



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
Office of Justice Programs

148568

**CATEGORICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRESS REPORT**

The information provided will be used by the grantor agency to monitor grantee cash flow to ensure proper use of Federal funds. No further monies or other benefits may be paid out under this program unless this report is completed and filed as required by existing law and regulations (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements — 28 CFR, Part 66, Common Rule, and OMB Circular A-110).

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1. GRANTEE<br>Boys & Girls Clubs of America   |  | 2. AGENCY GRANT NUMBER<br>90-JD-CX-K004                                    | 3. REPORT NO.<br>2   |
| 4. IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE<br>Program Services  |  | 5. REPORTING PERIOD (Dates)<br>FROM: October 1, 1992 TO: December 31, 1992 |  |
| 6. SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT<br>TARGETED OUTREACH, Youth Gang Prevention Intervention                  |  | 7. GRANT AMOUNT<br>\$ 468,444.00   | 8. TYPE OF REPORT<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL REQUEST<br><input type="checkbox"/> FINAL REPORT |
| 9. NAME AND TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR<br>William B. Kearney<br>Director of Delinquency Intervention |  | 10. SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR<br><i>William B. Kearney</i>             | 11. DATE OF REPORT<br>January 31, 1992   |

12. COMMENCE REPORT HERE (Continue on plain paper)

# QUARTERLY REPORT

---

**Objective #1:** *Transfer technology developed in the Youth Gang Prevention / Intervention Project to establish youth gang prevention programs in 20 Boys & Girls Clubs.*

1. Develop and disseminate program announcement and application.

The program announcement and application form was rough drafted during November, 1992. There were discussions with the grant monitor during December about the process for identifying and selecting Clubs for inclusion in the program. It was agreed that single and multi-unit Boys & Girls Clubs organizations would be identified and selected as a prevention sites based on their interest, capability, and need for the program. Based upon the agreed upon identification and selection approach, the program announcement and application were finalized and approved by the grant monitor, along with the transmittal letter, (see Appendix A.)

---

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| 13. CERTIFICATION BY GRANTEE (Official signature) | 14. DATE |
|---|----------|

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING OJP CATEGORICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRESS REPORTS

Grantees are required to submit Progress Reports on project activities and accomplishments. It is expected that reports will include data appropriate to this stage of project development and in sufficient detail to provide a clear idea and summary of work and accomplishments to date. The following should be observed in preparation and submission of progress reports:

- a. Due Date. Reports are due 30 days after the close of each full calendar quarter. The final report is due 90 days following the close of the grant period or any extension thereof.
- b. Submission. Grantees shall submit to OJP Office of the Comptroller an original and one copy of quarterly progress reports and an original and three copies of final progress reports.
- c. Form and Execution. Grantees should use OJP Form 4587/1 (Rev. 2-90) as a face sheet. If continuation pages are needed, plain bond paper is to be used. It should be noted that the report is to be signed by the person designated as project director on the grant application or any duly designated successor.
- d. Reporting Requirements. The reporting requirements noted in this section are designed to provide the grantor agency with sufficient information to monitor grant implementation and goal achievement. To support effective monitoring progress reports must be keyed to the grant implementation plan provided in Part IV of the grant application. Specifically, the report should:
  1. Indicate the status of each goal which was due for completion during a previous report quarter but carried over due to implementation or other problems.
  2. State the status of each goal which was scheduled to be achieved during the report period.
  3. State the corrective action planned to resolve implementation problems and state the effect of these problems on the remaining schedule for achieving the project remaining goals.
  4. If appropriate, identify changes which are needed in the implementation plan specified in Parts III and IV of the grant application to overcome problems. Changes which alter plans and/or goals set forth in Part III or IV of the application require prior grantor agency approval and the issuance of a Grant Adjustment Notice.
  5. State what technical assistance the grantor agency might provide during the coming quarter to help resolve implementation problems. If technical assistance has been provided to resolve implementation problems, state the problems (or tasks) addressed and the results (or impact) of the assistance provided.
  6. Based on the performance measures set forth in the grant application (implementation plan), indicate in quantitative terms the results (of the project) achieved both during the reporting period and cumulative-to-date. Explanatory and qualifying statements will be helpful here, especially if project objectives have changed.
- e. Special Requirements. Special reporting requirements or instructions may be prescribed for categorical projects in certain program or experimental areas to better assess impact and comparative effectiveness of the overall categorical grant program. These will be communicated to affected grantees by the agency.

---

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 2 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspects of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Comptroller, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20531; and to the Public Use Reports Project, 1121-0140, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503.

The process of identifying Clubs with the interest, capability, and need, will be completed by mid-January (with input from B&GCA regional Field Services staff). Applications will be mailed by mid-January.

2. Select 20 Youth Gang Prevention Sites.

Applications from Clubs are expected back during the first week of February. With two weeks for review and processing, it is anticipated that the grant monitor will be provided with a list of recommended sites by late February. As indicated earlier, Clubs will be selected based on interest, capability, and need for the program.

3. Presentation and completion of Site Youth Gang Prevention Action Plans.

Projected for completion during the second quarter of 1993.

4. Provide technical assistance, orientation and training for sites.

It is anticipated that sites will be notified of selection by early March, and work with the sites will begin at that point.

5. Monitoring the Clubs' progress.

Projected to begin during the next quarter after site selection.

148568

**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

Public Domain/OJP/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

---

**Objective #2:** *To document the day-to-day activities, technologies, and underlying principles of four Boys & Girls Club youth gang intervention programs.*

1. To identify potential sites for the project and invite them to apply for the grant.

Completed as part of the process with identifying prevention sites, described under Objective #1. The additional criteria for selection as an intervention site is that eligible Clubs must have an intervention program operating during the past year. This additional requirement was highlighted on the program description (see Appendix A).

2. Send invitation and application to identified Clubs.

The approved invitation and application, provided in Appendix A, will be mailed to the potential sites in mid-January.

3. Select four Clubs to receive a \$15,000 supplement to their existing youth gang intervention program.

Selection is projected for early March, based upon grant monitor review and approval of recommended sites.

4. Track involvement of targeted youth.

Tracking is projected to begin by the end of the next quarter, after site selection.

5. Provide technical assistance for sites.

Technical assistance will begin after sites are selected.

6. Monitoring the Clubs' programs.

Monitoring will begin upon site selection.

---

**Objective #3:** *To provide a briefing forum to elicit the technology, recommendation, cautions, and programmatic features of the four youth gang intervention programs.*

1. Secure arrangements for debriefing forum.
2. Invite selected people from each site and youth gang consultants to debriefing.
3. Facilitate debriefing forum.
4. Summarize findings in progress report.
5. Debriefing summary available to all Clubs and interested parties. Summary submitted to OJJDP for Bulletin/Update.

All Objective #3 steps will begin after intervention programs have had the opportunity to assess their program, and data for three quarters can be collected.

---

**Objective #4:** *To continue to collect, maintain, and disseminate "state-of-the-art" information and research on youth gang activities and effective program models.*

1. Update review of literature.

During November, the Project Director went through the existing youth gang materials currently residing with the project to weed out outdated information, and to identify information gaps. Next, phone calls were made to the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse and the National Gang Information Clearinghouse to identify additional literature worth getting for the collection. Appendix B identifies titles received during the quarter.

2. Renew subscriptions to professional journals.

Professional journal subscriptions were reviewed and continued where appropriate. In addition, the Project Director and Youth Gang Prevention Specialist were updated on many government, professional, and research organization mailing lists.

3. Maintain contacts with professionals in law enforcement and university research.

Significant time was spent during November and December by project staff, establishing contacts with the justice and research community. The following represents a list of contacts developed during the quarter:

University/Research Community

- ◆ David Curry, West Virginia University (NIJ Gang/Police Data Grantee)
- ◆ Del Elliott, University of Colorado (Prevention Research)
- ◆ Bill Feyerherm, Portland State University (B&GCA Gang Project Evaluator)
- ◆ Arnold Goldstein, Syracuse University (Psychological Perspective of Gangs)
- ◆ David Hawkins, University of Washington (Prevention Research)
- ◆ Matt Klein/Cheryl Maxson, USC, (Gang Migration Patterns)
- ◆ George Knox, Chicago State University (Gang Researcher)
- ◆ Irving Spergel, University of Chicago (Gang Researcher)
- ◆ Carl Taylor, University of Michigan (Gang Researcher)
- ◆ Terrence Thornberry, SUNY Albany (Delinquency in Gangs)

### Information Contacts

- ◆ Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse
- ◆ National Youth Gang Information Clearinghouse
- ◆ BJS Clearinghouse
- ◆ FBI, UCR Division
- ◆ Cosmos Corp. (HHS Youth Gang Initiative T.A. Provider)
- ◆ National School Safety Center
- ◆ National Center for Missing & Exploited Children

### Justice System Contacts

- ◆ OJJDP POLICY Training/Youth Gang Component
- ◆ New York State Division for Youth
- ◆ Illinois State Police

### Professional Associations

- ◆ American Probation/Parole Association
- ◆ National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges
- ◆ National Center for Juvenile Justice

In addition, contact was made with members of the past advisory board, as they finalized their review of the Manual draft. All 33 site contacts from the previous prevention/intervention program cycle were contacted to discuss past experience and to introduce them to the new project staff.

The contacts will continue to evolve during the year.

### 4. Update files with "state-of-the-art" youth gang prevention and intervention program information.

Journals, periodicals, newspapers, other media sources, and professional contacts were used during the quarter to collect information about "state-of-the-art" youth gang prevention and youth gang intervention programs. In addition, as project staff hear from Clubs and others, they are asked if they are currently operating a program. If so, information about the program is collected on a specially developed form, (See Appendix C.)

Information about new, promising approaches is particularly important to this project as technical assistance is provided to project sites, B&GC organizations not participating in the project but interested in serving youth at risk of gang involvement, and outside organizations, such as police, juvenile justice officials, etc.

5. Distribute information and research to all project sites and to other Boys & Girls Clubs and organizations upon request.

Appendix D provides a list of requests for information received during the quarter. A total of 17 requests were received; 5 by B&GC organizations, and 12 by outside organizations. A special form was designed (see Appendix E) to collect and document uniform information from requestors. In addition, the information is being maintained in a recently developed data base, so requests can be analyzed for trends on a periodic basis.



---

## Miscellaneous Activities

### Manual Development

During this quarter, the drafting of the Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach Manual was completed. Reader-reviewer and Advisory Board member comments were received by mid-October and incorporated into the final draft. Two additional people — Barry Glick, PhD of the New York State Division for Youth and Lt. Gary O'Connor of the Lower Gwynedd PA Police Department — provided a final review.

The draft was submitted to the grant monitor on December 10th. The draft will be finalized during the next quarter, based upon the grant monitor's comments. The Manual will then be printed and distributed to Clubs and other interested parties.

### Project Evaluation

The Final Research Report for the past program cycle was completed and submitted by William Feyerherm, PhD, the project evaluator from the Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University (Portland, Oregon). The report, including its Executive Summary, has been included in this monthly report as Appendix F.

The evaluation results reflect the value and importance of B&GCA's TARGETED OUTREACH/youth gang initiative. The findings and recommendations were used in planning and refining the next phase of the current grant, in identifying and selecting sites, as well as the level of support and coordination sites will receive from project staff.

### Training

In concert with the development for the Manual, a training syllabus was finalized during the period (See Appendix G). The training will be used for training the new project sites, as well as be provided by B&GCA's Human Resource Group to non-project Clubs interested in gang prevention training.

Three B&GC professionals, as well as project staff were trained on the new syllabus, and on training techniques. The three training associates, who will be used to train non-project Clubs, are from prior project sites: Rey Colón from Chicago, Amon Rashidi from Dallas, and Sondra Madison from Somerville Massachusetts. Non-project site training is scheduled for Santa Ana, CA in February, and Boston, MA in April.

---

# APPENDIX A

TRANSMITTAL LETTER, DESCRIPTION &  
APPLICATION

---

*Sample  
Invitation  
Letter*



**BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS  
OF AMERICA**

January 20, 1993

Mr. Robert K. Hassin  
President & C.E.O.  
Boys & Girls Clubs of Chicago  
625 W. Jackson Blvd., Ste. 300  
Chicago, IL 60661

Dear Robert:

Boys & Girls Clubs of America invites your organization to apply as a project site for an important youth gang prevention and intervention initiative. We are looking to work with B&GC organizations that have the interest, capability, and local need to participate in the program. Single and multi-unit organizations are encouraged to apply. Multi-unit organizations should indicate all units that have the demonstrable need as well as interest and capability for the prevention and/or intervention program. A total of twenty Clubs/units will be selected as prevention sites and four units will be selected as intervention sites to operate for a ten month program period.

Prevention sites will be expected to aggressively outreach to 50 new youth at risk of gang involvement, and mainstream these youth into regular Club programming, while providing case management services. Single unit Clubs and units from multi-unit organizations participating in the 1990-91 youth gang prevention initiative are not eligible for the prevention component.

Intervention sites will serve a minimum of 35 youth and participate in an indepth assessment of their existing intervention services, identifying what may be replicable by other Clubs. Single unit Clubs and units from multi-unit organizations participating in the 1990-91 project are eligible for the intervention component if they are currently operating an intervention program.

By participating in the program, your unit staff will receive training, periodic on-site technical assistance, and ongoing support. You and your Board will receive assistance with continued funding, policy, and organizational implementation issues. Organizations may apply for (1) a single intervention site, (2) single or multiple prevention sites, or (3) a single intervention site and single or multiple prevention sites. Organizations will receive \$1,500 for each unit selected as a prevention site, and \$15,000 for an intervention site.

All applications should be postmarked no later than Friday, February 5th. Should you have any questions in completing the application, please feel free to contact me at (212) 351-5911.

Sincerely,

*Bill*

William B. Kearney  
Director, Delinquency Intervention

WBK/jm  
Enc.

cc: Roxanne Spillett



BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS  
OF AMERICA

## TARGETED OUTREACH TO YOUTH AT RISK OF GANG INVOLVEMENT

# PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Boys & Girls Clubs of America's youth gang prevention and intervention initiative is designed to transfer effective gang prevention strategies to twenty units and to document the day-to-day activities, techniques, and underlying principles of four existing Boys & Girls Club youth gang intervention programs.

- ◆ **For participation in the Prevention Component**, B&GC units must be in an area with a documentable gang problem, and have the interest and capability to implement B&GCA's prevention program.
  - To implement the prevention program, each selected Club will receive the *Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach* Manual, training and on-site technical assistance from Boys & Girls Clubs of America project staff. Each prevention site will receive \$1,500 for the 10-month program period.
  - Each organization (with one or multiple prevention sites) will develop a preliminary Action Plan for the prescribed objectives, working with a local consortium of officials organized to address the gang issue and receiving technical assistance from Boys & Girls Clubs of America. The B&GCA project staff will visit the Club to provide a training workshop and on-site technical assistance for Boys & Girls Club professionals, and an orientation to the Club's Executive Director, Board of Directors and the local consortium. Each organization will then set out to implement their Action Plan, which will result in the recruitment and integration of 50 youth into the Club's core programs (aged 6 through 18 who are either at risk of gang involvement or who are fringe members of a gang and who would not come to the Club on their own).
  - Project staff from Boys & Girls Clubs of America will communicate with each Club at least twice a month, to provide technical assistance to the Club and monitor their progress with the program. The B&GCA project staff will schedule additional visits during the year to monitor progress, and provide technical assistance with operational, policy, and continuation funding issues.

**The effectiveness of the prevention effort will be determined by the successful implementation of the Action Plan, submission of progress and final reports, and enrollment of 50 new at-risk youth into core programming.**

- ◆ **For participation in the Intervention Component**, organizations must be in an area with a demonstrated gang problem, have an existing gang intervention program operational in the past year, have a working knowledge of TARGETED OUTREACH, and an established core program. Each intervention site will receive \$15,000 for the 10-month program period.
  - Intervention sites will provide services to a minimum of 35 youth, documenting participation and submitting detailed reports on the progress of the project and individual participants.
  - Intervention sites will participate in a debriefing meeting with other intervention sites, Advisory Board members, the independent evaluators, and B&GCA project staff.

**The effectiveness of this intervention effort will be determined by successful implementation of an Action Plan, serving a minimum of 35 targeted youth, submitting routine progress and detailed case management reports and a final report, participating in the debriefing meeting, and cooperating with independent evaluators.**

For your Club to apply, please submit the attached Application to:  
William B. Kearney, Director of Delinquency Intervention  
Boys & Girls Clubs of America, 771 First Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.  
**All applications must be postmarked by February 5th, 1993.**

**YOUTH GANG PREVENTION &  
INTERVENTION PROGRAM**

**APPLICATION  
1993**



**BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS  
OF AMERICA**

**Due February 5, 1993**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Applicant Information</b><br><i>Boys &amp; Girls Club Organization Name</i> | <b>Person Completing Application</b><br><i>Name</i> |
| <i>Address</i> _____   | <i>Title</i> _____                                  |
| <i>Telephone</i> _____   | <i>Address</i> _____                                |
| <i>Executive Director</i>  | <i>Telephone</i> _____                              |

**Site(s) of Proposed Program**

|                      |                      |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Unit Name</i>     | <i>Unit Name</i>     |
| <i>Address</i> _____ | <i>Address</i> _____ |
| <i>Telephone</i>     | <i>Telephone</i>     |
| <i>Unit Director</i> | <i>Unit Director</i> |
| <i>Type of Site</i>  | <i>Type of Site</i>  |
| <i>Unit Name</i>     | <i>Unit Name</i>     |
| <i>Address</i> _____ | <i>Address</i> _____ |
| <i>Telephone</i>     | <i>Telephone</i>     |
| <i>Unit Director</i> | <i>Unit Director</i> |
| <i>Type of Site</i>  | <i>Type of Site</i>  |
| <i>Unit Name</i>     | <i>Unit Name</i>     |
| <i>Address</i> _____ | <i>Address</i> _____ |
| <i>Telephone</i>     | <i>Telephone</i>     |
| <i>Unit Director</i> | <i>Unit Director</i> |
| <i>Type of Site</i>  | <i>Type of Site</i>  |

**Signatures:**

|                           |             |                        |             |  |  |
|---------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|--|--|
|                           |             |                        |             |  |  |
| <i>Executive Director</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Board President</i> | <i>Date</i> |  |  |

---

## **DIRECTIONS**

- If applying for prevention site(s) only, answer 1 through 5, and 6 if applying for multiple prevention sites.
- If applying for intervention site only, answer 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7.
- If applying for both prevention and intervention, answer all questions.
- Answer each of the following questions to the best of your ability
- Please try to keep your answers to the space provided.
- Use additional pages if applying for multiple units.

- 
1. State the extent and nature of youth gang activities in the specific areas for each unit applying for the project. Use / attach statistics, reports, or detailed statements from: police, juvenile justice authorities, judges, school officials, etc. Attach any media reports.

---

2. a. List hours of operation for each unit applying:

b. If warranted by your current program hours, would your organization be willing to change your hours of operation?

Yes  No

---

3. List community agencies [schools, social service agencies, police, juvenile justice authorities, etc.] you work with regularly, and role you see them playing in your youth gang program. Identify how this will be coordinated with individual units.

---

4. Is there a community Youth Gang Consortium and/or Task Force already established in your community? If so, what has the Club's role been in this effort? If a Consortium/Task Force does not currently exist, what plans are there to create one? [Attach any letters of support or commitment.]

ORGANIZATION: \_\_\_\_\_ *YOUTH GANG PREVENTION & INTERVENTION PROGRAM*

---

5. Describe your organization's experience with TARGETED OUTREACH, and any other special funds received to serve youth at risk of delinquency or gang involvement.

---

6. If you are applying with multiple sites, please describe how you will manage and coordinate your program.



7. If applying to be an intervention site, please describe your intervention program:  
[Applicants must have a gang intervention program in place].

Program Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_  
Unit where program operates: \_\_\_\_\_ & Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe Participant Composition (Race, Gender, Family Income, etc.)

No. to be Served: \_\_\_\_\_ Age Range: \_\_\_\_\_

Services Provided: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Project Description: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Other Participating Agencies / Roles: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Funding Source(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Funding Cycle / Program Duration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Attach copies of material you feel will support your application (program proposal, quarterly or annual report(s), evaluations, brochures, articles, letters of support, etc.).

**Return this Application No Later than February 5, 1993 to:**

**Mr. William B. Kearney, Director of Delinquency Intervention  
Boys & Girls Clubs of America,  
771 First Avenue, New York, NY 10017. .... (212) 351-5911**

---

# APPENDIX B

YOUTH GANG LITERATURE

---

*Youth at Risk*, by Capuzzi, D & Gross, D  
(Youth at risk resource written for parents, teachers, counselors)

*Working with Troubled Children*, by Savicki, V & Brown  
(Treatment techniques for treating troubled kids)

*Adolescents At Risk*, by Dryfoos, Joy G  
(High risk behavior, prevention, prevention strategies)

*The Girls in the Gang*, by Campbell, Anne  
(Case studies and observations of female gangs)

*Reaffirming Prevention: New York State Gang Task Report*,  
by NYS Division for Youth  
(NYS Gang Task Force Report, Statewide Gang Information)

*Violence Prevention: A Curriculum for Adolescents*, by Prothrow-Stith, Deborah  
(Violence Prevention/Dealing with Anger)

*Do or Die*, by Bing, Leon  
(LA Youth Gang interviews)

*Teens, Crime, and the Community*, by National Crime Prevention Council and  
National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law  
(Curriculum for teen education and action for safer schools & neighborhoods)

*Juvenile Gangs*, by Covey, H., Menard, S., & Franzese, R.  
(Textbook on Gangs; research and interventions)

*Fateful Choices*, by Hechinger, F. (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development)  
(Health issues for youth)

*Before its Too Late*, by Massachusetts Advocacy Center & Center for Early Adolescence  
(Dropout prevention in the middle grades)

*Black on Black Violence*, by Wilson, A.

(Psychodynamics of black self-annihilation in service of white domination)

*Delinquent Gangs*, by Goldstein, A.

(Psychological perspective of gangs)

*National Institute of Justice Research on Gangs*, by National Institute of Justice

(Summary of NIJ-funded research projects)

*Crime in the United States*, by FBI

(Uniform Crime Report Statistics)

*Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics*, by Bureau of Justice Statistics

(Crime and victimization statistics)

*OJJDP Annual Report 1991*, by Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention  
(Summary of juvenile justice projects funded in 1991)

*The Role of Juvenile Gangs in Facilitating Delinquent Behavior*, by Thornberry, T. et al.  
(Delinquent activity level before, during, and after gang involvement)

*Drugs and Crime Facts, 1991*, by Bureau of Justice Statistics  
(Summary of drug data published in 1991)

*Criminal Victimization 1991*, by Bureau of Justice Statistics  
(National Crime Victimization Survey report for 1991)

*Street Gang Questionnaire*, by Illinois State Police  
(Survey of street gang activities to police departments)

*The Cycle of Violence*, by National Institute of Justice  
(Research into cycles of family violence)

---

# APPENDIX C

## SPECIAL PROGRAM FACT SHEET

---

# SPECIAL PROGRAM FACT SHEET

Program Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Type:

(i.e.: Delinquency, Gang, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Participant  
Characteristics: \_\_\_\_\_

No. to be Served: \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Target Descriptors:

(Gender, race, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Services Provided: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Participation Duration: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Other Participating  
Agencies / Roles: \_\_\_\_\_

Funding Source(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Funding Amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Funding Cycle  
/ Program Duration: \_\_\_\_\_

---

# APPENDIX D

## LIST OF INFORMATION REQUESTS

---

Robin Downey  
Dept of Community Development  
906 Columbia St SW  
Olympia, Wa 98504-8300  
206:753-4948

DATE OF REQUEST: 11/04/92

REQUEST: Looking for information on TARGETED OUTREACH for her community.

RESPONSE: Sent packet of information on T.O & Gang initiative.

Ronald Brinn  
National Center for Youth Violence  
231-35 Merit Blvd  
Queens, NY 11413  
718:712-1100

DATE OF REQUEST: 10/29/92

REQUEST: Consultant helping a group in the Bronx with youth violence issues.  
Looking for resources — Club resources in the Bronx & gang  
prevention information.

RESPONSE: Referred to Kips Bay & will send info to him.

Herbert Styles  
Specialty Products Limited  
30 Chesapeake Road  
Nassau, Bahamas

DATE OF REQUEST: 11/05/92

REQUEST: Looking to start a Club and looking to deal with local gang info.  
Referred by Errol Sewell.

RESPONSE: Sending information, including draft manual Airmail by 11/6/92.

Christopher Thomas  
Doctor  
University of Texas, Medical Branch  
Graves Bldg D25  
Galveston, TX 77755  
409:772-9335

DATE OF REQUEST: 11/06/92

REQUEST: Looking for information on gang intervention. Mayor starting task  
force; local club will be involved.

RESPONSE: Sending information packet & gave him phone #'s of the 3  
intervention sites.



Jay Farron  
Director of Operations  
B&GC of South Hampton Rds  
3415 Azalea Gdn Rd  
Norfolk, VA 23513  
804:853-5632  
DATE OF REQUEST: 11/10/92  
REQUEST: On City Task Force. Setting up prevention programs in 3 Units  
RESPONSE: Sent draft of Manual; Keep in mind as site.

Kay Reynolds  
B&GC of Green Bay  
Box 8145  
Green Bay, Wi 54308-8145  
DATE OF REQUEST: 11/20/92  
REQUEST: Wants to be on the waiting list for the manual  
RESPONSE: Placed on waiting list for Manual.

Monica Erck, Student  
2122 Roundtop Court  
Colorado Springs, CO 80918  
DATE OF REQUEST: 11/20/92  
REQUEST: Looking for follow up info to PARADE article.  
RESPONSE: Sent info packet of materials.

Greg Reilly  
DARE Unit  
Norwalk Police Services  
297 West Avenue  
Norwalk, Ct 06852  
DATE OF REQUEST: 11/20/92  
REQUEST: Looking for information on the project.  
RESPONSE: Sent information package & put in touch with local efforts.

Ilene Bergsmann  
Cook County Judicial Advisory Committee  
118 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, Il 60607  
DATE OF REQUEST: 11/23/92  
REQUEST: Looking for Intervention programs  
RESPONSE: Sent Sample Models; Referred to Chicago & El Monte.

Doris Parker  
2821 Broadway  
Little Rock, Ar 72206  
501:376-2138  
DATE OF REQUEST: 12/03/92  
REQUEST: Interested in serving kids after school — Private Citizen  
RESPONSE: Referred to Little Rock Club, Sent TO material.

Troy Fritz  
Site Supervisor  
B&GC of Central Minnesota  
3rd St & 30th Ave N  
St Cloud, Mn 56303  
612:252-7616  
DATE OF REQUEST: 12/03/92  
REQUEST: Looking for Anti Violence programming information  
RESPONSE: Referred to Natl Net Of Viol Prev Pract.

Verne Speirs  
Chief Probation Officer  
1100 Van Ness PO 453  
Fresno, Ca 93709  
209-488-3427  
DATE OF REQUEST: 12/03/92  
REQUEST: Interest in programming for at-risk youth. Told Robbie Callaway he'd like to see the status of B&GCA's youth gang program.  
RESPONSE: Sent him draft of manual, based on conversation with Robbie.

Mary Flores  
Executive Director  
B&GC of Edinburg  
PO Box 1079  
Edinburg, TX 78540  
210-383-2582  
DATE OF REQUEST: 12/09/92  
REQUEST: Has At-Risk Youth program in Elementary School; being asked to serve 7th & 8th graders. Looking for TARGETED OUTREACH & Gang Prevention information.  
RESPONSE: Sent draft of Manual & TARGETED OUTREACH material.

Grace Alveri

Univision

Miami, Fl

DATE OF REQUEST: 12/11/92

REQUEST: Looking for stats on Gangs; Hispanic gangs in NYC especially.

RESPONSE: Gave data from NYS Division for Youth Task Force on Gangs Report

Dianne Bowman

Coney Island United Services

Brooklyn, NY

718-996-8967

DATE OF REQUEST: 12/06/92

REQUEST: Interested in Prevention Program help.

RESPONSE: Discussed with Brian Skanes, Northeast Regional Director, due to past contact they have had in the past. Couldn't reach her to set up meeting.

Dan Haren

Executive Director

B&GC of Monterey Park

Monterey Park, CA

818-573-2831

DATE OF REQUEST: 12/10/92

REQUEST: Interested in Teen information and proposal formats for new teen center.

RESPONSE: Sent TARGETED OUTREACH sample proposals; Referral to 4 Clubs with strong teen programs.

Normandy Brangan

Project Assistant

COSMOS Corporation

1735 Eye Street

Washington DC 20006

202-728-3939

12/31/92

REQUEST: Looking for youth gang and general prevention information. Doing NIJ's Gang Prevention evaluation.

RESPONSE: Sent information on B&GCA's gang initiatives, TARGETED OUTREACH, and Smart Moves.

---

# APPENDIX E

## INFORMATION REQUEST FORM

---



TARGETED OUTREACH / Youth Gang Program

## INFORMATION REQUEST FORM

Last Name: \_\_\_\_\_

First Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_

State: \_\_\_\_\_

ZIP Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Request: \_\_\_\_\_

Request Type: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Response: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

# APPENDIX F

FINAL RESEARCH REPORT

---

---

# FINAL RESEARCH REPORT

---

## YOUTH GANG PREVENTION AND EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

*CONDUCTED FOR:*

*BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS OF AMERICA*

*by:*

William Feyerherm, Ph.D.  
Regional Research Institute for Human Services  
Portland State University  
Portland, Oregon

Carl Pope, Ph.D.  
Rick Lovell, Ph.D.  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

---

December, 1992

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary .....                | 1  |
| Introduction .....                     | 6  |
| Evaluation Methods .....               | 10 |
| Results .....                          | 12 |
| Prevention / Consortium Sites .....    | 13 |
| Intervention Sites .....               | 19 |
| Program Data .....                     | 22 |
| Intake Characteristics .....           | 23 |
| At-Risk Factors .....                  | 28 |
| Activities .....                       | 31 |
| Conclusions from Program Data .....    | 33 |
| Suggested Issues to Be Addressed ..... | 34 |
| Recommendations .....                  | 39 |
| Appendix A: Interview Forms            |    |
| Appendix B: Program Sites              |    |



---

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

FINAL RESEARCH REPORT

YOUTH GANG PREVENTION AND  
EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

CONDUCTED FOR:

*BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS OF AMERICA*

*by:*

William Feyerherm, Ph.D.  
Regional Research Institute for Human Services  
Portland State University  
Portland, Oregon

Carl Pope, Ph.D.  
Rick Lovell, Ph.D.  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

---

December, 1992

## PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF EVALUATION

This report summarizes the evaluation of youth gang prevention and intervention programs in 33 Boys & Girls Clubs. This project was administered by Boys & Girls Clubs of America and funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP).

The OJJDP-funded project was designed to document strategies and techniques for reaching and mainstreaming youth at risk of or on the fringe of gang involvement. Thirty Boys & Girls Club sites were designated as Prevention Program Sites (of which eight received additional funds to develop youth gang prevention consortiums) and three as Intervention Program Sites.

This study, conducted from April 1991 to February 1992, was designed as a process evaluation, summarizing what happened at the Club sites. The information collected and used for the evaluation contained basic demographic descriptors, indications of at-risk factors, and indicators of school performance. The evaluation is based on data obtained from case management information collected by Club personnel at all sites, and on-site observations and interviews by members of the research team.

The evaluation centered on actual program implementation in order to draw inferences concerning the degree to which gang prevention and intervention program objectives were achieved. In addition, the descriptive data suggests some outcome trends; however, the evaluation was not designed as a scientific outcome study.

## FINDINGS

A total of 1,917 youth were served by the project: 877 were served by the 22 prevention sites, 668 by the eight prevention consortium sites, and 372 by the three intervention sites. Schools served as the largest referral source (45%), followed by youth walk-ins (23%), juvenile justice (9%) and youth agencies (9%). As defined in the program design, the prevention and consortium sites served younger youth between ages 7 and 11 (98% were 7 through 11 years old), while early intervention sites focused on serving older youth (85% were 12 through 18 year olds.)

A substantial number of girls participated in the program, especially at prevention and consortium sites (29% of all of their participants.) At intervention sites, girls made up 19% of the total served. The greatest percentage of youth served by the project were African-American (57%), followed by Hispanic youth (22%), and Caucasian youth (13%). Asian youth made up 3%, while Native Americans and other races each made up 1%.

The greatest at-risk factors identified were school-related, supporting schools as the largest referral source to the program. 41% of the youth exhibited behavioral problems in school, 31% were failing school, and 15% were chronically truant. Parental substance abuse and abuse/neglect were next in significance (15% and 12% respectively), followed by "other" at 10%, (defined by Club staff as environment/neighborhood.)

Once enrolled at the Clubs, most youth attended the Clubs regularly. Ninety percent of the youth attended once a week or more, with 26% attending daily, 19% attending half of the available hours and 19% attending at least twice a week. One third of the youth received recognition for in-Club accomplishments, while 26% received recognition for volunteer work they participated in outside of the Club. Project staff used referral sources as planned, with 41% of all youth involved in the project receiving some form of referral to a community agency.

Referrals to outside agencies for other services were highest among youth at intervention sites (73% of all intervention youth), followed by consortium sites (56%), and prevention sites (15%). It would be expected that intervention sites would require the greatest level of intense services, with assistance from outside sources, and that consortium sites, by virtue of their cooperation and coordination, would take advantage of a high level of referrals to outside resources.

Although this was a process evaluation, the descriptive data suggests trends in the educational arena. School behavior showed the greatest improvement among the school risk factors, with 48% of participants showing improvement (highest among consortium sites (62%) where the established relationships with schools were the strongest). Over one third of the youth showed improved grades, and one third showed better attendance. Less than 6% of the youth showed decreases in any of the school risk factors during or after program involvement.

## ELEMENTS OF SUCCESS

The experience of 33 project sites indicates that successful Boys & Girls Club youth gang prevention and intervention efforts share the following characteristics:

- Additional funding resources to support a youth gang prevention or intervention program. The program has cost implications, from additional hours of operation through program costs (youth transportation, meals, field trips, etc.).
- Expanded hours of operation to serve these youth during the time they most need to be served (later at night, weekends).
- Mainstreaming of youth involved in the gang prevention and early intervention program into the Clubs' regular services and activities. Educational services is an important part of the Club's regular services, as these targeted youth have a documented need for help in succeeding at school.
- An effective community network supporting the major components of the program: outreach, recruitment, and referral efforts.
- Appropriate recordkeeping and data collection to document individual youth progress, assess overall program impact, solicit new funds, and build community support.
- Family participation in the program providing support and encouragement to youth and allowing the family to feel good about the Club and that there are positive outlets for their child.
- Programs for teens to allow the Club to continue as a viable alternative for older youth.

## OVERALL CONCLUSION

The overall conclusion to this evaluation effort is that the youth gang prevention and early intervention initiative by Boys & Girls Clubs of America is both sound and viable in its approach. The neighborhoods and communities where many of the 1,450 Boys & Girls Clubs are located as well as the nature of Boys & Girls Clubs programming places them in a unique and ideal position to serve youth at risk of gang involvement. All sites in this project dealt with youth who were clearly at risk of gang involvement. As planned, the prevention sites clearly targeted a younger population, in which the risk factors were more on the lines of early warning signals (school performance, discipline problems, etc.). The intervention programs dealt with an older population, with a greater proportion with justice system contacts, substance abuse histories, etc.

The level of attendance and involvement served as a clear indicator of the ability of Clubs to provide programming and activities which attract these at-risk youth, bring them into the Clubs, and maintain their interest and participation in regular Club programming.

Each of the members of the evaluation team was impressed with the commitment to youth, especially to working with at-risk youth, shown by every Club administrator and every program person interviewed. Each of these persons deserves special recognition for his/her efforts and for providing a positive model to youth.

Boys & Girls Clubs of America stands out as an exemplar of a national network of youth serving organizations with the capacity and commitment to a nationwide offensive to counteract the problem of youth gangs in America. Given the scope of the gang problem nationally, and the need to reach youth before they become involved in youth gangs, more efforts should be made to publicize, market and expand these efforts within other Boys & Girls Clubs nationwide.

## INTRODUCTION

The constellation of problems related to gang and group delinquency in the U.S. is growing. Besides direct costs to victims resulting from offenses, "the community as a whole," is paying significantly for law enforcement efforts, trials and other judicial proceedings, and correctional efforts (Thompson and Jason, 1988). Further, large numbers of America's youth, especially in inner cities, are slipping into a quagmire from which return is extremely difficult.

With inner city conditions deteriorating, hundreds of thousands of young Americans face desperate and largely hopeless lives. Those who have a hard time believing this should summon the courage to take a leisurely stroll through an inner city housing development in a favorite nearby big city. The problems one sees reflected and magnified there are spreading. The resulting problems are coming home to all Americans either directly or indirectly as these emerge geographically, economically, politically, socially. Please keep in mind that it is not our contention or position that these problems simply are caused by the "inner city" but that these are more appropriately viewed as visited upon the inner cities in a complex sense. Directly, this means that many persons are born into conditions not of their own choosing (see W.J. Wilson, 1978). The extent of the gang and group delinquency problems is difficult to grasp; even rough estimates of parameters fluctuate with differing perspectives and conceptions. For example, those concerned with gang delinquency must decide whether to stick with identified or identifiable organized gangs (characterized by a committed core, leadership, gang paraphernalia, concerted and relatively continuous activities) or to include group delinquency (characterized by the relatively unorganized participation of collections of youth "hanging together," involved primarily in spontaneous activities, absent the commitment and paraphernalia associated with organized gangs). Either way, the overall picture is serious, and growing worse.

Beyond this, a significant number of American youth, especially inner city youth, are "at risk." These youth are situated on the verge of becoming gang or group delinquents. As individuals they may or may not have committed offenses, may or may not have been sporadically or spontaneously involved in delinquent activities. In a country where tens of millions partake of abundance, these youths live in conditions where their access to developmental opportunities is much different than that of their more well-situated "peers."

This report concerns the evaluation of youth gang intervention and prevention programs funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

and implemented in 33 Boys & Girls Clubs across America. The project was administered by Boys & Girls Clubs of America. These programs employed the youth development strategy as the central dimension of an approach tailored to local needs to reach youth at risk of becoming involved in gangs or gang related activities.

In considering this report, it is very important to visualize those portions of our small, medium, and large cities where resources which support the healthy development of youth are not a regular or automatic part of the lives of American youth. In an aggregate sense, most cities and counties in this country appear to have much to offer to youth. However, if one takes care to disaggregate the image, one finds large numbers of youth whose practical limits are their central city neighborhoods, where few developmental opportunities are available. It is this situation that the Boys & Girls Clubs efforts were to address.

### PREVENTION: A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Prevention has become a watchword, the direction of hope for reducing gang formation, diminishing gang membership, addressing problems of group delinquency, and leading at risk youth to develop into responsible, productive citizens. As a direction for application of resources, prevention makes sense. While one must not lose sight of the knowledge that some youth do quit gangs, the task of inducing gang members to do so is difficult. Efforts must be continued and increased to work with those who are already gang members; however, it is clear that without a major national commitment to prevention, problems will only worsen.

Prevention is more easily discussed than realized. The rubric of prevention encompasses a large set of potential strategies which may be pursued in many ways. In other words, there is no singular approach, no single package of approaches which is definitely preventive or known to be generally preventive. Nonetheless, those concerned with the problems of gangs and problems of at risk youth now recognize the need for primary prevention — reaching youth with developmental approaches as early in their lives as possible.

Even though there is no precisely discernible set of keys to success with every young person, research and practical experience show that, especially for inner city at risk youth, approaches built on a "full-service" concept are required. With gang prevention as the aim, "full-service" means providing at

risk youth with alternatives to gangs (positive social organizations) which fulfill those needs gangs tend to fulfill and which emphasize positive development. Beyond this, the effort must be to appeal to the interests of youth, building upon the inducement of positive activities to gain participation and acceptance. And, the positive organization must be available on a continuing basis, just as gangs are (see Irby and McLaughlin, 1990). Irby and McLaughlin (1990: 37) discuss an essential perspective in attempting to provide these positive alternatives. They point out that the positive organizations must be "neighborhood-based in their respect for indigenous values, problems, and needs and that draw on local knowledge as programs are designed and implemented." They further point out that "meaningful association in the terms of the particular youth served, respect for their ethnicity, and responsiveness to local realities seem to be the criterion for acceptance [of the organization]." Altogether, this means that there must be long term commitment, a focus on the needs and realities of particular areas, and a positive youth development orientation.

The dilemma we are facing is that there are too few organizations situated within inner city areas and committed to reaching the at risk youth who live there. Certainly, one may find local efforts of note in some cities, and one may find a fairly large number of public and private efforts in many cities offering limited opportunities of various sorts. One may also find that many organizations having the "full service" capacity have retreated to suburbs or more desirable areas to pursue more favorable and more traditional market orientations. However, Boys & Girls Clubs of America has made a commitment to further expand services in these neighborhoods, as evidenced by the 200 new Clubs established in public housing sites over the last five years. From the perspective of national policy, it is clear that means must be found and developed to address this dilemma.



## BGCA INVOLVEMENT

Boys & Girls Clubs of America (BGCA) is a national non-profit youth organization with over 1450 affiliated Boys & Girls Clubs nationwide. These Clubs are typically situated in large or medium-sized cities, usually in or near central city areas. BGCA has had an ongoing presence in the youth development and delinquency prevention arena for many years. This project has been an effort to document strategies and techniques for reaching youth at risk of becoming involved in gangs or gang related activities. These strategies and techniques were developed through the Boys & Girls Clubs TARGETED OUTREACH program and were applied in this project to a more specific population of at-risk youth. The project must also be viewed in the larger sense as an effort to identify and develop the means to counteract gangs with positive "full service" social organizations. Here, the implications for national policy and national perspective are very important. The administrator of OJJDP indicated that BGCA was selected for the current project because of the Clubs' strong record of positive involvement with children at particular risk, and because of successes through the years in developing and implementing various programs (especially TARGETED OUTREACH) to address problems facing at risk youth.

The BGCA project has involved 30 Clubs selected as gang prevention sites, with a commitment to provide case management and services for 35 youth. Through a special grant from the Office of Health and Human Service, eight of these sites were selected to work with their community's youth gang consortia to reach an additional 100 at-risk youth through community-wide events. In each of the sites prevention meant implementation of strategies to deter "at risk" youth primarily aged 7 to 11 from becoming involved in gangs or gang related activities. Three additional Clubs were selected as gang intervention sites. These Clubs received substantially more funding than the other thirty and were to develop and document strategies to serve at risk youth (typically individuals on the fringe of gangs or "wannabes") in the primary target ages of 12 to 16. At least 50 such youth were to be served in each gang intervention site. As implemented the BGCA efforts fall within the general rubric of prevention.

## EVALUATION METHODS

The Regional Research Institute for Human Services (RRI) at Portland State University was awarded a contract to conduct an evaluation of the prevention and intervention programs operated by BGCA. The evaluation was intended to be a process evaluation. This report, therefore, is descriptive of what happened. While some data suggests outcome trends, it is not designed as a scientific outcome evaluation. The evaluation was conducted by a research team consisting of Dr. William Feyerherm, Director of the RRI, and Drs. Carl Pope and Rick Lovell of the Criminal Justice Program, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. The methods used for the evaluation are described below.

### Prevention and Prevention / Consortium Programs

For the prevention sites, part of the evaluation was based on data obtained from case management information collected by Club personnel at each site. All available program records were used to provide an assessment as comprehensive as possible. Using the case management data, analysis was conducted to provide information on demographic characteristics of youth served. In addition, site visits to selected programs were accomplished. On-site observation was combined with interviews of various persons, arranged through the auspices of five local Clubs. The project design called for on-site interviews conducted with program directors, Club staff directly involved with the prevention programs, program participants, school officials, justice officials, and parents when possible. Copies of the interview instruments are contained in Appendix A. The evaluation centered on actual program implementation in order to draw inferences concerning the degree to which gang prevention program recommendations were achieved. The consortium sites were approached in the same way as other prevention sites. One visit was made to each of the selected sites by one member of the research team.

## Intervention Programs

Each of the three intervention programs was examined. As with the prevention programs, available case management information was analyzed to provide information on demographics of the participants involved in the programs. In addition, each of the intervention sites was visited twice by members of the research team. Two team members had responsibility for each of the intervention sites, and two visits were made to each site. Again, on-site observation was combined with interviews of various persons, as indicated above. In both the prevention and intervention program interviews, the evaluators used semi-structured interview schedules to obtain information on such issues as:

- the nature of the gang program in the area
- Club activities as part of the prevention or intervention program
- relationship to other Club programs and mainstreaming of participants
- relationships with other youth serving agencies.

Beyond this, interviews were conducted with program participants for the three intervention programs, using semi-structured interview schedules developed by the evaluation team.

In addition to the on-site activities, the evaluators had access to case management information collected by all sites on their participants. The information was collected at the youth's intake into the program and was to be updated by program staff as the youth progressed. The information contained basic demographic descriptors, indications of at-risk factors, indicators of past and current school performance, as well as gang and justice system involvement. The evaluators did not conduct an audit of program records nor engage in independent activities to verify the program data. The information was examined for internal consistency, but is used as provided by the participating Clubs.

## RESULTS

As discussed and agreed upon during an April, 1991, meeting between program directors of BGCA and the evaluation team, this was a process evaluation designed to document the activities of the Clubs in implementing the general principles of "TARGETED OUTREACH". Each of the prevention programs was to recruit and attempt to retain at least 35 "at risk" youth, with prevention consortium sites serving an additional 100 "at risk" youth. The intervention sites were to serve 50 youth.

For prevention programs, "at risk" means youth meeting any one of the following criteria:

- Having had two or more behavioral contacts with school authorities.
- Being frequently truant.
- Failing in two or more school subjects.
- Having run away from home.
- Being abused or neglected.
- Being involved in or having parents involved in substance abuse.
- Having been taken into custody for non-felony offenses.

The youth targeted by the prevention programs were aged 7 to 11.

For the intervention programs, "at risk" means youth meeting any one of the following criteria:

- Being a "wannabe" or fringe gang member.
- Having family members currently involved in gangs and/or criminal activities.
- Having been taken into custody by the juvenile justice system.
- Having run away from home.
- Being abused and/or neglected.
- Abusing substances or coming from a family where the parents abuse substances.

The youth targeted by the intervention programs were aged 12 to 16.

Because the Clubs tailored their efforts to local needs and realities, methods for recruiting the program participants varied. The natures of the gang or group delinquency problems in areas immediate to the various programs were different (perhaps hardcore, organized gangs in some areas; more likely groups "hanging together" and/or involved in "instrumental" delinquent activities such as selling drugs) and led to different approaches as appropriate. Referrals from school officials, court and police agencies,

parents, and others were used, as well as other techniques such as direct contact and distribution of information fliers. Overall, the commitment to TARGETED OUTREACH was present, and across programs, personnel did well in achieving recruiting goals, even though the tasks were difficult for some programs.

As discussed earlier, case management data was obtained from all programs, and a representative set of programs were visited. While the programs were tailored to local needs and realities, there was a common core to each type of program and much commonality across programs. Based primarily on information from the site visits, the following sections summarize findings by type of program; prevention/consortium and intervention.

### Prevention/Consortium Programs

During the time from August, 1991 through February, 1992, the evaluators conducted site visits at the prevention and consortium programs. One evaluator visited each program and followed the procedures outlined earlier. All persons involved with the administration and operation of these programs were cooperative and forthcoming during these visits. Each of the members of the evaluation team was impressed with the commitment to youth, especially to working with at risk youth, shown by every Club administrator and every program person interviewed. It is very important to understand that these persons are working "in the trenches." They are committed to making a real difference in the lives of as many youth as possible. Each of these persons deserves special recognition for his/her efforts and for living as a positive model to youth.

The prevention programs were funded at approximately \$2,500, with those designated as consortium programs receiving a higher amount (\$8,375) designed to support consortium efforts. In a strong sense "effort" may be a more appropriate term than "program," since this level of funding does not support a discrete "program." The Clubs visited had applied the funding in somewhat different ways. The funding was used primarily either to increase the number of hours of work time for staff directly involved with these outreach efforts and/or to provide for or contribute to activities which would be beneficial to the target groups.

The spirit of TARGETED OUTREACH was maintained throughout, as was the important objective of mainstreaming. With the prevention/consortium efforts, mainstreaming was actually the core of the efforts. In

other words, once identified/recruited, the targeted youth were involved as individuals in ongoing activities available to the general Club membership. Two considerations are important. First, at this level of funding, little could be accomplished without utilizing the resources of other Club programs and the general resources available. Second, retention was a major aim. For retention to be an actual aim, the Clubs' staff necessarily looked beyond the funding period and beyond the funds available to long term retention of the youth.

While mainstreaming the targeted youth, the Clubs' staff were responsible for maintaining case management records and for maintaining confidentiality regarding the identities of those who were targeted youth. Confidentiality was no problem in these efforts. Each Club designated one or two staff persons to maintain records, and each set of staff safeguarded identities of the targeted youth from other Club members. In most cases only certain staff knew who were the targeted youth. In each Club adequate measures protected the identities of targeted youth from other Club members.

Maintaining case management records was more problematic. Confidentiality of records was well-maintained, but the actual task of record keeping on an ongoing basis presented difficulties. The degree of attention to record keeping varied across Clubs - from minimal notation to rather extensive and continuous notation. Since these efforts were not discrete programs with staff devoted solely to the targeted youth, record keeping became an additional duty for someone assigned this responsibility. With intake forms, participation forms, assessment forms, and requirements for periodic reports and summaries to national headquarters, case management was demanding. Particular problems resulted from requirements not only to keep up with Club attendance but also to make notations on behaviors, attitudes, difficulties confronting the youth and so on. With youth perhaps arriving at different times, attending some days and not others, spreading throughout the Club to be involved in diverse activities, even simple record keeping would be quite demanding.

Furthermore, case management forms required information on school attendance, grades, contacts with justice officials, and other information difficult to acquire. In most cases, school officials were reported to be reluctant to participate in providing attendance information and grades. Where one Club was involved with a middle school in a separate program, this was not such a problem but did require additional attention from the staff person directly involved with the education program. Some Club staff

attempted to acquire the information in indirect ways, usually without much consistent success.

To understand this record keeping issue, think about Club operation. Most Clubs open after noon. Staff are busy with a variety of necessary activities. When Club members arrive (especially in large numbers), attention must be directed to them. Without a staff person whose main mission is acquiring information for case management records, the task becomes burdensome. For example, one must visit school or justice officials during their moments of availability, and these do not necessarily coincide with time available to Clubs' staff for acquiring information. The Clubs' staff did reasonably well in the case management area, given the difficulties. Nonetheless, with exceptions, record keeping did not meet the high expectations with which the project began.

As a group, the visited Clubs provided interesting and developmental activities to the targeted youth. As noted, most often these were activities generally available, and the targeted youth were encouraged to become involved. Some form of educational component was available at each Club. Tutoring, homework help, and computer activities were the most common. Staff in each Club emphasized the importance of school attendance and performance and the importance of other forms of educational development for the youth. Some Clubs required that homework sessions or tutorial sessions be completed prior to involvement in other activities, while some Clubs did not.

All Clubs visited provided after school activities and summer activities during the project period. During the school year Clubs typically open at approximately 1:00 PM and remain open until approximately 8:30 PM, sometimes until 9:00 PM. As noted above, activities available vary by Club, but all include educational components as well as other activities. Arts and crafts activities are typical offerings. SMART MOVES, a BGCA-wide program focusing on alcohol, drugs, and pregnancy prevention is available at all Clubs. Recreational activities common are basketball (often with team competitions, individual competitions, awards and so on), games room activities (pool tables and other such equipment available), swimming (where the Club has a swimming pool), among others. The Clubs also provide field trips (such as museum visits, visits to parks outside the immediate locale, and so on) and excursions to sporting events as periodic activities of interest.

The Clubs are typically open on Saturdays (daytime hours usually) and during summers (usually with extended hours). Summer activities may include camping trips or outdoor excursions of various sorts and more evening group activity (such as summer basketball leagues and other social activities). Overall, each of the Clubs provided ample opportunities for active involvement of the targeted youth. Some attention could be directed to consideration of hours of operation. The Clubs typically are not open during evening hours on weekends, times when perhaps there is much need of alternative activities for the targeted youth. Extended hours of operation may be desirable. The difficulty is feasibility, especially direct cost of operations. With adequate funding, this extended operation deserves careful consideration.

The Clubs all reported engaging in networking and coordination of efforts with other organizations and agencies. This appears to be a typical pattern of operation. Three of the sites visited were designated consortium sites, and the staff of these Clubs were to place particular emphasis on building alliances which would support the prevention effort. This direction of emphasis was notably successful. For example, staff from one Club (in addition to other arrangements) worked with officials at a nearby United States Army post to develop a ten week leadership and skills development program. This program included instruction by military officers and enlisted personnel on leadership and other topics, supervised physical training, orienteering, overnight activities at the post, visits by military personnel to the Club for sessions such as a demonstration of sniffer dog tactics, and collaboration with volunteer ROTC cadets from a nearby university in one-to-one activities.

Staff at another Club (in addition to other arrangements) worked with managers at a large advertising agency to develop a creative opportunity for targeted youth. The ad agency provided guidance and technical expertise, including professional production, for Club members to design and produce an anti-gang ad campaign. The youth involved contributed the images and ideas, and the agency contributed the resources to develop what eventually became an award-winning campaign including television and graphic advertisements. Involved youth even appeared in some of the advertisements.

There are other examples of consortium efforts. Those presented above highlight the possibilities of such efforts. Consortium arrangements require commitment, time, and energy. The payoff may be long term and important. Serious consideration should be directed to encouraging these efforts and to in-service education and sharing of information on the "how-to" of implement-



ing successful consortium arrangements. This aspect of the overall effort was quite strong.

The prevention/consortium efforts were directed primarily at pre-teens. Attention and serious consideration should be directed toward retention of youth into their teen years. Some Clubs direct most programming at pre-teen youth. It appears that far fewer are oriented toward teenage youth. If prevention is the central concept, it is not sufficient to allow youths' involvements to fade as these young persons reach their teenage years. Again, some Clubs aim at programming for teens as well as for pre-teens. Nonetheless, retention of targeted youth into the teen years is a notable difficulty. This difficulty deserves direct attention in that implementation of a "full service" concept requires continuing commitment and continuing involvement of youth and Clubs well into the teen years. Here, philosophy of operation, local realities, Club histories, and resources must be addressed.

Finally, for the prevention/ consortium programs, obtaining parental involvement was very difficult. Few Clubs had any success with bringing parents actively into the efforts. Staff at one Club did report gaining appreciable parental involvement through periodic discussions built around an evening meal provided at the Club facility. To understand the difficulty, one must begin to visualize the circumstances of those living in the areas where the Clubs are located. These Clubs are typically located adjacent to or among inner city housing developments. Often, the targeted youth live in a one-parent household or perhaps live with another relative. Conditions in these developments are generally poor.

The Boys & Girls Clubs and their staff are generally accorded respect and are valued resources to parents, especially so since parents can believe their children are in a safe place at given times and/or are occupied safely for given periods of time. Nonetheless, obtaining parental involvement is usually problematic for Club staff. Parents simply may want children to be somewhere other than home. Parents may completely lack a sense of involvement or may be too busy with work or their own activities. Club staff can present a large array of reality-based explanations, and these amount to problems gaining parental involvement. This is a general condition and is not peculiar to the prevention efforts.

## Intervention Programs

Three Clubs were selected to be intervention sites. The operationalizations relevant to "intervention" are presented above. These Clubs were funded at \$25,000, substantially more than the prevention/consortium efforts. Many of the summary comments concerning the prevention/consortium efforts apply as well to the intervention efforts. It is important once again to observe that all Club administrators and staff involved with these efforts were cooperative and forthcoming. It is also important to state again that these persons work "in the trenches," and that each of these persons deserves special recognition for his/her efforts and for living as a positive model to youth.

The Clubs selected as intervention sites are located in South Philadelphia, East Los Angeles, and Winston-Salem. The multi-dimensional nature of "gang" problems becomes most apparent in considering these three sites. East L.A. has a hard core organized gang situation, with a number of gangs operating in an area characterized by extremely poor conditions. South Philadelphia has a group delinquency ("street corner") situation with housing areas characterized by extremely poor conditions existing on the periphery of a large, cohesive Italian neighborhood. Drug sales and drug abuse are prominent problems, especially in the peripheral housing developments. Winston-Salem's inner city housing developments are characterized by poor conditions. The nature of the "gang" problem is again more a group delinquency problem, with groups identifying loosely by housing area. The difficulties of the delinquency problem are compounded by "instrumental" gang activity. In other words, drug dealers capitalize on the situation by enticing these "corner boys" to either directly sell drugs, act as lookouts, or participate in drug activities in other ways. These activities are not so much related to gang behavior and composition as to economic activities in the neighborhoods.

Each of the intervention efforts was tailored to local realities. Each Club staff proceeded with slightly differing conceptions, yet the core ideas of TARGETED OUTREACH, mainstreaming, positive activities, and retention of targeted youth was common.

Staffing was the major difference between the intervention and prevention/consortium efforts. The administration of one Club viewed the intervention effort as a "program," using most of the available funds to hire a full-time coordinator to recruit, maintain records, obtain information on participants, counsel participants, schedule activities, and monitor as much as possible the day-to-day activities of participants at the Club. This person also

made limited family visitation and participated as a member of an area justice advisory group. At \$25,000, there was some difficulty hiring a person capable of carrying out such a large array of time consuming and often difficult tasks. Nonetheless, administrators of the Club provided resources from other Club programs and leadership assistance required to make the program viable.

Administrators in the other two intervention sites saw the efforts as fitting into an ongoing dimension of gang oriented programming. That is, rather than viewing this effort as a discrete program, the TARGETED OUTREACH became an extension of ongoing activities, and the funding became an adjunct to a base of funding for this dimension existing before the project period and extending beyond the project period. With this conception, hours of part-time staff were enhanced and responsibilities of full-time staff were shifted to form core groups to concentrate on the targeted youth. Again, resources from other programs and leadership assistance were provided to make the effort viable.

Case management/record keeping were notably better in the intervention programs. This was no doubt due to increased staff time available and the resulting increase in direct attention to the targeted youth. As with the prevention/consortium efforts, adequate measures ensured confidentiality of records and identities of participants. Even with increased staff time, obtaining all the information necessary for the case management requirements was difficult. Here again, local realities and the proclivities of officials to cooperate or not were important factors. Staff in each of the intervention sites promoted the mainstreaming concept and took measures to ensure that the targeted youth were not identified as such. Activities similar to those described above (prevention efforts) were available to the targeted youth. While the combinations of activities varied across Clubs, the central notions of positive directions and providing activities which were both developmental and interesting to youth were the essence of the efforts.

As with the prevention/consortium efforts, hours of operation deserve attention. The Clubs involved in the intervention efforts did provide broader possibilities regarding hours and timing of activities. More weekend activities, especially in East L.A., were available. All three of these Clubs focused more, as well, on increased summer activities. Still, plans for prevention or intervention efforts in the future should specifically address the need to examine times and timing to provide positive opportunities as much as possible at times when targeted youth are most vulnerable to problematic behavior.

Networking and coordination of efforts with other organizations and agencies was a strong feature for the intervention programs. As was discussed with the consortium efforts, staff of the Clubs with intervention programs placed particular emphasis on building community partnerships and alliances. This is a crucial focus for "full-service" efforts and for development of continuing commitment in inner city neighborhoods.

Obtaining parental involvement was difficult. Those operating the intervention efforts had minimal success, although genuine attempts were reported. These Clubs reported encountering problems similar to those discussed earlier in relation to the prevention/consortium efforts. These served to inhibit the development of parental involvement with the intervention efforts.

As discussed earlier, a focus on teens is essential to implementation of a "full service" effort, especially to succeed in keeping youth from becoming involved in gang activities. One of the three intervention Clubs, East L.A., operates continuously with a strong emphasis on retaining youth through their teen years. Gearing many of the Club's activities to interest teens, and using these as an inducement to pre-teens to join and remain with the Club, the East L.A. Club deserves attention. The philosophy of operation may well be one which may benefit other Clubs in attempting to develop teen retention efforts. Certainly, this emphasis is one which must be considered seriously; and BGCA should begin to investigate approaches to teen retention, either as variations of the East L.A. philosophy or as approaches newly developed.

Overall, there appeared to be pervasive and genuine commitment to achievement of the aims established for all the programs.

## The Program Data

The following section of this report is derived from the records maintained by each of the program units engaged in the gang intervention / prevention project. These records have been reviewed for internal consistency (i.e. do the numbers total as they should), but the accuracy of the figures depends upon the efforts of the individual Clubs and staff in those Clubs assigned to this task. The picture which is portrayed by these numbers is consistent with the observations of the research team in the visits to selected program sites.

The data presented here are used to describe several major areas of importance in assessing the gang intervention / prevention programs. First is a review of the characteristics of the youth who were in the program, including basic demographic descriptions, as well as some consideration of the means by which these youth came to be in the programs. Second, and closely related, is a consideration of the mix of "at risk" factors which characterize these youth. Third is a description of some of the process variables which describe the youth's participation in Boys & Girls activities.

The data is presented separately by program type, since these programs by design were to target a somewhat different level of problem and different type of youth. From the data presented, it is clear that this intended difference in the sites was realized.

Finally it should be noted that ongoing nature of the programming at many of the Clubs leads to a situation in which some of the information is not available at this time for some of the participating youth. For example, many youth are still involved with activities, so it is not reasonable to inquire as to their school performance after the completion of the activities. In the tables which follow, whenever possible the information is based on the total of all youth who were enrolled as participants in the programs. However in some instances information is missing, either because the information is not yet available (as in the case of reporting the after-program behavior of youth, when they are still actively involved in Club activities) or because information simply was not gathered and recorded. Missing information is included in each table as a separate category, along with the base numbers in each category.

## I. Intake Characteristics of the Youth

**TABLE 1 — Intake and Retention**

| Club            | PREVENTION |     | CONSORTIUM |     | INTERVENTION |     | ALL PROGRAMS |      |
|-----------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|------|
|                 | INTAKES    | 877 |            | 668 |              | 372 |              | 1917 |
| REMAINED ACTIVE | 752        | 86% | 534        | 80% | 143          | 38% | 1,429        | 75%  |

A total of 1917 youth were served in the program by intervention and prevention programs. The variation in number of intake youth across the program types represents several factors. First, some types had more sites (e.g. the prevention programs). Perhaps more important was the decision of some programs to target on a relatively small number (approximately 35) of youth, as specified in their agreement with the national program, or to "take all comers" in which case some programs indicated involvement of 100 youth or more. In part of course this represents not only the individual Clubs judgements about which youth ought to be included in these programs, but also the total number of youth served by the Club, and the extent to which the Club was able to marshal additional resources to support the gang prevention / intervention activities.

A total of 372 youth were enrolled in the Intervention programs in the three intervention sites. As noted in Table 1, the majority (62%) of these youth are listed as "terminated or inactive" from the programs. In large measure this is attributable to two factors. First, these programs were more specialized and identifiable as separate entities than were the prevention programs. That is, it was possible to specify when a youth had finished the particular grade level program and perhaps had moved into other programs within the Club. It also appears that these programs dealt with older youth, who were more likely to "graduate out" of the Boys & Girls Club environment.

**TABLE 2 — Source of Referral for Program Youth**

| REFERRAL SOURCE  | PREVENTION |      | CONSORTIUM |      | INTERVENTION |      | ALL PROGRAMS |      |
|------------------|------------|------|------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
|                  | N          | PCT  | N          | PCT  | N            | PCT  | N            | PCT  |
| SCHOOL           | 340        | 39%  | 375        | 56%  | 148          | 40%  | 863          | 45%  |
| POLICE           | 17         | 2%   | 24         | 4%   | 1            | 0%   | 42           | 2%   |
| JUVENILE JUSTICE | 37         | 4%   | 19         | 3%   | 124          | 33%  | 180          | 9%   |
| SELF-REFERRAL    | 214        | 24%  | 132        | 20%  | 88           | 24%  | 434          | 23%  |
| MENTAL HEALTH    | 2          | 0%   | 3          | 0%   | 2            | 1%   | 7            | 0%   |
| YOUTH AGENCIES   | 88         | 10%  | 76         | 11%  | 4            | 1%   | 169          | 9%   |
| OTHER            | 138        | 16%  | 26         | 4%   | 0            | 0%   | 164          | 9%   |
| MISSING          | 40         | 5%   | 13         | 2%   | 5            | 1%   | 58           | 3%   |
| TOTAL            | 876        | 100% | 668        | 100% | 372          | 100% | 1917         | 100% |

Examination of Table 2 indicates the major sources of referral for the youth in these programs. It can be seen that in all programs a major source of referral comes from the school system. This is consistent with our field observations that the Clubs visited maintained good working relationships with the local school systems. Interestingly, the Police represent a small portion of referrals, even for the intervention program sites. This may be explained in two ways. First, in recording information, the Clubs may have included most police referrals in the juvenile justice category. Second, if disposition of particular juveniles is left to individual officers, some may know of the Boys & Girls programs, while many individual officers may not. Thus, referrals from police would be low. It is to be expected that the intervention programs would be more likely to include any justice system based referrals, which is evident from the information in Table 2.

The interesting thing about referrals for both the intervention programs and the prevention programs is the relatively high volume of self-referrals. This may be explained by where Clubs are located and many youths coming in on their own can fit the "at risk" definition used for the project. What is particularly important about these self-referrals is that they provide evidence that the programs are not seen as punitive, but rather as desirable, fun activities by these youth.

**TABLE 3 — Age Distribution of Program Youth**

| AGE     | PREVENTION |      | CONSORTIUM |      | INTERVENTION |     | ALL PROGRAMS |     |
|---------|------------|------|------------|------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
|         | N          | PCT  | N          | PCT  | N            | PCT | N            | PCT |
| 7       | 85         | 10%  | 68         | 10%  | 0            | 0%  | 153          | 8%  |
| 8       | 98         | 11%  | 86         | 13%  | 2            | 1%  | 186          | 10% |
| 9       | 140        | 16%  | 124        | 19%  | 18           | 5%  | 282          | 15% |
| 10      | 155        | 18%  | 185        | 28%  | 24           | 6%  | 364          | 19% |
| 11      | 230        | 26%  | 188        | 28%  | 12           | 3%  | 430          | 22% |
| 12      | 9          | 1%   | 5          | 1%   | 33           | 9%  | 47           | 2%  |
| 13      | 7          | 1%   | 0          | 0%   | 65           | 17% | 72           | 4%  |
| 14      | 1          | 0%   | 0          | 0%   | 59           | 16% | 60           | 3%  |
| 15      | 0          | 0%   | 0          | 0%   | 16           | 4%  | 16           | 1%  |
| 16      | 2          | 0%   | 0          | 0%   | 34           | 9%  | 34           | 2%  |
| 17      | 1          | 0%   | 0          | 0%   | 24           | 6%  | 24           | 1%  |
| 18      | 0          | 0%   | 0          | 0%   | 40           | 11% | 40           | 2%  |
| Over 18 | 0          | 0%   | 0          | 0%   | 20           | 1%  | 20           | 1%  |
| Other   | 25         | 3%   | 5          | 1%   | 0            | 0%  | 30           | 1%  |
| MISSING | 127        | 14%  | 7          | 1%   | 25           | 12% | 159          | 8%  |
| TOTAL   | 880        | 100% | 668        | 100% | 372          | 88% | 1917         | 99% |

Table 3 provides information on the age distribution of the program youth. The pattern is one which is to be expected from the nature of the programs. That is, the prevention programs were to be targeted at youth who were at risk of involvement, but not yet involved (at least intensely) with gangs. By and large, this label would apply to younger youth. The intervention programs were designed to provide programming for those youth involved with gangs, which would encompass an older age range. As may be seen in Table 3, these patterns are evident. Only 15% of the intervention program youth were below the age of 12, while the vast bulk of the prevention program youth were 11 or younger.



**TABLE 4 — Gender Distribution of Program Youth**

| GENDER  | PREVENTION |      | CONSORTIUM |      | INTERVENTION |      | ALL PROGRAMS |      |
|---------|------------|------|------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
|         | N          | PCT  | N          | PCT  | N            | PCT  | N            | PCT  |
| FEMALE  | 251        | 29%  | 196        | 29%  | 71           | 19%  | 518          | 27%  |
| MALE    | 593        | 68%  | 468        | 70%  | 301          | 81%  | 1362         | 71%  |
| MISSING | 33         | 4%   | 4          | 1%   | 0            | 0%   | 37           | 2%   |
| TOTAL   | 877        | 100% | 668        | 100% | 372          | 100% | 1917         | 100% |

The sex distribution of program youth is displayed in Table 4. It might be expected from common stereotypic notions of gang composition that all "gang" individuals would be males. However, as noted in the table, there are a substantial number of girls who are program participants, particularly in the prevention and prevention/consortium programs. These girls are also at risk of involvement in gang related activities, so their presence in the programs makes a great deal of sense. Although not reported in the Table, it is also interesting to note major differences across the regions of the country in terms of the percentage of female participants. In the Southeast there were the fewest number of female participants, while the number of female participants in the Pacific Clubs was nearly as high as the male participation level.

**Table 5 — Race and Ethnicity of Program Youth**

| RACE / ETHNICITY  | PREVENTION |      | CONSORTIUM |      | INTERVENTION |      | ALL PROGRAMS |      |
|-------------------|------------|------|------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
|                   | N          | PCT  | N          | PCT  | N            | PCT  | N            | PCT  |
| WHITE             | 94         | 11%  | 130        | 19%  | 25           | 7%   | 249          | 13%  |
| -AFRICAN AMERICAN | 593        | 68%  | 361        | 54%  | 152          | 41%  | 1106         | 58%  |
| HISPANIC          | 114        | 13%  | 151        | 23%  | 167          | 45%  | 432          | 23%  |
| ASIAN             | 18         | 2%   | 25         | 4%   | 22           | 6%   | 65           | 3%   |
| NATIVE AMERICAN   | 0          | 0%   | 8          | 1%   | 1            | 0%   | 9            | 0%   |
| OTHER RACES       | 3          | 0%   | 3          | 0%   | 2            | 1%   | 8            | 0%   |
| MISSING           | 55         | 6%   | 0          | 0%   | 3            | 1%   | 58           | 3%   |
| TOTAL             | 877        | 100% | 668        | 100% | 372          | 100% | 1917         | 100% |

Table 5 presents the race and ethnic identification of program youth. It may be seen that the Boys & Girls Clubs gang prevention and intervention programs served primarily non-white youth, which is understandable given the location of many Clubs in particular portions of urban areas. It is interesting to note that the distribution roughly follows the ethnic composition of the regions of the United States, in the sense that the highest proportion of white youth were served in the Mid-West, while the highest proportion of Hispanic youth were served in the Southwest. Asian youth were served most significantly in the Pacific region. It is also interesting to note the low rates of service for Native American and other youth.

## II. Factors Placing Youth "At-Risk"

Table 6 — Factors Placing Program Youth at Risk of Gang Involvement

| AT RISK FACTORS           | PREVENTION |     | CONSORTIUM |     | INTERVENTION |     | ALL PROGRAMS |     |
|---------------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
|                           | N          | PCT | N          | PCT | N            | PCT | N            | PCT |
| "WANNA-BE"                | 85         | 10% | 0          | 0%  | 19           | 5%  | 104          | 5%  |
| FAMILY GANG INVOLVED      | 5          | 1%  | 0          | 0%  | 36           | 10% | 41           | 2%  |
| SCHOOL BEHAVIORAL PROBLEM | 338        | 39% | 422        | 63% | 33           | 9%  | 793          | 41% |
| TRUANT                    | 133        | 15% | 136        | 20% | 15           | 4%  | 284          | 15% |
| FAILING SCHOOL            | 309        | 35% | 246        | 37% | 37           | 10% | 592          | 31% |
| RUNAWAY                   | 27         | 3%  | 29         | 4%  | 66           | 18% | 122          | 6%  |
| ABUSE / NEGLECT           | 164        | 19% | 64         | 10% | 4            | 1%  | 232          | 12% |
| SUBSTANCE ABUSE           | 26         | 3%  | 5          | 1%  | 52           | 14% | 83           | 4%  |
| PARENTAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE  | 177        | 20% | 98         | 15% | 4            | 1%  | 279          | 15% |
| IN CUSTODY                | 43         | 5%  | 63         | 9%  | 94           | 25% | 200          | 10% |
| OTHER                     | 84         | 10% | 113        | 17% | 98           | 26% | 295          | 15% |

Table 6 looks at the final set of intake characteristics for the program youth. This table represents the range of "at-risk" factors which were deemed applicable for the program youth. It is important to note that many of these youth had more than one such factor which was identified by the program personnel. It is also noteworthy that a relatively high percentage of youth had "other" factors listed for their situation. In reading the narrative descriptions and in discussions with program personnel it is clear that a majority of these "other" cases involved a youth living in an environment (neighborhood) in which the risk of gang involvement was high. This supports the importance placed on outreach in the design of the project, identifying and reaching out to youth in neighborhoods with gang activities. Again, the difference between the prevention programs and the intervention programs is apparent. For example, one quarter of the intervention youth were in juvenile justice custody (or at least involved with the juvenile justice system) at the time of intake. Less than 10% of the youth in either the prevention or prevention/consortium programs were so involved. In a similar fashion a larger proportion of the intervention youth were listed as runaways. On the other hand, it is also clear that the prevention programs took a very high proportion of their youth due

to school related problems (either failing multiple subjects or behavioral problems in school). The prevention sites also took a higher proportion of youth who were thought to be victims of abuse or neglect in the home. In contrast, the intervention sites had a higher proportion of youth involved in substance abuse and/or with family involvement in gang activity.

It is clear then that many of these youth were "at-risk" of involvement in various types of "misbehavior", that a significant portion (although a minority in all groups) were involved with the juvenile justice system at the time that they first became involved with the programs, and that a substantial portion of these youth have very serious problems.

### III. Activities

In assessing the extent and nature of youth participation in activities, three indicators are available which provide some idea of the kinds of involvement. The first is attendance (Table 7), the second and third are discipline and rewards (combined in Table 8).

**Table 7 — Program Youth Attendance in Activities**

| Club ATTENDANCE         | PREVENTION |      | CONSORTIUM |      | INTERVENTION |      | ALL PROGRAMS |      |
|-------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
|                         | N          | PCT  | N          | PCT  | N            | PCT  | N            | PCT  |
| NEVER                   | 15         | 2%   | 3          | 0%   | 10           | 3%   | 28           | 1%   |
| LESS THAN ONCE/<br>WEEK | 63         | 7%   | 29         | 4%   | 47           | 13%  | 139          | 7%   |
| ONCE / WEEK             | 99         | 11%  | 188        | 28%  | 210          | 56%  | 497          | 26%  |
| TWICE / WEEK            | 168        | 19%  | 106        | 16%  | 87           | 23%  | 361          | 19%  |
| HALF OF OPEN TIME       | 166        | 19%  | 193        | 29%  | 0            | 0%   | 359          | 19%  |
| ALMOST DAILY            | 326        | 37%  | 149        | 22%  | 18           | 5%   | 493          | 26%  |
| MISSING                 | 40         | 5%   | 0          | 0%   | 0            | 0%   | 40           | 2%   |
| TOTAL                   | 877        | 100% | 668        | 100% | 372          | 100% | 1917         | 100% |

As indicated in Table 7, the level of participation in programming was very high. In the prevention sites the youth were involved with programming on a daily or every-other-day basis at a level which encompassed nearly seventy percent of the youth. Many of these programs were of the after-school variety, and many provided daily activities for the youth. For the older youth involved in the intervention program, the level of contact was not quite so frequent, with fewer of the youth reported as attending on a daily or every-other-day basis. Nonetheless, three quarters were reported as having at least weekly contact with the programming. Since the attendance was not compulsory for most involved youth, this level of attendance, achieved in both the prevention and intervention programs, is a clear indicator of the ability of the Clubs to provide programming and activities which attract these at-risk youth, bring them into the Clubs, and which hold their attention once attracted.

**TABLE 8 — Discipline and Rewards for Program Youth**

|                      | PREVENTION |     | CONSORTIUM |     | INTERVENTION |     | ALL PROGRAMS |     |
|----------------------|------------|-----|------------|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
|                      | N          | PCT | N          | PCT | N            | PCT | N            | PCT |
| DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS | 229        | 26% | 121        | 18% | 7            | 2%  | 357          | 19% |
| ACCOMPLISHMENTS      |            |     |            |     |              |     |              |     |
| IN-Club              | 421        | 48% | 192        | 29% | 23           | 6%  | 636          | 33% |
| OUTSIDE              | 117        | 13% | 79         | 12% | 11           | 3%  | 207          | 11% |
| VOLUNTEER            | 236        | 27% | 153        | 23% | 102          | 27% | 491          | 26% |
| OTHER                | 51         | 6%  | 3          | 0%  | 183          | 49% | 237          | 12% |

Not only did the program youth attend the activities, but they participated in ways which were primarily positive. In Table 8 is presented the combination of information on disciplinary actions taken by the Clubs, and honors, awards and other positive activities. There are substantial variations in the level of disciplinary actions on a Club by Club level. This probably reflects more about the definition of discipline and the particular philosophies of personnel than it does about an actual range of behavior.

Three forms of accomplishments are counted. First, youth can receive recognition within the Club. These programs take place in the context of a larger Boys & Girls Club program in each facility. The recognitions and awards represent achievement within the context of the entire set of youth in the Clubs. For an average of 31.8% of the youth to receive recognition within Clubs is thus a strong indication of positive activity. Many of the youth were encouraged through the Clubs to become involved in volunteer activity and/or activities outside of the Club for which they might be recognized as having special accomplishments. It is not clear that the total of nearly 49% combined outside, volunteer and other recognitions refers to a "unduplicated" count, or whether many of the same youth were counted in multiple categories. Nonetheless, for youth who are considered to be "at risk" for anti-social gang type behaviors, this level of positive recognition is to be regarded as a valuable positive indication.

## Conclusions from Program Data

This project was not designed as an experimental model with elaborate controls to establish cause and effect relationships. Nonetheless, an examination of the data maintained by the Clubs can provide an indication of the nature of the effect of the prevention and intervention activities. While this examination cannot conclusively demonstrate that the programming was solely responsible for positive effects, it can explore whether the results are consistent with a belief that the programs were effective in achieving some positive results.

First, the programs dealt with youth who are clearly at risk. All of the programs dealt with youth who had several factors in their lives which placed them at risk of involvement with gangs and delinquent activities. As provided in the design of the program, the prevention programs clearly targeted a younger population, in which the risk factors were more on the lines of "early warning signals", related to school performance, etc. The intervention programs dealt with an older population, with a greater proportion of youth with justice system contacts, substance abuse histories, etc. Second, the Clubs clearly provide activities which engage these youth, attract them and maintain their interest and participation. Third, although not presented in the tabular materials due to high levels of missing information, indicators of juvenile justice system involvement, gang involvement, and school performance all point in the direction of a general improvement for all groups of youth involved in these programs.

As noted above, these factors cannot be used to conclusively establish the programs as the sole cause of improvement in these youth, but the clear indication in the data is that the behavior of the youth involved in programming has improved compared to the behavior described prior to program involvement. In that sense **the data is consistent with a belief in the efficacy of the approaches taken in both the prevention and intervention programs.**

## SUGGESTED ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

- (1) **Level of Funding:** Site reviews of the programs (intervention and prevention / consortium) led to the conclusion that many of these efforts were seriously underfunded. At the initiation of the project, each site realized and indicated through a formal letter of agreement that the monies provided through the project were not to provide the sole support for the gang intervention and training projects. Further, each Club was understood to have a stable funding base upon which to build core programs. Nonetheless, the program activities often seemed to suffer from inadequate funding levels. This was especially true for the prevention/consortium programs where the incremental funding levels were relatively modest. Even at somewhat higher levels in the intervention programs the level of incremental funding was not enough to accomplish the intended goals. For example, at one intervention site there was no money to provide food for the TARGETED OUTREACH youth while they were participating, for field trips or to purchase tokens for subway travel to and from the Community Center. Most of the sites that were visited used monies from other sources to enhance their outreach activities, as expected in the project design. The concern with funding levels also effects the quality and availability of staff to work with "at risk" youth. As noted earlier, it is commendable that the local Clubs engaged in these activities. This truly speaks to the commitment of the staff with regard to TARGETED OUTREACH efforts.
  
- (2) **Staff Commitment:** It is very clear from the site visits, and the staff who were interviewed, that there was a firm commitment to the intervention and prevention efforts. Obviously, the quality of any programming in this area is dependent on the quality of the staff who are involved in it. All efforts should be made to support and enhance this commitment. The Boys & Girls gang workshop held in December, 1991 in Atlanta is a good example of such enhancement. It was clear that there was support for the workshop which gave staff the opportunity to share information, to understand that their efforts were important and reaffirm their commitment to intervention/prevention efforts.



- (3) **Staffing Patterns:** As noted above, staffing patterns varied across the prevention / consortium and intervention sites depending upon the type of program efforts. This was understandable given the fact that operating within the guidelines of the Youth Gang Prevention and Intervention Program Recommendations each site was able to determine their own programs depending on the nature of the local gang problem and community resources. Staffing patterns which included professionals with local credibility and reputation appeared to be most successful.
- (4) **Mainstreaming of TARGETED OUTREACH Youth.** At each of the sites visited, in keeping in line with the national perspective, the overall goal was to mainstream targeted youth into Club activities. While sometimes youth were placed in a specific program based on age or other criteria, this was underscored by a full service concept. All Club activities and events were open to all including TARGETED OUTREACH youth. In other words, there was a definite plan and effort to maintain the interest and participation of these youth.
- (5) **Educational Component:** All of the sites that were visited included some type of educational component for TARGETED OUTREACH youth. Typically, this took the form of after school tutoring with the program funds being used to support this activity. Across all sites, interviewees stressed the importance of providing educational assistance for these youth who often were doing poorly in school and had attendance problems. It did seem to the evaluators that youth were benefiting from this effort and that educational support is an important part of any gang intervention or prevention strategy.
- (6) **Networking:** Across all the sites there were major efforts in networking and coordinating with other community agencies such as schools, police, probation and others. While in some instances the Boys & Girls Club intervention/prevention efforts were the only viable alternatives within the community, staff still coordinated and shared information with other agencies. This is extremely important given that gang activity is a complex phenomena requiring multiple resources to deal effectively with it. Clubs should be encouraged and supported in these activities.
- (7) **Targeting Youth:** The manner in which the Clubs identified and targeted "at risk" youth varied across sites. This is understandable given divergent community structures and the specific nature of the gang problem. In

some sites, for example, the gang problem was quite severe and established (eg. high levels of violence, drive by shootings and the like). In other sites it was more of a "corner boy" situation with kids "hanging" together without any organized structure. Typical of many sites, referrals were obtained from schools, courts and police agencies. One site used "walk throughs" — going through the housing project, handing out fliers and talking with youth and their parents or guardians. The manner for targeting youth should be clearly specified and monitored to ensure that it is effective.

- (8) **Family Participation:** One of the concerns expressed at many sites, and also at the Atlanta gang workshop, was the difficulty of involving parents/guardians in the Boys & Girls efforts. Although parents/guardians were generally found to be cooperative and supportive of the Boys & Girls efforts, it was difficult getting them to participate to any extent. Part of the problem may result from the non-traditional family situation of many of these youths who may reside with one parent, a grandparent or some other relationship (eg. sister or brother). This is a major problem within Asian communities where there is often distrust and fear of outsiders. Nonetheless, many of the respondents underscored the importance of family participation. Therefore, TARGETED OUTREACH program efforts should develop mechanisms for family participation.
- (9) **Program Location:** Concern should be given to the physical location where program efforts are housed. One could reasonably argue that programs should be located at or near the areas where the gang problems exist and from which youth will be recruited. Many sites did just that: they were present at or near the housing developments in which "at risk" youth resided.

- (10) Record Keeping: Maintenance of records (case management and tracking information) seemed to be an issue especially for the prevention sites. Here, the argument was that \$2500 is not enough to support a record keeping system given other Club activities and the prevention efforts. Some Clubs combined record keeping assignments with the person responsible for other Club activities such as "Smart Moves". In some instances records were haphazard at best while in others they were very detailed and precise information was provided. One intervention site, for example, was unaware of the case tracking forms. Consideration should be given to streamlining the record keeping system especially in the prevention sites. Second, there should be additional direction from the National program regarding the importance of accurate records.
- (11) Programming for Teens: Most of the prevention efforts targeted middle school youth or pre-teens. Concern was expressed at a number of sites, and at the Atlanta gang workshop as well, with keeping teenagers involved in Boys & Girls Club activities. The problem seems to be that when youth enter high school and the teenage years they tend to reduce or end their participation with the Clubs. As some interviewees expressed, the Clubs are seen places for the little kids to go. Therefore, a strategy should be developed to continue the participation of youth in Club activities.
- (12) Evaluation: If intervention and prevention activities are to continue in the future, consideration should be given to a long term evaluation effort. The current evaluation effort, because of time frame and scope, consisted of process measures — for example, what activities were undertaken by the various Clubs and whether or not they seemed to be working. There was no attempt to measure individual outcomes such as changes in a youth's behavior or level of self-actualization, self-esteem and the like. This would require a more intensive effort and over a longer period of time. However, if intervention and prevention efforts do continue than the latter approach may prove workable.

- (13) **Sharing of Information:** As noted earlier, there is a need for those staff participating in the intervention/prevention efforts to share information. This was expressed by a number of respondents at various sites and those attending the Atlanta gang workshop. Thus a continuing mechanism, whether a national workshop, training sessions or regional meetings, should be established to accomplish this objective. Given the variety of different approaches to the gang problem, it is important for staff to be kept abreast of what has worked and what hasn't across various sites. It is equally important for staff to be able to ask questions and engage in a dialogue to determine the extent to which the programs and approaches which have worked in some areas may be applicable in the context of their own locale.
- (14) **Programming Hours:** It is important that the Clubs and various programs be accessible to youth especially those who are "at risk". Many Clubs begin programming in early afternoon (eg. 2:00 PM) and end in early evening (eg. 8:30 PM). Some Clubs are open Mondays through Fridays but are closed on the weekends or have more restrictive hours. Still other Clubs provide services on a more inclusive basis and are open seven days a week. Hours of operation may also vary by season. Since, as many respondent stated, the Clubs do provide an alternative to the "streets", it is important that they be accessible. While such factors as funding level and availability of staff determine both programming and hours of operation, these issues should be addressed on a case by case basis.
- (15) **Facility Improvement:** As might be expected, some Clubs have "state of the art" facilities while others are in need of improvement. While a swimming pool in each Club is probably not feasible, nor necessary, some attention should be given to how each facility could be improved to better meet the needs of the area. Monies should be sought to accomplish this objective.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. Given that the Youth Gang Prevention and Intervention efforts of the Boys & Girls Clubs of America are sound and viable, a higher level of funding should be made available to support these activities.
- II. Given the importance of adequate record keeping, efforts should be made to improve and enhance data collection.
- III. Given the importance of prevention and intervention programs, staff training should be made a priority for all Club staff and information about the program and the successes at other sites should be shared among all participants.
- IV. Given the TARGETED OUTREACH model, provisions should be established to mainstream all "at risk" youth into various Club programs at all Clubs involved in prevention and intervention programming thereby providing a full service approach.
- V. Given the multi-faceted approach to gang intervention/prevention, efforts should be made to insure continued networking and coordination between the Boys & Girls Clubs and other community agencies.
- VI. Given the importance of timely and adequate information, provisions should be made for more communication and contact between the National Office and the local Boys & Girls Clubs.
- VII. Given the scope of the gang problem nationally, more effort should be made to publicize, market and expand the prevention and intervention efforts of the Boys & Girls Clubs of America.

---

APPENDIX A

*INTERVIEW FORMS*

---

## DIRECTOR/STAFF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

### ASSURANCES OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND NATURE OF EVALUATION PROJECT

| BACKGROUND INFORMATION             |                 |      |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|------|
| Age:                               | Race/Ethnicity: | Sex: |
| Educational Level and Area:        |                 |      |
| Length in Current Position:        |                 |      |
| Employment History and Background: |                 |      |

### NATURE OF GANG PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND LENGTH OF OPERATION:

### ATTAINMENT OF GANG PREVENTION RECOMMENDATIONS (WHAT STEPS WERE TAKEN TO ACCOMPLISH THE GOALS LISTED BELOW AND WITH WHAT DEGREE OF SUCCESS)

- Commitment and support of Board of Directors and staff (use of orientation and training):

- Assessment of local gang problem:  
●
- Cooperation with local agencies to develop response plan to the gang problem:
- Recruitment of youth to participate in the program (selection of at risk youth and methods used to avoid stigma):  
●
- Development of culturally sensitive program activities:
- Development of a network of support service providers (police, schools churches, community groups):  
●



- **Advocacy on behalf of youth:**

- **Maintenance of confidential case management system (record keeping):**

- **Opportunities for youth to build positive self-esteem:**

**Competence (to do something):**

**Usefulness (to contribute something):**

**Belonging (acceptance by others):**

**Power (influence decision-making):**

- 
- Integration of gang prevention recommendations in program development (total picture):

**INITIAL AND ONGOING PROVISIONS FOR STAFF TRAINING:**

**NATURE OF INTERVENTION ACTIVITIES:**

- 
- Involvement of youth in after school activities:
- 
- Outreach activities to home and families:
-



**PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS:**

**STRENGTHS OF THE PREVENTION PROGRAM:**

**AREAS OF THE PREVENTION PROGRAM THAT NEED IMPROVEMENT:**

**NEED FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND/OR MONIES:**

**OVERALL EVALUATION OF GANG PREVENTION EFFORTS WITH THE COMMUNITY (DEGREE OF SUPPORT):**

**PLANS FOR CONTINUATION OF PROGRAM PREVENTION EFFORTS:**

# COMMUNITY/AGENCY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

## ASSURANCES OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND NATURE OF THE EVALUATION PROJECT

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

What is your agency:

In what capacity does your agency deal with youth:

What is your specific job and how long have you been doing it:

In general, what is your relationship to the boys/girls club:

In what ways does the boys/girls club assist you in your job:

WHAT IS YOUR PERCEPTION OF THE GANG PROBLEM IN THIS AREA:

ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE GANG PREVENTION ACTIVITIES OF THE BOYS/GIRLS CLUB, IF SO, PLEASE DESCRIBE:

WHAT DO YOU PERCEIVE TO BE THE STRENGTHS OF THE BOYS/GIRLS CLUB GANG PREVENTION ACTIVITIES:

IN WHAT AREAS DO YOU PERCEIVE A NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT:

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO YOUTH IN THIS AREA AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS:

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO THE GANG PROBLEM IN THIS AREA:

WHAT DO YOU FEEL SHOULD BE DONE TO REDUCE THE LEVEL OF GANG ACTIVITY:



## PARENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

### ASSURANCES OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND NATURE OF THE EVALUATION PROJECT

| BACKGROUND INFORMATION                   |                 |      |
|--|-----------------|------|
| Age:                                     | Race/Ethnicity: | Sex: |
| Occupation:                              |                 |      |
| Educational Level:                       |                 |      |
| Type of Residence<br>and Length of Time: |                 |      |
| Number of Children and Ages:             |                 |      |

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE NATURE OF THE GANG PROBLEM IN THIS AREA:

HAVE ANY OF YOUR CHILDREN BEEN INVOLVED IN GANG ACTIVITIES:

HOW DID YOUR SON/DAUGHTER BECOME INVOLVED IN THE BOYS/GIRLS CLUB ACTIVITIES  
(HOW MANY):

ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH BOYS/GIRLS CLUB GANG PREVENTION ACTIVITIES, IF SO, PLEASE DESCRIBE:

IN WHICH OF THESE ACTIVITIES DOES YOUR CHILD PARTICIPATE AND HOW REGULARLY:

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE STRENGTHS OF THE BOYS/GIRLS CLUB PREVENTION PROGRAM:

IN WHAT AREAS IS THERE A NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT:

**IN GENERAL, WHAT RESOURCES ARE AVAILABLE TO YOUNG PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY:**

**PLEASE EVALUATE THE EFFORTS OF THE FOLLOWING TO REDUCE GANG ACTIVITY:**

- Police:

- Schools:

- Churches:

- Boys and Girls Club:

- Other Community Agencies:

**PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR CHILD'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE FOLLOWING:**

- Police:

- Schools:

- Churches:

- Boys and Girls Club:

- Other Community Agencies:

DO YOU FEEL THAT THE BOYS/GIRLS CLUB HAS HAD A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON YOUR CHILD?  
SO, IN WHAT WAY:

# YOUTH/PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

## ASSURANCES OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND NATURE OF EVALUATION PROJECT

| BACKGROUND INFORMATION  |                 |      |
|---|-----------------|------|
| Age:  | Race/Ethnicity: | Sex: |
| Educational Level:  |                 |      |
| Employment:   |                 |      |
| Residence (who do you live with):   |                 |      |
| Siblings:   |                 |      |
| Association with Boys/Girls Clubs (nature of and length):                 |                 |      |
| Degree of Participation in the prevention programs and length:            |                 |      |
| Involvement in other community activities (e.g., schools, churches, etc.) |                 |      |
| Previous contact with the juvenile justice system:                        |                 |      |

PERCEPTION OF GANG ACTIVITY IN THE AREA:

WHAT IS/HAS BEEN YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN GANG ACTIVITY:

WHAT DO THE GANGS IN THIS AREA DO:

WHY DO YOUTH JOIN THE GANGS:

**WHAT RECREATIONAL OR COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES ARE AVAILABLE IN THE AREA:**

**DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING:**

- School:

- Family:

- Church:

- Friends:

- Other:



WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE MAIN STRENGTHS OF THE BOYS/GIRLS CLUB (IN GENERAL AND WITH PREVENTION ACTIVITY):

IN WHAT AREAS DO YOU SEE A NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT:

WHAT ACTIVITY DO YOU SEE AS IMPORTANT TO REDUCE THE LEVEL OF GANG ACTIVITY:

WHY DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB:

HOW DID YOU FIRST ENCOUNTER THE BOYS/GIRLS CLUB:

IN WHAT TYPE OF HOUSING DO YOU LIVE:

WHAT TYPE OF WORK DO YOUR PARENTS DO?

**WHAT IS YOUR PARENTS' EDUCATIONAL LEVEL:**

**OVERALL HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE PERFORMANCE OF THE FOLLOWING AGENCIES IN YOUR COMMUNITY AND WHY**

- Police:

- Schools:

- Churches:

- Recreational programs:

- Other:

IN GENERAL, WHAT DO THE POLICE DO IN YOUR COMMUNITY:

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ENCOUNTERS WITH THE POLICE:

---

APPENDIX B

*SITE PROJECT SITES REPORTS*

---

# YOUTH GANG PREVENTION & EARLY INTERVENTION PROJECT SITES

## NORTHEAST

Boys & Girls Clubs of Boston, MA.  
Roxbury Unit †

Crime Prevention Association  
Boys & Girls Club, Philadelphia,  
PA. \*

Boys & Girls Club of Erie, PA.

Monmouth Boys Club,  
Asbury Park, NJ.

Somerville Boys & Girls Club,  
Somerville, MA.

Springfield Boys Club,  
Springfield, MA.

Boys & Girls Club of  
Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh,  
PA.

## SOUTHEAST

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Metro Atlanta, GA.

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Broward County,  
Fort Lauderdale, FL. †  
Lester H. White Unit  
Thomas D. Stephanis Unit

Boys & Girls Club of  
Lenoir County, Kinston, NC.

Boys & Girls Clubs of Tuscaloosa  
County, AL.

The Salvation Army Boys Club of  
Winston Salem, NC. \*

## MIDWEST

Boys & Girls Club of Alpena, MI.

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Des Moines, IA.

Boys & Girls Club of Danville, IL.

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Indianapolis, IN.

Legore Boys Club  
Wheeler Boys Club

Boys & Girls Club of Rockford, IL.

## SOUTHWEST

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Greater Dallas, TX.  
East Dallas Boys Club  
Oak Cliff Boys Club

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Metro Denver, CO. †  
J. Churchill Owen Unit  
Lincoln Park Unit

The Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Harlingen, TX.

## PACIFIC

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
King County, Seattle, WA. †

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Las Vegas, NV.

Boys & Girls Club of Río Hondo,  
Bell Gardens, CA. †

Boys & Girls Club of  
Santa Ana, CA. †

The Boys & Girls Clubs of  
San Diego, CA.

San Francisco Boys & Girls Club,  
CA. †

Boys & Girls Club of  
San Gabriel Valley, El Monte, CA.  
\*

Boys & Girls Clubs of  
Tacoma & Pierce County, Tacoma,  
WA. †  
Al Davies Boys & Girls Club  
East Side Boys & Girls Club

\* Early Intervention Sites  
† Consortium Sites

---

# APPENDIX G

## TRAINING SYLLABUS

---



**BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS  
OF AMERICA**

---

Youth Gang Prevention Workshop

# SYLLABUS

---



---

## YOUTH GANG PREVENTION WORKSHOP SYLLABUS

A one and one-half day workshop designed for Boys & Girls Club Unit Directors and others who are in a position of leadership and responsibility that can influence programs and have the direct ear of a Club's Executive Director. This program will have to be coordinated at the Unit Director level if more than one unit is doing gang prevention within a Club. There are possible programmatic implications with the resulting cost factors for implementing this gang prevention program, such as Club hours of operation and disciplinary procedures. Executive Directors and Boards will have to be involved in implementing these changes.

In addition to B&GCA staff and training associates, a local person knowledgeable about gang activity specific to the geographic location of the Clubs that are participating in training will be identified to be a resource during the first half-day of the training. A professional from law enforcement or social services should be identified by the host Club and briefed by the lead trainer. (See Section III)

Also, when Clubs sign up for the training they should be sent the Youth Gang Prevention Program Interview Guide with instructions on how to complete and summarize the interviews prior to training. Send the youth gang expert a copy so s/he can see what questions the workshop participants will be prepared to answer.

---

### *Learning Objectives*

#### PREBOARD:

- ◆ To be able to recruit and mainstream youth at risk of gang involvement into regular Club activities.
- ◆ To be able to meet the social and developmental needs of youth at risk of gang involvement and to prevent youth from joining gangs through their involvement at the Club.
- ◆ To take the steps necessary to provide and maintain a safe environment in the Club for all members.
- ◆ To develop a plan to implement the Youth Gang Prevention Program that includes networking, referrals, case management, and outreach.

---

## *First Day*

- I. Housekeeping: (2 to 5 minutes)
  - A. Trainers should introduce themselves as well as the local gang expert and share their roles in the project.
  - B. Acknowledge the host Club and thank them for making the arrangements for the training.
  - C. Share the schedule of the workshop. (Number and approximate time of breaks; lunch; ending beginning times.
  - D. Make sure everyone has signed the roster and tell them that at the conclusion of the workshop everyone will receive a certification credit.
  - E. Point out location of fire exits, rest rooms, etc.
  
- II. Climate Setting: To achieve a learning environment which encourages the active participation of all involved in the workshop. To establish agreement and clarity on content of the workshop. (45 to 60 minutes, depending on size of group.)
  - A. Present adult learning concept.
    1. Each participant brings a wealth of experience and knowledge that needs to be shared.
    2. The more participants share the more they will learn. The responsibility for learning is the participants, not the trainers.
    3. The trainer's role is that of a facilitator.
  - B. Ice Breaker.
    1. Have participants pair up with someone they do not know or know the least. They will find out the following information about their partner and present it to the group. (Preboard list)
      - a. Name
      - b. Club & Club's location
      - c. Position
      - d. Number of years in current position and number of years in the Movement.
      - e. In one sentence answer: Who within your community is most at risk of gang involvement?

2. After 5 to 7 minutes, or earlier if there is a hush in the room or you hear the majority of participants discussing other subjects, call the group back together. Randomly call on pairs. Have them stand and speak clearly. Limit the time of each presentation to less than a minute.

C. Contracting Objectives.

1. In the same pairs (or in a large group at their tables) have them identify a list of needs/expectations they have for the workshop. (What information or knowledge do they want to leave with at the end of the workshop?)
2. Allow a couple of minutes (but, no more than 5) for them to complete their list. Ask each diad or table for one expectation. Post on newsprint. Go around the room until all are posted.
3. Share pre-boarded list of learning objectives and discuss where in the workshop their expectations will be met. If some of their expectations will not be met, tell them where they might seek resources to answer their needs.
4. End with the following statement: "This program focuses not on stopping gang activity in your community (although this approach would ultimately do so), but on how to persuade youth at risk of gang involvement to choose involvement at the Club rather than that of the gangs." Discuss the program continuum of prevention, early intervention, and intervention, and point out that there is a pilot intervention site program, however this is not the focus of the current training. This training focuses on recruiting and serving youth in need of prevention or early intervention services. But, if we are going to be competing with gangs for these kids we need to know about our competition. The next exercise is designed to bring out what everyone in this room knows about gangs."

III. Youth Gangs: To clarify terms and identify characteristics of gangs and their activities, how to target youth at risk of gang involvement and identify the targeted youth's needs and interest. At the beginning of this discussion the focus will be gangs in general, ending by narrowing the focus to the individuals who are in gangs or at risk of gang involvement. The local expert will be utilized as a resource through-out this section. (Time: 2 1/2 to 3 hours. This section should end when you break for lunch. Plan on lunch starting at 1:00 p.m. You will need to control the time carefully.)

A. Give each table a marker, sheet of newsprint and Handout #1., containing the following discussion questions:

1. What is a gang?
2. How are gangs organized?
3. How can you identify a gang member?
4. How do you know if there is gang activity in your community?

5. How do gangs recruit members?
6. Why do youth join gangs?
7. What are the characteristics of youth who join gangs? And, how do these characteristics differ from kids that don't join gangs?

B. Ask the participants at each table as a group to utilize their summaries from their Youth Gang Prevention Program Interviews to come up with an answer to two or three questions you assign each group and to print their answers on newsprint. You can have each group answer each question if time and number and size of groups permits. Tell them they will have approximately 15 minutes to complete. Once they have transferred their answers to the newsprint, have them post the newsprint on the wall.

\* \* \*

..... *This is a natural place for a ten minute break.* .....

\* \* \*

C. When they return from the break, process their answers with the total group:

1. Ask everyone if they have had a chance to read the answers on the newsprint.
2. Summarize the answers out loud for the group.
3. After each summary, ask if anyone has anything to add or a comment to make.
4. If there is a preoccupation with dress, colors, tattoos, etc., put it in perspective with the fact that today's youth fashions can be misinterpreted as gang allegiance.
5. End the processing of each question by asking the gang expert to comment on the question and localize it. (S/he may see inaccuracies in the group's answers, challenge them and explain why. If, however, you see inaccuracy that the gang expert does not comment on you should challenge it and explain why.)
6. On question #6, if the senses of belonging, usefulness, competency and personal power do not appear in the group's answer, bring them up and:
  - a. ask the group, "How many of you are familiar with the Youth Development Strategy?"
  - b. tell them, "For those of you that do not know the Youth Development Strategy you will learn about it after lunch. It is one of the most powerful tools Clubs have in the competition with youth gangs."

7. On question #7, if the characteristics that we have determined as the at-risk criteria do not appear, present them to the group. (The characteristics should be PREBOARDED and ready to use at this time.)

Also stress that the main distinction between the targeted youth and members of the Club is simply that the members who have joined the Club on their means they are at less risk than the targeted youth because they are seeking positive alternatives to the street, are voluntarily abiding by the rules of the Club and are respecting adult staff and volunteers. The youth at risk may not have the social skills to join the Club without the extra help this approach provides. But they sure may have the interest once the opportunity is presented in the proper fashion.

NOTE: In the briefing sent to the youth gang expert, s/he should receive a copy of the questions, how we will be asking him/her to help us process them and our answers to questions #6 & #7.

- D. Say to the group, "Although, this program is not suggesting or in any way recommending that you recruit or welcome youth gangs into your Club, a frequently asked question is, "How can a Club retain its safe environment for all members when we are implementing a gang prevention program?" Before we break for lunch and while we still have (name of gang expert) with us I would like to discuss this question."

1. Handout #2 "Making Your Club Safe" and discuss.
2. Be prepared to answer the following question, "I feel we have a safe Club, but my staff is still afraid of letting gang members into the building, what can I do?" If this question is not asked bring it up in a question format, "Does anyone have staff who feel afraid to participate in this project? Do you know why they are afraid?"

One answer is: "This is where preventative measures really count. Make sure all your staff know that the safety precautions on HANDOUT #2 are in place at all times, that if a known gang member admitted to the Club they should be treated with the respect and dignity which all other members receive. If however, the gang member is participating in an illegal activity at the Club the staff should know what procedures they should follow to get outside help. All staff should also know that if they follow the prescribed procedures, their course of action will be supported by the Club."

3. Ask the expert to comment on this question.

End the discussion by thanking the expert for her/his participation. Excuse everyone for lunch and tell them the exact time the workshop will resume.

---

LUNCH BREAK (Time: 1 hour. To save time you may wish to have a lunch catered. When participants leave the site of the training you can count on 1 1/2 hours before training can resume.)

---

IV. Youth Gang Prevention Program: This section will present how to implement a Youth Gang Prevention Program in a Club. (Time: 4 to 4 1/2 hours. This section ends the first day and is continued into the second day.)

A. Youth Gang Program Continuum

1. Make three signs:

PREBOARD:

|            |                    |              |
|------------|--------------------|--------------|
| PREVENTION | EARLY INTERVENTION | INTERVENTION |
|------------|--------------------|--------------|

Place the signs at intervals across a wall.

2. Pass out HANDOUT #3 and read it to the group.

**Prevention** - where youth live in a gang-infiltrated community and have at-risk characteristics that make them vulnerable to the appeal of a gang lifestyle. These young people are not yet involved in gang activity. This approach is aimed at deterring youth from joining a gang.

**Early Intervention** - where youth are exhibiting "wannabe" behaviors or where it is believed that they are at least nominal members of a gang. They may have committed crimes against property but have not committed criminal acts against individuals. This approach is to deter them from joining a gang if they have not yet done so or, where they are peripherally involved, to influence them to drop their gang affiliation.

**Intervention** - where youth are hard core gang members who fully participate in the activities of the gang including crimes against both property and individuals. This approach is an attempt to reclaim youth from all gang involvement.

3. Ask participants to stand under the sign that best reflects their Clubs programmatic response.
4. Tell them to discuss why their Club has chosen the response with the other participants standing under the same sign and to select one member of their group to summarize their answer and present it to the entire group.
5. Tell the group that the approach we are focusing on during this workshop is one of Prevention and Early Intervention.

B. Say to the group, "How, you may be thinking, can the Boys & Girls Club compete with gangs for youth at risk of gang involvement? The answer can be found in what the needs and interest of these youth are and how well a Club fulfills them."

1. The needs and interests of youth at risk of gang involvement.

- a. Find their newsprint pages which list the reasons youth join gangs and place them in a prominent place where you can refer to them.
- b. Say to the group, "Does the list of reasons we determined earlier on why kids join gangs give us a clue to what their needs and interest are?"
- c. Write, THE NEEDS & INTEREST OF YOUTH AT RISK OF GANG INVOLVEMENT on top of a piece of newsprint. Copy the needs and interest that the group calls out. If the following items do not come from the group bring it to their attention:

- making new friends, to be accepted by a group of their peers, to assume a leadership role.
- excitement, risk taking, adrenaline flow.
- a safe place to go to at night, (if Club has extended hours.)
- support to reach their full academic potential.
- employability skills, career exploration and employment.
- independent living skills.
- alcohol, drug and pregnancy prevention.
- prevention of AIDS
- substance abuse counseling
- anger management
- recognition of socially appropriate achievements.

2. How does the Club meet these needs and interest?

a. Preboard four senses of Youth Development Strategy with short definitions.

A sense of competence - the feeling there is something they can do and do well.

A sense of usefulness - the opportunity to do something of value for other people.

A sense of belonging - a setting where the individual knows they have a place, where they "fit" and are accepted.

A sense of personal power - a chance to be heard and to influence decisions.

Say to the group, "Before we start looking at specific programs lets look at some underlining needs. I spoke this morning about the youth development strategy. This strategy was adopted by B&GCA in 1972 as the basis of our national delin-

quency prevention program. And, is now being used by Clubs as a tool for core program planning. The strategy helps staff enhance members self-esteem.

The strategy is based on a study by a group of social researchers from the University of Colorado. The researchers examined what the common elements were in children who did not become involved in negative behavior. They found that when youth were presented with opportunities to develop the four senses listed here, their self-esteem was enhanced and the behavior they exhibited was positive. The four senses are... refer to preboarded list." Pass out HANDOUT #4 (2-sided)

And continue..."When these enhancements are in place in a youth's live, they act against the negative forces that often derail youth from positive social development. To help you understand how the youth development strategy works we would like you to think about experiences in your life when you felt these four senses and how it impacted your self-esteem.

Pass out HANDOUT #5. And tell them to individually write down an experience they had as a youth between the ages of 6 and 12 and an adolescent between 13 and 18. When they have finished ask them to share their experiences with the participants at their table. You may wish to share a couple of the experiences with the entire group. (Be careful not to spend too much time on this. People can really get carried away.)

Then say, "To help members improve their self-esteem through Club activities, ask yourself how the programs and activities you are implementing at the Club naturally enhance the four senses and then ask yourself how they can be improved to give members a greater sense of competency, usefulness, belonging and empowerment. On the side 2 of Handout #4 there is an example."

Pass out HANDOUT #6 and work through a program of their choice.

- b. Say to group, "Now its time to evaluate if the program and services you are currently offering at the Club meet the needs and interests of the targeted youth. To begin with, you must start with a solid core program. How many of you are familiar with Boys & Girls Clubs of America's self assessment and planning tool for programs...Commitment to Quality? Pass out copies. Explain the process. (Read introduction and put in your own words.)

"In addition to a solid core program their are the specific needs and interest of the targeted youth we discussed earlier." Pass out Handout #8 and refer to the list and discuss resources as they appear on page 35 of the manual. (Make sure that the participants realize that the targeted youth should be mainstreamed into programs. That, in fact no program should be made up of more than 33% of the targeted youth. Therefore, any new programs that are developed at the Club



have to be for all members. Give an example of the damage that can occur when an identified youth are put in a special program. They are labeled and stigmatized and according to human nature the self-fulfilling prophecy goes into effect. Pass out HANDOUT # 9 sidebar on p. 16 of manual.)

- C. Say to the group, "It is apparent that Clubs can not provide all the specific programs and services needed by the targeted youth. You need to network and collaborate with other youth serving organizations and agencies.

Pass out HANDOUT # 10 (planning form from manual) Utilizing the listed needs and interest of the targeted youth and the answers from their Youth Gang Prevention Program Prevention Interviews have them complete the handout. (Have staff from the same Club work together.) Ask group to share the types of community organizations they will be working with. List them on newsprint. Tell them we are going to be referring back to this list in the morning.

\* \* \*

End of First Day: Give them a copy of *TARGETED OUTREACH To Youth At Risk of Gang Involvement* Manual and tell them it is a resource to help them remember what we are covering in the workshop. Tell the group what tomorrow's schedule will be and thank them for their participation.

\* \* \*

---

## Second Day

### Welcome & Housekeeping

**Icebreaker & Summary of first day:** Have the group stand in a circle with a ball, roll of tape, etc. toss the object to a person in the circle tell them they can consult with the people on both sides of them for the answer to ... ask a question from a subject you presented yesterday. For example, "What are the three program approaches that formed the continuum?" "What are the four senses of the youth development strategy?" (Time: 10 minutes)

\* Youth Gang Prevention Program (Continued from first day)

D. Recruitment: referrals and outreach

1. Post the list of identified community organizations in a prominent location. Say to group, "Yesterday you identified community organizations and agencies that you could refer targeted youth to for services and programs the Clubs does not provide, these same organizations may also have clients that could utilize the services of the Club.
2. Review the list and cross out the ones that the Club would not get referral from.
3. Continue, "Referral is one method of recruiting targeted youth. What other agencies and organizations might refer youth at risk of gang involvement to the Club?" Write down list on newsprint. (If schools or the juvenile justice system does not appear on their list, add them. Determine how much they know about the juvenile justice system. If knowledge is missing, fill them in. Trainer should be familiar with the juvenile justice section in the manual which explains the juvenile justice system and be able to refer participants who need more information to that section.)
4. Continue, "Once you have determined the organizations/agencies that might refer youth to the Club or provide the targeted youth programs and services that the Club does not provide, you will want to complete a profile and linkage form on each one." Pass out HANDOUT # 9 & 11 TARGETED OUTREACH Org./Agency Profile and Agency Linkage Form. Explain their purpose and ask for any questions. (Agency Profile - to organize gathered information. Linkage Form - make sure necessary information is collected. The forms really helps especially if a staff turn-over occurs.)
5. Continue, "The best way to precede, after you have developed your Club's methods of intake and mainstreaming targeted youth (which we are going to discuss in a minute) is to invite the contacts from each agency to the Club for a

meeting. You know how impressed people are after they visit the Club. Having a breakfast or lunch meeting increases the attendance. Here is a sample agenda:

**PREBOARD:**

- ◆ Welcome and Introductions
- ◆ Mission Statement of your Boys & Girls Club
- ◆ Objectives of the Youth Gang Prevention Program
- ◆ Referral System and Outreach Effort
- ◆ Youth Development Strategy
- ◆ Six Core Program Areas
- ◆ Tour of Club
- ◆ Closing Remarks

6. Say to group, "Outreach is another method of recruitment. What are some the qualities a Outreach Worker must possess? (If the following qualities are not mention, mention them: feel comfortable meeting youth in their territory; ability to quickly develop trust; excellent communication skills, especially the ability to listen; knowledge of the community; culturally sensitive; full knowledge and understanding of Club's mission and programs.)

**E. Method of introducing and mainstreaming targeted youth into core program.**

1. Say to group, "Before you start recruiting targeted youth you need to have a method of introducing and mainstreaming them into the Clubs core program. Here is the method that Clubs from the previous demonstration projects have found to be successful:
  - a. If the youth is a referral, the staff member assigned should have a meeting at the referral agency with the targeted youth, the person who referred the youth and if possible the youth's parents. At this meeting, you should provide an overview of the objectives of the program and the array of programs and activities that are awaiting the youth once s/he starts to attend the Club. Set a date and time when the youth will come to the Club for an orientation.
  - b. Ask participants, "How are new members provided with an orientation to your Club?" Listen and then say, "The orientation procedure we are about to present to you is a good one to adopt for all members. And, if you are serious about not stigmatizing targeted youth, will need to be implemented for all youth.

**PREBOARD**

- ◆ Greet youth and introduce him/her to person who will take her/him on a tour of the Club.

- ◆ Provide a tour of the facility. (This can be very effectively done by a Club member.)
  - ◆ Explain sign-in procedures, rules and consequences for breaking rules.
  - ◆ Review the program schedule.
  - ◆ Provide an opportunity for the youth to identify the activities which interest her/him and have him/her write down the dates and times of these activities.
  - ◆ allow for an open dialogue and questions and answers.
  - ◆ introduce the youth to staff and volunteers.
  - ◆ end the orientation by asking how long the youth can stay that day/night and if they can stay ask the member who conducted the tour to spend some more time with him/her.
- c. Ask for volunteers to role play a targeted youth and the staff member providing the orientation. Set up the scene and have a couple of teams act it out with input from the other participants and you.
- d. HAND OUT the Case Management Intake Form (Handout #14) and say, "This form needs to be completed immediately after the orientation. It provides a basis for you to evaluate your progress with the targeted youth."
- e. HAND OUT the Case Management Tracking Form (Handout #15) and say, "This form should be completed monthly to document the progress the youth is making. It will make you conscious of the youth's involvement." Review the form with the group and ask for questions.
- f. Say to group, "If a member misses the time s/he said they would be at the Club, call their home to find out what is wrong. If you can not reach them by phone, send them a letter. If a youth is missing several days in a row without reason and you can not reach them or if they decide they no longer wish to come to the Club, contact the referral agency immediately."

#### F. Evaluation of programs effectiveness

1. Ask, "Why is it important to evaluate the effectiveness of a program?" Note responses. If the following reasons are not mentioned, mention them: To find out what works and change what doesn't; to find out what effect the program had on the youth served; for funding source...so they know their money was spent on what it was granted for.

2. Hand out the Case Management Summary Report (Handout #16) and say, "This form summarizes the information from the intake and tracking forms and should be completed on a quarterly basis." Review and answer any questions.

G. Confidentiality

1. Pass out HANDOUT #17 (from manual) Review and answer any questions.

- V. Development of Workplan (Pass out Handout #18) (TIME: Depends on remaining time before 12:30 p.m. If there is time review and have them complete a draft. If little time is left, review it with them and return it to the Director of Delinquency Intervention for a response.)

\* \* \*

Conclusion 12:30 p.m.: Tell group that a member of B&GCA's Delinquency Intervention Program Staff will be visiting their Club to provide one-on-one technical assistance. During that visit the exact methods of project reporting will be presented.

Give everyone a training certificate.

Thank the group and wish them a safe journey.

---

## HANDOUTS / OVERHEADS

|      |  |            |
|------|--|------------|
| p.1  | Preboard list of Learning Objectives . . . . .                                     | Overhead 1 |
| p.2  | Preboard list of Ice Breakers . . . . .  | Overhead 2 |
| p.3  | QUESTIONS FROM III A. #1 . . . . .   | Handout 1  |
| p.5  | Preboard list of Characteristics of Youth At-Risk . . . . .                        | Overhead 3 |
| p.5  | "MAKING YOUR CLUB SAFE" FROM THE MANUAL . . . . .                                  | Handout 2  |
| p.6  | Separate Preboards - Prevention - . . . . .  | Overhead 4 |
|      | - Early Intervention - . . . . .   | Overhead 5 |
|      | - Intervention - . . . . .   | Overhead 6 |
| p.6  | P/EI/I DEFINITIONS FROM IV A. #2 . . . . .   | Handout 3  |
| p.7  | Preboard "The Needs & Interests of Youth At Risk<br>Of Gang Involvement" . . . . . | Overhead 7 |
| p.8  | Preboard 4: Senses & Brief Definitions . . . . .                                   | Overhead 8 |
| p.8  | 2 sided YOUTH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY — Description . . . . .                         | Handout 4  |
| p.8  | YOUTH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY HANDOUT . . . . .                                       | Handout 5  |
| p.9  | YOUTH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY BLANK WORKSHEET . . . . .                               | Handout 6  |
| p.9  | COMMITMENT TO QUALITY MANUAL . . . . .   | Handout 7  |
| p.9  | List of Interests/Needs and Sample Program Opportunities. . . . .                  | Handout 8  |
| p.9  | Theories of Juvenile Delinquency . . . . .   | Handout 9  |
| p.9  | PLANNING FORM FROM MANUAL . . . . .  | Handout 10 |
| p.10 | TARGETED OUTREACH TO YOUTH AT RISK<br>OF GANG INVOLVEMENT MANUAL . . . . .         | Handout 11 |
| p.10 | REFER TO JUVENILE JUSTICE SECTION OF THE MANUAL                                    |            |
| p.11 | ORGANIZATION/AGENCY PROFILE FROM MANUAL . . . . .                                  | Handout 12 |
| p.11 | AGENCY LINKAGE FORM FROM MANUAL . . . . .  | Handout 13 |

|      |  |             |
|------|--|-------------|
| p.11 | Preboard Sample Agenda . . . . .                 | Overhead 9  |
| p.12 | Preboard Orientation Process . . . . .           | Overhead 10 |
| p.12 | CASE MANAGEMENT INTAKE FORM . . . . .            | Handout 14  |
| p.13 | CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKING FORM . . . . .          | Handout 15  |
| p.13 | CASE MANAGEMENT SUMMARY FORM . . . . .           | Handout 16  |
| p.13 | CONFIDENTIALITY GUIDELINES FROM MANUAL . . . . . | Handout 17  |
| p.13 | ACTION PLAN FROM MANUAL . . . . .                | Handout 18  |