3

MICROFICHE

A Program Level Evaluation of Wisconsin's Youth Service Bureaus

Prepared for
THE WISCONSIN COUNCIL
ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

By
PETER S. VENEZIA
and DEBRA ANTHONY

January, 1978

A Program Level Evaluation of
Wisconsin's Youth Service Bureaus

Prepared under contract to:

The Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice

By: Peter S. Venezia
     Debra Anthony

     Associates for Youth Development
     2125 South Torrey Pines Circle
     Tucson, Arizona 85710

     January 31, 1978

Project Staff

Project Director	Peter S. Venezia, Ph.D.
Research Associate	Debra Anthony
Consulting Associates	Robert D. Cain, Jr. William A. Lofquist Bernard M. Bennett
Research Assistants	Theresa F. Spear Robert Kempen
Secretary	Teresa Brito

Introduction

Delinquency prevention and control efforts, like crime
fighting in general, are societal endeavors that have pro-
liferated and become institutionalized on the basis of perceived
failure. Over the years, existing agencies have been replicated,
and their budgets augmented in proportion to rising delinquency
rates and/or increased public concern about the problem getting
worse. The basic assumption underlying this approach seems to
be, "What we are doing is good, but we are failing because we
are not doing enough of it." It is a paradox that we, as a
society, subscribe to this notion when, as individuals, we are
not inclined to purchase more of the same services that fail
to remedy a problem.

Probation is a clear example of a correctional approach that
has been augmented as a result of the problem getting worse.
At its inception, it was the first systematic effort to divert
young people from harsh incarceration and to provide a cor-
rectional approach that would deter young offenders from sub-
sequent criminal careers. Its "success"--based upon anecdotal
case histories--combined with an increasing number of offenders
of all ages, led to an expansion of its services. It became
an accepted correctional approach for an indiscriminate variety
of offenders, both young and old. Today, it is an institution-
alized and expanding part of corrections in the United States,
with a multimillion dollar annual budget. It is ironic, too,
that in many quarters probation currently is seen as a part of
the justice process from which young people should be diverted!
Despite assertions as to probation's correctional effectiveness,

or lack of it, the reality is that no one knows the degree to which it reduces delinquent behavior. Even worse, is that a program to alleviate this condition of ignorance does not exist. An ongoing, research and evaluation process has not been built into the probation operation.

The parallel exists with Youth Service Bureaus. They were instituted approximately ten years ago as a "better" method of dealing with delinquency. Currently, they exist by the hundreds, and they are increasing in numbers as well as in budget allocations. It is likely that as "good programs for children," they will become institutionalized. Yet, it is the rare jurisdiction that is giving more than lip service to the idea of determining the effectiveness of such youth programs. Wisconsin is one of these. Through its Council on Criminal Justice, it has mandated evaluation of its Youth Service Bureau Program that was created with Federal Law Enforcement Assistance funds. In addition, the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice has made resources available within this program area for evaluation training, development, and implementation.

This evaluation is an outgrowth of the state's desire to "know what works." As such however, it is only a beginning step toward gaining the desired knowledge. It deals with only one state, also, several projects were eliminated from the evaluation due to their inner turmoil, and to their failure to provide data during a limited time period. In addition, an evaluation, itself, is a process that must be refined and improved on the basis of experience with it. The merits of this evaluation lie, then, in its methodology and in the start it has made in providing useful information.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

The Evaluation of Youth Service Bureaus

Youth Service Bureau evaluation approaches, both summative (process) and formative (outcome), encounter specific difficulties due to the nature of these agencies and their mode of operation. A partial enumeration of these problems, as they have existed in Wisconsin, follows.

Intra-program Diversity

None of the Bureaus have relied upon a single programmatic approach. Each Bureau is a conglomerate of subprograms, with multiple objectives--all aimed at the ultimate goals of reducing and/or preventing delinquency. In order to obtain an idea about a given Bureau's effectiveness, each of its subprograms had to be identified, its objectives specified, its operation described, and its accomplishments determined from objective measurements. Without even considering the interaction effect among subprograms, this multiplicity required several discrete evaluations within a given Bureau.

Inter-program Diversity

The complexity is compounded when a number of Youth Service Bureaus are included in a program-level evaluation strategy as was desired in Wisconsin. Not only is the number of subprograms increased proportionately, but the dissimilarity is often striking among supposedly similar programs and functions. For example, in terms of direct services, "alleviation of personal problems by means of counseling" is provided "in-house" by some Bureaus, while by others, it is brokered, purchased, or simply referred out. In addition, combinations of these approaches are utilized by some Bureaus. Though this diversity

can be an advantage from the point of view of the "natural experiment," data collection difficulties (especially from outside sources) significantly handicap intra-program effectiveness measurement and inter-program comparisons.

Program Reality

Here, there are two points to consider. First, several Youth Service Bureau operations--and their objectives-- differed drastically from those described on paper. The parameter for an effective evaluation cannot be developed for a duality--that which a project plan describes, and that which the project is actually doing. The best that can be accomplished in this situation is to identify the discrepancies in detail and to provide the information along with training as corrective feedback. This was done consistently as part of the evaluation development, design, and implementation.

The above problem arises, in part, from the evolutionary pressures upon Youth Service Bureaus to meet new needs. The resultant changes so alter programs that they no longer resemble their beginning states. This points up the second issue--that of through-time, intra-program change. The violence that was done by program modifications, to the evaluation and the data collection will be described later. Even continuous communication and close collaboration between project and evaluation staffs did not remedy the problem entirely.

Data Sources

The problems, here, were primarily tactical. Wisconsin Youth Service Bureaus typically interact with other agencies and attempt to impact the latter's functions. This is true

especially of diversion efforts, in relation to police, courts, and probation, and of system impact approaches that have communities and their agencies as targets. In order to assess the interactions and impacts, baseline, process, and outcome,data are needed from other agencies. However, in most instances, such data did not exist, were not collectable, some agencies were not willing to provide them, or the existing data were so inaccurate as to be erroneous. For example, police departments did not keep retrievable records of juvenile cases handled formally versus informally, and could not spare the time to collect data for other agencies. Court records were more complete, but record access was not feasible. Data collection for this evaluation was limited, then, to the Bureaus, the youth they served, and other knowledgeable individuals.

Youth Service Bureau Staff

The Youth Service Bureaus, as a condition of funding, were collecting data internally. The expectation, that this requirement was providing data useful to evaluation, however, was not being realized. Most Bureau staff were not aware of the stringent procedures necessary to provide accurate data, and they were committed to programs and people rather than "paper." Therefore, training and motivation was needed to obtain their collaboration in data collection. Even then, in two instances it was a resented chore that was done poorly, if at all.

Invasion of Privacy

The collection of information (especially follow-up data) on individuals implies the possibility that privacy will

be violated. Evaluation of Youth Service Bureau effectiveness requires that some youngsters be "tracked" to determine what happens to them in terms of program outcome measures. Unless guarded against, such an evaluation approach runs the risk of allowing unauthorized individuals access to personal information. Thus, data collection and processing procedures were developed with built-in safeguards against invasion of privacy--safeguards that complicated still further an already complex evaluation effort.

History of Wisconsin's Youth Service Bureau Program

The Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice began making
funds available, in 1973, for local communities to plan Youth
Service Bureaus. The planning process was expected to result
in:

Data Collection and Analysis - Each planning project
was to pull together available data from the juvenile
justice system and conduct extensive survey research on
youth and agency need in its target area;

Community Organization - The development of a community
coalition planning approach was to be facilitated. This
approach allowed for the integration of a variety of per-
spectives reflective of public and private "helping"
agencies, lay citizens, official juvenile justice agencies
and youth. This approach was also to assist in the develop-
ment of an ever-expanding circle of YSB knowledge and
commitment throughout the planning process within the com-
munity; and

Operational Model Which Was Reality-Based - An
organizational and staffing model which accounted for
project sponsorship, staff functions, goals and
objectives, the definitions of interagency work
relationships, etc. was to be the final product.
The Model was seen as evolving from both the data
and the community organization process.[1]

Fifteen YSBs have been funded by WCCJ since 1973. Twelve
were operating with WCCJ funds during the evaluation period:

Brown County Youth Resources Council
Kenosha County Advocates for Youth
Racine County Youth Service Coordinating System
Washington County YSB
Milwaukee County YSB's
Winnebago County Project Youth
Sheboygon County YSB
Dane County YSB
Fond du Lac County YSB
Outagamie County Youth Services
Marathon County YSB
Beloit YSB

The WCCJ funding for three ended in the fall of 1976. These
three, listed on the next page, were not included in the evaluation
process.

[1]*Soundings on Youth,* Volume I/Number 5/Sept. -Oct., 1974.

Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council
OMNI - La Crosse County YSB
Tri-City YSB (Wisconsin Rapids, Port Edwards,
    Nekoosa area)

WCCJ funding for many of the YSB projects will end in
1978. Some of them are pursuing the possibility of short term
continuation funding by the State Manpower Council (perhaps
up to 50% of expenses). This would help some of the YSBs
continue long enough to be considered for state support in the
next biennium budget.

The Wisconsin Association for Youth, of which most Youth
Service Bureaus are members, is helping to set funding prior-
ities by developing a set of standards for YSBs and by rating
funding proposals according to these standards (provided in
Appendix A).

Evaluation Planning Phase

In September, 1974, the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice contracted with the Research Center of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency for assistance in developing an evaluation program for the Wisconsin Youth Service Bureaus. During 1975, the Senior Author examined the potential for evaluating the Youth Service Bureaus. An Evaluation Training Seminar was held in the spring of 1975, with each bureau's staff invited. A number of additional meetings were held individually with the project to develop evaluation potential and to clarify project goals and objectives.

The next stage, from January to July, 1976, involved more specific planning for the implementation of an evaluation program. Each project was visited to: learn more about its operation; gain its input into the evaluation design; and, to encourage the involvement and collaboration of project staff with the evaluation.

Several projects provided developmental feedback to the tentative data collection design during the site visits. The first draft of the data forms was discussed at a meeting with WCCJ staff on April 12, 1976 and with YSB project staff on April 14, 1976. Using the suggestions made at these meetings, a second draft was developed and distributed for further comments. The resulting third draft was then used in a pre-test, using sample data. After the pre-test, additional refinements were made in the forms before their use in the implementation phase of the evaluation. Two sets of forms were developed: one for clients of direct service project and one for youth involved in community change projects.

An Evaluation Training Seminar was held on June 7-8, 1976.
On June 9, the evaluators met with YSB staff to discuss the
evaluation process in more detail.

The Final Report of the Evaluation Planning Phase,
July, 1976, summarized the evaluation planning phase and the
proposed evaluation methodology. Part of the plan was to com-
pare effects of direct service and community change projects.

Evaluation Implementation Phase

The WCCJ chose to proceed with the evaluation and con-
tracted with Associates for Youth Development, a new non-
profit group that had replaced the National Council on Crime
and Delinquency during the design phase. Despite the change
in contractors, the research staff remained the same. The
evaluation implementation period was from October 1, 1976, to
January 31, 1978. At the beginning of the implementation phase,
the evaluators again visited the projects, to discuss the specifics
of the evaluation process and to keep up to date on project
operations. Additional meetings and telephone conversations were
used as needed throughout the evaluation.

As data forms were received from projects, the data were
keypunched, computerized and tabulated, with summaries being
sent periodically to projects.

Problems Encountered During the Evaluation

A number of unexpected problems arose which delayed and
hampered the evaluation:

--A great deal of staff turnover occurred in many of

the projects. Six of the twelve projects changed directors

during the evaluation period. Three projects had three

directors (Beloit YSB, Sheboygan County YSB, and

Marathon County YSB) and three projects had two directors

(Outagamie County Youth Services, Dane County YSB and

Winnebago County Project Youth). Since the new

directors had not been involved in the evaluation

planning phase, they lacked commitment to and understanding of the evaluation. Data collection suffered, as a result, and the evaluation process had to be renewed with each of them by explaining the evaluation and by trying to enlist their support. Staff turnover was not limited to Directors. Therefore, it was decided to hold additional Evaluation Training Seminars, in February and in April, 1977, in order to rebuild the necessary evaluation support and collaboration.

--Many project directors and line staff had to take time away from program operation and evaluation in order to secure continued funding. It was necessary for them to: write follow-on proposals; gain approval; and, obtain local matching funds. This caused repeated interruption of data collections.

--The evaluation design had called for a comparison between individual client service and community change approaches. During the evaluation period, some projects began to change from individual client service to community change (Milwaukee County YSBs, Sheboygan County YSB, Marathon County YSB, Beloit YSB). This made it impossible to get outcome data from a group of individual client service projects.

--Some projects which had agreed to use Youth Surveys never did and some gave them to only a few youth. Only two projects used the Youth Surveys well--Brown

County Youth Resources Council and Kenosha County
Advocates for Youth. The evaluators repeatedly
encouraged project staff to use the Youth Survey--
explaining how the other forms they completed were of
little use without the Youth Survey. Some of the staff
seemed reluctant to ask youth to complete the Survey,
viewing it as additional paperwork for the youth. The
projects that employed the survey, however, found the
contrary to be true. Youth who completed the Survey
viewed it as an honor to be asked their opinions.

For additional information about the evaluation process and
the Wisconsin Youth Service Bureaus, the reader may refer to
the following reports compiled by Associates for Youth Devel-
opment under contract to the Wisconsin Council on Criminal
Justice:

    --Final Report of the Evaluation Plan Developed for
        Wisconsin Youth Services System - July, 1976

    --The Individual Assessments of each of the Youth Service
        Bureaus

    --Wisconsin Youth Service Bureau Evaluation--Interim
        Report - January, 1977

    --Youth Service Bureaus: The Current State of the Art,
        Nationwide and within Wisconsin - September, 1977

    --Comprehensive Evaluation of the Brown County Youth
        Resources Council - October, 1977.

The last three reports--from September and October, along with
this one--are intended as three volumes of the final evaluation
report. For the sake of brevity, and in order to avoid
redundancy, much material from the first two volumes will
not be repeated here. For example, a full discussion of the

growth and development of the YSB concept in America is the
substance of the first volume. In volume two, a detailed
description is included of the Brown County Youth Resources
Council. Throughout this volume, references will be made,
where pertinent, to the other two.

The Projects

Mentioned earlier, was the fact that several YSBs
changed their philosophy and focus during the course of the
evaluation. The shift away from Direct Service for in-
dividual youth, to Community Development approaches, was
abrupt for some projects and more gradual for others. In
both instances, several serious problems were created for
the evaluation.

> --An important component of the evaluation was designed
> to compare the effectiveness of the two approaches in
> reducing individual delinquency. The projects' tran-
> sition to community change methodologies, however,
> significantly reduced the number of direct service
> clients who could be studied for the evaluative
> comparison.
>
> --As well as reducing the number of client youngsters
> in the study, the change virtually eliminated an examination
> of a group of pure, direct service projects. This
> undermined an original intent of the evaluation--the direct
> comparison of two distinctly different program method-
> ologies.
>
> --The transitions necessitated within-project reorganizations,
> and evaluation retraining for new data collection procedures.
> Thus, valuable evaluation time was lost in terms of the
> contract deadline.
>
> --In some instances, the change in methodology eliminated
> the projects from the evaluation altogether. When the

shift occurred too late in the evaluation period for
the collection of four-month follow-up data, little could
be salvaged.

Despite this weakening of the evaluation, some comparisons of
the two approaches remained feasible. The results of these
are reported in a later section. At this point, it is
important to detail the conceptual, procedural, and impact
differences between the two approaches.

Direct Service and Community Development

Almost all of the hundreds of Youth Service Bureau type
programs that have proliferated during the past ten years have
devoted their rather limited resources to attempting to
alleviate the individual problems of "troubled," or "in trouble"
youth. This treatment-oriented, remedial approach has failed to
demonstrate any value in reducing delinquency, and for good
reasons:

   --The services offered are, most often, simply "more of the
   same" being provided by existing agencies
   --The limited resources of a funded project severely
   restricts the number of children who can be serviced
   --A less than perfect "success" rate with a relatively
   small number of children does not produce a significant
   impact upon a community's delinquency rate
   --Whatever community factors that underlie delinquency
   remain untouched, and a new cohort of problem youth is
   always there getting ready for "treatment"

   Recently, another approach is being tried--one that is
aimed at the community as the client. The underlying concept of

of Community Development is one of stimulating the community

to apply its resources to creative problem solving--with youth

seen as an important resource.

The projects that have operated in purely the Community

Development mode perceive themselves as "Youth Service Systems,"

in line with the "National Strategy for Youth Development"

advocated nationally by the U.S. Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare.[2]   Relatively new, the Community Development model

rarely had been implemented previously. The Racine Youth

Services Coordinating System was the first such youth project

in Wisconsin. Close on its heels were the Brown County Youth

Resources Council, and the Kenosha County Advocates for Youth.

Many of those established originally as Direct Service efforts

have modified their approach to approximate Community Development.

Others are considering doing so. The result in Wisconsin is

three types of WCCJ-funded youth service projects: Community

Development; Mixed, Community Development and Direct Service;

and Direct Service.

There are no reports in the literature of any Youth

Service System impact evaluations. However, this Community

Development models seems to have merit if only in terms of

cost efficiency. The problems of youth are so complex and

manifold that remedial projects with budgets the size of those

in Wisconsin would affect only a circumscribed number of

[2]Gemignani, R. J., "Youth Service Systems," *Delinquency Prevention
Reporter*, U.S. Dept. Health, Education, and Welfare, Youth
Devel. and Delinq. Prev. Admin., Wash., D.C., July-August, 1972.

children. By taking a "systems" approach, the Community Development projects introduce a multiplier effect--they broaden the possible impacts of their limited resources. A more precise understanding of this can be gained from a detailed comparison of the "developmental" approach with that of traditional remediation, as is provided below.

Community Development	Remediation
1. Community Development is an effort to create the conditions that promote the welfare and best interest of youth.	1. Remediation is a corrective effort to overcome personal, damaging circumstances.
2. Community Development is active, assertive.	2. Remediation is reactive, responsive.
3. Community development deals with causes	3. Remediation deals with effects.
4. Community Development focuses on organizations, the community, the system, the institution, the neighborhood, on decision processes.	4. Remediation focuses on the individual, the small group, the family, the peer group.
5. Roles appropriate to Community Development are consultant, planner, trainer, community organizer, organizational development specialist, public information specialist.	5. Roles appropriate to Remediation are diagnostician, therapist, (counselor, caseworker, etc.) group worker, consultant (to others responsible for remediation.)
6. Relationships generated through Community Development can be described as collaborative, resource people working together, team problem solving (these generally are subject-subject type relationships).	6. Relationships generated through Remediation can be described as therapist-patient, worker-client, counselor-counselee, probation officer-probationer (these are subject-object relationships: a giver-a recipient).
7. In Community Development people (even those with the problem that is of concern) are seen as resources.	7. In Remediation the person is seen as a recipient of remedial services, as having the problem.

Community Development	Remediation
8. In Community Development people in the community are engaged in a problem solving process that can benefit large numbers of persons, as well as select individuals.	8. In Remediation a private relationship exists that benefits one or a small number of persons.
9. In Community Development there is generally in the community a fear of and a resistance to the change being sought. Therefore, Community Development is a "high risk" approach.	9. There is a high toleration for Remediation in the community. It is safer, particularly when it takes place in an office. It is acceptable. Therefore, remediation is a "low risk" approach.
10. Community Development tends to foster participation and positive labelling.	10. Remediation tends to foster alienation and negative labelling.
11. Community Development promotes utilization of an expanding array of disciplines, insights, vantage points and "people experience" as it seeks out problem solving potential.	11. Remediation tends to depend more upon a tried and tested cadre of disciplines, skills and insights, usually narrowly defined.
12. Evaluation is difficult in Community Development in that the essence of it is a community change process. The products of community change, such as changes in decision making processes, may best be monitored on an inter-agency basis, with a number of programs and organizations participating in providing data and data analysis.	12. Evaluation to the extent of monitoring and outcome description is somewhat easy in Remediation. However, measuring effectiveness of Remediation efforts is extremely difficulty, expensive and time consuming.[3]

The Community Development Projects

Three projects qualified fully as community development efforts, even though some of their specific areas of focus differed. These were: Kenosha County Advocates for Youth, Racine County

---

[3] *Soundings on Youth,* Volume I/Number 6/Nov.-Dec., 1974.

Youth Service Coordinating System, and Brown County Youth Resources Council. The latter, located in Green Bay was evaluated intensively as an individual project and the evaluation report was submitted to the WCCJ in early November, 1977, as volume two. A detailed project description is part of that report.

Racine County Youth Service Coordinating System. The RCYSCS, beginning in April 1975, was the first youth service project in Wisconsin to adopt the Community Development approach to delinquency reduction. As stated in its 1974 proposal, its operation has been:

> . . .based on the premise that the agencies which provide services and programs for young people would be able to do a better job if there were established ways they could work together and if they had the benefit of input from youth in the community. It will provide a way for agencies to assess the effectiveness of their programs in the context of the total youth-serving system, backed by reliable data and the ongoing input of young people so that programs can be adjusted in response to changing needs.

The project staff attended Evaluation Training Seminars and worked with the evaluators to revise the project's goals and objectives early in its implementation phase. The evaluators kept in close contact with the staff throughout the evaluation process, through meetings and telephone calls. Neither Youth Surveys nor Involvement Forms were used by this project because so few youth have been involved with it since the evaluation phase began.

Description of Project Efforts--Crestview. Early in its operation, RCYSCS was contacted about problems in Crestview, a residential area north of Racine, close to Milwaukee. Relations between youth and adults were tense, resulting in fights. The police were being more strict and had called in the Sherrifs Department for assistance. Some stacks of hay were set on fire, and a year earlier a school building had been burned, with the offense remaining unsolved. Project staff helped bridge the gap between youth, adults, and police through discussions with each group and meetings between groups. People began discussing what kind of organization might be developed in the community to try to resolve the tensions and create some new opportunities for youth. Tension was reduced through the discussions. The police and youth developed a better relationship. Also, the arsons were solved due to an anonymous tip to the Police Chief.

RCYSCS surveyed the community to determine needs and the characteristics that contributed to the juvenile problem. A task force of adult, youth, and agency persons was formed to develop program plans for the area. They decided to explore the possibility of using the burned school for a community center. Eventually a private non-profit community foundation was established, which has worked to secure use of the school and to develop programs for the area.

High-Erie Street. Soon after the project started up, its help was sought in a second tense situation. Much conflict existed between young people and the police department concerning youth hanging around businesses and restaurants. The project

organized a meeting between the police and about forty youth,
which led to improved relationships and understanding. The
resulting reduction in problems for the police made it possible
for the police department to reassign the officer who had been
on full-time watch in the area.

A Youth Action Committee was formed which began raising
funds for planned activities and a drop-in center. A Task Force
of the Youth Services Commission also was formed.to study
the area and assess agency programming. The youth were not
successful in establishing the center that was recommended,
probably due to the lack of adult participation in the area.

Recreation Study. Community concern about the lack of recre-
ation in the county led to an RCYSCS study of the situation.
After surveying students in the western part of the county,
it developed and circulated a Directory of Recreational Services.

Job Referral Services. The project helped develop Job
Referral Services for areas in Western Racine County to connect
youth and employers, mainly for odd jobs.

Drop-out Study. Project staff studied educational needs
in Western Racine County, with special attention to truancy and
drop-out problems. Drop-outs were surveyed about their reasons
for leaving school. This resulted in some recommendations con-
cerning programming, including the possibility of alternative
education. This information was communicated in meetings with
representatives of schools, including counselors, to try to
prevent future drop-outs.

Rights and Responsibilities Course. The RCYSCS developed
a course and manual about youth rights and responsibilities,

which two police officers taught in an alternative school.

Drug Use Study. Following publicity about drug problems in one of the schools, staff volunteered to help with community planning. A Task Force of volunteers and parents was formed, which heard speakers on drug education. The Task Force then divided into two groups, one to promote youth drug education and the other aimed at parent and community education.

Police Social Worker Study. At the request of the Department of Social Services, project staff studied the possible need for a police social worker. A workshop was organized with a speaker experienced with police social workers, and a report was prepared, recommending such.

Detention Study. The Juvenile Services Committee of the County Board and the Juvenile Judge asked the Youth Services System to study the Racine County Detention Center. The committee and the judge were pleased with the first report, that focussed on the facility, and requested an additional study, with recommendations, about the program and procedures. One of the study group's recommendations was to develop alternative programs and placements and to reduce the number of beds planned for the detention section of the new center.

The detention center had been studied earlier by an outside consulting group, but the RCYSCS staff felt that its report had more impact because the project was locally based, and it had the support of law enforcement, courts and the County Board.

Community Accountability Board. At the request of a county board member and the Juvenile Court Judge, RCYSCS helped plan and organize a Community Accountability Board, similar to

a restitution program in Seattle. It was designed to operate out of a neighborhood center, receiving referrals from court intake. The proposal received CETA funding and began operation in the fall of 1977.

This program, however, has been a disappointment, apparently due to mismanagement by the persons hired with CETA funds (one director has already been fired). RCYSCS has not been very involved in the operation of the Accountability Board, for the four other agencies (Intake, Court, Neighborhood Center, CETA) which have been trying to direct it seem to provide too many masters. The evaluators had planned to study the effects of the restitution program by means of the Youth Survey being completed on a pre-post, comparison-group design. However, due to a delay in the program's implementation, four month follow-up surveys would not have been received within the evaluation period. In any event, very few referrals were received due to agency confusion.

Centralized Intake. RCYSCS was participating in the planning of a unified youth service coordinating system for the county, which would have included centralized intake. These plans were postponed because of the new Human Services Project, a pilot project for making the County, instead of the State, the major decision-maker concerning human service programs. Five major county agencies have been consolidated. Now Juvenile Court Intake, Probation and Detention are included under the same umbrella.

The RCYSCS Director views this as a positive development, but realizes that some of the coordination role that his project might have performed is now covered by the Human Services Project.

Data Collection. The RCYSCS has been collecting detailed information on juvenile apprehensions from the nine law enforcement jurisdictions in the county. Using the data, it provided feedback to the nine groups in a more detailed fashion and more quickly (monthly instead of yearly) than did the State. This helped the project focus its efforts according to current information and resulted in police seeking programming for identified problems.

The project has collected, also, social profile information about clients from a number of youth service agencies, including probation. Summary reports have been prepared and distributed. The intent is for these data to help in the coordination of youth services.

Other Activities. Other activities have included:

(a) Coordination of a Child Abuse Committee

(b) Assistance in drafting proposals for a youth camping program, a Girl Scouts Adventure Trails Program, a Runaway Program, and a Delinquency Group Home.

(c) Coordination of Community Meetings

(d) Participation in a seminar, "Juvenile Delinquency, A Search for Answers."

(e) Development of a Youth Resources Directory

Assessment by Original Planning Group. The original planning group, chaired by the Juvenile Court Judge, reconvened to assess the project's accomplishments and the community's views towards it. The group will recommend whether the project should continue, in whole or part. If continuation is recommended, funding will be sought from the county to start when WCCJ funds end in March, 1978.

The group has chosen not to apply for the possible State Manpower Council funds.

Evaluator Observations. One of the evaluators' concerns about this project is the currently sparce youth involvement. For more than a year, since the crisis situations with Crestview and High Street, less than twelve young people have been involved with RCYSCS. This is contrary to one of its objectives, which was to encourage and develop input from youth in decision-making.

In part, the project staff may have lost sight of the objective. On the other hand, two part-time staff, who worked in the neighborhoods to get youth involved, have gone on to other, full-time jobs. Perhaps budget arrangements need to be made that will permit retention of workers that are proficient in involving youngsters.

Another factor has impaired the ability to involve youth. An exhorbitant amount of the Director's time and energy periodically has been absorbed by the circumstances involved in obtaining the project's continued funding. At these times, his program function-ing, of necessity, was virtually nil. Thus, without staff back-up, the continuity of challenging and guiding youth was lost. (For additional organizational details, see the consultant's report, The Racine County Youth Services Coordinating System: An Empirical Assessment, submitted to WCCJ in November, 1975.)

Kenosha County Advocates for Youth. KCAY has been very cooperative with the evaluation process since the evaluation planning phase. Staff members attended Evaluation Training Seminars, consulted with evaluators in the clarification of goals and objectives, and kept

the evaluators informed of plans and progress through numerous meetings and phone conversations. In addition, they consistently completed Youth Involvement Forms and distributed Youth Surveys.

The overall mission of the Kenosha County Advocates for Youth has been:

> To encourage and assist the community in efforts
> that can affect the involvement of youth in the
> juvenile justice system to reduce entry to it,
> repeated contact with it, and the seriousness of
> such offenses as occur.

In order to accomplish this mission, the group identified a number of goals with corresponding objectives and activities. The following description of the project is organized according to these goals.

To Decrease the Practice of Detaining Youths. KCAY has been concerned about the use of jail detention for youth, especially since Kenosha County has the highest jail detention rate in Wisconsin. One concern is the possible misuses of twenty-four hour jail detention when a youth's parents cannot be reached. Thus, the project has been attempting to facilitate the development and implementation of detention guidelines for law enforcement departments. In line with this, a former staff member of KCAY, who now works with the Juvenile Court Judge in the New Court Services Unit, recently drafted proposed guidelines for detention.

The Juvenile Judge, police, sheriff and social service personnel have been surveyed and asked to indicate their level of agreement with a series of recommendations which were made in a report entitled Juvenile Detention in Wisconsin. A summary of their responses is being prepared to be used as a basis for a Detention Seminar for Criminal Justice and Social Service Agency Personnel. A written report on detention alternatives and a

public education seminar will follow.

To Increase Youth Participation in Activities That Are
Socially Constructive, Personally Rewarding and Which Improve the
Youth's Self Image. Youth employment has been the method chosen
to try to reach this objective. KCAY has devoted a large portion
of its efforts to improving youth employment, based on a strong
belief that employment is one of the best ways to prevent
delinquency and to increase one's self image, sense of belonging,
and ability to participate in chosen activities.

Funding was obtained to operate a Youth Employment Program
for low income youths in Western Kenosha County for the past two
summers. During the summer of 1977, participants and a comparison
group were asked to complete Youth Surveys for evaluation purposes,
with positive results.

Recently KCAY received funding for employment for out-of-
school youth in non-profit agencies and in a recycling center which,
it is hoped, will develop into a youth-operated corportation.
KCAY, unlike most of the other youth service projects studied,
has sought and received considerable funding for various sub-projects,
including those direct at youth employment.

A related Task Force on Employment Opportunities was organized
to explore and assess the existing situation in Kenosha County
and to recommend improvements. KCAY employed the task force
methodology for a number of problem areas as a way to create a
community-wide forum where concerned citizens can focus on a
particular topic and develop recommendations for improvement.
The Task Force reports, then, were used as tools to encourage the
implementation of the recommendations.

To Improve Youth's Understanding of and Preparation for
Their Career Choices. KCAY and Kenosha Unified Schools currently
are organizing a Career Education Task Force to study their
own and others' career education programs, and to make recom-
mendations for improvement.

To Increase Participation in Constructive Activities in A
Selected Village West of I-94. A program coordinating recreation,
tutoring, and information and referral was begun in Twin Lakes
in the fall of 1977. There is a great deal of community involvement,
including an active advisory committee, volunteers and donations
of facilities. This was funded as a pilot project, and additional
funding may be received to expand to other villages.

To Reduce the Number of Youth Detained for Running Away by
Ten Percent. KCAY has developed a proposal for a runaway home
which would offer information, counseling and referral on both
a live-in and drop-in basis. Another agency plans to use the
proposal to apply for funding.

To Improve Citizens Awareness of Resources within the Community
That Are Available to Deal with Juvenile Problems. KCAY provides
information and referral services to youth concerning resources
available to them.

The project sponsored a workshop entitled "Juvenile Problem
Solving: A Community Approach" in May, 1977. William Lofquist
of Associates for Youth Development was the workshop facilitator.
It was inteneded to help youth and adults to learn to work together
to make better decisions concerning resources for youth. Attitudes
and values about youth problems and delinquency were examined. The
seventy participants included youth, educators, citizens, pro-
fessionals in law enforcement and Social Services and KCAY staff.

The participants rated the workshop very positively on questionnaires, afterwards. In addition, KCAY sponsored seven community seminars on a variety of community problems. Also, they developed a resource directory, "Where Its At" and distributed it to social service agencies and school personnel. KCAY publishes a monthly newsletter, the Youth Advocate.

To Decrease Alienation Among Disaffected Youth Regarding Their Ability to Influence Their Social Environment. KCAY has been working for improved community responsiveness to youth-identified needs through the use of youth action groups who identify problems, develop strategies for change, and attempt to implement the changes. Such groups have been organized in neighborhoods identified as having the worse social and economic conditions. Two young adults are paid to organize in each area. KCAY's original plan was to pay the young people for their efforts, but the funding source objected.

Two of the neighborhood groups are currently identifying problems. The third has been seeking to open in its neighborhood a park building which has been closed due to vandalism, apparently caused by persons from other neighborhoods. The youth met with the Park Commission and received approval for their proposal in principle, with details to be worked out.

The youth, later, met with administrators of the Parks Department and Recreation Department. The outcome was hopeful; the youth may be able to use the park building if KCAY pays for liability insurance, organizes a schedule of activities, and coordinates supervision.

Diversion. A Diversion Task Force was coordinated by KCAY and a report issued in 1976. The report was presented to the City Council for its consideration in November, 1976.

The Kenosha County Juvenile Court Judge used the Task Force's recommendations in a successful proposal to WCCJ for a Court Services Unit. The Unit: provides intake and detention screening; establishes alternative dispositions for youth; and, is developing procedures for handling truancy. The Juvenile Court has incorporated the Task Force's recommendations in its revised diversion guidelines.

Other Projects. These have included:

(a) A mural painted on the side of the building, which was planned and painted by thirty-one youth and an outreach worker from KCAY.

(b) Summer day camps have been held in the western part of the country.

(c) A youth group was organized at an alternative high school to work on school problems.

(d) A Youth Art Contest, held in conjunction with the Community Workshop.

For more details about the project, see the consultant's 1976 report, Kenosha County Advocates for Youth: An Empirical Assessment.

Evaluator Observations. Kenosha County Advocates for Youth, and Brown County Youth Resources Council are generally similar. Both involve youth in productive activities, including community problem solving. Their focus is upon the community as the client, and upon the resolution of youth problems via community change, with youth being, in large part, the change agents. Racine has the same change focus, but it seems to have become more oriented toward adult impact upon adult decision makers.

All three projects, however, are rather "pure" examples
of Community Development approaches to youth-problem reduction.
In the following section, six other projects are described that
differ somewhat. As will be seen, they have utilized both the
Direct Service and the Community Change approaches. In most
instances, originally Direct Services Projects simply added
Community Development components.

Mixed Project Types

In the following six project descriptions, a wide methodol-
ogical diversity can be discerned. While it has been clear that
each project divided its efforts between Direct Service and
Community Development, it has been impossible to estimate with
any accuracy the proportion of energy and resources that have been
devoted separately to the two approaches. There has been just too
much overlap and interlocking of activities. This can be seen
from the descriptions, below, and from the six individual assess-
ment reports submitted by the consultant.

Washington County Youth Service Bureau. The evaluators visited the
Washington County YSB during March,1976, seeking the staff's
input into the evaluation design, while learning about the project.
The project director attended the Evaluation Training Seminar in
June, 1976. The evaluators visited the project again in November,
1976, to discuss implementation of the evaluation and the project's
progress.

Project staff used the Client Information Forms, but not the
Youth Surveys. The evaluators repeatedly encouraged them to use
the Surveys, describing the data's importance to evaluation and

the enthusiastic response other projects had experiened with the
forms. At the Evaluation Training Seminar in April, 1977, a
staff member promised to start using the surveys, but none were
forwarded. Through numerous personal contacts and telephone calls,
the evaluators aided the staff to design the methodology for a
job survey of high school students and a survey of the community.

The Washington County YSB combines service to individual
youth and community change efforts. Part of its efforts are aimed
at identifying needs, and at involving the community and its
agencies in meeting those needs.

Volunteers in Prevention. The YSB recruits, screens and
trains volunteers who are each matched with a youth referred by
the Department of Social Service or by law enforcement personnel.
Often the youth are status offenders. The YSB supervises and
assists the volunteers in their counseling of youth assigned to
them.

Though this is a direct-service counseling input into
individual youth, its volunteer aspect has several virtues.

--With the counseling done by volunteers, a greater number
of youth can be worked with than if the project staff were
the only counselors.

--Supervision of volunteers requires less than full time
staff input. Thus, staff have been able to devote time
and energy to other activities, including community development.

--The use of volunteers makes possible a very low "client"
to "counselor" ratio. Thus, youth are more likely to
receive counseling when they are in need than if counseling
appointments were fixed rigidly by a professional's schedule.

--The inclusion of lay volunteers brings the project into direct contact with representatives from the community. Often, such individuals make valuable contributions to program planning, development, and implementation.

Germantown Summer Activity Program. The YSB coordinated a summer recreation and enrichment program for children in the four through twelve age group. High school and college youth were employed in the program.

Germantown Youth Resource Center. Space contributed by a church was made available to youth and family serving agencies, in an effort to make services more accessible to residents in the outlying area.

Outward Bound. The YSB coordinated nine day wilderness trips for youth referred by the Department of Social Services, schools, and juvenile officers during the summers of 1976 and 1977. These experiences were seen as building youth independence, as well as augmenting their feelings of self-worth and a sense of accomplishment. The program has received very positive feedback from participants, the youth and the adult volunteers.

Youth Employment Study. The YSB surveyed youth about their previous work experience and plans for the summer. The information was provided to the youth employment agencies, to aid them in youth employment planning.

Newsletter. A newsletter, primarily summarizing YSB activities is periodically prepared and distributed.

Referral Services. The YSB provides referral services to youths on the basis of youths' needs and pressing problems. Profiles of needs, problems, and referrals are presented in the "Results" section.

Tutoring Assistance Program. Youth referred for problems
in school are paid to tutor younger children who need academic
assistance. This "cross-age tutoring" has been used in
many places as an effective way of helping both groups of
youngsters. The younger ones obviously get the help they
need with their studies--help they might not otherwise obtain.
Benefits for the older youngsters are not as direct. It
seems that the tutoring relationship allows them to feel
important and useful--needed by someone. Also, it seems that
the task occupies a portion of their time in something
meaningful and productive. The end result seems to be that
their behavior problems decrease in frequency and intensity.

Milwaukee County Youth Service Bureaus. Milwaukee County had
five Youth Service Bureaus located throughout the county,
all supervised by the Community Relations section of the
Social Development Commision in Milwaukee. The projects
served mainly individual clients. During 1977 efforts were
made to change towards community coordination.

Much of the project's activities during the evaluation
period were focussed on re-organizing from five groups with
a central administration to four groups; two under the central
office and two with delegate status. In addition, the projects
were seeking local funding to continue the YSBs after WCCJ
funds expired in October 1977.

The project already had a computerized set of data forms,
used for its own purposes of tallying clients and service
inputs, and did not complete any of the evaluation forms. Thus,
no outcome data were supplied for the evaluation.

Winnebago County Project Youth. The Winnebago County project is the newest Youth Service Bureau, with staff beginning in February, 1977. It is sponsored by ADVOCAP, the sponsor of the Fond du Lac YSB.

The evaluators visited the project in March, 1977 to explain the evaluation process and learn about the project. Some Cliet Information Forms were completed, but no Youth Surveys. The original director and staff left the project. A second director was hired in September and discussed the evaluation process with the research staff in November, but it was too late to begin participation in the evaluation.

Sheboygan County Youth Service Bureau. Sheboygan County YSB is one of the newer projects, with staff beginning in July, 1976. In August, 1976, the evaluators met with them and with members of the Board of Directors. The project's goals and objectives and the proposed evaluation methodology were discussed in depth.

The first director left in November, 1976, and the second director began in January, 1977. A meeting was held with the second director and the assistant director in March, 1977. The focus of the meeting was the evaluation methodology and the need for clearer goals and objectives.

The second director left in the fall of 1977 and a third director was hired in November, 1977.

The assistant director came to the Evaluation Training Seminar in February, 1977 and the second director listened to a recording of an Evaluation Training Seminar. In addition

-to site visits, the evaluators and project staff have had numerous telephone discussions.

The project staff completed some Youth Involvement Information Forms and asked a few youth to complete Youth Surveys. Staff also completed anecdotal records about their programs.

The project's long term goal has been to reduce the number of delinquent acts committed by juveniles in Sheboygan County. The objectives are to improve and increase resources for youth. The YSB has sponsored a variety of programs, in the hope that most of these will be run by other agencies after the YSB initiates them.

Restitution Program. The YSB assists youthful offenders in finding a way to repay their victims. The court intake department has referred to the project minor offenders, who would usually not be processed through court.

Youth Employment Service. The YSB helps youth under sixteen years of age in finding employment, since the Job Service assists youth over sixteen.

Greeting Gang. A group of youth seek out and help orient new youth to Sheboygan County. The YSB began this program after discovering that youth new to the area have many problems adjusting.

Youth Problems Library. The YSB has collected pamphlets and books on topics of interest to youth. This library has been advertised, so that youths know they are welcome to use the library.

Tutoring Program. The YSB recruits volunteers to work with students who need tutors, but are not able to obtain them through the school system.

Adult Education Program. Monthly programs of interest to adults are presented by resource people from the community. Topics have included: "How to Find Time for Your Children," "Vandalism," "Divorce and Its Effect on Children," "Teen-Age-Alcoholism," "What You Should Know About Teen-Age Sex," and "Depression."

Rap and Referral Service. The YSB provides short term counseling as well as referral to community resource for youth with problems.

Youth Summer Action Project. The YSB used CETA funds to employ a supervisor and twelve youth in a community clean-up program during the summer of 1977.

Vandalism Prevention. The YSB used various approaches to try to prevent vandalism. It collaborated with the Police Department and Rotary Club to sponsor a program in the schools. Groups of junior high students presented a prevention program to elementary school students.

Planning: Resource Development. The YSB collects and analyzes data in order to identify and define problems affecting youth. This information is used to design new programs in response to youth needs.

Dane County Youth Service Bureau. The Dane County Youth Service Bureau has experienced much staff turnover. The first director began in May, 1975. The first administrative assistant worked from August to November, 1975. The second administrative assistant began in December, 1975, and was chosen as director after the first director left in the fall of 1976. Other staff positions also have experienced turnover.

The evaluators met frequently with the first director during the evaluation planning phase, gaining input into the evaluation design and helping him to clarify goals and objectives.

The Project's participation in the implementation phase of the evaluation was delayed because of many problems threatening the continued existence of the project. Severe conflicts existed between groups in the community and on the Board of Directors about the appropriate role of the YSB--whether it should provide individual counseling services or focus on community change and coordination.

The planning proposal had been contradictory on this point. Therefore, each side based its argument on part of the proposal. Raising local match also occupied a great amount of staff time. In addition, much time has been spent in recruiting, selecting and training new staff because of turnover.

The evaluators met with the second director in February, 1977. Discussed, were the evaluation methodology, data collection, and the project's progress. In addition to telephone discussions, approximately five more meetings were held with the director and staff. Despite this, the project was subjected to too many conflicting needs. It simply did not reach the stage of being able to participate adequately in the evaluation.

The project began with a community coordination and community change emphasis. After the controversy, the second director agreed to add a referral service for youths sent by law enforcement officers in the county. No forms or surveys have been received from the project.

Some of the YSB's programs are described below.

Youth Services Consortium. The YSB facilitated the development of the Youth Services Consortium, with representation from various youth serving agencies. The organization attempts to coordinate the delivery of services, to cooperatively develop needed programs and to coordinate funding requests of youth serving agencies.

Purchase of Service Programs. The YSB provided financial and technical assistance to a number of projects:

(a) Different Voices, a group of youth who work as advocates for other youth

(b) Middleton Youth Council's Crisis Intervention Program, which had helped find emergency foster homes and has provided short-term crisis counseling

(c) Mazomanie low income Youth Work Experience Program

(d) Kennedy Heights Youth Recreation Program

(e) Summer Day Programs

Youth and Parent Effectiveness Training Programs. The YSB offered courses in Youth and Parent Effectiveness Training. The evaluators had discussed developing a pre/post test for these courses with the original trainer, but the project was delayed too long for inclusion in the evaluation period, in part, because the trainer left.

Newsletter. The YSB publishes a monthly newsletter, featuring news about the Youth Service Bureau and other events of interest to youth and youth serving agencies.

Fond du Lac County Youth Service Bureau. The Fond du Lac YSB is one of the older youth service bureaus. Its third year of WCCJ funds expires in February, 1978.

The evaluators met with the director and staff of the

Fond du Lac County YSB in March, 1976, during the evaluation planning phase. Their input into the proposed evaluation methodology was obtained, and they provided information about their activities.

Another meeting was held in November, 1976 with all of the staff. They were encouraged to use the forms, and updated information on the project was obtained. Project staff have completed some Client Information Forms, but did not use Youth Surveys with their clients. Some Youth Surveys were completed by youth who used the Youth Center, and they seemed to enjoy completing the survey.

The YSB staff has attempted to change the juvenile justice process in the county. Finding this very difficult, they turned their efforts toward changing State legislation related to the juvenile justice system. They have joined those encouraging passage of the proposed Children Code revision. In addition, they have initiated a number of programs.

Counseling. The YSB has accepted referrals from law enforcement and the juvenile court. Only one staff member worked with providing individual counseling. This had gradually occupied less and less of his time, as fewer referrals were received.

Youth Center. The YSB studied the problems and declining use of the Fond du Lac Youth Center, a city owned facility. Their proposal to operate the center was accepted. They have gained funds for remodeling the building and have sponsored organized activities at the Center.

Youth Newspaper. A newspaper, "The Other Side," was written by youth and distributed. This was a vehicle for youth to express their opinions and a way to inform youth of activities.

Brown Bag Lunches. The YSB sponsored informal, noon-hour meetings of personnel from youth serving agencies. These monthly meetings were intended to increase communication and cooperation, reduce duplication, and improve the quality of services.

At the request of project staff, the evaluators helped develop a questionnaire to gain participants' opinion of these meetings.

Bicycle Moto-Cross. This program encouraged youth to participate in organizing an activity they would enjoy.

Ripon Citizens' Task Force on Youth. Public sessions were coordinated for adults and youth to express their opinions and become involved in identifying needs, establishing priorities and solving problems.

Resource Directory. A directory of youth services was compiled and distributed.

Evaluators' Observations

A variety of situations led to unsatisfactory data collection from this group of projects. In summary, these were:

--Late project start-up

--Project staff turnover

--Changes in project modes

--High priority funding needs that left little
   project energy for anything else

--Lack of colloboration with the evaluation

The last two factors were particularly frustrating. Enormous amounts of project staff time went into: writing follow-on proposals; obtaining matching funds; and, in lobbying for support and approval for project continuation. An estimate would be that

up to two project months, per project, annually, were used by these activities. During these critical pre-funding renewal periods, most project operations came to a halt.

Most project staffs were attitudinally positive and verbally agreeable toward data collection procedures. However, in many instances the data were not forthcoming. This left the evaluators helplessly waiting, with the only recourse being to encourage the individuals concerned to live up to the agreements that had been made.

Direct Service Projects

The aforementioned problems were experienced even more
severely with the three projects in this group. The result was
that only one of them could be used in part of the examination
of Direct Service accomplishments. Thus the evaluation was left
without the ability to make full comparisons of accomplishments
between between discrete project types. This will be discussed
more fully in the section on "Methodology." For more details about
these projects, see the consultants' individual assessment reports.

Outagamie County Youth Services. The evaluators met with the first
director and staff of Outagamie County Youth Services in March
and June, 1976, during the planning phase of the evaluation process.
The staff provided their input into the design of the evaluation
methodology, and they began working toward clarifying their goals
and objectives. The project's main activity was individual
counseling. The first director attended the Evaluation Training
Seminar in June, 1976.

The evaluators contacted the second director in September,
1976 to discuss the proposed evaluation methodology. A nine hour
meeting was held with the second director during the implementation
phase of the evaluation, in the fall of 1976. The evaluation
process was explained in detail and she was encouraged to clarify
the project's goals and objectives, and to use the Youth Surveys
and Client Information Forms. She promised to use them as soon
as she could convince her staff of their usefulness.

The project completed only the first page (intake information)
of the Client Information Forms. No follow-up information was
received, even though the evaluators requested it on more than one

occasion.

Youth Surveys were administered, but not according to the evaluation instructions. Six were distributed to a school detention hall and collected in a way that at least one of the youth was identifiable. The YSB staff reviewed that youth's survey and shared the information with the youth's social worker at the Department of Social Services. In a January, 1978 communication to the Senior Author, the Project Director asserted that she had obtained the youth's permission before divulging the survey responses. However, the evaluators are very concerned about this action that could be seen as an invasion of individual privacy. The concerns are in several areas.

--The survey cover letter, signed by the evaluators, promised confidentiality.

--No effort was made to consult with the evaluators before identifying and/or divulging the minor's responses.

--A fifteen year old minor's permission is not sufficient, in the absence of parental permission, to divulge the minor's confidential responses about herself and her family.

--Any knowledge, on the part of other youth, that responses had been divulged could have had unpredictable effects upon respondents in subsequent survey administrations

The lack of collaboration with the evaluation may have stemmed from a rather negative attitude toward it on the part of the second project director. She expressed this in the April, 1977, Evaluation Training Seminar by stating that evaluation is fun to talk about, but impossible to do.

Neither client follow-up data, nor youth surveys, or anecdotal information about the project had been forwarded to the evaluators by early summer, 1977. At that point, it was too late in terms

of evaluation deadline for any useable amount of follow-up information to be obtained. Therefore, in the interests of conserving valuable evaluation resources, no further contact was made with the project.

Marathon County Youth Service Bureau. The evaluators met with the first director and staff in February, 1976, during the evaluation planning phase. They made input into the evaluation methodology and were very interested in clarifying their goals and objectives. The director attended the evaluation training seminar in June, 1976.

It was reported to the evaluators that the project had problems since its planning phase because the Juvenile Court Judge wanted it under his control. The first director mentioned to WCCJ that mandatory referrals were being made to the YSB by the Court and the Probation Department, in violation of WCCJ guidelines. Most of the referrals were for truancy, and the YSB was required to refer the youths back to court if they continued to be truant. Allegedly, the first director was fired in June, 1976 for mentioning this to WCCJ. In order to fire the director, the Judge called a meeting of the Youth Commission, which he chaired. The group had only met once before. The Judge had refused the director's earlier requests to have regular board meetings.

The Judge hired a second director in the fall of 1976. At the request of WCCJ, the Youth Commission was revised to have a greater role in project supervision. One of the two counselors resigned soon after the second director began. The evaluators met with the staff and Youth Commission in December, 1976,

explaining the evaluation process in detail and seeking their cooperation.

A new counselor and secretary were hired and the entire staff attended the Evaluation Training Seminar in February, 1977, and were very interested in participating in the evaluation. They have very conscientiously forwarded client information forms and follow-up data, but they have never used the youth surveys, even though they often promised to begin "next month." The evaluators repeatedly encouraged them to use the surveys, explaining that the client data would be of limited value without the young people's self-report data.

The project directed most of its efforts at individual client counseling. During the summer of 1977, it had considered planning for community change efforts, but the second director resigned in August, 1977, and one counselor resigned soon after-wards. The remaining counselor and two secretaries turned in their resignations, but withdrew them. It is very uncertain as to whether the County will fund the project after WCCJ funds expire in 1978. The YSB is supervised now by the same person who directs the County Special Education Department, and is receiving very few client referrals because agencies do not know if the YSB will exist much longer.

Beloit Youth Service Bureau. The evaluators met with the first director and staff of the Beloit YSB in March, 1976 and gained their input into planning and evaluation methodology. Before the first director left in the fall of 1976, the project emphasized individual counseling.

The second director began in December, 1976. The evaluation
process was discussed with him by telephone in January and the
evaluators met with him and his staff in February, 1977. Also,
the YSB staff attended the Evaluation Training Seminar in February.

The YSB had conflicts with its parent agency, the Rock County
Community Action Program, concerning use of one staff member's
time. Apparently, the CAP agency wanted him to organize community
groups for the provision of services to adults, while the project
staff believed that WCCJ was funding the project to work with
youth. The youth worker left because of this conflict. The
second director left during the summer of 1977. At that point
only one staff member was left.

The third director began in October, 1977, too late for the
project's full involvement in the evaluation process. The
project sent some Youth Surveys, but none of the youth completed
follow-ups.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation was an incremental process that built upon the developmental steps taken during a six-month planning and design phase. Measurement procedures varied among the Youth Service Bureaus to some extent so as to mesh with each project's activities and specific objectives. Despite this "tailoring" to bureau types, it was intended that the obtained information would coalesce into a description of Wisconsin Y.S.B. accomplishments--or lack of them.

There has been general agreement that the generic and broadly stated goal of the Wisconsin Y.S.B. program is:

> To contribute to the reduction of existing youth problems, and to their prevention.

"Youth problems" are defined for this evaluation as comprising several categories of societal difficulties experienced by people under the age of eighteen:

--<u>Delinquent Behavior</u>. Those actions defined by law as delinquent.

--<u>Delinquency Processing</u>. The sequence of official responses to delinquent behavior that forward a youth from one juvenile justice component to the next.

--<u>Unemployment</u>. The condition of being without gainful employment while being desirous and capable of it, especially for those youth who are legally eligible to work.

--<u>School Difficulties</u>.

    A.   Academic retardation or deficiency in the absence of intellectual deficit.

        B. Behavioral infractions, expecially those resulting in school discipline, such as suspension, expulsion, or referral to juvenile justice.

        C. Termination of academic careers in the absence of full-time employment.

        D. Lack of opportunity to make input into school processes and procedures.

        E. Routine reliance (as defined by a given Youth Service Bureau) upon traditional discipline automatically administered, such as suspension, expulsion and referral to juvenile justice.

--<u>Lack of Access to Meaningful Roles</u> (as defined by a give Youth Service Bureau) that would allow youth to have a stake in society.

--<u>Labelling</u>. The description of certain youth as less than desirable, i.e., "disturbed," "delinquent," "retarded," or "bad."

--<u>Family Conflict</u>. Problematic relationships within families, especially those that are seen to underlie behavior defined as runaway or incorrigible.

There is general agreement among youth workers that the above-described phenomena are major societal problems faced by youth today. A decrease in any of them, therefore, can be accepted as a legitimate objective, the accomplishment of which contributes to achieving the generic goal. Repeated discussions with Wisconsin Youth Service Bureau personnel during the last two years indicate that such decreases are, in fact, the YSB's outcome objectives.

<u>Outcome Measurement</u>

The evaluation design rested primarily upon measurement of change (increase or decrease) in the above listed dependent

variables (youth problems). That is, measurements were attempted of each pertinent dependent variable before and after given YSB interventions that constituted the study's independent variables (counseling, youth involvement, job finding, etc.). Outcome data were primarily of two types. The first relied upon project staff observations of individual youth. Secondly, in the absence of reliable official data descriptive of individual delinquent behavior, the more expensive and time-consuming self-report approach was used.

Process Objectives

The varying approaches of the youth service projects within the purview of this evaluation were categorized into two protypical program models:

--Direct Service. The assumption underlying this type of program is that one or more remediable conditions exist within the child and/or in the child's immediate environment that gives rise to the specific set of problems experienced by the individual. Two primary levels of project activity result from this assumption:

A. Diagnosis, or identification of individual service needs.

B. The provision of specific services aimed at alleviating the individual's difficulties.

The data collection was designed to provide for a quantification of both types of activities. The result was the ability to measure the degree to which each project accomplished process objectives such as

"to provide crisis counselling to 100 youth referred by law enforcement agencies." In addition, the data instrument required the identification of three case types for which services were provided:

A. Prevention. Child not in trouble; could not have been referred to court; danger of future court referral.

B. Intervention. Child in trouble; could have been referred to court, but would not have been so referred.

C. Diversion. Child referred to YSB in lieu of court processing.

This "case typing" permitted additional process measurements to be made, such as the number of youth diverted from juvenile justice due to the given project's existence.

--Community Change, Youth Involvement. The primary assumption underlying this bureau prototype is that specific conditions within communities give rise to large-scale youth problems. Project methodology, then, consists of identifying and remediating community deficiencies, such as: Inadequate or non-existent services; youth unemployment; lack of involvement of youth in community problem-solving; and, bureaucratic rigidities that result in systematic discrimination against youth (exclusion from decision-making) or in rote decisions injurious to youth (academic "tracking," automatic school expulsion, unwarranted juvenile justice processing).

Heavy evaluation emphasis was placed upon process description and upon examining how well community change projects accomplished process objectives, among which were:

A. Improved coordination and quality of existing
    community youth services.

B. Bringing about the filling of gaps in community
    youth services.

C. Increased youth employment opportunities.

D. Increased involvement of the community (including
    lay people) in accomplishing the above.

E. Increased direct involvement of youth in community
    processes and decision-making.

Close scrutiny of the community-change process was
indicated for two reasons. First, if this model proves
successful, there will be a need to understand how and
why it provides the desired outcome. Second, the com-
munity change approach to youth development is in the
innovative forefront of approaches aimed at alleviating
youth problems. Thus, if the Wisconsin experience
succeeds, an explication of the methodology will facilitate
replication of the approaches in other parts of the nation.

The collection of process data, then, was tailored
to these needs, and to project function. For example,
each community change project was asked to record
detailed information according to the following outline:

A. Brief title of the indicated problem.

B. List the sources and activities that were relied
    upon to identify the problem.

C. Identify the targets to be impacted in order to
    remediate the problem.

D. List the activities that will be carried out to
    impact the target.

   E. Describe the changes expected.

      1. Target impact

      2. Problem resolution

   F. Specify any logical and reasonable success criterion.

   G. Date by which that specified in E and/or F will
      be accomplished.

This before-the-fact information not only avoids ac-
cusations of after-the-fact anecdotal justification,
but sets the stage for structured follow-up after the
time interval set by G, per results as defined by C
through F.

Evaluation Scope and Goals

The evaluation was designed to estimate Wisconsin's
program level effectiveness in reducing and/or preventing
youth problems, especially delinquency, by means of state
funding of a wide variety of youth service bureaus, developed
idiosyncratically to meet self-perceived community needs.
In addition, each project was in operation a different
amount of time, and with virtually no built-in evaluation design.
Ordinarily, such a situation would not be amenable to impact
evaluation. In the present circumstance, the State's desire
for evaluation, its ability to provide evaluation resources,
and the stated willingness of the individual bureaus to
collaborate in the evaluation process, combined with the
innovative features of the community-change models, made
comprehensive, impact evaluation a possibility.

Goals

The evaluation methodology was aimed at providing
answers to two program level questions:

A. Does Wisconsin's Youth Services Programming reduce and/or prevent youth problems, especially delinquency?

B. Which of the two general program approaches, Direct Service or Community Change, is most effective in reducing and/or preventing youth problems, especially delinquency?

Detailed Procedures

Project - supplied data were used to describe the client groups, the service inputs, and the individual outcomes of the Direct Service bureaus. A similiar approach was applied to youth involved with Community Development projects. (See Appendices B and C). Project staff were not relied upon solely to describe youth outcomes.

An additional, more objective data approach was created to add explanatory power to the evaluation. For both the Direct Service and Community Change bureaus, pre-post, Program vs. Comparison Group measurements were implemented as a result of the following procedures.

Within two weeks of each youth's involvement with either type of bureau, the youth was to be asked by bureau staff to complete a rather comprehensive survey dealing with:

--The individual's perceptions of youth problems in the given community

--Blocked access to academic and employment goals

--Labelling by significant others

--Normlessness

--Alienation

--Self Concept

--Self reported delinquency

--Contacts with juvenile justice

This type of survey (see Appendix E) is in line with the theoretical underpinnings of the National Strategy for Youth Development, Office of Youth Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and has been demonstrated to be reliable and valid.[4]

Upon completion of the survey, the youth was directed to seal it in an envelope addressed to the evaluation office in Madison. The respondent, then, was asked to give the names and addresses of three close friends (people with whom respondent spends leisure time) who might be willing to answer the same survey. Each of the friends so identified was sent a survey, with an enclosed envelope addressed to the evaluation office.

Names, addresses, and I.D. numbers of the initial respondents and of their counterpart friends were kept as master lists within the respective bureaus, while the survey responses went directly to the evaluation staff, along with corresponding I.D. numbers. Four months later, for each respondent, the "Post" survey was sent by the appropriate bureau, with the same overall procedure being followed. Thus, individual privacy and confidentiality was maintained strictly,

[4] Behavioral Research and Evaluation Corporation, *Theory Validation and Aggregate National Data: Integration Report of OYD Research FY 1975.*

according to the guidelines issued by the National Academy of Sciences in 1975.[5]

The above process produced pre-post measures from two research groups:

--The Project Group, comprised of those youngsters who experienced the effects of the particular programs in which they were involved.

--The Comparison Group. The identification of close friends by the Program Group individual was considered a matching technique, in that "close friends" can be considered as very much like each other in most important respects. However, similarity was examined, rather than merely assumed. The "Pre" survey responses from the two groups were compared for similarities and differences on all pertinent variables. Any obtained differences were taken into account in later analyses.

The matching process was maintained throughout. That is, any one survey gap (Pre or Post) occurring in either group resulted in the elimination of all four analytic units from the evaluation.

The overall approach was designed to allow several comparisons to be made:

--Pre. The Program vs. Comparison on:

1. Socio demographic characteristics--In. V.

[5] National Academy of Sciences, *Protecting Individual Privacy in Evaluation Research*, Washington, D.C., 1975.

2. Blocked access to academic and employment goals--In. V.

3. Labelling by significant others--In. V.

4. Normlessness-In. V.

5. Alienation--In. V.

6. Self concept--In. V.

7. Self reported delinquency--D. V.

8. Contacts with Juvenile Justice--D. V.

--Post changes in the intervening variables (In. V.) and dependent variables (D.V.) between the program and comparison groups. The program hypotheses was significant improvement on each of the dependent variables. Each bureau was encouraged, however, to specify which, if any of the intervening variables would be expected to show improvement--based upon its methodology. Each project was asked to specify upon which dimension of youth problems, in addition to delinquency, that the maximum impact would be expected.

In addition to meeting impact evaluation needs, the survey approach provided management planning data feedback to the projects in two areas:

--Service needs as perceived by the client population

--Community Youth Problems in the need of attention, in the opinion of youth. Any bureau, in addition, could have used the survey to obtain responses from additional groups of youth, e.g., all tenth graders.

The remaining evaluation procedure included in the "package" pertained to Community Change Bureaus. Here, the

focus was upon estimating the nature and extent of the community changes for which each bureau was responsible, and upon the processes used to bring them about. A simple strategy was developed for this. Each community change bureau was asked to provide the following information, according to the formats provided in Appendix E:

Pro-Active

--Identify the specific change target. This is to be recorded as the decision is made to work on particular problem, e.g., "To increase juvenile diversion by Police."

--Indicate the procedures and information used to identify the particular target.

--Outline the broad steps to be followed in bringing about the change.

Retroactive

--List the steps taken in attacking the problem and in overcoming obstacles.

--Described the actual target impacts, i.e., the changes that occurred.

The pro-active information was forwarded to the evaluation staff prior to taking any "target action." The retroactive data were forwarded as appropriate. In any instance in which the pro-active information indicated to the evaluation staff that objective measurements of change were possible, efforts were made to develop and implement them.

As can be seen from all of the above, flexibility was planned into the overall evaluation framework so that each bureau could "call its shots" rather than simply being forced into an enmasse evaluation of dubious pertinence.

The Evaluation Period. All evaluation information was collected between October 1, 1976 and December 31, 1977. The follow-up data, however, represent a briefer time interval. A four-month period was used for post-involvement follow-up, and almost two months were needed for data processing, computer analyses, and for report preparation. Thus, the number of youth included in the impact portion of the Survey Study was limited to those who became involved with projects in the period October 1, 1976, to August, 1977.

The data descriptive of youth and of service inputs, on the other hand, represent, in addition to those above, some young people that participated with projects prior to October 1, 1976. This was accomplished by some project staffs collecting and providing post hoc data. The major effects of the time constraints, then, were:

--The validity of the staff-supplied data was weakened somewhat because a portion of it was supplied from memory

--The number of youth included differed in each portion of the quantitative research

--The experimental portion was based upon smaller than desirable samples

These issues will be expanded upon in the appropriate sections of the next chapter.

Results

The project staff turnover, the project workloads, and
the lack of cooperation that were described earlier seriously
impaired the evaluation data collection. Despite the fact
that over 1600 individual youth were in direct contact with
the nine projects during the evaluation period, there were
insufficient data to complete the evaluation process adequately
for any given project. (See Table A, on the next page.) The
most pervasive problem was with the Youth Surveys. The Direct
Service projects ignored them, while the Mixed Type projects
forwarded none or so few, initially, that the follow-up number
was nil. The three Community Change projects, however, can not
be faulted. The Brown County Youth Resources Council and Kenosha
County Advocates for Youth administered the surveys conscientiously.
Two other problems arose in connection with them, though. BCYRC
involved only thirty-three youth during the evaluation, and the
sixty percent return rate diminished the sample still further.
The situation with KCAY was quite different. It sent out almost
300 surveys that were never delivered. Even most of a second
mailing failed to reach the recipients. According to the project's
report, the local post office did not consider the large envelopes
worth being delivered! Racine County Youth Service, on the other
hand, simply involved too few youth--less than twelve during
the evaluation.

To a large extent, the Youth Surveys were the most crucial
evaluation component for several reasons.

> --Unlike the data supplied by project staff, they
> could be expected to be free of worker bias--the
> human tendency to see improvement in the child, even
> when there is none, because of ego involvement on
> the part of the project person.

Table A

Number of Youth Included in the Evaluation and Number of Data Forms Received from Each Project.
"Client Data Forms" Were Expected from Direct Service Projects Only. "Youth Involvement Forms"
Were to Be Forwarded by Community Change Projects. All Projects Were to Have Used the "Youth Survey

Project	No. of Project Youth During the Evaluation Period	Client Data Forms		Youth Involvement Forms		Youth Survey			
						Initial		Follow-up	
		Initial	Follow-up	Initial	Follow-up	Project Group	Comp. Group	Project Group	Comp. Group
Direct Service Type									
Marathon YSB	125	125	120			None	None	--	--
Outagamie YSB	218	218	None			None	None	--	--
Washington YSB	112	112	109			None	None	--	--
Mixed Type									
Beloit YSB	200 Approx.	None	None			12	18	1	None
Fond du Lac YSB	144	18	13			14	10	None	--
Sheboygan YSB	543	None	None	6	5	5	5	1	None
Winnebago Project Youth	90	82	None	42	None	None	--	--	--
Community Change Type									
Brown County Youth Resources Council	73 (38 fr. prior to Oct. 1)			72	71	24	34	15	16
Kenosha County Advocates for Youth	110			109	96	110	28	18	13
Racine County Youth Services	Less than 12			--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	1615	555	242	229	172	165	95	35	29

--They were intended to obtain youth self perceptions, which is done rarely in the course of a youth-project evaluation.

--They were the vehicle for the experimental design; for the Pre-Post comparisons of the Project vs. Comparison Groups.

Though this portion of the evaluation was weakened considerably, some valuable data were obtained. These will be discussed later, in the section delineating Community Change results.

Direct Services

Two of the three Direct Service projects, the Marathon County and Washington County YSBs, provided adequate initial and follow-up data on their clients, while none of the Mixed Type Projects did so. Outagamie YSB (Direct Service) and Winnebago Project Youth (Mixed Type) forwarded a considerable number of Initial Client Data Forms, but failed to complete any Four-Month Follow-up Forms.

Client Data. The data descriptive of 555 youth clients are summarized in Table B, starting on the next page. They represent the client characteristics of four of the projects: Marathon, Outagamie, Washington, and Winnebago. The eighteen youth in the Fond du Lac sample can not be considered representative of the 144 with whom it dealt directly.

As can be seen from the table, the client youth's mean age was just under fifteen, and less than three percent were minority group members. Only sixty-six percent had parents who were married and living together, while less than fifty-nine percent lived with their natural parents, and just over nine percent of the families were on welfare.

Table B

Client and Case Characteristics of 555 Youth Referred to
Five Direct-Service Bureaus from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Mean Age	14.9		Sex		N	%
Minimum Age	5.0		Female		269	48.5
Maximum Age	21.0		Male		286	51.5
				Total	555	100.0

Ethnicity		N	%	School Status		N	%
Black		2	.4	Enrolled		524	94.8
White		538	97.6	Not Enrolled		27	4.9
Mexican		3	.5	High School Grad.		2	.3
Native Amer.		8	1.5		Total	553	100.0
Other		-	-	Missing		2	
	Total	551	100.0				
Missing		4					

Last Grade in Which Enrolled (Currently or Previously)

Number in Household

Mean	9.3		Mean	5.1
Minimum	0.0		Minimum	1.0
Maximum	13.0		Maximum	15.0

Youth Living With	N	%	Parents' Marital Status	N	%
Natural Parents	308	58.6	Married and Living Together	343	65.6
Mother Only	128	24.3			
Father Only	10	1.9	Divorced or Separated	152	29.1
Mother and Step-Father	42	8.0			
Father and Step-Mother	9	1.7	Never Married	2	.4
			One Parent Deceased	26	5.0
Foster Family	6	1.1			
Relatives	9	1.7	Other	0	0
Independent Arrangement	2	.4	Total	523	100.0
Residential Place-ment	2	.4	Missing	32	
Other	9	1.7			
Unknown	1	.2			
Total	526	100.0			
Missing	29				

Table B (Continued)

Client and Case Characteristics of 555 Youth Referred to
Five Direct-Service Bureaus from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Family on Welfare		N	%
Yes		37	9.2
No		169	41.9
Unknown		197	48.9
	Total	403	100.0
Missing		152	

Referral Was:			
Mandatory		57	10.3
Voluntary		495	89.7
	Total	552	100.0
Missing		3	

Referred by:			
Law Enforcement		62	11.3
Court Worker before Adjudication		37	6.8
Court Worker after Adjudication		11	2.0
Juvenile Court Judge		4	.7
School		152	27.7
Other Agency		86	15.7
Parent		59	10.8
Friend		41	7.5
Self		72	13.1
Other		24	4.4
	Total	548	100.0
Missing		7	

Table B (Continued)

Client and Case Characteristics of 555 Youth Referred to
Five Direct-Service Bureaus from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Reason for Referral	N	%
Crimes Against Persons		
Forcible Rape	1	.2
Assault and Battery	1	.2
Crimes Against Property		
Burglary	7	1.3
Auto Theft	1	.2
Shoplifting	16	2.9
Other Theft	8	1.4
Forgery	1	.2
Embezzlement	1	.2
Poss. Stolen Property	2	.4
Vandalism	1	.2
Other Offenses		
Weapon Poss.	1	.2
Drug Law Viol.	4	.7
Disorderly Conduct	1	.2
Status Offenses		
Runaway	43	7.8
Curfew	91	16.5
Ungovernable Behavior	32	5.8
Liquor Violation	9	1.6
Other Status Offenses	1	.2
Return to Court	1	.2
Traffic Offenses		
Driving without License	2	.4
Dependency or Neglect		
Lack of Adequate Care or Support	3	.5
Conditions Injurious	1	.2
Abuse, Cruel Treatment	2	.4
Other Dep. or Neg.	1	.2
Termination of Parents Rights	1	.2

Table B (Continued)

Client and Case Characteristics of 555 Youth Referred to
Five Direct-Service Bureaus from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Reason for Referral (Continued)	N	%
Non-Offense Reasons		
Family Relationships	93	16.8
Relationships with Peers	20	3.6
School Behavior Problems	16	2.9
School Academic Problems	7	1.3
School Adjustment	7	1.3
Emotional Difficulties	29	5.2
Physical, Medical, Nutritional	4	.7
Economic Problems	11	2.0
Drug Problems	11	2.0
Alcohol Problems	6	1.1
Pregnancy/Parenthood Difficulties	3	.5
Wants a Job	47	8.5
Other	58	10.5
Unknown	9	1.6
Total	553	100.0
Missing	2	

Number of Occurrences of Reason for
Referral during Four Months Prior
to Referral

Mean	7.2
Minimum	0
Maximum	102.0

Other Identified Problems - 1

Crimes Against Property

Burglary	5	1.3
Shoplifting	10	2.6
Other Theft	2	.5
Stolen Property	1	.3
Vandalism	3	.8

Other Offenses

Weapons	2	.5
Drug Law	2	.5

Status Offenses

Runaway	15	3.9
Truancy	14	3.6
Curfew	2	.5

Table B (Continued)

Client and Case Characteristics of 555 Youth Referred to
Five Direct-Service Bureaus from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Other Identified Problems- 1 (Cont.)	N	%

Status Offenses (cont.)

Ungovernable Behavior	12	3.1
Possess/Drinking Liquor	3	.8
Other Status Offense	1	.3

Traffic Offenses

Driving without License	1	.3

Non-Care

Lack of Adequate Care/Support	2	.5
Conditions Injurious	1	.3
Abuse/Cruel Treatment	4	1.0
Other Dependency/Neglect	3	.8
Termination Parental Rights	1	.3

Non-Offense Reasons

Family Relationships	121	31.3
Relationships with Peers	28	7.2
School Behavioral Problems	19	4.9
School Academic Problems	19	4.9
School Adjustment	11	2.8
Emotional Difficulties	31	8.0
Physical/Medical/Nutritional	9	2.3
Economic Problems	12	3.1
Drug Problems	13	3.4
Alcohol Problems	7	1.8
Pregnancy/Parenthood Difficulties	2	.5
Wants a Job	12	3.1
Other	14	3.6
Unknown	5	1.3
Total	387	100.0
Missing	168	

Other Identified Problems- 2

Crimes Against Property

Robbery with Weapon	1	.4
Shoplifting	2	.9
Forgery and Counterfeiting	1	.4
Stolen Property	1	.4
Vandalism	2	.9

Table B (Continued)

Client and Case Characteristics of 555 Youth Referred to
Five Direct-Service Bureaus from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Other Identified Problems - 2 (Cont.)	N	%
Other Offenses		
Drug Laws	2	.9
Disorderly Conduct	1	.4
Status Offenses		
Runaway	3	1.3
Truancy	15	6.6
Curfew	1	.4
Ungovernable Behavior	7	3.1
Possess/Drinking Liquor	3	1.3
Traffic Offenses		
Other Traffic Offenses	1	.4
Non-Care		
Lack Adequate Care/Support	2	.9
Abuse, Cruel Treatment	2	.9
Other Dependency or Neglect	6	2.6
Non-Offense Reasons		
Family Relationships	37	16.3
Relationships with Peers	18	7.9
School Behavioral Problems	10	4.4
School Academic Problems	15	6.6
School Adjustment	15	6.6
Emotional Difficulties	33	14.5
Physical/Medical/Nutritional	2	.9
Economic Problems	6	2.6
Drug Problems	10	4.4
Alcohol Problems	7	3.1
Pregnancy/Parenthood Difficulties	2	.9
Wants a Job	15	6.6
Other	5	2.2
Unknown	2	.9
Total	227	100.0
Missing	328	

Table B (Continued)

Client and Case Characteristics of 555 Youth Referred to
Five Direct-Service Bureaus from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Type of Case		N	%
Prevention		228	41.9
Intervention		114	21.0
Diversion		74	13.6
Other		128	23.5
	Total	544	100.0
Missing		11	

Did the Referral Result
from Contact with:

Court			
Yes		39	7.0
No		516	93.0
	Total	555	100.0

Police			
Yes		66	11.9
No		489	88.1
	Total	555	100.0

State Institution			
Yes		1	.2
No		554	99.8
	Total	555	100.0

Other			
Yes		16	2.9
No		539	97.1
	Total	555	100.0

Youth on Probation?			
Yes		18	3.6
No		481	96.4
	Total	499	100.0
Missing		56	

If This Case Was A Referral Was It:			
Closed		15	93.8
Open		1	6.2
	Total	16	100.0
Missing		539	

The major referral source for the projects was the school
system, at almost twenty-eight percent, while law enforcement
accounted for only eleven percent. Just under ninety percent
of all referrals were voluntary. Reasons for referral
reflected the referral sources in that only eight percent of the
clients were referred as a result of criminal offenses. Fifty-
six percent of the clients arrived at the bureaus due to non-
offense reasons, such as disturbed family relationships (16.8%).
Over two thirds of the youth were described as having secondary
problems, primary among them being disturbed family relationships,
and emotional difficulties.

One fact worthy of note was in regard to case type. The
projects' personnel classified less than fourteen percent of
their cases as instances of diversion. Since diverting youth
away from further contact with the Juvenile Justice System is
a major objective of Direct Service projects, it can be said
that the objective was not accomplished very well.

Included in the Direct Service data collection on clients was
a form to be completed by referring agencies. (See Appendix B.)
The information sought, here, was the agencies' classifications of
case types, as to whether each case was an instance of "prevention,"
"intervention," "diversion," or "other."   The staff of Washington County
YSB and the Marathon County YSB completed this page after asking the referring
agencies their opinions as to the type of case. The referring agencies'
categorization was usually the same as the project staff's opinion.

Direct Services Delivery. Part three of the staff-provided
client data was the Service Delivery Record, which was completed
at case termination. These data made possible: a description
of client service needs; whether or not the services were pro-
vided; if provided, by whom; if not, why not; duration of service
provision; and frequency of provision. In all, 242 completed
follow-up forms were forwarded to the evaluators. As is in-
dicated in Table A, these were primarily from Marathon and
Washington YSBs, who followed-up on ninety-six percent and
ninety-seven percent of their cases, respectively. Outagamie
(218 cases) and Winnebago (eighty-two cases) failed to forward
any follow-up data. Fond du Lac followed up on thirteen of
the eighteen initial cases submitted, but these can not be
considered representative of its 144 cases dealt with during the
evaluation period. Thus, the service delivery data can be
accepted as representing the service delivery of only Marathon
and Washington YSBs.

It can be seen from Table C, in which these data are
summarized (next page), that for the 242 clients the greatest
staff-assessed, client need was for counseling: Individual (78.1%);
and Family (66.5%). This is an expected result, since these
YSBs were organized primarily and specifically to provide
counseling to problem youth and their families. Counselling is
seen by the Direct Service type of YSB, generally, as the most
effective method of reducing and/or preventing delinquent behavior.
This is the case despite the fact that no rigorously conducted
evaluation of counseling, per se, has shown it capable of accom-
plishing such results. More will be said about this in a later
section.

Table C

Service Delivery Record for 242 Clients Representative of the Washington County and Marathon County Youth Service Bureaus, During the Evaluation Period October 1, 1976 to December 31, 1977

Type of Service and Number of Clients Needing the Services (N = 242)	Needed Service Provided by YSB		Needed Service Provided by Other Agencies		Those Not Receiving Service, and Why		Duration of Service (in Weeks)	Frequency		
Individual Counseling	N	%	N	%	N	%		Code*	N	%
N %	157	64.9	63	33.3	5	2.7	Mean 14.6	1	18	10.3
189 78.1							Min. 1.0	2	14	8.1
					Refused by Youth 1		Max. 65.0	3	25	14.4
					Refused by Parent 1			4	50	28.7
					Client Disatisfied 1			5	21	12.1
					Other 2			6	1	.6
								9	1	.6
								10	44	25.3
									174	
Family Counseling										
161 66.5	114	70.8	69	42.9	9	5.6	Mean 15.0	1	22	15.6
					Refused by Youth 2		Min. 1.0	2	21	14.9
					Refused by Parent 6		Max. 65.0	3	18	12.8
					Other			4	26	18.4
								5	7	5.0
								10	47	33.3
									141	
Group Counseling										
16 6.6	11	68.8	3	18.8	2	12.5	Mean 12.2	4	10	90.9
					Program Did Not Exist 1		Min. 12.0	10	1	9.1
					Refused by Youth 2		Max. 14.0		11	

*Frequency Codes

1 - Once	3 - Twice Monthly	5 - Twice Weekly	7 - Four Times/wk	9 - Daily
2 - Monthly	4 - Weekly	6 - Three Times/wk	8 - Five Times/wk	10 - Irregular

Table C (Continued)

Type of Service and Number of Clients Needing the Services (N = 242)		Needed Service Provided by YSB		Needed Service Provided by Other Agencies		Those Not Receiving Service, and Why		Duration of Service (in Weeks)	Frequency		
Drug Program											
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		Code*	N	%
7	2.9	1	14.3	4	57.1	3	42.9	Mean 47.5	2	1	25.0
						Program Did Not Exist 1		Min. 43.0	3	1	25.0
						Refused by Youth 2		Max. 52.0	4	2	50.0
										4	
Job Referral											
53	21.9	37	69.8	9	17.0	11	20.8	Mean 14.5	1	8	22.2
						Referral OK, But No Job 10		Min. 1.0	3	1	2.8
						Other 1		Max. 26.0	4	9	25.0
									7	5	13.9
									8	2	5.6
									9	5	13.9
									10	6	16.7
										36	
Tutoring											
None											
Alternate Education											
33	13.6	1	3.0	27	81.8	6	18.2	Mean 23.6	1	1	4.6
						Program Did Not Exist 2		Min. 1.0	5	1	4.6
						Too Long to Wait 1		Max. 40.0	8	7	31.8
						Program Refused Client 1			9	13	59.1
						Refused by Youth 2				22	

*Frequency Codes

1 - Once	3 - Twice Monthly	5 - Twice Weekly	7 - Four Times/wk	9 - Daily
2 - Monthly	4 - Weekly	6 - Three Times/wk	8 - Five Times/wk	10 - Irregular

-72-

Table C (Continued)

Type of Service and Number of Clients Needing the Services (N = 242)	Needed Service Provided by YSB		Needed Service Provided by Other Agencies		Those Not Receiving Service, and Why		Duration of Service (in Weeks)		Frequency		
Vocational Training											
N %	N	%	N	%	N	%			Code*	N	%
1 .4	--	--	1	100.0	--	--	Mean	16	9	1	100.0
Recreational Program											
31 12.8	29	93.6	--	--	1 12.9		Mean	3.7	4	2	6.7
					Refused by Youth 1		Min.	1.0	9	4	13.3
							Max.	4.0	10	24	80.0
										30	
Medical											
12 5.0	2	16.7	8	66.7	2 16.7		Mean	2.0	1	4	40.0
					Refused by Youth 1		Min.	1.0	2	1	10.0
					Refused by		Max.	4.0	3	1	10.0
					Parent 1				4	3	30.0
									7	1	10.0
										10	
Legal											
None											
Youth Advocacy - School											
122 50.4	122	100.0	4	3.3	--	--	Mean	6.8	1	15	14.3
							Min.	1.0	2	9	8.6
							Max.	19.0	3	12	11.5
									4	21	20.0
									5	2	1.9
									7	1	1.0
									8	4	3.8
									10	41	39.1
										105	

*Frequency Codes

1 - Once	3 - Twice Monthly	5 - Twice Weekly	7 - Four Times/wk	9 - Daily
2 - Monthly	4 - Weekly	6 - Three Times/wk	8 - Five Times/wk	10 - Irregular

-73-

Table C (Continued)

Type of Service and Number of Clients Needing the Services (N = 242)		Needed Service Provided by YSB		Needed Service Provided by Other Acencies		Those Not Receiving Service, and Wh᾿		Duration of Service (in Weeks᾿		Frequency		

Youth Advocacy - Police

N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			Code*	N	%
11	4.6	11	100.0	--	--	--	--	Mean	2.0	1	4	36.4
								Min.	2.0	2	1	9.1
								Max.	2.0	10	6	54.5
											11	

Youth Advocacy - Court

9	3.7	9	100.0	--	--	--	--	Mean	1.0	1	5	71.4
								Min.	1.0	10	2	28.6
								Max.	1.0		7	

Youth Advocacy - Probation

11	4.6	11	100.0	--	--	--	--	Mean	4.7	1	3	30.0
								Min.	0.0	3	1	10.0
								Max.	8.0	10	6	60.0
											10	

Shelter

14	5.8	1	7.1	10	71.4	3	21.4	Mean	5.4	1	1	12.5
								Min.	0.0	4	1	12.5
				Refused by Parent 2				Max.	12.0	9	5	62.5
				Unknown 1						10	1	12.5
											8	

*Frequency Codes
1 - Once   3 - Twice Monthly   5 - Twice Weekly   7 - Four Times/wk   9 - Daily
2 - Monthly   4 - Weekly   6 - Three Times/wk   8 - Five Times/wk   10 Irregular

-74-

Table C (Continued)

Type of Service and Number of Clients Needing the Services (N = 242)		Needed Service Provided by YSB		Needed Service Provided by Other Agencies		Those Not Receiving Service, and Wh		Duration of Service in Weeks)		Frequency		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			Code*	N	%
Involvement in Systems Change Project (Mostly Fond du Lac YSB)												
17	7.0	14	82.4	-	-	3	17.7	Mean	20.4	4	1	7.1
						Referral OK, No Jobs 1		Min.	13.0	6	2	14.3
								Max.	26.0	7	5	35.7
						Other 2				8	5	35.7
										9	1	7.1
											14	
Other												
59	24.4	48	81.4	9	15.3	5	8.5	Mean	15.0	1	5	10.4
								Min.	1.0	2	2	4.2
						Too Long to Wait 1		Max.	56.0	3	2	4.2
						Refused by Youth 2				4	11	22.9
						Other 2				5	9	18.8
										6	5	10.4
										7	1	2.1
										8	6	12.5
										9	1	2.1
										10	6	12.5
											48	

*Frequency Codes

1 - Once	3 - Twice Monthly	5 - Twice Weekly	7 - Four Times/wk	9 - Daily
2 - Monthly	4 - Weekly	6 - Three Times/wk	8 - Five Times/wk	10 - Irregular

- 75 -

Table C (Continued)

Totals

Type of Service and Number of Clients Needing the Services (N = 242)	Needed Service Provided by YSB		Needed Service Provided by Other Agencies		Those Not Receiving Service, and Why		Duration f Service (in Weeks)	Frequency
	Met by YSB		Met By Other Agency		Unmet		ean Weeks Per Client	
Totals	N	%	N	%	N	%		
					50	6.7	12.8	
Instances of Need 746	568	76.1	204	27.4				
Average Per Youth 3.1								

Number of YSB Contacts with:

Client		Others		Unmet Due to Service Lack	
				N	%
Mean	7.0	Mean	6.9	17	2.3
Min.	0.0	Min.	0.0		
Max.	44.0	Max.	75.0		

Overall, the client population was seen as having slightly more than three service needs per individual. The YSBs met most of these needs (76.1%), while referrals to other agencies obtained the needed services for most of the remaining youth (27.4%). (Provision of services totals to more than 100 percent because some youth obtained the same service from the YSB, initially, and then from another agency, upon referral.)

The overwhelming majority of client youth received the indicated services. Very few did not (6.7%). Still fewer failed to get service due to some lack in the community (2.3%) and most of these were due to the absence of available jobs (1.5%). Thus, the two YSBs did well in providing/obtaining services for the client youth. Also, there seemed to be virtually no service gaps for youth in Marathon and Washington Counties.

Finally, the mean duration of service provided was just under thirteen weeks per client, with the counseling mean being less than fifteen weeks. Thus, the mean service duration fell within the evaluation follow-up period (16 weeks). Thus, at least some of whatever impact that would have been expected from the Direct Service input should have been apparent by the end of the four-month follow-up interval.

Direct Service Impact. A separate, four-month, post-YSB contact study was conducted in order to determine Direct Service outcome and impact, as perceived by project personnel. Completed Direct Service, four-month, follow-up Information Forms (Appendix B) were received for 242 clients. Again, these were representative

of just two YSBs, Marathon and Washington. The four-month interval accomplished two purposes:

--It standardized the follow-up period for each client

--An important comparison was made possible: number of occurrences of reason for referral could be compared four months subsequent vs. four months prior to YSB referral.

The most salient feature of the outcome and impact data summarized in Table D (next page) is the discrepancy between the client improvement, as perceived by project staff, and the lack of change indicated by the Pre-Post comparison of "reason for referral, incidents."

Project workers assessed a majority of the clients (68.4%) as displaying some decrease in the referral problem, with over a quarter of the problems (28.8%) being seen as "greatly de-creased." The results were comparable in terms of additional problems identified. Data on seventy-four cases referred to other agencies are nearly identical, and are not tabled here. On the other hand, the more objective measurement of service impact, the four month Pre-Post comparison of "number of occurrences of reason for referral" resulted in no significant difference be-tween the two. The comparison was:

Number of Occurrences of Each Reason for Referral

During Four Months Prior	Point of Referral to YSB	During Four Months Subsequent
Mean 7.0		Mean 7.5
Min. 0.0		Min. 0.0
Max. 102.0		Max. 174.0

These results are in line with those obtained from other studies of Direct Service, delinquency reduction projects,

Table D

Four Month Follow-up and Impact Data on 222 Direct-Service Clients Representative of the Marathon County and Washington County YSB Client Population for the Period October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

How Much Has the Reason for Referral to the YSB Changed?	N	%
Problem Greatly Decreased	62	28.8
Problem Slightly Decreased	85	39.5
No Change	55	25.6
Slightly Increased	6	2.8
Greatly Increased	7	3.3
Total	215	100.0
Missing	7	

How Much Have Other Identified Problems Changed?

First:

	N	%
Greatly Decreased	42	26.2
Slightly Decreased	55	34.4
No Change	55	34.4
Slightly Increased	5	3.1
Greatly Increased	3	1.9
Total	160	100.0
Missing	62	

Second:

	N	%
Greatly Decreased	12	14.1
Slightly Decreased	36	42.4
No Change	31	36.5
Slightly Increased	3	3.5
Greatly Increased	3	3.5
Total	85	100.0
Missing	137	

Have Any Additional Problems Arisen?

	N	%
Yes	26	14.0
No	160	86.0
Total	186	100.0
Missing	36	

Table D (Continued)

Four Month Follow-up and Impact Data on 222 Direct-Service Clients
Representative of the Marathon County and Washington County YSB Client
Population for the Period October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Number of Contacts YSB
 During the Four Months: N   %

 With Clients:

  Mean   7.0
  Minimum   0
  Maximum   44.0

 With Others Concerning
  the Clients:

  Mean   6.9
  Minimum   0
  Maximum   75.0

Case Status

  Active   94   43.3
  Inactive   49   22.6
  Case Closed   74   34.1

                              Total   217   100.0

  Missing   5

Reason, If Case Closed

  Refused Further Service   13   17.3
  Dropped Out   9   12.0
  Moved from Area   4   5.3
  Referred to other Agency   18   24.0
  No Further Service Necessary   12   16.0
  No Longer Met Project Criteria   9   12.0
  Adjudicated for Referral Reasons   2   2.7
  Adjudicated for New Violation   4   5.3
  Other   3   4.0

                              Total   74   100.0

  Missing   147

Number of Occurrences of Reason
 for Referral, During the Four
 Months Subsequent to First YSB
 Contact

 Mean   7.6
 Minimum   0
 Maximum   174.0

including studies conducted previously by the senior author.
It seems that people who work individually with troubled youth
tend to see problem reduction in the child, even when the objective
evidence is to the contrary. This is probably due to two factors.

--The worker's intense desire for client improvement,
and an ego involvement in bringing the improvement about.

--The through-time growth of a more comfortable relationship
between the counselor and the counselee, in which the
latter "relates better" to the worker. The counselee's
"opening up" is taken as a virtual sign of improvement.

Factors such as these have plagued the assessment of remedial,
delinquency-reduction programs for years. Probation, diversion-
treatment projects, mental health approaches, and Direct Service
YSBs all have shared the same pitfall--perceiving client improve-
ment, while problem behavior continues. This perception rarely
has been challenged, for seldom has it been possible to gather the
objective data with which to make objective measurements of
through-time, client behavior. Just as rare has been the evaluation
approach of asking the youth to describe themselves and their
behavior before and after experiencing a program aimed at
reducing delinquency. Such a self-report component was built
into this evaluation but, as was described in the earlier
section, the Direct Service Projects failed to administer the
Youth Surveys.

Direct Services Summary. These projects provided a wide range
of individual services to a heterogeneous population of at
least 500 young people, during the evaluation period. Only a
small proportion of these were youth who had been diverted
from traditional juvenile justice processing. Counseling
was the most widely provided service. In terms of impact,
worker judgments indicated problem alleviation in over half

of the clients. There was no through-time change, however, in the presenting problems--the reasons for which the youth were referred to the YSBs in the first place. The objective evidence, then, is that these projects did little to increase diversion, and that their direct services had no problem reducing impact.

Community Change Results

In 1972, the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration (YDDPA) of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare adopted a "National Strategy for Youth Development, aimed at the prevention of delinquency. It advocated, ". . .comprehensive, integrated, community-based programs designed *to meet the needs of all youth, regardless of who they are or what their individual problems may be.*"[6] (Italics added). The strategy called for the establishment, nationwide, of "Youth Service Systems" aimed at accomplishing specific objectives:

1. Provide more socially acceptable and meaningful roles for youth

2. Divert youth away from the juvenile justice system into alternative programs

3. Reduce negative labeling

4. Reduce youth alienation[7]

[6]Gemignani, R. J., "Youth Service Systems," *Delinquency Prevention Reporter*, U.S. Dept. Health, Education, and Welfare, Youth Devel. and Delinq. Prev. Admin., Wash., D.C., July-Aug., 1972, Pg. 5.

[7]IBID, Pg. 7.

The Brown County Youth Resources Council (BCYRC) in Green
Bay, the Kenosha County Advocates for Youth (KCAY), and the
Racine County Youth Services System are three of the very few
"pure" implementations, nationwide, of the YDDPA recommendations.
For this reason, alone, they warranted special evaluation emphasis.
However, other factors combined to limit comprehensive, single-
project evaluation to just one of the three--BCYRC. A primary
consideration was that the program level evaluation resources
limited in-depth evaluation to a single project. In addition,
BCYRC:

>--Resulted from a well-coordinated, comprehensive,
>community-based planning process that involved, actively,
>over one hundred residents.
>
>--Became operational during the evaluation planning
>process, and only shortly before the evaluation was
>initiated--an early, optimal evaluation opportunity.
>
>--Staff saw the evaluation process as a potential for
>growth-producing feedback to the project. As a result,
>they surpassed all expectations in the collaborative
>effort of data collection.

For these reasons, then, the BCYRC, was the most cost-efficient
evaluation opportunity presented by the eighteen projects
funded during the past four years, as part of the Wisconsin
Council on Criminal Justice's Youth Service Bureau Program.
As a result the evaluation staff made more site visits to this
project than to others, as well as attending a number of its
meetings and conferences. Also, a methodological component
was added to the evaluation for just this project. This

consisted of personal interviews with a number of youth and adults who were, or had been, connected with the project. The interview procedures, as well as the detailed evaluation results, were described in a prior report [8]. Only summary highlights will be reported here.

Youth Interviews. A major emphasis of two of the Community Change Projects was upon activating young people, training them, and involving them in the community development process. Given this focus, the BCYRC youth interviews were aimed at determining from young people, in their own words, their:

> --Type and degree of involvement
>
> --Opinions of BCYRC and its accomplishments
>
> --Perceptions of the effects of their involvement, on the community and on themselves.

Peer interviewers were hired to meet individually with as many of the "involved" youth as they could contact and schedule during the three days allotted. No potential respondent refused an interview, though a number could not be contacted, or be scheduled due to time constraints. A total of thirty youth were interviewed.

The responses were rather clear and straightforward. Summarized in brief, they indicated that:

> --Individual youth were involved in multiple activities, across a broad spectrum of BCYRC's programs.

[8] Associates for Youth Development, *Comprehensive Evaluation of the Brown County Youth Resources Council*, Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice, Madison, Wisconsin, October, 1977.

--The Teen Institute may have been the single most
effective method of drawing young people into active
collaboration with the project.

--Once active with BCYRC, youth tended to continue,
rather than "drop out."

--Those that did become inactive did so for reasons other
than dissatisfaction or disenchantment.

--The overwhelming majority of young people who became
part of BCYRC were motivated to "contribute," rather than
to profit themselves.

--There was a strong conviction that BCYRC brought about
changes in the community that are helpful to youth.

--Involvement with BCYRC resulted in significant personal
benefit for the young individual. Specific changes were
noted by eighty-seven percent, including twenty-seven
percent who indicated a turning away from prohibited
behavior.

--The minority of BCYRC youth specified something about
the project that was disliked. The "dislikes" were varied,
and did not yield a consensus about a fault to be remedied.

--More than half of the respondents made recommendations
for BCYRC improvement. These, too, exhibited no common
theme. However, there was an underlying implication that
more should be done, perhaps by way of increased youth
involvement.

The youth interview responses, then, support the project's
contention that BCYRC involved youth in bringing about community
and systems changes that may alleviate youth problems. In

addition, the self-perceptions reported gave credence to the
idea that youth involvement in contributing to the community
can result in positive individual benefits, including reduction
of delinquent behavior.

Adult Interviews. The forty-six adult respondents interviewed
by the evaluation staff clearly seconded the opinions of their
young colleagues. While the older people could not speak
to whether or not the individual young person benefited from
involvement with BCYRC, the majority assessment was definitive
in pointing out the project's accomplishments in the community.
As well as amplifying the youth comments, the adults focused
upon specific accomplishments of note.

> --BCYRC's coordinating and clearinghouse functions were
> mentioned as being especially productive. Agency people
> stated that they no longer felt isolated, and that there
> is collaboration and harmony as a result. It was pointed
> out that none of the existing youth service agencies
> could have coordinated the others without jealousy in
> that they compete with each other for clients.
> --Agency representatives and others pointed to BCYRC's
> youth involvement as an accomplishment, indicating that
> it was the only place in which youth were involved.
> --Respondents emphasized the competence, professionalism
> and dedication of the BCYRC staff.
> --The last item for respondent special mention was the
> newsletter--"The Youth Advocate." It was appreciated for
> its quality information on county, state, and national
> youth events and issues--without touting BCYRC's virtues
> or accomplishments.

In addition to the positive reactions, a few of the
adults were in agreement on several points of criticism.

--The most frequent complaint was that, "No one knows
what BCYRC is doing." The interviews, themselves, gave
support to this contention. Respondents knew little
about BCYRC program areas other than those in which they
were personally involved. This indicated some deficiency
in communication which may have been remedied, in part,
by BCYRC's report on the "Community Response to the Brown
County Study on Children and Youth Services," September,
1977. In this document, BCYRC enumerated its progress
toward implementing each of the original Planning Study's
recommendations.

--A related point was that the community at large was not
aware of BCYRC and its efforts. Since BCYRC did not
operate at a "grass roots," neighborhood level, this
assertion was most likely correct. The underlying
assumption, however, that there should have been greater
community awareness of BCYRC, is open to debate. The
basic questions are: "To what degree would such aware-
ness have assisted BCYRC in accomplishing its objectives?"
and, "Would the increased benefits have been worth
the efforts necessary to obtain more public recognition?"
The evaluators could not resolve these issues.

--Again related, was the criticism by some that BCYRC
did not take enough public credit for its accomplishments.
Given that this contention had some validity, it placed

BCYRC in a quandary. Most of its efforts were in concert
with others, and it functioned to: organize, coordinate,
facilitate, inform, and assist others in getting things
done. To claim credit publicly, then, could have be-
littled the efforts of others, while failure to publicize
BCYRC accomplishments resulted in it being viewed
by some as having achieved little, if anything. It is
the evaluators' opinion that there is no clear-cut
solution to this type of dilemma. To the extent that
something could be done, it seems to lie in the area of
educating those concerned as to the actual function
of a project like BCYRC; that it acts with and through
others to bring about desired community changes. In
this way, the demand that Community Change Projects claim
direct responsibility for such changes may be lessened.
--There was some feeling on the part of youth and adults
that BCYRC was not active enough outside of the City of
Green Bay. The staff accepted the validity of this, and
began to concentrate more in outlying areas.
--A few respondents asserted that BCYRC was not accomplish-
ing enough and/or was not being responsive to the
recommendations made in the Planning Study. These
criticisms seemed to stem from individuals not knowing
enough about BCYRC's programs, from the "low profile" the
project maintained in terms of taking public credit for
accomplishments, and from the extra-ordinarily compre-
hensive set of expectations that developed from the Study.

An expectation for project accomplishment in response
to every recommendation in the original plan, in less
than a five year period, was simply unrealistic. On the
other hand, careful observation of BCYRC activities and
achievements indicated that the project managed, in
its first eighteen months, to address most of the
recommendations and objectives, to some degree.

The adult interview responses agreed with those from
youth and with the anecdotal data and evaluator observations.
The evidence is substantial that BCYRC brought about desired
results in its three program areas: Systems Modification,
Youth Advocacy, and Public Information.

Program Analysis. The Brown County and Kenosha County projects
were very similiar in terms of their goals and programs,
except that BCYRC included public education in its repetoire,
while KCAY emphasized youth employment more than did BCYRC.
Racine's goals and community targets were much the same as
those of the other two, however, it lacked the strong emphasis
upon involving youth in the community change process. Thus,
except for the minimal youth involvement and youth employment
focus in Racine, the following summary represents the evaluators'
observations of the three projects' functional process.

They existed in a climate of basic acceptance, and were
the product of a well-organized, county-wide planning process.
They were staffed by qualified people, dedicated to youth and
the concepts of community change and youth involvement. Their
support groups were hardworking and diversified, being composed

of young people, service professionals, community officials, and lay individuals.

Virtually all of the objectives specified in their annual plans were being addressed by one or more program components that resembled closely the tasks designated in the plans. An increasing proportion of each project's geographic area was being activated to fulfill those objectives. This accounts for the sheer volume of program activity demonstrated by the projects. Relatively few staff, two to four in each, have produced prolific projects by informing, stimulating, challenging, guiding, leading, supporting, and convincing others to take part in creating community solutions to youth problems.

Each programmed effort has paid off to some degree, either directly, or in the form of spin-off, as well as in the positive reactions of participants and observers. As indicated in the foregoing project descriptions, events occurred in these counties that were attributable, at least in part, to project efforts.

> --The juvenile justice process was changing to accommodate
> more to youth needs, rather than system needs
> --Young people were employed by two of the projects, and
> as a result of their programs
> --Youth were involved in identifying and meeting youth
> needs, and demonstrated their ability to get the ear
> of decision-makers and to advocate for themselves
> --Conferences and informational processes amplified the
> project's efforts by creating community task forces and
> other subgroups aimed at meeting specific needs

Also, there was some indication that the youth involvement activities had direct, positive impacts upon the individual young people who took part in the projects' endeavors. This possibility will be examined in depth in subsequent portions of this chapter.

Youth Involvement and Its Impact

Since a major focus of two of the three Community Change Projects was to involve youth actively in all of its programs, part of the evaluation plan was to quantify the involvement, and to examine the possibility that the involvement might have a direct, problem-reducing impact for young people who take part in project activities. Two, separate data collection approaches were used to describe the involvement, and to determine impact. These were the Youth Involvement Forms, completed by staff, and the Youth Surveys.

Data Supplied by Staff--Initial. For each young person that was involved actively with BCYRC or KCAY, staff entered specific data on forms developed and provided for that purpose. (See Appendix C for the data collection manual and forms.) No names or other identifying data were forwarded to the evaluators.

The main categories of data supplied were:

--Type, frequency, and duration of involvement

--The identification of any problems that the youth was known to be experiencing. In order to keep data comparable with those collected from Direct-Service Bureaus, the "problem categories" were the same for both types of project. This posed a difficulty for BCYRC and KCAY

in that many of the categories were not applicable to
the youth involvement type of approach in that the
involved youth were not agency referred due to specific
problems.

--Changes noted in each youth's known problems after
a four-month interval, or upon termination with BCYRC,
whichever came first.

Staff Descriptions of Youth Involvement. A total of seventy-three
youth participated for varying amounts of time in BCYRC programs
since its inception in March, 1976. Project staff provided
data on their experience with seventy-one of these. Thirty-
eight had been involved prior to data collection implementation
in October, 1976. As a result, the staff invested considerable
effort in recording data on a post-hoc basis.

The number and percentage of individuals involved in the
various projects' activities, as well as the duration and
frequency of their involvement are summarized in Table E,
Part a, beginning on the next page. From the Table, many
individuals were engaged in multiple activities, with Youth
Advisory Board membership involving most of the youth. An
overwhelming majority of the activities, and those involving
most of the youth, were of a service nature, rather than a
"being serviced." Also, considerable personal time was con-
tributed by the youth to these endeavors. This, in spite of
the fact that the young people involved were not, themselves,
problem free.

Part b of Table E includes the combined youth involvement
for both Kenosha and Brown Counties. The same statement as

Table E

Number*, Percentage, Frequency and Duration of Involvement, by (a) Type of BCYRC Activity, for Seventy-one of Seventh-three Brown County Youth, and by (b) BCYRC and KCAY Combined, for 128 Youth Involved in Both Projects

	Type of Involvement	Those Involved; No.*	%	Frequency of Involvement; Periodicity	No.	%	Duration of Involvement in Weeks	
a.	Planning Community Change	29	41.9	Once	3	10.3	Mean	10.0
				Monthly	9	31.0	Range	1 - 24
				Weekly	1	3.5		
				Four Times/wk	16	55.2		
b.	Planning Community Change	53	41.4	Once	18	34.0	Mean	6.7
				Monthly	11	20.8	Range	1 - 24
				Weekly	5	9.4		
				Three Times/wk	2	3.8		
				Four Times/wk	16	30.2		
				Variable	1	1.9		
a.	Implementing Community Change	18	25.4	Monthly	2	11.1	Mean	13.2
				Four Times/wk	15	83.3	Range	1 - 41
				Variable	1	5.6		
b.	Implementing Community Change	18	14.4	Monthly	2	11.1	Mean	13.2
				Four Times/wk	15	83.3	Range	1 - 41
				Variable	1	5.6		
a.	Involvement in Governmental Action	10	14.1	Once	3	30.0	Mean	8.6
				Monthly	5	50.0	Range	1 - 21
				Variable	2	20.0		
b.	Involvement in Governmental Action	10	8.1	Once	3	30.0	Mean	8.6
				Monthly	5	50.0	Range	1 - 21
				Variable	2	20.0		

*The number involved totals to more than seventy-one or 128 due to the involvement of most individuals in multiple activities. Mean activities per youth was 3.1

Table E

	Type of Involvement	Those Involved; No.*	%	Frequency of Involvement; Periodicity	No.	%	Duration of Involvement in Weeks	
a.	Youth Advisory Board Member	63	88.7	Once Monthly Twice/Month Variable	4 7 49 3	6.4 11.1 77.8 4.8	Mean Range	12.4 1 - 29
b.	Youth Advisory Board Member	65	52.9	Once Monthly Twice/Month Variable	4 9 49 3	6.2 13.8 75.4 4.6	Mean Range	12.5 1 - 29
a.	Involvement with Other Agencies	8	11.3	Once Monthly Five Times/wk	1 1 6	12.5 12.5 75.0	Mean Range	7.0 1 - 21
b.	Involvement with Other Agencies	9	7.3	Once Monthly Five Times/wk	2 1 6	22.2 11.1 66.7	Mean Range	6.3 1 - 21
a.	Involvement in Youth Organization	1	1.4	Five Times/wk	1	100.0	Mean	6.0
b.	Involvement in Youth Organization	7	5.7	Twice/Month Five Times/wk	6 1	85.7 14.3	Mean Range	8.0 6 - 10
a.	Internship in Other Agency	9	12.7	Five Times/wk	9	100.0	Mean Range	6.0 6.0
b.	Internship in Other Agency	9	7.3	Five Times/wk	9	100.0	Mean Range	6.0 6.0
a.	Tutoring Others	1	1.4	Twice/wk	1	100.0	Mean	10.0
b.	Tutoring Others	1	.8	Twice/wk	1	100.0	Mean	10.0

Table E

	Type of Involvement	Those Involved; No.*	%	Frequency of Involvement; Periodicity	No.	%	Duration of Involvement in Weeks	
a.	Counseling Others	3	4.2	Four Times/wk	3	100.0	Mean	10.7
							Range	10 - 12
b.	Counseling Others	3	2.4	Four Times/wk	3	100.0	Mean	10.7
							Range	4 - 21
a.	Job Finding and Placement for Others	17	23.9	Twice/wk	1	5.9	Mean	10.9
				Four Times/wk	16	94.1	Range	4 - 21
b.	Job Finding and Placement for Others	18	14.6	Once	1	5.6	Mean	10.4
				Twice/wk	1	5.6	Range	1 - 21
				Four Times/wk	16	88.9		
a.	In-Service Training	30	42.3	Once	6	20.0	Mean	3.4
				Monthly	5	16.7	Range	1 - 12
				Four Times/wk	12	40.0		
				Five Times/wk	7	23.3		
b.	In-Service Training	32	26.0	Once	6	18.8	Mean	3.2
				Monthly	5	15.6	Range	1 - 12
				Three Times/wk	2	6.2		
				Four Times/wk	12	37.5		
				Five Times/wk	7	21.9		
a.	Providing Recreation for Others	1	1.4	Once	1	100.0	Mean	1.0
b.	Providing Recreation for Others	24	19.5	Once	2	8.3	Mean	5.5
				Monthly	1	4.2	Range	1 - 12
				Twice Monthly	4	16.7		
				Weekly	2	8.3		
				Twice Weekly	14	58.3		
				Variable	1	4.2		
a.								
b.	Organizing Youth Center	5	1.2	Weekly	4	80.0	Mean	3.6
				Variable	1	20.0	Range	3 - 4

Table E

	Type of Involvement	Those Involved; No.*	%	Frequency of Involvement; Periodicity	No.	%	Duration of Involvement in Weeks	
a.	Providing Information to Others	29	40.9	Monthly	4	13.8	Mean	9.5
				Twice/Month	2	6.9	Range	1 - 21
				Four Times/wk	18	62.1		
				Five Times/wk	4	13.8		
				Variable	1	3.5		
b.	Providing Information to Others	43	40.0	Once	14	32.6	Mean	6.7
				Monthly	4	9.3	Range	1 - 21
				Twice Monthly	2	4.6		
				Four Times/wk	18	41.9		
				Five Times/wk	4	9.3		
				Variable	1	2.3		
a.	Advocacy for Other Youth	17	23.9	Monthly	3	17.7	Mean	11.7
				Four Times/wk	14	82.5	Range	10 - 21
b.	Advocacy for Other Youth	21	17.1	Monthly	5	23.8	Mean	11.6
				Twice Monthly	2	9.5	Range	0 - 24
				Four Times/wk	14	66.7		
a.	Other, Such as Conference Attendance, Clerical Help, Assistance with Newsletter, etc.	20	28.2				Mean	6.9
							Range	1 - 90
b.	Other, (Conference Attendance, etc.)	77	62.6				Mean	11.6
							Range	0 - 90

above can be made about KCAY from these totals; the youth were
involved, for the most part, in giving rather than receiving.
In addition, these data permit some contrasts to be made
between the two projects. BCYRC, much more than KCAY, involved
young people in: community change; governmental action; its
Youth Advisory Board; other agencies; agency internships; job
finding and placement for others; inservice training; and,
advocacy for other youth. KCAY's youth, on the other hand, were more
involved with: other youth organizations; providing recreation
for others; and, organizing a youth center. Both youth groups
were about equally involved in providing information to others.

An additional activity carried out by KCAY was a summer-
time youth employment program for low income youth in western
Kenosha County. The data on fifty-two of the youth who were
included in this program in 1976 and 1977 were deleted from
the involvement data summarized in Table E because these youth
had been provided with a service, rather than being involved
in the project's efforts. The employment project was predicated
upon KCAY's position that youth employment is one of the best ways
to prevent delinquency, and to increase a young person's self
esteem and sense of belonging.

From the staff-supplied data, it was found that KCAY's job
finding and placement efforts were successful for forty of the
fifty-two cases (79.6%) for which initial data forms were received.
Mean job duration was three months (12.1 weeks), with a range of
from twelve to seventeen weeks. The outcome of the employment
program, as well as of the youth involvement will be discussed

in later sections.

Youth-involvement Reasons. For each youth, the staff recorded the project reason for involvement, and the young person's reason as perceived by staff. The results appear below, in Table F, for four projects; BCYRC, KCAY, Winnebago County Project Youth and Sheboygan County YSB. The small percentage of cases submitted by the latter two can not be taken, however, as representing their youth.

Table F

Project's Reasons, and Youth's Reasons as Perceived by Staff, for the Involvement of 229 Youth* in the Brown, Kenosha, Winnebago, and Sheboygan County Projects.

Project's Reasons

Reason	Number of Youth	Percent
To Get Youth Involved	165	72
To Get Youth Information	109	48
For Youth's Personal Growth	108	47
Other	13	6

Youth's Reasons as Perceived by Staff

Reason	Number of Youth	Percent
To Have a Job	99	42
Wants to Change Things in Community	84	37
Wants Something To Do	123	54
Pressured by Others, Such as Parent, To Do So	18	8
Thinks Its Good for Self	33	14
Other	9	4

*Most of the individuals were seen as involved with BCYRC for more than one reason. Also, the data include the fity-two youth in KCAY's employment program.

The projects clearly wanted, according to their tabled reasons, the involvement and input of young people. Also, the staff saw such participation as augmenting individual growth. On the other hand, the young people were seen as motivated primarily by desires for something to do, wanting jobs, and wishing to get involved and to bring about community changes. This reinforces the finding, from the youth interviews, that most of the young people wanted to "give;" be useful and involved.

Identified Problems of Involved Youth. During the period upon which this report was based, the evaluators were able to interact repeatedly with BCYRC young people in a variety of settings such as the Project Office, Conferences, and Meetings. In the senior author's judgment, as a clinical psychologist, and as a former probation officer, BCYRC attracted troubled adolescents. Many of them came from broken or emotionally torn homes and had experienced problems such as attempted suicide, promiscuity, drug use, family conflicts and the aimlessness that grows from despair. Others were, in a more general sense, lacking in personal resources, and could be termed socially, emotionally, or economically deprived. Few, however, had experienced the Juvenile Court process. Also, it is important to note that the youth had been drawn into BCYRC by outreach and recruitment in the communities, rather than by a formal process of agency referral of "problem children." Though there were fewer on-site contacts with Kenosha youth, the evaluators' impressions of them were similar.

A portion of the data collection was aimed at quantifying the individual youth problems known to the staff, and to monitor through-time changes in these problems areas, as perceived by staff.

(See Appendix C, Items five through seven, second page of data
form). These data, summarized in Tables G and H, were obtained
from staff contact with, and knowledge of, each youth involved.
They do not represent information existing in any agency files
and Winnebago did not submit any follow-up forms. The total number
of youth, then, was 172. Several factors combine to makes these
data estimates, rather than precise measurements of the variables
under consideration.

    --Structured, information-gathering interviews were
not conducted with each youth by project staff.

    --Some of the young people chose to confide in staff;
others did not.

    --Not all of the youth had the opportunity for close,
individual contacts with a staff member.

    --Since many individual, youth-staff interactions were
youth-initiated and spontaneous, codesheets were not
always completed by a staff person who knew the most about
the individual.

    --Data were provided post-hoc, from memory, for some youth
who had begun with BCYRC prior to data-collection implementation
in October, 1976.

Due to the above considerations, it is likely that the number
and type of problems known to the staff underrepresented, con-
siderably, the realities of the youngsters' lives. Later, it
will be seen from the Youth Survey results that more of the young
people experienced a greater range of difficulties than were known
to the staff. On the basis of the tabled data, which represent
BCYRC and KCAY, primarily, and WCPY to some extent, it can be

Table G

Summary of Individual Youth Problems Known to
Project Staff, Based upon 172 Youth Involved
with the Brown County and Kenosha County Projects
from October 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977

Main Problem	Number of Youth with Problem	Percent with Problem
Robbery without Weapon	1	.6
Auto Theft	1	.6
Vandalism	3	1.8
Runaway	1	.6
Truancy	1	.6
Ungovernable Behavior	2	1.2
Lack of Adequate Care or Support	1	.6
Family Relationships	6	3.6
School Behavior Problems	1	.6
Academic Problems	4	2.4
Emotional Difficulties	1	.6
Unemployment	59	35.8
Economic Problems	11	6.7
Drug Problems	1	.6
Unapplicable	5	3.0
Other	67	40.6
TOTAL	165	100.0

Secondary Problem	Number of Youth with Problem	Percent with Problem
Ungovernable Behavior	1	1.1
Hit and Run (Auto)	1	1.1
Family Relationships	3	3.4
Relationships with Peers	1	1.1
School Adjustment	1	1.1
Academic Problems	1	1.1
Emotional Difficulties	3	3.4
Economic Problems	35	39.8
Drug Problems	1	1.1
Unemployment	32	36.4
Other	9	10.2
TOTAL	88	100.0

Table H

Staff-perceived Changes in Problem Intensity
for 172 Youth Involved with BCYRC and KCAY
from October 1, 1976, to August 31, 1977,
Based Upon Four Months Subsequent vs. Four
Months Prior to Becoming Involved.

Change in Main-Problem Intensity	Number of Youth	Percentage of Youth
Greatly Decreased	92	55.8
Slightly Decreased	46	27.9
No Change	27	16.4
Slightly Increased	0	0.0
Greatly Increased	0	0.0
Missing	7	

Change in Secondary-Problem Intesntiy	Number of Youth	Percentage of Youth
Greatly Decreased	47	33.3
Slightly Decreased	34	24.1
No Change	58	41.1
Slightly Increased	1	.7
Greatly Increased	1	.7
Missing	31	

Combined	Number of Youth	Percentage of Youth
Greatly Decreased	139	45.4
Slightly Decreased	80	26.1
No Change	85	27.8
Slightly Increased	1	.3
Greatly Increased	1	.3

said that a significant portion were seen as experiencing problems, and that a variety of problems were noted, including delinquency. Staff knew about a "main problem" being experienced by 165 of the youth (95.9%, and about a "secondary problem" for eighty-eight (51.2%). Considering that some existing problems remained un-known, and these youngsters were not problem referred, the problem percentage was rather high. Thus, except for the unemployment subgroup, these youth may have been rather similar to the referred clients of the Direct Service Projects.

Staff-perceived Changes in Youth Problems. As part of the follow-up data collection, staff were asked to indicate, for each youth, the degree to which the known problems seemed to have increased or decreased four months after becoming involved with project (Item 6). These data were subject to the same shortcomings mentioned in connection with problem identification. In addition, two other considerations apply to interpreting the data.

> --Staff perceptions may have been subject to the bias toward improvement that was discussed with regard to the Direct Service Projects. Though, if such a bias operated in this instance, it would have been less since the Community Change Projects were not focussed upon alleviating individual problems.

> --As with the problem-change data for Direct Services, these data were not derived from a controlled experiment. Therefore, any perceived, through-time changes in problem intesnity can not be attributed necessarily to "involvement." That is, in the absence of other lines of evidence, observed changes could be the result of other influences, such as maturation.

A summary interpretation of the data provided in Table H, next page, would be: Staff perceived a decrease in problem intensity for a majority of the youth involved, and the perceived decrease was mostly in connection with the main problem known to

the staff. The perceived main-problem decrease was greater for these young people than for the Direct Service clients (83% vs. 68%). In addition, in response to Item Seven, staff-enumerated occurrences of known problems for each youth, in the "Pre" and "Post" periods, yielded means of 4.5 and 2.9 respectively. This significant reduction is in sharp contrast to the lack of a comparable change observed by staff for the Direct Service group. It is interesting to note, too, the mean number of staff contacts with youth was certainly greater for the Community Change Projects than it was for the Direct Service Projects (16 vs. 7 during the four-month period).

Youth Self-Report Measurements. This last portion of the evaluation evolved from the theoretical considerations embedded in the National Strategy for Youth Development, mentioned in the introduction to this report. The strategy, propounded in 1972 by the Office of Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention, was based upon a set of propositions and a resulting theory. The propositions included:

   --Adjudicated delinquency was increasing dramatically.
   --Existing efforts to address the problem were little more than "stop-gap" measures to help youth who were already in trouble.
   --Virtually all of society's remedial resources were being used in a fragmented, piecemeal, duplicative and futile manner, in dealing with known problem children.
   --Societal conditions that affect youth were being ignored.

--Any community condition or systematic procedure that fails
to meet youth needs or that produces youth alienation, blocked
youth access to desirable social roles, negative labelling of
certain youth, and negative self concept of individual youth,
is a factor contributing to youth problems, including de-
linquency.

--Little attention had been given to discovering and rein-
forcing the causes of non-delinquency.

The general theory suggested from these observations was:
law-abiding behavior of young people occurs: to the extent that
they have access to rewarding and legitimate social roles; to the
degree that they are viewed positively by others and, therefore,
themselves; to the extent that they are accepted and integrated
into their families and communities; and, to the degree that they
have reasonable personal control over their life situations.

The Office of Youth Development launched research that was,
in part, aimed at testing specific hypotheses derived from the
theory. In 1975, it reported that delinquent behavior was predicted
quite well from measurements of such youth variables as: "Alienation,"
"Blocked Access to Desirable Social Roles," "Negative Labelling,"
"Poor Self Concept," and "Parental Rejection."[9] The primary
research method used was a comprehensive, self-report, youth
survey comprised of separate scales for the measurements of each
of the pertinent variables. The reported evidence for the instru-
ment's reliability and validity exceeded commonly accepted research

[9] Office of Youth Development, Department of Health, Education and
Welfare, *Theory Validation and Aggregate National Data: Integration
Report of OYD Research FY 1975*, Vol. 12, prepared by Behavioral
Research and Development Corporation, Boulder, Colorado, Sept. 1975.

standards.[10] Since .· these results were based upon samples of youth from a representative cross-section of ten cities across the country, the measurement methods were accepted for use in this evaluation.

The Youth Survey. The self-report questionnaire was, basically, the instrument developed by the Behavioral Research and Evaluation Corporation.[11] Some modifications were made, however, to improve it usefulness for this evaluation. The first section, aimed at describing youth's self-reported problems and needs, was re-designed to include a youth assessment of problems as they exist in the community and as they impact youth.(See Appendix D). In addition, a few items were added to include problem areas specific to sexuality and to female youth. The youth problem section, then, was expanded to make it more encompassing for evaluation purposes, and to increase the survey's planning usefulness for youth service agencies.

Eight sections dealing with young people's perceptions of community agencies were deleted. These portion had little utility for a short-term, impact evaluation, and their deletion shortened a rather long questionnaire.

The original portions, used to measure alienation, access to desirable social roles, peer pressure, labelling, self concept, parent-child relationships, and delinquent behavior, were the ones used in the evaluation survey, with minor item modifications.

[10] Office of Youth Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *Theory Validation and Aggregate National Data: Integration Report of OYD Research FY 1975,* Vol. 12, prepared by Behavioral Research and Development Corporation, Boulder, Colorado, Sept. 1975, p. 41-89.

[11] Office of Youth Development, Dept. of Health,Education and Welfare, Research Handbook for Community Planning and Feedback Instruments Revised, Prepared by Behavioral Research and Evaluation Corporation, Boulder, Colorado, April, 1976.

The "Pre" vs. "Post," "Project Group" vs. "Comparison Group" procedures described earlier were found to be workable and efficient. Two Projects, BCYRC and KCAY, were conscientious in administering the surveys and in following up on the "no returns." Also, there was no apparent youth-respondent opposition to the procedures or to the questionnaire. Several situations occurred, however, that seriously impaired the definitiveness of the results.

> --Delay in evaluation-contract execution. The original plan was for an evaluation contract to have been promulgated in June, 1976, as a direct continuation of the design and training phase. Instead, the contract was executed in September, after some uncertainty, and work recommenced in October. As a result of this, youth who had been involved during the summer of 1976--a heavy involvement period for Direct Service Projects--were lost to this portion of the evaluation.

> Also, as luck would have it, this June through December, 1976, period was the time in which most of the project staff turnover took place. Thus, a serious discontinuity took place. The evaluators lost touch with some of the projects, and newly appointed project staff--even after evaluation training--had little time or energy for data collection. They were too busy mastering their new assignments. This accounted, to a degree, for the poor data collection in some of the Direct Service Projects. Since none of them administered the Youth Surveys, the original experimental design was violated. No comparison could be conducted of the youth-perceived impacts of the two program types.

> --Change in project emphasis. Two Community Change Projects, Brown and Racine involved fewer youth in 1977 than in 1976-- instead of involving more, as had been expected. This reduced still further the number of youth available for the experimental study, based upon the Pre-Post Surveys.

> --The problem of small sample size was compounded by the allegedly poor postal service in Kenosha. KCAY administered 110 surveys to project youth. BCYRC experienced an overall sixty-one percent mail return. KCAY's return rate was seventeen percent. As was indicated earlier, it was reported that the Postal Service failed to deliver a bulk of the surveys. An attempt was made by KCAY to remedy this with a second mailing, but even many of these were not delivered.

<u>Description of Youth Involved</u>. A total of 165 Youth Surveys were administered to youth involved in five projects. Three of the latter were Mixed-Type Projects that forwarded relatively few surveys: Fond du Lac (14); Beloit (12); and, Sheboygan (5). The surveys submitted by Brown (24) and Kenosha (110) were accepted as representing the youth involved in the two projects during the evaluation period (See Table A) since thirty-eight of BCYRC's young people were involved prior to October 1, 1976.

The sociodemographic, "Pre" data obtained as part of the Youth Surveys are reported in Table I, starting on the next page. The Project and Comparison Groups were compared on each of these thirteen items for significant differences. Chi Square, or "t" were used, as appropriate in making the comparisons. The fact that the two groups did not differ significantly on any of the variables provides evidence that a strong comparison group was selected by drawing upon friends of those in the project group. However, there was some indication from looking at tendencies in the overall data that the Comparison Group might have been a bit "better" in social terms. Though not significant, the numerical differences for important items all tended in the direction that correlates with fewer problems, such as delinquency. The trends for the Comparison Group, as opposed to the Program Group:

--A higher proportion of females
--Greater school enrollment
--More in grades ten through college
--Higher grade point averages (2.0, or better)
--Fewer instances of probation
--Father more often head of family, with fewer single
    parent families
--Head of family more often employed
--Head of family better educated (High School, or more)
--Families seen as better off economically
--Fewer siblings

Table I

Project Group (N = 167) vs. Comparison Group (N = 95)
on Twelve Sociodemographic Variables, Using Data Obtained
from "Pre" Surveys of Both Groups. (Appropriate "t" Test
or Chi-Square Analysis Resulted in Non-Significant Between-
Group Differences.)

Variable	Project Group		Comparison Group	
Mean Age	16.01		16.04	
Sex	N	%	N	%
Male	74	44.9	31	34.1
Female	91	55.4	60	65.9
Ethnic Classification				
Chicano	7	4.2	1	1.1
Black	11	6.7	8	8.8
White	135	81.8	79	86.8
Amer. Indian	1	.6	2	2.2
Asian	7	4.2	--	--
Other	4	2.4	1	1.1
Enrolled in School				
Yes	140	84.9	83	91.2
No	25	15.2	8	8.8
Present Grade				
6	2	1.4	1	1.2
7	4	2.7	3	3.6
8	6	4.1	3	3.6
9	26	17.7	8	9.5
10	28	19.1	20	23.8
11	33	22.5	35	41.7
12	39	26.5	11	13.1
College	6	4.1	2	2.3
Other	3	2.0	1	1.2
Grade Point Average				
3.6 - 4.0	17	10.7	8	8.9
3.0 - 3.5	42	24.4	26	29.2
2.6 - 2.9	28	17.6	20	22.5
2.0 - 2.5	34	21.4	20	22.5
1.6 - 1.9	19	11.9	7	7.8
1.0 - 1.5	10	6.5	2	2.3
Below 1.0	9	5.7	6	6.7

Table I (Continued)

Variable	Project Group		Comparison Group	
	N	%	M	%
Ever Been on Probation				
Yes	27	16.7	11	12.2
No	135	83.3	79	87.8
On Probation Now				
Yes	10	6.3	8	8.9
No	149	95.7	82	91.1
Head of Family				
Father	100	60.9	60	66.7
Stepfather	8	4.9	8	8.9
Foster Father	2	1.2	--	--
Mother	47	28.7	17	18.9
Other Relative	2	1.2	1	1.1
Other	5	3.1	4	4.4
Family Head Employed				
Employed	120	74.5	77	86.5
Unemployed	36	22.4	8	8.9
Retired	5	3.1	4	4.5
Education of Family Head				
Grade School Only	8	5.2	6	6.9
Junior High/Middle High	15	9.7	6	6.9
Some High School	38	24.5	10	11.5
High School Graduate	51	32.9	35	40.2
Some College or Bus. Sch.	23	14.8	14	16.1
Four-Year College Grad.	11	7.1	5	5.8
Post Graduate/Prof. Sch.	9	5.8	11	12.6
Do You Consider Your Family				
Poor	2	1.3	--	--
Not Poor, But Close To It	34	21.4	9	10.1
Not Rich, But Earning Enough	120	75.5	78	87.6
Rich	3	1.9	2	2.3
Number of Siblings				
Mean	4.33		3.88	

The absence of significant item differences warranted the further comparisons to be made on the study variables. The overall trend, though, generated the prediction that the Comparison Group would be found to have experienced fewer problems. That the prediction was validated, will be seen in the following section.

Pre-Survey of Study Variables. Three, self-report measures of the dependent variable, Delinquency, were included in the survey. These consisted of:

--Twenty-seven items (four of which were to be written in by respondents) descriptive of delinquent behaviors. The survey instructed the youth to answer whether they "never," "once or twice," "several times," or "very often" engaged in each of the behaviors during the previous four months. For these and the other study variables, the response categories were assigned, for statistical scoring purposes, numerical values of "1," "2," "3," and "4," respectively.

--A Seven-Item section was added to the original survey to measure the fact of and the frequency of being in trouble with authorities during the four months prior.

In addition, there were fourteen measures of as many inter-vening variables--those variables such as "alienation" that may serve as linkages between "youth involvement" (the independent variable) and delinquency. Since the Project and Comparison Groups had been found to be very much alike on sociodemographic variables, they were compared to determine if the same similarity existed in items of "Pre" measurements of the intervening and dependent variables. These results are summarized in Table J, beginning on the next page. From them, it can be seen that the

"Pre" Comparisons of Project (N = 167) and Comparison Group (N = 95) Mean Scores on Fourteen Intervening Variables and on Three Measures of Delinquency

(Each variable was scored in the direction indicated by its label, i.e. a higher mean equals greater alienation. A standard "t" test for the significance of the difference between independent means was used for the analyses. (Group 1 - Project; Group 2 = Comparison)

Variable	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the Mean	Difference Between Means	"t" Value	df	Significance Level*
Intervening Variables								
Problems/Needs Experienced by Respondents	1	84.6	14.5	1.1	3.6	1.83	322	.069
	2	81.0	17.2	1.8				
Alienation	1	42.6	6.3	.49	.41	.49	321	.625
	2	42.2	6.9	.71				
Normlessness	1	12.9	3.4	.26	.28	.66	321	.509
	2	12.6	3.1	.31				
Societal Estrangement	1	29.7	5.0	.38	.05	.07	321	.942
	2	29.7	5.1	.53				
Negative Peer Pressure	1	20.8	4.0	.31	.71	1.34	319	.181
	2	20.0	4.4	.46				
Blocked Access to Legitimate Educational Roles	1	8.4	1.9	.14	.16	.62	316	.536
	2	8.3	2.1	.22				
Blocked Access to Legtimate Social Roles	1	19.3	3.6	.28	.34	.66	321	.512
	2	19.7	4.0	.41				

*A significance level greater than .05 was accepted as indicating no difference between groups.

Variable	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the Mean	Difference Between Means	"t" Value	df	Significance Level*
Intervening Variables								
Blocked Access to Legitimate Occupational Roles	1 2	10.9 11.3	2.3 2.6	.17 .26	.41	1.26	320	.566
Negative Labelling	1 2	52.6 49.9	18.1 17.9	1.42 1.86	2.71	1.18	314	.238
Negative Labelling by Parents	1 2	17.9 16.9	7.3 6.9	.58 .72	1.03	1.13	310	.259
Negative Labelling by Peers	1 2	17.3 17.2	6.2 6.1	.49 .64	.12	.15	310	.881
Negative Labelling by Teachers and/or Employers	1 2	17.2 16.0	7.9 7.6	.62 .81	1.24	1.21	306	.226
Positive Self Concept	1 2	42.0 41.6	6.2 6.7	.48 .69	.37	.45	320	.655
Parental Acceptance	1 2	32.7 33.0	6.2 6.7	.48 .70	.35	.43	314	.671

*A significance level greater than .05 was accepted as indicating no difference between groups.

(Dependent variable comparison is listed on following page.)

Variable	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the Mean	Difference Between Means	"t" Value	df	Significance Level*
Dependent Variables								
Delinquent Behavior During Past Four Months	1 2	39.6 36.4	11.6 9.9	.90 1.03	3.19	2.36	319	.019 Significant
In Trouble with Authorities During Past Four Months-Yes	1 2	1.36 1.15	1.6 1.5	.13 .16	.21	1.05	317	.295
Frequency of Trouble with Authorities During Past Four Months	1 2	4.58 2.82	8.6 6.3	.66 .65	1.75	1.91	322	.057 Nearly Significant

*A significance level greater than .05 was accepted as indicating no difference between groups.

two groups differed significantly on one of the seventeen scales,
a dependent variable.   The Comparison Group had engaged in less
"Delinquent Behavior During the Past Four Months." On another
dependent variable, "Frequency of Trouble with Authorities During
the Past Four Months," the difference in favor of the Comparison
Group was nearly significant. Also, the numerical trend was toward
the positive for the Comparison Group for fourteen of the seventeen
variables, and for forty of the forty-five individual problems
experienced by the youth. Chi-square tests of probability of such
unbalanced proportions indicated that these two trends were
statistically significant. In addition, there were significant
differences on three individual problems. The Project Group had
experienced more difficulty with:

      --"A need for counseling about types of jobs" (Item 2)
      --"Police who are 'out to get' young people" (Item 33)
      --"Things stolen or destroyed in the neighborhood" (Item 42)

The Project Group, then, clearly experienced more problems
in the community, within themselves, with others, and with their
own behavior than did the comparison group. It is apparent,
too, that the Project-Group youth had engaged in delinquent behavior
more than "Once or Twice" on the average, in the four-month period,
and had been "In Trouble" with authorities (police, schools, or
parents) more than once a month.

These results have some important implications. First, it
seems that the Community Change Projects engaged youth in community
problem solving who were, themselves, problem ridden, and even
delinquent. This speaks well for the outreach capabilities of
such projects, in the absence of referrals. Also, it is indicated
that "problem youth" can be motivated to contribute to the community
instead of being put into the role of "clients" or "recipients."

Second, the results support the precision of the research methodology. The approach of surveying friends of those involved with the projects was able to identify a group of young people who were basically similar to the Project Group, and the measurement instruments were sensitive enough to register the differences.

Youth Problems and Needs Experienced in the Community. The first part of the survey asked the young respondents to indicate how often (from "Never" to "Often") they had experienced each of forty-five common problems or needs confronting young people. In the same part, they were asked to decide how much of a problem (from "No Problem" to "Big Problem") these situations were for youth in the community. Based upon the mean response for each item, the forty-five problem/needs were rank ordered separately for the Project and the Comparison Groups. Since the study groups had been found to be very similar, and the rank orderings were essentially the same, the two sets were combined to produce a problem/needs assessment of the 252 youth, as well as the latter's assessment of youth problem/needs in their geographic areas.

The results of both assessments are presented in Table K, beginning on the next page. Of those problems/needs experienced by the youth, themselves, the top fifteen were rated as occurring more than "Sometimes." The primary theme among these is economic difficulties, arising from an inability to get employment and from costly recreation. A second commonality pertains to the schools, where the youth were victimized by theft and vandalism, where they were unable to make input, and where they felt frustrated by adults and by the curriculum. The same general categories applied to the twenty-five situations ranked as the most serious community youth

Table K

Two Rankings of Youth Problems/Needs Obtained from Surveys
of 262 Youth Involved in Community Changes. On the Left,
the Situations Are Ranked in Terms of Frequency of Experience;
on the Right They Are Ordered by Seriousness for Community
Youth.

EXPERIENCED		SERIOUSNESS IN COMMUNITY
Problem/Need	Rank	Problem/Need
The things youth can do for fun cost too much	1	There are no jobs around
Students not having any say in how schools are run	2	Nothing to do for fun
Nothing to do for fun	3	The things youth can do for fun cost too much
Young people not being understood by adults in school	4	Students not having any say in how schools are run
There are no jobs around	5	Young people not being understood by adults in school
The only open jobs have no future	6	Parents who don't understand their children's problems
Teachers not being interested in students	7	The only open jobs have no future
Not enough really useful or important classes or courses	8	Parents who don't know where their children are or what their kids are doing
Police who treat things worse than they really are	9	Police who treat things worse than they really are
Not enough job training	10	Things stolen or destroyed in school
Parents who don't understand their children's problems	11	Teachers not being interested in students
No way to find out about what jobs there are	12	No way to find out about what jobs there are
A need for counseling about types of jobs	13	Not enough job training
Not enough different classes or courses in school	14	Police who are "out to get" young people

Table K (Continued)

EXPERIENCED		SERIOUSNESS IN COMMUNITY
Problem/Need	Rank	Problem/Need
Things stolen or destroyed at school	15	Things stolen or destroyed in the neighborhood
Police who are not interested in helping youth	16	Police who are not interested in helping youth
Police who aren't around when you need them	17	Drugs being too easy to get
Police who are "out to get" young people	18	A need for counseling about types of jobs
School counselors who don't know enough	19	Not enough really useful or important classes or courses
No adults that youngsters can talk to about problems	20	Parents who are not interested their children
Things stolen or destroyed in the neighborhood	21	Police aren't around when you need them
Drugs being too easy to get	22	Parents not spending enough time with their children
Police who hassle minority young people	23	No adults that youth can talk to about problems
Police who are crooked or dishonest	24	Being expelled or suspended from school
Parents who don't know where their children are, or what they are doing	25	Police who hassle young or minority people
Not enough school counselors	26	Not enough different classes or courses at school
Parents not spending enough time with their children	27	Police who are dishonest or crooked
Parents who are not interested in their children	28	School counselors who don't know enough
Being expelled or suspended from school	29	Families that are too poor for needed food, etc.
Being hassled by other kids to use drugs	30	Parents who physically attack their children

Table K (Continued)

EXPERIENCED		SERIOUSNESS IN COMMUNITY
Problem/Need	Rank	Problem/Need
Can't get drug counseling	31	Being hassled by other kids to use drugs
Young people being in physical danger from others in their neighborhood	32	Young people being in physical danger in their neighborhood
Parents who physically attack their children	33	Not enough school counselors
Families that are too poor to give their children needed food, clothing or medical treatment	34	Can't get a job because of police record
Can't get sex education	35	Can't get abortion counseling
Can't get pregnancy counseling	36	Being hassled by other kids to buy drugs
Can't get birth control counseling	37	Can't get drug counseling
Can't get abortion counseling	38	Can't get birth control counseling
Being physically hurt by teachers	39	Can't get V.D. counseling
Being hassled by other kids to buy drugs	40	Being physically hurt by teachers
Can't get V.D. counseling	41	Can't get pregnancy counseling
Can't get a job because of sex bias	42	Can't get sex education
Difficulty with teachers because of race or nationality	43	Can't get a job because of sex bias
Can't get a job because of police record	44	Can't get a job because of race or nationality
Can't get a job because of race or nationality	45	Difficulty with teacher because race or nationality

-120-

needs/problems. Here, however, other concerns entered; those for inept parenting and policing. The respondents saw a lack of adult understanding, interest and guidance as serious youth problems.

While these results can not be accepted as portraying accurately youth realities in the Project Communities, such findings may be indicative of areas in which youth experience unmet needs. It is the case, too, that the Community Change Projects, as described earlier, included efforts at community remediation in exactly the areas the respondents emphasized: youth employment; recreation; greater youth input into the school environment; parent education classes; and police-youth liaison. In addition, the projects provided a number of youth with something "to do."

Impact Results. The final analytic question was, "Did the project group show any improvement as a result of involvement in the   program." In order to answer this, several steps were carried out:

--Any project youth who did not forward a post survey, or for whom there was no comparison friend survey, was eliminated from the study. This resulted in Project and Comparison Groups of fourteen and seventeen individuals, respectively.

--The two groups were compared with each other on each of the study variables, using the "Pre" surveys, and again, on their "Post" responses.

--Each group was compared to itself, "Pre" vs. "Post" on every study variable.

--The two groups were compared with each other, "Pre" vs. "Post," using the sum of all the scale scores.

None of the comparisons resulted in a significant difference being demonstrated. The conclusion that must be reached, then, is that, on the basis of the samples studied, youth involvement had no measurable impact on delinquency. Several factors, though, raise a question as to what degree these results reflect impact reality.

--The number of cases in each group was inadequate to meet the demands of the study. With such a small number, the Pre-Post change in self-reported problems would have had to have been very large in order for the results to have been significant. Also, involvement in different types of project activity may have had differential effects. These and other pertinent subanalyses were made impossible by the sample size.

--The evaluation time constraints precluded using a follow-up interval subsequent to termination of involvement. Impact follow-up periods that begin with the date an individual starts in a program always bias the results in the direction of "no impact," because human behavior takes time to change.

--Staff observations, and statements from the youth themselves, controvert the experimental findings.

KCAY Youth-Employment Impact. A sub analysis was conducted of just those youth who had enrolled in KCAY's Summer Employment Program. All of their Youth Surveys were used, without regard to matching. That is, no case was eliminated due to the absence of a counterpart survey. The number of cases then was:

	Project Group	Comparison Group
Pre	52	20
Post	11	13

Comparisons between the two groups yielded no significant differences "Pre" or "Post" on any of the study variables. Nor, were there any "Pre-Post" differences for the Comparison Group. There was one significant scale difference, however, "Pre-Post" for the Project Group, in "Problems Experienced in the Community." For the purposes of contrast, the results for both groups are given below.

	Project Group	Comparison Group
"Pre" Mean	95.10	89.36
"Post" Mean	81.13	90.47
Difference Between Means	13.98	-1.11
Standard Dev. "Pre"	19.21	16.28
"Post"	19.64	12.83
Stand. Error "Pre"	2.64	3.64
"Post"	5.92	3.56
t	2.35	.17
Significance Level	.0211	.8626
df	63	32

For all of the comparisons described in this section, .10 was accepted as the level of significance for any observed difference, due to the small number involved. The fact that only the Project Group displayed a through time change, and that the change was on that particular variable, fits with the logic of the situation. The tangible attainment of employment could have registered during the brief follow-up period as a perceived problem reduction for the forty out of fity-two who obtained jobs.

This result can not be accepted as definitive, however, in that it was not the result of a controlled experiment. It is possible that the observed "Pre-Post" difference for the Project Group was the result of simple case attrition from fifty-two to eleven. The absence of other significant differences, though, cast some doubt on that likelihood.

Summary and Conclusions

The generic mission, for all of the youth service projects funded by the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice was the same-- to reduce youth problems in their respective communities. The classifications, Direct Service and Community Change, used in the foregoing report, referred to projects' objectives, methodologies and targets, rather than to their goals. With one possible exception, all of the projects had an explicit or implicit goal of delinquency reduction. The commonality of this goal provided the rationale for a program-level, impact evaluation which was seen as more cost efficient that project-by-project evaluations of effectiveness. Given a fixed amount of evaluation dollars, more definitive information can be obtained from several projects' pooled data, obtained within a single time frame, than from the successive examinations of single-project data descriptive of smaller samples.

While some individual, project assessments were completed in 1975, the impact evaluation process was begun early in 1976, with a development, design and training phase. During that period, the evaluators gained an in-depth knowledge of each project as it was at that time. In return, the evaluators held several evaluation training seminars to which were invited project staff, agency representatives, local officials, community lay people, youth, and WCCJ personnel. The major purpose of the seminars was to establish basic communication about evaluation between the research staff and those concerned with, or involved in, the projects. With regard to the project staffs the specific aims were to:

--Inform them of the importance of evaluation

--Clarify for them evaluation needs and procedures

-- Obtain their input into the evaluation development
   and design

--Gain their collaboration with the evaluation

It was hoped that the training seminars would produce a
collaborative endeavor on the part of project staffs with the
evaluators, based upon knowledge about and commitment to the
evaluation. Initially the seminars had the desired effect but,
it soon dissipated due to a delay in evaluation contract execution,
and to an astonishing rate of project staff turnover. The contract
delay caused a four month gap during which the evaluators began
to lose touch with the projects. This was especially significant
in that it was during this period that some of the turnover
occurred, and that some projects began to change their methodologies.
The staff changes were especially crucial. During the evaluation
period, six of the ten projects included in the evaluation had
fifteen directors! In addition, another forty percent of the ten
projects' staff were replaced. An attempt was made to remedy this
by additional site visits, and another training seminar early in
1977. However, the new staff people seemed too involved in mastering
their assignments to commit themselves to the evaluation. Also,
the turnover, continued, through time. Interesting to note is
that three of the four projects that submitted data consistently
did not change directors.

Despite the disappointments and the violence done to the
research methodology by these and other problems, the overall
evaluation program is viewed as having been a worthwhile endeavor.
Its products to date have been:

--Fifteen of Wisconsin's youth service projects were
assessed by the consultant and reported upon individually.

These were primarily organizational and management assessments aimed at providing technical assistance to the projects. The reports pertinent to the projects included in this evaluation are referenced in the chapter entitled "The Projects."

--Associates for Youth Development conducted a literature search to uncover and summarize what was known currently about Youth Service Bureaus, nationwide. This volume was submitted separately to WCCJ in September, 1977, under the title <u>Youth Service Bureaus: The Current State of the Art, Nationwide and in Wisconsin</u>.

--As part of the impact portion of the evaluation, an in-depth study of the Brown County Youth Resources Council was completed in October, 1977. In the report, <u>Comprehensive Evaluation of the Brown County Youth Resources Council</u>, the project was recommended as a model for replication elsewhere.

--This program level evaluation report, in which some important comparisons are made between the Direct Service and Community Change approaches to delinquency reduction.

The term, Direct Service Projects, as used in this evaluation, refers to those Wisconsin-funded projects that devoted a major portion of their resources to providing services (methodology) to individual youth (targets) with the objective of reducing the young people's problems, such as delinquency. This designation fit seven of the projects, even though more than half of these engaged in some community development activities. However, only two of these projects forwarded sufficient data to permit even a partial impact study of their client services.

A client profile, developed from data submitted by four Direct Services Projects, Marathon, Outagamie, Washington and Winnebago Counties' YSBs indicated their clientele to be much like those of similar projects across the country, with one exception. The proportion of ethnic minorities was relatively low due to the socio-geographic areas served. According to the data, the average client, age fifteen, was assessed as having at least three service

needs--with the primary one being for counseling. This is not surprising in the sense that Direct Service Projects were created expressly to provide counseling as the pre-ordained, remedial service to bring about individual change.

A high proportion of the service needs were met by project personnel, with approximately one-quarter of the needed services being met by other agencies to which the youth were referred. Less than two percent of the clients failed to receive needed services due to some lack in the community. This indicated that few gaps in services for troubled youth existed in the four project communities, and that the projects did well in getting services to the client youth.

In line with the high level of services provided, the Direct Services Projects were functionally sound. The outcome of their efforts, however, was questionable. Relatively few cases were identified by project staff as divertees from the juvenile justice process. This was in accord with the relatively low pre-adjudication referral rate from juvenile justice agencies. It would seem, then, that the general project objective, of increasing the diversion of youth by providing an alternative to the justice process, was not accomplished to any significant degree. Seventy four diversion cases (13.6%) in four counties would seem to be too few, especially in light of the fact that a majority of all the clients were referred due to non-offense reasons. This may have been due, in part, to the categories of cases handled by the bureaus. Almost one-fourth of the cases were identified by project staff as other than "delinquency" cases, per se. They

were classified as neither "prevention," "intervention," or
"diversion" cases. Thus, it may be that too great a proportion
of project services were provided for general social work or mental
health reasons. Whether such a situation was justifiable would
be for WCCJ to decide.

The final Direct-Service outcomes dealt with were through-
time client changes. Conflicting results were obtained on two
"pre-post" measurements of client change, using data supplied by
staff. A four-month period subsequent to referral to the project
was compared to the same interval prior to referral to make two
determinations.

> --Staff perceived change in clients' problems.
> Staff saw a decrease, for a majority of the
> youth, in incidents connected with "reasons for
> referral."

> --Staff enumerated incidents connected with reasons
> for referral. Here, no through-time reduction was
> found.

Though these results were not obtained from a controlled
experiment, both were obtained from staff-supplied data on the
same cases, for the same time period. In the evaluators' opinion
the second result can be accepted as more valid, in that it was
derived from an enumeration of incidents, rather than a subjective
judgment. As such, it was less subject to the very human bias
of the project workers' desires to see improvement in their clients.
A previously planned, controlled examination of client change,
using data self-reported by youth had to be abandoned due to
lack of collaboration in Youth Survey administration on the part
of Direct Service Project staff.

The Community Change projects viewed their communities as
clients, and aimed their remedial efforts at community problems

conceptually related to delinquency. In a real sense they viewed
youth as service providers instead of as service recipients.

Brown County Youth Resources Council, Kenosha County Advocates
for Youth, and Racine County Youth Services existed in a climate
of basic acceptance, and were the products of well-organized,
county-wide planning processes. They were staffed by qualified
people dedicated to youth and to the concepts of community change
and of youth involvement. Their support groups were hardworking
and diversified, being composed of young people, service profes-
sionals, community officials, and lay individuals.

Virtually all of the objectives specified in their second-
year plans were being addressed to some degree by one or more
program components that resembled closely the tasks designated
in the plan. An increasing proportion of their counties were
being activated to fulfill the projects' aims. All of this
accounted for the sheer volume of program activity demonstrated
by the projects. A staff of from two to four, and their Advisory
Groups, produced prolific projects by informing, stimulating,
challenging, guiding, leading, supporting, and convincing others
to take part in creating community solutions to youth problems.

Most of the Community Change Projects' programmed efforts
paid off to some degree, either directly, or in the form of spin-off,
as well as in the positive reactions of participants and observers.
Events occurred in the various counties that were attributable,
at least in part, to project efforts.

 --The juvenile justice process was changing to accommodate
  more to youth needs, rather than to system needs. This

included stronger court and law enforcement diversion
policies, and detention reduction procedures.

--Coordination occurred among such organizations as the
courts, schools, police, social services, colleges, and
private agencies. Agency representatives in Brown County
indicated that none of the agencies could have accomplished
the coordination brought about by the project's leadership.

--Young people were employed by the projects,and as a result
of their programs.

--Youth were involved in identifying and meeting youth
needs, and demonstrated their ability to get the ear of
decision-makers and to advocate for themselves.

--Conferences and informational processes amplified the
project's efforts by creating community task forces and
other subgroups aimed at meeting specific needs.

Given the fact that Direct Service Programs, using remedial
approaches with individual, troubled youth, had very limited
impact on the specific target of delinquency, the Community Change
Projects' accomplishments can be viewed in a positive light. With
budgets that were about average for funded youth service programs,
they produced far-reaching effects in the community. It was not
possible, within the constraints of a limited, one-year evaluation,
however, to discern exactly their diffuse impact upon community-
wide delinquency. However, their efforts and accomplishments were
well focussed, and held closely to the recommendations embodied in
the National Strategy for Youth Development. This strategy,
propounded by the Office of Youth Development and Delinquency

prevention, evolved from a theory of delinquency causation that was empirically tested and accepted as valid. Briefly stated, the theory asserts that youthful law-abiding behavior will occur in a given community to the degree that its youth: are integrated into community life; have meaningful community and family roles; are viewed as valuable human beings; and, have reasonable control over their own destinies. Since this theory was accepted as valid, and since the Community Change Projects were responsible for strengthening the community conditions indicated by the theory, it is likely that these projects had a delinquency prevention impact within their communities. However, this likelihood should not be accepted as an accomplished fact. The degree to which community change efforts directly effect community delinquency remains to be documented definitively.

In an effort to examine the project's specific impact upon the problems of individual youth, a portion of the evaluation was devoted to examining the effects on young people as a result of their involvement in the community change activities of two projects, Brown and Kenosha. Though the projects did not claim that they would reduce the delinquency of those youth involved with them, a general evaluation hypothesis was derived from the above theory, in light of the youth involvement approaches.

--Youth involvement in community-change planning and implementation, as members of decision making bodies, in self growth activities, and in being helpful to their peers, would increase their: integration into the community; ability to function in socially valuable roles; and perceptions

of self worth. As a result, their delinquent involvement would be reduced.

The hypothesis rested on two assumptions. One was that the youth involved in the project were "troubled" despite the fact that they were not formal "referrals" from community agencies such as police, courts, social services, etc. This contention was supported by project staff observations, by the evaluators' contact with the youth, by the young people's descriptions of themselves in interviews, and by self-report youth surveys. The other assumption was that the youth "involvement" was of a type that created valuable roles for youth, and permitted them to make significant input into community processes. That this was the case, was established from the projects' documented activities with youth, the interview response of youth and adults involved with one project, and from the quantified data on individual youth involvement.

Two sets of findings clearly supported the hypothesis. The young people in Brown County and both projects staffs agreed in their perceptions that individual benefits, including a turning away from delinquency, accrued from youth involvement.

The results of controlled, experimental examination of youth involvement's impact on delinquency, however, did not support the validity of the hypothesis. On the other hand, serious questions were raised as to the definitiveness of this finding due to inadequate sample size and to the evaluation's time constraints. One finding, though, from Kenosha County Advocates for Youth's Employment Project, indicated that its employment program might of had an impact in reducing problems for the youth

enrolled in it. This would seem warranted since many youth
indicated in their surveys that lack of employment and money
were problems for them. The high rate of employment of the
youth in the program would indicate, then, that these youth
would have experienced a reduction in these problems.

Summary Statement. In light of all of the evaluation evidence,
it is the evaluators' opinion that Wisconsin's Community Development
Approach to youth problem reduction, including delinquency, has
developed a model worthy of replication. It appears to be having
a significant, positive impact on those community conditions
that are postulated as precursors of delinquency. Per funding
dollar, it seems to have the potential for greater impact, on a
broader spectrum of youth problems, than the traditional remedial
approaches to individual, troubled youth. In addition, it is
possible that the youth involved in community-change approaches
experience personal benefits, including reduced delinquent behavior.
A limited, one-year evaluation was not sufficient, however, to
provide conclusive evidence as to the degree of the projects'
diffused impacts upon community delinquency. The next chapter
includes some guidance in relation to these issues.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are predicated on the
evaluators' assertion that Wisconsin's Community Change Approach
to youth services has shown enough progress, accomplishment, and
impact, to warrant its consideration as a demonstration of
innovative delinquency prevention methodology. In addition,
attention is given to the realities of project existence, and to
possible ways of increasing, as well as examining, future
effectiveness.

--State level consideration should be given to taking steps

to reduce the amount of project resources required to obtain

follow-on funding, and to assist projects with obtaining the

required local match, given that monitoring reports show the

projects to be functionally sound. To the degree that this

is done, action projects will be spared the exorbitant drain

on staff time and energy that is a concomitant with fighting

for funding existance. This is especially true for the

community change type of project, for these projects'

accomplishments depend upon a steady process of involving

people in bringing about desired changes. Any significant

interruptions of the process only detract from the projects'

potential achievements. Too much can not be said for the

need to reduce the number of federal and local dollars

used to obtain more federal and local dollars.

--The evidence of the general ineffectiveness of remedial

counseling approaches to reducing delinquency indicates

that the money allocated for this type of programming would

be spent more productively on efforts of more tangible value
for youth: tutoring, parent education, job finding and
placement, and involving youth in removing community
barriers to their own development. Counseling as it
is currently employed should be limited to very brief,
situational, crisis type input. This should be oriented
toward aiding youth with life problems, rather than treating
youth as patients with illnesses to be cured.

--Greater technical assistance to Community Change Projects
is needed in helping them to focus on more specific and well-
defined targets. This would augment their demonstrable effective-
ness. Target-specific approaches to increasing youth
employment, and to decreasing youth crime and adjudications
would provide more definitive tests of the effectiveness
of the project's methodology. For example, the youth
surveyed displayed considerable concern about crime and
vandalism in schools. Their concern could be turned to
good advantage, for there is considerable evidence from
around the country, including Madison, that a modification
of school approaches, to include youth in solving the problem,
produces dramatic results in reducing such within-school
problems.

--The evidence indicates that, through time, a smaller number
of youth have been involved with Wisconsin's Community
Change Projects in working toward desired community changes.
It is recommended that this trend be reversed by expanding
Youth Advisory Board and Junior Staff programming. Young

people, in sufficient numbers, can be a powerful constructive
force in any community if they are well coordinated and
provided with capable guidance.

--A set of efficient and sound evaluation methodologies
have been implemented for the Community Change Projects.
Also, the projects' staffs are strong, well-trained collab-
orators in the evaluation process. In view of this, and of
the projects' potential for long-term success, it is recommended,
strongly, that the Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice
capitalize on what has been accomplished by incorporating a
continuation of the evaluation into its "in-house" procedures.
If this were to be done, it is likely that definitive
results as to project effectiveness would be obtained.
Further, the cost of doing so would be considerably
lower than if the evaluation were to be continued by contract
with an outside evaluator.

Appendix A

Wisconsin Association for Youth,
"Standards for Youth Service Bureaus"

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION FOR YOUTH, INC.

c/o KCAY, 6527 39th Avenue
Kenosha, Wisconsin   53142

Standards
for
Wisconsin Youth Service Bureaus

Youth Service Bureaus shall make use of existing service for youth
through referral, systamatic follow-up and individual advocacy.

Youth Service Bureaus shall promote an increase in meaningful roles
for youth which reinforce feelings of selfworth, competence, use-
fulness and power.

Youth Service Bureaus shall facilitate increased and improved co-
operation and communication among community agencies which affect
youth.

Youth Service Bureaus shall act as advocates for youth in any system,
organization or governing unit which plans programs and/or operates
services which affect youth.

Youth Service Bureaus shall promote change and improvement in com-
munity systems which adversely affect youth.

Youth Service Bureaus shall be to seek sources of continuous funding frc
both state and local governments and private sources.

Youth Service Bureaus shall insure that approaches to meeting community
and youth needs will include problem appraisal, systematic planning,
use of available resources and citizen participation.

Youth Service Bureaus shall advocate and implement inclusion of youth
in decision-making that impacts on youth. Youth Service Bureaus shall
also provide youth opportunities to develop and utilize decision-
making skills.

Youth Service Bureaus shall reach-out to youth in the youth's own
environment to provide them with services to relieve problems and/or
conditions which affect them as individuals and or as groups.

Youth Service Bureaus shall be organized as independent, locally
operated agencies that involve the widest number of people in the Com-
munity, particularly youth, in the solution of youth problems. In no
case should Youth Service Bureaus be under the control of the justice
system or any of its components.

Appendix B

Direct Service Client Data
Collection Formats

DIRECT SERVICE DATA MANUAL

Wisconsin Youth Service Systems Evaluation

October 1, 1976

Associates for Youth Development
905 University Avenue, Room 301
Madison, WI   53715

This document is intended as a <u>provisional</u> set of directions for the collection of Direct Service Data. (Another set of procedures is being implemented for the collection of Youth Involvement-Community Change Data.) If the instructions included here fail to meet your needs in any way, please contact us. We have set up an office in Madison:

> Associates for Youth Development
> 905 University Avenue, Room 301
> Madison, WI 53715
> Phone (608) 251-7462

The data that you provide will be multi-purpose in the sense that they will be used to:

- Provide you with monthly tabulations and descriptions of your workload. If you desire any special breakdown or sub-group description, please let us know. For example, you may wish to know the client-service characteristics that are associated with: age, sex, type of referral, by whom referred, residence area, type of case, etc. As soon as the number of youngsters on whom you have submitted data becomes large enough for the type of information you desire, it will be provided.

- Document your workload to WCCJ and others. Therefore, it is recommended that you complete a data form for every youngster for whom you make a service input (direct, referred, brokered, etc.).

- Determine, to the degree that you can provide follow-up information, the impact of your efforts upon the presenting problems of the youth with whom you work.

As such, these data forms are to be completed for youngsters who receive <u>Direct</u> <u>Services</u>. Thus, the data collection is pertinent to any bureau that devotes all <u>or</u> <u>part</u> of its resources to arranging for service inputs to individual youth.

Please be aware that in addition to evaluating Wisconsin's Youth Service System, we wish to be of assistance to you in any way that lies within our functional area. Let us know of any difficulties you have with the evaluation procedure, and feel free to contact us for assistance or clarification with coding.

Further Description of Some Questions

Page 1: Client Information

For Questions 1 and 2:

Project Title	Project Code
Milwaukee County YSB	01-05
Outagamie County YSB	06
Fond du Lac County YSB	07
Beloit YSB	08
Brown Co. Youth Resources Council	09
Kenosha Co. Advocates for Youth	10
Dane County YSB	11
Marathon County YSB	12
Washington County YSB	13
Racine Co. Youth Services System	14
Sheboygan County YSB	15

For Project Title you may use any word or abbreviation that will be usedconsistently to designate your organization, such as Sheboygan, Advocap, and KCAY.

Question 3, STAFF CODE

Each project should assign each staff member a two-digit staff code. Please send the evaluators a copy of your staff code assignments. A form is provided. If you hire a new staff person, assign that person a new number-- one that has not been assigned to another staff member since October 1976.

Question 4, YOUTH CODE

Each youth should receive a five-digit youth code, with numbers used consecutively. These can start with 00001. Please take care to avoid giving the same number to two different youths, or to skipping any numbers.

It is absolutely essential that you create a roster of consecutive numbers,next to each of which a youth's name is entered at time of referral and contact. This will fulfill two purposes:

1. Data Control Any "gaps" occuring in the numerical coding sequence of the data forms received by the evaluation staff can be remedied by contact with you.

2. Follow Up In the interests of privacy and confidentiality, the data forms received by the evaluation staff will not identify individuals by name. Thus, in the instances of agreed-upon outcome follow up for individuals, it will be necessary for you to know the name of the individual corresponding to a given code number.

Note: If you have an existing case numbering system, it is not necessary to restart the numbers from 00001 for the purpose of coding the data forms. Simply code the first form with the next consecutive youth (client) number available.

In those instances in which a youth is referred to you, after a prior referral and contact, please complete Question 26.

Question 5, DATE OF INTAKE

The date youth has contact with the project as a client resulting from the current referral.

When writing dates, fill in empty boxes with zeros. For example:

$$\boxed{0}\boxed{2}\ \boxed{1}\boxed{9}\ \boxed{7}\boxed{6}$$
Mo.   Day   Yr.

Question 12, SCHOOL DISTRICT OR RESIDENCE AREA

Divide your "service area"-- the geographical area from which your clients come-- into any set of logical sections, e.g., school districts, census tracts, voting precincts, distinct socio-economic class areas, etc. Then, assign a two-digit number to each, i.e., 01 to 99. Use these codes to complete this item. Please provide the evaluation staff with a copy of your coding classifications at your earliest convenience.

Question 17, PUBLIC WELFARE

Defined as any form of public assistance to needy families. Payment for foster care services, etc., do not qualify as welfare.

Question 18, REFERRED BY

Two sets of boxes are available, in case the person was referred by two sources. Only fill in one set of boxes if the youth was only referred by one source.

For subsections "02 Court Worker-- Before Adjudication" and "03 Court Worker-- After Adjudication", please note:

"Court worker" is a general term which includes all persons working in an official capacity with youth involved in the juvenile court process, whether they are paid by the court or another agency (such as a probation or social service department).

"Adjudication" is the court procedure of determining whether the youth is "innocent" or "guilty" of the offense.

"Court Worker-- Before Adjudication" includes intake workers.

"Court Worker-- After Adjudication" includes probation officers and supervision officers.

Question 19, REFERRAL WAS

1. Mandatory-- The youth was required to be involved with the Youth Service Bureau. This could occur through a direct order by an official or by a threat that if he or she does not participate he or she will receive an undesirable alternative (such as court processing).

2. Voluntary-- The youth is under no obligation to be involved with the Youth Service Bureau, and no undesirable action would be taken by officials if he or she did not participate.

Question 20, REASON FOR REFERRAL

Choose the code from the right-hand column which corresponds to reason the youth was referred to the YSS. If the reason is not listed, code "90 Other" and write the reason under Question 20. If a code applies, but does not fully explain the reason, enter the code number and write a brief description on the lines provided. You do not need to write any description if the reason is clearly stated by the wording in the right-hand column.

Question 22, OTHER IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

If you have identified any problems the youth has other than the reason for referral, list codes for up to two problems.

Question 23, TYPE OF CASE

Prevention refers to any action taken prior to the time the youth becomes a candidate for juvenile justice processing.

Intervention includes those actions taken with a youth who is in trouble with authorities, but who would not have been processed through formal juvenile justice procedures (referral to police, arrest, or adjudication).

Diversion is defined as any action taken to prevent further formal processing of a youth through juvenile justice procedures. The key element here is that the youngster is a definite candidate for: police referral, court referral, adjudication or incarceration. In place of one or more of these actions the youth is referred to a YSB.

Question 24, HAS THE YOUTH HAD CONTACT WITH ANY OF THE FOLLOWING JUST BEFORE REFERRAL, WHICH LED TO REFERRAL TO THE Y.S.S.?

You may check more than one of these juvenile justice institutions, if applicable.

Page 2: For Agencies referring Youth to the Youth Service System

When a youth is referred to the Youth Service System by an agency (such as Law Enforcement, Court Worker, Judge, School, or other agencies) please ask the person referring the case to indicate into which category he or she thinks the case falls: prevention, intervention, diversion, or other. Be sure they consider the definitions provided.

The other agency can either be asked to fill this out directly or the YSS staff can ask the question and mark the agency's answer.

Page 3: Service Delivery Record

<u>Question 4, Date of Assessment</u>

Date staff member decided which services were identified as needed.

<u>Services Identified as Needed</u>

Check service you think the youth needs. This can help you in developing a service plan. Please mark needed services even if they do not exist or the youth may have trouble in receiving the service. By using the "service needed" column and the corresponding space for "reason service not received", we can help you identify needed services (by age, area of residence, source of referral and other characteristics).

<u>Services Record</u>

For each service received: fill in codes for who provided the service (YSB and/or other agency code), the beginning date, number of weeks duration, and the frequency (coded at bottom).

<u>Other Agency Codes</u>

Each project should assign three-digit numbers (001-999) to agencies to whom it refers cases. Please use the enclosed form to send a list of these codes to the evaluators.

If the YSS refers the case to another agency and no services are provided, you may still fill in the agency code and put zero for weeks received and frequency. Then you should also code reason not received in the last column.

If a service is provided by both the YSS and another agency, or by more than one agency, use the earliest beginning date and the <u>combined</u> duration and frequency.

<u>Services Identified as Needed, But Not Received</u>

Enter code for reason on each line marked as needed, but not received.

Page 4: Follow Up Information

This page should be completed four months after the youth's intake date (date on page 1 of form).

Question 7, HOW MUCH HAS THE REASON FOR REFERRAL CHANGED and
Question 8, HOW MUCH HAVE OTHER IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS CHANGED?

If you cannot determine change in any of the client's problems, please note the reason, such as, "Cannot get in touch with youth".

Question 14, NUMBER OF OCCURENCES OF REASON FOR REFERRAL FOUR MONTHS
          AFTER REFERRAL TO YSS

Refer to the Reason for Referral you had noted on page 1 at the time of intake. This item is very important. If at all possible, please try to complete it.

Page 5: For Agencies Providing Services to Youth Referred by the YSS.
         Four month follow-up.

The other agency can either fill out this form directly, or the YSS staff can ask them the question and write in the answers.

Each week, please send us the pages you have completed.

The correct timing for sending us each page is outlined below:

Page 1 and Page 2: AS SOON AFTER INTAKE AS PAGE IS COMPLETED.

Page 3, Service Record: AS SOON AS YOUTH HAS ENDED INVOLVEMENT WITH PROJECT, IF BEFORE FOUR MONTH FOLLOW UP DATE.

Page 4 and Page 5: ON FOUR MONTH FOLLOW UP DATE.

Note: Please let us know when your supply of forms is low and you will be needing more.

Associates for Youth Development
905 University Avenue, Room 301
Madison, WI 53715
Phone: (608) 251-7462

Study 1
Card No. 01 (2-3)

CLIENT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE

PROJECT CODE (4-5) ☐☐

STAFF CODE (6-7) ☐☐

YOUTH CODE (8-12) ☐☐☐☐☐

DATE OF INTAKE (13-18) ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐
Mo. Day Yr.

BIRTH DATE (19-24) ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐

7. AGE 25-26 ☐☐

8. SEX (check applicable square) (27)

1 ☐ Female   2 ☐ Male

ETHNICITY (28)

1 ☐ Black
2 ☐ White
3 ☐ Mexican
4 ☐ Puerto Rican
5 ☐ Native American
6 ☐ Other _____

SCHOOL STATUS (29)

1 ☐ Enrolled
2 ☐ Not enrolled
3 ☐ High School Graduate

11. LAST GRADE IN WHICH ENROLLED (currently or previously) ☐☐ (30-31)

12. SCHOOL DISTRICT OR RESIDENCE AREA ☐☐ (32-33)

13. PARENTS' MARITAL STATUS (34)

1 ☐ Parents married and living together
2 ☐ Parents divorced or separated
3 ☐ Parents never married
4 ☐ One parent deceased
5 ☐ Both parents deceased
6 ☐ Whereabouts unknown

14. YOUTH LIVING WITH (35-36)

01 ☐ Natural parents
02 ☐ Mother only
03 ☐ Father only
04 ☐ Mother and stepfather
05 ☐ Father and stepmother
06 ☐ Foster family
07 ☐ Relatives
08 ☐ Independent arrangement
09 ☐ Residential placement
10 ☐ Other _____
99 ☐ Unknown

15. NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD (including youth) ☐☐ 37-38

16. ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME (39-44)

$ ☐☐☐ , ☐☐☐

17. CURRENT RECIPIENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE? (45)

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Unknown

---

18. REFERRED BY (46-47) ☐☐   ☐☐ (48-49)

01 Law Enforcement
02 Court Worker--Before adjudication
03 Court Worker--After adjudication
04 Juvenile Court Judge
05 School
06 Other Agency _____
07 Project Staff
08 Parent
09 Friend
10 Self
11 Other _____

19. REFERRAL WAS (50)

1 ☐ Mandatory   2 ☐ Voluntary

20. REASON FOR REFERRAL (see codes at right) ☐☐ 51 52

Brief description: _____

21. NUMBER OF OCCURENCES OF REASON FOR REFERRAL FOUR MONTHS BEFORE REFERRAL TO YSS ☐☐☐ 53 54 55

22. OTHER IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

Main ☐☐ 56 57   Second ☐☐ 58 59

Brief description: _____

23. TYPE OF CASE (60)

1 ☐ PREVENTION (Youth could not have been referred to court, danger of future involvement with criminal justice system)

2 ☐ INTERVENTION (youth in trouble, would not have been referred to court, but could have been)

3 ☐ DIVERSION (youth would have been processed formally in place of project referral; project will prevent further formal processing)

4 ☐ OTHER _____

24. HAS THE YOUTH HAD CONTACT WITH ANY OF THE FOLLOWING JUST BEFORE REFERRAL, WHICH LED TO REFERRAL TO THE YOUTH SERVICE SYSTEMS?

(61) ☐ Juvenile Court
(62) ☐ Law Enforcement
(63) ☐ Is in state institution
(64) ☐ Other juvenile justice system contact:

25. YOUTH ON PROBATION? (65)

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

26. (COMPLETE THESE ITEMS ONLY IF THIS CASE IS A RE-REFERRAL TO YOUR PROJECT)

A. Previous youth code (66-70) ☐☐☐☐☐

B. Prior to this referral, was case (71)

1 ☐ Closed (terminated)
2 ☐ Open (ongoing)

Codes for Questions 20 & 22

OFFENSE RELATED REASONS

CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS

01 Murder
02 Manslaughter
03 Forcible rape
04 Assault & Battery

CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

11 Robbery with weapon
12 Robbery without weapon
13 Burglary (break/enter)
14 Motor vehicle theft--with intent to keep
15 Motor vehicle theft--without intent to keep
16 Shoplifting
17 Other theft (except shoplifting and motor vehicle theft)
18 Arson
19 Forgery & counterfeiting
20 Fraud
21 Embezzlement
22 Stolen property (receive or conceal)
23 Vandalism

OTHER OFFENSES

30 Weapons (reckless use, carry, or possess)
31 Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)
32 Prostitution
33 Gambling
34 Drug laws--narcotic
35 Drug laws--non-narcotic
36 Disorderly conduct
37 Vagrancy

NON-CRIMES

41 Runaway
42 Truancy
43 Curfew
44 Ungovernable behavior
45 Possess/drinking liquor
46 Other status offenses
47 Return to court

TRAFFIC OFFENSES

51 Driving under the influence
52 Reckless driving
53 Hit and run
54 Driving without a license
55 Other traffic offenses

NON-CARE

61 Lack adequate care or support
62 Conditions injurious
63 Abandonment
64 Abuse, cruel treatment
65 Other dependency or neglect
66 Termination parental rights
67 Commitment--Mental diff./mental ill
68 Other special proceedings

NON-OFFENSE RELATED REASONS

71 Family relationships
72 Relationships with peers
73 School behavioral problems
74 School academic problems
75 School adjustment
76 Emotional difficulties
77 Physical/medical/nutritional
78 Economic problems
79 Drug problems
80 Alcohol problems
81 Pregnancy/Parenthood difficulties
82 Wants a job

90 Other (specify)
91 Inapplicable
99 Unknown

(1)   (2-3)

2

FOR AGENCIES REFERRING YOUTH TO THE YSS

The information for the item below is to be obtained from agencies referring youth to the Youth Service System.

TYPE OF CASE

Please classify the case using the following criteria.
(17)
1 ☐PREVENTION   (youth could not have been referred to
                court, danger of future involvement
                with criminal justice system)

2 ☐INTERVENTION (youth in trouble, would not have been
                 referred to court, but could have been)

3 ☐DIVERSION (youth would have been processed formally
              in place of project referral; project will
              prevent further formal processing)

4 ☐OTHER _____

YSS Project completes these items:

Project code   ☐☐
                                      4-5

Youth code   ☐☐☐☐☐
                                  8 9 10 11 12

Date of agency's response above ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐
                                 mo. day yr.
                                 13 14 15 16 17 18

(1) **1. PROJECT TITLE** (2-3)

2. PROJECT CODE ☐ ☐

3. YOUTH CODE ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

4. Date of Assessment ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐
Mo.   Day   Yr.

WISCONSIN YOUTH SERVICE SYSTEMS

SERVICE DELIVERY RECORD

SERVICES IDENTIFIED AS NEEDED

(check applicable square)

SERVICES RECEIVED

SERVICES IDENTIFIED AS NEEDED, BUT NOT RECEIVED

(Enter code for reason on each line marked as needed, but not received)

		Provided by YSS (check applicable square)	Provided by other agency (enter agency code)	Beginning Date (Mo. Day Yr.)	Number of Weeks Duration	Frequency (enter code from below)	Services identified as needed, but not received
☐	Individual counseling	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Family counseling	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Group counseling	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Drug program	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Job referral/placement	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Tutoring	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Alternative academic education	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Vocational training	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Recreation program	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Medical aid	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Legal aid	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Youth advocacy with school	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Youth advocacy with police	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Youth advocacy with court	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Youth advocacy with probation	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Shelter facility	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Involvement in systems change project	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐
☐	Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐ / ☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐

Code for frequency

01 Once
02 Monthly
03 Twice monthly
04 Weekly
05 Twice weekly
06 Three times a week
07 Four times a week
08 Five times a week
09 Daily
10 Other (specify) _____

Code for reasons not received

01 Program does not exist
02 Too long of wait
03 Program refused to accept client
04 Refused by youth
05 Refused by parent
06 Client dissappointed with service
07 Client unable to pay
08 Youth moved out of county
09 Job referral program exists but jobs are not available
10 Other (specify) _____
99 Unknown

Please complete four months after intake date.

1. PROJECT TITLE

_____

2. PROJECT CODE   ☐☐
                  4   5

3. YOUTH CODE   ☐☐☐☐☐
               8   9   10   11   12

4. FOLLOW UP DATE   Mo.   Day   Yr.
                 ☐☐   ☐☐   ☐☐
                 13 14   15 16   17 18

5. MAJOR COUNSELOR
(code for counselor who
spent the most time with   ☐☐
this case)   19 20

6. REASON FOR CHANGE
(if major counselor different
from initial counselor, indicate
reason)

_____

7. HOW MUCH HAS THE REASON FOR REFERRAL TO THE
YOUTH SERVICE SYSTEM CHANGED? (21)

1 ☐ problem greatly decreased
2 ☐ problem slightly decreased
3 ☐ no change
4 ☐ problem slightly increased
5 ☐ problem greatly increased

8. HOW MUCH HAVE THE OTHER IDENTIFIED
PROBLEMS CHANGED? (refer to problems
identified on initial client information
form)

(a) Main problem (22)

1 ☐ problem greatly decreased
2 ☐ problem slightly decreased
3 ☐ no change
4 ☐ problem slightly increased
5 ☐ problem greatly increased

(b) Second problem (23)

1 ☐ problem greatly decreased
2 ☐ problem slightly decreased
3 ☐ no change
4 ☐ problem slightly increased
5 ☐ problem greatly increased

9. HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS ARISEN?
(24)
1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

If yes, describe: _____

_____

10. NUMBER OF CONTACTS PROJECT HAD
DURING THIS PERIOD:

(a) with the youth   (25-27) ☐☐☐

(b) with others concerning   (28-30) ☐☐☐
the youth

11. STATUS OF CASE AT THIS FOLLOW UP
DATE (31)

1 ☐ Active
2 ☐ Inactive
3 ☐ Case closed

12. IF CASE CLOSED, TERMINATION DATE   Mo.   Day   Yr.
                                    ☐☐   ☐☐   ☐☐
                                    32 33   34 35   36 37

13. IF CASE CLOSED, REASON FOR CLOSURE
(38-39)

01 ☐ Refused further service
02 ☐ Dropped out
03 ☐ Moved from area
04 ☐ Referred to other agency for service
and no further service provided by YSS
05 ☐ Closed by project with no further service
necessary
06 ☐ No longer meets project criteria
07 ☐ No treatment/services available
in the community
08 ☐ Adjudicated for original reason **for referral**
09 ☐ Adjudicated for new violation
10 ☐ Other _____
99 ☐ Not applicable (case not closed)

14. NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES OF REASON FOR REFERRAL

Four months after referral to YSS   ☐☐☐
                                         40 41 42

FOR AGENCIES PROVIDING SERVICES TO YOUTH REFERRED BY THE YSS

The information for the item below is to be obtained from agencies to whom
the Youth Service System refers youth.

Four month follow-up.

How much have the following problems changed?

(a) Type of problem: _____

(Type of problem and problem code   Problem code (refer
written in by YSS)   to p. 1)

(14)

1 ☐ problem greatly decreased
2 ☐ problem slightly decreased
3 ☐ no change
4 ☐ problem slightly increased
5 ☐ problem greatly increased

Comments: _____

(b) Type of problem: _____

(22)   Problem code

1 ☐ problem greatly decreased
2 ☐ problem slightly decreased
3 ☐ no change
4 ☐ problem slightly increased
5 ☐ problem greatly increased

Comments: _____

Have any additional problems arisen?   1 ☐ no
If so, describe: (25)   2 ☐ yes

_____

YSS Project completes these items:

Project code

Youth code

Date of agency's response above

No.   Day   Yr.

Appendix C

Manual and Forms for Data Provided
by Staff on Youth Involvement and on
Perceived Impact upon the Youth Involved
in Project Activities.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT DATA MANUAL

Wisconsin Youth Service Systems Evaluation

This document is intended as a <u>provisional</u> set of directions for the collection of Youth Involvement Data. (Another set of procedures is being implemented for the collection of Direct Service Data.) If the instructions included here fail to meet your needs in any way, please contact us. We have set up an office in Madison:

> Associates for Youth Development
> 905 University Avenue, Room 301
> Madison, WI 53715
> Phone: (608) 251-7462

The data that you provide will be multi-purpose in the sense that they will be used to:

-Provide you with monthly tabulations and descriptions of youth involved in your project. If you desire any special breakdown or sub-group description, please let us know. For example, you may wish to know the type and amount of involvement of youth that are associated with : reasons for youth's involvement (agency's reasons and/or youth's reasons), whether youth is on probation, and residence area.

-Document your workload to WCCJ and others. Therefore, it is recommended that you complete a data form for every youth involved in your project.

-Determine, to the degree you can provide follow-up information, the impact of the youth's involvement on any problems they may have.

As such, these data forms are to be completed for youngsters who are involved in your project. Thus, the data collection is pertinent to any youth sevice project that devotes all <u>or part</u> of its resources to youth involvement.

Please be aware that in addition to evaluating Wisconsin's Youth Service System, we wish to be of assistance to you in any way that lies within our functional area. Let us know of any difficulties you have with the evaluation procedure and feel free to contact us for assistance or clarification with coding.

Further Description of Some Questions

Page 1: Youth Involvement Information

For Questions 1 and 2:

Project Title	Project Code
Milwaukee County YSB	01-05
Outagamie County YSB	06
Fond du Lac County YSB	07
Beloit YSB	08
Brown County Youth Resources Council	09
Kenosha County Advocates for Youth	10
Dane County YSB	11
Marathon County YSB	12
Washington County YSB	13
Racine County Youth Services System	14
Sheboygan County YSB	15

For Project Title you may use any word or abbreviation that will be used consistently to designate your organization, such as Sheboygan, Advocap, and KCAY.

Question 3, STAFF CODE

Each project should assign each staff member a two-digit staff code. Please send the evaluators a copy of your staff code assignments. A form is provided. If you hire a new staff person, assign that person a new number-- one that has not been assigned to another staff member since October 1976.

Question 4, YOUTH CODE

Each youth should receive a five-digit youth code, with numbers used consecutively. These can start with 00001. Please take care to avoid giving the same number to two different youths, or to skipping any numbers.

It is absolutely essential that you create a roster of consecutive numbers, next to each of which a youth's name is entered at time of referral and contact. This will fulfill two purposes:

1. Data Control Any "gaps" occuring in the numerical coding sequence of the data forms received by the evaluation staff can be remedied by contact with you.

2. Follow Up In the interests of privacy and confidentiality, the data forms received by the evaluation staff will not identify individuals by name. Thus, in the instances of agreed-upon outcome follow-up for individuals, it will be necessary for you to know the name of the individual corresponding to a given code number.

Note: If you have an existing case numbering system, it is not necessary to restart the numbers from 00001 for the purpose of coding the data forms. Simply code the first form with the next consecutive youth number available.

Question 5, DATE OF FIRST CONTACT

The date youth has contact with the project for the current involvement. When writing dates, fill in empty boxes with zeros. For example:

$$\boxed{0}\;\boxed{2}\;.\;\boxed{3}\;\boxed{0}\;\;\boxed{7}\;\boxed{6}$$

Mo. Day Yr.

Question 8, SCHOOL DISTRICT OR RESIDENCE AREA

Divide your "service area"-- the geographical area from which your clients come-- into any set of logical sections, e.g., school districts, census tracts, voting precincts, distinct socio-economic class areas, etc. Then, assign a two-digit code number to each, i.e., 01 to 99. Use these codes to complete this item. Please provide the evaluation staff with a copy of your coding classifications at your earliest convenience.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT RECORD

For each type of involvement, complete the items: beginning date, number of weeks duration and frequency.

Page 2: Follow Up Information

Question 5, ANY IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

This question concerns problems, if any, that the youth had when he or she began involvement with your project or which you noticed during his or her involvement.

Choose the code(s) from the list which correspond(s) to the youth's problem(s). If the reason is not listed, code "90 Other" and write in the reason under Question 5. If a code applies, but does not fully explain the reason, enter the code and write a brief description on the lines provided. You do not need to write any description if the reason is clearly stated by the wording in the coded list of problems.

Question 7, NUMBER OF OCCURENCES OF MAIN PROBLEM FOUR MONTHS BEFORE AND AFTER BEGINNING INVOLVEMENT WITH THE YSS

Refer to the Main Problem you listed in Question 5. This item is very important. If it is at all possible, please try to complete it.

NOTE

Please send us the forms on the four-month follow-up date. The first page may be sent to us earlier if the youth ends involvement with the project before four months.

Please let us know when your supply of forms is low and you will soon be needing more.

WISCONSIN YOUTH SERVICE SYSTEMS

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE

_____

PROJECT CODE (4-5) ☐☐

3. STAFF CODE (6-7) ☐☐

YOUTH CODE (8-12) ☐☐☐☐☐

5. DATE OF FIRST CONTACT (Mo. Day Yr.)
☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐
13 14 15 16 17 18

6. REASONS FOR YOUTH'S INVOLVEMENT

A. AGENCY'S REASONS

(19)☐ To get youth involvement
(20)☐ To get information from youth
(21)☐ For youth's personal growth
(22)☐ Other (specify) _____

_____

B. YOUTH'S REASONS

(23)☐ To have a job
(24)☐ Wants to change things in the community
(25)☐ Wants something to do
(26)☐ Receiving pressure from others such as probation officers or parents. Please specify:

(27)☐ Thinks it's good for self
(28)☐ Other _____

_____

7. IS YOUTH ON PROBATION?
(29)
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

8. SCHOOL DISTRICT OR RESIDENCE AREA
☐☐
30 31

	Beginning Date Mo. Day Yr.	Number of Weeks duration	Frequency (enter code from below)
Planning of community change	32 33 34 35 36 37	38 39	40 41
Implementation of community change	42 43 44 45 46 47	48 49	50 51
Involvement in governmental action	52 53 54 55 56 57	58 59	60 61
Involvement in YSS advisory board	62 63 64 65 66 67	68 69	70 71
Involvement in other agencies	13 14 15 16 17 18		
Involvement in youth organization	23 24 25 26 27 28		31 32
Internship in other agency	33 34 35 36 37 38		
Writing or acting in plays	43 44 45 46 47 48		
Tutoring others	53 54 55 56 57 58		
Counseling others	63 64 65 66 67 68		
Job finding & placement of others	13 14 15 16 17 18		
In-service training	23 24 25 26 27 28		37
Providing recreation for others	33 34 35 36 37 38		
Organizing youth center	43 44 45 46 47 48		
Providing information to others	53 54 55 56 57 58		
Youth advocacy for other youth	63 64 65 66 67 68	69 70	71 72
Other: _____	73 74 75 76 77 78		
Other: _____	23 24 25 26 27 28	29 30	31 32

Code for frequency

01 Once
02 Monthly
03 Twice monthly
04 Weekly
05 Twice weekly
06 Three times a week
07 Four times a week
08 Five times a week
09 Daily
10 Other (specify)_____

Study 2   (1)
Card No. 05 (2-3)

WISCONSIN YOUTH SERVICE SYSTEMS

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT FOLLOW UP INFORMATION

(Please complete four months after contact with youth.)

1. PROJECT TITLE

   _____

2. PROJECT CODE ☐☐

3. YOUTH CODE (8-12) ☐☐☐☐☐

4. FOLLOW UP DATE Mo. Day Yr.
   (13-18) ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐

5. ANY IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS
   (See code at right.)

   19 20   21 22
   Main ☐☐   Second ☐☐

   _____

6. HOW MUCH HAVE IDENTIFIED
   PROBLEMS CHANGED?

   A. Main problem
      (23)
   1 ☐ Problem greatly decreased
   2 ☐ Problem slightly decreased
   3 ☐ No change
   4 ☐ Problem slightly increased
   5 ☐ Problem greatly increased

   Comments _____

   _____

   B. Second problem
      (24)
   1 ☐ Problem greatly decreased
   2 ☐ Problem slightly decreased
   3 ☐ No change
   4 ☐ Problem slightly increased
   5 ☐ Problem greatly increased

   Comments _____

   _____

7. NUMBER OF OCCURENCES OF MAIN
   PROBLEM

   A. Four months before beginning
   involvement with the YSS ☐☐☐
                            25 26 27

   B. Four months after beginning
   involvement with the YSS ☐☐☐
                            28 29 30

8. HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS
   ARISEN? (31)

   1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

   If yes, describe: _____

   _____

9. NUMBER OF CONTACTS PROJECT
   HAD DURING THIS PERIOD:

   A. With the youth ☐☐☐
                     32 33 34
   B. With others concerning
      the youth ☐☐☐
                35 36 37

10. IS YOUTH STILL INVOLVED WITH
    PROJECT AS OF THIS FOLLOW UP
    DATE? (38)

    1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

11. IF NO LONGER INVOLVED,
    TERMINATION DATE (Mo. Day Yr.)
    ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐ (39-44)

12. REASON IF NO LONGER INVOLVED
    (45-46)
    01 ☐ Completed responsibility
         in project
    02 ☐ Dropped out
    03 ☐ Moved from area
    04 ☐ No longer meets project
         criteria
    05 ☐ Adjudicated for original
         reason for referral
    06 ☐ Adjudicated for new
         violation
    07 ☐ Other (specify) _____

    99 ☐ Not applicable, youth is
         still involved

Codes for Question 5

A. CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS

   01 Murder
   02 Manslaughter
   03 Forcible rape
   04 Assault & Battery

B. CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

   11 Robbery with weapon
   12 Robbery without weapon
   13 Burglary (break/enter)
   14 Motor vehicle theft--with intent to keep
   15 Motor vehicle theft--without intent to keep
   16 Shoplifting
   17 Other theft (except shoplifting and motor vehicle theft)
   18 Arson
   19 Forgery & counterfeiting
   20 Fraud
   21 Embezzlement
   22 Stolen property (receive or conceal)
   23 Vandalism

C. OTHER OFFENSES

   30 Weapons (reckless use, carry, or possess)
   31 Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)
   32 Prostitution
   33 Gambling
   34 Drug laws--narcotic
   35 Drug laws--non-narcotic
   36 Disorderly conduct
   37 Vagrancy

D. NON-CRIMES

   41 Runaway
   42 Truancy
   43 Curfew
   44 Ungovernable behavior
   45 Possess/drinking liquor
   46 Other status offenses
   47 Return to court

E. TRAFFIC OFFENSES

   51 Driving under the influence
   52 Reckless driving
   53 Hit and run
   54 Driving without a license
   55 Other traffic offenses

F. NON-CARE

   61 Lack adequate care or support
   62 Conditions injurious
   63 Abandonment
   64 Abuse, cruel treatment
   65 Other dependency or neglect
   66 Termination parental rights
   67 Commitment--Mental diff./mental ill
   68 Other special proceedings

NON-OFFENSE RELATED REASONS

   71 Family relationships
   72 Relationships with peers
   73 School behavioral problems
   74 School academic problems
   75 School adjustment
   76 Emotional difficulties
   77 Physical/medical/nutritional
   78 Economic problems
   79 Drug problems
   80 Alcohol problems
   81 Pregnancy/Parenthood difficulties
   82 Wants a job

   90 Other (specify)
   91 Inapplicable

FOR OTHER AGENCIES WHICH HAVE CONTACT WITH THE YOUTH

(FOR EXAMPLE, PROBATION OFFICERS)

Four month follow-up.

How much have the following problems changed?

A. Type of problem: _____   ☐☐ Problem code (refer to p. 1)

(Type of problem and code
written in by YSS)
(19)

1 ☐ Problem greatly decreased
2 ☐ Problem slightly decreased
3 ☐ No change
4 ☐ Problem slightly increased
5 ☐ Problem greatly increased

Comments _____

B. Type of problem: _____   ☐☐ Problem code

(22)

1 ☐ Problem greatly decreased
2 ☐ Problem slightly decreased
3 ☐ No change
4 ☐ Problem slightly increased
5 ☐ Problem greatly increased

Comments _____

Have any additional problems arisen?
(25)

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes

If yes, describe: _____

_____

The following items are to be completed by YSS Project:

Project code ☐☐
            4 5

Youth code ☐☐☐☐☐
          8 7 10 11 12

Date of agency's response above
☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐
13 14 15 16 17-18
Mo. Day Yr.

Appendix D

The Youth Survey:

Procedure Manual
Introductory Letters
Reminder Letter
Questionnaire

Italics were added for the reader's
convenience, to label groups of survey
items that measure study variables such
as "alienation," "normlessness," "societal
estrangement," etc.

YOUTH SURVEY DATA MANUAL

Wisconsin Youth Service Systems Evaluation

This is a _provisional_ set of instructions for the Youth Survey. If you have any questions which are not answered by these instructions, please contact us:

> Associates for Youth Development
> 905 University Avenue, Room 301
> Madison, WI 53715
> Phone: (608) 251-7462

The Youth Survey is designed to help you gain a more complete picture of the views of youth about pleasures and problems they face and those which they think are importan, to other youth in the community. By insuring privacy and confidentiality, we are hoping to encourage youth to be open and honest in their answers to the survey questions.

We will be able to provide you with tabulations and summaries of the combined responses of youth from your project, whenever the number of youths responding is large enough that individuals' answers cannot be identified.

The Youth Survey may also help to identify changes in youths because of their involvement in your project. Therefore, the procedures were developed to allow for pre-post, program and comparison group measurements. A more detailed discussion of the analysis is included in the "Final Report of Evaluation Development For Wisconsin's Youth Services System," dated July 1976. (A copy was sent to each project.)

(Note: Some projects may want to use this survey on a more wide-spread basis-- such as for an entire high school or target area. If you are interested in using the survey on a broader scale, we will be glad to discuss this possibility with you.)

This survey is designed for youth who are _involved in community change projects_ and those who are _direct service clients_ of projects. The survey is also sent to two or three friends of each youth. We provide you with a cover letter to mail along with the survey, which explains the purpose of the survey and invites the youth to participate in the survey.

Since the youth fills out the forms in private, project staff only need to coordinate the process of distributing the forms and of encouraging youth to complete the survey and seal it in the envelope addressed to our Madison office.

The process is described in more detail below:

1. For Youth in Your Project

Within two weeks of each youth's involvement with your project, please ask the person to complete the survey. A cover letter is provided which explains the purpose of the survey. The letter for youth in your project begins with "This is an important survey."

Try to arrange for a place in your project's office where the youth can complete the form in private. When completed, ask the youth to seal it in an envelope addressed to the evaluation office in Madison. The project can mail these sealed envelopes to us.

2. For Youth's Friends

Ask the youth to give you the names and addresses of three close friends who are not in the project (people with whom the person spends leisure time), and who might be willing to answer the same survey. Mail a survey, cover letter (which begins with "One of your friends..."), and envelope addressed to the evaluation office to the first two friends. If one does not return a survey, we will ask you to send a survey to the third friend. (We want to receive responses from at least two friends of each youth.)

3. Project Records and Coding

Before giving the form to the youths, you need to code the date and youth code number on the top of the first page of the survey.

The date you gave or mailed a survey to a youth should be entered: month, day, year. Please put in zeros if any of the numbers are single digits, for example:

$$\boxed{0\;2}\quad\boxed{3\;0}\quad\boxed{7\;6}$$
Mo.   Day   Yr.

The next item has three parts: Project Code, Youth Code, and Letter.

Project Code is the same code your project was assigned for data forms.

Youth Code -- For the youth and his/her friends, use the same five-digit number you assigned to the youth for the data forms that staff completes. To differentiate between youth in your project and friends-- place the letter "A" in the last box for youth in your project, and use B, C, etc. for his/her friends. For follow-up purposes, it is essential that you keep an accurate list of the names, addresses, and code numbers for each youth in your project and his/her friends.

4. "Post" Survey

Four months later, for each respondant, send the "Post" survey, with cover letter and envelope addressed to the evaluation staff.

NOTE: Please let us know in advance whenever you anticipate you will soon be needing more copies of the survey.

ASSOCIATES FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, Inc.

Dear Friend,

This is an important Survey-- it is just for young people. We want
to know what is happening with youth and how life is going for them,
especially in this community. When we put together the answers from the
hundreds of people like yourself who are responding to this Survey, we
will get some ideas about the special needs and problems of youth. Also,
the answers may help the local Youth Service project to know how well it
is doing.

Please do not put your name any place on the enclosed form. We
want to make sure that no one knows <u>who</u> answered these questions. When
you have answered all the questions, seal the form in the addressed
envelope so that it comes to us. No one but us will see your answers, and
we will not have your name.

We really appreciate your help. If you have any questions, please
drop us a line.

Debi Anthony

Debi Anthony, Researcher
Associates for Youth Development
905 University Avenue, Room 301
Madison, WI 53715

CONTINUED

2 OF 3

ASSOCIATES FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, Inc.

Dear Friend,

One of your friends has just filled out a survey like this, and has told us that you might be interested in helping us by also filling one out.

This is an important Survey-- it is just for young people. We want to know what is happening with youth and how life is going for them, especially in this community. When we put together the answers from the hundreds of people like yourself who are responding to this Survey, we will get some ideas about the special needs and problems of youth. Also, the answers may help the local Youth Service project to know how well it is doing.

Please do not put your name any place on this form. We want to make sure that no one knows who answered these questions. When you have answered all the questions, seal the form in the addressed envelope so that it comes to us. No one but us will see your answers, and we will not have your name.

We really appreciate your help. If you have any questions, please drop us a line.

Debi Anthony

Debi Anthony, Researcher
Associates for Youth Development
905 University Avenue, Room 301
Madison, WI 53715

ASSOCIATES FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, Inc.

Main Office:	**Research Office:**
2125 South Torrey Pines Circle	905 University Ave. Room 301
Tucson, Arizona 85710	Madison, Wisconsin 53715
(602) 296-8383	(608) 251-7462

Reminder Letter

Dear Friend,

You may remember that you received a Youth Survey a few weeks ago to complete
and send to me at the Associates for Youth Development address in Madison.
I have asked the local Youth Service project to send you this note to
remind you that I have not yet received a completed survey with your number
on it. I could not send you the reminder myself, because I do not have
the names of anyone who received the survey.

We are very interested in learning more about the views of young people
in your county and throughout Wisconsin. We would really appreciate your
completing the Youth Survey and sending it to us in the return envelope.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Debi Anthony

Debi Anthony, Researcher
Associates for Youth Development
905 University Avenue, Room 301
Madison, WI 53715

Date ☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐

No. ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐

1. Each question, below, has two parts. Please answer the first part by circling the number that shows How Often You have had the problem.

For the second part, circle the number that shows How Much of a Problem each one is for Youth in this community.

Here is an example of the way a person might answer one of these questions:

TYPE OF PROBLEM	HOW OFTEN HAS THIS BEEN A PROBLEM FOR YOU?			HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS THIS FOR YOUTH IN YOUR COMMUNITY?.		
	Never	Sometimes	Often	No Problem	A Small Problem	A Big Problem
Adults think kids are bad	1	(2)	3	1	2	(3)

Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. We just want to know what you think.

TYPE OF PROBLEM	HOW OFTEN HAS THIS BEEN A PROBLEM FOR YOU?			HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS THIS FOR YOUTH IN YOUR COMMUNITY?		
	Never	Sometimes	Often	No Problem	A Small Problem	A Big Problem
1. There are no jobs around.	1	2	3	1	2	3
2. A need for counseling about types of jobs.	1	2	3	1	2	3
3. No way to find out about what jobs there are.	1	2	3	1	2	3
4. The only open jobs have no future.	1	2	3	1	2	3
5. Can't get a job because of a police record.	1	2	3	1	2	3

168.

TYPE OF PROBLEM	HOW OFTEN HAS THIS BEEN A PROBLEM FOR YOU?			HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS THIS FOR YOUTH IN YOUR COMMUNITY?		
	Never	Sometimes	Often	No Problem	A Small Problem	A Big Problem
6. Can't get a job because of race or nationality.	1	2	3	1	2	3
7. Can't get a job because of sex bias.	1	2	3	1	2	3
8. Not enough job training	1	2	3	1	2	3
9. Being hassled by other kids to use drugs.	1	2	3	1	2	3
10. Being hassled by other kids to buy drugs.	1	2	3	1	2	3
11. Drugs being too easy to get.	1	2	3	1	2	3
12. Can't get drug counseling.	1	2	3	1	2	3
13. Can't get pregnancy counseling.	1	2	3	1	2	3
14. Can't get abortion counseling.	1	2	3	1	2	3
15. Can't get birth control counseling.	1	2	3	1	2	3
16. Can't get sex education	1	2	3	1	2	3
17. Can't get VD counseling	1	2	3	1	2	3
18. Young people not being understood by adults in school.	1	2	3	1	2	3
19. Being physically hurt by teachers.	1	2	3	1	2	3
20. Not enough different classes or courses in school.	1	2	3	1	2	3
21. Not enough really useful or important classes or courses.	1	2	3	1	2	3

TYPE OF PROBLEM	HOW OFTEN HAS THIS BEEN A PROBLEM FOR YOU?			HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS THIS FOR YOUTH IN YOUR COMMUNITY?		
	Never	Sometimes	Often	No Problem	A Small Problem	A Big Problem
22. Teachers not being interested in students.	1	2	3	1	2	3
23. Students not having any say in how schools are run.	1	2	3	1	2	3
24. Being expelled or suspended from school.	1	2	3	1	2	3
25. Difficulty with teacher because of race or nationality.	1	2	3	1	2	3
26. Not enough school counselors.	1	2	3	1	2	3
27. School counselors who don't know enough.	1	2	3	1	2	3
28. Police who treat things worse than they really are.	1	2	3	1	2	3
29. Police who are dishonest or crooked.	1	2	3	1	2	3
30. Police aren't around when you need them.	1	2	3	1	2	3
31. Police who are not interested in helping youth.	1	2	3	1	2	3
32. Police who hassle young minority people.	1	2	3	1	2	3
33. Police who are "out to get" young people.	1	2	3	1	2	3
34. No adults that youth can talk to about problems.	1	2	3	1	2	3
35. Parents not spending enough time with their children.	1	2	3	1	2	3

TYPE OF PROBLEM	HOW OFTEN HAS THIS BEEN A PROBLEM FOR YOU?			HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS THIS FOR YOUTH IN YOUR COMMUNITY?		
	Never	Sometimes	Often	No Problem	A Small Problem	A Big Problem
36. Parents who don't know where their children are, or what their kids are doing.	1	2	3	1	2	3
37. Families that are too poor to give their children needed food, clothing, or medical treatment.	1	2	3	1	2	3
38. Parents who are not interested in their children.	1	2	3	1	2	3
39. Parents who physically attack their children.	1	2	3	1	2	3
40. Parents who don't understand their children's problems.	1	2	3	1	2	3
41. Young people being in physical danger from others in their neighborhood.	1	2	3	1	2	3
42. Things stolen or destroyed in the neighborhood.	1	2	3	1	2	3
43. Things stolen or destroyed at school.	1	2	3	1	2	3
44. Nothing for young people to do for fun.	1	2	3	1	2	3
45. The things youth can do for fun cost too much.	1	2	3	1	2	3
If there are any important problems that weren't listed write them in below:						
A. _____	1	2	3	1	2	3
B. _____	1	2	3	1	2	3
C. _____	1	2	3	1	2	3

2. Now we would like to know how you feel about some other things. Please show whether you <u>Strongly Disagree</u>, <u>Disagree</u>, <u>Agree</u>, or <u>Strongly Agree</u> with each one of the ideas below. Do this by putting a circle around the <u>one</u> number that shows how you feel about each statement.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
				normlessness
1. It is sometimes necessary to lie on a job application to get the job you want.	1	2	3	4
2. If one wants to get good grades in school, one will have to cheat sometimes.	1	2	3	4
3. It's OK to lie if you are protecting a friend in trouble.	1	2	3	4
4. One can make it in school without having to cheat on exams.	1	2	3	4
5. One should always tell the truth, regardless of what one's friends think of him/her	1	2	3	4
6. If one wants to have nice things one has to be willing to break the rules or laws to get them.	1	2	3	4
				societal estrangement
7. Most teachers, principals, and counselors don't really care about most kids.	1	2	3	4
8. It's hard to know who to trust these days.	1	2	3	4
9. I often feel bored.	1	2	3	4
10. A kid has to live for today and can't worry about what might happen to him/her tomorrow.	1	2	3	4

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
			societal estrangement	
11. It is easier for other people to decide what is right than it is for me.	1	2	3	4
12. The chances for me and my friends making it in life are getting better, not worse.	1	2	3	4
13. It's not worth planning for anything in the future because I really don't know what is going to happen these days.	1	2	3	4
14. I often feel like it's not worth even trying to change things in my life.	1	2	3	4
15. One problem with the world today is that most people don't believe in anything.	1	2	3	4
16. It seems that it is harder to know how to act today than it used to be.	1	2	3	4
17. Everything changes so quickly these days that I often have trouble deciding which are the right rules to follow.	1	2	3	4
18. I often feel lonely.	1	2	3	4

educational

4. Now we would like to know about your hopes for the future.

How far would you like to go in school? _____

		1	·2	3
1.	What do you think your chances are for getting this much education?	Good	Fair	Poor
2.	What are the chances you will drop out or be forced to quit school before completing high school?	1 Good	2 Fair	3 Poor
3.	When/If you have completed high school, what are the chances teachers will remember you as a good student?	1 Good	2 Fair	3 Poor
4.	Would you say that most, some, or none of your friends will enter college or a university?	1 Most	2 Some	3 None
5.	Some people say that every person in the United States has an equal chance to get an education. Other people say that some persons have a better chance to get an education than do others. What about you? Do you have a better, equal, or worse chance than others to get an education?	1 Better Chance	2 Equal Chance	3 Worse Chance

occupational

5. What kind of job would you like to have as an adult? _____

		1	2	3
1.	What do you think your chances are of ever getting that kind of job?	Good	Fair	Poor
2.	What are the chances of a young person in this town getting a good paying, honest job?	1 Good	2 Fair	3 Poor
3.	How good are your chances of getting any job as an adult you feel was a good, steady, dependable one?	1 Good	2 Fair	3 Poor
4.	How good are your chances of getting a job as an adult that really pays well?	1 Good	2 Fair	3 Poor
5.	How good do you think your chances are for getting ahead and being successful in your future job?	1 Good	2 Fair	3 Poor

3. The next set of statements have to do with your group of friends.

Please read each one and circle the number under the answer that best

fits your friendship group.

		MOSTLY TRUE	SOMETIMES TRUE	NOT TRUE
1.	My friends would think less of a person if he/she were to get in trouble with the law.	1	2	3
2.	Getting into trouble in my group is a way of gaining respect.	1	2	3
3.	My friends feel that the laws are good and should be obeyed.	1	2	3
4.	The people in my group get into trouble at home, in school, and in the city.	1	2	3
5.	The people that get into trouble a lot feel very uncomfortable in my group.	1	2	3
6.	My group of friends are not afraid to have a little fun even if it means breaking the law.	1	2	3
7.	People who get into trouble with the law are "put down" in my group.	1	2	3
8.	If you haven't gotten into some kind of trouble the people in my group think you are "chicken" or something.	1	2	3
9.	Police are respected by my group of friends.	1	2	3
10.	My friends don't care what they do as long as they don't get caught.	1	2	3
11.	The people in my group don't trust adults.	1	2	3

6. Some people say that every person in the
United States has an equal chance to get
the job he wants. Others say that some
persons have a better chance to get the
jobs they want. How about you? Do you
have a better, equal, or worse chance
than do others to get the job you want?

1	2	3
Better	Equal	Worse
Chance	Chance	Chance

LABELLING

6. The next items are a little different. Please look at the pairs of
words and think about how you get along at home. How do you think your
parents see you on the following pairs of words? Circle the number for
each pair of words that you feel best shows how your parents see you.
For example, on the first pair of words, if you think they see you as
somewhat cooperative you would probably circle the number 3. If you think
they see you as very cooperative you would probably circle number 1. If
you think they see you as somewhat troublesome, you would probably circle
5 or 6. Remember, for each set of words, circle the number that best
shows how you think your parents see you.

1.	Cooperative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Troublesome
2.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
3.	Obeying rules	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Breaking rules
4.	Delinquent (breaking laws)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Law-abiding (obeying laws)
5.	Unkind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Kind
6.	Polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Rude

7. Now think about how you get along with most of the <u>kids at school</u> or the kids you know. How do you think they see you on the same pairs of words? Circle the <u>number</u> for each set of words that you feel best shows how the kids you know see you.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1.	Cooperative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Troublesome
2.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
3.	Obeying rules	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Breaking rules
4.	Delinquent (breaking laws)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Law-abiding (obeying laws)
5.	Unkind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Kind
6.	Polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Rude

8. Now think about how you get along with <u>your teachers</u>. (If not in school, think about your boss.) How do you think they see you on this set of words? Select the <u>number</u> for each pair of words that you feel best shows how your teachers (or employer) see you.

Check whether these answers are about your teachers _____ or your employer _____ .

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1.	Cooperative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Troublesome
2.	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
3.	Obeying rules	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Breaking rules
4.	Delinquent (breaking laws)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Law-abiding (obeying laws)
5.	Unkind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Kind
6.	Polite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Rude

9. Now we would like you to think about yourself. Please read through the statements below and circle the answer for each statement that best describes how you feel about yourself.

		Never	Sometimes	Often	Always
1.	You feel that you are a person of worth, at least equal with others.	1	2	3	4
2.	You feel that other people see you as having good qualities.	1	2	3	4
3.	All in all, you feel that you are a failure.	1	2	3	4
4.	You are able to do things as well as most people.	1	2	3	4
5.	You feel you do not have much to be proud of.	1	2	3	4
6.	You take a positive attitude (think good about) toward yourself.	1	2	3	4
7.	You feel satisfied with yourself.	1	2	3	4
8.	You wish you could have more respect for yourself.	1	2	3	4
9.	You feel useless.	1	2	3	4
10.	You feel you are no good at all.	1	2	3	4
11.	You believe yourself to be a bright person.	1	2	3	4
12.	You feel you are the worst person in your family.	1	2	3	4
13.	You feel sure of yourself.	1	2	3	4
14.	You are a person that others can love.	1	2	3	4

10. In the following set of items, we would like you to answer some questions about your parents. Read each one and circle the answer which fits best.

		Never	Sometimes	Often	Always
1.	Your parents would help you if you were to get into serious trouble.	1	2	3	4
2.	Your parents find fault with you even when you don't deserve it.	1	2	3	4
3.	Your parents really care about you.	1	2	3	4
4.	Your parents are unhappy with the things you do.	1	2	3	4
5.	Your parents blame you for all their problems.	1	2	3	4
6.	Your parents like your friends.	1	2	3	4
7.	Your parents are easy to talk to about your problems.	1	2	3	4
8.	Your parents don't really understand you.	1	2	3	4
9.	Your parents trust you.	1	2	3	4
10.	Your parents admit their mistakes.	1	2	3	4
11.	Your parents treat you like a nobody.	1	2	3	4

DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

11. The next questions deal with rules and laws. Everyone breaks some rules and laws during a lifetime. Some break them regularly, others less often. Some are more serious and others less serious. Some rules and laws are just for youth. Others are for everybody.

Please read each item and then answer the question: "In the last _four months_, how often have you . . . "

Circle the answer you choose for each item. Remember, all your answers will be kept secret, because we don't know who you are.

In the <u>past four months</u>, how often have you . . .

		Never	Once or Twice	Several Times	Very Often
1.	Given a teacher a fake excuse for being absent.	1	2	3	4
2.	Taken little things (worth $5 or less) that didn't belong to you.	1	2	3	4
3.	Broken into a place that is locked just to look around.	1	2	3	4
4.	Broken into a place in order to take things.	1	2	3	4
5.	Taken a car without the owner's permission.	1	2	3	4
6.	Taken something from a person's locker without asking.	1	2	3	4
7.	Damaged public or private property.	1	2	3	4
8.	Beat up on other kids or adults.	1	2	3	4
9.	Took part in gang fights.	1	2	3	4
10.	Taken something worth $50 or more that didn't belong to you.	1	2	3	4
11.	Run away from home.	1	2	3	4
12.	Took part in an armed robbery.	1	2	3	4
13.	Taken something worth between $5 and $50 that didn't belong to you.	1	2	3	4
14.	Used force (strong arm methods) to get money from another person.	1	2	3	4
15.	Used marijuana.	1	2	3	4
16.	Sold marijuana.	1	2	3	4
17.	Skipped school without a legitimate excuse.	1	2	3	4
18.	Sniffed glue or inhaled toxic (dangerous) fumes.	1	2	3	4

In the <u>past four months</u>, how often have you . . .

		Never	Once or Twice	Several Times	Very Often
19.	Used hard drugs.	1	2	3	4
20.	Sold hard drugs.	1	2	3	4
21.	Used alcohol.	1	2	3	4
22.	Seriously disobeyed your parents.	1	2	3	4

23. Violated other laws:

		Never	Once or Twice	Several Times	Very Often
A.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				
B.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				
C.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				
D.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				

IN TROUBLE WITH AUTHORITY

During the <u>past four months</u>, have any of the following things happened to you?

1. Have you been arrested (taken into custody) by the police in the <u>last</u> <u>four</u> <u>months</u>?

   ____ Yes ____ No   If yes, how many times? ____

2. Have you been in trouble in school in the <u>past</u> <u>four</u> <u>months</u>?

   ____ Yes ____ No   If yes, how many times? ____

3. Have you been expelled from school in the <u>past</u> <u>four</u> <u>months</u>?

   ____ Yes ____ No   If yes, how many times? ____

4. Have you been in trouble at home in the past four months?

____ Yes ____ No   If yes, how many times? _____

5. Have you been in jail or held in a juvenile lock-up in the past four months?

____ Yes ____ No   If yes, how many times? _____

6. Have you been sent for a possible court hearing in the past four months?

____ Yes ____ No   If yes, how many times? _____

7. Have you been to juvenile court in the past four months?

____ Yes ____ No   If yes, how many times? _____

                         * * *

                                    SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. How old are you? _____

2. Sex   ____(1) Male   ____(2) Female

3. To what ethnic group do you belong?

____(1) Chicano   ____(4) American Indian

____(2) Black   ____(5) Asian

____(3) White   ____(6) Puerto Rican

                         ____(7) Other:_____

4. Are you presently enrolled in school? ____(1) Yes   ____(2) No

   If yes: A. What grade are you in now?

            ____(1) 6th ____(2) 7th ____(3) 8th ____(4) 9th ____(5) 10th

            ____(6)11th ____(7)12th ____(8) College

            ____(9) Other (specify): _____

   If no: B. Why are you not presently attending school?

            ____(1) Have gone to work full time   ____(5) Have been suspended

            ____(2) Left school, got married   ____(6) Have been truant a lot

            ____(3) Left school, looking for job ____(7) Other reason: _____

            ____(4) Have been expelled   _____

C.   About how long has it been since you were in school?

____(1) One week   ____(5) Seven-eleven months

____(2) Two-three weeks   ____(6) One-two years

____(3) One-three months   ____(7) More than two years

____(4) Four-six months

5.   What is/was your grade point average in school?

____(1) A, A-   3.6-4.0   ____(4) C, C+   2.0-2.5

____(2) B, B+   3.0-3.5   ____(5) C-   1.6-1.9

____(3) B-   2.6-2.9   ____(6) D, D+   1.0-1.5

                    ____(7) D-, F   Below 1.0

6.   Have you ever been on Probation?

____(1) Yes   ____(2) No

7.   Are you on probation now?

____(1) Yes   ____(2) No

8.   Who is the head of your family?

____(1) Father   ____(5) Stepmother

____(2) Stepfather   ____(6) Foster Mother

____(3) Foster Father   ____(7) Other Relative

____(4) Mother   ____(8) Other (please explain):

_____

9.   Is the head of your family:

A.   ____(1) employed   ____(2) unemployed   ____(3) retired

B.   What kind of job does he/she have? (write in) _____

_____

If unemployed or retired, what kind of job did he/she have when

he/she was working? _____

C. Briefly describe what he/she does at work. _____

_____

10. How many brothers and sisters do you have? _____

11. How far did the head of your family go in school? (Check the highest

level of education he/she completed.)

____(1) Grade school only

____(2) Junior High/Middle School

____(3) Some High School

____(4) High School graduate

____(5) 1-3 years of college or business school

____(6) Four-year college graduate

____(7) Post-graduate or professional training

12. Do you consider your family as:

____(1) Poor

____(2) Not poor, but close to it

____(3) Not rich, but earning enough money

____(4) Rich

Appendix E

Manual and Sample Forms for the
Anecdotal Records Collection

ANECDOTAL RECORDS MANUAL

Wisconsin Youth Service Systems Evaluation

Projects involved in community change efforts are asked to keep detailed anecdotal records, which are essential for determining the nature and extent of the community changes for which your project is responsible, and for documenting the processes used to achieve the changes. Thorough anecdotal records have numerous advantages for your project. By describing the intended achievements before-the-fact, accusations of after-the-fact anecdotal justification are avoided and the stage is set for structured follow-up at the time interval and according to the results specified by your project.

Thus, the anecdotal records allow us to tailor the evaluation more for your project. In any instance in which the before-the-fact information indicates to evaluation staff that objective measurements of change are possible, these can be developed and implemented. For example, changes in police behavior may result in changes in youth diversion rates; or changes in school administrative behavior, coupled with youth involvement, might reduce school vandalism rates.

The evaluation will pay close attention to the community-change process for two main reasons. First, if this model proves successful, there will be a need to understand how and why it provides the desired outcome. Second, the community change approach to youth development is in the innovative forefront of approaches aimed at alleviating youth problems. Thus, if the Wisconsin experience succeeds, explication of the methodology will facilitate replication of the approaches in other parts of the nation.

Format for Anecdotal Records

Please record detailed information according to the following outline:

I. To be recorded and sent to evaluation staff before taking any "target action."

    A. Identify the specific change target. This is to be recorded as the decision is made to work on a particular problem. For example, "To increase diversion of juveniles by police."

    B. Indicate the procedures and information used to identify this target.

    C. Indicate the broad steps to be taken in bringing about the change.

    D. Specify any logical and reasonable success criteria.

    E. Estimate the date by which the change will be accomplished.

II. To be recorded as you work to change the problem.

    A. Describe the steps taken in attacking the problem and in overcoming obstacles. This includes action taken by project staff, interaction with other persons or groups who help or hinder community involvement, press coverage, and all other related factors.

    B. List any other influences on the target area outside of your project such as: a new judge; a change in community attitude towards a certain type of offense; or a new ordinance, agency policy, or law.

    C. Describe the actual target impacts-- the changes that occur.

Specific Target: _____ ANECDOTAL RECORD FORMAT

Staff Person Involved: _____

Procedures and information used to identify this target	Broad steps to be taken to bring about the change	Reasonable success criteria	Date of completion

ANECDOTAL RECORDS - FORM II   Fill in as change takes place.

Specific Target: _____

Staff Person
Attacking the Problem: _____

Describe action steps taken by staff, other people or groups, press coverage and other related factors.	List other influences on target area such as: community attitude change, new law, new judge, etc.	Describe the actual impacts - changes that occur.

END