

EVALUATION OF THE  
SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT  
PROGRAM

OPERATION SUMMIT

November 1, 1974 to March 31, 1975

Submitted to:

Ruben E. Dominguez, Administrator  
Human Resources Agency

Kenneth F. Fare  
Chief Probation Officer

Prepared by:

San Diego County Probation Department  
Program Evaluation Unit

NCJRS

Consultation provided by:

American Justice Institute

JUL 27 1979

ACQUISITIONS

"The preparation of these materials was financially aided through a Federal grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. The opinions, findings and conclusions in this publication are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration or the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning."

"OCJP reserves a royalty-free, non-exclusive and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish and use these materials, and to authorize others to do so."

Dated May 5, 1975

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Summary and Recommendations	1
History and Philosophy	2
Program Description - overview	3
•Skills taught and expectations for Juvenile Field Services and Rancho Del Campo	3
•Juvenile Field Services	4
•Rancho Del Campo	6
•Rancho Del Rayo	8
•Summary and conclusions	9
Evaluation Methodology	11
•Design overview	11
•Screening and selection procedures	11
•Measurement of program objectives	12
•Analysis of client characteristics related to success and failure	13
•Analysis of trip performance related to success and failure	14
•Analysis of program costs	14
Results	15
•Screening and selection procedures	15
•Client descriptions	17
•Analysis of program costs	18
Recommendations	20
Appendix A - Tables	
Table I: Summary of Summit Program Trips	
II: Comparison of proposed program with activities to date	
III: Field Services Screening - rejected cases	
IV: Field Services Screening - eligible cases	
V: Selected client characteristics for Field Services	
VI: Selected client characteristics for Rancho Del Campo	
VII: Selected client characteristics for Rancho Del Rayo	
VIII: Overview of program costs	
IX: Program costs per ward	
Appendix B - Rancho Del Campo Summit Program	
I. Job responsibilities	
II. Description of teacher responsibilities	

Appendix C - Offense Behavior Tabulation Form

Appendix D - Juvenile Data Form

Appendix E - Ward Performance Summary

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation report on Operation Summit should be understood as preliminary to the complete evaluation. The information in this report is restricted to the first five months of activities; (November 1, 1974 to March 31, 1975) and no client impact analysis can be provided due to the short time period covered and the relatively small number of program participants involved. Consequently, the following recommendations are based on information regarding the cost of conducting the project, and an analysis of the apparent potential each segment of the program has for meeting their specified objectives.

The cost of the services provided in this correctional experiment is very high, and is added to the standard cost of community and/or institutional correction. Further, the programs in Rancho Del Rayo and Juvenile Field Services have little ability to provide follow-up, or to build on the stress education model. It is believed by the evaluators that the expense of continuing this experiment can be greatly reduced, and the potential benefits increased, by implementing the following recommendations.

### Recommendations

1. That the County of San Diego/Summit Expedition contract not be renewed.
2. That the participation of Juvenile Field Services in the Operation Summit program not be continued.
3. That the Rancho Del Rayo program (Wilderness Experience) be entirely County operated on a "staff available" basis.
4. That the Rancho Del Campo program be continued, with modifications in its operational design.

## HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

The Operation Summit Program came into existence on November 1, 1974, when the County of San Diego entered into a contract (#8553) with Summit Expedition, a division of Youth Development, Inc. The impetus for initiating this project came from the interest of a member of the Board of Supervisors and a collateral development of exposure to Summit Expedition's program by some professional staff members within the San Diego County Probation Department.

A substantial segment of the Summit program is concerned with affecting a participant's approach to life by exposing him or her to challenging and rigorous activities in a wilderness setting, and incorporating training in mountaineering, rock climbing, backpacking, and group problem solving. The basic premise behind the Summit program is that participating in these activities results in personal growth and strengthened character. The process whereby these intended results may be achieved is called stress education, and is historically derived from earlier experimental programs conducted with delinquent youths in Massachusetts. These programs, Outward Bound and Homeward Bound, along with a similar project conducted in the California Youth Authority form the basic philosophical foundation for the stress education approach to the correction of delinquent youths.

In none of the foregoing experiments, nor in the standard Summit Expedition program, are hiking, camping, and wilderness experiences alone considered to be the vehicles for character and personality growth. For stress education, the program must be demanding, physically arduous, and challenging. Group rap sessions and casual discussions encourage a youth's experimentation with life, and the program requires a level of commitment which transcends the satisfaction of individual needs.

A major distinction between the Summit program conducted in the Probation Department and the previously mentioned experimental programs is the duration of each. Outward Bound required a 26 day experience; Homeward Bound was six weeks in length; the California Youth Authority program combines a 26 day wilderness experience with a 60 day group home experience; the standard Summit Expedition program is 21 days.

In comparison, the three programs in the Probation Department have ranged in length from three to 12 days. The same basic skills are taught as on any of the longer trips in other programs; the length of wilderness exposure is, however, abbreviated.

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Operation Summit Program is presently operating in Juvenile field Services, at Rancho Del Campo, and at Rancho Del Rayo. Two Probation Officers have been assigned as full-time co-ordinators for the program in Field Services and at Rancho Del Campo and the overall program is directed by the Department's Chaplain. The program is conducted differently in each of the three areas and, because the differences are so great, each will be described separately throughout the body of this report.

### Skills Taught and Expectations For Juvenile Field Services and Rancho Del Campo Trips

In spite of the organizational differences between the Field Services and Campo programs, the trips themselves are essentially the same. All of the longer trips have been to Death Valley and all wards involved in these trips have been exposed to the same basic program. Briefly, wards are taught basic skills necessary to participate in certain course activities. The skills, and the activities to which they relate, are indicated below.

<u>SKILLS TAUGHT</u>	<u>COURSE ACTIVITY</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Knot Tying</li><li>•Rope Handling</li><li>•Belaying</li><li>•Signals and Commands</li></ul>	Rock Climbing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Packing</li><li>•Load Carrying</li><li>•Maintenance of Equipment</li><li>•Rhythmic Breathing</li><li>•Pacing</li></ul>	Back-packing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Problem Solving</li><li>•Use of Resources</li></ul>	Initiative Tests
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Fire Starting</li><li>•Shelter Building</li><li>•Food Preparation</li><li>•Plant Identification</li><li>•Water Retrieval</li></ul>	Survival
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Map and Compass</li><li>•Mountain Safety</li><li>•First Aid</li><li>•Mountain Travel</li></ul>	Final

The course "final" usually consists of a 24-hour "solo" experience. The boys are spaced out in an area where they cannot have contact with each other. They are essentially alone for a 24-hour period although they are checked periodically by staff. Additionally, specified times are set aside for wards to reflect on their experiences, to write in their journals, and to share experiences through rap sessions.

It is believed by the program personnel that participation in these activities will create positive changes in the following areas:

- Attitude change
- Heightened self-image
- Increased enthusiasm
- Re-directed aggression
- Lowered level of frustration
- Surfacing creativity
- Heightened self-confidence
- Heightened sensitivity to self, others, and environment
- New awareness of reality

Wards are expected to co-operate with both staff and peers, to participate in all activities, and in essence, to complete the course. They are individually and independently rated in all of these areas by every staff member on the trip. Feedback is also provided to each boy's Probation Officer for his information and use during future counseling with the ward. All of this activity is, of course, directed toward the ultimate goal of providing the wards with the internal feelings and strengths necessary to make a more positive adjustment in the community.

#### Juvenile Field Services

The Summit Program within Juvenile Field Services was instituted in order to provide stress education for Juvenile Court wards residing in the community. The original plan called for three phases, each phase consisting of four trips. The first three trips were to be five days long and each was to include eight new wards. The fourth trip was then to be ten days in duration and was to include the twenty-four wards who had gone on the first three trips of the phase. Each phase was to take approximately three months so that a total of 72 wards would have experienced fifteen days in the field by the end of a nine-month period. Each five-day trip was to be assigned to a different field supervision unit so that wards from all areas of the county would have an equal chance to participate. All parties agreed to adhere to the evaluation design as proposed by the Evaluation Unit in the area of screening and selection of participants. The program was originally to begin in September, 1974 and continue until May 31, 1975.

Because of delays in the signing of the contract it was not possible to schedule the first trip until mid-November. This necessitated some adjustments in the original scheduling but the number of trips and wards was to remain the same. It was decided that the first two trips would be combined into one trip to include 16 wards from two units. Screening was conducted, 16 wards were selected to participate, and 11 of those reported to the Juvenile Probation Center on November 18, 1974 to go on the first 5-day trip. It was later learned that a few boys failed to report because of transportation problems and the others simply lacked the motivation. The wards on this trip were all from Southeast San Diego and they were selected from the Southeast Subsidy Unit and the regular Supervision Unit covering that area.

Prior to the next trip there was some discussion about inclusion into the program of a particular group of wards, most of whom did not meet the eligibility criteria. These wards (12) were involved in a "Survival School" program and were also from the Southeast area. Because the Summit Program called for nine five-day trips and there were only eight participating units, it was decided to assign the extra trip to this school group because of the strong feelings expressed about their inclusion. Consequently, the next trip consisted of six wards from the school plus three wards who were arbitrarily substituted at the last minute by officers from the regular Supervision Unit covering the Southeast area. (For the purposes of this report, the nine wards on this trip have been included in the Experimental Group in the section dealing with "Client Descriptions." In future reports, however, they will be evaluated separately when discussing program impact because their "selection" was not in keeping with the requirements of the experimental design.)

The preceding group left on December 2, 1974, accompanied by two Summit staff members, the co-ordinating Probation Officer, and the two teachers from the Survival School. They returned two and one-half days later on December 4, 1974 primarily because of inclement weather and also because this group of wards proved to be a difficult group to supervise. One ward refused to participate in any activities even to the point of refusing to carry his own pack. This attitude affected some of the other wards creating some supervision problems. In addition, the Probation Officer was allegedly involved in a physical altercation with one of the wards resulting in the boy having to be returned to his home by a Summit staff member on December 3, 1974. The Probation Officer was subsequently re-assigned out of the program.

The next trip, as stated in the original plan, was to be a long trip involving the wards from the earlier trips. Consequently, this third trip consisted of seven wards from the first trip, six from the second trip, and one new ward (not selected through standard procedures), for a total of 14. The group left for Death Valley on January 9, 1975 and was out for nine days. Five staff members accompanied the group including a newly appointed Probation Officer, three Summit Staff members and a representative from the Campus Life organization.

Shortly after the conclusion of the third trip, the program was re-assessed by all personnel involved because of problems experienced in the earlier trips. As a result, the program was changed to nine-day trips of 12 to 16 wards each with follow-up trips for each group of five days each. The fourth trip, leaving February 9, 1975, was therefore nine days long and was comprised of 12 wards from the South Bay Subsidy Unit. Staff included the co-ordinating Probation Officer plus three Summit Staff members. (The follow-up trip for this group, scheduled for the week of April 7, 1975, was cancelled because of weather conditions and has been rescheduled for April 28, 1975.)

The fifth and last trip during this reporting period included 12 wards from the Beach Subsidy Unit and went out on March 13, 1975. Staff consisted of three Summit Staff members (including one woman), the program director, a female representative from Campus Life, and

one Probation Officer from the unit. (The co-ordinating Probation Officer was on vacation.) This was the first trip to include females and it was also the first to include a line officer from the unit. Originally, line officers had been excluded from participating because of the problems involved in providing caseload coverage during their absence from their regular duties. In this case, however, permission was granted on the basis that this officer would assume supervision responsibilities after the trip for all the participating wards. It was believed that program impact on the participants could be increased by providing them with follow-up counseling and services on an on-going basis after their return to the community. It was also believed that this could best be done by someone who had experienced the trip with the wards. To date, however, this officer has not yet been assigned any of the 12 wards for supervision. The follow-up trip for this group is also scheduled for April 28, 1975 and will be a joint trip with the group from Trip Four.

The present plans are to continue with the existing schedule which will mean two new groups during the months of May and June with their follow-up trips in July. The only anticipated change at this point is the appointment of a new co-ordinating Probation Officer, since the most recent co-ordinator has been promoted and re-assigned.

A summary of the Juvenile Field Services trips is presented in Table 1.

#### Rancho Del Campo

Rancho Del Campo is a Juvenile correctional institution for older boys committed by the Juvenile Court. The original intent of the Summit Program in that facility was to provide stress education for a selected group of wards fairly early in their camp experience. The Summit Program was to be in addition to, rather than in lieu of the regular camp program. It was hoped that the ward would make a better adjustment in camp after his return from the trip and ultimately, that the program would result in the ward's more positive adjustment in the community.

The original plan, as stated in the contract, called for 6 seven-day trips, and 3 ten-day trips, to include wards from previous trips. Seven-day trips were to include ten wards each and ten-day trips, twenty wards each, for a total of sixty during the nine month contract period. As with the Field Services Program, screening and selection procedures for evaluation purposes were proposed by the Evaluation Unit and agreed to by the program personnel.

The first trip of ten wards went out on November 16, 1974, accompanied by the co-ordinating Probation Officer and two Summit Staff members. On the fourth night of the trip, an argument ensued between two wards during which one ward struck the other with a flashlight knocking out several teeth. The following morning, the injured boy was returned to Rancho Del Campo for medical treatment and the other boy was taken to Juvenile Hall. A petition was filed

as a result of the incident and the boy was subsequently re-committed to Campo and successfully completed the program. The remainder of the group returned on November 22, a day earlier than expected because of a shortage of food, due to the wards stealing food from each other.

The altercation of the first trip resulted in a re-evaluation of the screening procedures for future trips. It was decided to exclude any ward who was thought to have a potential for violence or explosive behavior. The next trip was also much more structured than the first and no further problems involving violence were experienced. This trip of ten wards went out for five days beginning December 16, 1974, accompanied by the same three staff members of the first trip.

According to plan, the next trip was supposed to consist only of wards who had gone on one of the first two. Unfortunately, 16 of the 20 were unable to go. Three were no longer in the camp, five were sick, six simply didn't want to go again, and two were not asked because they were thought by staff to be unsuitable. The third trip was, therefore, composed of four wards who had gone on one of the first two trips, (one ward had already been released from Campo but attended anyway) plus six new wards selected from the camp population. This made it clear that the original scheduling plan was not going to work.

With this third group there began to be some concern about preparation for trips and follow-up work with the participants. It was suspected that whatever good was being accomplished on the trips was rapidly being lost when the boys were returned back to the camp situation. In an effort to counteract this, a more complex program began to emerge. The most significant change occurred when a teacher from the Rancho Del Rayo school program was placed on special assignment to the Summit Program. He began meeting with the wards several weeks prior to the trip itself for several hours a day. He provided academic instruction in relevant areas such as geology, astronomy, and ecology, as well as practical training in such things as first aid, cooking, survival procedures, and safety precautions. He was additionally involved in their physical and psychological preparation for the trip. This academic instruction was co-ordinated with and added to the standard Campo school program.

This third trip, accompanied by the teacher in addition to the regular trip staff, left on January 23, 1975 and remained in the field for nine days. As a part of the follow-up they were additionally scheduled to go on two over-night trips a few weeks later. Five boys were available for the first over-night but the second over-night was cancelled because only three boys were still in camp by that time. Additionally, the wards and their families were invited to attend "Recognition Night," an evening meeting held in the community after most of the boys had been released from camp. The purpose of the evening was to give the boys a chance to discuss their experiences and to attempt to provide the parents with some idea of what their sons had learned and accomplished. Movies of the trip were shown and certificates of program completion were awarded to the boys.

It was not until the fourth group that the program solidified into

it's present form. Ten new participants were selected, given three weeks of preparation, 12 days in the field, and one week of follow-up (including an additional overnight trip) for a total of six weeks exposure to the program. This was later followed by "Recognition Night" with their families. The 12-day trip left on March 3, 1975 with a staff of five including the teacher, the co-ordinating Probation Officer and three Summit Staff members. (Actually two of the ten new wards selected for this group were unable to participate at the last minute and two wards from the previous group replaced them on the trip.)

It is anticipated that three more groups of ten will participate in this program (which is described in greater detail in Appendix B). An overview is presented in Table 1.

### Rancho Del Rayo

Rancho Del Rayo is the facility for younger boys committed for correction by the Juvenile Court. It is located on the grounds of Rancho Del Campo but the wards in the Rayo dorm are younger, physically smaller, and more immature than those at Campo. The Summit Program there, as originally conceived, did not include the concept of stress education, and is, in fact, even known by a different name. The main thrust of the Wilderness Experience program (as it is known) was to promote the establishment of better interpersonal relationships between counselors and wards via a hiking and camping program.

The original plan was to place selected wards into a Wilderness Experience group shortly after their entry into the camp. The group was then to remain together throughout their camp experience. The program was to last nine to 15 weeks (as opposed to the regular camp program of 12 to 20 weeks) depending on the group's ability to achieve certain goals. Each group was to pass through three phases, each with specified objectives, with six one-day trips and two three-day trips spread throughout the phases. It was estimated that half the camp population, or approximately 130 wards could be accommodated during the nine month contract period. This program, in contrast to the Campo program, was to be an alternative to the regular program rather than an adjunct to it. Again in contrast to the other programs, there was to be no involvement by the Evaluation Unit in the screening and selection of participants. Evaluation was to be only in terms of program description with no assessment of program impact or effectiveness via an experimental design. The involvement of Summit Expedition was also to be less than in other programs in that the assigned Summit Staff member was to act primarily as a consultant to the program. The emphasis was to be on training of Rayo staff members to operate the program themselves.

The Rancho Del Rayo administrator primarily responsible for the design of the program was promoted and re-assigned shortly after its inception. Additionally, staffing problems made it impossible to operate two separate programs within the facility. As a consequence, most of the program as originally conceived had to be abandoned. Selected wards are still placed into WE groups upon entering camp but there has been no real separation of these wards from the regular camp program. Camping trips are scheduled when

time and staffing permits, and ten such trips, (ranging from two to four days in length) have been conducted thus far. Groups have ranged in number from five to nine wards and all have been accompanied by the Summit Staff member plus one Rancho Del Rayo counselor. Some of the same basic skills are taught on these trips as in the other programs but wards are certainly not exposed to the same breadth of experience. No expansion of the program is anticipated unless there are increases in staffing and changes in the existing staffing pattern. Table 1 summarizes trip activities for the first five months of the program.

### Summary and Conclusions

It is immediately apparent that there have been changes, some of them major, in all three segments of the Operation Summit Program. It was, however, expected that not all problems could be anticipated and that modifications would have to be made as the program went along. All programs had their difficulties in the beginning as Probation and Summit Staff learned to work together in a co-ordinated team effort. Problems arose centering around areas of responsibility, the transmittal of information, and other issues of this nature. For the most part, these issues were resolved as experience was gained. There were also some difficulties unique to each program that will be discussed separately.

### Juvenile Field Services

A rather serious morale problem arose very early in the Field Services Program. During the initial planning stages it was hoped by line Probation Officers that they would be able to participate in the trips with their own wards. When it was determined that this was not feasible, some officers were disappointed and chose not to give the program their full co-operation and support. With some, this meant not permitting their wards to participate. Other officers objected to the screening and selection procedures and as a result, there were some efforts to manipulate the process to include or exclude certain wards. The Summit Expedition Staff also experienced some difficulties as the result of never having worked with groups composed totally of delinquents. They were, at times, discouraged by their experiences. These, and previously mentioned factors all contributed to the program changes. Table 2 outlines what was proposed in terms of trips, numbers of wards, and total ward-days as compared with what actually occurred.

### Rancho Del Campo

The most serious problems in the Rancho Del Campo program have centered around trying to sell the program to both Campo staff and some groups of wards. There does not appear to be strong Campo staff support for the program and organizing groups has sometimes been both difficult and frustrating. The co-ordinating Probation Officer has lacked the authority (as well as the time) to do all the screening as originally planned, and consequently, he has had to be dependent on camp personnel for referrals. Other problems have had to do with the wards themselves and their reactions

to the program. For whatever the reason, some of the black youngsters decided from the beginning that blacks should not participate and they have put considerable pressure on those blacks who have volunteered. Consequently, very few blacks have gone into the program and only one has completed the full course. Staff have perceived this problem and have as yet found no correction measure since the program requires voluntary participation.

Peer pressure on all participating wards has always been and continues to be a problem in the program. Particularly in the beginning, wards returning from trips found themselves unable to communicate their experiences to others (including some staff) without having their accomplishments belittled and their new-found self-confidence diminished. As a result, they sometimes returned to old behavior patterns almost in self defense. This was the primary impetus for expanding the program to six weeks and adding so many in-camp activities. Table II compares the proposed plan with what actually occurred. It should be noted, however, that the Table represents only days actually spent in the field and does not show the considerable amount of time invested before and after the trips.

#### Rancho Del Rayo

The Rancho Del Rayo program has seen the greatest departure from the original plan. While it was never intended to be a stress education program per se, it was, nevertheless, going to be a very extensive program. The plan was not carried out primarily because of staffing problems completely beyond the control of the personnel involved. Without additional fiscal investment in this program by the County, beyond the current level, trips can only be scheduled when staffing permits. Table II will show that total time in the field has been far below expectations. Because of the impossibility of planning trips in advance and because there are no changes anticipated in the program, it can only be assumed that it will continue at approximately the same rate.

## EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

### Design Overview

The evaluation design will be concerned with four major areas of investigation:

- Evaluation of program objectives;
- Client characteristics associated with success and failure;
- Trip performance in relation to success and failure; and
- Program costs

The primary focus will be on the program's major objective of reducing delinquency. The overall design for the program in Field Services and at Rancho Del Campo involves comparing pre-post improvement in adjustment for those participating in the program with pre-post adjustment for control and experimental subjects who were eligible but did not participate. A multiple regression analysis will be conducted in an attempt to identify client characteristics associated with success and failure. In addition, the assessments of ward performance on trips by Summit personnel will be analyzed to determine the existence of any correlation between rated trip performance and the ward's ultimate success or failure. Program costs will be determined for all segments of the program including Rancho Del Rayo. Data collection for all groups will continue for a period of two years following program entry, and final conclusions will be based on a comparison of long-term behavior between experimentals and control and comparison subjects.

### Screening and Selection Procedures

The evaluation design for Field Services and Rancho Del Campo called for participants to be randomly selected from a pool of eligibles who met the eligibility criteria as established by the program personnel. The criteria were to be as follows:

1. Ward of the Court.
2. In Juvenile Court within the past six months on a petition
3. No physical disabilities
4. I.Q. above 80
5. Fourteen to 17.5 years of age

Additionally, the ward has to be willing to participate. Because the screening procedures were to be quite different for each program, each will be discussed separately.

### Juvenile Field Services Screening

In the Field Services program each trip was to be assigned to a different field supervision unit. The order in which units were to participate was to be determined by the co-ordinating Probation Officer. As each unit's turn came up, the unit officers (6) would

be asked if they wanted wards from their caseloads to participate. Participating caseloads would then be screened by Evaluation Unit personnel to determine all eligible wards, after which officers would be notified of those eligible and asked to contact each one to determine willingness to participate. When that was completed, participating wards were to be randomly selected from this pool by the Evaluation Unit. Those not selected would be the controls and those eligible but unwilling to participate were to be designated as comparison subjects. The potential participants and their families would then be contacted by the co-ordinating Probation Officer for the purpose of further orientation, and obtaining necessary forms. Any substitutions made prior to the trip were to be randomly selected from the control population.

### Rancho Del Campo

With the Rancho Del Campo population, the criteria for Summit participation closely matched the criteria for commitment to the camp itself. It was assumed that all wards would be eligible and that screening would therefore be a simple matter of determining who was willing and then making the random selection. Since the program was to occur early in the ward's camp experience, the co-ordinating Probation Officer was to screen only wards entering Campo during the month prior to the scheduled trip. It was expected that some would have to be eliminated because of relatively minor, but nevertheless disqualifying, health problems, such as the flu. The rest would be asked about their willingness to participate with the final random selection being made by evaluation personnel. The assignment of subjects to experimental, control and comparison groups was to be the same as in Field Services with substitutions to be made by random selection from the control group.

### Measurement of Program Objectives

The program has as its ultimate objective the reduction of delinquent behavior. This is to be measured by examining the severity, number and frequency of offenses pre- and post-program for experimentals as compared with control and comparison subjects. An offense is defined as any formally reported incident of delinquency, which includes referrals from schools and parents as well as police and probation reports.

Severity will be estimated by classifying offenses into the following categories:

- a. 601 - includes all offenses that would not constitute law violations for adults (e.g. truancy, curfew, runaway ) and offenses that would not apply to non-wards (e.g. leaving the County without permission, failure to report for the Work Project)
- b. 602, Other - includes all criminal code violations that do not directly involve victims and do not fall into any of the categories listed below (e.g. disturbing the peace, traffic violations resulting in petitions, unleashed dog on the beach)

- c. 602, Drug/Alcohol - includes all criminal code violations involving drugs or alcohol (e.g. drunk driving, possession of dangerous drugs)
- d. 602, Property - includes all criminal code violations involving the damage, destruction, or theft or property (e.g. malicious mischief, forgery, auto theft)
- e. 602, Person - includes all criminal code violations involving threat or injury to persons (e.g. assault, battery, rape)

In tabulating the numbers of offenses, multiple charges arising out of a single incident are counted as one offense, usually using the most serious of the charges. Offenses are further separated into those that result in the filing of a petition or information report and those that do not. (With some reported offenses there may be insufficient evidence for the filing of a petition, and in other cases, matters might simply be handled informally by the police or the Probation Officer.)

The frequency rate is the ratio between the time at risk during any given period and the number of offenses during that period. Time at risk is time actually spent in the community and is determined by subtracting out all time spent in a confinement situation for the time period involved.

Offense history is collected on all program subjects beginning with the first delinquent contact. For evaluation purposes, however, only the 24 months pre and post-program entry will be compared. Offense information is tabulated on the data collection form found in Appendix C.

In addition to the overall objective regarding reduced delinquency, the Rancho Del Campo program has the additional objectives of improving camp adjustment by reducing rule infractions and reducing the total time spent in the institution. An examination of camp records will provide the data necessary to determine any differences with regard to these objectives between experimental, control and comparison subjects.

#### Analysis of Client Characteristics Associated With Success and Failure

Data to be collected on all program subjects will include information (when available) in the following areas:

- Demographic information
- Offense history
- Placement history
- School information
- Employment information
- I-level classification
- Type of supervision
- Length of supervision time
- Other Probation programs
- Outside agency programs

Data will be recorded on the forms found in Appendix D and organized into six-month time frames for a period of two years following program entry. If certain characteristics can be identified as being associated with success and failure through a multiple regression analysis, information will be gained as to what kind of individual the program works with best.

#### Analysis of Trip Performance in Relation to Success and Failure

All wards participating in trips will be individually rated by all staff members involved. The rating from (as found in Appendix E) covers skills learned, behavior, and attitudinal changes. These ratings, together with other factors such as total time spent in the field, will be analyzed in terms of their relationship to the ward's overall success or failure at the end of the two-year follow-up period.

#### Analysis of Program Costs

Initially, program costs per ward will be determined by an analysis of all expenditures specifically associated with the program. Basically, this will include the cost of the Summit Expedition contract plus the cost to the County for the two co-ordinating Probation Officers added to the Department's budget. The analysis will not, however, include the costs for related personnel such as the program director or the Campo school teacher since these positions exist independently of the program.

A cost benefit analysis will be conducted at the conclusion of the two year follow-up period. It is assumed that a reduction in delinquency will result in an overall reduction in costs to the criminal justice system because of shorter periods of time on probation, less institutional time spent, and fewer Court appearances. Lowered costs in these areas which can be attributed to the program would be considered as benefits and, as such, would be analyzed together with initial costs for a more accurate assessment of true program costs. The information necessary for this analysis would come out of the data forms routinely kept on all program participants and again, the analysis would be based on a comparison of experimental with control and comparison subjects.

## RESULTS

It would not be appropriate on the basis of five months of experience to report on certain evaluation factors. Consequently, there will be no analysis of client characteristics related to success and failure, and no analysis of trip performance related to success and failure, as no program success and failure distinctions have yet been identified. This section will therefore be devoted to an analysis of screening and selection procedures, plus client characteristics in all three programs, and program costs.

### Screening and Selection Procedures

It became apparent right from the beginning that Screening and Selection procedures were not going to work as originally designed. Modifications were made from the beginning and because the problems that arose were unique for each program, they will be discussed separately.

#### Juvenile Field Services

There were immediate objections by Probation Officers to some of the criteria from the moment that screening began. First, it was felt that the requirement for a Court petition within the past six months was too limiting. Consequently, this was changed to include a Court action within the past six months or an annual review date at least six months away. (The trip date was the reference date used in determining time periods.) There were also objections to the I.Q. requirement because of the unreliability of some scores and the total lack of scores for some wards. Disqualification on the basis of this issue was, therefore, left totally to the discretion of the ward's Probation Officer. The officer could not, however, screen out a ward unless the file contained proof of a tested I.Q. lower than 80. (Very few were actually eliminated on this basis.)

In addition to the above modifications of existing criteria, new disqualifying factors had to be taken into account. For instance, it was discovered that an officer might be closing or transferring the case of an otherwise eligible ward in the near future, thereby making him unavailable for the trip. Other wards were residing out of the County, on runaway status, in Juvenile Hall or otherwise unavailable. Still others had Court orders for Work Project or other conditions of probation that precluded their participation. The final list of criteria used to determine eligibility is indicated below and is given in the order of importance with the most important factor being first:

1. Ward of the Court - excludes non-wards on informal supervision.
2. Male - excludes all females.
3. Court petition/appearance within past six months or annual review date at least six months away - excludes wards who have not been involved in delinquent activity in the recent past or who will not remain on probation in the near future.
4. Age 14 to 17.5 - excludes wards outside that age range figured from the date of the trip.

5. I.Q. above 80 - excludes wards who, in the opinion of their supervising officers, do not have the intelligence to learn the necessary skills and who might, therefore, jeopardize others.
6. No physical disabilities - excludes wards who would not be able to participate in strenuous physical activities because of injuries, illness or other physical problems.
7. Local resident - excludes wards living out of the County, in institutions, or on AWOL status.
8. No conflicting Court orders - excludes wards with conditions of probation that would conflict with participation in the program, such as orders to participate in Work Project during the same period of time.
9. Other - excludes wards unavailable for other reasons such Court hearings or other essential appointments scheduled for the same period of time.
10. Classification - excludes wards not of a particular I-level classification subtype and applied only to screening for Trip #5.
11. Case status T - excludes wards whose cases are being transferred in the near future to an officer in another unit.
12. Case status C - excludes wards whose cases are to be closed in the near future.

When more than one eliminating factor was present, only the more important one was used. It should be remembered that screening was only conducted for the first, fourth and fifth trips. A summary of cases screened out in Field Services is presented in Table III.

As previously mentioned, after the establishment of those eligible, supervising officers were asked to determine willingness to participate for those wards on their caseloads. Officers were also asked to report the ward's reasons if he did not wish to participate. Some of the reasons given by this group were: 1. Trip would interfere with job, school, or sports, 2. Parents wouldn't give permission, and 3. Simply not interested in camping activities. Table IV summarizes the break-down of eligibles who didn't want to participate, those who did, and those who actually went on trips.

It was originally planned that equal numbers of wards would be selected from participating caseloads. However, this did not prove feasible because of the large differences in numbers of eligibles and volunteers from one caseload to another. Selections were therefore made after pooling all the volunteers from the unit together. It is suspected that the officer's enthusiasm (or lack of it) probably communicated his degree of support for the program to the ward and very probably influenced the ward's decision. (One officer was even on vacation during the screening period and his wards were polled by student workers who were, in most cases, total strangers to the wards.) There was, however, no way of controlling for this variable and only a close examination of the various groups of program subjects and their comparability will determine if this was a critical factor.

## Rancho Del Campo

Screening procedures in the Campo program changed radically after the experiences of the first trip. Rather than assuming that all boys were eligible except those with medical problems, it was decided to also eliminate wards thought to have a potential for violence. The co-ordinating Probation Officer then began reviewing each ward's case file for indications of assaultive behavior and he also talked with each boy's counselor. Campo staff members also began to feel strongly that wards who misbehaved in camp should not be permitted to participate. Consequently, wards were then being eliminated because of fighting, instigating racial tension, and other types of misbehavior. The decision to exclude a boy gradually became the prerogative of the boy's counselor and the co-ordinating Probation Officer lacked the authority to overrule his decision. By the third trip all "screening" was being done by the camp counselors. They referred wards to the co-ordinating Probation Officer whom they believed to be "suitable" candidates and selections were then made from that pool. At least 16 counselors are involved in the process and there is no way of determining what criteria each one uses to determine "suitability." The effect of this process has been to drastically reduce the pool of eligibles. (For the next trip, for instance, only nine wards have been referred and ten are needed for the trip.) In terms of the evaluation, the process has virtually eliminated any possibility for a true control group since screening and selection criteria are unknown and can no longer be controlled.

### Client Descriptions

The client populations served by the three programs are quite different and will, therefore, be described separately. At this point, selected characteristics have merely been tabulated and no attempts have been made to test for significant differences between groups. However, this will be done at a later date when data for the full nine months is available.

### Juvenile Field Services

A description of selected characteristics for the Field Services subjects is summarized in Table V. No attempt has been made to present all the possible variables, but only those necessary to provide a basic understanding of the kind of individuals found in this program. Characteristics presented include age, ethnic background, months since first delinquent contact and prior offense history. This is presented only in terms of the total number of offenses resulting in a Court petition or information report even though much more detailed data has been collected.

### Rancho Del Campo

Although the Campo population is organized into groups of Experimental, Control and Comparison Subjects it should be noted that the only true control subjects were the four from the selection process for the first trip. Other "controls" (wards referred but not selected

for the later trips) are included in the description for the purposes of this report but they will be handled as another comparison group in later reports. The comparison subjects described relate only to the first two trips and are separated into two groups: Those that were eligible but declined to participate, and those that camp personnel ruled ineligible because of misbehavior or a potential for violence. It was possible to identify this group because for the first two trips screening was still limited to wards entering camp within one month of the trip. It was then an easy matter to determine who these wards were. This entry requirement was not true for later screening so it was impossible to determine which wards were even considered by the 16 or more counselors involved. Table VI summarizes selected client characteristics for the Rancho Del Campo subjects.

### Rancho Del Rayo

The Rayo program was not included in the experimental design calling for control and comparison groups. Therefore the client description is only of those who actually participated. Table VII summarizes this group.

### Analysis of Program Costs

No costs have been computed for the time spent by the Probation Department's Project Director, as his position was already budgeted as an ordinance position, and only a rough approximation of his Summit co-ordination duties could be accounted for in time. The two Probation co-ordinators have been employed full-time and 53.8% of the Probation budget had been spent during this time period.

### Juvenile Field Services

The cost of the Juvenile Services program includes the specific charges allocated by the Summit administration to that program (personnel, equipment, and trip expenses), plus one-third of the insurance cost and one-third of the Summit equipment replacement charge. Administration costs were extrapolated from the Summit figures, and assigned on the basis of the rates of personnel assigned to each of the three Summit/Probation programs. In the case of Personnel Services, 43.4% of this amount was for Juvenile Services. In addition, the salary and fringe benefits for the Probation staff member assigned full-time to the program was included (\$7,913.22).

The Juvenile Field Services program conducted five field trips during the reporting (November 1, 1974 to March 31, 1975). These trips ranged in length from three to nine days, and involved from three to six staff members (Summit and Probation staff combined) supervising from nine to 14 wards each trip. Forty-five boys were exposed to at least one trip, with some wards repeating the experience so that 58 ward trips were conducted, amassing 424 ward days. (This figure is a product of the number of days on each trip multiplied by the number of wards on that trip.)

The total cost of operating the Field Services Summit Program

for this period was \$32,537.88. Dividing this figure by the number of wards who were exposed to the program (45) results in an average cost per ward of \$723.06. Since 424 ward days were spent on Summit trips through this period of the program, the cost per ward per day was \$76.74.

#### Rancho Del Campo

The total cost of the Summit program at Rancho Del Campo was \$29,451.04 including a Probation staff cost of \$8,632.20. The average cost per ward was \$866.21 and the cost per ward per trip day was \$89.25.

The foregoing cost figures were computed in the same manner as the Juvenile Services costs. There were four trips conducted, with a trip length range of five to 12 days. Ten wards went on each trip with between six and ten new wards per trip, so that 34 wards were exposed to the program for some period of time, and amassing 330 trip ward days. The number of staff accompanying the wards ranged from three to five.

#### Rancho Del Rayo

The cost of operating a modified Summit program at Rancho Del Rayo was \$14,094.80; there were no additional County expenses incurred beyond the costs paid under the Operation Summit contract. Between five and nine wards went on each of ten trips, of two to four days duration, with between zero and nine new wards per trip. Forty wards were exposed to the program, and totalled 209 days in the field in Summit related activities. The average cost per ward was \$352.37 and the cost per ward per day was \$67.44.

Since it is possible for a private individual or family to contract with Summit Expedition, in order to participate in a group stress education activity, some comparability with that program seems reasonable. However, no precise comparison can be made between the "normal" Summit Expedition program and the programs which have been conducted within the Probation Department; there are certain obvious differences in clientele, as most Summit Expedition participants are non-delinquent persons. Nevertheless, a call to the Summit office elicited the information that a rigorous 21 day Summit Expedition experience would cost \$425.00, or \$20.23 per day, per participant.

It should be noted that the equipment purchased for the Rancho Del Campo and Rancho Del Rayo programs remains with those camp facilities; the Field Services equipment reverts by contract to Summit Expedition. Almost all of the equipment allotment for the project has been spent, as anticipated, and has been included in the costs for the first five months of the project, although it will be used throughout the project period. This accounts for the fact that 57.7% of the money had been spent when 55.5% of the project time had passed.

An overview of program costs is presented in tabular form for cross-program and status comparison in Table VIII; Table IX present program costs per ward.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is still far too early to draw any conclusions about the impact of the Operation Summit Program on delinquent youth. Nevertheless, this examination of the first five months of the program does permit some conclusions about other factors and some recommendations can be made even at this early date.

The most outstanding factor made clear by the evaluation is that it is an expensive program, particularly in relation to the amount of time actually spent with individual wards. Providing a full 14 day program for a Field Services ward, for instance, requires an investment of approximately \$1,075.00. That same 14 day program would run \$1,250.00 for a Rancho Del Campo ward, and it must be remembered that these costs are in addition to the institutional or supervision costs for the regular Probation program within which the ward is involved. At this point, the investment is being made without any documented evidence that benefits will result in the form of reduced delinquent behavior. The concept of stress education as a correctional tool has yet to be tested in this program. It is for this very reason that it is being recommended that the testing of the concept be continued on an experimental basis with some major modifications of the program.

### RECOMMENDATION I

It is recommended that the contract between the County of San Diego and Summit Expedition not be renewed after the expiration of the current contract.

The major expense (78%) in operating the program has been the cost of the Summit Expedition contract. It is believed that the same service could be provided much more economically through some other means and several alternatives have been considered. First, the program could be entirely managed by existing departmental staff members who have been trained by Summit Expedition during the course of the program. (Other staff members who have not participated in this particular program have also had training and experience in this area.) This alternative would eliminate the Summit Contract expense but would still involve the cost of assigned Probation personnel.

Another alternative would be to enter into personal service contracts with selected individuals to provide the on-course leadership and expertise. This would involve contracting for specified periods of time (trips only) and would eliminate all the overhead and administrative costs included in the present contract.

A third alternative would be to establish a Civil Service classified position, so that the expertise necessary to provide this service would be available on an on-going basis, and the employees would be accountable for their performance.

Within the present constraints dictated by budget considerations and because the program is still in an experimental stage, it would

appear that the first alternative is the most reasonable. It would involve the least amount of expense and draw only on existing personnel. If at some later date, however, it is determined that the concept does work and the County wishes to make a firm commitment to continue the program, then the third alternative of a new classified position would be the most ideal.

#### RECOMMENDATION II

It is recommended that the Operation Summit Program as it exists in Juvenile Field Services be terminated upon expiration of the contract.

What limited research has been conducted in the past with regard to stress education has all indicated that effectiveness is predicated on a fairly long exposure time to the program. Other programs have ranged from 21 to 42 days in the field and the Youth Authority program even found it necessary to follow-up the trips with 60 days in a group home. The Field Services program has provided wards with an average of nine days in the field with no follow-up work of any kind. Previous research would indicate that this is an insufficient period of time for client impact even if it could be done economically.

Additional factors have also become apparent that would indicate that resources could best be allocated elsewhere. It was originally anticipated that a large number of wards would be eligible to participate in the program. As it turned out, however, only 14.5% of the 468 wards screened were actually available and willing to participate. A large number of otherwise eligible wards declined to participate because the program would have caused an interruption of school, work, or other on-going activities. (Some of those who did go declined follow-up trips because of having fallen behind in school as a result of the first trip.) It would appear that the Summit Program is basically incompatible with the Field Services program in that trips can cause disruptions in other areas of the ward's life. The dilemma is that trips must be long to be effective, but this would only increase the degree of disruption.

In addition to the factors discussed above, continuation of the Field Services program without the services of Summit Expedition (as recommended) would require an additional investment in new equipment. As previously mentioned, all equipment purchased for Field Services reverts to Summit Expedition and would therefore have to be replaced.

#### RECOMMENDATION III

It is recommended that the Operation Summit Program involvement at Rancho Del Rayo be terminated upon expiration of the contract.

The Rancho Del Rayo Wilderness Experience Program was never intended to be a stress education program, and it, therefore, cannot be faulted for failing to provide longer periods of wilderness exposure. Their participation in the Summit Program was primarily to acquire the needed equipment and training necessary to operate their own

program. This objective has been accomplished and there does not appear to be any further need to include Rayo in future Operation Summit budgeting. While they did not operationalize the program originally conceived this was for reasons beyond their control. Should conditions in regard to staffing change in the future to permit the operation of a more extensive program than now exists, they will already possess all the resources necessary to run it as an internal program.

#### RECOMMENDATION IV

It is recommended that the Rancho Del Campo program be continued on an experimental basis with certain modifications.

From a theoretical perspective, the Rancho Del Campo program offers the greatest potential for client impact. It is possible to provide wards with wilderness experience for an extended period of time, and the daily contact during pre- and post trip time allows for a greater intensity of preparation and follow-up services. Additionally, the program does not represent an interruption of on-going activities, but rather it has the potential for including numerous activities into one co-ordinated effort. Academic, physical and emotional development can all be combined into an integrated experience for the ward, and this can all be done in an environment that is temporarily free of the distracting family and peer group pressures experienced by the ward in the community. The Rancho Del Campo program has the potential for developing a truly alternative approach to the standard institutional program via the vehicle of stress education.

The program as it has emerged has been moving in the right direction. It has been expanded beyond the basic trip experience and efforts have been made to co-ordinate the program with other activities such as the school program. (A ward in the Summit program now receives more hours of academic instruction than in the regular program rather than losing time as the result of being out on trips.) A greater emphasis has been placed on follow-up counseling including a final session with wards and their families usually after the ward's release from the institution. While the program is not yet a separate "alternative" program, it contains many of the basic ingredients.

At first glance it would appear that the Campo program is the most expensive in costs per ward. It should be pointed out, however, that these costs apply only to the trips themselves, the bulk of which are contract costs (71%). The total cost of the Probation Officer has been charged only to the time periods covering the trips even though he had much more contact with the wards during pre- and post trip periods. (Actual time spent was impossible to estimate but it would have made the daily cost a little lower.) Costs per day are not spread over the entire six weeks of the program since almost all of the pre-post time was with personnel not paid for by the program (i.e. the teacher). Closer examination shows, then, that much of the program is being operated with existing personnel and that the greatest additional expense has been the contracted

services of Summit Expedition.

(The potential for moving the Rancho Del Campo program in the direction of an alternative to longer confinement time could also, if deemed practical and advisable, be extended to the female wards at Las Colinas.)

Whereas the foregoing information supports the thesis that the Rancho Del Campo program has the greatest potential for significant client impact at reasonable cost, the evaluation potential at the present time is quite limited. Certain program alterations must be made, with the support of administration and staff, if the present (and on-going) evaluation is to be fruitful. Among these alterations are:

- Agreement on what criteria determine eligibility for participation in the program; and
- Standardization of procedures for screening and centralization of the selection functions of the program; and
- Provide the Departmental co-ordinator at Rancho Del Campo, with greater authority for conducting the program.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE I

## Summary of Summit Program Trips

Juvenile Field Services						
Dates	Total Days	Total Wards	New Wards	Ward Days	Total Staff	Location
11-18-74/11-22-74	5	11	11	55	3	Anza-Borrego
12- 2-74/12- 4-74	3	9	9	27	5	Cuyamaca
1- 9-75/ 1-17-75	9	14	1	126	5	Death Valley
2- 6-75/ 2-14-75	9	12	12	108	4	Death Valley
3-13-75/ 3-31-75	9	12	12	108	6	Death Valley
<b>Totals</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>424</b>		

Rancho Del Campo						
Dates	Total Days	Total Wards	New Wards	Ward Days	Total Staff	Location
11-16-74/11-22-74	7	10	10	70	3	Anza-Borrego
12-16-74/12-20-74	5	10	10	50	3	Anza-Borrego
1-23-75/ 1-31-75	9	10	6	90	4	Death Valley
3- 3-75/ 3-14-75	12	10	8	120	5	Death Valley
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>330</b>		

Rancho Del Rayo						
Dates	Total Days	Total Wards	New Wards	Ward Days	Total Staff	Location
11- 6-74/11- 7-74	2	6	6	12	2	Cuyamaca
12- 3-74/12- 5-74	3	6	6	18	2	Joshua Tree
12- 4-74/12- 6-74	3	5	0	15	2	Joshua Tree
1- 7-75/ 1- 9-75	3	7	1	21	2	Cuyamaca
1- 9-75/ 1-11-75	3	6	6	18	2	Anza-Borrego
1-22-75/ 1-24-75	3	9	9	27	2	Anza-Borrego
2- 5-75/ 2- 7-75	3	8	0	24	2	San Jacinto
2-25-75/ 2-27-75	3	7	5	21	2	Laguna
3-16-75/ 3-19-75	4	8	1	32	2	Death Valley
3-20-75/ 3-22-75	3	7	6	21	2	Cuyamaca
<b>Totals</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>209</b>		

TABLE II

Comparison of Proposed Program With Activities To Date

Number of Trips	Total Days	Wards Per Trip	New Wards Per Trip	Total New Wards	Total Days Per Ward	Total Ward Days
<b>Field Services Proposal for 9-Month Contract Period</b>						
9 5-Day	75	8	8	72	15	1080
3 10-Day		24	0			
<b>Actual Program Through March 31, 1975</b>						
1 3-Day	35	9	9	45	3-14	424
1 5-Day		11	11			
3 9-Day		12-14	1-12			
<b>Planned For Remainder of Contract Period</b>						
3 5-Day	33	12-24	0	24-36	14	336-504
2 9-Day		12-16	12-16			
<b>Total of Actual and Planned</b>						
	68			69-81		760-928

<b>Rancho Del Campo Proposal For 9-Month Contract Period</b>						
6 7-Day	72	10	10	60	17	1020
3 10-Day		20	0			
<b>Actual Program Through March 31, 1975</b>						
1 7-Day	35	10	10	34	5-21	330
1 5-Day		10	10			
1 9-Day		10	6			
1 12-Day		10	8			
<b>Planned For Remainder of Contract Period</b>						
3 12-Day	42	10	10	30	14	420
3 2-Day		10	0			
<b>Total of Actual and Planned</b>						
	77			64		750

<b>Rancho Del Rayo Proposal For 9-Month Contract Period</b>						
6 1-Day and 2 3-Day Per Ward in Groups of 6-10				130	12	1560
<b>Actual Program Through March 31, 1975</b>						
10 2-4 Day	30	5-9		40	3-13	209
<b>Planned For Remainder of Contract Period (Estimates based on above figures)</b>						
9 3-Day	14			18		252
<b>Total of Actual and Planned</b>						
	44			58		451

TABLE III

Summary of Juvenile Field Services Screening

Rejected Cases

	Trip #1	Trip #4	Trip #5	Total	Percent of Total Rejected
Total Screened	133	164	171	468	
Reasons for Rejection					
1 Ward	0	1	3	4	1.3%
2 Male	15	30	42	87	27.4%
3 Court Appearance	15	34	21	70	22.1%
4 Age	22	21	29	72	22.7%
5 IQ	12	0	0	12	3.8%
6 Physical	1	1	2	4	1.3%
7 Resident	3	3	1	7	2.2%
8 Court Order	0	3	0	3	1.0%
9 Other	2	1	1	4	1.3%
10 Subtype	0	0	33	33	10.4%
11 Transfer	4	6	1	11	3.5%
12 Close	7	3	0	10	3.2%
Total Rejected	81	103	133	317	100%
Percent of Total	60.9%	62.8%	77.8%	67.7%	

**TABLE IV**  
**Summary of Juvenile Field Services Screening**  
**Eligible Cases**

	Trip #1	Trip #4	Trip #5	Total
Total Screened	133	164	171	468
Total Eligible	52	61	38	151
Percent of Total	39.1%	37.2%	22.2%	32.3%
Total Volunteers	33	17	18	68
Percent of Eligible	63.5%	27.9%	47.4%	45.0%
Percent of Total	24.8%	10.4%	10.5%	14.5%
Total on trips	11	12	12	35
Percent of Volunteers	33%	70.6%	66.7%	51.5%
Percent of Eligibles	21.1%	19.7%	31.6%	23.2%
Percent of Total	8.3%	7.3%	7.0%	7.5%

TABLE V

Selected Client Characteristics  
Juvenile Field Services

Characteristic	Experimental (N=45)	Control (N=29)	Comparison (N=81)
Average Age	16.3	16.0	16.2
Range	14.0-17.95	14.2-17.4	14.1-17.4
Ethnic: Black % of Total	15 33%	12 41.4%	16 19.8%
Caucasian % of Total	18 40%	10 34.5%	36 44.4%
Mexican % of Total	12 27%	6 20.7%	27 33.8%
Other % of Total	0 0	1 3.5%	2 2.5%
Months Since First Delinquent Contact	33.76	39.96	39.03
Range	5.6-117.4	7.4-93.3	3.1-122.3
Offenses: Total Priors	6.91	9.66	8.80
Range	1-18	1-25	1-32
Total Peti- tioned Priors	3.05	4.79	4.25
Range	1-8	1-12	1-16

TABLE VI

Selected Client Characteristics  
Rancho Del Campo

Characteristic	Experimental (N=34)	Control (N=18)	Comparison 1* (N=3)	Comparison 2** (N=13)
Average Age	16.45	16.60	16.13	15.61
Range	15.15-17.80	15.48-17.82	15.7-16.75	13.68-17.14
Ethnic: Black	6	3	0	3
% of Total	17.6%	19%	0	23.1%
Caucasian	20	9	1	7
% of Total	58.8%	56%	33%	53.8%
Mexican	7	4	2	3
% of Total	20.6%	25%	67%	23.1%
Other	1	0	0	0
% of Total	2.9%	0	0	0
Months Since First Delinquent Contact	42.11	36.18	31.87	40.03
Range	4.0-123.9	6.5-85.2	19.1-48.6	13.7-91.2
Offenses: Total Priors	12.21	11.56	12.33	10.31
Range	4-35	3-28	9-14	3-35
Total Peti- tioned Priors	7.32	7.0	7.33	5.23
Range	2-22	1-18	5-11	1-17

\*Eligible - did not volunteer

\*\*Eligible - excluded by officer

TABLE VII

Selected Client Characteristics  
 Rancho Del Rayo

CHARACTERISTICS	PARTICIPANTS (N=40)
Average Age	15.37
Range	13.02-17.37
Ethnic:	
Black % of Total	7 17.5%
Caucasian % of Total	24 60%
Mexican % of Total	8 20%
Other % of Total	1 2.5%
Months Since First Delinquent Contact	31.01
Range	2.4-88.6
Offenses:	
Total Priors Range	9.15 4-19
Total Peti- tioned Priors Range	5.48 1-13

TABLE VIII

## An Overview of Program Costs

	Summit Contract	Probation	Total
Total Budget	\$103,240.00	\$30,750.00	\$133,990.00
Expenses Through March 31, 1975			
Juvenile Field Services	24,624.66	7,913.22	32,537.88
Rancho Del Campo	20,818.84	8,632.20	29,451.04
Rancho Del Rayo	14,094.80	None	14,094.80
Total	\$ 59,538.30	\$16,545.42	\$ 76,083.72
Percent of Total Budget	57.7%	53.8%	56.8%

TABLE IX

## Program Costs Per Ward

	No. of Indivi- dual Wards	Avg. No. Days Per Ward	Total Ward Trip Days	Avg. Cost Per Ward	Daily Cost Per Ward
Juvenile Field Services (\$32,537.88)	45	9.42	424	\$723.06	\$76.74
Rancho Del Campo (\$29,451.04)	34	9.71	330	\$866.21	\$89.25
Rancho Del Rayo (\$14,094.80)	40	5.23	209	\$352.37	\$67.44
Total (\$76,083.73)	119	8.09	963		
Average (\$25,361.27)	39.67	8.09	321	\$639.36	\$79.01

APPENDIX B

Rancho del Campo Summit Program

The RDC Summit Program is a six-week course involving Summit personnel, the co-ordinating Probation officer, and the teacher. The individual areas of responsibility are outlined below.

RANCHO DEL CAMPO  
JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

	Summit Program Director	Summit Instructor	Co-ordinating Probation Officer	Teacher
Pre-Course - 3 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program planning and coordination</li> <li>• Presentations</li> <li>• Interviewing</li> <li>• I-level testing</li> <li>• Recon. areas</li> <li>• Notifying area authorities of trips</li> <li>• Develop goals &amp; objectives for ward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logistics ... coordination</li> <li>• equipment</li> <li>• food</li> <li>• vehicles</li> <li>• Presentations</li> <li>• Interviewing</li> <li>• Recon. areas</li> <li>• Develop goals &amp; objectives for each ward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Securing candidates for trips</li> <li>• Parental OK to orientation</li> <li>• Court order</li> <li>• Medical clearance</li> <li>• Presentations</li> <li>• Interviewing</li> <li>• Campo-Summit liaison</li> <li>• Develop goals &amp; objectives for each ward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom prep with students for trips on subjects to be covered in field</li> <li>• Develop goals &amp; objectives for each ward</li> </ul>
On-Course - 12 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination of course</li> <li>• Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rock climbing</li> <li>• survival</li> <li>• first aid</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Dialogue</li> <li>• Ecology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rock climbing</li> <li>• survival</li> <li>• first aid</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Dialogue leader</li> <li>• Pictures of activities &amp; students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group control</li> <li>• Counseling</li> <li>• Map &amp; Compass</li> <li>• Astronomy</li> <li>• Dialogue leader</li> <li>• Counseling prep.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Astronomy</li> <li>• Geology</li> <li>• Ecology</li> <li>• Nature Art</li> <li>• Journals</li> <li>• Dialogue leader</li> <li>• Counseling prep.</li> <li>• Outdoor lore (love of area)</li> <li>• Indian lore</li> <li>• First Aid</li> </ul>
Post-Course - 1 week	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of wards</li> <li>• Course evaluation</li> <li>• Participate in 2 overnights with wards</li> <li>• Recognition night</li> <li>• Program Development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of wards</li> <li>• Course evaluation</li> <li>• Participate in 2 overnights with wards</li> <li>• Coordinate</li> <li>• Recognition night</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of wards</li> <li>• Course evaluation</li> <li>• Participate in 2 overnights</li> <li>• Recognition night</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 hours of classroom follow-up, teaching of wards on subjects covered during course</li> </ul>

A more detailed description of the role of the teacher and the program he has developed is presented below.

### DESCRIPTION OF TEACHER RESPONSIBILITIES

- I. PRE-TRIP PREPARATION - 30 to 50 hours of classroom preparation in three basic areas.
  - A. Academic Presentation - preparation in various topics needed for successful completion of the program and those topics which enhance the appreciation of the out-of-doors.
    1. Basic First Aid leading to Red Cross Certification.
    2. Instructors Aide Program for leadership development in first aid.
    3. Elementary Geology relevant to Stress Program Site.
    4. Natural History of Campo and Stress Program Site.
    5. Astronomy with evening programs of star and constellation identification.
    6. Ecology discussions relevant to students and Stress Program Site.
    7. Weather including student development of forecast for Stress Program.
    8. Drawing and sketching of themes in nature.
    9. Anthropology of Stress Site including Early Man, Indian Lore and Historical significance.
    10. Introduction of basic mountaineering skills in the following areas:
      - a. Equipment
      - b. Camp procedures
      - c. Cooking
      - d. Map and compass orientation
      - e. Technical rock climbing procedures and safety precautions
      - f. Survival and rescue procedures.
  - B. Physical Development - a one-day field trip for the development of various skills and physical conditioning to a previously selected site to include the following:
    1. A nature walk describing 25 plants and their significance in the desert chaparral area.
    2. Safety training procedures for technical climbing.
  - C. Psychological Preparation - requires that each ward keep a daily journal in order to help direct and focus his thoughts and feelings for the purpose of creating greater behavioral change, development, and growth. Journals will include the following:
    1. Essays on selected topics
    2. Comments on daily activities
    3. Sketches
    4. Poems.
- II. STRESS PROGRAM - (12 days) - principle responsibility with staff team for management, supervision, teaching and counseling during the trip.
  - A. Instruct the many practicums augmenting the scholastic program and facilitate awareness of the relevancy of the educational program.

- B. Direct the ongoing development of the student's journals and related topics
- C. Co-lead in group and individual dialogue sessions.

III. FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM - (10 to 30 hours) development of follow-up program regarding topics covered during program.

- A. Help in the development of student goals and objectives and help students focus on their thoughts and feelings in preparation for the overnight program
- B. Testing and certification of students
- C. Evaluation and re-development of program
- D. Participation in Recognition Night three weeks after program
- E. Development of Public Relations Presentations
- F. Selection of future candidates.

ENTRY DATE

PRE-PROGRAM ENTRY

POST PROGRAM ENTRY

ENTRY DATE / /	PRE-PROGRAM ENTRY					POST PROGRAM ENTRY				
	-24	-18	-12	-6	Tot.	+6	+12	+18	+24	
INCIDENTS										
A. 602-Other										
B. 602-D/A										
C. 602-Prop.										
D. 602-Person										
602 Total										
E. 601										
601-602 Total										
PETITIONS & I.R. TOTAL FILED										
Total 601 I										
Total 602 I										
Tot. 601-602 I										
MONTHS AT RISK Prob. 3059 (4-75)										

C-1

APPENDIX C  
Offense Behavior Tabulation Form



### PLACEMENT HISTORY

Name	Entry	Release	Total Months	Comments

### OPEN/CLOSE DATES

Open	Close	Open	Close

Activity since program entry, by month. (Citations, placements, dismissal, marriage, release from placement, etc.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	601 602 D/A
7	8	9	10	11	12	601 602 D/A
13	14	15	16	17	18	601 602 D/A
19	20	21	22	23	24	601 602 D/A

APPENDIX E  
OPERATION SUMMIT  
WARD PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

1. WARD'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_ TRIP NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

2. SKILLS (Place a check next to each skill learned by the ward.)

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Knot tying..... _____                  | 11. Problem solving..... _____      |
| 2. Rope handling..... _____               | 12. Use of resources..... _____     |
| 3. Belaying..... _____                    | 13. Fire starting..... _____        |
| 4. Signals/commands..... _____            | 14. Shelter building..... _____     |
| 5. Safety..... _____                      | 15. Food preparation..... _____     |
| 6. Packing..... _____                     | 16. Plant identification..... _____ |
| 7. Load carrying..... _____               | 17. Water retrieval..... _____      |
| 8. Maintenance of<br>equipment..... _____ | 18. Map and compass..... _____      |
| 9. Rhythmic breathing..... _____          | 19. Mountain safety..... _____      |
| 10. Pacing..... _____                     | 20. First aid..... _____            |
|   | 21. Mountain travel..... _____      |

3. ON-COURSE BEHAVIOR (Place a check next to the level of behavior which best describes the ward in relation to both peers and staff.)

	refused	reluc- tant	average	quite willing	out- standing
1. Participation with peers					
2. Participation with staff					
3. Cooperation with peers					
4. Cooperation with staff					

4. CHANGES DURING TRIP (Place a check next to the degree of change which best describes the ward's movement from the first to the last day.)

	much worse	scmewhat worse	no change	some improve.	much improvement
1. Attitude					
2. Self Image					
3. Enthusiasm					
4. Aggression					
5. Frustration					
6. Creativity					
7. Confidence					
8. Sensitivity self					
others					
environment					

**END**