This monograph presents 36 juvenile delinquency prevention program models, which describe a range of approaches for preventing delinquency before young people become involved with the law. The strategies of each program model are delineated as well as the rationale, objectives, target population, implementation requirements and implementing agency, budget, and effectiveness reported by program evaluators. A program matrix is provided as a reference for readers interested in particular types of programs. Although no proven technology exists for effective delinquent prevention, these programs can be used as models in cause-focused delinquency prevention planning. (JAC)
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FOREWORD

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and its Amendments of 1977 mandated the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to assume leadership in planning for delinquency prevention. Recognizing prior difficulties in conceptualizing and developing effective prevention approaches, the Act also mandated a systematic gathering and assessment of data on the causes, prevention, and treatment of juvenile delinquency to serve as a foundation for planning prevention policies and programs. To fulfill these mandates, the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention within the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention established the Assessment Centers Program. The present monograph is a product of the National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention at the Center for Law and Justice, University of Washington.

The field of delinquency prevention is clouded with opinion, varying and often conflicting definitions and approaches, and inadequate research. In this context it is important that both researchers and practitioners work together to identify and develop effective strategies for preventing delinquency. The present monograph presents 36 prevention models which have been identified as promising by the National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention. They are intended to stimulate creative thought and action toward the development, implementation, and testing of effective prevention approaches. I encourage those interested in the field of prevention to use this monograph to inform their own efforts.

J. Price Foster, Ph.D
Acting Director
National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
PREFACE

This paper was developed at the National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention (NCADBIP). Located within the Center for Law and Justice at the University of Washington, the NCADBIP was established in July of 1977. The NCADBIP conducts and assesses research on the theories, causes, and correlates of delinquent behavior; studies programs designed to prevent delinquent behavior before youths become involved with the juvenile justice system; and reviews evaluations of these programs to identify effective prevention approaches. Analyses of a number of existing data sets on self-reported delinquency and the results of a national survey of promising prevention programs have informed much of the NCADBIP's work.

"Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: A Compendium of 36 Program Models" presents a range of promising approaches for preventing delinquency before young people become involved with the law. The programs presented here were identified through the NCADBIP's national survey of prevention programs. This is intended as a resource volume for those interested in developing, implementing, and testing effective ways to prevent delinquency.

The intention of the National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention is that its reports and papers will help practitioners, researchers, policymakers, and the public in establishing a theoretically sound framework for the understanding of delinquent behavior that will lead to sound decisions on preventive measures. I hope that readers find this volume useful to those ends.

Joseph G. Weis
Director
Associate Professor, Sociology
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This monograph presents 36 juvenile delinquency prevention program models. Few of these programs have been adequately evaluated to determine effects in preventing delinquency. Thus, the models are designed to foster not mere imitation or replication but creative thought and action on the part of those concerned with preventing youth crime. The field of prevention needs innovative workers who are willing to subject the results of their efforts to careful research and scrutiny if an effective technology of delinquency prevention is to be developed. This is intended as a resource for such persons. A prevention program matrix is provided to assist readers in identifying programs of interest on the basis of key characteristics.
A. INTRODUCTION

Juvenile crime has become a serious problem. Arrests of youths aged 11 to 17 for index and property crimes increased 27 percent and 24 percent respectively during the period from 1968 to 1977. During the same period, arrests of 11 to 17 year olds for violent crimes increased 44 percent (adjusted UCR rates from Smith et al., 1979:349-351). Fortunately, there is some evidence that the rates of serious juvenile crime have leveled off in recent years (Alexander et al., 1979), though youth crime remains a major problem. Self-report research has shown that a large proportion of youths, not arrested, also engage in delinquent acts (Elliott and Voss, 1974; Gold, 1966, 1970; Hindelang, 1973; Hirschi, 1969; Short and Nye, 1957). The costs of youth crime are great. The annual cost of school vandalism alone is estimated at $200 million (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978). In 1977, capital and operating expenditures for the country's public juvenile custody facilities were close to $708 million (U.S. Department of Justice, 1979). Beyond these economic costs, public fear of youth crime is widespread.

Traditionally, this society's approach to youth crime has been reactive. Juvenile courts and diversion programs have responded to crimes by juveniles with a wide range of services focused on control and/or rehabilitation of youthful offenders.

In the last decade, however, a new approach has emerged: the prevention of crime before youths engage in delinquent acts. In 1967, the Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice advocated prevention as the most promising and important method of dealing with crime. Subsequently, this prevention emphasis was written into federal law in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1972, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1977.

Most broadly conceived, delinquency prevention is an attempt to preclude future delinquent acts. Three general levels of prevention have been identified (United Nations Consultative Group, 1968). Primary prevention is directed at modifying conditions in the physical and social environment that lead to crime. Secondary prevention is directed at early identification and intervention in the lives of individuals or groups in criminogenic circumstances. Tertiary prevention is directed at the prevention of recidivism (after delinquent acts have been committed and detected) (Newton, 1978:246). Primary and secondary prevention are the components of juvenile crime control which have been emphasized in recent policy. The emphasis is on preventing delinquent acts before youths ever engage in criminal behavior.

Unfortunately, a proven technology for effective delinquency prevention is not currently available. While a broad range of programs with potential to prevent juvenile crime have been initiated, few of these programs have been adequately evaluated for prevention effects and even fewer have demonstrated effectiveness when evaluated. The field of delinquency prevention remains exploratory and experimental. Yet across the country, an increasing number of individuals and organizations concerned with youth crime have turned their
attention and efforts to prevention. There are few reliable guides they can use in the search for an effective prevention approach.

The National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention (NCADBP) at the University of Washington is producing a set of materials to assist policymakers and practitioners concerned with the prevention of youth crime. The first volume in the set is A Typology of Cause-Focused Strategies of Delinquency Prevention (Hawkins et al., 1980), which describes the importance of cause-focused planning for effective delinquency prevention and defines 12 cause-focused delinquency prevention strategies. Delinquency prevention efforts should be explicitly grounded in one or more of these cause-focused strategies.

This compendium of program models is the second volume in the set of materials. It is designed as a resource volume. It describes 36 prevention programs currently operating in the United States. All 36 programs target factors shown by research to be important correlates and causes of delinquency. As a result, they can be used as models in cause-focused delinquency prevention planning. However, it should be noted that not all of these programs have been proven effective in preventing delinquency. Only two of these programs have been adequately tested for delinquency prevention effects using rigorous evaluation designs. While many of the remaining programs in this volume have shown positive results, their evaluations were not sufficiently rigorous to allow the conclusion that the programs themselves were responsible for the observed results. Therefore, we cannot say with confidence that these 36 programs prevent delinquency. However, their approaches are promising. Programs which have been shown to have negative results when evaluated for their impact on delinquency have not been included here.

The third volume in the set, The Social Development Model: An Integrated Approach to Delinquency Prevention, presents an empirically grounded theory of delinquency and a comprehensive model of prevention which addresses causes of crime in the major institutions and groups affecting youths during the developmental process.

Other volumes in this set of materials discuss prevention approaches focused on specific institutions and groups. They include Alternative Education: Exploring the Delinquency Prevention Potential (Hawkins and Wall, 1980) and the forthcoming Youth Employment and Delinquency Prevention; Community Crime Prevention Programs and Issues; Delinquency Prevention in Schools: Programs and Issues; Family-Oriented Approaches to the Prevention of Delinquency; and The Utilization of Peers in Delinquency Prevention.

The reader may find it useful to know how the 36 programs in this volume were selected. In 1979, the National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention initiated a national survey in search of programs whose activities qualified as primary or secondary prevention. To identify a broad representation of such programs, a questionnaire was mailed to 898 public funding, policy, and planning agencies of the Federal Government and all 50 states and Puerto Rico; to private foundations and agencies; and to local social service agencies in 261 U.S. cities. Agencies responsible for social services,
youth programs, law enforcement, recreation, education, and labor were surveyed. The director of each surveyed organization was asked to nominate three programs he or she viewed as the most promising or effective for preventing delinquency before youths became engaged with the law. A total of 875 programs were identified in this way. The principal administrator of each of the identified programs was then surveyed using a second questionnaire. Fifty-nine percent (512) of the 875 surveyed programs returned completed questionnaires. Respondents included a broad cross section of youth-focused programs in 48 of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Schools, various components of the criminal justice system, mental health centers, youth service bureaus, church-related agencies, and other organizations offering a broad range of services were represented.

Three criteria were used to select 36 programs from the 512 programs which responded to the survey. The first criterion was that the program should address at least one empirically supported cause of delinquency. Secondly, those programs showing the most promising evaluation results were included. Finally, a range of programs focusing on the major institutions affecting the lives of youths during the developmental process were selected for inclusion.

Inclusion of programs in this volume is not an endorsement. These programs were selected to represent a range of promising approaches. The programs, their results, and important issues surrounding them, are presented here so that those seeking to develop the practice of delinquency prevention can learn from the experiences of others in designing their own experimental programs. These program models are intended to stimulate creative thought and action by those concerned with youth crime, rather than to encourage imitation or replication. Currently the field of delinquency prevention requires innovative pioneers willing to subject the results of their efforts to careful scrutiny, not imitators who seek quick and easy solutions. Continued experimental work is essential to develop an effective technology for delinquency prevention.

B. THE PREVENTION PROGRAM MODELS: A DESCRIPTION

The 36 prevention programs described here are arranged alphabetically. Each program model presents the following information:

1. The name of the program and the city and state in which it is located.

2. Strategies: The NCADBIP has developed a typology of 12 strategies to distinguish among approaches to delinquency prevention. Each strategy addresses a distinct presumed cause of delinquency. Programs may include more than one of the strategies in their interventions.

The 12 Strategies are: Biological/Physiological, Psychological/Mental Health, Social Network Development, Criminal Influence Reduction, Power Enhancement, Role Development/Role Enhancement, Activities/Recreation, Education/Skill Development, Consistent Social Expectations, Economic Resources, Deterrence, and Abandonment.
of Legal Control/Social Tolerance. Complete definitions of the 12 strategies are presented in Appendix B. (See also Hawkins et al., 1980).

3. Causes of the Problem: The causes of juvenile delinquency addressed by the program's intervention(s) are described. In some cases, programs have not explicitly stated the causes they seek to address. In such cases, we have extrapolated and placed in parentheses the causes the programs appear to address.

4. Program Rationale: The program rationale is the program's assumption of how its intervention approach will address causes of delinquency and thereby prevent delinquency. As in the previous section, we have extrapolated and placed in parentheses the apparent rationale of programs which have not specified one in materials provided.

5. Target Population: The number of people served by the program identified by race, sex, geographic location, and approximate age or age groups (such as junior high school students or employable youths) is presented.

6. Program Description: This is a description of the program's activities and services.

7. Implementation Requirements: This section describes basic organizational requirements that must be satisfied to implement the program. At a minimum, the number of staff members, institutional and community support, program planning, and resources needed are identified. More detailed implementation information (such as historical factors integral to implementation, enabling legislation, staff training needs, board membership and role, and other key issues) are described when available.

8. Budget: The amount and sources of program's annual operating budget (if known) are provided. Funding agencies are indicated.

9. Implementing Agency: The contact person currently responsible for implementing and maintaining the program is identified and contacting address provided.

10. Effectiveness: The effectiveness of the program as reported by program evaluators in meeting its program goals and in impacting delinquency is indicated if the program has been evaluated. (These program evaluations were not conducted by the NCADBIP staff.)

In cases in which detailed information is available, sample size and sampling technique, hypotheses of the intervention, variables measured and measurements used, significance levels, testing schedule, and evaluation results are presented. Where evaluations were made available only in summary form, results are reported and the lack of complete evaluative information is noted.
11. Comments: The comments section highlights our views on key aspects of the program's conceptualization, target population, program activities, implementation, and evaluation. The section both critiques and highlights program features as we assess them. Generally, the comments section is intended to stimulate critical and constructive thought by readers about the program model presented.

C. THE PREVENTION PROGRAM MATRIX: AN OVERVIEW

The Prevention Program Matrix has been developed to assist readers to identify programs of interest on the basis of key characteristics. Eleven program characteristics are summarized in the matrix:

Prevention Intervention
1. System of Intervention
2. Prevention Level
3. Prevention Strategies
4. Level of Intervention

Effects
5. Effectiveness
   a. Program Effectiveness
   b. Delinquency Impact

Population Served
6. Number Served/Service Recipient Sex
7. Service Recipient Ethnicity

Geographic Location
8. Program Location (Population Density)
9. Catchment Area Size

Implementation/Organizational Concerns
10. Service Setting
11. Annual Budget
Readers interested in programs with certain characteristics (e.g., programs which focus on families or programs which serve predominantly black populations) can use the matrix to quickly select programs which meet their specifications. Programs are listed alphabetically in rows on the left side of the matrix along with the page in this volume where the program model begins. The identifying characteristics are listed in columns across the top of the matrix. The square which marks the intersection of the program row and the identifying characteristics column contains information about that particular characteristic of the program. Appendix A (Page 145) contains definitions of the variables used in the matrix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVENTION PROGRAM</th>
<th>SYSTEM OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>PREVENTION LEVEL</th>
<th>PREVENTION STRATEGIES</th>
<th>LEVEL OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>a) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>a) NUMBER SERVED</th>
<th>b) DELINQUENCY IMPACT</th>
<th>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT SEX</th>
<th>SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</th>
<th>SERVICE LOCATION</th>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA SIZE</th>
<th>SERVICE SETTING</th>
<th>ANNUAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE LEARNING PROJECT - Providence, Rhode Island (p. 17)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Power Enhancement, Role Development, Education</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>a) 150 Youths</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>b) 50% Male 50% Female</td>
<td>30% Black 5% Hispanic 65% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Whole City</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BERKELEY YOUTH ALTERNATIVES | Community | Primary Prevention, Diversion | Psychological/Mental Health, Power Enhancement, Role Development | Individual | a) Incomplete Information | a) 418 (288 Youths and 130 Parents) | b) Not Evaluated | b) 50% Male 49% Female | 39% Black 3% Asian 12 Native American 72 Hispanic 48% White 22 other | Urban | Greater City Area | Non-Residential Social Service Agency | $375,000 |

<p>| CENTRO de ORIENTACION y SERVICIOS | Community, Peers | Primary Prevention, Diversion, Intervention | Social Reorganization, Criminal Influence Reduction, Role Development, Power Enhancement, Activities/Recreation | Individual, Interactional | a) Incomplete Information | a) 4,500 Youths | b) Incomplete Information | b) 60% Male 40% Female | 100% Hispanic | Urban | Local Neighborhood | Open Community, Residential Social Service Agency | $350,000 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVENTION PROGRAM</th>
<th>SYSTEM OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>PREVENTION LEVEL</th>
<th>PREVENTION STRATEGIES</th>
<th>LEVEL OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>a) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>a) NUMBER SERVED</th>
<th>b) DELINQUENCY IMPACT</th>
<th>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT SEX</th>
<th>SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</th>
<th>PROGRAM LOCATION</th>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA SIZE</th>
<th>SERVICE SETTING</th>
<th>ANNUAL* BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHILD DEVELOPMENT SPECIALIST</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Social Network, Education</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 20,000 Youths</td>
<td>Rural, Medium-Sized Town, Suburban, Urban</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>Whole State (55 sites)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$67,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem, Oregon (P. 26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1979-1981 biennium) State contribution varies from limited assurance to 50% of total program costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY ROADS Montpelier, Vermont (p. 37)</td>
<td>Family, Community</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Psychological/mental Health, Role Development, Education, Consistent Social Expectations, Deterrence</td>
<td>Individual, Interaction</td>
<td>a) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>a) Approx. 200 Youths</td>
<td>Rural County</td>
<td>99% White 1% Other</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td>$ 46,500</td>
<td>90% HEW</td>
<td>10% Public Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM FOR MEETING MODERN PROBLEMS</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Individual, Interaction</td>
<td>a) Positive</td>
<td>a) 500 Teachers; 50,000 Students</td>
<td>Rural, Medium-Sized Town, Suburban, Urban</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>Multiple Individual Sites Beyond State</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$ 43,885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood, Ohio (p. 49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE BASED CAREER EDUCATION Portland, Oregon (p. 43)</td>
<td>FAMILY TEACHING CENTER Helena, Montana (p. 46)</td>
<td>GLASTONBURY YOUTH SERVICES, CREATIVE EXPERIENCES Glastonbury, Connecticut (p. 52)</td>
<td>HOMEBUILDERS Tacoma, Washington (p. 55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE BASED CAREER EDUCATION Portland, Oregon (p. 43)</td>
<td>FAMILY TEACHING CENTER Helena, Montana (p. 46)</td>
<td>GLASTONBURY YOUTH SERVICES, CREATIVE EXPERIENCES Glastonbury, Connecticut (p. 52)</td>
<td>HOMEBUILDERS Tacoma, Washington (p. 55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, Work</td>
<td>Family, School</td>
<td>Community, Peers</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Role Development, Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>Education, Consistent Social Expectations</td>
<td>Social Network, Role Development, Activities/Recreation</td>
<td>Psychological/ Mental Health, Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</td>
<td>SERVICE RECIPIENT SEX</td>
<td>SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) DELINQUENCY IMPACT</td>
<td>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>5% Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>95% White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 5,000 Youths</td>
<td>Medium-Sized Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 50% Male 50% Female</td>
<td>Non-Residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Site Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>100% White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 600 Youths and Community Members</td>
<td>Whole City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>Non-Residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45% Male 55% Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>11% Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>2% Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 110 Families</td>
<td>b) 44% Male 56% Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% Black</td>
<td>85% White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% United Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% HEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% CETA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77% State Government</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$25,000 for Creative Experiences</td>
<td>$90% Private Sources, 10% State Government</td>
<td>20% State Government</td>
<td>10% Local Government</td>
<td>70% HEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Program</td>
<td>System of Intervention</td>
<td>Prevention Level</td>
<td>Prevention Strategies</td>
<td>Level of Intervention</td>
<td>a) Program Effectiveness</td>
<td>b) Delinquency Impact</td>
<td>b) Service Recipient Sex</td>
<td>Recipient Ethnicity</td>
<td>Program Location</td>
<td>Catchment Area Size</td>
<td>Service Setting</td>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Home Support Services</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Psychosocial/Health, Role Development, Education, Consistent Social Expectations, Social Network</td>
<td>Individual Interaction</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>12 Black 1X Hispanic 98% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Region Within State</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>$201,000</td>
<td>75% State Government 25% United Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs for Youth</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Role Development, Education, Economic Resources</td>
<td>Individual Institutional</td>
<td>a) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>50% Black 6% Hispanic 42% White 2% Other</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Greater Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>Work Site</td>
<td>$473,000</td>
<td>51% LEAA 4% Corp. 26% HF 8% CETA 12% Private Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Justice Awareness</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Social Network, Education, Activities/Recreation, Deterrence</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>a) No Effect</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>32% Asian 28% White 39% Pacific Island Groups 1% Other</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>100% Local Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law in a Free Society</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>a) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>Rural, Medium-Sized Town, Suburban, Urban</td>
<td>Multiple Individual Sites Beyond State</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>25% LEAA 40% National Endowment for Humanities 20% Private Foundations 15% Sale of Educational Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM OF INTERVENTION</td>
<td>LEVEL OF INTERVENTION</td>
<td>PREVENTION PROGRAM</td>
<td>LEVEL OF INTERVENTION</td>
<td>PREVENTION STRATEGIES</td>
<td>a) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>b) DELINQUENCY IMPACT</td>
<td>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</td>
<td>SERVICE RECIPIENT SEX</td>
<td>SERVICE LOCATION</td>
<td>CATCHMENT AREA SIZE</td>
<td>SERVICE SETTING</td>
<td>ANNUAL BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Diversion, Intervention</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Psychological/Mental Health, Education</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>b) Promising</td>
<td>40% Black</td>
<td>10% Hispanic</td>
<td>50% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Multiple Sites Within State</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH PREVENTION PROJECT</td>
<td>Community, Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Psychological/Mental Health, Social Network, Education, Consistent Social Expectations</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) No Effect</td>
<td>b) No Effect</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>Rural, Medium-Sized Town</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>School, Work Site, Home</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>95% State Government 5% Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000 Youths</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.: 1,000 Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70% LEAA 15% Local School Dist. 15% Private Foundations</td>
<td>Wash., D.C. Missing Data 100% Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Program</td>
<td>System of Intervention</td>
<td>Prevention Level</td>
<td>Prevention Strategies</td>
<td>Level of Intervention</td>
<td>a) Program Effectiveness</td>
<td>a) Number Served</td>
<td>b) Delinquency Impact</td>
<td>b) Service Recipient Sex</td>
<td>Service Recipient Ethnicity</td>
<td>Program Location</td>
<td>Catchment Area Size</td>
<td>Service Setting</td>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Directions for Young Women, Tucson, Arizona (p. 78)</td>
<td>Community, Family, School, Work</td>
<td>Primary Prevention, Diversion</td>
<td>Education, Role Development, Power Enhancement, Abandonment of Legal Control</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) About 1,400</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>b) 100% Female</td>
<td>62% Black, 19% Native American, 30% Hispanic, 45% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Non-residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Road/Student Involvement Project, San Francisco, California (p. 81)</td>
<td>School, Peers</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Education, Power Enhancement, Social Network, Role Development</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 300 Youths</td>
<td>b) Missing Data</td>
<td>b) Missing Data</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Multiple Individual Sites Beyond State</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Child Education, Des Moines, Iowa (p. 85)</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Individual, Interaction</td>
<td>a) Mixed</td>
<td>a) 88 Youths, 80 Parents</td>
<td>b) Promising</td>
<td>b) 64% Male, 36% Female</td>
<td>100% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Non-Residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td>$40,742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* LEAA = Law Enforcement Assistance Act
*百分比表示种族比例
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVENTION PROGRAM</th>
<th>SYSTEM OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>PREVENTION LEVEL</th>
<th>PREVENTION STRATEGIES</th>
<th>LEVEL OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>a) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>b) DELINQUENCY IMPACT</th>
<th>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</th>
<th>SERVICE LOCATION</th>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA SIZE</th>
<th>SERVICE SETTING</th>
<th>ANNUAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERS Denver, Colorado (p. 88)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Primary Prevention, Diversion</td>
<td>Social Network, Role Development, Activities/Recreation, Education</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 700 Youths</td>
<td>20% Black</td>
<td>Medium-Sized Town, Urban</td>
<td>Multiple Sites Within State</td>
<td>Open Community</td>
<td>$1,113,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOMONA VALLEY JUVENILE DIVERSION Pomona, California (p. 92)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Primary Prevention, Diversion</td>
<td>Social Network, Role Development, Power Enhancement, Psychological/Mental Health, Economic Resources, Deterrence, Consistent Social Expectations</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 800 Youths</td>
<td>40% Black, 40% Hispanic, 20% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Multiple Sites Within State</td>
<td>Non-Residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td>$576,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE PEER CULTURE Omaha, Nebraska (p. 96)</td>
<td>School, Peers</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Social Network, Role Development, Education</td>
<td>Individual Interactional</td>
<td>a) Mixed</td>
<td>a) 400 Youths</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Greater City Area</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table contains data on prevention programs with details on program effectiveness, delinquency impact, service recipient ethnicity, program location, catchment area size, service setting, and annual budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention Program</th>
<th>System of Intervention</th>
<th>Prevention Level</th>
<th>Prevention Strategies</th>
<th>Level of Intervention</th>
<th>a) Program Effectiveness</th>
<th>b) Delinquency Impact</th>
<th>a) Number Served</th>
<th>b) Service Recipient Sex</th>
<th>Service Recipient Ethnicity</th>
<th>Service Location</th>
<th>Catchment Area Size</th>
<th>Service Setting</th>
<th>Annual* Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARENTING TRAINING Portland, Oregon (p. 101)</td>
<td>Family, School</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Psychological/Mental Health, Education</td>
<td>Individual, Interpersonal</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>Rural, Medium-Sized Town, Suburban, Urban</td>
<td>Multiple Sites</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>100% HED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIDE Hialeah, Florida (p. 104)</td>
<td>School, Peers</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Education, Social Network</td>
<td>Individual, Interpersonal</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>250,000 Youths</td>
<td>60% Male, 40% Female</td>
<td>33.3% Black, 33.3% Hispanic, 33.3% White</td>
<td>Urban, Suburban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT 7001 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (p. 107)</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Social Network, Role Development, Education, Economic Resources</td>
<td>Individual, Interpersonal</td>
<td>a) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>200 Youths</td>
<td>40% Male, 60% Female</td>
<td>90% Black, 5% Hispanic, 5% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Work Sites</td>
<td>$607,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL INTERVENTION PROJECT Nashville, Tennessee (p. 110)</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Biological/Physiological, Psychological/Mental Health, Education, Social Network</td>
<td>Individual, Interpersonal</td>
<td>a) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>b) Not Evaluated</td>
<td>70 Families</td>
<td>75% Male, 25% Female</td>
<td>25% Black, 75% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Non-Residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td>Approx. $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL YOUTH ADVOCACY Lansing, Michigan (p. 114)</td>
<td>School, Peers</td>
<td>Primary Prevention, Diversion, Intervention</td>
<td>Social Network, Power Enhancement, Role Development, Education</td>
<td>Individual, Interpersonal</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>b) Promising</td>
<td>2,000 Youths</td>
<td>50% Male, 50% Female</td>
<td>50% Black, 50% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Multiple Towns</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>First Year $35,000; Subsequent Years $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Program</td>
<td>System of Intervention</td>
<td>Prevention Level</td>
<td>Prevention Strategies</td>
<td>Level of Intervention</td>
<td>Level of Prevention</td>
<td>a) Program Effectiveness</td>
<td>b) Delinquency Impact</td>
<td>b) Service Recipient Sex</td>
<td>Service Recipient Ethnicity</td>
<td>Program Location</td>
<td>Catchment Area Size</td>
<td>Service Setting</td>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for Democratic Participation Tallahassee, Florida</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Power Enhancement, Role Development, Education</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 1,500 Youths</td>
<td>33% Black, 67% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Whole City; To Be Replicated Statewide</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$116,953</td>
<td>100% HEW (ESEA Title IV-C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching for Responsible Behavior: Parent Valuing in the Family Workshops Santa Ana, California</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Social Network, Education, Consistent Social Expectations</td>
<td>Inter-Actional</td>
<td>a) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>a) 4,000 Parents Trained Since 1971</td>
<td>2% Black, 11% Hispanic, 83% White, 2% Asian, 3% Other</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Home, School</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>100% Local Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends Savannah, Georgia</td>
<td>School, Peers</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Social Network, Role Development, Education</td>
<td>Individual, Inter-Actional</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 2,400 Youths</td>
<td>52% Black, 48% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>100% Local School Dist. (Budget represents cost of materials; staff recruitment is from existing faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Youth Action Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Community, Work</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Power Enhancement, Role Development, Education, Economic Resources</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) Incomplete Information</td>
<td>a) 2,800 Youths</td>
<td>90% Black, 3% White, 2% Asian, 5% Other</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Work Sites, Non-Residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td>$371,000</td>
<td>10% Public Contributions, 25% United Way, 50% Private Foundations, 15% Corp. Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREVENTION PROGRAM</td>
<td>SYSTEM OF INTERVENTION</td>
<td>PREVENTION LEVEL</td>
<td>PREVENTION STRATEGIES</td>
<td>LEVEL OF INTERVENTION</td>
<td>a) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>a) NUMBER SERVED</td>
<td>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT IMPACT</td>
<td>b) SERVICE RECIPIENT ETHNICITY</td>
<td>SERVICE LOC./ JON</td>
<td>CATCHMENT AREA SIZE</td>
<td>SERVICE SETTING</td>
<td>ANNUAL BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN STATES YOUTH AND FAMILY INSTITUTE Salt Lake City, Utah (p. 131)</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>Social Network, Power Enhancement, Education</td>
<td>Individual, Inter-actional</td>
<td>a) Positive</td>
<td>a) 150 Youths</td>
<td>15% Hispanic 5% Native American 80% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Non-residential Social Service Agency</td>
<td>Fee for service based on hourly rate; rate varies for different therapists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIGHT BROTHERS CAREER HIGH SCHOOL San Diego, California (p. 135)</td>
<td>School, Work</td>
<td>Primary Prevention</td>
<td>Role Development, Education, Economic Resources</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 300 Youths</td>
<td>16% Black 2% Asian 1% Native American 16% Hispanic 67% White</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Whole City</td>
<td>School, Work Sites</td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUTH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT Waterville, Maine (p. 139)</td>
<td>Community, School, Work</td>
<td>Primary Prevention, Diversion</td>
<td>Power &quot;enhancement, Role Development</td>
<td>Individual, Institutional</td>
<td>a) Promising</td>
<td>a) 2,000 Youths</td>
<td>100% White</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Multiple Towns Within State</td>
<td>Community Settings, School, Work Sites, Non-residential Social Service Agencies</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* KEY TO BUDGET SOURCES:

- CETA = Comprehensive Employment and Training Act - Department of Labor Funds.
- HEW = Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Funds.
- LEAA = Law Enforcement Assistance Administration - Department of Justice Funds.
THE PREVENTION PROGRAM MODELS

ALTERNATE LEARNING PROJECT

Providence, Rhode Island

Strategies: Education, Power Enhancement, Role Development

CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM: The program does not specify causes of delinquency. (Experiences of failure or dissatisfaction in traditional schools may cause youths to commit delinquent acts.)

Program Rationale: (Disaffected students provided with a supportive environment in which they can learn and experience success are likely to form strong, positive attachments to their school and are less likely to commit delinquent acts.)

Target Population: One hundred fifty students in grades 9 through 12 from schools in the city of Providence form the student body. Applicants to the school are selected by a lottery with consideration given to race, family income, sex, and grade level reflecting the city's demographic profile. Currently, the school is 30 percent black, 5 percent Hispanic, and 65 percent white. The student body is evenly distributed between males and females.

Program Description: The Alternate Learning Project (ALP), an alternative public school in the Providence school system, provides students with a highly individualized and exploratory education program in which attainment of basic skills is emphasized. The school's low student-teacher (adult) ratio, currently about 16:1, allows for a high degree of flexibility.

Students at ALP are offered a full range of traditional academic courses in addition to fine arts coursework, career placements, special projects and tutorials. They may also explore courses at institutions outside the school, such as Rhode Island College, Brown University, and the Rhode Island School of Design. Through a site placement program, students also have the opportunity to obtain work experience in vocational areas of their choice. Responsibility for structuring a student's program is primarily the student's.

Graduation from ALP requires: 1) an ALP Life Skills Competency Assessment, which is an evaluation of individual student competencies in practical, real life situations; and 2) an ALP Core Diploma. Students must pass proficiency exams in English, math, and science, earn credit in U.S. history, and complete a minimum number of other courses and educational activities for the diploma.

Students, parents, and staff are involved in school policymaking. The present form of government consists of committees which make recommendations to the school director. Decisions may be reversed by an ad hoc meeting of the school community. Membership on committees is voluntary but must include parents, students, and staff. Committee responsibilities include curriculum, budget, staff review, graduation review, discipline, communication, and coordination.
In addition to its academic offerings, ALP is concerned with the affective development of students and provides a Family Life Peer Counseling Service and a Child Care Center.

Implementation Requirements: Students, educators, and parents implemented ALP in 1972 to provide students, disaffected with the traditional school system, an alternative learning environment. Implementing an alternative school like ALP requires cooperation with the school district and a separate facility. ALP offers a wide range of courses (an evaluation report indicates students were involved in 88 different courses during one quarter at the school) through the use of volunteers and arrangements with other educational institutions in the Providence area. Currently, the school employs ten teaching professionals and four part-time support staff.

Budget: ALP's annual budget is $350,000: Fifteen percent is from the state government; 70 percent from the local school district; 10 percent from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW); and 5 percent from the Department of Labor (CETA funds).

Implementing Agency: ALP has received a U.S. Office of Education grant to disseminate information about the school and to develop a training format for those interested in adoption of the ALP model. Technical assistance is available free of charge to local school districts. For more information contact: Mr. Paul Gounaris, Coordinator of Alternative Programs, Alternate Learning Project, Dissemination Services, 321 Eddy Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903.

Effectiveness: Summary external evaluations of ALP have shown that the project has greatly reduced absenteeism and dropout rates. Fifty-five percent of ALP students have gone on to four-year colleges; many of these students traditionally would not have pursued further education. Other measures have shown improved attitudes toward self and schooling (reported in Educational Programs that Work, U.S. Office of Education, 1977).

Comments:

1. ALP appears to provide youths disaffected with the traditional school system with an educational environment in which they can experience success. The program should be evaluated to assess its delinquency potential.

2. ALP's program requires a great deal of self-motivation from students. Although some students may flourish in such a self-directed, supportive environment, others may need a more structured program. Applied behavioral methods have been used to help such students learn and improve behavior. See Project Success Environment (Rollins et al., 1974) in which teachers from 16 inner city Atlanta public schools were trained in methods of reinforcing positive classroom behavior resulting in significant increases in student academic achievement.

3. ALP appears to combine a number of factors important to providing student success experiences and to curtailing problem behavior in school. These factors include individualized instruction; a goal-oriented classroom
environment focused on work and learning; a small student population; a low student-adult ratio; and caring, competent teachers. It also includes student and parent involvement in school decision-making, a factor which may have prevention potential.

Research has indicated that failure in school is closely related to delinquent behavior. If alternative schools can provide disaffected youths with successful experiences, they may be effective as prevention interventions. For a detailed discussion of alternative education and its delinquency prevention implications, see "Alternative Education: Exploring the Delinquency Prevention Potential" (Hawkins and Wall, 1980).
BERKELEY YOUTH ALTERNATIVES

Berkeley, California

Strategies: Psychological/Mental Health, Power Enhancement, Role Development

Causes of the Problem: Society's "problem" youths are assigned to the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. However, this overburdened institution is ill-equipped to deal with the social conditions which engender youths' problems. These conditions include an inadequate and inappropriate educational system, lack of employment opportunities, and few recreational resources and facilities. Youths are likely to commit delinquent acts in the absence of these resources.

Program Rationale: By providing constructive services for youths and their families who find themselves alienated from traditional institutions, the agency strives to help people make choices about their lives. People who can make choices can better maintain their autonomy and individuality, and are more in control of what happens to them. Youths who are in control of their lives are less likely to commit delinquent acts.

Target Population: The project serves Berkeley and Alameda County young people, through the age of 17, who have family, legal, or personal problems. About 418 people (288 youths and 130 parents) are served annually. Thirty-nine percent of the client population are black, 3 percent Asian, 1 percent Native American, 7 percent Hispanic, 48 percent white, and 2 percent other racial groups. Fifty-one percent of those served are male.

Program Description: BYA has four major components: the Crisis Center, the Foster Home, Legal Services, and the Berkeley Youth Recycling Center.

The Crisis Center is the initial contact point for youths and their families who seek assistance and/or are referred to BYA. The Center is open 45 hours per week and has a 24-hour hotline telephone emergency service. Primary services are crisis intervention for youths and families who drop in or are referred by schools, police, probation, or other agencies. The goals of the Center are to assist youths in resolving problems and, where possible, to return youths to their families. Support services include legal consultation, transportation, temporary shelter care, food and clothing, advocacy, and referrals to other community services.

The Foster Placement Program operates on a 40-hour week schedule. Its goal is to provide youths with temporary housing until they can be reunited with their families. Short-term placements last one night to several weeks. Long-term foster care arrangements are made if a youth cannot return home. Efforts are made to prepare young people to meet their social, emotional, academic, and financial responsibilities.

The Legal Advocacy Program provides advocacy for pre-hearing release from incarceration, transportation, housing, referral, and recommendations to the court for dispositional alternatives. The BYA attorney provides legal
consultation to program coordinators, as well as to youths and their families. Consultation is also provided for young people and their families regarding the legal issues involved in emancipation, support, medical care, and other daily concerns. The BYA attorney has written a Youth Law Handbook describing youths' rights and responsibilities under the law.

The Berkeley Youth Recycling Center provides youths from low income and Third World communities with employment, career counseling, and education assistance. Operated under a Youth Employment Grant from the Department of Labor, the project is a youth-run business which employs 24 youths in 3 sites established for the delivery of recyclable goods. The Center trains youths in the skills required to operate a small enterprise -- i.e., financial, program development, staff management, and the specialized skills required to run a recycling plant.

In addition to these four components, BYA offers recreational activities and art classes for clients and community youths.

**Implementation Requirements:** As a Youth Service Bureau, BYA stresses youths' rights to self-determination through knowledge acquisition; the program emphasizes "service to youths, not control of youths." The agency Board of Directors includes 25 percent youth membership, most of whom are previous BYA clients. The agency also relies heavily on 20 volunteers to meet its goals. The agency staff includes 9 professionals, 4 paraprofessionals, and 2 support staff.

**Budget:** BYA's budget is $375,000. LEAA contributes 10 percent; the local government 38 percent; the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) 20 percent; and the Department of Labor (CETA Funds) 32 percent.

**Implementing Agency:** Contact: Mr. Ed Clarke, Executive Director, Berkeley Youth Alternatives, 2141 Bonar, Berkeley, California 94702.

**Effectiveness:** The program has been evaluated with regard to achievement of its service objectives. The findings were favorable. Highlighted services included the agency's Foster Placement component, the publication of its Youth Law Handbook, its management and research capabilities, its involvement of youths in agency policy decisionmaking, and the organization's approach to providing comprehensive services to youths. The program's volunteer training was cited as being insufficient to meet trainees' needs.

**Comments:**

1. BYA is distinguished as a Youth Service Bureau by its Recycling Program and its philosophical emphasis on individual autonomy and self-determination through knowledge development.

2. The program should be evaluated to assess its impact on delinquency. Although the agency may effectively provide services, it is not clear how those services affect the agency's client population.
3. The agency's recycling service is an example of a community-based economic development project which youths operate. A limitation of this approach is the number of youths who can be provided such a non-traditional employment opportunity. BYA's project employs 24 youths. Thus, while it may provide a positive work experience for those youths who participate, it does not significantly affect the local labor market. This type of employment project probably has greatest potential as a secondary or corrective approach to delinquency prevention for identified high risk youths who are not committed to more traditional roles. It is doubtful that community economic development activities employing youths, such as recycling, housing rehabilitation, or food distribution projects, can employ sufficient numbers of youths in roles which meet the criteria of the role development strategy (see Appendix B) to be viable for primary preclusive delinquency prevention.
Strategies: Social Network, Criminal Influence Reduction, Power Enhancement, Role Development, Activities/Recreation

Causes of the Problem: Delinquency results from the disorganization of the larger community and the transmission of delinquency-producing values that such disorganization produces. Youths perceive their parents as unable to control their own lives and unable to impose sanctions on people who threaten their well-being. The evidence of this inability to control one's own life persuades youths that the "cards are hopelessly stacked against them and that fate...will not permit them to 'make it' in any legitimate form" (Silberman, 1978), thereby encouraging crime as an alternative.

Program Rationale: The most effective way to change juvenile behavior is to change adult behavior -- and the most effective way to change adult behavior is to create a structure that enables people to assume roles that require responsibility in and to their own community. When parents are able to exert influence in legitimate ways over the factors that control their lives, youths are socialized to believe they can also have such power and will be less inclined to pursue criminal careers.

Target Population: The program serves La Playa, an impoverished section of Playa Ponce, Puerto Rico's second largest city. La Playa's population is 17,000. The agency serves about 4,500 people directly, and 10,000 indirectly. Sixty percent of those served are male.

Program Description: Narrowly defined, "El Centro" is a Youth Service Bureau which diverts youths from the juvenile court. However, the agency seeks a more vital role in the community through helping residents in ways that reduce dependency and enhance dignity and self-respect.

The central vehicle for organizing the community is a corps of ten full-time paid "advocates" who have been trained to protect, represent, and help youngsters in trouble with the law, other governmental agencies, or the community itself. Some of the advocates are ex-addicts or ex-offenders, all are selected for their knowledge of the community and their leadership potential. Each is assigned to specific neighborhoods or "barrios" in La Playa. The advocates do not limit themselves to youths in trouble. They work with all youths and their families and are mediators between the Center and the community, linking people with problems to those able to provide help.

An example of the advocate's work involved a confrontation between the youths and adults in Barrio Palmita. Youths complained they had nothing to do; adults were annoyed by the youths' raucous behavior. The advocates organized a public meeting at which both adults and youths agreed that a basketball court might solve their problems. Rather than have the Palmita residents rely on them to obtain money for the court, the advocates asked the residents to devise ways to raise the money themselves. Although initially considering the proposal
outlandish, the community sponsored a steel drum band show, a radio marathon, a "friendship lunch" campaign in which La Playa housewives cooked meals for nearby factory workers, and other activities. Residents raised $700 by the end of summer and then approached a nearby tuna packing plant for a matching sum of money and the City Parks and Recreation Department for the labor. The basketball court was built.

Using this approach, the advocates have helped La Playa residents solve their own problems with a sense of competence and responsibility. Other efforts have led to a job training center, a drug prevention program, and the development of a community health center that serves about 13,000 families and has an operating budget of $1.4 million annually.

Implementation Requirements: The program operates under the auspices of the Dispensario San Antonio, Inc., a small health clinic started in 1950 by the Catholic Missionary Sisters of the Most Blessed Trinity which has since developed into the health center mentioned above. Integral to the program's achievements are the strong ties between community and the advocates. Altogether, El Centro, the health center, and other organizations developed by the agency employ 25 professionals, 40 paraprofessionals, 5 support staff, and 35 volunteers. Twenty youths are also on the staff.

Budget: Program budget for the Dispensario is $350,000. Twenty percent comes from the Puerto Rican LEAA planning agency; 29 percent from the state government; 20 percent from corporate funds; 15 percent from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) Bureau of Handicapped; 2 percent from the local government; 1 percent from public contributions; and 13 percent from other sources.


Effectiveness: In Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice, Charles E. Silberman (1978) reports the goal to divert juveniles from the court has been achieved; "the number of adjudicated delinquents has been reduced by about 85 percent since 1970." La Playa policemen have recognized the agency's utility and divert most youths (except those who have committed particularly serious offenses) to the advocates. "In 1976, delinquency proceedings were filed against only 20 youngsters, compared to 144 in the year the program began." However, Silberman emphasizes the program is much more than a diversion project and that an evaluation of the agency should take into account the changes that have been wrought in the community's self-respect and sense of responsibility and competence.

Comments:

1. Although programs like El Centro have been in operation for many years, it is not clear that they are successful in curtailing delinquency. This program appears to have made substantial changes in the physical and emotional lives of the La Playa community. The community organization
approach appears to be successful in accomplishing community development goals. The program, however, should be evaluated rigorously to assess its impact on delinquency.

2. The El Centro program, and others like it, are based on the seminal work of Clifford R. Shaw and the Chicago Area Project. Writing about the project, Anthony Sorentino (1959) has suggested a number of problems inherent in the model. Those who would replicate the program should be aware of some counteracting factors:

(a) An aspect of life in low income neighborhoods is the diversity of various competing groups. Conflicts between "political parties, factions, national or provincial groups, gangs, religious, ethnic and racial groups interfere with collective action."

(b) High transiency rates amongst the population, as well as displacement due to public improvements and urban reinvestment, can destroy old neighborhoods, thereby undermining organizational activities.

(c) A critic of this approach, French anthropologist Jean Monod (1967), notes a "uniformization" of youth culture brought on by the American mass media. The advances made in communications and transportation technology have created an identity among youths themselves, creating a "youth culture" divorced from traditional influences and unlikely to respond to traditional local community cultural values and institutions.
Strategies: Education, Social Network

Causes of the Problem: If a child's early developmental needs are not met, he or she may be burdened by emotional, intellectual, social, and/or physical problems later in life. (These problems may lead to delinquency.)

Program Rationale: Schools should be designed to do more than teach students to read with comprehension, write legibly, and compute accurately. They also must help children know themselves and their environments in a positive way. To help children assume six roles in life -- learner, individual, producer, citizen, consumer, and family member -- schools must stress affective and cognitive development on an equal basis. By working to develop the whole child at an early age (i.e., elementary school years, K-6), the Child Development Specialist can prevent problems from developing later in life.

Target Population: The program targets elementary school-age students in kindergarten through sixth grades in 55 school sites throughout the State of Oregon. Over 20,000 youths are served annually. Ethnic and sex percentage breakdowns are not available.

Program Description: Working as a member of a school district staff and usually assigned to one school, the Child Development Specialist (CDS) acts in five capacities:

1. As a resource to students, the CDS designs and/or coordinates programs and strategies to assist children to reach optimum growth and development evidenced by successful functioning in a variety of social interactional systems -- family, peer group, classroom and school, neighborhood, and community. Activities include assessments of the child's physical, social, and cognitive development through the use of a number of standardized tests. Interventions include individual counseling and home visits; referrals to physicians, dentists, other practitioners, and agencies outside the school; and small group processes, such as role playing, puppetry, and the "Sharing Circle."

2. As a resource to the school staff, the CDS provides in-service training and support services. Interventions with school staff include communication skills training; small group process facilitation techniques; teacher effectiveness training; seminars that relate teacher-value systems to those of the children in the program; training in classroom management techniques; use of testing and assessment instruments and instructional kits; and management and record keeping skills.

3. As a resource to parents, the CDS seeks to involve parents in the program through advisory committee membership and participation in conferences and workshops. These workshops are designed to help parents understand the program and develop the skills they need to become more effective parents. Sites have implemented parent-component programs in different
ways. Salem and Roseburg held a number of coffee sessions in various homes to introduce parents to the program. Hermiston organized a six-session class for parents on child rearing practices and parent-child communication. Parents have also been trained to help in the projects. Portland parents were trained to visit families of kindergarten children. Other activities include Parent-CDS-teacher conferences, home visits, and publications of newsletters and other informative materials.

4. As liaisons between the community, the school, and the individual and his or her family, the CDS develops an awareness of available community resources and refers children to appropriate agencies if indicated. The CDS orients the community to the intent of the program, involves the community through the development of an advisory committee, provides coordination of resources for children in the school, and provides staff conferences with community agencies on the problems of specific children.

5. As coordinator of the project, the CDS is responsible for maintaining an adequate record keeping system which includes the collection of data and assessment of project progress. In this capacity, the CDS is also responsible for establishing agendas, conducting project planning meetings, and working effectively with the local committees.

Implementation Requirements: The enactment of House Bill 2455 in 1973 by the Oregon Legislative Assembly created the Child Development Specialist Program. Oregon Revised Statute (ORS 343.145) gave the State Board of Education the authority to implement CDS programs and provided for partial state reimbursements for costs of the program. As a requirement of the legislation, specific performance competencies for the Child Development Specialist have been developed. The guidelines are used to monitor the effectiveness of the CDS in meeting the expectations of the five capacities outlined above. They also serve as a basis for pre-service and in-service staff training. The program employs 55 specialists and 40 paraprofessional staff assistants. Volunteers and local advisory committees are used extensively in all sites.

Budget: Child Development Specialist Programs for the 1979-1981 biennium are funded at $667,730. These monies will be utilized to provide financial assistance to the 55 programs during the biennium. The amount of financial aid will vary from limited assistance to 50 percent of total program costs.

Implementing Agency: The Child Development Specialist Program was initially implemented in nine pilot sites in Oregon: Kingston and Kenwood Elementary Schools in Bend; White City Elementary School in Eagle Point; Sunset Elementary School in Hermiston; Newby Elementary School in McMinnville; Sunnyhill Elementary School in North Bend; Whitman and Abernathy Elementary Schools in Portland; Fir Grove and Rose Elementary Schools in Roseburg; and Englewood Elementary School in Salem. To date, the program has been implemented in 55 schools in 11 school districts. Limited new program development has been projected for the 1979-81 biennium due to budgetary constraints.
Contact: Mr. Claude Morgan, Specialist, Child Development Services, Oregon Department of Education, 700 Pringle Parkway S.E., Salem, Oregon 97310.

Effectiveness: The City of Portland, Oregon, in conjunction with the Portland Public School District, is currently conducting a longitudinal study of the CDS program's effect on academic achievement, affective development and self-esteem, school behavior, and officially recorded juvenile delinquency. Nine elementary or primary schools in Area II of the district are providing experimental (N = 374) and comparison (N = 364) group students. Subjects for the treatment group are those who started kindergarten in 1978. Comparison group students are those who started in the fifth grade in 1978 in the same schools as the treatment subjects. The evaluators acknowledge that the failure to control historical factors could influence results using this methodology though it was considered the best alternative available. Matching comparison schools along demographic, socioeconomic, achievement, and other variables was not feasible due to the unique features of Area II. Therefore, children receiving CDS services and pre-CDS students in the same school were selected for study to yield a closer match in socioeconomic backgrounds, school demographics, and the general school program (teaching policies, curriculum, etc.). Random assignment within school was not used.

Early findings after year one of the four-year study are very tentative but favorable. The program has been implemented successfully and has gained the support of parents and teachers. Teachers, parents, and specialists have indicated the program is having a positive effect on youths' self-concepts and social development and that the program is having a positive impact on classroom behaviors, such as cooperation, participation, and an interest in learning. The program appears most beneficial to those students who are receiving individualized educational activities (IEA's). However, as noted in the evaluation, the information provided in this first report is tentative. Future data will provide a more comprehensive and accurate picture of results.

Comments:

1. Currently, measurement of program effects is based on adult perceptions of changes in children's behaviors. Use of such measures involves great potential for substantial measurement error produced by prior expectancies of the impact of the program.

2. Even if one could have confidence in parent/teacher/administrator reports of gains in self-concept, cooperation, participation, and the like, the evaluation design does not allow for an adequate assessment of what has produced the effect. The effects of age and treatment are confounded in this study. They prevent a determination of the individual effects of each. An equally plausible explanation for the observed differences is that rapid socialization occurs during the first year of school and that it slows down in later years.

3. The orientation of the CDS program is both remedial and preventive in nature. By working with classrooms as a whole and providing individual assessments of all students, the program may avoid labeling problems
which can occur through treatment focused solely on problem individuals. However, those children who are experiencing developmental difficulties still receive the attention (and the referrals to resources) they need.

4. During the pilot phase (1973-77), the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory provided the external evaluation for all pilot sites. This process data indicated a positive impact of CDS on the total educational community.
COMMUNITY CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAM
Seattle, Washington

Strategies: Social Network, Deterrence

Causes of the Problem: Many residential burglaries are crimes of opportunity, committed by juveniles who gain entry through unlocked doors and windows during the day when the residents are away. The sheer volume of burglaries, the lack of witnesses, and the ease of committing thefts make detection and apprehension of burglars difficult.

Program Rationale: "The first thing to understand is that the public peace...is not kept primarily by the police, necessary as the police are. It is kept primarily by an intricate, almost unconscious, network of voluntary controls and standards among the people themselves and enforced by the people themselves..." (Jacobs, 1961). By informing citizens about how to make their homes and neighborhoods more secure, citizen action can be mobilized to prevent burglaries. If a crime is committed, prompt and complete citizen reporting will increase the chance of a burglar's apprehension.

Target Population: Prior to the program's implementation in 1974, the Seattle Law and Justice Planning Office (LJPO) identified neighborhoods which were most vulnerable to burglaries using demographic, criminal incidence, and physical characteristic statistics. Neighborhoods with many low income, single family, or duplex dwellings were selected as target areas for the project. Such areas were selected because research showed that single family and duplex units had higher rates of burglary victimization than other types of housing. Currently, the project is being disseminated in other areas of the city.

Program Description: A geographic area is first selected by the Community Crime Prevention Program (CCPP) staff. Discussions are held with residents, local leaders of churches, community councils and clubs, and the police who work in that area to obtain initial support and cooperation. A "Community Profile," which includes detailed demographic and crime data obtained from city planning agencies, is drawn up as a base for subsequent action.

Next, all residents in both single-family and duplex dwellings in the target area receive an introductory letter explaining the volume of burglaries in the city and the services the program offers to reduce the chance of becoming a burglary victim.

This is followed with a personal contact by a CCPP representative. At this time, the interest of the individual citizen is determined and a host is solicited for a meeting with all neighbors on that particular block. The program's preventive concepts are transmitted to citizens through individual block meetings. The CCPP staff concentrates on four tactics to help people recognize their own vulnerability to burglary and learn how to decrease that risk through cooperative action. These tactics are described below:

1. To encourage citizens to protect their homes against relatively easy entry by burglars, CCPP provides residential security information. Using a home
security checklist and lock displays citizens are made aware of common problems with doors and windows. Simple remedies are provided during the meeting to aid individuals in making their own homes more secure. Questions regarding individual doors and windows are answered by a CCPP staff member during a home visit within a few weeks following the meeting.

2. To deter burglars, discourage fencing of property, and assist in returning property to owners, CCPP provides information and equipment for marking personal property. Each block is loaned an electric engraving pen which individual homeowners may borrow for one day. All owners are encouraged to engrave their property with their drivers license numbers. Once this has been completed, a CCPP staff member inspects at least one item to insure that the engraving was completed properly. All residents are encouraged to display decals that are provided warning potential burglars that property has been marked.

3. "To augment the 'range of vision' of traditional police preventive patrol, CCPP organizes neighborhood burglary prevention groups, familiarly known as Block Watches. A Block Watch typically consists of 10 to 15 families on a block who are willing to exchange information about their schedules and habits, watch each other's homes, and report suspicious activities to each other and to the police. CCPP considers the Block Watch the citizen's most important weapon against burglary.

4. "To promote citizen awareness of their role in reducing burglary rates, the program supplies informative materials about burglary and its prevention" (Cirel et al., 1977:5-6).

To keep close ties between the CCPP and the organized neighborhood, a "Block Watch Captain" is elected by the block to act as a liaison. The captain distributes the Block Watch newsletter to the block residents. Thus, she or he keeps community residents in communication with each other and provides new prevention information as it becomes available.

The program’s objective for each geographical area where service is provided is to involve at least 40 percent of all residents in all four tactics. Each individual CCPP community organizer is expected to involve this proportion of the residents in each area that he or she organizes.

Implementation Requirements: The CCPP recommends the consideration of the following demographic factors for those interested in project replication.

1. Victimization data reveal that there is no displacement of crime due to the project. (In other words, residential burglaries do not appear to increase in areas surrounding target areas where the program is implemented.) This finding suggests that burglars deterred by the program are those who capitalize on, rather than create, criminal opportunities. Thus, the program is likely to be most effective in areas where crimes of opportunity are most prevalent — generally, urban residential neighborhoods.
2. As discussed above, single family or duplex units are more easily organized than high density multi-family units.

3. Population density in the area should be relatively high since the value of the block watch is reduced in areas in which houses are isolated or set apart. Low density population areas, such as rural areas, will not benefit from this program. High income neighborhoods in suburban settings with low population density will also benefit little from the block watch component of the program. In these areas, an advisory model is recommended, enlisting interest through localized advertising and supplying equipment on request.

4. Implementation of the program is difficult in neighborhoods characterized by a high residential turnover or transiency.

5. Although programs should not exclude neighborhoods with a heterogeneous population (in terms of age, race, sex, and socioeconomic status), CCPP has found homogeneous neighborhoods are easier to organize due to a higher probability of uniform interests.

6. Competition with other methods of crime control, such as expensive security devices used in high income neighborhoods, may undermine program effectiveness if residents are reluctant to participate in neighborhood organizing activities.

Thirteen staff members run the project: a project director, one field supervisor, nine community organizers, and two administrative personnel. Successful operation of the project depends on close cooperation among the CCPP staff. CCPP staff members rely on the police statistics for advice in selection and organization of neighborhoods. At the request of neighbors, police officers are often invited to attend block watch meetings in the area that they patrol. The program is also active in the training of new police recruits about this operation.

Budget: The 1979 program budget was $431,172 obtained in full through the local government.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Mr. Mark Howard, Director, Community Crime Prevention Program, Seattle Police Department, Seattle, Washington 98104.

Effectiveness: In 1975, the Seattle LJPO interviewed 1,474 Seattle residents, including both participants and nonparticipants in the CCPP, to gather pre-project data on crime committed in 1974 (SEA-KING Study). This effort was followed the next year by a second wave of personal interviews with 1,216 Seattle residents to gather post-project data for 1975. The LJPO also conducted an independent telephone survey of another sample of participant (N = 1,970 residents) and nonparticipant households (N = 1,322 residents) to collect similar information (LJPO telephone study).

Project tracts were selected randomly rather than on the basis of high crime rates to control for the statistical phenomenon of a regression toward the mean.
Experimental and control residences (i.e., CCPP participants and nonparticipants) were drawn from the same census tract to ensure a close match between respondents. Adjacent census tracts were used as comparisons to assess the possible displacement of crime. No additional police activities took place in project areas to minimize possible distortions of an evaluation of program effectiveness.

Highlights from the project's evaluations indicate:

SEA-KING Study

1. Burglary Rates
   a. Within experimental tract, post-treatment burglary rates of the CCPP-treated homes and nontreated homes were virtually identical (6.18 percent vs. 6.9 percent, \( \chi^2 = .03, df = 1, p = .86 \)).
   b. A comparison of the post-treatment data for CCPP and non-CCPP residences within experimental tracts showed a statistically significant lower burglary rate for CCPP participants (2.43 percent vs. 9.65 percent, \( \chi^2 = 1.818, p = .03 \), one-tailed test). The reduction in burglary in CCPP residences was 61 percent (from 6.18 to 2.43).
   c. A marginally significant overall reduction in the burglary rate occurred within the experimental tracts when CCPP residences and non-CCPP residences were combined (6.34 percent in 1974 vs. 4.04 percent in 1975, \( \chi^2 = 3.24, df = 1, p = .07 \)).
   d. Within adjacent control tracts, pre-treatment burglary rates were higher than those in experimental tracts (10.43 percent vs. 6.43 percent, \( \chi^2 = 8.04, df = 1, p = .01 \)). However, control tract burglary rates were not significantly different between 1974 and 1975 (10.43 percent vs. 9.95 percent, \( p = .35 \)), indicating no displacement of residential burglaries to other neighborhoods as a result of the program.

2. Reporting Rates
   a. Reporting rates (proportion of residential burglaries reported to the police by victims) did not differ significantly between experimental
and control tracts in the pre-treatment period, or between 1974 and 1975 for control tracts. Reporting rates between 1974 and 1975 increased at a marginally significant level for experimental tracts (50.9 percent vs. 76.5 percent, p = .06).

b. Within experimental tracts, pre-treatment reporting rates differed significantly between CCPP participants and nonparticipants (68 percent vs. 40 percent, p = .05). A statistically valid comparison of post-treatment reporting rates for the CCPP and non-CCPP groups was not possible due to the small number of burglary cases. All of the six burglaries to CCPP residents were reported, however.

3. Burglary Displacement

a. Data from the SEA-KING survey do not support the hypothesis that deterred burglaries are displaced to non-CCPP residences. It might be expected that non-CCPP residences in the same census tract as CCPP residences would become the most likely target of displaced burglaries. These residences showed a 12 percent decline in burglary, however, (from 6.45 percent to 5.65 percent). Burglary rates in the adjacent census tracts also declined by 5 percent (from 10.43 percent to 9.95 percent). These data are not conclusive, but suggest that displacement is not occurring. These decreases compare to a 61 percent decline in burglary in treated residences.

LJPO Telephone Survey

1. Burglary Rates

a. LJPO survey data indicated a lower level of burglary for CCPP members (5 percent for 6 months) compared to non-CCPP members (6.1 percent), but this difference is not statistically significant:

b. When LJPO data were combined with SEA-KING post-treatment data, a significantly lower burglary rate was found for CCPP participants compared to non-CCPP residences (9.2 percent vs. 11.1 percent, p < .05, one-tailed test).
Unexpectedly, non-CCPP participants had a significantly higher reporting rate than CCPP members for the combined LJPO and SEA-KING survey data (83 percent vs. 72 percent, [(X^2) = 6.07, df = 1, p < .01]). These non-CCPP participants lived in CCPP treated census tracts and may have increased their burglary reporting due to their awareness of the project's activities. As was seen in the SEA-KING data, individuals in control census tracts have particularly low reporting rates (47 percent).

2. **Length of Time of Project Impact**

   a. LJPO survey data allow for an estimation of the duration of project effects, since various tracts surveyed had received services at different periods of time. Tracts served at periods of 14, 12, and 9 months prior to the survey showed significant differences between CCPP and non-CCPP residences with CCPP residences having lower burglary rates. Tracts served 17 and 18 months prior to the survey did not show a significant difference between CCPP and non-CCPP residences, and CCPP members were burglarized at a slightly higher rate than non-CCPP members (4.9 percent vs. 3.3 percent). Thus, the LJPO researcher concluded that project effects last from 12 to 18 months and stated that while not significant, (data) could possibly suggest that with the passage of time, CCPP members begin to become burglary-prone and that some sort of retreatment may be necessary. The researcher stresses that this is only a tentative suggestion (Cirei et al., 1977:49-54).

**Comments:**

The Seattle CCPP has been acknowledged by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice as one of 23 programs to have earned the Institute’s "Exemplary" label. These programs are noted for their overall effectiveness in reducing crime or improving criminal justice, adaptability to other jurisdictions, objective evidence of achievement, and demonstrated cost-effectiveness.

2. The Community Crime Prevention Program model makes crime more difficult to commit but does not address the motivation to commit crime in youths or in adults. However, the program does effectively increase the risk and decrease the opportunity for burglary through deterrence.
3. The effectiveness of the CCPP is enhanced by the moderate population density of the neighborhoods in which the program has been implemented. Blocks with higher density multi-family dwellings, from triplexes to large, elevator-serviced apartment buildings, encounter different problems in implementation, and may in fact be less appropriate for the program.

Ms. Karen Ekdahl, Community Planning Director for the Minnesota Crime Prevention Center, a similar "Block Watch" organizing effort, reports that it is difficult to organize apartment dwellers. In some inner city, high crime rate areas, block organizations may not work. More basic problems may need to be overcome before this form of crime prevention should be considered. Ms. Ekdahl reports it is important for people to have a sense of territoriality about their environment before they can be organized around the issue of crime.

4. The CCPP offers a vehicle for continued community education and organization. This education and organization can be crime-related as in Chicago's Senior Citizen Community Safety Program, which offers "prevention tip" lectures to seniors who have been organized around crime issues and runs an "inter-generational sensitivity" program which confronts youths with the problems of senior citizens. However, it can also be used to organize residents around other personal and public issues that affect their lives, such as housing, food, and energy cost problems.

5. The program's effect on other types of criminal activity beyond residential burglary has not been assessed. It would be interesting to discover if its deterrent effects could be generalized to other types of crime (such as theft or car theft).
COUNTRY ROADS
Montpelier, Vermont

Strategies: Psychological/Mental Health, Deterrence, Education, Consistent Social Expectations, Role Development.

Causes of the Problem: Youths run away from home for a variety of reasons. Among these are family interpersonal problems, such as emotional neglect, physical violence, and sexual abuse. Other causes, unrelated to the family, may involve problems with school or a lack of employment opportunities. Delinquency results from the inability of youths to cope with their life problems.

Program Rationale: By providing an emergency linkage between the needs of youths-in-crisis and the community, the project can help youths resolve their problems. Encouraging youths to make mature and responsible decisions can enable them to take control of their lives. Youths in control of their lives are less likely to commit delinquent acts.

Additionally, communities lack an awareness of the problems facing youths and of community roles in contributing to these problems. Country Roads emphasizes a more positive image of youth in the community. The assumption is that an aware community will use its resources to help its youthful population.

Target Population: The program is established to help runaway youths and other youths-in-crisis in rural Washington County, Vermont. Since the program began on September 9, 1976, it has provided emergency temporary shelter to 151 youths (62 men and 89 women). Forty youths spent from 1 to 7 days, 23 youths from 8 to 14 days, 15 youths from 15 to 21 days, and 73 youths more than 1 month at the shelter. The longest stay was 215 days (2 youths). The program serves predominantly white youths (99 percent); one hundred and forty-one of the youths were from Vermont, mostly from Washington County. The average age of Country Roads' clients is 16 with a range from 13 to 19. The total number of youths and families served since the program began, including the 151 provided shelter care, is 500. Through community education efforts the agency has reached over 2,000 people.

Program Description: The program provides crisis intervention and advocacy services for runaways and other youths-in-crisis. Youths referred to Country Roads are handled on a 24-hour basis. After their emergency food, clothing, legal, and/or medical needs are met, clients begin working on their problems. Each youth must contact his or her parents within 72 hours. A formal signed consent of the parent must be obtained by a Country Roads' Counselor to place the youth in temporary shelter care. The program has a well-developed and trained network of 30 community residents who have been trained as Temporary Shelter Parents and who are financially reimbursed ($5/night) to house young people. Although all counseling services are voluntary, youths are encouraged to make a commitment to some form of counseling, either individual, group, peer, or family. Roughly 80 percent of the families of youths provided shelter at Country Roads have participated in counseling at the program.
Since 1978, the program's second year of operation, it has endeavored to broaden its orientation from simply crisis intervention to primary prevention by including youth-advocacy and community education in its services. New program components include:

1. **Roadrunners**: The Roadrunners are high school or college-age volunteers who have been trained in crisis intervention and counseling techniques. They function as peer counselors and also organize recreational and educational programs for youths, provide them with information on drugs, sex, nutrition, health, etc., and assist in program planning.

2. **Parent's Support Group**: The parent's group provides an opportunity for parents to discuss their needs and concerns about their children with other parents.

3. **Temporary Shelter Parent's Group**: This group is a training and support group for individuals, families, and couples who provide temporary shelter. Group members receive training in communication skills and parenting techniques and information on the legal issues and responsibilities associated with their role as shelter parents. They also can contribute to future program planning and assessment by making recommendations.

4. **Special Aftercare Program**: This program helps youths gain self-reliance in solving practical life problems. It consists of a series of workshops and group meetings which cover finding an apartment, landlord-tenant problems and concerns, employment, personal budgeting, shopping, nutrition, buying an automobile, sexuality, birth control, and marriage. Local merchants, bankers, social workers, and other community resource people participate in the workshops.

5. **Young and Pregnant Women's Group**: The women's group offers support, counseling, information, and education to young pregnant women.

6. **Youth Employment Project**: The youth employment demonstration project seeks to place youths in jobs which provide them with meaningful roles and responsibilities. Two youths have prepared a feasibility study to assess the financial potential of a youth-run business. Six youths have been involved in the Roadrunners Program, participating as liaisons between the local school and the program and working in other components of the Washington County Youth Service Bureau. Another youth has been employed to work with the program's Youth Coordinator to disseminate a quarterly newsletter. Finally, a community service component has provided youths with positions in five other community agencies with an emphasis on youth, such as the local school district and the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth.

**Implementation Requirements**: Country Roads is one program component of the Washington County Youth Service Bureau. The program is staffed by a program director and two counselors, and utilizes the YSB's employment, recreation, education, and counseling services for its clients. The organization has a Board of Directors composed of representatives from schools and colleges, human service agencies, police and legal services, and parents.
Budget: Country Roads is funded at $46,500. Ninety percent of the funds are from the Youth Development Bureau of HEW, and 10 percent are "in-kind donations."

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Liz Rocklin, Program Director, Country Roads Runaway Program, P.O. Box 525, Montpelier, Vermont 05602.

Effectiveness: The program has been evaluated as 1 of 20 National Runaway Youth Programs. No evidence of the program's effectiveness in preventing delinquency is available. Process evaluative information indicated that the program was successful in meeting all of its service objectives -- i.e., the provision of crisis intervention, family strengthening, return-to-home placements, youth advocacy, and community education services. The evaluation, however, does not specifically describe long term outcomes of Country Roads' clients. In the short term, 58 of the 151 youths sheltered by Country Roads were returned to their homes, 31 became independent, 54 were placed in alternative living situations (group homes, adoption homes, foster care, etc.), 3 were institutionalized, 3 ran away from their placement shelter, and 2 were incarcerated in a juvenile institution (jail) upon leaving Country Roads.

Comments:

1. A major focus of the National Runaway Youth Programs Project, of which Country Roads was a part, was to reunite runaway youths with their families. The evaluation of the project, however, indicates that in many cases, a "runaway" move may be a positive and healthy decision for a youth. For these youths who have been abused by their parents or legal guardians, the appropriateness of a return to home is questionable. These considerations suggest a redefinition of successful "outcomes." Policy-makers should be aware of this issue.

2. The fact that many youths run away from home for good reasons indicates an increasing need for adequate aftercare services, either for temporary or long-term shelter care. The cost-factor for these services in some sites has been prohibitive. Country Roads' ability to develop a well-trained, short-term volunteer shelter care system is an important development in the area. The program's extensive use of para-professionals offers a model for other runaway services.

3. Country Roads appears to be unique in its successful implementation of local community education, outreach, family strengthening, and return-to-home placements.
Curriculum for Meeting Modern Problems/ The New Model Me
Lakewood, Ohio

Strategy: Education

Causes of the Problem: Behavior is the result of the convergence of a number of motivating forces or needs, the available resources, and one's immediate physical setting. Violent or aggressive behavior occurs when a person seeks to meet needs in a given situation by using behavior intended to harm some person or object. That behavior may result from 1) a lack of understanding about the human motivation underlying behavior; 2) a lack of knowledge of nonviolent ways to respond to a situation; 3) a lack of awareness of the effects of one's own behavior; or 4) a lack of problem-solving/decision-making skills to select less harmful behavior to achieve one's needs.

Program Rationale: Providing youths with cognitive skills in understanding the causes and effects of behavior and with affective skills to identify, select, and implement alternatives to violence will lead to a reduction of violent and aggressive behavior (including violent delinquent acts).

Target Population: The program targets all students in grades 1 through 12. The project staff of two trains educators to use The New Model Me curriculum offered through the U.S. Office of Education's National Diffusion Network. As of February 5, 1979, workshops offered by the project had trained 3,350 educators in 34 states, and 231 school districts in 29 states had made commitments to adopt the program. The project estimates that 50,000 students are introduced to the curriculum annually and approximately 900 educators are trained in workshops each year.

Program Description: The Curriculum for Meeting Modern Problems has three components:

1. Dealing With Causes of Behavior: The first component is designed for students in grades one through five. Six study units focusing on feelings, needs, actions, frustrations, anger, and harmful actions are provided for those in grades one through three. Eight study units focusing on behavior; fears and security; friendship, love, and belonging; self-worth; anger; aggressive behavior; behavior towards people and property; and making changes are provided for grades four and five. Designed for flexible adoption, the project encourages use of the curriculum in a noncompetitive atmosphere where performance is not graded.

2. Dealing With Aggressive Behavior: The second component is for middle and junior high school students. Study units are "A Profile of Behavior and Aggression," "Youth in Confrontation," "Vandalism," "Protest," and "Why Violence?" The curriculum is flexible and nondirective. A multimedia approach is used. Small group and whole group activities are included.

3. The New Model Me: The final component is for high school students. Units are "Behavior," "Controls," "Real-Self," "Values," "Response," and "Change." The curriculum can be an independent course of study or can be
integrated into existing courses. Individual and small group activities as well as multimedia approaches are included.

All curricula are for general student populations in urban and rural areas. Both cognitive and affective skills are targeted. Teachers’ manuals and student texts are provided.

Implementation Requirements: Although the program can be implemented by one teacher, the project recommends broader adoption to enable a group of school personnel (teachers, counselors, and administrators) to participate in in-service training in two-day workshops and in follow-up activities. No special equipment is required.

Budget: The project's budget is $43,885 (15 percent from local school districts and 85 percent from HEW). An estimate for the first year cost-per-student adoption of the high school curriculum is $6.00 based on a student population of 300. This includes cost of texts and in-service training. Continuation costs are minimal. Per student costs for primary and junior high curricula are considerably less. These cost estimates do not include regular teachers' salaries or school building space cost.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Mr. John R. Rowe, Curriculum for Meeting Modern Problems, Lakewood Board of Education, 1470 Warren Road, Lakewood, Ohio 44107.

Effectiveness: Evaluation data from diversified socioeconomic settings with control/experimental classrooms in 1972-73 showed significant student growth at the .05 level in a cognitive test (project developed) and in an attitude measure (Personal Orientation Inventory). Teacher growth was shown using the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Analyses of student/teacher feedback forms indicated strong support of the curriculum.

No data regarding the effects of the curriculum on students' behaviors or on delinquency has been provided.

Comments:

1. The project approach focuses largely on the individual student's responsibility for finding acceptable, nonviolent responses for meeting needs in his or her environment. It does not focus on changing institutional factors in schools such as governance, educational quality, and disciplinary procedures which may themselves contribute to aggressive behavior by students. In spite of the project's recognition of environmental factors in causing behavior, the prevention approach seeks to encourage youths to abandon aggressive behavior rather than to change environmental factors which may stimulate such behavior.

2. The project's focus on the general population of youths in a school or class, rather than on only high risk, pre-delinquent, or disruptive students, has merit. It avoids stigmatization and labeling of "troubleshooters" and transmits a message that everyone needs to find nonharmful ways to meet needs and respond to environmental conditions. However, the voluntary
nature of the selection process may result in the recruitment of students who are not particularly prone to aggressive acts in the first place.

3. The project literature notes that it is vital that teachers understand their role as being nonjudgmental and nondirective. When teachers do not have this basic orientation to teaching, a two-day training workshop prior to curriculum adoption may not be sufficient to generate such a teaching philosophy. The effectiveness of the curriculum may be limited if teachers do not approach teaching with this philosophy. It is important to note that reported project effectiveness results are based on 1972-73 implementation in schools where project involvement in training and technical assistance was considerably greater than a two-day workshop. In summary, there may be a trade-off between low cost implementation of the curriculum as currently disseminated and curriculum effectiveness.

4. The project does not focus on securing parent support or involvement. There is a risk that in some communities the study units could be viewed as a threatening intrusion of schools into the family's area of responsibility unless parents are oriented to the program and their support for it is secured. Parent involvement in curriculum implementation and the inclusion of parent-focused materials in the curriculum might enhance the project's effectiveness in minimizing aggressive and violent behavior in youths.

5. Ultimately, the project seeks to reduce violent and aggressive behavior by youths. Though the project has been operating for ten years and is being widely disseminated, its impact on behavior has not yet been assessed. Evaluation of the effectiveness of this approach in actually preventing delinquency, aggressiveness, and violent behavior by youths is needed.
EXPERIENCE BASED CAREER EDUCATION
Portland, Oregon

Strategies: Education, Role Development

Causes of the Problem: Youths have inadequate opportunities to develop vocational expectations and aspirations prior to job market entry. Additionally, a substantial portion of the youths seeking employment upon leaving high school are unskilled in the basics of job seeking, interviewing, and job protocol. (Students without clear vocational interests, job seeking and holding skills, or commitments to occupational futures may be likely to become involved in delinquent activities.)

Program Rationale: When academic coursework and career experiences are combined in school, students develop greater awareness of career options and clarify occupational aspirations while completing school. Additionally, positive contributory roles in work placements can encourage attachment to school and commitment to educational pursuits to achieve career goals. Finally, skills learned and contacts made can increase students' opportunities for job market placement. (Achieving any of these conditions should decrease the likelihood of delinquent behavior.)

Target Population: The program serves interested high school students, generally juniors and seniors, in a number of sites across the country. Five thousand students are enrolled in various programs which range in size from 20 to over 300 students. Although the program was initially designed and tested in Tigard, Oregon, it is now operating with various special populations, such as low income, talented, and gifted migrant and Native American youths. The program has also been expanded to serve junior high students in some communities.

Program Description: Experience Based Career Education (EBCE) is an individualized, career-oriented, community-based education model. Students gain both work experience and academic credit as they explore job sites and complete individually prescribed and job/career-related learning activities. Students participate for up to two years and complete their academic requirements through exposure to a wide variety of career opportunities. Teachers act as managers or coordinators of student learning and help students select community business, industrial, labor, cultural, professional, or public sector work places as their primary placement sites. Students spend part of the school day in school and part at their chosen site. They may explore up to 15 field sites during an academic year.

By completing a program that includes life skills, survival skills, basic skills, and career development, a student can satisfy the requirements for a traditional high school diploma. "Life Skills" organizes learning around the attitudes, information, and techniques needed in adulthood. "Survival Skills" include learning about credit, insurance, income taxes, the electoral process, real estate, family responsibilities, and budgeting. The "Basic Skills" component focuses on the acquisition of reading, mathematics, writing, listening, and communication skills essential to performing tasks and functions students encounter in the program and in adulthood. "Career Development" consists of actual job experience as well as career counseling and awareness. Students
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spend from 15 to 20 hours weekly exploring career options and working on individual goals in the other content areas. After the exploration phase they may choose to continue at a particular site for an in-depth learning experience or a skill-building internship of from three to six weeks.

Students are held accountable for their experiences through learning contracts negotiated with staff. Agreements are made regarding the topic of a project, the kinds of activities to be performed, the resources that can be used, and the evaluation criteria by which student performance can be judged. They must earn competency certification in a set of "Life Skills" identified by a community advisory group as important for adult survival. Students also maintain journals which they use to reflect on their experiences and to make connections between their learning activities and other aspects of their personal lives.

Implementation Requirements: EBCE is a flexible model that has been implemented as an off-campus program separate from the traditional school as well as an in-school supplement to the traditional curriculum. The central characteristics of the model include: (a) the use of community work sites as the locus for student learning experiences; (b) an individually-focused curriculum based on students' career and academic needs; (c) integration of academic learning with career learning; and (d) preparation of both college-oriented and vocationally-oriented youths with the skills to make adult choices and to assume adult responsibilities.

Adoption and/or adaptation of the model is facilitated through approximately eight days of in-service introduction and training for teachers and administrators. Interested school districts are involved in a three-day workshop for planning and information dissemination. If the district decides to adopt the program, a training seminar of approximately five days is scheduled. The methods and schedules for this training are designed to be flexible to meet the needs of the staff developing the program in a district.

Budget: Cost per adopter site is equivalent (approximately) to the average secondary school per-pupil cost.

Implementing Agency: Begun in 1971 by the National Institute of Education, EBCE has been developed and implemented through four regional educational laboratories: Appalachian Educational Laboratory, Charleston, West Virginia; Far West Laboratory for Research and Development, San Francisco, California; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon; and Research for Better Schools, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. For information regarding the model discussed above, contact: Dr. Larry McClure, Program Director, Education and Work, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL), 710 S.W. 2nd Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204.

Effectiveness: NWREL reports that the EBCE program has been extensively evaluated over a six-year period by NWREL itself, independent third party evaluators in local districts, and by a team of evaluators from the Educational Testing Service. Multiple evaluation strategies have been used including comparative pre- and post-testing within an experimental design; student case studies; follow-up studies of EBCE and control group graduates; ethnographic
studies; survey questionnaires; and a panel review by national experts from education, labor, and industry. EBCE has been reviewed and approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel in Washington, D.C. made up of representatives of the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education.

In a September 1975 evaluation prepared by the NWREL, EBCE Evaluation Unit (Owens, Haenn, Fehrenbacher, 1975), the Tigard High School site was studied using an experimental design. Thirty-one juniors and seniors were randomly assigned to Tigard's EBCE program and 44 juniors and seniors were randomly assigned to the control group. Unfortunately, "seventeen of these students dropped out of school prior to pretesting and two more were not available for testing, leaving a pretested control group of twenty-five students." Of these 25, only 12 were available for post-testing. Of the experimental group students, 30 were available for the post-test. It was hypothesized by the evaluators that experimental students would score as well as control students on measures of Basic Skills but would score better than control students on measures of Life Skills and Career Development Skills.

On the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, no statistically significant differences were found in the gains made by the EBCE group and the control group in reading, arithmetic, or study skills. On the Life Skills measurements, The (EBCE) students appear to have become less idealistic in their concept of work and more critical in self-assessment of their own personal work habits than the control group. No significant differences were found between the (EBCE) and control group students on self-reported measures of individual or social adequacy, nor on ability to match their career preferences with personal interests and abilities. Over 80 percent of the students in both groups indicated career preferences congruent with their personal attributes.

On other areas comparing the performance of (EBCE) and control group students the (EBCE) students scored significantly higher in: (a) knowledge of information related to the world of work, (b) self-confidence in the ability to complete the necessary steps for entering a career of their choice, (c) use of public resources, especially public libraries, (d) number of public meetings attended, and (e) perceived overall effectiveness of their educational experience during the year.

No significant differences between the (EBCE) and control group students were found in: (a) level of career choices; (b) amount of post-secondary education planned, (c) proportion of jobs listed that students had ruled out as career choices during the year, (d) sources of information used in decisions to eliminate potential careers and (e) attitude toward the concepts of "me," "school," "adults," "learning," "community resources" and "decision making" (Owens, Haenn, and Fehrenbacher, 1975:2).
Assessing the experimental group students themselves, statistically significant growth was recorded in:

(a) reading comprehension; (b) arithmetic concepts and applications; (c) attitudes toward the concepts of "me," "community resources," "adults," "learning" and "school"; (d) attitudes of trust and openness to change; and (e) "capability to apply learned behaviors and to assume responsibility," "understanding another person's messages and feelings," and "conversation with an adult that reveals self-confidence" as rated by (EBCE) staff (Owens, Haenn, and Fehrenbacher, 1975:3).

Experimental students also reported that the two greatest strengths of the program were its opportunities for "hands-on" learning and the program's "empathetic and helpful staff." Weaknesses included difficulties or inconveniences encountered in locating desired employer sites, problems with transportation arrangements, and "too much work." (Owens, Haenn, and Fehrenbacher, 1975:3).

Comments:

1. The program provides a transition between the school and work world by linking academic curricula with the work experience. As a result, youths are more prepared to take on the responsibility of adult employment roles as well as to qualify for and find jobs in areas which are of interest to them. In addition, they begin to see the significance of academic learning because they pursue it in relation to career and personal interests.

2. When the program is introduced as an academic elective option, it may not reach those youths most in need of job preparation and skill development. Efforts should be made to recruit and involve those youths who have dropped out or are close to dropping out of school. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory reports that CETA-funded EBCE sites are currently serving youths with this background.

3. Although the program provides youths with the basic skills necessary to obtain and retain entry level, minimum skill positions, it cannot reduce the competitiveness involved in acquiring entry-level jobs. Particularly during times of recession, people in these positions are often the first to experience layoffs. Limited employment opportunities in the private and public sectors remain a problem.

4. The evaluation of the Tigard, Oregon program utilized a true experimental design. Unfortunately, the findings are hampered by the high attrition rate of the control group. Future research of EBCE or other prevention programs should endeavor to provide follow-up data on those subjects who leave the program. Larger initial experimental and control groups can counter attrition of testing groups and can result in more definitive results.
The program’s effect on delinquent behavior is unknown. While it may hold promise in this regard, the results of previous employment-focused delinquency prevention projects generally have not been favorable. This approach should be carefully evaluated for delinquency prevention effects if it is to be implemented in hopes of achieving this goal.
Family Teaching Center
Helena, Montana

Strategies: Education, Consistent Social Expectations

Causes of the Problem: Children learn disruptive, violent, and delinquent behaviors through daily interactions with members of their natural communities -- parents, kin, peers, and teachers. Delinquency is learned through reinforcement in social interactions.

Program Rationale: Behaviors will continue to occur only so long as they are supported by others. When taught how their responses support problem behaviors, parents can learn to change their interactions and therefore prevent or extinguish children's delinquent and oppositional behaviors.

Target Population: The program serves working and middle class, two parent, and single parent families with aggressive or out-of-control children ages 4-12. Ninety-five percent of the service recipients have been white. Five percent have been Native Americans. Sixty-five percent of the children served have been male. Annually, the program serves about 150 families.

Program Description: In keeping with the social learning philosophy of the center, therapists at the Family Teaching Center (FTC) operate as "behavior ecologists" as well as clinicians. In order to understand the child's behavior, they seek to understand his/her interactions with significant others (usually parents or school teachers) in his/her natural community (home, school).

The family is the starting point for therapeutic interventions. Initially therapists meet the family in the home, observing the family's interactive style, and administering a self-concept scale (Piers-Harris) to the child. Therapists also instruct parents in the use of a parent daily report instrument which the FTC staff uses in monitoring the child's behavior.

Parents attend a series of six to seven weekly evening classes which focus on child management skills. Parents learn to:

1. Pinpoint and observe problem and prosocial behavior;
2. Use social, activity, and tangible reinforcers to strengthen appropriate behavior;
3. Apply mild punishment in a nonabusive and corrective manner;
4. Modify or extend the basic treatment strategies to other children in the family or to new problems;
5. Evaluate their effectiveness using data they collect.

After treatment, the families enter a one-year fadeout follow-up period, during which FTC staff maintains periodic telephone contact.
The FTC also has a school involvement program. School contact begins after the parents have completed several instructional sessions. Depending on the child's need and the school's desire to participate in the program, interventions may consist of an individualized child-school program collaboratively arranged by the FTC therapist, school teachers, and social service personnel.

**Implementation Requirements:** Training of parents is carried out by paraprofessional (B.A. degree) and professional therapists. No extensive prior clinical experience is reported to be necessary. The agency currently employs one professional therapist and three paraprofessionals full-time, one paraprofessional part-time, one volunteer, and two support staff. Paraprofessional training lasts approximately six weeks and involves an intensive literature review, role playing, observation of the trained staff, and actual therapy under supervision. Ongoing supervision and case discussion take place in regular staff meetings.

**Budget:** The program has an annual budget of $117,000. Seventy percent of the funds come from HEW (Title XX), 20 percent from the state government, and 10 percent from local government.

**Implementing Agency:** Contact: Dr. Steven Syzkula, Center Director, Family Teaching Center, 324 Fuller, Helena, Montana 59601.

**Effectiveness:** An evaluation of changes in problem children in families served by the FTC during two time periods, 1976-1977 (N = 24) and 1977-1978 (N = 39), was conducted. The study compared children's behavior before, during and after the intervention. No comparison or control groups were studied. Eleven families (35 percent) dropped out of the treatment during the 1977-1978 evaluation.

The results were:

1. Direct observation (by the therapists) of 24 children showed a reduction in the number of problem behaviors per minute from a baseline mean of .62 to a post treatment mean of .14. A one year follow-up indicated enduring and perhaps accumulating effects as parents reported an average of .10 problem behaviors per minute.

2. Parent reports of the average number of child (N = 24) problems per day showed a similar reduction from 3.33 at baseline to 1.40 at the end of treatment. One year after treatment parents reported .94 child problems per day.

3. Noxious behaviors (whining, crying, teasing, fighting, etc.) observed by trained raters decreased by 71 percent from baseline to post-test (p < .005). Twice weekly phone reports indicated a 51 percent reduction in a list of 10 negative behaviors read to parents before, during, and after treatment.

4. With regard to consumer satisfaction, 100 percent of responding clients (N = 39 - 11 = 28) believed that the FTC "does its job helping children" and "is visible to the community." However, 30 percent indicated that it "has communication problems with the community."
5. The Piers-Harris self-concept measures showed no significant changes.

6. Costs for fiscal year 1978 were $970.15 per family or $33.00 per hour. (During the past year, the agency has increased the number of families it serves to about 150. This has brought the per-client cost down to approximately $700.) The evaluation reports that the cost per client is high, but may be worthwhile given program effectiveness and the usual cost of institutional care for troubled adolescents (estimated at over $20,000 per child per year).

Comments:

1. This is a corrective approach offered to families in which children's behavioral problems have already emerged and must be remedied. Offering this service to individual families with problem children is not only costly, it is also unlikely to prevent the initial occurrence of family-induced behavior problems among children. Programs which offer the skills taught by the FTC to parents of pre-school and primary school children on an open enrollment basis may hold greater potential for the prevention of delinquency.

2. During the time the program was evaluated (1976-1977 and 1977-1978), the FTC served white middle class and lower middle class families who were referred by the public schools. More than half of those who dropped out of the program during the 1977-1978 period were from poverty-level backgrounds, suggesting that the program, as then operating, was best suited to middle class families. However, since 1978, the program has introduced service delivery changes that have increased the percentage of lower socioeconomic families to 60 percent of the caseload. Dr. Syzkula reports that dropout rates have decreased. Efforts should be made to rigorously assess the effectiveness of this type of program on families from other ethnic backgrounds.

3. The lack of a comparison or control group impairs the evaluation. It is not clear that the observed changes in behavior resulted from the program intervention rather than from participant maturation, selective attrition, or other factors. However, the results are clearly positive and significant. A more rigorous empirical investigation of the Family Teaching Center's social learning model is warranted.

4. The utilization of parents' reports of children's behavior allows for the possibility of systematic bias in the measurement of the dependent variable. Parents who have undergone a 6-7 week training period are likely to be aware of the objectives of such interventions. If they want to show that they have been successful in putting into practice what they have been taught, parents may underestimate the amount of "problem behavior" on the part of their children. FTC has used direct, third party observations of parent-child interaction to independently assess behaviors. Dr. Syzkula reports that results of these third party observations have been highly correlated with parent reports. Since the validity of parent reports has been questioned by others (e.g., Schenelle, 1974), this cross-checking is an excellent evaluation strategy.
5. To reduce attrition, the FTC staff works in individual sessions with parents who have difficulty applying the training concepts. Assistance in solving day-to-day problems is also provided. This type of supplementary program has been used by other parent training projects and appears to be a promising strategy in reducing the drop-out rate of low income, multi-problem families.
GLASTONBURY YOUTH SERVICES, CREATIVE EXPERIENCES
Glastonbury, Connecticut

Strategies: Social Network, Role Development, Activities/Recreation

Causes of the Problem: Age segregation in the United States in the last 50 years has had serious effects on the family. In the transitional rural to suburban "bedroom" community of Glastonbury, parent and child activities are often separate, reflecting this social trend. The lack of communication and interaction between the age groups can cause adolescent alienation and can result in delinquent behavior.

Program Rationale: The program strives to help children develop positive attitudes toward themselves, their environment, and the people around them; to help them share a sense of community; and to make them feel that they belong and that they are wanted and needed. Involving youths in community-wide, creative, group experiences can develop a healthy self-concept and attachment to the community. Youths who feel good about themselves and who are involved in positive activities in their communities will not commit delinquent acts.

Target Population: Creative Experiences is open to all members of the Glastonbury community. Each year about 600 people participate. Youths served are white; 55 percent of the participants are women.

Program Description: Creative Experiences' programs are cultural and artistic and are designed both to promote civic causes and for pure fun. The major program is the annual summer musical theater production. Planning begins in the late winter for each summer production and rehearsals start in June. Every person who auditions is integrated into the cast, crew, or orchestra. For the summer of 1979's production of Li'l Abner, the fifth production to date, the cast numbered 350, including 186 children under 12. More than 400 people ranging in age from 2 to 57 participated in the production. Emphasis is placed on recognition of all participants in a cooperative effort.

Youths are recruited for the production and for other Creative Experiences' activities by advertisements in the local newspaper, staff members of Youth Services, the school system, their families, and other community service groups. Former members are notified by postcards and newsletters which discuss current Creative Experiences events.

Youth Services seeks to develop an awareness among production members that the success of the production can be achieved only through the cooperation and work of those involved. The philosophy of the production is that shared goals and shared effort will lead to the development of strong bonds among participants. The program reports that youths considered delinquent often assume a helping role toward younger children in the cast and that barriers between young and old are dissolved through activities in which all ages participate.

High school and college students also assist in ticket selling, poster making, and other production activities. Town residents and business people purchase ads
in the production program, and local newspapers publicize the event with photographs, interviews, and a poster-drawing contest for children under 12.

Creative Experiences sponsors a number of other activities. The Peter Pan Players, a small group of young actors and actresses, performs children's plays throughout the year at elementary schools and libraries. The Youth Services Action Group, initiated by a group of high school students, devotes itself to completing one community project per month—e.g., the yearly cleaning of the Senior Citizen Center and an annual "dog wash" with proceeds donated to a memorial fund.

Creative Experiences also offers free six-week mini-courses in such subjects as guitar playing, clowning, acting, and yoga taught by Youth Services staff members and community volunteers. Throughout the year, special agency-sponsored events—Kite Day, a Halloween haunted house, an annual Thanksgiving dinner, and Christmas caroling—seek to keep young people actively involved. A tutorial program for students with academic problems is operated by volunteers from high school and college.

Implementation Requirements: The Creative Experiences approach relies heavily on community support for its success. The agency hires two professionals, four youths, four paraprofessionals, and one part-time support staff seasonally. Five to 30 volunteers work at different times during the year.

Budget: The total agency budget is $115,000. Foundation grants from the Connecticut Commission on the Arts and the Mobil Oil Foundation, support from local businesses, and other public contributions for Creative Experiences' activities range from $12,000 to $40,000 per year.

Implementing Agency: Creative Experiences is a component of the Glastonbury Youth Services, a community-based, municipally-funded, multi-service treatment facility. Contact: Mr. Thomas P. Gullota, Director, Glastonbury Youth Services "Creative Experiences," 321 Hubbard Street, Glastonbury, Connecticut 06033.

Effectiveness: The agency and its programs have not been rigorously evaluated, though some reductions in official juvenile delinquency rates have occurred since the initiation of the Creative Experiences program. There was a 45 percent decrease in juvenile court referrals from the Town of Glastonbury from 1975 to 1976. Data from the Glastonbury Police Department also show that the number of youths sent to juvenile court declined from 1974, when 46 youths representing 81 referrals were sent to juvenile court, to 1976, when 27 youths representing 46 referrals were sent to juvenile court. These changes cannot, however, be directly attributed to the program in the absence of a controlled evaluation.

Comments:

1. This program has the potential to build better communications between members of a community. It can provide a vehicle for community development. The program should be evaluated thoroughly for its delinquency impact using both self-report and juvenile justice system statistics.
2. The program operates in a relatively small, suburban middle class community. On the basis of the juvenile justice statistics reported, youth crime does not seem to be a major problem in Glastonbury, though self-report data might show a different picture. In communities characterized by problems of poverty, high unemployment, inadequate shelter, inadequate health care, or socioeconomic and cultural diversity, programs of this nature may hold less promise.
HOMEBUILDERS
Tacoma, Washington

Strategies: Psychological/Mental Health, Education

Causes of the Problem: Families in which there is extreme conflict between parent(s) and child(ren) often come to the attention of the criminal justice, social welfare, or physical/mental health systems. Often the youthful member is placed in a correctional or mental institution or in some other type of alternative living situation. Outside placement can compound the individual's behavioral problems and the family's sense of inadequacy and hopelessness. (Youths in conflict with their families are likely to commit delinquencies.)

Program Rationale: Strengthening the family unit through provision of training in parenting and communication skills can increase attachment between parents and children and can prevent a further deterioration of the family unit, out-of-home placement, (and juvenile delinquency).

Target Population: Families experiencing a variety of problems, including the imminent out-of-home placement of a child, are accepted for service if at least one family member expresses a desire to keep the family together, and no key family member absolutely refuses to participate. Typical precipitating problems include truancy, running away from home, pregnancy, delinquency, physical violence, parental emotional exhaustion, child abuse or neglect, lack of parenting skills, and any family member's substance abuse, psychosis, or high suicide potential.

About 110 families are served annually (85 percent white, 11 percent black, 2 percent Asian, 1 percent Mexican-American, 1 percent other). In approximately 56 percent of the cases the referrals involve female children. In 1976, 18 percent of the cases involved children between birth and 10 years; 58 percent involved children between the ages of 11 and 15; and 24 percent involved children 16 and over. Sixty-two percent of the families served had three or more children living at home at the time of the crisis. Slightly less than half were single-parent households. Sixty percent had incomes under $10,000 and 25 percent had incomes between $10,000 and $15,000.

Program Description: Homebuilders is a short term, intensive, in-home, education-based therapy designed to improve family interactions and preserve the family structure. Therapists intervene in the homes of families in crisis and remain until relative stability is achieved. The first session may last up to eight hours and staff may spend the night at the family's home, though this happens infrequently. Because therapists allocate large blocks of time to the family, pain, anxiety, and frustrations are usually greatly decreased after therapists' visits. Therapists stay involved with a family from three to six weeks. During this time, they may deliver several hundred hours of therapy and training. To maximize therapists' availability to clients while preventing "burn out," therapists are limited to no more than two new cases per month and may have no more than three families on their caseload at one time.
Homebuilders uses a Parent Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1970) procedure, "active listening," to elicit information in a supportive manner. Therapists are trained in a variety of skills, including PET, behavior modification, assertiveness training, values clarification, rational emotive therapy, fair fighting, and crisis intervention. Clients receive immediate reinforcement for becoming involved in negotiations for change and are frequently paired with a "spokesperson" therapist, i.e., one who helps interpret the family member's position. When possible, the Homebuilders' therapist involves representatives from the local Youth Services Bureau, mental health center, or other community service agency to tie the family into a network of social services and to provide the family with support when the crisis is over.

Implementation Requirements: Homebuilders began in October of 1974 as part of a National Institute of Mental Health grant awarded to an affiliated group of five social, educational, and medical service agencies in Tacoma, Washington. Homebuilders began and continues to function under the auspices of Catholic Community Services of Tacoma, a non-profit social service agency. Homebuilders currently employs 2 co-directors, 12 Homebuilders therapists, and 7 support staff. Close linkages with the community mental health, social welfare, and criminal justice agencies have been integral to successful program utilization.

Budget: Homebuilders' annual budget is $215,000. Most funds are received through state welfare contracts (77 percent). Other sources include the United Way (5 percent), HEW (15 percent), and CETA (DOL) (3 percent).

Implementing Agency: Contact: Dr. Jill Kinney or Mr. David Haapala, Co-Directors, Homebuilders, 5410 North 44th, Tacoma, Washington 98407.

Effectiveness: A three-month follow-up study has been conducted to assess program effectiveness as measured by the avoidance of out-of-home placements and to assess program cost-benefits. Initially, 173 of the 188 families (92 percent) who received treatment avoided initial outside placement. After 3 months, 166 families (88 percent) continued to avoid out-of-home placement.

Cost savings were computed by taking the projected costs of placing all the Homebuilders' clients in out-of-home placements ($747,152) and subtracting the Homebuilders' budget for the first 2 years of operation ($197,024) plus the projected cost of 15 clients who required placement despite intervention ($78,797). Homebuilders projected where youths would be placed in the absence of its intervention -- foster care (124), group care (38), a private psychiatric hospital (21), the state psychiatric hospital's children's unit (3), the state diagnostic center (1), or juvenile court detention (1) -- and arrived at a cost based on the average length of stay in each particular placement. Indirect benefits such as the intervention's effect on other siblings were not computed. On this basis, it cost $471,331 (or $2,507 per client) less to provide the intensive family crisis services of Homebuilders than to place problem youths in foster, group, or institutional care.
Comments:

1. Without a comparison or control group, it is difficult to ascertain the percentage of children who would have required out-of-home placement without Homebuilders' services. Therefore, the cost-savings results presented above are questionable. Furthermore, the program's impact on delinquency has not been measured. However, given the apparent positive results and the program's potential cost-benefits (based on the data presented), Homebuilders merits a rigorous evaluation to assess its prevention impact on problem youths and their siblings. A two-year quasi-experimental study of its effects is currently underway.

2. There is no systematic evaluation of the effect of Homebuilders' interventions on various dimensions of family dynamics (e.g., decisionmaking, expressive communication, and task-oriented behavior) which may, in turn, influence the behavior of adolescent family members.

3. In the prior evaluation the follow-up measurement of out-of-home placement occurred only three months after the intervention. Assessment of the stability of the intervention's effects requires a more lengthy follow-up (see Kinney et al., 1977).

4. While the in-home crisis intervention model appears to be promising, it is unclear with whom it is most effective. To date the program claims effectiveness with clients from all different income levels and ethnic backgrounds; such omnibus efficiency is improbable and should be assessed in future research.
IN-HOME FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES
Des Moines, Iowa

Strategies: Psychological/Mental Health, Role Development, Education, Consistent Social Expectations, Social Network

Causes of the Problem: When a family's interactive or "ecological" system is unstable and nonsupportive, families lose their power to socialize children and to provide them with models of conventional behavior. Since such families are frequently isolated in the community, their children often are removed from models of conventional behavior. Juvenile delinquency, child abuse, and child neglect arise from family instability and a lack of social integration.

Program Rationale: Families may be strengthened or made more stable by changing the environmental context in which the family unit is enmeshed and by changing interactions within the family unit. Families can be integrated into their social environments by the provision of concrete services designed to decrease stress arising from homemaking needs, inadequate income, poor housing, lack of health care, etc. Family therapy can address structural and interactional problems. Children in socially integrated, well-functioning families are less likely to commit delinquencies.

Target Population: Although any family may receive services, those who do must be willing to engage actively in the change process as a family. Because of the expense and strain of out-of-home placement, the program seeks to serve families with a youthful member in jeopardy of placement. About 70 families are served each year. They are 98 percent white, 1 percent black, and 1 percent Hispanic. Forty percent of the youths in jeopardy of placement are male.

Program Description: Support services are provided by in-home family support workers, each with an ongoing caseload of four to five families. The worker is responsible for a family assessment and the execution of an intensive comprehensive family plan. Based on a worker-family agreement, the plan specifies activities to be undertaken to resolve problems. Time-limited goals are established and reviewed monthly.

Plans are likely to include homemaker services, professional family therapy, training in child management, advocacy, and collaboration with other agencies to provide special services (e.g., health care, county home-extension services, legal and financial aid). The key ingredient of the service is consistent, readily accessible assistance on the family's "own turf." Workers spend eight to ten hours a week with each family. The goal of the intervention is to integrate the family into a network of community services and informal supports.

Implementation Requirements: Small caseloads are essential in this approach. Workers must spend time in the home and be willing to engage in multiple roles, e.g., trainer, advocate, and friend.

Budget: The statewide budget is $201,000 (75 percent state government and 25 percent United Way). The cost per family has been about $3,000,
representing a substantial savings in comparison with the costs of out-of-home placement.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Mr. Douglas Stephens, Supervisor, In-Home Family Support Services, 1101 Walnut Street, Des Moines, Iowa 50309.

Effectiveness: The program has been evaluated by the Iowa State Division of Planning regarding its effectiveness in maintaining family stability. A random sample of 21 of the 105 families who received services during a two-year period were interviewed after treatment. The lack of a control or comparison group prevented the assessment of maturation effects or other threats to the internal validity of the findings. Areas of inquiry included family communication, family stability, family member self-esteem and self-confidence, parenting skills, understanding of family dynamics or behaviors, and comparative cost-effectiveness.

Of the 21 families sampled, 15 were located. At least 1 member of each of these 15 families was interviewed and an additional 25 interviews were held with local office staff or other familiar with the families. Several of the 6 families which were not interviewed had moved from the state, while others simply could not be located.

Twelve of the 15 families reported that positive changes had resulted from involvement in the In-Home Family Support Services Program. (The reasons for family referral included abuse/neglect, running away from home, adjusting to stepparents, marital conflict, and aggressive or noncompliant behavior in school and home.) Changes noted included improved family communication, a more stabilized family, increased family self-esteem, improved parenting skills, and the like. One family noted a reduction in truancy and two reported improved school behavior.

The program was deemed cost-effective by the evaluators. Although the cost of in-home support services ($287.84 per month) is more than the cost of foster care ($222 per month), it is considerably less than the cost of group home care ($737 per month) or residential treatment ($879 per month). The evaluators assumed that families utilizing the service would need the latter treatment if not served by the In-Home Family services.

Comments:

1. The program should be subjected to a rigorous controlled evaluation. The current evaluation assumes that all families who receive the In-Home Family Support Services will not need future treatment and that one member would be placed in a group home or a residential treatment center in the absence of services. Such assumptions may inflate the cost effectiveness estimates.

2. While this program identifies ecological factors as targets for intervention, the services provided do not seek to alter the environment but rather to increase the family's ability to cope with external stress-producing factors.
JOBS FOR YOUTH
Boston, Massachusetts.

Strategies: Role Development, Economic Resources, Education

Causes of the Problem: Disadvantaged youths who are unfamiliar with the demands and requirements of obtaining employment, need guidance and support in making the transition from high school to the world of work. Typically, they also lack the skills required to obtain jobs in an increasingly tight labor market. Unable to find work and a legitimate living in an environment in which crime is prevalent, inner city youths often choose illegal means to obtain their income.

Program Rationale: With assistance in finding and holding jobs, youths can earn an income, succeed in an adult role, and feel they are contributing to society. This should enhance their self-concept and lessen the likelihood of their engaging in delinquent acts.

Target Population: The program serves economically disadvantaged high school dropouts (ages 16-21) in the cities of Boston and Cambridge. Nine hundred fifty youths (60 percent male) are served annually. The ethnic distribution of the client population is 50 percent black, 6 percent Hispanic, 42 percent white, and 2 percent other races.

Program Description: Jobs for Youth (JFY) - Boston is a private, non-profit employment organization that has been replicated from a model program which has operated in New York City for twenty years. The program assists youths with little or no work experience to prepare for employment, find jobs, and succeed in a work situation. It consists of three components:

1. Counseling Services: After a pre-job orientation workshop, clients are assigned to a vocational counselor. The counselor is seen two to six times prior to a job placement. During the counseling sessions youths learn to prepare for job interviews, understand the responsibilities of employment, and find a job most suited to their skills. Counselors refer their clients to support services if necessary and conduct regular follow-ups (weekly contacts with employers and visits to the job site) after a job placement.

2. Employer Services: JFY assists employers in the private sector (generally small-and medium-sized businesses) in finding qualified candidates for vacant positions. Positions are full-time, entry level, or semi-skilled jobs. After an employer notifies JFY about an opening, the agency screens applicants and refers the most qualified person. The agency has been able to develop approximately 1,400 jobs from 350 employers annually, and has been able to make about 650 placements. The employer pays all wages.

Services to both employer and employee are free. On-site follow-up services include a verification of adequate job performance and punctuality. Weekly contact with both employer and employee verifies employee adjustment to the job. Employer satisfaction with JFY services is facilitated through an employer representative assigned to each JFY employee. Attempts are made to resolve any problems that would impede
successful functioning on the job. For those youths whose performance on
the job has been satisfactory for three to six months, JFY advocates for
job upgrading.

3. **Educational Services:** Vocational training, job-related skills, life skills, and
functional academic skills are provided on a voluntary, individualized basis.
Instruction is geared toward becoming job-ready, entering GED or adult
education programs, or entering vocational training or other post-
secondary school programs. After a youth is placed on the job, any training
necessary for the job or for job advancement is provided after work hours.

The program makes a two-year commitment to assist youths. All client
and employer services are documented by a Management Information
System. For those youths not considered job ready, the Work Evaluation
Project provides an opportunity to work for two weeks at JFY itself in
various capacities (such as in the office) under close supervision.

**Implementation Requirements:** The program requires a large staff for
counseling, teaching, job development and advertising, fund raising, and public
relations. The staff includes outreach workers to develop a network of referral
agencies and to design and supervise work training positions. Maintenance of
good relations with private sector businesses and public sector referral sources is
vital to the operation of the program. JFY collaborates with 60 referral
agencies and 350 private businesses. Presently, JFY employs 14 full-time
professionals, 3 full-time and 3 part-time paraprofessionals, and 4 support staff.
Sixty-four youths participate as paid staff members (52 part-time and 12 full-
time). JFY-Boston has been in operation for two years. It is currently being
replicated in Chicago.

**Budget:** JFY was initially funded by a 3-year LEAA grant. Its $473,000
annual budget is now funded from the following sources: 51 percent LEAA, 4
percent corporate funding, 26 percent HEW (for the educational component), 8
percent CETA, and 12 percent private foundations. The program strives for
maximum flexibility and self-sufficiency through increased private foundation
and corporate support.

**Implementing Agency:** Contact Ms. Betsy Friedlander, Executive
Director, Jobs for Youth, 119 Charles Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02114.

**Effectiveness:** Several evaluations of the program are near completion.
According to the Director of Employer Services, 50 percent of the youths who
come to the orientation find and keep a job for a year. One problem in assessing
the impact of the program involves the difficulty in contacting the youths who
leave the program after only a brief period of involvement (less than one month).

**Comments:**

1. The program develops jobs in the private sector, the source of 100 percent
of all jobs. The use of employer representatives and follow-up counselors
increases the probability of employee job success and employer satisfaction
with employees from the program.
2. Unfortunately, despite pre-employment support and follow-up services, only half of the employees stay on a job for more than a month. This may result from inadequate job readiness or from the fact that the jobs provided are menial and offer low starting salaries. The agency reports that the average starting wages are $3.10 and $3.25 per hour. Although not all youths choose illegal means to earn money, a recent pilot study of 75 black youths in Boston by Joseph Cooper revealed that half of the interviewees could make between $150 and $450 per week selling drugs. Unless employers can offer youths meaningful employment with advancement potential and a reasonable starting salary, the motivation to use criminal means to attain income may be difficult to offset and job retention may remain a problem. The National Supported Work Demonstration Project encountered similar difficulties with youthful participants who were high school dropouts (Board of Directors, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1980:9).

3. The program has developed a referral network with area schools. Closer linkages with school combined with earlier interventions may increase the likelihood of a higher client retention rate.

4. The program's effectiveness in preventing delinquency is unknown and has not been evaluated. If this approach is to be used to achieve the goal of delinquency prevention, it should be carefully evaluated. However, the reader should be aware that evaluations of other youth employment programs and rigorous research on the National Supported Work Demonstration Project (Board of Directors, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1980:111-115) have not shown positive delinquency prevention results.
LAW AND JUSTICE AWARENESS
Honolulu, Hawaii

Strategies: Education, Social Network, Activities/Recreation, Litigation

Causes of the Problem: Youths usually come in contact with law enforcement agents and the judicial system under negative circumstances. These negative experiences taint youths' perceptions of all law and justice issues and decrease youths' beliefs in the legal order. Lack of accurate knowledge regarding the law and the legal system inhibits development of positive attitudes towards the law (and may result in delinquency).

Program Rationale: By placing a law enforcement officer in school, rapport can be built between youths and the police through daily contacts as friends rather than as antagonists. A school-based police officer can help build communication between the school, police, and the community and can act as a deterrent to both major and minor law violations by students in school. Finally, law-related curriculum supplements can provide youths with accurate knowledge that can lead to positive attitudes towards the law and the legal system.

Target Population: All elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools on Oahu participate. This includes approximately 80 schools and over 15,000 students. About 39 percent of the students in these schools are Hawaiian and other Pacific Island groups, 32 percent Asian, 28 percent white. The remainder are black, Native American, and Hispanic.

Program Description: Police-School Liaison Officers (PLO's) are assigned to schools throughout the city and county of Honolulu. PLO's serve two primary functions: as teachers and as community liaisons.

As teachers, PLO's instruct elementary through senior high school students (depending on their assignments) using a two-to-six week instructional program. The programs are geared to the needs of the respective student audiences. Elementary grade level students are taught about problems relevant to their individual campuses (e.g., vandalism, drugs, hijacking, runaways, traffic danger spots), as well as danger prevention skills such as the avoidance of strangers on the home-to-school route. The intermediate school program is a concentrated study of the criminal justice system which has been incorporated into the eighth-grade social studies curriculum. The high school lesson plan is a combination of several units taken from the intermediate lesson plan and revised to the level of students in grades 10-12. It is designed to prepare students for the "adult world" when they leave high school. PLO's possess knowledge of child development and adolescent problems and are expected to be able to provide in-depth information on crime causation factors, traffic and school problems, law, narcotics, the criminal justice and penal systems, first aid, bicycle safety, and juvenile delinquency.

As community liaisons, PLO's attend school functions such as meetings of student clubs, the student council, and the PTA, acting in an advisory capacity to school officials and students on the handling of school events. PLO's also participate in, create, or help implement extracurricular student activities such
as sports programs, law enforcement explorer posts, and community service projects.

Officers also provide individual counseling and guidance to selected students and their parents through home visits. They wear their police uniforms to class Monday through Thursday, and "Aloha" attire (plain clothes) on Fridays.

Implementation Requirements: Initially a Model Cities Project (1969-75), the program has continued as an ongoing Honolulu Police Department function in cooperation with the school district. Four Metropolitan Police Sergeants (District Coordinators) spend approximately 75 percent of their time coordinating the program in their districts and the remainder of their time working with public and private agencies, organizations, associations, and individuals promoting other police-community relations programs. Five Metropolitan Police Officers - Motorized (MPOM) are on permanent or "permanent special assignment" status and eight MPOM's are on rotating-status with the program 100 percent time.

The project requires active collaboration between police and schools, adequate training for participating police officers, as well as training and orientation for school personnel, especially teachers and counselors.

Budget: The annual budget is $330,000. Funding is provided to the police department through local government resources.

Implementing Agency: The program is operated through the Honolulu Police Department and School District. Contact: Chief Francis Keala, Honolulu Police Department, 1455 South Beretania Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96815.

Effectiveness: A 1975 evaluation used a pre-post test design for students and police officers. No comparison group was used and no attempt was made to assess program effects on delinquency. A modified version of the Chapman "Attitude Toward Police Scale" (1960) was used to assess the improvement of the attitudes of 71 intermediate school students in the program toward the law and the police. No significant difference in attitude was found between the pre- and post-test periods; nor were significant changes found in students' knowledge of law and justice issues.

In assessing police attitudes toward the community, three instruments were used: the Albers' "Attitudes Toward Juvenile Delinquents" scale (1963); the Wrightsman's Trustworthiness Scale ("Philosophy of Human Nature Test," 1964) which was modified as the "Attitudes Toward Model Neighborhood Area Residents" scale; and a project-developed "Attitude Toward Community" scale. The latter instrument was used to assess a Community Relations Training Program for the participating PLO's. No significant change in police attitude was found using any of the three measurement instruments. Failure to improve on the last scale may be attributable to the fact that participating officers' scores were very high when they began the project.
Comments:

1. The limited available evaluation data do not show positive program effects in improving youths' attitudes toward police or their knowledge of the law. Thus, the program has not demonstrated achievement of the intervention goals by which it seeks to prevent youth crime. Therefore, the program's promise for delinquency prevention among junior high school students appears limited. However, it is possible that without the police-school liaison officer program, student attitudes toward police officers would deteriorate over time. If this were the case, the observed lack of change in students' attitudes would be an important positive finding. The research design used in the evaluation was not adequate to test this possibility.

2. A key assumption of the approach is that a school-based police officer can become a respected and trusted member of the school community. Success in achieving this goal may depend largely on the personal characteristics of the police officer. It is important to select officers for this duty who can perform the liaison role.

3. The failure of this program to increase students' knowledge of law and justice issues may reflect inadequate training and preparation of PLO's to function as classroom teachers. An adequate training program for PLO's requires substantial time and financial resources.

4. Given the special characteristics and training required, it is likely that only a small proportion of officers in a community can function effectively as PLO's. This would suggest that a small group of officers from a department be trained and permanently assigned to duty as PLO's if this approach is to be used. However, assigning officers to permanent duty as PLO's may, over time, isolate them from the rest of the department and reduce their effectiveness as communication links between the department and the community.
LAW IN A FREE SOCIETY
Calabasas, California

Strategies: Education

Causes of the Problem: Youths are not adequately provided with ongoing educational exposure to the legal and political institutions of our society and the fundamental values and principles upon which they were founded. Consequently, they may fail to view delinquent acts as violations of shared social values, leaving them free to commit delinquent acts without constraint.

Program Rationale: This approach assumes that education can increase a person's capacity and inclination to act knowledgeably, effectively, and responsibly, and to make intelligent choices based on respect for others and for the law. Early and ongoing exposure to civic education can help provide the framework necessary to establish norms and values consistent with a democratic society and an understanding and willingness to use democratic processes in decisionmaking and conflict management. This will minimize inappropriate behavior which stems from the lack of such knowledge.

Target Population: Elementary and secondary students of requesting schools or districts; teachers in requesting schools or districts.

Program Description: Law in a Free Society (LFS) offers staff development materials for in-service training of teachers, classroom materials for students in K-12 (including sequential multi-media instructional modules), and consultation for school districts and other agencies in developing and organizing local programs and in-service training. The curriculum focuses on eight fundamental concepts: authority, responsibility, privacy, justice, participation, property, diversity, and freedom. The program is designed to relate students' experiences to social and political problems, and to develop conceptual and analytic skills which can be applied in the context of their lives. Guided discussions, role playing, and other teaching methods provide a means for stimulating students to acquire the skills necessary for analysis and resolution of conflict and other problems.

Implementation Requirements: This is a project of the State Bar of California conducted with the cooperation of the faculty of the University of California and other schools, bar associations, and agencies. An Executive Committee appointed by the Board of Governors is the supervising and policymaking body. The program has been designed so that it can be implemented with a minimum of expense and outside assistance. It can be integrated into the normal social studies and humanities curricula or can be an elective course at the secondary level. Since attitudes about law and society begin to form at an early age, the curriculum is designed to begin in kindergarten and to develop sequentially through the 12th grade.

Budget: The annual budget is approximately $600,000 (25 percent from LEAA, 40 percent from the National Endowment for the Humanities, 20 percent from private foundations, and 15 percent from the sale of educational materials).
Support has also been provided by the State Bar of California and other local bar associations and school systems.

**Implementing Agency:** Contact: Charles N. Quigley, Executive Director, 5115 Douglas Fir Drive, Calabasas, CA 91302.

**Effectiveness:** LFS project literature asserts that "evidence from field testing indicates that LFS programs seem to foster feelings of efficacy, self-esteem, tolerance of diversity, and a tendency to work within the rules of the game...there is also evidence that the analytic and evaluative skills are transferable to other subjects and to day-to-day life." However, past assessments have been primarily anecdotal, and have not included control or comparison groups. The program's impact on delinquency has not been measured. An evaluation currently in progress will focus largely on subjective measures, such as teachers' and administrators' perceptions of student attitudes, participation, and attendance.

**Comments:**

1. This program focuses on changing the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of individual youths. Little attention is paid to the need for institutional or environmental change to prevent disruptive behaviors. The responsibility of adherence to socially prescribed norms is viewed as resting primarily with individual students.

2. The premise of the program is that acquisition of knowledge and "pro-social" values will lead to the reduction of inappropriate behavior. It is not clear that cognitive and attitudinal change lessens delinquent activity. Unfortunately, the lack of evaluation data limits knowledge of the program’s effects on behavior and precludes a determination of the potential of the program for reducing youth crime.

3. The program is designed to follow a sequence throughout the school career, thus using a developmental model. The continuity provided by an ongoing program such as this is likely to have a greater effect than a single or short-term presentation.
LEARNING ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM

Tampa, Florida

Strategies: Psychological/Mental Health, Education

Causes of the Problem: Disruptive students often exhibit poor academic achievement, low self-concept, lack of responsibility, and little respect for authority. If their negative behavior remains unchecked, many of these youths may be suspended or expelled, or may drop out of school. They are also likely to engage in delinquent behavior and to come into contact with the criminal justice system. A criminal record will stigmatize and alienate them, further compounding their problems.

Program Rationale: When provided with individualized academic attention and supportive counseling in an intensive learning environment, youths can develop cognitive and communication skills and positive self-concepts. Early school-based interventions with disruptive students will reduce the likelihood of their committing delinquent acts.

Target Population: One hundred ten youths are served annually in seven junior high schools in Hillsborough and Manatee Counties. Students are identified as needing specialized educational and behavioral services by school deans based on a history of problems such as truancy, learning difficulties, and law violations. Referrals are screened and prioritized by a teacher and a counselor. Program participation is voluntary. Parental consent is required. The ethnic distribution is 40 percent black, 10 percent Hispanic, and 50 percent white. Sixty percent of the school population is male.

Program Description: The Learning Alternatives Program (LAP) is an alternative educational program operating within the regular junior high school. Youths who are disruptive and have learning problems are provided with intensive academic and counseling services. The goals of the project are to keep potential dropouts in school, off the streets, and out of institutions; to decrease their disruptive behaviors; and to improve their academic abilities and attitudes towards self, school, family, and teachers.

Students attend four LAP classes (English, math, science, and social sciences) each morning and two regular school classes in the afternoon. The schedule is designed to ease re-entry into regular classes and to lessen the stigma attached to being in a special program. The last period of the day is set aside for LAP students to meet as a group. The teacher and the counselor assigned to the LAP program review the activities of the day, deal with problems that may have arisen, set short-term goals, and reinforce student achievements.

The teacher develops an individualized, prescriptive academic plan for each student. All students are pre-tested and post-tested in English and math, as well as assessed on attitudinal and behavioral measures. Building success is the program emphasis. Problem solving and employability skills are taught. Respect for authority and student self-responsibility are expected. The counselor deals with any nonacademic problems that arise, and is available to provide support after school-hours. Also, weekly sessions are held in students' homes to enable
youths to experience support in a nonschool environment. The counselor meets with parents in regular group sessions and in individual parent conferences to teach parenting and communication skills. Follow-up contacts are made on student absences and truancies. In addition, the counselor is available for home visits and crisis intervention after school hours.

Students in LAP also participate in after school recreational activities. They participate in team sports such as football or basketball. Although these activities are primarily the counselor's responsibility, teachers often attend.

Implementation Requirements: The program is a collaborative effort of the Youth Services Program of the Department of Health and Rehabilitation Services (DHRS) and the County School Board. In 1977, a target school was chosen and one teacher and one counselor from DHRS were assigned. The program now operates in seven junior high schools with one teacher from the school staff and one DHRS counselor assigned full time to each group of ten students.

Budget: The program is funded in full by the state government at $293,000 per year.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Mr. Larry Lumpee, Youth Counselor Supervisor, Learning Alternatives Program, 4000 West Buffalo, Tampa, Florida.

Effectiveness: An evaluation of the program was made upon completion of the 1977-78 academic year. Data were collected only on LAP students. During the course of that year, 74 students participated in LAP. Periods of enrollment ranged from one day to an entire year. At the time of entry into the program, 50 percent of the students were under DHRS supervision, 43 percent were on probation, and the group had accumulated a total of 128 delinquency offenses and 44 status offenses. Forty-two youths finished the school year while attending LAP; 32 left the program for various reasons. Of those who left, 25 percent left as a result of behavioral problems or for other negative reasons, 44 percent left for "neutral" reasons, and 31 percent were mainstreamed back into the regular academic program. Based on court and school records during the intervention period (1977-78 academic year), the evaluators report a 91 percent reduction in delinquency offenses, a 23 percent reduction in status offenses, a 52 percent reduction in suspensions, a 72 percent reduction in unexcused absences, and a 20 increase in students' academic grade levels (California Test of Basic Skills), though these results are tempered by methodological problems discussed below.

Comments:

Although the evaluation results suggest that the program is effective in reducing delinquency and in affecting intervening variables, the results are inconclusive due to the following inadequacies in the research design and methodology:
a. The pre-intervention baseline interval used to compare delinquency and status offenses was substantially longer than the post intervention period. (The pre-intervention period equalled the youth's entire life prior to program entry. The intervention period was only the 1977-78 academic year.) Without equivalent baseline and follow-up time frames, it is impossible to determine if rates of delinquent behavior were actually reduced.

b. No control or comparison group was studied to control for maturation effects or other variables (e.g., history, selection, statistical regression) which could have produced the observed results.

c. The evaluation includes only the 44 students who finished the program. In evaluating the program's effects, all the students who were involved in the program for a substantial length of time should have been assessed, including those students who left for negative reasons.

Care should be taken in future evaluations to avoid methodological problems which prevent the interpretation of results.

2. The program strives to help students in the major areas of their lives -- school, home, and work. It provides ongoing in-school support and out-of-school support through counselor contacts with the student and his or her family. By involving parents in parent education and support services, greater consistency may be created between the youth's home and school environments.

3. The program does not focus on systemic school policies or practices which may help generate student disruption and alienation, though it does provide an educational alternative for those who have become alienated from school.

4. While an in-school alternative education program may reduce re-entry problems, isolating students for specialized attention in the regular school may also increase their separation and alienation.

5. The program appears to be a good example of collaboration between schools and a state social service agency.

6. It does not appear that students are involved in the design of their own learning programs at LAP, despite the fact that this is an individualized alternative program. Increased student participation might enhance students' commitment to and interest in the program and increase retention rates.
MARION COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH PREVENTION PROJECT
Salem, Oregon

**Strategies:** Psychological/Mental Health, Social Network, Education, Consistent Social Expectations

**Causes of the Problem:** "Alcoholism, drug abuse, and emotional disorders result from: 1) excessive stress upon the individual, and 2) an inability to cope with existing stress." (An inability to cope with stress may result in delinquent behavior.)

**Program Rationale:** Community members and groups can be educated to the causes of behavioral and other problems. Increasing people's awareness of stresses in their lives and in the lives of those around them, and helping them to acquire skills and to take responsibility for reducing or coping with those stresses in positive ways will lead to decreases in alcoholism, drug abuse, emotional disorders (and crime).

**Target Population:** The program primarily serves the residents of the city of Salem but also works with those in Marion County. The ethnic and sex distributions of those served are not available.

**Program Description:** The core of the Marion County Mental Health Project is a Primary Prevention Task Force whose goal is to identify, encourage, and coordinate primary prevention activities in the Marion County area. The Task Force consists of members of the County Community Mental Health Advisory Board, mental health and social service agency representatives, and citizen representatives. It works as a liaison for prevention planning with the Advisory Board and the community and also provides for prevention activities.

The prevention project utilizes an educational model to disseminate information. Workshops, classes, and presentations are tailored to the particular needs of various groups in the community, with emphasis placed on describing, in the group's language, the purposes and desired outcomes of the project. For example, for neighborhood groups, the emphasis has been on improving the quality of neighborhood life and on helping people in the neighborhood help each other. For employees in city government, making the city a better place to work and improving relationships between city employees and the citizens of Salem have been emphasized.

The Prevention Program has worked with the Salem Public Schools to develop an affective education curriculum. Teachers and counselors were trained by a consultant in human relations. Workshops included the use of affective education materials and the development of teachers' skills for helping students express themselves and develop strong self-images. Parent workshops have been provided to assist parents in learning new child-raising skills and in reducing their anxiety about parent-child problems. Training content has included awareness of feelings; valuing; decisionmaking; causes of behavior; listening; cooperation and conflict resolution; occupational and educational decisionmaking; and classroom management.
A peer counseling program was initiated at South Salem Public High School. An outside consultant provided counselors, teachers, and administrators with the material to plan and implement the program. Two student groups and one adult group completed the peer counseling activities. One student group completed the peer counseling practicum. However, the program was not maintained.

The City of Salem CREW (Community Relations Employees Workshops) emphasized stress and coping skills development through experimental workshops. During the first two years of the project, the workshops were designed for receptionists who had high frequency contact with the public. In the third year, the CREW materials were revised to enable all city employees to obtain problem solving skills and communications training.

During the first two years of the project a Mental Health Impact Statement tool was developed. The social impact measures focused on social indicators of illness including arrest records, requests for help at a community hot line, and referrals from target schools to the community mental health program. During the third year, a measurement tool was developed for assessing the potential stress impact of a particular policy or program upon neighborhoods in the community. An index of community well-being was developed which includes measures of social health, stability, community cohesion and identity, heterogeneity, problem-solving capacity, and the physical environment itself. The Advisory Board has utilized these tools to make major recommendations regarding the mental health plan and the development of needed services.

Implementation Requirements: The Salem Primary Prevention Project was enabled by House Bill 2745, passed by the Oregon State Legislature in 1973. Six projects were established to demonstrate methods for the primary prevention of alcohol and drug abuse problems. The Salem Project has been included as a permanent feature of the Marion County Mental Health Program, employing one professional staff person.

Implementing the project required the cooperation of many community groups and individuals. Students from local universities participated in the evaluation. Local police department personnel helped analyze social data. Teachers and counselors in several schools met regularly over a period of several years to develop the curriculum modules for the affective education program. City of Salem Personnel Department and Organization Development Program staff assisted in CREW training and in expanding the workshops to other city employees and departments. Local neighborhood groups and city planners provided input for the "Mental Health Impact Statement" tool.

Budget: Currently, the Marion County Mental Health Prevention Project is funded at $50,000. Ninety-five percent of the funds come from the state government and another five percent from the local government.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Carol Morgan, Prevention Specialist, Marion County Mental Health Primary Prevention Project, 3030 Center Street N.E., Salem, Oregon 97301.
Effectiveness: An evaluation of the third year of the Salem Prevention Project consisted of site visit and staff interviews, project reports on the accomplishment of objectives, and outcome measures of alcohol and drug abuse prevention and stress reduction in the community. The process evaluation indicated successful implementation of an affective education curriculum in the local Salem schools and Community Relations Employee Workshops in the city, along with progress on the broader goals of establishing community-wide prevention educational programs and developing a network of helping systems. The project failed to attain two of its goals: field testing of a Mental Health Impact tool and establishment of a peer counseling program (though other student groups were to be involved in peer counseling during the project's fourth year).

The outcome evaluation included measures of Community Stress (using the Standard Holmes Scale and other stress measures), an attitude survey of a sample of Oregon's total population, a Mental Health Social Impact Assessment Tool (which includes measures of social health, stability, community cohesion, and problem solving capabilities), instruments measuring self-concept, and pre/post test measures of organizational climate in the schools. Unfortunately, there is little elucidation of either research design or findings, and descriptions of the project's outcomes are haphazard and incomplete.

The evaluation indicates that there was no program effect on alcohol and drug abuse as measured by community-wide social indicators, police and juvenile statistics on alcohol and drug related arrests, and referrals to various agencies. These figures and statistics are not reported. Although the evaluation reports acquisition of Coping Skills and decreased stress levels in the community, these findings are not explicated. An attitude survey conducted the first and second years of the project in Salem indicated a limited understanding in the community of prevention concepts and a significant drop in "feeling toward the city" by a neighborhood participating in the school program. Neither the survey design nor the nature of its respondents are described.

The outcome evaluation of the program's effectiveness focused on community-wide indicators. The project's effects on individuals were not assessed.

Comments:

1. The Marion County Prevention Project is commendable as a comprehensive community-wide effort to address broad institutional and ecological variables, and to "incorporate preventive principles and practices into many organizations" (Willard, 1978:54). It represents a relatively successful mobilization of diverse groups in a primary prevention effort. It attempts not only to link existing agencies, but also to engage youths, parents, teachers, local police, city personnel, and other community members in numerous program activities.

2. The exclusive reliance on community-wide indicators in evaluating the project's effect is unfortunate. While the project did not affect community social indicators, it may have had positive effects on those who were directly served. No reports of such possible individual level effects are
available. Thus, the project's impact on alcoholism, drug abuse, and criminal behaviors is largely unknown.

3. The evaluation suffers from additional flaws which make a determination of program impact impossible. The evaluation itself reports methodological problems. (For example, the evaluation notes that self-concept measuring instruments "did not correlate with one another," post test data were not collected for many students, major differences in test scores existed between schools in the city, and poor data collection techniques hampered the evaluation.) Most of the components which were evaluated did not involve control or comparison groups; the sampling design, number, and nature of survey respondents are not specified; and important findings are mentioned but not elaborated. For example, the document reports that analysis of data on pre/post tests measures of organizational climate in pilot and control schools has been completed. However, neither the nature of organizational changes implemented nor the findings are discussed. It is unfortunate that the evaluation of a project of this scope was hampered by a lack of rigor and complete reporting.

4. The major risks in a project of this type are that its goals will be too broad to be accomplished and that peoples' expectations will be raised beyond the project's ability to achieve them. The evaluation states:

   Neighborhood groups were told that the project would help them improve the quality of life in their neighborhoods and help people in the neighborhood help each other. Employees in city government were told the project would help make this city a better place to work... Elementary-School Staff were told the project would help children develop in all areas and help them learn the multiple ways to cope with problems they might face during their lives... (Willard, 1978:48).

The goals of the community-wide prevention of drug and alcohol abuse, reduction in neighborhood stress, reduction of other social ills, and improvement of the overall quality of life are important. Such broad goals are, however, difficult to achieve or evaluate. Reasonable expectations should be maintained as people are recruited for participation in such a project in spite of the fact that successful recruitment requires that prospective participants be convinced that the project will be worthwhile.

5. According to the evaluation, the social impact assessment indicators developed by the project may be useful for assessing the quality of life in communities. They could, perhaps, be used in similar community-focused prevention projects in other sites.
Strategies: Education, Power Enhancement

Causes of the Problem: Due to a lack of knowledge of their rights and responsibilities under the law, youths may engage in delinquent acts without understanding the consequences of their actions. Furthermore, if interactions with agents of the legal system are negative, youths are likely to distrust that system and feel it operates against them. This sense of distrust and alienation may lead to increased delinquency.

Program Rationale: By educating youths about the law, the curriculum seeks to replace feelings of alienation with empowerment. A broader understanding of the law, along with a more positive attitude toward the role of law and the legal system, will enhance youths' pro-social behavior and develop a willingness to utilize legal means to change laws and policies.

Target Population: The program has been designed for high school age youths, but has also been offered to jail and prison inmates and to interested community members. Approximately 200,000 youths are served nationwide. In the D.C. Project, 1,000 students, half male and half female, participate. Eighty percent of these students are black, 5 percent are Hispanic, and 15 percent are white.

Program Description: The project has two components. The School Program is the youth education component. Street Law courses are incorporated into a school's curriculum and are taught by law students. The curriculum topics include law and the legal system; criminal, consumer, family, environmental, housing, and individual rights law. Student involvement is emphasized through use of role playing, case studies, values clarification, and simulation activities such as mock trials and negotiations. Classroom visits from attorneys, judges, and police, along with court visits and projects in the community, are often included.

High school students from 16 public institutions participate in a full year elective course which culminates in a mock trial competition between the schools. A case is enacted by students who perform all the various court roles -- attorney, bailiff, witnesses, etc. -- except the judge. In the final match, each of the two competing school teams presents its side before a judge of the District of Columbia Superior Court.

The Law School Program component helps to establish projects in which law students teach law in high schools, adult education programs, prisons, or mental facilities. Curriculum materials and technical assistance offered by this component are listed in the "Implementation Requirements" section below.

Implementation Requirements: The National Street Law Institute has compiled a number of materials which are available to schools interested in
implementing a Street Law curriculum. A list of these materials is available from the institute.

In addition, the following technical assistance is available:

1. Awareness workshops for teachers and administrators.
2. Assistance in design of, and participation in, in-service courses, seminars, and training institutes or symposia.
3. Technical assistance in designing a program and in involving local legal and other community resources.
4. Assistance with mock trial competitions.
5. Assistance in establishing community-based, law-related programs for youth group homes, adult education programs, and social service agency staffs.
6. Training of trainers and/or correctional personnel and assistance in designing such training programs.
7. Assistance in designing and editing state and/or local supplements to the curriculum.

The National Institute employs 6 full-time and 2 part-time professionals. The D.C. Project relies on 3 professionals, 2 support staff, and 40 Georgetown Law School student volunteers.

Budget: The National Street Law Institute is funded at $450,000 annually. Seventy percent of these funds are from LEAA, 15 percent from the local school district, and 15 percent from private foundations. The D.C. project is funded in full by the local school district.

Implementing Agency: In addition to the original Street Law Project started in the District of Columbia, the National Street Law Institute has helped implement programs in the metropolitan areas of Cleveland, San Francisco, Wilmington, Chicago, Minneapolis-St. Paul, St. Louis, Davis, and South Bend. Contact: Mr. Jason Newman, Director, National Street Law Institute, 605 G Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

Effectiveness: The program has not yet been evaluated; an evaluation in progress will assess students' knowledge acquisition and effects on preliminary indicators of delinquency such as alienation, apathy, and normlessness.

Comments:

1. Whether acquisition of knowledge about the law and the functions of the legal system will result in reduced delinquency is an empirical question. The program should be evaluated for delinquency impact.
2. The Street Law Institute approach differs from a number of other law-related education programs in that it provides students with information on their rights as consumers and in civil matters as well as knowledge about the legal system. Additionally, the experiential learning approach of "mock trials" distinguishes this program.

3. The D.C. Project course is an elective in the 16 high schools which offer it. It is not clear that those most likely to benefit from such a course will take it as an elective. In other districts, the Street Law curriculum is offered as part of the required social studies curriculum. This approach is more likely to reach students at risk of involvement in delinquent behavior.
NEW DIRECTIONS FOR YOUNG WOMEN
Tucson, Arizona

Strategies: Education, Role Development, Power Enhancement, Abandonment of Legal Control

Causes of the Problem: Female adolescents, particularly those who have been in contact with the juvenile justice system, experience many problems while growing up. These problems may include an inability to communicate with their parents, lack of skills, and the social and-economic consequences of running away from home. Although all youths may encounter these problems, young women also experience unique problems because of their sex. For example, they may be unable to attend school because of pregnancy or childrearing responsibilities; they may be unable to express their needs due to inexperience in being assertive; or, as a result of sex role stereotyping, they may be unaware of the opportunities available to them. These factors can contribute to a young woman's commission of delinquent acts and to involvement with the juvenile justice system.

Program Rationale: By removing young women from secure facilities and offering them opportunities for positive personal growth, the problems they experience which may contribute to delinquency can be avoided and juvenile delinquency among teenage women can be prevented or reduced.

Target Population: The program serves young women between the ages of 12-21 in Tucson and in the rural areas of Pima County, Arizona, including the Papago Indian Reservation. Of the 1,429 served in 1978, 633 (45 percent) were white, 437 (30 percent) were Mexican-American, 100 (6 percent) were black, and 259 (19 percent) were Native American.

Program Description: New Directions for Young Women (NDYW) advocates change in the juvenile justice system and other social institutions (such as the school, the family, and the labor market) with respect to their treatment of young women. Its focus has been advocacy for the deinstitutionalization of female status offenders in Pima County and the provision of technical assistance to other agencies to establish new programs as alternatives to incarceration. These new programs include "Creative Teen Power," a collaborative project with the YWCA and the Tucson Urban League which provides practical on-site work experience for females in nontraditional job areas (carpentry, construction, and other trades); the establishment of a Teenage Women's Task Force as part of the Tucson Women's Commission with a Young Women's Column inserted in the Commission's newspaper; and advocacy efforts which have resulted in the prioritization of the needs of female status offenders by the Arizona League of Women Voters and the American Association of University Women.

NDYW has sponsored two national conferences entitled "Changing Values: Teenage Women in the Juvenile Justice System" and has published a book on the first conference to heighten public concern regarding female status offenders (Crow and McCarthy, 1979). Other training/education efforts have included workshops with the Arizona State Department of Education, the U.S. Army, and personnel of the Tucson Unified School District. NDYW has also developed a
Sex-Role Stereotyping Awareness Tool for use with junior and senior high school students. Tucson teachers have used the tool and other materials to help break down sex-role stereotyping with their students.

In addition to its advocacy function, NDYW provides a number of direct services to young women who are in need of "support, information, and guidance" rather than "intensive therapy." Individual and family counseling are offered on an appointment or drop-in basis at the Center, in school, or at the client's home. All services are free. The counselor seeks to provide support and a positive atmosphere for the client and to act as a resource to the young woman and her family, particularly with regard to birth control, rape, sexuality, the job market, and local cultural and educational opportunities.

An alternative education program is available to women 16 years old or over. Free day care is provided for those with children. Coursework emphasizes the basic educational requirements needed to obtain a GED, as well as independent living skills such as parental effectiveness, job preparation skills, budgeting, and the like. Informational and support groups are available to all young women, who are encouraged to make their own decisions, resolve conflicts, and be independent and self-confident. Assertiveness training, sex role stereotyping awareness, women's sexuality awareness, parent readiness and single parent training, and a general communications group are offered.

A nine-week parent study group, Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, is provided to parents to help them "live with their children as equals." NDYW also offers a two-day camping trip/retreat program which combines recreation with many of the training and awareness programs the agency sponsors. The retreat seeks to provide young women with non-threatening ways of dealing with problems and building communication skills. Supervised by NDYW staff and other agency personnel who volunteer to participate, the retreats are usually held in camping sites in the nearby mountains.

Implementation Requirements: NDYW has gained legitimacy through extensive liaison work with the Pima County Juvenile Court, the Tucson School District, and other social service agencies in Pima County. The agency's all-female staff consists of five professionals, one paraprofessional, one youth, and two support workers.

Budget: NDYW currently is funded at $220,000; $70,000 is spent on direct service provision and $150,000 on public advocacy efforts. LEAA provides 75 percent of the agency budget, 10 percent is received from the local government, 10 percent from private foundations, and 5 percent from public contributions.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Carol Zimmerman, Executive Director, New Directions for Young Women, 376 South Stone, Tucson, Arizona 85701.

Effectiveness: The program is currently being evaluated. The 1978 Annual Report indicates that it has virtually eliminated the practice of detaining female status offenders in Pima County as a result of gaining the initial support of the court's presiding judge, the court administrator, and others within the juvenile court center. Opposition to deinstitutionalization has been effectively neutralized by ongoing conversations, meetings, and training of community resource
persons who work with young women served by the court. Close coordination of agencies and the development of alternative services have been integral to the program's deinstitutionalization efforts.

Comments:

1. NDYW provides a comprehensive program encompassing institutional change, as well as attention to individual needs. By cultivating or creating an extensive number of direct service resources in the community, it has provided a base within the county to advocate for the deinstitutionalization of female status offenders. This two-pronged approach appears to be an effective implementation technique for creating institutional change and securing quality services.

2. The agency's focus on the specialized needs of women status offenders and delinquents is notable. Frequently, programs target all juvenile offenders or focus primarily on males. The agency's specialized interventions should be evaluated to ascertain their effectiveness for women.

3. Although the expansion of occupational opportunities for women in non-traditional jobs is desirable, there is a risk that training marginally employable women for their first jobs in areas that are not fully accessible to women may result in further discouragement. Such problems should be anticipated and dealt with in projects such as this.
OPEN ROAD/STUDENT INVOLVEMENT PROJECT
San Francisco, California

Strategies: Social Network, Power Enhancement, Role Development, Education

Causes of the Problem: Schools located in the inner city and in changing neighborhoods face a number of problems resulting from poverty, racial prejudice, and fear. These factors infect school life and are manifested in a rapid turnover of administration and faculty, high absentee and dropout rates, and high levels of school violence and vandalism. Although security measures (self-locking doors which restrict movement, highly durable plastic windows, and the like) can reduce vandalism, the resulting atmosphere contributes little to a positive learning climate.

Program Rationale: Involving students in substantive areas of school policy making and other school affairs can decrease student alienation and provide the grounds for students to become attached to school and committed to educational pursuits. Establishing such bonds to school should reduce student misbehavior and delinquency.

Target Population: Approximately 300 students in 7 California schools are involved in Concerned Student Organizations in the schools. Information on participant ethnic and sexual characteristics is not available.

Program Description: The Open Road/Student Involvement Project (OR/SIP) enables students to participate actively in the administration of their school through two vehicles, a Student Involvement Class and a Concerned Student Organization.

The Student Involvement Class is designed to develop ongoing student leadership abilities to sustain and enhance the Concerned Student Organization. Students enroll in a leadership training class and they receive academic credit for participation. Course content is both process and issue oriented. Students work on real issues in the school while acquiring skills in issue identification, problem resolution, negotiation, leadership, and student rights and responsibilities. The class is taught by an Open Road staff member.

The Concerned Student Organization involves "natural student leaders" in an organization designed to create a positive atmosphere in the school and to change or eliminate conditions that jeopardize the school as a learning environment. Participating students include both those who are typically involved in school activities, and those who are not ordinarily selected for school leadership activities but who are leaders in other groups of the adolescent society. CSO's select projects based on the unique issues of the individual school. The revision of student codes of rights and responsibilities, the upgrading of student councils, the examination of school lunchroom food services, the initiation of peer tutoring programs, and the opening of "closed campuses" are projects which CSO's have undertaken. Support groups composed of the school principal, interested faculty, parents, community members, and others are instituted to assist CSO's. When the two groups become familiar with each other and are able
to work together, CSO students can affect important substantive issues of school policy. To date, CSO's have been involved in the selection of two school principals, have assisted faculty in the selection of textbooks, and have participated in workshops on school desegregation.

Implementation Requirements: Open Road/Student Involvement is one program component of the Open Road organization, a program of the Citizen's Policy Center. The Center's purpose is to encourage policies and programs which help young people to become competent, independent, and socially responsible. The organization includes Open Road/New Jobs, a public-sector employment program; Open Road/New Enterprises, a private sector employment program; and Open Road/Issue Research, a policy research arm of the Center.

Implementing the Open Road/Student Involvement program requires a strong commitment on the part of a school's administration to involve students in school policy and decision-making. Furthermore, since students are often unacquainted with the process of school negotiations, a leadership class is important to successful implementation. Although the program currently employs project coordinators to teach the classes and assist the CSO's, interested schools can receive technical assistance from Open Road to train a faculty member to run the program.

Budget: The program is funded at approximately $244,000 per year. All funds are from LEAA.

Implementing Agency: Open Road/Student Involvement has operated in three Los Angeles high schools (Fremont, Van Nuys, and Gardenia) and in three Oakland schools (Fremont, King Estates, and Hamilton). The organization provides technical assistance to a similar project at Santa Barbara High School. Contact: Ms. Melinda Moore, Project Director, Open Road/Student Involvement Project, 155 9th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Effectiveness: The program has been evaluated. However, due to a lack of consistency among the participating schools regarding the reporting of violent incidents, vandalism, and other student behavioral measures, outcome data cannot be compared across schools to assess the success of the project as a whole. Furthermore, comparison or control group data are not available to assess the program's impact on delinquency with confidence. Thus, the evaluation results must be seen as preliminary.

According to principals at the Open Road schools, the program was extremely effective in preventing flareups between different ethnic and racial groups and between gang members. A Rumor Control Network established by the CSO of Van Nuys High School and a round table discussion at Hamilton Junior High were deemed successful in quelling student disruption. The program was also reported to be helpful in decreasing "routine" fights. Students informed the Open Road Coordinators of impending conflicts in time for nonviolent resolutions. However, the project did not reduce the incidence of serious assaults (including the use of weapons and grave physical injuries) in the schools.
Vandalism generally decreased at the Open Road schools. Hamilton Junior High and Fremont High recorded 88 percent and 79 percent reductions, respectively, in the number of incidents from the previous year. However, some of this decrease may be attributable to major physical improvements, closed campus policies, and higher levels of staff and student morale at the schools. The Los Angeles schools reported a slight increase at Gardenia, a dramatic decrease at Fremont, and no change at Van Nuys, "despite a distinctly visible reduction in the amount of graffiti around the front of this school brought about as a direct result of the Mural and Neighborhood Watch Projects organized by the Open Road Concerned Student Organization" (Dreier and Werthman, 1978). The principal at Fremont believed that the reduction in vandalism resulted from improved relations between students and school staff both on and off campus and a cleanup campaign organized by the Fremont CSO.

Burglary rates at the schools were unchanged.

One of the successes cited by principals of participating schools was the involvement of marginal students who had attended school sporadically because they lack the basic skills to function in the classroom. Teachers and principals unanimously concurred that the project was effective in involving these students in a variety of legitimate extracurricular activities, thus integrating them into the school. Such students were able to participate in leadership classes and a peer counseling program set up by the school coordinators and the CSO's.

Recommendations based on the study included involving more teachers in the project; providing better feedback to both teachers and principals; organizing assault prevention workshops for teachers; involving more parents; organizing in-school management centers for marginal students; applying community crime prevention techniques in the schools; and developing a uniform system for reporting violence and vandalism in the schools.

Comments:

1. Although the evaluation provides much useful information concerning the program's role in schools, conclusions about program effects cannot be drawn without a more rigorous evaluation design. Given the promising changes in several participating schools, Open Road merits a thorough evaluation.

2. Open Road/Student Involvement Project appears to include students in school administrative decisions. It is unclear, however, to what extent involving students in school governance will impact their delinquent behavior. Although a number of schools -- such as the Alternative Learning Project described in this work and the Cleveland High School in Seattle, Washington (Howard, 1978) -- have created positive school atmospheres, apparently in part through student involvement, delinquency reduction cannot yet be attributed with confidence to student participation in school governance. The National Institute of Education's Violent Schools-Safe Schools study reports "no evidence that a more democratic form of government helps to reduce school crime," although "schools in which students feel they have no control over their circumstances are schools which tend to have more violence" (U.S. Department of Health,

3. The evaluation notes that a majority of the principals interviewed felt their most vexing problem had to do with students who wished to attend school, but were doing poorly in regular classes. It recommends organizing "Management Centers" to deal with these students.

Elliott and Voss (1974) have indicated that youths who commit delinquencies do so as a result of immediate experiences of failure in the school. They recommend interventions that will increase the opportunities for these youths to experience success. Many such students are "marginal students" as described in the Open Road evaluation. Efforts should be made to involve these students in activities that will heighten their chances of experiencing success, both academic and social, in school. While leadership classes and CSO's can involve these students in the legitimate social life of the school, they may not greatly improve their prospects of academic success. One way to improve their academic achievement may be to create in-school alternative learning opportunities for these students. (See the Learning Alternatives Program described in this work.)
Strategies: Education

Causes of the Problem: "Delinquent behavior is almost invariably related to low self-esteem, and... parents are the major factors influencing self-esteem." Poor communication between parents and their children reduces family members' abilities to be supportive of each other's needs. Lack of a supportive family environment can lead to a youth's delinquent behavior.

Program Rationale: Improving the communication skills of family members can create a supportive environment and increase children's self-esteem, thereby reducing the risk of delinquency.

Target Population: Services are provided to youths, ages 12 to 18, and their families (parents and siblings) in Polk County, Iowa. Referrals to PACE are received from schools, families, law enforcement personnel, and social service agencies. While some referrals have been received from the juvenile court, PACE prefers to target services to families of predelinquent youths with "poor attitudes toward school and family." As of June 30, 1978, training had been provided for 88 youths and 80 parents from 54 families. Program participants were white and 64 percent were referred on the basis of problems with a male child.

Program Description: Parent and Child Education (PACE) is designed to increase family unity and the use of the family as an effective support system for teenagers with poor attitudes toward school or family. The program serves both youths and their parents in 16 evening sessions extended over a two-month period.

The program utilizes Dr. Thomas Gordon's Parent Effectiveness and Youth Effectiveness Training (PET and YET) to increase family unity and communication skills. Parents and youths meet "simultaneously but separately except for designed activities and exercises." The approach is nonthreatening and instructional, and relies upon group processes and activities such as values clarification and confrontive role playing. Parent groups include discussion of community resources and support systems for themselves and their families and the appropriate use of controls and limits.

Implementation Requirements: The program requires parental participation. Weekly group facilitators are paid $10 per hour -- two nights per week for two-hour sessions. Each family purchases training materials for $7.50. Four part-time paid professionals administer the program and provide direct services. Good referral linkages with schools, social service agencies, and law enforcement are essential if adequate numbers of target families are to participate.

Budget: The program's budget is $40,742 per year (75 percent LEAA, 4.5 percent state government, 20.5 percent local social service agencies). The cost of the program is approximately $516 per family.
Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Ileta Wilson, Director, PACE Program, Family Life Education, Division of Catholic Council for Social Concern, Inc., Des Moines, Iowa 50309.

Effectiveness: PACE has been evaluated for its impact on children's behavior and self-esteem. A pre-post test design was used. No control or comparison group subjects were tested. A modified version of the Missouri Children's Behavior Checklist was used by parents who assessed the behavior of their children before and after training. Five areas of interest included self-control, adult relations, peer relations, community values, and family life. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) was used to assess children's self-esteem.

Parental ratings of children's behaviors consistently showed improvement after participation in the PACE Project. Positive ratings were more pronounced in the areas of self-control, adult relations, and peer relations. Children referred by the juvenile court and social agencies, as well as self-referrals showed greater gains than those referred by police or schools. The self-esteem of youth as measured by TSCS did not significantly change during PACE participation. Children under the age of 13 showed negative changes in self-control, peer relations, and family life. A letter from the juvenile court dated September 25, 1978 indicated that none of the children served were institutionalized at either of the state juvenile institutions subsequent to participation.

Comments:

1. Although this program was implemented as a juvenile delinquency prevention program which sought to achieve this goal by developing intra-family communication skills, the evaluation did not assess delinquent behavior or communication skills. Therefore, the effect of the project on these variables is not known. Furthermore, in the absence of a control or comparison group of nonparticipating youths and families with similar characteristics, it is difficult to determine whether any of these youths would have been institutionalized had they not received program services. Thus, the program's effect in preventing institutionalization of youths is also unknown.

2. The program served an all-white clientele. Its generalizability to other cultural or ethnic populations is not known.

3. The program evaluation indicates that PACE was not able to serve as many children or parents as originally anticipated. Recruitment of participants who need family communication skills is likely to be difficult for any parenting program offered on a voluntary, client-paying basis. Unless adequate incentives for participation and for cost remuneration (such as third-party insurance payments) can be found, the ability of parenting education programs to reach large proportions of the parent population in need of parenting skills may be limited.

4. The program has an excellent retention rate. Less than 10 percent of the families who began the PACE sessions dropped out before the end of the program. PACE retained families who might not have been "predisposed"
to the treatment. This suggests that the critical problem to be overcome by parenting programs may be getting people to attend the first session.

5. The program's negative effect on children under the age of 13 suggests that the techniques may have been too sophisticated for them or that an insufficient time was allowed in acquainting them with the YET materials.
PARTNERS
Denver, Colorado

Strategies: Social Network, Role Development, Activities/Recreation, Education

Causes of the Problem: Many youths commit delinquent acts because they lack experience and expertise in coping with the pressures of home, school, and their peers. These youths also often lack stable adult friends who can model successful coping lifestyles for them.

Program Rationale: A one-to-one relationship with "an adequately supported, coping, adult" can help a youth learn the necessary skills to successfully function in society and can provide an attachment to a conforming member of society. Skills for effective functioning and a bond to a conforming adult can reduce the likelihood of delinquent behavior.

Target Population: Partners targets youths between the ages of 10 and 18 who may or may not be in trouble with the law, but who are identified as youths who will penetrate further into the juvenile justice system without immediate intervention. Although referred by juvenile justice system agencies, all youths enter on a voluntary basis. Partners will not accept youths for whom program participation is a mandatory condition of juvenile court sentencing. Partners currently operates in the Denver, Weld, Mesa, and Larimer Counties of Colorado. Partners also has programs in the San Francisco Bay area of California and in Wake County, North Carolina. It serves about 700 youths annually. Approximately 20 percent of those served are black, 4 percent Hispanic, and 40 percent white. Slightly more males (60 percent) are served than females.

Program Description: Partners links "Junior Partners" (i.e., youths) with "Senior Partners" (adult community volunteers) in a relationship in which mutual trust, honesty, open communication, and a sharing of values are sought. The goal of the pairing is to increase the Junior Partners' sense of self-worth and effectiveness, to develop an awareness of the way in which social values and institutions affect one's life, and to learn more effective ways of coping with the world.

Senior Partners, the majority of whom are young, white, middle class men or women in their early 30's and who are "successfully coping adults," agree to spend at least 3 hours per week in a one-to-one relationship. The paired partners have no required activities other than spending time with each other, getting to know each other, and participating in some recreational and educational activities of their choice. To facilitate the relationship building, the Partners organization sponsors a number of activities throughout the year, including river rafting, hiking, skiing, plane rides, and education classes. In addition, many community recreational facilities, such as theaters, swimming pools, bowling alleys, and restaurants provide discount or free admission rates to Partners.

Partners also has a number of programs auxiliary to the Junior-Senior Partners pairing. Forty Junior Partners attend Partners Alternative School, a full-time compensatory Denver Public School operated in the Partners facility.
Remediation of basic skills deficits and the development of a positive self-concept are stressed in the school.

Six special projects presently in operation include Restitution, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention, Branching (replication in other sites), Ranching (a wilderness experience), NYPUM (trail biking), and River Rafting.

Partners' professional staff provides scheduled counseling at least once every two weeks, crisis counseling, and referrals to community legal, medical, and psychological services. Two hundred twenty-five doctors, dentists, and optometrists provided comprehensive medical assistance on a voluntary basis.

Implementation Requirements: Partners recruits Senior Partners through the media and one-to-one contacts made by staff and volunteers themselves. The ongoing recruitment campaign includes presentations to organizations, appearances on television and radio talk shows, public service spots, newspaper features, and other resource development activities. The program targets young adults, both singles and couples.

The organization itself is operated on a private business model. The agency's Board of Directors is comprised of executives from private industry, and community, academic, and agency leaders. The Board is an active decision-making body. Partners solicits funds from the private sector and posits that business people will contribute directly to social programs if they have a voice in determining how the programs are operated. Therefore, when a corporation makes a contribution, it is asked to provide representation for the Board of Directors and to provide other services including employee participation. This enables the contributing business to become actively involved in the program.

Partners' current goal is to establish three new branches each year. A replication design book for starting a Partners project is available from the organization. Each branching operation requires a budget of between $50,000-$75,000 and usually begins with a 2-to-3 person professional staff. Partners insists that a community have 75 percent of the first-year funds in hand, and 75 percent of the first two years' budget in pledges before being considered as a branch. The branch development process is supported by a community task force that oversees a feasibility study, a public awareness campaign, and fundraising. The process takes about two years to complete.

Budget: Partners' current annual budget is $1,113,450. Thirteen percent is obtained from LEAA, 16 percent from the state government, 3 percent from United Way, 26 percent from HEW, 15 percent from private foundations, 15 percent from corporate funding, and 12 percent from private donations and program fees. The overall budget consists of $873,450 in cash and $240,000 of in-kind services.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Mr. Jeff W. Pryor, Executive Director, Partners, Inc., 1260 West Bayaud, Denver, Colorado 80223.

Effectiveness: The program has been evaluated several times. In the evaluation summary sent to NCADBIP, 115 youths referred by the police and the court who received Partners' services, i.e., the Junior-Senior Partner match,
were compared with 834 youths who were not diverted to a program of any kind. (Partners’ youths were 67 percent male, predominantly 12-15 years old; 43 percent Hispanic; 35 percent white; 21 percent black. Comparison youths were 74 percent male; their age and ethnicity were not reported.) The comparison sample represented about 17 percent of the total arrested juveniles in the jurisdiction matched according to ethnic group, number of prior arrests, and the point or level at which they left the juvenile justice system (i.e., prior to court appearance, or after being found delinquent).

In a pre-post test design over a 16-month time period, the recidivism rates of Partner’s clients were compared with rates of the nondverted comparison group. Recidivism was defined as "repenetration into the justice system to or beyond the point of previous exit." (For youths diverted at the police level, for example, recidivism consisted of re-arrest.) Partners’ clients, mostly misdemeanants, had recidivism rates 20-to-30 percent below their comparisons.

Comments:

1. The evaluation of the project used a nonequivalent experimental and comparison group design. The comparison group consisted of nondverted youths. The assumption that the experimental and comparison youths were similar may not be correct and could influence outcomes. Further, lack of matching criteria with regard to the nature of the offense, prior offense record, and age may further compromise the findings. However, given the selection procedures, these biases could influence outcomes in favor of comparison group clients. In fact, Partners’ clients had more favorable outcomes, suggesting the program’s effectiveness in spite of the absence of a true experimental design.

2. A potential problem with the Partners model is that expectations of the Junior Partner can be raised and then not fulfilled. If Senior Partners do not honor their one-year time commitment, Junior Partners can experience a feeling of rejection. Currently, 70-to-80 percent of the Partnerships last 3 months and 65 percent last 12 months. The mean length of a relationship is 9 months.

Part of the problem with unfulfilled commitments is the contracting agreement with the juvenile justice system which focuses on the number of placements, not on the quality of the placements. People interested in replicating the Partners’ model should carefully screen the Senior Partners being matched and should involve Senior Partners in supportive termination training and counseling. Recruitment of ethnic minority Senior Partners is also a task which requires careful attention.

3. Partners is a unique combination of private sector and public sector involvement in the provision of a social service. The model could be expanded. The attention of private sector board members could be focused on facilitating institutional changes in economic areas that affect youths. For example, board members could work to promote increased employment opportunities for youths in the corporations represented on the board. Alternatively, institutional changes in schools could be facilitated by "matching" participating Partners’ businesses with individual schools to
help fund and create innovative programs, Partner's success in involving the private sector businesses in social program funding and decision-making is an important achievement in the present era of disillusionment with public sector social programs.
POMONA VALLEY JUVENILE DIVERSION PROJECT
Pomona, California


Causes of the Problem: (Youths commit crimes for a variety of reasons including a lack of education and work skills, negative peer influences, an absence of recreational facilities, lack of employment opportunities, ineffective parenting, and/or emotional problems.)

Program Rationale: (When youths are involved in prevention and diversion activities offering alternatives to crime, such as employment, family counseling, and positive peer influence programs, they are less inclined to commit delinquent acts.)

Target Population: The program serves high risk youths (52 percent) or those currently in conflict with the law (48 percent) in Pomona Valley. The service area encompasses five cities, La Verne, Pomona, San Dimas, Claremont, and Walnut, and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. At least 50 percent of the referrals to the program must come from law enforcement agencies. The other half come from schools, welfare, or other social service agencies. Many youths have been arrested for first-time offenses. Others have school related problems or are drug abusers. Eight hundred youths are served annually: 40 percent are black, 40 percent Hispanic, and 20 percent white. Sixty percent of the participants are male.

Program Description: The Pomona Valley Juvenile Diversion Project (PVJDP) is a cooperative, regional effort of five cities and unincorporated areas of Pomona Valley. The project is designed to provide both prevention and diversion programs for youths. The bulk of the funding is for the purchase of services for a maximum of 24 to 26 weekly sessions for each youth referred. Program objectives are as follows:

1. To establish an area-wide mechanism to coordinate referral and resource agencies involved;

2. To create new resource agencies and strengthen existing ones;

3. To foster cooperation between law enforcement and school districts in dealing with problems of prevention and crime reduction;

4. To reduce the rate of intake of juvenile offenders into the criminal justice system;

5. To increase the number of juveniles diverted to community service agencies;

6. To reduce the cost of juvenile offenses to communities and institutions involved.
The project has five components:

1. The counseling component provides one-to-one counseling for parents and youths. Counselors include community residents and college students trained in the project's internship program. Parent education classes also are offered to train parents in child-raising effectiveness techniques.

2. An employment component utilizes CETA funds to hire youths for jobs in the public and the private sectors.

3. A second employment component includes "juvenile diversion businesses" in which youths participate in the development and operation of several small industries. The businesses include a woodshop, a recycling program, an urban farming/horticulture program, and a motorcycle repair shop. All businesses are run by youths with staff supervision. Youths in both employment components can also enroll in career planning and guidance classes.

4. A gang component employs two staff members to work with juvenile gangs to try to redirect gang behavior into positive activities.

5. The fifth component consists of services purchased from other community-based agencies to engage youths in counseling, tutoring, recreation, wilderness training, and alternative schools. The PVJDP also participates in a joint school district-law enforcement agency-sponsored truancy program entitled "Operation Increased Attendance," designed to reduce truancies and daytime burglaries.

Implementation Requirements: This cooperative, regional effort involves agreements among six jurisdictions. The project's organizational structure allocates fiscal and administrative authority to a Project Board composed of city council members and designees. An advisory committee is made up of representatives of community agencies in each of the jurisdictions. Collaborating agencies include probation, community social service agencies, local law enforcement, and local school districts. The project has three professional and three paraprofessional staff members and six support staff. One youth works as a paid staff member. Community people and college students work as volunteer counselors.

Budget: The budget of the project is $576,915. Funding sources include the city and county (25 percent), state (6 percent), CETA (62 percent), and other federal sources (7 percent). Cost per client is estimated at $359 per year.

Implementing Agency: Contact Person: Mr. John Owsley; Pomona Valley Juvenile Diversion Project, 568 East Foothill Boulevard, Pomona, California 91767.

Effectiveness: The program was evaluated to assess its delinquency impact for each of its first four years of operation. Data were collected on participants during all four years, but rearrest was assessed only during the year of enrollment. No subsequent follow-up data are available. Further, although recidivism rates have been compared with other jurisdictions, no attempt has
been made to match PVJDP participants with other control or comparison youths on other than an aggregate city-by-city or county-wide basis.

Recidivism of clients referred by law enforcement agencies was measured for each year, declining from 21 percent of a random sample of 186 of the total of 330 referred youths the first year; to 16.6 percent the second year (N = 392); to 12.8 percent the third year (N = 289). The estimated recidivism rate for the first six months of the fourth year was 20 percent (N = 147). Several problems inhibit interpretation of these findings. First, the definition of recidivism was changed between the first and second year evaluations to one that would produce a lower rate. The first year definition was any rearrest after the original referral; the second year definition was rearrest for an offense more serious than the one which caused the referral initially or rearrest for two or more offenses subsequent to the original diversion referral. Determination of recidivism was hampered by incomplete reporting of juvenile arrest and police contact data to the Central Juvenile Index. Finally, the first year recidivism figure did not include arrests in jurisdictions other than those involved in the project while later recidivism statistics did. Given these problems of comparability, it is impossible to draw conclusions about changes in recidivism rates over time.

In a cross sectional effort, the first year recidivism rate of 21 percent was compared with a rate of 23 percent for a nearby diversion program and rates of 46.3 percent and 28.1 percent for two programs in Northern California judged "exemplary by LEAA." However, it is not clear that these comparisons are valid since recidivism was not defined and measured in the same ways in all these studies and the comparability of youths involved in the different projects was not established.

Another outcome measure assessed was community arrest rate, but again comparable data are not available for the four years of the project. In 1973-74, before the project, the number of arrests in Pomona Valley increased by 7.2 percent compared to a 9.4 percent increase for Los Angeles County as a whole. Figures for 1974-75 (the first year of implementation) show declines of 12.1 and 3.6 percent respectively. However, arrests for "serious crimes against persons" increased, crimes against property remained the same, and felony drug and misdemeanor arrests decreased. The data for 1976-77 and 1977-78 are for "WIC 602" or status offenses only and indicate a drop of three percent in Pomona Valley compared with a decrease of one percent for other parts of Los Angeles County with similar "juvenile arrest profiles." This difference is not viewed as significant by the evaluators.

Generally, the evaluations suggest a relationship between the rate of recidivism and the seriousness of the original offense. Although there are some exceptions, the programs with the lowest recidivism rates were those which dealt with youths referred for the least serious offenses. The data are not presented in a form that allows determination of the effectiveness of the various service components of the project.

Although school referrals accounted for almost half of PVJDP clients, outcome results for these clients are incomplete. During the second year, school staffs were asked to report on behavior change for a 50 percent sample of the
school-referred clients. The low response rate from school staffs prohibited a valid interpretation of results.

Comments

1. The evaluations would have been more conclusive if comparable and consistent data for recidivism, arrest rates, and cost per client had been gathered each year on the program participants and on a control or a comparison group. The program tracked participants only during the year they were involved in the program. Follow-up data on the same individuals over a four-year period would have provided greater information on the program’s long-term effectiveness. Finally, self-reports of delinquency would have given an additional indication of results, particularly for those youths engaged in less serious offenses.

2. The relationship between recidivism and seriousness of crime and the overall decline in number of referrals with prior arrest records (from 40.7 percent in 1974-75 to 22 percent in 1977-78) suggests the possibility that the project may have the undesired effect of "broadening the net" of justice system involvement for youths. Many youthful project participants would probably not have become involved in either serious criminal activity or the juvenile justice system even without this program. Program participation itself may have been an unnecessary and unwarranted intervention into the lives of these youths.
POSITIVE PEER CULTURE
Omaha, Nebraska

Strategies: Social Network, Role Development, Education

Causes of the Problem: The lack of social bonds to conventional others, poor self-concepts, and the lack of opportunities to contribute to one's community may lead to involvement in delinquent behavior.

Program Rationale: Adolescents exert great influence on each other. While peer influence often encourages youths to engage in delinquent behaviors, peer influence can also help youths find positive solutions to their problems with drugs, sex, school work, and family, and can increase their commitments to school. Additionally, when youths give help to others, their own feelings of self-worth increase. (Forming close bonds with conventional peers and developing feelings of self-worth will reduce the likelihood of involvement in delinquent activities.)

Target Population: The program serves four junior and senior high schools in the Omaha area. About 400 youths are served directly each year. The ethnic and sexual compositions of those served are not available.

Program Description: Positive Peer Culture (PPC) consists of self-help peer groups which are designed to "promote socially acceptable behavior and prevent disruptive activities and discipline problems." Each group is composed of 7 to 11 students of the same sex and an adult group leader. There are two kinds of peer groups:

1. Leadership groups are composed of students identified as either "positive" or "negative" student leaders by the school faculty and student body. The PPC program seeks to develop the leadership skills of these natural leaders, to give them a positive opportunity to work within the system, and to enable them to be part of the school decisionmaking process. Prospective members are invited by the faculty to join the group. The group meets at least once a week with a trained adult group leader to work on misbehavior and attendance problems of members, to develop preventive strategies for disruptive behavior, and to deal with individual problem students. "Problem students" can be referred to the leadership group by teachers, school administrators, other school staff, and students. Participation in the leadership group is voluntary. No academic credit is given for participation.

Monroe Junior High School and Burke High School in Omaha offer examples of leadership group functions. At Monroe, two girls who were harassing opposing team members during a home basketball game were stopped by staff members during the game. The following day, they were asked to come to the Positive Peer Culture Girls' Leadership Group where the group confronted their behavior. The Leadership Group at Burke was asked by faculty to help solve a problem of vandalism in the restrooms which was
making restrooms unusable. The students met with the school administration and agreed to use their influence to help prevent the problem. Restrooms were reopened during the entire day and vandalism decreased.

In addition to working with problem students, PPC Leadership Groups have addressed problematic school policies. Program Director Ken Butts (1979: personal communication) notes, "Leadership groups have been instrumental in giving feedback to the school administration on a variety of school policies. As a matter of fact, one of the benefits of the program for the students is the realization that working with the administration can result in a healthy and humanistic school environment -- an environment produced by students and staff working together."

2. Student Help Groups are composed of students with identifiable behavior and attendance problems. Such students are referred to the group by a staff committee composed of students, teachers, assistant principals, the principal, counselors, the school nurse, and the PPC group leader. An interview is held with the student. The function of the group is explained and the student is asked to join. If the student agrees to join, he or she is informed that he or she must remain in the group until the group decides that the student no longer needs to attend the meetings. Improved behavior and attitude are the major criteria for termination. Unlike the ongoing Leadership Student Groups, Student Help Groups are established on an "as needed" basis.

Implementation Requirements: PPC is a national corporation based in Shenandoah, Virginia. One of the nation's first PPC school programs began in an Omaha public school in 1973. Since then, Omaha's PPC program has expanded to several schools in the district. Currently, it is administered by the Omaha Public School District's Department of Human Community Relations Services.

One PPC professional staff member works with schools' students and staffs. He trains teachers who voluntarily agree to be involved on their own time. Training lasts approximately eight to nine weeks with one one-and-a-half hour training session per week. The trained teachers provide the organization and support for the group. The primary requirement for program implementation is the willingness of the staff to participate in the program. Omaha's program presently involves a school district staff of one program administrator and 64 teachers who volunteer as group leaders.

Budget: The program's annual budget is $35,000. One hundred percent of the funds come from the Omaha School District.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Dr. Don R. Benning, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Human-Community Relations Services, Omaha Public Schools, 3902 Davenport Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68131.

Effectiveness: A 1975 quasi-experimental design evaluation compared eighth grade Leadership Group students (experimental group) with randomly selected comparison students, also in the eighth grade. The number of experimental and comparison group students varied according to six program effectiveness variables tested.
The variables and results are listed below:

1. **Suspension rate per student for the academic year**: The suspension rate was higher during the base and the intervention year for the experimental students. The PPC students showed a nonsignificant reduction in suspensions and the controls a nonsignificant increase. (N intervention = 87; N control = 61; data source = school records.)

2. **Tardy rates per student for the academic year**: The intervention group had a nonsignificantly higher tardy rate than the comparison group during the baseline year. The experimental group showed a nonsignificant decrease in tardy rates over the two years while the comparison group had a significant increase in tardy rates. (N intervention = 90; N control = 61; Data source = school records.)

3. **Absence rates per student for the academic year**: The absence rate for the intervention group was significantly less than for the comparison group for both the baseline and intervention years. However, the experimental absence rate increased significantly over the two-year period. The control group's rate also increased, but not significantly. (N intervention = 91; N control = 62; data source = school records.)

4. **Academic achievement**: Academic achievement, as measured by school grades, remained unchanged for both groups. There was no difference in grades between the groups. (N intervention = 68; N control = 58; data source = school records.)

5. **Attitudes toward school**: Only the PPC intervention group was tested. Although no change was recorded on a locally developed pre-post questionnaire, the evaluators claim that deterioration was expected and that the finding of "no change" in attitudes toward school was a positive finding. (N intervention = 115.)

6. **Situation problem-solving skills**: After participation in PPC, experimental group students scored significantly higher (p = .01) on a test of problem-solving skills than did control students. (N intervention, 7th grade = 53, 8th grade = 31; N control, 7th grade = 49, 8th grade = 43.)

**Comments:**

1. The program evaluation did not compare equivalent experimental and comparison groups. Random assignment to PPC was not used. The experimental group students were those involved in the Leadership Group. Comparison group students were drawn from the regular student body. Although the evaluation indicates that the composition of the experimental groups (i.e., number of "positive" and "negative" students) was proportionately similar to that of the regular class from which comparison group students were randomly selected, it is not clear that Leadership Group students were matched accurately with a comparison group of regular school students. Thus, selection factors may have affected the results reported above. In particular, the fact that participants are not awarded academic credit or provided other extrinsic incentives to participate makes
it likely that "alienated," disruptive, and generally nonconventional students were self-selected out of the PPC groups.

2. Baseline data were gathered when students were in the seventh grade and intervention data when students were in the eighth grade. If the members of the PPC experimental groups were selected for participation on the basis of extreme initial behavior (in either direction), the changes over time could represent regressions toward the mean.

3. PPC has been recognized nationally as an effective drug abuse prevention program. In 1973, the PPC program initiated at Monroe Junior High School in Omaha was cited by the Nebraska Commission on Drugs for excellence in its work to prevent drug abuse among young Americans. In 1975, the program was awarded a National Certificate of Merit by NIDA.

Despite the awards, the evaluations provided to NCADBP do not include measures of PPC's impact on delinquency or drug abuse. Program materials offer only anecdotal indication of effects such as a reduction of broken windows from "60 to 5 per month." Furthermore, the evaluation findings that are available are not uniformly positive. No significant differences were found between participants and non-participants in suspension rates and school grades. While participants had significantly lower rates of absenteeism than the comparison group before the program, their rates of absenteeism increased significantly during the year of the project. Absenteeism rates for non-participants also increased, but not significantly. On the other hand, tardy rates for participants were higher than for non-participants during the year before the project and significantly lower for participants during the year of the project.

Given the conflicting results, the failure of the evaluation to control for selection and regression effects, and the current proliferation of "peer influence" models as delinquency prevention strategies, it appears prudent to evaluate these programs more carefully. More rigorous research designs and outcome measures which assess delinquency, drug abuse, student academic achievement, and school behavior variables should be used. Ethnographic data also should be gathered to assess process and group interaction issues in peer-focused programs.

4. Encounter type programs like PPC may experience resistance from teachers and parents in implementation. Omaha's program was initially rejected by many teachers because they felt the program's claims of effectiveness were unreliable and that the students might be given too much power. Likewise, parents may express fears if they misperceive the intentions of the groups. PPC has tried to offset these fears by making teacher participation in the program voluntary. Teachers are not required to participate as group leaders.

5. In some schools, PPC meetings are held during the regular school hours. Participating students leave their usual classes to participate in PPC groups. This can create friction between PPC leaders and other teachers.
6. As noted above, there are few external incentives provided for PPC participation. Students do not receive academic credit and in some schools, PPC groups meet during the lunch hour. Recruitment and maintenance of ongoing participation of "negative" school leaders is likely to be very difficult in this context. Yet the program's approach relies on the interaction of "positive" and "negative" leaders for its effects.
PRE-PARENTING TRAINING
Portland, Oregon

Strategies: Psychological/Mental Health, Education

Causes of the Problem: Although most young adults become parents, little formal training is given in parenting. The growing incidence of "battered, delinquent, and behaviorally or emotionally disturbed children" may indicate that many parents are unprepared for the job. Furthermore, the breakdown of the nuclear family, the emergence of single-parent families, and other changes in traditional family systems are changing the nature of parenting itself. When parents are ineffective, children feel lost, lack a sense of their role in their family and community and do not become attached or committed to acceptable patterns of living. Effective parents can help their children develop into well socialized community members. Without this support, many young people may engage in negative behavior such as drug abuse and delinquency.

Program Rationale: Schools cannot teach a particular life-philosophy or set of values. Within a general value framework, however, they can provide controlled experiences and practice in decisionmaking. The success of the pre-parent adolescent in becoming a parent is "deeply rooted in the individual pre-parent's ability to make life decisions and to find...a sense of direction." Training in these areas will increase the probability that young adults will become effective parents. In turn this will reduce the probability that their offspring will engage in self-destructive or negative behaviors (including delinquency).

Target Population: The project is designed for all high school students in the State of Oregon. From 1975-78, it was tested in two high schools with a total of 46 students. During this pilot phase 95 percent of the participants were female. One school was an alternative education program for pregnant or behaviorally disturbed adolescents. In the school year 1978-79, the program was introduced in 50 schools across the state. (Current statistics on the ethnic and sex composition of program participants are not available.)

Program Description: Pre-Parenting Training (PPT) is a self-contained curriculum which was developed at Adams High School in Portland, Oregon. It focuses on the development of greater self-awareness, values clarification, decisionmaking, and conflict resolution in the classroom and in practice. The program consists of two nine-week segments or terms (two terms to a semester or half-year of school) during which students attend classes three days a week for two class periods. They also work twice a week as "interns" at a day care center serving youth who range in age from six weeks to five years. Classes utilize role play, fantasy simulation, lecture, discussion, and films. Twice monthly, each student may be video taped while working with an infant. These tapes form the basis for biweekly individual conferences with the student covering parenting techniques, child development, and discipline. The program does not duplicate home economics curricula in nutrition, finance, or child care.
Implementation Requirements: Four in-service training sessions, dealing specifically with material presented in the curriculum, such as Transactional Analysis, communication theory, and self-image psychology, are available as part of the PPT package. Districts adopting the curriculum must provide substitute teacher pay and mileage for teachers attending the four in-service sessions, the resources for purchase of audio-visual materials used in the curriculum, and access to grade schools or child care center(s) within transporting distance for student internships. In Oregon, the project pays the costs for the first term of adoption in a district. The project includes three professional staff members and one support person who have developed and tested the curriculum.

Budget: The program's annual budget is $50,000 (100 percent from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IV-C). The cost to adopting schools is approximately $1,000. This includes the curriculum adoption guides, film strips, teacher in-service training (four sessions), and teacher-texts.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Robin Hickox, Project Director, Pre-Parenting Training, Adams High School, 5700 North East 39th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97211, or Mr. Ray Talbot, The Oregon State Department of Education, 942 Lancaster Drive NE, Salem, Oregon 97310.

Effectiveness: The program has been evaluated using a pre-post test design (no control or comparison groups) for students completing only the first term of the curriculum (N = 35) and for students who completed both nine-week terms (N = 16). The evaluation measured changes in three variables: student self-concept, parenting skills as perceived by the Project Director and the day care staff, and parenting skills as perceived by the student participants.

Self-concept, as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept scale, improved significantly for those students who completed both terms of the semester. Students involved for only one term showed nonsignificant declines in self-concept.

All three parenting skills reports (director, staff, and self) showed significant increases at post test. Student self-reports showed consistently greater change than that reported by the director or staff. There was some inconsistency between the self-reported scores and the scores of the other observers. Raters consistently indicated that the greater gains in parenting skill occurred during the first term and tended to rise less dramatically during the second segment.

Comments:

1. Offering pre-parenting training in public schools overcomes a problem encountered in parenting education. The adults who volunteer for parenting classes are often middle class whites with pre-existing interests in improving family communication, or people experiencing current crises with their children. Parents from other segments of the population have not participated in parenting education classes in large numbers. Providing course credits in secondary and alternative schools for pre-parenting classes may provide an incentive for a broader segment of the population to learn parenting skills.
2. The effectiveness of pre-parenting training in preventing delinquency is totally unknown. Further, a rigorous evaluation of the approach for delinquency prevention effects would be extremely difficult and costly, requiring follow-up over 15 to 20 years and assessment and statistical control of numerous intervening variables. Thus, while the program may have some long range delinquency prevention potential, it is unlikely that this potential will be measured or known in the near future. The program should be considered primarily on its merits as a parenting program rather than as a delinquency prevention approach.
PRIDE (PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES IN DRUG EDUCATION)
Hialeah, Florida

Strategies: Education, Social Network

Causes of the Problem: (Low self-concept is a cause of drug abuse and other behavioral problems among youths.)

Program Rationale: Affective educational programs designed to produce positive attitudes towards self can increase youths' self-concepts. If individuals change the negative views they have of themselves, substance abuse (and delinquency) will be minimized.

Target Population: PRIDE serves public school students in grades K-12 in Dade County. Two hundred-fifty thousand youths are served each year. Approximately one-third are black, one-third are Hispanic, and one-third are white. Sixty percent of the students are males.

Program Description: PRIDE is a comprehensive drug abuse prevention program. The program has three major components:

1. The Instructional component is primarily cognitive. Students learn decisionmaking and values clarification skills using substance abuse as a discussion topic.

2. The Affective component focuses on development of positive attitudes towards self and others. A number of techniques are used at various levels. Elementary school-age children participate in "Magic Circle" group discussions and receive "teen counseling" in which trained high school students talk with them about feelings of alienation, loneliness, and responsibility, and about communication problems with peers and adults. For students in secondary schools, peer counseling approaches are used. Students selected and trained in interactive skills by the Substance Education Specialist meet informally with their classmates to discuss problems. "Drop-in" or "Rap" rooms are available for privacy.

3. The Alternative Activities component, an expansion of the extracurricular activities of the schools, offers athletic, social, and parent-involved activities aimed at countering drug abuse. Personality development programs such as classes in Transcendental Meditation (TM), Yoga, Karate, and Arica (exercise and meditation) are included.

In addition, PRIDE provides parent communication skills education and teacher training in affective techniques.

Implementation Requirements: During the 1972-73 academic year, the Dade County Board of Public Instruction committed itself to an affective education, student involvement model for an intensive Substance Education Program. Resources were allocated for implementation in every school throughout the district. The program was implemented under the State's Alternative
Education Act. Presently, 75 professionals work in the program in the school system, and 2,000 student volunteers participate in operating the program.

Budget: The annual budget is $1,300,000, all of which comes through the local school district.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Joyce Hickson, PRIDE, 5975 East 7th Avenue, Hialeah, Florida 33013.

Effectiveness: The program was evaluated during the 1973-74 school year to assess student self-esteem. The program's impact on substance use or delinquency was not evaluated. Elementary school students were assessed on a project-developed "As I See Myself" self-concept rating scale using a post-test only design. Students were grouped by grade and sampled (randomly selected) from 24 schools (14 percent of the 1973 Dade County elementary schools). Experimental group students -- those who participated in PRIDE in the fourth grade (N = 108) and the fifth grade (N = 118) -- scored significantly higher than their comparison group students (N 4th = 109; N 5th = 113). Sixth grade experimental group students (N = 102) scored nonsignificantly lower than their comparisons (N = 100).

Secondary school students also were tested on an "As I See Myself" rating scale using a post-test only design. Twelve junior high schools (representing 30 percent of the Dade County junior high schools) and 12 senior high schools (representing 60 percent of the 21 county high schools) were sampled. Results showed experimental group students (N = 141) scored significantly better than the controls (N = 130).

Results for high school students were consistent regardless of grade level, administrative area, or sex of students. Teachers reported that participating students improved in their school behavior. Student counselors indicated that participation in the peer counseling component improved their awareness of their own feelings and the feelings of others.

Comments:
1. The program evaluation is hampered by several methodological problems:
   a. The treatment group included students trained to be peer counselors. These students may have had positive school and personal attitudes and may have skewed the results of the experimental group's aggregate score in a positive direction.
   b. The evaluation does not measure drug usage, delinquency, or changes in knowledge or attitudes about drug usage, despite the program's claim to be a drug abuse prevention model. Future evaluations of affective education, peer counseling, and cross-age tutoring models should include self-report measures of delinquency and drug abuse. Self-esteem measures alone are inadequate.
   c. The post-test comparisons assume pre-test equivalence. This is a particularly questionable assumption if either (1) assignment to
treatment and control groups is not random, or (2) samples have not been matched on background criteria. In either case, appropriate analysis would involve comparison of pre-test/post-test differences across groups. Because a post-test only design was used, it is difficult to know if observed self-esteem differences between PRIDE participants and other students were the result of program participation or other factors.

2. The PRIDE program represents the implementation of a prevention program across an entire school district and is noteworthy for the scope of its efforts.
Strategies: Social Network, Role Development, Education, Economic Resources

Causes of the Problem: Disadvantaged youth who drop out of school face severe obstacles limiting their employability. Lacking the knowledge and motivation to secure and maintain jobs, they easily become frustrated when job searches fail to yield well-paying and high-status employment. The jobs they are qualified to perform frequently are limited in number and the competition for them is intense. School dropouts may begin jobs expecting to fail or may hold negative values regarding work and authority. (The inability to succeed in a meaningful work role or to earn a living through gainful employment may motivate disadvantaged youths to commit delinquent acts.)

Program Rationale: The employability of disadvantaged, dropout youths can be increased by replacing their former failures with a series of programmed successes; providing them with a better understanding of the nature of work; increasing their self-esteem and coping skills; developing realistic individual and career goals; and instilling them with proper motivation. By assisting youths in these ways, the program seeks to enhance the likelihood of job success and upward mobility. It also should contribute to their community's economic well-being by helping them become self-supporting taxpayers and consumers. Gainful employment that increases youths' self-respect can curtail delinquent behavior.

Target Population: The program targets dropouts, minority poor, and/or underemployed or unemployed youths, ages 16-22. Youths are referred through agency contacts with school counselors, youth-serving agencies, the court system, and community-based organizations. Approximately 200 youths from Philadelphia County are served each year. Program participants are predominately black (90 percent), with Hispanics (5 percent), and whites (5 percent) comprising a small proportion. Sixty percent of the program participants are female.

Program Description: Project 70001 seeks to increase the employability of enrolled dropouts through a three-component program that includes motivational training, employment opportunities, and academic training. Developing self-reliance is a prime program goal.

Youths are tested initially to determine their academic strengths and deficiencies and to tailor the program's educational component to their needs. Those clients who could benefit from extensive remedial education are enrolled in a 13-week "prep component" consisting of 300 hours of classroom instruction in basic reading, arithmetic, and communications skills. The goal of this component is to bring the youths' reading and math skills up to a sixth-grade level. Enrollees are paid $1.20 per hour for participation and remain in this component until they reach that goal. Other students take ABE or GED courses according to their abilities. Classes are taught five days and two evenings per week. Positive behavior is rewarded. During the pre-employment period, program participants, called "associates," also receive supportive vocational
counseling and an orientation to the world of work. This portion of the program is funded by the Department of Labor. When considered job ready, youths are referred to private sector employers for employment in entry-level positions. On-the-job training is paid by the employer once the participant is hired. Project 70001 believes that a salary commitment made by the employer will lead to the retention of the employee over the long run and to greater employee responsibility. Most youths are placed in distribution occupations. Those with good arithmetic and reading skills are placed in retail selling (about 30-35 percent of the youths placed). The jobs are viewed as sources of income while youths are enrolled in 70001's education programs and are a means of establishing an employment record. The average starting wage is $3.25 per hour. The goal for each job placement is for the youth to remain employed for at least 90 days. Employee job performance is monitored by a 70001 program coordinator.

To develop positive attachments with the other youths involved in the program, the associates participate in SEVCA (70001 Career Awareness), a recreational and employment-focused club. SEVCA helps plan local 70001 activities. Linked to the other 70001 organizations across the country, Philadelphia SEVCA works with the other clubs in sponsoring regional and national employment seminars. The national scope of the program may help youths develop a sense of belonging, importance, and power.

Implementation Requirements: Project 70001, Philadelphia, is a local chapter of a national program which has 55 chapters in 27 states. The national project gives technical assistance to local programs for the implementation of local operations and disseminates the program model to local agencies. Local affiliates adapt the program model to fit local needs and labor market conditions. The Philadelphia chapter employs 14 professionals, 12 paraprofessionals, and 3 support staff.

Budget: 70001's Philadelphia budget is $607,934 yearly, 10.5 percent from LEAA and 89.5 percent from CETA. All participants' wages after job placement are paid by employers (and are not contingent upon further CETA funding). The National 70001 budget is $3.4 million annually.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Mr. John S. McGowen, Project 70001, 219 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107.
Local 70001 chapters are administered by community-based institutions. The Philadelphia project is administered by the Department of Youth Activities of the Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Effectiveness: The 1978 year-end report of the Philadelphia chapter indicates major difficulties in finding a sufficient number of jobs for enrollees that satisfy their interests and aspirations. Also, many participants have severe academic deficiencies which interfere with job functioning. The project had difficulty in providing sufficient instructional time for these enrollees. Of 39 placements made during the first six months of the program, 80 percent lasted at least 30 days.
Comments:

1. Difficulties in finding job placements for youths which they view as meaningful or interesting and academic deficiencies which interfere with participants' job functioning are problems which could seriously limit the project's ability to achieve its goals. Job placements with long-term prospects for upward mobility appear important if jobs are to bond youths to non-delinquent roles. Provision of basic reading and math skills appears necessary if participants are to perform competently on the job. In a communication from the agency, 70001's Director reports that the implementation of the "prep component" and an intensification of the other educational components have impacted on these problems positively: "We are making progress in placing more and more youths in jobs that do offer chances for upward mobility; in banking, the credit and insurance industries, and other large employers such as Sears and Roebuck or the Bell Telephone Company ..."

2. To assess the impact on youths' current and long-term employment and on delinquency, the program should be evaluated rigorously by following participants and a comparison group of unserved youths over a one-to-three year period.
REGIONAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM
Nashville, Tennessee

Strategies: Biological/Physiological, Psychological/Mental Health, Education, Social Network

Causes of the Problem: When a handicapped child is born into a family or when a very young child becomes a severe behavior problem, the entire family is affected. (If the parents lack behavior management skills, parent-child attachment is threatened. Children in families whose members are in conflict with one another or have poor attachments to each other are likely to commit delinquent acts.)

Program Rationale: By learning specific behavioral management techniques, parents can gain better control over their children and help bring emotional stability to the family. (When children receive clear and consistent messages from their parents, delinquency is less likely.)

Target Population: Parents from 465 families with developmentally disabled, autistic, behaviorally-disordered, or multi-handicapped children have been trained over the past ten years. The program serves about 70 families from Davidson County annually. Twenty-five percent of the families are black and 75 percent are white. About 75 percent of the families served are referred due to problems with a male child. Thirty-eight percent of the families' incomes fall below $7,000, fifty-one percent are between $7,000 and $13,000, and eleven percent are above $13,000. Referrals come from pediatricians, welfare workers, social workers, public health nurses, and child development specialists. Designed to serve the preschool population, the upper age limit for children entering the program is five years. There is no lower limit.

Program Description: The Regional Intervention Program (RIP) is a professionally administered, parent-operated therapeutic preschool for handicapped or behaviorally disordered children. Its objectives are to inexpensively teach parents effective techniques for preventing or overcoming behavior problems with their children. The program is operated by parents who have completed the program. Professional staff act as on-the-spot resource persons and provide close supervision.

All children and their families served by RIP first enter an "Intake" classroom in which their conceptual and behavioral performance levels are assessed. Based on the assessment, they are assigned to one of the following four modules:

1. The Individual Tutoring Module: Parents receive training in language-related behavior management techniques.

2. The Generalization Training Module: Parents are taught reinforcement techniques for managing their child's behavior in nonclinical situations. Trained parents visit trainee parents in their homes to offer support and instruction.
3. The Basic Skills Module: The module is designed for parents of severely handicapped children and specializes in training in self-feeding and dressing.

4. The Preschool Module: The module seeks to develop children's social skills through three preschool classes. Each classroom has approximately ten children and one full-time parent along with a changing number of trained parents and parents-in-training.

5. The Family Module: Due to the difficulties working parents encountered in participating in daytime sessions, RIP has incorporated a "Family Module" into its program format. The module offers the same basic services provided in the other modules in the late afternoon and early evening (from 3:30 to 7:30 P.M.) to accommodate parents who work during the day.

In all modules, parents are videotaped while training their children. Parents review the tapes of themselves and other parents. They learn to count and record behaviors and to establish individual behavioral objectives for their child's growth. Average treatment time is eight months.

The final step for all RIP families is the Liaison Module. In this phase, the child is prepared to move into a program outside of RIP, such as a community school or daycare center. Well-trained, experienced parents who have accepted responsibility for finding placements work in this module. Follow-up visits to the home and/or school (placement) are made every six months or until the parent feels that RIP services are no longer necessary.

Parents are involved not only as teachers but also in an administrative capacity as evaluators. A RIP Evaluation Committee, composed of elected parents along with professional staff, holds monthly meetings to monitor all aspects of the program. The paid staff of the agency are responsible for assessments, devising individualized remediation programming, data collection, and evaluation. Clinical consultation is provided by consultants in child psychiatry, clinical psychology, special education, pediatrics, and speech pathology.

Implementation Requirements: Families pay for their training by committing themselves to providing services and training for new families for six months after work with their child is completed. There are no fees for the service. In order to assist parents in the training, child care is provided. As mentioned above, the Family Module was introduced into the program recently to accommodate parents who work during the day. Thirty "volunteer" parents currently staff the program.

The agency employs five full-time professionals in special education (Master's level or above), eight paraprofessionals, and seven support staff.

Budget: The program budget is approximately $200,000 (100% from state government sources). The average cost per child is $2,400 per year. Initially RIP was funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped under the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program.
Implementing Agency: Contact: Dr. Mathew A. Timm, Director, Regional Intervention Program, 2400 White Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee 37204.

Effectiveness: The program reports that evaluations have shown positive effects but evaluation data have not been received by NCADBIP.

Comments:

1. Administratively, RIP is part of a large regional psychiatric hospital operated by the Department of Mental Health. Program materials report that the hospital suprastructure is "unwieldy, requiring too much unnecessary paper work." It is possible that this type of program would function better in a small nonprofit organization.

2. A commendable aspect of this program is its use of parents in multiple roles -- trainee, teacher, evaluator, observer, etc. Because parents become involved in many center activities, they may develop commitments to one another that extend beyond the clinical setting. Thus, a benefit of the training method appears to be the establishment of a supportive helping network of parents. This may be an important factor in extending treatment effects over time.

3. As presently structured, the program may not adequately provide for the involvement of fathers. Given that 75 percent of all referrals involve a male child and that the socialization literature has repeatedly shown a substantial impact of same-sex parent on offspring behavior, it would be desirable to develop program schedules which provide for the maximum possible participation by fathers.

4. The RIP program uses a promising parent training model: 1) build knowledge; 2) enhance skills; 3) practice and apply skills; 4) gradually disengage from training. This approach has been shown to be effective with oppositional children (Patterson and Reid, 1973; Patterson 1974; Wiltz and Patterson, 1974).

5. Many parenting programs have had difficulty in recruiting and training low income minority parents. RIP's use of parent peers in many program capacities may represent an effective strategy in the delivery of parenting services to disadvantaged families.

6. RIP's Liaison Module assists parents in solving concrete problems, i.e., in finding appropriate community day placements for children after the training is completed. To assist parents with problems after the end of training, parent peers conduct six month follow-ups by making home or school visits. The provision of such supports on a broader scale may allow multi-problem families respite from day-to-day stresses. Gordon (1970, 1972) and Wahlert (1979) hypothesize that this is an effective, and perhaps necessary, component of parenting programs designed to assist low income families. It has not yet been evaluated.
7. Specific efforts by parent trainers to insure the generalization of in-clinic training to the home have only recently been evaluated. The Generalization Module concept is a noteworthy attempt to extend clinical effects by in vivo training. Evaluation of this module in terms of the generalization of parent skills to other settings, other child behaviors, and other times (i.e., following training) should be undertaken.
SCHOOL YOUTH ADVOCACY
Lansing, Michigan

Strategies: Education, Social Network, Power Enhancement, Role Development

Cause of the Problem: Students with unmet emotional and academic needs may show their frustration through disruptive behavior. Dropping out of school is "one of the last stages in a chain of failures for these students. Typically students who drop out have a poor self-concept, are shy about taking risks, lack skills in handling interpersonal relations and conflicts, and express their frustrations through withdrawal or hostility." Such students are likely to become delinquents.

Program Rationale: Guided group interaction will help students improve attitudes toward self, others, and school, and help improve academic achievement. Acquisition of skills to effectively manage behavior can eliminate the need for disciplinary sanctions. A structured peer support group can prove a viable alternative to traditional disciplinary action, and may prevent disruptive behavior. (Students who remain in school and who experience improved attitudes toward self and school and improved academic achievement are not likely to commit delinquent acts.)

Target Population: The program currently serves 2,000 youths in 26 junior high schools and 4 senior high schools in 16 Michigan school districts. The program was designed to deal with institutionalized youths returning to school, predelinquent or delinquent youths, youths who exert strong positive or negative influence on other youths, and youths who would benefit from problem-solving techniques. Program participants are selected from students having leadership qualities, both positive and negative. They are recommended by faculty, administrators, other youths, and parents. The ethnic distribution varies from school to school, but is approximately 50 percent black and 50 percent white.

Program Description: The program provides school personnel with "a systematic means to deal positively with the disruptive student." Guided group interaction, a short term group process, seeks to utilize the existing peer group culture "to modify roles, norms, values, and attitudes which are counterproductive," and "to strengthen those which are conducive to the students' social and academic development."

Students participate in groups of 9 to 12 members. The program believes that junior high school youths are more comfortable talking about problems with peers of their own gender; thus groups are segregated by sex. The groups meet for one period each day, confronting each other and discussing any problems that arise. Students receive academic credit for participation. An adult coordinator leads each group in problem-solving activities and is available when needed outside the group. The group is seen as a legitimate unit with decision-making capacities regarding sanctions for any infractions perpetrated by members. For example, if a person in the group is caught using marijuana, group members decide what measures should be taken and that decision is enforced. However,
the groups do not have broader decision-making powers in the school and are not involved in school governance or policy formulation.

Implementation Requirements: In 1972, the Michigan Department of Social Services awarded an ESEA Title III planning grant to four Michigan school districts to establish an experimental model to address three school problem areas (the reintegration of institutionalized youths, viable alternatives to suspension and expulsion, and the creation of a school climate which would foster development of responsible citizens). Based on a needs assessment, the planning committee set objectives to be met through the guided group interaction process. Four secondary schools were selected to participate.

As implemented, a program consultant trains two coordinators from each school to lead groups. Coordinators are usually teachers or counselors, and are selected by the school principal to work in the program on a half-time basis. As each group matures, the coordinator takes a less active role, letting members run the group, while providing support and back up. Cooperation from the school administration is necessary to ensure that the groups are allowed to follow up on decisions made regarding disciplinary sanctions for misbehavior.

Budget: The program budget for the first year of operation in a new school district is approximately $35,000. The consultant's salary for training and program implementation is included in this figure. After the first year, the consultant is no longer needed and the cost is approximately $10,000, which covers the portion of teachers' salaries allocated to running the groups. As implemented in Michigan, funds have come primarily from LEAA (90 percent) with the state government contributing the remainder (10 percent).

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Gwen McIntosh, Program Director, School Youth Advocacy, 300 South Capitol Avenue, Lansing, Michigan 48926.

Effectiveness: The program was evaluated during the third year of operation (1975-1976) using a pre-post design to assess 11 outcome objectives. The criterion for successful accomplishment of these objectives was a statistically significant change from the pretest to post test at the .05 level. Data were collected only on the treatment group. No comparison or control groups were assessed.

Variables measured (and their reported results) included improved attitude towards self (no significant change was found); improvement in group members' perceptions of self-control (highly significant change in the desired direction was measured using the Rotter I-E Scale); teacher rating of groups (no significant change was found); fewer referrals for incidents of verbal and physical abuse (significantly fewer referrals were made in the post-test period); parent rating of the program (positive); less negative encounters with the law (the results were indeterminate); fewer absences from school (no significant changes were found); fewer suspensions from school (no significant changes were found); less vandalism (three out of four schools sites evaluated experienced decreased vandalism); increased cognitive growth (there was an insignificant downward trend in participants' grades when compared with those of the prior school year); and improved attitudes of teachers toward group members (limited data indicate a
significant positive change in participating teachers' attitudes toward participating students).

Comments:

1. Although the evaluation uses a number of different measures, data were collected only for treatment group students. A number of problems limit the interpretation of results from such pre-post test studies. Perhaps most importantly, in the absence of control or comparison group students, the observed changes cannot be attributed to the program. Moreover, few measurable changes were noted. Many of the positive changes were in subjective responses or attitudes rather than in observed or reported behaviors. The evaluation attributes the fact that only limited changes were observed to implementation problems (such as a lack of out-of-group contact among participants and variation in the quality of the program at different sites) rather than to a failure of the approach itself. Given the current proliferation of a number of peer group confrontation models, rigorous evaluations of such programs using control groups and delinquency outcome measures should be undertaken.

2. The evaluators note that participation in groups is limited to one hour per day. They suggest that this may limit the effects of the program. If group members were scheduled together in other classes during the day, they might be able to provide the ongoing support necessary to reinforce group decisions. Without this, the effects of the group may be diminished by interaction with other peers outside the group who negatively influence participants.

3. The evaluators note that many families resisted involvement of their children in the program. Teachers were also unsupportive. A more thorough orientation to the project, in addition to active solicitation of parent and teacher involvement, could improve such a program's legitimacy and perhaps its effects.

4. The program is limited to involving students in a disciplinary peer group process. It does not allow the groups to focus on those policies or practices within the school which may contribute to delinquency or to negative behaviors, nor does it allow them to work to enhance the role of youths in the school. The evaluators state that group members should be allowed to participate in broader school governance and decisionmaking. Given the opportunity to participate in broader roles which provide a sense of worth and power, students may develop greater commitment and attachment to school and show improved behavior. The limited "self-policing" authority given to the groups may minimize their effects. The program should be implemented in such a way that the contributory role for youths is developed to its fullest.

5. In contrast to Positive Peer Culture discussed elsewhere in this volume, the School Youth Advocacy project offers academic credit to students for participation and release time from other teaching assignments for teachers who serve as group leaders. These incentives increase the likelihood that those students who will benefit from participation will join
and that the groups will become institutionalized as part of the school's ongoing program.
SKILLS FOR DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION
Tallahassee, Florida

Strategies: Education, Power Enhancement, Role Development

Causes of the Problem: If students feel that they are not part of their school community and if they are unable to voice their concerns in a positive, constructive manner, they may lack confidence in their teachers and school administrators. A sense of alienation from school and lack of confidence in school leadership may lead to student misbehavior, insubordination (and delinquency).

Program Rationale: Normal school events can be used to teach students about channels of authority for decisionmaking in schools and to teach them how to have a positive voice in those decisions. As a result of participation in shared decisionmaking, students will feel that they are important citizens of the school, will have the skills to know how to voice their concerns, and will have increased trust in their teachers and administrators. School problems should be alleviated and misconduct should decrease.

Target Population: Skills for Democratic Participation (SDP) is designed for sixth and seventh grade students in the state of Florida. During its development stage in Tallahassee (school year 1978-1979), it served approximately 1,500 students (33 percent black, 67 percent white; 55 percent male). Currently, the program is being disseminated statewide.

Program Description: SDP is a school-wide approach. Modules developed for the sixth grade teach students how decisions are made at the classroom level and what effective participation skills are. Actual participation in decision making is limited to the classroom in the sixth grade. The seventh grade program reinforces knowledge learned in the previous grade, but addresses decisionmaking beyond the classroom and emphasized actual student participation in broader decisions.

Curriculum goals are (1) to teach students which people in the school make decisions related to a specific topic and what processes, alternatives, and influences are involved in that decision; (2) to teach students skills which might be used either to influence or to help make a decision; and (3) to involve students in using the skills in a decisionmaking context.

Teachers determine the decisionmaking topics around which the curriculum materials are developed. The project does not change the lines of authority in school governance; administrators and teachers have final authority in all decisions.

Module topics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth Grade Topics</th>
<th>Seventh Grade Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Entry Behaviors</td>
<td>1. Entry Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom Rules</td>
<td>2. Extracurricular Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Classroom Responsibilities
4. School Passes
5. Lockers
6. Student Government
7. Field Trips
8. Rewards and Punishments
9. Seating Arrangements
10. Classroom Assignments
11. School Traffic
12. Evaluation

3. Class Project
4. School Planning
5. Energy
6. Student Legal Rights
7. Administrative Decisions
8. Human Relations
9. Finances
10. Community Involvement
11. Classroom Management
12. Communications

Implementation Requirements: Skills for Democratic Participation has been packaged for dissemination nationwide. Program implementation requires an in-school manager to be trained regarding the nature of the program, the manager's specific responsibilities, and implementation strategies. Training time is six hours. Program teachers participate in six hours of training to acquaint themselves with the program's content and to determine an adaptation strategy. Teachers also must complete two self-instructional modules which require approximately ten hours. All training can be done at the adopter site.

Budget: Cost for program materials alone is $86.00 for the sixth grade program and $76.00 for the seventh grade program. Optional transparencies are available at extra cost. If cost for duties to be performed by personnel already on staff (opportunity costs), travel, and paper and masters for reproduction of student materials are included, implementation costs are estimated at $1,701.59 for the sixth grade program and $1,683.53 for the seventh grade program. The budget for the state ESEA Title IV-C Project is $116,953 (10/79 - 9/80).

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Martha Simone, Project Director, Skills for Democratic Participation, ESEA Title IV-C Project, 723 West Orange Avenue, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

Effectiveness: The project has been evaluated with regard to students' acquisition of knowledge. It has not assessed the project goals of reducing student alienation and disruption. The project hypothesized that:

1. Sixth and seventh grade students participating in the SDP program will exhibit a significant (p < .05) pre- to post test gain on Skills and Knowledge tests scores. This gain will be associated with a magnitude of effect at or greater than d = .20.

2. Participating students also will show a significantly greater (p < .05) pre-test to post test increase in Skills and Knowledge tests scores than will comparison group students.

The sample consisted of 92 experimental group sixth grade students and 207 seventh grade students. The comparison group consisted of 163 sixth grade students and 141 seventh grade students. All sixth and seventh grade students available for testing in the treatment and comparison schools were tested. Tests which contained gross mistakes or inappropriately answered questions were discarded. Schools were matched on the basis of teacher experience, student and
teacher race, and student family income. No significant differences were noted between experimental and comparison schools on these variables.

Students were tested using a pre-post design. The instrument used, the "Skills and Knowledge Acquisition Test," was designed by the project.

Gain scores for the experimental students were both significant (p < .05) and sizable (d > .20). Sixth grade scores: $F = 137.69; df = 191; p < .001; d = 1.19$. Seventh grade: $F = 118.92; df = 1,206; p < .001; d = .58$.

Experimental students exhibited significantly greater gains than did comparison school students in both sixth and seventh grades on the Skills and Knowledge Acquisition tests. Sixth grade scores: $t = 5.71; df = 132.9; p < .001$. Seventh grade: $t = 3.83; df = 344.9; p < .001$.

Comments:

1. The evaluation results are somewhat compromised by methodological questions regarding the analyses. The use of raw gain scores to measure program effects is questionable. An analysis of covariance controlling for pretest scores would have been more appropriate. Additionally, there is a question as to whether the analyses should have been done for individual students or for classrooms which were the units sampled. A classroom level analysis, which might have been more appropriate given the sampling procedure, would have decreased the degrees of freedom in the analyses and decreased the apparent significance of results. While a comparison group design was used, these analysis issues suggested some caution in drawing conclusions regarding the program's effects.

2. Although the program espouses student involvement in decisionmaking, students are given very limited decisionmaking roles in the school and in the SDP classes (e.g., what food should be served in the lunchroom). The extent of student participation is dependent on teacher willingness to share authority in the classroom. The curriculum is designed to "inform students who control the school" (i.e., the administration). According to the program materials, "the program does not change the manner in which decisions are currently made within the school." Rather, it teaches students "methods which they can use within the school which will increase the likelihood that they can influence decisions. Administrators and teachers will continue to have the final authority" (emphasis added).

In contrast, many alternative schools such as the Alternative Learning Project in this volume have experimented with giving students larger roles in school governance. "Town meetings" have been held in which students and parents have a direct and equal voice with school teachers and administrators. Although these "participating democracies" have experienced implementation problems, primarily in maintaining student involvement, they do offer students a voice in school decisionmaking. Training for participation, as provided by SDP, in conjunction with increased student roles in school governance, could represent a more comprehensive approach to achieving the program goals of increased student attachment to school and trust in teachers and administration.
3. It should be noted that there is not consistent agreement or evidence regarding the effects on student alienation and school crime of giving students a voice in school governance. The National Institute of Education's Violent Schools - Safe Schools study reports that there is "no evidence that a more democratic form of government helps to reduce school crime." However, "schools in which students feel they have no control over their circumstances are schools which tend to have more violence" (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978).

An evaluation of the School Team Approach to Problems of Crime and Disruption in the Schools reports the preliminary conclusion that student participation in school decision-making in both high schools and middle schools improves the climate of the school:

... programs that allow participation in decision making -- that is, programs that offer opportunities for expansion of traditional school roles -- are associated with improved student outcomes (Grant et al., 1979:123).

This issue clearly requires further research. It is likely that the effect of student participation in school governance will be determined, in part, by implementation considerations revolving around the ways in which opportunities for involvement are made available to students, the nature of the decisions in which students are allowed to participate, and similar issues regarding how to stimulate and maintain student motivation to be involved. Even if these implementation issues can be successfully handled, students will need the skills to participate effectively in school governance. SDP may offer students an early opportunity to develop the necessary skills.
TEACHING FOR RESPONSIBLE BEHAVIOR:
PARENT VALUING IN THE FAMILY WORKSHOPS
Santa Ana, California

Strategies: Social Network, Education, Consistent Social Expectations

Causes of the Problem: Parents often lack the skills required to meet their needs and their children's needs. When children are alienated from their parents and the home setting fails to meet the basic needs of its members, youths are likely to engage in delinquency and drug abuse.

Program Rationale: Youths are less likely to "act out" their problems if their parents are able to help them. By training parents to understand family attitudes and actions which affect their children's behaviors, to enhance the quality of life in the home, and to use problem-solving skills in the home, alienation between parents and their children can be reduced and delinquency prevented.

Target Population: The program serves parents of school-age children in Orange County (school enrollment approximately 500,000 students). The program serves a predominately white population (83 percent) with Hispanics (11 percent), Asians (2 percent), blacks (2 percent), and other ethnic groups (3 percent) comprising the remainder of participants. Since the program started in 1971, approximately 4,000 parents have been trained.

Program Description: Parent Valuing in the Family Workshops are two-hour evening sessions held once a week for ten weeks to develop and strengthen the family attitudes and actions which will deter youths from undertaking "high risk/low gain" behavior like drug abuse or other forms of delinquency. The parent training program is designed to strengthen parent-child relationships and to provide a practical workshop on family living.

The format for each session follows the text Valuing in the Family (Brayer and Cleary, 1972) with one set of parents volunteering to lead the discussion of one chapter at each session. Discussion is prompted by the readings. Problems and issues are reviewed by all present before the instructor summarizes and helps the groups understand ways of dealing with them. Through the text, handouts, charts, and exercises, suggestions and plans are offered to help parents meet the "values needs" of each of their children. Emphasis is on "strengthening the family unit through continuous and consistent involvement in the sharing of values by all members" and on fulfilling the needs of each individual family member so that he or she feels unique and an integral part of the family unit.

Parents sign up for the course at an implementing school through the P.T.A. (or other parent organization). Enrollment in each group is limited to 24 mothers and fathers. Single parents are accepted only if there is no spouse in the family. All meetings except the first orientation session are held in one of the participating parents' homes. The program emphasizes that participants must feel free to say what they want in full confidence. It is felt that the home environment is the best place to do this. Rules for the sessions are kept to a
minimum: there is no smoking; no refreshments are served before, during, or after a session; and all are expected to participate actively but not to their embarrassment.

Implementation Requirements: The Parent Valuing in the Family Workshop is one component of the Teaching for Responsible Behavior (TRB) Program offered by the Orange County Department of Education. The TRB program is a cooperative effort between the Drug Abuse Prevention Education Center of the Department of Education, a number of county school districts, and the University of California at Irvine. In addition to its parent program, TRB also sponsors workshops for school administrators, teachers, school nurses, law enforcement, and other general community groups. An affective education program is provided to students in the third through twelfth grades.

The staff of the Education Center includes one professional coordinator, one paraprofessional, and one support staff member. Students preparing to seek licensing in Marriage and Family Counseling at California State University--Long Beach have been trained to run the workshops.

Budget: The program's annual budget is $58,600. One hundred percent of the funds are obtained from the local government. The text for the course is loaned to the participants and handout materials costing approximately $6-$7.00 per parent-couple are provided free.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Dr. Bert K. Simpson, Coordinator, Drug Abuse Prevention Education, 1300 South Grand Avenue, Building B, P.O. Box 11846, Santa Ana, California 92711.

Effectiveness: A process evaluation of the workshop revealed nearly unanimous enthusiasm by participating parents. Post treatment self-report forms have indicated that parents are using the techniques learned. Two independent evaluations by students in counseling psychology at California State University at Long Beach have also yielded favorable findings. One reported significant attitudinal changes by both parents and significant improvements in the behavior of their children, particularly those up to 13 years of age. A reduction in juvenile problems, potential delinquency, and drug abuse was noted. Several parents indicated that one or more of their children who were "experimenting" with drugs had stopped subsequent to parent interventions learned in the workshops. The other study which investigated one workshop of middle class parents reported that over the ten-week workshop period, both fathers and mothers had become more realistic in evaluating the attitudes and behaviors of their children and had acquired new skills for handling both pre-adolescent and adolescent problems.

Comments:

1. The evaluations of the Parent Valuing in the Family Workshop were presented to the NCADBP Staff in summary form. Therefore, due to lack of complete knowledge about the research methodology and the study results, conclusions cannot be drawn on program effectiveness. However, the positive reports of participants in this parent training model suggest that the program is worth further investigation. Evaluations should study
the program's effectiveness in curtailing delinquency, as well as issues such as its effects on other negative behaviors of youths, the impact of the workshops over time on changing both youths' and parents' behaviors and interactions, and its impact on the behavior of youths of different ages. (The first independent evaluation noted above indicates that the techniques learned were most effective with children under the age of 13).

2. Parent Valuing has not successfully recruited minority parents. This is not unusual. Many affective education and parenting programs appear to serve predominately white populations. Future programs and research should address this issue.

3. To date, teachers, parents, and children have not been trained concomitantly. Joint training of a child and his or her teacher and parents would appear to minimize the probability of future delinquent activity.

4. While this program appears promising, its exclusive emphasis on affective issues is not consistent with cognitive behavioral models which seek to enhance specific skills, such as Robin's (Robin et al., 1977) short term problem-solving training. Changes arising from increased knowledge or changed attitudes may quickly erode unless accompanied by specific skills training which shows parents how to put into action their new knowledge and beliefs.

5. The project director has reported that the support of the school principal is critically important to the success of teacher training efforts. He recommends that principals sit in on all teacher training sessions. Program failures appear to be associated with a lack of administrative enthusiasm and support for the project.

6. Several characteristics of this program are notable. Each training session is well planned. While sensitive family issues are discussed when they arise, the format is largely didactic with group discussions. Parents report that they use the "8 needs" paradigm to diagnose home problems not brought up in weekly meetings. This indicates that generalization may be occurring. Use of in-home meetings and the assignment of parents as discussion leaders have not been evaluated but are promising tactics.

7. Self-reports of child and parent behavior change are used by this and many other parent training projects. These measures, however, have been shown to inaccurately estimate behavior changes (see Schnelle, 1974 and Patterson and Reid, 1973). In-home observation of behavior or, at a minimum, reports of in-school oppositional behavior should supplement the use of self-report measures in evaluations of such programs.
TRENDS (TEENS REACT-ENCOURAGE NEW DIRECTIONS FOR SAVANNAH)

Savannah, Georgia

Strategies: Education, Social Network, Role Development.

Causes of the Problem: Causes of drug abuse and delinquency are not stated. (Lack of bonds to conventional others and lack of clear values and decisionmaking skills can cause youths to fail to incorporate social values and to exhibit antisocial behavior.)

Program Rationale: By enabling sixth grade youths to consider substance abuse rationally before they enter junior high school where they will experience peer pressures to indulge, substance abuse (and delinquency) can be curtailed. Youths can acquire new behavior patterns and attitudes through imitative learning if the educational model has credibility. High school age teenagers are highly regarded by pre-adolescents and can influence sixth graders against drug abuse. Furthermore, a values clarification curriculum can enhance students' abilities to understand themselves and to find answers to their problems. Students who can search for appropriate solutions to their problems will not abuse drugs.

Target Population: The program targets 2,400 sixth grade students in the Savannah-Chatham County public school system. Fifty-two percent of the students are black, 48 percent are white. The program serves approximately equivalent numbers of male and female students.

Program Description: TRENDS is a drug-related health program that teaches youths to examine their values and beliefs and to learn coping skills to handle their problems. The program addresses drugs and alcohol abuse, smoking, and venereal disease. It utilizes a cross-age tutoring model in which high school students teach younger students.

The high school student-teachers enroll in TRENDS as a one-credit, quarter long course and take it as a part of their regular daily academic schedule. The course is offered at each high school in the district one quarter each year. Students may take the course for a total of three quarters for credit. Requirements for admission to the course are tenth grade enrollment or above, a cumulative high school grade point average of B or better, no current abuse of drugs or alcohol, a sincere desire to help others, a recommendation of teachers and administration concerning good citizenship and moral character, and final approval by the TRENDS class instructor.

The 12-week course is divided into 2 parts. In part one (8 weeks), the high school students learn basic facts concerning drugs, alcohol, smoking, and venereal disease, as well as teaching methods for value education and decision-making training. In part two (4 weeks), the students are assigned in pairs to elementary sixth grade classes to instruct students. Each pair of "teen counselors" attends 1 class for 30 minutes a day every day for 4 weeks.
The teen counselors schedule the presentation of topics themselves. The classroom procedure generally includes a "getting acquainted" session, a mini-lecture, at least one values clarification exercise, a discussion, and a brief summary.

Implementation Requirements: Under the entrance requirements indicated in the program description, trained high school students teach the TRENDS classes. Training for high school students is provided by the TRENDS project coordinator and is supplemented by community professionals who volunteer their time and expertise. Speakers include representatives from the Chatham Clinic for Alcoholism, the Chatham County Police-Metro Drug Squad, and the Board of Education - psychology department. Locally prepared handbooks, films, and booklets are utilized. One teacher from each high school acts as a TRENDS faculty advisor and trainer for the student-teachers. Currently, the program is operated by professional staff members and 115 youths.

Budget: The program utilizes existing staff and faculty resources. The Coordinator of Health Services acts as the TRENDS project coordinator and one teacher from each high school acts as a trainer-advisor. Beyond costs for the time of these staff members, the annual budget is $1,000 for materials.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Ms. Kathy O'Neill, TRENDS, 208 Bull Street, Savannah, Georgia 31401.

Effectiveness: More than 500 students in 25 sixth grade classrooms were randomly assigned to either experimental education programs or to no treatment programs. In five classrooms there was no treatment, in five classrooms teachers used the standard lecture method, in five classrooms teachers used the values program, in five classrooms the trained high school students used the lecture method, and in five classrooms the trained students used the values program method.

Three measures were used to assess the program's effectiveness: an eleven-item attitude scale measured participating students' views of the program, a brief opinion instrument assessed the attitudes of the adult school personnel who had an opportunity to observe the program, and a ten-item multiple choice knowledge test measured students' knowledge of drugs and drug abuse.

Both sixth graders and adults who worked with them strongly favored the use of teenagers over teachers as group leaders. There was a modest preference for the values clarification method over the standard lecture method. The knowledge test administered before and after the program did not reveal any significant differences associated with the type of instructor or method used, but did show a significant increase in knowledge about drugs for the experimental groups compared with the no treatment groups.

Comments:
1. The program is designed as a substance abuse prevention program, yet neither student intention to use drugs or alcohol nor actual use has been assessed in evaluations. Delinquency prevention effects have not been
evaluated. At a minimum, the program should be evaluated using both substance abuse and self-reported delinquency as outcome measures.

2. The program may have positive effects on tenth grade "teen counselors." These should be assessed.

3. The rigorous criteria for "teen counselors" insure selection of an elite group of students, thereby precluding the involvement of students who could serve as role models for non-academically oriented younger students. The program's potential beneficial effects on teen counselors' own attitudes and behaviors may also be smaller than if a broader range of students had the opportunity to function as teen counselors. However, easing the criteria for teen counselors could generate opposition to the program from parents of sixth graders.
URBAN YOUTH ACTION, INC.
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Strategies: Economic Resources, Role Development, Power Enhancement, Education

Causes of the Problem: Young people growing up in deprived neighborhoods experience failure, witness the decay of their communities, and watch lives in the process of destruction. These youths' abilities have not been recognized or channeled into practical and effective employment pursuits. (Minority youths from economically disadvantaged backgrounds may commit delinquent acts due to their lack of opportunities in the labor market and their relative lack of employment skills.)

Program Rationale: One of the principal needs of youths is to experience success on a permanent basis. By encouraging, planning, and promoting educational, economic, social, and community improvement activities, programs can provide young people with a chance to succeed and to feel a part of their community. (Programs which help youths to prepare for opportunities in education and employment, to take on responsible occupational roles, and to assist in the economic development and environmental improvement of their communities can help reduce juvenile delinquency.)

Target Population: High school students (90 percent black, 2 percent Asian, 3 percent white, 5 percent other; 45 percent male) in deprived neighborhoods in the city of Pittsburgh and in Allegheny County are the focus. About 2,800 youths are served annually.

Program Description: Urban Youth Action (UYA) provides disadvantaged youths with a comprehensive employment program. In addition to private-sector employment, the agency holds weekly training and employment counseling sessions. As a condition of employment with UYA, each student must attend one training session per week during the period of employment, in addition to scheduled counseling. Students receive up to two credits per year at their local high school for participation.

A 13-week employment training course is offered twice during the year. Sessions are held each Monday. An 8-week summer session is also offered. Approximately 70 students divided into 2 classes are enrolled at the beginning of each session. Topics covered include career choices, résumé composition, completion of job applications, job hunting techniques, and preparing for an interview (including individual career interviewing and video tape practice sessions). UYA awards letters of recommendation and certificates of completion to students who finish the course.

Educational Training Sessions are held on Thursday. These sessions are designed to expose youths to career opportunities in the business, educational, and social worlds beyond their immediate communities. Class sessions include visits to local corporations, schools, or institutions to expose students to entry level positions and training in life skills such as money management and making decisions about purchases.
Concurrent with their training, students work in a three-phase process. During phase one, participants are paid by UYA to work in its own offices or in a nonprofit organization (or a small business) familiar with UYA's training program. Students work after school for 2 to 20 hours per week in places such as Radio Station WAMO, the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, the Visitors' Bureau, and the local branch of the American Cancer Society.

After each student has been employed for at least 13 weeks and has completed the employment sessions, he or she is placed in a position related to his or her career interests. Students receive half of their salaries from the company and half from UYA. Placements for the "career interns" have included law firms, IBM Corporation, and Midland-Ross Corporation. Because of minimum age requirements, Phase two employment is only open to high school juniors and seniors.

Phase three involves seniors and some juniors who are interested in part-time work during high school that can be turned into full-time employment after high school. An active employment referral service works with student placement employers and others to locate jobs for youths.

UYA also involves a number of adult volunteers in providing direct advice to those students involved in running departments at UYA (see below). Others participate in employment and education training sessions.

The agency has recently added a new program for elementary school students in which students work around the school for wages, help in the lunchroom, help teachers correct papers, and work in the office.

Implementation Requirements: The program is a youth-run organization which has been in operation since 1966. Twenty-four youths are supervised by 3 adult professional staff members and 25 adult volunteers. Using a Management by Objectives system, the youths manage 7 departments -- employment, education, accounting, public relations, clerical, enterprise, and alumni. The program also employs 4 support staff members.

Budget: UYA's annual budget is $371,000. Fifty percent of its resources come from private foundations, 15 percent from corporate funding, 10 percent from public contributions, and 25 percent from the United Way. The establishment of special economic incentives and educational funds has enabled board members and alumni to invest in the organization. Students who work for UYA tax themselves and this special endowment goes to the organization.

Implementing Agency: Contact: Mr. G. Richard Gillcrese, Executive Coordinator, Urban Youth Action, Inc., 300 Sixth Avenue, Suite 240, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222.

Effectiveness: Evaluations of UYA have been conducted by the Richard King Mellon Foundation and the National Commission on Resources for Youth, but they do not measure the impact of the program on delinquent behavior. These studies have not been made available to NCADBIP. According to a recent follow-up study of all program participants since 1975, 90 percent of the graduates were working, enrolled in school, or both. However, results for program dropouts rate are not available.
Comments:

1. While most UYA graduates appear to continue in productive employment or in educational programs, we do not know how many participants fail to graduate. Furthermore, since the evaluation of UYA has not included control or comparison subjects, we cannot conclude from available evidence that UYA is effective in either guaranteeing post participation employment or in delinquency prevention or reduction. The program should be evaluated rigorously to assess these variables both during and after program intervention.

2. The UYA model combines a number of innovative programmatic features. Twenty-four youths staff the program in responsible positions. An extensive number of professional volunteers (from 75 to 100 during the course of the year) assist in fund raising, training, UYA's management, elementary student age teaching, and organizational policymaking. UYA also provides an interesting model of local private sector involvement in the enhancement of employment opportunities for disadvantaged youths. Finally, unlike most youth employment programs, the program appears to function without heavy reliance on public sector funds.

The model could be expanded to provide employment training and opportunities for more youths in community development and other public sector employment areas in addition to its current private sector emphasis.

3. Private sector entry level employment positions are among the first to suffer from cyclical downturns in the economy. Public sector job creation programs may be necessary in times of economic slowdown.

4. UYA attempts to place its clients in jobs that will lead to careers, an important component in an employment program seeking to prevent delinquency. Elliott and Knowles (1976) have indicated that job satisfaction is an essential component in motivating disaffiliated youths to retain jobs. Menial, low level jobs do not appear to be effective in meeting these goals.
WESTERN STATES YOUTH AND FAMILY INSTITUTE
Salt Lake City, Utah

Strategies: Education, Social Network, Power Enhancement

Causes of the Problem: Running away, truancy, shoplifting, and other problem behaviors result from disintegrating family systems characterized by an absence of reciprocal communication and positive exchange among family members.

Program Rationale: Although families maintain systems of communication and exchange, members may not have the skills to communicate and negotiate effectively with one another. Skills for effective family communication and functioning can be developed through an educational approach, working with the family as a system. If family members are taught to communicate with one another in ways which guarantee that each member listens to others and has an opportunity to fully express his or her views, to negotiate responsibilities and rewards, and to reward others' positive behaviors, family dynamics are less likely to lead to problem behaviors and delinquency.

Target Population: The program works with youths aged 13 to 16, referred to juvenile court for "status offenses" and minor delinquencies, and their parents. One hundred and fifty youths, approximately equally divided between males and females, are served annually. Eighty percent of the client population is white, 15 percent Hispanic, and 5 percent Native American.

Program Description: Institute staff conduct training sessions with the family members as a group. Sessions are held with individual families, not with groups of families. Therapists "(a) assess the family behaviors that maintain delinquent behavior; (b) modify the family communication patterns in the direction of greater clarity and precision, increased reciprocity, and presentation of alternative solutions; (c) institute a pattern of contingency contracting in the family designed to modify the maladaptive patterns and institute more adoptive behavior" (Alexander and Parsons, 1973).

Using a defined curriculum, both parents and children are trained in communication and contingency contracting skills. Parents are taught to negotiate contracts with their children which define responsibilities and privileges. Unambiguous and positive structures for family interactions are developed through teaching clear communication, explicit rule setting, and negotiated agreements. The amount of time spent on specific skills and the order in which skills are taught are tailored to the individual family.

While highly flexible in implementation, the model of short-term behavioral intervention is:
Week 1. (8 hours)
Family sessions (two at 2 hours each).
Individual contacts with the youth and extrafamilial systems such as peers, employment resources, and the educational system (4 hours total).

Week 2. (6 hours)
Family sessions (two at 1½ hours each).
Extrafamilial contacts (three at 1 hour each).

Week 3. (4 hours)
Family sessions (two at 1½ hours each).
Extrafamilial contacts (1 hour).

Week 4. (4 hours)
Family sessions (two at 1½ hours each).
Extrafamilial contacts (1 hour).

Week 5. (2½ hours)
Family sessions (1½ hours).
Extrafamilial contacts (1 hour).

Week 6. (2½ hours)
Family sessions (1½ hours).
Extrafamilial contacts (1 hour).

Week 7 and thereafter.
Contact as needed to monitor progress, meet new crises, and maintain desired behaviors.

Implementation Requirements: Family training has been provided by graduate students in clinical psychology who received 24 hours of initial training from program professionals. The program currently employs 7 professional staff members. Replications have been carried out with social agency personnel as service providers.

Budget: The average number of hours of family training is 12. Maximum required family training is 21 hours. Costs depend on the salaries of the therapists.
Implementing Agencies: The program has been implemented, tested, and replicated on an experimental basis at the University of Utah's Family Clinic. Information is not available on its use in community not-for-profit social service agencies. Contact: Dr. James F. Alexander, Department of Psychology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112.

Effectiveness: An experimental and quasi-experimental study in which clients were randomly assigned to treatment and control conditions and assigned non-randomly to a comparison group was conducted to assess program effectiveness. Measures included:

1. Equality of speech, i.e., time speaking per person
2. Seconds of silence
3. Frequency of interruptions
4. Length of interruptions
5. Recidivism of adolescents
6. Recidivism of adolescents' siblings.

The first four measures were rated by trained observers tested for inter-rater reliability at 90 percent. At intake, youths referred to juvenile court for a "behavioral offense" consisting of truancy, running away, or ungovernability were eligible. In the follow-up period, recidivism was defined as any referral to the juvenile court.

In the 6-to-18-month follow-up period, recidivism of youths involved in the short term behavioral intervention approach was roughly half of that for comparison family counseling and nontreatment groups (26 percent versus 57 percent and 50 percent respectively). Families in which youth recidivated were, as a group, significantly worse on family interaction and communication measures, indicating the importance of these variables in preventing undesirable youth behavior. In addition, the benefits of short term behavioral intervention extended beyond the crisis period and generalized to other children in the family. After three years, only 20 percent of the treated families had another child referred to court. Referrals of children from comparison and control families ranged from 49 percent to 63 percent with the highest percentage of referrals coming from families which received traditional psychodynamic family counseling.

Comments:

1. The comparison group in the study consisted of adolescents and their families who received traditional psychodynamic services at a Mormon Counseling Center. Random assignment was attempted with this group. However, since non-Mormons were excluded, it could not be attained completely. Thus, it is possible that those families receiving psychodynamic counseling were in some way systematically different from the
families in the experimental treatment group and that this difference accounts for their high rate of recidivism.

2. Follow-up did not examine family interaction and communication variables. It would be of interest to know the "durability" of the intervention in terms of these measures.

3. The program has been used successfully with white families in a predominantly Mormon community. The effectiveness of the strategy with families of other socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds in other community contexts should be explored.

4. While out-of-home placement is often desired by parents and youths at the time of referral to the Western States Institute, intuitively, the approach appears most promising when family crises have not reach the point in which out-of-home placement is imminent or has already occurred. (In such cases other models, such as Homebuilders, may be more appropriate.) The model discussed here delivers services on a biweekly schedule in the therapist's office. This approach may not effectively reduce immediate crises.

In communication with NCADBIP, Dr. Alexander has indicated that he hopes to develop the agency's crisis intervention capacities. He believes that this will allow "for more dramatic reattribution techniques and (provide) great motivation for early change."
WRIGHT BROTHERS CAREER HIGH SCHOOL
San Diego, California

Strategies: Role Development, Education, Economic Resources

Causes of the Problem: Many students leave high school ill-prepared to take their places in the community. They have no career plans, no marketable skills, and little awareness of the work world. Their school experiences have left them with a sense of hopelessness and failure. (Delinquent behavior may result when youths lack skills, have negative self-concepts, and lack opportunities for productive roles in the community.)

Program Rationale: By preparing students for work that is meaningful and satisfying in an educational environment that enhances student learning and success, students can become productive members of society. (Students who are satisfied with their education and who are successful in their work are not likely to commit delinquent acts.)

Target Population: San Diego's Wright Brothers Career High School (WBCHS) is a magnet alternative high school serving 300 students annually in grades 9 through 12. As a magnet school, its enrollment goals are 65 percent majority students and 35 percent ethnic minority students. Actual school enrollment during the 1978-79 school year was 67 percent white, 16 percent black, 2 percent Asian, 1 percent Native American, and 14 percent Hispanic. Enrollment is approximately equally divided between males and females.

Program Description: WBCHS offers highly motivated students an individualized educational experience with an employment orientation. Students complete the requirements of their high school diploma while obtaining employment training. Supervised work experience credit is a graduation requirement.

Although the program is not closed to students who are failing or are chronically truant, WBCHS requests such students to evidence their interest in the school by showing improvement in their studies and behavior for a semester in their current high school. This requirement is based on the high level of individual student initiative and responsibility the program demands.

The program is developed around student work schedules. Each student selects one of five career clusters which provides him or her with the specific competencies required for entry into an occupation in that cluster. The five clusters are:

1. Urban Agriculture: This cluster covers the career areas of floriculture, landscaping, and small animal care and grooming.

2. Construction and Industry: This cluster focuses on work in the construction and maintenance of residential and commercial buildings and covers skills such as metal working, drafting, and carpentry.

3. Business and Office: Employment in office and clerical careers is studied with training in accounting, typing, shorthand, and recordkeeping.
4. **Community and Personal Services:** Students are prepared for employment in the areas of nutrition, catering, and food preparation and service.

5. **Marketing and Distribution:** Employment in positions as salespersons, stock clerks, and cashiers is covered in a general merchandising curriculum.

Work experience is required for program completion. There are 3 types of work experience in the program. General work experience is provided for students in supervised, paid, part-time jobs. The goal is to teach students good work habits and attitudes. Students work 3 to 4 hours per day for a minimum total of 200 hours over a 10-week period to earn 1 credit. For those students who have unclear career objectives, an opportunity to explore several career opportunities is provided. Working with the school's career counselors, students try different jobs. Eight hours of nonpaid work per week is the normal work load in this component; 75 hours per semester earn 1 work credit. Students must complete a minimum of 150 hours of work to earn 2 semester credits. A maximum of 8 work credits can be earned toward graduation. Work experience also enables students who have chosen a cluster to extend their vocational experiences through part-time, paid employment.

Although a goal of the school is to help students obtain jobs after graduation, the program also helps students enter college or community college. The school offers basic academic training in English, mathematics, science, and social studies leading to a high school diploma. Coursework compliments cluster area studies. Credits are earned through achievements of competencies established in learning contracts and course requirements. Special education classes are available for students with remedial learning needs. Personalized contact between faculty and students is enhanced by a ratio of certified teachers to students of 20 to 1 and an overall adult-to-student ratio of 8 to 1.

Implementation Requirements: Model development and curriculum materials are available from WBCHS to those interested in replication or adaptation of the program. Staff are available to other school districts to act as consultants and to conduct workshops. Original development of the school itself was facilitated through summer training workshops for the staff and a community advisory board of local business representatives. The Board was organized to validate the curriculum. The program has a faculty and administrative staff of 22 professionals, 14 paraprofessionals, and 10 support staff.

Budget: The current program budget is not available. Funding comes from the local school district and a variety of federal resources including the Emergency School Assistance Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Regional Occupational Program.

**Implementing Agency:** Contact: Mr. Garold Spitler, Principal, Wright Brothers Career High School, 1100 Carolina Lane, San Diego, California 92102.

Effectiveness: The program has been evaluated to assess changes in student academic achievement and career concept development and with regard to the employment status of students completing the program in comparison with a non-participant comparison group. Data were collected on students enrolled...
between November 1974 and February 1976. Delinquency impact was not assessed.

Student academic achievement was measured using 2 instruments. On the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), 31 participating students showed nonsignificant gains in reading (a gain of 13 months) and mathematics (a gain of 2 months). No comparison or control group data were available. (The evaluation notes that the city-wide scores of students who took the CTBS were "poorer than expected." Since WBCHS primarily works with students whose achievement is at least one stanine below the city average, the evaluation asserts that the achievement scores are in keeping with the school's expectations.) A second scholastic measure concerned grade point average improvement. Data were collected on 90 treatment students. Twenty percent gained a full grade point in their cumulative average in 3 or more semesters at WBCHS; 27 percent gained between .5 and 1 grade point; and 40 percent gained between .1 and .5 points. Again, no comparison or control group data were collected.

Career concept development was tested on a WBCHS-developed "Career Concepts Inventory" (CCI) and "Career Planning Inventory" (CPI). Since neither had been normed or previously field tested, the evaluation accurately reports that the findings may be inconclusive. Results of the CPI showed that "a majority of the participants had received career-type experiences at the school which would provide them with the basic tools needed in seeking and applying for employment." Results on the CCI are not reported.

A follow-up study on 1975 graduates was successful in locating 55 of 110 potential respondents. Of those located, 51 percent were working. Thirty-six percent were unemployed and 13 percent were continuing their education. In contrast, the general city-wide follow-up of all 1975 graduates from vocational programs in comprehensive high schools (N unreported) found that only 25 percent of the respondents were employed.

Comments:
1. The evaluation of the program's effectiveness is inconclusive due to a number of methodological problems:
   a. Grade point averages (subjective evaluations of students' work by teachers) can fluctuate widely depending, in part, on teacher idiosyncrasies in grading practices. Objective measures (standardized tests appropriate to course content such as the CTBS) are better suited for measuring student achievement over time. While the use of the CTBS is appropriate, the evaluators appear reluctant to conclude that nonsignificant gains on CTBS reading and math tests indicate that students are not making adequate progress in these areas.
   b. The evaluation is hampered by the lack of an adequate comparison or control group. It is impossible to determine if observed student outcomes are due to WBCHS participation or to other events in their lives.
c. The follow-up study on program graduates was able to track only 55 of the 110 respondents sought, an insufficient proportion to allow generalization to all WBCHS graduates. Additionally, the evaluation compares the occupational status of WBCHS students with other students who graduated in 1975 from vocational high schools in the San Diego area. This comparison assumes that the two groups of students are similar, an assumption which is not assessed and which is not necessarily valid given possible differences in admission criteria for the different programs.

2. Since programs like WBCHS are receiving increased attention as possible solutions to youths' unemployment and delinquency problems, such programs should be subjected to rigorous, experimental evaluations to assess their impact on these problems.

3. A problem any joint high school/youth employment program must address in preparing its students for jobs is the increasing demand for people with specialized skills. Such jobs usually require more education or an apprenticeship period beyond high school. A high school training program like WBCHS can help orient students to the world of work, but it should be careful to inform students about the realities of the labor market. Education at WBCHS and schools like it does not guarantee employment for youths, particularly in well-paying jobs with advancement potential. Its main function may be to help students recognize the types of skills they need to acquire to obtain high status, lucrative employment.

4. As the program is presently structured, students must be highly motivated to enter. As a result, those students who may need job preparation skills the most (i.e., those students who are likely to drop out of school and will be entering the labor market) may be denied entrance. Efforts should be made to adapt such programs for students who may be less committed to traditional pursuits at the time of program entry as a result of school failure or other problems experienced in traditional academic programs.

5. The experiential learning aspect of WBCHS's program is an important and promising element in programs seeking to prepare youths for adult roles.
YOUTH-COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Waterville, Maine

Strategies: Power Enhancement, Role Development

Causes of the Problem: A major source of juvenile delinquency in a community is the systematic failure of community institutions to respond adequately to the basic needs of youths. The "youth development" approach identifies three primary conditions which contribute to a child's becoming delinquent: 1) lack of access to socially desirable roles (without a role in his or her school, community, family, or local labor market, the child does not see himself or herself as valued or needed by others in his or her environment); 2) lack of involvement in the decisions that affect his or her life (the child sees his or her life as controlled by others and thus feels little responsibility for his or her own actions); and 3) premature negative labeling (the child is seen as a "problem" by family, school, and community).

Program Rationale: To address these causes of delinquency the project strives to change those conditions which contribute to delinquency and to increase the capacity of the community to identify and solve its youth problems without negative labeling. To change conditions and build community problem-solving capacity, the project involves the local community in educational and planning activities.

Target Population: All youths and other residents in the rural towns of Pittsfield, Farmington, Dixfield, Norway, and Paris, Maine were viewed as the target population. The population served was 100 percent white and approximately evenly divided between males and females.

Program Description: Acting in a coordinating capacity, the Youth Community Development Project staff organized local youth-serving agency representatives, school personnel, community group representatives, private business people, professionals, clergy, other concerned citizens, and youths themselves into Advisory Committees. These committees were organized to address community and youth problems and to mobilize community institutions and other resources to provide a better environment for positive youth development.

Problems were identified by the Advisory Committee members and through a Youth Needs Assessment survey. Administered by Project staff and by youths trained by the staff, the instrument surveyed 1,000 youths in the 5 rural towns.

A number of conditions which respondents believed contributed to delinquency were identified. These included: the lack of opportunities for youths and adults to work together to solve problems within the community which affect youths; school board policies which prohibit the use of facilities by outside organizations; the lack of alternatives to organized competitive sports for constructive use of leisure time; the lack of a forum for youths to express their needs and concerns; the inability of the community to secure the funds needed for youth programs; the inability of some families to provide the direction and care needed by their children; the lack of a vehicle whereby residents, adult and
youth, can implement desired programs and services and participate fully in the planning and operation of those programs; the lack of an organization which can coordinate, plan, and encourage cooperation among existing youth-serving organizations; and the lack of opportunities for youths to be exposed to career options, to learn cross-occupational skills, and to develop proper work habits.

In gathering this information, the project emphasized both the actual survey findings and the process by which youths were involved in program development. The survey served as a basis for planning and as a vehicle to draw youths into a positive community activity.

Based on the identified needs, four general responses were developed:

1) **Collaborative Projects**: Youth Development Staff facilitated collaboration between service systems and agencies to fulfill identified needs. For example, a GED program was created through the cooperative efforts of a Community Action Agency and the State Department of Education.

2) **Community Resource Development Projects**: Project staff identified and mobilized local resources, both human and physical, that were underutilized. For example, school physical facilities were opened past the usual closing time, private funding sources were tapped, and a number of community residents volunteered their time to various programs.

3) **Community Education and Awareness Projects**: Project staff conducted consciousness-raising presentations before community youth-serving agencies. Findings from the Youth Needs Assessment Survey were utilized to stimulate problem-solving discussions. The discussions led to the formation of youth-serving agency member committees which worked to improve youth employment, health, education, and legal services.

4) **Community Planning**: Staff assisted youths in their respective communities to plan and implement programs for themselves through a youth council. Programs and projects developed by youths included "jobs for youth" workshops, GED classes, a "Rent-A-Youth" project to link young people with people who needed work done, and a Youth Yellow Pages which listed agency services for youths.

Efforts were made to include a wide variety of youths in planning councils. Referrals were solicited from agencies serving youths who were "experiencing difficulties" (i.e., referrals from the Sheriff's Departments, Police Departments, and courts) and from other youth-serving organizations. The local media were enlisted to advertise the youth programs. Also, the program recruited specific youths who were experiencing problems and who were known to the agency staff.

**Implementation Requirements**: Implementation of the Youth Community Development Project was achieved through the support and coordinated efforts of youths themselves, community youth-serving agencies (including juvenile justice personnel), school personnel, political leaders, business and labor representatives, and other concerned community members and volunteers. Committee members varied from town-to-town, but generally consisted of middle- and upper-income people with a base of influence in their communities. The YCDP
was implemented by the State YMCA of Maine. The program employs 2 professionals, 7 paraprofessionals, 16 youths, and 4 support staff. Forty volunteers supplement the agency staff.

**Budget:** Program budget for fiscal year 1978 was $125,000; 40 percent was from the state LEAA planning agency, 5 percent was from local government, 40 percent was from CETA (project staff positions), and 15 percent was from local fund-raising efforts and public contributions.

**Implementing Agency:** Contact: Mr. David Whalen, Youth Community Development Project, State YMCA of Maine, 173 Main Street, Waterville, Maine 04901.

**Effectiveness:** An interim evaluation reports that the project involved 36 percent of the combined communities' youths in activities of more than 6-weeks duration over the course of 1 year. Approximately 2,000 youths were served directly and 4,000 were indirectly involved. The project reports that over 1,800 hours of volunteer service were provided.

It is not clear from the evaluation if these youths would have been served without the Youth Community Development Project. However, the evaluation states that the project seems to have made "substantial differences in the number of options open to adolescents for experiences in positive development." The evaluation reports that the YCDP initiated contacts and created linkages with 50 schools, 19 law enforcement agencies, 9 town governments, and 52 special programmatic resources. The investment per participant who was involved for at least 6-weeks in a program was $29 of grant funds.

With regard to the YCDP's delinquency impact, the evaluation claims that 54 of 62 youths referred by the criminal justice system to community services had no further contact with law enforcement over an 8-month period of time. The evaluation reports: "As we have no comparison data available ... it is not possible to say with precision that the YCDP has prevented recidivism. Normally, however, we would expect a higher rate of continued contact with law enforcement in this population of youths, and from interviews with the project director, it is clear to me that the YCDP is a much needed alternative to current institutions and probation options." No data are available regarding the program's effectiveness in preventing delinquency before youths become involved with the law.

**Comments:**

1. Skok (1978), in an evaluation of a Connecticut program utilizing the Youth Development approach, notes that the research literature has not substantiated that the needs expressed by community youths are related to empirically derived factors which contribute to delinquency. Although the needs identified through youth surveys may be real, programs developed to address them may not address underlying causes of delinquency and, hence, may not prevent delinquent behavior. This issue requires further research in the absence of direct evidence of the effectiveness of the "perceived needs" approach to designing delinquency prevention programs.
2. It is not clear from available reports how well programs and projects developed by YCDP actually addressed the causes which are assumed by the "youth development" approach to lead to delinquency. The evaluation did not measure the extent to which the program provided youths with roles which they perceived as socially desirable, increased their decision-making power in significant areas of their daily lives such as family and school, and/or prevented negative labeling of youths. In the absence of such data it is difficult to determine the extent to which the conditions sought by the youth development strategy were actually achieved.

3. Because the YCDP approach emphasizes collaboration, it is difficult to determine from available reports the extent to which new services and opportunities for youths were created which would not have otherwise been available. Special attention should be paid in research and evaluation of such projects to identify a baseline of available services against which the effectiveness of program efforts can be measured.

4. The success of the "Youth Development" approach appears to depend on the involvement of youths other than traditional "student leaders" in problem identification, planning, and program implementation. Programs seeking to ensure youths' participation and involvement should take pains to include a broad spectrum of youths. The YCDP appears to have made efforts to recruit a broad cross-section of youths.

5. Selection of a citizen's advisory group is a difficult task which must balance considerations such as the extent to which members actually represent their communities, the abilities and commitments of members to facilitate the goals of the project, and the abilities of members to work with program staff. In many communities a small number of "professional citizens" are involved as "citizen participants" or "community representatives" on a large number of committees. Involving influential "professional citizens" to serve on committees facilitates a project's ability to get what it wants/ accomplished. However, such a group may not adequately represent those in the community most in need of services.

The evaluation of the YCDP indicates that the program is wrestling with these issues. It notes, "the more heterogeneous the advisory group in regard to income, education, age, and occupation, the greater the probability of success. The difficulty in a very mixed group will probably occur at the outset in helping them to become a group and in getting them to work with each other comfortably. When they can work with each other, it is likely that the mixture of backgrounds and interests will broaden their sphere of influence within individual communities and make their work easier."

6. The Youth Development model requires that institutions and agencies which have historically provided individually-focused services for problem populations engage in system change activities. Organizations tend to resist structural change and individuals in these organizations may resist changes in their task requirements. Additionally, there is a potential conflict of interest when a service organization engages in advocacy efforts which ultimately may benefit its own direct service component.
This potential conflict of interest may jeopardize the organization's effectiveness in advocacy for system change. On the other hand, providing direct services may be a good vehicle for establishing credibility and legitimacy as a base for system change activities.

7. Systems change-oriented Youth Development models may be difficult to implement in rural areas. In correspondence with NCADBIP, the Director of the YCDP indicated, "In rural areas, where few, if any, services exist, the demand is usually for services. While our focus is not direct services, many were created as a result of the project. The committee's involvement in the process has increased their awareness of certain needed systems changes. They started on a small scale but were led to a much greater emphasis in this area. There is a considerable void in research in the area of community development in rural areas. Most of the time, urban models are used to evaluate and draw conclusions about what should or should not be done in a rural area. The Youth Development model itself may be inappropriate in some ways in a rural area."

Future research should seek to identify the most effective approaches for creating change in institutional settings in both rural and urban areas.
DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES IN THE PREVENTION PROGRAM MATRIX

The 11 variables in the prevention program matrix are defined below.

A. Prevention Intervention

1. System of Intervention: This variable refers to five social systems in which a delinquency prevention program may intervene. The five systems are:

   a. School
   b. Work (the employment arena/labor market)
   c. Community (neighborhood)
   d. Family
   e. Peers (the adolescent society or youth peer group).

2. Point of Intervention: This variable identifies whether the program intervenes before youths come into contact with law enforcement; after youths come into contact with law enforcement but before court adjudication; or after juvenile court adjudication. Points of intervention are:

   a. Primary prevention (before contact with law enforcement)
   b. Diversion (after contact but before adjudication)
   c. Post-adjudication (after juvenile court adjudication).

3. Prevention Strategies: Twelve separate prevention strategies have been identified. Each strategy addresses a different cause of delinquency. A prevention program may employ more than one strategy. For this reason, the strategy cell may indicate more than one strategy. The twelve strategies are:

   a. Biological/Physiological
   b. Psychological/Mental Health
   c. Social Network
   d. Criminal Influence Reduction
   e. Power Enhancement
   f. Role Development
g. Activities/Recreation  

h. Education  

i. Consistent Social Expectations  

j. Economic Resources  

k. Deterrence  

l. Abandonment of Legal Control or Social Tolerance.

The strategies are defined in Appendix B (Page 149).

4. Level of Intervention: This variable identifies whether the program's services focus primarily on changing individual youths as a means of preventing delinquency; on changing youths' face-to-face interactional groups (classrooms, families, peer groups, gangs); or on changing the structural, institutional, or organizational context in which youths participate (schools, local labor markets, laws or statutes) as a means of preventing delinquency. The level of intervention are:

a. Individual  
b. Interactional  
c. Institutional.

B. Effectiveness

5. Program Effectiveness:

a. Outcome Objectives: This category indicates the effectiveness of the program in affecting intervening variables which may cause delinquency. (Our ratings are based on evaluative materials returned to us by programs or by independent evaluators, not on research we have conducted at NCADBIP.) Program ratings are:

1) Not evaluated (outcome data not available)  
2) Negative results  
3) Neutral or no effect  
4) Positive results  
5) Mixed results (both positive and negative)  
6) Promising results (preliminary information indicates favorable outcomes but research is not sufficiently rigorous to determine program effects)
b. Delinquency Impact: This category indicates the effectiveness of the program in curtailing delinquency as indicated by the program evaluation. (As above, these ratings are based on the evaluative materials provided to us by the programs or independent evaluators of those programs. The ratings are not based on research we have conducted at NCADBIP.) Program ratings are:

1) Not evaluated (outcome data not available)
2) Negative results
3) Neutral or no effect
4) Positive results
5) Mixed results (both positive and negative)
6) Promising results (preliminary information indicates favorable outcomes but research is not sufficiently rigorous to determine program effects)
7) Incomplete information (outcome evaluations have not been provided to NCADBIP or insufficient information has been provided to allow judgment of program outcomes).

C. Population Served

6. Number Served/Service Recipient Sex: the approximate number of people served by the program annually and the sex of the client population as a percentage of the number served is indicated if available.

7. Service Recipient Ethnicity: the ethnicity of the client population is provided as a percentage of the number served.

D. Geographic Location

8. Program Location: this variable indicates the population density of the area served by the program. Density groups are as follows:

a. Rural area (population of the main town in the area is less than 15,000)

b. Medium-sized town but not a suburb (population between 15,000 and 75,000)

c. Suburban area near an urban center (regardless of population size)
9. Catchment Area Size: the catchment area size indicates the extent of a geographical area which the program serves. Catchment areas are:

a. A local neighborhood, or sectors of a city which are less than the whole city
b. A whole city
c. A greater city metropolitan area, or a town plus its outskirts or suburbs
d. A county
e. Multiple sites within a state
f. A region within a state or a portion of state
g. A whole state
h. A region larger than state
i. Multiple individual sites beyond state boundaries, or a nationwide program.

E. Implementation/Organizational Concerns

10. Service Setting: This variable indicates the environment in which services are provided.

a. School
b. Home (an individual's or family's own home)
c. Work site
d. A non-residential social service agency (private or public), such as a community center or counseling clinic
e. A residential social service agency, such as a runaway or treatment center
f. A community setting (on the street, not in a building but in the open community).

11. Annual Budget: the annual budget and funding sources for the program are indicated if available.
APPENDIX B

A TYPOLOGY OF CAUSE-BASED JUVENILE CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

The Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention has developed the following typology for distinguishing among approaches to delinquency prevention. The 12 strategies defined below represent different approaches to delinquency prevention which seek to address distinct causes of delinquency.

1. **BIOLOGICAL / PHYSIOLOGICAL** strategies assume that delinquent behavior derives from underlying physiological, biological, or biopsychiatric conditions. They seek to remove, diminish, or control these conditions.

2. **PSYCHOLOGICAL / MENTAL HEALTH** strategies assume that delinquency originates in internal psychological states viewed as inherently maladaptive or pathological. They seek to directly alter such states and/or environmental conditions regarded as generating them.

3. **SOCIAL NETWORK DEVELOPMENT** strategies assume that delinquency results from weak attachments between youths and conforming members of society. They seek to increase interaction, attachments, and/or involvement between youths and nondeviant others (peers, parents, and other adults) as well as the influence which nondeviant others have on potentially delinquent youths.

4. **CRIMINAL INFLUENCE REDUCTION** strategies assume that delinquency stems from the influence of others who directly or indirectly encourage youths to commit delinquent acts. They seek to reduce the influence on youths of norms toward delinquency and those who hold such norms.

5. **POWER ENHANCEMENT** strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of control over impinging environmental factors. They seek to increase the ability or power of youths to influence or control their environments either directly or indirectly (by increasing the power or influence of communities, institutions, and groups in which youths participate). (Efforts to increase community or institutional influence or power over youths are not power enhancement.)

6. **ROLE DEVELOPMENT / ROLE ENHANCEMENT** strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of opportunity to be involved in legitimate roles or activities which youths perceive as personally gratifying. They attempt to create such opportunities. To meet the conditions of role development, the roles developed or provided must be perceived by youths as worthwhile (i.e., sufficiently valuable or important to justify expenditure of time and effort). Furthermore, they must offer youths an opportunity to perceive themselves as either:
   
a. **Useful** (i.e., the youth perceives that his or her activities contribute to a legitimate social unit which the youth values);
b. Successful (i.e., the youth perceives that he or she has achieved something desired, planned or attempted); or

c. Competent (i.e., the youth perceives that he or she has achieved mastery over a task).

7. ACTIVITIES / RECREATION strategies assume that delinquency results when youths' time is not filled by legitimate activities. They seek to provide nondelinquent activities as alternatives to delinquent activities. The condition which activities strategies seek to achieve (i.e., filling youths' time with nondelinquent activities) is invariably met if the conditions of several other strategies are met. Thus, activities strategies are a lowest common denominator in a number of strategies.

8. EDUCATION / SKILL DEVELOPMENT strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of knowledge or skills necessary to live in society without violating its laws. Education strategies provide youths with personal skills which prepare them to find patterns of behavior free from delinquent activities, or provide skills or assistance to others to enable them to help youths develop requisite skills.

9. CONSISTENT SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS strategies assume that delinquency results from competing or conflicting demands and expectations placed on youths by organizations and institutions such as media, families, schools, communities, and peer groups. Inconsistent expectations or norms place youths in situations where conformity to a given set of norms or expectations results in an infraction of another set of norms or expectations. This situation can result in confusion as to what actually represents conforming behavior and/or a cynical attitude toward legitimate expectations of any kind. These strategies seek to increase the consistency of the expectations from different institutions, organizations, and groups which affect youths.

10. ECONOMIC RESOURCE strategies assume that delinquency results when people do not have adequate economic resources. They seek to provide basic resources to preclude the need for delinquency.

11. DETERRENCE strategies assume that delinquency results because there is a low degree of risk or difficulty associated with committing delinquent acts. They seek to change the cost/benefit ratio of participation in crime. They seek to increase the cost and decrease the benefit of criminal acts through restricting opportunities and minimizing incentives to engage in crime.

12. ABANDONMENT OF LEGAL CONTROL / SOCIAL TOLERANCE strategies assume that delinquency results from social responses which treat youths' behaviors as delinquent. These responses may be viewed as contributing to delinquency almost by definition. The presence of social intolerance as expressed in the "black letter law," the actions of legal agents, or the attitudes of community members may be viewed as creating opportunities for youthful behavior to be defined as delinquent. In addition, such responses -- whether in the general form of rules or in the more specific form of an instance of legal processing -- may cause youths whose
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presumed Cause</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Goal of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abnormality/Illness</td>
<td>Biological-Physiological</td>
<td>Remove, diminish, control underlying physiological, biological or biopsychiatric conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Health Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Neurological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Genetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Disturbance Disorder</td>
<td>Psychological/Mental Health</td>
<td>Alter internal psychological states or conditions generating them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Epidemiological/early intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Psychotherapeutic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Attachments to Others</td>
<td>Social Network Development</td>
<td>Increase interaction/involvement between youth and nondeviant others; increase influence of nondeviant others on potentially delinquent youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Linkage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Influence</td>
<td>Criminal Influence Reduction</td>
<td>Reduce the influence of delinquent norms and persons who directly or indirectly encourage youth to commit delinquent acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Disengagement from criminal influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Redirection away from criminal norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>Power-Enhancement</td>
<td>Increase ability or power of youth to influence or control their environments, directly or indirectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Useful Worthwhile Roles</td>
<td>Role Development/Role Enhancement</td>
<td>Create opportunities for youth to be involved in legitimate roles or activities which youth perceive as useful, successful, competent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Service roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Production roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied Time</td>
<td>Activities/Recreation</td>
<td>Involve youth in nondelinquent activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Skills</td>
<td>Education/Skill Development</td>
<td>Provide individuals with personal skills which prepare them to find patterns of behavior free from delinquent activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Affective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Moral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Environmental Demands</td>
<td>Clear and Consistent Social Expectations</td>
<td>Increase consistency of expectations/messages from institutions, organizations, groups which affect youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Necessity</td>
<td>Economic Resources</td>
<td>Provide basic resources to preclude the need for delinquency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resource maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resource attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Degree of Risk/Difficulty</td>
<td>Deterrence</td>
<td>Increase cost, decrease benefits of criminal acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Target hardening/removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Anticipatory intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusionary Social Responses</td>
<td>Abandonment of Legal Control/Social Tolerance</td>
<td>Remove certain behaviors from control of the juvenile justice system; decrease the degree to which youths' behaviors are perceived, labeled, treated as delinquent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expliciter jurisdictional abandonment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implicit jurisdictional abandonment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Covert jurisdictional abandonment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental tolerance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
behaviors are so treated to perceive themselves as "outsiders" and, consequently, to engage in delinquent acts. These strategies seek to remove the label "delinquent" from certain behaviors. They take these behaviors as given and seek to alter social responses to them. Abandonment of legal control removes these behaviors from the control of the juvenile justice system, thus preventing them from being labeled or treated as delinquent. Increasing social tolerance for certain behaviors decreases the degree to which these behaviors are perceived, labeled, and treated as delinquent.
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