



Report To The Legislature Of The  
State Of California

## Regional Youth Educational Facility

*An Evaluation Of A Short-term Intensive Program for  
Juvenile Court Wards Piloted by the San Bernardino  
County Probation Department*

State of California

Department of the Youth Authority

Program Research and Review Division

December 1986

111805  
S08111

State of California  
GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN,  
GOVERNOR

Youth and Adult Correctional Agency

N. A. CHADERJIAN,  
SECRETARY



Department of the

# Youth Authority

PROGRAM RESEARCH AND REVIEW DIVISION

ELAINE DUXBURY  
Chief

JOACHIM P. SECKEL  
Research Manager II

Principal Author:

NORMAN SKONOVD, Ph.D.  
Research Program Specialist

Word Processing Unit

86-7

LDA

JAMES ROWLAND,  
DIRECTOR

CRAIG L. BROWN  
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

C. A. TERHUNE,  
Deputy Director  
INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS  
BRANCH

WILBUR A. BECKWITH,  
Deputy Director  
PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

RONALD W. HAYES,  
Deputy Director  
PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY  
CORRECTIONS BRANCH

FRANCISCO J. ALARCON,  
Deputy Director  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES  
BRANCH

111805

REGIONAL YOUTH EDUCATIONAL FACILITY:

An Evaluation of a Short-term Intensive Program for Juvenile Court  
Wards Piloted by the San Bernardino County Probation Department

111805

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by  
California Youth Authority

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Presented to:

THE LEGISLATURE

of the

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Department of the Youth Authority  
Program Research and Review Division  
December 1986

NCJRS

JUN 7 1988

ACQUISITIONS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgments . . . . .	ii
Summary . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER I Introduction . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II Description of Program . . . . .	3
CHAPTER III Method of Evaluation . . . . .	14
CHAPTER IV Findings . . . . .	19
CHAPTER V Conclusions . . . . .	32
APPENDICES . . . . .	34
Appendix A Ch 1455/84 (AB 3306, Leonard) . .	35
Appendix B Screening Format and Rejection Profile . . . . .	39
Appendix C Assessment of Client Risk and Need Forms . . . . .	44
Appendix D Citizens Advisory Committee Members . . . . .	46

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Staff of the San Bernardino County Probation Department provided unusual cooperation and were constructively interested in this evaluation. Invaluable assistance in the collection of data was provided by Jerry Hill, Chief County Probation Officer, and the following staff from the Regional Youth Educational Facility: Arthur Miyashiro, Director; Joan Kirtley, Supervising Group Counselor II; Joyce Wilson, Supervising Group Counselor I; David Newman, Psychologist; Bob Barrows, School Teacher; Roger Meyers, Vocational Education Teacher; Virginia Fisher, Career Development Coordinator; and Letecia Dorame, Clerk III. Wesley Krause, Supervising Probation Officer, and Steve Bell, Principal, Juvenile Court Schools, also provided much needed assistance.

## Summary

This report is an evaluation of the Regional Youth Educational Facility, a pilot program for juvenile court wards from San Bernardino and Riverside counties. This program was made possible by CH 1455/84 (AB 3306, Leonard), which authorized the Department of the Youth Authority to fund and evaluate one or more Regional Youth Educational Facilities. The application of San Bernardino County Probation Department for a Regional Youth Educational Facility was accepted with the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside being designated as a region. San Bernardino County was awarded \$1 million for the operation of the facility for two years, with the county providing \$1 million in matching funds and resources. A program for 40 male wards was initiated in July 1985, staffed by county employees.

The evaluation establishes that the Regional Youth Educational Facility has been implemented as mandated by the legislation:

- o It provides a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts of the designated region.
- o It serves the wards for whom it was intended. Program participants are juvenile court wards who are awaiting out-of-home placement in juvenile hall, educationally behind in school, educable, able to participate in vocational activities, not yet in need of commitment to the Youth Authority, and primarily 16- and 17-years old at time of program entrance.

- o Services required by the legislation are provided. The program provides a short-term, intensive educational experience. The educational components include competency-based education services, assessment for learning disabilities including visual perceptual screening and treatment, remedial individual educational plans for diagnosed learning disabilities, electronic and computer education, physical education, vocational and industrial arts and training, job training and experience, character education, and victim awareness. Restitution and intensive supervision by a probation officer in ward's county of residence for a minimum of 120 days are also program components.
- o Ward behavior and achievement both change in a positive direction during the program period. Specifically, the educational level of participants increases, wards are held accountable for their actions through restitution programs, and wards are prepared to return to the community as responsible and productive members through vocational training and work experience. Additionally, the community may be better protected at time of release due to intensive probation supervision.
- o The community, victims, volunteers, and private industry are involved in the program.
- o A citizens advisory committee with membership drawn from law enforcement, judiciary, probation, education, corrections, business, and the general public has been established to review the facility's goals, objectives, programs, and provide input.

The evaluation also notes that the most significant impact of the Regional Youth Educational Facility on the juvenile justice system is the reduction in the juvenile court's utilization of juvenile hall confinement time (Ricardo M. commitments) as a condition of probation. It appears, that, as legislation intended, the older, more delinquent juveniles are committed to this new program.

The important question of whether a program such as this affects recidivism has not been addressed because the program has not been in operation long enough to obtain the post-release criminal histories necessary to adequately determine this outcome. This evaluation, nevertheless, indicates that the Regional Youth Educational Facility has been programmatically successful. The most outstanding feature is the facility's apparent positive atmosphere--essentially lacking the typical institutional culture.



## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Chapter 1455 (AB 3306, Leonard), which was passed by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor in 1984, authorized the Department of the Youth Authority to fund and evaluate a pilot program of one or more Regional Youth Educational Facilities (see Appendix A). Intended to provide a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts, a Regional Youth Educational Facility is to function as a residential program for wards who are: primarily 16- and 17-years old, coming under the definitions of Section 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, who are awaiting out-of-home placement in juvenile halls, and who are not appropriate for commitment to the Youth Authority. Each facility is to provide a short-term intensive educational experience, including program elements such as competency-based education services, visual perceptual screening and treatment, remedial individual educational plans for diagnosed learning disabilities, electronic and computer education, physical education, vocational training, work experience, character education, victim awareness education, and restitution. Additionally, following completion of the residential program, all wards are to receive intensive supervision by a probation officer for a minimum of 120 days.

The application of San Bernardino County Probation Department for a Regional Youth Educational Facility was accepted with the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside being designated as a region. Constituting a partnership between the State and the participating counties, \$1 million was awarded to San Bernardino County for the operation of the facility for two years, with San Bernardino County providing \$1 million in matching funds and

resources. A program for male wards was initiated in July 1985. The facility consists of two 20-bed residential units, classrooms, offices, and recreational areas adjacent to the juvenile hall. It is staffed by county employees.

This report evaluates the Regional Youth Educational Facility in San Bernardino County primarily in terms of the objectives of the authorizing legislation. However, the program has not been in operation long enough to obtain the post-release criminal histories necessary to adequately determine if a program of this kind has an impact on recidivism. The organization of the report is as follows: Chapter II describes the program; Chapter III explains the evaluation design and methods of data collection; Chapter IV presents the evaluation findings; and Chapter V offers conclusions.

## CHAPTER II

### Description of Program

The Regional Youth Educational Facility operated by the San Bernardino County Probation Department has a highly structured program designed to guide a young man toward developing, practicing and internalizing effective adult and community survival skills, as well as learning to accept responsibility and accountability for personal behavior and decisions. Sixteen and seventeen year-old wards are provided a competency-based remedial education program which includes: accelerated physical training; screening for learning disabilities, including visual and audio handicaps; contact with victims of crimes and an awareness program to present the impact of crime on the victim; vocational training and work experience; and restitution, including community service work. The program is ten to twelve months in duration, consisting of a six-month residential phase (mean length of stay is 5.9 months) and a four to six month intensive aftercare or probation phase.

The program's facility consists of two, 20-bed units and auxiliary classrooms, offices, and recreational facilities. Staffing consists of the following: Program Director; Supervising Group Counselor II; Supervising Group Counselor I (2 positions); Clinical Psychologist; Group Counselor (15 positions, including the Career Development Coordinator); Youth Work Supervisor; Teacher (2 positions); Teacher's Aide (2 positions); Deputy Probation Officer (3 positions); Clerk (2 positions).

Male wards are referred to the program by probation officers or the court in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. (Ten beds in the 40-bed program are

reserved for wards from Riverside County.) A screening committee composed of the program director, a supervising group counselor, the clinical psychologist, and an aftercare probation officer reviews the applicants. Prospective program participants are evaluated on the basis of their meeting basic program requirements such as: 16- or-17-years of age; need for out-of-home placement; educable (defined as I.Q. of 80 or above); need for remedial education and vocational training; and ability to participate in vocational activities and work projects. Additionally, because the program requires participation in community programs and work sites, the screening committee evaluates wards in terms of their risk to the community. Reasons for rejection include: behavior which is physically or sexually threatening, explosive or unpredictable, and escalating in violence; lack of motivation for change; immaturity; drug addiction; and lack of sophisticated delinquent history. (See Appendix B for a copy of the Screening Format and a profile of wards rejected for the program from August 1, 1985, through September 30, 1986.) 1/

The ward's 2/ progress through the institutional phase of program is governed by a "level" classification system. This system provides the basic foundation for programming. It is also intended to assist the ward in improving his individual decision-making skills as he is given increased responsibility with each move to a higher level. The level system consists of:

---

1/ This subjective screening process is in the process of being replaced with a screening system based upon numerical scores from the newly implemented San Bernardino County Probation Department Assessment of Client Risk and Need forms for juveniles (see Appendix C).

2/ The Regional Youth Educational Facility staff refer to the wards in their program as "clients." This report, however, will use the legal term "ward," that is, a juvenile under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court per Section 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

- Level 1 -- Institutional program only (4 weeks).
- Level 2 -- Institutional and community programs under staff supervision (2 weeks).
- Level 3 -- Institutional and community programs with some unsupervised time, such as vocational education classes and short furloughs of 4 hours (2 weeks).
- Level 4 -- Institutional and full-time community programs with furloughs of 8-24 hours duration (4 weeks).
- Level 5 -- Institutional and full-time work or vocational training; aftercare planning commences (12 weeks).

The ward must complete assignments at each level, pass evaluations by staff on his performance and be reviewed at each level before promotion to the next. Level demotions are used for disciplinary purposes.

With the "level" classification system as a framework, the following elements comprise the program a ward receives in the Regional Youth Educational Facility:

#### Counseling Services

Upon entry to the program, each ward is administered a battery of three tests developed by the Institute of Personality and Ability Testing (I.P.A.T.). These personality tests provide standardized scores which are used by the clinical psychologist to determine each ward's personality profile. If serious problems are identified, individual therapy is provided by the psychologist. The psychologist also meets regularly with the group counselors for case consultation, during which time each ward's status and progress is monitored and counseling approaches discussed. The group counselors also provide

individual and group counseling sessions for the wards on their caseloads as well as both individual and group counseling with the other wards on the living units. The I.P.A.T. tests are administered again at time of release.

#### Competency-Based/Remedial Education Services

Also at entry, each ward is administered the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) in order to determine his ability level. Work is individualized to fit the particular remedial needs of each ward. The instruction is competency-based and computer-assisted. The following are the major subject areas taught: reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies/consumer education, science, computer education. Diagnostic services for learning handicaps are available. However, due to the need to restrict the program to those who can participate in vocational activities, wards who are severely learning disabled may be excluded. The CTBS is administered again at time of release.

#### GED Preparation

A computer-assisted program, the GED preparation class is coordinated and staffed by Casa Ramona, a nonprofit corporation receiving Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) funds. Seven computers and two instructors are available to wards on grounds who become ready for GED preparation. The GED exam may be taken by program participants at age 17 at La Puente High School in La Puente. A high school diploma may be secured through cooperation with local high schools. Wards completing their high school requirements or receiving their GED may participate in higher level educational experiences at local community colleges.

### Character Education

The goal of character education is to have wards develop and internalize socially productive values and develop sound decision-making skills. Each ward is enrolled two hours per week in character education classes. These classes teach value clarification, character and law-related education, and adult survival skills.

### Physical Education

This program element has three goals: 1) to improve physical fitness; 2) to improve all-around awareness of good health and nutrition; and 3) to increase self-esteem. Wards receive two hours of physical education each day, including physical fitness, weight lifting, jogging, and individual and organized team sports. Wards may be tested for body fat and are provided instruction on nutrition, physical fitness, personal hygiene, and the harmful effects of smoking.

### Victim Awareness

The goal of the victim awareness program component is to sensitize wards to the personal impact of crime through an eight-week class with two, three-hour sessions per week. Emphasis is placed on sensitizing wards to property offenses, rape, cruelty to animals, child abuse, domestic violence, and vehicular manslaughter. The class examines the financial, physical, and psychological trauma experienced by victims. The featured speakers and presenters include victim support groups and actual crime victims.

### Substance Abuse Education and Counseling

Wards with alcohol or drug abuse problems are referred for education and individual, family, and group counseling to the Family Center, a nonprofit corporation. Wards who need the program must attend no less than three counseling sessions per week at the Family Center's facility in Colton. Additionally, an Alateen group and an Alcoholics Anonymous group meet at the Regional Youth Educational Facility weekly.

### Visual Perceptual Screening and Treatment

Upon entry to the program, each ward receives a complete visual examination, including a full visual-developmental perceptual evaluation, and an audio test. This battery of tests identifies visual problems that could hinder the ward in a learning or occupational situation. Wards identified as having visual problems (including poor eye movement and tracking skills) are provided corrective lenses or Vision Therapy. Such therapy is individually programmed with the goal of eliminating all visual problems and producing an efficient visual system. Therapy sessions consist of monocular and binocular training, utilizing lenses, prisms, eye-hand coordination, and sports vision techniques.

### Career Education

Upon entry to the program, each ward is administered the Career Occupational Preference System to determine career interests and the Career Ability Placement Survey to determine vocational aptitude. The results of these tests are used to assist the ward in career exploration and goal setting. Each ward participates in a conference with the vocational education instructor and



career development coordinator to review test results and to develop the ward's goals for vocational training and employment. Wards attend classes in career-consumer education which include mock job interviews, resume preparation, career education field trips, and money management. Presentations by community business people, trade union personnel, and educators are a key component of these classes.

### Vocational Training and Work Experience

When wards enter the program and are still in the beginning "levels", emphasis is placed on the educational components of the program. Wards have the opportunity to attend four to six hours of classroom education and also participate in on-grounds vocation/work programs which include landscaping, grounds maintenance, and equipment maintenance. As wards reach higher "levels" and are permitted off grounds, the following programs and opportunities for vocational education, job training, and employment are available:

1. Regional Occupational Program (ROP). The Regional Occupation Program, administered by the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, provides vocational training in various areas to prepare for entry-level employment. Occupational areas include: car upholstery, electronics, computer programming, food service, heavy equipment operation, horticulture, welding, auto mechanics, and body repair.
2. Affiliation Agreement. Affiliation Agreements have been negotiated between San Bernardino County Schools and local businesses for short-term, nonpaid, on-the-job training.

3. Trade Schools/Colleges. The Regional Youth Educational Facility has placed wards in the following: Adelphi Business College, Golden State Welding and Electronics, San Bernardino Valley College, I.T.T. Career Training Center, and Casa Ramona Electronic School.
  
4. Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The Regional Youth Educational Facility has had the following JTPA programs made available to its wards through the San Bernardino County Department of Manpower Services: On-the-job training subsidies to private industries for training and hiring students; Summer Youth Employment Training Program for students to obtain paid work experience in public, nonprofit agencies; and State of California, Employment Development Department Targeted Job Tax Credits issued to employers who hire eligible Regional Youth Educational Facility wards.
  
5. Paid Employment. Part-time and full-time paid employment in private businesses. Most wards who obtain permanent employment have been hired after completion of Affiliation Agreement training or JTPA program training and employment.

It is the intention of the program that all wards promote from the residential phase of the program with usable work skills and, for most, full-time employment.

## Restitution

An important component of the program is restitution, which includes both monetary restitution and community service work. Community service projects have included the following:

1. Removal of graffiti by painting for the San Bernardino County Parks and Recreation Department.
2. Work project at the Lake Perris State Recreation Area involving the construction of a nature trail, planting shrubbery, building bridges, and constructing a dry river bed and an irrigation system.
3. Work project for Frazee Community Center, including the razing of wood structures, clearing fields, cleaning flower beds, and pruning trees.
4. Visiting and working with the psychiatric and elderly patients at local psychiatric facilities and convalescent homes.
5. Moving furniture, clearing fire access roads, and general grounds and equipment maintenance for the Probation Department.
6. Picking up trash along roadways, assisting with the city/county weed abatement program, and a variety of similar projects.
7. Staging puppet shows for community groups, convalescent homes, and hospitals.

8. Cleaning, painting and weed abatement for apartment complexes in a city-wide community beautification service project.
9. Donating blood every six weeks at the local San Bernardino/Riverside County Blood Bank.

Wards owing restitution must complete their financial obligations to their victims before they can successfully complete the program. Wards who are involved in paid employment programs have contractual agreements to pay a percentage of their salary toward the balance of their restitution obligations.

#### Religious Programming

The religious needs of the wards are met by volunteers who come in weekly to provide Bible study and nondenominational religious services. Wards are afforded the opportunity to attend the religious service of their choice during their weekly furlough opportunities.

#### Aftercare

Preparation for the Aftercare phase of the Regional Youth Educational Facility begins at time of entry. Aftercare probation officers meet the ward soon after he has arrived at the facility and participate in individual planning conferences and other critical conferences related to the ward's progress in the program. By the time the ward is released from the institution, the aftercare probation officer has already developed a relationship with the ward and has an intimate knowledge of his strengths and weaknesses. Each probation officer has a maximum caseload of 15 (instead of the typical 65-ward caseload

in Riverside County or the 65- to 110-ward caseload in San Bernardino County), enabling the officer to make frequent personal contacts with the ward at the probation officer's office, the ward's home, school, or place of employment. At least one face-to-face contact, along with two or more telephone contacts, are made each week. The purpose of this intensive aftercare is to encourage wards to meet the educational, employment, and personal objectives they have agreed on prior to release, to provide any needed counseling, assure that restitution payments are collected, and refer wards to appropriate service agencies. Intensive supervision extends from a minimum of four months after release to a maximum of six months. Depending on need, wards may be transferred to regular probation supervision after six months.

## CHAPTER III

### Method of Evaluation

The major outcome measure which would be of most value in evaluating the Regional Youth Educational Facility is recidivism, or criminal activity subsequent to release from the program. However, the program has not been in operation for a sufficient length of time to obtain the post-release criminal histories necessary to determine if a program of this kind has an impact on recidivism. The Regional Youth Educational Facility began operation in July 1985 with wards nearing the end of their length of stay in another commitment program and only began admitting program cases in August. The first wards did not complete the entire program (including the residential and intensive aftercare portions) until about a year later, which was August 1986. Eight had successfully completed the entire program as of September 30, 1986. This is not a sufficient number of cases, nor has enough time elapsed since they completed the program, to begin looking at recidivism data as a measure of program success.

Other measures of program success, such as ward reading level, were available and were used. However, in order to determine whether the Regional Youth Educational Facility is more effective than programs currently in operation on this or any other outcome measure, an experimental design is required. An experimental design involves the comparison of individuals in an experimental group with individuals in a comparison or control group who do not receive the experimental treatment but who are otherwise statistically alike. The two groups then are monitored during the treatment phase and followed for a period of time after treatment to determine whether the experimental group differs

from the comparison group on the outcome measures. Without a comparison group, outcomes due to program effects cannot be differentiated from those due to characteristics of wards participating in the program.

At the time the Regional Youth Educational Facility evaluation was initiated, a comparison group could not be created because technical problems did not allow for identifying similar wards who received other dispositions. Moreover, a randomly assigned control group was not established because of legal and ethical concerns on the part of the San Bernardino County Probation Department. County officials suggested that defense attorneys might challenge the random assignment of wards to the control group who were otherwise deemed eligible for the program. Additionally, they had concerns about the ethics of randomly selecting wards who might benefit from the program.

The Regional Youth Educational Facility has recently adopted an objective screening process based on San Bernardino County Probation Department's newly revised Assessment of Client Need and Assessment of Client Risk forms for juveniles. This will make possible a more rigorous evaluation. Research staff from the California Department of the Youth Authority are working with the San Bernardino County Probation Department to initiate such an evaluation. This evaluation will establish a comparison group from the county's general placement population based on the same criteria as those newly developed for the Regional Youth Educational Facility screening. The program or experimental wards and the wards comprising the comparison group will then be monitored and followed for approximately two years after program completion.

In the absence of an experimental or a comparison group-based design, the evaluation of the Regional Youth Educational Facility relies on qualitative and quantitative descriptive data. Informal interviews with staff and wards, as well as observations, provide information on the program and its operation, the facility's social climate, and ward interest in the program. Youth Authority-developed Ward Description Forms, which were completed by program staff for each ward, provide detailed information on ward offense history and basic demographic and service need factors. Program records provide pre- and post-test data on the educational and psychological tests administered at the facility as well as information regarding number of GED's completed and the hours of community service provided by program wards.

The major thrust of the evaluation focuses on the following four questions:

1. Does the Regional Youth Educational Facility serve the wards for whom it was intended? Does it meet the legislative objectives of providing a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts for wards who are: awaiting out-of-home placement in juvenile hall, educationally behind in school, educable, able to participate in vocational activities, not yet in need of commitment to the Youth Authority, and primarily 16- and 17-years old at time of program entrance? Data from the Ward Description Form and program records are used to address this question.
2. Are the services required by the legislation provided by the Regional Youth Educational Facility? Does the program provide a short-term intensive educational experience (with specified program elements),



restitution, and intensive supervision by a probation officer in ward's county of residence for a minimum of 120 days? This question is addressed by information collected from direct observation, informal interviews with staff and wards, and by an examination of program records.

3. How does ward behavior and achievement change while in the Regional Youth Educational Facility? Does it meet the legislative objectives of increasing the educational level of participants, provide better offender accountability, prepare participants to return to the community as responsible and productive members, and provide better community protection? This question is addressed by an examination of pre- and post-test data on the educational and psychological tests administered at the facility as well as by an examination of information regarding GED completions and vocational training and job placement. As discussed earlier, it will not be possible to determine whether the public is provided better community protection than would be the case without the program due to shortness of follow-up time and absence of a comparison group.
  
4. What is the impact of the Regional Youth Educational Facility on the juvenile justice system? Does it provide a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts and does it reduce population pressures on local juvenile halls? This question is addressed by information on juvenile hall and camp populations provided by the county probation departments.

In addition to addressing these four major questions, this report evaluates the implementation of the following two legislatively mandated features: 1) involvement of community, victims, volunteers, and private industry in the program, and 2) a citizens advisory committee with membership drawn from law enforcement, judiciary, probation, education, corrections, business, and the general public to review the facility's goals, objectives, programs, and to provide input. These features are evaluated on the basis of observation, informal interviews, and an examination of program records.

## CHAPTER IV

### Findings

The findings presented in this chapter are organized by the major evaluation questions presented in the previous chapter on method. It should be emphasized here again that the Regional Youth Educational Facility has not been in operation long enough to obtain adequate post-release criminal histories necessary to answer the important question of whether a program of this kind has an impact on recidivism. Nevertheless, the following evaluative information addresses a number of important questions regarding the implementation and internal success of this pilot program.

The following population data, covering the period from August 1, 1985 through September 30, 1986, are provided for background information:

	<u>San Bernardino County</u>	<u>Riverside County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Admissions	100	14	114
Readmissions	4	0	4
Promotions to Aftercare	40	6	46
AWOLS	24	0	24
Removals	15	0	15

Does the Regional Youth Educational Facility serve the wards for whom it was intended?

The legislation stipulates that the Regional Youth Educational Facility provide a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts for wards who are: awaiting out-of-home placement in juvenile hall, educationally behind in school, educable, able to participate in vocational activities, not yet in need of commitment to the Youth Authority, and primarily 16- and 17-years old at time of program entrance. The following data constitute a profile of the 114 wards admitted to the program between August 1, 1985, and September 30, 1986, including some of the information necessary to document whether the Regional Youth Educational Facility serves the wards for whom the legislation intended it to. (These 114 wards do not include the 12 nonprogram wards who were brought into the facility to commence operation in July 1985.) The data are derived from the Ward Descriptive Form.

Acceptance Profile

	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Intake</u>
		(114 = 100%)
San Bernardino County Wards: .....	100	(87.7%)
Riverside County Wards: .....	14	(12.3%)
Total Wards Admitted Between August 1, 1985 and September 30, 1986: .....	114	
Average (mean) Age at Entry: .....	17 years	
Average (mean) Age at First Arrest: .....	13 years	
Ethnic Distribution:		
White.....	53	(46.5%)
Hispanic.....	39	(34.2%)
Black.....	19	(16.7%)
Other.....	3	( 2.6%)

	<u>No.</u>	<u>% of Intake</u>
Current Sustained Offense (excluding violations of court orders): .....		
Personal Violence	22	(19.3%)
Property Offenses	74	(64.9%)
Drug Offenses	13	(11.4%)
Other Offenses	5	( 4.4%)
 Average (mean) Number of Prior Offenses (including violations of court orders): .....		3.3 offenses per ward
 Number of Wards With Prior or Current Offenses For: .....		
Personal Violence	48	(42.1%)
Property Offenses	109	(95.6%)
Drug Offenses	29	(25.4%)
Other Offenses	25	(21.9%)
Welfare and Institutions Code	47	(41.2%)
 Number of Wards Whose Current Commitment Involved Technical (nonlaw) Violations: .....	35	(30.7%)
 Number of Wards with Prior Private Placements .....	38	(33.3%)
 Number of Wards with Prior County Camp and/or Juvenile Hall Commitments (of 30 days or more): .....	48	(42.1%)
 Number of Wards with Prior "Ricardo M" Commitments <u>3/</u> : ..	25	(22.0%)
 Number of Wards who, at Time of Commitment were Awaiting: .....		
Out-of-Home Placement	107	(93.9%)
"Ricardo M" Commitment	1	(0.9%)
Other	6	(5.3%)
 Number of Wards Whose Family at Time of Current Petition Consisted of: .....		
Natural Mother & Natural Father....	22	(19.3%)
Natural Parent & Stepparent.....	42	(36.8%)
Mother only.....	35	(30.7%)
Other.....	15	(13.2%)
 Socioeconomic Status of Ward's Family: .....		
Upper .....	6	( 5.3%)
Middle .....	38	(33.3%)
Lower .....	35	(30.7%)
Very Low .....	35	(30.7%)

3/ Ricardo M. referring to: In re Ricardo M (1975) 52 CA3d 744, 125 CR 291, which upheld the right of the juvenile court to impose juvenile hall confinement time as a condition of probation.

Number of Wards Whose Last			
School Grade Completed was: .....	7th Grade .....	1	( 0.9%)
	8th Grade .....	15	(13.2%)
	9th Grade .....	34	(29.8%)
	10th Grade .....	44	(38.6%)
	11th Grade .....	18	(15.8%)
	Information		
	Missing .....	2	( 1.8%)

Academic Status at			
Admission: .....	At or Above		
	Grade Level .....	15	(13.2%)
	Below Grade Level...	96	(84.2%)
	Information		
	Missing .....	3	(2.6%)

Number of Wards with Current			
and/or History of: .....	Alcohol Problems ...	71	(62.3%)
	Drug Problems .....	90	(78.9%)
	Psychological/ Psychiatric		
	Problems .....	29	(25.4%)
	Physical Abuse .....	15	(13.2%)
	Sexual Abuse .....	5	( 4.4%)
	Emotional Abuse ....	20	(17.5%)
	Gang Involvement ...	27	(23.7%)
	Use of Weapons .....	42	(36.8%)

In examining the above data regarding the question of whether the Regional Youth Educational Facility serves the wards for whom it was intended, the following observations can be made:

- o Of the 114 wards sentenced to this program, 107, or 93.9 percent were awaiting out-of-home placement in juvenile hall at the time of commitment--clearly the vast majority of cases.
- o Ninety-six, or 84.2 percent of wards committed to this program were below grade level--a good indicator that they were educationally behind in school.

- o Average age at entry was 17 years--indicating that the wards were primarily 16- and 17-years old at time of program entrance--in fact except for three wards who had just turned 18, all were either 16- or 17-years old.
- o That Regional Youth Educational Facility wards are not yet in need of commitment to the Youth Authority can only be inferred by the data. The seriousness of their commitment offenses tend to be less than male wards committed to the Youth Authority from the juvenile courts (for example, 19.3 percent of Regional Youth Educational Facility wards were committed for offenses of personal violence compared to 36.5 percent of first commitments to the Youth Authority in 1985.) <sup>4/</sup> However, the phrase "need of commitment to the Youth Authority" has no precise definition. Rather, the recommendations of county probation officers and the courts, by their decisions, define this need.

The data displayed above do not document whether the wards served by the Regional Youth Educational Facility are educable and able to participate in vocational activities. However, all wards referred to the program are carefully screened. Those who are not educable (defined as having an I.Q. below 80) and not able to participate in vocational activities (defined as having severe physical disabilities or as presenting too high a risk to the community) are not admitted to the program (see Appendix B).

---

<sup>4/</sup> "Characteristics of First Commitments to the Youth Authority, 1985." (1986) Data Analysis and Information Systems Bureau, California Department of the Youth Authority.

Are the services required by the Legislation provided by the Regional Youth Educational Facility?

The Legislation requires that the Regional Youth Educational Facility provide a short-term intensive educational experience. The educational program elements required include competency-based education services, assessment for learning disabilities including visual perceptual screening and treatment, remedial individual educational plans for diagnosed learning disabilities, electronic and computer education, physical education, vocational and industrial arts and training, job training and experience, character education, and victim awareness. Restitution and intensive supervision by a probation officer in ward's county of residence for a minimum of 120 days are also mandated program components. These services are all provided and are described in Chapter II, "Description of Program." In addition to these required program elements, the Regional Youth Educational Facility also provides substance abuse education, individual and group counseling, and voluntary religious programs. Direct observation, informal interviews with staff and wards and an examination of program records indicate that the program elements described in Chapter II have been refined over time and integrated into an intensive, highly effective service system.

How does ward behavior and achievement change while in the Regional Youth Educational Facility?

The legislation sets a number of ward behavior and achievement objectives for the Regional Youth Educational Program: Increase the educational level of participants; Provide better offender accountability; Prepare participants to return to the community as responsible and productive members; Provide better community protection. The program's success in meeting these objectives is evaluated below.



Program wards show gains educationally as demonstrated by the following:

- o California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) scores show an average increase for both the reading and math sections. For the 67 wards on whom both the pre- and post-test scores are available, average reading grade level increased from 7.2 to 8.6 and average math grade level increased from 7.9 to 8.9. However, the amount of increase which these CTBS scores indicate may be less than that actually attained by the wards. The reason for this is that the test is administered according to ability level and each ability level has an upper grade level limit above which it is impossible to score. According to program staff, a number of wards scored at the highest grade level on the test administered to them at post-test but could have scored higher. For increases to be statistically reliable, however, the same version of the CTBS must be given at post-test time as at pretest time.
- o The 84 wards who were enrolled in high school credit-earning classes between August 1985 and September 1986 earned an average of 21.6 credits each.
- o Twenty-four wards completed GED's during the same period of time.

There are no standardized tests or credits by which to measure the program's success in providing better offender accountability. However, several program components which address offender accountability indicate that wards in the Regional Youth Educational Facility are encouraged to face up to the results of their actions and be accountable for them. First of all, the

Victims Awareness Class (which program staff developed with the use of victim volunteers) is a mandatory part of each ward's program and forces the wards to confront the psychological, physical, and financial suffering which victims of crime must endure as the direct or indirect result of specific crimes. This appears to be an effective class. Wards interviewed for this evaluation claimed to have been highly sensitized to the plight of victims as a result. Questions regarding victims awareness are administered in test form at the beginning and end of the course and inspection of pre/post changes on individual items indicates an apparent increase in sensitivity and awareness of the suffering of victims on the part of wards completing the course. The test also indicates that wards tend to agree less with attitudes which can be characterized as antisocial after the course experience.

A second indicator of the program's effectiveness regarding offender accountability is the stipulation that wards with outstanding restitution payments cannot complete the program successfully. As mentioned earlier under the program description section of this report, wards who are in paid employment programs have contractually agreed to pay a set percentage of their earnings toward their restitution obligations. Between August 1985 and September 1986, 22 wards with monetary restitution obligations paid a total of \$3,117 in restitution.

The third indicator of offender accountability, community service, is also considered restitution. The community service projects with which the Regional Youth Educational Facility have been involved have been described previously. The projects all involve wards in significant work activities of a nature

which contributes to the overall well-being of the community and to the ward's self-esteem. The number of community service hours provided by the program between August 1985 and September 1986 totals 5,918.

In assessing the Regional Youth Educational Facility's success in preparing wards to return to the community as responsible and productive members, psychological pre- and post-test results and several program components provide useful information. As mentioned previously, a battery of three tests developed by the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing (I.P.A.T.) are administered to wards at entry and at time of release. Pre- and post-test results on 31 wards completing the program were sent to the I.P.A.T. by the program psychologist for analysis. (At the time these data were sent to I.P.A.T. pre- and post-test results were available on only these 31.) The results of these tests indicate that the following changes occurred over the "treatment period" (that is, during the six-month program). The first test, a measure of normal personality functioning (the "16PF"), showed significant increases in problems solving ability, stress tolerance, ability to deal with the feelings of self and others, and in the use of internal resources to solve problems. The second test, a measure of pathology (the "CAQ"), indicated lowered tendencies toward hypochondria, suicidal depression, low energy depression, self blame and resentment, boredom and withdrawal, and paranoia. The third test, a measure of temperament (the "SMAT"), indicated less conflict regarding sex drive, and increased motivation to feel good about themselves. These results can generally be interpreted as indicating that positive changes have occurred within the program participants--changes which should better enable wards to return to the community as responsible and productive members.

In further assessing program success in preparing wards to return to the community as responsible and productive members, it is important to note that many of the program components such as competency-based/remedial education services, visual perceptual screening and treatment, GED preparation, career education, and vocational training and work experience relate directly or indirectly to enabling wards to obtain employment. In fact, except for wards pursuing advanced education, virtually all wards who advance to Level 5 are placed in training or work sites off grounds. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the fact that approximately half of the wards have obtained permanent, well-paying jobs in the community by the time they promote to aftercare.

Even though it is not possible to determine whether the public is provided better community protection than would be the case without the program because, as was mentioned earlier, there is not sufficient follow-up time and no comparison group, one program component, in particular, is relevant to this issue. Aftercare services provided to Regional Youth Educational Facility wards at time of release from the institutional phase of the program involve intensive supervision by a probation officer for four to six months. Because each probation officer has a maximum caseload of only 15 (instead of the typical 65-ward caseload in Riverside County or the 65- to 110-ward caseload in San Bernardino County), it can be argued that Regional Youth Educational Facility wards are more closely monitored and that the community is therefore provided better protection. However, as reasonable as this argument may appear, without follow-up data comparing program wards to similar nonprogram wards, it cannot be substantiated. Additionally, the significant number of

AWOLS which have occurred during the program phase (and the time which elapses between their escape and apprehension) indicates that there may be public protection problems which have yet to be solved.

What is the Impact of the Regional Youth Educational Facility on the Juvenile Justice System?

The legislation authorized that a Regional Youth Educational Facility should provide a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts. The fact that juvenile courts in San Bernardino County and Riverside County committed 114 wards to this program (100 from San Bernardino and 14 from Riverside) clearly indicates that it is being used as a sentencing alternative.

The impact of the Regional Youth Educational Facility on the juvenile justice population seems to have been most significant in terms of a reduction in the juvenile courts' utilization of juvenile hall confinement time (Ricardo M. commitment) as a condition of probation. The juvenile courts in both San Bernardino County and Riverside County appear to be committing the older, more delinquent juveniles to the Regional Youth Educational Facility instead of to a period of confinement in juvenile hall. In fact, in San Bernardino County, the estimated number of male Ricardo M. commitments in juvenile hall has been reduced from a mean of 60 per day in early 1985 to 4 per day since the program began. However, it appears that this program has not affected the populations of the two counties' juvenile ranches.

Involvement of Community, Victims, Volunteers, and Private Industry in the Regional Youth Educational Facility Program.

As mandated in the legislation, the Regional Youth Educational Facility has integrated the community, victims, volunteers, and private industry in its program and thereby greatly extended its staff and program resources. The community is involved in the program through the membership of community leaders on its citizens advisory committee (see Appendix D) and as the recipient of the thousands of hours of work which program wards provide through community service projects. Victims of crime are involved in the victims' awareness class in which victims make formal presentations and interact with wards regarding financial, physical, and emotional suffering as crime victims. Volunteers provide the added program component of religious programming, which includes weekly Bible studies and involvement of wards in puppet shows presented to residents of convalescent homes, hospitals, and other groups. Volunteers are also involved in the career education classes with business people, trade union personnel, and educators volunteering time to make presentations to the wards. Private industry is heavily involved in the program by providing vocational training and work experience sites.

Although not fitting neatly into the categories examined above, it is important to note that the Regional Youth Educational Program has been enriched by the following programs whose services are provided without cost: Substance abuse education and counseling provided by the Family Center, a nonprofit community corporation; GED preparation classes (including seven computers and two instructors) provided on grounds by Casa Ramona, a nonprofit corporation receiving Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) funds; Vocational training and employment programs also provided by JTPA funds; Vocational

training provided by the Regional Occupational Program (ROP), administered by the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools; Trade school program opportunities made possible through scholarships provided by the respective trade schools/colleges. These program resources were obtained for the Regional Youth Educational Facility through considerable research and negotiation on the part of staff.

#### A Citizens Advisory Committee

The legislation mandates that the Regional Youth Educational Facility shall have a citizens advisory committee with membership drawn from law enforcement, judiciary, probation, education, corrections, business, and the general public to review facility's goals, objectives, programs, and provide input. A citizens advisory committee was formed and held its first meeting on January 7, 1986. It has met at least bimonthly and has met the above mentioned legislative requirements, including the stipulation regarding the composition of its membership (see Appendix D). Program staff regard the advisory committee as particularly helpful in providing contacts with private businesses which have resulted in training and work site agreements for program wards. Because of their broad array of backgrounds and leadership positions in the community they also have provided the program with feedback on how the program is viewed in the community and have encouraged community support.

CHAPTER V  
Conclusions

Based on the qualitative and quantitative data available for this evaluation, the Regional Youth Educational Facility has been implemented as mandated by CH 1455/84 (AB 3306, Leonard). It provides a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts of the designated region (the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside), it serves the wards for whom it was intended, and the services required by the legislation are provided. Ward behavior and achievement appear to change in a positive direction, and the program involves community, victims, volunteers, and private industry. A citizens advisory committee with membership drawn from law enforcement, judiciary, probation, education, corrections, business, and the general public has been formed.

The important question of whether a program of this kind has an impact on recidivism has not been addressed because the program has not been in operation long enough to obtain the post-release criminal histories necessary to adequately determine this. This evaluation, however, has indicated that the Regional Youth Educational Facility has been programmatically successful. The only negative feature noted is the significant number of AWOLS which have occurred during the program phase. Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the program is the facility's positive atmosphere. The typical "delinquent culture" appears to be absent. It may be that the program elements mandated by the legislation, both because of their substantive content and number, helped create a program which keeps wards so occupied with positive activities



that a "delinquent culture" cannot take root. Nevertheless, evaluation of the ultimate success of this and other program features must await comparison of recidivism data on program wards and matched nonprogram wards from the general commitment population.

APPENDICES

## CHAPTER 1455

(Assembly Bill No. 3306)

An act to amend Sections 48645 and 48645.1 of the Education Code, to add Section 3364.7 to the Labor Code, and to amend Section 889 of, and to add and repeal Article 24.5 (commencing with Section 894) of Chapter 2 of Part 1 of Division 2, of the Welfare and Institutions Code, relating to juveniles, making an appropriation therefor, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

[Approved by Governor September 25, 1984. Filed with Secretary of State September 26, 1984.]

## LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 3306, Leonard. Juveniles: regional youth educational facilities.

Existing law provides for the commitment of certain juveniles who are made wards of the court to juvenile halls, juvenile homes, ranches, and camps.

This bill would additionally authorize, as a pilot project ending June 30, 1987, a voluntary program for the establishment and administration of regional youth educational facilities under the control of the Youth Authority, as specified. Under this project, wards of the court not committed to the Youth Authority could be committed to such a facility. The Youth Authority would be required to evaluate the project and report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1987.

Existing law provides that a ward of the juvenile court who is assigned by order of the court to rehabilitative work without pay on a public work project, is entitled to workers' compensation benefits, under specified conditions.

This bill would add the provision that a ward of the juvenile court who is committed to a regional youth educational facility and engaged in rehabilitative work without pay on public property would similarly be entitled to worker's compensation benefits, under certain conditions.

Existing law directs local boards of education to provide for public schools in juvenile homes, halls, day centers, ranches, and camps.

This bill would provide for public schools in any regional youth educational facility as well.

The bill would appropriate \$1,000,000 to the Youth Authority for the purposes of the bill.

The bill would take effect immediately as an urgency statute. Specified portions would be inoperative on June 30, 1987, and would be repealed as of January 1, 1988.

Appropriation: yes.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

**SECTION 1.** The Legislature finds and declares that, currently, many counties lack short-term intensive residential programs for minors who are not yet in need of commitment to the Youth Authority. This act is intended to provide a needed local sentencing alternative in order to provide certain minors, primarily 16 and 17 year olds, who are awaiting out-of-home placement, with the educational programs they

need to become law-abiding, productive citizens. This act constitutes a partnership between the state and participating counties based on matching funds and resources which will provide needed juvenile facilities staffed by county employees. Counties may contract with the private sector for needed program services. It is the intent of the Legislature that these programs emphasize screening for visual and other learning disabilities, basic education and job readiness, community involvement, participation of victims, volunteers, and private industry, accountability of young offenders for their crimes, and restitution.

SEC. 2. Section 48645 of the Education Code is amended to read:

§ 48645. The purpose of this article is to provide for the administration and operation of public schools in juvenile halls, juvenile homes, day centers, juvenile ranches, juvenile camps, or regional youth educational facilities established pursuant to Article 14 (commencing with Section 850), Article 15 (commencing with Section 880), and Article 24.5 (commencing with Section 894) of Chapter 2 of Division 2 of the Welfare and Institutions Code or in any group home housing 25 or more children placed pursuant to Sections 362, 727, and 730, of the Welfare and Institutions Code or in any group home housing 25 or more children and operating one or more additional sites under a central administration for children placed pursuant to Section 362, 727, or 730 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, with acceptable school structures at one or more centrally located sites to serve the single or composite populations, and to provide the juvenile court school pupils therein detained with quality education and training.

Nothing in this section shall be construed as indicating that it is the intent of the Legislature to prevent juvenile court school pupils who are housed in group homes from enrolling in regular public schools, or that it is the intent of the Legislature to transfer the responsibility for any costs associated with the operation of group homes to the counties.

SEC. 3. Section 48645.1 of the Education Code is amended to read:

§ 48645.1. Public schools or classes in any juvenile hall, juvenile home, day center, juvenile ranch, juvenile camp, or regional youth educational facility established in accordance with Article 14 (commencing with Section 850), Article 15 (commencing with Section 880), and Article 24.5 (commencing with Section 894) of Chapter 2 of Division 2 of the Welfare and Institutions Code or in any group home housing 25 or more children and operating one or more additional sites under a central administration, with acceptable school structures at one or more centrally located sites to serve the single or composite populations of juvenile court school pupils detained therein in accordance with the provisions of Sections 362, 727, or 730 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, shall be known as juvenile court schools.

SEC. 4. Section 3364.7 is added to the Labor Code, to read:

§ 3364.7. Notwithstanding Sections 3351 and 3352, a ward of the juvenile court committed to a regional youth educational facility pursuant to Article 24.5 (commencing with Section 894), engaged in rehabilitative work without pay on public property within the jurisdiction of any governmental entity, including the federal government, shall, upon the adoption of a resolution of the board of supervisors declaring that such wards shall be deemed employees of the county for purposes of this division, be entitled to the workers' compensation benefits provided by this division for injury sustained while in the performance of such public work project, provided:

(a) That the ward shall not be entitled to any disability indemnity benefits.

(b) That in determining permanent disability benefits, average weekly earnings shall be taken at the minimum provided therefor in Section 4453.

SEC. 5. Section 889 of the Welfare and Institutions Code is amended to read:

§ 889. The board of education shall provide for the administration and operation of public schools in any juvenile home, hall, day center, ranch, camp, or regional youth educational facility pursuant to Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 48645) of Chapter 4 of Part 27 of the Education Code.

SEC. 6. Article 24.5 (commencing with Section 894) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

#### ARTICLE 24.5

##### Regional Youth Educational Facilities

§ 894. In order to provide a sentencing alternative for the juvenile courts, one or more pilot regional youth educational facilities shall be established as short-term intensive residential programs to which primarily 16- and 17-year-old minor juvenile court wards not committed to the Youth Authority who fit the description in Section 602 may be committed. Participating minors shall be those who are awaiting out-of-home placement in county juvenile halls, educationally behind in school, educable, able to participate in vocational activities, and able to participate in work projects. Each facility shall provide a short-term intensive educational experience, including program elements such as competency-based education services, assessment for learning disabilities including visual perceptual screening and treatment, remedial individual educational plans for diagnosed learning disabilities, electronic and computer education, physical education, vocational and industrial arts and training, job training and experience, character education, victim awareness, and restitution. Wards who complete the short-term intensive program who need continuing services shall be transferred to local facilities for up to 60 days of additional education and training. Following institutional placement, all wards in the program shall receive intensive supervision by a probation officer in their county of residence for a minimum of 120 days. Intensive supervision means a 10 to 15 person caseload per deputy probation officer.

§ 895. (a) From any state moneys made available to it for that purpose, the Youth Authority shall assist counties in the establishment of pilot regional youth educational facilities. Interested counties that agree to provide matching funds or resources, in compliance with standards established by the department, may enter agreements with the Youth Authority to establish these facilities. The facilities shall be operated by participating counties, either solely or under a joint powers agreement. The counties may contract with private agencies to provide job training consultation or other services.

(b) The Youth Authority shall develop selection criteria for participating counties to include, but not be limited to, all of the following factors:

- (1) Eligible target population.
- (2) Demonstrated ability to administer the program.
- (3) Facility capability.
- (4) Financial ability to provide matching funds or resources.
- (5) Demonstrated need for the program.
- (6) Ability to meet regional needs.
- (7) Ability to provide specified program elements.

§ 896. (a) The Youth Authority shall establish minimum performance standards for programs of education and training and for qualifications of personnel for all youth educational facilities in the program, including local continuation and intensive supervision components. These standards and qualifications shall be designed to achieve program goals such as an increase in the educational level of participants, better community protection and offender accountability, and prepara-

tion of participants to return to the community as responsible and productive members.

(b) The Youth Authority shall conduct an initial inspection and an annual inspection thereafter of each regional youth educational facility. In addition, the Youth Authority may conduct such other inspections as it deems necessary. If the Youth Authority, after inspection, finds that a facility is not in compliance with the standards adopted pursuant to subdivision (a), the Youth Authority shall give notice of its findings to all persons having authority to confine minors in that regional facility. Commencing 60 days thereafter, that regional youth educational facility shall not be used for confinement of any minor until such time as the Youth Authority finds, after reinspection of the facility, that the conditions which rendered the facility unsuitable have been remedied and that the facility is a suitable place for the confinement of minors.

(c) The custodian of each regional youth educational facility shall make such reports as may be required by the Youth Authority to effectuate the purposes of this section.

§ 897. The capacity of each regional youth educational facility shall be established pursuant to Sections 886 and 886.5.

§ 898. The participating counties shall appoint a citizens advisory committee with a membership drawn from law enforcement, judiciary, probation, education, corrections, business, and the general public, whose function is to review the goals, objectives, and programs of each youth educational facility and provide input to the facility.

§ 898.5. The Youth Authority shall evaluate the effectiveness of this article and shall report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1987.

§ 899. This article shall become inoperative on June 30, 1987, and, as of January 1, 1988, is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, which becomes effective on or before January 1, 1988, deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes inoperative and is repealed.

SEC. 7. The sum of one million dollars (\$1,000,000) is hereby appropriated from the General Fund to the Youth Authority to provide matching funds to counties for the establishment of pilot regional youth educational facilities pursuant to Section 895 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. Participating counties shall provide funds or resources of equal value to sums provided by the Youth Authority under this act.

SEC. 8. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to provide urgently needed local sentencing alternatives for the juvenile courts as soon as possible, it is necessary that this act take immediate effect.

EXPLANATORY NOTES CH 1455:

Ed C § 48645. Amended the first paragraph by substituting (1) "juvenile camps, or regional youth educational facilities" for "or juvenile camps"; and (2) ", Article 15 (commencing with Section 880), and Article 24.5 (commencing with Section 894)" for "and Article 15 (commencing with Section 880)".

Ed C § 48645.1. Substituted (1) "juvenile camp, or regional youth educational facility" for "or juvenile camp"; and (2) ", Article 15 (commencing with Section 880), and Article 24.5 (commencing with Section 894)" for "and Article 15 (commencing with Section 880)".

W & I C § 889. Substituted "camp, or regional youth educational facility" for "or camp".

SCREENING FORMAT FOR SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY TREATMENT INSTITUTIONS1. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION:

- a. MINOR'S NAME: J#-
- b. DOB: AGE:
- c. HEIGHT: WEIGHT:
- d. Status of case in court process (Is placement already court ordered?)

2. Review all present allegations (motivation-remorse-attitude toward)

3. Review all prior records, pending restitutions and pending charges.

4. Violence potential.

5. Maximum time--time in custody, considering good/work time.

6. Review and summarize prior placement/Juvenile Hall detention history.

## 7. Family Dynamics:

- a. Role of father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, parent substitute.
- b. Role of siblings
- c. Prior record of parents and siblings
- d. History of abuse (physical, emotional and sexual) against minor/siblings

SCREENING FORMAT

PAGE 2

- e. Family violence
8. History of Substance Abuse:
- a. Family alcohol/drug abuse (i.e., mother, father, minor, sbilings)
  - b. Degree of problem
  - c. Evaluation of need for special referral in this area.
9. Minor's adjustment in home, school and community:
- a. School status:
    - 1) Current status (active, expelled, suspended)
    - 2) Basic attendance history and progress.
    - 3) Academic potential (school testing)
    - 4) Special needs (i.e., MCM, special education, speech therapy)
    - 5) Individual education plan (IEP)
    - 6) Behavior history.



SCREENING FORMAT

PAGE 3

b. Community status:

- 1) Social organization, organized sports
- 2) Gangs/supremacy groups

10. Medical/Psychological History (Clinical Services to supplement):

a. Present status

b. Diet and nutrition

c. Special needs or problems

d. Medication, past and present

e. Previous psychological counseling, therapy, testing, psychiatric reviews EEG, neurologicals, etc. (where, when by whom?) (provide copies when available)

f. History sexual maturation, activity, preference

11. Goals for Placement:

a. Probation Officer's goals (Why are you choosing this placement?)

b. Attitude of family and minor towards placement and their goals.

REGIONAL YOUTH EDUCATIONAL FACILITY

SCREENING REJECTION PROFILE

Of one hundred eighteen (118) wards rejected for acceptance into the program from August 1, 1985 to September 30, 1986:

1. Thirty (30) wards were rejected for a single reason.
2. Sixty (60) wards were rejected for two reasons.
3. Twenty-four (24) wards were rejected for three reasons.
4. Three (3) wards were rejected for four reasons.
5. One (1) ward was rejected for five reasons.

There are sixteen (16) separate reasons used for rejection:

1. Lack of motivation for change; lack of commitment to program structure and goals - forty-one (41) wards.
2. High risk to the community - thirty-one (31) wards.  
This includes:
  - a. Physically or sexually threatening behavior
  - b. Escalating history of violent behavior
  - c. Explosive or unpredictable behavior
3. Immaturity; inability to handle program expectations - nineteen (19) wards.
4. Extreme AWOL risk; wards who have runaway from placement a minimum of three (3) previous times - twenty (20) wards.
5. Addictive drug behavior - forty-four (44) wards.

REGIONAL YOUTH EDUCATIONAL FACILITY  
(Continued)

6. Psychological needs are too extensive - twenty-one (21) wards.
7. Too old; 18 years plus - five (5) wards.
8. No prior placements; lack of sophisticated delinquent history - twenty-six (26) wards.
9. Less than six months maximum confinement time available - eight (8) wards.
10. Had benefit of previous long-term emancipation program - one (1) ward.
11. Illegal alien - one (1) ward.
12. Primary focal need is for family counseling - thirteen (13) wards.
13. Full scale I.Q. under 80 - two (2) wards.
14. Professed homosexual lifestyle - one (1) ward.
15. No previous formal probation history - two (2) wards.
16. No family support system after placement - eight (8) wards.



SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY  
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

ASSESSMENT OF CLIENT RISK: JUVENILE

- Client's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Initial Classification Date: \_\_\_\_\_ P.O.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_ Minor's Court Number (J#): \_\_\_\_\_

		Initial Score	Reclassification	Reclassification
1) Employment:	Part-time, full-time, not relative	0		
	Needs employment/job training	1		
2) Alcohol Use:	No known/infrequent/no impairment	0		
	Occasional/frequent/excessive use	2		
	Dependency	3		
3) Illegal Drug Use:	No known/infrequent/no impairment	0		
	Occasional/frequent/excessive use	2		
	Dependency	3		
4) Family Relationships:	Relationships and support strong	0		
	Relatively stable relationships or not applicable	1		
	Some disorganization or stress, potential for improvement	2		
	Major disorganization or stress	3		
	Abuse or neglect	4		
5) School:	Attending, graduated, G.E.D., equivalence	0		
	Problems handled at school level	1		
	Severe truancy or behavioral problems	2		
	Not attending/expelled	4		
6) Academic Achievement:	At or above grade level	0		
	Below grade level	2		
) Emotional Stability:	Appropriate adolescent responses	0		
	Exaggerated or self-defeating responses to stress, counseling would be beneficial	2		
	Emotional disorder. Professional treatment required	3		
8) Primary/Alternate Parent Problems:	Both natural parents	0		
	Natural parent (+) stepparent	1		
	Single parent home/relative	2		
9) -----	Parental alcohol/drug abuse	2		
10) -----	Parent physical illness	1		
	Parent psychological illness	2		
11) -----	Family criminal history	1		
12) -----	Above average income	0		
	Adequate family income	1		
	AFDC or subsistence income	2		
13) -----	Family address changes past year (one point for each).			
14) Opposite sex peer:	Appropriate relationships	0		
	Inappropriate relationships	1		
	Confirmed homosexual life-style	2		
15) Recreation/Hobby:	If no constructive leisure time activities or no regular physical exercise, enter	2		
16) Learning Disability:	Yes	1		
	I.Q. tested below 80 points	2		
17) Health (physical appearance):	Sound physical health	0		
	Handicap or illness interferes with functioning	1		
	Serious handicap or chronic illness	2		

REGIONAL YOUTH EDUCATIONAL FACILITY CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SAN BERNARDINO/RIVERSIDE COUNTIES

## MEMBERSHIP

James Anthony	Chief of Police Chino Police Department Chino, CA
Otis Brantley	Superintendent Youth Training School Chino, CA
Thomas Callanan	Chief Probation Office Riverside County Probation Dept. Riverside, CA
Mary Curtin	Executive Secretary-Treasurer AFL-CIO Riverside, CA
E. Fred Davies	Chairman-Elect Riverside Co. Juvenile Justice Comm. Cherry Valley, CA
Sister Nora Dwan	Administrator St. Bernardine Hospital San Bernardino, CA
Ray Farmer	Chief of Police Rialto Police Department Rialto, CA
Ted Harrison	Director of Alternative Education Chino Unified School District Chino, CA
Marjorie Hollinger	President Rapid Data, Inc. Redlands, CA
Jack Klepper	Private Citizen Colton, CA
Alex Lujan	Supervisor San Bernardino/Riverside Unit Department of Corrections San Bernardino, CA
F. Douglas McDaniel	Justice of the Appellate Court San Bernardino, CA

Membership (Continued)

J. Willard Monninger	Private Citizen San Bernardino, CA
Janet Paule Reynolds	Director of Staff Development San Bernardino Unified School Dist.
Anthony J. Piazza	Attorney at Law Victorville, CA
Earl A. Rowland	Private Citizen San Bernardino, CA
Peggy Sartor	Private Citizen Victorville, CA
Jonathan Scherer	Private Citizen San Bernardino, CA
Marie Schmidt	Private Citizen Appley Valley, CA
Charles S. Terrell, Jr., Ph.D.	County Superintendent of Schools San Bernardino, CA
A. Rex Victor	Attorney at Law San Bernardino, CA
Patrick J. Morris	Presiding Judge/Juvenile Court San Bernardino, CA
<hr/>	
Chief County Probation Officer Jerry D. Hill	San Bernardino County Probation Dept. San Bernardino, CA
Staff Services Art Miyashiro, Probation Director II Joan Kirtley, Supervising Group Counselor II	Regional Youth Educational Facility San Bernardino County Probation Dept. San Bernardino, CA