions and processes. May be an adversarial or legalistic program oriented toward "righting wrongs" in the youth service or juvenile justice system.

5) Youth Development

Program focus is on changing institutions to provide for greater youth involvement and participation. Institutions rather than youth are defined as problematic, and the program goal is structural development of institutions. Youth are participants in, rather than receivers of, program services and activities.

B. YSBs and Their Service Environment

Unlike other agencies which are for the most part self-sufficient, most YSBs are intricately linked to the community they serve. They receive clients from the public and service agencies and they get their mandate and funds to operate from private or public sources. Thus, they are held accountable to the public they serve. While the internal workings of a YSB can reveal much about their success or failure, the full picture is told by looking at the YSB as part of a greater service environment. The community of which the YSB is a part includes the youth, their families, the juvenile justice system, and social and educational institutions.

1. YSBs and Youth

The community of young people is the primary group with which the YSB is intended to interact. The President's Crime Commission report stated that the principal focus on YSBs should be children violating the standards and laws of the community. However, the Crime Commission also argued for inclusion of non-delinquents to avoid the stigma that would be associated with a program designed exclusively for delinquents. Thus, as the site visits were to confirm, YSB target groups varied from program to program. The differences were demographic as well as relating to the offending act.

2. YSBs and the Juvenile Justice Community

It is through the acceptance of diverted youth that most YSBs interact with the juvenile justice system. However, the kinds of juvenile justice system agencies making referrals to the YSB (i.e., police, probation departments, the courts) and the formal and informal relationships which develop between the YSB and the juvenile justice system (such as information flow, funding arrangements, etc.) are other aspects of YSB-juvenile justice system interaction which must be analyzed.

3. YSBs and Their Relationship with Schools

The school is perhaps the most important non-juvenile justice system institution to which the YSB relates. Schools are the primary environment in which youth are observed exhibiting behaviors that signal the possibility of present or future delinquency. In many communities, schools have become the primary focus of delinquency prevention activities. In these communities the way in which a YSB relates to the school is probably critical to its own viability and survival.

4. YSBs and Their Relationship to Other Agencies

The degree to which YSBs are integrated with other community services should bear on the viability of the programs. This has been the rule with all programs--both human services and criminal justice--which are newly introduced into a community. Ways in which programs come to be integrated with a local service network include working agreements relating to the processing of clients, information exchanges, and other such joint ventures.

IV. SUMMARY OF STUDY FINDINGS

A. Overview of Study Findings and Conclusions

The Phase I Assessment set out to identify YSBs to analyze their similarities and differences. This task was made difficult by the fact that almost any type of youth serving program, inside or outside the juvenile justice system, apparently can call itself a YSB or can qualify as one based on the history and literature of YSBs. This fact alone plays havoc with the process of trying to group or classify such projects for purposes of an overall evaluation of the topic area.

If any general pattern emerged from the study, it was that a variety of institutional, community, and other pressures have tended to push YSBs into the delivery of direct services and referrals while pushing YSBs away from system or institutional change and aggressive case of class advocacy. Beyond this significant finding, the Phase I Assessment yielded little information for evaluators studying the universe of YSBs. Rather, the Phase I Assessment confirmed the belief of some that, as a single topic area, YSBs are not evaluable. The differences among individual programs and among the processes which connect YSBs to the justice system are simply too profound. A meaningful, full-scale evaluation would have to be predicated on a more limited definition of the area under study where such factors as services delivered, functions performed, strategies used, and processes involved were held constant. While this conclusion argues against pursuing an in-depth evaluation of YSBs as a single topic area, the Phase I Assessment still yielded a wealth of information which should be considered in evaluating youth programs.

The principal sources of the following information on YSBs were the telephone interviews which were conducted with the staff of 372 YSB projects and the site visits made to twenty-seven YSBs (or, if they were not called YSBs, agencies which fit the general concept of YSBs) throughout the country.

B. Highlights of YSB Telephone Survey Findings

1. Project Scale

According to the results of the YSB telephone survey, a majority of YSB programs are located in communities of 10,000

persons or less. Most serve 500 or fewer clients per year, with only 15% serving fewer than 150, and only 14% serving more than 1,000 persons annually. Total funding was \$100,000 or less for a majority of projects; only 7% had budgets of \$500,000 or more while 23% operated with \$50,000 or less in program funds.

2. Client Characteristics

Clients of YSBs are predominantly white and male. Over half of the programs' client populations are comprised of 30% or fewer minority group members and 40% or fewer females. Status offenders comprised 40% or less of most of the programs' client populations.

3. Program Orientation

Direct service predominates as the primary type of program orientation* - 78% of all projects are direct service programs. Referral/brokerage emerges as an important secondary program orientation. Both service development and youth advocacy are at least represented in more than a third of the programs surveyed, but usually in secondary or tertiary levels. Youth development, while representing only 3% of the first rank of program orientation is represented at some level in 21% of the projects reporting. The norm is representation of more than one program orientation: 82% of the projects reported at least two of the program orientations mentioned earlier, and half of the projects engage in at least three types of program activity. Only 23% represent four program types, and all five types are represented in only 8% of the programs surveyed. An analysis of program orientation at different funding levels reveals that direct service predominates at each level, but that as the level of funding rises, a larger proportion of projects perform one or more of the other program functions identified. (See Exhibit 4 on page 38).

4. Sources of Funds

Sources of funds, in order of importance, were as follows: LEAA (70% of the projects surveyed), county government

*

* For a listing of program orientations, see page 38.

(30%), programs other than LEAA (21%), and private sources (14%). Most projects had multiple sources of funds. It is interesting to note that only LEAA provides more than half of total project funding to a majority of their own grantees. Other federal agencies and city government provide half or more of total project funds to a substantial number of their projects (47% and 36% respectively), but the remaining sources - state and county governments and private sources - provide less than 50% of total project funds to the projects that they support.

5. Sources of Referral

Projects had multiple sources of referrals, of which the most common source was the juvenile justice system, providing clients to 91% of the projects surveyed. Schools were nearly as important a source of referral, providing clients to 82% of the projects. Parent or self-referral was cited by 71% of the projects as a source of clients. Other community agencies were a much less important source, providing clients to only 37% of the YSBs surveyed.

6. Diversion

Not surprisingly, a large majority of programs (90%) considered themselves diversionary. The proportion which considered diversion their primary objective, however, dropped to 70%. In terms of action taken in the event of client non-participation, YSB programs appear to engage in a substantial amount of coercion. Some 84% of the YSB programs surveyed send a client back to a juvenile justice system agency or take some other action against the client. Only 16% take no action. Furthermore, 91% provide information to referring juvenile justice system agencies, with only 9% providing no feedback. It is interesting to note that the proportion providing information only drops to 83% if the referring agency is outside the juvenile justice system, with 17% providing no information.

C. Lessons from the Site Visits

The site visits confirmed the project team's growing belief that the projects in the universe of YSBs could not meaningfully be classified according to particular types. In part this may be a factor of the site selection process--a process which sought

to obtain both "typical" and "unique" kinds of programs. Thus, individual programs interviewed and visited do not always conform to the "norm" as described in the findings of the telephone survey with respect to project scale, client characteristics, sources or referrals, source of funds, program orientation, etc.

1. Differences Among Seven YSBs

The site visits afforded a valuable opportunity to become familiarized with the dynamics of real YSBs. To illustrate what some of these YSBs look like, seven projects have been singled out for special attention. It should be emphasized that these projects have not been selected because they seem to be representative of types of projects. Rather, they have been selected because they are suggestive of the ways in which programs differ along five critical dimensions--organizational placement, target group, functions, relationship with juvenile justice system and degree of institutionalization-- and, by extension, illustrate the kinds of problems encountered in suggesting an individual evaluation framework which would suffice in a study of the universe of projects.

The seven projects shown in the following chart are not mentioned by name. However, they come from six different states, and represent different enough environments to be illustrative of the range of existing YSBs. For simplicity, all are referred to as YSBs, though some use other names to describe themselves.

While these programs show even more variation when their internal detail is considered, they do point to some interesting observations. An examination of each of the programs (and the remaining 20 not described here) indicates that program sponsorship is a chief determinant of target group population, functions, the relationship with the juvenile justice system and the existence of or potential for institutionalizing the program into the existing service network. Other observations about the site visits are discussed in the section which follows.

2. Issues from the Site Visits

a. Project Scale

Project scale differed considerably among programs, both in terms of number of clients served annually (from a low of 62 to a high of 3645) and annual budgets (from a low of just over \$23,000 for a small YSB to just under \$12,000,000,

	Southern Region YSB	North- Central Region YSB	Impact Cities YSB	Mountain Region YSB
Organizational Placement	YSB is offshoot of Juvenile Court	YSB is city's youth service agency	YSB is under auspices of LEAA's Impact Cities Program	YSB is a division of police department
Target Group	Non-criminal juvenile offenders	Youth 7-18 who "demonstrate need"	96% come from police and juvenile court	CHINS, mis- deemeanants, and some non- violent felony cases
Functions	Diversion and delin- quency prevention; Direct services and counseling provided	Prevention thru health, education, counseling and referral services	Diversion program does intake eval- uation and referral/ brokerage; some limited direct services	Diversion, does counseling, referrals, and coordination of community services
Relationship with Juvenile Justice System	Closely allied. Court does all YSB planning and management, makes referrals to YSB	No real connection with JJS	Closely allied as JJS is source of referrals	Closely allied as YSB is part of police department
Institution- alization	Well integrated with existing court services	Fully integrated with city bureaucracy	Program survives on limited federal funds and has not been institution- alized at all	Well integrated with police department

EXHIBIT 10. SIGNIFICANT PROGRAM DIFFERENCES AMONG SEVEN YSBs

for a large city's youth service agency, with most programs--fifteen--falling between the \$100,000 to \$500,000 funding levels). Such disparities in size lead to profound differences with respect to range and amount of services which can be provided, client/staff ratio, and, potentially, program impact on a community.

b. Target Group

Of the 27 sites visited, target populations varied from one eastern program which served all youth from ages 1 to 21, to a program in the mountain region which was geared to serious offenders, potentially serious offenders and first and multiple offenders. Other intake criteria include: "status offenders", "no formal complaint cases", "no more than five prior offenses", those "not currently receiving services", "adjudicated or awaiting disposition" cases, and "preference for school district residents", among others. In two of the programs selected for site visits no youth were served. Rather, these programs focussed on serving community agencies which in turn serve clients.

c. Program Orientation

The direct service programs analyzed (23 out of 27) provide relatively similar kinds of services. Intake evaluation, counselling and referral are standard strategies used throughout the country. In addition, a number of programs have academic services including programs with alternative schools, four or five YSBs indicated they do tutoring, one program does "teacher training" and a few do school advocacy work. Recreation programs also figured highly in the complement of services provided by the YSBs visited. Apart from normal recreational activities, one program offers creative dance and another has a summer survival camp. These kinds of activities have the result of extending the programs' clientele to youth who have had only marginal or no contact with the justice system. Legal services, employment counselling and, in some cases, shelter care services are also undertaken by some of the YSBs visited.

A few of the programs visited provide no direct services. These programs administer the contracts of other direct service projects, do community development work and/or work for service coordination in the community.

d. Sources of Funds

As with the YSBs contacted in the telephone survey, LEAA is the major source of funds for YSBs visited in the field. LEAA provided 50% or more of the funds to 11 of the 27 sites visited. The counties, cities, and states, in that order, were the next sources of funds.

e. Sources of Referral

Information on sources of referrals from the site visits varied as to completeness. However, Exhibit 2 was prepared from those sites which were able to supply intake information by source. The "other" category includes welfare agencies, community programs, friends, etc. With a few exceptions, the justice system figures as a significant source of referrals to YSBs, though schools and parents are also actively involved with making referrals.

The different sources of clients conforms to the proposals of the President's Crime Commission. While the Crime Commission felt that YSBs have an important role in relieving the justice system of youth cases, it also argued against programs where all participants would be law-violating youth coming from the juvenile justice system as this might stigmatize the YSB.

f. Diversion

The ambiguity of the concept of "diversion" as it relates to YSBs was reinforced by the site visits. The term was operationalized differently and was often confused with the notion of prevention.

The source of clients is a chief determinant of whether a program is diversionary. Those YSBs which accepted referrals from the police or courts were diversion programs. YSBs which served clients with no juvenile justice system contact and which provided education, recreation and other similar services would have to be described as prevention oriented. With many programs the source of clients was mixed (as shown in Exhibit 2) and the kinds of services varied--some prevention and some diversion.

One YSB visited felt that some contact with the justice system is advisable for youth in trouble. This runs contrary to the notion that true diversion and immediate removal from the system is best. Thus, an unofficial court hearing is held to instill enough concern in the child to deter further delinquent behavior.

Source of Referrals by Percent	YSBs with Referral Data											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Police	40	83	17	10	33	45	46	30	66.3	39	2	2.3
Courts		13	/	15	10	8	6			15	28	18.4
Probation	10		46		2			40	5.2			
School	4	1	10	45	12	12	16	10	21.5	9	33	16.4
Parents	14			25	8	20	13	20	4.7	15		5
Self		1			10	+ other 15	11		2.3	10		13.8
Parents/ Self			14.5								18	
Other	32	2	12.5	5	25	5	8			12	19	44.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

EXHIBIT 2

TABLE OF REFERRAL SOURCES FOR 12 YSBs

There were two programs which, on the surface, appeared to be engaged in diversion activities but which, on further examination, were not. One program did "problem formulation" for specially selected youth and specified other agencies in the community for referral. Because the program appeared to "cream" for the youth it would see, the police and the family court regarded it as a peripheral service provider and would only rarely use it for diversionary purposes.

The second program professed to do diversion but the very close relationship the program had with the probation department calls into question the validity of the diversion done. YSB staff worked so closely with the probation department staff that they were almost indistinguishable. When a child was diverted to this YSB, he would most likely feel he was still in the juvenile justice system.

g. Relationship with the Juvenile Justice System

Closely related to the question of diversion are other relationships that YSBs have established with the juvenile justice system. Those relationships run the gamut from non-existent to fully integrated with some YSBs acting as arms of the justice system.

Some programs were designed to be completely autonomous from the justice system. While referrals from the police and courts are encouraged, little or no formal or informal contact exists. Our site visits revealed that in the few instances where this has actually been the case, communications and coordination problems emerged inducing YSBs to eventually develop more vehicles through which to work with the other elements of the justice system.

On the other end of the spectrum were the programs which were indistinguishable from the justice system. One YSB was a diversion of the police department. Another program appeared to be an arm of the probation department though officially the two were separate. One youth program visited was not a part of any element of the juvenile justice system but rather did planning for all juvenile justice law enforcement programs in the city and county in which the YSB resided. While another program had close contacts with the juvenile court, it was prohibited by statute from taking police referrals. However, informal contacts and cooperation with the police have developed, alleviating some of the difficulties resulting from the prohibition.

h. Institutionalization

The President's Crime Commission report argued for the creation of new social institutions--YSBs--geared solely to the problems and needs of youth. As many of the defunct programs of the "War on Poverty" can attest, the creation of new social institutions is risky at best and doomed to failure if the program is unable to capture local support and respect. The strongest expressions of that support are making funds available or institutionalizing the program in the local government or the community's network of services.

The program which appeared to be the least institutionalized and therefore the most tenuous in terms of long-term viability are those which were funded totally or primarily by the Federal government. One Impact Cities YSB will probably terminate after that money has run out as it has not been able to attract local dollars. Another small youth program in trouble is LEAA funded, the grant of which was awarded to a multi-county court. After LEAA money has dried up it is questionable whether or not any individual county will pick up all or a portion of the project.

Based on the site visits, it appears that many programs which have strong links to the juvenile justice system are ensured survival by that fact alone. Where the YSB receives funding or administrative assistance from the juvenile justice system the system either develops a vested interest in the program's survival or simply, the connection is enough for a program to establish its credibility. (It can, of course, work the other way. An ineffective program fully integrated with the justice system will soon be exposed and probably terminated.) The same process appears to operate when a YSB is part of city government or is able to gain credibility with the civic leaders.

One program (which, it must be said, had other problems) failed to become institutionalized for reasons worth examining. While this YSB was well-connected with some parts of city government, it was not favorably connected with others such as the police, family court, and other agencies. Thus, the YSB was not able to define a viable role for itself despite some local support.

V. THE ISSUES AND UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS

The study of YSBs served to raise more questions than it answered. Because of the diversity of the programs, the Phase I Assessment team was unable to devise a list of issues which, if addressed in a comprehensive national evaluation would even settle the questions of what a YSB is, much less what it does and how well it does it.

By extension, one of the most important findings of this study is that YSBs, taken as a group, do not constitute a clearly defined universe of projects which is amenable to national evaluation. The findings suggest that the national evaluator look beyond just the name--YSB--to what a YSB does and how it relates to the juvenile justice system for selecting the primary determinants of the topic area(s). Such an approach might result in the separation of prevention programs from diversion programs; direct service programs--such as counselling and referrals and alternative schools, etc.--would be considered separately from programs which develop grants and attempt to coordinate services. YSBs which engaged almost exclusively in advocacy work would be clustered with similarly oriented programs.

Despite conceptual problems encountered in this Phase I Assessment, the literature, telephone survey and site visits did flag some issues of relevance which are worthy of discussion--if not because they can guide future national evaluators, then because they highlight some very important questions.

A. Characteristics of a YSB

I. Juvenile Justice and Non-Juvenile Justice Origins of a YSB

The YSB telephone survey and site visits found that YSBs were developed for a variety of reasons--ranging simply from availability of funds to the need to combat serious problems of juvenile delinquency--and were sponsored under quite different auspices.

The analysis of all the individual programs suggests that program origin tends to fall in one of three broad categories, each of which carries with it its own set of consequences: juvenile justice system divestment, local sponsorship and de novo programs.

a. YSBs as Juvenile Justice System Divestment

A small number of YSBs visited appeared to be arms of the justice system--either by virtue of their origin or placement within the justice system. Two such programs were adjuncts of the court and a third was a division of the local police department.

More and more juvenile courts and police departments are anxious to cut down on their caseload and they see an active way of doing this as being the creation of a YSB-type agency. YSB-type agencies that are created this way appear to have the most distinctly limited and defined target group of all, that is, they are so closely justice-related that their target group is invariably defined as status offenders or juvenile delinquents. In addition their services are most likely to become (or be interpreted as) semi- or quasi-judicial functions. On the other hand, the site visits indicate that close affiliation with the justice system can contribute to the viability of the program over the long term--especially the program's ability to gain needed political support and local funding.

b. YSB Origins Outside the Juvenile Justice System

YSBs which are not begun as juvenile justice system divestment projects come into being through two vehicles--local sponsorship or as de novo programs. In the first instance a local community group, perhaps in response to a crisis around drugs or juvenile crime, decides to sponsor a YSB-type program. It then seeks local, state and federal funding. The de novo program is one in which government funding is applied to the development of a new agency without the sponsorship or deep involvement of any of the existing community agencies.

In the field visits, the project team encountered YSBs with both local sponsorship and de novo origins. The programs with strong local sponsorship (either because they began that way or as a de novo program which was able to capture support) appeared to be more viable and integrated with other community services. One de novo program, funded by LEAA Impact Cities money, appeared doomed to failure because it has not received the necessary local sponsorship.

There are a variety of community and program factors that tend to promote or inhibit the development of a YSB as a viable agency for diversion of youthful law violators. First, where

a YSB is sponsored by local government or an agency of the justice system, its community-wide acceptance tends to be greater when it has access to other agency resources and has the ability to obtain local funding. The independent non-profit YSB is at a disadvantage in all of these respects. Although the study team was unable to obtain complete data on the sponsorship of YSBs that have folded during the past 5 or 6 years, the impression gained from available data is that the "failure" rate among private YSBs has been considerably higher than among the public counterparts.

Another factor which appears to contribute to the viability of a YSB is the perception of delinquency in the community. Where juvenile delinquency is perceived as a serious and visible problem, the YSB can capitalize on that awareness for establishing the value of its services. Where juvenile delinquency is not perceived as a problem, the program director and other sponsors of the program must work to overcome this obstacle through public information campaigns and other vehicles.

Despite the impact that program origin has on YSBs, very few, if any, of the programs interviewed were implemented exactly as conceived. The realities of working with youth and other community agencies had the result of altering initial objectives and strategies. The fact that many YSBs moved toward the provision of direct services is one example of the significant kinds of program modifications which have taken place over time. Thus, program origin, while it can signal potential for problems or success, must be assessed in relation to other activities undertaken by the YSB.

2. YSBs and the Diversion Mandate

Most YSBs interviewed in the telephone survey (and visited) considered themselves diversionary (see Exhibit 3). A major factor resulting in pressures for diversion programs was the President's Crime Commission Report. The general thrust of the Commission's recommendations was to limit referral to juvenile court to the more serious offenders, and to maximize the use of non-judicial community agencies through diversionary referral. Unfortunately, the elaboration of possible diversion activities reads more like a laundry list than a description of a coherent strategy for intervention.

The diversion activities uncovered in the site visits highlighted the fact that diversion programs bear little similarity to one another save for the source of their referrals.

YSBs as Diversionary Programs

Do you consider
yourself a
diversionary
program?

YSBs	TOTAL	Yes	No
Number*	366	331	35
Percent	100%	90%	10%

Is diversion
your primary
objective?

YSBs	TOTAL	Yes	No
Number**	266	187	79
Percent	100%	70%	30%

* Information presented is for 366 YSBs. Percentages are calculated on this base.

** Information presented is for a subset of YSBs numbering 266, for which this information was available. Percentages are calculated on the base number 266.

EXHIBIT 3

What is done after a decision has been made to remove a youth from the justice system is very much subject to the beliefs and practices in the local juvenile justice system.

The limited data that was examined revealed that a large percentage of diverted cases are recidivating and being recycled through the justice system (though no hard data on this was obtained in this study). Data on who benefits from diversion, with (and without) services is non-existent. In fact, even data on the outcome of diversion in terms of recidivism rates (i.e., custody, arrest, court referral, intake disposition, petition, pre-adjudication disposition) generally are non-existent. All that is really known is that many youth are being handled differently than they would have been under the traditional system.

It is argued that the diversion process reduces the potential damage caused by labeling. However, based on the limited field studies conducted, the conclusion of Cressy and McDermott appears valid:

So far as we know no one has shown that the juvenile offender and his family perceive their handling as materially different under the auspices of a diversion unit than under a more traditional juvenile justice agency.

YSBs are perceived by youth, community agencies and others as handling "problem youth"--from schools, the justice system and other sources. Where a YSB is viewed as "effective", it is precisely because it has developed the capability to handle these cases and probably is singular in the community for this very reason.

The Phase I field surveys of 27 YSBs confirmed the findings of the research literature with respect to the complexity of the diversion process. Whether or not a youth is referred to a YSB providing direct services depends on:

- a. the nature of the precipitating offense (e.g., seriousness), incident or problem
- b. the youth's prior justice and/or school record
- c. the intervening agency's perception of the youth's demeanor and attitude
- d. the youth's family situation

- e. the victim's attitude
- f. the provisions of the juvenile code
- g. the intervening agency
- h. the attitudes, philosophy and policies of the intervening agency and/or official
- i. the pressures, conditions and norms under which the intervening agency operates
- j. the policies and practices governing the intake/screening process and referral process
- k. the intervening agency's perception of community resources
- l. the intervening agency's perception of the role, capabilities and resources at its own command and provided by the YSB
- m. the availability of diagnostic/assessment resources.

In opting for referral to a YSB as a pre-adjudicative decision, courts are able to reduce overloaded court dockets and probation workloads. In the process, however, several alternative conditional dispositions which may have equal or superior merit are used less. Restitution, for example is infrequently used by courts even though it offers a concrete way for offenders to assess the demands of their penalty, engage in constructive behaviors, and use their skills for redressing the wrongs committed. The following states have restitution provisions in their juvenile codes: Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming. Clearly, the purposes of the juvenile justice system include teaching youth that there are consequences stemming from illegal behavior. Restitution may be one of the best ways to accomplish this.

At the other end of the sanction spectrum is unconditional release accompanied by a reprimand and/or warning. Often, just the existence of a YSB may lead the courts to forget these other more traditional options when such options might better serve the needs of youth.

Because of the dearth of quantitative and qualitative data pertaining to flows of cases through the justice system and between YSBs and the justice system, this Phase I Assessment **only** succeeds in adding substance to the speculation on the nature of diversion and in raising more questions which may be susceptible to answers through research evaluation, as follows:

Would youth referred to YSBs by, for example, the police, (a) simply have been warned and released or (b) referred to court intake? Would these same youth have committed subsequent law violations and been taken into custody or arrested had they simply been handled by the police with warn-and-release? Did those youth who might have been warned-and-released commit offenses subsequent to YSB referral? Likewise for youth who might have been court referrals? Does the fact of YSB referral by, say police, subsequently influence police behavior and decision-making - positively or negatively - when that youth is taken into custody for an alleged new offense? Does the existence of the YSB, to which police are making referrals, have more of an influence on police decision-making when a prior referral is taken into custody again than, say, police policy and practices regarding diversion or the attitudes of individual police officers towards juvenile law violators, or certain types of law violations, or certain types of youth committing certain types of alleged law violations? Can YSBs impact more on official recidivism rates by influencing juvenile behavior? How does one measure the differential impact of these types of interventions--institution-focused or youth-focused?

3. Dynamics of the Direct Service Model of YSBs

Despite the original intention that YSBs not provide direct services but rather screen clients into other community services, most of the site visits and telephone interviews indicated that bureaus were in fact delivering a high level of direct services to referred youth. The table in Exhibit 4 shows that most YSBs ranked provision of direct services as the top-

PROGRAM FUNCTION ORIENTATION*

Rank		Direct Service	Referral/ Brokerage	Service Development	Youth Advocacy	Youth Development	TOTALS
1	Number of YSBs	274	30	24	15	9	352
	Percent of Rank	78%	9%	7%	4%	3%	100%
	Percent of Total	78%	9%	7%	4%	3%	100%
2	Number of YSBs	29	164	43	32	20%	288
	Percent of Rank	10%	57%	15%	11%	7%	100%
	Percent of Total	8%	47%	12%	9%	6%	82%
3	Number of YSBs	14	45	40	55	23	177
	Percent of Rank	8%	25%	23%	31%	13%	100%
	Percent of Total	4%	13%	11%	16%	7%	50%
4	Number of YSBs	7	18	24	17	16	82
	Percent of Rank	9%	22%	29%	21%	20%	100%
	Percent of Total	2%	5%	7%	5%	5%	23%
5	Number of YSBs	3	7	5	7	5	27
	Percent of Rank	11%	26%	19%	26%	19%	100%
	Percent of Total	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	8%
TOTAL		327	264	136	126	73	
		93%	75%	39%	36%	21%	

* Percentage of Total is based upon 352 YSB projects for which program orientation data were available.

EXHIBIT 4

ranked activity they perform.* While many YSBs had not been initially designed to deliver direct services, they slipped into that function over time. In looking at this phenomenon more closely, there were many compelling reasons why YSBs would move toward a direct service model.

Primary among these reasons were pressures of referring agencies (particularly the police and the courts) for results regarding their referrals. It is perhaps difficult for police and courts to see the benefits of an agency that simply refers youth to still other agencies. They might well wonder why bother to refer a youth to the YSB if the bureau itself is only going to pass along the child to another agency. Additionally, there is an expectation in any sort of referral that a beneficial result will accrue and that this can be attributed to the work of the accepting agency. Thus, if the police refer a youth to a YSB and he is simply referred elsewhere, ultimately to return to the justice system, the tendency is to blame the YSB for not performing. In such a situation the YSB finds itself caught in the middle, being held accountable for performance but having no real capacity to deliver adequate services or treatment to those youth. Thus, providing direct services is one way of controlling the performance and outcome of services to youth accepted by the bureau.

Another factor leading to the direct services approach is that it is often easier. There is a good deal of available information and technology on the delivery of direct services while technology for networking, coordination and integration of agencies is more limited. Further, agencies in a community tend to resist and be suspicious of one another's attempts at service or program integration. Attempts by one agency to integrate other agencies are sometimes seen as empire building on behalf of the initiating agency. Thus, an agency that presents itself as an integrator and coordinator of other agencies, such as the YSB, might find those agencies resistant to cooperating and even accepting referrals.

An additional factor that contributes to YSBs' slipping into the direct service model is the lack of direct service resources for youth in many communities. And, monies are more accessible for providing direct services than any other form

* Each project was asked to rank the five program function orientations by importance (row headings) and then to indicate, in relative terms, the amount of effort expended on each activity (column headings).

of social service. The YSB also gets a tangible feeling of doing something constructive within the community. Often the benefits and successes of networking and interagency facilitation are nebulous and difficult to perceive. Direct service, on the other hand, involves real clients and real contacts with agency personnel.

Finally, the provision of direct services in a community where other agencies are primarily interested in providing direct services themselves tends to create a basic credibility of the YSB with respect to other agencies. In other words, the YSB becomes more believable as an agency that understands the problems of youth if it, in fact, is trying to serve youth itself. This can lay the basis for future efforts and facilitation and network building.

4. Referral Brokerage Activities

As the table in Exhibit 4 indicates, referral/brokerage is ranked second in importance as a program function orientation. In none of the programs visited did any YSB do referral/brokerage activities exclusively. On the other hand, in only one program was it stated that no referrals were made.

YSBs must make referrals out to other service agencies, even if the YSB itself provides direct services. Referral relieves YSBs of excessive caseloads in the same way that the YSB acts to relieve the caseloads of the courts and probation departments. This ongoing flow of clients into, through and out of the YSB enables it to continue to absorb--not turn away--new referrals from the justice system and the schools.

The decision to refer a youth to another service agency is often influenced more by the availability of service agencies and their willingness to accept referrals from the YSB, than by the perceived needs of the clients. Since YSBs were created to fill a gap in youth services it is not surprising that there would be a shortage of existing services to meet a youth's needs. However, the YSB can act as a clearinghouse for tracking and following up on clients who only pass through it and receive direct services elsewhere.

5. Limitations on Systems Development and Youth Advocacy

Very few of the YSBs that were visited or interviewed over the phone were engaged in youth advocacy or systems change activities for a variety of reasons:

- YSBs have very little official leverage in the communities they serve and must build credibility with the juvenile justice system, the schools, and other social service agencies through the delivery of effective direct services, through cooperative information-sharing, and through the non-adversarial persuasive skills of its staff members, particularly the director.
- The provision of the direct services that are necessary to establish credibility uses up the time and energy of staff members.
- The provision of needed direct services by a YSB relieves some of the pressure and need for change in the systems that refer youth to the YSB: why, for example, should a school system change its ways of dealing with aggressive, angry, problematic youth when it can simply refer those youths and their problems to the YSB. The availability of the YSB's direct services can reduce the felt need for change in the system. At the same time, the availability of those services at the YSB is, in itself, a change in the system.
- The short-lived reality of many YSBs (LEAA funding typically lasts only 3 years) makes it difficult for the YSB to establish lasting credibility and leverage with the systems it may want to change.
- Youth advocacy and systems change are complicated, subtle, difficult activities to carry out, and the measurement of the impact of such activities is also difficult to achieve with clarity, particularly in the short-term. Consequently, YSBs will tend to avoid these activities and opt for direct services so that they can show themselves, and others, that they are doing something clear, specific, and demonstrably useful.

- YSBs that are closely connected to the juvenile justice system will have a difficult time engaging in youth advocacy and systems change with the juvenile justice system because of the commitment and loyalties that inevitably go along with that close relationship.
- YSBs that are more autonomous from the juvenile justice system will also have a difficult time engaging in youth advocacy and systems change with the justice system because it probably has little influence with the juvenile justice system unless the YSB staff, particularly the director, is a skilled persuader and mobilizer of support for change.
- The kind of relationship-building that is necessary to establish a foundation of trust or openness to systems change in the juvenile justice system, schools, or other social service agencies probably requires activities and behaviors that conflict with the protection of the rights and autonomy of the YSB's clients (e.g., extensive information-sharing about clients, etc.).

The reasons why a YSB may avoid systems change or youth advocacy work are understandable, given the context in which these programs operate. Still, the YSB was seen by the Crime Commission and others as helping to coordinate community services, identify gaps in services and develop new ones. Thus, it was surprising to find that very few YSBs even took the first step in this direction by actually conducting a study of the coordination or service development needs of existing agencies in relation to the needs of delinquent youth. One such needs assessment did exist in a YSB funded by LEAA Impact Cities money, but it was largely ignored in the program planning process.

YSB boards generally contribute little to accomplishment of systems development aims. The boards include representatives from various community agencies involved in service delivery to youth and their families but in the Phase I field studies little evidence of board members influencing the policies of their representative agencies in relation to the objectives and needs of YSBs was found. Again, notable exceptions to the rule exist which prove the potential value of boards in development, expansion and, not least of all, survival of YSBs.

B. YSBs and Their Relationship to Client and Community

The formal and informal relationships which have developed between the YSB and its client, between the YSB and the juvenile justice system and between the YSB and other social institutions and community agencies varied significantly from one program to another. A common element, though, is the importance of such external liaisons to program viability and survival. YSBs do not exist in a vacuum. They are, in fact, defined and sustained by their relationship to the community in which they reside.

1. YSBs, Youth, and Their Legal Status

Aside from very limited information about intake criteria, size of annual population, sex, race and age group of the target population, this study did not examine the youth who use YSBs (see Exhibit 5 for the characteristics of the youth and communities for the YSBs visited in the field study). However, the Phase I team did examine the question of youth in relation to the YSB and the legal structures which apply to them.

The Phase I field studies support the arguments of those who claim that diversion can be a violation of the due process rights of children and other rights guaranteed by the Constitution and Supreme Court decisions. Data from the site visits suggest that diversionary referrals from courts to YSBs essentially : defer prosecution; that YSB referrals tend to be quasi-legal dispositions without findings of guilt--rather, such referrals are contingent upon admissions of guilt without the advice of counsel; that "voluntary agreements" or consent decrees are often obtained under coercive circumstances which vitiate the meaning of voluntariness; that throughout the diversionary and referral process the youth seems to inhabit a legal limbo which increases his vulnerability to subsequent punishment for offenses previously committed, which may be a much more subtle and pernicious problem than double jeopardy.

The potentially coercive nature of many YSBs is supported by Exhibit 6. This table shows that 60% of those clients who do not elect to participate in YSB activities are returned to the juvenile justice system, thus calling into question the voluntariness of the original referral. While a table such as this cannot give the range of reasons why such "send backs" are warranted, the site visit information suggests that one possible explanation lies in the relationship of YSBs to other service providers and the juvenile justice system. On the continuum of services from completely voluntary social services to non-voluntary

	YSBs						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A) Age Group	10-18	10-17	N/A	10-18	10-18	7-19	7-16
B) Intake Criteria	Status and first offenders, misdemeanors, dependency and neglect	School problems, all youth	Not formal complaint cases	First offenders, non-offenders pretrial release	Serious and potentially serious offenders, first and multiple offenders	Live in target area; project serves specified number of youth	Reside in town, attend town alternative school
C) Characteristics							
1) Active Case-load	280	507	N/A	130	38	4,300	N/A
2) Annual Total	1,505	3,645	1,021	786	398	3,200	700
3) % Female Clients	48%	32%	27%	47%	31%	30%	59%
4) % Status Offenders	43%	N/A	31%	N/A	2%	N/A	N/A
5) % Minority Clients	60%	82%	N/A	25%	75%	80%	90%
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
A) Age Group	10-18	12-21	5-18	5-18	9-25	9-17	No Client
B) Intake Criteria	No more than five prior offenses	All youth	Truancy incorrigibility, all school youth	See #10	All youth	Adjudicated awaiting disposition discretion of Judge	
C) Characteristics							
1) Active Case-load	186	216	94	61	N/A	1,115	
2) Annual Total	163	325	126	78	600	1,167	
3) % Female clients	30%	40%	12%	25%	N/A	35%	
4) % Status offenders	48%	35%	55%	85%	N/A	60%	
5) % Minority clients	5%	5%	25%	12%	-0-	-0-	

EXHIBIT 5
TARGET GROUPS OF TWENTY-SEVEN YSBs

	YSBs					
	15	16	17	18	19	20
A) Age Group	12-17	1-21	4-22	10-17	No Clients	9-18
B) Intake Criteria	First and non-offenders	All youth	All youth	Not currently receiving services		N/A
C) Characteristics						
1) Active Caseload	N/A	N/A	3,364	45		217
2) Annual Total	62	N/A	N/A	525		400
3) % Female Clients	5%	N/A	12%	50%		40%
4) % Status Offenders	N/A	N/A	N/A	38%		N/A
5) % Minority clients	N/A	99%	99%	-0-		5%

	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
A) Age Group	12-18	8-17	5-17	5-17	12-17	12-18	17 & under
B) Intake Criteria	Preference for school district residents	N/A	N/A	All school students	All youth	N/A	N/A
C) Characteristics							
1) Active Caseload	60	200	172	227	N/A	50	388
2) Annual Total	317	650	N/A	237	343	157	623
3) % Female clients	N/A	30%	32%	33%	40%	40%	44%
4) % Status offenders	N/A	60%	34%	100%	15%	25%	4%
5) % Minority clients	1%	97%	32%	30%	3%	30%	91%

EXHIBIT 5 (cont.)

CONSEQUENCES OF CLIENT NONPARTICIPATION*

	TOTAL	Client Sent Back to JJS	Other Action	No Action
Number YSBs	334	200	80	54
Percent of Total	100%	60%	24%	16%

* Data are presented for 334 YSB projects for which information was available; percentages are calculated on this base. No data were available for 33 projects. Some projects, such as those engaged in Service Development or Referral/Brokerage, have no long-term clients. The question or consequences of nonparticipation was not applicable to 5 such projects in the telephone survey sample.

"Other Action" includes courses of action taken by a YSB that fall short of automatically sending a client back to the JJS. An example is a policy involving no sanctions in the first instance of non-cooperation, but return of the client to the JJS in the event of a second failure to cooperate.

EXHIBIT 6

action by the justice system, the YSB often falls next to the justice system. YSBs cannot send troublesome youth to a program less equipped to deal with such problems and the only remaining alternative is the justice system.

It would be misleading to suggest that all YSBs are the recipients of "unconstitutional" referrals, though this phenomenon exists. In one program it was reported that by providing a twenty-four hour receiving center for police use, the YSB has almost eliminated inappropriate detention for first offenders and CHINS cases. Thus the benefits of a more congenial environment must be weighed against the harm of a potentially unconstitutional referral. Still, the data seem to suggest that more concern is put on relieving the police and the courts of unnecessary burdens than on guaranteeing due process to youngsters.

2. The YSB and the Juvenile Justice System

a. The Effects of Direct Services in the Context of the Juvenile Justice System

The tendency of YSBs to provide direct services that are structured on the precipitating event, symptomatic relief, flexible negotiation and counselling model has the effect of formalizing what had heretofore been an informal relationship between the client and the juvenile justice system. This happens because a large portion of the youth referred to YSBs are youth who previously would have been simply counselled and released by the police. Now, however, there is a place--the YSB--where they can be sent for more services than just counselling. This in effect creates a more formal way of dealing with minor offenses than existed in the past.

In most communities of any size, alternative dispositions for judges basically are limited to probation or institutionalization. In a few communities, especially smaller ones, YSBs provide a significant alternative disposition. Elsewhere, however, relieving the problem of lack of alternative dispositions while maintaining the existing scope of juvenile court jurisdiction, would require (1) a phenomenal increase in the number of adequately funded YSBs, and (2) an almost exclusive programmatic emphasis within these YSBs on diversion, i.e., accepting referrals from court intake. Apart from the possible adverse consequences of restricting YSB intake to court referrals, most YSBs interviewed by telephone and in the field that are not part of the court would resist shifting their target group to predominantly court referrals. In this respect, many judges and YSB staff interviewed agree that:

- community programs are needed for prevention of delinquency; and
- a basic cause of delinquency is the inability of youth to adjust to the educational system, which should receive priority attention in a delinquency prevention program.

According to this Phase I survey, the YSB generally has evolved as neither a diversion program, which directly and significantly relieves judicial workloads, nor a prevention program which indirectly relieves judicial workloads by dealing with primary or secondary causes of delinquency in their target areas. Most YSBs maintain a split focus - diversion and prevention - as indicated by program type, target group and sources of referrals. Where YSBs are effective in implementing this dual focus, they can establish and maintain credibility with the justice system in spite of the small extent to which the YSBs contribute to remedying justice system problems.

Even in YSB programs in which referrals are predominantly from non-justice agency sources, the juvenile justice system is felt and responded to as an important influence. This influence is reinforced by LEAA funding even where such money constitutes less than half of YSBs funds. Both the justice system and LEAA stress the importance of data focused on recidivism which promote the view of the YSB as an arm of the justice system. This image of a YSB is also reinforced by other community agencies which view the YSB as the last stop or chance before court processing. The YSB frequently is viewed as a probation-type or quasi-probation agency, especially if it maintains close working relationships with the court.

YSBs may have been established under public or private auspices as alternatives to juvenile justice system processing, but in actuality they operate more as extensions of the justice system. From the field studies, it appears that YSBs have evolved as a new form of authority "system" that has grown in the interstices of existing institutional authority systems. It draws its authority, legitimacy and status from schools, the justice system, public and private social agencies which sanction its functions and presence in the community as an "alternative" to and extension of their own authority.

b. Consequences of Information Feedback by YSBs to the Juvenile Justice System and Other Referral Agencies

If handled correctly, information exchange can be one of the most useful functions a YSB can perform. The tables in Exhibit 7 illustrate the degree to which information is passed along to other agencies. Note the high percentage of YSBs providing information to the juvenile justice system.

There are potential detrimental aspects to information feedback from the YSB to other agencies. First, to the extent that the YSB is obligated to provide feedback - initially or as a continuation of past practices - its autonomy is limited. Autonomy per se may not be essential but the degree of autonomy probably is interrelated with the capacity to perform advocacy.

Information feedback may also be detrimental to youth in terms of stigmatization from negative labeling perpetuated through cumulative recordkeeping. While the psychological impact of labeling on youth is still a problematic matter for speculation and research, the ways in which records on diverted youth affect their future opportunities should be assessed.

Still, despite the potential for abuse, there are substantial, if not essential benefits to YSBs from information feedback, not the least of which is the credibility gained with referral agencies and the improved services that youth receive. Balancing the pluses and minuses by developing effective communication procedures which are non-stigmatizing represents a continuing challenge for all youth programs.

c. Perceptions of Diversion Among Justice System Officials

That some YSBs are an integral part of the courts, probation or the police is regarded by justice system officials as a significant innovation and indicative of a progressive system. The fact that many youngsters referred to the YSB probably should not be in the justice system in the first place is not an accepted view among most justice officials. From their perspective the youth has committed an unlawful act, which he usually admits, and the YSB provides a legitimate alternative to a petition. Also, the fact that many of these youth referred to YSBs do not appear again in court is interpreted as a sign of success even though studies indicate that most would not return to court anyway.

These same justice officials, however, would agree that fewer youngsters should be handled formally by the justice system. These views are not incompatible because handling fewer youths formally does not mean doing nothing. It means referring

CLIENT INFORMATION FEEDBACK*

Table 1. Is Client Information Provided to Referring Agencies?

Referring Agency	Data Not Available	Total	YSBs Providing Feedback	YSBs Providing No Feedback
Inside JJS	24	348 100%	316 91%	32 9%
Outside JJS	24	348 100%	288 83%	60 17%

Table 2. Types of Client Information Provided by YSB

Referring Agency	Y YSBs Providing	Type of Feedback			
		Formal Written	Informal Written	Formal Oral	Informal Oral
Inside JJS	Number	219	59	62	75
	% of Total	63%	17%	18%	22%
Outside JJS	Number	151	66	60	101
	% of Total	43%	19%	17%	29%

* Data are presented for 348 YSB projects for which feedback information was available. Percentages are calculated upon this base for all three tables. How totals in Table 2 may not equal 100% because projects may provide more than one type of feedback.

EXHIBIT 7

them to community resources, which justice officials universally lament are lacking. The percentage of youth that justice officials view as inappropriately handled by the formal justice system ranged, in the interviews conducted, from 25% to 90%. The higher the percentage of youth that justice officials in positions of responsibility (e.g., chief probation officer, district attorney, police captain, judge) believe should be diverted from traditional handling, the greater amount of diversion that actually seems to be taking place. In other words, the official position on diversion within segments of the justice system seems to percolate down, even when a specified level of diversion is not official policy. Furthermore, the higher the percentage of youth seen as benefiting from diversion, the greater seems to be the tolerance within the justice agency of recidivism.

The problems of youth in trouble with the law, as reviewed by juvenile judges in surveys conducted in 1963 and 1973 by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, have changed little in recent years in relative importance. Changes have occurred only in absolute magnitude.¹² A comparison of the findings of the Phase I Assessment with problems identified and ranked by judges indicates that many problems have not, in relative terms, changed. Presumably, the ways in which YSBs address these problems affect the regard with which they are held by judges.

- Judges ranked their top problem as inadequate facilities for detention or shelter care pending disposition. Most YSBs provide few alternatives to detention or shelter care facilities.
- Second, insufficient foster home placement. Most YSBs don't provide foster care or other residential alternatives for court referred youth.
- Third, inadequate or insufficient training or correctional institutions. This problem is not applicable to YSBs since YSBs by and large are not programmatically designed as non-residential alternatives to institutionalization of youth.
- Fourth, insufficient probation or social service staff. Most YSBs in effect augment probation and probation-related social service staff and thereby contribute to one degree or another to relief of this manpower problem.

- For metropolitan juvenile court judges, the fourth-ranked problem was excessive judicial workloads. YSBs in metropolitan areas with populations over 250,000 are too few in number (89 according to our survey) to make more than a small dent in the problem of overly broad juvenile (or family) court jurisdiction. Although referrals from police, schools, parents, social agencies, etc. surely tend to indirectly reduce judicial workloads, the majority of referrals to YSBs in metropolitan areas do not come directly from courts.

3. YSBs and Schools

Schools are a major source of client referrals for many of the YSBs visited and interviewed by telephone. Schools are not only an important arena in which delinquent behavior is acted out; the restrictiveness and authoritativeness of some public school systems also can contribute to, or exacerbate, delinquent behavior patterns.

Staff of justice agencies, YSBs and other community agencies interviewed in field visits to 16 states in every region of the country, covering metropolitan and rural communities, were almost unanimous in their agreement that school factors significantly influence delinquency and that schools should be the first line of social defense in delinquency prevention. This may be the single most important finding of the field survey.

School referrals to the YSB are made primarily by (a) principals and/or assistant principals in charge of disciplinary action in the school, (b) guidance counselors, and (c) pupil personnel services who deal with truancy cases and other problems that guidance staff are unable to handle. In many cases, these people refer students to a YSB because they perceive a need for family intervention which they are not equipped to provide themselves. In other cases, they refer youth to the YSB because the YSB counselors can provide more of a "big brother" type relationship than is possible within the school system. Also, referrals are made to the YSB because the YSB can get things done in behalf of problem youth more quickly and effectively than school system personnel (e.g., in a Massachusetts YSB the guidance counselors interviewed reported that the YSB was able to expedite a Chapter

766 application* in behalf of one student far more effectively than anyone else in the school system or social service system of the city).

This Phase I study has shown that many YSBs are involved in providing direct counseling services (individual and family) to school-referred youth, but very few YSBs are engaged in active systems modification efforts with schools. The reason for this appears to be that schools are difficult systems to penetrate and may be resistant to change and influence from outsiders.

The direct services provided by YSBs to youth referred by schools are undoubtedly helping to prevent some youth from actually becoming involved with the juvenile justice system. Unfortunately, none of the YSBs visited have really evaluated their work with school referrals in ways that indicate their impact on the future delinquent behavior of such youth or on the problem of delinquency in general.

4. YSBs and Other Community Agencies

In very few communities is there an abundance of social or other services targeted at juvenile delinquents. Rather, an abundance of social services may exist, particularly in urban areas, while the need for direct services for juvenile delinquents remains unmet. The existence of ample social service resources frequently leads the YSB to become a catalyst to other resource agencies to increase the system's overall capacity for dealing with juvenile delinquents or troublesome youth.

Where states or localities have flexible funds to purchase services for youth in trouble, larger numbers of community agencies tend to expand their services, thereby pushing a YSB in the direction of (a) accepting referrals that do not meet the intake requirements of existing agencies, (b) attempting to coordinate the provision of services by existing agencies, or (c) actually becoming the funding mechanism for such services. In several larger cities visited, the YSB has assumed the role of combining, planning, funding, coordinating, monitoring and evaluation.

YSB programs visited in the field serve or are capable of serving essentially the same clients as runaway programs and drug

* special education funds

programs. Their philosophies and treatment modalities increasingly are becoming indistinguishable in the following respects:

- Broadening of service to youth regardless of presenting symptom;
- Movement away from eligibility criteria;
- Acceptance of justice system referrals based on a contract and/or fee-for-service arrangement;
- Emphasis on program flexibility, multi-service, multimodality, voluntariness, parent involvement, one-to-one advocacy/counseling model as primary "treatment";
- Emphasis on day-care/counseling/alternative schools, etc., rather than residential programs;
- Short-term residential placement as last resort;
- Utilization of para- or non-professionals along with professionals; and
- Active involvement in networks of public and private agencies.

The successful YSB requires a substantial degree of integration with the community subsystems with which it works; it requires positive perceptions from other agencies; it needs to minimize goal differentiation; and it needs a distinct identity in terms of a particular goal, namely delinquency prevention. Mutual attraction among service agencies does not grow on the basis of continued disagreement. Since YSBs typically lack power, at least to begin with, the YSB is in no position to use coercive tactics. YSBs have to persuade justice, educational and social agencies to use and value their services and resources. YSBs perceived as effective by these agencies become more or less integrated with their service network.

One of the principal tools at a YSB's disposal for fostering good relations with other community agencies is information. Sharing of information about clients frequently proves to be of more importance than accomplishment of other objectives (see Section V-B-2b).

From the site visits it was evident that the YSB director has to have credibility in the community, especially among justice system and service agencies and the school system to have an influence over (a) the referral of youth to the YSB, (b) the availability of service referral resources, (c) the policies and practices of those agencies, and (d) continuation of YSB funding from Federal and/or local sources. Apart from personality and expertise, the style of the director in dealing with these community institutions and agencies is crucial. Non-abrasive and non-adversarial style usually is essential, which limits the type and scope of advocacy on behalf of clients. Even asserting a role of service coordination and monitoring tends to reduce cooperation from these agencies. The goals of the YSB have to be well-defined in non-threatening terms and these goals have to appear congruent with the goals of schools, justice and service agencies.

VI. EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION RESEARCH

A. Planning and Evaluation Activities of YSBs and SPAs

1. Planning and Evaluation by YSBs

YSB planning and evaluation is typically unsophisticated and often set within the limits of the grant guidelines. As a result, this YSB Phase I Assessment yielded little information which demonstrated that YSBs, taken as a group, are successful or unsuccessful. A small handful of the programs could point to improved recidivism statistics or a "good" rating from an SPA as evidence of their worth. But, in general, the findings of this study with respect to evaluation run parallel to other study conclusions. That is, the YSBs analyzed, collected different kinds of information for different purposes and at different levels of detail and reliability. Furthermore, what program information did exist tended to relate more to the processing of clients through the YSB (sources of clients, kinds of services rendered, and referrals made out) than the impact of the YSB on youth in trouble or the juvenile justice system.

None of the YSBs described in the research literature or surveyed by the Phase I Assessment team used experimental research strategies or methodologies. (Nor would they have appeared to have been appropriate without much more design and control of the programs themselves.) Where YSB data had been systematically collected and analyzed, the purpose was program evaluation. Hypotheses being tested usually were implicit and derived from the objectives of the program rather than from theory. Usually they did not have as their primary or even secondary purpose the formulation of a problem or set of questions or hypotheses as the basis for more rigorous future research. The intent to clarify concepts and issues involved in YSB development, operations or impact usually was unclear or absent. Data collection methods did not usually employ (1) intensive analysis of a sampling of the client group, (2) interviewing of program participants, or (3) theoretical analysis of the phenomena being evaluated. These inadequacies of YSB program evaluation are not at all unique. Like most social or human service programs, they have not been evaluated in ways that can tell us whether or not the programs have produced their intended impact or have produced intended side effects.

But even if appropriate evaluation research conditions are reasonably satisfied, all that is answered is the question:

how effective is this type of YSB in meeting its goals as compared with another type of program or no program at all? The evaluations have not been designed to go beyond YSB programmatic considerations. They ignore or significantly underplay the social and institutional structures within which the problems of the target group are generated or sustained--hence, the importance of doing juvenile research as system research with a functional orientation rather than considering the YSB topic area as a discreet entity.

This Phase I Assessment finds that the YSB topic area taken alone might be unevaluable as a topic area at the national level (and also might be difficult to evaluate alone even at the local level). The variation among programs which fit the concept of a YSB and which have been documented here is too great--the combination of program and process variables produces a range of legitimate program types, each of which carries with it unique kinds of evaluation difficulties.

2. SPA Involvement with YSBs

The Phase I Assessment team conducted telephone interviews and, in some states, on-site interviews, with SPA juvenile delinquency staff in planning, grants management, and/or evaluation in all states except Alabama, Indiana, Vermont, Minnesota and Pennsylvania. The interviews enabled project team members to ascertain the SPA role in YSB planning, funding, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and technical assistance.

In particular, the project team attempted to learn the ways in which state criminal justice planning units contributed directly and indirectly to shaping YSB objectives, operations, referral sources and referral patterns, sponsorship, location, evaluation activity, etc. The interviews probed for the assumptions of SPAs which influenced the program and funding priorities of YSBs. More difficult to assess through the interview process was the impact of the structure and politics of criminal justice on the status of YSBs in terms of basic decisions on policy, program development, budget, and evaluation. With the focus of the Phase I Assessment on evaluation of the study team attempted to assess the type and extent of monitoring and evaluation activities directed at YSBs, both currently and projected for the future. Collectively, the SPA and YSB interviews, reviews of project evaluation reports, field visits and review of the evaluation literature gave the project team a good basis for piecing together the state-of-the-art in YSB evaluation.

The survey of SPAs found that Sherwood Norman's model of YSBs, with some state-to-state variations, has had considerable influence in shaping the conception of YSB objectives and functions.¹³ The major points are as follows:

- Coordinate all youth services in the community.
- Define youth problems in the community and develop a plan for addressing those needs.
- Identify gaps in services.
- Define the role of local service agencies regarding the needs of the community.
- Foster the expansion and improvement of services to a larger number of youth.
- Serve all the youth of the community (but with primary emphasis on diverting youth from the juvenile justice system).
- Provide probation departments with better services so as to allow them to increasingly use local services and therefore decrease the number of youth served directly by the juvenile justice system.

In most SPAs, the distinction between "diversion" and "prevention" is unresolved and the debate has been intensified by the passage of the Juvenile Justice Act. In general LEAA is viewed as a reactive agency - responding to law violating acts that have occurred (indicating, perhaps a diversion focus). It is anticipated that under the provisions of the Juvenile Justice Act, LEAA programs may shift into a more proactive role (which would tend to support an increase in prevention activities).

Comprehensive plans tend to vary from state to state, so that projects that call themselves YSBs in some states turn up as diversion projects in other states, and perform essentially the same functions. Even within states many SPA juvenile justice projects--such as alternatives to incarceration, employment services, treatment and referral--duplicate YSB-type functions, making the distinction between YSBs and other activities unclear. Still some states are much more specific about the requirements for program objectives and content (e.g., target group such as status offenders) and, specifically have solicited YSB proposals.

A few states even involve themselves in YSB operational policy. In Connecticut, the SPA has been studying the issue of possible consequences (i.e., return to court) for clients referred to YSBs in lieu of adjudication and the SPA is leaning towards a policy that the client should not be liable to sanctions for non-participation in SPA-funded programs.

The level and quality of SPA evaluation varies from non-existent or very rudimentary to sophisticated, with complex research designs and demanding requirements for such things as the maintenance of information bases. Still, information obtained from SPA staff site visits and data collection activities is used primarily for program funding accountability rather than program evaluation purposes. Uniform and improved data formats for YSB projects, along with uniform measures of success, is the next step in improved "evaluation" currently sought by most SPAs. The more sophisticated SPAs are moving towards comprehensive evaluation systems aimed at providing comparative information within program categories; much more specificity of objectives; and more operational information on diversion and YSB services.

Some SPAs have evaluation studies designed like the NEP. That is, they fund "cluster" evaluations or evaluations of groups of similarly oriented projects. In attempting to "cluster" evaluations many SPAs may well face the dilemma of this Phase I Assessment. That is, projects will have been implemented differently across the state. What is needed is a more systematic way of viewing the juvenile justice system (such as that proposed by the OJJDP perhaps) and a process whereby the SPA might categorize YSBs in relation to their program functions and relationship with the justice system. Thus, "clusters" should be clearly defined by what projects do rather than by what seems to be a logical grouping on the basis of what they are called.

3. Suggestions for Improving YSB Planning and Evaluation

Both planning and evaluation employ well-known tools of investigation and research which need not be discussed here.*

* Monitoring for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, August 1974.
Intensive Evaluation for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, July 1975.

There are, however, some suggestions which might be considered. In the areas of improved planning, one of the most promising vehicles is the newly formed state associations of YSB directors. These associations provide a forum for discussing and analyzing common problems and developing practical guidelines for planning related to these problems. One option of SPAs would be to fund technical assistance in planning for these state associations to enable them to develop such guidelines in conformity with Federal, state and local requirements. This approach already is being used in the area of evaluation.

As indicated above, the Phase I Assessment team has determined that YSBs, as a topic area, are probably not evaluable. A more specific definition of the program and process variables to be studied should be articulated before a study is begun. As suggested above, the OJJDP's strategy for looking at the components of the juvenile justice both functionally and as a system may be the answer.

Apart from these general recommendations concerning the national strategy for a YSB evaluation, the site visits did suggest some other points which may be relevant to individual YSBs and YSB evaluators.

First, the need for basic information about each YSB, despite its form and functions, is paramount. But, while every program should have some form of assessment, that does not mean that every program must have the same level of evaluation effort. Consideration should always be made of two different approaches to evaluation: program accounting or monitoring, and in-depth, experimentally-based evaluation and assessment. The value in the former is that it enables funding or sponsoring agencies to provide more confident answers to legislative, professional and other audiences regarding what it is, in fact, they are supporting. Impact evaluation, while much more costly, is better suited to answering more essential questions regarding the true results of the program in terms of its clients--youth, the justice system and the community.

The decision of which level of evaluation to employ must, in the case of YSBs, probably be a local one. Considerations such as a need to know (e.g., mandated by a city council or a state legislature), available funds for evaluation, size of the program in terms of funds and people served, and intervention strategies (innovative or commonly used) should be factored into each decision. Despite which approach is selected, some evaluation strategy is essential. Some of the problems encountered in this Phase I Assessment would have been avoided had more individual programs been documenting their activities and evaluating their impacts.

4. Suggested Measures of YSB Outcome

The diversity of program emphases in YSBs makes the tasks of specifying outcome criteria awkward and cumbersome. What appears necessary, however, is a standard set of abstract variables at least for all model accountability and evaluation programs recognizing that this standard set will be a small part of the total number of variables handled in any particular investigation.

Put in practical terms, the program and outcome variables are very different in the case of an intensive family crisis intervention program on the one hand and a youth development/employment program on the other. Although quite different, both programs can perhaps be evaluated locally in measures related to the: (1) reduction in problematic behavior, (2) increase in pro-social behavior, and (3) changes in self-concept.

In the case of program evaluation, the emphasis of the YSB on the task of delinquency prevention and control would require assessment of variables pertaining to youth misconduct, including:

- law violation rates
- school violations (truancy, school withdrawal)
- recidivism (probation or parole revocations)
- self-reports of deviant or problematic behavior.

In addition, since reduction or delinquency in most cases can be assumed to be accompanied by increased "pro-social" behavior, it would be appropriate to look at such items as:

- evidence of improved school performance (grades, classroom participation)
- increased effectiveness in work setting
- increased participation in political or community activities

Since most behavioral changes, either positive or negative, can be assumed to be connected with changes in self-perceptions, some social-psychological measures can be suggested in such areas as:

- perceptions of increased "belongingness", decreased "isolation"

- perceptions of increased self-worth, lowered "meaninglessness"
- perceptions of increased competence, lowered perception of self as incompetent
- perceptions of increased potency, reduced feelings of powerlessness.

The fact that the programs are quite different requires, at some stage in the evaluation process, a procedure whereby the particular and specific goals of the program are explicated. Thus, a program designed to produce its effects through a change in family functioning should be able to state what kinds of family changes are the target of the program, and concretely how these changes can be measured in terms of both the behavior and attitudes of those involved. Built into each model program, in other words, would be an evaluation component created around the unique and specific procedures and objectives of the bureau. This will mean that the sponsoring agency would need some procedures for peer review of the evaluation objectives and criteria produced by the individual projects.

A final area of criteria has to do with system effects of the youth service bureau. Diversion, in all its meanings, is a system variable. Thus, to have a minimally adequate evaluation, programs should be able to "map" over time the referral rates between such agencies as schools, police, courts, and institutions (using schemes such as Elliott's "transitional probabilities" or the new ones under development by OJJDP). By plotting the way a youth service bureau is "nested" in these networks of referrals, the evaluation can then trace the level of "removal", reduced "penetration", and even "decriminalization". A mandate to "divert" by means of the YSB will make such measures and their mapping an essential part of the local monitoring and evaluation of YSBs.

B. Review of the YSB Evaluation Literature

Evaluation studies tend to support the preliminary observations of this study with respect to the problems of conceptualizing what a YSB is and categorizing what it does. The evaluation studies wrestle with definitional problems posed here (particularly the question of what diversion is) catalogue YSB activities, and, in some cases, describe changes in patterns of delinquency--many of which could not specifically be tied to the activities of the YSB. Still, the evaluation work of others, despite understandable

problems, is significant in that it points to conceptual and methodological difficulties inherent in any such evaluation, and, by extension, provides guidance to future YSB evaluators. A selection of those studies are discussed here.

1. A California Study - (Elaine Duxbury, 1973, Evaluation of Youth Service Bureaus, Department of the Youth Authority, State of California).

Duxbury's evaluation of ten California YSBs sought to answer three questions:

- Were YSBs able to divert youth from the juvenile justice system?
- Could YSBs coordinate existing local youth services?
- Did YSBs effect a reduction in delinquency in the target areas?

The methodology entailed use of an information system on youth in the programs and statistics on delinquency in the target area; it involved interviews with relevant program staff and community representatives; and it was buttressed by observations and descriptions of the programs.

Based on data from selected bureaus, the study showed that youth referred to the YSB from all sources were less likely to be arrested in the six months following intake than in the six months preceding bureau contact. The study also noted an apparent decline in the juvenile arrest rates overall for most target areas. With regard to diversion, the study showed that the YSBs appeared to be somewhat successful in removing youth from the justice system. The number of juvenile arrests referred to probation intake decreased from 20 to 40 percent in four or five areas where data were available.

What the study was not able to do is to tie specific outcomes to specific program activity. The range of direct services provided by the ten programs suggests a lack of a theoretical framework guiding program activities. This impedes the evaluation process and provides little assistance to other projects seeking to replicate, for evaluation purposes or otherwise, the experiences of the YSBs which were studied.

2. A Massachusetts Study - (Kenneth Polk and Gerald F. Blake. Final Report: Evaluation of Youth Resource Bureaus (Phase I) Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice, Boston, Massachusetts, 1970).

The Massachusetts study was more limited than the Duxbury study and the research was primarily descriptive. Two of the programs studied were initiated at the same time as the evaluation, so the evaluators focussed on describing the process whereby a YSB organizes itself in a community. Two other YSBs were operative at the start of the evaluation. Thus, the research on them focussed on examining the nature and theoretical consistency of services provided by the programs. Some of the findings were that:

- YSBs provided widely divergent direct services, most of which were already being provided to youth by existing services
- the YSBs were closely identified with the juvenile justice system, and
- in neither case did investigators observe a consistent set of guiding principles or ideas which could tie the services together in a framework which could be termed delinquency prevention.

3. The 1973 Elliott Study: A National Survey - (Delbert Elliott, Survey of Six Youth Service Bureaus, Report submitted to the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

In this evaluation six YSBs were studied along several dimensions:

- The extent to which YSBs could integrate and coordinate youth services in the target communities.
- Amount of youth participation in development and implementation of the YSB.

- Degree to which YSB could improve functioning of other institutions.
- Degree to which YSB could affect institutional processing of juveniles in agencies like the police.
- Degree to which YSB could affect the amount of penetration into the justice system and the probability of exiting youth to YSB.
- The social/psychological impact of the YSB on youth.

An important aspect of the methodology was a comparison of YSB youth with youth processed formally in the justice system. This was an attempt to analyze the effects of differential experiences or labels on specific attitudes, feelings, and behaviors of youth.

Elliott found that diverted youth held more positive attitudes toward the programs they had entered than did their counterparts on probation. Elliott also found that youths processed formally tended to be more frequent offenders and/or charged with more serious delinquent acts. There was also some indication that youth service bureaus which were closely tied to or sponsored by the juvenile justice system, and bureaus which received virtually all of their referrals from the justice system, were more likely to be negatively perceived by participating youth.

The second major part of Elliott's evaluation concerning the effects of diversion on police and probation processing practices employed a method of "transitional probability"--that is, determining the likelihood that youth apprehended by the police will be maintained in the justice system, or the likelihood that youth referred to probation intake will be petitioned into court.

Among the findings of this analysis was that youth processed officially by the police appeared to be more frequent offenders and/or charged with more serious delinquent acts than those diverted. The probation department and the court were less likely to divert these youth. Moreover, while it was anticipated that diversion would occur mostly among youth apprehended for status offenses, this was not always found to be the case.

4. A National Evaluation, the 1974 Elliott Study -
(Delbert Elliott, National Evaluation of Youth Service Systems, report submitted to the Office of Youth Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. July 1974).

No brief review can capture the detail and wealth of information contained in this study (almost 800 pages). The study attempts to provide an explicit conceptual framework and empirical data regarding the impact of the YSB on the community youth serving "system". As usual in this type of work by Elliott, one of the major virtues of the report lies in its identification of a wide range of relevant outcome variables. Given that these programs were derived from a "national strategy" which was assumed to stimulate coordination and integration between diverse and autonomous youth serving agencies in the communities, Elliott and his associates identified what they considered to be the significant terms in the logic of coordination, and they connected these with their own adaptation of the theory of inter-organizational linkage suggested by Litwak (Elliott, 1974: 17-33). As was true in the previous study, this report contains interesting and informative data and maps the system flows that define the specific components for diversion of young persons out of the juvenile justice system.

5. The HEW/YDDPA National Study of Youth Service Bureaus
(National Youth Service Bureaus) - (Final Report submitted to the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, Social and Rehabilitative Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1972).

This investigation, conducted under the direction of Robert L. Smith of the California Youth Authority, was able to locate, through mailed questionnaires, some 170 programs which conformed to the YSB concept. Field visits were made to 58 YSBs. It is in the area of definitions and issues that this research makes its major contribution. The investigators note that many of the key terms involved are exceptionally ambiguous, including the definition of a YSB itself. With regard to diversion, they observe that:

No common definition of diversion exists, either as a process or concept and there are many questions and interpretations about what is meant by diversion. In some places diversion means the number of cases referred to a program, in others a specified reduction in court petitions, in others it relates to the number of arrests, etc.

The work also provides a valuable review of ways that people have attempted to define the functions of YSBs, although the study avoided a definitive statement itself as to the meaning of the term YSB. In sum, this report notes the wide diversity of programs and reinforces the notion that the lack of common focus makes the task of definition and identification exceptionally difficult.

6. "Diversion from the Juvenile Justice System"-(Donald B. Cressey and Robert A. McDermott, Diversion from the Juvenile Justice System, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, June 1973).

One valuable contribution of this study lies in the author's examination of how the term "diversion" is conceptualized and operationalized. They conclude that, despite all the concern for diversion, there still is no common understanding of what the word means. Cressey and McDermott attempt to add their own definition to the confusion, opting to use the term "true" diversion as that which occurs after initial court contact and prior to adjudication. Still, they did note that using such a definition in the state they studied, "little such diversion is likely to be found." Despite such definitional problems, the authors question whether or not the young person being diverted sees any difference.

One of the most significant cautions underscored by Cressey and McDermott is that when a theory of diversion evolves, it may tend to wash out concerns with the conditions that make young persons vulnerable to the label of delinquency in the first instance:

The emphasis on diversion, unfortunately, diverts our attention from the etiology of juvenile offenses. It serves to focus our resources on the problem of secondary deviancy rather than on the problem of preventing juveniles from engaging in initial acts of deviance. As a consequence, the pro-active process of delinquency prevention is downgraded in favor of expanding our reactive capabilities.

7. The King County Youth Service Bureau Preliminary Evaluation Report - (Prepared for the Washington State Law and Justice Office by the staff of the Division of Youth Affairs, King County, Seattle, Washington, July 1974, mimeo).

This is a preliminary report of the first year of operation of six YSBs located in King County, Washington. From the standpoint of the Phase I Assessment, one of the most useful discussions in the report concerned problems an evaluator would face in studying YSBs. Three were mentioned:

First, researchers may fail to learn about program activities not defined as 'outcomes', but actually present in the program and relevant to funders' concerns; or the 'outcome' data may be ineffectively assessed because of agency procedures or policies which the researcher may not recognize.

Second, when agency personnel see evaluation as failing to take account of staff conception of problems and appropriate program outcomes, they may have little interest in providing accurate and complete information, or may see no reason to give the evaluation any serious consideration. Issues related to the Youth Service Bureaus' overall evaluation consistently received a lower priority among staff than did program operation considerations, and evaluation 'paperwork' was generally resisted, delayed, and often incomplete.

Third, once completed, formal outcome evaluation is difficult to interpret, since it provides no information on how the outcomes measured related to program operations. Without this information, funders and administrators have found evaluation easy to misconstrue, and an inadequate tool for comparing programs.

Unfortunately, since this is only a preliminary report, there is little data on the outcomes of the six YSBs studied.

8. The Minnesota Study of Seven Youth Service Bureaus in the Twin Cities Region - (A report submitted to the State of Minnesota Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Evaluation of Seven Youth Service Bureaus in the Twin Cities Region, March 1974).

This study is another extensive, detailed, and valuable piece of evaluation research which cannot properly be summarized in a report such as this. One finding, however, seems particularly relevant. The report states that one basic reason that accounts for failure of YSBs to impact on rates of youthful deviance is that, when examined in terms of theory and methods, these programs are not designed to produce such effects. Only when the program activity has some stated or statable connection with deviance can there be any assumed possible impact on such youthful deviance.

FOOTNOTES

1. Juvenile Court Statistics, 1970: 1971; President's Commission on Law Enforcement: 1968, Uniform Crime Statistics: 1970.

2. Juvenile Court Statistics, 1970: 1971.

3. Ibid.

4. 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), p. 165.

5. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals; President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation, The Criminal Offender--What Should be Done? (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970); California Board of Corrections, Correctional System Study--Coordinated California Corrections: The System, Sacramento, 1971.

6. John Howard Association. Comprehensive Long-Range Master Plan: Department of Juvenile Services, State of Maryland. Chicago, 1972; Arnold Schuchter, Massachusetts Department of Youth Services. A Strategy for Youth in Trouble, Boston, 1972.

7. Becker, Howard S., Outsiders. (New York, N.Y., The Free Press, 1963) p. 9; Edwin Lemert, Social Pathology. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1951); Harold Garfinkel, "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies," American Journal of Sociology 61 (March) 1956, 420-24; John Lofland, Deviance and Identity. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentiss-Hall, 1969); Edwin Shur, Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Implications (New York: Harper and Row, 1971); Travis Hirschi, Courses of Delinquency. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

8. Gemignani, Robert, "National Strategy for Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention," as cited in Center for Action Research, University of Colorado, BSR, Document No. 34, October 1971; Elliott, Delbert S., "The Prevention of Delinquency through Youth Development: Strategy and Project Evaluation," as cited in Center for Action Research, University of Colorado, Bureau of Sociological Research, Document No. 34, February 1971.

9. President's Commission. op.cit., supra 22 at p. 83.

10. President's Commission. op.cit., supra 1 at pp. 223-224.

11. Norman, Sherwood. The Youth Service Bureau: A Key to Delinquency Prevention. (Paramus, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972); Rosenheim, Margaret K., "Youth Service Bureaus: A Concept in Search of a Definition," Juvenile Court Judge's Journal, Vol. 20 (#2) Summer, 1969, pp. 69-84; Elliott, Delbert S., Behavioral Research Institute, June 1974. HEW Grant N. MH 26141-01.
12. Smith, Kenneth Cruce, "A Profile of Juvenile Court Judges in the United States," Juvenile Justice, Vol. 25, No. 2, August 1974.
13. Norman, Sherwood, op.cit.

END