

EVALUATION REPORT

**AB 3121 IMPACT EVALUATION
ATTENTION HOME
PROGRAM EVALUATION**

46589



RESEARCH UNIT • PROBATION DEPARTMENT

AB 3121 IMPACT EVALUATION
ATTENTION HOME PROGRAM EVALUATION

NCJRS

APR 20 1978

~~APR 20 1978~~

APR 20 1978

by

Research and Evaluative Services Unit

James Rowland
Chief Probation Officer

Don Hogner
Assistant Chief Probation Officer
January, 1978

NCJRS

APR 02 1978

ACQUINTANCES

PROJECT STAFF

Donn Beedle Supervisor
Marilyn Watts Research Psychologist
Kathleen McCormick Research Assistant
Doris Briscoe Secretary

ABSTRACT

Assembly Bill 3121, which became effective on January 1, 1977, resulted in a decided change in the juvenile justice process. This evaluation was an attempt to measure some of the impact.

Baseline data was information collected on all juveniles referred to juvenile hall intake for the preceeding twelve months prior to the date on which Fresno County implemented the new law (December 1, 1976).

The data on the population effected by the new law (current study population) was collected on all juveniles referred for the ten months (December 1, 1976 thru September 30, 1977) immediately proceeding the new law.

Gross population comparisons showed the following:

- A reduction of about 15 percent in the overall referral rate.
- An increase of 13 percent in the 602 population.
- A decrease of 54 percent in the 601 population.
- An increase of 24 percent in charges involving alcohol.

- A projected decline of four percent in the juvenile hall population.

Characteristics of detained 601 population pre and post AB 3121 showed the following:

- Attention home population was 50 percent of the juvenile hall population in the baseline data.
- Proportionally, the female population in the current study group increased by 12 percent over the baseline detained population.
- The Caucasian population in the attention homes proportionally increased by seven percent in the attention home population over the detained baseline population.

Comparisons made between runaway and non-run populations indicated the following:

- Females ran away more frequently than males.
- Fourteen year olds accounted for a greater percentage of runaways than they represented.
- The runaway population tended to have arrest histories more heavily weighted with 601 charges than the non-run population.

Two characteristics noted of AWOLs were:

- Twenty-one percent of the runaway population

took off within the first five hours of placement.

- Twenty-eight percent of the runaway population ran off two or more times.

Follow-up studies indicated the following:

- Twenty-four percent of the attention home population had 602 charges brought against them within five months follow-up period.

To the question as to what kind of offender was handled as a status offender, we found 21 percent of the 601 population had severity ratings of 5 points when the average of the population was 2.6 points.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project could not have been accomplished without the contributions made by the Director of Juvenile Hall, Linzie Daniel, and his staff. Research wishes to commend Mr. Daniel on his ability to anticipate problems inherent in evaluations: Such as this, and of equal importance, on his accommodation to our needs as they arose.

Special mention has to be made of the many extra hours of work put in by Nancy Upton, Secretary, in facilitating data collection; John Kubo, Assistant Superintendent of Juvenile Hall, for always being available when Research needed a clearer understanding of the technical systems involved in the operation. Finally, we wish to recognize the extra work Research caused line staff by pulling records and disrupting files over a five month period. To all of these persons, Research says, "Thanks."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
INTRODUCTION	1
FRESNO COUNTY D.S.O. PROGRAM	3
EVALUATION OF D.S.O. PROGRAM	5
Evaluation Objectives	5
METHODOLOGY AND DATA NEEDS	7
Areas of Study	8
Objective 1	8
Objective 2	9
Objective 3	10
Objective 4	11
PRESENTATION OF DATA COLLECTED	12
Baseline Data	12
Intake Dispositions of 601 Baseline Data . .	18
Data Covering Current Study Period	18
Current Study 601 Population Dispositions	21
Evaluation Objective 1: Comparisons Between Baseline and Current Study Data	23

	Page
Gross Population Comparisons	23
Juvenile Hall Population Comparisons	23
Comparison of Sex Composition of 601 Population for Baseline with Current Study Periods	24
Disposition Comparisons	25
Evaluation Objective 2: The Scope of the Utilization of Community Based Services	26
Services Associated with Deinstitutionalization	26
What Kind and How Many?	26
Overview of Community Services	28
Status Offenders Served by Agencies	30
Accessibility of Services	30
Limitations In Community Based Services	33
Criteria for Acceptance	34
Summary of Community Based Services Provided	35
Evaluation Objective 3: Characteristics of Detained 601 Population Pre and Post AB 3121.	36
Some Demographic Characteristics	36
Offenses Compared	39
Time In Detention Compared	39
Time In Before Going AWOL	42
Frequency of AWOL	42
Comparisons Between Runaway and Non-Run Populations	45

Some Demographic Characteristics	45
Prior Delinquency of Non-Run and Runaway Populations	47
Subsequent Offenses of Non-Run and Runaway Populations Compared	48
Summary of Characteristics Associated with Attention Home Clients	50
Baseline Detained 601 Population Compared With Study Group Attention Home Population	50
Characteristics of AWOLs	51
Comparisons Between Runaway and Non-Run Populations	51
Evaluation Objective 4: Impact of Program on Juvenile Behavior, Juvenile Justice Staff and Budget	52
Behavior Analysis of Attention Home Residents	52
Incidence of Runaway	52
Offending Prior and Subsequent Attention Home Placement	55
Severity Rating of Prior Histories of Attention Home Clients	56
Decision to Handle Status Offenders by Offense of Record	59
Prior Offenses Related to Subsequent Offenses	60
Probable Error in Handling 601 Charges as Status Offenders	62
Conclusions	62
Opinion Survey of Parents	62

Summary of Findings in Parent Survey 64

Attitude Survey of Juvenile Justice Staff 65

Cost Comparisons 67

 Questions to be Answered 69

Summary of Findings of Juvenile Behavior 72

APPENDIX SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES 74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total Cases Referred to Juvenile Hall Baseline Data (Dec. '75 through Nov. '76)	13
2. Total Cases Referred to Juvenile Hall 1970 - 1975	14
3. 601 Population by Male and Female for Years 1970 Through 1975	16
4. Number of Offenders Charged with Drunk and/or Possession of Alcohol 1970 Through 1975	17
5. Dispositions made on 601 Baseline Population	19
6. Current Study Population (December 1976 Through September 1977)	20
7. Alcohol Related Charges in Current Study Groups	21
8. Sex Breakdown of 601 Current Study Population . . .	21
9. Dispositions Made on 601 Current Study Population	22
10. Age Distribution of Baseline and Current Study Groups	37
11. Sex Distribution of Baseline and Current Study Populations	38
12. Ethnic Background Distribution Between Baseline Population and Current Study Population	38
13. Offense Distributions of Baseline Population and Current Study Population	40

Table	Page
14. Distribution of Time In Detention	41
15. Distribution of Time In Before Going AWOL	43
16. Frequency Distribution of Runaways	44
17. Age Distribution of Non-Run and Runaway Populations	46
18. Sex Percentages of Non-Run and Runaway Populations	46
19. Ethnic Background of Non-Run and Runaway Populations	47
20. Arrest Histories of Non-Run and Runaway Populations	48
21. Subsequent Charges of Non-Run and Runaway Populations	49
22. Runaway Frequency by Sex	54
23. Change of Offending Prior and Subsequent to Placement	55
24. Severity Rating of Prior Delinquencies	58
25. Frequency of Juveniles with 602 Priors	59
26. Prior Offending Related to Subsequent Offending . .	61

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. The Extent of Community Based Services	29
2. Comparison of Child Care Maintenance Rate	70
3. Budget Items and Funding Source for Three Attention Homes	71

INTRODUCTION

In January 1976, James Rowland, Chief Probation Officer of Fresno County, sent a letter to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (O.C.J.P.) which outlined the commitment of the Probation Department, Juvenile Court, citizen commissions, and several public and private organizations in Fresno County to the principle that status offenders should not be institutionalized with delinquent young people in either detention or treatment facilities. The letter went on to propose the establishment of "Attention Homes" for status offenders as one facet of the process of deinstitutionalizing 601 offenders in Fresno County.

Following this letter, Linnie L. Daniel, Director of Juvenile Hall, worked out in detail and submitted the standard O.C.J.P. application for a grant to fund the Community Attention Homes Project.

In May 1976, the County Board of Supervisors signed a resolution agreeing to the terms and conditions of the project and steps were made to implement the program under the direction of Linnie L. Daniel, Director of Juvenile Hall.

The grant application listed three main program objectives:

1. To deinstitutionalize the status offender by providing a non-secure environment which would not be available without funding assistance.
2. To provide immediate counseling services which will reduce the amount of time spent in custodial care by the target population.
3. To provide follow-up services which will reduce the recidivism rate of the status offender.

FRESNO COUNTY D.S.O. PROGRAM

To fulfill the objectives listed in the grant application, two non-secure residential attention homes were established each with a six-bed capacity to receive juveniles from the target population. These were juveniles who were alleged to have committed acts as defined in Section 601 of the California Welfare and Institutions Code and would have, prior to the establishment of the attention homes, been confined in the Fresno County Juvenile Hall.

Contracts were made with community based agencies to provide crisis intervention, counseling and medical services. Arrangements were made with the Fresno Unified School District to accept juveniles into public schools out of the district of residence. Juvenile hall counselors were trained to arrange for and encourage clients to maintain wholesome community relationships, such as attending religious services and social activities. On top of all of this, transportation was provided for juveniles who had activities or appointments away from the attention home.

The first home was in operation in December 1976 and

four juvenile status offenders were transferred out of the juvenile hall to the home. At the present time there are three attention homes, each with a six-bed capacity, in operation along with an additional home operating under the E.O.C. Program with a ten-bed capacity making a total bed capacity of 28. Two of these homes are for females, with the other two for males.

EVALUATION OF D.S.O. PROGRAM

Evaluation Objectives

The proposed evaluation of the D.S.O. Program resulted in the development of evaluation objectives that reflect the basis upon which the program developed: Non-secure, community based attention homes accepting status offenders with treatment programs offered by public agencies are a viable alternative to detention and institutionalization.

In the light of this hypothesis, the following evaluation objectives were constructed:

1. To determine the extent to which status offenders are redirected into community based facilities by juvenile hall intake dispositions.

2. To determine the range and scope of the development and utilization of community based services.

3. To determine the characteristics of detained 601 population prior and post AB 3121.

4. To determine impact of Fresno County's D.S.O. Program on:

- a. behavior of clients.

- b. attitudes and opinions of juvenile justice staff and agency personnel.
- c. juvenile hall's fiscal year budget.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA NEEDS

It takes only a superficial reading of AB 3121 to recognize the changes it would effect on the juvenile justice system. The new way of doing business impacts on filing charges brought against specific behaviors of juveniles, procedures for filing petitions, the forbidding of detention for status offenders, and finally even the way status offenders receive community services.

Focusing on one component of the system as this evaluation does, has its dangers. Conclusions drawn from the data collected may seem logical in a limited sense, but still fail to take into account compensating data in another component in the system.

The plan developed was to gather data that reflected the program statements which in turn were translated into evaluation objectives.

Information for the baseline population and the current study population was obtained from the daily intake logs at the juvenile hall. The log contained the charge, so the placement into a 602 or 601 population could be made.

Additional information such as name, offense, sex, age, date of entry and ethnic background were also taken from the log. Having established our populations for comparisons we obtained information of time of entry into juvenile hall or attention home along with date and time of release from the case folder on the child. From this same source, we were able to record the dispositions of all cases and compiled our special study group of juveniles referred to the attention homes. Finally, we utilized the juvenile index to record prior and post offenses of all juveniles who went through an attention home.

Unfortunately, as is so often the case, missing information plagued the data collection process and caused us to go to various other sources. In spite of the effort, we were not successful in all cases.

Information needed for Objective #2 was generated from survey questionnaires designed for the purpose (see Appendix). The needs of Objective #4 also resulted in the development of a survey questionnaire (see Appendix).

Areas of Study

Objective 1. The first area of study related to the changes taking place, by disposition, of the 601 status offender--juvenile hall intake population pre and post AB 3121. Baseline data (December 1975 through November 1976) was

collected on juvenile hall intake dispositions on all 601s. The data on 602s was reported by total number only as a measure of impact control. Juveniles charged with being drunk were counted separately as another impact measure.

Next, the data on the study control group (601s and 602s from December 1976 to September 1977) passing through juvenile hall intake processing, was collected and comparisons were made as to the number and type of dispositions made.

Objective 2. The next area of study for the evaluation dealt with community based services developed or utilized by the D.S.O. Program. These are the services available to status offenders who are no longer held in juvenile detention. The two survey questionnaires (see Appendix) developed for this purpose were used. One was designed to record the range of services offered while the other was used to attempt to assess the impact of these services along with the new way of handling status offenders as viewed by the juvenile's parent. The intent of the law is to maintain, as much as possible, the feeling of community based services instead of law enforced treatment. This being the case, a vital issue was the success experienced by treatment services that stay free of attempts to control the juvenile by implying an indirect judicial order exists which governs the juvenile attending meetings or

classes, etc.

Objective 3. This objective was fulfilled by obtaining information concerning characteristics of juveniles detained in juvenile hall on a 601 charge prior to the implementation of AB 3121. These juveniles were those held in the juvenile hall longer than four hours. The data of this group was compared with data of the current study group--the 601 population that utilized the non-secure attention homes after the implementation of AB 3121.

A list of the characteristics obtained on these two groups follows:

1. Time in juvenile hall/attention home.
2. Age.
3. Race.
4. Sex.
5. Status offense.
6. Prior delinquent history.
7. Runaways.
8. Subsequent offenses.
9. Counseling hours.

The statistical manipulations and comparisons of these characteristics should provide information in developing successful programmatic changes.

Objective 4. This part of the evaluation examined the impact the D.S.O. Program had on three areas:

1. Client behavior while in attention homes and subsequent behavior upon return to parent's home.
2. Attitudes of staff from the probation department and juvenile hall. Essentially, the survey results dealt with organizational alternative procedural changes and to some degree philosophical considerations. This information will assist management in successfully implementing AB 3121.
3. Cost comparisons were made in the handling of youths while they were under the authority and responsibility of the director of juvenile hall. These comparisons were made between pre and post D.S.O. Program periods.

PRESENTATION OF DATA COLLECTED

Baseline Data

Data was collected for twelve months starting December 1, 1975 and continuing through the month of November 1976. The data included all juveniles referred to the juvenile hall intake staff and the nature of their charge was categorized as either 601 or 602. Charges involving being drunk or possession of alcohol were extracted from the total population to show the impact the new law made on the filing of charges.

Charges involving crimes (602) were reported only as totals while offenses classified as status offenses (601) were reported by the disposition made by juvenile hall intake staff. The dispositions numbered eight (8) possible alternatives: released home, released home detention, placed in a foster home/group home, released other agency, placed in C. K. Wakefield, detained juvenile hall and released to other institutions. In addition to the above dispositions, we have used the headings, "Escape/AWOL Juvenile Hall" and "Runaway Attention Home." While these headings were not dispositions and

were not comparable for the baseline data and the current study year, it was felt to be the most graphic way of displaying the impact of the new law.

Table 1

Total Cases Referred to Juvenile Hall
Baseline Data (Dec. '75 through Nov. '76)

Type Offense	Number	Percent
602	2820	58* of total
601	2138	39 of total
Drunk & poss. alcohol	384	10.86 of 602 pop.
Unknown	149	3 of total
Totals	5536	100

* This percentage included the 384 clients that were charged with an alcohol offense.

In going back through the years, it was noted that the total number of referrals to juvenile hall fluctuated from year to year so it was decided to check the baseline figures (see Table 1) with the average totals covering years 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975 (see Table 2).

The results of averaging the populations from 1970 through 1975 seemed to agree rather closely with the population totals in the baseline data. We proceeded

Table 2

Total Cases Referred To Juvenile Hall 1970-75

Year	Totals	602s	%	601s	%
1970	6038	2979	49	3059	51
1971	5852	3039	52	2813	48
1972	5792	2953	51	2839	49
1973	5161	2412	47	2749	53
1974	6421	4449	69	1972	31
1975	6167	4130	67	2037	33
Totals	35431	19962		15469	
Averages	5905	3327	56	2578	44

with a little more confidence that the baseline data was truly representative of the juvenile hall referral rate before the implementation of AB 3121.

Since we have analyzed in some detail the status offender population (601s), it served well to compare the breakdown of the baseline data as far as male and female was concerned with a similar population from 1970 through 1975 (see Table 3).

As can be seen in the results, when the male and female 601 population was averaged for the years 1970 through 1975, the percentages were quite similar to the percentages we found in the baseline data.

One other comparison was felt to be useful at this time as further confirmation that the baseline data was a valid 12-month period upon which to measure the impact of the new law. Since we handled the charge of drunk and/or possession of alcohol separately, it was thought useful to find the average population of this charge and break it down into male and female offenders (see Table 4).

An analysis of the yearly rate of drunk and/or possession of alcohol was rather revealing. The six-year average percentage rate (16%) of the charge was somewhat higher than the percentage (12%) established in the baseline period.

Table 3

601 Population by Male and Female
for Years 1970 Through 1975

Year	Tot. 601 Pop.	Male	%	Female	%
1970	3059	1849	60	1210	40
1971	2813	1615	57	1198	43
1972	2839	1572	55	1267	45
1973	2747	1591	58	1156	42
1974	1972	976	49	996	51
1975	2037	1023	50	1014	50
Totals	15467	8626		6841	
Averages	2578	1438	56	1140	44
Baseline	2183	1170	54	1013	46

Table 4

Number of Offenders Charged with Drunk
and/or Possession of Alcohol 1970 Through 1975

Year	Total 602	Total poss. & Drunk	%	Male	%	Female	%
1970	2979	541	18	470	87	71	13
1971	3039	699	23	574	82	125	18
1972	2953	602	20	494	82	108	18
1973	2412	404	17	350	87	54	13
1974	4449	548	12	468	85	80	15
1975	4130	469	11	408	87	61	13
Totals	19962	3263		2764		499	
Averages	3327	544	16	461	85	83	15
Baseline	3205	385	12	335	87	50	13

If the percentage is followed year by year, however, it is seen to be at a high of 23 percent in 1971, with a steady decline down to 11 percent in 1975 and 12 percent in the baseline period. The percentages seen from 1973 to 1975 (average=13 percent) seemed to be more reflective of current trends than the average of all six years.

Intake Dispositions of 601 Baseline Data. In preparation for making comparisons as to the impact the new law has had on the types of dispositions of status offenders, all dispositions were recorded for the baseline year (December 1975 through November 1976) as shown in Table 5.

Data Covering Current Study Period

The information on the population effected by the new juvenile law covered a period of ten (10) months, starting December 1976 and continuing through September 1977. Time limitations made it impossible to extend the data collection beyond the ten months. However, there was nothing to indicate the 601 population would accelerate at a more rapid pace than it had for the first ten months. The pace was consistently less than the comparable month in the baseline data. It ranged from 30 to 60 percent less.

The opposite was true regarding the 602 offender monthly population totals. The current study population

Table 5
Dispositions Made on 601 Baseline Population

Dispositions	Number	Percent
1. Released home	481	22
2. Released home detention	33	2
3. Placed foster/group home	30	1
4. Placed attention home	5	+
5. Released other agency	766	35
6. Placed C. K. Wakefield	30	1
7. Detained juvenile hall	830	38
8. Released other institutions	8	+
Totals	2183	99+
Escape/AWOL Juvenile Hall	24*	
Runaway Attention Home	2*	

* These two statistics were not counted in the 601 population total.

accumulated at a rate between 104 to 175 percent of the comparable month in the baseline period.

As in the baseline data, the information collected on the 602 population was reported only as totals while the 601 population was recorded by disposition (eight alternative dispositions were those made by the juvenile hall intake staff. Again, the escapes and AWOLs from the juvenile hall were kept separate as were the runaways from the attention homes (see Table 6.)

Table 6
Current Study Population
(December 1976 through Sept. 1977)

Offense Category	Total Number	Percent
602	2650	79** of total
601	838	21 of total
Drunk/Poss alcohol	430	13.96 of 602 pop.
Unknown	25	
Totals	3943*	100

* This total was limited to 10 months.

** This percentage included the 430 clients that were charged with an alcohol offense.

Two other broad statistics were extracted from the total current study population as useful information to assess the influence of the new law on (1) booking charges and (2) the percentages of males and females referred. Specifically, the booking charge in question was the one in which alcoholic beverages were involved (see Table 7).

Table 7

Alcohol Related Charges in Current Study Group

Total 602 Pop.	Alcohol Chges	%	Male	%	Female	%
3080	430	14	368	85	63	15

The breakdown of the 601 offender population into male and female is presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Sex Breakdown of 601 Current Study Population

Total 601 Pop.	Male	%	Female	%
838	353	42	485	58

Current Study 601 Population Dispositions. Listed below are all dispositions and number made by juvenile hall intake staff on 601 offenders from December 1976 through

September 1977. Also listed are escapes and AWOLs from the juvenile hall and runaways from the attention homes. It should be noted that these totals were not included in the dispositional totals (see Table 9).

Table 9

Dispositions Made on 601 Current Study Population

Dispositions	Number	%
1. Released home	215	25.6
2. Released home detention	19	2.3
3. Placed foster/group home	4	.4
4. Placed attention home	548	65.4
5. Released other agency	46	5.5
6. Placed C. K. Wakefield	1	+
7. Detained juvenile hall	4	.5
8. Released other institutions	1	+
Totals	838	99.7
Escapes/AWOLs Juvenile Hall	0	
Runaway Attention Home	196	

Evaluation Objective 1: Comparisons Between Baseline and Current Study Data

Gross Population Comparisons. The total juvenile population referred to intake services in the baseline year was 5536 with the 602 offenders accounting for 3204 (including those juveniles charged with an alcohol offense) which represented 58 percent of the total.

In the current study period (10 months), the total population referred was 3943 with the 602 population at 3080, which represented 79 percent of the total.

The 601 population went from 39 percent of the total in the baseline statistics down to 21 percent of the total in the current study period.

There was also a movement in the percentage of juveniles charged with an offense involving alcohol from 10.86 percent of the baseline population up to 13.96 percent in the current study population. Listed below is the population movement from the baseline period (12 months) to the current study period (projected from 10 months to 12 months).

Juvenile Hall Population Comparisons. In making statements concerning population shifts, it was of some interest to find out that the population detained in juvenile

hall has not been effected to any great extent. If the total number of 601s referred to juvenile hall in the baseline year amounted to almost 40 percent of the total, one would expect a decided drop in juvenile hall population when AB 3121 went into effect. Such was not the case, however. In the baseline period, the population of the juvenile hall reached 36,338 child care days* while a projected (12 months period) current study group population would reach 34,863, which only represents a decline of 4.1%.

1. Reduction of about 15 percent in the overall referral rate (601 plus 602).
2. An increase in the 602 population of 13 percent.
3. A decrease of 54 percent in the 601 population.
4. An increase of 24 percent in the charges involving alcohol.

Comparison of Sex Composition of 601 Population for Baseline with Current Study Periods. The composition of the baseline population according to sex of the child was 54 percent males (1170) and 46 percent females (1013). When compared to the current study population, the findings had just about reversed, 42 percent males and 58 percent females.

* Child care days: the total number of juveniles who spend 24 hours or any part thereof in the hall on any given day.

When projected to a 12-month period, these percentages represented 423 males and 583 females.

Listed below is the movement of the sex composition of the 601 current study population compared to the composition of the baseline 601 population:

1. Percentage of males went down 12 points.
2. Percentage of females went up a corresponding number of points (from 46 to 58 points.)

These are merely percentages and do not represent an increase in actual numbers since the total population dropped considerable.

Dispositional Comparisons. When comparisons were made on dispositions of 601s in the current study population (see Table 9) with the dispositions made on the baseline population (see Table 5), it was noted that percentages remained about the same, except in the obvious dispositions, detained in juvenile hall, and placed in attention home. The only other disposition with a change was released to other agency. The current study population dropped 29 percent from the number in the baseline population.

A more detailed examination of case folders revealed the drop was actually an artifact of recording since almost 70 percent of juveniles placed in attention homes were also referred to other agencies, but it was not recorded as a disposition.

Evaluation Objective 2: The Scope of the Utilization of
Community Based Services

Services Associated with Deinstitutionalization. The implementation of a law which made it illegal to institutionalize juveniles committing status offenses required the removal of juveniles from secure detention facilities. Equally important was the need to develop programs and community based services suited to meet the needs of juveniles outside of detention. It was presumed that the deinstitutionalized status offender would have unique needs dictated by the way he was to be handled. For example, a runaway juvenile who could no longer be placed in secure detention would have need for emergency shelter care. He might also require counseling, be it; crises, individual or family, while in the shelter care facility. Another possibility was that a juvenile on the run for any length of time might be in need of medical services or judicial services to reunite him with his family. These, of course, were only a small number of the many community based services which required procuring or developing.

What Kind and How Many? It was necessary to determine the approximate number of status offenders requiring community based services. Data derived from the previous 12 months (December 1975 through November 1976) showed that 2,183 status offenders were processed through the juvenile hall intake

system. From this population, a group of 1659 offenders either utilized or had recognized needs for utilization of community based services. This group consisted of those juveniles who were detained in juvenile hall, released to community agencies, placed on home detention, or placed in a foster or group home. The group did not include these status offenders who were released to their own home, placed in jail or C. K. Wakefield, or sent to the Youth Authority. This population was used as a baseline period from which a logical prediction was made as to the number needing community services for the next 12 months (December 1976 through November 1977). An estimate of around 1700 status offenders, who were no longer being held in secure detention, were deemed candidates for community services.

In order to determine the range and scope of the development and utilization of community based services in Fresno and the surrounding area, an agency survey was developed. The survey consisted of questions chosen from the National Evaluation Design for the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offender Program (Survey of Program Facilities)". Sixteen community agencies were interviewed by telephone. Information was obtained from three attention homes, one EOC home, three group homes, three schools, four counseling centers, one religious organization, and one recreational organization.

Data showed that ten of the sixteen agencies surveyed were in operation prior to December 1976 when Fresno County implemented AB 3121. Of these ten agencies, four developed additional services specifically oriented toward the needs of the deinstitutionalized status offender. The remaining six agencies surveyed were new agencies established after December 1976. These agencies were designed to be utilized by the deinstitutionalized status offenders.

Overview of Community Services. Provision for sheltered care services for deinstitutionalized status offenders was of primary importance to the successful implementation of AB 3121. This requirement was met through the establishment and staffing of three attention homes which was later increased by a home established by E.O.C. The various services provided by the attention homes were guided by and established according to juvenile hall policies, state licensing standards, and standards set forth in AB 3121. The extent of community based services provided by the other agencies surveyed, as well as the attention homes, is shown in Figure 1. This matrix shows the standard services available to the 601 population and the number of community agencies who provided these services. Generally speaking, the number of community agencies and the range of services they offer is better than adequate, however, there are deficits in services which will be discussed later

Figure 1
The Extent of Community Based Services

	Attention Homes	E.O.C. Home	Fairmont G/Home	Outreach For Youth	Rolling Hills G/Home	New Centurion School	Tioga Junior High School	Hoover High School	County Mental Health	Youth For Christ	Recreation Intern	S.A.Y.	Alternative	Comprehensive Youth Service
Crisis Intervention	X		X	X	X				X			X	X	
Counseling Indiv-Client	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Indiv-Family	X	X							X			X	X	X
Group-Family		X			X				X			X	X	X
Group-Peer	X					X			X					
Drug Abuse Educational Normal Class	X		X			X	X	X	X			X		X
Special Class				X		X			X					
Open Class						X								
Remedial						X	X							
Tutoring				X				X						
Recreational Employment Referral	X		X	X	X				X	X	X			X
Employment Counseling		X	X	X	X			X	X				X	
Work Placement		X		X	X			X					X	
Emergency Shelter Care	X	X											X	X
Removal From Home	X	X	X	X	X				X				X	
Diagnostic Screening						X			X					
Medical	X	X	X	X	X				X					

in the analysis of the survey data.

Status Offenders Served by Agencies. The cumulative total of 601 offenders served by various community agencies from December 1976 through September 1977 was approximately 1,700 juveniles as reported by the sixteen surveyed. It must be noted, however, that the individual number of status offenders handled within that time frame was much less than 1,700 due to the fact that a large number of juveniles were enrolled with two or more agencies. For example, a juvenile staying at an attention home might also be using counseling services, recreational services, etc. The average length of time a juvenile client utilized services in the community varied greatly with the average time ranging from 7.5 hours for counseling to about 9 months placement in a group home. This wide range in utilization time shows that the average length of time an agency will work with a juvenile depends largely upon the type of service or program in which the offender is involved.

Accessibility of Services. The availability of the services offered by the 16 agencies was compiled from the agency survey. Seven agencies were basically daytime operations, with some limited to weekdays only, while others were open on weekends as well, but could not be classified as 24-hour services. The nine agencies offering a 24-hour program were

residential facilities, such as attention or group homes where staff were always available to serve the needs of clients. A few agencies tried to arrange their working schedules according to the needs of the juveniles. Generally speaking, routine services were more available than those that were classified as crisis.

The question which pervaded the evaluation of community services was this: Did the community provide an adequate number of services to meet the needs of the deinstitutionalized status offenders? The survey results found neither an all encompassing "yes" or "no" answer to the question.

Emergency shelter care service was usually adequate. With three attention homes sponsored by the program and another sponsored by E.O.C. providing a total of 28 beds, it was felt to be more than adequate; however, further analysis revealed that at times any slight increase in juvenile runaways could result in an overcrowded situation that prevented some juveniles from receiving the benefits of the intervention program associated with a short stay in an attention home.

Individual counseling service for status offenders was sufficiently provided by community based agencies. All sixteen agencies surveyed provided counseling on one level or another ranging from school counseling to therapy provided by Fresno County Mental Health Department. Scheduling of treatment

ranged from twice weekly sessions to on-the-spot counseling as a problem arose.

In order to fulfill the educational needs of the status offenders staying at the attention homes, special arrangements were made between the four attention homes and the public school system. Juveniles were allowed to attend school nearest to the attention homes in spite of the district rules which require children to attend the school near their own home (the parents' home). The school counselors and deans also noted an increased awareness of a status offender's presence in the school and were careful to watch for any problems which might have arisen or any special needs the juvenile might have had.

As required by state licensing standards, medical care was provided to the status offenders in the attention, E.O.C., and group homes. The attention homes made special arrangements with the juvenile hall nursing staff to make visits to the home for medical attention as needed.

Recreational needs were sufficiently provided to the status offenders by many of the community agencies. A grant fund supported a recreation intern in her work with the status offenders in the attention homes where the juveniles participated in a variety of recreational outings and activities. Each group home scheduled its own recreational activities, and it was noted that recreation was a large part of the programming in all the

homes.

Limitations In Community Based Services.... Although deficiencies in community based services were not numerous, where they did exist they appeared to be decided in nature. It was found that services relating to crises in a child's life were deficient. As an example; a 601 runaway placed in an attention home was upset and emotionally unstable and in need of some rather intensive intervention. Fresno County, not unlike other counties, has not been able to develop a comprehensive intervention program at this point to reduce the 20 percent AWOLs that occur in the first five hours of placement.

If the juvenile did go AWOL he would be hard pressed to find food or shelter from a legitimate source, outside the justice system, that would work toward resolving the conflict between himself and his family.

Emergency counseling of the "hot line" type was obtainable if the juvenile was cool-headed enough to seek it out.

The data showed the first 24 hours a child was in the attention home was a very critical period in which extensive intervention was needed.

Not only would extensive intervention be needed in the first 24 hours of stay in the attention homes, it would be an ongoing process throughout the juvenile's entire stay. Data

showed that another 30 percent of the AWOLs occurred between the 6th and 24th hour of stay. Thus, 50 percent of the AWOLs from the attention homes were within the first 24 hours. One supposition is that a strong intervention program could have prevented many of these runaways.

Another weak segment of the community services for status offenders was that of family counseling. This service was provided by Social Advocates for Youth, with whom the attention homes held a contract. However it seemed that the total number of agencies offering family counseling was low when consideration was given as to the type of juvenile and offense being handled.

It should be noted that one of the group homes surveyed reported they no longer accepted status offenders in their program. Their reason was that the new law made it easy for a juvenile to run off.

This same complaint was heard from the Adolescence Day Care Program at the County Mental Health Department. They felt that something had been lost in the facilitation of treatment for juveniles. They considered the offenders to be "high risk" clients who would not be likely to stay in the program long enough to benefit.

Criteria for Acceptance. The sixteen agencies used similar criteria in accepting referrals into their programs.

Most agencies worked with juveniles from ages 13 to 18; however, a few accepted clients younger than 13 years. There were approximately the same number of services for males as for females. Four agencies accepted only those juveniles who were willing to make a commitment to working in the program. Two of the counseling agencies noted that they accepted no psychotic youths or those with severe behavioral disorders.

Summary of Community Based Services Provided

Overall the services provided for the deinstitutionalized status offender were complete and accessible in most areas of need.

- Shelter care was adequate if a sudden influx of runaways did not occur.
- Medical attention was always available.
- General counseling was good, family counseling was limited.
- Educational needs were well met.
- Recreational services were well supplied.
- Crisis intervention could be more immediately available.

Evaluation Objective 3: Characteristics of Detained601 Population Pre and Post AB 3121

Some Demographic Characteristics. While planning for the anticipated population to be dealt with in the attention homes, it was logically felt the 601 juvenile hall population would reflect the expected attention home population. However, the process change seemed to have had considerable impact. While the age distribution and the mean average age of the two populations were very similar, the total numbers showed the change. The attention home population was just about 50 percent of the juvenile hall population in the baseline data (see Table 10). This was true if the current study 601 population for 10 months (N=548) was projected for a 12-month period (N=658).

The disposition process for whatever reason resulted in a greatly reduced number of status offenders removed from their own homes from pre to post AB 3121. Two other characteristics were altered. One was the male and female percentages in each population (see Table 11). In the baseline population the percentages were about equal while in the current study population the percentage shifted towards females.

The second change took place in the distribution of ethnic background. The percentage of Caucasians rose

Table 10

Age Distribution of Baseline and Current Study Groups

Age	Juv.Hall Number	601 B.L. Pop. %	Attention Home Number	601 Pop. %	Movement
17	49	3.9	69	11	+ 7.1
16	318	25.3	96	17.5	- 7.8
15	365	29.1	149	27	- 2.1
14	284	22.6	154	28	+ 5.4
13	149	11.9	61	11	- .9
12	83	6.6	24	4	- 2.6
Unknown	4	.3	2	.4	
Totals*	1252	99.7	548**	98.9	

Average Age = 14.7 years

Average Age = 14.7

* All totals included repeat offenders and as such reflect incidents.

** The total attention home population was for 10 months and included 6 offenders who had two charges filed on them.

significantly in the attention home population (see Table 12).

Table 11

Sex Distribution of Baseline
and Current Study Populations

Sex	Juv.Hall Number	601 B.L. %	Attention Home Number	601 C.S. %	Movement
Male	608	48.5	205	37	- 11.5
Female	644	51.4	343	63	+ 11.6
Totals	1252	99.9	548*	100	

* Ten months only.

Table 12

Ethnic Background Distribution Between
Baseline Population and Current Study Population

Ethnic	J.H. 601 Number	B.L. Pop. %	Att. Home Number	C.S. 601 %	Pop. Movement
Mex-American	371	29.6	145	26	- 3.6
Caucasian	715	57.1	348	64	+ 6.9
Black	137	10.9	44	8	- 2.9
Other	29	2.3	11	2	- .3
Totals	1252	99.9	548*	100	

* Ten months total only.

The increase in the Caucasian population in the attention homes was difficult to understand except to suggest a cultural attitude on the part of the blacks and Mexican-Americans.

Since placement into an attention home was often made as a result of being unable to resolve a conflict in the home, it might be that the alternative was less fearful for Caucasians than for minorities.

Offenses Compared. Distributions were compiled for the baseline, juvenile hall, 601 population and the current study, attention home, 601 population (see Table 13).

The results were rather inconclusive although there appeared to be a reversal in the relative percentages of juveniles charged with out of control and runaway. This will be discussed later.

Time In Detention Compared. The director of the project wished to know how the average length of time in detention between the two populations compared. Would, as the new law implied, the increased emphasis on services result in a decrease in average detention time? Table 14 presents the distributions of the time in detention between the groups.

The average time spent in detention (juvenile hall or attention home) was reduced by almost two full days. However, when the juveniles that made a sudden departure within the first 24 hours were eliminated from the calculations, the average time spent in the attention homes was just about the same (6 days, 7 hours) as the time 601s spent in juvenile hall in the baseline population (6 days, 4 hours).

Table 13

Offense Distributions of Baseline Population
and Current Study Population

Offense	Juv. Hall 601 B.L. Pop. Number	%	Att. Home C.S. 601 Pop. Number	%
O/C	772	61.6	246	45
R/A	391	31.2	273	50
Curfew	34	2.7	9	2
Ct. Hold	13	1.0		
Warrant	11	.8		
Mod. Order	2	.1		
Viol. Prob.	6	.5	2	.3
Ct. Order	13	1.0		
AWOL	6	.5	14	2
Viol. Court Order	4	.2	4	.7
Total	1252	99.10	548	100

Table 14
Distribution of Time In Detention

Time In	Juv. Hall 601 B.L. Pop.		Attention Home C.S. Pop.		Movement
	Number	%	Number	%	
3+ mos. to more	5	.4	0	0	
2+ mos. to 3 mos.	11	.9	3	.5	- .4
1+ mo. to 2 mos.	44	3.5	7	1.3	- 2.2
2+ wks to 1 mo.	93	7.4	42	7.6	+ .2
1+ wk. to 2 wks.	55	4.4	43	7.8	+ 2.9
3+ days to 7 days	106	8.5	55	10.0	+ 1.5
24 hrs. to 3 days	494	39.4	113	20.6	- 18.8
0 to 24 hours	444	35.4	285	52.0	+ 16.6
Totals	1252	99.9	548	99.8	
Average Time:	6 days, 4 hours		4 days, 16 hours		

There were 104 incidents of runaways from the attention homes within the first 24 hours (see Table 15). Some understanding of this statistic was gained after interviewing the intake staff of the juvenile hall. At the time the child was referred any conflict that existed between himself and his parents was at its strongest. Phone calls made to the parents at that time met with a lot of resistance. The parent was angry and upset and did not want to work toward a resolution. In many cases, they were glad the child was in the hands of the authorities and wanted nothing to do with him. The same could be said for the child. In other words, it seemed there had to be a cooling off period before constructive action could be started. Usually effective crisis intervention could not be started until the day following the pickup.

Time In Before Going AWOL. As has been mentioned previously, the time a juvenile spent in an attention home before running off was somewhat longer on the average than was expected. Table 15 is the distribution of frequency of this statistic. While it was true that the greatest incidence (41) of AWOLs occurred within the first five hours of placement in the attention home, there were a sufficient number of juveniles who stayed three days or longer before running away to bring the average up.

Frequency of AWOL. There were 196 incidents of

Table 15
Distribution of Time In Before Going AWOL

Time In	Number of Incidents	%
14+ days to 16	11	5.6
7+ days to 14	21	10.7
3+ days to 7	25	12.7
25 hrs. to 3 days	35	17.8
13 hrs. to 24 hrs.	37	18.8
6 hrs. to 12 hrs.	23	11.7
0 to 5 hours	41	20.9
Unknown	3	1.5
Totals	196	99.7

Average Time In before going AWOL = 3.2 days

juveniles running or walking away from the attention homes, but individuals accounted for more than one incident. Table 16 presents the frequency distribution of runaways.

Table 16
Frequency Distribution of Runaways

Runaways	Juveniles	Offenses
1 incident only	91	91
2 incidents	20	40
3 incidents	8	24
4 incidents	2	8
5 incidents	3	15
6 incidents	3	18
Totals	127	196

Calculating a rate of AWOL tended to be invalid since the way the juvenile was handled when picked up varied. Some juveniles who refused to return to the attention home got a resulting opportunity to try again in their own home. On the other hand, some runaways were unable to return home and had to be replaced in the attention home time and time again. In spite of this inconsistency, the total incidence of 196 AWOLs divided by the total attention home population of 548 gave a runaway rate of 35.7 percent.

Later on in the report an analysis was made of those juveniles who ran off more than one time (36). Identification of "high risk" juveniles perhaps can be made and placed in a program designed to forestall such behavior.

Comparisons Between Runaway and Non-Run Populations

Some Demographic Characteristics. In an attempt to find predictive characteristics; age, sex, and ethnic background in the runaway population (N=196) and the non-run population (N=352) comparisons were made (see Tables 17, 18 and 19).

The average age of both groups was 14.7 years. This was the same age as was found in the baseline 601 juvenile hall population.

The second characteristic, compared by percentage, was the sex of the runaways to the non-run population (see Table 18).

As will be noted in Table 18, the percentage of females running away was significantly higher than the percentage of females in the non-run group. These findings tend to support the contention of some authorities in the field who feel that teenage females are extremely difficult to deal with in a correctional setting.

The final demographic characteristic collected in this evaluation was the ethnic background. A comparison was

Table 17

Age Distribution of Non-Run and Runaway Populations

Age	Non-Run		Runaway		Movement
	Number	%	Number	%	
17	41	11.6	22	11.2	
16	65	18.4	29	14.7	- 3.7
15	99	28.1	51	26.0	- 2.1
14	88	25.0	67	34.1	+ 9.1
13	40	11.3	20	10.2	- 1.1
12 or less	18	5.1	6	3.0	- 2.1
Unknown	1	0	1	0	
Totals	352	99.5	196	99.2	

Table 18

Sex Percentages of Non-Run and Runaway Populations

Sex	Non-Runs		Runaways		Movement
	Number	%	Number	%	
Male	151	42.8	52	26	- 16
Female	201	57.1	144	73	+ 16
Totals	352	99.9	196	99	

made in Table 19. The largest percentage shift was toward the Caucasians running off from the attention homes.

Table 19

Ethnic Background of Non-Run
and Runaway Populations

Race	Non-Runs		Runaways		Movement
	Number	%	Number	%	
Mex-American	108	30.6	35	17.8	- 12.8
Caucasians	206	58.5	142	72	+ 13.5
Black	34	9.6	12	6	- 3.0
Other	4	1.1	7	3.5	+ 2.4
Totals	352	99.8	196	99.3	

Prior Delinquency of Non-Run and Runaway Populations.

In this section status offense (601) charges and/or delinquent offense (602) charges were listed without regard to numbers or severity in each category. Table 20 is a presentation of the data.

The runaway population tended to have arrest histories more heavily weighted with 601 charges and less histories void of any charges than the non-run population.

The 18 percent increase in the 601 charges for the runaway population became more easily understood when it was recalled that 73 percent of this group were females. There is

a decided tendency for females in conflict to commit 601 offenses. The increase by almost 6 percent in the category, "both 601 & 602," along with the decrease of almost 19 percent in the category "none," points out another portion of the runaway population is made up of the more severe offenders and much less of the first time offenders.

Table 20

Arrest Histories of Non-Run and Runaway Populations

Prior Charges	Non-Runs		Runaways		Movement
	Number	%	Number	%	
Only 601	74	21	77	39	+ 18
Only 602	32	9	8	4	- 5
Both 601 & 602	53	15	41	20.9	+ 5.9
None	140	39.7	41	20.9	- 18.8
Unknown	53	15	29	14.7	
Totals*	352	99.7	196	99.5	

* Total incidents for 10 months only.

Subsequent Offenses of Non-Run and Runaway Populations

Compared. The same classification system was used with offenses committed in the follow-up period as was employed with the priors. Offenses were arrest charges with no attempt made to weigh the severity or number. Table 21 presents the

data.

Table 21

Subsequent Charges of Non-Run and Runaway Populations

Subsequent Charges	Non-Runs		Runaways		Movement
	Number	%	Number	%	
Only 601	36	10.2	58	29.5	+ 19.3
Only 602	41	11.6	21	10.7	- .9
Both 601 & 602	25	7.1	41	20.9	+ 13.8
None	198	56.2	46*	23.4	- 32.8
Unknown	52	14.7	30	15.3	
Totals	352	99.8	196	99.8	

* The 46 runaways that did not accumulate an additional 601 offense for going AWOL were those that avoided being picked up or were allowed to return to their own home without an additional charge being made.

A word of explanation is needed concerning the time interval for the follow-up period in which subsequent charges were recorded. When a juvenile entered the attention home, the follow-up time period started. The offense that led to his placement in the attention home was not counted, but all charges after that date were recorded. Since the current study population covered 10 months, it resulted in some juveniles having a follow-up period of 10 months. Some had 9 months and on down to the closing date in which the last

juvenile included in the study was admitted to an attention home September 30, 1977. This juvenile had little or no chance to accumulate a subsequent offense record.

As was demonstrated in the prior offenses the runaway population tended to have proportionally more frequent offending and more severe offenses than the non-run population. While the very act of running away from the attention home could have caused the category "only 601" to rise, the category "both 601 & 602," also rose proportionately.

Summary of Characteristics Associated with Attention Home

Clients

Baseline Detained 601 Population Compared with Study

Group Attention Home Population. Listed below are the main comparisons between the two populations:

<u>Similar Characteristics</u>	<u>Dissimilar Characteristics</u>
1. Average age (14.7 years) was the same for both.	1. Total attention home population was about one-half juvenile hall 601 population.
2. Time In remained the same in both groups if runaways were not calculated in averages.	2. Dispositional process resulted in a greatly reduced number of juveniles removed from their own home.
	3. Attention home population had a higher percentage of females by almost two to one.
	4. Ethnic background shifted to Caucasians entering attention homes 7 percent more often.

Characteristics of AWOLs. Listed below are tow characteristics of the runaway population that cannot be compared to another population:

1. Twenty-one percent of the runaway population took off within the first five hours of placement.
2. Twenty-eight percent of the runaway population ran off two or more times.

Comparisons Between Runaway and Non-Run Populations.

Following is a list of comparisons between the two populations that might aid in identifying potential runaways:

1. Females ran more frequently than males (16% or more).
2. Caucasians ran more frequently than any other ethnic group (13.5%).
3. Runaway population had 601 offenses show up more frequently in their prior arrest history than any other classifications (18% more frequent).
4. The runaway population accumulated subsequent offense charges of 601 more frequently in the follow-up period than the non-run population (19% or more).

Evaluation Objective 4: Impact of Program on Juvenile Behavior, Juvenile Justice Staff, and Budget

Behavior Analysis of Attention Home Residents. The enactment of any new law has as a basis the redirection to which the process of justice will take. AB 3121 certainly is reflective of this premise, but there is an implicit objective to the law which is to encourage more positive behavior on the part of the juvenile. To this end the new law takes a hand in the nature of the intervention to be used with status offenders. First, there are the items within the bill to decriminalize the juveniles and secondarily, the items which address themselves to treatment. Within the items for treatment is the program which this evaluation deals, attention homes and community based services. As such then, the behavior of the juvenile from the time he is placed in an attention home is grist for the evaluation mill.

Incidence of Runaway. As has been pointed out repeatedly, a high rate of AWOL from the non-secure facilities was expected. The total population (10 months) for the three attention homes was 548 with the incidents of runaway at 196 which made a general AWOL rate of 35.7 percent.

Further analysis showed 36 (28%) juveniles who ran away accounted for 105 (53%) of the total incidents of runaways. On the other side of the scale, 64 percent of juveniles placed

in the attention homes did not run at all (some ran from the attention home but were not filed on when they returned to their own homes and attempted to resolve their conflicts).

The monthly runaway rate was calculated and covered the period from December 1976 through September 1977 (Study Group Period). It ranged from a low of 24 percent to a high of 51 percent. There was no particular pattern discernable.

Just as females were over-represented in the attention home population so also were they over-represented in the AWOLs. Out of a total of 196 incidents of runaways, they accounted for 144 (73%) while only accounting for 62 percent of total population. The female population of 343 accounted for 144 (42%) runaways. In the male population (205) in the attention homes, 52 (25%) ran away (see Table 22).

The number of female runaways was 95, but they accounted for 144 incidents, or 1.5 runaways per female. The number of male runaways was only 32, but they accounted for 52 incidents, or 1.6 runaways per male. A higher percentage of females (74%) than males (66%) had only 1 runaway, and the females who had two or more runaways averaged slightly more (2.96) subsequent runaways per person than males (2.8). These results seemed to indicate that although females were more likely to run away, they were no more persistent in this behavior than males.

Table 22
Runaway Frequency by Sex

Females				Males			
Frequency		Number	Total Incident	Frequency		Number	Total Incident
1	x	70	= 70	1	x	21	= 21
2	x	12	= 24	2	x	8	= 16
3	x	7	= 21	3	x	1	= 3
4	x	2	= 8	4	x	0	= 0
5	x	3	= 15	5	x	0	= 0
6	x	1	= 6	6	x	2	= 12
Totals		95	144	Totals		32	52

Offending Prior and Subsequent Attention Home

Placement. Again it is noted that the follow-up period on the attention home population was on an individual basis (see Page 49). The time frames ranged from a full 10 months on those who entered the home on the first day it opened officially (12-1-76) down to one day only on those entering on the cut off date of the data collection (9-30-77). The average time used in the follow-up period was five months.

The type of offending change occurring from the prior history to the follow-up period was calculated in Table 23.

Table 23

Change of Offending Prior and
Subsequent to Placement

Offense	Prior		Subsequent		Change
	Number	%	Number	%	
Only 601	151	27.5	94	17.1	- 10.4
Only 602	40	7.3	62	11.3	+ 4.0
Both 601 & 602	94	17.1	66	12.0	- 5.1
None	181	33.0	244	44.5	+ 11.5
Unknown	82	14.9	82	14.9	
Totals	548*	99.8	548*	99.8	

* Six juveniles had arrests on double charges.

The number of juveniles who did not offend in the

follow-up period as compared to those juveniles who had no previous offending histories prior to placement in an attention home rose meaningfully by 11.5 percent. The number of juveniles who offended as 601s in the follow-up period were decreased by about 10 percent. Those juveniles who had 602 offenses in their prior histories remained about the same in the follow-up period. It should be noted that there is a time element involved in this statistic which could have a bearing on the results. The question would be; if more time had elapsed in the follow-up period would more frequent and severe offending occurred?

Another question has been, "are 601s being permanently diverted from the juvenile justice system?" While information was not available as to the number of juveniles who went to court after being charged with a 602 offense, we do know that 24 percent of the attention home population had 602 charges brought against them within an average of five (5) months follow-up period. This was a total of 128 out of the population of 542.

Severity Rating of Prior Histories of Attention Home Clients. One complaint heard repeatedly with the new law is that some juveniles being processed as status offenders have arrest histories which more accurately classified them as

delinquent. The rationale of the complaint is that a definition of a status offender should take into account the nature and severity of the juvenile's offending history.

An attempt to evaluate this complaint was made by arbitrarily assigning one point to each 601 offense and two points to each 602 offense in the juvenile's history. Table 24 is a compilation of the results.

The total severity score of 1205 was divided by the total number of juveniles (N=465) which gave an average severity score of 2.6 points. Rounding off the average to 3.0, we found 132 juveniles had severity scores higher than the average (an average of three points could be collected by a juvenile having three 601 offenses or one 602 offense plus one 601 offense).

Addressing the question, "what kind of offenders were handled as status offenders and processed through the attention homes?", it was found that 99 juveniles (21.3% of total population) had severity ratings of five (5.0) points when the average of the population was 2.6 points.

Five points could be collected by a juvenile having five 601 offenses, three 601 offenses plus one 602 offense, or one 601 offense and two 602 offenses.

To develop a clearer picture of the nature of

Table 24
Severity Rating of Prior Delinquencies

Severity Score	Number of Juveniles	Total Score	Severity Score	Number of Juveniles	Total Score
0	181	0	11	7	77
1	55	55	12	4	48
2	59	118	13	2	26
3	38	114	14	2	28
4	33	132	15	1	15
5	24	120	16	1	16
6	24	144	17	0	0
7	13	91	18	0	0
8	7	56	19	1	19
9	6	54	20	0	0
10	5	50	21	2	42
			Totals	465*	1205

* 77 unknowns.

offenders, a distribution was made of those juveniles who had 602 charges in their histories (see Table 25).

Table 25

Frequency of Juveniles With 602 Priors

Frequency of 602 Charges	Number of Juveniles	Frequency of 602 Charges	Number of Juveniles
1	74	6	0
2	30	7	1
3	10	8	0
4	7	9	0
5	1	10	1
		Total	= 124

Out of a total population of 465 juveniles whose prior records were available, 124 had at least one 602 charge (26.6%). Fifty juveniles (10.7% of total attention home population with prior record available) had two or more 602 charges.

Decision to Handle Status Offenders By Offense Of Record

Since AS 3121 was drawn up to further legal procedures to protect the public from criminal conduct by minors along with decriminalizing status offenders, it was felt that subsequent offenses were an important aspect of the

evaluation.

In order to emphasize the validity of focusing attention upon the classification system used in deciding who was a status offender certain assumptions were made.

1. The status offender is not a pure type which would make it possible to separate him from the criminal type.
2. The offense of record should not be the only one that would determine the suitability of confinement.
3. Dispositional hearings in court have been based on a child's total situation rather than his offense.
4. The offense of record is often superficial and purely technical in nature and is not geared to suggest the needs of a juvenile.

Prior Offenses Related to Subsequent Offenses. While the total attention home population was 542 juveniles, this number was reduced to 459 juveniles whose prior and subsequent records were complete and available. Table 26 shows the type of offenses in the juvenile's prior history (all charges listed for the juvenile before the 601 offense which resulted in his placement in an attention home) related to the type of offense he committed within the follow-up period.

Table 26

Prior Offending Related to Subsequent Offending

Prior Offense	Subsequent Offense		Percentage of Type	Criminal Offense
	None	= 137	76.5	
None N = 179	Only 601	= 25	13.9	
	Only 602	= 11	6.1	} = 9.4
	Both 601 & 602	= 6	3.3	
Totals		179	99.8	
	None	= 48	32.2	
Only 601 N = 149	Only 601	= 49	32.8	
	Only 602	= 17	11.4	} = 34.8
	Both 601 & 602	= 35	23.4	
Totals		149	99.8	
	None	= 22	57.8	
Only 602 N = 38	Only 601	= 5	13.1	
	Only 602	= 9	23.6	} = 28.8
	Both 601 & 602	= 2	5.2	
Totals		38	99.7	
	None	= 32	34.4	
Both 601 & 602 N = 93	Only 601	= 17	18.2	
	Only 602	= 21	22.5	} = 47.2
	Both 601 & 602	= 23	24.7	
Totals		93	99.8	

Probable Error In Handling 601 Charges as Status Offenders. First time offenders charged with a 601 offense had a 9.4 percent likelihood of committing a 602 offense within the five-month follow-up period.

The 601 offender who had a history of only 601 offense(s) had a 34.8 percent likelihood of committing a 602 offense within the five-month follow-up period.

The 601 offender who has a history of only 602 offense(s) had a 28.8 percent likelihood of committing a 602 offense within the five-month follow-up period.

The 601 offender who had both 601 and 602 offenses in his prior history had a 47.2 percent likelihood of committing another 602 offense within the five-month follow-up period.

Conclusions. The overall rate of a status offender committing a 602 offense within five months subsequent to the offense of record is 27 percent. A determination should be made as to what is an acceptable percent of error. To the question, "are 601s being permanently diverted from the juvenile justice system?", the answer is not at this time.

Opinion Survey of Parents

Some attempt was made to interview parents whose child was placed in an attention home (see Parent Interview Format in Appendix). It was hoped that enough knowledgeable parents

could be reached that some impact to the law on them could be measured. Unfortunately, it was difficult to find parents who had experienced their child having been handled by placement in juvenile hall along with the placement in an attention home.

A total of 16 interviews were conducted with one of these accounting for two separate interviews. Ten juveniles were first time offenders, so a comparison of the changed way of handling 601 offenders could not be made. Of the six remaining interviews, two of them felt the attention home was the better way of handling children. The remaining four felt the non-secure attention home was a bad idea. The reasons given for this opinion were: "In juvenile hall at least my son got a chance to dry out"; "there is no control, they come and go when they want to--he was doing that at home"; "he didn't have a home of his own--ours was bad too"; and finally one mother said, "It's the same as being at home except they can hire someone to stay up all night and wait for the kids to come home; we have to try to get some sleep because we have to go to work in the morning."

As to the question concerning an improvement in the child's behavior, nine parents did not see any change in the behavior of their children, two felt the child's behavior had worsened. Three parents felt their child's behavior had improved.

Six of the parents recognized that other agencies were involved with their child while in the attention home program.

Seven parents stated that something more should be done for their child. Most parents tended to feel the child should be helped in school (tutoring of child) or helped to find work (usually the child was male) or helped by counseling (this could be for drugs, or just emotional problems).

Summary of Findings in Parent Survey

The survey was very limited, partly due to lack of cooperation of the part of the parents.

- Findings suggested parents were not knowledgeable about the new law and what the intent was.
- The impact of the new law on them and their child was in most cases a source of frustration and in a few cases counter-productive in helping them get their child under control.
- Parents tended to look to the school system, employment agencies and mental health services for sources of help when they have children out of their control.
- Parents tended to view the juvenile justice system as a controlling agency.

Attitude Survey of Juvenile Justice Staff

With the new law changing the position of the District Attorney in Juvenile Court, along with the role the probation officer is to play, it was decided to survey the attitudes of personnel involved with the justice system.

We are indebted to Supervising Deputy, Steve Crosby, for allowing the Research Unit to utilize a portion of a questionnaire he developed which contained questions pertaining to the impact of AB 3121. The survey was distributed to a sample group of staff who worked with status offenders (i.e., probation officers, attention home staff, and supervisors in the department). Completed surveys were obtained from 29 persons.

The following is a list of questions and their answers extracted from the survey:

1. Should Fresno County have separate 601 and 602 facilities?

96.6 percent answered "yes."

3.4 percent answered "no."

2. Should Fresno County have separate limited time secure facilities for selected 601 cases?

89.7 percent answered "yes."

10.3 percent answered "no."

3. Does AB 3121 help 601's or ignore 601's?

17.2 percent believed it helped.

72.4 percent believed it ignores.

3.4 percent believed it both helps and ignores.

6.9 percent did not answer.

4. Who should pay for the costs incurred in compliance with AB 3121?

37.9 percent felt that the state should pay for costs.

62.1 percent felt that both state and county should pay for costs.

5. Where has AB 3121 impacted most in probation services?

13.8 percent felt that investigations were impacted most.

34.5 percent felt that supervision was impacted most.

44.8 percent felt that both investigations and supervision were impacted.

3.4 percent felt that intake was impacted most.

3.4 percent did not answer the question.

6. Should the Home Supervision Program be conducted by Probation Officers?

37.9 percent answered "yes."

58.6 percent answered "no."

3.4 percent did not answer the question.

7. Should Probation get out of the 601 business?

41.4 percent answered "yes."

58.6 percent answered "no."

It appeared that the majority of the county employees surveyed agreed with the basic theories behind AB 3121, yet it seemed that the employees were dissatisfied with the bill in its final form. For example, an overwhelming majority of employees believed that Fresno County should have separate 601 and 602 facilities, which is a primary tenet of AB 3121. However, on the other hand, a large majority of employees believed that AB 3121 ignores, rather than helps, 601 offenders. The majority also believed that Fresno County should have separate secure facilities for selected 601 cases, which is not in accordance with the non-secure detention policy in AB 3121. Thus it seemed that staff working with 601s would like to see some changes made in AB 3121 while having many of the basic tenets in the bill remain unchanged.

Cost Comparisons.

With the implementation of AB 3121, it was a foregone conclusion that removal of 601 offenders from Juvenile Hall was going to be costly. Shelter had to be developed that measured up to the standards set forth in the

assembly bill. Money was available through the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, but a budget had to be submitted along with the concept plan. The responsibility for developing the project and figuring a projected budget fell to the director of Fresno County Juvenile Hall. He felt it was important to him to assess the costs of such a program in anticipation of the time Fresno County would have to bear the total expense. AB 3121 reiterated the correctional standard that in implementing the new law a justice agency responsible for the community supervision of offenders should supplement its rehabilitative services by referring offenders to social services and activities available to citizens generally. From an economic perspective, the carrying out of the above standard could greatly reduce the costs associated with the attention home program.

 Making a cost comparison between the attention homes with the juvenile hall facility was hazardous and faulty. There existed a tremendous amount of variation in all the descriptive characteristics of the facilities. There was a decided difference in the stated goals and objectives, locational characteristics, facility makeup, staff size, number and types of services provided. It was therefore decided to narrow the possible comparisons to one figure only, the cost of maintenance per child per day. This figure would

show the cost of handling 601 offenders pre and post AB 3121.

Using line item cost data from the three budgets, the information was collected and illustrated in Figure 2. A set of cost estimates associated with each type of facility was made: The juvenile hall, the three attention homes, and the one run by E.O.C. (see Figure 2).

To clarify the expenditures connected with the running of the three attention homes, further explanation was needed. Figure 3 displays the costs offset by grant monies and those costs assumed by Fresno County.

The costs associated with the attention home maintained by E.O.C. were not assumed by the grant project under which the three attention homes were financed. Realistically, Fresno County should be thinking of a commitment to the costs associated with the E.O.C. attention home.

Questions To Be Answered. This brief report has highlighted by comparison the child care maintenance costs per day of three kinds of facilities. This evaluation, however, was not able to go into an analysis of the cost-affecting or cost-related variables that were associated with the differing goals and objectives of the programs associated with the different facilities. Future evaluations should include:

- The short- and long-term cost differentials between renting and buying locations.

Figure 2

Comparison of Child Care Maintenance Rate

	Baseline Period Dec. 1975 - Nov. 1976		Study Period Dec. 1976 - Sept. 1977	
	<u>Juvenile Hall</u>	<u>Attention Homes</u>	<u>E.O.C. Home</u>	
Salaries & Emp. Benefits	\$1,201,591.06	\$141,111.05	\$42,549.00	
Service & Supplies	<u>298,062.42</u>	<u>38,676.49</u>	<u>40,784.00</u>	
Total Direct Cost	1,499,653.48	179,787.54	83,333.00	
Less: Cost Applied	<u>78,244.66</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	
Net Operating Costs	\$1,421,408.82	\$179,787.54	\$83,333.00	
Divided by Annual				
Child Care Days	36,338.00	2,790.00	1,247.00	
Child Care Maintenance				
Cost Per Day	\$ 39.11	\$ 64.43	\$ 66.82	

Figure 3

Budget Items and Funding Source
For Three Attention Homes

Total Operating Costs	\$ 179,787.54
Total Amount Offset by Grant	122,033.40
	<hr/>
Total Fresno County Costs	\$ 57,754.14

- The most efficient administrative design-- privately owned or public agency.
- The best balance between rehabilitative costs and administrative costs.
- The best available methods for measuring cost benefits of handling status offenders in an attention home setting.
- The types of status offenders that benefit most by attention home programs.
- The relating of program costs to performance of clients.

As in most evaluative programs, this project has raised more questions than it has answered. Answers will be found only after several years more of handling status offenders by alternative programs.

Summary of Findings on Juvenile Behavior

Listed below in capsule form are the general findings in regard to the behavior of attention home clients:

- Proportionately more female than males ran away.
- The number of juveniles who did not offend in the follow-up period rose 11.5 percent over those juveniles who were first time offenders.

- . An educated guess is that 50 percent handled as status offenders will permanently be kept out of the juvenile justice system.
- . Twenty-one percent of the status offenders more rightly could have been thought of as delinquents.

APPENDIX
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Brief explanation of D.S.O. (Deinstitutionalized Status Offender) program for those who may not know it by that name:

2. Is this a newly established agency or was it existing prior to December-1976 when the D.S.O. program began?
 - A. (If in existence prior to D.S.O. program) - has your agency developed any services especially geared for these 601 (Status Offenders) clients? (i.e., see examples below in question 3):

3. In either case - What services are provided:

- Crisis Intervention	01
- Counseling	
Individual - Client	02
Individual - Family	03
Group - Family	04
Group - Peer	05
Drug Abuse Program	06
- Educational Program	
Community Based Classrooms	
Normal Classroom	07
Separate, Specialized	08
Alternative School (open class)	09
Individual Remedial Work	10
Individual Tutoring	11
- Recreational Program	12
- Employment Program	
Referral to Employment Agency	13
Job Counseling Only	14
Work Placement Only	15
Counseling and Work Placement	16
- Legal Services	17
- General Supervision	18
- Emergency Shelter Care	19
- Advocacy (i.e., helping client out- interaction in the name of youth with youth services)	20
- Removal from Home	21
- Multiple Impact	22
- Advanced Diagnostic Screening	23
- Other: _____	24

4. How many D.S.O. clients (only 601) has this agency accepted since the program began?

How many D.S.O. clients is this agency working with currently?

5. What is the average length of time your agency is involved with a client?

6. What is the degree of accessibility to the services of this program? (Indicate its daily schedule of operation, i.e.: 24 hour service, daytime operation only, hotline service, etc.).

7. Does your agency have any particular criteria for accepting referrals? (What makes a client eligible for services)?

List criteria: (i.e., age, sex, presenting problem, legal status).

8. Degree of Coercion - How are kids referred to you, and how do you keep them in your program? (i.e., Court Order).

ANSWER SHEET
AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

AGENCY: _____ PHONE NO: _____

PERSON TO CONTACT: _____

2. _____ Newly established _____ In existence
prior

A. _____ Yes _____ No

3. 01 - 02 - 03 - 04 - 05 - 06 - 07 - 08 - 09 - 10 - 11 - 12
13 - 14 - 15 - 16 - 17 - 18 - 19 - 20 - 21 - 22 - 23 - 24

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
STAFF ATTITUDES

RE: Questions of Interest To Me Regarding Information From
The Juvenile Division Of The Impact Of AB 3121

DATE: October 17, 1977

- 1). Should we have separate 601 and 602 facilities?
- _____ Yes
_____ No
- 2). Should we have separate limited time secure facilities
for selected 601 cases?
- _____ Yes
_____ No
- 3). Does AB 3121 help 601s or ignore 601s?
- _____ Help
_____ Ignore
- 4). Who should pay for the costs incurred in compliance
with AB 3121?
- _____ State
_____ County
_____ Both
- 5). Where has AB 3121 impacted the most in probation
services?
- _____ Investigations
_____ Supervision
_____ Both

6). Should the Home Supervision Program be conducted by Probation Officers?

_____ Yes

_____ No

7). Should Probation get out of the 601 business?

_____ Yes

_____ No

PARENT/GUARDIAN INTERVIEW FORMAT

Instructions

This survey will be made by placing a phone call to the home of selected status offenders. When contact is made:

1. Identify yourself and agency.
2. Explain the purpose of the call.
(making a survey to determine the effectiveness of the non-secure attention homes).
3. Ask if they mind helping us by answering some questions.

Survey Questions

Q 1. Had (name) ever been arrested before the time he was placed in the attention home?

(If answer is "yes", go on with the following questions. If answer is "no", jump down to Q 7).

Q 2. Was he taken to Juvenile Hall? _____

Q 3. Did he go to Court? _____

Q 4. Was he placed on probation? _____

Q 5. Did the experience help improve (name's) behavior?

Q 6. In what way did it help (name) ?

This time when he was arrested, he was sent to an attention home. I want to ask you some questions about this treatment of (name) .

- Q 7. Do you see a difference in the way he was handled
this time? _____
- Q 8. What was the difference? _____

- Q 9. Do you think this was a better way? _____

- Q10. Was any other agency involved in helping your child?
What agency? _____
- Q11. Did your child's behavior improve as a result of the
help? _____
In what way? _____
- Q12. Do you think something else should be done to help you
and your child? _____
What? _____

END