

EVALUATION OF THE
SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT
PROGRAM

OPERATION SUMMIT

Final Report

November 1, 1974 to July 31, 1975

Submitted to:

Ruben E. Dominguez, Administrator
Human Resources Agency

Michael D. Garvey
Acting Chief Probation Officer

Prepared by:

San Diego County Probation Department
Program Evaluation Unit

Project Director:

Frank L. DuPont
Supervising Probation Officer

Principal Researcher:

Mary V. Ramirez
Senior Probation Officer

Data Collection:

Judy Breland
Jan Crist

59697 Copy 2
"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 November 3, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Executive Summary	1
II. History and Philosophy	2
III. Program Description	3
A. Skills Taught and Expectations for Juvenile Field Services and Rancho Del Campo Trips	3
B. Description of Juvenile Field Services	4
C. Description of Rancho Del Campo	8
D. Description of Rancho Del Rayo	10
E. Discussion	12
1. Juvenile Field Services	12
2. Rancho Del Campo	14
3. Rancho Del Rayo	15
IV. Evaluation Methodology	17
A. Screening and Selection Procedures	17
1. Juvenile Field Services Screening	17
2. Rancho Del Campo	18
B. Analysis of Client Characteristics	18
C. Evaluation of Program Objectives	18
D. Analysis of Trip Performance in Relation to Post Program Offense Behavior	20
E. Analysis of Program Costs	20
V. Results	21
A. Selection and Screening Procedures	21
1. Juvenile Field Services	21
2. Rancho Del Campo	26
3. Rancho Del Rayo	26
B. Client Characteristics	27
1. Age	27
2. Ethnic Background	28
3. Area of Residence	30
4. Type of First Contact	32
5. Type of First Delinquent Contact	33
6. Time Since First Delinquent Contact	34
7. Total Time Case Active	35
8. Total Time Spent in Confinement	36
9. Involvement in Subsidy Programs	37
10. Involvement in Other Programs	38
11. Employment History	39
12. Discussion of Results	41
C. Analysis of Program Objectives	42
1. Analysis of Prior Record Information	42
2. Analysis of One Year Pre-Post Differences in Offense Behavior	47

NCJRS

JUL 27 1979

ACQUISITION:

	<u>Page</u>
a. Juvenile Field Services	48
b. Rancho Del Campo	52
c. Rancho Del Rayo	56
D. Additional Information	59
1. Sealing of Juvenile Record	59
2. Closing of Juvenile Record	59
3. Certification to Adult Court	61
4. Commitments to the Youth Authority	61
E. Performance Ratings	63
1. Description of Trip Performance Ratings	63
2. Correlation of Trip Performance with Offense Behavior	67
F. Analysis of Program Costs	69
1. Juvenile Field Services	69
2. Rancho Del Campo	69
3. Rancho Del Rayo	70
VI. Conclusions and Recommendations	72
VII. Appendix A - Juvenile Data Forms	
VIII. Appendix B - Ward Performance Form	

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Operation Summit stress education program was operated in the San Diego County Probation Department from November 1, 1974 to July 31, 1975; consultant services were obtained by contract with Summit Expedition, a program of Youth Development, Inc. The program was segmented into separate programs at Rancho Del Campo, Rancho Del Rayo, and Juvenile Field Services.

Total expenditures for the nine-month program were \$128,185.25, which should be understood as additional to the standard cost of service to the wards in their routine or special programs. One hundred and ninety-one youngsters participated for some time, at an average daily cost of \$73.56.

Using a pre-post evaluation design in addition to control and comparison groups where feasible, it was determined that:

1. The Operation Summit program did not result in a significantly greater reduction of offense behavior for participating wards.
2. A stress education program is probably incompatible with the life situations of wards in the Field Services program.
3. Institutional settings have the greatest potential for achieving maximum benefit from a stress education program.

It is, therefore, respectfully recommended:

1. That a stress education program not be re-instituted in Juvenile Field Services.
2. That any future stress education program be instituted in an institutional setting only.
 - a. that any such program be operated by Departmental staff rather than by external contract.
 - b. that any such program be designed as a true alternative to the standard institutional program, with substantial periods of preparation and follow-up services.
 - c. that selection and screening procedures be standardized and centralized under the authority of a designated Program Director or Program Planning Committee.

II. 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.

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Operation Summit Program was operated in Juvenile Field Services, at Rancho Del Campo, and at Rancho Del Rayo. Two Probation Officers were assigned as full-time coordinators for the program (one in Field Services and one at Rancho Del Campo) and the overall program was directed by the Department's Chaplain. The program was 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 were essentially the same. All of the longer trips were to Death Valley, Mt. Whitney, and Sequoia, and all wards involved in these trips were exposed to the same basic program. Briefly, wards were 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">•Knot Tying•Rope Handling•Belaying•Signals and Commands	Rock Climbing
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Packing•Load Carrying•Maintenance of Equipment•Rhythmic Breathing•Pacing	Back-packing
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Problem Solving•Use of Resources	Initiative Tests
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Fire Starting•Shelter Building•Food Preparation•Plant Identification•Water Retrieval	Survival
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Map and Compass•Mountain Safety•First Aid•Mountain Travel	Final

The course "final" usually consisted of a 24-hour "solo" experience in which the boys were spaced out in an area where they could not

have contact with each other. They were essentially alone for a 24-hour period although they were checked periodically by staff. Additionally, specified times were set aside for wards to reflect on their experiences, to write in their journals, and to share experiences through group discussions.

It was believed by the program personnel that participation in these activities would 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

Wards were expected to cooperate with both staff and peers, to participate in all activities, and in essence, to complete the course. They were individually and independently rated in all of these areas by every staff member on the trip. Feedback was also provided to each boy's Probation Officer for his information and use during future counseling with the ward. All of this activity was, 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.

DESCRIPTION OF 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 that 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 five-day trip. It was later learned that a few boys failed to report because of transportation problems and that 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", even though 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 coordinating 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 coordinating Probation Officer plus three Summit Staff members.

The fifth trip 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 coordinating 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. However, this officer never was assigned any of these 12 wards for supervision, possibly because he was transferred out of the unit a few months later.

The next trips scheduled were supposed to be follow-up trips for groups #4 and #5. Group #4 had gone on a nine-day trip in February and a five-day trip was scheduled for them to begin on April 7, 1975. Group #5 was scheduled for the week of April 21, 1975. However, because of bad weather, the first trip was cancelled and it was decided to combine the two groups (totaling 24 wards) for one trip. This trip left on April 28, 1975, and was out for five days. It included 13 wards (eight from group #4 and five from group #5), four Summit Staff members, a student worker, and the new Probation coordinator. One youngster had to be returned to his home the following day because he was "acting crazy." He was unable to keep up with the group activities and it was decided that it would be in the best interests of all concerned to remove him and return him home. The rest of the trip was uneventful except for some discomfort due to bad weather.

The 11 additional wards who were scheduled for this trip were contacted as to their reasons for not attending. Of the 11, four were simply not interested in going again, one was ill, two had been arrested on new charges and were in Juvenile Hall, and four indicated that their participation on the previous trip had caused them serious problems with their school work.

The wards for trip #7 were selected from a regular Field Supervision Unit using the normal selection procedures. Planning and preparation went smoothly and the group left on May 22, 1975, with 14 wards, three Summit Staff members, the coordinating Probation Officer, and one Probation Officer from the Supervision Unit. The trip went well and all agreed that it had probably

10-26

10-26

10-26

been the most successful trip to date.

Trip #8 was equally as successful in terms of selection, planning and preparation. Eight wards selected from another regular Field Supervision Unit left on June 19, 1975, for a nine-day trip. They were accompanied by two Summit Staff members and the Probation coordinator. The trip went without serious incident and was successful in all respects.

As had been planned, the next two trips were five-day follow-up trips for groups #7 and #8. From group #7, nine of the original 14 wards left on July 7, 1975, with three Summit Staff members and the coordinating Probation Officer. (The coordinating Probation Officer had already been assigned out of the program as of June 30 because of budgetary considerations but elected to participate in this trip on her vacation time.)

The tenth and last trip of the program left on July 21, 1975, with five of the original eight wards from group #8. They were accompanied by two Summit Staff members who reported great success possibly because of the small number of wards involved.

Those wards who did not attend follow-up trips were contacted as to their reasons for not participating. They gave reasons almost identical to the previous groups polled. Some were ill, others had fallen behind in school, and some simply felt that once had been enough.

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

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF SUMMIT PROGRAM TRIPS

Juvenile Field Services						
Dates	Total Days	Total Wards	New Wards	Ward Days	Total Staff	Location
1 11-18-74/11-22-74	5	11	11	55	3	Anza-Borrego
2 12- 2-74/12- 4-74	3	9	9	27	5	Cuyamaca
3 1- 9-75/ 1-17-75	9	14	1	126	5	Death Valley
4 2- 6-75/ 2-14-75	9	12	12	108	4	Death Valley
5 3-13-75/ 3-31-75	9	12	12	108	6	Death Valley
6 4-28-75/ 5- 2-75	5	13*	0	62*	6	San Jacinto Mts.
7 5-22-75/ 5-30-75	9	14	14	126	5	Sequoia Nat. Park
8 6-19-75/ 6-27-75	9	8	8	72	3	Sequoia Nat. Park
9 7- 7-75/ 7-11-75	5	9	0	45	4	Mt. Whitney
10 7-21-75/ 7-25-75	5	5	0	25	2	Mt. Whitney
Totals	68	107	67	754		

*one ward returned home on the second day

DESCRIPTION OF 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, 20 wards each, for a total of 60 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 coordinating 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 coordinated 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 final 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 coordinating 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.)

For trip #5, 13 wards were selected to participate in the three-week preparation program beginning on March 31, 1975. During that period, three boys changed their minds and dropped out of the program, another boy went AWOL, and another was removed from camp for becoming involved in an assault. The remaining eight wards left for an 11-day trip on April 14, 1975, accompanied by two Summit Staff members, the Probation coordinator, and the teacher. There were no serious problems or incidents and the trip was successful in all respects. Unlike previous trips, this one included a 48-hour solo experience for all participants and it was felt that this greatly contributed to the impact of the experience. Seven of the eight boys participated in the follow-up overnight trip on May 7, 1975, and all eight of the boys

attended "Recognition Night" with their families on May 14, 1975.

For trip #6, 21 wards were originally selected to participate in the program. During the three-week preparation period, nine were dropped from the program for reasons similar to those given in trip #5. The other 12 boys left for a 12-day trip beginning on June 2, 1975. They were accompanied by the same four staff members that had gone with the previous trip, and the trip went smoothly with no major problems. There was no overnight trip scheduled for this group because many of the boys were scheduled for release from camp shortly after their return from the 12-day trip. "Recognition Night" was held on June 26, 1975.

Trip #7 began with 25 volunteers and eventually finished with nine boys on the trip. This trip, lasting 12 days, left on July 14, 1975, accompanied by the four staff members from previous trips. This trip was also highly successful and the wards went on to complete the two-week follow-up program.

A summary of all the Rancho Del Campo is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF SUMMIT PROGRAM TRIPS

	Dates	Rancho Del Campo			Ward Days	Total Staff	Location
		Total Days	Total Wards	New Wards			
1	11-16-74/11-22-74	7	10	10	70	3	Anza-Borrego
2	12-16-74/12-20-74	5	10	10	50	3	Anza-Borrego
3	1-23-75/ 1-31-75	9	10	6	90	4	Death Valley
4	3- 3-75/ 3-14-75	12	10	8	120	5	Death Valley
5	4-14-75/ 4-24-75	11	8	8	88	4	Death Valley
6	6- 2-75/ 6-13-75	12	12	12	144	4	Sequoia Nat. Park
7	7-14-75/ 7-25-75	12	9	9	108	4	Sequoia Nat. Park
Totals		68	69	63	670		

DESCRIPTION OF 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 were 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 were scheduled when time and staffing permitted, and 15 such trips (ranging from two to six days in length) were conducted. Groups ranged in number from five to nine wards and all were accompanied by the Summit Staff member plus one Rancho Del Rayo staff member. Some of the same basic skills were taught on these trips as in the other programs but wards were certainly not exposed to the same breadth of experience. Altogether, a total of 61 boys participated in at least one trip with a few boys going on as many as three trips.

A summary of Rancho Del Rayo trips is given in Table 3.

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF SUMMIT PROGRAM TRIPS

Rancho Del Rayo							
Dates	Total Days	Total Wards	New Wards	Ward Days	Total Staff	Location	
1	11- 6-74/11- 7-74	2	6	6	12	2	Cuyamaca
2	12- 3-74/12- 5-74	3	6	6	18	2	Joshua Tree
3	12- 4-74/12- 6-74	3	5	0	15	2	Joshua Tree
4	1- 7-75/ 1- 9-75	3	7	1	21	2	Cuyamaca
5	1- 9-75/ 1-11-75	3	6	6	18	2	Anza-Borrego
6	1-22-75/ 1-24-75	3	9	9	27	2	Anza-Borrego
7	2- 5-75/ 2- 7-75	3	8	0	24	2	San Jacinto
8	2-25-75/ 2-27-75	3	7	5	21	2	Laguna
9	3-16-75/ 3-19-75	4	8	1	32	2	Death Valley
10	3-20-75/ 3-22-75	3	7	6	21	2	Cuyamaca
11	4-14-75/ 4-16-75	3	6	4	18	2	Joshua Tree
12	5-14-75/ 5-15-75	2	5	2	10	2	Laguna
13	5-20-75/ 5-22-75	3	6	4	18	2	Anza-Borrego
14	6- 8-75/ 6-10-75	3	7	4	21	2	San Jacinto
15	6-30-75/ 7- 5-75	6	7	7	42	2	Mt. Lyell
Totals		47	100	61	318		

DISCUSSION

It is immediately apparent that there were 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 coordinated team effort. Problems arose centering around areas of responsibility, the transmittal of information, and other issues of this nature. Almost all of the major changes occurred during the first five months of the program. Overall, the last four months were characterized by greater stability for all segments of the program even though minor problems continued to arise. Each segment will be discussed separately because of the uniqueness of each.

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 cooperation 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.

After the conclusion of the program, it was generally agreed that the trips of the last four months had been much more successful than the earlier trips. This was probably true for a variety of reasons. Obviously, things became easier as experience was gained and as the individuals involved learned to work together. Additionally, the program appeared to gain greater support from Field Services Probation Officers and this facilitated screening and preparation of wards considerably. A third factor contributing to the greater success of the last four months may have been the wards themselves. A very large majority of the wards for the first five trips were selected from Intensive Supervision (Subsidy) caseloads. The assumption is that they were more likely to be "hard-core" delinquents and, therefore, more difficult to supervise. In contrast, wards on later trips were all taken from "Regular" Supervision caseloads and this may partly account for the fact that there were fewer "incidents" on later trips. Many of these youngsters were "first time offenders" and it may be that they simply did not present the same kinds of supervision problems found with the earlier groups.

In spite of the overall improvement, there were still some problem areas that were not resolved. First, the program had three different Probation coordinators during its nine-month span, the last of whom was re-assigned even before the program was completed. While it is understood that these changes arose unexpectedly and could not be avoided, they still caused some difficulty in maintaining program continuity. Each new person had to be familiarized with all procedures and new relationships had to be established. Additionally, there was no Probation coordinator for two of the ten trips, and on another trip the coordinator had to attend on her own time.

Perhaps the most serious problem with the program was that it may have been basically incompatible with the life situations of Field Services wards. A very large number of wards did not participate because the program would have interfered with school, work, and other activities. Even some of those who did participate later indicated that they had experienced school problems as a result. It is possible that whatever benefits may have been gained by some wards by their participation, were later lost by causing them problems in other areas of their lives. This is a very serious issue that has yet to be resolved.

Table 4 outlines what was originally proposed in terms of trips, number of wards and total ward-days as compared to what actually occurred after all the program changes.

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF PROPOSED PROGRAM
WITH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Number of Trips	Total Days	Wards Per Trip	New Wards Per Trip	Total New Wards	Total Days Per Ward	Total Ward Days
Field Services Proposal for 9-Month Contract Period						
9 5-Day 3 10-Day	75	8 24	8 0	72	15	1080
Accomplished						
1 3-Day 4 5-Day 5 9-Day	68	5-14	0-14	67	3-14	754

Rancho Del Campo

The most serious problems early in the Rancho Del Campo program centered around trying to sell the program to both Campo staff and some groups of wards. There did not appear to be strong Campo staff support for the program and organizing groups was sometimes both difficult and frustrating. The coordinating Probation Officer lacked the authority (as well as the time) to do all the screening as originally planned, and consequently, he had to be dependent on camp personnel for referrals. Other problems 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 put considerable pressure on those blacks who volunteered. Although this was much more prevalent during the first five months of the program, it continued throughout and consequently, only eight blacks completed the course.

Peer pressure on all participating wards also continued 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.

The program also continued to have problems with screening, and it finally became necessary to give up the requirements of the evaluation design with regard to the selection of participants. Wards were referred by their counselors rather than being selected by the Probation coordinator, and it is suspected that only those boys who exhibited good behavior and "deserved to go" actually

became participants. It is possible that boys excluded by these criteria could also have benefited from the program.

Overall, however, the program did run much more smoothly during the last four months. This program had the benefit of stability in staffing throughout its duration and perhaps this is one of the reasons they were able to expand into a more comprehensive and cohesive program. All the program personnel involved exhibited a great degree of personal commitment to the program and they coordinated their efforts to provide a program of maximum potential. Additionally, they had the advantage of dealing with wards who were already temporarily removed from the community and they did not have to contend with the problem of disrupting other activities as was true in Field Services.

Table 5 details the changes that occurred in terms of trip schedules as compared to the original proposal.

TABLE 5
COMPARISON OF PROPOSED PROGRAM
WITH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Number of Trips	Total Days	Wards Per Trip	New Wards Per Trip	Total New Wards	Total Days Per Ward	Total Ward Days
Rancho Del Campo Proposal for 9-Month Contract Period						
6 7-Day	72	10	10	60	17	1020
3 10-Day		20	0			
Accomplished						
1 5-Day	68	8-12	6-12	63		670
1 7-Day						
1 9-Day						
1 11-Day						
3 12-Day						

Rancho Del Rayo

The Rancho Del Rayo program saw 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. The program continued to operate in very much the same way throughout the entire nine month period and the number of participating wards continued to remain far below expectations.

Table 6 compares the proposed and the actual program schedules.

TABLE 6
 COMPARISON OF PROPOSED PROGRAM
 WITH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Number of Trips	Total Days	Wards Per Trip	New Wards Per Trip	Total New Wards	Total Days Per Ward	Total Ward Days
Rancho Del Rayo Proposal for 9-Month Contract Period						
6 1-Day and 2 3-Day Per Ward in Groups of 6-10				130	12	1560
Accomplished						
2 2-Day 11 3-Day 1 4-Day 1 6-Day	47	5-9	0-9	61	1-6	318

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation design is concerned with five major areas of investigation:

- Screening and selection procedures;
- Client characteristics;
- Evaluation of program objectives;
- 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. 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. All follow-up data is for a one year period following program entry figured from the trip date.

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 and the order in which units were to participate was to be determined by the coordinating 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 coordinating 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 coordinating 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 and 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.

ANALYSIS OF CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS

Data collected on all program subjects included 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 was recorded on the forms found in Appendix A and organized into six-month time frames pre and post program entry.

EVALUATION 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 of 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 and total time at risk is figured from the date of that first contact.

ANALYSIS OF TRIP PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO POST PROGRAM OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

All wards participating in trips were individually rated by all staff members involved. The rating form (as found in Appendix B) 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 year follow-up period.

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM COSTS

Costs will be analyzed in terms of the financial expenditures necessary to operate the program, divided into the sub-components and their totals. Further breakdowns include separation of the contract costs from Probation Department costs, and the costs per ward (unit costs) for participation in the program.

Excluded from the cost analysis is the fractional salary of the Departmental coordinator and the cost of the Evaluation Staff; in both instances, these are not considered to be additive to the operation of the Summit Program. All costs included in the analysis are in addition to the Departmental expenditures for standard services provided to the client population.

V. RESULTS

SCREENING AND SELECTION PROCEDURES

Modifications in procedures began to occur early in all program segments as unexpected problems began to arise. These modifications as well as the final screening results are detailed by program.

Field Services

The major change that occurred very early in relation to screening procedures was that the number of categories for disqualification was greatly enlarged.

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 as 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. The number of disqualifying items rose from five to 12 because of many problems that had originally been unforeseen. Fortunately, however, this number remained stable during the remainder of the program and the screening became a much smoother process. Additionally, those units screened in the last four months contained a much larger number of cases providing for a larger pool of eligibles from which to draw the experimental, control, and comparison populations. Table 7 presents the results of the screening in terms of the total number screened, those eligible, and those volunteering. (It must be remembered that screening of new cases was only done for trips #1, #4, #5, #7 and #8. As was previously noted, trip #2 was assigned to a special group of wards and no screening was necessary. Trips #3, #6, #9 and #10 were follow-up trips for wards who had been on previous trips and, consequently, no screening was necessary for them either.)

TABLE 7
SUMMARY OF JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES SCREENING
ELIGIBLE CASES

	Trip #1	Trip #4	Trip #5	Trip #7	Trip #8	Totals
Total Screened	133	164	171	310	220	998
Total Eligible	52	61	38	113	64	328
Percent of Total	39.1	37.2	22.2	36.5	29.1	32.9
Total Volunteers	33	17	18	53	20	141
Percent of Eligible	63.5	27.9	47.4	46.9	31.3	43.0
Percent of Total	24.8	10.4	10.5	17.1	9.1	14.1
Total on Trips	11	12	12	14	8	57*
Percent of Volunteers	33	70.6	66.7	26.4	40	40.4
Percent of Eligibles	21.1	19.7	31.6	12.4	12.5	17.4
Percent of Total	8.3	7.3	7.0	4.5	3.6	5.7

*Ten additional Field Services wards went on trips but they were not selected through the normal process nor were they part of the groups summarized above.

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.

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.

Of the 998 cases screened, 670 were rejected for one or more of 12 different reasons. Table 8 summarizes these cases in terms of reason for rejection. (The categories are listed in order of priority with #1 being the most important. In those instances where a case was ineligible for more than one reason, only the factor with the highest priority was listed.)

TABLE 8
SUMMARY OF JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES SCREENING
REJECTED CASES

	Trip #1	Trip #4	Trip #5	Trip #7	Trip #8	Total	Percent of Total Rejected
Total Screened	133	164	171	310	220	998	
Reasons for Rejection							
1 Ward	0	1	3	25	21	50	7.46
2 Male	15	30	42	30	30	147	21.94
3 Court Appearance	15	34	21	34	22	126	18.81
4 Age	22	21	29	63	28	163	24.33
5 I.Q.	12	0	0	1	1	14	2.09
6 Physical	1	1	2	7	5	16	2.39
7 Resident	3	3	1	14	19	40	5.97
8 Court Order	0	3	0	9	9	21	3.13
9 Other	2	1	1	9	4	17	2.54
10 Subtype	0	0	33	0	0	33	4.93
11 Transfer	4	6	1	3	4	18	2.69
12 Close	7	3	0	2	13	25	3.73
Total Rejected	81	103	133	197	156	670	
Percent of Total	60.9%	62.8%	77.8%	63.5%	70.9%	67.1%	100%

Rancho Del Campo

The screening process began to break down very early in the program and by the end of the first five months it was virtually non-existent. The Probation coordinator became entirely dependent on referrals to the program from some 16 different Campo counselors all of whom employed their own selection criteria. Even after youngsters were referred, their continuing participation was predicated on good behavior and it was still possible for them to be removed from the program right up until the last minute before the trip. This situation continued to exist throughout the remainder of the program.

The effect of this process on the program was that it drastically reduced the pool of eligibles since the Probation coordinator could no longer draw on the entire camp population. Nevertheless, the program did continue to operate even though there were fewer boys involved than had originally been thought desirable.

In terms of the evaluation design, the loss of screening control had more serious impact. It was no longer possible to establish control or comparison groups based on any known criteria. Consequently, it was decided that all wards admitted to camp within the month prior to a scheduled trip date would be designated as a comparison group for that trip. This included all wards who were not referred to the program as well as those who were and later dropped out. These comparison subjects cannot be viewed as a true control since there is no way of determining if they were, in fact, eligible, or assuming they were eligible, that they would have volunteered for the program. The data analysis, therefore, includes only 23 control subjects, all of whom come from the early trips when screening was still being done by the Probation coordinator.

Rancho Del Rayo

No screening procedures were ever developed in the Rayo program beyond the informal selection of a small group of wards whenever there was time and staffing to allow for a short trip. Consequently, there are no control or comparison groups for this program and descriptive data will be presented only for those who actually participated in trips.

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS

The client populations for all groups will be described in terms of some selected background characteristics in order to provide a better idea of the kinds of youngsters involved. Statistical tests were also run on some characteristics to determine the comparability of experimental, control, and comparison groups and the results of those tests will also be presented. The data is presented by program status (experimental, control and comparison) for each service, and the characteristics to be examined are as follows:

- A. Age
- B. Ethnic background
- C. Area of residence
- D. Type of first contact
- E. Type of first delinquent contact
- F. Time since first delinquent contact
- G. Total time case active
- H. Total time spent in confinement
- I. Involvement in subsidy programs
- J. Involvement in other programs
- K. Employment history

All variables involving time as a factor (items A, F, G and H) were figured using the trip date as the reference point.

Table 9 presents a breakdown of the total population by Service and by status.

TABLE 9
SUMMARY OF POPULATIONS BY SERVICE

Service	Experimental	Control	Comparison	Totals
Field Services	67	78	181	326
Rancho Del Campo	63	23	101	187
Rancho Del Rayo	61*			61
Totals	191*	101	282	574

*The Rayo program did not include selection of control and comparison populations and only those wards who actually went on trips will be described. Since they are not true experimentals they will, hereafter, be referred to as Rayo "participants."

A. Age

Each ward regardless of status or service is related to a specific trip. Age is figured as of the date of the trip to which the ward is attached. Tables 10, 11 and 12 present age information.

TABLE 10
FIELD SERVICES

AGE	Exp N=67	Con N=78	Comp N=181	Tot N=326
Mean Months	191.9	192.3	193.0	192.6
Mean Years	15.99	16.03	16.08	16.05
Range-Months	165.6-215.5	170.1-209.3	168.9-213.2	165.6-215.5
Range-Years	13.8-17.9	14.2-17.4	14.1-17.8	13.8-17.9

There was no significant difference in age between the three groups. The difference in means between highest and lowest is 32 days.

TABLE 11
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

AGE	Exp N=63	Con N=23	Comp N=181	Tot N=187
Mean Months	197.6	201.7	195.4	196.9
Mean Years	16.47	16.81	16.28	16.41
Range-Months	181.8-214.3	179.7-214.1	161.8-214.8	161.8-214.8
Range-Years	15.2-17.9	15.0-17.8	13.5-17.9	13.5-17.9

The comparison group in this population tended to be a little younger (approximately 100 days) than the experimental and control groups combined, but the differences were not statistically significant.

TABLE 12
RANCHO DEL RAYO

AGE	PARTICIPANTS N=61
Mean Months	181.8
Mean Years	15.15
Range-Months	156.3-208.4
Range-Years	13.0-17.4

B. Ethnic Background

Information regarding ethnic background as presented in Tables 13, 14 and 15 was taken from documents found in case files.

TABLE 13
FIELD SERVICES

ETHNIC	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Caucasian	39	58.2	54	69.2	125	69.0	218	66.9
Mexican	13	19.4	9	11.5	35	19.3	57	17.5
Black	15	22.4	13	16.7	17	9.4	45	13.8
Oriental	0		2	2.6	3	1.7	5	1.5
Other	0		0		1	.6	1	.3
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

The differences in ethnic distribution between groups was not statistically significant.

TABLE 14
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

ETHNIC	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Caucasian	45	71.4	16	69.6	52	51.5	113	60.4
Mexican	9	14.3	4	17.4	23	19.8	33	17.6
Black	8	12.7	3	13.0	26	25.7	37	19.8
Amer. Ind.	0		0		2	2.0	2	1.1
Oriental	1	1.6	0		1	1.0	2	1.1
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

There was no significant difference in ethnic characteristics between groups.

TABLE 15
RANCHO DEL RAYO

ETHNIC	N	%
Caucasian	40	65.5
Mexican	9	14.8
Black	9	14.8
Amer. Indian	1	1.6
Other	2	3.3
Total	61	100%

C. Area of Residence

This characteristic was determined by tabulating the residence zip codes for each ward and then grouping them into eight general areas of the County as follows:

General Area	Zip Codes
A. Beaches	037, 106, 107, 109
B. North City	117, 122, 126, 127, 128
C. East City	104, 105, 115, 116, 119
D. Southeast City	102, 113, 114
E. Center City	101, 103, 108, 110, 111, 112, 120, 123, 124
F. South Bay	010, 011, 032, 050, 073, 118, 139, 154
G. East County	005, 017, 020, 021, 035, 040, 041, 045, 062, 065, 071, 077
H. North County	024, 025, 027, 054, 064, 069, 083

Tables 16, 17 and 18 indicate residence by general area.

TABLE 16
FIELD SERVICES

AREA	Exper.		Control		Comp.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. Beaches	4	5.97	2	2.56	7	3.87	13	3.99
B. North City	7	10.45	6	7.69	14	7.73	27	8.28
C. East City	4	5.97	8	10.26	8	4.42	20	6.13
D. Southeast City	19	28.36	15	19.23	21	11.60	55	16.87
E. Center City	3	4.48	5	6.41	22	12.15	30	9.20
F. South Bay	12	17.91	5	6.41	37	20.44	54	16.56
G. East County	14	20.90	37	47.44	58	32.04	109	33.44
H. North County	3	4.48	0		12	6.63	15	4.60
Out of County	0		0		2	1.1	2	.61
Unknown	1	1.49	0		0		1	.31
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

The Table indicates that the Southeast area of the city is over-represented in the experimental population and that the East County is similarly under-represented. The difference is statistically significant but can be explained by the fact that several early trips were targeted at the Southeast population.

TABLE 17
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

AREA	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. Beaches	3	4.76	1	4.35	3	2.97	7	3.80
B. North City	2	3.17	2	8.70	7	6.93	11	5.98
C. East City	7	11.11	3	13.04	11	10.89	21	11.41
D. Southeast City	7	11.11	3	13.04	27	26.73	37	20.11
E. Center City	6	9.52	4	17.39	8	7.92	18	9.78
F. South Bay	14	22.22	3	13.04	15	14.85	32	17.39
G. East County	14	22.22	3	13.04	16	15.84	33	17.93
H. North County	9	14.29	4	17.39	12	11.88	25	13.59
Out of County	1	1.59	0		0		1	.54
Unknown	0		0		2	1.98	2	1.09
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	184	100%

With this group, Southeast wards are somewhat under-represented in the experimental population but the differences are not statistically significant and could have occurred by chance. There was no effort to concentrate on a specific population in this program and, therefore, no real differences were expected.

TABLE 18
RANCHO DEL RAYO

AREA	Participants	
	N	%
A. Beaches	1	1.64
B. North City	4	6.56
C. East City	4	6.56
D. Southeast City	8	13.11
E. Center City	9	14.75
F. South Bay	10	16.39
G. East County	13	21.31
H. North County	9	14.75
Out of County	0	
Unknown	3	4.92
Totals	61	100%

D. Type of First Contact

Case files were examined to determine if a ward's first contact with this department was as a dependent or as a delinquent (601 or 602). Tables 19, 20 and 21 present this information.

TABLE 19
FIELD SERVICES

Type of Contact	Experiment		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Delinquent	64	95.5	70	89.7	169	93.4	303	92.9
Dependent	3	4.5	8	10.3	12	6.6	23	7.1
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

By far, the greater number of wards were first referred as delinquents but the proportion in each group is roughly the same with no significant difference.

TABLE 20
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Type of Contact	Experiment		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Delinquent	61	96.8	21	91.3	94	93.1	176	94.1
Dependent	2	3.2	2	8.7	7	6.9	11	5.9
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

Again, distribution on this variable is evenly distributed according to statistical testing.

TABLE 21
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Type of Contact	N	%
Delinquent	58	95.1
Dependent	3	4.9
Totals	61	100%

E. Type of First Delinquent Contact

Regardless of whether a ward was originally referred as a dependent or a delinquent, the first delinquent contact was examined to determine if it was a 601 (status offense) or a 602 type of contact. Results are presented in Tables 22, 23 and 24.

TABLE 22
FIELD SERVICES

Type of Del. Contact	Exper.		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
601	7	10.4	13	16.7	25	13.8	45	13.8
602	60	89.6	65	83.3	156	86.2	281	86.2
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

The small differences between groups are not statistically significant.

TABLE 23
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Type of Del. Contact	Exper.		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
601	9	14.3	6	26.1	27	26.7	42	22.5
602	54	85.7	17	73.9	74	73.3	145	77.5
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

While the experimental group appears to have a smaller percentage of 601 first contacts represented, the difference is not significant and could have occurred by chance.

TABLE 24
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Type of Delinquent Contact	N	%
601	11	18.0
602	50	82.0
Totals	61	100%

F. Time Since First Delinquent Contact

In order to provide some idea about delinquent history, the period of time from the first delinquent contact to the trip date was calculated for each group. The data is presented in Tables 25, 26 and 27.

TABLE 25
FIELD SERVICES

Time	Exp. (N=67)	Con. (N=78)	Comp. (N=181)	Tot. (N=326)
Mean Months	32.6	33.1	32.7	32.8
Mean Years	2.72	2.76	2.73	2.73
Range-Months	3.2-117.4	5.3-98.3	2.6-100.8	2.6-117.4
Range-Years	.27-9.78	.44-8.19	.22-8.40	.22-9.78

These figures are quite close for all groups (a spread of only 15 days from high to low) indicating no significant differences on this variable.

TABLE 26
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Time	Exp. (N=63)	Con. (N=23)	Comp. (N=101)	Tot. N=187)
Mean Months	38.5	38.5	38.0	38.3
Mean Years	3.21	3.21	3.17	3.19
Range-Months	2.8-123.9	4.8-124.8	3.1-136.6	2.8-136.6
Range-Years	.23-10.33	.40-10.40	.26-11.38	.23-11.38

Again, the difference from high to low is only 15 days (.5 months) indicating a high degree of similarity for all groups.

TABLE 27
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Time	Participants (N=61)
Mean Months	30.8
Mean Years	2.57
Range-Months	1.3-118.6
Range-Years	.11-9.88

G. Total Time Case Active

While the previously discussed variable indicates the amount of time since a ward was first referred to this department, it does not mean that the ward was under supervision for that entire period. Consequently, data was collected to reflect how much time each case was actually active. The data, as presented in Tables 28, 29 and 30 does not indicate continuous supervision time, but totals all active case time. (It was the rule rather than the exception that cases were opened and closed several times during the time span under consideration.)

TABLE 28
FIELD SERVICES

Time Active	Exp. N=67	Cont. N=78	Comp. N=181	Tot. N=326
Mean Months	14.9	13.4	13.2	13.6
Mean Years	1.24	1.12	1.10	1.13
Range-Months	3.2-152.6	2.0-71.4	1.9-121.3	1.9-152.6
Range-Years	.27-12.72	.17-5.95	.16-10.11	.16-12.72

This difference between the high and low is approximately 51 days (1.7 months) with the experimental group showing the longest active time. While the difference is still not statistically significant, it still may reflect the program's early emphasis on the more "hard-core" delinquent.

TABLE 29
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Time Active	Exp. N=63	Cont. N=23	Comp. N=101	Tot. N=187
Mean Months	13.4	15.9	14.7	14.4
Mean Years	1.12	1.33	1.23	1.20
Range-Months	2.1-57.9	1.0-71.5	1.7-131.5	1.0-131.5
Range-Years	.18-4.83	.08-5.96	.85-10.96	.08-10.96

The range for this group is 75 days (2.5 months) with the experimental group showing the shortest time and the controls showing the longest. However, if these two groups are combined, their mean is 14.0 months which is still a little below the comparison group. This differs slightly from the Field Services program and there are two possible contributing factors. First, it was never the intent of the Campo program to concentrate on a more delinquent population as was the case in Field Services. Secondly, screening in the Campo program was eventually reduced to those who "deserved" to go and this may have resulted in the exclusion of those with the more serious delinquent histories. This is especially evident when looking at the ranges for each group and noting that the maximum for comparisons (the excluded

group) is almost double the maximums for the other two. The differences, however, are not statistically significant and still could have occurred by chance.

TABLE 30
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Time Active	N=61
Mean Months	9.95
Mean Years	.83
Range-Months	.8-77.9
Range-Years	.07-6.49

H. Total Time Spent in Confinement

To further describe delinquent history, time spent in a confined situation was also calculated for each ward. This includes time in Juvenile Hall, any of the camps or any 24-hour school operating in a closed setting. Again, the data reflects total rather than continuous time and may, for instance, represent numerous short term detentions in Juvenile Hall.

TABLE 31
FIELD SERVICES

Time in Conf.	Exp. N=67	Cont. N=78	Comp. N=181	Tot. N=326
Mean Months	.95	1.34	1.29	1.23
Mean Years	.08	.11	.11	.10
Range-Months	0-15.3	0-32.1	0-30.5	0-32.1
Range-Years	0-1.28	0-2.68	0-2.54	0-2.68

The difference between high and low is approximately 12 days with the experimental group showing the lowest mean of .95 months or 28.5 days. This group also shows the shortest range but the differences are still not statistically significant.

TABLE 32
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Time in Conf.	Exp. N=63	Cont. N=23	Comp. N=101	Tot. N=187
Mean Months	4.09	4.01	3.79	3.92
Mean Years	.34	.34	.32	.33
Range-Months	1.2-31.5	.5-20.7	.5-20.2	.5-31.5
Range-Years	.10-2.63	.04-1.73	.04-1.68	.04-2.63

Confinement times for these groups were extremely close with the only real variation being in a somewhat longer range for the experimental group.

TABLE 33
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Time In Confinement	N=61
Mean Months	1.52
Mean Years	.13
Range-Months	.1-22.9
Range-Years	.01-1.91

I. Involvement in Subsidy Programs

Cases were examined to determine each ward's past or present involvement in Intensive Supervision (Subsidy) programs. Those with Subsidy involvement are generally assumed to be the more serious cases but by the same token, it can also be assumed that they have received a greater concentration of Probation services. Tables 34, 35 and 36 describe this variable.

TABLE 34
FIELD SERVICES

Subsidy Involvement	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Active	33	49.3	23	29.5	64	35.4	120	36.8
Past Active	0		2	2.6	8	4.4	10	3.1
Never Active	34	50.7	53	67.9	109	60.2	196	60.1
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

The differences between groups approach statistical significance in that Subsidy wards are over-represented in the experimental group. However, this was by design and the differences were, therefore, anticipated.

TABLE 35
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Subsidy Involvement	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Active	1	1.6	0		0		1	.5
Past Active	18	28.6	5	21.7	28	27.7	51	27.3
Never Active	44	69.8	18	78.3	73	72.3	135	72.2
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

The differences here are rather close and do not approach statistical significance. This would indicate that experimental subjects were not selected with regard to Subsidy involvement as was true in Field Services. (The table shows only 1 "active" case because when a ward is committed to Campo, the case is normally transferred to a non-subsidy caseload.)

TABLE 36
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Subsidy Involvement	N	%
Active	0	
Past Active	7	11.5
Never Active	54	88.5
Totals	61	100%

J. Involvement in Other Programs

Involvement in programs other than Subsidy was also tabulated. This includes such programs as the Survival School, Work Project, formal counseling or psychiatric programs and others of this nature. Tables 37, 38 and 39 present this information.

TABLE 37
FIELD SERVICES

Other Programs	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Yes	38	62.3	38	62.3	80	53.0	156	57.1
No	23	37.7	23	37.7	71	47.0	117	42.9
Totals	61	100%	61	100%	151	100%	273	100%
Unknown	6		17		30		53	
Totals	67		78		181		326	

While no statistical differences emerged, the figures still show a somewhat larger percentage of wards involved in other programs. This may be because Subsidy wards tend to be more involved in special programs of all kinds and Table 34 has already shown that they were over-represented in the experimental population.

TABLE 38
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Other Programs	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	33	61.1	8	80.0	49	60.5	90	62.1
No	21	38.9	2	20.0	32	39.5	55	37.9
Totals	54	100%	10	100%	81	100%	145	100%
Unknown	9		13		20		42	
Totals--	63		23		101		187	

The only group showing a big difference is the control population. This is probably due, at least in part, to the large number (57%) of unknowns in this group. The other two groups match quite closely (with only 14% and 19% "unknowns") and even including the control group the differences are not statistically significant.

TABLE 39
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Other Programs	N	%
Yes	22	36.1
No	39	63.9
Totals	61	100%
Unknown	0	
Totals	61	100%

K. Employment History

Employment history was recorded for all wards and included paid employment of any kind, regardless of length or type. This data was tabulated simply into "yes" and "no" categories without specifying amount and is summarized in Tables 40, 41 and 42.

TABLE 40
FIELD SERVICES

Employment History	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	19	65.5	23	50.0	76	68.5	118	63.4
No	10	34.5	23	50.0	35	31.5	68	36.6
Totals	29	100%	46	100%	111	100%	186	100%
Unknown	38	56.7	32	41.0	70	38.7	140	42.9
Totals	67		78		181		326	

When the experimental and control groups are combined, their percentage with an employment history (56%) is well below the comparison group and the difference approaches statistical significance. While this may be a spurious result considering the large numbers of unknowns (43% for the total) it may also be the result of the screening process. Many wards in the comparison group (those that did not want to participate) gave "have a job" as their reason for not wishing to participate.

TABLE 41
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

Employment History	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	31	77.5	9	81.8	35	45.5	75	58.6
No	9	22.5	2	18.2	42	54.5	53	41.4
Totals	40	100%	11	100%	77	100%	128	100%
Unknown	23	36.5	12	52.2	24	23.8	59	31.6
Totals	63		23		101		187	

The difference between the experimental/control and the comparison populations is quite large and statistically significant at the .01 level. While some of this difference may be the result of incomplete data (31.6% of total is "unknown") it is more likely that it is the result of the screening process. Comparison subjects were excluded from participation because staff believed that they were "unsuitable" or "undeserving". It is possible that, that judgment was based on the ward's background and that past performance in terms of employment may have been one of the factors.

TABLE 42
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Employment History	N	%
Yes	12	19.7
No	49	80.3
Totals	61	100%
Unknown	0	
Totals	61	100%

Discussion of Results

It would appear that overall, the experimental and control and even the comparison populations were comparable within each program segment in relation to those characteristics described thus far. Where differences occurred, it usually involved a difference in the comparison populations that could be explained by some factor in the selection and screening process. It was expected that this group might show some differences and the results are, therefore, not surprising.

The results also show that each program segment dealt with a different kind of youngster and this also was not unexpected. On the average, the Campo ward was older, had a longer and more serious delinquent history, and fewer had positive characteristics such as an employment history, when compared to the Field Services group. The Rayo wards were the youngest and had the shortest delinquent histories when compared to the other groups. For those reasons, the populations of the three program segments cannot be compared to each other in terms of final outcomes.

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The program has as its ultimate objective the reduction in the number, severity and frequency of delinquent offenses. Therefore, delinquent histories in terms of offenses were recorded in some detail in order to compare pre-post behavior in relation to the stated objectives. Total offense history was tabulated as well as that occurring one year prior and one year after program entry. The data was broken down in the following categories:

- I. Incidents - All referrals from any source were tabulated regardless of whether or not any formal action was taken. Incidents were broken down into the following categories:
 - A. 602 - Other
 - B. 602 - Drug/Alcohol
 - C. 602 - Property
 - D. 602 - Person
 - E. 602 - Total Incidents
 - F. 601
 - G. 601 - 602 Total Incidents

- II. Court Filings - The following categories relate to petitions or Information Reports filed in the Juvenile Court as the result of some delinquent incident:
 - H. Total number of Petitions/Information Reports Filed
 - I. Total 601 Incidents resulting in a filing
 - J. Total 602 Incidents resulting in a filing
 - K. Total 601-602 Incidents resulting in a filing

- III. Months at Risk - This was determined by taking the total time from the date of the first contact and subtracting out all confinement time during that period.

Total prior record information will be described by program segment to provide further descriptive data about the populations. Additionally, an analysis of variance was conducted between experimental, control and comparison groups to determine the comparability of groups in terms of these variables. Further statistical tests were conducted comparing one year pre and one year post records to determine if there was a significant change in offense behavior.

Analysis of Prior Record Information

Tables 43 and 44 summarize the Juvenile Field Services groups in terms of the total prior records. The mean figure represents the average number of offenses per ward and the range indicates

the lowest and the highest numbers found for one ward within that group. The results of the analyses of variance performed for each category are briefly summarized on the right hand side of the table with a statement as to whether or not the differences are significant. A probability value equal to or less than .050 is assumed to be significant.

TABLE 43
FIELD SERVICES
TOTAL PRIOR INCIDENTS PER WARD

	DESCRIPTION			ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE		
	Exp.	Cont.	Comp.	F Ratio	Proba- bility	Significant Difference
	N=67	N=78	N=181			
A. 602-Other				1.282	.278	No
Mean	.30	.49	.46			
Range	0-2	0-5	0-5			
B. 602-Drug/Alc				1.288	.277	No
Mean	.91	1.17	1.34			
Range	0-5	0-12	0-9			
C. 602-Prop.				1.247	.288	No
Mean	3.75	4.13	3.46			
Range	0-13	0-14	0-20			
D. 602-Person				1.641	.193	No
Mean	.39	.26	.45			
Range	0-4	0-3	0-5			
E. 602-Total				.515	.604	No
Mean	5.34	6.04	5.70			
Range	1-14	1-20	1-23			
F. 601				.255	.778	No
Mean	1.19	1.42	1.29			
Range	0-9	0-8	0-9			
G. 601-602 Tot.				.548	.584	No
Mean	6.54	7.46	6.99			
Range	1-18	1-25	1-32			

TABLE 44
FIELD SERVICES
TOTAL PRIOR PETITION/INFORMATION REPORTS PER WARD

	DESCRIPTION			ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE		
	Exp.	Cont.	Comp.	F Ratio	Proba- bility	Significant Difference
	N=67	N=78	N=181			
H. Total Filed				2.264	.103	No
Mean	2.09	2.68	2.30			
Range	1-6	1-10	1-11			
I. 601 Incidents filed on				.524	.599	No
Mean	.40	.58	.47			
Range	0-4	0-6	0-6			
J. 602 Incidents filed on				.986	.376	No
Mean	2.94	3.47	3.10			
Range	1-14	1-11	0-12			
K. 601-602 Inci- dents filed				1.259	.285	No
Mean	3.34	4.06	3.57			
Range	1-15	1-12	1-16			
Months At Risk				.087	.909	No
Mean	31.68	31.65	30.46			
Range	3.2- 117.4	2.6- 98.3	1.7- 117.5			

The Analysis of Variance indicates that there were no significant differences between experimental, control and comparison populations on any of the prior record variables. Highs and lows for each category were scattered over the groups without any pattern emerging. The similarity of the groups makes it possible to compare pre-post differences with the confidence that the groups were similar to begin with.

Tables 45 and 46 present the data on the Rancho Del Campo wards in exactly the same format.

TABLE 45
RANCHO DEL CAMPO
TOTAL PRIOR INCIDENTS PER WARD

	DESCRIPTION			ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE		
	Exp.	Cont.	Comp.	F Ratio	Proba- bility	Significant Difference
	N=63	N=23	N=101			
A. 602-Other				1.701	.183	No
Mean	1.32	.70	.80			
Range	0-21	0-2	0-8			
B. 602-Drug/Alc				1.087	.340	No
Mean	1.75	1.39	1.29			
Range	0-7	0-5	0-14			
C. 602-Prop.				.814	.448	No
Mean	4.97	5.52	4.58			
Range	0-13	0-15	0-18			
D. 602-Person				1.445	.237	No
Mean	.49	.43	.73			
Range	0-3	0-3	0-9			
E. 602-Total				1.119	.329	No
Mean	8.43	8.09	7.34			
Range	0-28	2-19	1-33			
F. 601				.497	.615	No
Mean	2.54	2.70	2.26			
Range	0-10	0-9	0-10			
G. 601-602 Tot.				1.362	.258	No
Mean	11.06	10.35	9.59			
Range	1-35	3-28	3-35			

TABLE 46
RANCHO DEL CAMPO
TOTAL PRIOR PETITION/INFORMATION REPORTS PER WARD

	DESCRIPTION			ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE		
	Exp.	Cont.	Comp.	F Ratio	Proba- bility	Significant Difference
	N=63	N=23	N=101			
H. Total Filed				.280	.760	No
Mean	3.37	3.74	3.51			
Range	1-9	1-10	1-11			
I. 601 Incidents filed on				.483	.623	No
Mean	1.13	.96	.90			
Range	0-6	0-6	0-6			
J. 602 Incidents filed on				.577	.568	No
Mean	5.16	5.48	4.75			
Range	0-19	1-13	0-15			
K. 601-602 Inci- dents filed				.697	.504	No
Mean	6.29	6.43	5.65			
Range	1-22	1-18	1-17			
Months At Risk				.003	.987	No
Mean	34.6	34.4	34.3			
Range	0-118	1.4-122	1.6-133.7			

As was true in Field Services, no significant differences were found to exist between experimental, control and comparison groups in the area of prior record information.

Table 47 simply summarizes the information for the participants in the Rancho Del Rayo program. No statistical tests were conducted as there are no other groups with which the participants can be compared.

TABLE 47
RANCHO DEL RAYO
TOTAL PRIOR INCIDENTS AND PETITIONS BY WARD

INCIDENTS		PETITIONS	
A. 602-Other		H. Total Filed	
Mean	.49	Mean	2.89
Range	0-2	Range	1-6
B. 602-Drug/Alcohol		I. 601 Incidents	
Mean	.74	Filed On	
Range	0-4	Mean	1.0
C. 602-Property		Range	0-5
Mean	5.31	J. 602 Incidents	
Range	0-18	Filed On	
D. 602-Person		Mean	4.64
Mean	.53	Range	1-16
Range	0-3	K. 601-602 Incidents	
E. 602-Total		Filed On	
Mean	7.08	Mean	5.64
Range	1-18	Range	1-16
F. 601		Months At Risk	
Mean	2.0	Mean	29.2
Range	0-6	Range	.3-118.6
G. 601-602 Total			
Mean	9.18		
Range	1-20		

Analysis of One Year Pre-Post Differences in Offense Behavior

The paired t test statistic was employed in comparing the offense behavior one year following program entry with the record for the one year immediately preceding the program. Pre and post means are presented as well as the probability value and a statement of significance (again, .050 or less was assumed to be significant).

Juvenile Field Services

Tables 48 and 49 summarize Juvenile Field Services.

TABLE 48
FIELD SERVICES
COMPARISON OF ONE YEAR PRE-POST DIFFERENCES IN DELINQUENCY INCIDENTS

INCIDENTS	EXPERIMENTAL N=67				CONTROL N=78				COMPARISON N=181			
	Incidents Per Ward		Paired t Results		Incidents Per Ward		Paired t Results		Incidents Per Ward		Paired t Res	
	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Proba- bility	Signif.* Differ.	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Proba- bility	Signif* Differ.	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Proba- bility	Signif Differ
A. 602-Other	.18	.21	.718	No	.24	.21	.650	No	.28	.21	.270	No
B. 602-Drug/Alc.	.58	.46	.398	No	.62	.36	.091	No	.79	.48	.001	Yes
C. 602-Prop.	1.92	1.00	.007	Yes	2.27	.85	.000	Yes	1.43	.56	.000	Yes
D. 602-Person	.22	.16	.375	No	.12	.19	.320	No	.30	.14	.004	Yes
E. 602 Total	2.39	1.84	.171	No	3.26	1.62	.000	Yes	2.75	1.37	.000	Yes
F. 601	.45	.36	.457	No	.47	.40	.495	No	.41	.34	.319	No
G. 601-602 Tot.	3.31	2.19	.013	Yes	3.72	1.99	.000	Yes	3.14	1.72	.000	Yes

*Significance is a probability value of .05 or less

TABLE 49
FIELD SERVICES
COMPARISON OF ONE YEAR PRE-POST DIFFERENCES IN COURT FILINGS

PETITIONS & INFO. REPORTS	EXPERIMENTAL N=67				CONTROL N=78				COMPARISON N=181			
	Incidents Per Ward Pre Mean	Post Mean	Paired t Probability	Results Signif. Differ.	Incidents Per Ward Pre Mean	Post Mean	Paired t Probability	Results Signif. Differ.	Incidents Per Ward Pre Mean	Post Mean	Paired t Probability	Results Signif. Differ.
H. Total Filed	1.54	.84	.000	Yes	1.86	.85	.000	Yes	1.56	.82	.000	Yes
I. 601 Incidents Filed	.22	.13	.182	No	.24	.23	.883	No	.23	.20	.696	No
J. 602 Incidents Filed	2.25	1.40	.030	Yes	2.74	1.22	.000	Yes	2.25	1.08	.000	Yes
K. 601-602 Incidents Filed	2.48	1.54	.020	Yes	3.12	1.45	.000	Yes	2.53	1.28	.000	Yes

An analysis of variance was also conducted per category on both pre and post scores. On the pre scores, the groups were comparable in all categories except two. The control group showed a significantly higher mean in category C (602-Property incidents) and in category E (602 Total incidents). (The difference in Total 602 incidents is probably the result of the higher number of 602-Property incidents.) The analysis of post scores, however, indicated no significant difference in any category and it would appear that the initial difference found in property offenses did not show itself in the end results.

Examination of the t tests results indicates that offenses for every group went down significantly in a number of categories. The experimental population saw a significant reduction in property incidents (C), and in 601-602 Total incidents (G) as well as in three of the four Court Filing categories (H, J and K). The control group showed change in the same categories plus an additional one, 602 Total incidents (E). The comparison group showed the greatest number of significant reductions (8) and included all categories except 602 Other (A), 601 (F) and 601 Incidents filed (I).

Even though the analysis of variance indicates that the groups were not statistically different on any post score category, the fact that the comparison group showed the greatest number of significant reductions deserves some comment. The analysis of screening procedures indicated that many of these wards declined participation because it would interfere with school, work or other on-going activities. It may be that these wards had more "going for them" in terms of community resources and support than those who did volunteer, and that this may account for their somewhat greater improvement. Whatever the case, it is clear that program participation did not result in any marked improvement in experimental wards when compared to other groups.

The major implication of the results is that while offense behavior went down significantly, it was not as the result of the Summit Program because the reductions occurred for all groups. One can only speculate about why the reductions occurred but probably the most likely explanation can be found in the literature. The literature dealing with juvenile offenses indicates that in general, offenses for juvenile males peak at around the age of 16 and that the rate decreases after that. The average age for this population was almost exactly 16 years of age (16.05) at the time of program entry and it may be that increased maturity during the one year follow-up period accounts for the reductions that occurred.

Examination of the experimental group only, also provides some interesting data in relation to the program objectives of reducing number, frequency and severity of offenses. The offense categories in order of decreasing number (according to pre-program means) are as follows:

602 Property	(\bar{X} =1.92)
602 Drug/Alcohol	(\bar{X} =0.58)
601	(\bar{X} =0.45)
602 Person	(\bar{X} =0.22)
602 Other	(\bar{X} =0.18)

The largest number of offenses are of the 602-Property type with the smallest number falling into the 602-Other category. The results show some decrease in most categories except 602-Other but the decrease is only statistically significant in the 602-Property category. Because the time periods compared are of equal length (one year pre and post) the same can be said for the issue of frequency.

In relation to the issue of severity, the results are even less impressive. The reduction in the 602-Person category (which can be considered the most severe kind of offense) showed the smallest reduction and one category showed a slight increase. The differences in pre and post means from high to low as follows:

602 Property	(-.92)
602 Drug/Alcohol	(-.12)
601	(-.09)
602 Person	(-.06)
602 Other	(+.03)

In actuality, the proportion of the total number of offenses represented by each category remained fairly consistent (except 602 Property) from pre to post. This is illustrated in Table 50.

TABLE 50
PERCENT OF TOTAL OFFENSE RECORD BY CATEGORY

Offense Category	Pre	Post
602 Property	57.31%	45.66%
602 Drug/Alcohol	17.31%	21.00%
601	13.44%	16.44%
602 Person	6.57%	7.31%
602 Other	5.37%	9.59%
Totals	100%	100%

It is clear then that while number and frequency were reduced, severity was not affected.

Rancho Del Campo

Tables 51 and 52 summarize the results of the one year pre-post comparisons for the Rancho Del Campo groups.

TABLE 51
COMPARISON OF ONE YEAR PRE-POST DIFFERENCES IN DELINQUENCY INCIDENTS

INCIDENTS	EXPERIMENTAL N=63				CONTROL N=23				COMPARISON N=101			
	Incidents Per Ward Pre Mean	Incidents Per Ward Post Mean	Paired t Proba- bility	Results Signif. Differ.	Incidents Per Ward Pre Mean	Incidents Per Ward Post Mean	Paired t Proba- bility	Results Signif. Differ.	Incidents Per Ward Pre Mean	Incidents Per Ward Post Mean	Paired t Proba- bility	Results Signif. Differ.
A. 602-Other	.79	.19	.004	Yes	.43	.22	.203	No	.48	.36	.348	No
B. 602-Drug/Alc.	1.22	.46	.002	Yes	.96	.43	.162	No	.76	.33	.001	Yes
C. 602-Prop.	2.60	.94	.000	Yes	2.57	.96	.001	Yes	2.39	.88	.000	Yes
D. 602-Person	.25	.21	.626	No	.35	.43	.796	No	.45	.45	1.000	No
E. 602 Total	4.87	1.65	.000	Yes	4.30	2.04	.004	Yes	4.10	2.00	.000	Yes
F. 601	1.19	.48	.000	Yes	.83	.13	.001	Yes	.98	.38	.000	Yes
G. 601-602 Tot.	5.92	2.11	.000	Yes	5.13	2.17	.000	Yes	5.05	2.29	.000	Yes

53

TABLE 52
 RANCHO DEL CAMPO
 COMPARISON OF ONE YEAR PRE-POST DIFFERENCES IN COURT FILINGS

PETITIONS & INFO. REPORTS	EXPERIMENTAL N=63				CONTROL N=23				COMPARISON N=101			
	Incidents Pre Mean	Per Ward Post Mean	Paired t Proba- bility	Results Signif. Differ.	Incidents Pre Mean	Per Ward Post Mean	Paired t Proba- bility	Results Signif. Differ.	Incidents Pre Mean	Per Ward Post Mean	Paired t Proba- bility	Results Signif. Differ.
H. Total Filed	2.51	.76	.000	Yes	2.57	1.00	.000	Yes	2.38	.99	.000	Yes
I. 601 Incidents Filed	.78	.22	.002	Yes	.52	.09	.009	Yes	.56	.23	.000	Yes
J. 602 Incidents Filed	3.94	1.37	.000	Yes	3.87	1.48	.000	Yes	3.36	1.71	.000	Yes
K. 601-602 Incidents Filed	4.71	1.57	.000	Yes	4.39	1.57	.000	Yes	3.92	1.93	.000	Yes

The analysis of variance conducted for each category showed no statistical differences between groups either pre or post for any category. The groups were, therefore, comparable in the beginning and remained similar after the one year follow-up.

Examination of the t test results indicate findings similar to those for Field Services. Significant reductions occurred in numerous categories for all groups. The experimental group showed a significant reduction in every category except 602 Person incidents (D). The controls showed reductions in eight out of 11 categories, and the comparisons in nine out of 11. No group showed a significant reduction in 602 Person incidents. Again, the conclusion must be drawn that while the overall numbers of offenses and filings went down significantly, this was not as the result of the Summit Program. It is probable that these reductions occurred for the same reasons that they occurred in Field Services. (The average age for these wards was also around 16 (16.4 years for the total) and increasing maturity during the follow-up period probably accounts for the decreases.)

The experimental group showed change in the greatest number of categories even though this was not statistically significant. This could have occurred by chance but it may also have been influenced by the screening process. Experimental wards were those who "deserved" to go and the effect of this might have been to select those wards with a greater potential for success.

The experimental group was also analyzed in terms of program objectives. The offense categories (A, B, C, D, and F) are listed in descending order according to the pre-mean values.

602 Property	(\bar{X} =2.60)
602 Drug/Alcohol	(\bar{X} =1.22)
601	(\bar{X} =1.19)
602 Other	(\bar{X} = .79)
602 Person	(\bar{X} = .25)

The decrease for each category is listed below with all decreases being significant except 602 Person.

602 Property	(-1.66)
602 Drug/Alcohol	(- .76)
601	(- .71)
602 Other	(- .80)
602 Person	(- .04)

602 Property offenses, again, showed the greatest decrease with 602 Person offenses showing the smallest.

Table 53 presents the percentage of total offenses accounted for by each category both pre and post.

TABLE 53
PERCENT OF TOTAL OFFENSE RECORD BY CATEGORY

Offense Category	Pre	Post
602 Property	42.98%	41.23%
602 Drug/Alcohol	20.17%	20.18%
601	19.66%	21.05%
602 Other	13.06%	8.33%
602 Person	4.13%	9.21%
<hr/>		
Totals	100%	100%

The pre and post percentages are quite similar with a slight increase showing in 602 Person offenses. The data indicates that while both number and frequency were significantly reduced, severity of offense behavior was not affected.

Rancho Del Rayo

Table 54 is a summary of the pre-post data for the Rayo Participants. There were significant decreases in nine out of the 11 categories with only 602 Other and 602 Drug/Alcohol showing no significant reduction.

TABLE 54
 RANCHO DEL RAYO
 COMPARISON OF ONE YEAR PRE-POST DIFFERENCES IN INCIDENTS AND COURT FILINGS

	INCIDENTS				PETITIONS AND INFORMATION REPORTS				
	Means Per Ward		Paired t Results			Means Per Ward		Paired t Results	
	Pre	Post	Proba- bility	Signif. Differ.		Pre	Post	Proba- bility	Signif. Differ.
A. 602 Other	.31	.16	.151	No	H. Total Filed	2.41	.75	.000	Yes
B. 602 Drug/Alcohol	.52	.39	.280	No	I. 601 Incidents Filed	.84	.11	.000	Yes
C. 602 Property	3.36	.90	.000	Yes	J. 602 Incidents Filed	3.80	1.13	.000	Yes
D. 602 Person	.39	.11	.008	Yes	K. 601-602 Incidents Filed	4.57	1.25	.000	Yes
E. 602 Total	3.66	1.56	.000	Yes					
F. 601	1.25	.23	.000	Yes					
G. 601-602 Total	5.54	1.77	.000	Yes					

Offense categories in descending order are listed below along with the amount of decrease between pre and post.

Offense Category	Pre Mean	Decrease
602 Property	3.36	-2.46
601	1.25	-1.02
602 Drug/Alcohol	.52	- .13
602 Person	.39	- .28
602 Other	.31	- .15

Table 55 presents the percent of offenses accounted for by each category pre and post.

TABLE 55
PERCENT OF TOTAL OFFENSE RECORD BY CATEGORY

Offense Category	Pre	Post
602 Property	57.63%	50.27%
601	21.44%	12.85%
602 Drug/Alcohol	8.92%	21.79%
602 Person	6.69%	6.15%
602 Other	5.32%	8.94%
Totals	100%	100%

As with the other programs, number and frequency were reduced but there was little or no effect on severity.

No conclusions about program effectiveness can be drawn from this data because there were no control or comparison groups. If there had been, however, it is quite likely that the results would have been similar to those of the other two programs.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

A few additional outcome variables were examined in order to provide a little more general information of a descriptive nature. The additional variables are:

- A. Sealing of Juvenile Record
- B. Closing of Juvenile Record
- C. Certification to Adult Court
- D. Commitment to the Youth Authority

A. Sealing of Juvenile Record

Tables 56 and 57 tabulate the data on all cases sealed during the one year follow-up period.

TABLE 56
FIELD SERVICES

SEALED	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	67	100	78	100	178	98.3	323	99.1
Yes, First Six Months	0		0		0		0	
Yes, Second Six Months	0		0		3	1.7	3	.9
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

TABLE 57
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

SEALED	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	62	98.4	23	100	98	77.0	183	97.9
Yes, First Six Months	0		0		0		0	
Yes, Second Six Months	1	1.6	0		3	3.0	4	2.1
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

No records were sealed from the Rancho Del Rayo population.

B. Closing of Juvenile Record

Tables 58, 59 and 60 summarize information about Juvenile Records that were closed and remained closed during the follow-up period.

TABLE 58
FIELD SERVICES

CLOSED	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	20	29.8	31	39.7	54	29.8	105	32.2
Yes, First Six Months	17	25.4	19	24.4	52	28.7	88	27.0
Yes, Second Six Months	30	44.8	28	35.9	75	41.5	133	40.8
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

TABLE 59
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

CLOSED	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	18	28.6	8	34.8	43	42.6	69	36.9
Yes, First Six Months	20	31.7	11	47.8	29	28.7	60	32.1
Yes, Second Six Months	25	39.7	4	17.4	29	28.7	58	31.0
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

TABLE 60
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Cased Closed	N	%
No	26	42.6
Yes, First Six Months	12	19.7
Yes, Second Six Months	23	37.7
Totals	61	100%

C. Certification to Adult Court

Tables 61 and 62 indicate all those wards who were certified to the Adult Court for prosecution from the Juvenile Court.

TABLE 61
FIELD SERVICES

CERT. TO ADULT	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	65	97.0	76	97.4	176	97.2	317	97.3
Yes, First Six Months	0		1	1.3	5	2.8	6	1.8
Yes, Second Six Months	2	3.0	1	1.3	0		3	.9
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

TABLE 62
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

CERT. TO ADULT	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	57	90.5	20	87.0	94	93.1	171	91.4
Yes, First Six Months	2	3.2	0		1	1.0	3	1.6
Yes, Second Six Months	4	6.3	3	13.0	6	5.9	13	7.0
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

None of the Rancho Del Rayo wards were certified to Adult Court.

D. Commitments to the Youth Authority

Commitments to the Youth Authority during the follow-up period are presented in Tables 63, 64 and 65.

TABLE 63
FIELD SERVICES

COMMIT. TO YA	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	66	98.5	71	91.0	172	95.0	309	94.7
Yes, First Six Months	1	1.5	4	5.2	3	1.7	8	2.5
Yes, Second Six Months	0		3	3.8	6	3.3	9	2.8
Totals	67	100%	78	100%	181	100%	326	100%

TABLE 64
RANCHO DEL CAMPO

COMMIT. TO YA	Experimental		Control		Comparison		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	57	90.5	18	78.3	82	81.1	157	84.0
Yes, First Six Months	4	6.3	2	8.7	14	13.9	20	10.7
Yes, Second Six Months	2	3.2	3	13.0	5	5.0	10	5.3
Totals	63	100%	23	100%	101	100%	187	100%

TABLE 65
RANCHO DEL RAYO

Commitment to YA	N	%
No	53	86.9
Yes, First Six Months	3	4.9
Yes, Second Six Months	5	8.2
Totals	61	100%

PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Those wards who participated in trips from the Field Services and Campo programs were rated on their performances by all the accompanying staff members. Ratings for each ward were then combined to arrive at a composite score for each item measuring the ward's performance. (When a ward went on more than one trip, all the resulting ratings were combined into one set of scores.) This data was then analyzed in terms of its relationship to offense behavior during the follow-up period.

Description of Trip Performance Ratings

Table 66 describes the two experimental groups in terms of the numbers of trips on which the wards participated.

TABLE 66

NUMBER OF TRIPS	Field Services		Rancho Del Campo	
	N	%	N	%
1	28	41.8	57	90.5
2	39	58.2	6	9.5
Totals	67	100%	63	100%

Table 67 tabulates the total number of days spent in the field, regardless of the number of trips.

TABLE 67

TOTAL DAYS	Field Services		Rancho Del Campo	
	N	%	N	%
3	3	4.5		
5	4	6.0	9	14.3
7			7	11.1
9	21	31.3	4	6.3
10	1	1.5		
11			8	12.7
12	6	9.0	29	46.0
14	32	47.8	3	4.8
16			1	1.6
21			2	3.2
Totals	67	100%	63	100%
Mean	11.16		10.7	
Mode	14		12	
Range	3-14		5-21	

The number of raters scoring any one ward varied greatly depending on how many trips the ward participated in and how many adults were on each trip. Table 68 presents this data.

TABLE 68

NUMBER OF RATERS PER WARD	FIELD SERVICES		RANCHO DEL CAMPO	
	N	%	N	%
1			9	14.3
2	2	3.0	1	1.6
3	15	22.4	10	15.9
4	6	9.0	38	60.3
5	14	20.9	1	1.6
6	11	16.4	3	4.8
7	12	17.9	1	1.6
8	7	10.4		
Totals	67	100%	63	100%
Mean	5.20		3.54	
Mode	3		4	
Range	2-8		1-7	

Certain mountaineering skills (as described in the program description) were taught on the trips and wards were rated on whether or not they adequately learned them. Table 69 summarizes the number of skills not learned.

TABLE 69

NUMBER OF SKILLS NOT LEARNED	FIELD SERVICES		RANCHO DEL CAMPO	
	N	%	N	%
0	18	26.9		
1	10	14.9	21	33.3
2	7	10.4	20	31.7
3	5	7.5	3	4.8
4	2	3.0		
5	5	7.5	1	1.6
6	4	6.0	8	12.7
7	3	4.5	9	14.3
8	1	1.5	1	1.6
9	3	4.5		
11	2	3.0		
12	2	3.0		
13	2	3.0		
16	1	1.5		
17	1	1.5		
20	1	1.5		
Totals	67	100%	63	100%
Mean	4.13		3.08	
Mode	0		1	
Range	0-20		1-8	

Wards were rated in terms of their on-course behavior and in terms of what changes if any, occurred in attitudes. Ratings were on a scale of one to five with five indicating the greatest amount of improvement. The average scores for each group are presented in Tables 70 and 71.

TABLE 70
ON COURSE BEHAVIOR

	Field Services	Rancho Del Campo
Participation with Peers		
Mean	3.56	3.37
Mode	4	3
Range	2.0-4.57	2.0-4.75
Participation with Staff		
Mean	3.64	3.63
Mode	4	4.25
Range	1.33-4.86	2.0-5.0
Cooperation with Peers		
Mean	3.57	3.46
Mode	4	3
Range	2.0-4.57	2.0-4.75
Cooperation with Staff		
Mean	3.68	3.67
Mode	4	3.75
Range	1.33-5.00	2.0-5.0

TABLE 71
CHANGES IN ATTITUDES

	Field Services	Rancho Del Campo
Attitude Change		
Mean	3.96	3.96
Mode	4	4.25
Range	1.67-5.0	2.25-5.0
Heightened Self Image		
Mean	3.98	4.00
Mode	4	4
Range	2.83-5.0	2.67-5.0
Increased Enthusiasm		
Mean	3.90	3.69
Mode	4	4
Range	2.5-4.75	2.0-5.0
Re-Directed Aggression		
Mean	3.58	3.59
Mode	4	3
Range	1.67-4.67	2.0-5.0
Lowered Level of Frustration		
Mean	3.54	3.69
Mode	4	4
Range	1.67-4.71	2.0-5.0
Surfacing Creativity		
Mean	3.82	3.76
Mode	4	4
Range	3.0-5.0	3.0-4.67
Heightened Self-Confidence		
Mean	4.01	4.29
Mode	4	4
Range	3.0-5.0	3.0-5.0
Heightened Sensitivity to Self		
Mean	3.93	3.94
Mode	4	4
Range	3.0-5.0	2.67-5.0
Sensitivity to Others		
Mean	3.76	3.86
Mode	4	4
Range	2.67-5.0	2.67-4.75
Sensitivity to Environment		
Mean	3.86	4.04
Mode	4	4
Range	2.67-5.0	3.0-5.0

CORRELATION OF TRIP PERFORMANCE WITH OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

A statistical analysis (Spearman Correlation) was performed on all the rated items to determine if there were correlations between rated items and subsequent offense behavior during the one year follow-up. The comparisons were made with post one year 601-602 total incidents and post one year 601-602 total incidents filed. The results are presented in Tables 72 and 73.

TABLE 72
FIELD SERVICES
CORRELATION OF TRIP PERFORMANCE WITH OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

RATED ITEMS	601-602 Incidents		601-602 Incidents Filed	
	Proba- bility	Signif. Correlat* #	Proba- bility	Significant Correlation
Total Days	.153	No	.488	No
Skills not Learned	.429	No	.212	No
Participation with Peers	.001	Yes	.001	Yes
Participation with Staff	.002	Yes	.002	Yes
Cooperation with Peers	.002	Yes	.004	Yes
Cooperation with Staff	.001	Yes	.001	Yes
Attitude	.012	Yes	.014	Yes
Self Image	.002	Yes	.004	Yes
Enthusiasm	.001	Yes	.001	Yes
Aggression	.040	Yes	.010	Yes
Frustration	.032	Yes	.015	Yes
Creativity	.158	No	.116	No
Self Confidence	.020	Yes	.036	Yes
Sensitivity to Self	.008	Yes	.002	Yes
Sensitivity to Others	.005	Yes	.003	Yes
Sensitivity to Environment	.005	Yes	.002	Yes

*Significance is assumed to be a probability value of .050 or less.

The analysis shows that while total days in the field and skills learned did not correlate with subsequent offense behavior, almost all of the attitude items (except creativity) did. This means that those wards who performed well on the trips also performed better in the follow-up period in terms of lower offense rates.

TABLE 73
 RANCHO DEL CAMPO
 CORRELATION OF TRIP PERFORMANCE WITH OFFENSE BEHAVIOR

RATED ITEMS	601-602 Incidents		601-602 Incidents Filed	
	Proba- bility	Signif. Correla.	Proba- bility	Significant Correlation
Total Days	.411	No	.443	No
Skills not Learned	.123	No	.060	No
Participation with Peers	.054	No	.203	No
Participation with Staff	.006	Yes	.035	Yes
Cooperation with Peers	.009	Yes	.011	Yes
Cooperation with Staff	.005	Yes	.021	Yes
Attitude	.390	No	.427	No
Self Image	.063	No	.105	No
Enthusiasm	.052	No	.098	No
Aggression	.094	No	.204	No
Frustration	.017	Yes	.044	Yes
Creativity	.004	Yes	.026	Yes
Self Confidence	.236	No	.282	No
Sensitivity to Self	.012	Yes	.046	Yes
Sensitivity to Others	.051	No	.109	No
Sensitivity to Environment	.076	No	.253	No

In the Rancho Del Campo group, not as many items were significant in terms of subsequent offense behavior as with the Field Services group. The most important items appear to be the behavior items of participation and cooperation. The only significant attitude change items are frustration, creativity and sensitivity to self. However, many of the other items approached significance and it can still be assumed that an overall positive trip performance was correlated with good performance in post-program offense behavior.

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 coordination duties could be accounted for in time. The two Probation coordinators were employed full-time, except for the last month of the program, when the Field Services coordinator was not budgeted.

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 addition, the salary and fringe benefits (computed at 16%) for the Probation staff member assigned to the program was included (\$11,480.77).

The Juvenile Field Services program conducted ten field trips during the program. 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. Sixty-seven boys were exposed to at least one trip, with some wards repeating the experience so that 107 ward trips were conducted, amassing 754 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 was \$54,290.76. Dividing this figure by the number of wards who were exposed to the program (67) results in an average cost per ward of \$810.31. Since 754 ward days were spent on Summit trips through this period of the program, the cost per ward day was \$72.00.

The Field Services coordinator was re-assigned out of the program for the last month of the project, and not replaced for budgetary reasons. The cost figures are, therefore, not representative of total anticipated project costs. If the coordinator had been on salary throughout the last month, the Probation cost would have risen from \$11,480.77 to \$12,631.49; Juvenile Field Services total cost would have been \$55,441.48; average cost per ward would have been \$827.48 and daily cost per ward would have been \$73.53.

Rancho Del Campo

The total cost of the Summit program at Rancho Del Campo was \$51,474.98, including a Probation staff cost of \$14,996.46.

The average cost per ward was \$817.06 and the cost per ward per trip day was \$76.83.

The foregoing cost figures were computed in the same manner as the Juvenile Services costs. There were seven trips conducted, with a trip length range of five to 12 days. Eight to 12 wards went on each trip with between six and 12 new wards per trip, so that 63 wards were exposed to the program for some period of time, amassing 670 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 \$22,419.51; 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 15 trips, of two to six days duration, with between zero and nine new wards per trip. Sixty-one wards were exposed to the program, and totalled 318 days in the field in Summit related activities. The average cost per ward was \$367.53 and the cost per ward day was \$70.50.

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 reverted by contract to Summit Expedition.

An overview of program costs is presented in tabular form for cross-program and status comparison in Table 74; Table 75 presents program costs per ward.

TABLE 74
AN OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM COSTS

	Summit Contract	Probation	Total
Total Budgeted	\$103,240.00	\$30,750.00	\$133,990.00
Total Expenditure	101,758.02	26,427.23	128,185.25
Juvenile Field Services	42,809.99	11,480.77	54,290.76
Rancho Del Campo	36,528.52	14,946.46	51,474.98
Rancho Del Rayo	22,419.51	None	22,419.51

* Includes fringe benefits computed at 16% of salary.

TABLE 75
PROGRAM COSTS PER WARD

	No. of Individual Wards	Avg. No. Days Per Ward	Total Ward Trip Days	Avg. Cost Per Ward	Daily Cost Per Ward
Juvenile Field Services (\$54,290.76)	67	11.25	754	\$810.31	\$72.00
Rancho Del Campo (\$51,474.98)	63	10.64	670	\$817.06	\$76.83
Rancho Del Rayo (\$22,419.51)	61	5.21	318	\$367.53	\$70.50
Total (\$128,185.25)	191		1742		
Average (\$42,728.42)	63.67	9.12	580.7	\$671.13	\$73.56

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding information presents in detailed form, the results of a nine-month experiment in correctional treatment for juveniles. Although the program was segmented into three separate efforts, the available data does not require separate conclusions about the results of the effort. The results are uniformly supportive of the following conclusions:

1. The Operation Summit program did not result in a significantly greater reduction of offense behavior for participating wards.

In examining the reductions in offense behavior which did occur, it is obvious that reductions occurred in all groups, and is probably a function of social maturation. Special programming did not have an additional effect which might warrant the significant additional expenditure of operating the program, especially with the Field Services group. This group, undoubtedly, suffered the greatest disruption in their lives as a result of the program, and with no discernible benefit during the study period.

It should be noted that the program as operated in the Probation Department by the contractor did not follow the pattern of similar programs in other jurisdictions. The trips were significantly shorter (by at least one third) than other programs, and were still an interference. The following conclusion is, therefore, warranted:

2. A stress education program is probably incompatible with the life situations of wards in the Field Services program.

It is conceivable that one year is insufficient time for the benefits of the program to be detected statistically and behaviorally. Nevertheless, the program may be presumed to present disadvantages to those wards in Field Services, except during an idle summer; the cost of the program as it has been offered by the contractor to the general public is considerably less than the cost of Departmental operation.

Although it cannot be supported from the present study results, the concept of stress education as an alternative to a standard institutional program may have merit. The present study does not test that hypothesis, and the Summit program at Campo was neither integrated nor an alternative. On the basis that the concept of stress education is still intriguing and may have long-range benefits not discernible from the present study, the following conclusion is tendered:

3. Institutional settings have the greatest potential for achieving maximum benefit from a stress education program.

In view of the foregoing conclusions, the following recommendations are respectfully submitted:

1. That a stress education program not be re-instituted in Juvenile Field Services.
2. That any future stress education program be instituted in an institutional setting only.
 - a. that any such program be operated by Departmental staff rather than by external contract.
 - b. that any such program be designed as a true alternative to the standard institutional program, with substantial periods of preparation and follow-up services.
 - c. that selection and screening procedures be standardized and centralized under the authority of a designated Program Director or Program Planning Committee.

APPENDIX A

JUVENILE DATA FORMS

ENTRY DATE

____ / ____ / ____

FRE-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)									

APPENDIX B

WARD PERFORMANCE FORM

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. Maintainance of
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	somewhat 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					