

E X E C U T I V E   S U M M A R Y

EVALUATION OF YOUTH SERVICE  
BUREAUS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
PHASE II REPORT

Prepared For:

Washington State Office of Community Development  
Law and Justice Planning Division

Acting Administrator: Dr. Donna D. Schram  
Project Director: Jack O'Connell

Prepared By:

Carkhuff Associates, Inc.  
Amherst, Massachusetts

This document was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Law and Justice Planning Office, of the Washington State Office of Community Development. This contract was supported by funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice.

December, 1977

46944

MAY 9 1978

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ACQUISITIONS

EVALUATION OF YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS  
IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Table of Contents

	Page
A. Overview. . . . .	1
B. Summary of Report One: Overview of the Existing Data Regarding Washington State Youth Service Bureaus . . . . .	3
C. Summary of Report Two: Evaluation of the Selected Youth Service Bureaus in Washington State . . . . .	7
1. Description of the Selected Youth Service Bureaus . . . . .	7
2. Evaluation of the Youth Served. . . . .	18
3. Evaluation of the Programs and Services. . . . .	26
D. Summary of Report Three: Policy Analysis and YSB Programs . . . . .	58
1. Application of Policy Analysis	
2. Recommendations . . . . .	75

## A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

The evaluation of the Washington State Youth Service Bureaus was made possible through the cooperation of many individuals. The YSB directors and their staff are gratefully thanked for their assistance. In particular, the directors of the following programs are to be acknowledged for the extensive participation in the various phases of the study:

1. Roger Kuhrt, Director  
Union Street Center, Olympia
2. Larry Keller, Director  
Community Resources Consolidated, Bremerton
3. Guy Pepoy, Director  
Youth Eastside Services, Bellevue
4. Peggy Morgan, Director  
Mercer Island Youth Services, Mercer Island
5. John Little, Director  
Mt. Baker YSB, Seattle
6. Jan Michels, Supervisor  
Youthful Offender Program, King County

The law enforcement agency directors are acknowledged for their cooperation in the collection of the offense data.

Dr. Donna Schram, Acting Administrator for the Washington State Law and Justice Planning Division provided valuable perspectives in the early stages of the Phase Two effort. Her participation is greatly appreciated. Jack O'Connell,

the project director of this study for the Law Justice Department, who in addition to initiating this study, was involved at every major stage of the project. He provided considerable assistance with the major conceptualization as well as with the little details that went into portions of the project. He is sincerely recognized for his participation in the study.

## A. OVERVIEW

The State of Washington began funding Youth Service Bureaus through the Law and Justice Planning Department in 1973. By 1976, there were twenty-five YSB program sites across the state which were serving thousands of youths. At the initiation of this study no one was sure how many youths were being served and at what cost. Though some of the individual Youth Service Bureaus had collected adequate evaluation data, there was no data on Washington State's programs as a whole. In 1976, the Law and Justice Planning Division of the Washington State Office of Community Development initiated such a study through a contract with Carkhuff Associates, after going through a competitive bid process.

The first part of the study, Phase One, focused upon describing the history, organization, staff, programs, evaluation and future problems and plans for the twenty-five YSB sites. In addition, any existing evaluation data which the Youth Service Bureaus had was collected and compiled together on a computer tape. The data was analyzed and summarized on several basic, but important youth background variables. All of the above information was published in the Phase One Report in March, 1977, including a national review of Youth Service Bureaus research and evaluation.

The goals of Phase Two were: (1) to analyze the collected data on the computer tape more extensively, (2) to thoroughly

evaluate four to six selected YSB programs; and (3) to apply the procedures of policy analysis to the formulation of recommendations. As this phase of the study began it was decided to proceed on all the three above goals, but to give the greatest weight to the in-depth evaluation of the four to six YSB sites which would be selected. The reason for this emphasis was that it appeared that Washington State had developed several very effective programs which might qualify as national models. Therefore, it was important to document those programs and discover just how effective, in fact, they were. A secondary goal of that aspect of the study was to also extensively describe this social service intervention called Youth Service Bureau.

However, before proceeding to the results of the above portion of the project which is found in the summary of Report Two, the findings regarding the first goal are summarized in the next section. The final chapter of the Executive Summary presents the results and recommendations of the application of policy analysis procedures to the Youth Service Bureau data.

## B . SUMMARY OF REPORT ONE :

### OVERVIEW OF THE EXISTING DATA REGARDING WASHINGTON STATE YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS

The purpose of this phase of the study was to examine the existing data which the Washington State Youth Service Bureau had collected on the youths and their services. When the data was available it was possible through data transformation and APL computer programming to make the data compatible with similar information from other YSBs. The twenty tables presented in the first part of the final report document how this process was successfully achieved. However, the twenty tables also document the considerable extent of missing data that was not available for collection or analysis. For important data such as the extent of recidivism after six months follow-up, there was, at least, 48% missing data.

The larger extent of missing data led to the decision in Phase Two of this study to collect basic program and youth data on the selected YSBs as well as the more intensive evaluation data. In fact, the lack of existing data put the priorities of the study upon that part of the project described in Report Two. However, before proceeding to Report Two, it is important to review what was learned by presenting the synthesized data across all twenty-five sites. The following questions and answers summarize the evaluation data from the first part of this study.

MAJOR FACTS ABOUT WASHINGTON STATE'S  
YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS

1. How many Youth Service Bureaus are there in Washington State?

25 unique sites within eleven organizations.

2. Where are they?

Primarily around the Puget Sound including Everett, Seattle, King County, Tacoma, and Olympia, and also across the state in Spokane.

3. When were they started?

Primarily in 1973 and 1974. Several as late as 1976.

4. How many youths have been served?

From 1973 - 1976 there were 81,871 youths served. In 1976, there were 25,831 served.

5. How much money was spent on the youths through the YSBs?

For the 81,871 youths, from 1973 - 1976, \$6,667,654 was spent. For the 25,831 in 1976 \$2,426,636 was spent.

6. What then was the cost per youth who received services?

For 1973 - 1976 youths the cost was \$81.44 per youth.  
For 1976 youths the cost was \$93.94 per youth.

7. What were the youth like who were served by YSBs?

- a. How old were they?

Between 5 - 20 years. But the average was approximately 15 years.

- b. Were they mainly boys or girls?

They were 67% male and 33% female served in the YSBs.



- c. Which race were the youths?  
91% White, 4% Black, 2% Asian and 3% Other.
- d. Why did the youths need YSB services?  
Almost half of the youths were referred for legal problems. Another half had personal and family problems.
- e. What was the primary referral source to the YSB?  
The primary referral sources were criminal justice agencies, either the police, sheriff or Juvenile Court.
- f. What kind of families did the youths come from?  
About half the youths came from intact families where their mother and father were still together. However, the other half of the youths came from broken or otherwise non-intact families.
- g. Were the youths still attending school when they were referred to the YSB?  
Yes, the majority of the youths were still in school. There were some though who had dropped out or who were attending a YSB alternative school.
8. Did the YSBs primarily refer to other agencies or did they provide direct services themselves?  
They provided services themselves. However, many of the YSBs made extensive use of community volunteers to help deliver services.
9. What were the primary services delivered by the YSBs?  
Counseling was the major service, including individual, group and family counseling. The Washington State YSBs were also unique in their utilization of restitution programs for the legal offenders.
10. What other services were provided by the YSBs?  
Job training, academic training, job placement, and follow-up services.

11. What type of services did the YSB refer youths to?

Counseling, family counseling, tutor services, job training, job placement, and shelter help.

12. How long did the youths receive services from the YSB?

The time varied from one month to over 19 months.  
The average amount of time for most youths was between  
1 - 6 months.

13. How effective were the Youth Service Bureaus in reducing juvenile crime?

The YSBs varied in effectiveness. Reoffending ranged from as low as 11% to as high as 41%. Therefore, there was nothing special about the YSB itself which reduced delinquency. The programs which had the youth complete a restitution assignment appeared to have lower recidivism rates than the other programs.

The above findings provide an overview of the main facts which were learned by evaluating the existing data provided by the YSB programs themselves. The weakest area on which there was the least data was in regard to how effective the YSBs were. The last conclusion presented above is based more upon the data collected in Phase Two of the study than the data collected in Phase One. The next section will discuss the results of the data collected in Phase Two more extensively.

## C . S U M M A R Y O F R E P O R T T W O :

### EVALUATION OF THE SELECTED YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS IN WASHINGTON STATE

#### 1. Description of Selected Youth Service Bureaus

The previous section discussed the results of attempting to utilize existing data to evaluate Washington State's youth service bureaus. The major problems of missing data and a lack of detailed information concerning the youths and their programs were revealed. To compensate for these deficiencies, a portion of the project was designed to collect extensive evaluation data on six selected youth service bureaus.

A series of questions were formulated around the following major areas to evaluate the selected YSBs:

1. What were the goals of the Youth Service Bureaus?
2. How were the programs and organizations managed?
3. What were the relationships of the Youth Service Bureaus and their communities?
4. What were the youths like who received services from YSBs?
5. What were the programs and services which the youths received?
6. How effective were the Youth Service Bureaus in reducing subsequent arrests of the youths?

7. What factors in the YSBs appeared to contribute most to a reduction in juvenile delinquent behavior?

Data on each of the above issues would assist in the goal of understanding what this social service called youth service bureau was and what its impact appeared to be. Phase I of the Washington YSB Study revealed that the state had a wide diversity of approaches to providing a youth service bureau program. It was important to answer the question whether this variety of approaches is due to variations of the same goals or to the existence of different goals for each singular YSB. Following this first question is another issue which asks to what extent do the programs and services appear to be logically linked to the goals. The emergence of these questions determined the examination of the goals of each YSB program studied.

The questions concerning the management of the youth service bureaus emerged because it appeared that the programs with low recidivism results had better leadership and management. It was, therefore, decided that the important management variables in each program should be documented. Management in criminal justice programs as a whole is a neglected area of study and this portion of the Phase II YSB study would represent a step in the right direction.

A rationale for the development of youth service bureaus was centered around the concept of successful community involvement in solving their own juvenile delinquent problems. Therefore, the evaluation question concerning the relationships of the YSBs to their

communities was addressed to determine this degree of community involvement.

The questions related to describing the youths served by the YSBs are important for a number of reasons. Whether the youths are primarily first-time offenders, multi-offenders or non-offenders addresses the issue of whether the programs are diversion, rehabilitation, or prevention oriented. The data gathered concerning the youth referred to the YSBs represents a summary of needs assessment data on the youth. Such needs assessment information is usually the most important ingredient in program development and planning. Data is likewise needed on the programs and services provided in order to know what is specifically done with the youths. It is also of worth knowing to what extent the services are related to the diagnosed problems of youth.

The sixth area of questions related to effectiveness are concerned with how worthwhile or beneficial is this intervention called youth service bureau. For the public and its elected officials the degree of effectiveness is important when funding decisions are being determined. A related issue is concerned with whether some approaches are more effective than others. The final question of this part of the study addresses identifying factors or variables of effectiveness. The discovery of the ingredients of effectiveness can be utilized in developing more relevant program standards for juvenile delinquency intervention strategies. This last area of concern holds the most

promise for favorably influencing future groups of youths who create legal problems.

Using the reports collected in Phase I, seven programs were chosen for on-site visits to collect further information for the final selection. Appointments were made with the directors of those programs for an on-site visit. In addition to gathering data on the programs, the purpose of the interviews was also to gain the cooperation of the agency with regard to participation in the project. In order to provide geographic and ethnic balance to the study as well as to examine what were thought to be a cross section of some of the better programs, the following six sites were selected for this phase of the project:

1. Olympia
2. Bremerton
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.
4. Mercer Island
5. Mt. Baker--Seattle
6. Youthful Offender Program---

King County Sheriff's Office

It was later discovered that the Bellevue Y.E.S. program included one of the King County Conference Committee programs, which in many respects represents a distinct program. Therefore, for most of the data analysis, results concerning seven programs are presented with Bellevue Conference Committee included.

The data collected in the first series of on-site visits was grouped and analyzed. The evaluation design and questions were

then formulated for the remainder of the study. It was decided that intensive data would be collected on an entire group of youths completing the YSB program at that site as of April, 1977. Information would also be collected on the staff, the leadership, the organization and the programs that were in effect for those youths. This information would then be compared to six month arrest data that would be collected for each youth.

Each YSB director was interviewed regarding what the specific problems were in their community for which the YSB was designed to handle. The purpose of this question was to find out what the historical roots were for each program and the initial reason the YSB was started. The reasons for the initiation of each YSB are listed in Table 1. Except for the fact that Bellevue Y.E.S. and Olympia were both begun because of drug problems, each of the other programs had unique motives for coming into being. A common ingredient in Olympia, Bellevue Y.E.S., Mercer Island and Mt. Baker's reasons for needing a YSB were community problems. This contrasted with Bremerton and the Youthful Offender Program where it was a need by an existing organization which caused the programs to come into being.

To understand the activities of the YSBs it was first necessary to document the present stated goals. The following is a list of each sites goals. It should be noted that the goal of the Union Street Center in Olympia is to provide diversion services for juveniles as an alternative to entrance into the criminal justice system. The goal of the Community Resources Consolidated program in Bremerton is to be "a community-based diagnostic and treatment planning agency con-

SUMMARY OF THE REASONS  
WHY EACH YSB WAS STARTED

Table 1

Youth Service Bureau Site	Reasons
1. Olympia	There was a community awareness re- garding drugs and a solution was needed.
2. Bremerton	The juvenile court wanted more intensive diagnosis before disposi- tion.
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	Drug abuse was a major problem and the community wanted a solution.
4. Mercer Island	a. Lack of temporary shelter. b. Lack of youth employment opportunities. c. Dissatisfaction with the juvenile court.
5. Mt. Baker	The upper middle class wanted to defend itself against lower class juvenile crime.
6. Youthful Offender Program	a. The King County Department of Public Safety was doing nothing for juveniles. b. The Department of Public Safety wanted a social service component in law enforcement



cerned with the most troubled and delinquent youth of Kitsap County". The goals of the Bellevue Y.E.S. programs are to prevent juvenile delinquency by providing positive relationships in a comfortable atmosphere and by working with families and youth to divert police referred youth from the juvenile justice system.

The Bellevue Conference Committee which is a separate program within the Bellevue Y.E.S. has as its stated goals "to help the child and his family find a solution to their problems and remedy minor delinquencies before they become serious enough to require official intervention by the Juvenile Court." The goals of Mercer Island Youth Services are to provide and coordinate resources for Mercer Island Youth and their parents and to facilitate personal and social adjustment. The specific goal for youth referred for legal problems is to provide an alternative resource to the juvenile court.

The stated goal of the Mt. Baker Youth Service Bureau, which serves minority youth living in or near the Mt. Baker Community of Seattle, is "to divert youth out of the Juvenile Justice System into the community and at the same time to hold youth accountable for their criminal behavior." The goal for the final YSB, the Youthful Offender Program, "is to provide a diversion program for first-offender juveniles who would normally be referred to the King County Juvenile Court".

As can be seen in the primary goal of six of the seven above programs is now in some way concerned with diverting first-time juvenile offenders out of the criminal justice system. Only the

Bremerton program deviates greatly from the policy of working primarily with first offenders and handles the most serious offenders. The Olympia, Bellevue Y.E.S., and Mercer Island programs help other groups of youth with problems in addition to legal referrals. For all seven of the above programs from the six selected sites, effectiveness of goal attainment could be accepted if the programs significantly reduce the illegal behavior of the youths served.

Table 2 summarizes the overall standing of each bureau with regard to five major areas of management which were evaluated. As can be observed the majority of the six YSBs did have employee selection instruments, provided staff training, had weekly staff meetings and utilized formal employee evaluation procedures. In addition, the programs averaged a total of nine reinforcement and discipline techniques per site. The overall findings regarding these management standards indicate formalized efforts to recruit and maintain quality staff in the provision of the YSBs services, at least in the sites surveyed. These results document that program managers in criminal justice agencies can meet certain minimal standards with regard to organization and management.

An acknowledged purpose of the Youth Service Bureau is to attempt to provide local community involvement in the solution of the local problems of juvenile delinquency. It is therefore, important to examine the degree to which the selected YSBs in the evaluation were linked with their communities. Table 3 summarizes

SUMMARY OF YSB MANAGEMENT  
EVALUATION RESULTS

Table 2

Youth Service Bureau Site	Employee Selection Instrument Used	Staff Training Provided	Frequency of Staff Meetings	Formal Employee Assess- ments	Number of Staff Rein- forcement and Disci- pline Techniques
1. Olympia	No	Yes	Weekly	No	8
2. Bremerton	Yes	Yes	Weekly	Yes	15
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	No	Yes	3 Per Week	No	6
4. Mercer Island	Yes	Yes	2 Per Week	Yes	8
5. Mt. Baker	Yes	Yes	2 Per Week	Yes	13
6. Youthful Offender Program	Yes	Yes	Every Two Weeks	Yes	6
<hr/>					
Average or Most Frequent Response	Yes	Yes	Weekly	Yes	9

SUMMARY OF EACH YSB'S  
STRONGEST LINK-UPS WITH THEIR  
LOCAL COMMUNITY

Table 3

Youth Service Bureau Site	Strongest Areas of Involvement with the Community
1. Olympia	Community Board
2. Bremerton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Community Board.</li> <li>b. Community agencies' weekly participation in the diagnostic meeting.</li> <li>c. Constant follow-up with community agencies.</li> </ul>
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Entire volunteer program.</li> <li>b. Feedback to community agencies.</li> <li>c. Community provides jobs for restitution clients.</li> </ul>
4. Bellevue Conference Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Volunteer Committee members.</li> <li>b. Volunteer chairman and assistant.</li> <li>c. Community provides jobs for restitution clients.</li> </ul>
5. Mercer Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extensive use of volunteers.</li> <li>b. Administratively linked with the Mercer Island City government.</li> <li>c. Volunteer advisory board.</li> <li>d. Extensive feedback system with clients, parents and referral sources.</li> <li>e. Jobline and jobs for restitution clients.</li> </ul>
6. Mt. Baker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Community Accountability Board.</li> <li>b. Community Advisory Board.</li> <li>c. Administered under City of Seattle.</li> <li>d. Community donations and jobs.</li> </ul>
7. Youthful Offender Program	Administratively linked with King County Sheriff's Office.

the various approaches to community linkage employed by each YSB. Five of the programs, Bremerton, Bellevue Y.E.S., Bellevue Conference Committee, Mercer Island and Mt. Baker, had three or more types of community link-up with their programs. Olympia and the Youthful Offender Program each had one major type of community involvement. Overall, there were nine different forms of community involvement including the three major ways, volunteers, administrative linkages and community boards.

Not only do the above interrelationships with the communities improve the potential effectiveness of the YSB, but they also increase the likelihood that the community will support the program financially and otherwise. It was a goal of the federal government that the funding of the YSB programs be assumed by the local communities after three to four years of initial federal funding. Bellevue Y.E.S., Mercer Island, Bremerton, Mt. Baker, and the Youthful Offender Programs have all been picked up either by local funding sources or some combination of local and state funding. The fact that the funding responsibilities have been assumed by the local and state agencies, provide validation for the importance of the above discussed forms of community linkages. If it continues to be a goal of federal and even state programs that the funding eventually be assumed or shared by local communities, then the above types of community involvement should be required standards for a program to receive funds.

## 2. Evaluation of the Youth Served

The first aspect of the youths to be described is the number of males versus females participating in the programs. Table 4 presents the summary of the number and proportions of each sex involved in the seven programs. Overall there were 171 males, 64%, and 96 females, 36%, in the study. The YSB with the greatest proportion of males to females was the Youthful Offender Program, which had 80% males and 20% females. Two programs, Bellevue Y.E.S. and Mt. Baker, were very close to having almost an even balance of males and females, with 53% and 54% males respectively. The selected YSBs had a slightly greater number of female referrals compared to the proportion of males and females referred to the juvenile courts of Washington State. As reported in the 1976 Washington State Juvenile Court Statistics and Trend Analysis, there were 46,792 or 73% males referred for delinquency and status offenses. The same study identified 16,676 females or 27% referred to juvenile courts for comparable offenses.

The next table, Table 5, presents the racial background of the selected youths. Overall there were 89% White, 6% Black and 5% other for the 267 youths. All of the Youth Service Bureaus had over 90% participation of Whites except for Mt. Baker YSB. The Mt. Baker program had 44% White, 34% Black, and 22% Other, a truly multi-racial program.

SUMMARY OF YOUTHS' SEX FOR  
THE SELECTED YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU SITES

Table 4

Youth Service Bureau Site	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Olympia	27	63%	16	37%	43
Bremerton	26	74%	9	26%	35
Bellevue Y.E.S.	17	53%	15	47%	32
Bellevue Con- ference Committee	20	57%	15	43%	35
Mercer Island	26	65%	14	35%	40
Mt. Baker	22	54%	19	46%	41
Youthful Offender Program	<u>33</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>41</u>
Total	171	64%	96	36%	267

SUMMARY OF YOUTHS' RACE FOR  
THE SELECTED YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU SITES

Table 5

Youth Service Bureau Site	<u>White</u>		<u>Black</u>		<u>Other</u>		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Olympia	39	91%	1	2%	3	7%	43
Bremerton	33	94%	1	3%	1	3%	35
Bellevue Y.E.S.	32	100%	0	-	0	-	32
Bellevue Con- ference Committee	35	100%	0	-	0	-	35
Mercer Island	39	97%	1	3%	0	-	40
Mt. Baker	18	44%	14	34%	9	22%	41
Youthful Offender Program	<u>40</u>	<u>98%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>41</u>
Total	236	89%	17	6%	14	5%	267



The 22% Other represented in the Mt. Baker program is primarily composed of Oriental youths. Racially, the sites are comparable to each other except for Mt. Baker which is unique with its multi-racial composition.

The average age of the participants from each site is reported in Table 6. The ages presented reflect the youths age at intake into the YSB program. The average for the entire group of youths was 14.8 years. The Youthful Offender Program had the youngest group of youth with 13.9 years average age. In the remainder of the programs the average age was over fourteen and one half years, while the Bellevue Conference Committee had the oldest group with 15.8 years of age. Bremerton's youth are similar to Bellevue Y.E.S. and Mt. Baker in age. While Olympia's average age is comparable with Mercer Island's.

The next series of tables are concerned with the delinquency histories of the youth participating in the seven selected programs. This data was collected from the law enforcement records of the jurisdictions wherein the youths resided and the surrounding communities. Of all the background data which can be collected on a juvenile delinquent youth, this is perhaps the most relevant in terms of identifying the extent of delinquency in which the youth has been engaged. Table 7 presents the average number of offenses committed by the youths from each site 12 months prior to program entry. There were a total of 360 delinquent offences

# SUMMARY OF YOUTHS' AGE

## FOR THE SELECTED YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS

Table 6

Youth Service Bureau Site	Average Age
Olympia	15.2 years
Bremerton	14.7 years
Bellevue Y.E.S.	14.8 years
Bellevue Conference Committee	15.8 years
Mercer Island	15.1 years
Mt. Baker	14.5 years
Youthful Offender Program	13.9 years
Average Total	14.8 years

and 140 status offenses for the 267 youths in the study. Therefore, it can be concluded that as a group the programs served youths with predominantly delinquent offenses in their backgrounds.

A second major finding reflected in Table 7 is that as a group the youths had an average total of 1.87 offenses per youth in the 12 month period prior to referral. In examining the number of offenses per youth per site it can be seen that all of the programs had from 1.14 to 1.91 offenses, except for Bremerton. Bremerton's youth averaged almost five offenses per youth and as was discussed in an earlier section was designed specifically for more delinquent youths. The important result for the other programs is that they do indeed serve first or second time offenders.

The next area of interest in regard to the youth's delinquency history is what type of offenses were committed prior to program entry. Table 8 presents the most common offenses committed by the youths from each YSB. The most common 12 month prior offense for six of the seven programs was shoplifting. The only program not reporting shoplifting as the most common offense was Bremerton, where burglary was the most common. However, burglary was the second most common offense for four of the programs. The major conclusion is that the YSBs were primarily dealing with youths who were first or second time shoplifters, except for the Bremerton program which deals with youths who commit burglary and auto theft.

# NUMBER OF 12 MONTH PRE-PROGRAM OFFENSES

Table 7

Youth Service Bureau Site	Number of Status Offenses	Number of Delinquent Offenses	Total Number of Offenses	Total Number of Offenses per Youth
Olympia	35	47	82	1.91
Bremerton	69	99	168	4.80
Bellevue Y.E.S.	8	31	39	1.22
Bellevue Conference Committee	6	34	40	1.14
Mercer Island	5	52	57	1.43
Mt. Baker	3	49	52	1.27
Youthful Offender Program	14	48	62	1.51
Total	140	360	510	1.87

# MOST COMMON 12 MONTH PRIOR

## OFFENSES COMMITTED BY YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU YOUTH

Table 8

Youth Service Bureau Site	Most Common 12 Month Prior Offense	Percent of Youth	2nd Most Common 12 Month Prior Offense	Percent of Youth	Other 12 Month Prior Offenses
Olympia	Shoplifting	23%	Runaway	16%	Burglary; Marijuana
Bremerton	Burglary	20%	Auto theft	9%	Breaking and entering; Incorrigible
Bellevue Y.E.S.	Shoplifting	53%	Burglary	9%	Marijuana; Possession of alcohol
Bellevue Conference Committee	Shoplifting	51%	Marijuana	9%	Assault; Auto theft
Mercer Island	Shoplifting	35%	Burglary	10%	Larceny; Assault
Mt. Baker	Shoplifting	68%	Burglary	7%	Larceny; Robbery
Youthful Offender Program	Shoplifting	27%	Burglary	20%	Breaking and entering; Assault

### 3. Evaluation of the Programs and Services

Five of the seven of the above programs have an intermediary link between the arresting officer and the YSB. Only the Youthful Offender Program and Bellevue Y.E.S. have direct contact with arresting officers. One concern of this evaluation of Washington State's Youth Service Bureaus was the immediacy of the YSBs response compared to when the youth committed his or her offense. One reason offered for community-based programs such as YSBs is that they can offer more immediate help through a quicker response time. In the present evaluation study the number of days between each youth's offense date and the date of the first contact by the YSB was calculated. The average length of time for the link-up of the youth and the YSB was calculated for each YSB.

The results of the data analysis regarding average link-up time by bureau are presented in Table 9. The average length of link-up time for youths across all of the YSBs was 25.8 days. The shortest amount of time for link-up was for the Youthful Offender Program and was an average of five days per youth. The next shortest time was 16.1 days for Bellevue Y.E.S.. It may be remembered that both of these programs did not have intermediary steps in their link-up between the police referral the youths contact. In fact, in some cases the Youthful Offender Program had same

# AVERAGE LINK-UP TIME

Table 9

Youth Service Bureau Site	Average Link-up Time
Olympia	38.5 days
Bremerton	32.6 days
Bellevue Y.E.S.	16.1 days
Bellevue Conference Committee	26.9 days
Mercer Island	25.0 days
Mt. Baker	36.1 days
Youthful Offender Program	5.0 days
Average total	25.8 days

day link-up between the law enforcement agency and the youth program.

Three programs, Olympia, Bremerton and Mt. Baker, required over a month to complete the referral, link-up process. Both the director of the Mt. Baker program and the Olympia programs recognized prior to this data being collected that there was somewhat of a time lag. However, in on-site observations of the initial program contacts of Olympia, Bremerton, and Mt. Baker the problem incident, though over a month old, was still fresh in the youth's and parent's thinking. The reason the problem was probably very much alive was because the law enforcement officers or probation officers did communicate to the youth and his or her family that they should expect some form of consequences and a contact from the YSB. One could, therefore, speculate that the long lag time from offense to YSB contact might have created sufficient anxiety in the youth or his or her parents to get their attention about the problem. The positive value of a quick response by the YSB to deal with the problem may be offset by the positive benefits of creating anxiety in the youth by leaving him or her up in the air about what is going to happen.

Each youth's record was also examined to determine what services had been provided during his or her involvement in the YSB. The most common services provided by each YSB are presented in Table 10. Some form of counseling was either the first or second most common service for five



# SUMMARY OF THE MOST FREQUENTLY

## DELIVERED SERVICES BY YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU SITE

Table 10

Youth Service Bureau Site	Most Common Service Provided	Percent of Youth	2nd Most Common Service Provided	Percent of Youth	Other Services Provided
Olympia	Self counseling training	26%	Assertiveness training	26%	Educational workshop; Individual counseling
Bremerton	Family counseling	43%	Group home	40%	Individual counseling; Probation
Bellevue Y.E.S.	Family counseling	53%	Restitution	47%	Individual counseling; Group counseling
Bellevue Conference Committee	Restitution	57%	Attended Conference Committee meeting only	29%	Refer youth to Alcoholics Anonymous Teens; Individual counseling
Mercer Island	Individual counseling	85%	Family Counseling	78%	Restitution; Telephone counseling
Mt. Baker	Restitution	98%	Behavioral contract developed	7%	Family counseling; Special school program
Youthful Offender Program	Telephone counseling	93%	Family counseling	85%	Individual counseling; Parents attending parenting class

of the programs, Olympia, Bremerton, Bellevue Y.E.S., Mercer Island and the Youthful Offender Program. Restitution was either the first or second most common service for three programs, Bellevue Y.E.S., Bellevue Conference Committee and Mt. Baker. The Bremerton program, which deals with the more serious offender, in addition helped to place 40% of its youths in group homes. The most common services across all the YSBs were counseling and restitution.

As part of each YSBs delivery system it is of use to learn how much of each youth's time was structured by participation in the YSB. The amount of time structured can be viewed as punishment from the perspective of the youth and it could be looked upon as constructive time when the youth can not get in trouble. Each youth's record was examined to determine the approximate number of hours per week the youth's time was in some way taken up by the YSB. If the youth was working on a restitution project, then those hours were calculated as time that was structured. If the youth was in counseling then that time was calculated as time that was under control by the YSB.

Table 11 presents the average number of hours per week which were structured for the youth as a result of participation in each Youth Service Bureau. The program with the greatest amount of structure was Bremerton, which included a lot of youth being placed in group homes outside their own home. From earlier sections it will be remembered that the Bremerton program worked with more delinquent youth

SUMMARY OF THE AVERAGE AMOUNT  
OF THE YOUTHS' TIME STRUCTURED AS A  
RESULT OF YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU INTERVENTION

Table 11

Youth Service Bureau Site	Average Amount of Youths' Hours Per Week Structured as a Result of YSB's Intervention
Olympia	1.7 hours
Bremerton	70.3 hours
Bellevue Y.E.S.	1.6 hours
Bellevue Conference Committee	1.3 hours
Mercer Island	1.9 hours
Mt. Baker	4.6 hours
Youthful Offender Program	1.3 hours
Average total	11.0 hours

who had committed on the average more than four offenses per youth. Therefore, as a result of the diagnostic meeting, a series of program recommendations were implemented which resulted in a series of strong interventions in the youth's life. The Mt. Baker YSB averaged 4.6 hours of intervention per youth, which was primarily restitution work hours.

The remaining five Y.S.B. programs averaged from 1.3 to 1.9 hours of structure per week. For most of the youths that represented about one hour of counseling per week. However, Bellevue Y.E.S., Bellevue Conference Committee and Mercer Island had a number of youth in restitution programs. The implication is that youths from those programs averaged less hours per week of work, compared with the Mt. Baker restitution program.

The amount of time from the youth's intake to the youth's termination in the YSB was calculated. The average amount of participation time is presented for each YSB in Table 12. The time for Bremerton is listed as five months. However, youths at Bremerton participate in the program from the entry point to their 18th birthday. The actual length of participation, then, is almost three years per youth. However, for the purposes of this study, a five month period was utilized as the intensive service delivery time. The next highest length of participation was 4.8 months for the Youthful Offender Program. Bellevue Y.E.S. had 2.6 months while Mercer Island youths participated for an

# AVERAGE LENGTH OF PARTICIPATION

## IN THE YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU PROGRAM PER YOUTH

Table 12

Youth Service Bureau Site	Average Length of Program Participation
Olympia	2.1 months
Bremerton	5.0 months*
Bellevue Y.E.S.	2.6 months
Bellevue Confer- ence Committee	1.9 months
Mercer Island	2.5 months
Mt. Baker	1.7 months
Youthful Offender Program	4.8 months
Average Total	2.9 months

\*Length of participation in Bremerton is based upon total time from youth's entry until his or her 18th birthday. In order to calculate during and post program offenses for Bremerton, 5 months was used as intensive service delivery time.

average of 2.5 months. The shortest length of participation was 1.7 months in the Mt. Baker program. It may be remembered from the preceding table that Mt. Baker had the greatest number of hours per week of structure for the YSB with a restitution program. It can be concluded that Mt. Baker hits the youth hard for a short amount of time.

The data regarding the restitution and counseling programs which were provided to the youths will now be presented. Table 13 presents the summary of the number of youths who participated in some form of a restitution program. The total number of youths across all sites involved in restitution programs was 112, while there were 155 non-participants. Of the 112 youths participating in the service, 95, or 85%, successfully completed their assigned restitution.

Mt. Baker had the greatest number of youths participating in the restitution program, 41 youths or 100% of the sample. Mercer Island had the next largest group of youths with 31 participants. A very interesting finding is that the Juvenile Conference Committee which was established to require youths to make some form of restitution, did not impose that requirement on 18 or 51% of the youths appearing before the Committees. For those 18 youths it was generally determined that the family and youth were sufficiently handling the problem and did not need to enter into a restitution program. The Bellevue Y.E.S. had 17 youths

# SUMMARY OF YOUTHS

## PARTICIPATING IN A RESTITUTION PROGRAM

Table 13

Youth Service Bureau Site	<u>R e s t i t u t i o n</u>		Total Restitution Participants	Total Non- Restitution	Total Youth
	Number of Successful Completions	Number of Non-Com- pletions			
Olympia	1	0	1	42	43
Bremerton	0	0	0	35	35
Bellevue Y.E.S.	17	0	17	15	32
Bellevue Conference Committee	16	1	17	18	35
0 Mercer Island	22	9	31	9	40
Mt. Baker	35	6	41	0	41
Youthful Offender Program	4	1	5	36	41
Total	95	17	112	155	267
			42%	58%	

involved in restitution programs and all of them successfully completed their programs. The Youthful Offender Program had five participants while the Olympia program had only one. There were no participants in a restitution program from the Bremerton YSB.

When each youth's case record was examined to discover the type of services which were provided the following information regarding counseling was collected. Table 14 presents an overview of the number of youth who participated in counseling from each site. Overall there were 178 youths, or 67% who received some form of counseling. This finding means that, at least two-thirds of the group of 267 youths received counseling during the course of their involvement with the Youth Service Bureaus.

The YSB with the greatest proportion of counseling participants was the Youthful Offender Program with 100%. Mercer Island had 98% of its youth involved, while Olympia had 84% participation. Bellevue Y.E.S. had 75% of its sample receiving counseling. It should be pointed out that almost all of the Mercer Island youths received both restitution and counseling. For youths receiving both, the counseling generally focused on their restitution program. The Bremerton program had 66% involvement with the service, while Bellevue Conference Committee only had 38% participation. The YSB with the least number of youth receiving counseling



# SUMMARY OF COUNSELING

## SERVICES PROVIDED

Table 14

Youth Service Bureau Site	Counseling Services Provided		No Counseling		Total Number of Youth
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
1. Olympia	36	84%	7	16%	43
2. Bremerton	23	66%	12	34%	35
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	24	75%	8	25%	32
4. Bellevue 1 Conference Committee	13	38%	22	62%	35
5. Mercer Island	39	98%	1	2%	40
6. Mt. Baker	2	5%	39	95%	41
7. Youthful Offender Program	41	100%	-	-	41
TOTAL	171	67%	89	33%	267

1. It should be recognized that the Bellevue Conference Committee form of counseling was primarily composed of the interaction between the youths and his or her parents and the Conference Committee which occurred at the Conference Committee meeting. Youths in this program who needed more intensive counseling were referred to the Bellevue Y.E.S. program and other programs.

was Mt. Baker with only two youths or 5% receiving some type of counseling. Therefore, the major counseling programs were the Youthful Offender Program, Mercer Island, Olympia, and Bellevue Y.E.S.

Table 15 presents the data for the average number of times each youth was counseled and the average length of counseling. The total averages for both of these factors were calculated both as means and medians because of the heavy influence of the Youthful Offender Program on the total average across all sites. The average number of times the youths received counseling had a mean of 3.4 times and a median of 4.8 times. Therefore, the average youth was counseled about five times. The Youthful Offender average youth was counseled 17 times while the Bremerton youths averaged 12 sessions of counseling.

Mt. Baker, Mercer Island, Bellevue Y.E.S. and Olympia all averaged between four to six counseling sessions per youth. The Bellevue Conference Committee had an average of 1.5 sessions of counseling for its youths. These results indicate that the majority of the programs which had counseling provided between four to six sessions of counseling. The Youthful Offender Program had approximately three times more contacts but they were usually short telephone contacts with either the youth or the mother.

The median average length of counseling across all sites was approximately one month. The average length of counseling

SUMMARY OF THE AMOUNT OF  
COUNSELING PROVIDED BY THE YOUTH SERVICE BUREAUS

Table 15

Youth Service Bureau Site	Average Frequency Counseled	Average Length of Counseling
Olympia	5.8 times	38.2 days
Bremerton	12.0 times	75.1 days
Bellevue Y.E.S.	4.7 times	24.9 days
Bellevue Conference Committee	1.5 times	14.1 days
Mercer Island	4.3 times	42.7 days
Mt. Baker	4.0 times	30.0 days
Youthful Offender Program	17.0 times	136.4 days
Mean total	8.4 times	62.9 days
Median total	4.8 times	30.4 days

for the Youthful Offender Program was again the greatest and was over four and one half months. Bremerton's youths averaged almost two and one half months of counseling. Three programs averaged near one month of counseling per youth, Mt. Baker, Bellevue Y.E.S. and Olympia. Mercer Island's youth had almost one and one half months of involvement in counseling, while the youths in the Bellevue Conference Committee were only involved for approximately one half a month. For most of the YSBs in this study the average length of counseling was between two and six weeks.

In this portion of the description of the Washington State Youth Service Bureau evaluation, primary attention will be given to how well the selected YSBs affected the youths' subsequent behavior. The first set of results are concerned with the number of offenses which were reported for the youths while they were participating in their respective YSB programs. These during program offenses are reported in Table 16. It should be recalled that the offense data for this study was collected from the youth's home town law enforcement agency as well as law enforcement agencies from adjoining jurisdictions.

The first column of data in Table 16 presents the fact that there were 26 status offenses for the entire group of 267 youths at the same time they were still participating in their program. There were also 51 delinquent offenses for a total of 77 offenses. As useful as the number of of-

# NUMBER OF DURING PROGRAM OFFENSES

Table 16

Youth Service Bureau Site	Number of Status Offenses	Number of Delinquent Offenses	Total Number of Offenses	Total Number of Offenses per Youth.	Offenses per Youth per Month
Olympia	2	6	8	.19	.05
Bremerton	19	18	37	1.06	.21
Bellevue Y.E.S.	1	3	4	.13	.05
Bellevue Conference Committee	0	1	1	.03	.01
Mercer Island	0	3	3	.08	.02
Mt. Baker	0	2	2	.05	.02
Youthful Offender Program	4	18	22	.54	.18
Total	26	51	77	.29	.08

fenses at each site is, it is more valuable for comparison purposes to know the average offenses per youth. Inspecting this data we find that there was .29 of an offense per youth during program participation. The Bellevue Conference Committee had the most favorable rate, .03 offense per youth. Low rates of offenses were also found for youth from Mercer Island and Mt. Baker Youth Service Bureaus, .08 and .05, respectively. The rate per youth for Olympia was .19, while it was only .13 of an offense for the Bellevue Y.E.S. youth. The largest rates of during program offenses were for the Youthful Offender Program, .54 and for Bremerton, 1.06 offense per youth.

The greatest amount of offending was in the Bremerton and Youthful Offender Programs. However, it was also known that youth participated in these programs for longer amounts of time. Therefore, the youth in these programs had a greater length of at risk time in which to acquire a greater number of offenses compared to the rest of the YSBs. To control for this factor, each youth's during program offenses were averaged by the amount of time the youth was involved in his or her respective YSB. The final column in Table 16 presents the results of these calculations in terms of the average number of offenses per youth per month for each site.

Table 17 presents some of the most important information collected in the study. This data begins to address the evaluation question, how well did the YSB's perform in terms

# NUMBER OF 6 MONTH POST-PROGRAM OFFENSES

Table 17

Youth Service Bureau Site	Number of Status Offenses	Number of Delinquent Offenses	Total Number of Offenses	Total Number of Offenses per Youth
Olympia	9	6	15	.40
Bremerton	6	7	13	.37
Bellevue Y.E.S.	1	2	3	.09
Bellevue Conference Committee	0	16	16	.46
Mercer Island	2	5	7	.18
Mt. Baker	1	9	10	.24
Youthful Offender Program	1	16	17	.42
Total	20	61	81	.30

of reducing delinquency in the youth referred to their programs. The number of six month post program offenses for each YSB are presented. There were 20 status offenses and 61 delinquent offenses committed overall by the 267 youths in the time period six months immediately following their program termination. The greatest number of recidivism status offenses, 9, were committed by youths from the Olympia YSB. Six status offenses were committed by Bremerton youths in the follow-up period. To develop comparable follow-up data for Bremerton the six month period immediately following the first five months of program participation was selected for each youth's post-program at risk period.

The Youthful Offender Program and the Bellevue Conference Committee both had the greatest number of delinquent offenses, 16, committed during the six month follow-up period. The least number of delinquent offenses, 2, were committed by youths from the Bellevue Y.E.S.. The total number of offenses are also presented for each site in Table 17. However, because the different YSBs had different numbers of youths in the study groups, the total offenses are not in the best form for comparison purposes. By calculating the total number of offenses per youth for each site, as was done, a better basis of comparison is available. There was an average of .30 offense per youth across all sites for the six month follow-up period.

The Bellevue Y.E.S. program had the lowest post-of-



fense rate per youth with .09 of an offense. The next lowest rate was .18 for the Mercer Island program. The Mt. Baker program which worked with a large proportion of minority youth was not far behind with a rate of .24 of an offense per youth. Bremerton youths had a rate of .37, while Olympia youths had a per youth rate of .40. The rate for the Youthful Offender Program was the second highest, .42. The program with the highest offense rate was not Bremerton as might be expected, but the Bellevue Conference Committee, with .46 offense per youth. It should also be pointed out that all of those post-offenses committed by Conference Committee youths were delinquent. Three programs which had low post-program offense rates were Bellevue Y.E.S., Mercer Island, and Mt. Baker. Later, in this section program evaluation data will be presented to understand why those programs did so well.

The previous tables have presented the during and post-program offense rates. Table 18 presents the recidivism rates for those same two time periods. Whereas the offense rates were concerned with the number of offenses, recidivism rates in this study dealt with the number of youths who got in further trouble. The overall during program recidivism rate across all sites was 15 percent, while the six month follow-up rate was 17 percent across all sites. The program with the lowest during program recidivism rate was the Bellevue Conference Committee with 3 percent. Mt. Baker,

# RECIDIVISM RATES

Table 18

Youth Service Bureau Site	<u>During Program Offenses</u>			<u>Six Month Post Offenses</u>		
	Num. of Youth	Recidi- vism Rate	Severity	Num. of Youth	Recidi- vism Rate	Severity
Olympia	3	7%	3.6	13	30%	2.1
Bremerton	16	46%	3.0	7	20%	2.8
Bellevue Y.E.S.	2	6%	3.7	2	6%	3.0
Bellevue Conference Committee	1	3%	2.0	5	14%	3.9
Mercer Island	3	8%	4.0	6	15%	3.2
Mt. Baker	2	5%	3.5	8	20%	3.8
Youthful Offender Program	12	29%	3.8	5	12%	4.1
AVERAGE TOTAL	39	15%	3.0	46	17%	3.0

Mercer Island, Bellevue Y.E.S. and Olympia all had low during recidivism rates between five percent and eight percent.

The second greatest during program recidivism rate was 29 percent for the Youthful Offender Program. The highest during recidivism rate, 46 percent was obtained by Bremerton, which means that 46 percent of the youth committed, at least, one offense during the first five months of program participation. The average offense severity for each program's during program offenses are also presented. The offense severity is based upon a 1-7 severity scale where seven is the most severe. The scale which was used is an adaptation of the Springer-King County scale found in the Final Report. The average seriousness for all during offenses was 3.0.

The site with the lowest average during offenses severity was the Bellevue Conference Committee, with an average of 2.0. While Bremerton's youths committed a large number of during program offenses, it can be seen that their average severity was only 3.0. The next lowest average offense severity was 3.5 for the Mt. Baker youths. Three programs, Olympia, Bellevue Y.E.S., and the Youthful Offender Program had severity levels of 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 respectively. The highest during program offense severity, 4.0, was for the Mercer Island offenses. To help the reader understand this scale, a 2.0 offense for example is runaway; driving while intoxicated is a 3.0 offense and shoplifting is a 4.0 offense.

How did the seven YSBs do in terms of their six month post program recidivism rates? The lowest recidivism rate was found for the Bellevue Y.E.S. program and was only six percent. The next lowest recidivism rate came surprisingly from the Youthful Offender Program and was 12 percent. Since the YOP program had the largest offense rate, .42, per youth, it must be concluded that 12 percent of the youths or only 5 youths committed 17 offenses between them. The Bellevue Conference Committee rate was 14 percent while Mercer Island had a 15 percent six month recidivism rate. Mt. Baker and Bremerton both had 20 percent. The low rate of 20 percent for Bremerton is favorable because this was with more serious offenders.

The 20 percent recidivism rate for the Mt. Baker YSB is also favorable because this program dealt with a large number of minority youths from lower socio-economic backgrounds than the other programs. Olympia had the largest recidivism rate, which was 30 percent. However, it can be observed that the Olympia youths also had the lowest severity, 2.1, for those post offenses. The highest post offense severity was for the Youthful Offender Program and was 4.1. The Bellevue Conference Committee had an average severity score of 3.9, while Mt. Baker's score was 3.8. Surprisingly, the second lowest average severity score was for the Bremerton YSB, which is another indication that YSB's serious offenders were positively affected.

The overall interpretation of the offense and recidivism rate data is that three YSBs' youths consistently performed favorably, Bellevue Y.E.S., Mercer Island and Mt. Baker. Based upon the six month offense data there is strong evidence that those programs are having a favorable impact upon their youths' juvenile delinquency. The Bellevue Conference Committee youths had low recidivism rates which were positive indications of impact, but they had a high average offense rate per youth.

Bremerton, which worked with the multiple offenders, had a high during program recidivism rate, but was able to obtain a relatively low six month follow-up offense rate of 20 percent. To understand the impact of the Bremerton project it is important to understand the impact of the number of prior offenses on expected recidivism. For example, utilizing these three studies of juvenile recidivism:

Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, Delinquency in a Birth Cohort, Appendix. 1-1.3, 1972 (Philadelphia)

Springer and Mathews, Youthful Offender Criminal History Survey, Final Report, P.4, 1976 (Seattle)

Carr, Molof & Weller, Characteristics and Recidivism of Juvenile Arrestees in Denver, Section c, 1974.

the following rates of recidivism were found for the different number of increasing offenses:

# EXPECTED RECIDIVISM RATES

Chart 1.

Study Group	Number of Prior Offenses	Discovered Rate
A. Philadelphia (Males Only)	1 Prior Offense	45% to 65% Recidivism
	2 Prior Offenses	55% to 74% Recidivism
	5 Prior Offenses	65% to 78% Recidivism
B. Seattle (Males and Females)	1 Prior Offense	34% Recidivism
	2 Prior Offenses	55% Recidivism
	5 Prior Offenses	76% Recidivism
C. Denver Delinquent Offenses Only (Males Only)	1 Prior Offense	50% Recidivism
	2 Prior Offenses	65% Recidivism
	5 Prior Offenses	75% Recidivism

The Youthful Offender program had a high during program recidivism rate, 29 percent, a high rate of post offenses per youth, .42, but was able to obtain the second lowest follow-up recidivism rate, 12 percent. Olympia's youth had a high post program recidivism rate, 30 percent, a high rate of post offenses per youth, but had a low rate of

recidivism for the during program offenses, 7 percent. Three of the YSBs studied had consistently favorable results in terms of this offense data, while the other four YSBs each had, at least, one area where they obtained favorable results.

One uniqueness which emerged in this evaluation study was the presence of restitution programs in the majority of the seven selected Youth Service Bureaus. A preceding section has described the structure and uniquenesses in the restitution programs. Four of the YSBs utilized restitution programs extensively while two programs, Olympia and the Youthful Offender Program, had from one to five youths in restitution programs. Only the Bremerton program participants did not have documentation of involvement in a formal restitution program.

The follow-up results for those youth who participated in a restitution program compared with the youths who did not participate are presented in Table 19. The average number of six month post-program offenses was calculated and compared for restitution participants and non-participants. The 112 restitution program participants had a significantly lower total offense rate, .18 of an offense per youth, compared to the 152 non-participants who had .38 of an offense. The calculated statistical significance of the difference was .02 and was highly significant. These results indicate that for the entire group of youths,

T-TEST RESULTS COMPARING 6 MONTH  
POST-PROGRAM OFFENSE RATES OF RESTITUTION  
PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS WITH  
NON-RESTITUTION PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

All Sites

Table 19

	Number of Cases	Mean Number of 6 Month Post Offenses	Probability
A. Status Offenses			
1. Restitution Participants	112	.03	.01
2. Non-participants in Restitution	152	.11	
B. Delinquent Offenses			
1. Restitution Participants	112	.15	ns
2. Non-participants in Restitution	152	.27	
C. Total Offenses			
1. Restitution Participants	112	.18	.02
2. Non-participants in Restitution	152	.38	



participants in a restitution program have half the number of follow-up offenses as non-participants.

The overall results regarding participation in a restitution program were favorable in terms of lower post-program offense rates. The next concern involved how well those youths did who completed their restitution assignment versus those youths who did not satisfactorily finish their assignment. The results comparing the participants who completed thier program versus the non-completing participants is presented in Table 20. The youths completing the program had a statistically significant lower rate of offending, .11, than the non-completers, .53. The average offense rates for the four major groups are:

- a. Restitution participants who  
completed their restitution-- .11
- b. All restitution participants-- .18
- c. All restitution non-participants-- .38
- d. Restitution participants who did  
not complete restitution-- .53

As can be seen the lowest offense rate was for the youths who participated in a restitution program and completed it.

On the other hand, the highest offense rate was for those youths who participated but did not complete their restitution program. A conclusion is that participating in a restitution program and not being held accountable to

T-TEST RESULTS COMPARING 6 MONTH  
POST-PROGRAM OFFENSE RATES OF RESTITUTION PROGRAM  
PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLETED THEIR RESTITUTION  
VERSUS THOSE PARTICIPANTS NOT COMPLETING RESTITUTION

All Sites

Table 20

	Number of Cases	Mean Number of 6 Month Post Offenses	Probability
A. Status Offenses			
1. Completed Restitution Program Participants	95	.03	ns
2. Non-Completed Resti- tution Participants	17	.00	
B. Delinquent Offenses			
1. Completed Restitution Program Participants	95	.08	.03
2. Non-Completed Resti- tution Participants	17	.53	
C. Total Offenses			
1. Completed Restitution Program Participants	95	.11	.04
2. Non-Completed Resti- tution Participants	17	.53	

complete the assignment is worse than never participating in such a program in the first place. This conclusion is also logical when one considers the fact that one purpose of the restitution program is to teach youths that they will be held accountable for their unlawful behavior. The fact that some youths were not fully held accountable by being compelled to complete their restitution assignment taught those youths a negative lesson. The youths who participated in and completed their restitution averaged less than one offense per nine youths after six months of post program follow-up.

The results of this study regarding the effectiveness of restitution as a program component for juvenile delinquent youths were favorable. The findings in terms of lower follow-up offense rates were even more dramatic when the youths were required to successfully complete their assigned restitution program. The last part of this section will now report the effectiveness of the other most frequently utilized service, counseling.

Earlier in this report it was documented how counseling was the most frequently provided service for the youths from the seven selected Youth Service Bureaus. In fact, 178 youths, or 67 percent of the total group participated in some type of a counseling program. We have just seen how the restitution programs obtained significant differences for participants compared to non-participants.

Table 21, now presents the results of comparing participants in the counseling programs with non-participants. There was not a statistically significant difference between the 178 counseling participants and the 89 non-participants. In fact, the participants had a higher delinquency offense rate, .25, than the non-participants, .18. The total offense rate for participants was also greater, .31, than for the non-participants, .29.

The preceding presentation of evaluation results has shown that while restitution had a favorable influence upon reduced follow-up delinquency, counseling had no such impact. The participants in the counseling program, in fact, had slightly higher offense rates than the non-participants. We can conclude that as far as a preferred course of treatment in a Youth Service Bureau, restitution is the preferred alternative.

T-TEST RESULTS COMPARING 6 MONTH  
POST-PROGRAM OFFENSE RATES OF COUNSELING  
PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS WITH  
NON-COUNSELING PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

All YSB Sites

Table 21

	Number of Cases	Mean Number of 6 Month Post Offenses	Probability
<b>A. Status Offenses</b>			
1. Counseling Participants	178	.06	
2. Non-Participants in Counseling	89	.11	ns
<b>B. Delinquent Offenses</b>			
1. Counseling Participants	178	.25	
2. Non-Participants in Counseling	89	.18	ns
<b>C. Total Offenses</b>			
1. Counseling Participants	178	.31	
2. Non-Participants in Counseling	89	.29	ns

D. SUMMARY OF REPORT THREE:  
POLICY ANALYSIS AND YSB PROGRAMS

1. Application of Policy Analysis

The final report presents an extensive discussion of policy analysis including an annotated bibliography, a description of its history, a presentation of terminology and a description of its process. The annotated bibliography presented on Policy Analysis is divided into three major sections: Technical References, Political References, and Criminal Justice References. The history of policy analysis begins with examples from as early as the eleventh century in China and works up through the twentieth century where the use of policy analysis has proliferated. The distinctions between the terms policy analysis, operations research, system analysis, cost effectiveness analysis and cost benefit analysis are carefully presented. The five major factors in policy analysis, objectives, alternatives, models, impacts and criteria, are discussed.

The policy analysis process was then applied to the Youth Service Bureau evaluation data. This summary will now focus on how policy analysis was used with the Washington State data and what the results of the analysis were. One potential application of the policy analysis approach to a study of Washington State Youth Service Bureaus might have been to compare the major alternatives on whether or not

to have Youth Service Bureaus at all. Such a study would have tried to analyze the benefits of Youth Service Bureaus compared to their costs. However, as this study was planned it became evident that governmental decision-makers had already decided that Youth Service Bureaus were beneficial. Those leaders were already at various points in the implementation stage of policy analysis. Therefore, an application of policy analysis to the decision of whether to have Youth Service Bureaus or not would be of little value. A much more relevant concern emerged relative to what kind of YSB programs should be recommended for Washington State Youth Service Bureaus. The review of the literature reported in Phase One of this study had examined the results of 21 research projects evaluating the effectiveness of different YSB programs. As over half of the programs obtained negative results it was concluded that there was nothing inherent in a Youth Service Bureau that reduced juvenile delinquency. In other words it was not the YSB as a community diversion and correction effort itself which decreased offending behavior, but the combined effects of the quality staff and programs. Because of the above concerns, the decision was made to apply the methods of policy analysis to determine which program approach should be utilized in Washington State Youth Service Bureaus.

Table 22 presents the initial policy analysis model for which data was collected and analyzed. Three major types of

## POLICY ANALYSIS DATA SUMMARY

Table 22

Program Site	Program Rating	Program Cost Per Youth	Resources Paid Back Per Youth	Total Cost Per Youth	Follow-up Offenses Per Youth	Community Interface Rating
A. Restitution Programs						
1. Mt. Baker	5	\$165	\$21	\$144	.24	5
2. Mercer Island	4	\$ 49	\$20	\$ 29	.13	5
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	3	\$ 44	\$11	\$ 33	.12	5
4. Bellevue Conf. Comm.	3	\$ 16	\$19	(+\$3)	.18	3
5. Average Restitution	3.8	\$ 69	\$18	\$51	.18	4.5
B. Counseling Programs						
1. Mercer Island	2.7	\$ 44	0	\$ 44	.33	5
2. Youthful Offender	2.5	\$ 79	0	\$ 79	.42	2
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	2.3	\$ 47	0	\$ 47	.12	5
4. Olympia	2.1	\$ 58	0	\$ 58	.28	3
5. Bellevue Conf. Comm.	-	\$ 22	0	\$ 22	1.00	3
6. Average Counseling	2.4	\$ 50	0	\$ 50	.32	3.6
C. Bremerton Program						
	4.0	\$1612	0	\$1612	.37	5



program alternatives were considered, restitution programs, counseling programs and the Bremerton Community Resources Consolidated Program. Each of these alternatives has been discussed in detail in Report Two. Within the restitution approach there were four different types of programs, while counseling involved five different alternatives. For each of the ten program alternatives, data was collected for six important factors relative to their programs. Each program was rated on its overall quality relative to the other approaches. Within the restitution programs Mt. Baker received the highest rating, 5, for the degree to which its restitution program was systematized.

The Mercer Island restitution program obtained the second highest rating, four. Both the Bellevue Y.E.S. and the Bellevue Conference Committee received restitution program quality ratings of three. For the four restitution programs the average rating was 3.8. The counseling program ratings are the average counselor empathy scores that were obtained as part of the counseling program evaluation described in Report Two. These average counselor ratings were utilized as the best estimate of the overall quality of the counseling program. The Mercer Island counselors obtained the highest average rating, 2.7, while the Youthful Offender Program counselors had the second highest rating, 2.5. The Bellevue Y.E.S. counselors had an average rating of 2.3 and the Olympia workers had a 2.1 rating.

The Bellevue Conference Committee volunteer workers did not submit counseling ratings as their counseling was provided informally to the youth and parents in the Committee hearing. The average counseling score rating was 2.4. The program rating, four, for Bremerton's Community Resources Consolidated program was based upon the overall program quality rating presented in Table 29 of Report Two. It should be pointed out the three different types of program ratings are not comparable across approaches because of the different criteria utilized in the three sets of ratings.

The next major factor upon which policy analysis data was collected was the program costs per youth. To insure concurrent validity these program costs were obtained for each program for the time period in which the majority of the 267 youths were participants. In the case of the restitution programs and Bremerton the program costs were directly calculated on per youth cost basis. For the counseling programs, an average cost of counseling per hour was calculated and that cost was multiplied times the average number of counseling hours received by the youths from each program. The least expensive, and therefore from a cost standpoint the most favorable, restitution program was the Bellevue Conference Committee per youth costs of \$16. Their costs were the lowest because of the almost total reliance upon volunteers to operate the program.

The second least expensive program was Bellevue Y.E.S. with a cost of \$44 per youth, closely followed by the Mercer Island restitution program cost of \$49. The most expensive program was the Mt. Baker YSB with program costs of \$165. The Mt. Baker program was more expensive because of a greater amount of professional time allocated per youth. The greater use of professionals in the Mt. Baker restitution program may be necessary because of the greater proportion of minority and low income youths in that service delivery population. The average per youth costs for all of the restitution programs was \$69.

The cost of the counseling programs per youth are also presented in Table 22. The least expensive program was once again the Bellevue Conference Committee with a cost of \$22 per counseling program participant. The Mercer Island program was the next most favorable in terms of cost with \$44 average amount. Bellevue Y.E.S. costs were once again close to the Mercer Island program amount, \$47 per youth. Olympia's counseling program costs per youth were \$48. The Youthful Offender Program had the most expensive costs, \$79, primarily because the program lasts longer for their youths. The average per youth counseling program costs were \$50. The cost of the Bremer-ton program which serves the much more serious juvenile delinquent offenders was \$1612 per youth.

The preceding data would fairly well summarize the costs of the YSB programs except for one major factor. The youths in the restitution programs pay back money, time and services to society as part of their restitution program assignments. It is, therefore, necessary to calculate the resources paid back by these youths and subtract it from their program's cost to society. Each dollar paid back by the restitution program participants was added to the number of hours of community service provided by the youths and their other restitution assignments. This calculation assumed that each hour of community service was equal to one dollar. The amount of one dollar an hour is more consistent for part-time community service work by a fourteen or fifteen year old youth than higher amounts.

The greatest amount of average restitution paid back per participant was \$21 by the Mt. Baker YSB youths. The Mercer Island average figure of \$20 per youth was close behind. The Bellevue Conference Committee was able to get their youths to pay back an average of \$19 while Bellevue Y.E.S. had an average of \$11 paid back per youth. For the restitution programs as a whole the average amount reimbursed to society was \$18 per participant. The counseling programs and the Bremerton program did not have their participants systematically pay back money or community service for their offenses.

The average amounts of restitution per youth were then subtracted from the average restitution program costs. The resulting difference became the total costs per youth. The average cost for the restitution programs was \$51 per youth while the comparable amount for the counseling programs was \$50 per youth. Therefore, the total average costs of both programs are almost identical. The least expensive restitution program was the Bellevue Conference Committee with \$3 surplus per youth. The Mercer Island program became less expensive, \$29 per youth, than the Bellevue Y.E.S. program, \$33 per youth. The program cost of the Mt. Baker program decreased to \$144 per youth.

The next most important factor in the policy analysis relates to the goal of the YSB program intervention which is to decrease subsequent offenses by the youths. Follow-up offense data was collected and analyzed for the six month period of time immediately following the youth's program termination. The offense rate per youth was used rather than the recidivism rate because recidivism rates merely give a measure of the percentage of youth who reoffend. Offense rates, on the other hand, measure the amount of crime that is experienced by the community which is more germane to policy analysis. The number of follow-up, post-program offenses per youth was calculated for each program. Overall, the restitution programs had

an average offense rate per youth of .18 which was lower than the average offense rate for the counseling programs, .32 of an offense. The restitution program with the lowest offense rate was Bellevue Y.E.S. with .12 offense. However, the Mercer Island rate was also very low, .13. This represents about one offense per eight youths for the six month time period.

The offense rate for the Bellevue Conference Committee restitution program was .18, while the rate for the Mt. Baker YSB was .24 offense per youth. As one considers the higher rate for Mt. Baker, one should keep in mind the more difficult type of offender with which they deal. Still the Mt. Baker restitution program offense rate was lower than all of the counseling programs except one. The best rate for the counseling programs was obtained by the Bellevue Y.E.S. program and was .12 of an offense. The next best rate was Olympia's, .28, which was followed by Mercer Island's youths who had an average rate of .33 per youth. It should be noted at this point that almost all of the Mercer Island youth had counseling, including the restitution participants. This data is for those youth who only had counseling. The Youthful Offender Program offense rate was .42. The highest follow-up offense rate was obtained by Bellevue Conference Committee and averaged 1.0 offense per youth. The offense rate of the Bremerton serious offender program was .37. Though high, it was

still lower than the rate of the two counseling programs which worked with much less delinquent youth. Also, as we saw earlier, having more prior offenses as the Bremerton group had, should have resulted in even greater amounts of reoffending.

One of the major purposes of the Youth Service Bureau approach to combating juvenile delinquency was to have local communities involved in trying to solve their youth problems themselves. Even with a YSB, the community can be isolated if the YSB program and staff do not make and keep a place for the community in their program. Community involvement in the YSB program is also an important factor from the standpoint that the citizens then are aware of what is available for their youths. All of the YSB programs in this policy analysis phase of the study were rated on a one to five scale of interface with their local communities. These ratings were discussed in more detail in Report Two.

Three of the restitution programs all obtained the highest rating, 5, for community interface. These programs were Mt. Baker, Mercer Island and Bellevue Y.E.S. The Bellevue Conference Committee restitution program obtained a rating of 3. The Bellevue Y.E.S. and Mercer Island counseling programs also had the highest ratings, 5, for the counseling programs. The Olympia and Bellevue Conference Committee counseling programs both had community

interface ratings of 3. The Youthful Offender Program had the lowest rating on this fact with a two. The average community interface rating for the restitution programs was 4.5 while the average rating for the counseling programs was 3.6. The Bremerton program obtained the high rating of 5 for its involvement with the community.

This completes the discussion of the policy analysis data summary. The next step in the analysis was to rank each of the programs on the three major factors of cost, effectiveness, and community interface. Table 23 presents the results of the first set of rankings of the counseling and restitution components in each of the YSB's. These rankings are based upon each of the three factors being weighted equally in the policy analysis. The first column ranks the four restitution programs and the five counseling programs in terms of the degree to which each program had the lowest total costs per youth. The highest rank, 4, was given to the Bellevue Conference Committee restitution program for its lowest per youth costs. Mercer Island received a three for the second lowest costs of those programs. As can be seen, the higher rankings indicate better performance on that dimension.

Bellevue Conference Committee had the lowest costs for the counseling programs and therefore received the highest rank, five. The next highest rank went to Mercer Island for low total costs. The second factor



on which the program approaches were ranked was lowest follow-up offense rate. Bellevue Y.E.S. had the highest ranking of both the restitution and counseling programs on this dimension, because of its low offense rates in both programs. The Mercer Island restitution program had the next highest rank and was followed in order by Bellevue Conference Committee and Mt. Baker.

After Bellevue Y.E.S., the next best counseling program in terms of low offense rate was the Olympia counseling program. Mercer Island was the third best and was followed by the Youthful Offender Program and the Bellevue Conference Committee. The rankings of the final factor, degree of community interface, had several tied ranks because of identical rating scores. Three restitution programs, Mt. Baker, Mercer Island, and Bellevue Y.E.S. had high rankings on this factor. The Bellevue Conference Committee had the lowest ranking of the restitution programs on community interface. The highest ranking in the Counseling program for community involvement was shared between Mercer Island and Bellevue Y.E.S.

Table 23 then presents the average composite rankings for the two sets of programs across the three factors. Two programs were tied for the highest composite ranks of the restitution programs, Mercer Island and Bellevue Y.E.S. The Bellevue Conference Committee was next followed by Mt. Baker. However, it should again be emphasized that the Mt.

# YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU POLICY ANALYSIS RANKING

All Factors Weighted Equally

Table 23

	Total Cost Rank	Follow-up Offenses Rank	Community Interface Rank	Average Composite Rank
<b>A. Restitution Programs</b>				
1. Mt. Baker	1	1	3	1.6
2. Mercer Island	3	3	3	3
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	2	4	3	3
4. Bellevue Conference Committee	4	2	1	2.3
<b>B. Counseling Programs</b>				
1. Mercer Island	4	3	4.5	3.8
2. Youthful Offender Program	1	2	1	1.3
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	3	5	4.5	4.2
4. Olympia	2	4	2.5	2.8
5. Bellevue Conference Committee	5	1	2.5	2.8

1 = highest in cost; highest in recidivism; and highest in lack of quality community contacts.

Baker youths were different from the other programs' participants in terms of ethnic and socio-economic background. The highest ranking of the counseling programs was obtained by Bellevue Y.E.S. followed closely by Mercer Island. Next in order were Olympia, Bellevue Conference Committee and the Youthful Offender Program.

The preceding table reports the results of the composite rankings when cost factors were equally considered along with follow-up offenses and community interface factors. Policy analysis enables the decision-maker to modify the policy analysis model in terms of giving higher priority weights to one or more factors relative to the other factors. The model presented in Table 24 assumes that the decision-makers, members of a city council, place the highest priority upon the cost of the program with the other factors remaining equal. Among both the restitution and counseling programs it can be seen how the Bellevue Conference Committee now emerges as the preferred program in each area by receiving the highest rankings. Mercer Island becomes the second most preferred approach under each area when cost is the primary determining factor.

Assuming that cost is important, but that the highest importance for another group of decision-makers is reduced juvenile crime, we observe the new rankings in Table 25. For the restitution programs and the counseling programs, Bellevue Y.E.S. clearly has the top rankings.

# YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU POLICY ANALYSIS RANKING

Low Total Costs Weighted Five

Table 24

	Total Cost Rank (Weight = 5)	Follow-up Offense Rank (Weight = 1)	Community In- terface Rank (Weight = 1)	Average Composite Rank
<b>A. Restitution Programs</b>				
1. Mt. Baker	5	1	3	3
2. Mercer Island	15	3	3	7
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	10	4	3	5.7
4. Bellevue Conference Committee	20	2	1	7.6
<b>B. Counseling Programs</b>				
1. Mercer Island	20	3	4.5	9.2
2. Youthful Offender Program	5	2	1	2.7
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	15	5	4.5	8.2
4. Olympia	10	4	2.5	5.5
5. Bellevue Conference Committee	25	1	2.5	9.5

1= highest in cost; highest in recidivism; and highest in lack of quality community contacts.

# YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU POLICY ANALYSIS RANKING

## Low Follow-up Offenses Weighted Five

Table 25

	Total Cost Rank (Weight=5)	Follow-up Offense Rank (Weight=5)	Community Interface Rank (Weight=1)	Average Composite Rank
<b>A. Restitution Programs</b>				
1. Mt. Baker	1	5	3	3
2. Mercer Island	3	15	3	7
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	2	20	3	8.3
4. Bellevue Conference Committee	4	8	1	4.3
<b>B. Counseling Programs</b>				
1. Mercer Island	4	15	4.5	7.8
2. Youthful Offender	1	10	1	4
3. Bellevue Y.E.S.	3	25	4.5	10.8
4. Olympia	2	20	2.5	8.2
5. Bellevue Conference Committee	5	5	2.5	4.2

1 = highest in cost; highest in recidivism; and highest in lack of quality community contacts.

Mercer Island is the second highest ranked restitution program, while Olympia is the second ranked counseling program.

In terms of recommendations for this final report of which program should be utilized, there can be no one answer. The recommendations are cast in terms of the different ways in which decision-makers can establish priorities among factors as we have seen above.

## 2. Summary Recommendations

After examining the seven selected Youth Service Bureaus from a number of different perspectives, it is now possible to formulate recommendations based upon the results obtained both in Report Two and Report Three. The youths from five of the seven programs, Olympia, Bellevue Y.E.S., Bellevue Conference Committee, Mercer Island and the Youthful Offender Program were similar in age, race, sex and prior offenses. The youths were white, with an average age of 15 years and had committed only one or two prior offenses. For these youths it appears that a restitution program is effective in reducing subsequent delinquency. The counseling programs from the selected programs were not able to effect such changes in their participants.

In terms of a recommended restitution program, the preceding policy analysis models indicate how recommendations have to take into consideration the priorities of policy decision-makers. For example, if the three major values, cost, subsequent offense rates, and community interface are weighed with the cost factor higher than the other factors, then the recommended restitution program is the Bellevue Conference Committee. If decreased subsequent offense rates is a value to be assigned a higher priority, then the Bellevue Y.E.S. restitution model is the preferred choice. Finally, if all of the

above three factors are weighted equally, the Bellevue Y.E.S. and Mercer Island restitution programs are recommended.

The specific components of each of the above recommended restitution programs are discussed in detail in Report Two, so that program directors can choose from those aspects which can best integrate with their existing program. However, just as it has been documented that there is nothing inherent in a Youth Service Bureau which reduces delinquency, a similar conclusion must be articulated: There is nothing inherent in a restitution program which will effectively reduce delinquency in and of itself. We saw in the preceding section how the different restitution programs varied in their effects upon juvenile crime. Therefore, the prediction can be made that: A restitution program will only be successful to the degree it systematically addresses the important program components to, at least, the quality level to that of Bellevue Y.E.S. and Mercer Island's programs. The evaluation also revealed the importance that the youth complete the restitution assignment as well. These stipulations about the potential effects of restitution are important as nationally restitution programs become the new trend in juvenile corrections.

The above program recommendations are made primarily for YSB's and other community based programs which deal with middle or upper class first offenders. For youths from minority racial backgrounds and lower socio-economic



status the above restitution models would probably not be as effective as the Mt. Baker approach. The Mt. Baker restitution program obtained favorable follow-up results with minority youths, but was ranked low on cost because of its greater use of professional staff. The activities carried on by professional staff usually involved a more assertive approach in dealing with the youths and their families. For example, the professional Restitution Outreach Worker went into the home to gather the intake data and went to pick up the youth the first time to deliver him or her to the restitution work assignment.

It is thought that the more outgoing approach of the Mt. Baker program and its associated higher costs are probably necessary for minority youths. Therefore, for either minority and/or lower income first time juvenile offenders, the Mt. Baker restitution program is recommended. Aspects of the Mt. Baker program such as finding out how the youth spends his or her time in the intake investigation are recommended for other non-minority youth programs.

The final recommendations to be discussed are concerned with Bremerton's Community Resources Consolidated program. For youths who are multiple offenders, but the offenses are of a severity similar to shoplifting or less, the Bremerton program is recommended. The Community Resources Consolidated significantly reduced the quantity and severity of the juveniles' offenses after five months

of participation. For the Bremerton program two recommendations are made. First, because of the apparent success of the restitution programs for first offenders, it might be advantageous to include some restitution component for their multiple offenders. The development of recommendations for restitution could be incorporated into the diagnostic process.

The second recommendation is concerned with improving the quality of the services delivered to youths in the CRC program. The CRC program has direct control of the quality of the input, diagnosis, goal setting, and follow-up phases of the youths' program. The diagnosis and goals could be of the highest level possible and if the implemented programs are low in quality, the net effect would be zero or less. Therefore, the Bremerton program should improve the services which their youths receive.

The above recommendations have been made based upon the collected data and analysis of findings. The greatest value of this entire study is that it has extensively documented the goals, management, community interface, the youths served, the delivery system, the programs, the staff and the results of this social service called Youth Service Bureau in at least one state. The results reported throughout the three reports and the process used to organize them are as important as the above recommendations.



**END**