Evaluation of the Enhanced Ranch Program
Santa Clara County Probation Department

Barry Krisberg Ph.D.
NCCD
Enhanced Ranch Program

• Implementation in August 2006
• Two sites: James Boys Ranch and Muriel Wright Center, both in Morgan Hill, CA
• Adaptation of the Missouri Model developed by the Missouri Division of Youth Services
The Missouri Model

- Home-like physical setting: bed covers, couches, arranged in pods of 12 so youth and counselors can sit and talk
- Youth wear their own clothes
- Focus on changing thinking rather than on simply changing behavior
- Staff are counselors with specific training
- Therapeutic units focused on cognitive behavior, personal development, and group processes
Previous Ranch

- 40% failure rate
- 6-month program
- High number of escapes
- High number of incidents during confinement
- Didn’t promote growth of detained youth (CPO)
- High recidivism rate upon returning home
County Support

• Probation Department takes the lead in the development of new programs with support of Board of Supervisors
• Probation Department leads study groups to analyze effectiveness of old ranch program and improve outcomes for youth in custody
• 20-person delegation visited Missouri
• Board of Supervisors approved $3.2 million to implement the Missouri model
Implementation

• Made physical improvements to facilities to replicate the pods and home-like setting
• Decreased the populations at the ranches
• Variable time in the ranch (6-8 months)
• 96 hours of instruction on Cognitive Based Treatment model of group counseling, plus onsite mentoring/coaching of staff
• Staff ratio: 1:6 day/evening; 1:12 night
• Previous: 1:15 day/evening; 1:30 night
Characteristics of the Program

• Geared toward high risk, high need youth with gang affiliations, substance abuse, and significant criminal histories
• Therapeutic using proactive models of rehabilitation
• Holistic program – develop pro-social skills, critical thinking, self control, anti-criminal thought patterns, and positive relationships
• Primary focus is to internalize learning to do what is right rather than because the counselors enforce behavior
• Behavior management program that is cognitively based
• Comprehensive aftercare supervision and aftercare program services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhanced Ranch Program Admittance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Ranch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony or multiple misdemeanors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must be appropriate for open housing setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental/caretaker involvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Elements

- Staff development and coaching
- Treatment
- Family atmosphere
- Group process
- Small staff-to-youth ratios
- Family participation
- Personal enhancement opportunities
- Extended length of stay for youth
- Relationship building
- Education
- Aftercare programs
Gender of Enhanced Ranch Participants (Cohort 2)

Male 88%

Female 12%
Race/Ethnicity of Enhanced Ranch Participants (Cohort 2)

- Hispanic: 80%
- Black: 10%
- White: 5%
- Asian: 3%
- Other: 2%

Black: 10%
Asian: 3%
White: 5%
Other: 2%
Hispanic: 80%
Age of Ranch Participants by Cohort

- **13 - 15 years**
  - Cohort 1 (N=499): 31%
  - Cohort 2 (N=291): 43%

- **16 - 18 years**
  - Cohort 1 (N=499): 69%
  - Cohort 2 (N=291): 57%
Most Serious Sustained Offenses that Resulted in Confinement of Ranch Residents

Cohort 1 (N=499)  Cohort 2 (N=291)
## Outcome Measures Identified by SCCPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Ranch Participants (Cohort 1)</th>
<th>Enhanced Ranch Participants (Cohort 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>While at Ranch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violations/failures</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New arrest</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 12 Months Of Exiting ranch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violations/failures</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation violations</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New arrest</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Ranch Participants (Cohort 1)</td>
<td>Enhanced Ranch Participants (Cohort 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents</td>
<td>4647</td>
<td>1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique individuals</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of incidents per individual</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range per individual</td>
<td>1-65</td>
<td>1-46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Continue to monitor outcomes of the Enhanced Ranch Program
• Examine root causes of those who fail aftercare
• Investigate program elements that will strengthen aftercare and produce better outcomes