

State of California

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

Health and Welfare Agency

MARIO OBLEDO
SECRETARY



TABLE OF CONTENTS

NO 133

JUN 24 1977

Page

HIGHLIGHTS	1
INTRODUCTION	1
EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	3
STUDY METHOD	4
FINDINGS	5
<i>OBJECTIVE ONE: Determine the extent to which wards utilize the law libraries.</i>	5
Part I - Law Library Usage	5
Part II - Law Library Accessibility	13
<i>OBJECTIVE TWO: Determine the reasons for wards using the law libraries.</i>	19
<i>OBJECTIVE THREE: Determine the extent to which wards are getting the needed assistance when using the law libraries.</i>	22
<i>OBJECTIVE FOUR: Determine the adequacy of training given to the law library personnel.</i>	28
CONCLUSIONS	29
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A - REPORTING FORMS FOR LAW LIBRARY DATA	32
APPENDIX B - RESPONSES FROM WARDS IN REGARD TO LAW LIBRARIES	35
APPENDIX C - LAW LIBRARY VISITS - FEBRUARY - JULY, 1975	36
APPENDIX D - LAW LIBRARY VISITS - AUGUST, 1975 - JANUARY, 1976	37
APPENDIX E - LAW LIBRARY VISITS - FEBRUARY, 1976 - JUNE, 1976	38
APPENDIX F - LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS - FEBRUARY - JULY, 1975	39
APPENDIX G - LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS - AUGUST, 1975 - JANUARY, 1976	40
APPENDIX H - LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS - FEBRUARY, 1976 - JUNE, 1976	41

Department of the

Youth Authority

PEARL S. WEST
DIRECTOR

GEORGE R. ROBERTS,
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

C. A. TERHUNE,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PAROLE AND
INSTITUTIONS BRANCH

ROBERT L. SMITH,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS BRANCH

ROBERT H. MABBUTT,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
MANAGEMENT SERVICES BRANCH

JAMES C. BARNETT,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PLANNING, RESEARCH, EVALUATION
AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

KEITH S. GRIFFITHS
Chief of Research

ELAINE DUXBURY
Research Manager III

JOACHIM P. SECKEL
Research Manager II

DAVID D. DILLINGHAM
Research Analyst II

Principal Author

GORDON E. MARSHALL
Research Analyst II

LENA MARQUEZ
Graduate Student Assistant

LDA

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Con't)

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX I - LAW LIBRARY USE PER 100 WARDS - FEBRUARY - JULY, 1975	42
APPENDIX J - LAW LIBRARY USE PER 100 WARDS - AUGUST, 1975 - JANUARY, 1976	43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NUMBER

1	LAW LIBRARY USE PER 100 WARDS - FEBRUARY, 1975 - JUNE, 1976	6
2	WARD VISITS TO LAW LIBRARIES AT YOUTH AUTHORITY INSTITUTIONS - FEBRUARY, 1975 - JUNE, 1976	10
3	LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS - FEBRUARY, 1975 - JUNE, 1976	12
4	REASONS GIVEN BY WARDS FOR USE OF LAW LIBRARIES, BY STUDY PERIODS	19
5	WARDS' RESPONSES TO QUESTION: "Were You Able To Find The Material That You Wanted To Find?", BY STUDY PERIODS	23
6	WARDS' RESPONSES TO QUESTION: "Did You Need Any Help In Using The Law Library And If So, Was The Needed Assistance Provided?", BY STUDY PERIODS	24
7	WARDS' RESPONSES TO QUESTION: "Did You Have Any Problems In Using Or Understanding The Material In The Library?", BY STUDY PERIODS	25

HIGHLIGHTS

- Rulings by the nation's judiciary have linked the right of access to the courts with the right to use legal materials and law libraries to assist in the preparation of petitions. As a result of these rulings, the California Youth Authority, in early 1975, established law libraries in its ten major residential facilities for use of both wards and staff.

- During a seventeen-month period, approximately six percent of the total resident population at the ten major California Youth Authority facilities used the law libraries.

- Various factors within the different facilities appear to influence law library usage. These factors include staff attitude, physical facilities, accessibility beyond regular school hours, and assistance from law students.

- To a considerable degree, wards are not getting the needed assistance in learning how to effectively use and interpret legal material and law library resources.

- As expressed by the majority of librarians and ward aides, the law library personnel need more training in general legal research, as well as help in dealing with specific legal problem areas.

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1960's, the legal right of incarcerated individuals to have access to the courts for presenting their complaints has been consistently affirmed by the nation's judiciary. Rulings have linked the right of access to the courts with the right to use legal materials and law libraries to assist in the preparation of petitions.¹ As a result of these rulings, the California Youth Authority, in early 1975, established law libraries in all of its major resident facilities for the use of both wards and staff.²

The California Youth Authority's policy stipulates that law libraries be established and maintained in all institutions, except youth conservation camps, for ward use. A coordinator for each institution is to be accountable for implementation of its law library program. Law libraries are to be kept open to wards a minimum of 30 hours a week during times when wards can realistically gain ready access to them. Each institution must provide wards ready access to law library resources, including wards in lockup or those otherwise unable to go to the law library. An appropriate number of wards must be trained

¹ See Johnson vs. Avery, 393 U.S. 483 (1969) and Mounger vs. Gilman, 404 U.S. 15 (1971).

² The ten resident facilities are as follows: Northern Reception Center and Clinic (NRCC), Southern Reception Center and Clinic (SRCC), O. H. Close School, Karl Holton School, DeWitt Nelson Training Center, Preston School of Industry, Youth Training School (YTS), Ventura School, El Paso de Robles School, and Fred C. Nelles School.

in law research to assist other wards in the use of law library resources. These trained aides, however, do not preclude the use of "untrained" wards to assist others in use of the law library resources.

Managerial procedures for each law library are determined at the local institutional level. Specific scheduling of hours when a law library is available for ward visits varies from library to library. In general, a ward wishing to visit a law library makes an appointment either through a staff member on his living unit or through one of the education staff. Allowances are also made for "walk-in-traffic" in some instances.

Law library users are encouraged to utilize available legal materials and are given help if needed. Personal assistance is offered by either the staff librarian or an assigned law library ward aide.

Because of the pioneering nature of this program which provides youthful offenders with access to legal materials and information, the California Youth Authority's Division of Research in cooperation with the Parole and Institutions Branch undertook a comprehensive evaluation beginning in February, 1975. An interim report, Law Libraries in the California Youth Authority - The Right To Legal Assistance, was issued in September, 1975. It covered the first six months of the study. This second and concluding report deals primarily with data from August, 1975, through June, 1976, with some references dating from February, 1975.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The overall goal of this evaluation is to provide information about the effectiveness of law libraries within the California Youth Authority's institutions and to furnish data useful to administrators in supervising present operations and planning for future needs.

Specifically, the evaluation is addressed to four basic objectives. These are:

- 1) To determine the extent to which wards utilize the law libraries.
- 2) To determine the reasons for wards using the law libraries.
- 3) To determine the extent to which wards are getting the needed assistance when using the law libraries.
- 4) To determine the adequacy of the training given law library personnel.

STUDY METHOD

To obtain data relative to these objectives, the following tasks were undertaken:

- 1) An information system was implemented whereby library personnel report monthly on the number of visits made by wards, length of visit, and if assistance was provided. A second form asks library personnel to note the general topic area of ward requests. Refer to Appendix A.
- 2) Structured interviews were conducted by Division of Research staff at all institutions having a law library with a sample of randomly selected wards. During April-May, 1975, 153 ward interviews were completed, which represents approximately 18 percent of the total individuals who used the law libraries from the program's inception through the end of May. During January-February, 1976, 53 additional randomly-selected ward interviews were completed which represents approximately 13 percent of the total number of law library users during these two months.
- 3) Structured interviews were conducted by Research Staff with available supervising law librarians as well as law library ward aides during two separate time periods - first during May-June, 1975, and second during January-February, 1976.
- 4) Additional data were also collected regarding the law libraries as wards were interviewed about the Ward Grievance Procedure. A sample of 349 wards were interviewed during the six-month period, March through July, 1975, at the Youth Training School, O. H. Close School, and El Paso de Robles School. Finally, a total of 578 wards were interviewed at three institutions, the Youth Training School, Preston School of Industry, and O. H. Close School from August through November, 1975.

FINDINGS

OBJECTIVE ONE: Determine the extent to which wards utilize the law libraries.

There are two major areas of concern regarding wards' utilization of the law libraries within the ten major CYA facilities. Part I, Law Library Usage, pertains to the extent to which wards made use of the law libraries. Part II, Law Library Accessibility, pertains to ward appraisals - including those of, both law library users as well as potential users, and law library personnel - with regard to accessibility of the law libraries.

Part I - Law Library Usage. In the seventeen-month period covered by this study, an overall monthly average of law library users was 6.36 wards per 100 residents at the various institutions.³ As shown in Table 1, there was a gradual overall increase of law library users, although usage varied considerably from month to month as well as among the ten facilities.⁴ (See Appendix I and J). As seen in Table 1, for seven of the ten institutions usage

³ Computational adjustments were made for those facilities which submitted less than the 17 possible monthly law library reports to Research staff. For example, O. H. Close School submitted only 10 of the 17 monthly reports. Therefore, its overall monthly average was computed only on those 10 report-months.

⁴ The data in Table 1 are based upon reported library visits to Research staff and entail computing the ratio of individuals using the law libraries each month to the total monthly resident population of the ten CYA institutions. These figures cite the number of individual law library users in relation to each 100 resident wards.

during the last five months increased compared to the preceeding twelve months.⁵ In some cases the reasons for this upswing are relatively clear. For example, the increase in usage at Karl Holton School and DeWitt Nelson Training Center may very likely be attributed to each institution now having its own law library rather than sharing a mobile law library among those three institutions at the Northern California Youth Center (NCYC) as had been the case during the earlier reporting periods. Karl Holton, DeWitt Nelson, and O. H. Close schools established their law libraries in February, 1976.

TABLE 1

LAW LIBRARY USE PER 100 WARDS
FEBRUARY, 1975 - JUNE, 1976

Institution	Total 17 Months Feb. 1975 - Jan. 1976	1st 6 Months Feb. 1975 - Jul. 1975	2nd 6 Months Aug. 1975 - Jan. 1976	3rd 6 Months Feb. 1976 - Jun. 1976
TOTAL	6.36	5.4	5.4	6.1
NRCC	5.48	11.3	4.3	*
SRCC	5.25	5.7	4.1	6.1
O. H. Close	0.54	0.6	0.1	*
Karl Holton	3.53	1.3	2.6	7.6
DeWitt Nelson	3.65	2.3	3.4	5.7
Preston	7.06	5.2	6.6	9.9
YTS	6.55	4.1	3.3	6.7
Ventura	14.18	11.8	16.5	16.1
El Paso de Robles .	4.70	2.0	3.6	5.9
Fred C. Nelles	9.61	7.2	10.6	7.5

*No reports submitted.

⁵ This increase of users may have been even more pronounced except that two institutions, O. H. Close School and Northern California Reception Center and Clinic, did not submit reports during the last five months.

In comparison to the increases reported for two of the three institutions which comprise the Northern California Youth Center, relatively little law library usage was apparent for the third institution, O. H. Close School. (Although no reports were submitted for the last five months, a check with the school librarian substantiated no change in law usage from earlier months). This result may be related to the fact that as late as July, 1976, many law books had not yet been placed on shelves and some were still in the original shipping boxes. O. H. Close law library usage is likely to increase substantially if legal resources become more accessible and integrated into the total school program.

A possible assumption could be that the minimal use of the law library by O. H. Close wards is because of the youthful and immature characteristics of its population. But, as of June, 1976, the mean age at Nelles was 16.5 years compared to 16.8 years at O. H. Close; and Nelles has more than ten times the law library usage than does O. H. Close. The difference between O. H. Close and Nelles seems to be an aggressive policy at the latter school of integrating the law library into the school curriculum, as well as a more positive attitude by staff, a good physical plant, and an attempt to make the facility accessible for more hours than at O. H. Close.

Ventura School reported the most widespread overall use of a law library during the seventeen-month evaluation period, with a monthly average of 14.2 users for every 100 residents, climbing from 11.8 users per 100 during the first six months to more than sixteen per 100 during the last eleven months. The high level of usage may well be related to the type of older wards assigned to this co-ed school (for example, excluded are many wards with relatively severe behavior problems) and its emphasis on academics, including a community

college program.

Table 1 shows that the Northern Reception Center and Clinic (NRCC) had a considerable drop in law library users during the February-July, 1975, period compared to the August, 1975-January, 1976, period. NRCC had a monthly average of 11.3 law library users per 100 residents during the first six months of record keeping, including the summer months when law students from a local law school were hired to assist wards with use of the law library and related legal questions. During the period when the law students were hired, the monthly average per 100 residents rose considerably (June, 13.2 percent; July, 24.6 percent; and August, 21.1 percent). (See Appendices I and J.)

In summation of the data posted in Table 1, it has been observed that there has been considerable variation in the rate of law library users among the ten major CYA facilities. Age alone does not appear to correlate well with level of usage. For example, institutions with a relatively older and more sophisticated population, such as DeWitt Nelson Training Center, Karl Holton School, Youth Training School, and Preston School of Industry, have not had a relatively high level of usage of their law libraries as has the Fred C. Nelles School with its relatively younger and less sophisticated population.⁶

Various factors within the different institutions, rather than age or sophistication do appear to influence law library usage. Possibly because the

⁶ The present study does not include a detailed analysis of the relationship between age and law library usage involving comparisons within facilities. It is possible, of course, that there is no correlation between age and usage across institutions but some correlation within one or more of the facilities.

Southern Reception Center and Clinic has a comparatively short term program, its population also makes minimal use of its law library and materials. On the other hand Nelles, with its relatively high rate of usage, as stated previously, has integrated its law library into the school curriculum, its staff has a positive attitude, its physical facilities are good, and it is accessible beyond regular school hours. Another contributing factor for increased law library usage was the hiring of law students to assist wards at NRCC with use of legal materials and related questions. Despite variances among the ten facilities, the overall trend has been toward increased use of the law libraries during this seventeen-month study.

Table 2 shows the number and proportions of individual ward visits to law libraries at the ten Youth Authority facilities over the three study periods under consideration. In the entire seventeen-month period covered by the study, a total of 6,252 ward visits were reported by the law libraries. As with individuals, the number of visits differed widely among the ten locations, ranging from 1,628 at Ventura School to 30 at O. H. Close School.

For the total facilities, there was a gradual increase of law library contacts. These visits, however, varied considerably from period to period at the different facilities. Thus, while the final five-month period shows an increase in visits compared to the two previous six-month periods, this reflects substantial increases at only five of the ten facilities: Karl Holton School, DeWitt Nelson Training Center, Preston School of Industry, Youth Training School, and El Paso de Robles School.

TABLE 2
WARD VISITS TO LAW LIBRARIES AT YOUTH AUTHORITY INSTITUTIONS
FEBRUARY, 1975 - JUNE, 1976

Institution	Total		Feb. - Jul. 1975		Aug. - Jan. 1976		Feb. - Jun. 1976	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	6523	100.0	2026	31.1	2113	32.4	2384	36.6
NRCC	418	100.0	319	76.3	99	23.7	*	*
SRCC	457	100.0	186	40.7	146	32.0	125	27.4
O. H. Close	30	100.0	21	70.0	9	30.0	*	*
Karl Holton	364	100.0	36	9.9	88	24.2	240	65.9
DeWitt Nelson	334	100.0	76	22.8	99	29.6	159	47.6
Preston	726	100.0	206	28.4	216	29.8	304	41.9
YTS	1146	100.0	324	28.3	264	23.0	558	48.7
Ventura	1628	100.0	507	31.1	588	36.1	533	32.7
El Paso de Robles	296	100.0	40	13.5	103	34.8	153	51.7
Fred C. Nellies	1124	100.0	311	27.7	501	44.6	312	27.8

*No report received.

Table 3 features the number of different wards who visited the law libraries, as well as the percentage of multiple visits by individual wards for each of the three study periods. Of the 4,030 individuals who visited the law libraries over the entire 17-month period, 27.5 percent made more than one visit during the same month. This seems consistent with the fact that legal research is relatively time consuming and complicated; thus more than one visit would be needed to satisfactorily deal with an issue. As noted in Table 3, visits by individuals increased from 1,214 during the period from February-June, 1975, to 1,443 visits by individuals during the five months of February-June, 1976.

Multiple visits to the law library at the Youth Training School dropped from 31.6 percent during the first six-month period of the study to 2.5 percent during the final five-month period. This may be attributable to several changes that took place at YTS during this period. The institution-wide "Phase Program" had begun assigning wards to different programs with varied demands placed on them depending upon their program placement. For example, wards assigned to Phase A had a minimum of demands required, hence they received a minimum of rewards. Those wards assigned to other "Phases" had a higher degree of program participation; hence higher rewards. This may have contributed to not only whom, but when, library visits could be made. Also a change in library program, as well as changing physical setting all could have discouraged wards from making multiple law library visits during the final five months of this study.

TABLE 3
LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS
FEBRUARY, 1975 - JUNE, 1976

Institution	Total		February 1975 - July 1975		August 1975 - January 1976		February 1976 - June 1976	
	Number of Individual Users	Multiple Visits Percent	Number of Individual Users	Multiple Visits Percent	Number of Individual Users	Multiple Visits Percent	Number of Individual Users	Multiple Visits Percent
TOTAL	4030	27.5	1214	29.7	1373	24.7	1443	28.5
NRCC	264	30.6	191	38.7	73	12.3	*	*
SRCC	308	37.3	121	30.6	87	33.3	100	13.0
O. H. Close	15	40.0	12	33.3	3	66.7	*	*
Karl Holton	240	20.8	30	20.0	60	28.3	150	18.0
DeWitt Nelson	235	24.2	52	23.1	77	24.7	106	24.5
Preston	478	29.1	126	27.8	162	30.9	190	28.4
YTS	713	16.1	212	31.6	185	21.6	316	2.5
Ventura	988	28.5	269	34.6	397	22.9	322	30.4
El Paso de Robles ...	237	15.6	35	11.4	85	16.5	117	16.8
Fred C. Nettles	552	35.9	166	36.1	244	27.9	142	49.3

*No report received.

Part II - Law Library Accessibility. Central to the issue of wards' access to the law libraries is their knowledge that these libraries are available to them. During the six-month period, March through July, 1976, a sample of 349 wards at four institutions (Youth Training School, O. H. Close School, Karl Holton School, and El Paso de Robles School) were asked if they were aware that their schools had law libraries open for their use. Since this was several months after the opening of the law libraries, knowledge should have been fairly widespread among the wards, and in fact it was. Of the total, 82 percent knew of the law library existence, while only 18 percent did not. Of the group who were aware of the libraries, 74 percent had some idea regarding procedures for visiting the law library. However, only 40 percent of those who knew about the library though arranging a visit was at least relatively easy. Thirty percent saw gaining access to the library as difficult, and the rest didn't know.⁷

A second sample of wards (578) were interviewed from August through November, 1975, from three institutions (Youth Training School, O. H. Close School, and Preston School of Industry). Results of these interviews show almost no change in responses to the same questions asked of the first sample of wards. About 80 percent were aware that their school had a law library available for wards' use. This varied among the three institutions, with Preston School of Industry having the highest proportion of wards (97%) who stated that they were aware of the law library's existence. The Youth Training School was next with 82 percent of the respondents aware, trailed by O. H. Close with 67 per-

⁷ See Law Libraries in California Youth Authority, The Right to Legal Assistance, Interim Report, September, 1975, pp. 9 and 10.

cent knowing the law library was open.⁸ (See Appendix B.)

Wards were asked if they were aware of procedures for making law library visits. All of the 115 wards interviewed at Preston School of Industry had at least a fairly good idea of the procedures to be followed. This was less so at O. H. Close (74.4%) and at the Youth Training School (60.6%). (See Appendix B.) Overall, this is roughly comparable to the previous interviews which show 74 percent of the 294 respondents stating they have some idea of how to get to the law library.⁹

The final question, "In your opinion, how easy is it for wards to use the library?" was asked of 463 wards. Over 50 percent felt that it would be relatively easy to get to use the law libraries. However, responses did vary among institutions. Nearly 80 percent (77.4%) of the wards interviewed at Preston thought it either very easy or relatively easy for wards to use the law library, whereas 48.8 percent of those interviewed at O. H. Close felt that it was easy to use. Less than 40 percent of the respondents from YTS also thought it very easy or relatively easy for wards to get to use the law library. (See Appendix B.)

To summarize, an overwhelming majority of interviewed wards are aware that the law libraries are available. Also, a majority of wards are aware of the procedures involved in getting to use the law libraries. However, data also

⁸ Interestingly enough, wards' usage of the law library was lowest at O. H. Close School. It is not clear if the lack of knowledge regarding the existence of the law library contributed to minimal use.

⁹ Law Libraries in California Youth Authority, The Right to Legal Assistance, Interim Report, September, 1975, pp. 9-10.

show that more than 50 percent of the respondents from O. H. Close and YTS felt that it was difficult to arrange for use of the libraries.

The question, "How accessible is the law library?" was put to staff and wards working in the libraries themselves. Of the 33 respondents, 85 percent saw their facilities as being accessible (including 19 of the 24 aides and all 9 of the librarians interviewed). Only five ward aides (21%) saw the law libraries as less than being easily accessible.

Despite this generally favorable overall assessment by library personnel, further analysis of responses from all sources indicate that in some locations access to the law library may be limited by conditions peculiar to a specific institution. It is not unusual for the libraries to be open largely when the academic school is in operation. Teachers or staff supervising wards in vocational assignments may resist allowing wards to take time to go to the library. Likewise, wards in tightly restricted programs, such as detention units and/or protective custody units, are severely restricted in the use of law library facilities.

To further explore the issue of accessibility, users of law libraries and personnel working within them were asked how they thought staff reacted to wards' use of legal facilities. Such reactions - negative or positive - would do much to either hinder or facilitate accessibility. Among respondents, there was little consensus - with answers ranging from staff being supportive, to not knowing/not caring, to defensiveness/resentment. Those staff who were perceived as supportive were in the minority.

There was some consensus that staff support varies depending on the reasons for using the law libraries. Respondents indicated that concerns of wards

perceived as "legitimate" by staff elicit more support/cooperation than do "non-legitimate" concerns. The result is that some screening takes place, which has the effect of abridging a ward's right of full access to legal materials.

Library personnel at Preston School of Industry stated that their law library was quite accessible for wards, even more so than their regular library. Most wards do not have any problems getting away from work assignments and there are no time limits when using the law library. Wards have also been escorted from the lockup unit with a minimum of difficulties. However, it was reported that teachers were reluctant to allow wards to use the law library unless their assigned school work had been completed.

The law library at the Fred C. Nelles School is accessible to wards during school hours as well as weekends and two evenings during the week. An adjunct to the curriculum at Nelles is the scheduling of classes in the uses of libraries and law libraries in particular.

At the law library at the Youth Training Center, some basic problems were reported in providing adequate accessibility to all wards. One problem was lack of adequate space for a law library. At times this contributed to an excessive amount of noise for research. This is being remedied with some structural modifications. Another problem at YTS, as stated by several ward aides, is that wards in the restrictive program phase (as described previously in the study) may not be eligible to visit the law library because the instructor seemed hesitant to release them from class.

As stated previously in this study, the three institutions at the Northern California Youth Center no longer share a mobile law library, but each has its own legal materials. Karl Holton School has encouraged law library visits

by making such requests a priority item. DeWitt Training Center has an adequate law library facility, but wards from the forestry training units have difficulty in arranging library visits because of their relatively short program as well as scheduling problems. For much of their stay, they are working outside the institution during the day and thus are not able to visit the library, as do other wards confined to the institution.

The Northern Reception Center and Clinic has recently started classes in the use of the law library. A pilot project, consisting of a class of ten wards, was started to both train and educate them in the various attributes and functions of a law library. Plans are to continue this program with subsequent groups. In addition, volunteer law students from a local law school are resource people for wards but are not part of the law library staff. They work from the administrative office, and wards are recommended to them for assistance in legal matters, including research.

Although wards at Ventura School generally reported adequate accessibility to its law library, ward aides indicated that those from the Ventura Reception Center and Clinic had some difficulty in getting to the library. It has been reported to Research staff that this situation is being remedied.

IN SUMMARY, the extent of ward use of law libraries varies considerably at the different facilities. Usage appears to be related to the age and sophistication of the ward populations at the various facilities, although other factors also seem to be operating. For example, the high level of usage at Nelles School (which has a relatively youthful population) may be related to the extensive open hours maintained by its law library, as well as the library's integration with the school curriculum.

The question of wards' accessibility to the law library was also explored. Findings indicate that while most wards interviewed were aware of the law library's existence and a substantial number had some idea of the procedure to be followed in getting there, a substantial number thought it would be relatively difficult to actually do so. In contrast, personnel working in the library by-and-large saw it as accessible to potential users. Moreover, it was felt that in some cases, "screening" takes place based on judgements made by staff. According to law library users and personnel, however, staff do not generally support wards' right to use the law libraries.

OBJECTIVE TWO: Determine the reasons for wards using the law libraries.

To get some idea of why wards are using the law libraries, a sample of wards who visited the law library were questioned about their reasons for seeking legal assistance. The first sample of 153 users were interviewed in April and May, 1975, and the second sample of 53 were interviewed in January and February, 1976. Responses from these interviewed users are divided into six major categories, as seen in Table 4.

TABLE 4
REASONS GIVEN BY WARDS FOR USE OF LAW LIBRARIES,
BY STUDY PERIODS

Purposes	Total		1st Period April-May, 1975		2nd Period Jan.-Feb., 1976	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	206	100.0	153	100.0	53	100.0
Pre-Conviction Issues	89	43.2	70	45.7	19	35.8
Post-Conviction Issues	31	15.1	16	10.5	15	28.3
General Inter- est	31	15.1	24	15.7	7	13.2
YA Policies ...	25	12.1	17	11.1	8	15.1
Ward Grie- vances	4	1.9	2	1.3	2	3.8
Other	26	12.6	24	15.7	2	3.8

The most frequently mentioned reason for going to the law library concerned pre-conviction issues; 43.2 percent were in this category. Basically, this includes questions about the legality of the process leading up to commitment to the Youth Authority. To a lesser extent, two categories Post-

Conviction Issues and General Interest, each with 31 responses, followed. The Post-Conviction issues dealt primarily with treatment within the institution and procedures while the General Interest category was for those users who came to the law library to see what it contained. Closely associated with Post-Conviction issues was Youth Authority Policies. Table 4 shows that 12.1 percent of those interviewed used the law library seeking clarification of YA policies. The balance of the respondents (12.6%) gave diverse answers which did not fit into any single category.

Interestingly enough, as shown in Table 4, only four of 206 wards (1.9%) stated they were seeking any help with a grievance they had filed using the Ward Grievance Procedure.¹⁰ This is supported by interviews with wards who filed grievances. A bare minimum stated that they had used the law library while pursuing their grievance.

To further determine reasons for using the law library, the library personnel were interviewed and asked to give the most common reasons for which wards used the law library. Again, the most frequently stated reason was that wards wanted material relevant to the legal aspects surrounding their commitment offense. Mentioned with less frequency were matters related to filing writs, the Youth Authority's Disciplinary Decision Making System (D.D.M.S.), Youth Authority Board actions, and the Youth Authority's Administrative Manuals. Finally, there was some interest in materials related to divorce, custody of children, and various

¹⁰ The Ward Grievance Procedure was made official Youth Authority policy in all of its institutions and camps July 1, 1975. It is a formal grievance procedure assuring all wards of a hearing on most issues, excluding Board action and matters brought before the Department's Disciplinary Decision Making System (D.D.M.S.).

other civil matters.

IN SUMMARY, based on the information gathered thus far on reasons for using law libraries, it appears that most wards have a specific purpose for wanting to use legal materials and get legal assistance. One of the major reasons is to obtain information about the legal aspects of their commitment offenses. Other areas cover a wide variety of issues on legal matters, ranging from their personal life on the outside, such as outstanding warrants, divorce, custody of children, as well as matters within the Youth Authority, such as D.D.M.S. and Youth Authority policies, as well as Board actions.

OBJECTIVE THREE: Determine the extent to which wards are getting the needed assistance when using the law libraries.

Legal research is relatively complicated and it is unlikely that the average person without either considerable training or experience would be able to locate answers to specific questions. Therefore, an assessment was made of the extent to which wards are being provided with adequate assistance when using the law libraries. Each institution was requested to report not only the number of visits to the law library but also the number of cases where assistance was given by either the staff librarian or one of the ward aides. (See Appendix C.)

Most wards received assistance from either ward aides or the librarians during their visits. Procedures vary among the ten law libraries. Wards are allowed to personally use the legal material themselves in most of the libraries. However, in at least two facilities, procedures were in effect which did not allow for a ward's direct access to the legal material. For instance, at El Paso de Robles School, he worked with the librarian or aide who "researches" the questions raised and reports back. At NRCC a procedure was in effect where the visitor didn't see the legal material himself but received direct advice from a paraprofessional with access to the law library.

To determine the "adequacy" of the help, a sample of wards who had used the law libraries were asked a series of questions. One group consisting of 153 users, was interviewed in April and May, 1975, and a second group of 53 users was interviewed in January and February, 1976.

Responses to the first question, "Were you able to find the material that you wanted to find?" have been tabulated in Table 5. Of the 206 wards interviewed, 51 percent said yes, they were able to find the material. An additional 17.5

percent said they found at least part of the material they were seeking. However, 15 percent said they left without finding anything. An additional 16.5 percent of the respondents stated that they either didn't use the books or gave diversified answers. Though the sample size for the second group of respondents was relatively small compared to that of the first group, the data in Table 5 show an increase in wards being able to find the wanted material.

TABLE 5

WARDS' RESPONSES TO QUESTION: "Were You Able To Find The Material That You Wanted To Find?", BY STUDY PERIODS

Responses	Total		1st Period Apr.-May, 1975		2nd Period Jan.-Feb., 1976	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	206	100.0	153	100.0	53	100.0
Yes	105	51.0	72	47.1	33	62.3
Yes - Some, but not all ...	36	17.5	21	13.7	15	28.3
None	31	15.0	28	18.3	3	5.6
Didn't use books/other	34	16.5	32	20.9	2	3.8

A second question asked was, "Did you need help in using the library and if so, was the needed assistance provided?". Table 6 shows that respondents (84.5% of the total group) stated they needed assistance. Of those needing assistance, 80.5 percent felt the help which had been given was sufficient, while 19.5 percent felt that the help was not sufficient. "Sufficient" help referred primarily to locating the available legal material and getting cooperation from law library personnel. The data in Table 6 suggest that approxi-

TABLE 6

WARDS' RESPONSES TO QUESTION: "Did You Need Any Help In Using The Law Library And If So, Was The Needed Assistance Provided?", BY STUDY PERIODS

Responses	Total		1st Period Apr.-May, 1975		2nd Period Jan.-Feb., 1976	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	206	100.0	153	100.0	53	100.0
Not need help	32	15.5	22	14.4	10	18.9
Needed help	174	84.5	131	85.6	43	81.1
Needed help	174	100.0	131	100.0	43	100.0
Sufficient	140	80.5	104	79.4	36	83.7
Not sufficient	34	19.5	27	20.6	7	16.3

mately one out of every five law library users stating the need for help is receiving insufficient assistance. This does not necessarily imply that approximately 20 percent of the users needing help are not getting cooperation from law library personnel in locating legal material, but that either the relevant material is not available or that the library personnel lack the skills required in locating the material. Although there are indications of differences among institutions in terms of satisfaction with help given, comparisons are difficult because of the different numbers of wards interviewed at the various institutions.

Finally, as shown in Table 7, respondents who visited the law library were asked, "Did you have any problems in using or understanding the materials in the law library?". Of those 173 who used legal materials, 45.7 percent stated that they had no problems, while the remaining 54.3 percent expressed having had prob-

TABLE 7 .

WARDS' RESPONSES TO QUESTION: "Did You Have Any Problems In Using Or Understanding The Material In The Library?", BY STUDY PERIODS

Responses	Total		1st Period Apr.-May, 1975		2nd Period Jan.-Feb., 1976	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	206	100.0	153	100.0	53	100.0
Did not use material/ Other	33	16.0	30	19.6	3	5.7
Used material	173	84.0	123	80.4	50	94.3
Used material, problems ...	173	100.0	123	100.0	50	100.0
No-none	79	45.7	54	43.1	26	52.0
Yes-some	83	48.0	65	52.8	18	36.0
Yes-much	11	6.3	5	4.1	6	12.0

lems (48 percent - some problems and 6.3 percent - many problems). Thirty-three of the users made no use of the material.

Another point of interest, based upon the figures in Table 7, is that over 60 percent of the respondents either didn't attempt to use the legal material or had varying degrees of problems in using or understanding it. In fact, less than 40 percent of all those users who were interviewed stated that they had no problems either using or understanding the legal material, suggesting that appropriate steps be taken in narrowing the gap between accessibility of legal material and the understanding of its meaning, as well as the methods of using it.

In the interviews with library personnel, they were asked essentially the

same questions. A summary of the responses shows that they thought wards did have some problems in finding the material needed, such as the right book(s) or case. However, library personnel generally thought this to be less of a problem for wards than actually understanding the material once it was found. Many of the wards do not have reading capabilities commensurate with the material at hand. Some experienced difficulty with the legal vernacular or wording. Library personnel expressed major concerns with how to interpret the material and how it could be used or applied to a specific issue facing the ward. Library personnel also cited that a law student could explain legal material in generalities understandable in lay terms, but where and when the line was to be drawn between explanation and providing legal advice was unclear. There was almost universal agreement among the librarians and aides that these are substantial problems which limit the effectiveness of the law libraries.

This view is further supported by library personnel's responses to two additional questions. One relates to the kind of help wards seem to need when they come to the law library and the other pertained to the adequacy of the material available within the library.

The kind of help needed was generally seen as two types: first, finding material pertinent to the question asked and, second, giving assistance in understanding as well as knowing how to act on the information. There is considerable agreement that once appropriate material is located, there is often insufficient expertise to adequately use it and know how it applies to a particular problem. It was felt by library personnel that these judgements were difficult to make even for those who had considerable training in the study of law.

With reference to the adequacy of material in the law library, there was

an area of dispute. Most said that the legal material was adequate, but there were some reservations. Some felt that the materials were inadequate, while others agreed that the materials were adequate but inappropriate. (For example, the improbability of wards using law books related to federal tax laws, maritime laws, or foreign situations). Still others complained that needed material is missing - such as material dealing with military law.

IN SUMMARY, it appears that there are substantial problems in wards getting the needed assistance when using the libraries. To some extent this involves insufficiencies of the legal material now available in the law libraries. However, to a larger degree, the problem is that the librarian or aides do not have the necessary expertise to assist wards in interpreting and using legal materials and documents. These concerns pertaining to giving the needed assistance to wards by library personnel have yet to be resolved. Further effort is needed to more explicitly clarify not only what assistance can be provided but by whom.

OBJECTIVE FOUR: Determine the adequacy of training given to the law library personnel.

The librarians and ward aides were asked several questions on training. The first concerns the training they have received thus far. Most mentioned that their formal training was limited to attending either one or two of the training sessions sponsored by the Youth Authority and presented by a representative of West Publishing Company (suppliers of the books in the law libraries). A few librarians reported that, at their own initiative and expense, they had taken additional courses to augment this CYA-sponsored training. Generally, those interviewed felt that their training was very limited in scope, being just an introduction to legal research and not adequate to sufficiently prepare them for using the material in the libraries.

A second question on training was asked, "What kind of training is needed?". Most of those interviewed suggested the following two general, but related, areas: more training in how to use the material rather than doing legal research per se, and more on-going training to refresh skills as well as maintain awareness of new materials. Specifically, library personnel stated they need training in the following: preparing writs, filing appeals, and increasing skills of legal research.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The provision of law libraries for youthful offenders of the California Youth Authority appears to be meeting a real need. In the seventeen months under study, more than 6,500 visits were made to the law libraries by wards seeking help with legal questions. Thus, the number of visits made appears to be substantial, considering that law libraries have been in operation a relatively short period of time.

Nevertheless, the number of individuals using the law libraries is somewhat limited. On the average, only six in 100 wards made use of the facilities during any given month. This varied considerably among the ten institutions - ranging from an average of less than one ward per 100 at O. H. Close School to more than 14 wards per 100 at Ventura School.

Several factors appear to influence the degree to which the law libraries are used. Although the extent of usage does not appear to be related to the age range and sophistication of the facilities' ward populations, other factors appear to be operating. For example, at the Fred C. Nelles School, which has a relatively youthful population, there has been considerable use. This may be attributable to accessibility, integration with the school program, as well as the relatively spacious law library at Nelles. Additional factors associated with the extent of law library usage are: utilization of law students to assist wards in use of legal materials and related questions; integrating the law library into the school curriculum; having a viable community college program

as do Ventura and Karl Holton Schools: and the adequacy of help given to users.

3. The law libraries appear to be relatively accessible to wards at most institutions. However, based on ward perceptions, evidence suggests that some wards seeking to use legal materials are "screened" by staff to determine the legitimacy of their request. This may contribute to the not uncommon perception of wards that getting to the law library can be somewhat difficult. Accessibility is further limited for some wards because of their program assignments. If the law library is only open during school hours, students sometimes find teachers or trade instructors somewhat less than eager to release them from their school work to pursue a legal problem. Likewise, wards in protective custody or security units generally find usage difficult at best; many are not even aware of the possibility of using the law libraries.

3. It appears that most of the wards who visit the law libraries have a specific purpose for wanting to use the legal material. Reasons for using the libraries fall into three major categories: 1) pre-conviction issues, 2) post-conviction issues, and 3) civil matters. The most frequent reason for use concerns legal aspects of the wards' commitment offense - for example, questions about the legality of the process leading to their commitment to the Youth Authority. Other frequently stated reasons concern issues dealing with the Youth Authority's Disciplinary Decision Making System (D.D.M.S.), Youth Authority Board actions, Administrative decisions, and civil matters such as custody of children.

4. Getting needed assistance when using the law libraries appears to be a substantial problem for wards. In part, the problem pertains to the adequacy of the material now available in the law libraries. For example, some of the material may require updating, or additional materials may be needed in parti-

cular areas while less may be needed in others. However, the major problem is that many wards are not getting sufficient assistance from law library personnel to interpret legal material and, more significantly, to know how it could be applied to their specific case. Knowledge is lacking because staff are not trained to any extent in legal matters and because a relatively rapid population turnover does not enable wards to develop much legal expertise or to become "jailhouse" lawyers.

5. As expressed by the majority of librarians and ward aides, the training of law library personnel has not been adequate. The orientation sessions conducted by West Publishing Company have not, to any significant degree, set into motion a process by which those who follow are adequately trained by those who precede them. While it is not yet the "blind leading the blind", many personnel are concerned that they have no "expert" to turn to when a question arises. In relative isolation, each person does the best he can, hopes it is right, but is left with no real way of knowing.

APPENDIX A

TRANSMITTAL COVER FOR SIGN-IN SHEETS (Form LL-2)
AND REASONS FOR USING LAW LIBRARY (Form LL-3)

1. Name of institution _____
2. Person responsible for submitting reports:
 - a. Name _____
 - b. Title _____
 - c. Telephone No. _____
3. Date submitted: Mo. _____ Day _____ Yr. _____
4. Attachments:
 - a. Sign-in sheets (Form LL-2)
 - (1) Number of pages attached _____
 - b. Reasons for using law library (Form LL-3)
 - (1) Number of forms attached _____

Send to:

Law Library Evaluation Unit
2740 Arden Way, Suite 212
Sacramento, California 95825

INDIVIDUAL REASONS FOR USING LAW LIBRARY (Form LL-3)

NAME OF INSTITUTION: _____

Name of librarian or ward clerk _____

<u>Date</u> Mo./Day/Yr.	Describe nature of request:
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
11.	
12.	
13.	
14.	
15.	

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES FROM WARDS IN REGARD TO LAW LIBRARIES

Questions	Total		YTS		Preston		O.H.Close	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Do you know there is a ward law library here?								
TOTAL	578	100.0	260	100.0	119	100.0	199	100.0
Yes	261	79.8	213	81.9	115	96.6	133	66.8
No	117	20.2	47	18.1	4	3.4	66	33.2
If you want to go to the law library, how do you go about getting there?								
TOTAL	463	100.0	213	100.0	115	100.0	133	100.0
Has some idea	344	74.3	129	60.6	115	100.0	99	74.4
Don't know	115	24.8	82	38.5	0	0.0	33	24.8
No response	4	0.9	2	0.9	0	0.0	1	0.8
In your opinion, how easy is it for wards to get to use the law library?								
TOTAL	463	100.0	213	100.0	115	100.0	133	100.0
Very easy	110	23.8	41	19.2	48	41.7	21	15.8
Relatively easy ...	127	27.4	42	19.7	41	35.7	44	33.0
Fairly difficult ..	49	10.6	28	13.1	11	9.6	10	7.5
Difficult	42	9.1	24	11.3	11	9.6	7	5.3
Don't know	122	26.3	67	31.5	4	3.4	50	37.6
No response	13	2.8	11	5.2	0	0.0	1	0.8

APPENDIX C

LAW LIBRARY VISITS
FEBRUARY - JULY, 1975

Institution	Total		February		March		April		May		June		July	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL	2026	100.0	306	15.1	356	17.6	338	16.7	363	17.9	294	14.5	369	18.2
NRCC	319	100.0	20	6.3	32	10.0	38	12.0	16	5.0	77	24.1	136	42.6
SRCC	186	100.0	33	17.8	34	18.3	30	16.1	42	22.6	22	11.8	25	13.4
O.H. Close	21	100.0	9	42.9	0	0.0	3	14.3	0	0.0	9	42.8	*	*
Karl Holton	36	100.0	0	0.0	2	5.6	4	11.1	7	19.4	15	41.7	8	22.2
DeWitt Nelson ...	76	100.0	15	19.8	9	11.8	9	11.8	4	5.3	21	27.6	18	23.7
Preston	206	100.0	16	7.8	29	14.1	34	16.5	18	8.7	29	14.1	80	38.8
YTS	324	100.0	34	10.5	102	31.5	37	11.4	69	21.3	48	14.8	34	10.5
El Paso de Robles	40	100.0	35	87.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	5	12.5
Fred C. Nelles ..	311	100.0	69	22.3	58**	18.6	86	27.7	98	31.5	*	*	*	*

*No report received. At El Paso de Robles, Library closed during months of April, May, and June.

**Fred C. Nelles Library closed part of June for training of ward clerks.

APPENDIX D

LAW LIBRARY VISITS
AUGUST, 1975 - JANUARY, 1976

Institution	Total		August		September		October		November		December		January	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL	2113	100.0	279	13.2	255	12.1	381	18.0	401	19.0	395	18.7	402	19.0
NRCC	99	100.0	80	80.8	15	15.2	4	4.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
SRCC	146	100.0	21	14.4	2	1.4	13	8.9	40	27.4	26	17.8	44	30.1
O. H. Close	9	100.0	*	*	6	66.7	2	22.2	*	*	*	*	1	11.1
Karl Holton	88	100.0	*	*	*	*	24	27.3	31	35.2	25	28.4	8	9.1
DeWitt Nelson ..	99	100.0	19	19.2	13	13.1	14	14.1	29	29.3	19	19.2	5	5.1
Preston	216	100.0	49	22.7	17	7.9	45	20.8	44	20.4	22	10.2	39	18.0
YTS	264	100.0	6	2.3	38	14.4	30	11.4	41	15.5	59	22.3	90	34.1
Ventura	588	100.0	94	16.0	52	8.8	84	14.3	114	19.4	130	22.1	114	19.4
El Paso de Robles	103	100.0	10	9.7	12	11.6	41	39.8	11	10.7	25	24.3	4	3.9
Fred C. Nelles .	501	100.0	*	*	100	20.0	124	24.6	91	18.2	89	17.8	97	19.4

*No report received.

APPENDIX E

LAW LIBRARY VISITS
FEBRUARY, 1976 - JUNE, 1976

Institution	Total		February		March		April		May		June	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL	2384	100.0	336	14.09	562	23.57	573	24.04	416	17.45	497	20.85
NRCC	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SRCC	125	100.0	20	16.00	37	29.60	21	16.80	23	18.40	24	19.20
O. H. Close	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Karl Holton	240	100.0	47	19.58	35	14.58	67	27.92	43	17.92	48	20.00
DeWitt Nelson ..	159	100.0	31	19.50	48	30.19	22	13.84	38	23.90	20	12.58
Preston	304	100.0	37	12.17	57	18.75	83	27.30	81	26.64	46	15.13
YTS	558	100.0	35	6.27	113	20.25	157	28.14	107	19.18	146	26.16
Ventura	533	100.0	77	14.45	155	29.08	107	20.08	56	10.51	138	25.89
El Paso de Robles	153	100.0	13	8.50	39	25.49	46	30.07	21	13.73	34	22.22
Fred C. Nelles .	312	100.0	76	24.36	78	25.00	70	22.44	47	15.06	41	13.14

*No report received.

APPENDIX F

LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS
FEBRUARY - JULY, 1975

Institution	Total		February		March		April		May		June		July	
	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)
TOTAL	1214	29.7	218	22.9	207	33.3	206	29.1	205	31.2	169	26.0	209	36.4
NRCC	191	38.7	16	25.0	24	29.2	30	16.7	14	7.1	36	58.3	71	50.1
SRCC	121	30.6	20	30.0	25	24.0	24	20.8	26	30.8	13	46.1	13	46.1
O. H. Close	12	33.3	5	60.0	0	0.0	3	0.0	0	0.0	4	25.0	0	0.0
Karl Holton	30	20.0	0	0.0	2	0.0	3	33.3	5	20.0	14	14.3	6	33.3
DeMitt Nelson	52	23.1	12	16.7	8	12.5	6	33.3	3	33.3	10	30.0	13	23.1
Preston	126	27.8	13	23.1	20	25.0	20	25.0	14	28.6	23	26.1	36	33.3
YTS	212	31.6	26	30.8	54	37.0	31	21.9	41	35.6	34	26.5	26	30.8
Ventura	269	34.6	58	13.8	44	40.9	40	37.5	53	35.8	35	40.0	39	38.5
El Paso de Robles ...	35	11.4	30	13.3	**	**	0	0.0	**	**	**	**	5	0.0
Fred C. Nelles	166	36.1	38	36.8	30	40.0	49	38.8	49	30.6	0	0.0	0	0.0

*Percentage using two or more times.

**No report received.

APPENDIX G

LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS
AUGUST, 1975 - JANUARY, 1976

Institution	Total		August		September		October		November		December		January	
	Users	Multiple Visits* (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)
TOTAL	1374	24.7	207	18.4	177	26.0	256	20.3	255	23.9	232	32.8	247	27.1
NRCC	73	12.3	59	13.6	10	10.0	4	0.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
SRCC	87	33.3	13	38.5	2	0.0	11	18.2	17	35.3	18	27.8	26	42.3
O. H. Close	3	66.7	*	*	1	100.0	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.0
Karl Holton	60	28.3	*	*	*	*	14	28.6	23	30.4	15	40.0	8	0.0
DeWitt Nelson	77	24.7	15	20.0	10	30.0	10	40.0	18	22.2	19	26.7	5	0.0
Preston	162	30.9	35	25.7	24	41.7	31	25.8	26	38.5	19	15.8	27	37.0
YTS	185	21.6	5	20.0	28	14.3	20	15.0	32	9.4	46	28.2	54	29.0
Ventura	397	22.9	71	15.5	40	17.5	58	17.2	82	23.2	61	47.5	85	17.7
El Paso de Robles ...	85	16.5	9	11.1	11	9.1	28	32.1	11	9.1	22	9.1	5	20.0
Fred C. Nelles	244	27.9	*	*	51	37.3	79	13.9	46	23.9	32	40.6	36	38.9

*No report received.

APPENDIX H

LAW LIBRARY USE BY INDIVIDUALS
FEBRUARY, 1976 - JUNE, 1976

Institution	Total		February		March		April		May		June	
	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)	Users	Multiple Visits (%)
TOTAL	1443	28.5	175	40.57	264	32.95	257	28.40	213	19.72	218	25.23
NRCC	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SRCC	100	13.00	15	26.67	22	18.18	20	5.00	21	9.52	22	9.04
O. H. Close	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Karl Holton	150	18.00	18	22.22	25	24.00	39	20.77	35	14.29	36	21.21
DeWitt Nelson	106	24.53	19	42.11	22	40.91	16	25.00	33	9.29	16	12.50
Preston	190	28.42	26	19.23	40	25.00	46	34.78	43	37.21	35	20.00
YTS	316	2.50	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ventura	322	30.43	53	30.19	79	32.91	68	30.88	39	23.90	83	31.33
El Paso de Robles ..	117	16.80	9	33.33	32	15.63	35	20.00	19	10.53	22	22.75
Fred C. Nelles	142	44.30	35	42.86	44	61.36	33	36.36	23	43.48	7	85.71

*No report received.

APPENDIX I

LAW LIBRARY USE PER 100 WARDS
FEBRUARY - JULY, 1975

Institution	Average Use Feb. - July	February	March	April	May	June	July
TOTAL	5.4	5.4	5.0	5.0	5.9	4.8	6.1
NRCC	11.3	5.6	8.4	10.8	5.2	13.2	24.6
SRCC	5.7	5.9	6.8	6.6	7.6	3.8	3.7
O. H. Close	0.6	1.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.2	0.0
Karl Holton	1.3	0.0	0.5	0.7	1.3	3.6	1.5
DeWitt Nelson	2.3	3.2	2.0	1.5	0.8	2.6	3.5
Preston	5.2	3.2	4.9	5.1	3.4	5.6	9.0
YTS	4.1	3.2	6.2	3.5	4.7	3.9	2.9
Ventura	11.8	13.9	11.7	10.8	13.9	9.2	11.1
El Paso de Robles	2.0	10.4	*	*	*	*	1.5
Fred C. Nelles	7.2	10.0	7.7	12.6	12.6	*	*

*No report received.

APPENDIX J

LAW LIBRARY USE PER 100 WARDS
AUGUST, 1975 - JANUARY, 1976

Institution	Average Use Aug. - Jan.	August	Septmeber	October	November	December	January
TOTAL	5.4	4.8	4.1	6.6	5.9	5.4	5.8
NRCC	4.3	21.1	3.7	1.4	*	*	*
SRCC	4.1	3.6	0.6	3.0	4.8	5.1	7.5
O. H. Close	0.1	-	0.3	0.3	*	*	0.3
Karl Holton	2.6	-	-	5.0	6.0	4.0	2.1
DeWitt Nelson	3.4	4.0	2.7	2.8	4.7	5.0	1.4
Preston	6.6	8.5	5.3	7.8	6.6	4.7	6.8
YTS	3.3	0.6	3.1	2.2	3.4	4.8	5.6
Ventura	16.5	17.0	10.1	14.6	20.4	15.2	21.5

*No report received.

END

7 11 11 11 11