



KING COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

YOUTHFUL OFFENDER PROGRAM

PROGRAM EVALUATION FINAL REPORT

48517

COMPASS MANAGEMENT GROUP, INC.

JANUARY 1977

KING COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

YOUTHFUL OFFENDER PROGRAM

PROGRAM EVALUATION

COMPASS MANAGEMENT GROUP, INC.

January 1977

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Compass Management Group project team wishes to extend their gratitude and appreciation to all persons who participated in and assisted with the various aspects of the study. In particular, we wish to thank the Director, Supervisor, and counselors of the Youthful Offender Program. We also wish to thank Sheriff Lawrence Waldt, King County Department of Public Safety, and all members of the Department who assisted with data-gathering activities throughout the conduct of this project.

We also gratefully acknowledge all the directors and staff members of other social service agencies, and parents for the assistance and participation in this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I - OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND	1
Background to the Study	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Description of the Youthful Offender Program	2
Remaining Chapters of this Report	3
CHAPTER II - SUMMARY	4
Accomplishment of Program Goals	4
Diversion Objectives	5
System Impact	5
Recommendations	7
CHAPTER III - EVALUATION APPROACH	9
Evaluation Approach	9
Methodological Considerations	9
CHAPTER IV - FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	12
Review of Program Operations and Administration	12
Sworn Personnel Questionnaire	25
In-Depth Interviews	43
Parent Questionnaire	50
Agency Survey	63
Description of Client Population	67
Time Analysis: Direct Services versus	
Administrative Activities	74
Cost Effectiveness Analysis	76

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER V - RECOMMENDATIONS	80
Service Delivery	80
Program Administration	84
Cost Effectiveness	87
APPENDICES	
Appendix A - Description of Data Collection Instruments and Administration	88
Appendix B - Complete List of Responses to Question 11 (Sworn Personnel Questionnaire)	93
Appendix C - Detailed Descriptive Data of Population	95
Appendix D - Literature Search	108

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

I. OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

Background to the Study

Since 1973 the King County Department of Public Safety has operated the Youthful Offender Program (YOP). This program is a direct social service and referral program for juveniles and their families and is operated with LEAA grant funds.

In August 1976 Compass Management Group was awarded the contract for the YOP program evaluation, which was conducted from August through December 1976. The project team collected most of the program data during this period, but was provided with historical client data (in coded form) from records which the YOP staff had maintained since the project's inception. In addition, the findings in previous evaluation reports were reviewed and considered in the performance of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this evaluation project, as listed in the KCDPS's Request for Proposal, was as follows:

Assess the degree to which YOP has met its stated grant objectives of:

- Providing King County Police Officers with an alternative to formal court referral and to fill the void between court referral and "advise and warn" with no follow up.
- Providing counseling and/or referral services to juveniles' families and significant others as close to the time of police contact as possible.
- Providing King County Department of Public Safety with a credible social service capability within law enforcement.

Describe and analyze the referral population in terms of demographic information, characteristics, intervention used, recidivism patterns, and subsequent perceptions about contact with police and YOP.

Examine the YOP in terms of efficiency, its role in the community, and against current literature concerning juvenile justice.

Description of the Youthful Offender Program

The YOP was begun as one component of the KCDPS services to juveniles in unincorporated areas of King County.

In view of the stated grant objectives, the primary operational goal of the YOP is to provide a diversion program for first-offender juveniles who would normally be referred to the King County Juvenile Court or other agencies, and provide individual and family counseling services to the juveniles and their parents who are referred by KCDPS.

The YOP staff consists of six counselors, one supervisor, and clerical support located in the various police precincts, as follows:

Central Precinct (County Courthouse) - YOP Supervisor and Clerical Support

North, Precinct No. 2 (North King County) - Two Counselors

Southeast, Precinct No. 3 (Kent) - Two Counselors

Southwest, Precinct No. 4 (Burien) - Two Counselors

The project is funded with LEAA grant moneys channeled through the Law and Justice Planning Office, with ten percent matching funds provided by the State and County. KCDPS also provides office space and miscellaneous clerical support to the YOP.

The target population is juveniles (and their families) under the age of 18 years who are "first offenders" that police officers feel would benefit from counseling intervention. This is generally defined as a youth with no previous record with Juvenile Court, but one who might have had previous contacts of a minor nature with the police.

The range of services provided includes receiving referrals from police personnel and either referring the youth to another social service agency, providing direct counseling service, or providing counseling service in coordination with another social service agency. The YOP counselors in the precincts work closely with patrol officers and detectives in dealing with their juvenile contacts. The counselors perform screening, record checks, counseling and referral, maintenance of client files, and follow-up activities within their normal scope of duties. Counseling is conducted both in their precinct offices and within client homes. The average active caseload is approximately 41 cases per counselor. A total of 95 client referrals is screened per month. Specific duties and details of the referral process are contained in a later chapter.

Remaining Chapters of This Report

The remaining chapters of this report include the following:

- Executive Summary - A brief description of findings, conclusions, and recommendations
- Evaluation Approach - Description of data collection activities and methodology used, and an explanation of the unique methodological considerations in this evaluation project
- Findings and Conclusions - Separated into sections corresponding to the various areas of evaluation and data collection activities
- Recommendations - Separated into sections corresponding to the purposes of the evaluation
- Appendices

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY

II. SUMMARY

This chapter summarizes the findings, conclusions, and recommendations presented in the remainder of the report.

Accomplishment of Program Goals

In terms of the stated grant objectives, the Youthful Offender Program has accomplished the goals, sometimes with exceptional success.

- The YOP has definitely provided a viable alternative to either referring a youth to Juvenile Court or releasing them under the "advise and warn" procedure. Feedback from interviews and questionnaires indicates the need for such an option, especially considering the dissatisfaction expressed by KCDPS staff with support from the King County Juvenile Court.
- The YOP staff has achieved a rapid response time in contacting juveniles and their families. In approximately 68 percent of the treatment cases, contact is made on the same day that the YOP counselors received the referral, with an average of .7 day time lapse. The average lag between the date of police contact to date of YOP receipt of referral is 3.2 days, with 55 percent of these cases referred to the YOP within one day.
- The YOP operations received favorable comments concerning their provision of a credible social service capability within the King County Department of Public Safety. From within KCDPS, it was felt that the YOP provides a professional counseling service for juveniles and their families and performs a mission which officers and detectives do not have the time or skills to handle. Other social service agency personnel indicated that no other agency addresses the same population of juveniles, and that the YOP is very successful in establishing a good rapport with the police and in providing an immediate and preventive-type counseling and referral service.

In addition to the stated grant objectives, there are several implicit objectives of any juvenile diversion program. One such aim of a diversion program is to simply divert the juvenile contacts from the formal juvenile criminal justice system. A second objective is to accomplish this task in such a manner as to reduce recidivism.

Diversion Objectives

There is clear evidence that the YOP is in fact diverting first-offender juveniles from the formal juvenile justice system (Juvenile Court) and providing them with services which are perceived to be more beneficial and effective than they would have otherwise received. Specific numbers are difficult to determine due to the general lack of data on juveniles; however, the estimated number of diverted juveniles is approximately 1,000 youths per year, who, if not handled by YOP, would have been referred to the Juvenile Court or some other agency. It cannot categorically be stated, however, that all of these potential referrals would in fact have been referred. Due to the paperwork necessary for a Juvenile Court ¹ referral, the perceived dissatisfaction with the Juvenile Court program by KCDPS staff, and the lack of knowledge of other agencies by KCDPS staff, it is likely that some juveniles would simply be released.

System Impact

Within the overall system of juvenile services in the County, the YOP appears to perform a unique function. It concentrates on first offenders and/or those committing less serious offenses and is oriented towards problem solving and preventing future delinquency. The YOP also handled cases where there is legal insufficiency to prosecute or where the victim chooses not to press charges, but where the police officers feel some intervention will help. Most other agencies provide services only after the juvenile has established a pattern of delinquency, an approach which has not been overwhelmingly successful.

¹ In this section and throughout the report references to the Juvenile Court and other agencies are reported. These references are based on responses from KCDPS staff as they perceive these other agencies, rather than on the observations of the consultant. Also, personnel from the Juvenile Court and other agencies have not had any opportunity to respond to these concerns.

The YOP has also developed an operating plan which is unique and appears to be very successful. The rapid contact by counselors with juveniles and their families, thorough follow-up and feedback to police officers and detectives, and the location of the counselors in the police precincts (which facilitates close working relationships when dealing with juvenile cases) are considered extremely positive approaches to police-related social service programs. Such aspects have played an important part in the acceptance of this social work component by the KCDPS staff.

Within the various service strategies provided by the YOP, there is evidence that the clients the YOP handles themselves are better served than the group of clients referred to other agencies (bulletin referral group). KCDPS personnel expressed more trust in knowing that the youth they referred to the YOP were handled personally by the YOP staff, and that feedback on the case disposition was always available. Once a client is bulletin referred for assistance, the YOP has no control over the actual provision and quality of the help provided. Based on the limited feedback received from other agencies, it appears that the referred clients received only limited assistance with fewer contacts.

There appears to be little duplication of effort by the YOP and other juvenile service agencies, including the Juvenile Court. The Juvenile Court appears to make referrals to other agencies only after the youth has been involved in multiple police contacts. The YOP normally refers juveniles or counsels them in-house after the first offense, providing a more immediate crisis-oriented response after the initial law enforcement contact.

Also, in terms of minor offenses handled by the KCDPS, the YOP appears to provide a necessary service. In many juvenile situations some staff member would normally be expected to gather data about an incident, contact the family, explain the action taken to the victim, and follow up at some later time. If the YOP counselors were not available for such tasks, the patrol officers and detectives would probably have to perform such duties. This would mean that they would be unavailable for normal patrol duties, investigations, and handling more serious incidents. Specific cost savings were not computed due to the unavailability of time utilization data for patrol officers and detectives. However, since minor juvenile offenses account for a significant portion of police activities, the time savings provided by the YOP staff could prove to be an important contribution to KCDPS operations.

Recommendations

The major recommendations of this report are summarized in this section. The Recommendations chapter later in this report lists all recommendations, including explanatory comments and rationale.

The YOP should define more clearly its primary mission within the KCDPS

The YOP currently provides both counseling and referral services, which are unique and separate activities. The counseling function appears to be the most beneficial type of assistance, and program changes should be considered to take this into account.

The YOP staff should develop better controls for referral clients

If the YOP continues to refer juveniles to other agencies, improved procedures for ensuring service is provided should be developed.

The treatment group service delivery strategy appears to be a valid and workable approach and should be continued

The strengths of the YOP are immediate contact of youth and his or her family, the actual provision of counseling aimed at problem solving, and that the counselors are located in the police precincts. This latter program component fosters good working relations and facilitates the provision of feedback on case disposition to the officers and detectives.

YOP should explore the possibility of using skilled volunteers or graduate students in counseling to augment/assist the permanent staff

The counselors currently have full caseloads and must refer some YOP cases to other agencies for assistance. Volunteers or students could be used to increase the service to clients and serve more clients at little additional cost. Procedures should

be developed to cover selection and control of volunteers if they are utilized.

The YOP Supervisor should perform more liaison activities with other social service agencies

Some personnel in other agencies are still unfamiliar with the purpose and scope of services provided by the YOP. Since the YOP refers clients to other agencies, it is important for other agency personnel to be aware of the YOP to preclude overlapping or duplicate services and to ensure the referred youths are offered appropriate help. Liaison work should be coordinated with the Supervisor of the Juvenile Unit, KCDPS.

The name of the program should be changed

One rationale for diversion programs is that it precludes the labeling stigma of a court action. Care should be taken not to label the youth within the diversion program itself. In addition, the program covers families as well as youths, and not all the referred youths are offenders.

The use of CID vehicles should be discontinued

A savings of approximately \$5,000 per year could be expected by using private vehicles instead of CID vehicles. In addition, the use of "official" marked cars is not perceived by parents to be desirable for home visits.

CHAPTER III

EVALUATION APPROACH

III. EVALUATION APPROACH

This chapter outlines and explains the evaluation approach used for the YOP evaluation.

Evaluation Approach

The general approach employed in this project involved the use of questionnaires, personal interviews, and on-site observations of YOP operations at each precinct. Interviews were conducted with KCDPS personnel, the YOP Supervisor and staff, and directors and staffs of other social service agencies in the King County area. In addition, coded client data provided by YOP staff was analyzed and summarized to provide descriptive and comparative program data.

Questionnaires were sent to all sworn police personnel and parents of juveniles referred to and worked with directly by YOP counselors.

YOP program materials, including management plans, budgets, and operating and recordkeeping forms, were reviewed.

In addition to on-site observation of YOP operations, a member of the project team accompanied a patrol officer on a normal shift patrol.

Data collection instruments were developed with the assistance of the YOP and approved prior to administration. Questionnaires were also field tested prior to their use.

The various data collection activities are described in detail in Appendix A.

Methodological Considerations

Several methodological considerations should be noted which affect the evaluation of juvenile justice projects in general and influenced this project in particular.

The traditional experimental model for program evaluation consists of baseline measurement, performance of service or treatment, and post-intervention measurement, using both an experimental and control group to determine causal relationships. The following paragraphs discuss various factors which precluded the use of this structured traditional model for the YOP evaluation.

Impact of External Factors

The goal of program evaluations is to measure the growth or reduction of specific behaviors in the subjects and isolate the cause of that change. The YOP might not have been the only social service agency providing assistance to the juvenile and his or her family. Accordingly, reduced recidivism cannot be attributed solely to the influence of the YOP. In addition, the influence of the family and peers and normal maturation are factors which affect delinquent behavior.

Availability of Control Groups

The use of control groups for comparison purposes is not always desirable in program evaluation, depending on the goals and objectives of the specific program. This is often the case in social service programs due to the cost and difficulty of identifying control subjects, the confidentiality of personal data, and the notion that some client groups are being used as "guinea pigs" while other groups are receiving special attention. This is especially true in law and justice projects where it is difficult to rationalize taking no legal action against certain types of offenders. Comparison groups from other juvenile programs were not used due to different referral criteria, target populations, and modes of operation.

Random Assignment to Treatments

When comparisons are made among different types of interventions available within one program, assignment to the various types of interventions should be made in a random, unbiased manner. However, this is not always feasible in law and justice programs because interventions are predicated on client

needs and severity of the offense. Random assignment to different interventions was not (until recently) used by the YOP staff, but statistical checks were performed to identify any significant differences in the client characteristics of groups being compared.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter reports the findings and conclusions based on the various data-gathering activities. Specific details of sample size, administration of questionnaires, and interviews are described in detail in Appendix A. The activities covered in detail include:

- Review of Program Operations and Administration
- Sworn Personnel Questionnaire
- In-Depth Personal Interviews
- Parent Questionnaire
- Agency Survey
- Description of Client Population
- Time Analysis: Direct Services versus Administrative Activities
- Cost Effectiveness Analysis

Review of Program Operations and Administration

This portion of the chapter reviews the various aspects of Youthful Offender Program operations, staffing, procedures, and administrative staffing and activities.

Staffing and Facilities Location

The YOP locations and staffing are as follows:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Staffing</u>	<u>Hours</u>
KCDPS Precinct No. 2 (North)	2 counselors	40 hours/week, flexible

<u>Location</u>	<u>Staffing</u>	<u>Hours</u>
KCDPS Precinct No. 3 (Kent)	2 counselors	40 hours/week, flexible
KCDPS Precinct No. 4 (Burien)	2 counselors	40 hours/week, flexible
King County Courthouse (CID Unit)	1 supervisor 1 office asst. (part-time)	40 hours/week, flexible

The hours of all counseling staff are flexible depending on the need to meet with juveniles and/or parents. The range extends from approximately 7 A.M. to 9 P.M. Monday through Friday.

Facilities provided in the KCDPS police precinct are basically office space, including office furniture, and support such as telephone, office supplies, and some clerical-type support such as office copiers.

Counselor Qualifications and Responsibilities

A major service component of the YOP is providing counseling to youths and their families. The following paragraphs summarize the experience of the program supervisor and counseling staff.

The Supervisor has a BA (Psychology) and an MSW in Social Work Research, and has 12 post masters credit hours in counseling and supervisory skill development. The Supervisor had over eight years of experience in supervisory or juvenile social work positions prior to joining the YOP.

The six-member counseling staff all have bachelor degrees, with three persons also having either an MSW or an MA. The BA-level degrees are generally in Social Work, Psychology, or Social Welfare, with the Masters degrees in Counseling and Human Services.

The length of experience prior to joining the YOP ranged from one year to over five years, with an average of about two years' experience.

The counselors are responsible for the following service-related and administrative activities:

Service-related duties:

- Receive and screen referrals from officers/
detectives
- Perform records check for previous Juvenile
Court contacts
- Make referrals to YSB or conference committee
(if juvenile has previous contact, but is not
currently assigned to a caseworker)
- Refer to probation officer, if current Juvenile
Court action pending
- Select cases for YOP intervention
- Refer cases to other agencies (either directly or
after interview)
- Conduct counseling with youth and/or family
- Follow up with youth and/or family
- Coordinate with other agencies
- Consult with officers and detectives on cases
- Serve as information source for availability of
other programs

Administrative duties:

- Forward client files to other agencies
- Compile and maintain client case materials
- Contact or correspond with youth and/or family
(use of form letters)
- Compile statistics
- File and maintain records
- Attend staff meetings
- Attend training and consultation sessions
- Maintain liaison with community agencies

Population Served

Juveniles served by the YOP are under the age of 18 years; the average age of the boys and girls is 14 years. Youths are "first offenders" or have committed only minor previous offenses and receive YOP intervention on a voluntary basis. Youths are referred to the YOP counselors at the discretion of the police officers, who are able to seek advice from the counselors concerning their opinions of the best approach to helping the youth and/or the family.

The only selection criterion for receiving assistance from the YOP is whether or not the juvenile is currently on probation or has a previous Juvenile Court contact (details of the referral process are covered in a later section). However, counselors do refer cases based on lack of time available, and there are currently no guidelines for which type of case is given priority.

Typical minor offenses which are handled by the YOP are shoplifting, stealing and larceny, runaways, and use of marijuana. However, more serious felony cases are occasionally assigned to the YOP by police personnel. The juvenile cases are referred to the various YOP counselors at the discretion of the patrol officers and detectives. The seriousness of the offense and the attitude of the juvenile (and sometimes the parents or guardians) are prime factors in the officer's determination of what action to take.

Counselor Caseload

The following guidelines indicate the typical caseload for the total YOP staff:

Referrals received and screened: 100/month

Referrals to YSB/conference committees: Est. 40/month

Accept cases for YOP action: 60/month

Average active cases: 35/month per counselor (210 total per month)

The following statistics for treatment group clients describe the average time spent per client, average number of contacts per client, and the total in-person contacts with each client:

	<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>
Time spent per client (direct case service)	5.9 hrs.	1 hour to 25 hours
Total number of contacts	16.5	1 to 82 contacts
Total in-person contacts	1.4	1 to 10 contacts

The average case length for YOP counseling cases (extending from the date YOP staff receives referral forms to case closure) is 120 days. The range in length is from one week to one year, three months.

Data for these figures were gathered over the entire three-year period of YOP operations. The total in-person contacts is generally higher than the 1.4 average during the recent program years as opposed to the start-up period. When the YOP was first started, operating policies allowed for an interview followed by periodic telephone checks. Current operations stress personal follow-up contacts and counseling.

YOP Response Times

In handling various types of cases, the YOP staff attempts to respond within the following time frames:

Response Time Guidelines:

Time from date of incident* to YOP receipt (from officer)	2 days
--	--------

*For patrol officers the incident date is usually the same as contact date.

Time from date of incident to YOP receipt (from detective)	21 days*
Time from receipt by YOP to contact youth/family	1.5 days
Time from receipt by YOP - Referrals cases refer to other agency	1.5 days
Time from receipt by YOP - Refer to YSB/JC conference committee	1.5 days
Time from feedback to referring officer/detective	a. Immediate as assigned b. Periodically as appropriate c. At case closure

*When detectives receive cases, the purpose is to investigate, which can take an indeterminate amount of time.

Based on the sample² of client data analyzed, the actual response times were as follows:

Treatment Group:

Time from police contact to YOP receipt**	3.2 days
Time from YOP receipt to contact of juvenile/family	.7 days

**This calculation uses patrol officer referral date and detective referral date. Due to the indeterminate investigation period for detectives, use of the detective date of initial contact would not accurately represent the response time.

² These statistics are based on the coded client data provided by the YOP staff. However, for some clients there were missing dates, or obviously incorrect dates, and these cases were not used to develop these average response times. The sample sizes are as follows: treatment - 311; bulletin referral - 257; non-treatment - 75.

Bulletin Referral Group:

Time from police contact to YOP receipt**	3.6 days
---	----------

Time from receipt to referral agency contact with client	10.1 days
--	-----------

Non-Treatment Group:

Time from police contact to YOP receipt**	6.8 days
---	----------

**This calculation uses patrol officer referral date and detective referral date. Due to the indeterminate investigation period for detectives, use of the detective date of initial contact would not accurately represent the response time.

The actual response time for the treatment group (time lapse from when the YOP staff receives the referral until the juvenile/family is contacted) averages .7 days, which betters the guideline. The guidelines are not met for the bulletin referral and non-treatment groups. However, it should be kept in mind that providing an immediate response with the treatment group is the prime intervention consideration for the YOP staff. A comparison can be made based on the findings in a report on the YOP issued by the King County LJPO.³ This report indicated that, based on data from 1973-74, the response time was 1.7 days. The current data indicates a significant improvement in this average response time figure.

However, although the average response time was less, fewer same-day contacts were made. The following figures display the percentage of contacts made with the juvenile/family on the same day as the referral was received.

³ Report on the Youthful Offender Program, prepared by Laurie Bender, King County Law and Justice Planning Office, July 1976.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Same day response⁴</u>
1973-74 data	49%
1974-75 data	85%
1976 data	68%

It appears that the number of same-day contacts is decreasing from these statistics, and if this is the case immediate attention should be given to this problem. However, it is not known if the previous years' figures were calculated in the same manner, making it difficult to categorically state that this apparent decrease is a valid concern or not.

Also, there were changes to the program which occurred during 1975-76 which could have affected the same-day response figures. During this period the burglary/larceny detective units were transferred out to the precincts. Detective referrals increased, and these generally take longer due to the fact they require investigations. Also, a new procedure was initiated for typing the case reports from officers. The new procedure involved dictating the report over the phone to a central typing pool; the referral report would then be sent to YOP for action. Once it was discovered that this procedure was creating delays, it was changed to ensure the YOP counselors received the referral information as soon as possible. Either of these events could have adversely affected the YOP's capability to make same-day contacts.

The overall conclusion is that the YOP staff takes prompt action on the referrals received from police, especially with the clients they personally counsel.

⁴ The same-day response times were calculated based on cases handled on the same work day as received. Thus, police contacts occurring on weekends, but handled on Mondays, were considered same-day responses.

Office Procedures

There is no formal policies and procedures manual; however, the King County Manual is currently being updated and is applicable for most general areas of operations within the YOP.

The major functions of the offices are the screening, referral, and counseling activities, which are described in detail below:

Officer Contact:

Patrol officers who contact juveniles make a discretionary judgment concerning disposition of the juvenile. This decision is often made on the basis of limited information provided by the youth and/or the parents/guardians at the time of contact. The officer either releases the boy or girl to their parents/guardians (advises/warns or issues a citation to Court) or takes the youth to Juvenile Court for detention.

If the officer decides the offense is more serious than advise/warn but does not warrant detention, he/she can either take the youth home and refer the case to YOP or send the case to CID for further investigation. The officer usually discusses the situation with parents and youth prior to sending the referral to the YOP.

Detectives make contact with youths during investigation of incidents referred to them by patrol officers and, based on their discretionary judgment of the seriousness of the case, may refer the case to YOP. Other options for detectives are to charge the juvenile (and refer the case to Juvenile Court) or close the case.

YOP Action:

Once the YOP staff receives a referral, they review the case for prior Juvenile Court contact. If there is a previous court contact (but no current probation status), the youth is referred (bulletin referral) to a YSB or Juvenile Court conference committee for action. However, the

YOP can handle juveniles with prior court contact if that contact was for dependency reasons or traffic citations. If the Juvenile Court is involved in any way, the youth is referred to the probation officer. If the youth has had no previous contact with Juvenile Court, at the discretion of the YOP counselor the case can be accepted for YOP intervention. Juveniles with previous police contacts can be selected for YOP intervention depending on the seriousness of those incidents and the current incident.

An "interview and referral" is an action where a youth is accepted for YOP intervention and the counselor determines additional services (not available through YOP) are needed.

A "bulletin referral" occurs when the juvenile is referred to the various social service agencies (e. g. , YSB) without an interview and based on record check of prior or current incidents or probation status. This alternative is used to handle case overloads on YOP counselors.

There are no formal criteria for how many cases or what types are accepted for YOP intervention. The staff of each precinct accepts a certain number of cases based on their current caseloads and forecasts of available time. However, the guidelines applied by the Supervisor specify 30-35 cases per month for each counselor.

The YOP direct counseling intervention involves counseling for the youth and parents, and follow-up contacts. Some minor cases involve only a minimum of direct service followed by "benevolent surveillance". Other cases require continuous counseling for a period of months, with both youths and parents involved in all client contacts. The first interview usually is held at the police precinct and involves an explanation of the program and parent/juvenile responsibilities. Background and family information is also collected at this time.

In most cases the juvenile and/or parents/guardians are contacted by phone, but occasionally it is necessary to send letters asking the juvenile or family to contact the

YOP for an appointment. A series of form letters has been developed to facilitate these contacts, and is used to set up appointments, notify parents, and alert other agencies of an impending referral.

No formal treatment plans are prepared for each client, but treatment recommendations, plans, and progress are recorded on two separate forms maintained in the case file. This record appears to be in sufficient detail to ensure continuity of service in the event of personnel turnover or transfer of counselors and is adequate for case planning and supervision purposes.

Recordkeeping and Filing System

An extensive and detailed recordkeeping and file system has been developed to provide case tracking and counselor data. The forms which comprise the recordkeeping system are:

<u>Form</u>	<u>Use</u>
Form 1: Referral Form	Completed by officer/detective and sent to YOP counselor; provides data on incident and includes a detachable section to provide feedback to referring officer/detective
Form 2: Contact Sheet	Used by counselor for inclusion in client file
Form 3: Investigation- Analysis- Recommendation	Used by counselor for background data, placed in client file
Form 4: Counselor Follow-Up	Completed by counselor and provides disposition of case information to referring officer/detective

The following forms are used to record counselor activities and are forwarded to the YOP Supervisor for program management purposes.

<u>Form</u>	<u>Use</u>
Form 5: Case Activity Record	Completed by each counselor to record time on a case-by-case basis and the number, date, and type of contact
Monthly Case Log	Completed by each counselor to summarize cases processed and status
Counselor Time Sheet	Completed by each counselor to record time use
County Expense Form	Completed by each counselor to record mileage and expenses

Each counselor maintains a client file for each individual, and these are maintained at the police precinct office. In addition, case data is summarized on 5 x 7 cards, and a file of these cards is maintained at the precinct and in the supervisor's office at the County Courthouse.

For program analysis purposes, data was extracted from case files and coded for eventual keypunching. This coding is performed by a person experienced in police record systems. Comprehensive data is maintained about each client, and separate code books are maintained for the treatment group, bulletin referral group, and no-contact group. Four-digit client numbers are used to protect the confidentiality of client data.

Program Administration

The Program Supervisor monitors and supervises the counselors in the precincts, supervises the statistical recordkeeping activities, coordinates counselor training, and oversees all administrative activities. Other functions of the Supervisor include coordination on policy matters with KCDPS management and overseeing budgetary and administrative matters, including all grant-related activities such as report preparation.

The Supervisor is located in the King County Courthouse and visits the precincts approximately six times per month on an as-needed basis. In addition, there are periodic staff meetings where administrative as well as case service questions are discussed.

The Supervisor conducts training with all counselors on an individual basis, and outside consultants are periodically used for consultation on specific cases and types of client situations. The Supervisor is also available for consultation with officers and detectives on case dispositions and appropriate action based on case needs.

A management by objectives plan for 1976 has been developed in coordination with counselors and is currently being used. Each counselor submitted a "management worksheet" containing his or her goals, and these were summarized and compiled into the following categories:

- Basic program operations
- Support/administration
- New program developments
- Implementation of evaluation and research

In addition, responsibility for task accomplishment is assigned to the appropriate staff (such as director, supervisor, counselor, or clerical) and the method of accomplishment is specified in detail. The timing (by month) and the result and date of accomplishment are also recorded on the worksheets. Periodic meetings are held to discuss progress with the responsible persons, and the worksheet annotated as changes occurred.

Comprehensive quarterly reports are prepared for the Law and Justice Planning Office, Office of Community Development, the funding agency.

The Project Director (Commander of the Criminal Investigation Division) is also located at the County Courthouse. The Lieutenant in charge of the Crimes Against Persons Section provides direct supervision of the YOP Supervisor and assists with YOP coordinating efforts with other police sections.

Sworn Personnel Questionnaire

A written questionnaire was distributed to all sworn personnel within the four precincts, including special operations units. The Police Chief and Sheriff in the Department of Public Safety were not asked to complete the written questionnaire. A total of 233 responses was tabulated.

The purpose of this questionnaire was to ascertain the general level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the YOP and to determine the extent of contact with or use of YOP services by detectives, patrol officers, and other staff. Appendix A contains details of questionnaire administration.

The results of this questionnaire will be reviewed in this section, specifying the individual question when appropriate, and broken out by precinct where significant differences arise.

The extent of familiarity with the YOP and the recency of contact are reflected in the following data based on questions 1 and 2 of the survey, which are summarized in the following exhibits.

Exhibit 1

KCDPS Staff Familiarity with Program

	Percentages				
	Total	Central	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Never had contact with YOP	12%	33%	2%	2%	4%
Had contact with YOP in past	44	44	38	50	47
Have current contact with YOP	44	23	60	48	49

Exhibit 2

Familiarity with Support Services

	Percentages				
	Total	Central	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Very familiar	39%	32%	60%	25%	35%
Somewhat familiar	24	30	13	30	23
Moderately familiar	20	5	21	34	26
Slightly familiar	10	12	7	11	12
Not familiar at all	7	21	0	0	4

The responses in Exhibit 1 indicate that 88 percent of the sworn personnel have current contact or have had contact in the past with the YOP. When analyzed by precinct, this figure is much higher with the exception of the Central Precinct located in the County Courthouse. Also, because the three outlying precincts are staffed with YOP counselors, this pattern of contact with the YOP is not unexpected. All patrol and burglary/larceny detective units are located in the outlying precincts, and these units account for most juvenile contacts. Special operation units are housed at the County Courthouse.

The data in Exhibit 2 reflects a similar pattern, with a large number of Central Precinct staff not familiar with the program. However, there remains a segment of personnel who noted only "moderate" familiarity with the YOP and its activities. This appears to indicate that more effort should be made to ensure that all personnel, especially patrol and detective staff, are completely familiar with the YOP and how it operates.

A more detailed analysis of level of familiarity by type of position (see Exhibit 3) indicates that a large number of patrol officers in the outlying precincts fall into this group that might benefit from additional and/or periodic orientations. Although it was not possible to analyze the patrol officer responses by shift, the periodic rotation of shift assignments would ensure that all patrol officers have had the opportunity to work directly with YOP counselors.

Exhibit 3

Detailed Breakout of Familiarity with Support Services

	Percentages																
	Central					#2				#3				#4			
	Patrol	Detect	Super	Civil	Other	Pat	Det	Sup	Oth	Pat	Det	Sup	Oth	Pat	Det	Sup	Oth
Very familiar	0	27	77	0	29	55	86	58	66	10	72	38	0	25	60	56	0
Somewhat	50	40	8	11	43	13	0	17	34	36	14	24	0	19	20	33	50
Moderately	0	9	0	0	0	25	14	17	0	36	14	38	100	37	20	0	0
Slightly	0	15	15	0	14	7	0	8	0	18	0	0	0	19	0	0	0
Not at all	50	9	0	89	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	50

Exhibit 4 displays responses to the question about the adequacy of information/orientations received about the YOP operations.

Exhibit 4

Adequacy of Program Information

Yes, received adequate information/orientation

No, did not receive adequate information/orientation

	Percentages				
	Total	Central	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Yes, received adequate information/orientation	71%	64%	89%	59%	70%
No, did not receive adequate information/orientation	29	36	11	41	30

Based on these responses it appears that precincts three and four warrant more attention to ensure that department personnel completely understand how the YOP assists with the handling of juvenile contacts and how the YOP counselors can be utilized.

The next two questions (number 4 and 5) were intended to get an estimate of the flow of juvenile contacts through the police department, either to advise and warn, the YOP, or Juvenile Court.

There are no current records to allow exact figures on juvenile dispositions, and it should be kept in mind that the questionnaire data are only estimates by patrol officers and detectives. In addition, the use of average figures tends to decrease the generalizability of the data, since there were wide variations in the reported estimates.

Question 4 was for patrol officers only, based on the fact that these officers have first contact with juveniles and then refer appropriate cases to detectives. The following exhibit displays the estimates for all respondents and for the three precincts with the most juvenile contacts⁵.

Exhibit 5

Percentage Referrals (including YOP)

Question 4: Where and in what percentage are current first-offender juvenile contacts referred?

	Patrol Officers		
	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Advise and warn	40%	49%	51%
Issue citation to Juvenile Court	19	17	15
Take to Juvenile Court (detention)	5	5	6
Refer directly to YOP	27	21	18
Send for investigation/charges	6	7	8
Other	3	1	1

⁵ The Central Precinct has only four patrol officers, with very few juvenile contacts, and was not included in this analysis.

The average estimates of referrals to the YOP range from 18 to 27 percent, and the referrals to Juvenile Court (either detention or issuing a citation) range from 21 to 24 percent for the three precincts.

These figures become meaningful when compared to the data in the exhibit below.

Exhibit 6

Percentage Referrals (YOP not in existence)

Question 5: If the YOP ceased to exist, where and in what percentage would you refer first-offender juvenile contacts you currently refer to the YOP?

	Total	Precincts		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Advise and warn	41%	37%	32%	45%
Issue citation to Court (patrol)	17	24	14	10
Take to Juvenile Court (detention)	6	6	7	11
Refer to Juvenile Court (detectives)	22	22	27	13
Send for investigation/charges	8	8	11	11
Close case	4	2	3	9
Other	2	1	6	1

When comparing the estimates on these two exhibits, the percentages of advise and warn remain fairly constant. However, if YOP did not exist, the overall percentages of youths taken, referred, or cited to Juvenile Court almost double. (These comparative figures are arrived at by adding columns for taking, referring, or issuing citations to the Court in the two exhibits.) This is supported by interviews with officers and detectives indicating that if they decide more than an advise-and-warn action is needed, without the YOP they would take or refer the youth to Juvenile Court.

Question 6 asks how satisfied the respondents are with feedback from various agencies or groups, and the results are displayed in Exhibit 7 on the following page.

The results indicate the feedback from YOP staff is generally perceived as very satisfactory. Only in Precinct No. 3 and with the patrol officers in Precinct No. 4 is there any indication that the type of level of feedback can be improved. In interpreting this data, however, the number of respondents (N) should be kept in mind. Some percentage figures represent the feelings of only one or two persons in certain job categories.

In contrast to the reported high level of satisfaction with feedback from the YOP, the feedback from other agencies and the Juvenile Court was perceived to be less satisfactory. The overall responses indicate that the police personnel feel that the feedback is either not satisfactory or that none is received.

The remaining questions required an open-ended response, and are summarized by precinct where appropriate. An occasional quotation is included and appears in reduced-size type.

Question 7: Please list the most important type(s) of support/assistance in handling juveniles provided to you by the YOP staff.

The most heavily mentioned benefits are as follows, with the percentage frequency of responses indicated in parentheses:

- Provides an option (to advise and warn and Juvenile Court) (20%)
- Provides follow-up support (16%)
- Provides counseling support (16%)
- Provides assistance with family counseling (14%)
- Relieves police staff of handling minor offenses and allows them to concentrate on more serious crimes (9%)
- Provides feedback on juveniles (7%)

Exhibit 7

Satisfaction with Feedback

	Total	Central					#2				#3				#4			
		Pat.	Det.	Sup.	Civil	Other	Pat.	Det.	Sup.	Oth.	Pat.	Det.	Sup.	Oth.	Pat.	Det.	Sup.	Oth.
<u>YOP</u>																		
N =	198	2	26	9	1	5	40	7	9	3	27	7	7	1	35	10	8	1
Extremely satisfied	21%	0%	34%	33%	0%	20%	35%	57%	22%	0%	7%	29%	0%	0%	11%	10%	0%	0%
Very satisfied	48	100	46	56	0	60	40	14	45	100	56	57	58	0	43	60	63	100
Moderately satisfied	18	0	8	11	0	20	15	29	33	0	15	0	14	100	23	30	37	0
Slightly satisfied	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	7	0	14	0	9	0	0	0
Not satisfied	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	14	0	3	0	0	0
Don't get feedback	6	0	8	0	100	0	5	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	11	0	0	0
<u>Other agencies*</u>																		
N =	200	2	27	10	2	4	39	7	10	3	27	7	7	1	35	10	8	1
Extremely satisfied	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very satisfied	2	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	10	0	0
Moderately satisfied	7	50	11	20	0	0	8	14	0	67	0	0	14	0	3	10	0	0
Slightly satisfied	13	0	26	20	50	0	13	14	0	0	7	29	0	0	3	30	12	0
Not satisfied	25	50	26	40	0	25	18	58	20	33	19	29	29	0	28	10	38	0
Don't get feedback	52	0	33	20	50	75	59	14	70	0	74	13	57	100	66	40	50	100
<u>Juvenile Court</u>																		
N =	202	2	27	10	2	4	40	7	10	3	28	7	7	1	35	10	8	1
Extremely satisfied	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very satisfied	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	10	0	0
Moderately satisfied	6	0	15	20	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	3	20	0	0
Slightly satisfied	9	0	26	10	0	0	0	43	0	0	0	14	0	0	9	40	0	0
Not satisfied	25	50	33	70	0	0	25	43	30	67	18	14	14	0	9	20	50	0
Don't get feedback	57	50	22	0	50	100	75	14	60	33	79	30	72	100	79	10	50	100

*Examples used in question were youth service bureaus and court conference committees.

The following list contains a sample of comments reflecting these results:

Central Precinct

"They follow up the initial contact by patrol and observe and counsel the juvenile and parents for a short time. With feedback provided we will usually know if juvenile will repeat."

"The YOP allows patrol and detectives more man-hours to concentrate on heavier offenses. Feedback from the YOP staff frequently assists in solving additional crimes."

"Cuts my first offenders handling approximately in half."

"Immediacy -- follow up the very positive image left with citizens involved."

Within the Central Precinct there was also a large number of responses (nine) indicating no contact due to the unit location. For example:

"Does not apply to me at this time (in Warrants) - I have never had contact with YOP."

"Have not had contact with YOP in past because of not working with juvenile offenders that have not already been referred."

Precinct No. 2

"Referral of first-time offenders to YOP where attitudes indicate Juvenile Court is not appropriate but some type of follow-up to case is needed."

"Continued follow-up on marginal cases that could help the juvenile out of trouble -- without YOP I believe we would have more juvenile problems with the same juveniles."

"Allows for a reasonable alternative to charging, thus taking into account the many variables associated with the commission of a crime."

"Less caseload for the officers. Less follow-up for officers. Impact on the community has been excellent."

Precinct No. 3

"They relieve the necessity of police spending time trying to counsel young persons instead of catching crooks."

"YOP gives a needed middle ground for referral between advise and warn and Juvenile Court. Also ensures that something, however minor, is done by parents that is not ensured if juvenile is warned and taken home."

"One-on-one counseling with family involvement."

"YOP handles cases that patrol doesn't have time to handle."

"Offers an alternative to Juvenile Court and other failures."

Precinct No. 4

"The main thing about YOP is they basically take the responsibility of the juvenile offenders off my shoulders, thus allowing me to concentrate on matters of a more urgent nature."

"A place to send youths who appear to be likely to benefit from counseling and be able to discuss your views of juvenile's problems directly with the counselor."

"Immediate contact with suspects and parents as well as recurring contacts."

"Provides a place to refer children for immediate counseling."

Other types of support were also indicated and are listed in their order of frequency:

- Is a beneficial service to offenders
- Assists with referrals to other agencies
- Provides on-the-spot support
- Provides immediate action with juvenile contacts
- Allows contact with first offenders

- Provides background information on cases
- Allows better relationships with juveniles
- Allows more service than officers and detectives can provide

The following is a sample of other comments (less frequently mentioned):

Central Precinct

"Enables an officer to help those in need of social services."

"Background information on offenders."

Precinct No. 2

"No satisfaction from any agency."

"Handling of first offenders."

"Personal conference with YOP staff for every referral."

Precinct No. 3

"When you can't pin anything on a kid, but he causes a lot of problems in the neighborhood."

"Counseling to correct future criminal behavior."

Precinct No. 4

"Gets the juvenile in the system."

"Continued contact with juvenile and family -- proper referral and guidance."

"Close working relationship."

"Referral and familiarity with agencies in area."

There was little variance in the responses among precincts except in two instances. The three outlying precincts accounted

for all but one of the comments about YOP providing an option to the Juvenile Court. However, the Central Precinct responses far outweighed the other precincts in comments regarding the YOP's relieving police staff of minor offenses and allowing concentration on more serious crimes.

There was only one response indicating that there was no support/assistance provided by YOP.

Question 8: Are there types of support/assistance in dealing with juveniles that you currently do not get from the YOP but believe would be helpful?

The purpose of this question was to elicit suggestions on program operations that might improve the YOP support to police personnel.

The most common response to this question was "no", "unknown", or "very satisfied" with the current support/assistance. This is interpreted as an overall favorable attitude about the current operations of the YOP.

The remainder of the responses covered a wide range of suggestions, mentioned by less than three persons each. These are listed below:

- Provide written summaries of cases and action (monthly, annually)
- More follow-up (after initial counseling)
- YOP should refer uncooperative parents/juveniles to Juvenile Court
- YOP should be able to handle appropriate second or third offenders
- More feedback (on restitution or counselor action)
- Use YOP as information source for related crimes
- More counseling in suspect's home
- Don't like YOP not personally handling cases and subsequently referring to other agencies

- More coordination with police and high school counselors
- More staff to operate like the community crime prevention unit
- More staff
- Serve as liaison with Juvenile Court
- Faster YOP contact, e. g. , on weekends and evenings
- Staff should work in outlying areas
- Provide more effective family counseling and referral for juvenile (domestic problems)

The following list contains a sample of comments reflecting this range of suggestions:

"Very satisfied with their operations. "

"Perhaps written summaries of their monthly activity - names, etc. "

"Perhaps YOP could/should have a more disciplinary effect by threatening to refer the offenders to the Court for charges filed if the juveniles don't cooperate with the counseling. "

"I am irritated when they do not handle the problem but refer it to another unit; however, I understand this relates to their function and to their limited resources. "

"Coordination among YOP, police, and high school counselors. Would aid in truancy problems that result in law enforcement problems; i. e. , residential burglary, larceny, and vandalism. "

"Would like to know specifically what type of meeting is set up with parents/offenders and if any restitution, etc. is decided, and what results are. "

"YOP is worthwhile and should be continued. "

"Status reports on juveniles currently being handled by YOP so that we are familiar with names of youthful offenders. "

Question 9: Are there types of support/assistance you currently receive from YOP which you feel are not necessary?

The purpose of this question was to determine if the YOP staff was doing anything which was not helpful or not needed by police department staff.

Over seventy percent of respondents indicated there were "none" or "no" superfluous activities performed by YOP staff. Twenty-two percent indicated unfamiliarity with specific YOP operations. The following comment indicates a specific response:

"In narcotics cases, detailed follow-up reports are not particularly necessary."

In addition, two persons said that detailed feedback is not needed, but two other persons indicated that the feedback was exactly what they needed.

The general interpretation of the responses to this question is that the level of YOP interaction with police personnel is satisfactory.

Question 10: Based on your experience, what are the benefits of the YOP to the community?

This question provides the opportunity to add any perceived program benefits to those already listed under question number 7.

The most heavily mentioned benefits to the community are as follows, with the frequency (in percentages) of responses indicated in parentheses:

- Provides immediate professional counseling and concern for youth and family (16%)
- Provides opportunity to get first offender into system with no record (12%)
- Provide alternative to taking home or Juvenile Court, with no record (9%)
- Provides advice on referrals and follow up (7%)

- Makes parents aware of responsibilities and gets them involved (7%)
- Helps with rehabilitation and lowers recidivism (7%)

The following list contains a sample of comments reflecting these results.

Central Precinct

"Providing an opportunity to make a first-time offender realize the consequences of his actions."

"Immediate care and concern that the people need help in facing the problem is involved with."

"I believe the program is more family oriented and for the first-time offender achieves better results with fewer repeaters."

Precinct No. 2

"The main advantage is getting the parents involved and they are able to divert the first offender."

"Helps to make small offenders and parents accountable for their actions. They also have extensive knowledge of various community resources that patrolmen do not have."

"Makes the offender aware of the police/criminal justice system without leaving a lasting negative effect."

Precinct No. 3

"YOP gives a direction to many parents in dealing with problem juvenile and also helps juveniles with a parental problem."

"I believe in some cases it can correct the attitude of the juvenile before he gets in more serious problems which could create problems in the neighborhood."

Precinct No. 4

"In many cases YOP makes both the juvenile and parents aware of a problem before it develops into chronic delinquency."

"Provides counseling for offenders and family."

The range of comments on the benefits to the community was very broad, and some of the less frequently mentioned comments are summarized below:

- Reduces juvenile problems
- Provides social service help for family problems
- Lack of information about effect in community
- Frees police for other activities
- Performing the job of Juvenile Court
- Provides liaison between police and community

The following list contains a sample of comments reflecting these other benefits to the community:

Central Precinct

"Work as a liaison between juveniles and police."

"Immediate contact and counseling -- very little bureaucratic shuffle."

"I have very seldom had to deal twice with juveniles referred to YOP. Without YOP I feel I would have had to deal more often with these juveniles, thus I believe YOP is beneficial to the community."

Precinct No. 2

"Cut down on Juvenile Court workload."

"It is a very good program."

"Circumvents Juvenile Court, which is already crowded, and gives the offender a chance to have personal, one-to-one counseling tailored for him."

"Less caseload for the officers, less follow-up for officers; impact on the community has been excellent."

Precinct No. 3

"Public relations -- give people the impression we really care."

"None."

"Family counseling."

Precinct No. 4

"Keeps the first offender from having a criminal record."

"It does provide a better alternative to patrol officers than citing youth."

"Places a sort of control over delinquent children that Juvenile Court does not provide -- this should protect the community."

Some of the perceived benefits to the community were also mentioned in Question Number 7, which asked about benefits of the YOP to police department personnel. While several groups of responses were similar in nature, such as providing an alternative for officers and providing counseling support, there was a slightly different orientation to the benefits to the community. The YOP staff was seen as an extension of the police department which handled juvenile and family problems, with speed and concern, and did so in a way (i. e., no formal court record of incident) that presented the police in a positive and helping atmosphere. The potential offshoots of this orientation were seen as a reduction in future juvenile problems and improved public relations for the Police Department. Another perceived benefit to the community was that the YOP engendered more parent awareness of their responsibilities and that the officers and detectives could be sure that some action would be taken by YOP staff. This was felt to be an important part of the program, as opposed to the Juvenile Court, which was felt to leave juveniles with the opposite expectation that there are no consequences to their "offenses".

While the overwhelming number of responses indicates some type(s) of benefit to the community, there were a few negative responses. Out of approximately 200 specific responses, nine indicated unknown or lack of information about the program. More importantly, however, there were five definitely negative responses, with three of

these in Precinct No. 3. It should be kept in mind that this represents a minority of responses, but indicates that more attention should be paid to officer understanding of and questions about the program. Examples of these comments are as follows:

"Very little due to lack of manpower. "

"None, just one more stumbling block until the suspect is charged in court with very few exceptions. "

"Unknown, juvenile crime does not seem to have slowed down any. "

Question 11: Do you have any other suggestions on how to make the YOP more helpful to you?

The intent of this question was to gather any other comments on how to improve or change the program.

The most heavily mentioned suggestions are listed below, with the percentage frequency indicated in parentheses. In addition, since the responses to this question were primarily concerned with potential program improvements, the complete range of suggestions is listed in Appendix B.

- More staff and expand program (16 %)
- No suggestions (15)
- Satisfied with program (10)
- Provide information about appropriate types of referrals and YOP activities (9)
- Maintain funding (8)
- Be able to refer second and third offenders and those with Juvenile Court records to YOP (7)

The following list contains a sample of comments reflecting these results:

Central Precinct

"Continue to fund and expand. "

"I feel that there are a great number of patrol officers who don't realize that they can refer first-offender juveniles to YOP. My suggestion would be that the YOP advertise their worth."

Precinct No. 2

"More personnel."

"I think they should be allowed to handle some of the tougher cases as well as 'first offenders'. I believe they might better help the more serious (and chronic) offender and the parent(s) than Juvenile Court does -- at least from my perspective."

Precinct No. 3

"More information about YOP."

"Unfortunately it is the only diversion I get any feedback from. Keep it up."

"Have them available for in-field contact."

Precinct No. 4

"Yes -- add more to the staff to lighten the heavy caseload."

"Many officers are unaware of what YOP has to offer. It might be beneficial to get together, however, without squad meetings I don't know when it would be possible."

"More accurate feedback. Often I'll get back information on a juvenile with no listing of violation, date of violation, or any reference to reason for referral. When I get a progress report weeks or months later it's meaningless. YOP forms should have more space allotted for narrative on offense and attitude."

The overall tone of these responses is favorable to the YOP program. Throughout all responses to the questions, including Question Number 11, there was the feeling that the YOP is more effective than Juvenile Court and ~~should~~ be retained at the precinct level.

As with the previous questions, there were a few complaints that this program was not justified, or that there was too much "red tape" involved.

In-Depth Interviews

As a follow-up activity to the questionnaires distributed to all sworn personnel, in-depth interviews were conducted with a small sample of police department staff. These in-depth interviews allowed the consulting team to explore specific areas of interest which were identified during the more general questionnaire, and to confirm certain responses received on the written questionnaire.

The results of these interviews will be reviewed on a question-by-question basis. Responses will be broken out by precinct where significant differences arise, but in general there were no apparent differences in responses among the various precincts.

The first four questions are more general in nature and are primarily for supervisory personnel. The remaining questions, starting with number five, are oriented towards patrol officer and detective personnel who have primary contact with the juveniles and the YOP.

Question 1: What are your feelings about the YOP and their assistance to Police Department personnel?

The unanimous response of all persons interviewed was that YOP was an excellent and effective program. It was perceived as offering an optional or alternative way of handling these juveniles, and as a problem-oriented program. Besides providing an option to officers and detectives, it was seen as a beneficial program for the youth and the community in that it helped with family-oriented problems.

There appear to be two factors which caused these favorable judgments by police staff. On one side is that the YOP helps them with their jobs, provides actual service, saves them time and paperwork, and provides feedback on cases. On the other side, the YOP apparently fills the gap in service to minor juvenile offenders which is viewed as a problem with the King County Juvenile Court. The Juvenile Court is viewed by respondents as ineffective and is seen as providing little actual service, being too crowded, being too slow, and providing no feedback on case disposition.

There were no differences among the responses of various precinct personnel. However, the supervisory personnel comments

generally viewed the YOP as more of a resource and aid to police personnel in the field. The YOP is seen as good public relations, as providing an expert and educated counseling staff (an area in which the police view themselves as weak), and as allowing the police to assure victims that appropriate action is being taken.

Question 2: Do you consider it possible for a counseling/social service program such as YOP to be an effective part of police work?

The responses to this question generally indicated yes, with some qualifications. The YOP counseling function was seen as appropriate and needed, especially for juvenile and family-type problems. The YOP seemed to be accepted because of the staff's good rapport with police personnel, their location right in the precinct, and their attitudes and emphasis on solving problems. However, the Juvenile Court was used as an example of a social service agency, because of their attitudes about causes of juvenile problems and their remoteness from police, which would not fit into the police system. In other words, social service activities are seen as needed components of police work only if operated in a certain fashion, and the YOP meets their expectations.

One comment indicated that, in the respondent's opinion, the success of the YOP has "opened some eyes" of police personnel as to the feasibility of such a counseling program being part of police work.

Question 3: How is the YOP useful to officers and detectives in performing their duties better?

The responses to this question are in part covered by the comments in the previous questions, and fall into a few separate areas. Time savings to police personnel, both in counseling to juveniles and their families and in paperwork, is the most often mentioned area. Other areas of usefulness include the view that the YOP staff is specifically trained for counseling, is located in the precinct, and is trusted to take action and follow up on cases.

It was also noted by a number of respondents that juvenile incidents and contacts comprise a good proportion of their time, and that any type of assistance with processing them (or reducing future juvenile problems) was welcome.

Question 4: If YOP did not exist, what efforts would be made to contact/counsel "first-offender" youths and/or their families?

The responses to this question were basically pessimistic concerning the lack of attention this group would receive. The primary reason was cited as the lack of time on the part of police personnel to contact juveniles and their families. A few personnel indicated that there would be some attempt for the families to be contacted, but only in a perfunctory manner, with no follow up or serious attempt to identify or solve the underlying problem.

Question 5: Why or why don't you make referrals to YOP counselors?

A few respondents mentioned specific types of offenses, such as morals, house burglary, or runaways that they refer to YOP because they feel they can count on appropriate action being taken.

General reasons were also mentioned, including that the officers do not have time to explore the full range of juvenile programs available and that the YOP is easily accessible, and that the YOP is simply an appropriate action to take for many minor offenses where no "formal" criminal record is initiated. The police personnel feel that "kids who are beginning to get into the crime pattern" need the type of attention that YOP provides.

Another minor positive reason for referring to YOP is that there is low turnover in YOP staff, whereas they feel they never know staff members in other agencies due to high turnover.

Two persons indicated they referred very few cases to the YOP because the referral criteria (i. e., first offenders) had already been surpassed by most juveniles they see in their particular patrol area.

Question 6: What types of juvenile cases do you refer or not refer? Why?

Most persons indicated that their referrals are decided on a case-by-case basis. Factors that affect their decisions are the attitude of the youth (and family if contacted) and whether they think that the YOP program will be beneficial to the juvenile.

As indicated in responses to other questions, officers believe they have legal sufficiency and can substantiate their reasons for taking action. This implies that referrals to YOP (and other agencies) are made based on appropriate ways to help juveniles, rather than not knowing what to do with them.

Question 7: If YOP did not exist, how would you handle such cases? (This question is similar to question number four, but is intended to determine alternative action at the operational level.)

The majority of responses (approximately fifty to sixty percent) indicated that advise and warn would be the most probable action if the YOP did not exist. However, this response is not totally consistent with other data collected in this project. Past responses have indicated that officers and detectives who made YOP referrals had decided that some action (more than advise and warn) was appropriate. Based on overall impressions of feedback, the explanation for this inconsistency is that police personnel would revert to advise and warn rather than going to the time and effort to refer juveniles to the Juvenile Court, which they view as ineffective.

Other alternative actions mentioned were referrals to a YSB or Conference Committee, but these answers were qualified with the feeling that they were already "saturated" and could not handle the increased workload. This was not the case in Precinct No. 3, however, which expressed confidence in the Federal Way YSB and specific counselors on their staff to handle certain types of cases.

Question 8: How much time do the YOP counselors save you by being available to assist you?

Information from this question was general in nature as opposed to specific estimates of hours saved per week or month. However,

most persons indicated that there were time savings involved in handling juvenile cases with YOP's aid. This was primarily in the referral forms YOP used, which were considered easy to use and much less time consuming than what was involved in referring a case to Juvenile Court.

Another area of time savings was in the follow-up work performed by the YOP staff which police personnel were relieved of doing. For example, the writing/dictating of case reports, taking statements, reviewing and proofing all written material, and the clerical time involved were tasks which are eliminated by referring cases to YOP rather than the Juvenile Court.

There was a small percentage of persons indicating that relatively little time was saved by the use of the YOP, but their responses also indicated that the program was worthwhile and should be continued.

Question 9: How do you explain the YOP to juveniles and families?

Approximately eighty percent of the respondents explained the YOP as a voluntary program, with the remainder not indicating that the parents or the juvenile had any choice in the matter. However, as consistent with other findings, almost all police personnel presented the alternatives after deciding that some action needed to be taken; and it was implicit in the review of options that if the families were not agreeable to the YOP, then a citation to Juvenile Court would be made.

Most police personnel explained the YOP as a counseling program oriented to the youth and their parents, as a problem-oriented approach to helping them, and as an option which would result in no formal juvenile record. There was also an indication that most parents were pleased that such an option was available, and agreed to participate in the program. One respondent indicated that "due process" rights of the juvenile were not violated because the juvenile "oftentimes" confessed to the incident, and the YOP was not seen as punishment but rather the best approach to solving the problem.

Question 10: How much and what types of feedback on YOP referrals would be most helpful to you?

Feedback is an important component of the YOP and its relationship with police personnel, and overall the police personnel are pleased with feedback they receive from the YOP counselors. Both in these interviews and in other data-gathering activities, the fact that the YOP staff provides them with feedback on case progress seems to be unique when compared with most agencies and/or programs for juvenile service.

The suggestions concerning how to make the delivery of feedback more helpful are basically minor in nature and fall into a few distinct categories. Some respondents indicated that they would like more person-to-person communications, especially when there is something out of the ordinary to report about a juvenile, such as the juvenile not cooperating or when there are some mitigating circumstances concerning the incident.

However, there is also a group of suggestions which request more detailed narratives on the feedback forms. Also, more detail concerning the log number, violation date, and contacting or arresting officer was mentioned, and the respondent said this would help jog his memory about the incident. On the other hand, a few persons indicated that the feedback forms should be shortened, in part because there are too many forms in the first place.

Another group of responses cited the value of feedback on juveniles for getting to know the patrol area and in order to keep tabs on juvenile activity in general. The YOP feedback in this case was used as an unofficial client tracking information network, which aids in solving other offenses and keeping track of neighborhood problems in various patrol areas. The need for monthly summaries (of all youth handled by YOP) was also noted.

In general, however, the police personnel interviewed expressed satisfaction with the type and frequency of feedback.

Question 11: How could the YOP counselors do more to help you with your job?

This final question was asked to ensure that no areas (either pro or con) had been overlooked. The majority of responses

indicated that very little should be changed in a program which was working smoothly. Specific strengths mentioned were the rapid feedback, easy accessibility of precinct offices, and their counseling and problem-oriented approach. While the persons interviewed felt that immediate action on the referrals was important and felt that the counselors' flexible work hours (e. g. , evenings) were good, few felt that round-the-clock staffing was necessary.

Two persons mentioned that YOP counselors should be given more authority or clout in order to put more pressure on juveniles, and be able to take stronger action if juveniles/families did not cooperate.

Other general comments praised the "police work" oriented nature of the program and the good rapport which has been developed between the police and the counselors. Also, the YOP was seen as an important and unique link in the total system of services to juveniles within the King County area, and suggestions were made that the YOP should be maintained separately from the King County Juvenile Court.

Parent Questionnaire

A written questionnaire was sent to a sample of YOP treatment group parents. The sample was drawn from an alphabetical card listing, with every third card placed into the sample.

The purpose of this questionnaire was to collect information on the attitudes and perceptions of parents about the usefulness of the YOP and whether or not the program had any effect on their children's behavior.

The results of this questionnaire will be reviewed on a question-by-question basis, with differences among responses from the three precinct areas noted where appropriate. Total responses tabulated were 77 out of a total of 213 names in the sample. Due to this relatively low response rate, it is possible that the information reported is biased and is not representative of the entire population. Accordingly, care should be taken in interpretation of these data.

The first few questions were biographical-type data used to define the sample respondents and their particular situation.

The sex of the referred children is as follows:

Exhibit 8

Sex of Referred Children

	Total	Precincts		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Male	78%	83%	77%	71%
Female -	22	17	23	29

Of the responding families, twelve had two or more children who were referred to the YOP counselors.

The average age at time of referral was 13.8 years of age, with the range from ten to seventeen years. The average age of the males was

13.6, and of the females was 14.4 years. The most typical reasons for YOP referral were shoplifting, stealing, breaking and entering, and marijuana use.

There was also only very slight difference in the average for the precinct areas, as indicated in the following table:

Exhibit 9

Average Age of Juveniles
(in years)

	Precinct		
	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Male	13.2	14.0	13.8
Female	13.6	14.8	14.8

Question 4: When did you first have contact with the YOP counselor?

Exhibit 10

	Total	Precinct		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
At the same time youth had contact with police	7%	17%	0%	0%
Within two days after police contact	13	17	9	10
Three or more days to one week	43	38	55	38
More than one week	24	21	27	24
Don't remember	14	7	9	29

This data indicates a longer response time (by the YOP counselors) between time of referral and contact with parents than the records check. This discrepancy is attributed to the difficulty of parents' remembering specific dates as long ago as two to three years.

Question 4 (second part): How were you first contacted by the YOP counselor?

Exhibit 11

Type of Contact

	Total	Precinct		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Telephone call	82%	79%	86%	80%
Letter	7	7	5	10
In person	11	14	9	10

Question 5: What are your feelings about the assistance YOP counselors provided?

The responses to this question are contained in Exhibit 12 on the following page.

These figures suggest overall favorable attitudes toward the Youthful Offender Program and its operations. The YOP counselor's attitude received very high ratings in the extremely satisfied category. However, in Precinct No. 4 there was evidence of only moderate satisfaction with the counselor's attitude and the services provided to the family and children.

Exhibit 12

Total for All Precincts

First contact with YOP
 Further contacts with YOP
 YOP Counselor's attitude
 Services provided to family
 by YOP
 Services provided to your
 child

Precinct No. 2

First contact with YOP
 Further contacts with YOP
 YOP Counselor's attitude
 Services provided to family
 by YOP
 Services provided to your
 child

Precinct No. 3

First contact with YOP
 Further contacts with YOP
 YOP Counselor's attitude
 Services provided to family
 by YOP
 Services provided to your
 child

Precinct No. 4

First contact with YOP
 Further contacts with YOP
 YOP Counselor's attitude
 Services provided to family
 by YOP
 Services provided to your
 child

Ex- tremely satis- fied	Very satis- fied	Moder- ately satis- fied	Not very satis- fied	Not satis- fied
41%	37%	18%	1%	3%
44	39	11	6	0
60	31	9	0	0
44	27	23	5	2
49	25	20	5	2
45%	41%	21%	0%	0%
46	36	14	4	0
68	25	7	0	0
52	24	20	0	4
48	32	16	0	4
36%	50%	5%	0%	9%
47	47	0	6	0
58	37	6	0	0
39	50	6	6	0
59	29	6	6	0
40%	25%	30%	5%	0%
37	37	16	11	0
50	30	20	0	0
37	11	42	11	0
42	11	37	11	0

Question 6: Were you referred to any other agencies/persons by the YOP?

Exhibit 13

Referrals to Other Agencies

	Total	Precinct		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Yes	32%	20%	23%	60%
No	67	80	77	35
Don't remember	1	0	0	5

Overall approximately one-third of the juveniles referred to the YOP are referred to another agency. This is generally due to the lack of time to assist additional clients or a more appropriate service by some other agency or person. The exception to this finding is Precinct No. 4, which refers approximately two-thirds to some other agency or person (see Exhibit 13).

The second part of this question covers the respondents' satisfaction with the assistance provided by other agencies or persons.

Exhibit 14

Satisfaction with Other Agency Services

	Total	Precinct		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Assistance was excellent	48%	50%	20%	58%
Assistance was good	26	17	40	25
Assistance was moderately helpful	4	17	0	0
Assistance was poor	9	0	0	17
No assistance was given, but was desired	4	0	20	0
No assistance was given, nor was desired	4	0	20	0
Referred if wanted, but did not use	4	17	0	0

These data indicate that the respondents' attitudes were basically favorable concerning the quality of assistance from these other agencies.

Question 7: Has the situation or incident connected with the police contact changed in any way since you met with the YOP counselors?

Exhibit 15
Situation Changes

	Total	Precinct		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Situation has been solved	63%	63%	77%	45%
Situation has improved	19	7	23	35
No change in situation	4	7	0	5
Situation has become slightly worse	1	0	0	5
Situation has become much worse	4	7	0	5
Other (please explain)*	8	17	0	5

*The "other" comments included items such as no further contacts, somewhat improved, and going to some other type of counseling.

The majority of responses indicated that the situation has been resolved or has improved. However, as indicated in the Methodological Considerations section, this indication of improvement cannot be solely attributed to the YOP intervention.

Reasons given for the change in situation were as follows:

Precinct No. 2

"My son realized it was serious because of the constant contact he had with YOP."

"I feel our son has a better understanding of the police and law enforcement and dangers of getting involved in teenage pranks."

"When we went we were told that it was private, and everything the boys had to say was given to police."

"No, but the stealing seems to have stopped; however, the home situation seems about the same."

Precinct No. 3

"The situation is much better because we are now able to talk openly and honestly and although we don't agree -- we do listen to other viewpoint and pray that it will change."

"The situation is better for various reasons."

Precinct No. 4

"While the problem has not occurred again, attitude of son has not improved."

"Better - because we have had counseling with YOP and a psychiatrist, recommended by YOP."

"Situation completely solved - much credit due to YOP."

"I think the family counselor is far more helpful - one reason is that he understands my son and knows the difference between snow jobs and the truth."

Question 8: Were the YOP counselors helpful with other family situations or needs?

Exhibit 16

Helpful Assistance in Other Situations

	Total	Precinct		
		No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Yes	19%	25%	14%	15%
No	16	7	14	30
Not applicable	66	68	73	55

These data indicate that in most cases no assistance was needed with other family situations. However, when such assistance was provided by counselors, the Precinct No. 2 staff appeared to be more successful in providing help.

Question 9: What suggestions do you have, based on your experience, about how the YOP could improve its services to youthful offenders and their families?

Precinct No. 2

The majority of parents indicated satisfaction with the program and felt it should be continued and/or expanded. Specific suggestions for change are as follows:

"Make sure services are needed. Counselor's time and ours was completely wasted."

"Gain some family background information which may be helpful to the individual case."

"I think male offenders respond better to male counselors."

"Staying in close contact - and I truly believe visits to the home (which we had) helped considerably."

Precinct No. 3

As in Precinct No. 2, the majority of respondents indicated satisfaction with the program; however, there were a few more specific suggestions for changes in the operations of the program, as follows:

"...encourage the counselor to utilize communications within the family."

"Earlier contact - more mature counselors."

"Keep more perseverance going in their contacting and not assume the job was done too early."

"Sometimes the kids can hoodwink the counselors on the first visit, and they should not be taken in."

Precinct No. 4

The majority of respondents indicated that they had no suggestions or were satisfied, with the following specific comments"

"None, other than that the first contact might occur sooner if possible."

"I think the counselors should also check on the kids at the schools they attend. Also some kind of program set up to allow these kids to have group sessions and set a goal."

"More discussion with parents."

Question 10: What did you like best about the contact you had with the YOP counselors?

Precinct No. 2

Every comment had some relation to the counselors' behavior, and the most often mentioned attributes were a genuine concern or interest, and the ability to put the parents at ease in a very difficult situation. A sample of the comments is as follows:

"She seemed to show a genuine interest and concern."

"Low key - no pressure."

"Their ability to 'get through' to the young person."

"I feel the genuine concern the counselor had for my child, expressed by many telephone calls, and visits with her showed that she really cared."

"She tried to be very helpful and did follow up."

Precinct No. 3

As with Precinct No. 2, almost all comments dealt with the YOP counselors and their personal concern and interest, courtsey in a difficult situation, and their understanding. Specific comments are as follows:

"Personal concern for 'our' case."

"Their understanding, consideration, and ability to deal with the younger generation."

"She kept contact with our son - called once in a while to see how he was doing."

"Sincere interest in welfare of offender and family."

Precinct No. 4

Similar comments pertaining to the counselors were received from this precinct area. Comments indicated satisfaction with the qualifications, availability, and ability to understand and relate to the child. Representative comments are as follows:

"Counselor was very kind and understanding. She didn't act like she was scolding the youth but like she understood and really wanted to help. Youth was very impressed."

"YOP counselor's ability to relate to child and child's needs."

"Always available to answer questions or advise by phone."

"Having a male counselor personally interested in son."

Question 11: What did you like least about your contact with the YOP counselors?

Precinct No. 2

The most common response was "nothing", with specific comments as follows:

"Too much phone contact. Counseling should be done in person."

"Because it wasn't confidential like we were told it was."

"She assumed our son was guilty without benefit of any proof. If I had the money I would have sued for false arrest."

"The apprehension involved in the initial contact with the counselor."

"They seemed to underestimate the seriousness of the situation."

Precinct No. 3

Parent responses for this precinct did not fall into any specific categories, and representative comments are as follows:

"Not sufficient time to do the job at hand, resulting in an uncoordinated effort."

"I did not dislike anything about the program. I feel it is a must in any community."

"We felt she had come to check us out as fit parents with reference to our son. If you have any further problems let her know."

Precinct No. 4

The majority of responses indicated "none or nothing" and specific comments are as follows:

"Not very positive in attitude."

"Settling without our assistance. In other words, cut and dried behind our backs."

"The invasion of privacy due to personal visiting in my home; but it was necessarily there, as I had no transportation available to hold these meetings elsewhere. Poor home environments do cause feelings of social inadequacy and embarrassment."

Question 12: Any further comments?

Precinct No. 2

The responses to this question were overwhelmingly favorable, with seventy-five percent positive, twenty percent neutral, and five percent (one person) expressing a negative attitude. Representative comments are as follows:

"The program makes a lot of sense in terms of a positive approach. The child had a brush with the law, which, while serious in nature, did not prove to be totally unpleasant. This has got to go a long way toward improving our son's respect for authority."

"Our situation was a misunderstanding on the part of a sales clerk and should never have become a police incident."

"I highly recommend this service ... it was corrective and effective. We're very thankful that our son was treated so decently ... instead of him becoming defensive, he learned a valuable lesson. Our sincere thanks."

"We think there should be a very thorough investigation of King County Police at the North Precinct on 15th." (This comment related to concern over release of information to police personnel by YOP counselors.)

Precinct No. 3

There was a seventy-three percent positive response to this question, with seven percent neutral, thirteen percent negative (two people), and one suggestion (seven percent). The following quotes are representative of parent comments:

"Maybe worker could give suggestions of what to watch for in future to be sure problem is not ongoing in any way."

"I think this is a tremendous service. I felt so ashamed and unprepared to face things. She helped so much. Thank you!"

"We feel very thankful and grateful for this service. It has to be far superior to sending child to a 'center', etc. It was very upsetting and traumatic experience for our family and we're very happy with the way we were treated."

"Recommend the YOP program stress responsibility to others and their actions."

Precinct No. 4

The parent comments to this question totaled fifty-three percent positive, thirty-three percent "no" or "none", and thirteen percent suggested changes in the program. The following quotes are representative of parent comments:

"I don't think the counselor put enough stress on the act that was committed. More contact with the offender to listen to what he has to say but also more help with their (offender's) attitude toward others."

"Nothing, but much praise."

"We feel that the counselor took a sincere interest in our son's problems and provided appreciated follow-up calls."

"More counselors to reach more young people -- praise."

Agency Survey

A survey of other agencies providing services to juveniles was conducted to determine overall awareness of YOP activities and scope of services. The survey was conducted with agency directors and personnel from the King County area, and utilized a structured interview form. A list of agencies contacted and details of administration are listed in Appendix A.

The YOP staff makes referrals to approximately 100 different agencies based on the unique needs of the youth in the treatment group who are counseled personally. In the case of bulletin referral clients, who are referred to other agencies without any counseling from the YOP staff, less than twenty agencies receive referrals. The reason for this is fewer agencies offer a comprehensive program for juveniles, and the YOP staff only refers to other agencies about which they are familiar.

Most agency personnel contacted were aware of the Youthful Offender Program and identified it as working closely with the King County Police. They reported that it was a diversion-type program for first offenders and less serious police contacts. This was the general response regardless of the level of referrals between YOP and the survey agency. Only two respondents had no awareness of YOP activities.

However, there was some uncertainty about the function of the YOP in terms of being primarily a service agency (counseling to juvenile and family) or a referral agency.

As might be expected, the extent and type of contact between YOP and the agencies varied considerably. The number of referrals ranged from none to twelve per month, with the YSBs generally receiving the most referrals. Most agencies received only two to three per month. Some of these figures might be questionable due to lack of recordkeeping procedures to identify source of referrals. Most agencies received referrals (bulletin referrals) from YOP, but two agencies indicated that they made referrals to YOP when they felt YOP intervention would be appropriate. It was also common for the public school personnel to exchange information on specific juveniles as opposed to actually referring the case. Other types of interaction, besides exchanging data on clients, ranged from strictly receiving bulletin referrals to administrative coordination on specific cases to personal contacts by YOP counselors. In the few cases where respondents indicated they had personal contact with the YOP staff, respondent comments were very favorable.

In most cases the survey agencies treated YOP referral cases as a typical referral and assigned no special priority to the case. Most agencies had a first-come, first-served type procedure for all referrals which they received, including YOP. Two respondents indicated that "personal" referrals did receive special attention based on personal contacts with YOP counselors. One person indicated that some cases were treated as "emergencies" based on the needs of the situation.

Agency personnel indicated that most of the YOP clients referred to them were assisted in some way. Limiting factors were the lack of resources and the large number of referrals for assistance. Another problem cited by one respondent was that lots of parents failed to show up for appointments and/or elected not to receive help from the agency.

In terms of the adequacy of information on case referrals, over sixty percent of the persons responding felt that the client information was satisfactory. Four persons indicated that there was not enough information accompanying each referral; specifically information about the offense and the impressions of the patrol officer. One agency member indicated that the YOP forwarded too much information, and that the counselors did not like to be biased by contents of the case report. Another respondent said that their agency policy was to prepare a complete social history, and thus there was really no need for such information from the YOP staff.

Based on the respondent answers, it appears that most agencies provide client feedback to the referring agencies as a normal practice. Over forty percent of the respondents specifically mentioned the YOP feedback letter, and another fifteen percent indicated that written feedback was used. While the remainder of respondents indicated that information was "exchanged freely", there was no formal procedure for feedback. However, two respondents indicated that they felt obligated to get client approval of any release of information, thus making it very time consuming to provide client feedback.

Personnel from the other agencies were also asked to comment on the impact of YOP services on their agencies, and the expected effect if the YOP were discontinued. Agencies which had little direct dealings with the YOP indicated no impact would be felt if the YOP did not exist. Examples of these types of agencies are school district, work training, and DSHS Child Protective Services programs. These agencies generally received few referrals from YOP. Agencies with greater contact with YOP indicated that they would expect a brief period of decreased referrals, but that then their caseloads would increase as the juvenile cases were

handled by other referral agencies or by the police themselves. Implicit in their responses was the idea that if the juveniles did not receive help from YOP, it was only a matter of time before they came to the attention of some other agency or became involved with another police incident.

Respondents also felt that YOP was able to provide "immediate" service to juveniles contacted by the police, and that if YOP did not exist, it would take longer for the juveniles and their families to be offered help, if any help was offered at all. Respondents indicated that a gap would be created in the communications "link" with the local police if YOP did not exist. This would increase the workload of some agencies which would be required to contact police officers directly to gather information about specific cases.

Juvenile Court personnel contacted indicated that their referrals might increase, but that this would depend on what decisions were made by the local police in how to handle or where to send the juvenile contacts. In addition, they felt that the YOP strategy of "preventive services" to juveniles was a viable concept, and that juveniles would only be more difficult to deal with if not contacted as rapidly and as early as possible.

Other respondents indicated that the YOP, as opposed to the Juvenile Court and YSBs, was able to make contact with juveniles very rapidly (after the police incident) and operated out of the police precincts. Both of these factors were considered unique and valuable aspects of a juvenile diversion program.

Respondents were also asked for general comments and/or suggestions about the YOP. Agencies with little YOP contact had neither pro nor con comments. However, six agency persons commented that YOP staff should spend more time in liaison and/or community relations activities and was not very visible in the community. Several agency personnel indicated that they were not well versed in the services and programs offered by the YOP; others expressed "surprise" that the YOP had not contacted them, and "wished that their agency would get referrals from" (YOP).

Eleven respondents indicated positive attitudes towards the YOP. Four of these respondents felt that the YOP had established a good working relationship with the police, and three commented specifically about the helpfulness and dedication of the YOP counseling staff. Other favorable comments included the "preventive" nature of the YOP services, the need for more YOP staff, and the rapid response in contacting juveniles and their families.

Four agency personnel indicated a need for new control procedures to ensure that bulletin referral clients actually kept their appointments with the agencies. In some cases the problem was seen as inability of the juveniles and/or their families to follow directions, but there was some indication that the respondents felt the YOP needed more "authority" to pressure the clients into going to the appointments with agencies they were referred to.

One person for a public school counseling program expressed satisfaction with how well the YOP counselors had worked with their personnel, and another person liked the fact that some YOP counselors arranged their schedules to accommodate client needs after normal working hours.

Description of Client Population

This section provides descriptive information on the major groups of clients (juveniles) handled by the YOP. These groups are the treatment group, bulletin referral group, and the non-treatment group. Available recidivism data is also reported in this section.

The information presented in this section was summarized from the coded case files maintained by the YOP staff.

Each of these groups will be described separately in the following sections. Detailed descriptive data in tabular displays are contained in Appendix C.

The actual number of clients served in the various treatment groups is displayed in the following exhibit:

Exhibit 17

Client Population

	1974	1975	1976
Treatment Group			
Direct Counsel	251	340	454
Counsel and Refer	<u>119</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>68</u>
Total	370	444	522
Bulletin Referral Group	689	529	408
Non-Treatment Group	189	156	133

The trend over the three-year period is one of increases in the number of treatment group clients, with decreases in the bulletin referral and non-treatment group. Based on the YOP's apparent success with the boys and girls they counsel personally, this is a favorable trend.

Profile of Treatment Group

Juveniles and their families in this group receive the most intensive services provided by the YOP. This type of intervention includes direct counseling by YOP staff and, when additional services are appropriate, referrals to other agencies to augment the YOP counseling.

The typical⁶ juvenile in this group is a 13.8-year-old Caucasian male (77 percent male) who was referred for burglary, shoplifting, or vandalism, and various status offenses. Sixty-eight percent had no previous law enforcement contact, with twenty-four percent having had only one previous contact. The previous contacts were primarily shoplifting and property crimes, such as vandalism or larceny. Only one percent had previous Juvenile Court referrals. The majority (51 percent) were considered well behaved in school, with 24 percent considered mildly disruptive or attention seeking. A majority (51 percent) had no learning problems. School attendance was not considered a problem, with forty-eight percent reported to like school.

Profile of Bulletin Referral Group

This group is comprised of juveniles and their families who were originally assigned to the YOP but, due to lack of counseling staff availability, were referred to other agencies for assistance. In this case, the other agencies were responsible for providing the necessary assistance, but the YOP staff did request feedback on the assistance provided.

The typical juvenile in this group is 14.2 years old, male (78.8 percent) and is Caucasian (this last statistic based on limited sample due to lack of ethnic race data). The referral offenses were primarily burglary, shoplifting, vandalism, and assaults, with lesser numbers of runaways, larceny, and marijuana.

Seventy-seven percent had no previous law enforcement contact, while eighteen percent had one previous contact. The previous

⁶ "Typical" refers to the mode, or most frequently indicated, statistic in each characteristic used to describe the youth. Please refer to Appendix C for a more detailed description of client characteristics.

law enforcement contacts were primarily property crimes, followed by runaway and crimes against persons (robbery, assaults). Very few had other agency contacts.

These youths were referred primarily to the YSB in each precinct area; i. e., the Federal Way YSB, Highline YSB, Shoreline YSB, and the Kent YSB. Other YSBs receiving a significant number of referrals were INC-SPOT, Youth Eastside Services, and RAYS.

Profile of Non-Treatment Group

The non-treatment group consists of those juveniles who were referred to the YOP for assistance but who, for some reason, did not participate in any treatment or intervention plan. This group is much smaller than the treatment and bulletin referral groups (N of 120 compared to 341 and 485 youths, respectively), but looks much the same when compared to the other groups.

The typical juvenile in this group is a male Caucasian (63 percent male), 12.5 years old, who was apprehended or contacted for shoplifting, burglary and larceny, use of marijuana, and runaways. Only 3 percent had any previous contact with Juvenile Court, and of the 11 percent who had other agency contact, counseling agencies were the most prevalent.

No treatment was provided this group primarily because the families of the youths were handling the problem, or because upon preliminary investigation it was determined that another agency or the Juvenile Court was involved. Less than 10 percent of the juveniles/families in this group refused assistance by YOP counselors.

One question of interest concerning YOP operations was the possibility of bias in the types of juveniles accepted for treatment compared to those referred to other organizations.

While only limited data is available on the bulletin referral juveniles (compared with the comprehensive data maintained on the treatment group), some comparison is possible. There appear to be few differences in the profiles of the two groups, with the exception that treatment group juveniles had fewer previous law enforcement contacts (68 percent versus 77 percent for the bulletin referral group). The types of referral

offenses were basically the same, and the average age of both groups was comparable.

The Wolfgang seriousness scores⁷ were also compared in an effort to determine if any bias was present in the selection of cases to handle. While only limited data is available for the bulletin referral group, it appears that there is no bias in the selection of cases which the YOP staff chooses to retain as their treatment caseload. In fact, the treatment group, when compared based on the range of seriousness scores, appears to have slightly higher scores (more serious in nature) than the bulletin referral and non-treatment groups. Please refer to the display of Wolfgang scores contained in Appendix C.

Recidivism

Recidivism data for all juveniles in the sample was maintained by YOP staff as part of the coded program data base. All names in the sample were checked in the 1973, 1974, 1975, and 1976 KCDPS incident files by YOP staff, and all incidents were noted. A recidivism entry was recorded in the client record if the youth was listed as the subject of the offense. All offenses after the original offense or incident (for which the child was referred to the YOP) were counted as recidivisms. Similar checks were made in Seattle Police Department records. The cutoff date was June 30, 1976, with an at-risk time ranging from one month to almost three years.

Within King County there are twenty-seven other separate police departments in incorporated cities or towns. In compiling the KCDPS incident files, the accepted procedure is for KCDPS to be notified if a juvenile is charged (and referred to Juvenile Court) by other police departments, but there is no assurance that this practice is always carried out. This appears to indicate that the recidivism rates based

⁷ The Wolfgang seriousness scores are based on a scoring system developed by Marvin E. Wolfgang and Thorsten Sellin. This system attempts to objectively rate the seriousness of certain delinquent acts by assigning points depending on elements of the offense, such as the value of property stolen or number of victims of bodily harm. For further information please refer to Sellin and Wolfgang, The Measurement of Delinquency, 1964.

on KCDPS records will be understated, but it is impossible to determine the extent.⁸

When analyzing the YOP recidivism rates with those of other diversion or YSB programs on a national basis, it is difficult to make valid comparisons for a number of reasons. For example, not all programs receive similar groups of children to help, and not all programs use similar service strategies. Some programs utilize group counseling, or stress different counseling plans, such as providing educational skills development, recreation, interpersonal training, or providing assistance with securing employment. Another problem with comparing recidivism rates is that there is no assurance that the criteria for what constitutes a recidivism is always the same. Different recordkeeping procedures also complicate such comparisons. While the YOP counts police contacts, other programs use juvenile court petitions filed or bookings. Also, the at-risk time for developing recidivism rates varies by program, with some agencies using three-, six-, or twelve-month periods, and others only measuring recidivism while the child is participating in the program.

⁸ Records from two of the 27 other police departments were partially sampled in order to provide some indication of the accuracy of KCDPS records. It was determined that a small percentage, .6% and 1.6% in the two departments checked, of recidivisms were not recorded in the KCDPS records. While this seems to indicate that there is only minimal understating of YOP recidivism figures, there is no guarantee that these two departments (Bellevue and Auburn) are representative of the remaining King County police departments and their operating procedures.

In addition, Juvenile Court records were checked for a sample of treatment and bulletin referral group youths to determine subsequent referrals to the Court after YOP intervention. Random sampling was used, and a total of 54 percent of the treatment group sample and 52 percent of the bulletin referral group sample were checked. It was found that approximately 13 percent of the treatment group and 27 percent of the bulletin referral group had been referred to the Juvenile Court for investigation. Offense dates were not checked, and these data should be considered approximate figures. However, this records check also provides evidence that the recidivism rates are understated when only KCDPS records are used.

Also, when analyzing the recidivism rate for the YOP itself, care should be used in interpreting the percentages. There is no control group for comparison purposes within the YOP. Thus, while it appears that relatively few youths recidivate after YOP intervention, it is not possible to attribute these results to YOP counseling, or state that these results would have been any different if the YOP had not intervened.

Keeping these methodological concerns in mind, it is still possible to make tentative comparisons with other programs and within the YOP itself based on the different types of intervention.

Based on recidivism rates listed in evaluation reports of other programs, the YOP recidivism rates appear to be favorable. Some programs reported very successful results with only three out of 1,800 juveniles recidivating. However, some programs were considered a total failure, with youths in the program recidivating at a higher rate than control group boys and girls receiving no assistance. The YOP recidivism rate for the treatment group is 7.1 percent (at risk time ranges from one month to three years). A sample of other program rates is as follows: 14 percent recidivism over six months for an employment-oriented program; 6 percent recidivism during the twelve-month period the youths were in a program concentrating on recreation opportunities and remedial reading; and a 20 percent rate based on subsequent juvenile court referrals over a twelve-month period while juveniles were still in the program.

When compared to the results of other programs reviewed in the literature, the YOP results appear to be favorable, especially considering some programs showed either no significant differences or higher recidivism rates as a result of the program intervention.

Within the YOP, the recidivism figures indicate that, when compared to the bulletin referral and non-treatment group, fewer youths from the treatment group recidivate; and fewer youths from the treatment group recidivate more than once (see Exhibit 18).

Exhibit 18

Recidivism Rates (after YOP intervention or referral)

Treatment Group Recidivism Rate:	
No further police contact (no recidivism after original offense)	92.9%
One contact only (first recidivism)	3.9
Two or more contacts (multiple recidivisms)	<u>3.2</u>
	100.0%
Bulletin Referral Group Recidivism Rate:	
No further police contact (no recidivism after original offense)	81.2%
One contact only (first recidivism)	12.6
Two or more contacts (multiple recidivisms)	<u>6.2</u>
	100.0%
Non-Treatment Group Recidivism Rate:	
No further police contact (no recidivism after original offense)	83.2%
One contact only (first recidivism)	7.6
Two or more contacts (multiple recidivisms)	<u>9.2</u>
	100.0%

45%

45%

10%

being treated in other Social Service
among geographic zone
then cooperation of SO on.

Time Analysis: Direct Services versus Administrative Activities

Records for counselor utilization were reviewed in order to determine the amount of time spent on providing direct service as opposed to administrative type functions.

In terms of staff composition, the YOP emphasizes providing direct counseling and referral services to juveniles and their families. The Supervisor, with only a minimum of clerical and professional assistance, handles the agency liaison and recordkeeping functions and prepares all reports. The six counselors are thus freed of these functions and can concentrate their efforts on direct service.

The following table displays the activities of counselors for the 1975 and 1976 calendar years:

	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
Direct Services*	65.6%	67.8%
Administrative Activities**	25.8	21.6
Travel Time	8.6	10.6

*Direct Services includes counseling with youth, parents, peers, or neighbors; contact with police staff, Juvenile Court, schools, and referral agencies; consultations with other staff of consultants on case-related matters; and maintaining case files.

**Administrative time includes completing office forms and time logs, staff meetings, contact with supervisory personnel, and public relations. Normal holidays, sick leave, and vacation time are not included in these calculations. These percentage figures represent the activities based on the time worked. The average sick days taken (two per month for all staff) does not appear to be a significant factor).

These figures indicate that the percentage of time involved with direct services increased, while the percentage of time spent with administrative tasks decreased. This is seen as a favorable indication of good program

management. The supervisor and staff monitor time utilization data on a regular basis, and have developed guidelines in an attempt to maximize direct service time. Based on on-site visits and a review of program materials, there appears to be a minimum of bureaucratic forms and reports required of the counseling staff, and preprinted letters and forms are used whenever possible.

The travel time activity is governed by the number and location of clients and is difficult to control through procedural or supervisory action. However, during the last year of operations fewer of the initial meetings with clients have been held at the precinct, thus slightly increasing travel time and expenses over previous years. This appears to be a departure from established procedures and is a potential area of concern.

Cost Effectiveness Analysis

This phase of the project evaluation is concerned with the cost effectiveness of the YOP operations.

Identification of Cost Factors

The YOP is funded primarily with LEAA grant moneys, with a total of ten percent matching funds provided by the State and King County. The total funds allocated in 1976 amounted to \$149,105; however, approximately \$12,000⁹ of this amount has not been expended during the program year.

The costs of the YOP are categorized as follows:

Direct Costs -

Salary and Fringe Benefits (supervisor, 6 counselors, one part-time office assistant)		\$110,285
Supplies and materials	\$ 500	
Telephone expenses	<u>1,200</u>	1,700
Transportation:		
3 CID vehicles	10,080	
1 motor pool vehicle	168	
Mileage, private vehicle	<u>1,248</u>	11,496
Evaluation and Consultants:		
Program evaluation	10,000	
Records coding	1,850	
Police Foundation consultation	900	
Keypunching	400	
Casework consultants	1,200	
Training materials, books	<u>124</u>	14,474
		<u>\$137,955</u>

⁹ These unused funds came primarily out of the salary and fringe benefit budget allocation. As of March 1976 the YOP counselors and supervisor were assigned career service ratings by the King County Personnel Office.

Indirect costs* -

- Office space
- Office furniture
- Supervision of program
- Secretarial support
- Payroll and personnel costs

*No dollar estimates are included for the indirect costs because no out-of-pocket expenses are involved; however, these are costs which would not significantly increase the cost-per-client figures.

The direct cost category is comprised of expenditures which would not occur if the YOP did not exist, or in other words, the out-of-pocket expenses involved with the YOP. Oftentimes grants of this nature include an overhead figure or percentage which reimburses the parent agency for indirect costs. This percentage varies, but ten percent is an approximate figure. This overhead percentage is not taken out by the KCDPS, but in calculating the cost per client some overhead costs, such as telephone and materials, are included.

The calculations on the number of cases involve three types of clients: those receiving treatment, those referred to other agencies (bulletin referrals), and the no-contact (non-treatment) group. These clients cannot simply be summed together due to the different amounts of time and effort involved with each group. For example, the treatment group averaged six hours per client, while the estimated time involved with the other groups required less than one hour each.

The composite case cost-per-client represents the cost of the counseling and referral services to clients throughout the year. It should be kept in mind, however, that 568 is not the actual number of clients, which is approximately 1,060 per year.

Accordingly, two separate cost-per-client figures were developed in an attempt to accurately reflect the program costs. These cost figures are based on the number of clients for the 1976 program year, and the 1976 program costs from the previous page:

	<u>Number Served</u>	<u>Cost per Client</u>
Total treatment cases (includes direct counseling and counseling and referral cases)	522	\$264.28
Composite cases (includes bulletin referral, non-treatment cases, and treatment cases; see explanation above)	568	\$242.88

Based on a review of cost figures contained in the literature on youth service bureaus and diversion programs, the YOP costs appear to fall into the low end of the range. Figures cited for other programs ranged from \$153.44 to \$1,222.55 per client. However, extreme caution must be used when comparing such figures due to the lack of information on the extent and scope of services these costs represent.

As expected with a counseling agency, the most important cost item is salaries. Any reduction in personnel would necessitate a corresponding reduction in the number of clients served or a reduction in the quality of service, neither of which appears desirable.

The areas where cost reductions appear possible are in the transportation and evaluation areas. The use of private automobiles rather than CID vehicles would result in an estimated savings of approximately \$5,500 per year. While this might result in some inconvenience and/or hardship to staff, there was some feedback (from the parent questionnaires) that "officially" marked cars were not desirable for home visits. The transportation expenses might also be reduced by a small amount if more counseling sessions are scheduled at the precincts. The policy of having the parents and juveniles attend the initial meeting at the precinct should be emphasized, both for cost savings and program effectiveness reasons.

The percentage of total program costs allocated to evaluations (the annual program evaluation) could conceivably be reduced in scope in the future. The present evaluation, and the results from

previous evaluation efforts, should provide sufficient findings to determine the usefulness and effectiveness of the program. Accordingly, if the program is continued without a significant change in operations, future evaluations could be oriented towards program improvements and juvenile system impact and relationships, with less emphasis on descriptive analysis and other time-consuming activities. However, one problem cited in the literature was the lack of outside evaluations, and this suggestion should not be interpreted as minimizing the need for periodic evaluation efforts.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains recommendations based on the findings and conclusions presented in the previous chapters. The recommendations are grouped into the following areas, which comprise the major areas of emphasis of the program evaluation:

- Service Delivery
- Program Administration
- Cost Effectiveness

Service Delivery

The YOP should define more clearly its primary mission within the KCDPS.

The YOP is currently accomplishing stated objectives, including providing counseling and/or referral services. However, counseling and referral are unique and separate activities requiring a different set of skills. The YOP has been extremely successful in its counseling function, which appears to be the most beneficial type of support to the Department staff. While the referral function was necessitated due to limited YOP staff, there is no guarantee that the agency referred to provides timely and/or the needed assistance. In fact, there is evidence that the bulletin referral group receives less help than the clients personally handled by the YOP staff. Also, the police staff places more confidence in the YOP counselors whom they work with and trust them to follow through on cases they personally process.

One possibility is to place more emphasis on providing direct counseling with fewer bulletin referrals. If the time spent on bulletin referrals was eliminated, approximately 170 hours (based on 1976 data) could be allotted to direct counseling. However, this is not sufficient to handle all incidents, and the time spent on clients would have to be stretched out over a longer period or more staff added to the YOP. (The YOP staff would still be required to refer some clients to other agencies, in conjunction with their counseling, when such action is in the best interests of the clients.)

Another possible solution is described in the following recommendation.

The YOP staff should consider developing criteria for selection of clients for counseling based on the need for assistance and likelihood of recidivism.

The YOP is basically a resource to the patrol officers and detectives, but it is currently a very limited resource. The juveniles handled cover a wide range of ages and types of offenses. Based on the initial interview with the juvenile and family, a "triage" procedure could be used where only the clients in most need of help or where there is a strong likelihood of recidivism would receive assistance. Criteria for direct counseling might be based on the counselor's estimates of the probability of future police contact. The less serious incidents could be relegated to less frequent follow-ups or a reduced level of assistance. Such a classification system would ensure that the most serious juvenile clients would receive YOP help, and that less serious incidents would receive help only if YOP staff were available.

The YOP staff is currently developing a prediction system which might prove useful in developing service criteria; this effort should be continued.

However, despite the apparent need for classifying potential clients, extreme care should be taken with such a procedure. In past attempts it has proved very difficult to predict recidivism in youth, and it is also difficult to determine which boys and girls have the greatest need for assistance. Also, there are questions about excluding or limiting help to specific classes of juveniles in a government funded program. Such concerns should be addressed prior to implementation of any classification system.

The YOP staff should develop better controls for referral clients.

If the YOP continues to refer juveniles directly (bulletin referrals) to other agencies for assistance, improved procedures for ensuring service is provided should be developed.

Such controls might involve telephone checks with agencies and/or referred clients to ensure that appointments were kept and service

was provided. While necessary, such procedures are time consuming and take limited resources away from counseling activities.

The treatment group service delivery strategy appears to be a valid and workable approach and should be continued.

The primary strengths of the YOP are that immediate contact is made with the juvenile and family, actual counseling is provided, and the YOP is located in the police precinct. The precinct location has fostered good working relations and rapport with officers and detectives and facilitates the provision of feedback to the police staff concerning action taken. The KCDPS personnel interviewed (and responses to the questionnaire) indicated that few other agencies provided satisfactory feedback on case disposition, and that no other agencies worked as closely with the police staff at the field level. The consensus of police personnel was that the YOP was the only social service agency which they could trust and which they felt "good" about referring juveniles to for counseling help.

Develop procedures for different types and amounts of feedback to the referring officer and detective.

The overall feedback on case disposition was felt to be very good; however, a few persons commented on the need for different types of feedback for different clients. For example, each officer/detective could request different types of feedback by checking a specific option on the referral form, and could receive verbal, written, or follow-up data as desired. Also, for written data, some "reminder" type of information might be useful to the officer/detective. Such items might include date, type of offense, log number, case number, and other information which would facilitate remembering the individual case.

YOP should explore the possibility of using skilled volunteers or graduate students in counseling to augment/assist the permanent staff.

The YOP counselors currently have full caseloads and cannot handle additional clients without a reduction in services. However, with the less serious cases, and with bulletin referral

cases (if this service is continued in the future), skilled volunteer staff could be used to provide the necessary counseling assistance. While this involves some additional administrative activities by permanent YOP staff, the overall effect is expected to increase the availability of counseling time for juveniles and their families.

If volunteers are used with the YOP in the future, procedures should be developed to ensure that their skills and experience are appropriate for the tasks to be performed, and that their conduct is strictly monitored and controlled.

Develop improved procedures and/or instructions for clients referred to other agencies.

There appears to be some confusion on the part of clients who are referred to other agencies (bulletin referrals or agency referrals for specific types of assistance). In some cases they are initially contacted by the YOP staff and then referred to some other agency, with which they are unfamiliar, and have had no personal contact. Without personalized assistance, including an introduction to a specific person to contact, directions to the location, and a specific time and date, many juveniles and/or parents do not make the effort to follow through.

Unfortunately, solutions to this problem will require more time by the YOP staff, unless volunteers could be used to schedule appointments and monitor client progress.

Explore the possibility of allowing YOP counselors to handle more serious cases and/or repeat offenders.

By definition, many juveniles contacted by the police are not eligible due to prior Juvenile Court contact. These juveniles are then referred again to the Juvenile Court (and are not handled by YOP). The effect of referrals to Juvenile Court is perceived to be unsatisfactory by police personnel, and many expressed the desire that the YOP should handle this category of offender and that program policies should be changed accordingly. Any such changes should be considered within the scope of King County's comprehensive planning for juvenile services.

Program Administration

The YOP Supervisor should perform more liaison activities with other social service agencies.

Information from personnel in other agencies indicates that many are unfamiliar with the objectives and operations of the YOP and how it fits into the total juvenile services system in the County. This recommendation is especially important if the YOP continues to refer some of its clients to other agencies for assistance. Such liaison activities should be coordinated with the Supervisor of the Juvenile Unit, KCDPS.

More comprehensive data on juvenile contacts needs to be maintained.

The KCDPS maintains no comprehensive figures on the number of juvenile contacts nor any centralized data collection system. Reported figures understate the total number of contacts, and, while the YOP maintains excellent data on the juveniles referred to their program, contacts with many other minor offenders are never recorded. Such a recommendation is outside the scope of this evaluation, but complete and easily accessible data are vital to the operation and monitoring of diversion programs. (There is currently an effort to include juvenile information in SEAKING, which might provide the necessary data.)

All YOP clients should be asked to sign a consent form concerning their agreement to participate in counseling activities.

In order to ensure that YOP client data can be used for research and follow-up activities, all parents/guardians should be requested to sign a consent form. This would ensure that they understand the scope of the service and approve the use of client data in future research or evaluation projects. The consent form should include the stipulation that no individual names will be released except for follow-up surveys. During the course of this evaluation, some parents indicated concern over the use and availability of confidential information.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

Guidelines for the confidentiality of client data within the KCDPS should be developed.

The potential use of information on specific offenses or incidents gathered during counseling should be determined and clearly explained to juveniles and their parents. For example, often-times information from juveniles is useful in the solution of other crimes/incidents; however, such information is sometimes considered confidential by the juvenile and family. Accordingly, the use of this type of information should be clearly understood by all involved persons. Among the various precincts, the police staff and counselors have different perceptions of how best to use such data.

A policy should be developed to cover safeguarding and destruction of client files.

While client files are now maintained in an appropriate manner to ensure confidentiality of client information, specific policies should be prepared in writing. Also, guidelines for the destruction of case files after specified holding periods should be developed and observed. This is important in grant programs which might be discontinued and questions arise as to what to do with client records and files.

The name of the program should be changed.

The program name, Youthful Offender Program, is not appropriate in some cases where no offense was committed by the juvenile. Also, the families are usually included in the counseling and considered an integral factor in the counseling program. It might be appropriate for the name to reflect the type of services offered and/or the type of clients. An even more important concern is with the stigma of labeling the boys and girls, which is one reason for diversion programs. Care should be taken not to label the youth within the diversion program itself.

Periodic briefings/orientations should be held for patrol and detective staff.

Some type of periodic communication mechanism, such a briefings, orientation sessions, or newsletters, for patrol officers and

detectives in the precincts should be held. This would serve to ensure continued awareness of the YOP and its objectives, allow two-way communications on juvenile problems, and allow the YOP staff to make progress/status reports on YOP activities.

Provide monthly status reports on clients and the disposition of client cases.

Police staff expressed the need to be kept informed on who is currently receiving assistance from YOP and the disposition of completed cases. A monthly summary/status report was suggested. This was especially important for officers on the evening and night shifts who had relatively little face-to-face contact with YOP counselors.

The YOP should continue to stress direct services and minimize administrative activities.

The YOP counseling staff are able to spend approximately 79 percent of their time in activities connected with providing service to clients. This emphasis on direct service, with a minimization of administrative duties, should be continued (this ratio improved over the 1975 program year, with a 4.2 percent reduction in administrative activities).

Time limit guidelines should be placed on diversion programs.

Most diversion programs are informal, non-statutory, and discretionary in nature. In order to prevent possible abuses of this informal probation period, guidelines should be developed as to how long the program staff have to decide on the proper disposition and provide the counseling to the juvenile and family. Care must be taken not to subject the juvenile to an inordinately long period of supervision by program staff.

Cost Effectiveness

The use of CID official vehicles should be discontinued.

Based on an estimated cost savings of approximately \$5,500, the YOP staff should use their own vehicles as opposed to CID vehicles. While this might result in some inconvenience and/or hardship to staff, there is some indication that "official" marked vehicles are not desirable for home visits. In addition, counseling sessions could be held at the precincts whenever possible, and this would reduce both the travel time and overall transportation expenses.

The scope of future evaluations should be limited.

The results of the current and previous evaluations should have provided sufficient findings to determine the usefulness and effectiveness of the program. Accordingly, future evaluations should be more limited in scope and design in order to reduce program expenditures.

However, the importance of and need for continuous evaluations to determine program effectiveness should not be overlooked. Also, the need for evaluations remains important as changes in the program's scope and operations occur over time.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF DATA COLLECTION
INSTRUMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

A. DESCRIPTION OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
AND ADMINISTRATION

Sworn Personnel Questionnaire

A questionnaire was sent to all sworn personnel (with the exception of the Police Chief and Sheriff) in order to ascertain the general levels of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the YOP and to determine the extent of contact with or use of YOP services by detectives, patrol officers, and other staff.

A total of 288 questionnaire was distributed, with 244 returned. However, eleven were not tabulated due to incompleteness or inability to identify unit, leaving a total of 233 responses for tabulation and analysis.

The distribution of the questionnaires was handled by YOP staff and KCDPS supervisory personnel. Respondents returned sealed envelopes to their unit supervisory personnel which were then forwarded to and collected by YOP staff, and subsequently given to Compass staff. The questionnaires were anonymous to ensure confidentiality of responses.

The questionnaire was developed in coordination with the YOP Review Committee, and after review of YOP questionnaires used in previous years. A cover letter from Chief Actor accompanied the questionnaire, explaining the purpose and uses of the data to be gathered.

A breakout of the respondents by position, unit, and precinct is as follows:

Central Precinct (Courthouse)

Patrol Officers	4
Detectives	34
Supervisors/Administrators	13
Civil Division	9
Other	<u>10</u>
Total	70

Precinct No. 2 (North)

Patrol Officers	40
Detectives	7
Supervisors/Administrators	12
Other	<u>3</u>
Total	62

Precinct No. 3 (Kent)

Patrol Officers	28
Detectives	7
Supervisors/Administrators	8
Other	<u>1</u>
Total	44

Precinct No. 4 (Burien)

Patrol Officers	36
Detectives	10
Supervisors/Administrators	9
Other	<u>2</u>
Total	57

In-Depth Personnel Interviews

As a follow-up activity to the sworn personnel questionnaire, in-depth interviews were conducted with a small sample of police department personnel. Based on the questionnaire analysis, specific areas of interest were identified, and a structured interview form was developed. The personal interviews allowed in-depth exploration of key questions, such as reasons for referrals to the YOP, benefits and time savings, and the use of YOP feedback.

Approximately twenty-five personnel were selected for interviews. The sample covers the full range of personnel in the department, including patrol officers, detectives, precinct supervisory personnel, and department supervisory personnel. In addition, personnel from all four precincts were interviewed. These interviews took place either at the precincts or via telephone for certain shift personnel.

The sample was drawn from a suggested list of police personnel, ranging from top-level supervisory personnel to detectives and patrol officers. To preclude the possibility of receiving biased input from these personnel, other personnel were selected for an interview by the consulting team members. Also, precinct records were reviewed and detective personnel with the lowest rate of referral of juveniles to YOP (over the past six-month period) were also selected for interviews.

Parent Questionnaires

Questionnaires were sent to parents of juveniles who were referred to YOP and provided with some type of assistance. The names and addresses of this sample were drawn from YOP records (taking every third name from an alphabetical list) and included the following number of parents:

North Precinct (No. 2) area	85
Kent Precinct (No. 3) area	95
Burien Precinct (No. 4) area	<u>75</u>
Total	255

Some names from the sample were not used due to reasons of unavailability, such as incomplete address, the family had moved with no forwarding address, or the juvenile was deceased. In addition, forty-two of the questionnaires were returned by the U. S. Postal Service, which was unable to deliver them for various reasons.

The questionnaire was administered by mail and included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, the confidentiality of their responses, and instructions for completing the form. In addition, a pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope was included.

A follow-up letter was also sent out after a short period, which included another questionnaire and envelope and a different cover letter. The letter expressed thanks for those who returned the questionnaires, and urged those who had not to please complete and return their questionnaires.

All respondents were anonymous and no names were requested from respondents. However, several parents responded in letter form, and their names were not released.

Residents of precinct numbers 2, 3, and 4 comprised the sample selected for this data-gathering activity.

Of the 213 questionnaires which we can assume were delivered, there were 80 questionnaires returned, one written response, and two telephonic responses. Out of these total responses, five were not used due to incomplete information or their refusal to answer, and four were received too late to include in the tabulation. The overall rate of return for tabulated questionnaires was 35 percent.

Agency Survey

A survey of other agencies which handled juveniles in the King County area was conducted. The purpose of this survey was to determine the overall awareness of the YOP activities, review the various agencies' scope of service, and to develop a picture of the range of overall juvenile services and how the YOP fit in.

The survey was conducted with agency directors and personnel from the King County area; the agencies were selected based on degree of coordination with the YOP; i.e., primary, secondary, and infrequent contacts. The majority of interviews was conducted with agencies from the primary and secondary contact groups, with fewer agencies in the infrequent contact group interviewed. The interviews were conducted using in-person and telephone interviews. A list of the agencies contacted is presented on the following page.

LIST OF SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES
CONTACTED IN SURVEY

Juvenile Court Conference Committees
Children's Protective Service, Department of Social and Health
Services
Youth Eastside Services
Shoreline Youth Services
Shoreline Public Schools - Pupil Services Office
King County Work Training Program
Highline Public Schools - Student Placement Office
Highline Youth Service Bureau
Park Lake Neighborhood House
Bellevue Community Services
Big Sister
Big Brother
Family and Child Services of Metropolitan Seattle
Youth and Alcohol Program
Kent Valley Youth Services
Renton Area Youth Services
Federal Way Youth Service Bureau
Auburn Youth Resources
Comprehensive Alcohol Services
King County Juvenile Court and Youth Service Center

APPENDIX B

COMPLETE LIST OF RESPONSES TO
QUESTION 11 (SWORN PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE)

B. COMPLETE LIST OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 11
(SWORN PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE)

This appendix summarizes the full range of responses from Question Number 11 from the Sworn Personnel Questionnaire. These are listed in detail based on their potential value for program improvements. The figure in parentheses indicates the number of times each item was mentioned.

- More staff and expand program, make a formal part of Department (17)
- No suggestions (16)
- Currently satisfied with program (10)
- Provide information about appropriate type of referrals and how YOP handles cases (9)
- Keep YOP funded (8)
- Allow YOP to handle second and third offenders and those with Juvenile Court records (7)
- Provide more detailed feedback with case number, dates, and other data to remind officer of case (7)
- Keep YOP at precinct level (4)
- Put YOP on swing and night shift (3)
- Give more leverage and power to YOP staff to persuade kids to cooperate (3)
- Provide more service to outlying areas such as North Bend and Vashon Island (3)
- Make YOP staff available for field contacts (3)
- Involve officers in discussions with parents and offenders (2)
- Provide written monthly summaries

LIST OF SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES
CONTACTED IN SURVEY

Juvenile Court Conference Committees
Children's Protective Service, Department of Social and Health
Services
Youth Eastside Services
Shoreline Youth Services
Shoreline Public Schools - Pupil Services Office
King County Work Training Program
Highline Public Schools - Student Placement Office
Highline Youth Service Bureau
Park Lake Neighborhood House
Bellevue Community Services
Big Sister
Big Brother
Family and Child Services of Metropolitan Seattle
Youth and Alcohol Program
Kent Valley Youth Services
Renton Area Youth Services
Federal Way Youth Service Bureau
Auburn Youth Resources
Comprehensive Alcohol Services
King County Juvenile Court and Youth Service Center

B. COMPLETE LIST OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 11
(SWORN PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE)

This appendix summarizes the full range of responses from Question Number 11 from the Sworn Personnel Questionnaire. These are listed in detail based on their potential value for program improvements. The figure in parentheses indicates the number of times each item was mentioned.

- More staff and expand program, make a formal part of Department (17)
- No suggestions (16)
- Currently satisfied with program (10)
- Provide information about appropriate type of referrals and how YOP handles cases (9)
- Keep YOP funded (8)
- Allow YOP to handle second and third offenders and those with Juvenile Court records (7)
- Provide more detailed feedback with case number, dates, and other data to remind officer of case (7)
- Keep YOP at precinct level (4)
- Put YOP on swing and night shift (3)
- Give more leverage and power to YOP staff to persuade kids to cooperate (3)
- Provide more service to outlying areas such as North Bend and Vashon Island (3)
- Make YOP staff available for field contacts (3)
- Involve officers in discussions with parents and offenders (2)
- Provide written monthly summaries

- YOP staff needs more familiarity with patrol function (2)
- Reduce paperwork for referrals to YOP (2)
- More publicity to community
- Provide more coordination among YOP, police, and school counselors
- YOP is not a justified expense and should not be part of police role
- Forget YOP and put kids in jail
- Replace Juvenile Court with YOP
- Have YOP pressure other agencies for feedback
- Evaluate the Juvenile Court to determine why they provide no feedback

APPENDIX C

DETAILED DESCRIPTIVE DATA
OF POPULATION

C. DETAILED DESCRIPTIVE DATA OF POPULATION

This appendix displays in tabular form statistics about the client populations for the treatment group, bulletin referral group, and non-treatment group. The Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to summarize and display the descriptive data. Unless otherwise shown, percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Description of Sample

A systematic sample was drawn from the referral population (during the period from November 1973 to June 1976). The breakout per type of intervention group is as follows:

	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Sample N</u>	<u>Sample Percentage</u>
Treatment Group	1,222	341	28%
Bulletin Referral Group	1,545	485	31%
Non-Treatment Group	451	120	27%

All sample data was coded from case records by a person experienced in police records and was subsequently keypunched and verified to allow computer analysis.

It should be kept in mind that the relative size of the three client groups changed over the three-year period since the program began. The treatment group has grown in size, while the bulletin referral and non-treatment groups have decreased. Accordingly, some of the descriptive data displayed in this section will not completely accurately reflect the most recent program year of YOP operations.

Reason for Referral - Referral Incident

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
N/A	9	3%	32	6.6%	3	2.5%
Strong Arm Robbery	1	0	4	.8		
Assault	9	3	31	6.4	1	.8
Burglary	73	21	109	22.5	12	10.0
Larceny \$200 and Over	6	2	5	1.0		
Larceny \$50 to \$200	20	6	8	1.6	10	8.3
Larceny Under \$50	15	4	29	6.0	3	2.5
Shoplifting	73	21	93	19.2	49	40.8
Auto Theft, Taking and Riding	17	5	10	2.1	2	1.7
Other Assaults	2	1				
Arson, Setting Fires	3	2	2	.4		
Forgery, Counterfeiting	2	1	1	.2		
Fraud			1	.2	1	.8
Stolen Property - Buying, Selling			3	.6		
Vandalism	27	8	43	8.9	6	5.0
Traffic			1	.2		
Promiscuous Behavior	2	1	2	.4		
Loitering	3	1			2	1.7
Prowling	2	0	3	.6		
Possession of Drugs	5	1	9	1.9	2	1.7
Drug Overdose	1	0	2	.4		
Marijuana	17	5	23	4.7	10	8.3
Glue Sniffing	1	0	2	.4	1	.8
Runaway	21	6	30	6.2	10	8.3
Child Molesting	2	1				
Fighting, Disturbing the Peace	1	0				
Suspicious Circumstances	1	0	5	1.0		
Associations with Improper Companions	1	0	2	.4		
Questionable Living Situation	1	0	3	.5	1	.8
Neighborhood Problems			1	.2	1	.8
Liquor Violation	2	1	8	1.6	3	2.5
Other	19	6	20	4.1	3	2.5

Race of Juvenile

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
N/A, Unknown	169	50%	431	88.9%	70	58.3%
Caucasian	167	49	51	10.5	48	40.0
Negro	2	1	2	.4		
Asian	1	0			1	.8
Indian	1	0			1	.8

Sex of Juvenile

N/A, Unknown

Male

Female

Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
8	2%	17	3.5%	-	-%
264	77	382	78.8	75	63
68	20	86	17.7	44	37

Wolfgang Scores

Not Applicable

Range of Seriousness:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Intimidation of Someone

Attempts to Steal, Larceny

Victimization of a Person

Victimization of a Commercial Establishment

Victimization of Community at Large

Consensual Offenses (drug offenses; if crime also applied to adults)

Status offenses (crime only for juvenile)

None

Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
41	12%	217	45%	18	16%
21	6	28	6	4	3
66	19	14	3	15	13
29	9	10	2	1	1
17	5	3	1	2	2
3	1	3	1		
1	0	1	0		
1	0	1	0		
2	1	2	0		
75	22	99	21	51	44
15	4	6	1	1	1
3	1	2	0		
11	3	10	2	3	3
27	8	37	8	13	11
29	9	42	9	8	7
		4	1		

Child's Number of Previous Law Enforcement Contacts

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
0	232	68%	371	76.5%	Insufficient Data	
1	82	24	87	17.9		
2	12	4	17	3.5		
3	9	3	7	1.4		
4	4	1				
5	1	0	1	.2		
6			1	.2		
7	1	0	1	.2		

Category of First Previous Law Enforcement Contact

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
None	233	68%	376	77.5%	102	85.0%
Person Crime (robbery, assault)	1	0	13	2.7		
Property Crime (vandalism, larc.)	32	9	43	8.9	2	1.7
Runaway	10	3	30	6.2	6	5.0
Other Status Offense	4	1				
Traffic	10	3				
Alcohol Citation	8	2	4	.8	2	1.7
Drugs	4	1	7	1.4	2	1.7
Shoplifting	35	10	7	1.4	6	5.0
Other, or Unspecific	4	1	5	1.0		

Family Status

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
N/A - Unknown	13	3.9%	Not Available		Not Available	
Natural Parents	168	50.6				
Natural Father/Stepmother	17	5.1				
Natural Mother/Stepfather	45	13.6				
Father Only	7	2.1				
Mother Only	65	19.6				
Adopted	13	3.9				
Moth.or Fath. & Common Law Spouse	2	.6				
Unrelated Adults	1	.3				

School Learning

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not known	35	10%	Not Available		Not Available	
Does well	29	9				
Adequate, no notable problems in this area	175	51				
Resolved learning problems from earlier (was in spec. ed., etc)	1	0				
In spec. ed. currently; learning prob)	20	6				
In spec. ed. currently; behav. prob)	4	1				
In spec. ed. currently; retarded	1	0				
Underachiever, below grade level - moderate	62	18				
Underachiever, below grade level - serious	6	2				
In spec. alternative prog. (voc. tech., night sch., cont. high sch)	8	2				

School Attendance

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not known	36	11%	Not Available		Not Available	
No problem in this area (assumed unless noted)	200	59				
Frequent illness	2	1				
Occasionally tardy	3	1				
Occasionally skips	58	17				
Frequently tardy or class skips	9	3				
Frequently skips whole days	16	5				
Has been suspended in past for attendance	1	0				
Many suspensions/expelled/serious attendance problems	5	1				
Dropped out, not in school	11	3				

School Attitude

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not known	45	13%	Not Available		Not Available	
Likes school - no attitude problem	120	48				
Apathetic or neutral to school, no serious problem	64	19				
Not motivated - some problems	112	33				

Self Concept

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not known	43	13%	Not Available		Not Available	
Good self image	66	19				
Fair self image - some doubts	133	39				
Bad - feels physically inferior, ugly	18	5				
Bad - feels mentally inferior, dumb	40	12				
Feigns competence	40	12				

Family Reaction to this Police Incident

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not known	22	6%	Not Available		Not Available	
No real reaction	1	0				
Defensive/guarded/denied/rationalize	21	6				
Passive/passively cooperative but really as above	22	6				
Concern, but no effective follow through	25	7				
Concern, but ineffective reaction	57	17				
Concerned, incident forced on family to see problem and/or forced community reaction	38	11				
Concerned, family sought appropriate action	112	33				
Appropriate concern and action of own	40	12				
No real problem, worker concurs	3	1				

Sibling/Parent Law Enforcement Contact

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not applicable	65	19%	Not Available		Not Available	
Minor contact (status/traffic)	39	11				
A few incidents	22	6				
Moderate number of contacts past seriousness	12	4				
Moderate number of contacts current seriousness	10	3				
Fairly serious involvements in past	16	5				
Fairly serious involvements current	3	1				
None	174	51				

School Behavior

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not ascertained or known	32	9%	Not Available		Not Available	
Well behaved, noteworthy	13	4				
Acceptable	173	51				
Mildly disruptive & attention getting	83	24				
Moderately disruptive, fights, defiance	21	6				
Serious school misbehavior, vandalism, assaultive	4	1				
Not in school	15	4				

Estimate of the Most Determinant Factor
in Juvenile's Behavior

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not known	28	8%	Not Available		Not Available	
No real problem, question does not apply	2	1				
Bad judgment or poor impulse control	131	39				
Life decision tensions of juvenile	12	4				
Lack of supervision, concern, or interest of parents	28	8				
Excessive parental expectation	7	2				
Negativistic parenting	39	11				
Mental health of parents	1	0				
Alcohol or drug problems of parents or juvenile	17	5				
Frequent disruptions in living patterns (earlier or now)	18	5				
Disturbed family dynamics	57	17				

Case Recommendations

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not known	13	4%	Not Applicable		Not Applicable	
YOP counseling	173	51				
Other agency continuing w/family	39	12				
Family dealing w/problem without intervention	11	3				
Referral for family counseling	55	16				
Referral for diagnostic evaluation	15	4				
Referral for drug problems	1	0				
Referral for medical assistance	1	0				
Referral for Big Brother/Sisters	2	1				
Referral for foster care	3	1				
Referral for school problems	2	1				
Referral for social/recreational problems	1	0				
Other referral	2	1				
YOP counseling with use of another agency	20	6				

Specific Casework Goals

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unknown	14	4%	Not Available		Not Available	
None, no casework needed						
Structure building (limit setting, rule making, responsibility setting)	24	7				
Communication facilitation within family (relationships)	5	1				
Support - keep family working on problem (going to therapy)	12	4				
Counseling with child (looking at self and problem)	102	30				
Educational focus about children, relationships, resources	35	10				
Encouragement of real problem definition	63	18				
Maintenance of contact to maximize police intervention	83	24				

Overall Interventional Goals (Primary and Secondary)

	Treatment Group Only			
	Primary		Secondary	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unknown	5	1.5%	15	4.5%
No intervention required	10	3.0	7	2.1
Benevolent surveillance	66	20.0	66	20.0
Stress police impact	55	16.6	76	23.0
Advise parents	46	13.9	50	15.0
Counseling to child	39	11.8	47	14.2
Family therapy/communications work	11	3.3	4	1.2
Plan for specific needs, or make specific referral	82	29.8	40	12.1
Monitor other agencies' interventions	17	5.1	22	6.6
Coordinate intervention program			4	1.2

Agency Referred To
(for bulletin referral group only)

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
None	Not Applicable		11	2.3%	Not Applicable	
CHANNEL			8	1.7		
Creative Life			8	1.7		
Federal Way YSB			77	15.9		
Highline YSB			150	31.1		
INC SPOT			37	7.7		
Kent Area YSB			42	8.7		
KISANA			9	1.9		
New Day			7	1.4		
Rays			21	4.3		
Shoreline YSB			75	15.5		
Youth Eastside Service			26	5.4		
Other agency			4	1.7		
Conference committees			4	.8		

Number of Juvenile Court Contacts

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Number of Referrals:						
0	337	98.9%	Not Available		116	96.7%
1	4	1.1			4	3.3

Agency Referred to or Worked with by YOP
(for treatment group only)

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not ascertained	13	4%	Not Applicable		Not Applicable	
None	183	56				
YSB	17	5				
Mental health/counseling agency	62	19				
Drug agency (or special drug program in other agency)	3	1				
Alcohol agency (or special drug program in other agency)	1	0				
Medical facility	4	1				
Psychiatrist	2	1				
Schools (testing, evaluation ...)	5	2				
Tutor	1	0				
Big Brother/Big Sister	2	1				
Recreation (scouts, YMCA, clubs, etc.)	1	0				
DSHS	9	3				
Private therapy - other	26	8				

Reason for No Further Contact
(for non-treatment group only)

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not applicable	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		1	.8%
Not given					1	.8
Family handling					29	24.4
Other agency already involved					29	24.4
Juvenile Court involved					21	17.6
Incomplete I.D. information					3	2.5
Many times, no response					3	2.5
Resident of other county					8	6.7
Unworkable					6	5.0
Direct referral elsewhere					4	3.4
Already at conference committee					2	1.7
Refused					11	9.2
Witness only					1	.8

Thoroughness of Follow Up

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unknown	12	4%	Not Applicable		Not Applicable	
Fair, feedback to officer skimpy, little other follow through	64	18				
Average, feedback given is adequate, clear case movement	238	70				
Good, good feedback to officer, agency contacts checked, everyone should feel pretty finished	27	8				
Exceptional - all ends followed up completely; case plan pursued and completed	1	0				

First Recidivism

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
No recidivism	286	92.9%	393	81.2%	99	83.2%
Armed robbery			1	.2		
Strong arm robbery			1	.2	1	.8
Assaults	2	.6	4	.8	2	1.6
Burglary	10	3.2	17	3.5	4	3.3
Larceny \$200 and over	1	.3				
Larceny \$50 to \$200	1	.3	3	.6		
Larceny under \$50	3	1.0	6	1.2	1	.8
Shoplifting			3	.6		
Auto theft, taking and riding	3	1.0	2	.4		
Other assaults			1	.2		
Forgery, counterfeiting	1	.3				
Stolen property - buying and selling	1	.3				
Vandalism			4	.8	1	.8
Traffic			4	.8		
Possession of drugs			2	.4	1	.8
Marijuana			5	1.0	1	.8
Runaway			28	5.8	8	6.7
Fighting, disturbing the peace			2	.4		
Suspicious circumstances			2	.4		
Questionable living situation			2	.4		
Liquor violation			3	.6	1	.8
Other			1	.2		

Second Recidivism

	Treatment Group		Bulletin Referral Group		Non-Treatment Group	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
No recidivism	313	96.9%	455	93.8%	109	90.8%
Armed robbery			1	.2		
Strong arm robbery			1	.2		
Assaults			3	.7		
Burglary	3	1.0	5	1.0		
Larceny \$200 and over					1	.8
Larceny \$50 to \$200	2	1.0			3	2.5
Larceny under \$50						
Shoplifting	2	1.0				
Auto theft, taking and riding	1	0.0	2	.4		
Other assaults	1	0.0				
Fraud	1	0.0				
Vandalism			1	.2	1	.8
Prowling			1	.2		
Marijuana			1	.2	1	.8
Runaway			13	2.7	4	3.3
Fighting, disturbing the peace			1	.2		
Questionable living situation					1	.8
Liquor violation			1	.2		

APPENDIX D

LITERATURE SEARCH

D. LITERATURE SEARCH

This appendix briefly summarizes the results of the literature search. A separate document containing citations was prepared for future reference by YOP and KCDPS staff.

Overview

The materials in the literature search were gathered from a number of sources. Publications and bibliographies from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (LEAA), and the Newsletter of Innovative Projects funded by LEAA were reviewed for pertinent materials. Selected articles from state and local publications were also screened. In addition, pertinent selections from the ongoing Washington State YSB Evaluation Project (sponsored by LJPO, Office of Community Development) were reviewed and included in the compendium.

The scope of the review included materials on diversion programs as well as YSBs and other programs designed for juveniles.

These materials were reviewed for their relevance to the conduct of the program evaluation of the YOP, and were useful in comparing the scope of other similar programs and comparing how the programs were staffed, operated, and structured. In addition, specific data such as cost per client figures were used for comparative purposes in the Findings and Conclusions section.

Summary of Findings

The following paragraphs briefly summarize the literature reviewed as compared with the KCDPS Youthful Offender Program.

The diversion of juveniles is not a new concept, with many police departments using advise and warn procedures to divert youth and with juvenile courts diverting youth from the adult system. However, the operation of special programs for diversion is a current and growing phenomenon in

the juvenile justice system. And, while a good deal of evaluation has taken place, no definitive conclusions are available on their usefulness in reducing juvenile recidivism. In addition, there are a number of fundamental concerns about diversion programs, such as the lack of statutory guidelines and possible infringement on the rights of juveniles.

The common elements of the diversion program approach are generally as follows:

1. The use of paraprofessionals typically drawn from the same "community" as the juveniles being served by the program.
2. The utilization of "crisis intervention" techniques to substitute immediate, short-range aid to juveniles and their families rather than involve them in the long, cumbersome procedures of the judicial system.
3. A reliance on administrators or arbitrators, rather than judges, with a central concern for conflict resolution rather than the determination of guilt.
4. The attempt to avoid the "stigma" of the juvenile court process by not keeping records or by restricting their availability to outsiders.
5. A policy of limiting the population served to status offenders and minor delinquents.¹⁰

In terms of the YOP in particular, its scope of operations is similar to many other diversion programs. The number of diversion counselors is generally relatively small, although police officers are sometimes part of the program staff, and sometimes students or volunteers are utilized. The ages of the target population vary, but are similar to the range of the YOP. The programs are designed for first offenders and status offenders. Unlike some programs, however, the YOP maintains extensive records on youths served and the type and results of intervention (but does restrict their availability to persons outside of KCDPS).

¹⁰Nejelski, Paul, "Diversion: The Promise and the Danger", adapted from Pursuing Justice for the Child, 1976, University of Chicago Press.

The scope of services usually includes counseling and referral services (similar to the YOP), with some programs aimed specifically at working with school personnel, families, or in providing employment counseling.

The goals and objectives of the YOP are not as specific as some other programs, which include the reduction of recidivism, reduction in the number of juvenile court petitions filed, or lower costs.

The rationale for diversion programs is usually to alleviate the overburdened juvenile judicial system, and the situation appears to be similar in King County. Diversion of youth takes place at various levels within the overall juvenile justice system, and, in the case of the YOP, diversion is at the police level, as opposed to the pretrial or post-conviction level.

Another common characteristic of diversion programs is the lack of evaluation studies. In this context the YOP is not similar, as a number of evaluations by independent consultants have been conducted, with the results used for program improvement.

If more information is desired on diversion programs, the complete list of literature and materials is available for review. Please contact the YOP Supervisor, KCDPS.



END