



State of Maryland Executive Department

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony Brown
Lieutenant Governor

Anne Sheridan
Executive Director

April 24, 2013

The Honorable Martin O'Malley
100 State Circle
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1925

Re: At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
MSAR # 5886 SB882/ Ch. 445, Sec. 3, 2006

Dear Governor O'Malley:

The Governor's Office for Children (GOC) is required by Senate Bill 882 (2006 Session) to report to the General Assembly by December 31st of each year on the "implementation and effectiveness of at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs." (SB 882 Ch. 445, Sec. 3, 2006). The GOC is submitting a compilation of applicable sections of the FY2012 Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) Annual Report that summarizes each program's effectiveness as reported by the Local Management Board (LMB) of the respective jurisdiction.

The General Assembly has defined an "at-risk youth prevention and diversion program" as "services provided to school-aged youth and their families to prevent or divert youth from entering the juvenile justice system and to help make them ready for adulthood by age 21" (Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services (HS) Article, §8-601). The General Assembly has set forth a framework for the development of such programs through LMBs that coordinate, monitor, and support prevention and diversion programs through specific requirements detailed in Md. HS Art., §8-603. The statute further requires that LMBs provide fiscal and program reports to GOC about these programs and that the LMBs apply to GOC for funding for such programs (Md. HS Art., §§8-603, 604). For FY2012, funding for at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs is \$10,394,020.

Each year, the LMBs work with GOC staff to develop performance measures which are used by GOC and the LMBs to monitor program effectiveness. Data on each program's success in meeting its defined targets is included in the LMB's annual report of performance measures which is submitted to GOC in September of each year.

Attached please find the following:

- Attachment 1: Annual Report Summary.

- Attachment 2: A list of the FY2012 funded at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs and funding amounts approved by the Children's Cabinet.
- Attachment 3: Appendix A Compilation of FY2012 CPA Annual Reports that summarizes each program's effectiveness as reported by the LMB of the respective jurisdiction.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 410-767-6211 if you have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anne Sheridan". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Anne Sheridan
Executive Director

c: Dan Feller, DBM
David Juppe, DLS
Sarah Albert, DLS (five copies)

FY2012 At Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs Annual Report Summary

Overview:

In 2007, local jurisdictions were provided an opportunity through each Local Management Board (LMB) to develop a Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) for FY2008-FY2010 that included at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs. In accordance with the requirements of SB882 (2006) (now codified in Maryland Human Services Code, Annotated, Title 8, Subtitle 6), each LMB convened a prevention planning entity to ensure that services provided would be designed to:

- Protect children from harm (and providing logical consequences for children when they harm society);
- Prevent a range of negative outcomes, from drug abuse to gang involvement;
- Promote positive outcomes, such as academic success; and
- Ensure that children are both fully prepared and fully participating in their community in positive ways.

Since then, LMBs have continued to fund programs and strategies both meet the intent of SB882 but also address Governor O'Malley's strategic policy goals. In FY2012, more than 117 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs at multiple sites were funded for \$10,488,029. Each LMB was required to submit a semi-annual program report and an annual program report that included performance measures for each program. Information from the annual report submitted by each LMB was compiled for each program that was funded and is included in this report as Attachment 3.

Alignment of State Plans:

The importance of At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs is described in three key documents guiding the work of the Children's Cabinet: the *Ready By 21™ - 5 Year Action Agenda*, that discusses how to prepare young people to be ready for work, school and life by the age of 21; *Maryland's Three Year Children's Plan* (which has been subsumed in the Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan), which outlines how the Children's Cabinet will work with stakeholders to improve child well-being in Maryland; and *The Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan*, which outlines a coordinated interagency effort to develop a stronger child-serving system. Out-of-school-time programs (*e.g.*, programs that operate before or after school, during school holidays and school breaks), evidence-based programs, prevention programming and support services for children are promoted within each of these State agendas/plans.

Highlights:

Although overarching evaluative conclusions cannot be definitively made for the At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs, the improvement in the results and indicators measured annually and documented in *Maryland's Results for Child Well-Being* can be attributed, at least in part, to the collaborative efforts implemented by LMBs in their communities.

Conclusion:

FY2012 At Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs Annual Report Summary

Data as reported from the LMBs supports that:

- Children who receive services show improvement in overall functioning as measured by various assessments and/or a decrease in negative behaviors and outcomes; and
- Children who are engaged in programs are less likely to re-offend during service interventions.

Every child diverted from the juvenile services system or who rejects negative behaviors (*e.g.*, drug use, pregnancy, gang involvement, dropping out of school) represents a fiscal savings to the State, as well as a more socially responsible, productive young adult who can contribute to the overall success of our State for many years to come.

**FY2012 Community Partnership Agreement
At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

Jurisdiction	Program/Project Name	Funding Amount
Allegany	Juvenile Review Board/Expanded Diversion Services	118,328
	Mt. Ridge High School After School Program	68,721
	Substance Abuse Intervention @ Eckhart School & YMCA	53,950
	Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol	28,514
	Jurisdiction Total	\$269,513
Anne Arundel	After School Program at Mills Parole	35,585
	Youth Services Bureaus	178,881
	Community Conferencing	31,000
	Behavioral & Emotional Support and Training (BEST)	189,837
	Youth Empowerment Services (YES) - Annapolis	115,914
	Treasure Hunter's Clearing House	23,319
	Gems and Jewels Mentoring Institute	43,775
	Strengthening Families Program	45,000
	Keep A Clear Mind (KACM)	39,957
	Communitites Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol	20,097
	YWCA STAR Academy After School Program	95,898
	Brooklyn Park Middle School Teen Club	20,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$839,263
Baltimore City	Youth Services Bureaus*	403,466
	Out-of-School Time Program	856,848
	Expanded School Mental Health	100,000
	Choice Program	128,285
	Project Craft	279,075
	Jurisdiction Total	\$1,767,674
Baltimore County	Functional Family Therapy	369,660
	Youth Services Bureaus*	302,084
	Jurisdiction Total	\$671,744
Calvert	Youth Services Bureaus	38,992
	Saturday Schools	30,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$68,992
Caroline	Teen Court	44,247
	Lifelong Learning Centers - After School Program	109,876
	School/Community Program for Sexual Risk Reduction Among Teens	58,529
	Addictions Counselor in Schools	26,474
	School Based Mental Health	25,468
	Caroline Mentoring Projext	33,630
	Laurel Grove Family Literacy	12,390
	Child & Family Behavioral Support Program	62,596
	Jurisdiction Total	\$373,210
Carroll	Youth Services Bureaus - Brief Strategic Family Therapy	124,506
	Cultural Navigator	27,601
	Jurisdiction Total	\$152,107

**FY2012 Community Partnership Agreement
At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

Jurisdiction	Program/Project Name	Funding Amount
Cecil	Advance	43,976
	Achieve LifeSkills	49,981
	Ascend	83,679
	Perryville Police Department Outreach Program	60,903
	Cecil County Drug Abuse Symposium	3,846
	Out-of-School Time Programs*	70,479
	Jurisdiction Total	\$312,865
Charles	Functional Family Therapy	51,518
	Youth Services Bureaus	139,088
	Summer Youth Achievement Program	23,677
	Summer/Mobile Meals	24,995
Jurisdiction Total	\$239,278	
Dorchester	Youth Services Bureaus	65,296
	Girls Circle	50,000
	Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol	22,000
	School Based Mental Health Services	80,000
	TREK	73,786
	Teen Ambassadors	18,190
Jurisdiction Total	\$309,272	
Frederick	Juvenile Entry Diversion Initiative	107,026
	Frederick County Out-of-School Programs	133,547
	Jurisdiction Total	\$240,573
Garrett	Healthy Communities/Healthy Youth	35,000
	Nurse Family Partnership	300,000
	Partners After School @ Southern Middle School	24,512
	Partners After School @ Oakland	24,512
	Summer Youth Employment Supplement	20,618
Jurisdiction Total	\$404,642	
Harford	Teen Court	12,000
	CINS Prevention	95,983
	CINS Diversion	95,983
Jurisdiction Total	\$203,966	
Howard	Community-Based Learning Centers @ Community Homes	72,000
	Alpha Achievers	11,250
	Bear Trax	18,000
	Club LEAP	14,033
	The Drop-In	18,900
	STARS @ Bollman Bridge ES	22,500
	Cougar Time @ Harpers Choice	45,000
	5th Period @ PVMS	36,000
	Education & Empowerment Center @ Oakland Mills	24,750
	Howard County Library Teen Time	18,000
Jurisdiction Total	\$280,433	
Kent	Addictions Counselor in Schools	72,443
	Girls Circle	70,025
	Adventure Diversion Program	62,583
	Early Morning Drop-Off	43,407
Jurisdiction Total	\$248,458	
Montgomery	Youth Services Bureaus*	111,992

**FY2012 Community Partnership Agreement
At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

Jurisdiction	Program/Project Name	Funding Amount
	Excel Beyond the Bell Services	487,884
	Linking Youth with Diversions	54,900
	Jurisdiction Total	\$654,776

**FY2012 Community Partnership Agreement
At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

Jurisdiction	Program/Project Name	Funding Amount
Prince George's	Youth Services Bureaus*	377,936
	Multi-Systemic Therapy	175,403
	Kinship Care	91,257
	Gang Prevention Initiative	73,243
	After School Programs	364,911
	Teen Court	60,000
	Truancy Prevention & Intervention	130,890
	Jurisdiction Total	\$1,273,640
Queen Anne's	After School - "Partnering for Youth" Program	52,244
	CASASStart	59,658
	Character Counts!	3,000
	Healthy Families	57,616
	Youth Mentoring	25,360
	Jurisdiction Total	\$197,878
St. Mary's	After School Program	62,320
	Youth Services Bureaus	119,219
	Mentoring	50,000
	Drug Screening	20,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$251,539
Somerset	K is for College	140,784
	Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol	25,435
	Jurisdiction Total	\$166,219
Talbot	After School Homework Club and Enrichment Activities*	68,319
	Voluntary Family Services	42,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$110,319
Washington	Tomorrow's Leaders	64,181
	Juvenile Delinquency Prevention & Diversion	176,000
	Rural Out-of-School Time Initiative	125,000
	Family Centered Support Services	36,000
	Positive Youth Development Coordinator	45,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$446,181
Wicomico	Building Foundations for Families (BFF)	192,000
	LAM: The Family Connection Center	115,000
	Family Empowerment Initiative	120,000
	Out-of-School Time (OOST) Initiative	272,487
	Jurisdiction Total	\$699,487
Worcester	Strengthening Adolescent Girls through Education and Support (SAGES)	73,860
	Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY)	27,790
	After School Academies Elementary Schools*	10,711
	After School Academies Middle and High Schools*	4,640
	Family Asset Building Initiative (FABI)	40,970
	Just for Girls/Guys	54,020
	Jurisdiction Total	\$211,991
FY2012 Total Statewide		\$10,394,020

*Information provided in aggregate for multiple sites.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Behavior and Emotional Support and Training

Program Summary: Two Behavior Specialists and one Family Behavior Specialist provide behavioral and emotional support and training to parents and child care providers for children exhibiting challenging behaviors.

Target Population: Pre-K and Kindergarten youth expressing serious behavior/emotional problems in a day care setting.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Depending on age of child, Brief Infant Toddler Social/Emotional Assessment – determined to be reliable by Journal of Pediatric Psychology or Preschool/Kindergarten Behavior Scale – a practice widely used in Head Start.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: BEST targets specific risk factors that lead to delinquent behavior. Once these risk factors are lessened, the problem behavior is much less likely to occur.

FY12 Funding: \$189,837

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of children served.	573	695	512	199	195	271
▪ Number of children with formal assessments.	75	118	78	84	51	70
▪ Number of Center Environmental Assessments.	5	18	19	6	17	2+
▪ Number of visits made by Behavioral Specialists to child care programs.***	1037	1185	1187	1013	1000	N/A
▪ Number of visits by Family Behavioral Specialist to homes.***	453	341	519	355	350	897++
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Ratio of Behavior Specialists to children with formal assessments.	1:25	1:39	1:26	1:28	1:25	1:23
▪ Average number of visits per child (families and centers).***	8	7.4	10	11	5	12.8
▪ Average number of visits per Center.***	8.5	6.2	5.5	4.5	3	5.5
▪ Percentage of children completing pre/post-tests.	85%	83%	92%	89%	80%	60%+++
	(N=75)	(N=69)	(N=55)	(N=41)		(N=42)
Is Anyone Better Off:						
▪ Percentage decrease in problem behaviors of children with formal assessments.	96%	92%	93%	100%	80%	73%ж
				(N=46)		(N=16)
▪ Percentage of children with formal assessments who showed an improvement in social skills.	99%	97%	91%	89%	89%	86%ж
				(N=41)		(N=19)
▪ Percentage of children with formal assessments not involuntarily removed from childcare during program year.	71%	98%	95%	100%	92%	100%
				(N=46)		(N=24)
▪ Percentage of Center Environmental Assessments that showed improvement in pre/post Assessments** during program year.	100%	100%	91%	100%	90%	100%
				(N=6)		(N=24)

**This ratio is based on the number of children with formal assessments. The total number of children served was not used because this number includes all the children in childcare programs as well as individual children and therefore does not reflect the intensive services that are provided to individual children.

***These numbers are now blended. The changes in funding and staffing resulted in a format for services that does not delineate between family and Child Care Centers/Programs. The Behavioral Specialists respond to calls as needed, there is no longer one person making only family visits.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Annapolis Youth Service Bureau (AYSB)

Program Summary: The AYSB offers individual, family, and group counseling services, crisis and suicide prevention and intervention services, substance abuse and mental health assessment and referral services, and positive youth development programming.

Target Population: Annapolis K-12 youth identified by DJS, DSS, LSS and SOC as vulnerable and at high risk for juvenile delinquency.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Kids at Hope, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The AYSB serves the k-12 population at a higher risk for juvenile delinquency, which often is the result of poverty, family violence, poor academic performance, lack of job/vocational training.

FY12 Funding: \$89,117

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	76	78	116	68	114	57
▪ Family*	68	74	N/A	64	95 ^	54
▪ Group*	4	7	8	1	19 #	3
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	161	156	86	60	95	61
▪ Family*	43	150	49	54	76	51
▪ Group*	4	12	0	0	0	0
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.						
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	41	21	54	0	5	53
	4	4	4	N/A	20	4 ^^
# of individuals recommended for Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as a result of assessment.	**	**	**	**		57
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4th session.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
▪ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	92%	94%	93%	100% (N=52)	90%	95% (N=57)
▪ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=30)	100%	100% (N=54)
▪ % of individuals completing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as recommended.	**	**	**	100% (N=4)	80%	100% (N=4)
				**		86% (N=49)
Is Anyone Better Off?						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	94.4%	94.5%	93% (N=98)	95% (N=52)	90%	96% (N=45)
▪ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.	**	**	**	**	60%	N/A
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	N/A
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	N/A
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	N/A
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	N/A
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	N/A
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	N/A
▪ # and % of individuals receiving Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) with an increased Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge.	**	**	**	**	80% ***	N/A

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**This performance measure is new for FY12

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Pascal Youth and Family Services, Inc. (RAPYFS)

Program Summary: RAPYFS offers individual, family, and group counseling services, crisis and suicide prevention and intervention services, substance abuse and mental health assessment and referral services, and positive youth development programming.

Target Population: North County youth K – 12 identified by DJS, DSS, LSS and SOC as vulnerable and at high risk for juvenile delinquency.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TFCBT), Second Step Violence Prevention (Second Step), Child Centered Play Therapy (CCPT)

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: RAPYFS targets the K-12 population at high risk for delinquency in Glen Burnie and the surrounding neighborhoods through family and group counseling services

FY12 Funding: \$89,764

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:				229		
▪ Individual*	108	159	196	140	114	120

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Family*	139	101	90	40	95	44
▪ Group*	60	400	421	49	19	58
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	51	121	223	161	95	116
▪ Family*	151	57	52	30	76	155
▪ Group*	6	81	8	0	0	30
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	99	42	64	96	76	75
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	42	6	25	49		
# of Youth participating in Second Step curriculum.	***	***	***	***	50	58
# of Youth participating in CCPT.	***	***	***	***	20	35
# of Youth participating in TFCBT.	***	***	***	***	15	15
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4th session.	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=229)	100%	100% (N=222)
▪ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	90%	93%	92%	91% (N=208)	90%	92% (N=202)
▪ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	87%	100% (N=15)	100%	100% (N=15)
▪ % of participating youth completing the Second Step curriculum.	**	**	**	**	80%	96% (N=56)
▪ % of participating youth completing Child Centered Play Therapy.	**	**	**	**	80%	85% (N=30)
▪ % of participating youth completing TFCBT.	**	**	**	**	80%	100% (N=15)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	90%	94%	95% (N=98)	100% (N=52)	90%	98% (N=135)
▪ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater	**	**	**	**	60%	69% (N=45)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	66% (N=20)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	51% (N=23)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	77% (N=17)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	77% (N=16)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	64% (N=27)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	65%	65% (N=11)
▪ % of youth exhibiting improvement in anger management/control as measured by Second Step pre and post-treatment testing.	**	**	**	**	80%	96% (N=56)
▪ # and % of youth participating in CCPT with an increased Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge	**	**	**	**	80%	86% (N30)
▪ # and % of youth participating in TFCBT who exhibit a reduction in PTSD symptoms as measured by trauma pre and post screening instrument.	**	**	**	**	80%	100% (N=15)

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**This performance measure is new for FY12.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: YWCA STAR Academy After School Program

Program Summary: An after school program offered three days a week that provides homework help and academic tutoring, training in the Second Step Anti-Violence Curriculum, daily group discussions, daily recreation and arts and crafts activities, and field trips.

Target Population: Middle school-aged students (grades 6-8) who are at risk for either school failure or suspension/expulsion due to poor academic performance and behavior problems. This program is offered at Annapolis (Annapolis) and George Fox (Pasadena) Middle Schools.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #320 EBP - Second Step; NREPP - Guiding Good Choices, Project Alert

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This school-based after school program to deter juvenile delinquency by providing personal accountability training and educational assistance to middle school-aged students who are at-risk for either failure or suspension/ expulsion due to poor academic performance or behavior problems.

FY12 Funding: \$95,898

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of students enrolled.	116	77	76	65	50	51
▪ Number of sessions offered.	100	100	77	98	92	91
▪ Number of program sites submitting program self-assessments	**	**	**	**	2	2
▪ Number of program sites submitting Program Improvement Plans	**	**	**	**	2	2
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.***	**	**	**	**	1	1
How Well We Do It:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.70
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	3.17
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	3.5
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	3.67
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	**	**	**	**	N/A	3.76
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	**	**	**	**	100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)
▪ # and % of program sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan	**	**	**	**	100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by a 90% program attendance rate.	77% (N=89)	81% (N=63)	89% (N=68)	84% (N=55)	80%	83% (N=42)
▪ Average daily attendance.	*	*	*	84% (N=55)	80%	80% (N=40)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level.	100%	95%	100%	100% (N=65)	80%	100% (N=51)
▪ Percentage of students absent from school less than 15 days during the academic year.	100%	90%	100%	100% (N=65)	90%	98% (N=50)
▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program.	98%	93%	100%	98% (N=64)	90%	94% (N=48)

* New performance measure for FY11. ** New performance measure for FY12. *** Both sites have the same program manager who is trained in YPQA.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: After School Program at Mills-Parole

Program Summary: An after school program offered four days a week that provides homework assistance, tutoring, recreation and cultural activities, healthy choices programming, community service, and field trips. This program is offered at Mills-Parole Elementary School.

Target Population: Elementary school-aged Latino/Spanish-speaking students attending Mills-Parole Elementary School (grades K-5)

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Research-based model programs “Voyager Passport” & “Ticket to Read” for English literacy and reading proficiency; Colorado #320 EBP - Second Step

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Targets elementary school aged Latino/Spanish speaking students attending Mills Parole Elementary School (Grades K-5) who are at-risk for expulsion/suspension and later delinquency due to behavior problems and educational challenges.

FY12 Funding: \$35,585

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of students enrolled ▪ Number of sessions offered ▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training. 	70	40	50	42	20	38
	121	115	118	104	92	107
	**	**	**	**	1	1
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain. ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain. ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain. ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain. ▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below). ▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed program as measured by 90% program attendance. ▪ Average daily attendance. 	**	**	**	**	N/A	5.00
	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.91
	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.63
	**	**	**	**	N/A	5.00
	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.89
	100%	80%	84%	80%	80%	89%
	*	(N=32) *	(N=42) *	(N=34) 80%	80%	(N=34) 89%
				(N=34) 80%		(N=34) 89%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level ▪ Percentage of students absent less than 15 days during the academic year. ▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program ▪ Percentage of students who moved from non-English Levels to demonstrating higher levels of English while enrolled using adopted assessment ▪ Percentage of students who improved English language proficiency at least one grade level using the adopted assessment. 	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%
	100%	100%	100%	(N=42) 100%	90%	(N=38) 92%
	100%	100%	100%	(N=42) 100%	90%	(N=35) 100%
	100%	100%	100%	(N=42) 100%	N/A	(N=38) NA
	**	**	**	(N=42) **	80%	82%
						(N=31)

* New performance measure for FY11. ** New performance measure for FY12.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Gems and Jewels Mentoring Institute

Program Summary: An after school program offered three days a week at Bates Middle School and providing Personal Accountability Training to include Group Dynamics/Discussions, Conflict Resolution, Cultural Diversity Training, Healthy Choices through the Fit for Life Program, Substance Abuse Education and Refusal, violence prevention through the Second Step Anti-Violence Curriculum, tutoring, opportunities for community service, recreational activities, fine arts training, and mentoring. This program is offered at Bates Middle School, a Title I underperforming school.

Target Population: Female students at Bates Middle School in grades 6 through 8 at-risk for either failure or suspension/ expulsion due to poor academic performance or behavior problems or juvenile delinquency.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #320 EBP – Second Step

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Deters juvenile delinquency by providing personal accountability training to middle school-aged students who are at-risk for either failure or suspension/ expulsion due to poor academic performance or behavior problems or juvenile delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$43,775

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of students enrolled	34	56	23	20	20	20
▪ Number of sessions offered	92	92	92	100	92	99
▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	**	**	**	**	1	2
How Well We Do It:						
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.06
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.80
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.075
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	3.83
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	**	**	**	**	N/A	4.20
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by 90% program attendance.	24%* (n=8)	91% (n=51)	87% (n=20)	80% (N=16)	80%	90% (N=18)
▪ Average daily attendance.	*	*	*	80% (N=16)	80%	90% (N=18)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=20)	80%	100% (N=20)
▪ Percentage of students absent less than 15 days during the academic year.	56%	78%	87%	100% (N=20)	80%	80% (N=16)
▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program	100%	100%	91%	90% (N=18)	90%	95% (N=19)
▪ Percentage of students not involved in the DJS system during program period.	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=20)	90%	100% (N=20)

* New performance measure for FY11. ** New performance measure for FY12.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Brooklyn Park Middle School Teen Club

Program Summary: Offered after-school four days a week to middle school-aged students at Brooklyn Park Middle School. Program activities include teacher-led homework/tutoring sessions, community service projects, social skills development, team building, sign language, karate, drug/alcohol awareness, recreation, arts and crafts, field trips, family events.

Target Population: Students (grades 6-8) identified by school staff as being at risk for academic failure, suspension/expulsion or juvenile delinquency.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #320 EBP – Second Step

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serves students at-risk for academic failure, suspension/expulsion, or juvenile delinquency.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY12 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of students enrolled	136	98	129	75	100	127
▪ Number of sessions offered	4	4	4	4	4	4
▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	**	**	**	**	1	1
How Well We Do It:						
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	Not yet available –
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	see note
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	**	**	**	**	N/A	
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	**	**	**	**	N/A	
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by 90% program attendance.	98%	88%	95%	96% (N=72)	80%	98% (N=125)
▪ Average daily attendance.	*	*	*	96% (N=18)	80%	98% (N=125)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level.	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=75)	80%	100% (N=127)
▪ Percentage of students absent less than 15 days during the academic year.	100%	99%	99%	100% (N=75)	90%	98% (N=125)
▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=75)	90%	100% (N=127)

* New performance measure for FY11. ** New performance measure for FY12.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Keep A Clear Mind (KACM)

Program Summary: KACM is a take-home drug education program for elementary school-aged students and their parents. The take-home materials consist of four lessons that are to be completed by children and their parents together that are designed to help develop specific skills to refuse and avoid gateway drug use.

Target Population: Fifth grade students in County public schools selected by teacher assessment with need to increase protective and resiliency factors.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #171 – Keep A Clear Mind

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program targets youth who may be at increased risk for ATOD use and later, delinquency.

Research shows a direct correlation between ATOD use and delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$39,957

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of students enrolled. ▪ Number of students who participated in the pre- and post-test evaluation. ▪ Number of take home lessons for which materials were furnished. 	1,325 ***	1,727 ***	1,876 ***	3,032 3,032	900 720	1,396 1,333
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed all four take-home lessons. ▪ Percentage of students who completed the pre- and post-test evaluation. ▪ Percentage of teachers orientated to the program who voluntarily administered the KACM curriculum. 	100% (n=1,325) ****	100% (n=1,727) ****	100% (n=1,876) ****	100% (N=3,032) 100% (N=3,032) 71% (N=85)	80% 80% 80%	80% (N=1,067) 95% (N=1,272) 84% (N=1,120)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of students who reported increased knowledge and awareness of ATOD as assessed by a post-test at completion of program. ▪ Percentage of parents who participate in the parent-child take home KACM drug education program, as measured by the completion of the lessons. ▪ Percentage of parents who report that the KACM program would have a "Significant Impact" on reducing the likelihood that their child would use ATOD. 	91% (n=1,095) **** **	97% (n=1,675) **** **	*** **** **	98.2% (N=2,978) 86.4% (N=2,619) **	80% 80% 80%	76.8% (N=1,024) 75.6% (N=1,008) 83.8% (N=845)

** New measure in FY12

*** Data pending report from Evaluator. (N/A)

****New measure in FY11

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol

Program Summary: CMCA decreases the perception that underage drinking is normative and acceptable behavior. MCA aims to decrease the availability of alcohol to persons under the age of 21 and to increase the enforcement of existing drinking laws and uniform sanctions for violations of underage drinking laws.

Target Population: Anne Arundel County youth and parents who perceive underage drinking as acceptable and/or permissible.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #82 - CMCA

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program addresses the relationship between under-age alcohol use and at-risk behaviors leading to delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$20,097

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of education, awareness, or outreach events held. ▪ Number of people who attended education, awareness and/or outreach events. ▪ Number of retail alcohol establishments monitored by AACo Police Department for selling alcohol to underage youth. ▪ Number of monthly meetings facilitated by Community Mobilization organizer. 	19 5606 160 12	14 5430 120 12	32 4479 ** 12	31 5169 ** 12	10 3000 ** 12	21 7163 ** 12
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and percentage of retail alcohol establishments that are not found to be in violation for selling alcohol to underage youth after receiving a warning. ▪ Number and percentage of CMCA Core Strategy Team members attending monthly CMCA meetings. ▪ Number and percentage of new community partners participating on the Core Strategy Team during current fiscal year. ▪ # and % of outreach event participants completing the exit survey 	83% (N=27) 10 3 *	18% (N=22) 10 5 *	** 13 3 *	** 10 2 *	** 50% (N=10) 25% (N=5) 80% (N=2400)	** 64% (N=12) 25% (N=5) 90% (N=2,921)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number/percentage of event participants who self-reported an increased knowledge and awareness of ATOD after attending an event - measured by exit survey. ▪ Decrease in the percentage of students reporting alcohol abuse in the last 30 days as measured by the American Drug and Alcohol Survey (ADAS) administered during the Annual Teen Summit in the spring of each year. ▪ % of parents who express disapproval of underage drinking as measured in outreach event exit surveys 	91% (n=1123) *** *	75% (N=295) *** *	98% (N=213) *** *	100% (N=744) 5% *	80% 5% 80%	100% (N=4,242) 5% 100% (N=4,242)

* New measure in FY12

**Compliance checks funded by GOCCP beginning in 2010.

***New measure in FY11.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Youth Empowerment Services (YES)

Program Summary: YES is a 16 week after-school diversion program which operates in two separate locations in Anne Arundel County. Each of the two locations was identified by DJS data as being areas at high-risk for delinquency. YES incorporates a research based prevention curriculum which focuses on school performance, drug involvement, and behavioral and emotional distress. Each location maintains a Site Coordinator, prevention educator and volunteers.

Target Population: Status and 1st time non-violent offender males between the ages of 12-18.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #320 EBP – Second Step

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program serves two areas identified by DJS data as being high-risk areas for delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$115,914

Performance Measures	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of participants served. ▪ Number of hours a week students will be facilitated in participating in a research-based prevention curriculum. ▪ Number of locations served. ▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.***** 	65	64	48	25	60	47
	5	8	5	7.5	5	8
	2	2	2	2	2	2
	***	***	***		1	2
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain. ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain. ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain. ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain. ▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below). ▪ Percentage of participants enrolled who complete a minimum of 12 weeks of the 16-week evidence-based Reconnecting Youth program while maintaining an attendance rate of 75% or better. ▪ Percentage of participants who self-disclose or exhibit characteristics of drug involvement who were referred to the appropriate substance abuse treatment services. ▪ Percentage of staff trained to teach the curriculum. ▪ Average daily attendance. ▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training. ▪ # and % of program sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan 	***	***	***	***	N/A	4.2
	***	***	***	***	N/A	4.66
	***	***	***	***	N/A	3.75
	***	***	***	***	N/A	4
	***	***	***	***	N/A	4.15
	65%	85%	65%	84% (N=21)	75%	76% (N=36)
	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=0)	*	*
	50%	100% (N=8)	100% (N=8)	100% (N=5)	*	*
	****	****	****	72% (N=18)	80%	88% (N= 17)
	***	***	***	***	80%	100% (N=2)
	***	***	***	***	100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of participants who demonstrated an increase in the following as indicated by a comparison of report card data for the marking periods before and after program participation:						
○ School attendance:	79%	81%	75%	84% (N=21)	75%	81% (N=38)
○ Grades (overall GPA)	61%	94%	75%	84% (N=21)	75%	83% (N=39)
○ School behavior**	53%	88%	80%	84% (N=21)	75%	85% (N=40)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Percentage of participants promoted to the next grade level.	85%	94%	100%	100% (N=25)	90%	100% (N=47)

* Data no longer collected. ** School behavior is included in the report card data. ***New Performance Measure for FY12.
**** New Performance Measure for FY11. ***** Both sites have the same program manager who will be the individual trained in YPQA

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Community Conferencing

Program Summary: Community conferencing is a juvenile diversion program that provides ways for people to safely, collectively and effectively prevent and resolve conflicts and crime. It aims to bring the victim, offender and interested community stakeholders, including parents, together with a trained facilitator. The volunteer facilitator works with the parties to assist them in responding to destructive behavior in constructive ways and to build connections that serve the well-being of all. Community Conferencing adheres to Restorative Justice principles that emphasize offender accountability and responsibility.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Community Conferencing – Promising Practice (Diversion)

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Diverts from the juvenile services system, promotes responsibility and preparation for adulthood.

Target Population: 1st time, non-violent offenders between the ages 10-17.

FY12 Funding: \$31,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ Number of participants diverted from Juvenile Services.	7	30	91
▪ Number of conferences.	3	30	59
▪ Number of additional conference participants engaged in process (above and beyond victim and offender).	**	22	230
How Well We Do It:			
▪ Percentage of participants who successfully completed sanctions within the time period allowed.	100% (N=7)	90%	100% (N=91)
▪ Percentage of Community Conferences resulting in agreements.	100% (N=7)	80%	98% (N=58)
▪ Percentage of consumers expressing satisfaction with services as measured by post-conference survey.	100% (N=7)	80%	98% (N=58)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ Percentage of participants who did not recidivate within 12 months of successfully completing the program.	N/A*	90%	95% (N=56)
▪ Percentage of compliance with Community Conference agreements at 1 month from creation of agreement.	100% (N=7)	90%	95% (N=56)
▪ Percentage of compliance with Community Conference agreements at 6 months from creation of the agreement.	N/A*	80%	100%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

*Program did not begin until the second half of FY11, so participants had been in the program for less than six months at the conclusion of the fiscal year. Therefore, these two items were not able to be measured. ** New measure for FY12.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Treasure Hunter’s Clearing House

Program Summary: A collaboration among all after-school programs and funders within the City of Annapolis. The Clearing House will increase the number and quality of caring adult volunteer mentors for youth in the City of Annapolis using the “Kids At Hope” evidence based model.

Target Population: Vulnerable youth ages 5-18 in the City of Annapolis.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Mentors will be certified in the Evidence-based “Kids at Hope” training curriculum. Mentors work with children in improving three areas; education, community and social skills

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Targeting the k-12 population at risk for delinquency

FY12 Funding: \$23,319

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of mentors recruited. ▪ Number of mentors who complete “Kids At Hope” mentor training. ▪ Number of mentors matched to mentees 	75 50 25	125 12 28
How Well We Do It:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of mentors still in place after 3 months. ▪ Percentage of mentors still in place after 1 year. ▪ Number and percentage of Directors of enrolled youth-serving programs that indicate satisfaction with the Clearing House on the end of year survey. ▪ Number and percentage of matched mentors satisfied with their mentoring assignment as measured by the annual mentor survey. 	90% 90% 90% 90%	100% ^ N/A N/A 75% (N=6)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who improve in the ‘Hope’ categories as shown by report card data on the following measures between 1st and 3rd quarter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School Attendance: ○ Grades (overall GPA) ○ School Behavior * ▪ Percentage of participants promoted to the next grade level. 	90% 90% 90% 85%	N/A N/A N/A N/A

* School behavior is included in the report card data.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Strengthening Families Program

Program Summary: Strengthening Families is a 14-session program that provides parent training for adults and life skills sessions for children aged 6-17.

Target Population: Families with youth at-risk for substance abuse.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #343 – Strengthening Families

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The goal of the SFP is to reduce the substance abuse risk status of children (ages 6-17). In Anne Arundel County, the Program has reached high-risk families with incarcerated parents, parents in treatment, and families identified through Anne Arundel County Public Schools pupil personnel workers, school social workers, and guidance counselors. The children of these families are at risk for delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$45,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do			
▪ Number of children (6 -11) participating in the program.	40	30	35
▪ Number of adolescents (12-18) participating in the program.	40	30	41
▪ Number of parents participating in the program.	55	36	67
How Well We Do It			
▪ Percentage of children graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units).	65% (N=26)	60%	80% (N=28)
▪ Percentage of adolescents graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units).	80% (N=32)	60%	66% (N=27)
▪ Percentage of parents graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units).	80% (N=44)	60%	81% (N=54)
▪ Percentage of parents satisfied with the program on completion as measured by program survey.	93% (N=28)	90%	100% (N=29)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ Percent of graduates attending the 6 month reunion who report positive behavior changes on 50% of indicators (family meetings, family meals, status of parent, school attendance of child(ren) in the administrated survey.	94% (N=30)	75%	95% (N=42)
▪ Percentage of parents who report increased school attendance.	91% (N=29)	80%	93% (N=41)
▪ Percentage of parents who report increased family communication.	88% (N=28)	80%	80% (N=35)

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Out of School Time Programs

Program Summary: School and community based after school programs that serve youth who need safe, nurturing environments during out of school hours in which they: receive additional academic skills development; learn new skills and discover new talents in areas of arts and athletics; and build attitudes and assets they need to be successful.

Target Population: Baltimore City youth ages 7–18. Youth from low-income neighborhoods, with high risk-index data will be targeted. Programs will work with partner schools to recruit youth who have been identified as at risk for chronic absenteeism and/or poor school performance. Programs are listed below with primary school that participating youth attend and primary neighborhood where they reside.

Program	Primary School	Primary Neighborhood(s)
Living Classrooms Foundation - CARE 1	Inner Harbor East Academy for Young Scholars	Jonestown/Oldtown
Living Classrooms Foundation - CARE 2	Tench Tighlman Elementary School	Jonestown/Oldtown

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Living Classrooms Foundation – BUGS	Commodore John Rodgers Elem/Middle School	Perkins/Middle East
YMCA @ Dr. Raynor Brown Elem/Middle	Dr. Raynor Brown Elem./Middle School	Clifton-Berea
YMCA @ George Washington Elem.	George Washington Elementary School	Washington Village
YMCA @ Patterson High	Patterson High School	Patterson Park North and East
YMCA @ W.E.B. Dubois High	W.E.B. Dubois High School	Northwood
YMCA @ Booker T. Washington	Middle School for Arts @ Booker T. Washington	Upton/Druid Heights
YMCA @ Montebello Elem/Middle	Montebello Elem/Middle School	Montebello
Chesapeake Center for Youth Development	Benjamin Franklin High School @ Masonville Cove	Brooklyn
Village Learning Place	Margaret Brent Elem/Middle School	Charles Village/Barclay/Greenmount

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Out of School Time programs that adhere to quality youth development principals, as measured through the validated Youth Program Quality Assessment tool. Programs demonstrating high YPQA scores have demonstrated that they promote youth engagement. Additionally, data shows that youth in Baltimore who participate in quality OST programs have participated in school at a higher rate, are less likely to be chronically absent, and more likely to be high attenders.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Programs are serving youth residing in low-income high-risk neighborhoods; in addition, youth with chronic absenteeism and/or poor school attendance will be recruited by schools and CBOs.

FY12 Funding: \$856,848

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	11	11	8
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	11	11	8
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	11/100%	8
# of youth served	927	995	1,178	969 ¹	900	978
# of meals served	NA	NA	New for FY11	83,433 ²	80,000	107,541
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily Attendance (ADA%) (average daily attendance in the programs / number of youth programs are contracted to serve)	87%	90.8%	109%	97.1% ³	90%	104% ⁴
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	11/11 (100%) ⁵	11 /100%	8/100%

¹ Data on sites identified in FY11 CPA

² Data on sites identified in FY11 CPA

³ Data on sites identified in FY11 CPA

⁴ ADA% calculated 952 average daily attendance / 915 youth contracted to serve

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
YPQA program self-assessment averaged score for Safe Environment domain. ⁶	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	4.74	4.50	4.83
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	4.01	3.80	4.21
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	3.04	3.00	3.66
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	2.25	2.50	2.80
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living Classrooms Foundation - CARE 1 • Living Classrooms Foundation - CARE 2 • Living Classrooms Foundation – BUGS • YMCA – Dr. Raynor Brown Elem/Middle • YMCA – George Washington Elem. • YMCA - Patterson High • YMCA – W.E.B. Dubois High • YMCA –@ Booker T. Washington • YMCA – Montebello Elem/Middle • Chesapeake Center for Youth Development • Village Learning Place 				3.98 4.06 3.59 3.07 2.61 3.96 3.64 Did not meas. Did not meas. Did not meas. Did not meas.	3.50 3.50 3.50 3.50 3.50 3.50 3.50 3.50	3.74 3.86 4.07 4.26 4.38 4.18 3.37 3.23
# / % of sites with completed YPQA assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	11 /100%	8 of 8 / 100%
#/% of programs that meet target for YPQA Instructional Score ⁷	Did not measure	Did not measure	Did not measure	7/ 63.6%	9/ 81.8% (66.7%)	6 of 8 / 66.7%
# OST staff who participate in base Professional	Did not	Did not	Did not	Did not	200	242 ⁸

⁵ Data on sites identified in FY11 CPA

⁶ FY12 Actual YPQA average scores for all 4 domains are based on self-assessment scores for 7 Child First Authority sites, and external assessment score for UMAR boxing.

⁷ Target standard is a score of 3.0 for the YPQA Instructional Score (which is determined by taking the average of the following 3 YPQA domains: Supportive Environment; Interaction; and Engagement) - Benchmark data for sites identified in FY12 CPA.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Development (minimum 16 hours)	measure	measure	measure	measure		
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of students who are regular attenders (not chronically absent)⁹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elementary ○ Middle School 	Did not Measure	Did not Measure	Did not Measure	NA NA	90% 82%	NA ¹⁰
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of youth who are high attenders¹¹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elementary ○ Middle School 	Did not measure	Did not Measure	Did not Measure	NA NA	37% 34%	NA ¹²
Youth have increased attitudes and assets (as measured on Out of School Time Surveys): ¹³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # and % of youth reporting increased sense of possibilities for future • # and % of youth reporting that participation in out of school time helped them feel safe • # and % of youth reporting connections to caring adults / youth respected by program staff • # and % of youth reporting positive peer relationships • # and % of youth reporting improved academic skills • # and % of youth reporting improved non-academic skills 		93.3%	86.4%	94.1%	90%	92.5% 317 of 401 total responses
		93.3%	85.6%	95.3%	90%	90.7% 362 of 399
		92.0%	85.7%	95.3%	85%	89.5% 357 of 399
		72.2%	62.5%	77.0%	75%	76.9% 310 of 403
		89.2%	88.2%	92.9%	85%	88.1% 356 of 404
		94.3%	81.1%	92.5%	85%	86.7% 359 of 414

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Expanded School Mental Health (ESMH)

Program Summary: ESMH is a comprehensive and integrated model of prevention and direct mental health treatment services. Prevention services can include participation in school-wide strategies and activities to promote positive learning environments, consultation and training with school staff, and group activities with students, families, and staff on a variety of topics and issues. Direct mental health treatment services can include, but aren't limited to, individual counseling, and group and family therapy. ESMH services (using a 0.5 FTE model) will be in approximately 4 schools.

⁸ This target includes staff for sites funded with resources beyond GOC funding. A total of 68 program sites had staff attend the base professional development.

⁹ Youth are chronically absent if they miss 20 or more days of school during the school year.

¹⁰ This data is not yet available from Baltimore City Schools.

¹¹ Youth are high attenders if they miss 5 days or fewer during the school year.

¹² This data is not yet available from Baltimore City Schools.

¹³ For FY11, this data is not specific to the FY12 GOC funded sites. For FY12, survey data is from GOC funded sites only.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: Students enrolled in general education programs, their family members as well as teachers and school personnel will participate in the prevention services; direct mental health services are targeted to students exhibiting behavioral, social and/or academic issues within the school environment. The programs will be located in schools serving southeast Baltimore City. Students are identified for intervention through a number of mechanisms within the school, including direct teacher referral, referrals from student support teams, as well as parent requests. ESMH clinicians are considered an integral part of the school environment and work throughout the year to establish and facilitate open communication with school staff, parents and youth, and other partners to ensure that services are widely promoted.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Universal prevention and early intervention mental health services are promising practices shown to have an impact on improving school climate, improving school attendance, and reducing long-term suspensions.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Youth taking part in the prevention and direct mental health treatment services are exhibiting behavioral, social, and/or academic issues that can contribute to poor academic outcomes, such as, truancy, failure and school dropout.

FY12 Funding: \$100,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of staff/teacher consultations per school per year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target for 1.0 FTE clinician ○ Target for 0.5 FTE clinician • # of group prevention activities/group sessions per school per year² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target for 1.0 FTE clinician ○ Target for 0.5 FTE clinician 	~256	***	***	***		
	~97	~52	1,109 (total)	130	60	773
	~82	***	***	***		
	~66	~64	307 (total)	32	30	112
	~18		***	***		
	~13	~20				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of students engaged in treatment services per school at a given time³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target for 1.0 FTE clinician ○ Target for 0.5 FTE clinician 			40 (total)	23	10	75
How Well We Do It:						
% of participating schools who maintain the services of 0.5 FTE ESMH clinician.	100%	75%	100% (N=7)	100% (N=4)	100% (N=4)	100% (N= 5)
% of 0.5 FTE clinicians maintaining full licensure					100% (N=4)	100% (N= 5)
% of school-wide climate activities supported by the 0.5 FTE clinician					100%	100%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual			FY11 Actual				FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Is Anyone Better Off?											
For students taking part in these services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % who attended school at least 90% of school days after beginning services % of who had no official long term suspensions after beginning mental health services 	Data being analyzed by BCPS	~50% ~77% Not avail.	EBMHP 90.4% N=232 100% N=257	HH 89%/N=16 0 95%/N=17 1	LR 93%/ N=30 97% / N=31	#87 89%	#206 93.4%	#242 94.7%	#246 92.6%	80% 80%	NA ¹⁴
• % of students who were promoted to next grade (retired as of FY10).						98.8%	100%	99.8%	99.1%		
• % of students that evidence improved behaviors associated with academic achievement as measured annually through parent/teacher satisfaction and impact surveys										80%	85%

¹Funding will support the prevention component of an ESMH program; mental health providers must access reimbursement through the Public Mental Health System to support the treatment services component of an ESMH program.

²These activities include small student group prevention activities; classroom wide prevention activities; school-wide prevention activities/assemblies; and, parent/family focused group prevention activities.

³These activities include screening/assessment/evaluation/treatment planning; treatment services; crisis response; family contacts; and, teacher consultations, clinical documentation, and reimbursement activities (billing for service). Numbers reflect average # of students seen per month.

*** - Performance measure no longer applicable in FY09 & FY10 – all funded sites are 0.5 FTE.

Elementary Schools listed in FY11 data: #87-Windsor Hills; #206 – Furley; #242 – Northwood; #246 – Beechfield.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Youth Service Bureau - East Baltimore Youth and Family Services

Program Summary: East Baltimore Youth and Family provide a combination of individual, family, and group counseling; referral and information services; case management; crisis intervention, informal counseling; and in accordance to particular community needs: tutoring, alternate leisure activities, employment assistance, community education, training and information relating to youth suicide prevention, and other specialized services. East Baltimore Youth and Family Services will continue the Parent Empowerment Project which is the intentional effort to adapt and respond to urgent community needs. The Department of Juvenile Services will provide funding to serve youth by preventing them from entering secure detention solely for the reason of a parent’s inability or unwillingness to pick them up after police contact.

Target Population: Transitional services serve pre-delinquent and at risk youth in East Baltimore zip codes (21205, 21213, 21224, and 21231).

Specific jurisdictions of service include Inner Harbor East; Patterson High School; and the Baltimore Juvenile Justice Center. The Parent Empowerment target population will be citywide and referrals from the Baltimore City Juvenile Justice Center Intake Office.

¹⁴ This data is not yet available from Baltimore City Schools.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: As of FY2012, the YSB will train and certify all staff in the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS). This automated web-based tool will track clinical outcomes for individual clients, Assign cases to appropriate levels of care, help generate a guided, strength-based plan of care, increase active care of coordination, communicate youth's needs to caregivers; and evaluate program effectiveness.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Youth taking part in services provided by the YSB are at risk for juvenile justice system involvement, poor academic and social outcomes, and reside in high-risk communities.

FY12 Funding: \$201,733 (CPA); \$39,776 (BPD)

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	417	564	151	241	170	264
▪ Family*	62	86	85	172	125	0
▪ Group*	534	293	0	114	160	0
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	143	60	67	149	135	195
▪ Family*	45	30	0	20	0	0
▪ Group*	6	0	0	0	0	0
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	347	493	151	76	75	41
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	20	12	11	35	50	33
# of formal counseling cases using a Best Practice/EBP model					100%	7% 37 of 264
# of individuals referred/linked to community based services.					119	77
How Well We Do It:						
% of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	78%	82%	80%	176/85%	119/70%	184/70%
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	66%	74%	83%	174/83%	119/70%	211/80%
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	92%	86%	100%	5/100%	6/100%	6/100%
% of formal case client surveys which the sum of the responses for the required three questions will equal 9 or higher.					76/45%	No Data Available
# of individuals who attended the first appointment after referral.					119/70%	No Data Available
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of	499%/93%	550/97%	99%	271/80%	119/70%	211/ 80%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
counseling.						
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					76/45%	20/ 54%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					76/45%	23/62%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					76/45%	17/45%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					76/45%	9/24%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					76/45%	20/54%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					76/45%	8/21%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					76/45%	9/ 24%
# and % youth who reduce identified behavior problems (showed improvement) by one or more levels listed above.					76/45%	32/86%
# and % of individuals who successfully completed linked services.					119/70%	6/15%

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

*Previous report separated each Youth Service Bureau's performance measure. This template was not to be altered. Therefore reports are now separate.

**CAFAS: The CAFAS tool is now a mandate and shall be implemented as of 10/1/11. Training for the tool has not been conducted at the time of this report.

Targets may be adjusted after September 2011 training.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Youth Service Bureau - Northwest Youth and Family Services

Program Summary: Youth Service Bureaus provide a combination of individual, family, and group counseling; referral and information services; case management; crisis intervention, informal counseling; and in accordance to particular community needs: tutoring, alternate leisure activities, employment assistance, community education, training and information relating to youth suicide prevention, and other specialized services.

Target Population: Transitional services will continue to serve pre-delinquent and at risk youth in Northeast Baltimore (21212, 21218, and 21239) and Northwest Baltimore (21215, 21217, and 21207). Referrals come from self, schools, care takers, social services, health centers and community partners.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: As of FY2012, the YSB will train and certify all staff in the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale. This automated web-based tool will track clinical outcomes for individual clients, Assign cases to appropriate levels of care, help generate a guided, strength-based plan of care, increase active care of coordination, communicate youth's needs to caregivers; and evaluate program effectiveness.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Youth taking part in services provided by the YSB are at risk for juvenile justice system involvement, poor academic and social outcomes, and reside in high-risk communities.

FY12 Funding: \$201,733 (CPA); \$39,776 (BPD)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	417	564	204	167	99	109
▪ Family*	62	86	0	44	0	2
▪ Group*	534	293	204	323	70	175
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	143	60	0	0	0	17
▪ Family*	45	30	28	0	0	18
▪ Group*	6	0	609	0	350	102
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.					99	109
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	347	493	204	172	3	0
# of formal counseling cases using a Best Practice/EBP model					100%	33% 36 of 109
# of individuals referred/linked to community based services.					75	3
How Well We Do It:						
% of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	78%	82%	100%	39/100%	99/100%	109/100%
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	66%	74%	88%	21/100%	87/88%	90/ 83%
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	92%	86%	100%	6	4/100%	4/100%
% of formal case client surveys which the sum of the responses for the required three questions will equal 9 or higher.					48/50%	No Data Available
# of individuals who attended the first appointment after referral					48/50%	64 of 109 58%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	499/93%	550/97%	100%	0/100%	87/88%	109/ 100%
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					45/45%	No Data Available
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					45/45%	32 of 36 88%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					45/45%	7 of 36 19%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					45/45%	2 of 36 5%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					45/45%	23 of 36 63%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					45/45%	20 of 36 55%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					45/45%	4 of 36 11%
# and % youth who reduce identified behavior problems (showed improvement) by one or more levels listed above.					45/45%	36 of 36 100%
# of individuals who successfully completed linked services					48/50%	No Data Available

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

Reporting Structure: Previous report separated each Youth Service Bureau's performance measure. This template was not to be altered. Therefore reports are now separate.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Choice Program - Choice Jobs

Target Population: Baltimore City youth who are involved with the Department of Juvenile Services between the ages of 11–18. Though the Choice program will serve all youth referred for this intervention, the priority population is African American males between the ages of 14-17 who are disproportionately overrepresented in the juvenile justice system or who are residing in the communities in the Cherry Hill community. Referrals are generated from the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS).

Program Summary: Choice Jobs provides community-based vocational counseling, preparation, and placement services. The Choice Jobs Program provides a full array of services including; job assessment, preparedness, acquisition and retention. An employment training program operates at The Flying Fruit Fantasy Stand (FFF) in Camden Yards. The Building Resiliency and Independence through Developing Gainful Employment (BRIDGE) component is a curriculum-based job readiness training program.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Choice Jobs is an official partner of the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship (NFTE) – participants can take part in a curriculum to build entrepreneurship skills relevant in today's economy.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program is community-based, providing comprehensive job readiness services, which are essential to develop self-sufficiency. Services are targeted to youth involved with the juvenile justice system as well as residing in the Cherry Hill community, considered a high-risk community.

FY12 Funding: \$128,285

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
How Much We Do:							
# of youth served (Intensive Advocacy [^])	144	172	171	96	84		
# of youth served (Choice Jobs)	*	*	*	121	145	80	81
# of eligible youth who applied for a job+						45	65
# of eligible youth who complete a job interview+						30	47
How Well Did We Do:							
% of youth who complete the program (Intensive Advocacy)	44%	50%	74%	73% (N=51 of 70)	75% (N=36 of 48)		
% of youth who complete 3 units of programming (Choice Jobs)	*	*	*	*	81% (N=30 of 37)	85%	88% 71 of 81
% of youth who complete 3 units of programming who subsequently complete an additional 3 units (completing 6 units in total).						75%	78% 63 of 81
% of staff who complete Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) Job Development Certificate.						100%	100% 6 of 6
Is Anyone Better Off?							
% of youth who do not re-offend during service intervention (Intensive Advocacy)	*	83 / 96.5%	137/97%	88% (N=62 of 70)	87% (N=42 of 48)		
% of youth who reside in the community at the time of program completion (Intensive Advocacy)	*	64 / 74%	113/80%	76% (N=53 of 70)	79% (N=38 of 48)		
% of youth completing three units of programming who demonstrate increased knowledge and skills as measured by pre and post tests and by instructor observation of successful completion of program components related to job readiness skills**	*	*	*	*	100% (N= 30 of 30)	90%	100% 81 of 81
% of youth completing 6 units of programming who demonstrate increased knowledge and skills as measured by pre and post tests and by instructor observation of successful completion of program components related to job readiness skills**	*	*	*	*	*	90%	100% 81 of 81
% of youth completing the job preparation program who are ultimately placed on jobs or paid internships through Choice Jobs					38% (N=5 of 13)	25%	62% 50 of 81

Choice Jobs began in FY10; data for years prior to this is not available. There is slight modification of performance measures based on the program's first year of operations.

**Job readiness skills include a completed resume, completed job application, documented job interviews, documented job searches, business plans (NFTE).

[^]The Intensive Advocacy team funded by the Children's Cabinet ended in FY11. All funds are allocated towards the Choice Jobs program in FY12; therefore the performance measures associated with Intensive Advocacy are no longer reported to the LMB. These services are still provided through the vendor's contract with DJS.

+Eligible youth are defined as having completed three units of programming (for FY12 it is projected that 60 will achieve this benchmark).

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Project CRAFT

Program Summary: Project CRAFT (Community Restitution Apprenticeship Focused Training) is a residential construction trades training program that works with young people residing in Baltimore City who are involved with the Department of Juvenile Services and participate in a therapeutic component as well.

Target Population: Young people between 16-19 years of age under the supervision of Maryland Department of Juvenile Services and are also participating in Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST), Functional Family Therapy (FFT) or Intensive Family Centered Services (IFCS).

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: The youth served will be engaged in productive activities and be prepared for employment in home building industries & becoming tax-paying citizens with a lower likelihood of re-offending. Youth will receive a Department of Labor approved industry-validated certification.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Youth taking part in the program are under the supervision of DJS

FY12 Funding: \$279,075 (CPA) + \$70,829 (Earned Reinvestment) = \$349,904

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
# of youth served.	17	40	11
# of youth who complete the program.	13	30	4
# of youth who transition to employment within 30 days of program completion.		20	0
How Well We Do It:			
% of youth who graduate and earn a PACT (Pre-Apprenticeship Certificate of Training) certification.	76% (13 of 17)	75% / 30	36% / 4 of 11
% of graduates who transition to unsubsidized employment.		85%	0
% of youth who attend at least 85% of scheduled classes.		75%	64% / 7 of 11
Is Anyone Better Off?			
% of participating youth who do not re-offend during the training program.		85%	55% / 6 of 11
% of participating youth who do not re-offend within 6 months of program graduation.	100% (13 of 13)	80% / 24 of 30	55% / 6 of 11
% of program completers who are placed on jobs, continued training or placed in education within 6 months of program completion.	76% (13 of 17)	90% / 27	36% / 4 of 11

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Lighthouse, Inc. (Youth Services Bureau)

Program Summary: Lighthouse provides low cost, community-based therapeutic counseling services for school-aged children, youth and their families/caregivers.

Target Population: The target population includes school-aged children and youth residing in the southwest region of Baltimore County. Examples of issues that bring individuals and families to Lighthouse include family conflict, substance abuse, poor academic performance and/or school-based behavior, and involvement with law enforcement and/or juvenile services for delinquent behavior. Individuals and families may self-refer for services. Additional referral sources include schools, police, the faith-based community, social services, health department, and juvenile services.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Lighthouse uses a variety of treatment models including cognitive behavioral family counseling, Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT), social skills training, parent coaching, and neurofeedback. The treatment model chosen is based on the identified needs of the client.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Delivers therapeutic counseling services to school-age children and youth at risk for developing chronic mental health issues that may lead to entry or further penetration of the health, social service, and/or law enforcement-juvenile service systems.

FY12 Funding: \$96,667

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	80	104	121	122	80	131
▪ Individual*	56	62	62	96	80	131
▪ Family*	80	89	115	116	80	124
▪ Group*	21	28	33	74	50	49
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:					40	115
▪ Individual*	120	0	62	60	20	115
▪ Family*	103	41	25	58	20	26
▪ Group*	1	1	3	3	0	2
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	160	140	98	116	80	124
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	1	2	0	1	1	0
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services					200	99 ^A
How Well We Do It:						
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=122)	100%	100% (n=131)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	75%	80%	77%	85% (n=103)	75%	83% (n=108)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=6)	100%	100% (n=6)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in TF-CBT					100%	100% (n=6)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	100%	98%	99%	100% (n=186)	95%	100% (n=131)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					80% (n=64)	84% (n=46/55)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					80% (n=16)	89% (n=34/38)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					80% (n=16)	82% (n=33/40)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					75% (n=3)	100% (n=1/1)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					80% (n=15)	87% (n=33/38)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					80% (n=20)	90% (n=46/51)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					65% (n=3)	100% (n=2/2)
➤ % of parents/caregivers reporting improvement in their child's behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.					75%	96% (n=43)

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Dundalk Youth Services Center, Inc. / DYSC (Youth Services Bureau)

Program Summary: DYSC provides low cost, school and community-based therapeutic counseling services for school-aged children, youth and their families/caregivers.

Target Population: The target population includes school-aged children and youth residing in the southeast region of Baltimore County. Examples of issues that bring individuals and families to DYSC include family conflict, substance abuse, poor academic performance and/or school-based behavior, and involvement with law enforcement and/or juvenile services for delinquent behavior. Individuals and families may self-refer for services. Additional referral sources include schools, police, the faith-based community, social services, health department, and juvenile services.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: DYSC uses a variety of treatment models including Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT), Client Centered Play Therapy, Relationship Enhancement Therapy, Active Parenting, and Filial Play Therapy. The treatment model chosen is based on the identified needs of the client.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Counseling services to school-age children and youth at risk for developing chronic mental health issues that may lead to entry into or further penetration of the health, social service, and/or law enforcement-juvenile service systems.

FY12 Funding: \$114,792

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	71	94	104	85	95	73 ^A
▪ Individual*	71	94	104	85	95	73 ^A

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Family*	71	94	104	85	95	73 ^A
▪ Group*	0	0	6	0	0	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:					38	8 ^B
▪ Individual*	49	47	53	22	28	8 ^B
▪ Family*	49	47	53	22	28	8 ^B
▪ Group*	0	0	0	213	10	0 ^B
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	99	141	157	107	117	81 ^B
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	0	0	3	0	1	0 ^C
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services.					735	742
How Well We Do It:						
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	98%	100%	100% (n=85)	100%	99% (n=72)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	85%	89%	93%	84% (n=49)	60%	53% ^D (n=26)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=6)	100%	100% (n=7)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in TF-CBT					100%	71% ^E (n=4)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	100%	96%	100%	99% (n=84)	98%	100% (n=73)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					60% (n=35)	68% (n=32/47)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					50% (n=17)	70% (n=23/33)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					50% (n=17)	79% (n=26/33)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					30% (n=1)	91% (n=10/11)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					50% (n=17)	67% (n=26/39)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					50% (n=17)	71% (n=27/38)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of					50%	86%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					(n=4)	(n=6/7)
➤ % of parents reporting improvement in their child's behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.					75%	0% ^F

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**Data not available for this fiscal year.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: First Step, Inc. (Youth Services Bureau)

Program Summary: First Step provides community-based therapeutic counseling services for school-aged children, youth and their families/caregivers.

Target Population: The target population includes school-aged children residing in the central region of Baltimore County. Examples of issues that bring individuals and families to First Step include family conflict, substance abuse, poor academic performance and/or school-based behavior, and involvement with law enforcement and/or juvenile services for delinquent behavior. Individuals and families may self-refer for services. Additional referral sources include schools, police, the faith-based community, social services, health department, and juvenile services.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: First Step uses a variety of treatment models including Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, play therapy and motivational enhancement therapy – with the exact modality used based on the identified needs of the client.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Delivers community counseling services to school-age children and youth at risk for developing chronic mental health issues that may lead to entry into or further penetration of the health, social service, and/or law enforcement-juvenile service systems.

FY12 Funding: \$90,625

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	57	66	89	85	80	100
▪ Individual*	57	66	89	85	80	100
▪ Family*	57	66	82	85	80	100
▪ Group*	0	0	0	0	0	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:					20	38
▪ Individual*	20	31	22	23	20	38
▪ Family*	7	16	20	23	20	38
▪ Group*	0	0	0	0	0	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	77	97	89	0	80	100
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.			49	65	20	8 ^A
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services.					200	362
How Well We Do It:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=85)	100%	100% (n=100)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	70%	75%	80%	86% (n=73)	80%	86% (n=24/28)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=10)	100%	100% (n=8)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in completing the CAFAS assessment.					100%	100% (n=8)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	90%	100%	100%	100% (n=85)	100%	100% (n=80)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					80% (n=64)	71% ^B (n=20/28)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					80% (n=32)	53% ^B (n=9/17)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					80% (n=48)	63% ^B (n=10/16)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					80% (n=40)	100% (n=2/2)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					80% (n=40)	58% ^B (n=11/19)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					80% (n=48)	73% ^B (n=11/15)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					80% (n=16)	67% ^B (n=2/3)
➤ % of parents reporting improvement in their child's behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.					75%	0% ^C

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**Data not available for this fiscal year.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Functional Family Therapy (FFT)

Program Summary: FFT is an evidence-based family therapy intervention for the treatment of violent, criminal, behavioral, school, and conduct problems with youth and their families. FFT also provides treatment to the younger siblings of referred youth.

Target Population: The target population includes youth, ages 10-17, who have begun to demonstrate either internalized or externalized behaviors that have been shown to be indicative of future delinquent behavior. Referrals are accepted from any source, including self-referrals.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: FFT is rated as an “exemplary” program per the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence and the Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: FFT delivers therapeutic services to youth at risk for developing chronic behavioral issues that may lead to entry into or further penetration of the health, social service, and/or law enforcement-juvenile service systems.

FY12 Funding: \$369,660

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of youth/families served	31	89	76	83	108*	92
▪ Number of youth/family slots available at any one time	**	**	**	35	36***	36
▪ Average duration of services (in days) for youth/families receiving FFT	**	**	**	136	135****	170
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth/families who complete the intervention and are discharged from the program by mutual agreement	0	65%	81% (n=59)	67% (n=31)	75%	73% (n=70)
▪ Minimum average dissemination adherence score required for an FFT team to be considered adherent to the model*****	**	**	**	**	4	5.62
▪ Minimum average fidelity score required for an FFT team to be considered adherent to the model*****	**	**	**	**	3	4.03
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report a reduction in the level of family conflict post therapy, as indicated by a score of 3 or higher on the Client Outcome Measure (COM-P)	**	100% (n=28)	95.5% (n=35)	93% (n=28)	90%	98% (n=49)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians reporting improvement in their parenting skills, as indicated by a score of 3 or higher on the Client Outcome Measure (COM-P)	**	**	**	100% (n=28)	90%	98% (n=49)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report improvement in their child’s behavior as measured by the Youth Outcome Questionnaire (Y-OQ 2.01) pre to post	**	70% (n=23)	91.5% (n=35)	82% (n=28)	80%	86% (n=42)

* 4 therapists with an average caseload of 9 (range is 8-10) = 36; with 4 months of service the target for the year is 108 youth/families

**Data not available for this fiscal year.

***4 therapists averaging 9 cases each = 36 on any given day

****FFT model service duration is 120-150 days, so chosen target is the midpoint of 135 days.

*****FFT measures both dissemination adherence (the degree to which a therapist is complying with the basic procedural elements of the model) and fidelity (a combination score about whether the therapist is using the right skills in the right phase of treatment-called clinical adherence-And how well they are using those skills-call clinical competence).

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: School/Community Program for Sexual Risk Reduction Among Teens

Program Summary: This program is a comprehensive multi-faceted approach to public health education encompassing five principles; responsible decision making, effective communication, values clarification, enhanced self-esteem and improved understanding of reproductive science/sexual risk prevention. These principles are emphasized through three strategies, 1) Public Awareness, 2) Community Workshops, and 3) Teacher/School Workshops.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: Caroline County school-aged youth ages 10 to 19 that are at risk of teenage pregnancy and delinquency. The program is held at the middle and high schools, afterschool programs in the middle and high schools, community events, DJS and through a public awareness campaign.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: School/Community Program for Sexual Risk Reduction Among Teens is an evidence-based practice originally funded by a grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the United States Office of Population Affairs, the School/Community Program was first developed and rigorously evaluated for effectiveness by the University of South Carolina. The School/Community Program was proven to significantly reduce teen pregnancy in the target rural counties of South Carolina. The knowledge survey taken by youth is the model’s evaluation tool.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program not only helps to reduce teenage pregnancy but also builds protective factors and positive developmental assets. Research has shown that young people with these skills are less likely to become involved with the juvenile justice system. As noted in the “*Longitudinal Study of Delinquency, Drug Use, Sexual Activity, and Pregnancy Among Children and Youth in Three Cities*” there is a correlation between sexual activity and juvenile delinquency. As well as, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) considers teenage parenthood a risk factor for delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$58,529

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of public awareness venues.	7	7	7	9	7	15
▪ # of community workshops.*	45	122	55	31	10	11
▪ # of professional workshops.	2	3	2	2	2	2
▪ # of student workshops.**	0	0	89	132	50	129
How Well We Do It (all from pre-post survey):						
▪ # / % of professionals satisfied with the workshops.				27/100%	#/75%	24/100%
▪ # / % of students satisfied with the workshops.				3006/99%	#/75%	2482/98%
▪ #/ % of community attendees satisfied with workshops.					#/75%	119/99%
▪ #/% of participants that report being more confident to apply the information learned in real life situations.					#/75%	2572/98%
▪ #/% of students that report they have more knowledge on sexting.					#/75%	483/96%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ # /% of students with any improved scores on the knowledge survey (taken at end of classroom workshops).				3006/98%	#/90%	2482/98%
▪ # / % of students with any improved scores on the attitude survey (taken at end of classroom workshops).				2747/96%	#/80%	2482/97%
▪ #/% of participants who report on the workshop survey they have more knowledge of current issues facing at-risk youth.					#/75%	563/98%
▪ #/% of youth who report on the survey*** using contraceptive methods.					#/50%	393/99%

*Community workshops included student workshops/classroom sessions in FY08 & FY09.

**The peer education component of the program was eliminated for FY10 because there was no interest by students to participate. The student workshop or class presentation was added to capture the work being done in the schools.

***Survey given pre and post-workshop. Due to workshop only being 1 hour and students not wanting to take 2 surveys in an hour the survey will only be given post workshop to determine more knowledge.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Addictions Counselor in School

Program Summary: The Addictions Counselor provides individual and group therapy in the two high schools, Lockerman Middle School and the Caroline Counseling Center*** using the Stages of Change treatment model and a shorter intervention program, Teen-Intervene. Informational support is also offered as a prevention measure.

Target Population: Teens age 12-17 at Lockerman Middle School and the Caroline Counseling Center in need of alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse prevention, intervention or treatment and are at risk of delinquency. Students are referred by self, parent, teachers, guidance counselors, Teen Court, DJS and the public mental health clinic.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: The Addictions Counselor uses the Teen Intervene model, which is listed on the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP). Teen Intervene is an early intervention for youth that are not using on a daily basis. It is based on the *Stages of Change* theory that includes motivational enhancement, cognitive behavioral therapy and aims to help teens reduce and ultimately eliminate their alcohol or other drug use. It is a program that is designed as an in-school program. The *Stages of Change* was developed in the late 70 to early 80s by James Prochaska and Carlo DiClemente. It contains six (6) stages from pre-contemplation to relapse. Later on Dr. Kern added a 7th stage “maintain maintenance.” Improvements on the GAF, lack of drug related suspensions and DJS involvement all indicate reductions in/elimination of drug/alcohol use.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program serves school-age youth and addresses the link between drug and alcohol use and delinquency. In fact, by definition, drug and alcohol use by young people is a crime, so preventing use or ending use is delinquency prevention.

FY12 Funding: \$26,474

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of students (total unduplicated) receiving services.	123	144	60	96	90	65
▪ Number of sessions.				551	200	237
▪ Number of prevention presentations.	9	10	8	4	10	11
How Well We Do It:						
▪ #/% of participants attending at least 6 therapy sessions (based on youth strategies 5-year experience).	123/100%	144/100%	61/57%	48/96%	#/60%	42/65%
▪ #/% of participants satisfied with quality of services as measured by survey given at end of program.	123/100%	144/100%	105/100%	11/73%	#75%	0>>
▪ #/% of participants who complete Teen Intervene as planned.				10/71%	#75%	0>>
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of participants <u>not</u> receiving a drug-related school suspension while in treatment.	70/90%	99%	61/100%	21/100%	#/90%	65/100%
▪ #/% participants not receiving alcohol related school suspension.					#85%	65/100%
▪ # /% of participants not referred to DJS for drug use while in treatment.	15/12%	1/99%	59/98%	21/100%	#87%	65/100%
▪ #/% of participants not referred to DJS for alcohol use while in treatment.					#85%	65/100%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ #/% of participants demonstrating any increase on GAF between intake and discharge.	60%	19%	57/62%	11/73%	#60%	15/83%

*These counts reflect duplication of children who receive both services.

**GAF Global Assessment of Functioning

***The SOCRATES (Stages of Change Readiness and Treatment Eagerness Scale) is an experimental instrument designed to assess readiness for change in alcohol and drug abusers. It yields three factorial-derived scale scores: Recognition (Re), Ambivalence (Am), and Taking Steps (Ts).

^ info will not be gathered until end of program

^^ thus far no current clients have fallen into the category of level0.5 which follows the program of Teen Intervene

^^^at this time the 3 clients who have been administratively discharged from the program have not demonstrated an increase in the GAF scores

>numbers served did not reach target due to school space with renovations of both high schools

>>No surveys were returned In FY13 the vendor will have participants fill out the survey while in session before discharge.

>>>No current clients have fallen into the category of Level 0.5 which follows the program of Teen Intervene

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: School-Based Mental Health Program

Program Summary: Provides in-school therapeutic services including billable individual, group and family sessions using the Cognitive Behavior Therapy model and non-billable services such as working with school personnel.

Target Population: Students in need of mental health services and at risk of juvenile delinquency at Lockerman Middle and Greensboro* Elementary Schools. Students are referred to the program by parents, self-referral, teachers, guidance counselors and caseworkers.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: Cognitive Behavior Therapy (CBT) is considered by OJJDP to be a model program. It combines psychotherapy and behavioral therapy and uses the underlying principle that thoughts affect emotions which influence behaviors. Improvements on the GAF are measured as an indicator of improved functioning.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program serves school aged children and as many other OJJDP prevention programs that target young people that are at risk for delinquency uses the CBT strategies.

FY2 Funding: \$25,468

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of students served (unduplicated total):						
▪ Lockerman	67	66	67	51	50	61
▪ Greensboro*				47	50	46
▪ # of non-billable points of service:						
▪ Lockerman	1141	1,045	1377	649	900	1108
▪ Greensboro				1188	500	995
▪ # of billable points of service:						
▪ Lockerman	1,271	1,461	1763	751	800	1251
▪ Greensboro*				367	270	595

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
How Well We Do It:						
▪ #/% of students that attend six behavioral health sessions (six is based on five years of Youth Strategies recommendations):						
▪ Lockerman	45/67%	25/41%	30/45%	16/45%	#/75%	33/70%>
▪ Greensboro*				23/52%	#/75%	33/72%>
▪ #/% of students who are satisfied with services on the annual consumer satisfactory survey:						
▪ Lockerman				7/86%	#50%	23/100%
▪ Greensboro*				None received	#50%	5/100%
▪ #/% of participants who complete CBT intervention by mutual agreement with therapist.						
▪ Lockerman					#75%	0/0%>>
▪ Greensboro					#/75%	0/0%>>
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of students attending six sessions that demonstrate any improved score or maintain improved (prior score that was improved) on the GAF:**						
▪ Lockerman	64/96%	59/90%	98%	5/33%	#50%	29/93%
▪ Greensboro*				10/43%	#50%	22/67%
▪ #/% of students attending 6 sessions who have no more than three office referrals while in the program:						
▪ Lockerman				12/80%	#/75%	31/95%
▪ Greensboro*				22/96%	#75%	33/100%
▪ #/% of students who report the program has helped them better understand behavioral health on survey given at end of program						
▪ Lockerman					#/50%	21/92%
▪ Greensboro*					#50%	5/100%
▪ #/% of students who indicate on annual consumer survey that their mental health has improved.						
▪ Lockerman					#/70%	21/92%
▪ Greensboro*					#/70%	5/100%

*Greensboro Elementary was added in the 3rd qtr. of FY11.

**GAF is the Global Assessment of Functioning pre and post measure given at intake, every six month thereafter and at discharge.

^ info is gathered in Spring of 2012

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

^^ CBT Interventions are ongoing. Oended tx. in 2nd qtr

^^^ Not a sole intervention but CBT techniques are used in conjunction with others. 3 were closed successful

>this target was not met with no explanation

>>CBT is ongoing, not a sole there were no interventions but CBT techniques are used in conjunction with others

CBT is a technique that is used in the treatment plan and is continuous the student does not “complete” CBT. This measure will be replaced with a new measure for the FY13 Performance Table. The only way completion is accounted is if the student drops out of the program or transitions to High School.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Caroline Mentoring Project (CMP)

Program Summary: CMP matches mentors with mentees (youth) to foster positive relationship for young people with caring adults.

Target Population: Elementary and middle school students who have been identified as at-risk of school failure or juvenile justice involvement by a teacher, guidance counselor, parents, case worker or other interested persons. Youth are referred by parents, youth, teachers, guidance counselors, clergy, DJS and DSS caseworkers. Mentor trainings are advertised in the local newspaper.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) is listed as a model program on six different sites including OJJDP which views it as a delinquency prevention program. While the Caroline Mentoring is not affiliated with BBBS it does follow the guidelines of its community-based mentoring programs. In addition, Caroline Mentoring has adopted the two essential aspects of mentoring from OJJDP; 1) high level of contact between the mentor and mentee; 2) a relationship that defines the mentor as a friend not an authority figure and the four prerequisites for a successful mentoring program; 1) volunteer screening to eliminate unfavorable mentors; 2) communication and limit-setting trainings for mentors; 3) procedures that take into account youth and volunteer preferences; 4) intensive supervision and support for each match. Improvement in academic achievement is measured as well as the satisfaction of mentee with the program.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Caroline Mentoring serves school age youth and mentoring is an effective way to prevent at-risk youth from becoming involved in delinquency and also to help already delinquent youth change their lives for the better. Mentoring relationships have been shown to improve youth's self-esteem, behavior, and academic performance.

FY12 Funding: \$33,630

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of mentor relationships (youth & mentor).	19	26	21	19	20	21
▪ # of mentor trainings.	4	3	4	1	4	4
▪ # of group activities.	4	6	6	3	5	10
How Well We Do It:						
▪ #/% of mentors who spend at least 8 hours/month mentoring their mentee.	95%	100%	(18) 95%	19/95%	#/90%	19/90.7%
▪ #/% of mentor relationships that remains intact for six months.				17/95%	#/75%	21/100%
▪ #/% of Mentors/Mentees who attend group events.**					#/80%	15/70%>
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of mentees who show improvement in overall GPA (from first marking period to last for the school year).*	50%	74%	85%	85%*	#/75%	17/81%
▪ #/% of mentees who see value in the relationship and want to continue as measured by Mentee – Caroline Mentoring Project Annual Evaluation Survey.*	25% declined 95%	100%	100%	97.5%*	#/90%	21/100%
▪ #/% Mentees who report the relationship has made a difference in their lives at					#/90%	21/100%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
home and school - Caroline Mentoring Project Annual Evaluation Survey.						
▪ #/% of participants who have no DJS involvement while involved in program.					#80%	21/100%

* # new in FY12 number was not tracked in FY11.

^info to be gathered at end of year

>many of the mentees/mentors have preferred individual events but as more tempting group events are added more are attending

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Lifelong Learning Centers (LLC) – After School Program

Program Summary: After school activities that develop academic, social and life skills that benefit the students, their families and the community.

Target Population: Colonel Richardson Middle School and Lockerman Middle School students at risk of school failure and DJS involvement. Students will be targeted through an outreach campaign to teachers, parents, guidance counselors and students.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: The LLC Afterschool Program follows the Quality Standards Framework developed by the Maryland Out-of-School Time Network (MOST) and will work with the research based Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) Tool. Lockerman Middle School and Colonel Richardson Middle School staff have been certified in the YPQA Training and currently use the YPQA Assessment Tool. The training was provided by MOST.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: MOST issued a policy brief, “*Providing Youth with Opportunities in the Out of School Hours as Alternatives to High Risk Behaviors*,” (May 2010) which makes a very strong case that afterschool programs provide a safe place for students in the hours from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Research shows us that these are peak hours for youth to engage in risky behaviors including committing crime. Quality afterschool programs incorporate youth development as an approach to providing services to offer an alternative to these high risk behaviors. The afterschool programs supported by the HSC follow this youth development approach and are preventing juvenile delinquency. Additionally, OJJDP sites three major functions for afterschool programs all of which are part of our afterschool program. They are: 1) provide supervision; 2) offer enriching experiences; and 3) improve academic achievement.

FY12 Funding: \$109,876

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					5	6
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.					2	2
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.					2	2
▪ # of Middle School students served.	258	296	358	265	200	186^
o Colonel Richardson Middle School	164	209	201	165	125	86
o Lockerman Middle School	94	95	157	100	75	100
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Average Daily Attendance.				85%*		
o Colonel Richardson Middle School				^^	60%	76%
o Lockerman Middle School				^^	60%	82%
▪ #/% of students who attend the program 30 days or more.						91/60%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School	38%	39%	40/53%	90/55%	53%	
○ Lockerman Middle School	38%	46%	100/50%	70/70%	53%	56/81%
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					4	4.4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					3.5	3.7
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3	3.2
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					3	2.5
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).					3.25	3.3
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School						
○ Lockerman Middle School					3.25	3.5
▪ #/% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					2/100%	2/100%
▪ #/ of Parents participating in Family Events						63/100%
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					#/50%	
○ Lockerman Middle School					#/50%	49/100%
▪ #/% of students satisfied with the program at the end of family events (survey administered at end of event)						
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School				292/88%^^	#/75%	69/86%
○ Lockerman Middle School					#/90%	110/93%
▪ #/% of parents who indicate they are satisfied with the academic help provided for their child (survey)						
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					#/80%	44/96%
○ Lockerman Middle School					#/80%	20/83%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of students who attend 30 days or more with program entry grade of D or lower in Language Arts who increase the grade by at least one letter grade by the 3 rd Term						
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					#/75%	^^
○ Lockerman Middle					#/75%	^^
▪ #/% of students who attend 30 days or more with program entry grade of D or lower in math who increase the grade by						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
at least one letter grade by the 3 rd Term						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School					#/75%	3/100%
o Lockerman Middle School					#/75%	1/100%
▪ #/% of students who were chronically absent (more than 20 days) in 2010-2011 school year who miss less than 15 days of school in 2011-2012.						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School					#/75%	1/100%
o Lockerman Middle School					#/75%	1/100%

*The schools were not tracked separately in FY11.

^^^YPQA Cumulative Scoring and Corrective Action Plans have not been written yet because the training has not been received from Weikert that was paid for as part of the package. The first set of observations was completed in Oct/Nov 2011 at both sites.

^ Lockerman and CRMS program was on hold for 1 week while youth were attending camp at North Bay. After School was not able to operate at LMS

^^ No one had a D or lower in Language Arts

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Laurel Grove Family Literacy Program

Program Summary: Laurel Grove provides evening adult education classes for parents and an evening enrichment camp for their children in a community-based setting in Federalsburg. Laurel Grove is modeled on a family literacy approach.

Target Population: Haitian/Creole families (parents & their children 5 to 14 who are at risk of DJS involvement) in Laurel Grove area of Federalsburg. Families will be recruited from this community through the school system and a community outreach effort.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: Laurel Grove is based on the national standards for family literacy programs and will include: adult education, youth/child education activities, parent-child together time (PACT); and parenting education. In addition the youth component will align with the MOST Quality Standards Framework. Research overwhelming shows that two key elements in student success are related to their parents. These are (1) a parent's direct involvement in a student's academic life and (2) parents' own education levels. **How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population:** Laurel Grove Program serves school age children that have childhood risk factors for delinquency as noted by OJJDP, such as poor academic performance, neighborhood disadvantage and living in a poor family.

FY12 Funding: \$12,390

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of adults participating.	22	19	11	9	12	11
▪ # of students participating.	17	20	23	21	20	26
▪ # evening sessions.	71	61	65	56	65	46
▪ # of outside partners to provide educational workshops.					5	5
How Well We Do It:						
▪ #/% of adults meeting the adult education standard of 60 hours or 30 sessions.	0/0%	7/73%	5/50%	5/56%	#/60%	3/75%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ #/% of students attending 30 sessions.	6/30%	17/77%	20/80%	18/74%	#/60%	21/95%
▪ #/% of families attending educational workshops.					#/60%	5/100%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of adults (30 sessions or 60 hours) increase 1 NALS level on the BEST PLUS pre/post-test. **		64%	5/45%	3/60% ***	#/60%	3/100%
▪ #/% of students with 60% attendance rate with first term grade of D or lower in math who increase the grade by at least one letter grade by the 3 rd term.				2/100%	#/50%	^
▪ #/% of students with 60% attendance rate whose teacher reports improvement on Annual Teacher Survey.				****	#50%	^^
▪ #/% of students who report on Annual Survey that the program has increased their social skills.					#/70%	^^

**Pre/Post Assessment used in FY07 was a locally-designed assessment. Best Plus was adopted in FY08.

***Both students who attended the program who had grades of D or below increased their grades to C by the end of the 2nd term: 2/2 – 100% and maintained it at C or better through the 3rd term; additionally 92% of students maintained or increased their grades in Language Arts, including 6/50% who increased their grades by at least one letter grade; 67% of students attending maintained or increased their grades in math. *Conversely, for the one student who dropped out during the third quarter of the program, the results were dramatically different with grades dropping from a C in Math to an E and from a C to a D in Language Arts.* Final grades and MSA scores will be added to the matrix upon receipt of the independent evaluation of the program due to CCRP by August 15, 2011.

****Not completed due to program ending at end of school year and teachers leaving for summer. Average school attendance for children attending the family literacy program was 93%, slightly below the schools attendance rate of 95%, however the these families are very high risk – with 11% receiving special education services and 67% receiving ESL services. It is notable that no students who attended the program missed more than 20 days of school, which is often used as an indicator for “high risk” of failure. MSA scores. School administrators (principals/assistant principals) who were informally polled suggest that involvement in this family literacy program is linked to student success both in the classroom, on tests and n behavior scales.

^ All 26 students in grades 7/8 who attended the Program had a C or higher as their final math grade both in 2011 and 2012

^^ no teachers or students returned surveys, the Afterschool Coordinator became very ill in the 3rd and 4th qtr and was not able to comply with the end of year survey

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Child and Family Behavioral Support Program (CFBSP)

Program Summary: Provides families and educators with behavioral consultation that will enhance their capacity to manage or change problem behaviors.

Target Population: Children (ages 3-15) who exhibit challenging behaviors that disrupt their daily functioning in the home and/or school environment and put them at-risk of future involvement with DJS.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: CFBSP is a locally developed program that is anchored on the concept of the functional behavioral assessment (FBA) and positive behavior support. The FBA is an approach that incorporates a variety of techniques and strategies to diagnose the causes and identify likely interventions intended to address problem behaviors. It goes beyond the overt topography of the behavior, focusing upon identifying biological, social, affective, and environmental factors that initiate, sustain, or end the behavior in question. Research has demonstrated that behavior intervention plans based on the knowledge of “why” the behavior is occurring increases the probability that the interventions will be successful and extremely

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

useful in addressing a wide range of problems. Positive behavioral support (PBS) is a general term that refers to the application of positive behavioral interventions and systems to achieve socially important behavior change. At the core, PBS is the integration of behavioral science, practical interventions, social values and a systems perspective. The goal of PBS is to use information from FBAs to guide the design of learning and teaching environments that support and encourage adaptive behavior and lessen the usefulness of problem behavior. Reductions in problem behaviors are measured.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Students with challenging behaviors represent one to five percent of students but account for more than 50% of behavioral incidents. These behavioral incidents result in disciplinary referrals, suspensions and expulsions. In one state, 10.7% of students who have been suspended or expelled also were found in the state’s Department of Juvenile Justice Database; 5.4% of suspended students were arrested while on suspension; and 18.7% were arrested while on expulsion (National Association of Child Advocates, 1998). These statistics point to the need for intervention strategies that are based on sound evidence. The use of PBS based on a FBA has demonstrated to be an effective approach in addressing problem behaviors. Additionally, this program addresses the OJJDP risk factors of high behavioral activation and low behavioral inhibition

FY12 Funding: \$62,596

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # Children referred to the program.	34	15	15	4*	14	25
▪ # Children participating in the program.	19	14	14	6*	11	18
▪ # of Educators provided with Consultation.				0*	4	22
How Well We Do It:						
▪ # & % children successfully discharged with a functioning treatment plan (parent or educator is the plan with positive results).	100%	100%	(13)100%	3/50%*	90%	9/90%
▪ # & % of caregivers who rate behavior at home as 3.7** or higher on the Satisfaction Survey at end of service.	31%	100%	(13)100%	100%	90	5/100%
▪ # & % of Caregivers Satisfaction Surveys** that rate behavior at school as (3.7) or higher.	100%	100%	(13)100%	No cases received in school services*	90%	5/100%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of children whose targeted behaviors were reduced during course of treatment through frequency*** data collection.	81.4%	87.2%	(9) 78%	50%*	#/78%	5/86%
▪ #/% of children with improved scores on the CAFAS/PECFAS between intake and discharge.	100%	100%	(13) 100%	100%	#/90%	7/77%^^
▪ #/% of care givers who now have the ability to identify why the problem behavior is occurring (Annual Care Givers Satisfaction Survey).					#/75%	6/100%

*Targets were not reached because vendor terminated the program in December 2010. A new vendor has been selected through the RFP process to continue the CFBSP in FY12. Some funds left over from this program were used for a one time Resiliency in Action Program.

** Questions on 4-point scale with 4 being the most favorable.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

*** Counting the occurrence of target behaviors.

^ Program did not begin 11/1/12 when the new vendor hired the social worker/coordinator for the program ^^youth being referred to the program have much more intensive needs and behavioral issues than in the past years, the program has actually performed in a case management capacity and some of the youth end up in placement.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Teen Court

Program Summary: Offers youthful offenders an opportunity to accept accountability for their minor crimes without incurring a criminal record. The program is run by teens for teens with an adult judge used on a rotating basis. Teen volunteers act as jury, counsel, and bailiff and administer consequences to respondents coming before the court.

Target Population: First and second time offenders who are 11-17 years old who would be involved with DJS. Referrals to the program are from DJS, School Resource Officers, school personnel, Sheriff's Department and town police departments.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: Teen Court is listed by the OJJDP as a promising evidence based program type using the peer justice approach to prevention/intervention. A recent evaluation by Butts, Buck and Coggeshall (2002) of Teen Court programs suggests that teen courts are a promising alternative to the juvenile justice system. Caroline's Teen Court follows the guiding principles for dispositions 1) address the needs of victim/community; 2) based on restorative justice; 3) promote positive youth development. Teen Court measures the recidivism of respondents.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serves school aged youth 11-17 years old and diverts them from DJS system and further delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$44,247

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # 1 st & 2 nd time offenders diverted from the juvenile justice system (including tobacco & alcohol citations).	93	100	109	93	95	55>
▪ # court sessions.	19	20	19	19	19	14>
▪ # Teen Court Volunteers.				40	40	40
How Well We Do It:						
▪ # and % of participants who complete their Teen Court consequences by the deadline.	93/100%	85/85%	109/97%	93/100%	#/75%	53/97.5%
▪ #and % of teen volunteers that attend at least 10 court sessions during a year.				42/60%	#/50%	40/100%
▪ #and% of parents satisfied with the program (survey at end of court session).				87/98%	#/80%	53/95.5%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of Teen Court respondents who do not re-offend (no DJS involvement) 12 months (FY) after completing the program.*	88%	88.4%	98%	100/92%*	#/75%	87/94%
▪ #and% of Teen Court Respondents who are not suspended from school during the				93/100%	#/80%	87/94%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
current school year.						
▪ #and % of Teen Court Respondents who report Teen Court Peers had an impact on them** (survey at end of court session).					#75%	40/96%

*Calculated at the end of the FY, not 12 months out.

**Survey will capture whether or not coming before peers had a strong effect on the respondents.

^ info collected at end of FY12

>The Coordinator went on disability leave in March 2012. In May 2012, a new Coordinator was hired to continue the program, this resulted in less sessions of the Teen Court

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau

Program Summary: Brief Strategic Family Therapy is an evidence-based treatment (SAMHSA and OJJDP). BSFT is a family-based intervention aimed at preventing or treating child and adolescent behavior problems. The goal is to improve child behavior by improving family interaction.

Target Population: Youth ages 6-17 exhibiting acting out or CINS-like behaviors and their family members residing in Carroll County.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: BSFT is rated Exemplary 2 from Strengthening America's Families; recognized as an effective program by OJJDP and Effective Communities that Care; and is in review by SAMHSA and Blueprints for Violence Prevention. Carroll County Youth Service Bureau clinicians are certified in BSFT and maintain high fidelity to the model.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: BSFT addresses acting out school age youth and meets the at-risk youth prevention and diversion program in preventing or diverting youth from entering the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$100,199 YSB + \$24,307 EIP = \$124,506

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:					60	49
▪ Individual*					0	0
▪ Family*					60	49
▪ Group*					0	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:					0	0
▪ Individual*					0	0
▪ Family*					0	0
▪ Group*					0	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.					0	49
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were					0	3

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
subsequently made.						
➤ Total individuals served			279	372	200	192
How Well We Do It:						
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.					80%	100%(N=49)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.					80%	55.6%(N=17)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.					80%	100% (N=6)
➤ Percentage of parents/guardians who are satisfied with BSFT as indicated on exit survey.	75%	94% (N=37)	94% (N=90)	95.2% (N=20)	85%	100%(N=12)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.					80%	98% (N=47)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					67% (N=4)	75% (N=3)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					67% (N=4)	75% (N=3)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					67% (N=4)	75% (N=3)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					67% (N=4)	100%(N=4)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					67% (N=4)	75% (N=3)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					67% (N=4)	75% (N=3)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					67% (N=4)	100%(N=4)
McMaster Assessment Tool*						
➤ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy effective verbal communication of information within the family when measured pre and post treatment.		55% (N=25)	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	70%	66% (N=10)
➤ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy approaches to resolve problems to a level that maintains effective family functioning when measured pre and post treatment.		80% (N=37)	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	70%	93% (N=15)
➤ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy appropriate roles by which family members fulfill family functions when measured pre and		64% (N=29)	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	70%	68% (N=11)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
post treatment.						

Prior year data for formal & informal counseling not available. Since FY08, YSB funds available from the Cabinet Funds were redirected from YSB core components (formal and informal counseling) to evidence-based Brief Strategic Family Therapy. *Implemented in FY09.

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Brief Strategic Family Therapy

Program Summary: Brief Strategic Family Therapy is an evidence-based treatment (SAMHSA and OJJDP). BSFT is a family-based intervention aimed at preventing or treating child and adolescent behavior problems. The goal is to improve child behavior by improving family interaction.

Target Population: Youth ages 6-17 exhibiting acting out or CINS-like behaviors and their family members residing in Carroll County.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: BSFT is rated Exemplary 2 from Strengthening America's Families; recognized as an effective program by OJJDP and Effective Communities that Care; and is in review by SAMHSA and Blueprints for Violence Prevention. Carroll County Youth Service Bureau clinicians are certified in BSFT and maintain high fidelity to the model.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: BSFT addresses acting out school age youth and meets the at-risk youth prevention and diversion program in preventing or diverting youth from entering the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$100,199 YSB + \$24,307 EIP = \$124,506

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of families that receive BSFT.	67	52	62	60	60	49
▪ Total number of individuals served.			279	374	200	192
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who are satisfied with BSFT as indicated on exit survey.	75%	94% (N=37)	94% (N=90)	95.2% (N=20)	85%	100%(N=12)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
McMaster Assessment Tool*						
▪ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy effective verbal communication of information within the family when measured pre and post treatment.		55% (N=25)	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	70%	66% (N=10)
▪ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy approaches to resolve problems to a level that maintains effective family functioning when measured pre and post treatment.		80% (N=37)	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	70%	93% (N=15)
▪ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy appropriate roles by which family members fulfill family functions when measured pre and post treatment.		64% (N=29)	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	70%	68% (N=11)

*LMB consulted with Olga Hervis, co-developer of BSFT, who suggested using McMaster Assessment tool to capture change in family system as opposed to individuals. This evidence based treatment looks to change acting out youth by changing maladaptive family interaction/function. Tool is administered pre- and

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

post-treatment and was implemented in FY09. Beginning January 2012 data will be forwarded to The Institute for Innovation and Implementation for analysis and evaluation.

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Cultural Navigator (CN)

Program Summary: Cultural Navigator bridges the gap for immigrant and non-English speakers by providing information, referral and outreach activities. The Cultural Navigator engages with the Hispanic population, the fastest growing minority group in Carroll County.

Target Population: Hispanic population in Carroll County with a special focus on at-risk minority youth.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: The Cultural Navigator program embodies System of Care principles including cultural competency.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: By addressing the needs of at-risk minority youth and their families, the Cultural Navigator prevents or diverts school age minority youth from entering the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$27,601

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of calls received.	216	303	137	199	200	226
▪ Number of walk-ins.	27	91	43	170	75	213
▪ Number of callers/walk-ins given referrals to community resources.	243	381	363	592	250	331
▪ Number of outreach events.	15	15	18	11	15	16
▪ Number of contacts at outreach events.	400	1,800	1,672	1,025	1,000	1,930
▪ Number of referrals at outreach events.	N/A	17	73	118	75	134
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of total contacts who participate in follow-up sample survey (%= survey sample/ total number of calls).	10% N=21	11% N=33	16% N=30	5% N=17	5% N=15	5% N=21
▪ Percent of surveyed contacts satisfied or higher with CN services (by subscale/question). Indicate number of surveys completed (N).	10% N=21	11% N=33	16% N=30	5% N=17	5% N=15	5% N=21
○ Respectful of family	80%	100% (N=33)	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)
○ Knowledgeable	80%	100% (N=33)	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)
○ Understandable	80%	100% (N=33)	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)
○ Gave appropriate referral	80%	100% (N=33)	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that they understood information or referral provided.	80%	100% (N=33)	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that they contacted the suggested referral.	50%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that referral was able to	40%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
provide requested information or services.						
▪ Percentage of contacts who were satisfied with the referred service.	40%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)
▪ Percentage of contacts who report increased confidence/competence in addressing future needs.	50%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	80%	100%(N=21)

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Achieve

Program Summary: Achieve is an evidence-based intervention program that addresses drug and alcohol abuse resistance, goal setting, communication, decision making, conflict resolution and other life skills. Consists of three major components: drug resistance, personal self-management, and general social skills.

Target Population: Elementary, middle and high school youth who are identified by the vendor and their partner agencies as at-risk for substance abuse or delinquent behavior.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Botvin Life Skills.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Achieve program works with children in grades 3-9 who are identified by the vendor and their partner agencies as at-risk for substance abuse or delinquent behavior.

FY12 Funding: \$49,981.44

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of youth served.	146	158	93	89	80	113
Number of classes offered per session.				10	8	12
Number of schools/programs served.				8	10	11
How Well We Do It:						
% of participants who successfully complete Life Skills Training (8 of 10 classes with satisfactory participation).	90%	58%	75% (N=70)	89% (N=79)	85%	87% (N=98)
% of participants involved in the creation of educational materials designed to teach prevention topics to their peers.				100% (N=89)	90%	94% (N=106)
% of sites served where administrators express satisfaction with the materials presented, staff professionalism and overall experience for students, as noted on year-end survey.					90%	92% (N=11)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of participants who demonstrate an increased knowledge of Life Skills topics as measured by pre- and post-tests.		56%	100% (N=70)	89% (N=79)	90%	98% (N=96)
% of participants who demonstrate an increased knowledge of drug resistance skills as measured by pre-and post-tests at the beginning and end of each 10-week session.	95%			80% (N=63)	85%	94% (N=92)
% of participants who demonstrated an increased knowledge of personal	75%			84%	85%	92%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
management skills as measured by pre-and post-tests at the beginning and end of each 10-week session.				(N=66)		(N=90)
% of participants who demonstrated an increased knowledge of social skills as measured by pre-and post-tests at the beginning and end of each 10-week session.	50%			85% (N=67)	85%	90% (N=88)

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Advance

Program Summary: Advance is a prevention and intervention program that serves youth who are involved with the juvenile justice system, or who are at-risk for DJS involvement. The program supports improved school attendance, academic success and individual goal setting and achievement.

Target Population: Youth ages 8-16 who are involved with the juvenile justice system and who are at-risk of out of home placement.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Botvin Life Skills

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Advance program works with children ages 8-16 who are involved with or at risk of becoming involved with the juvenile justice system and who are at risk of out of home placement.

FY12 Funding: \$43,976.44 + \$10,000 United Way = \$53,976.44 Total

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of youth served:						
o Active	35	36	19	52	50	53
o Linked	30	30	32	24	25	20 ¹⁵
Number of schools served.					18	15 ¹⁶
Number of participants who transitioned to aftercare (which involves less-frequent case manager interaction).	40	9	40	17	25	20 ¹⁷
How Well We Do It						
Percentage of participants who successfully complete Botvin Life Skills program.				27%	30%	28% ¹⁸
Percentage of participants who require and complete anger management classes.				76%	75%	75%
Percentage of participants who require and complete substance abuse classes.				72%	75%	50% ¹⁹
Is Anyone Better Off?						

¹⁵ There were less clients requiring this service.

¹⁶ Maximum number of clients served was attained prior to meeting target number of schools.

¹⁷ There was a large number of clients needing more frequent case management so could not be transitioned.

¹⁸ Classes offered, participants lacked follow through.

¹⁹ Services were provided, participants lacked follow through.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
% of participants with prior DJS involvement who have no subsequent involvement for the duration of their program participation.		95%	94%	98%	90%	83% ²⁰ (N=5/6)
% of participants who are deemed to be at high-risk of eventual juvenile justice involvement who have no DJS involvement while participating.				100%	90%	91% (N=21/23)
% of participants who had no school suspensions for the duration of their program participation.		67%	71%	94%	90%	89% ²¹ (N=47/53)
% of participants who show improved school attendance, evidenced by report card.					50%	40% ²² (N=21/53)
% of participants who show improved grades, measured by GPA.					50%	51% (N=27/53)

*Measure to be assessed later in the year and included in the final report for FY12.

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Ascend

Program Summary: Ascend is a client management program that focuses on initially identifying client's needs and developing short and long term goals enabling the client to achieve self-sufficiency in a core set of functional areas: GED or high school diploma, employment, housing, access to mental health or health services, transportation, crime/substance abuse-free, and social skill development.

Target Population: Cecil County youth ages 16–21 who have withdrawn from high school and who are in need of additional support in order to achieve self-sufficiency in adulthood.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Transitions Life Skills Program

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Ascend program focuses on transition skills for school-aged youth and young adults who are at risk for police or DJS involvement.

FY12 Funding: \$83,679.44 + \$2,720 Fidelity Grant = \$86,399.44

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number served.	181	130	170	78	60	57 ²³
Number of youth who transition to aftercare (which involves less-frequent case manager interaction).		74 new/56 aftercare	79 new/91 aftercare	^	20	4 ²⁴
Number of participants assessed by Cecil College for ABE/GED placement.					30	46

²⁰ Out of 53 clients, 6 were involved in DJS; 5 did not reoffend, 1 participant did.

²¹ There was just a 1% difference, only 6 students had some type of suspension out of 53.

²² Some students did not need improvement; 21 students showed improvement in attendance therefore explaining the difference.

²³ All clients that had need or requested assistance were served. For FY14, targeted goals are expected to be met.

²⁴ Not enough students to transfer as many required intense case management. The GED process took too long; meeting regularly to observe and track progress.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Number of youth who present with the need that obtain a State-issued identification card.				9	5	6
How Well We Do It:						
% of participants who complete vocational training.	43%	62%	59%	15%	20%	3.5% (N=2/57) ²⁵
% of participants who enroll in GED classes.	58%	69%	61%	83%	85%	79% ²⁶ (N=15)
% of participants who complete Job Ready and computer literacy training.		62%	25%	45%	50%	26% ²⁷ (N=15/57)
% of participants successfully completing the Life Skills Transitions Program.				5%	20%	0% ²⁸ (7 took portions, none completed)
% of ABE students who transition to GED.				33%	20%	23% (N=13/57)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of participants who obtain a GED.	13%	52%	23%	8%	5%	7% (N=4)
% of clients who obtain full- or part-time employment	75%	80%	33%	29%	10%	16% (N=9) (N=5)
% of clients who increase GED/ABE test level while working toward GED		90%	15%	92%	90%	90%
% of clients who complete all goals listed on their ISP	22%	22%	18%	5%	5%	5% (N=3)
% of participants on target to meet goals of ISP within timeframe allotted.				76%	70%	72%
% of participants who have passed GED pre-test and obtained GED.				8%	15%	5% ²⁹ (N=3/57)

²⁵ Many classes were offered to meet individual needs but participants lacked follow through. We have requested the removal of this item for FY14 as the vendor has found the trend is moving away from vocational training and toward regular college classes.

²⁶ The remaining students tested at ABE level classes which must be completed prior to the GED classes.

²⁷ Classes were offered but participants lacked follow through. We plan to divide the performance measures as students are finding full time employment but are not necessarily computer literate.

²⁸ Lack of follow through on participants' behalf. This measure is inappropriate for a program that does not meet as a group, and members will not complete work individually. We are requesting removal of this measure for FY14.

²⁹ This is strictly a time factor but due to availability of testing sites and times; it may take in excess of 3 months just to get a test date scheduled. This issue has been addressed by the Board and Cecil College in an effort to improve these outcomes in the future.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
% of youth in need of community services (e.g., transportation, housing, medical) who are connected to those services.					70%	84% (N=16)

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Out-of-School Programs, Elkton Middle School and Bohemia Manor Middle School

Program Summary: Out-of-School Programs look to improve on middle school youth who are experiencing many internal and external pressures of puberty and the need for strong support, reduce the number of unsupervised students in the afternoons, reduce the potential number of students engaging in drug abuse and/or juvenile crime activities or being victims of crimes and raise the academic skill and performance levels of students.

Target Population: Middle school youth attending Elkton Middle and Bohemia Manor Middle School who are unsupervised by their families for extended periods of time and at risk of engaging in drug abuse and/or juvenile criminal activities or being victims of crimes.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Botvin Life Skills, the Character Chronicles curriculum, 4-H Science program, Functional Reading program, Love U2 (dating smarts).

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serves middle school children at risk of engaging in drug abuse and/or juvenile crime.

FY12 Funding: \$70,479.08 (\$32,979.08 – EMS and \$37,500.00 – BMMS)

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number served.	130	135	110	34 (EMS) 65 (BMMS)	30 (EMS) 50 (BMMS)	22 (EMS) ³⁰ 44 (BMMS) ³¹
Number of parents who participate in the program, defined as attending at least one activity per fiscal year.				2 (EMS) 9 (BMMS)	10 (EMS) 12 (BMMS)	4 (EMS) ³² 8 (BMMS) ³³
Number of staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					4 (EMS) 2 (BMMS)	4 (EMS) 2 (BMMS)
Number of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.					2	1 (EMS) 1 (BMMS)
Number of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans					2	1 (EMS) 1 (BMMS)
How Well We Do It:						
Staff to Student Ratio.	1:06	1:15	1:15	1:8 (EMS)	1:8 (EMS)	1:7 (EMS)

³⁰ This school has a high number of transient students which factored into lack of participation.

³¹ They aimed high and fell short. They learned a great deal about their program by participating in the YPQA process and hopes that this knowledge helps them improve. Students responded by survey that they did not like the required instructional programming.

³² Transient community, single parents unable to attend due to work schedule or lack of childcare.

³³ Parents tend to feel this program is an extension of the school day, many are not home from work in time to participate due to rural area served, also a lot of the parents are just not inclined to participate even when it is at a convenient time.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
				1:5 (BMMS)	1:5 (BMMS)	1:5 (BMMS)
% of students who attend program at least 50% of the time.		80%	39%	71% (EMS) 26% (BMMS)	80% (EMS) 50% (BMMS)	95% (N=21) 47% (N18/44) ³⁴
Average daily program attendance.				38% (EMS) 26% (BMMS)	50% (EMS) 40% (BMMS)	68% (N=15) 36% (N=16) ³⁵
Participants' average attendance in school, as measured by the inverse of the absences noted on report cards.				93% (EMS) 92% (BMMS)	94% (EMS) 95% (BMMS)	91% (N=20) ³⁶ 94% (N=5.7) ³⁷
% of youth who rate their satisfaction with the program as excellent, as measured by annual survey.				N/A (EMS) 33% (BMMS)	30% (EMS) 30% (BMMS)	100% (EMS) N/A* ³⁸
% of parents who rate their satisfaction with the program as excellent, as measured by annual survey.					30% (EMS) 30% (BMMS)	33% N/A* ³⁹
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.					100%	100% (EMS) 100% (BMMS)
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					3.0 (EMS) 3.0 (BMMS)	4.4 (EMS) 4.42 (BMMS)
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					3.0 (EMS) 3.0 (BMMS)	4.3 (EMS) 4.65 (BMMS)
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.0 (EMS) 3.0 (BMMS)	4 (EMS) 4.21 (BMMS)
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					3.0 (EMS) 3.0 (BMMS)	2.6 (EMS) ⁴⁰ 2.92 (BMMS) ⁴¹
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of					3.0 (EMS)	3.8 (EMS)

³⁴ Even though they fell short, it was a significant improvement over past year. They hope to enrich the instructional component which will hopefully improve on attendance.

³⁵ Students felt they spent a lot of time doing instructional programming after spending all day in school. Instructional programming was over an hour and has been slightly reduced.

³⁶ Only 2 students did not show improvement in attendance, low number of students effects percentage.

³⁷ They only missed this by 1%

³⁸ Cecil Human Service Agency lost the data.

³⁹ Cecil Human Service Agency lost the data.

⁴⁰ Their program is very structured; they are surveying the students to see how the program can be amended to improve this score.

⁴¹ They intend on utilizing some of the instruction time to allow their students to participate in activities that showcase their talents and then invite the parents to see what they have accomplished. They would like to reduce class size to improve the experiences. They also instituted "student government" committees giving them a voice to the structure and policies of the programs. Committees are program improvement, social, safety and communications.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
the 4 domains above) by site.					3.0 (BMMS)	4.05 (BMMS)
% of sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					100%	100% (EMS) 100% (BMMS)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of participants who increase pro-social attitudes (anger management, group participation/teamwork, resist peer pressure, ask for help/advice when have a problem) as measured by self and staff pre and post-tests administered at the beginning and the end of the school year.	65%	85%	56%	N/A^ (EMS) 71% (BMMS)	70% (EMS) 70% (BMMS)	100% (EMS) 57% (BMMS) ⁴²
% of student participants who improved English, Math or Reading scores	57%	35%	55%	38% (EMS) 47% (BMMS)	60% (EMS) 50% (BMMS)	87% (EMS) 62% (BMMS)
% of students who show any improvement on school grades as measured by quarterly report cards.				42% (EMS) 39% (BMMS)	60% (EMS) 50% (BMMS)	87% (EMS) 89% (BMMS)

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Perryville Police Department Outreach Program

Program Summary: Youth outreach program run by the local police department for ages 13-21 in the Perryville area during non-school hours (evenings, weekends, etc) to provide positive interactions with law enforcement and reduce the number of kids vulnerable to gang activity and divert arrestees from DJS.

Target Population: Youth ages 8 – 19 from the Perryville School district demonstrating risk factors for DJS and police department involvement.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: ARISE program (self-esteem and healthy relationships) and Phoenix Curriculum (gang prevention and intervention).

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Perryville Police Department Outreach Program works with children 11-19 years of age who are referred by or are at risk of involvement with the Perryville Police Department and/or the Department of Juvenile Services.

FY12 Funding: \$60,903

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of first-time offenders referred to DJS/local police Diversion Component.	11	22	7	35	19	29
Number of individual counseling sessions provided for youth in	150	329	41	202	180	113 ⁴³

⁴² The sample size was small due to it being mandated to take the survey in the last week of the program and many students are tired, ready for school to end and the attendance drops. It would be beneficial to take the survey maybe in the beginning of the last month of the program. Also, the survey is given in the first week of the program when registration is still ongoing and students are just trying the program out, it would probably be better to take the survey about 4 weeks into the program when things have settled and the routine has started. This year extra care has been taken to get surveys done by all of the students and we are changing the curriculum some in hopes of retaining more students.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
DJS/local police Diversion Component.						
Number of group counseling sessions provided in DJS/local police Diversion Component.	22	38	1	69	33	64
Number of walk-in youth participating in Outreach component.	28	50	3	86	50	118
How Well We Do It:						
% of participating youth whose parent(s) or guardian(s) participated in no fewer than 50% of parent involvement activities.	70%	10%	7%	25%	50%	21% ⁴⁴ (N=25)
% of Outreach Component participants attending on a daily basis.				20%	30%	21% ⁴⁵ (N=25)
% of Diversion Program participants without subsequent DJS or police referral while involved in program.					80%	93% (N=27)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of Diversion Program participants with no DJS intake/referral 6 months after program participation ends.	99%	86%	N/A ¹	90%	90%	93% (N=27)
% of Outreach Component program participants with no DJS intake/referral 6 months after program participation ends.	91%	98%	N/A ¹		90%	97% (N=115)
% of Outreach Component participants who improve pro-social skills (anger management, group participation/teamwork, resist peer pressure, ask for help/advice when having a problem) as measured by pre- and post-tests administered at the beginning and the end of the school year.				80%	80%	83% (N=98)
% of Diversion Program youth who improve pro-social skills (as above) based on Life Skills Assessment pre- and post-tests done at program enrollment and program ending.				70%	80%	90% (N=26)

¹Numbers for FY10 are significantly lower than other years because previous LMB provided funding for the first three months of FY10.

²The number of individual counseling services is lower than anticipated because fewer referrals are being made and therefore fewer counseling sessions are required.

⁴³ The number of individual counseling services is lower than anticipated because fewer referrals are being made and therefore fewer counseling sessions are required.

⁴⁴ The goal to have 50% of the participating youth's parents attend 50% or more of parent involvement activities was auspicious at the outset. One factor that does impact this is the number of parents who work during our activity hours. The parent participation rate is still up significantly from FY09 and FY10. We will request an amendment of this performance measure to 20% in FY14, which is more aligned with numbers seen in similar after-school programs in Cecil County.

⁴⁵ This number fluctuates due to other school activities that run during the same hours as their program and also due to the way they calculate their active membership. They are in the process of reviewing their methods of calculation, which is currently based on a 90 day active rate.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

³The goal to have 50% of participating youth’s parents attend 50% or more of parent involvement activities was auspicious at the outset. The parent participation rate is currently the same as FY11, and still up significantly from FY09 and FY10.

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Cecil County Drug Abuse Symposium

Program Summary: A one-day symposium to bring together stakeholders from the fields of education, social services, health, law enforcement, substance abuse prevention and treatment, youth service and faith-based programs to create a cohesive County-wide plan addressing substance abuse and the attendant issues of child maltreatment and access to services.

Target Population: Stakeholders, service providers and community members interested/involved in the prevention or treatment of substance abuse and its attendant issues.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Based on *Community Monitoring Systems: Tracking and Improving the Well-Being of America’s Children and Adolescents* and *Preventing Drug Use among Children and Adolescents*, both from National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Symposium will create a plan to increase and enhance substance abuse prevention programs for at-risk school-aged youth, and will address relevant attendant issues including child maltreatment and access to services.

FY12 Funding: \$3,846

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
Number of participants attending the symposium	50	40
Number of resources identified to provide substance abuse prevention education for youth.	10	16*
Number of resources identified to address child maltreatment prevention.	10	8**
Number of impact measures identified for substance abuse prevention programs for youth.	3	18
Number of impact measures identified for child maltreatment prevention programs.	3	21
Number of action steps proposed during Symposium that can be enacted within 0-3 months.	8	14
Number of action steps proposed during Symposium that can be enacted within 3-12 months.	8	15
How Well We Do It:		
% of participants rating the Drug Symposium as Excellent based on evaluation surveys completed at the end of the event.	25%	59%*** N=17
% of invitees who attend the Symposium or send an agency representative in their stead.	80%	80%*** N=40
% of participants who agree to return for a follow-up session in one year, as noted on evaluation survey.	90%	100%*** N=40
Is Anyone Better Off?		
% of Symposium attendees indicating they were made aware of statistical data that was new to them, as noted on evaluation survey.	10%	90%*** N=26
% of Symposium attendees indicating they were made aware of current resources with which they were unfamiliar, as noted on evaluation survey.	10%	72%*** N=31
% of Symposium attendees forming at least one new partnership to address substance abuse and/or its attendant issues.	10%	72%*** N=21

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

*CCPS – Health Education and MD Student Assistance Program; CCHD – MD Strategic Prevention Framework and Keep a Clear Mind; Project Crossroad – Achieve, Advance, Ascend and Momentum Programs; Perryville Police Outreach Program; Boys & Girls Club of Cecil County, MD; Generation Station Out-of-School Program; medical community; local police departments; organizations with parenting classes (Upper Bay Counseling & Support Services, Inc.); public libraries; possibly other youth organizations such as Scouts or church groups

**Cecil County Public Schools, Cecil County Health Department, Cecil County Dept. of Social Services, local police departments; public libraries; medical community; Cecil Pregnancy Center; local churches.

***All percentages reported are based on 29 evaluations completed by participants

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Functional Family Therapy (FFT)

Program Summary: Provides an intervention to families in need of services to maintain stability, provided prevention and intervention services.

Target Population: Children ages 11-18 deemed ‘at-risk’ for being removed from their home due to delinquent and/or behavioral issues. Clients served are often referred from various agencies and clinics although self-referrals are also accepted.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: FFT is an Evidence-Based Practice program.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: FFT serves youths in their communities and homes; reduces out of home placements for at-risk youth offenders; and promotes positive outcomes for youths.

FY12 Funding: \$51,518

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of Youth Served for the year.	7	7	10*	16	25	27
▪ Average Daily Capacity					8	8
▪ Average duration of services (in sessions) for youth receiving FFT services.				18	18	12.8
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of attendees who complete counseling successfully (based on mutual termination).	80%	100%	57% (N=4)	100% (N=3) †	100%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of cases completing treatment with 50% of outlined goals attained (when comparing treatment plan goals from beginning to case closure).				100%	100%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of families satisfied with services as measured by client survey completed after case closure.				100%	75%	100% (N=14)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of youth participants who are not placed outside the home during program duration.	100%	100%	100% (N=7)	100% (N=16)	100%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of participants who report improved family functioning as measured by the Client Outcome Measure (COM) administered at the completion of the program.	75%	100%	75% (N=2)	100% (N=3)	87.5%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report a reduction in the level					75%	100%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
of family conflict post therapy, as indicated by a score of 3 or higher on the Client Outcome Measure (COM-P)						(N=14)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians reporting improvement in their parenting skills, as indicated by a score of 3 or higher on the Client Outcome Measure (COM-P)					75%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report improvement in their child's behavior as measured by the Youth Outcome Questionnaire (Y-OQ 2.01) pre to post					75%	100% (N=14)

*Reflects three families involved with Child Protective Services that did not follow through with the program after enrollment.

†The FFT program previously reported, at the time of the Semi-Annual Report, 25% of attendees completed counseling successfully. This number was based on the 4 cases that had been terminated, regardless of reason (i.e. mutual termination). When revisiting this area, it was discovered that only those that were “mutually terminated” should be accounted for; hence the 100% for the actual. The Semi-Annual Report should have also reflected 100% as well, not the 25% initially reported

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Summer/Mobile Meals

Program Summary: A collaborative initiative to feed at-risk children during the summer months while school is not in session. The program aims to address the contributory factors of low-income, prevention and awareness in efforts to touch on various results area and indicators chosen by the community.

Target Population: Children are between 3-18 years of age and are at risk for hunger due to poverty.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: N/A

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The youth, who reside in Area Eligible locations for Free and Reduced Meals as determined by MSDE and the Charles County Board of Education, receive meal delivery in their communities. These youth are at a lower risk for legal involvement because a healthy meal is provided along with a safe place during meal times. Without this service youth would be unsupervised and hungry utilizing alternative means to secure money to purchase food.

FY12 Funding: \$24,995

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ Number of Meals Served	8,018*	5000	6423
o Camps	3,255	3000	2678
o Mobile	4,764	2000	3745
▪ Number of mobile areas served (Geographic area eligible sites for free lunch as determined by MSDE & CCBOE)	13	12	12
▪ Number of “Second Meals” served to children		100	457
How Well We Do It:			
▪ Percentage of overall meals served through the mobile unit as compared to stationary sites (i.e. camps)	59%	45%	58.3% (N=3,745)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Percentage of meal participation increase from the first week of meal distribution to the final week	79%	80%**	98% (N=924)
▪ Percentage of Second Meals served throughout the duration of the program		2%	7% (N=457)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ Percentage increase in number of mobile meals served in prior summer	100% (N=4764)	100%	-21%◇ (N=3,745)
▪ Percentage increase in free and reduced meal identification or status as a result of information disseminated to participants during the distribution of meals for the program	6%***	10%	4%*** (N=351)
▪ Percentage increase in Second Meals served from previous summer		1%	NA (N=457)

*Does not include paid meals or Second meals. (Paid meals were parent meals/ Second meals were for children)

** Mobile meals only July 1 – August 19, 2011

***One school year to another i.e. SY'09-'10 to SY'10-'11

◇ Negative percentage is a result in the decrease from FY 11 to FY12 in the number of Second Meals served.

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Summer Youth Achievement Program

Program Summary: This program, operated by the Charles County Sheriff's Office, is for youth at risk for juvenile intervention and prevention through its supervision, social skills, service delivery for juveniles, and education and awareness components.

Target Population: At-risk middle school students (generally 10-14 years of age from the 8 middle schools within Charles County) who have been referred by school staff and/or juvenile services amongst other agencies that see these youth may be "at-risk" for delinquent/negative behaviors.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Model Program (Healthy Choices/Healthy Children and Badges and Baseball Programs). Curriculum seeks to help youth understand vital life lessons needed to display a positive, productive, and healthy lifestyle.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Promotes positive outcomes for youths that ultimately prevent juvenile crimes and delinquency. As a result of these actions, there will be a reduction in disproportionate minority contact within the county.

FY12 Funding: \$23,677

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of served	53	53	70	82	60	83
▪ Number of days in operation				20	22	20
▪ Number of sessions per day				3	3	3
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Student to Staff ratio	5 to 1	4 to 1	5 to 1	4 to 1	5 to 1	4 to 1

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Percentage of participants who attend 75% or more of the scheduled sessions	75%	89%	91% (N=64)	73% (N=60)	90%	80% (N=66)
▪ Average daily attendance				80% (N=66)	80%	83% (N=69)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of youth who report improvement in their view of authority figures (Police, Principals, Vice Principals, etc.) as measured by the Pre and Post surveys		70%	28% (N=20)	55% (N=30)	65%	75% (N=44*)
▪ Percentage of students who feel connected to their school as measured by the Pre and Post survey		53%	38% (N=27)	80% (N=44)	60%	81% (N=48*)
▪ Percentage of students not referred to juvenile services while in the program	94%	100%	100% (N=70)	100% (N=82)	100%	100% (N=83)

*Number is based on those who completed both Pre and post surveys. 71% (59 of 83 students) completed the Pre and Post surveys.

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Tri-County Youth Services Bureau (TCYSB)

Program Summary: Prevention and intervention service to pre-delinquent and adjudicated youth up to age 18 and their families. The program is designed to reduce the rate of entry in the juvenile justice system, and to reduce recidivism rates among youth. Counseling, crisis intervention and youth development services will be provided.

Target Population: Pre-Delinquent and adjudicated youth (up to age 18) including their families, referred by various agencies and also self-referrals. While there is only one Youth Service Bureau in Charles County, there is no specific geographic area identified.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: The YSB utilizes Second Step and Reconnecting Youth for their Evidenced Based Programs

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Youth Service Bureau serves youth and their families within their communities and schools; works directly with youth that are at-risk or are already involved with the juvenile services system in an effort to maintain the youth in the home versus being placed out of the home for services. The Bureau provides group and family sessions thus resulting in promotion of positive outcomes for the youth and families. The YSB will also house a Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Coordinator to help reduce the disproportionate number of minorities being arrested, detained and placed out of their homes.

FY12 Funding: \$139,088

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total number of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	780	506	359	455	400	318
▪ Individual*	380	120	141	235	185	162
▪ Family*	227	271	164	81	75	36

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Group*	173	115	54	139	140	91
➤ Total number of Formal Individual youth receiving Second Step Curriculum	♦	♦	♦	♦	48	45
➤ Total number of Formal youth receiving Reconnecting Youth Curriculum	♦	♦	♦	♦	48	75
➤ Total number of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	742	565	387	460	415	552
▪ Individual*	527	94	110	184	170	128
▪ Family*	78	222	82	73	70	101
▪ Group*	137	249	195	203	175	323
➤ Number of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	18	137	87	151	150	147
▪ Number of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	4	9	4	6	25†	1
➤ Number of formal counseling cases receiving additional information on community based services where appropriate	♦	♦	♦	♦	91	42
➤ Number of formal counseling cases where referrals were made to other community based services ±	♦	♦	♦	♦	91	39
How Well We Do It:						
➤ Percentage of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100%	98.5% (N=139)	91% (N=214)	100%	93% (N=187)
➤ Percentage of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	90%	69%	78% (N=110)	64% (N=58)	50%	58% (N=14)
➤ Percentage of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	93.75%	92.5% (N=6)	91%£ (N=20)	75%	88% (N=21)
➤ Percentage of calls seeking information and referrals that are returned within 48 business hours	♦	♦	♦	♦	85%	92% (N=330)
➤ Percentage and number of youth (Formal) who complete the Second Step Curriculum Program	♦	♦	♦	♦	80%	84% (N=38)
➤ Percentage and number of youth (formal) who complete the Reconnecting Youth Curriculum	♦	♦	♦	♦	80%	68% (N=51)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ Percentage of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	80%**	82%**	85%**	97%** (N=74)	75%	99% (N=160)
➤ Number and Percentage of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.	♦	♦	♦	84% ◊ (N=76)	70%	100% (N=162)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
➤ Number and Percentage of youth who improved on at least one of 3 indicators between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments. Indicators include: meaningful and reliable improvement, # severe impairments, and Pervasive Behavioral Impairment.	♦	♦	♦	♦	60%	100% (N=162)
➤ Number and Percentage of youth who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“improved”) and those who still had at least 1 severe impairment at most recent assessment (“not improved”).	♦	♦	♦	♦	60%	81% (N=131)
➤ Number and Percentage of youth who were identified as being Pervasively Behaviorally Impaired (PBI) at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment.	♦	♦	♦	♦	60%	84% (N=136)
➤ Number of Percentage of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. Or more on each of eight CAFAS subscales	♦	♦	♦	♦	60%	84% (N=136)
➤ Number and Percentage of formal counseling participants who improved on each of the 8 CAFAS subscales. Improved = those with a mild impairment or higher with a score reduced by 10 pts. at exit.	♦	♦	♦	♦	60%	86% (N=139)
➤ Number and Percentage of Reconnecting Youth graduates that do not recidivate within 90 days of program completion.	♦	♦	♦	♦	79% (N=30)	98% (N=50)
➤ Number and Percentage of Second Step Graduations that do not recidivated within 90 days of program completion.	♦	♦	♦	♦	79% (N=30)	100% (N=38)

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

** Percentage represents those not committing an offense during the 90-day post-termination from services

◇ Percentage is based on a 5 point improvement in overall functioning as measured by the CAFAS

◆ Data not previously collected at this YSB. Some CAFAS components were previously collected as evidenced in the table. Prior assessments included the NCFAS and the PIY.

† Number based on those youth who complete the voluntary assessment and are over the age of 12

£ Number reported in FY11 was based on Tri-County Staff in its entirety, not solely Charles County staff.

± Services reflect those not offered at TCYSB (i.e. Substance Abuse Counseling, Psychiatric/Medication Management, Sexual Offender, etc.).

LMB: Dorchester County Local Management Board

Program Name: School Based Behavioral Health Services

Program Summary: Case Management, individual session, group sessions, referral linkages, family liaison, parent support groups, home visits and social skill building to strengthen individual, school and family functioning.

Target Population: Elementary school students at Hurlock, Choptank, and Sandy Hill referred by school guidance for disruptive behaviors.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Focuses on early intervention and prevention strategies for elementary age youth and seeks to increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency and reduces disruptive behavior to prevent involvement with juvenile services

FY12 Funding: \$80,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of children served (unduplicated count).	100	101	118	119	115	156
Total # of new cases served.					5	5
# of children participating in individual /family sessions.*				43	35	61
# of children participating in group sessions.*				112	80	104
How Well We Do It:						
% of children served who attended eight or more behavioral health sessions (counted from the start of the fiscal year or from intake date not per quarter). N = number of children served.*				85%	80%	83% N=129
% of parents who report overall satisfaction at case closure on satisfaction survey.	100%	85%	100% n=75	83%	80%	100% N=7
% of referring teachers who reported overall satisfaction on survey at case closure.	87%	85%	92% n=69	80%	80%	88% N=63
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of children attending 8 or more sessions that maintain or improve function based upon the Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) administered to participants at start of fiscal year or at intake and every six months after/or case closure). N=total # of participants in 8 or more sessions.				80%	80%	91.5% N=42
% of program participants who attend 8 or more group sessions who demonstrate a gain in teacher rating of classroom behavior from pre & post-tests. N=total number of participants who attend 8 or more group sessions.				80%	80%	48.5% N=29
# and % of children with any improvement in the CAFAS total score at six months. *					70%	58% N=39
# and % of children with any improvement in the CAFAS total score at discharge. *					70%	27% N=18

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: Girls Circle

Program Summary: A best practice/evidence-based program to address teen pregnancy.

Target Population: Pregnant/parenting teens and middle/high school girls at risk of engaging in risky behaviors (gang, sexual activity, domestic violence).

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Girls Circle

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Curriculum that focuses on increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency for teen girls in underserved communities that are high in crime, domestic violence and teen pregnancy. Goal is to promote positive self-esteem in girls to prevent involvement with juvenile services.

FY12 Funding: \$50,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
# of Girls Circle participants.	94	75	81
# of pregnant teen participants/parenting teens	51	35	36
# of sites where Girls Circle is implemented		5	4
How Well We Do It:			
% of participants that attend at least 6 sessions who show at least a 4 point increase on self-efficacy scale** at program exit. N=number of participants attending at least 6 sessions.	43%	50%	64% N=27
% of participants attending at least 6 sessions who show a 3 point improvement on healthy lifestyle scale** at program exit. N=number of participants attending at least 6 sessions.	47%	50%	69% N=35
% of participants who rate Girls Circle program at 21 points or higher on the Girls Circle Satisfaction Survey.	0*	40%	93% N=75
Is Anyone Better Off?			
% of pregnant teen participants who remain in school at least one year after birth of baby. N=number of pregnant teens.	72%	75%	100% N=5
% of participants that report positive changes in behavior on Girls Circle Satisfaction Survey (D11 of survey).	0*	40%	61% N=49
% of participants who self-report increased use of protection when having sex (B4) on Girls Circle Survey on pre/post-test scales administered at entry & exit of program.		70%	N=12 of 42 29%

**Scales are pre-and post-test scales administered at entry/exit of the program. *Girls had not been in the program long enough to see change on survey.

LMB: Dorchester County Local Management Board

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol

Program Summary: Community organizing approach to implement change in community attitudes and local institutional policies relative to underage drinking.

Target Population: Teens, parents, general community. Alcohol compliance checks and new policies impact sales to the entire community. Advertising and social marketing target the entire community through billboards, newspaper ads and ads in school programs and banners.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: CMCA

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Change community attitudes toward underage alcohol use to avoid involvement in legal system.

FY12 Funding: \$22,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY 12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
# of people who attend education awareness and/or outreach event.	850	800	330

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY 12 Actual
# of alcohol sales compliance checks (includes multiple merchants being targeted during each compliance check).	33	15	37
# of under 21 alcohol citations/arrests (new in 2012)	78	75	4
# of under 21 alcohol DUI arrests (new in 2012)		5	1
# of new written policies/ordinances implemented to change the local environment in a way that makes it more difficult for young people to obtain alcohol and makes underage drinking less acceptable.	2	1	1
# of advertising/social marketing strategies implemented targeting underage drinking	5	5	5
How Well We Do It:			
Number and percentage of licensed merchants in Dorchester County who were included in at least two alcohol sales compliance checks.	58%	20%*	33% N=22
Number and percentage of retail alcohol establishments that were in compliance for not selling alcohol to underage youth after receiving a warning (n=number of establishments receiving warning.)	5/80%	50%	0
% of parents who express disapproval of underage drinking as measured by outreach event exit survey.	55%	70%	0
Is Anyone Better Off?			
# and % of retail establishments showing increased compliance over first round of checks (n= total # of checks).	22/30%	22/30%	1% N=37
# and % increase in the number of alcohol related citations issued to youth.	78/No baseline to calculate increase.	20/5%	1/0%
# and % of restaurants showing increased compliance over the first round of checks.	^	60%	0

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: TREK

Program Summary: Recreational, educational and service oriented activities for at risk youth.

Target Population: Middle school age youth in grades 6-8 from neighborhoods with high incidents of juvenile crime and gang activity.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: MOST

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Prevention and intervention programming serving students in grades 6-8 in high risk (high crime, gangs, drugs, teen pregnancy) communities. Goal is to prevent criminal behaviors, and increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency.

FY12 Funding: \$73,786

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	1	1
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	3	3
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.		
# of participants		310 Total Participants.
▪ # of males	150	Not broken
▪ # of females	200	

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
		down by gender
# of programs offered at each location:		
▪ Maces Lane	10	16
▪ North Dorchester Middle School	10	16
▪ YMCA	5	3
How Well We Do It:		
Average Daily Attendance.	80%	82%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	100%	100%
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	3	4.4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	3	4.6
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3	3.5
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	3	3.6
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.	100%	No plan required
% of students who participate in at least 80% of all sessions.	70	90%
Staff to Student Ratio	1:15	1:15
% of youth satisfied with the program as evidenced by satisfaction survey at program completion.	75	93% N=288
Is Anyone Better Off?		
% of participating students who meet satisfactory school attendance standards of 94% (less than 11 days absent from school) as reported on quarterly report card.	75%	95% N=295
% of participating students with no DJS referral during program period.	70%	100%
% of youth who are not suspended or expelled from school while involved in the program.	75%	85 N=264

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: Teen Ambassadors

Program Summary: Recreational, educational and service oriented activities for at risk youth.

Target Population: Middle school age youth in grades 6-8 from neighborhoods with high incidents of juvenile crime and gang activity.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: MOST

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Prevention and intervention programming serving students in grades 6-8 who live in a community that leaves them at risk of engaging in criminal activity such as gangs/drugs/violence. Goal is to prevent criminal behaviors and increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency.

FY12 Funding: \$18,190

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Target	FY 12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					1	1
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.					1	1
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.					0	Not required
# of participants		12	25	12		
▪ # of males					10	4
▪ # of females					15	6
# of meals served through Supper Program.					25	30
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily Attendance.				70%	70	75%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.					3	1 only 1 site
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					3	4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					3	3.6
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3	3
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					3	1.6
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).					3	3.0
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					100%	Not required
% of students who participate in at least 80% of all sessions.	60	100%	75%	69%	75%	65%
Staff to Student Ratio	2:25	1:10	1:12	1:10	1:15	1:10
% of youth satisfied with the program as evidenced by satisfaction survey at program completion.	Not collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	75% N=10	75%	60% N=6
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of participating students who meet satisfactory school attendance standards of 94% (less than 11 days absent from school) as reported on quarterly report card.	91%	80%	80%	90% N=12	75%	100% N=10
% of participating students with no DJS referral during program period.	85%	80%	80%	100	70%	90% N=9
% of youth who are not suspended or expelled from school while involved in the program.					75%	80% N=8

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau (YSB)

Program Summary: Community based, nonresidential program that provides delinquency prevention, youth suicide prevention, drug and alcohol abuse prevention and youth development services to youth and their families.

Target Population: Youth ages 8-18 in Dorchester County. Primary referrals will be received from the Department of Juvenile Services. Secondary referral source will be from New Direction Learning Academy from Dorchester County Public Schools

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: YSB goal is to divert entry into the juvenile system while increasing personal responsibility and self-sufficiency.

FY12 Funding: \$65,296 + \$21,765 (Required County Match) = \$87,061

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual^	FY09 Actual^	FY10 Actual^	FY11 Actual**^	FY12 Target	FY 12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	136	72	101	180**	40	25
▪ Individual*	60	72	18	144	15	32
▪ Family*	75	0		5	5	2
▪ Group*	1	0	83	33	20	36
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	96	89	45		10	23
▪ Individual*	40	89	18	101	5	3
▪ Family*	55	0	0	3	0	18
▪ Group*	1	0	27	16	5	7
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	6	5	5	1	10	21
# of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	unknown	2	2	7	5	0
# of students served at New Directions Learning Academy.					30	5
How Well We Do It:						
% of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. N= number of formal cases with service plans developed before 4 th session/total number of formal cases.	85%	100%	100%	100	80%	100% n=1
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	85%	91%	75%	96	80%	94% N=34
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	50%	100%	100%	100	100%	100% N=4
% and # of youth participants referred from New Directions Learning Academy that return to home school in 12 weeks.					80%	30 % n=3

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual[^]	FY09 Actual[^]	FY10 Actual[^]	FY11 Actual^{**^}	FY12 Target	FY 12 Actual
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	75%	98%	100%	95%	75%	91% n=10
# and % of youth receiving formal counseling services with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					70%	100% N=13
# and % of youth who improved on at least one of 3 indicators between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments. Indicators include: meaningful and reliable improvement, # severe impairments, and Pervasive Behavioral Impairment,					70%	92% n=12
# and % of youth who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“improved”) and those who still had at least 1 severe impairment at most recent assessment (“not improved”).					70%	69% n=9 23% n=3
# and % of New Directions youth who were identified as being Pervasively Behaviorally Impaired (PBI) at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment.					70%	100% n=3
#and % of New Directions participants that returned to home school and completed 12 weeks without a new referral.					80%	0
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on each of the eight CAFAS subscales.					70%	85 N=11
# and % of formal counseling participants who improved on each of the 8 CAFAS subscales. Improved = those with a mild impairment or higher with a score reduced by 10 pts at exit.					75%	0

**Due to the downsizing of the program due to budget cuts and ending of other grant opportunities, the number served is not accurate. The program has been transferred to a new entity in FY12 with a specific target population.

LMB: Frederick County

Program Name: Frederick County Out-of-School Programs (OOSP)

Program Summary: Frederick County Out of School Programs are provided to middle school youth who are deemed by referral source to be at risk for negative academic, social and/or legal outcomes. Comprehensive programming includes daily opportunities for youth engagement during the school year, as well as summer programming for youth deemed most at-risk for academic failure, behavioral/emotional problems and/or DJS involvement. This research-based programming is aligned with established best-practices and is designed to engage youth in meaningful programs that assist them in becoming healthy young adults.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: School-Year Component – 150 youth, 30 from each of the five middle schools prioritized through a multi-variable analysis of school attendance, suspensions, FARM, MSA scores and DJS referrals. At least 50% of youth attending after school programs must be referred by an outside referral source such as DJS, CASS, school guidance counselor or psychologist.

Summer Component – 25 youth are selected from the referred participants in the school-year program. These youth are deemed by educators/referral sources to be at highest-risk for academic failure, social/behavioral problems and/or DJS involvement. In addition to established staffing and programming, youth participating in the summer component will be paired with trained high school mentors for peer-to-peer support and modeling.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Locally developed program offered each school day and throughout the summer. Program modeled after national and state best practices (High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Harvard Family Research Project and the Forum for Youth Investment).

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Frederick County Out of School Programs meet the mandates of SB 882 in the following ways: 1. The program builds capacity to serve youths in their communities and at home; 2. The program serves youth who have been referred to the program for high-risk behaviors in the school, community or family system; 3. The program promotes positive outcomes for youth; and 4. The program operates in unserved/underserved areas of Frederick County, as identified through a multi-factorial risk assessment.

FY12 Funding: \$133,547 + County \$94,779 = \$228,326

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.^					10	8
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.^					5	5
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.^					5	5
School Year Component:						
▪ # of youth receiving OOS programming.	164	182	159	194	150	230
▪ # of hours of programming per week (5 sites total).	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5
Summer Component:						
▪ # of youth receiving summer programming.				**	25	36
▪ # of hours of programming per week (1 site).					32	52.5
How Well We Do It:						
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.						4.60
▪ Brunswick Middle School						4.41
▪ Crestwood Middle School						3.97
▪ Governor Thomas Johnson Middle School						4.58
▪ Monocacy Middle School						4.16
▪ West Frederick Middle School						
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.						4.54
▪ Brunswick Middle School						3.34
▪ Crestwood Middle School						3.53
▪ Governor Thomas Johnson Middle School						4.02

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monocacy Middle School ▪ West Frederick Middle School 						3.63
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brunswick Middle School ▪ Crestwood Middle School ▪ Governor Thomas Johnson Middle School ▪ Monocacy Middle School ▪ West Frederick Middle School 						2.75 3.71 3.29 3.04 2.54
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brunswick Middle School ▪ Crestwood Middle School ▪ Governor Thomas Johnson Middle School ▪ Monocacy Middle School ▪ West Frederick Middle School 						3.17 3.00 3.00 2.50 2.50
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brunswick Middle School ▪ Crestwood Middle School ▪ Governor Thomas Johnson Middle School ▪ Monocacy Middle School ▪ West Frederick Middle School 						3.77 3.62 3.45 3.54 3.21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan. 					100%	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training. 					100%	100%
School Year Component:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average daily attendance. 				72%	70%	63%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth participating in the OOSP who are referred by child serving professionals or educators. 	58%	68%	50%	57% N=109	50%	66% N=151
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of middle school principals indicating satisfaction with the quality of the OOSP program as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in 3rd quarter. 	80%	80%	85%	100% N=3	80%	100% N=5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % parents indicating satisfaction with the quality of their child's OOSP as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in 3rd quarter. 	75%	80%	85%	100% N=48	80%	100% N=47

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Summer Component:						
▪ Average daily attendance				72%	70%	78%
▪ % parents indicating satisfaction with the quality of their child's summer program, as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in August 2012.				100% N=21	80%	100% N=12
Is Anyone Better Off:						
School Year Component:						
▪ % of youth who do not experience an out of school suspension during program period.	96%	90%	88%	92% N=178	90%	88% N=202
▪ % of youth participating who do not experience school expulsion during program period	100%	100%	99%	100% N=194	95%	99% N=227
▪ % of youth who do not experience new DJS involvement during program period.	100%	100%	100%	100% N=191	95%	100% N=230
▪ % of youth indicating (on youth survey administered by LMB in 3 rd quarter that participating in the after school program helps them:						
○ Stay out of trouble.	62%	75%	76%	67% N=64	75%	69% N=68
○ Stay away from drugs.	82%	86%	94%	89% N=85	80%	89% N=87
○ Feel better about themselves.	75%	70%	75%	79% N=76	75%	81% N=79
○ Treat others with respect.				78% N=75	75%	85% N=83
Summer Component:						
▪ % of youth who do not experience new DJS involvement during program period.				100%	95%	100% N=36
▪ % of youth indicating (on youth survey administered in August to youth present for at least 60% of the sessions that participating in the summer school program helps them:						
○ Stay out of trouble.	*	*	*	86%,N=24	75%	90%,N=26
○ Stay away from drugs.	*	*	*	93%,N=26	80%	90%,N=26
○ Have greater confidence in their academic ability.	*	*	*	71%,N=20	75%	93%,N=27
○ Feel more prepared for school.	*	*	*	71%,N=20	75%	83%,N=24

*Data not collected / indicates new performance measure or programmatic element.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Frederick County

Program Name: Juvenile Entry Diversion Initiative (JEDI)

Program Summary: Case management and diversion services focusing on three core components: diverting juvenile offenders from the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), redirecting pre-adjudicated Children In Need of Supervision (CINS) youth away from DJS to community-based services, and developing community-based mentoring services as a diversion from detention, commitment or re-offense.

Target Population: Youth who are: 1) first-time non-violent offenders, first-time violent (specifically 2nd degree assault) offenders, as well as certain second-time misdemeanor offenders, 2) pre-adjudication CINS youth (defined as youth who exhibit at-risk behaviors that do not constitute a delinquent act such as: truancy, run-away, ungovernable, incorrigible, and/or disobedient and for whom a parent has filed a Application of Child in Need of Supervision Petition).

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Based on Washington County’s Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Diversion Initiative – modeled upon Restorative Justice best practices.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Juvenile Entry Diversion Initiative (JEDI) meets the mandates of SB 882 in the following ways: 1. The program builds capacity to serve youths in their communities and at home; 2. The service reduces reliability on institutional care as primary mode of intervention; 3. The program is designed to prevent juvenile crimes and delinquency; and 4. The program promotes positive outcomes for youth.

FY12 Funding: \$107,026

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ # of youth referred	85	79
○ # of Juvenile Offender referrals		66
○ # of pre-adjudicated CINS referrals		13
▪ # of youth served	65	47
○ # of Juvenile Offender referrals		47
○ # of pre-adjudicated CINS referrals		0
▪ # of referrals made to community-based resources	130	55
How Well We Do It:		
▪ % of youth with an identified need who are referred to mental health and/or substance abuse services and are successfully linked (successful linkage is defined as completing an intake)	70%	92% N=9
▪ % of families at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey)	80%	100% N=4
▪ % of youth at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey)	80%	100% N=4
Is Anyone Better Off:		
▪ % of diverted cases that satisfy all obligations to successfully complete the diversion program within 16 weeks.	85%	80% N=8
▪ % of diverted youth who avoid re-offending for one full year from case open date	75%	N/A
▪ % of CINS youth who avoid any adjudication for one full year from open date	75%	N/A

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Garrett County Nurse-Family Partnership

Program Summary: Through ongoing home visits from registered nurses, low-income, first-time moms receive the care and support they need to have a healthy pregnancy, provide responsible and competent care for their children, and become more economically self-sufficient.

Target Population: NFP serves ONLY first-time, low-income mothers. Enrollment occurs prior to 28 weeks gestation, and services continue until the target child reaches age 2. Almost all of Garrett County, including three designated communities in the 21541 McHenry zip code are eligible for NFP service. The Barton, MD zip code is not included for NFP services.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: NFP has achieved the following designations on the *Blueprints* matrix.

Matrix of Programs (Updated 8/29/11)	Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy	Blueprints for Violence Prevention	NREPP-SAMHSA	Communities That Care	OJJDP Model Programs Guide	Office of Justice Programs Crimesolutions.gov	Child Trends / LINKS
Nurse-Family Partnership	Top Tier	Model	3.2-3.5	Effective	Exemplary	Effective	Effective

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Over half (53%) of the NFP mothers are ages 14-19. These mothers meet the target age for SB882 funding and are considered to be “at risk” for poor life outcomes (both mothers and babies) because they are low-income pregnant teens.

FY12 Funding: \$300,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY 12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of families served, per FY ▪ # of target children born, per FY ▪ # of completed home visits, per FY ▪ # of families that graduated (completed NFP), per FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 39 ▪ 23 ▪ 511 ▪ N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 86 ▪ 26 ▪ 1,226 ▪ N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 102 ▪ 36 ▪ 1,622 ▪ 19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 113 ▪ 29 ▪ 1,380 ▪ 26 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 95 ▪ 30 ▪ 1,400 ▪ 15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 113 ▪ 74 ▪ 1,340 ▪ 29
How Well We Do It: ⁴⁶						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of pregnant women that enroll by 28 weeks gestation or earlier, (<i>cumulative since program inception 8/07</i>) ▪ % of families discharged: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a) during pregnancy; ○ b) during infancy; and ○ c) during toddlerhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (39) ▪ a) 11.5% ▪ b) N/A ▪ c) N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (89) ▪ a) 13.6% ▪ b) 3.8% ▪ c) N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (119) ▪ a) 13.0% ▪ b) 11.7% ▪ c) 3.8% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (163) ▪ a) 12.1% (17/141) ▪ b) 13.9% (15/108) ▪ c) 8.3% (5/60) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% ▪ a) 10% ▪ b) 20% ▪ c) 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (187) ▪ a) 12% (20/167) ▪ b) 14% (19/134) ▪ c) 8%

⁴⁶ Reports generated from the NFP online data collection system contain *cumulative data* since program inception in August 2007. Performance targets listed have been established for ALL NFP programs by the Nurse-Family Partnership National Service Office (NFP NSO). For example, the NFP NSO target for attrition during the pregnancy phase is stated as “10% or less”.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY 12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of expected home visits completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a) during pregnancy; ○ b) during infancy; and ○ c) during toddlerhood. ▪ % of NFP CSQ-8 survey respondents satisfied with services, per FY (25+ on 32 pt. Likert scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a) 90% ▪ b) N/A ▪ c) N/A ▪ 100% (12/12) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a) 88% ▪ b) 73% ▪ c) N/A ▪ 100% (32/32) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a) 87% ▪ b) 67% ▪ c) 70% ▪ 97.6% (41/42) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 78%⁴⁷ ▪ 65%³ ▪ 55%³ ▪ 100% (48/48) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a) 80% ▪ b) 65% ▪ c) 60% ▪ 90% 	(8/104) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a) 85%³ ▪ b) 83%³ ▪ c) 76%³ ▪ 100% (79/79)
Is Anyone Better Off?¹						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of healthy birth weight births (>=2500 grams) ▪ % of NFP enrolled children, up to date w/immunizations at age 2 (ages 19-35 months) ▪ % reduction in the percentage of women smoking from intake to 36 weeks pregnancy ▪ Monitor workforce participation at 24 mos. for clients a) 17 years or younger at intake and b) 18 years+ at intake 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 87% (17/20) ▪ N/A ▪ N/A ▪ a) N/A ▪ b) N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 88% (44/50) ▪ N/A ▪ -14% ▪ a) N/A ▪ b) N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 87% (80/92) ▪ 100% (15/15) ▪ -24% ▪ a) 0% (0/1) ▪ b) 57.1% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 86.6% (103/119) ▪ 96% (90/96) ▪ -16% (31 to 26) ▪ 25% (1/4) ▪ b) 45.5% (15/33) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 95% ▪ 90% ▪ -20% a) Monitor b) Monitor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 97% (35/36) ▪ 90% (9/10) ▪ -16% (38 to 32) ▪ a) 25% (2/8) ▪ b) 48% (17/36)

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Healthy Communities / Healthy Youth

Program Summary: HC/HY is a model prevention program that utilizes a community-focused asset development approach to promote the healthy development of youth. The Search Institute's 40-developmental asset framework is integrated into activities by local community and youth groups and into the PHLC ATOD-free youth events.

Target Population: This at-risk youth prevention and diversion environmental strategy for entry/re-entry into the juvenile system utilizes community based activities that are alcohol, tobacco, and other drug free. The activities are targeted toward school age youth and their families residing in Garrett County.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: The 40 developmental assets are grounded in extensive research in youth development, resiliency, and prevention. They represent the relationships, opportunities, and personal qualities that young people need to avoid risks and to thrive. Research indicates that youth with more developmental assets are less likely to engage in risky behaviors.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Lowers the instance of risky behaviors (alcohol, tobacco, other drug use, sexual activity, negative peer pressure) in youth, prevent or divert youth from entering the juvenile justice system and increase the number of youth ready for adulthood by age 21 in the

⁴⁷ The NFP data in this section is received in report form directly from the NFP NSO. The "N" was not provided for the percentage of expected home visits completed.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

community “Play Hard. Live Clean.” teen activities and Developmental Asset education for youth and adults, access to supporting materials, and asset-rich activities for youth and families.

FY12 Funding: \$35,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of asset development trainings ▪ # of “youth hours” and “adult hours” (actual) for HC/HY asset trainings facilitated by the HD ▪ # of HC/HY media activities ▪ # of PHLC activities (ATOD-free focus) and # of youth participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 89 ▪ 107.8, youth, 10 4.3 adult ▪ 56 ▪ 4 activities, 1,566 youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 45 ▪ 59 youth 80.5 adult ▪ 48 ▪ 4 activities, 1,073 youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5 ▪ 12.25 youth 43.5 adult ▪ 48 ▪ 4 activities, 260 youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 6 ▪ 30 youth, 78 adult ▪ 54 ▪ 3 activities, 197 youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5 ▪ 20 youth 50 adult ▪ 48 ▪ 3 activities, 500 youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5 ▪ 78 youth 41.5 adult ▪ 48 ▪ 4 activities, 160 youth
How Well We Do It:						
% of Community Resource Survey respondents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indicating “<i>Recreation for Families</i>” is ‘somewhat’ or ‘very much’ a Strength, annually ▪ Indicating “<i>Recreation for Youth</i>” is ‘somewhat’ or ‘very much’ a Strength, annually ▪ Indicating “After School Programs” is “somewhat or “very much” a Strength, annually 	<i>N/A – New for FY 2009</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 23.9% (83/348) ▪ 22.4% (77/344) ▪ Not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 51.1% (97/190) ▪ 38.2% (71/186) ▪ Not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 45.5% (40/88) ▪ 39.8% (35/88) ▪ Not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 35% ▪ 35% ▪ 35% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30% (15/50) ▪ 28% (14/50) ▪ 34% (17/50)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ % of 9th graders reporting that they have at least 75% of the 40 Developmental Assets, annually ▪ % of 9th grade Asset Survey respondents reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ “I feel safe at home, at school, and in the neighborhood” ✓ “I want to do well in school” ✓ “I feel good about myself” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 36.4%, NHS (43/118) ▪ 87.3% (103/118) ▪ 91.5% (108/118) ▪ 84.7% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 39.3%, SHS (136/346) ▪ 85.8% (297/346) ▪ 91.3% (316/346) ▪ 84.7% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 55.4% (46/83) ▪ 95.2% (79/83) ▪ 96.4% (80/83) ▪ 89.2% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 55.4% (46/83) ▪ 95.2% (79/83) ▪ 96.4% (80/83) ▪ 89.2% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 40% ▪ 88% ▪ 90% ▪ 85% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 57% (64/113) ▪ 89% (101/113) ▪ 88% (99/113) ▪ 88%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
	(100/118)	(293/346)	(74/83)	(74/83)		(99/113)
Secondary Indicators <i>(potentially impacted by the intervention)</i>				Updated data not available		
▪ Monitor Juvenile Non-Violent Arrest Rate (3-yr. average, ages 15-17)	▪ 1,908 ('06-'08)	▪ 47 ('07-'09')	▪ 64 ('08-'10)	▪ 262	▪ Monitor	▪ 90% ('10-'12)
▪ Monitor High School Drop-Out Rate (3-yr. average)	▪ 2.21% ('06-'08)	▪ 2.22% ('07-'09)	▪ 1.95% ('08-'10)	▪ 2.2% ('09-'11)	▪ Monitor	▪ 2% ('10-'12)
▪ Monitor Teen Pregnancy Rate (3-yr. average, ages 15-19)	▪ 31.2 ('06-'08)	▪ 31.5 ('07-'09)	▪ 24.3 ('08-'10)	▪ 32.3** ('09-'11)	▪ Monitor	▪ 57.3% ('10-'12)
▪ Monitor High School Program Completion – met UMD requirements (3-yr. average)	▪ 49.0% ('06-'08, UMD)	▪ 51.9% ('07-'09, UMD)	▪ 54.9% ('08-'10, UMD)	▪ 91.9% ('09-'11)	▪ Monitor	▪ 56% ('10-'12)

** Data obtained from GC Health Department Personal Health Family Planning Clinics.

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Partners After School @ Grantsville

Program Summary: Partners After School @ Grantsville operates four days per week, three hours per day, during the school year. Activities include homework help, tutoring, academic enrichment activities, computer skills, recreation, arts/crafts, community service, and field trips.

Target Population: This targeted at-risk youth prevention and diversion strategy is offered at Grantsville Elementary School to students in grades 3-8 that reside in the Grantsville Elementary School and Northern Middle School attendance areas.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Partners After School @ Grantsville operates under the MOST guidelines.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program will prevent and divert criminal behavior and increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency by promoting positive outcomes for students in grades 3-8, who are determined to have academic, behavior, or developmental risk factors that could inhibit academic success.

FY12 Funding: \$24,512

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of students served by PAS @ Grantsville, per SY	▪ 45	▪ 47	▪ 47	▪ 33	▪ 45	▪ 32
▪ # of students served 30 or more days, per SY	▪ 39	▪ 43	▪ 46	▪ 30	▪ 40	▪ 22
▪ # of parent/other adult volunteer hours, per SY (includes AmeriCorps tutors)	▪ 2,804	▪ 2,702	▪ 2,043	▪ 1,374	▪ 2,000	▪ 10.5
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics					▪ 2	▪ 2

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
training.						
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of PAS students attending 8+ days who attend at least 75% of the days they are scheduled, per SY	▪ 98% (43/44)	▪ 100% (46/46)	▪ 98% (46/47)	▪ 75.8% (25/33)	▪ 90%	▪ 73% (8/11)
▪ % of students attending PAS 30+ days w/satisfactory school attendance (<16 days absent during the SY)	▪ 92% (35/38)	▪ 95% (41/43)	▪ N/A	▪ NAfrom school	▪ 95%	▪ 91% (20/22)
▪ % parents satisfied with PAS @ Grantsville, per SY	▪ 95% (42/44)	▪ 94% (33/35)	▪ 100% (36/36)	▪ 100% (14/14)	▪ 95%	▪ 100% (25/25)
▪ % of students attending 30+ days with at least one parent attending two or more PAS activities	▪ 86% (25/29)	▪ 74% (28/38)	▪ 57% (26/46)	▪ 80% (24/30)	▪ 60%	▪ 64% (14/22)
▪ Average daily attendance (average daily attendance / number of program slots)	▪ 80% (32.1/40)	▪ 83% (33.0/40)	▪ 80% (31.8/40)	▪ 72% (21.6/30)	▪ 85% (25.5/30)	▪ 57% (17/30)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					▪ 3.8	▪ 4.9 (24.5/5)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					▪ 4.3	▪ 5.0 (30/6)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					▪ 4	▪ 4.7 (18.7/4)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					▪ 4.3	▪ 4.3 (13/3)
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).					▪ 4.1	▪ 4.7 (18.9/4)
▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					▪ 1	▪ 0
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 with a grade of "B-" or better in a) Reading/English and b) Math/Algebra	a) 69% (25/36) b) 64% (23/36)	a) 63% (24/38) b) 63% (24/38)	a) 75% (30/40) b) 70% (28/40)	a)90% (27/30) b) 87% (26/30)	a)70% b) 70%	a) 73% (8/11) b) 73% (8/11)
▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 who score <i>proficient</i> or <i>advanced</i> in a) Reading and b)	a) 69% (24/35)	a) 87% (33/38)	a) 100% (23/23)	a) Not received from school	a) 70%	a) TBD

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Math on the MSAs	b) 63% (22/35)	b) 63% (24/38)	b) 91% (21/23)	b) Not received from school	b) 70%	b) TBD
▪ % of students served 30+ days with NO disciplinary referrals, suspensions, or expulsions during the SY	▪ 97.4% (37/38)	▪ 95.3% (41/43)	▪ 96.3% (26/27)	Not received from School	▪ 95%	▪ 100% (32/32)

*The PAS@GV program has been in operation for more than 12 years, with funding from other sources. FY 2012 is the second year of funding by the Children's Cabinet.

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Partners After School @ Oakland

Program Summary: Partners After School @ Oakland operates four days per week, three hours per day, during the school year. Activities include homework help, tutoring, academic enrichment activities, computer skills, recreation, arts/crafts, community service, and field trips.

Target Population: This targeted at-risk youth prevention and diversion strategy is offered at Southern Middle School to at-risk students in grades 3-8 that reside in the Broad Ford Elementary School, Dennett Road Elementary School, Yough Glades Elementary School, and Southern Middle School attendance areas.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Partners After School @ Oakland operates under the MOST guidelines.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program will prevent and divert criminal behavior, increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency by promoting positive outcomes for students in grades 3-8 who are determined to have academic, behavioral, or development risk factors that could inhibit academic success.

FY12 Funding: \$24,512

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of students served by PAS @ Oakland, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 23	▪ 72	▪ 45	▪ 61
▪ # of students served 30 or more days, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 13	▪ 48	▪ 40	▪ 40
▪ # of parent/other adult volunteer hours, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 33	▪ 1291	▪ 100	▪ 354
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training					▪ 2	▪ 2
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of PAS students attending 8+ days who attend at least 75% of the days they are scheduled, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 39% (9/23)	▪ 38% (26/64)	▪ 50%	▪ 64% (38/59)
▪ % of students attending PAS 30+ days w/satisfactory school attendance (<16 days absent during the SY)	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 78% (32/41)	▪ 95%	▪ 98% (39/40)
▪ % parents satisfied with PAS @ Oakland, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 100% (19/19)	▪ 100% (26/26)	▪ 95%	▪ 100% (51/51)
▪ % of students attending 30+ days with at least one parent attending two or more PAS activities			▪ 23% (3/13)	▪ N/A	▪ 50%	▪ 88% (35/40)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Average daily attendance (average daily attendance / number of program slots)	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 15% (7.3/50)	▪ 50% (25/50)	▪ 85%	▪ 71% (29/41)
Performance Measure	FY08 Actual*	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 with a grade of “B-” or better in a) Reading/English and b) Math/Algebra	a) N/A b) N/A	a) N/A b) N/A	a) 69% (9/13) b) 62% (8/13)	a) 60% (31/52) b) 63% (33/52)	a) 70% b) 70%	▪ a) 60% (24/40) ▪ b) 55% (22/40)
▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 who score <i>proficient</i> or <i>advanced</i> in a) Reading and b) Math on the MSAs	a) N/A b) N/A	a) N/A b) N/A	a) N/A b) N/A	a) 91% (21/23) b) 91% (21/23)	a) 70 b) 70%	a) TBD b) TBD
▪ % of students served 30+ days with NO disciplinary referrals, suspensions, or expulsions during the SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 97% (57/59)	▪ 95%	▪ 93% (37/40)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					▪ 3.8	▪ 4.4 (22.1/5)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					▪ 4.3	▪ 4.3 (26/6)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities Environment domain.					▪ 4	▪ 4.3 (17.1/4)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment for Engagement domain.					▪ 4.3	▪ 3.2 (9.5/3)
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).					▪ 4.1	▪ 4.1 (16.2/4)
▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					▪ 100% (1/1)	▪ 0

*The PAS@OK program has been in operation for more than 10 years, with funding from other sources. FY 2012 is the first year of funding by the Children’s Cabinet.

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board
Program Name: Summer Youth Employment Supplement (S-YES)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Program Summary: The Summer Youth Employment Supplement (S-YES) provides thirteen low-income Garrett County youth, ages 14-21, with summer employment and educational opportunities. This supplemental funding expands the Western Maryland Consortium’s Summer Youth Employment Program (SYES) in Garrett County. Youth are employed for up to six weeks of supervised work experience. Participants work in a variety of entry-level jobs at government agencies, hospitals, summer camps, nonprofits, small businesses, law firms, museums, sports enterprises, and retail organizations.

Target Population: This targeted at-risk youth prevention and diversion strategy is for transitional aged youth, ages 14-21. Eligible youth must meet economic guidelines, as well as have a barrier to entering employment and/or a barrier to completing their education. Barriers may include lack of transportation, documented disability or other special need, involvement with Juvenile Justice System, or deficiency in basic literacy skills.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Research has shown that early work experiences are crucial to youth acquisition of 21st Century skills. In an analysis of Maryland data, Sum et al.⁴⁸ found that the employment success is strongly linked to individual’s prior work experience. The more teens worked in earlier periods, the more likely that they are working today. This holds true for years worked, number of weeks worked, and hours worked.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Eligibility criteria for WIA (and LMB) funding targets youth ages 14-21 from low income families, as well as youth with disabilities or special needs as well as those involved with Juvenile Services to increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency, while enhancing educational success, increasing employment opportunities and increase youth ready for adulthood by age 21.

FY12 Funding: \$20,618

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of eligible youth who complete the S-YES application, annually ▪ # of program days (program length), annually ▪ # of youth enrolled in S-YES, annually 	XX	XX	XX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 58 ▪ 8 ▪ 34 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 60 ▪ 12 ▪ 30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 82 ▪ 27 ▪ 27.63 (746 wrk hrs/27)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth that complete the S-YES, annually ▪ % of youth satisfied with the S-YES, as measured by the Attkisson 8-item Client Satisfaction Survey (CSQ-8) (25+ on 32-point Likert scale) ▪ % of youth who attend all scheduled program days, annually 	96%(X/Y)	73% (X/Y)	89% (X/Y)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (8/8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 88%⁴⁹ ▪ 80% ▪ 80% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 89% (24/27) ▪ 100% (16/16) ▪ 26% (7/27)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of high school students, identified at risk for drop-out, who return to school the next year, following completion of 	XX	XX	XX	XX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 85% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 89% (24/27)

⁴⁸ Andrew Sum, Ishwar Khatiwada, Joseph McLaughlin, with Sheila Palma and Paulo Tobar. *Developments in the Teen and Young Adult Labor Market in Maryland, 2000 - 2007: Implications for Workforce Development Policy*. Baltimore : Job Opportunities Task Force, 2008/2009.

⁴⁹ Baseline data for FYs 2008-2010 is for all youth participating in the Western Maryland Consortium’s Summer Youth Employment Program.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

S-YES. ▪ % of participants who show improvement in job skills and attitudes as measured by the SCANS Evaluation (pre / post test).				▪ 63% (5/8)	▪ 75%	▪ 33% (4/12)
---	--	--	--	----------------	-------	-----------------

LMB: Harford County

Program Name: CINS Prevention Program

Program Summary: Licensed therapists provide program services and engage children and their parents in individual and family counseling. CINS Prevention focuses on youth exhibiting disruptive behavior or presenting behaviors such as acting out or withdrawing at home, school or in the community by effectively reducing aggressive or disruptive behaviors, improving parent engagement in their child’s education and promoting positive outcomes such as improved family functioning and school attendance.

Target Population: Elementary age youth identified as in need of therapeutic intervention. Services specifically offered at schools in the geographic areas of Bel Air, Edgewood, Havre de Grace, Aberdeen and Joppatowne. Referrals can be made by agency or family.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Practice-Based Evidence

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Links families to support services needed including mental health, financial assistance and medical assistance. Research points to the importance of health and mental health in student achievement as well as prevention of delinquency (OJJDP, Child Delinquency Bulletin, April 2003).

FY12 Funding: \$95,983

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of youth served	47	74	73	51	50	56
How Well Did We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth completing services (# completed services/# admitted into program)	87% (27/31)	79% (45/57)	77% (36/47)	94% (33/35)	80%	100% (43/56)
▪ Percent of families who indicate they are satisfied or better with the program (N=number of returned surveys)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=18)	94% (16/17)	100% (N=2)	80%	(26/26)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of participants, for who violent incidences have been a problem, that demonstrate a decrease in violent incidences in the home and the school based on parent and teacher surveys administered at the close of service	100% (21/21)	60% (24/40)	81% (17/21)	100% (N=1)	85%	100% (1/1)
▪ Percentage of children who maintained or improved school attendance during service delivery as it compared to the previous marking period*	93% (25/27)	96% (43/45)	100% (N=36)	94% (31/33)	85%	100% (15/15)
▪ Percentage of families who report an improved relationship with the school, based on parent survey at the close of service	88% (15/17)	83% (15/18)	81% (13/16)**	100% (N=2)	85%	86% (37/43)
▪ Percentage of youth who demonstrate increased functioning in two or	100%	100%	97%	100%	90%	94% (15/16)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
more domains of the CANS as administered at the start, middle and close of service	(27/27)	(45/45)	(35/36)	(N=33)		

*Maintained is defined as attendance not getting any worse, improved is defined as an increased number of days in attendance at school.

**Note that one family was provided with the staff version of the satisfaction survey, and therefore did not have this question to respond to.

LMB: Harford County

Program Name: CINS Diversion Program

Program Summary: CINS Diversion serves middle and high school age youth who meet the CINS (Children in Need of Supervision) criteria meaning they are habitually truant, ungovernable and/or have run away from home. The goal of this program is to divert these at-risk youth from the juvenile justice system. Issues of truancy and academic withdrawal are addressed by a case manager who works with youth to identify and eliminate the barriers that are keeping them from being successful in school. Case managers link youth and their families with additional services needed such as tutoring, counseling, substance abuse treatment and parenting classes.

Target Population: Middle and high school age youth exhibiting CINS-type behavior. Services targeted within the geographic areas of Bel Air, Edgewood, Havre de Grace, Aberdeen and Joppatowne. Referrals can be made by an agency or the family.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Practice-Based Evidence

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Program is school and community-based and serves middle and high school-age youth at risk of becoming formally involved or further involved, in the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$95,983

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:	A Different Vendor provided the CINS Diversion Program						
▪ Youth served with Level I Services	35	8	8	0	0	0	18
▪ Number of youth served	32	39	35	30	28	50	23
How Well Did We Do It:							
▪ From the returned surveys, percent of families receiving Level II services who were satisfied or higher (%/N)	100% (25)	100% (N=18)	95% (21/22)	92% (11/12)	100% (N=11)	75%	100% (11/11)
▪ Percentage of youth completing Level II services (# completed services/# admitted into program)	89%	98% (39/41)	83% (35/42)	96% (23/24)	78% (28/36)	80%	72% (13/18)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ % of Level II clients diverted from formal DJS involvement	90% (28/31)	97% (38/39)	97% (34/35)	96% (22/23)	100% (N=28)	75%	77% (10/13)
▪ % of Level II clients, for whom running away has been a problem, who showed a decrease in incidence of running away behavior during service delivery (N=number improved/number with a history of running away).	89% (8/9)	88% (21/24)	97% (34/35)	100% (N=3)	100% (N=8)	88%	100% (1/1)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ % of Level II clients who maintained or improved school attendance during service delivery	89% (17/19)	87% (34/39)	97% (34/35)	100% (N=23)	93% (26/28)	50%	69% (9/13)
▪ % of Level II clients completing the program who maintained or improved their GPA during service delivery as compared to the previous marking period*	29% (9/31)	38% (15/39)	91% (32/35)	100% (N=23)	89% (25/28)	50%	54% (7/13)

*Maintained is defined as academic grades not getting any worse, improved is defined as an increase in academic grades

LMB: Harford County

Program Name: Teen Court

Program Summary: Teen Court operates under the restorative justice model to determine what is best for the respondent, the victim, and the community at large. Teen Courts can promote a feeling of self-worth and desire for self-improvement among offenders by providing them with opportunities to take responsibility for their actions, give back to the community and participate as a future Teen Court jury member.

Target Population: First time offenders between the age of 13 -17 that have committed a non-violent misdemeanor offense. Program is open to youth county-wide with a special emphasis on the zip code areas of Bel Air, Edgewood, Havre de Grace, Aberdeen and Joppatowne. Referrals are made by the Sheriff's Department or other local agencies.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Practice-Based Evidence

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Teen Court is offered as an alternative to criminal charges for a first time offender, and thereby works to divert youth from a pattern of criminal behavior.

FY12 Funding: \$12,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ Number of youth offenders served by Teen Court	30	40
▪ Number of youth volunteers that participate in Teen Court	30	51
How Well Did We Do It:		
▪ Percent of clients completing Teen Court proceedings (# completed program/# accepted into the program)	75%	99% (4/4)
▪ Percent of dispositions successfully completed (# dispositions completed/# dispositions assigned)	75%	97% (33/34)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
▪ Percent of youth diverted from formal juvenile justice involvement at least 3 months following conclusion of Teen Court involvement	75%	100% (25/25)

LMB: Local Management Board for Children's and Family Services of Kent County

Program Name: Addictions Counselor in School

Program Summary: Based on a partnership among the vendor, Kent County Public Schools, and the LMB, the program supports an addictions counselor who provides individual and group therapy to school students, primarily in grades 5-12. Student participation is voluntary after the 1st session. For continuity of care,

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

the addictions counselor may see students at a local mental health clinic during after-school hours or over the summer; or refer students to the clinic at any point during the school year if their needs exceed what the counselor can provide during the school day. New in FY12, AlcoholEdu will be integrated for high school into health education classes and/or other applicable venues.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Stages of Change Treatment Model; Teen Intervene (as appropriate); AlcoholEdu (new)

Target Population: Adolescents age 11-18 who display the early stages of alcohol and drug use problems, or with a history of alcohol or drug use.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The target population, above, is within the SB882 Population.

FY12 Funding: \$72,443

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ # of children (total, unduplicated) receiving services.	33	56	37	38	27
▪ # of youth who participate in the Teen Intervene (TI) Program (included in the total number, above).			25	24	12
▪ # of parents who attend session 3 of Teen Intervene.			7	8	2
▪ # of youth who participate in the AlcoholEdu for High School online evidence-based program.				136	100
How Well We Do It:					
▪ # and % of participants attending at least 6 therapy sessions.	54.5% (18/33)	27% (n=15/56)	50% (n=4/8, or 25/37, incl TI)	60%	22% (n=6/27)
▪ % of students that complete all three TI sessions.			80% (n=20/25)	75%	58% (n=7/12)
▪ # and % of participants taking GAF**** pre and post-test.	64% (n=21/33)	94% (n=34/36)	100% (n=29)	75%	59% (n=10/17)
▪ # and % of youth who complete AlcoholEdu for High School program (Part One-two 50 minute sessions).				70%	86% (n=86/100)
▪ # and % of youth who completed all components of the AlcoholEdu for High School program (Part One-two 50 minute sessions, and Part Two-one 20 minute session).				50%	67% (n=67/100)
▪ % of program participants <u>not</u> referred to DJS for drug use while in treatment with ASAC.	100%	100%	100% (n=0)	90%	100% (n=0/28)
▪ % of participants demonstrating an increase on GAF between intake and discharge.	38% (8/21)	61% (n=14/23)	100% (n=4/4) (n=18/29 or 62% if T-I included)	40%	80% (n=8/10)
▪ % of TI participants who show an increase in willingness to change between Sessions 1 & 2, as documented in worksheets completed with the ASAC in Sessions 1 & 2.			75% (n=15/20)	50%	75% (n=6/8)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increase of the mean test score (%) testing baseline of knowledge and decision-making strategies around alcohol use (Survey One / Survey Two, Session One) for AlcoholEdu High School student participants, as reported in End of Year AlcoholEdu generated report⁺ 				20%	8%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % decrease (Survey One / Survey Three) in perceived acceptability of three high-risk behaviors (underage drinking, drinking on weekends), for AlcoholEdu High School student participants, as self-reported in End of Year AlcoholEdu generated report. ⁺ 				50%	****

**These counts may reflect duplication of children who receive both services during the course of the year.

***GAF is the Global Assessment of Functioning pre and post measure

⁺The “Is Anyone Better Off” measures related to AlcoholEdu will be reported end of year only, as they are generated cumulatively by Outside the Classroom Inc., in the spring of each year.

****This measurement comes from data collected in the 3rd part of AlcoholEdu that will not be available until Oct 21.

LMB: Local Management Board for Children’s and Family Services of Kent County

Program Name: Girls Circle /Mother-Daughter Circle/ Boys Council

Program Summary: Approximately 8-12 youth of similar age and development meet weekly with an adult facilitator and a co-facilitator. Sessions are 90 or 120 minutes and follow an 8-12 week curricula, depending on the theme. By talking and listening respectfully and engaging in expressive activities, participants build resiliency by experiencing safety in relationships. The groups are gender-based, fostering better honesty, group retention, and outcomes. Participants may be recruited by facilitators, referred to the program by local agencies & organizations, or court-ordered.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Girls Circle is an OJJDP “Promising Approach”

Target Population: Adolescents age 9-18 at-risk of entering the juvenile justice system.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The target population, above, is within the SB882 Population.

FY12 Funding: \$70,025

Performance Measure ⁺	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of girls participating in Girls Circle program. 	12	20	49
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of mother/daughter couples participating in Girls Circle Mother/Daughter program. 	0	5	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of boys participating in Boys Council program. 	8	20	42
How Well We Do It:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # and % of girls who attend at least 60% of group sessions. 	12/100%	13/65%	35/75%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # and % of mother/daughter couples who attend at least 60% of group sessions. 	0/NA	3/60%	3/75%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # and % of boys who attend at least 60% of group sessions. 	5/62%	13/65%	15/34%
Is Anyone Better Off?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of girls who report increase in school engagement, as self-reported in pre/post survey. 	**	55%	92%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure ⁺	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
			(n=23/25)
▪ % of mother/daughter couples who report increase in self-efficacy/self-image, as self-reported in pre/post survey.	**	55%	75% (n=3/4)
▪ % of boys who report increase in school engagement as self-reported in pre/post survey.	**	55%	89% (n=23/26)

**These measures were not collected in FY11 due to LMB error. This error has been identified and addressed in FY12. The program has a new vendor, and the vendor is collecting pre/post self-reported program data.

LMB: Local Management Board for Children’s and Family Services of Kent County

Program Name: Early Morning Drop Off

Program Summary: School staff will provide supervision and academic support for one hour prior to the school day at Kent County Middle School, Garnett Elementary School, Galena Elementary School, and Rock Hall Elementary School.

Target Population: School age youth, Pre-K – 8th grade, who are at risk of developing truant behaviors due to lack of early morning supervision. Truant students are at risk for substance abuse and other high risk behaviors.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: This is a locally developed program with strong results, developed in response to needs in this “commuter community.” Performance measured identified below pertain specifically to this program.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The target population (above) falls under the universal prevention category within the IOM framework. Truancy problems develop in elementary school years and become habits in middle school. Students who are not in school are at risk for substance abuse and other high-risk behaviors.

FY12 Funding: \$43,407 + \$2,000 Earned reinvestment = \$45,407

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ # of students enrolled in Early Morning Drop Off.	199		106	130	199
▪ # of schools participating.	4		4	4	4
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.				8	1
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.				4	4
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.				2	4
How Well We Do It:					
▪ Average Daily Attendance (ADA) all student participants.	95.1%		95.2%	95%	96%
▪ Percentage of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA basics.				100%	0
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					5
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.8
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					2

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for all sites.					3.7
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Kent County Middle School.					3.8
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Garnett Elementary School.					3.8
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Galena Elementary School.					2.8
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Rock Hall Elementary School.					3.8
▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.				50% (N=2)	100% (n=4)
▪ % of parents who report that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the program.**	97%		98%	90%	100% (n=93/93)
▪ % of youth participants who report that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” overall with the program on the program satisfaction survey.				75%	96% (n=75/79)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with an ADA higher than their school grade ADA.	85%		67%	85%	62%
▪ % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with a GPA equal to or greater than their school grade GPA.***			67%	60%	100%
▪ % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with a truancy rate lower than their school grade truancy rate.+				75%	100%

*Early Morning Drop off was not operated in FY10. Partial data only available for FY09.

** Satisfaction surveys are mailed to parents/guardians of participants twice per year (10/11 and 2/12) with self addressed stamped envelopes.

*** GPA will be reported at the end of year only for 4th-8th grade students, based on GPA scores reported at the end of the third quarter. GPA is not calculated below fourth grade.

+ The truancy rate is defined as the percent of students who are enrolled in Kent County Public School for 91 days or more, and who are absent for more than 20 days of school, September-June. Excused and unexcused absences are both counted. The truancy rate will be reported end of year only.

LMB: Local Management Board for Children’s and Family Services of Kent County

Program Name: Kent County Diversion Program

Program Summary: This is a mandatory supervised evening reporting program that provides weekly experiential learning, conflict resolution and pro-social skill development, blended with outdoor recreation activities and community service over a 90 day period. With a rolling admission process and a daily census of up to 5 youth, the program operates a minimum of three nights per week with a minimum of six face-to-face program hours per week (excluding travel time), plus a monthly weekend venturing activity. Monthly weekend outdoor activities (typically eight hours in length) are the practical application of the skills learned during weekly sessions.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Based on Carroll County’s Adventure Diversion Program, an OJJDP “Promising Program.” The materials and training to support this program have been provided to Kent County.

Target Population: Adolescents ages 13-18 who are identified by Department of Juvenile Services, and/or a local group home for boys, and/or Kent County Public Schools.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The target population, above, is within the SB882 Population.

FY12 Funding: \$62,583

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ Number of youth participants.	15	15	25
▪ Number of evening reporting sessions completed.	60	50	92
▪ Number of venturing activities conducted.	33	20	38
How Well We Do It:			
▪ % of participants who attend at least 96% of evening reporting sessions (only one session missed) within 98 days.		50%	68% (n=17/25)
▪ % of participants who complete the KCDP 91-day program within 98 days. ⁵⁰	90% (n=9/10)	50%	68% (n=17/25)
▪ % of participants who are satisfied with the Program as indicated on the exit survey.	100% (n=8)	75%	94% (n=15/16)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ % of participants who did not have a subsequent violation of criminal and/or a court order while participating in KCDP ⁵¹	78.3% (n=5/23)	75%	100% (n=25/25)
▪ % of participants not court ordered to detention or shelter placement for three months after completing the program.	100% (n=0)	70%	100% (n=17/17)
▪ % of participants who showed improvements in both pro-social and conflict resolution skills as measured by the pre/post assessment.	60% (n=3/5)	80%	76% (n=13/17)

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: Excel Beyond the Bell (EBB) Services

Program Summary: Excel Beyond the Bell Services is comprehensive out-of-school time (OST) programming serving middle school students at three sites for 30 weeks for 2 hours per day, four days per week. The goal is to develop an intentional array of program options during after school hours to support positive youth development and academic achievement in high poverty areas of Montgomery County where students may also be at risk of academic failure.

⁵⁰ The Kent County Diversion Program is a 91-day program (13 weeks), however an additional week is included in this performance measure to permit the makeup of up to three unexcused absences.

⁵¹ The subsequent violation must be a new charge, not a ‘basic’ violation such as smoking or truancy.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: All programs serve youth held at the following middle schools: Argyle, Clemente and Loiederman MS. Academic eligibility is not a criterion for participation in these programs.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: The Excel Beyond the Bell Services supports providers to successfully deliver programs through collaborative practice. We employ the following guiding principles for quality after-school programs detailed in “Putting it All Together”, Public/Private Ventures: exposure, supportive relationships, and continuous improvement.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The focus for student participation is youth who are low income, culturally diverse, having academic problems and vulnerable to or showing risky behaviors.

FY12 Funding: \$487,884

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					22	22
▪ # of programs submitting program self-assessments.					11	10 ¹
▪ # of programs submitting Program Improvement Plans.					11	10 ¹
▪ # of participants at professional development trainings.					50	306
▪ # of OOST options available for students beyond extracurricular school offerings.					36	44
▪ # of programming hours offered.					320	282 ²
▪ # of youth served.	1471	1669	1009	786	600	744
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Average Daily Attendance.*				73%	200/75%	160/77%
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.				89%	N=11 100%	N=10 ¹ 91%
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					3.5	4.62
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					3.5	4.51
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3	3.96
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					3	3.63
▪ # and % of programs with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					N=11 100%	N=10 ¹ 91%
▪ # and % of program participants who participated in programming 4 hours per week.					60%	N=582 48% ³
▪ % of program participants satisfied or very satisfied with their program (sense of belonging, fun and safety)	96%	78%	78%	84%	75%	N=524; 78%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
as measured by an average of all surveys administered at the end of each program session.						
▪ % of program participants satisfied or very satisfied with the program staff (supportive, trust and choice) as measured by an average of all surveys administered at the end of each program session.		81%	84%	87%	75%	N=517; 77%
▪ # and % of programs that report satisfaction with their overall involvement in EBB services: 1) clarity of role and purpose. 2) nature and frequency of communication. 3) problems/barriers adequately addressed. as measured by a survey administered at the end of the school year.					1) N= 8; 75% 2) N= 8; 75% 3) N= 8; 75%	1) N= 18; 82% 2) N= 18; 82% 3) N= 18; 82%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of program participants that report contribution of program to positive social and personal skills: 1) making positive life choices, 2) stronger sense of self, and 3) improved core values. as measured by a survey administered at the end of the school year.			1) 71% 2) 75% 3) 68%	1) 77% 2) 81% 3) 75%	1) 75% 2) 80% 3) 70%	1) N=248; 63% ⁴ 2) N=264; 67% ⁴ 3) N=240; 61% ⁴
▪ % of program participants who demonstrate: 1) positive changes in academic attitudes. 2) school attendance (mean % days attended). 3) year-end grade average (mean average). 4) academic eligibility (% eligible end-of-year). as measured by a survey administered at the end of the school year and by data from the school.			1) 60% 2) 95.3% 3) 2.71 4) 82.4%	1) 64% 2) N/A 3) N/A 4) N/A	1) 60% 2) 95% 3) 2.5 4) 80%	1) N=225; 57% ⁴ 2) 96% 3) 3.0 4) 88% N=463

*Average Daily Attendance was calculated differently in previous years based on an average daily attendance for each program averaged across all programs. For FY11, on any given day any given program had 18 participants. FY12 model looks at participation in all out of school time activities so average daily attendance would be higher and not averaged across separate programs.

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: Linking Youth with Diversions

Program Summary: This program seeks to engage eligible youth and their families in diversion programs in partnership with the Montgomery County Police Department/Family Crimes Division and the Department of Health and Human Services' Screening and Assessment Services for Children and Adolescents so that intake/referral to the Department of Juvenile Services is avoided and the youth's juvenile record is cleared.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: Youth who have been charged with a misdemeanor delinquent offense, may be eligible for diversion with the case then not being forwarded to DJS for intake, their record expunged and pro-social behaviors learned.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Children’s Cabinet discretion, program with data showing positive results.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Youth who are charged with an offense by the police department.

FY12 Funding: \$54,900

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
How Much We Do:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of youth served ▪ Number of youth referred but not served 	52 4	45 8	209 12	125 25	170 16
How Well We Do It:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of surveyed parents/guardians who are satisfied or higher with services for subscale/questions: Respectful of family, Knowledgeable ▪ Percentage of surveyed parents/guardians who reported they understood the diversion process and eligibility requirements. ▪ Percentage of workers in police and teen court who are satisfied with the case manager’s ability to get information on youth eligible for diversion. ▪ Percentage of families contacted by the case manager who followed up with diversion options (i.e., SASCA and Teen Court). 	100%	100%	100% (N=52) 100% (N=52) 100% (N=13) 75% (N=156)	90% (N=65) 90% (N=65) 90% (N=20) 80% (N=65)	95% (N=38) 95% (N=38) 100% (N=10) 74% ¹ (N=126)
Is Anyone Better Off:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of diverted youth who do not re-offend while involved in the program. ▪ Percentage of youth served who are diverted from DJS intake for the presenting charge. 	90%	90% 90%	92% (N=102) 75% (N=95)	85% 80%	NA ² 74% ³ (N=126)

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau (YSB)

Program Summary: Youth Service Bureaus are community-based, non-residential entities that provide delinquency prevention, youth suicide prevention, drug and alcohol abuse prevention and youth development services to youth and their families. Each YSB provides the following core services for children, youth and families: Formal and Informal Counseling (Individual, family and group); Information and Referral Services; Crisis Intervention and Substance Abuse Assessment and Referral.

Target Population: Youth ages 5 – 18 and their families residing and/or attending school in targeted areas of Bethesda, Rockville and Gaithersburg.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Required program to be funded by General Assembly

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Families and their children and youth who are encountering difficulties in school, communities and homes. Catchment areas for the three YSB’s: Bethesda, Rockville and Gaithersburg

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY12 Funding: \$111,992

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	52	109	91	81	85	109
▪ Family*	72	91	87	79	55	54
▪ Group*	22	7	0	0	0	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	28	130	107	280	92	155
▪ Family*	49	35	28	6	20	44
▪ Group*	22	14	0	0	10	0 ¹
➤ # and % of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	296	169	121	129	122	40% N=105 ²
▪ # & % of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	11	24	19	33	23	18% N=19 ²
➤ # of Social Skills/Conflict Resolution Programs held					15	59 ²
How Well We Do It:						
➤ % & # of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100%	70%	100% N=135	100%	96% N=156
➤ % & # of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	75%	90%	70%	88% N=21	85%	71% N=123 ⁴
➤ % & # of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	93%	70%	93% N=32	85%	92% N=11
➤ % and # of clients reporting satisfaction with services received based on surveys administered quarterly.					60%	97% N=102
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	80%	95%	93%	100% N=61	90%	100% N=117
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					60%	48% ³ N=29
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					60%	36% N=22
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					60%	36% N=22

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					60%	2% N=1
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					60%	39% N=24
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					60%	44% N=27
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					60%	3% N=2
➤ % and # of clients reporting an increase in their knowledge and ability to identify individual, family or common risk factors as measured by survey at the end of the year.					60%	89% N=103

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

Program Summary: An intensive family & community based treatment program that focuses on chronic and violent juvenile offenders.

Target Population: Children and youth involved with DJS.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Exemplary/Blueprints for Violence Prevention

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: All of the children/youth referred to the MST program have formal DJS involvement.

FY12 Funding: \$175,403

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Number of youth served by MST.	56	59	45	47	15	18	15
Average length of duration in days for youth receiving MST services.	128	104	112	134	112	120	93
Number of service "slots" available.**					6	6	6
How Well We Do It:							
% of families satisfied with services per the client satisfaction survey at the completion of services.	91%	91.84%	93%	85% N=40	100% N=15	85%	73% N=11
% of cases completing treatment with goals attained.	87%	80.49%	88%	81% N=38	86% N=13	80%	87% N=13
% of parents with parenting skills necessary to handle future problems measured at termination by survey.	77%	75.61%	78%	85% N=40	86% N=13	70%	80% N=12
Is Anyone Better Off?							
% of youth at home at case discharge.	87%	87.80%	84%	90%	100%	85%	87% N=13

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
				N=42	N=15		
% of youth attending school or working at discharge.	87%	80.49%	80%	87% N=41	86% N=13	80%	73% N=11
% of youth who do not experience arrest or re-arrest while receiving services.	91%	90.24%	89%	90% N=42	86% N=13	60%	87% N=13

**Calculated as 1 therapist x 6 cases = 18 averaging 4 months of service per client. The budget reduction resulted in the loss of a half time therapist thus reducing the number of cases to be served. Story Behind the Performance: The service provider mistakenly thought that he requested and received approval to reduce the target number of youth to be served from 18 to 15 youth. He was unable to provide any documentation to support this request being approved and was advised that the target number remained 18 youth.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: After School Programs

Program Summary: Provides safe, structured learning and enriching activities that promote the physical, emotional, cognitive and social development for school age youth after normal school hours.

Target Population: School-aged children and youth at-risk of poor academic performance residing in emergency shelter and low income apartment complexes.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Maryland Out of School Time Network

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: These after school programs serve children/youth who are residing in emergency shelters, a large percentage reside in Section 8 or low income housing and/or are on free and reduced lunch. The communities are Capitol Heights, Forest Heights, Seat Pleasant, Mount Rainier and Landover which have significant amounts of single parent households, unemployment, high crime and thus presenting environments where children/youth are at substantial risk for delinquency and criminal activity.

FY12 Funding: \$364,911

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual*	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					9	11	7
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self- assessments.					3	4	3
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.					3	4	3
▪ # of children/youth served in after school programs.	642	450	483	573	393	350	386
▪ # of after school sites.	15	9	9	8	8	9	8
▪ # of snacks served.						50,000	44,649
▪ # of meals served.						50,000	40,137
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Average Daily attendance.					71% N=279	60%	80% N=257
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.					100%	80%	100% N=3

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual*	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					4.78	4	4.4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					4.38	4	4.5
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.31	3	3.83
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					2.33	2	2.79
▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					3/100%	90%	100% N=3
▪ # % of participants who attend 90% of the total sessions.	95%	98%	76%	91% N=521	79% N=310	70%	88% N=341
▪ # and % of after school staff retained since the start of the school year.						75%	93% N=22
▪ # and % of Youth Engagement Surveys where the student score was 7 or higher (administered quarterly).						70%	86% N=332
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ % of youth with a grade of C or less in Reading or English that show an improved grade in that subject based on report cards comparing the 1 st and 3 rd quarters.	80%	83%	32%	55% N=315	50% N=197	50%	61% N=236
▪ % of youth with grade of C or less in Math that show an improved grade based on report cards comparing the 1 st and 3 rd quarters.	75%	76%	58%	50% N=287	51% N=200	50%	54% N=207
▪ % of youth who show both improved emotional & social skills as measured by the Child Development Tracker & Social & Emotional Learning Assessment administered at beginning and end of school year (CAFÉ & Edgewood)	Not collected	98%	35%	92% N=478	73% N=287	70%	100% N=335
▪ % of participants whose school attendance improved from the 1 st quarter to the 2 nd or 3 rd quarter.***						60%	67% N=259

*In FY08 reduced to four service providers and nine program sites fully funded as a result of an RFP issued. FY07 had 10 service providers at 15 program sites partially funded.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Gang Prevention Initiative

Program Summary: Prevention awareness, training and activities utilizing Phoenix Gang Prevention and Intervention model program curriculum.

Target Population: Youth aged 12-19 residing in areas with high gang activity and in schools where gang problems have been identified.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Phoenix Gang Prevention Curriculum

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program is designed to address needs and risk factors underlying joining a gang, leaving a gang, gang violence, and the gang mindset. The goal is to provide youth with effective life and social skills to promote self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and problem-solving, and to facilitate resilience to avoid violence and other antisocial behaviors

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY12 Funding: \$73,243

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Number of times the curriculum is implemented in its entirety.	7	3	2	3	4
▪ Number of communities where trainings held.	16	13	6	5	5
▪ Number of outreach activities to communities.	48	50	21	4	6
▪ Number of youth participants in the rounds of curriculum implementation.	164	116	82	75	85
▪ Number of schools and other sites implementing the curriculum.				3	3
How Well We Do It:					
▪ % of participants who indicated on survey that they would recommend training to others.	100%	100%	80%	80%	80%
▪ % of participants who indicate they are satisfied with the quality of service they have received.	**	N=116 **	N=66 96%	80%	N=46/57 94%
▪ % of participants who feel that services have helped them to deal with their problems more effectively based on post-test at end of curriculum.	^	^	N=79 ^	75%	N=54/57 75%
				75%	N=43/57
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ % of participants with any increase in their general conflict resolution skills as measured by the Rosenberg Scale.	47%	40%	100%	80%	99%
▪ % of participants who have a “positive attitude change” toward gang membership/involvement as measured annually by the curriculum survey.	80%	N=46 100%	N=82 90%	80%	N=56/57 80%
▪ % of participants who have a greater knowledge of gang issues based on post-test at end of curriculum.	^	N=116 ^	N=74 ^	80%	N=46/57 85%
				80%	N=48/57

**New measure for FY11. ^New measure for FY12.

LMB: Prince George’s County

Program Name: Kinship Care

Program Summary: Supportive services for caregivers of relative children whose biological parents are unwilling or unable to care for them.

Target Population: Families caring for related children.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: N/A

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program serves children/youth who have been placed with relative caregivers because their biological parents are unable or unwilling to care for them. These children/youth have in most cases been at risk or experienced abuse and/or neglect which increases their potential to become involved in the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$91,257

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Number of families served.	111	109	143	117	81	70	59
Number of children served.					74	70	107

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Number of referrals made to community resources.						100	130
How Well We Do It:							
% of families with reduced stress upon completion of services based on Family Satisfaction Survey.*	98%	84%	90%	97% N=113	100% N=59/59	90%	98% N=40/41
% of families with increased community support at end of services based on Family Satisfaction Survey.**	95%	92%	90%	99% N=116	98% N=58/59	90%	100% N=40/40
% of families with a Plan of Care developed within 7 days.	N/A	52% N=57	71% N=101	97% N=112	96% N=57	85%	94% N=46/49
Is Anyone Better Off?							
% of youth receiving kinship care services who are not placed out-of-home while participating in program.	98%	100%	80%	95% N=111	100% N=78/78	80%	100% N=46/46
% of families who are not reported for abuse or neglect while involved in program services.	98%	99%	80%	96% N=112	99% N=77/78	80%	98% N=45/46
% of youth receiving kinship care services who are not placed out-of-home a minimum of 6 months after completing the program.	89%	100%	80%	100% N=69	95% N=128/135	80%	98% N=58/59
% of families who are not reported for abuse or neglect a minimum of 6 months after completing the program.	Not collected	100%	80%	100% N=69	87% N=117/135	80%	98% N=58/59

*The reduction in stress on the family satisfaction survey is one question pertaining to the reduction of stress in general. The question is: Has the services you received helped you reduce stress and deal more effectively with your issues? 1 - Yes, they helped a great deal; 2 - Yes, they helped somewhat; 3 - No, they didn't really help; 4 - No, they seemed to make things worse

**The question is: Did you find the list of community resources to be helpful? 1 Very helpful 2 Somewhat helpful 3 Not very helpful 4 Not at all helpful

LMB: Prince George's County Commission for Children, Youth and Families

Program Name: Truancy Prevention & Intervention

Program Summary: Improve attendance to schools assigned by providing case management services to elementary & middle school children and their families.

Target Population: Children with intensive behavioral, health, and/or emotional needs that become barriers to learning and prevent regular attendance in school.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Check & Connect

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program targets children/youth who are truant which if not addressed is often a precursor to involvement with the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$130,890

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Number of families served.*	40	212	140	233	50	140	181
Number of participants served.*	40	225	155	260	50	150	354

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Number of trained school personnel.**	50	100	75	40	12	10	0
Number of referrals made to community resources.						100	91
How Well We Do It:							
Staff to family ratio.	1:25	1:75	1:70	1:15 N=217	1:25 N=50	1:25	1:89
Percentage of assessments completed within 15 days of referral.	75%	75%	75%	93%	60% N=30	75%	35% N=123
Number of participants with improved school engagement as determined by assessments shared at interdisciplinary team meetings or court hearings during case reviews measured on a quarterly basis.						50%	43% N=153
Is Anyone Better Off?							
Percentage of participants served who decrease number of days absent:	70%	95%	70%	64% N=149	34% N=17	50%	34% N=121
Percentage of participants served who decrease in-school behaviors that result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office referrals ○ In-school or out-of-school suspensions ○ Expulsions 	50%	80%	50%	73% N=170	48% N=24	60%	34% N=121
Percentage of participants served who decrease number of days absent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From 1st to 2nd quarter. From 2nd to 3rd quarter 						50% 50%	39% N=98/260 39% N=108/278
Percentage of participants served who decrease number of days tardy.						50%	53% N=70/133

*The number of families and participants served for FY2009 and FY2010 reflect a reduction in truancy staff from three to two and also a reduction in the number of schools served from nine to six.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus

Program Summary: Provides core services of formal counseling, informal counseling, substance abuse assessment and referral, crisis intervention, suicide prevention and information and referral.

Target Population: Youth & their families at risk or involved in delinquency, family disruption, school failure & other self-destructive behaviors residing in Beltsville, Bowie, College Park, District Heights, Greenbelt, Laurel & surrounding areas.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Brief Strategic Family Therapy.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program provides counseling and related services to children/youth and their families experiencing family dysfunction, behavioral problems at home or in school and at risk of or involvement with DJS.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY12 Funding: \$377,936

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	352						
▪ Individual		379	91	162	139	100	149
▪ Family		297	350	358	462	300	346
▪ Group		62	58	85	88	50	59
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	659						
▪ Individual		511	295	317	374	250	274
▪ Family		241	250	265	296	200	260
▪ Group		29	4	123	66	50	8
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	403	402	521	536	558	500	790
▪ # of individual youth for who substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	35	74	87	77	122	50	138
# of formal counseling cases served in CBT as a result of assessment						50	227
How Well We Do It:							
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	97%	92%	95%	94% N=569	93% N=642	85%	95% N=528
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	68%	66%	71%	71% N=430	69% N=287	70%	74% N=408
➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	50%	95%	99%	97% N=25	97% N=25	80%	92% N=23
➤ % of individuals completing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as recommended.						75%	89% N=480
Is Anyone Better Off?							
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	99%	98%	94%	N=162 100%	97% N=520	85%	96% N=532
➤ % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.	70%	76%	85%	92% N=162	86% N=536	75%	81% N=449
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.						70%	79% N=438
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.						70%	82% N=454
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.						70%	83% N=460

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.						70%	88% N=488
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.						70%	82% N=454
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.						70%	93% N=515
➤ # and % of individuals receiving CBT with an improved Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge.						70%	96% N=95

Data unavailable as waiting on DJS report for the not committing an offense measure during counseling. CAFAS data unavailable as the YSBs just started using the CAFAS in November 2011. GAF data is unavailable as the YSBs were just advised recently they would need to collect this data.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Teen Court

Program Summary: Provides access services and services coordination for the Local Access Mechanism. Teen Court is a justice program managed by teens for teens with appropriate levels of supervision and oversight. It is an alternative justice system that offers teenage offenders an important opportunity to learn from their mistakes without acquiring a criminal record.

Target Population: First time juvenile offenders & juvenile offenders with non-violent offenses referred through DJS or local law enforcement.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: OJJDP Promising

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program is designed to target first time or non-violent misdemeanor juvenile offenders to prevent them from penetrating further into the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$60,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
Number of juveniles referred to Teen Court	125	255
Number of juveniles served through Teen Court	100	61
Number of volunteers recruited	15	214
How Well We Do It:		
Percent of youth participants successfully completing Teen Court program during the 60 day time period.	75%	86% N=22/24
Percent of participants who earn student service learning hours while involved with Teen Court program.	80%	100% N=214
Percent of youth satisfied with the program as indicated on a survey administered as part of the discharge process.	80%	100% N=24/24
Percent of youth respondents who serve as Teen court volunteers after completing the program.	50%	0
Is Anyone Better Off?		

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Percent of youth not experiencing arrest, rearrest or any subsequent DJS involvement during program duration.	75%	100% N=24/24
Percent of youth whose charges were dismissed as a result of successful program completion.	60%	86% N=22/24
Percent of youth whose record was expunged as a result of successful program completion.	70%	86% N=22/24

LMB: Queen Anne’s County

Program Name: After School – “Partnering for Youth” (PFY) Program

Program Summary: After school program at two middle schools – 3-4 days a week for two sessions.

Target Population: Students at two county middle schools who are at risk of school failure due to academic and behavioral concerns.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Harvard Family Research Project; MOST Programs’ Quality Standards Framework

Explain How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: Through this program, including students at-risk from Matapeake and Stevensville Middle Schools, will receive out of school time services between the hours of 3-5 p.m., thus allowing students to participate in productive activities during traditionally hazardous times for at-risk students. Additionally, at-risk students will be receiving benefits from the program that will help them become more attached to school and less prone to negative behaviors and more prone to positive outcomes.

FY12 Funding: \$52,244

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics Training.				3	1
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.				2	2
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.				2	0
# of middle school youth served:	323	290	320	240	307
▪ Matapeake				125	126
▪ Stevensville				115	182
How Well We Do It:					
Average Daily Attendance.		82.8%	82.5%		
▪ Matapeake				75%	84.7%
▪ Stevensville				75%	74.5%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics Training.				2	0
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.				3	MMS 4.92 STMS 4.15
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.				3	MMS 4.41 STMS 3.83
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.				3	MMS 3.96 STMS 3.58

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.				3	MMS 2.33 STMS 3.00
YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).				3	MMS 3.91 STMS 3.64
#/% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.				2/100%	0/0%
#/% of Activity Instructors who grade the orientation as a grade B or higher as helpful in preparing them for a job.**			7/100%		
▪ Matapeake				#/60%	9/81%
▪ Stevensville				#/60%	5/83%
#/% of parents/guardians that gave a grade B or better to the Activity Instructors being responsive to their child's needs/requests.***			10/100%		
▪ Matapeake				#/80%	12/100%
▪ Stevensville				#/80%	17/100%
Is Anyone Better Off?					
#/% of participants that self-report positive personal change (as per annual survey given at end of program).	261/81%	116/88%	88/80%		
▪ Matapeake				#/80%	157/99%
▪ Stevensville				#/80%	144/93%
#/% of full-time program participants who achieved school attendance of 94%.	229/71%	95.45%	55/74.5%		
▪ Matapeake				#/70%	8/73%
▪ Stevensville				#/70%	16/80%
#/% of participants that self-report learning new skills (as per annual survey given at end of program).					
▪ Matapeake				#/80%	149/97%
▪ Stevensville				#/80%	144/93%

**As measured by the PFY Activity Instructor "Grade the Performance Survey" given at the end of each session.

***As measured by the PFY Parent/Guardian "Grade the Performance Survey" given at the end of each session.

LMB: Queen Anne's County

Program Name: Youth Mentoring

Program Summary: A part time Mentor Coordinator recruits volunteer mentors for students at-risk of juvenile delinquency.

Target Population: Students in grades 6-10 in Queen Anne's County Public Schools that are at-risk of juvenile delinquency.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: National Mentoring Partnership and the Maryland State Mentoring Program

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: Queen Anne’s County Middle and High School students who are receiving services through the Behavior Monitoring and Reinforcement Program model (BMRP) can receive mentoring services as well. Students in this program are always at risk for suspension, placement at the Alternative School, out of home placement or Department of Juvenile Services involvement.

FY12 Funding: \$25,360

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
# of youth served.	8	15	9 ¹
# of mentors recruited.	5	10	10
# of mentors completing at least one additional training for at-risk youth offered by the Local Management Board during the school year.	3	6	4 ²
How Well We Do It:			
#/% of mentees that rate the program as increasing their attachment to school as measured by the Attachment to School Scale administered in the spring of every year.	4/50%	#/76%	2/50%
#/% of mentors that indicate on the Mentor Survey** that the mentor orientation/training was satisfactory.	7/88%	#/85%	6/86%
#/% of volunteer mentors who participate in additional (non-required) training.	^	50%	4/40% ³
Is Anyone Better Off?			
#/% of participants with no new involvement with the juvenile justice system while enrolled in the program.	3/100%	#/76%	4/100%
#/% of mentees that report any increase in the knowledge of the negative effects of substance abuse and benefits of non-use as measured by the Mentee Survey administered in the spring of every year.	2/25%	#/50%	1/20% ⁴
#/% of mentees that show any increase in school performance after 6 months in the program as measured by school records.	2/25%	#/50%	3/75%
#/% of mentees with a school attendance rate of 90% or higher for the school year.	4/50%	#/55%	3/75%

** Mentor Survey administered in the spring of every year.

LMB: Queen Anne’s County

Program Name: CASASTART

Program Summary: Case Management services at 3 middle schools to coordinate youth/family connection to behavioral, academic, and social resources.

Target Population: Middle school students at-risk of entry into the juvenile justice system.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: OJJDP Effective Program

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Centreville, Matapeake, and Sudlersville Middle School students who are receiving services through the Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program (BMRP). Students in this program are always at risk for suspension, placement at the Alternative School, out-of-home placement or Department of Juvenile Services involvement.

FY12 Funding: \$59,658

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of youth served.	28	27	25	25	25	18
# of youth/families referred to community services.				15	15	10
# of referred youth who are matched with an Achievement Mentor.				5	5	3
How Well We Do It:						
#/% of parents updated on participant progress on a monthly basis during the school year.	93%	24/88%	23/92%	21/85%	#/85%	15/83%
#/% of participants who stay enrolled in the program for at least 3 months.	87%	26/96%	25/100%	20/80%	#/80%	16/88%
#/% of mentors who meet with students at least 15 minutes per school week to acknowledge accomplishments.					#/75%	2/66%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
#/% of participants with less than 8 behavioral referrals in the last 6 months.	84%	26/96%	23/93%	21/85%	#/85%	14/75%
#/% of participants that maintain at least a 90% school attendance.	52%	20/73%	19/76%	19/75%	#/75%	13/71%
#/% of participants who have no Department of Juvenile Services referrals while enrolled in the program.	91%	25/92%	21/84%	21/85%	#/85%	17/94%

LMB: Queen Anne's County

Program Name: Character Counts!

Program Summary: A national character development initiative which utilizes the six pillars of character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship. Character Counts! in Queen Anne's County includes weekly volunteer character coaching in schools, community capacity building, and social marketing of character development.

Target Population: School-age youth who are at-risk of entering the juvenile justice system.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Search Institute's Youth Developmental Assets & Josephson Institute of Ethics

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: All elementary and middle schools of Queen Anne's County, plus Queen Anne's County High School youth will receive Character Counts via volunteer coaches who conduct 15 minute lessons each week in classrooms. These lessons impart the pillars of character: Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring and Citizenship, which in turn will help the youth of Queen Anne's County to become more productive in their communities, while instilling in them a sense of attachment to school and their peers, and leading them to make positive choices rather than negative choices. Such activities have been shown to divert children from negative outcomes that could result in office referrals, suspension and referrals to the Department of Juvenile Services.

FY12 Funding: \$3,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of volunteer Character Counts coaches.	116	117	111	107	110	111
# of months with bi-weekly press releases, cable coverage and/or participation in a community event.	12	12	12	12	12	12
# of students served.				4295	4000	4,777
How Well We Do It:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
#/% of classes with Character Counts coaches for grades 1-6.	88%	102/87%	150/92%	143/91%	98/89%	107/86%
#/% of annual retention rate for Character Counts coaches.	97%	63/54%	70/60%	70/65%	66/60%	43/62%
#/% of character coaches who present a monthly anti-bullying message to their class.					66/60%	86/90%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
#/% of pillars of character for which respondents report a “statistically significant” (as defined by external evaluator) increase in the practice of the character trait (through the Six Pillar Personal Inventory). Survey administered every other year.	Survey administered every other year	4/67%	Survey administered every other year	6/100%	Survey administered every other year	To be administered in 2013
#/% of “Business of Character” that meet 100% of their Character Counts! Plan of Commitment goals.	90%	40/85%	39/85%	40/85%	37/80%	35/88%
#/% of 8 th grade students that report on the Annual Bullying Survey* that the anti-bullying lessons presented by the Character Counts coach in their classroom helped them deal with bullying concerns.				122/70%	266/50%	24/15%

*Annual Bullying Survey Administered in the spring of every year.

LMB: Queen Anne’s County

Program Name: Healthy Families

Program Summary: Intensive home visiting service which prevents child maltreatment and supports healthy brain development in children prenatal to 5 years, using child development education for parents, screenings, and service referrals.

Target Population: First-time teen parents who are eligible for Maryland Children’s Health Program (M-CHP) who are at risk of poor parenting outcomes due to several risk factors for juvenile delinquency.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: OJJDP Effective Program

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program will target at least 15 teens (age 19 and younger) who are at risk for delinquency.

FY12 Funding: \$57,616

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of families served.	55	59	43	38^^	40	50
# of developmental screenings.	84	81	71	78	55	119
# of referrals to service.	64	80	157	175	65	288
# of teen parents served (subset of # of families served).				12^^^	15	13
# of referrals to service for teen parents.				62	40	78
# of home visits.					200	611
How Well We Do It:						
#/% of participants who report they are satisfied or very satisfied with services. (survey given at end of services).	100%	59/100%	20/100%	13/100%	#/90%	24/100%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
#/% of participants that maintain or reach the target range for "Use of Community Resources" using the Life Skills Progression Tool (new measure).				9/75%	#/60%	11/79%
#/% screened children that are identified as having a developmental delay.					#/1%	0/0%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
#/% of participants without child abuse/neglect findings while enrolled in the Healthy Families Program.	98%	58/98%	43/100%	37/97%	#/85%	46/100%
#/% of participants that maintain or reach the *target range for "Family Relationships" using the Life Skills Progression Tool (new measure).*				8/67%^^^	#/50%	10/83%
#/% of participant children who are fully immunized for the year.					#/90%	45/98

*Target Range is a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1-5

LMB: St. Mary's County

Program Name: Afterschool Program

Program Summary: A two hour per day, four day per week after school program focusing on academics, fitness and enrichment.

Target Population: Grade 3, 4, and 5 students from Park Hall Elementary School who are not working at grade level in math and/or reading, with a special focus on homeless students, physically unfit students, and students with a high need to improve social skills.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Extended Day Academic Enrichment (standard model for increasing achievement used by the education system). Locally-developed model to increase student achievement.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: We choose students who have fallen behind academically and use small group instruction, plus exciting enrichment via Interest Clubs, and daily physical activity to boost their skills and keep them safe and engaged. Without these activities, there is the increased likelihood to become involved in risky behaviors (e.g. drinking etc.), possibly become the victim or commit delinquent acts, or fall further behind academically. It has been well documented that children and youth that do not perform well in school are more likely to become involved with the juvenile justice system. Identifying these students early on is the key to decreasing their involvement with the Juvenile Justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$62,320

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	3	7
Number of children served.	60	44@
Number of days of operation of the program.	75	85
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	1	1
How Well We Do It:		
Average Daily Attendance.	85%	83%# (n=37)
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	3.5	3.5125
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.	100%	100% (n=1)
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	100%	100% (n=7)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	3	4.44
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	3	3.4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3	3.38
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	3	2.83\$
% of staff with formal training in youth development.	75%	90% (n=6)
% of participants attending 80% of the sessions.	75%	80% (n=35)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
Fact Fluency: % of participants who need remediation in fact fluency, who are fluent in addition, subtraction and multiplication facts from 0-12, measured pre/post-test.	80%	83%
Reading Fluency: % of participants who increase reading fluency rate by 20 words per minute, measured pre/post-test.	75%	68%^
Fitness: % of participants who improve results on the "Fitness Gram" fitness test from the beginning of program to the end.	80%	70%&
Percentage of participants who attended 30 or more days of the program who increase the attachment to school and increase academic achievement, measured pre/post-test.	85%	91%

@ When the program began, the YPQA training had not been complete and the program was run in a more traditional way, which resulted in lower attendance. After YPQA training, the program was adjusted to include student choice, group work, authentic service learning projects, an outdoor classroom and other strategies that were more attractive to students. Attendance and enrollment steadily grew throughout the program with May attendance 15% higher than January.

It was more difficult to enroll students since we did not begin the program in August, so many parents had already made day care arrangements for students. Also, operating four days per week resulted in some parents not signing up their children because they needed five day per week care. 47 students were on the roster, however we did not count a student as served if did not have regular attendance.

\$ YPQA standards are very high. Using YPQA resulted in many positive changes to the program as mentioned above under Average Daily Attendance, however more will need to be done to reach 3.0 and higher.

^ Students enrolled generally had low fluency rates than anticipated and the absolute increase in the goal of 20 words per minute was too high for most.

Using percentage as a goal would make more sense. A student reading at 20 words per minute as a baseline, for example, would need to increase by 100% to meet the goal we selected. A better goal would be a 30% increase in fluency, in which case the student with a baseline of 20 words per minute would meet the goal by increasing to 26 words per minute.

& Fitness Gram: Some students have restricted activity due to health issues.

LMB: St. Mary's County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau (YSB)

Program Summary: Prevention and intervention service to pre-delinquent and adjudicated youth up to age 18 and their families. The program is designed to reduce the rate of entry in the juvenile justice system and to reduce recidivism rates among youth. Counseling, crisis intervention and youth development services will be provided.

Target Population: Pre-Delinquent and adjudicated youth (up to age 18) including their families, referred by various agencies and also self-referrals.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Second Step (to address violence prevention).

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The YSB works directly with youth that are at-risk or are already involved with the juvenile services system in an effort to maintain the youth in the home versus being placed out of the home for services.

FY12 Funding: \$119,219

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	780	506	359	455	400	415
▪ Individual*	380	120	141	235	185	132^
▪ Family*	227	271	164	81	75	52&
▪ Group*	173	115	54	139	140	231
Total number of youth in formal counseling youth (those referred or mandated to receive TCYSB assistance) receiving Second Step curriculum (12 youth per quarter; groups run 8 weeks).					48	102
Total number of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	742	565	387	460	415	515
▪ Individual*	527	94	110	184	170	217
▪ Family*	78	222	82	73	70	44&
▪ Group*	137	249	195	203	175	254
Number of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	18	137	87	151	150	151
▪ Number of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	4	9	4	6	25†	26
Number of formal counseling cases receiving additional information on community based services where appropriate.					91	131
How Well We Do It:						
Percentage of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100%	98.5% (N=139)	91% (N=214)	100%	100% (n=132)
Percentage of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	90%	69%	78% (N=110)	64% (N=58)	50%	77% (n=5)
Percentage of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	93.75%	92.5% (N=6)	91% (N=20)	75%	100% (n=4)
Percentage of calls seeking information and referrals that are returned within 48 business hours					85%	100% (n=102)
Percentage (and number) of youth receiving formal counseling who complete the Second Step curriculum as scheduled.					80% (N=51)	87% (n=89)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	80%**	82%**	85%**	97%** (N=74)	75%	92% (n=121)
#/% of formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.				84% ◊ (N=76)	70%	100% (n=40)
#/% of formal counseling participants who improved on at least one of 3 indicators between initial and most recent CAFAS assessments. Indicators					60%	100% (n=132)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
include: meaningful and reliable improvement, # severe impairments, and Pervasive Behavioral Impairment.						
#/% of formal counseling participants who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“improved”) and those who still had at least 1 severe impairment at most recent assessment (“not improved”).					60%	81% improved (n=106) 19% not improved (n=26)
#/% of formal counseling participants who were identified as being Pervasively Behaviorally Impaired (PBI) at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment.					60%	83% (n=110)
#/% of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on each of the eight CAFAS subscales.					60%	83% (n=110)
#/% of formal counseling participants who improved on each of the 8 CAFAS subscales. Improved = those with a mild impairment or higher with a score reduced by 10 pts at exit.					60%	86% (n=113)
#/% of formal counseling participants that followed up with referred service(s), measured at the end of counseling sessions by exit interview.					60%	83% (n=110)
#/% of Second Step graduates who were involved with DJS that do not recidivate within 90 days of program completion.					80% (N=38)	100% (n=102)

*These counts may reflect duplication among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**Percentage represents those not committing an offense during the 90-day post-termination from services.

◇Percentage is based on a 5-point improvement in overall functioning as measured by the CAFAS.

†Number based on those youth who complete the voluntary assessment and are over the age of 12.

^Significant reduction in DJS referrals.

& Significant reduction in referrals

LMB: St. Mary’s

Program Name: Mentoring

Program Summary: Provide at risk youth the opportunity to foster relationships to diminish at risk behaviors and increase resiliency.

Target Population: Elementary and middle school students deemed to be at high risk for substance abuse, delinquency and academic failure.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Developmental Assets

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program is identifying youth that potential could become involved with risky behavior and working with youth to learn how to move away from those risky behaviors and to becoming positive influences in their community.

FY12 Funding: \$50,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
----------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
Number of youth served by the program	125	133
Number of sessions held per year, per school site:		
▪ Spring Ridge	30	25**
▪ Lexington Park	30	25**
▪ Carver	30	25**
▪ Great Mills	35	30**
Number of mentors in the program.	15	20
How Well We Do It:		
Percentage of participants who attend at least one trip or special event.	90%	100% (n=133)
Percentage of mentors who continue for one full school year.	90%	95% (n=126)
Percentage of students who successfully complete the program by attending 75% of the mentoring sessions.	80%	87% (n=116)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
% of participants that maintain at least 80% school attendance*.	75%	99%(n=132)
% of mentees who decrease or maintain their number of discipline referrals during the course of the school year.	70%	95%(n=126)
% of participants who increase or maintain their GPA (comparing first marking period report card to the third quarter report card).	60%	44%(n=58)***
Percentage increase in each participants' developmental assets as measured by pre/post-test.	60%	65%(n=86)

*More school that child/youth attends, the less like they will become involved with juvenile system.

**Original goal of 30 weeks was unrealistic, because when identifying mentors from the community, the recruiting, screening selection and background checks take more than a month, which does not leave 30 weeks for programming.

***Note, this mirrored the general population of the schools. Overall, each of the schools showed a decrease in GPA from first to last marking period.

LMB: St. Mary's

Program Name: Drug Screening

Program Summary: A part-time drug screener/counselor provides initial assessments and counseling to youth in juvenile court.

Target Population: Youth that are adjudicated and identified to be in need of assessment and drug/alcohol treatment.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: N/A

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serves youth already involved in the juvenile services system and provides the opportunity to identify and address their substance abuse issues.

FY12 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Total # of hours the addictions counselor participates in juvenile court case deliberations.	300	300
# of total treatment hours the addictions counselor will provide to juvenile clients, including individual appointments, group and supervision from a licensed alcohol and drug addictions counselor.	100	1000
Total # of clients served.	100	25@
How Well We Do It:		
% of referred clients who receive a drug screen at the court.	90%	90% (n=23)
% of mandated youth who have their first counseling appointment within 2 weeks of their initial screening.	75%	79% (n=20)
% of clients who complete counseling recommendation during timeframe prescribed.	65%	65% (n=16)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
% of recommended clients who complete six weeks of treatment counseling.	60%	56%* (n=14)
% of clients with a positive court drug screen who attend at least 5 sessions and has a negative random drug screening after the initial assessment test.	80%	88% (n=22)
% of mandated youth whose probation is not violated because of drug treatment or related issues, from entrance to completion of the program.	80%	88% (n=22)

@The number of referrals are lower than expected by the provider, because there is no way to predict the number actual referrals to be provided by the courts. The provider has no control over this matter, but is working with the judges and DJS to develop protocols for referrals.

*While the number of clients that completed six weeks of treatment counseling was less than the expected budget, the vendor had a significant number(88%) who access treatment and continued participation. This is the area of greatest control, where the provider has the ability to ensure that adolescents in need of treatment and willing to participate, continue with services.

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: K is for College

Program Summary: The program is designed to divert youth from DJS involvement by providing structured programs, supervision, and community support. The program provides specialized homework assistance and tutoring, character development, reading intervention programming, violence prevention, graduated sanctions, and participation in the after school and summer meals programs.

Target Population: Children ages 5 through 18 in the Crisfield and Princess Anne areas of Somerset County. Children will be recruited for the program based on school referrals, DJS referrals, LAM referrals and self-referrals from families. Children with current or past DJS involvement will receive priority; however, no child will be denied service if there is available space.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Positive Action, Too Good for Violence

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: By preventing youth from becoming involved in DJS services through early prevention and helping youth already involved in DJS services to find alternatives to delinquent behaviors

FY12 Funding: \$140,784 + \$111,984 Federal = \$252,768

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Total number of youth served.	86	125	100	197
▪ Total number of staff working with youth.^				
○ Paid Staff			18	20
○ Volunteer Staff			12	25
▪ Number of EBP sessions provided.^				
○ Positive Action			20	120
○ Too Good For Violence			20	82
▪ Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.^			2	2
▪ Number of Programs/Sites submitting program self-assessments.^			2	1
▪ Number of Programs/Sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.^			2	1
How Well We Do It:				
▪ Percentage of youth who are “glad” they participated in the program, as measured by the end of program Satisfaction Survey.	97% (N=41 of 43)	95% (N=119)	80%	88% (N=174)
▪ Percent of youth who attend at least 80% of program days.	N/A**	64% (N=80)	60%	84% (N=165)
▪ Percent of participating youth completing all EBP sessions successfully (workbook completion).^				
○ Positive Action			50%	89%
○ Too Good for Violence			50%	(N=176) 92% (N=182)
▪ Average Daily Attendance^			80%	81% (N=160)
▪ Percentage of program sites that have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.^			100%	100%
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.^				
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.^				
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.^				
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.^				
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site:^				
○ Village Youth Center				
○ Garland Hayward Youth Center				
▪ Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program			N=2	N=1

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.^			100%	50%
Is Anyone Better Off?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who decreased their total school disciplinary actions in the 3rd and 4th quarter of the previous school year as compared to their total school disciplinary actions in the 3rd and 4th quarter of the current school year. 	3%	29% (N=37)	35%	4.7% (N=10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percent of youth with prior offenses who have not re-offended during the program period. 	No Prior Offenses	No Prior Offenses	50%	No Prior Offenses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who increased their reading grades from the 3rd and 4th quarter of the previous school year as compared to their reading grades in the 3rd and 4th quarter of the current school year.^ 			35%	32% (N=63)

*New program in FY10 – data not available for all measures. ^This is a new measure for FY12.

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA)

Program Summary: A universal prevention strategy aimed at reducing the availability of alcohol to minors by decreasing public support for underage alcohol use, affecting policies and ordinances, and increasing enforcement of current laws.

Target Population: Special focus on the Princess Anne area, specifically around the University of Maryland Eastern Shore campus, but all residents of Somerset County will be affected, targeting adults supplying alcohol to youth and youth actively using alcohol.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: CMCA

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: By reducing alcohol access for youth - preventing delinquent behavior as a result of substance use.

FY12 Funding: \$25,435 + \$35,144 Federal = \$60,579

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of alcohol sales compliance checks completed. 	59	69	131	81	75	102
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of CMCA Team Members. 	12	17	15	20	15	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of alcohol-related citations issued to youth. 	11	13	19	47	15	19
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average score on Question #18 of the CMCA Team Member Survey. 	4.75	5.1	5.6	5.6	5	5.6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average score on Question #25 of the CMCA Team Member Survey. 	6.75	5.6	5.6	5.6	5	5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percent of CMCA Task Force Team members who are community based, not agency-based.** 					25%	47% (7 of 15)
Is Anyone Better Off?						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

▪ Percent of increased compliance over first round of checks.	14%	15%	21%	100%	20%	21.5% (N=22)
▪ Percent increase in number of alcohol related citations issued to youth.	0%	9%	46%	247%	10%	0%
▪ Percent of Merchants receiving educational packets regarding underage drinking laws.**					50%	91% (32 of 35)

*The LMB has changed the data that will be collected during FY08-FY10. A notation of "N/A" indicates that data was not collected during that fiscal year.

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: Voluntary Family Services (VFS)

Program Summary: Intensive support to families in their homes, improve family functions, and prevent out-of-home placements by allowing for a paraprofessional, parent aide to work in collaboration with a professional to provide an interagency approach to meet family needs.

Target Population: The target population for this program could be identified by the ELIAC and LCT as children at risk of abuse and neglect; families would be identified as having risk factors that would suggest that without intervention the children could fall victim to abuse or neglect and would not need to have a prior child protective services (CPS) report to be eligible.

Promising Practice/ Model Program/ Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Interagency Family Preservation Services

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Intensive support to families in their homes, improve family functions, and prevent out-of-home placements by allowing for a paraprofessional, parent aide to work in collaboration with a professional to provide an interagency approach to meet family needs. The program is preventative, providing services that may divert youth from DJS. According to a National Institute of Justice study, abused and neglected children were 11 times more likely to be arrested for criminal behavior as a juvenile, 2.7 times more likely to be arrested for violent and criminal behavior as an adult, and 3.1 times more likely to be arrested for one of many forms of violent crime (juvenile or adult) (English, Widom, & Brandford, 2004)

FY12 Funding: \$42,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of families served (new families)	7	11	9	7	7	13
▪ # of families served (new & ongoing)	7	16	13	13	15	19
▪ # of contact hours per family per week, per phase:						
o Intensive	5	5	5	5	5	5
o Step-down		3	3	3	3	3
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of referrals for services vs. actually served.	100%	100%	82% (N=9/11)	70% (10 referrals vs. 7 actually served)	80% (6/7)	93% (N = 13/14)
▪ % of participants rating the services as satisfactory or better (N= number of surveys received).	100%	100%	N/A	N/A (0 of 7 surveys returned)	27% (5/15)	0% ¹ (N = 0)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ % of families that are discharged from the program satisfactorily (met goals or stepped down to another less-intensive DSS service).					73% (11/15)	85% ² (N = 11/13)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of children from new families served who are NOT placed into foster care one year from start of services.	82%	100%	73% (N=16/22)	100% (N= 17/17)	100% (7/7)	93% ³ (N = 25/27)
▪ % of participants who are not referred to DSS for abuse or neglect one year from start of services.	100%	100%	95% (N=21/22)	94% (N= 16/17)	100% (7/7)	100% (N = 27/27)
▪ % of new participants who do not have a Child Protective Services report while receiving VFS.				94% (N= 16/17)	100% (7/7)	100% (N = 27/27)

¹ Zero surveys were returned. The survey distribution method and the survey itself has been redesigned for FY 13.

² One family did not follow through after agreeing to services.

³ The mother of one child is now receiving in-patient substance abuse treatment where she is able to have the child with her, which is what needs to occur for them to remain a family; The mother of the other child still had three of her children with her, the child that was removed has significant disabilities

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: After School Homework Club & Enrichment Activities

Program Summary: The programming will operate in school-based or community-based locations, providing safe havens within positive environments and offer enriching activities including but not limited to academics, character development and service learning, recreation, community involvement, and the arts

Target Population: Prek-12th grade youth in Title I schools. Participants are at risk of school failure which can lead to a feeling of disconnectedness with the school and community. Participants may be recruited by school staff based on grades and/or test scores.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Maryland Out of School Time (MOST) Quality Framework

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serving at risk school-age youth and their families to prevent or divert youth from entering the juvenile justice system and help them gain skills to make them ready for adulthood.

FY12 Funding: \$68,319

Performance Measure	FY12 Target*	FY 12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	1	4
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	1	2
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.	1	1
# of youth served.	100	175
# of program/activities offerings (social, recreational, academic, etc.).	20	43
How Well We Do It:		
Average Daily Attendance.	80% (80/100)	96%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics	100% (1/1)	100% (2/2)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Target*	FY 12 Actual
training.		
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	3	4.1
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	3	3.76
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3	3.02
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	3	3.52
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	3	Combined Average 3.6 (SM – 3.29 TAYA – 3.91)
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.	100% (1/1)	50% (1/2) ¹
% of participants attending at least 75% of their scheduled time.	75% (75/100)	86.9%
% reporting satisfaction with services as measured by survey each Spring		
o youth	80% (80/100)	100% (89/89)
o parents	80% (80/100)	100% (60/60)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
# and % of participants who attend school at least 95% of the time (at least 171 of 180 days).	80% (80/100)	78% (136/175) ²
# and % of participants with final math grade of C or better.	80% (80/100)	96% (168/175)
# and % of participants with final/year-end reading or English or Language Arts grade of C or better.	80% (120/150)	95% (166/175)

*The LMB previously funded OOST in FY08-FY11 but the performance measures for those years are not applicable to FY12 strategies.

¹The targeted number of program sites was exceeded so rather than 1 program there were 2. The targeted number of sites completing this strategy was met. The second site's contract was from January – June 2012 and this site is still in the process of completing their plan.

²One site achieved this target (88%) and the other fell below (70%). In the second case this number reflects the attendance rate of the entire school as well. The school and the program are working on ways to effect change in this area.

LMB: Washington County Office of Community Grant Management

Program Name: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention & Diversion Initiative

Program Summary: Case management and diversion services focusing on three core components: diverting juvenile offenders from the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS), redirecting Children In Need of Supervision (CINS) youth away from DJS to community-based services, and developing community-based mentoring services as a diversion from detention, commitment or re-offense.

Target Population: Youth who are: 1) first-time non-violent offenders, first-time violent (specifically 2nd degree assault) offenders, as well as certain second-time misdemeanor offenders, 2) pre-adjudication CINS youth (defined as youth who exhibit at-risk behaviors that do not constitute a delinquent act such as: truancy, run-away, ungovernable, incorrigible, and/or disobedient and for whom a parent has filed an Application for CINS Petition). These youth have not been formally adjudicated by the court system. Mentoring services are targeted to participants of the first-time diversion component and the CINS component of the program as well as those youth currently involved with DJS as a diversion for detention, commitment or diversion from re-offense.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Locally developed program which is based upon Restorative Justice best practices.
Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program targets youth as identified in SSB 882 which is codified in Title 8, Subtitle 6 of the Human Services Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. Specifically, the program targets school age youth at-risk for entry into the juvenile services system as first-time offenders and/or adjudication as a CINS youth.

FY12 Funding: \$176,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Total number of new youth served by the program.	526	141	340	320	300	278
▪ Total number of ongoing youth served by the program.	102	351	96	83	70	96
▪ Number of eligible referrals that agree to diversion services (must meet <u>all</u> eligibility requirements and sign a diversion contract).	224	222	110	272	220	246
▪ Number of CINS youth who agree to a Family Service Plan.	35	43	39	40	35	32
▪ Number of mentors recruited, trained and actively working with youth.^				3	12	12
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth with an identified need who are referred to mental health and/or substance abuse services and are successfully linked (successful linkage is defined as completing an intake).	60.9%	76.1%	75% N=54	67.6% N=68	65%	73.6% N=38
▪ Percentage of families at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey).	95% (N = 40)	89.8% (N = 53)	81.5% N =66	95.7% N=91	85%	100% N=95
▪ Percentage of mentors who report that adequate training was provided per mentor phone survey conducted 4 to 8 weeks after initiation of mentoring relationship.^				N/A***	85%	100% N=12
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of diverted cases that satisfy all obligations to successfully complete the diversion program.	94.5%	92.6% (N = 387)	86.5% (N = 262)	86.9% N=191	85%	87.7% N=260
▪ Percentage of diverted youth who avoid re-offending for one full year from open date.	85.7% (N=363)	82.0% (N = 340)	81.6% (N = 334)	75.8% N=567	75%	73.3% N=308
▪ Percentage of CINS youth who avoid adjudication for one full year from open date.	83.1% (N=59)	80.0% (N = 40)	74.5% N = 35	81.6% N=98	80%	80.8% N=73
▪ Percentage of CINS youth served who increase pro-social behaviors as measured by the Parent and Youth Vanderbilt Functioning Indexes completed shortly after intake and then every six months.	66.6%* (N=15)	87.5%* (N = 7)	60%** N=3	51.4% N=35	50%	57.8% N=38

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of youth paired with a mentor who report via phone or in person to Case Manager, a positive mentoring relationship (information collected semi-annually and annually)^. 				0***	80%	100% N=10

*CAFAS used in FY07-FY11

**Data limited to Level 2 CINS cases only (i.e., those requiring ongoing case management services beyond initial information and referral). Of the 5 Level 2 CINS cases that closed within the reporting period, none remained in services for 3 or more months and could be reassessed by the CAFAS.

***Mentoring Program Manager was hired in January 2011, received training in best practices, started Mentoring Advisory Board, developed program mentoring policies and began recruitment of mentors. Four mentors were recruited and three were trained but no matches were made by the end of FY11.

LMB: Washington County Office of Community Grant Management

Program Name: Rural Out of School Time Initiative (ROSTI)

Program Summary: The ROSTI will provide safe, nurturing school-based and community-based environments that offer supervision and alternative activities a minimum of 20 hours a week to at-risk elementary, middle and high school-age children and youth attending schools in Cascade, Hancock and Williamsport.

Target Population: Elementary, middle, and high school-age children and youth attending schools in Cascade, Hancock and Williamsport who are at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system. Program access will be provided to all student populations but also with the following refined participant eligibility considerations: demonstrates poor academic performance, poor daily school attendance, previous history of disciplinary actions, history of substance use/abuse, mental health diagnosis or developmental disability/delay, household income at or below 200% of poverty level, single parent, head of household, involvement in Diversion Program or DJS, maladaptive/bullying behavior, and/or gang or pseudo gang.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Locally developed program which utilizes the MOST Quality Standard Framework.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program targets youth as identified in SB 882 which is codified in Title 8, Subtitle 6 of the Human Services Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. Specifically, the program targets elementary, middle, and high school-age children and youth attending schools in Cascade, Hancock and Williamsport who are at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$125,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.^					4	4
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.^						3
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.^						3
# of unduplicated youth served.	79	76	58	178	150	173
# of hours of structured, supervised activities available per child (calculated as hours per day x number of operational days).	1,585.5	1,614.5	661	2,163.5	1,950	2,551

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily Attendance.^				82% N=82	80%	99% N=94
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.^						100% N=3
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.^						Cascade: 4.7 Hancock: 4.8 Williamsport: 4.2
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.^						Cascade: 3.6 Hancock: 4.2 Williamsport: 3.9
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.^						Cascade: 3.5 Hancock: 3.2 Williamsport: 3.2
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.^						Cascade: 2.2 Hancock: 2.8 Williamsport: 2.3
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).^						Cascade: 3.5 Hancock: 3.8 Williamsport: 3.4
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.^						3 100%
% of operational days where attendance meets or exceeds 80% of capacity.	72%	94% N=80 Cascade N=78 Hancock	88% N=66 Cascade N=77 Hancock	50% N=213	85%	88% N=485
% of youth who report overall satisfaction with the program as reported on youth satisfaction survey completed by the end of the program (May or June).^				97% N=99	70%	97% N=94
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of participants who can report two or more of the steps to making a good decision (per Boys & Girls Club Smart Moves curriculum post-test).	86%	91%	N/A	95% N=96	70%	80% N=78

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
% of participants who can demonstrate or report peer pressure resistance skills (through role play or Smart Moves post-test).^^				97% N=99	70%	92% N=89
% of participants who can report two or more effective strategies to deal with being bullied (per post-test).^^				98% N=100	70%	98% N=95
% of participants who can report two or more safe internet practices (per post-test).^^				97% N=99	70%	92% N=89

^^New measure for FY12.

^^New measure for FY11.

LMB: Washington County Office of Community Grant Management

Program Name: Family Centered Support Services

Program Summary: Funds will be utilized to augment childcare staffing at the Washington County Family Center which will enable more parents to work toward their High School Diploma, GED or External Diploma. Childcare staff also complete developmental screens on the children attending the Center. Childcare staff must complete their required trainings. Childcare will also support parents in order to participate in other parenting programs at the Center.

Target Population: Children age 0-4 of parents receiving services from the Washington County Family Center, who are at increased risk for involvement in the juvenile justice services. The secondary population is pregnant and parenting teens who want to obtain their High School Diploma, GED or External Diploma.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Program that meets Friends of the Family support center standards at an exemplary level. Targets at risk teen parents and their children and secondarily young parents, who do not have a high school diploma, and their children.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program targets youth as identified in SB 882 which is codified in Title 8, Subtitle 6 of the Human Services Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. Specifically, the program primarily targets at-risk teen parents and their children and secondarily young parents who do not have a high school diploma and their children.

FY12 Funding: \$36,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of participants engaged in self-sufficiency services (job readiness, education programs, parenting classes, etc.).	139	106	103	110	103	106
▪ Number of children for whom childcare was provided.	50	97	83	88	83	87
▪ Number of children enrolled at center who receive an ASQ screening.^^					72	74
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of participants who complete at least 10 of 12 sessions in the National Nurturing Program curriculum.**			73% N=22/30	71% N=30	68%	65% N=26

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ Percentage of children at least one month of age, who receive an ASQ (Ages and Stages Questionnaire) screening semi-annually and annually. [^] .				93% N=82	85%	85% N=74
▪ % or families who agree/strongly agree that the childcare provided met their expectations as measured by the Family Center Evaluation of Services Survey administered at the end of their educational program. ^{^^}					85%	100% N=42
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of participants receiving a high school diploma, General Equivalency Diploma (GED) or Maryland External Diploma (ED).	37%	37% N=29	42% N=24	54% N=17	43%	41% N=18
▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrate an education gain as measured by passing a testing level or receiving a grade promotion. [^]				91% N=63	80%	91% N=44
▪ Percentage of children developing on target as per ASQ collected every six months. [^]				97% N=86	92%	95% N=70

**New measure for FY10.

[^]New measure for FY11.

^{^^}New measure for FY12.

LMB: Washington County Office of Community Grant Management

Program Name: Positive Youth Development Initiative Coordination

Program Summary: Youth serving agencies and organizations in Washington County will work collaboratively to address risky youth decisions and behavior by pooling their resources and expertise to positively and proactively engage youth. This Initiative will provide technical assistance to collaborators, offer coordination of collaborative projects, pursue and leverage additional grant and in-kind resources in order to support joint initiatives.

Target Population: Middle/high school youth who are at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Locally developed initiative that supports positive outcomes and supports. Also recognized as a promising practice by HHS Office for Adolescent Health. Targets middle & high school age youth who are at risk for drug/alcohol use/abuse, teen pregnancy/STIs (not sexually abstinent) and juvenile violence (gangs, bullying, etc.).

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The program targets youth as identified in SSB 882 which is codified in Title 8, Subtitle 6 of the Human Services Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. Specifically, the program targets school age youth at-risk for drug and alcohol abuse/use and youth who are not sexually abstinent.

FY12 Funding: \$45,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ Number of community partners/organizations that participate in the development and implementation of a County Wide Youth Development Plan.	41	32	51
▪ Number of middle/high school age youth receiving prevention education information,	2,942	2,800	3,177

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
programming and/or services.			
▪ Number of online contacts (via Teens Have Choices: website, Facebook fans, YouTube views, Twitter followers).	6,013	6,200	7,121
How Well We Do It:			
▪ Percentage of organizations that were invited to participate in a County Wide Youth Development Plan, who actually participate.	80% N=31	80%	88% N=43
▪ Percentage of youth who would recommend the prevention education program to a friend as measured by post program surveys.	80% N=888	77%	84% N=1,079
▪ % of surveyed youth who report that the Teens Have Choices website provided useful information and resources related to their health.		70%	85% N=17
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ Percentage of surveyed youth who report that they learned new information as measured by post program survey.	80.6% N=1609	70%	82% N=1,870
<i>Using the teen survey on sexual activity, knowledge and attitudes developed by Shattuck and Associates:</i>			
▪ Percentage of sexually active youth who report always using birth control/protection.	69% N=18	33%	48% N=22
▪ Percentage of sexually active youth who report <u>never</u> having sex under the influence of drugs or alcohol.	86% N=49	70%	59% N=29
▪ Percentage of youth who report they have never have had five or more alcoholic drinks on one occasion.	75% N=43	60%	59% N=54

LMB: Washington County Office of Community Grant Management

Program Name: Tomorrow's Leaders

Program Summary: Tomorrow's Leaders is a curriculum-based Positive Youth Development Program offering eight (8) 2-hour sessions for each of 4 components: Life Skills, Substance Abuse, Sexuality, and The Road to Independence. Participants will obtain knowledge on such topics as health and life skills, homelessness, addictions prevention, and fiscal skills and responsibility. Social, recreational, sports and technology activities will also be provided. Job Readiness Skills training will be a major component of the program.

Target Population: Economically disadvantaged youth, ages 13 through 18 residing in the subsidized housing communities in Hagerstown and the vicinity (as identified by the Comprehensive Needs Assessment) who are at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Locally developed program that utilizes best practices from SAMHSA and CDC research. Targets youth ages 13-18, inner city, disadvantaged youth.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Targeted toward meeting the needs of center city, disadvantaged youth.

FY12 Funding: \$64,181

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
---------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ Number of unduplicated youth served.	127	50	118
▪ Number of hours of structured supervised instruction/activities available per youth (FY11 - calculated as 2 hours/session x 8 sessions x 4 components + 2 hours supervised community service per component; FY12 - calculated as 2 hours/session x 8 sessions x 4 components + 36 hours supervised community service per component).	206	100	522
▪ Number of youth placed in internships/junior staff positions.		50	88
How Well We Do It:			
▪ Percentage of youth in internships/junior staff positions who successfully complete their schedule and work responsibilities (per supervisor report).	78% N=99	75%	83% N=73
▪ Percentage of youth who would recommend the program to a friend (post program survey).	92% N=112	75%	94% N=59
▪ Percentage of youth who attend 80% or more (26 or more) of the onsite instructional sessions.		65%	76% N=53
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ Percentage of youth able to identify 4 personal goals (2 of which must be long-term) following completion of the goal setting section of the curriculum as measured by staff review of participant individual goal worksheets or their video interviews.	93% N=112	50%	93% N=89
▪ Percentage of youth demonstrating increased knowledge related to financial skills as measured by being able to develop a personal budget based upon living on their own, which is covered during section 4 of the curriculum.	65% N=53	50%	98% N=61
▪ Percentage of youth who disagree or strongly disagree that “being a teen parent would be ok with me” (per Sexuality component post-test.^		75%	97% N=61

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: Building Foundations for Families (BFF)

Program Summary: Truancy prevention through system navigation/service linkage with students & their families.

Target Population: Truant students and families with community indicators that put them at risk of involvement with the Dept. of Juvenile Services (DJS) attending five elementary schools with high FARM participation and PBIS teams in place.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: This program uses a national evidence-based model for delivery of services based on wraparound and system of care concepts and principles.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Schools are concentrated in the Safe Streets area.

FY12 Funding: \$192,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of families served: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New ○ Total 	32	18 50	11 46	32 42	15 50	22 32
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of students served <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New ○ Total 	29	18 52	13 46	32 44	15 50	27 37
▪ Number of school personnel trained by program	16	30	5	8	10	10
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff to family ratio <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ System Navigation ○ Intensive Navigation*** 	1:15 1:10	1:40 1:10	1:36 1:10	1:35 1:10	2:35 1:10	2:35 1:10
▪ % Advisory Committee members who report medium to high satisfaction with delivery of program services as measured by survey administered.				Not Conducted	80%	N=4 100%
▪ % Advisory Committee members who report satisfaction with accessibility of program staff. Accessibility is defined as access to staff during behavioral outbreaks during school or with parent/caregiver. This ensures program staff is working as the liaison between school personnel and family.					80%	N=4 100%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of participants who decrease number of days absent measured from academic quarter (marking period) previous to start of service to academic quarter at point of services.	94%	93%	92%	95%	90%	N=51 81 %
▪ % of participants who decrease in-school behaviors i.e. office referrals or in/out-of-school suspensions measured from academic quarter (marking period) previous to start of service to academic quarter at point of services.	72%	69%	69%	80%	70%	N=51 71%
▪ % of Families reporting success in receiving needed services and or supports as provided by program staff (as measured by survey annually).					80%	92%

Notes: ***Defined as intensive wraparound delivery of services available 24/7 which differs from the Wraparound model implemented by Maryland's Care Management Entities

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: Family Empowerment Initiative

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: Wicomico County families/parents/caregivers including high-risk, low income families, caregivers of children with and without special needs, relatives raising children as parents, parents with special needs all residing within Wicomico County with a focus on recruiting from the City of Salisbury area which is identified as the Safe Streets area.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: The Family Empowerment Initiative aims to establish a peer-to-peer network of 'Family Leaders' to provide parenting/caregiver education and family support services and natural supports that are community-based, ongoing, high-quality, affordable, empowering, family and child centered and accessible. An additional goal is to seed train parent leaders in community based settings who can facilitate workshops to specifically targeted populations. The evidence based Active Parenting Curriculum is used as the model for providing workshops and materials to families and participants. Active Parenting is recognized by SAMHSA as part of the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program will target the Safe Streets Area, and provide targeted mobile resources to ensure familiarity with services offered. The majority of low-income high risk families reside in the City of Salisbury, which is the area identified as Safe Streets Area.

FY12 Funding: \$120,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of family support activities	25	32	28	4	3	8
▪ # of parents/caregivers trained as Family Leaders (N)	17	38	7	43	10	17
▪ # of family empowerment workshops.	21*	95*	156*	50*	6	13
▪ # of parents who participate in family empowerment workshops (unduplicated count)	72	157	396	134	60	117
▪ # of people reached with mobile family resources.				1371	1000	2473
▪ # of trainings held to train Family Leaders.				2	3	6
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of committee members who report satisfaction with the activities.	86%	98%	95.3%	100%	80%	N=29 100%
▪ % of Family Leaders (N) who complete all trainings within one year of their start date.	50%	81%	74%	50%	60%	N=24 62%
▪ % of parents enrolled in Family Empowerment Workshops who receive a certificate of completion during fiscal year.	37%	97%	98%	93%	80%	N=102 87%
▪ % of leaders expressing satisfaction with their facilitation experience in the workshop setting through survey after facilitation of Active Parenting workshop				100%	75%	N=29 100%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of parents who feel that as a result of the material presented, their relationship with their child(ren) will improve over time as measured by the Workshop Evaluation Form completed at conclusion of workshop.	75%**	75%**	60%**	70%**	70%	N=96 94%
▪ % of families who report increased family communication on survey at end of workshop. Increase is defined as any greater feeling of betterment in conjunction with family communication	90%	89%	90%	80%	80%	N=93 91%

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
due to gaining skills from attending and completing workshop.						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of family members reporting on survey at end of workshop an increased knowledge that empowers them to both understand and strive to meet their children’s needs after participation in a Family Empowerment Workshop. Increase is defined as any greater feeling of betterment in conjunction with a gain in overall knowledge in meeting the child’s needs due to gaining skills from attending and completing workshop. 	92%	96%	97%	80%	80%	N=97 95%

*Workshops were measured by length of workshop sessions.

**Measure reworded for better clarity.

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: Out-of-School Time (OOST) Initiative

Program Summary: Out-of-school programs/trainings that provide safe places with positive, structured activities for school aged children.

Target Population: School age youth grade K-12 at-risk for juvenile delinquent behaviors due to community and/or family factors.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Beginning in FY11, the Out of School Initiative has focused on enhancing existing sites as well as developing a network of providers to serve those sites. Following the After Zone Model in Providence, Rhode Island, the city has been divided into 3 service areas to focus resources within those communities.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The initiative will target the Safe Streets Area, and provide targeted mobile resources to ensure familiarity with services offered.

FY12 Funding: \$272,487

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of youth enrolled in OOST programs receiving Children’s Cabinet funding :	46	75	235	289	250	203
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At SITES ▪ In ACTIVITIES By Network Providers 	27	35		348	500	1214
Number of hours of structured, supervised activities available per site (calculated as hours per day x number of operational days)				930	930	1677
Number of parents who participate in the program, defined as attending at least one activity per fiscal year				238	250	385
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.						6
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.						3
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.						3
How Well We Do It:						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Average Daily attendance of site participants				241/83%	65%	N=117 85%
% of students who attend after school program for 90% of school days	65%	90%	80%	182/86%	80%	N=137 80%
▪ # and % of program sites that meet or exceed goal of initiating minimum of 10 Developmental Assets in program structure	2/75%	2/100%	1/100%	5/100%	5/50%	N=5 100%
▪ Number and % of after schools sites that participate in Youth Programming Quality Assessment (YPQA) Process				5/40%	3/60%	N=3 60%
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff that completed YPQA Basics training.					3/60%	N=4 80%
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					3.5	4.30
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					3.5	4.07
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.5	3.43
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					3.5	3.22
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of participants who increase or maintain school attendance from first to last marking period. As measured by school report card	88%	95%	80%	173/91%	80%	N=145 97%
▪ Percentage of participants who do not have a DJS intake during the school year. Measured by self-report @ 6months and End of Year	100%	94%	0%	187/98%	80%	N=183 99%
▪ Percentage of participants reporting program helped them become more interested in going to school.					80%	N=94 68%

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: SAGES (Strengthening Adolescent Girls through Education and Support)

Program Summary: SAGES is a non-residential, gender specific program for girls who are experiencing difficulty or conflict in school and at home. Direct Impact on 4 domains of wellness: intellect, sexual, emotional, and family and relationships.

Target Population: At-risk middle school girls experiencing: academic underachievement, delinquency, substance abuse, truancy, physical/emotional abuse, absentee parents, parental incarceration and social difficulties, acknowledged risk factors for involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Practical Academic Cultural Education and Spirited Girls

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: By providing community-based services for high risk girls that prevent and divert criminal behavior, entry and reentry into the juvenile system; criminal behavior; and increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY12 Funding: \$73,860

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of clients (child) enrolled	14	15	29	20	12	28
▪ Number of group activities by type:						
○ Tutoring	61	61	126	40	34	40
○ Education groups	35	53	136	39	39	61
○ Team meetings	10	12	18	6	5	7
○ Service projects	20	19	18	12	12	12
○ Field Trips	5	7	20	11	6	10
▪ Number of counseling sessions:						
○ Individual	412	546	1036	540	365	374
○ Family	108	120	240	131	96	88^
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth completing program.	86%	100% (15)	93% (29)	92% (12)	86%	96% (27)
▪ Average percentage of attendance at each group activity.	89%	94% (14)	95% (10)	98% (6)	80%	84.5% (23)
▪ Percentage of SAGES staff attending State and local trainings offered.					80%	100% (2)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of youth showing any improvement on the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS).	100%	100% (15)	100% (29)	100% (12)	93%	100% (13)
▪ Percentage of youth showing any increase in knowledge about sexuality measured by OWL Curriculum pre/post testing.	100%	100% (15)	100% (29)	100% (12)	93%	100% (13)
▪ Percentage of youth reaching goals as measured by CANS.*	92%	100% (15)	100% (29)	100% (12)	80%	100% (13)

*Percentage of youth reaching 75% of their goals as measured by CANS assessment. Defined as one or more domains selected by certified administrator.

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: HIPPY

Program Summary: The Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) is a successful, proven, early intervention, home-based, parent involvement, school readiness program. It helps parents prepare their three-, four-, and five-year-old children for success in school. HIPPY programs increase parent's involvement as a primary educator of their children in the home and community to maximize the chances of successful early school experiences.

Target Population: Northern Worcester County families with children ages 3-5, prioritized by the Worcester County Public Schools Pre-Kindergarten Criteria Checklist, including: enrollment in the Title I school, Head Start, and household income.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Parents Making a Difference

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: By providing community-based services for identified underserved communities with critical needs and increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency. The HIPPY program empowers parents as primary educators of their children in the home and fosters parent involvement in school and community life to maximize early school experiences. This consistency and stability between parent and child provides a safe environment for children and decreases their chances for involvement in the criminal justice system.

FY12 Funding: \$27,790

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Total number of children served.	28	29	28	29	25	26
▪ Total number of home visits.	683	743	789	617	550	530
▪ Total number of parent trainings.	11	12	11	11	7	17
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of families completing program.	82%	93% (26)	97% (28)	100% (26)	85%	100% (26)
▪ Percentage of HIPYPY USA Curriculum packets successfully completed.	82%	87% (25)	93% (28)	88% (26)	85%	86% (22)
▪ Percentage of HIPYPY staff attending State and local trainings offered.	100%	91% (3)	100% (3)	100% (3)	80%	100% (3)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of families showing improvement on the Parent Involvement Survey.**	80%	92%(24)	93% (27)	83% (10)	80%	65% (15) ✓
▪ Percentage of children showing improvement on the Ages and Stages Questionnaire.**	100%	88% (25)	93% (27)	91% (11)	80%	67% (17) ✓
▪ Percentage of HIPYPY children entering kindergarten on time.	100%	100%(28)	100% (28)	100% (29)	100%	100% (26)

** Improvement is at least a 5% increase from last measurement.

✓ LMB staff will address parent involvement with HIPYPY staff as numbers are declining

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: After School Academies Pocomoke Elementary (PES) and Buckingham Elementary (BES)

Program Summary: Promote academic success and character development for at-risk students as determined by FARMS (students who qualify for free or reduced lunch), grades kindergarten through third, by providing remedial, enrichment, and recreational activities during after school hours. Academies provide an opportunity for students to engage in enriching activities after school day.

Target Population: Students at-risk of entry or reentry into the juvenile system in grades K-3 living in poverty and performing at the basic level. We also consider children at-risk if they have been displaced from their family with DSS and/or DJS actively involved in their lives, have the potential of DSS and/or DJS involvement, or receive counseling services.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: LifeSkills Training and Building Assets

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Prevent and divert entry and reentry into the juvenile system of at-risk Pocomoke and Buckingham students living in poverty and performing at the basic level.

FY12Funding: BES \$2,861 and PES \$7,850

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of students enrolled.	326	540	121	164	150	170
▪ PES	198	254	90	116	97	142

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
▪ BES	128	286	31	48	45	28 ✓
Number of total academies offered.	14	16	10	10	8	11
▪ PES	10	12	9	8	6	9
▪ BES	4	4	1	2	2	2
Average Number of weeks per academy.						
▪ PES	13	13	12	11	8	14
▪ BES	28	10	24	8	8	9
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.						
▪ PES					1	0
▪ BES					1	0
Number of programs submitting program self-assessments.					2	0
Number of programs submitting Program Improvement Plans.					1	0
How Well We Do It:						
Percentage of FARMS students participating						
▪ PES	52%	54% (137)	64% (90)	82%(95)	44%	68% 96)
▪ BES	42%	58% (166)	59% (31)	77% (37)	35%	71% (20)
Percentage rate of attendance overall:^						
▪ PES	80%	83% (211)	92% (90)	84%(97)	83%	89% (126)
▪ BES	94%	96% (275)	95% (31)	85% (41)	74%	84% (23)
Student/Staff Ratio.						
▪ PES	20:1	20:1	20:1	20:1	20:1	20:1
▪ BES	12:1	16:1	15:1	12:1	15:1	7:1
Average daily attendance.						
▪ PES				87% (101)	75%	80% (113)
▪ BES				85% (41)	75%	84% (23)
Percentage of program sites that have at least one program staff that completed YPQA Basics training.						
▪ PES						
▪ BES						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.						
▪ PES						
▪ BES						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES ▪ BES 						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES ▪ BES 						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES ▪ BES 						
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES ▪ BES 						
Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES ▪ BES 						
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of students showing any academic improvement** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES ▪ BES 	85% 64%	85% (216) 77% (220)	90% (90) 60% (31)	95%(110) 50% (24)	74% 52%	95% (134) 78% (21)
Percentage decrease in total number of office referrals as collected in the Character School Wide Information System (SWIS). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PES ▪ BES 	0% (118) *(47)	53% (56) 0% (52)	0% (56) 0% (72)	0% (109) 6%(68)	5% 5%	54% (77) 0 % (0)
Percentage of students achieving proficiency in at least one area of MSA.					72%	100% N/A^^

*Percentage cannot be determined – data for prior year not collected.

**Measured by overall grade point average at the end of the last grading period prior to participation in the academy and the first grading period after the academy.

^Attendance for all kids for each day/possible attendance for all days (if all children attended all days).

^^ Academy is for kindergarten and First graders. They do not take the MSA test

✓ Enrollment in after school programs at BES is not meeting targets. The LMB plans to meet with BES in fiscal year 13 to discuss strategies to increase enrolment.

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: After School Academies Pocomoke Middle/High (PMS/PHS) and Snow Hill Middle/High (SHMS/SHHS)

Program Summary: Promote academic success; enhance life skills and character development for at-risk students in grades four through twelve. Academies provide an opportunity for students to engage in enriching activities after the school day.

Target Population: Students in grades 4-12 at-risk for criminal behavior and drug/alcohol involvement living in poverty and performing at the basic level. We also consider children at-risk if they have been displaced from their family with DSS and/or DJS actively involved in their lives, have the potential of DSS and/or DJS involvement, or receive counseling services.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Building Assets

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Prevent and divert entry and reentry into the juvenile system of at-risk Pocomoke and Snow Hill Middle and High School students grades 4-12 living in poverty and performing at the basic level.

FY12 Funding: \$4,640

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of students enrolled						
▪ PHS/SHHS	710	418	279	1022	200	46/419
▪ PMS	160	23	20	427	17	615
▪ SHMS	373	182	118	312	91	284
Number of total activities	177	213	151	283	92	20 ✓
Number of hours spent on activities	22	24	9	6	6	118
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.						
▪ PMS					1	0*
▪ SHMS					1	0*
Number of programs submitting program self-assessments.					2	0*
Number of programs submitting Program Improvement Plans.					1	0*
How Well We Do It:						
Average daily attendance.						
▪ PMS				35% (110)	75%	21% (130) ✓
▪ SHMS				63% (178)	75%	70% (199)
Percentage of eligible students who completed Driver's Education by the end of school year.						
▪ PHS	100%	100% (13)	80% (4)	100% (4)	78%	100% (1)
▪ SHHS	100%	100% (10)	100% (0)	100% (4)	78%	100% (2)
Percentage of eligible students who attended Career Exploration trips to local colleges.	21%	24% (95)	30% (6)	100% (13)	78%	34% (39)
Percentage of eligible students who attended Career Exploration trips to business.	0%	37% (79)	55% (11)	70% (7)	20%	12% (128)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Percentage of program sites that have at least one program staff that completed YPQA Basics training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 						
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 						
Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 						
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of students showing any academic improvement.** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMS ▪ SHMS 	No data available	No data available	No data available	89.1% (277) 100% (283)	72% 72%	90% (550) 98% (278)
Percentage of students who pass Driver's Education class and obtain Driver's License within the school year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PHS ▪ SHHS 	83% 83%	100% (13) 100% (10)	100% (4) 100% (0)	100% (4) 100% (4)	78% 78%	100%(1) 100%(2)

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Percentage of students achieving proficiency in at least one area of MSA.					72%	PMS 90% (554) SHMS 98% (284)

*YPQA trained staff (Jennifer Baumann) resigned before implementation of YPQA. Need to have new staff trained in model in FY 13.

**Defined as any improvement shown by MSA.

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: FABI – Family Asset Building Initiative

Program Summary: A countywide approach to enhance the quality of established parent education programs, supplementing parent resources providing technical assistance to family program providers utilize the 40 Developmental Asset approach to train adult and youth volunteers and coordinating the activities of the Worcester County Youth Council.

Target Population: Worcester County families that are court-ordered to participate, parent in crisis, youth, and parent education providers.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Building Assets

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: By increasing personal responsibility and self-sufficiency and recommend programs that can be established or enhanced to address the unmet needs of youth and their families. Serves CINA and DJS cases under age 15.

FY12 Funding: \$40,970

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of parents accessing resources.	731	658	650	701	500	740
▪ Number of website hits.	27510	53189	20018	18295	15000	15536
▪ Number of answer line calls received.	781	729	641	659	250	387
Number of Meetings Facilitated:						
▪ Worcester Co. Youth Council	10	10	9	11	6	6
▪ Parent Consortium	6	6	6	5	4	4
Number of Trainings Provided:						
▪ Parent Education (subset)	31	33	35	31	25	30
▪ Assets in Motion	16	15	18	15	12	14
How Well We Do It:						
Percentage of annual goals met by Assets in Motion (AIM) Committee.	85%	80% (4)	80% (4)	80%	50%	75%(3/4)
Percentage of participants satisfied with Parent Education Training.**	99%	99% (32)	99% (267)	100% (217)	95%	100% (68)
Percentage of participants satisfied with AIM training.^					80%	82%
Is Anyone Better Off?						

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Percentage of parent education participants showing pre/post-test improvement using curriculum-specific tool.	98%	97% (32)	100% (119)	100% (60)	90%	100% (21)
Percentage of AIM training participants who indicated benchmark proficiency in knowledge of assets.^	91%	92% (642)	93% (57)	88% (76)	75%	86% (38)
Percentage of AIM training participants who indicated benchmark proficiency in attitude – intentionality.*	99%	94% (656)	93% (58)	92% (79)	90%	91% (40)

^During training by the Asset Survey.*During trainings by the Intentionality Survey.**Pre- and post-testing supplied by the curriculum based in proven effective parenting and life skills, with a 7% increase where the limit many believe that change will occur and possibly stick. #82% is the correct percentage

LMB: Worcester County’s Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Just for Girls/Guys –Berlin Intermediate School

Program Summary: After school program with focus on minority and at-risk students. Provides middle school girls and guys with gender-specific, abstinence only, substance abuse prevention, homework assistance, social skills training, peer education, community service and recreation.

Target Population: Prevent and divert criminal behavior of middle school girls/boys exhibiting anti-social behavior (indicators: office referrals, suspensions, tardiness, absenteeism), having difficulty with academic performance (poor grades, low test scores, incomplete homework assignments) and family problems (lack of supervision, unstable homes, and foster care). Children are considered at-risk if they have been displaced from their family by DSS and/or DJS or actively involved with agency, have the potential of such involvement, or receive counseling services.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Managing Pressures before Marriage and All Stars

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Provides community-based services for high risk youth that: prevent and divert criminal behavior and entry and reentry into the juvenile system; provide alternatives to incarceration and institutionalization; increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency.

FY12:\$25,010Just for Girls + \$29,010Just for Guys = \$54,020

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of students enrolled.	62	68	63	42	34	44
Number of total activities.	1090	1094	1020	708	700	554^^
Number of hours spent on activities.	770	850	681.5	457	450	340^^
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					1	N/A#
How Well We Do It:						
Percentage of participants who are:						
o Minority	75%	78% (53)	72% (45)	68% (29)	52%	77% (34)
o FARMS	75%	74% (50)	74% (47)	75% (32)	44%	70% (31)
Attendance	82%	83% (56)	87% (55)	91% (38)	70%	91% (40)
Retention	89%	80% (54)	70% (44)	71% (30)	65%	88% (39)
Client/Staff Ratio	1:07	1:8	1:8	1:9	1:10	1:9

**FY2012 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Target	FY12 Actual
Average daily attendance.				91% (38)	75%	91% (40)
Percentage of program sites that have at least one program staff that completed YPQA Basics training.						
YPQA program self-assessment scores for Safe Environment domain.						
YPQA program self-assessment scores for Supportive Environment domain.						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.						
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above).						
Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.						
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrate a decrease in risk factors associated with substance use.**^ ▪ Percentage of female participants who demonstrate an increase in knowledge and attitude which support an abstinent lifestyle before marriage.*** ▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrate an increase in social skills.**** 	10%	7% (5)	5% (3)	4%(2)	9%	13.5% (6)
	12%	14.2% (10)	42% (12)	33% (4)	9%	19% (8)
	2%	16.71% (11)	2% (2)	12% (6)	9%	9% (4)

**ALL STARS pre/post (substance abuse) percent increase measured prior to curriculum and within four weeks of end.

***Managing Pressures before marriage pre/post-percent increase measured prior to curriculum and within four weeks of end.

^SSRS pre/post academic performance and social skills – percentage increase measured within four weeks of enrollment and within four weeks of end.

^^Program had to correspond with the schools schedule, this cut down the number of activities they were able to have and the hours spent on them.

Jennifer Bauman participated in the training and got everything set up but then left the LMB. Goal is to train Brittany Hines to implement the program in FY 13.