



State of Maryland Executive Department

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony Brown
Lieutenant Governor

Anne Sheridan
Executive Director

January 8, 2014

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 FY2013 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 FY2013, funding for at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs totals in excess of \$10 million.

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.

301 West Preston Street, 15th Floor · Baltimore, Maryland 21201
410-767-4160 · Fax 410-333-5248 · <http://goc.maryland.gov>

- Attachment 2: A list of the FY2013 funded at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs and funding amounts approved by the Children's Cabinet.
- Attachment 3: Appendix A Compilation of FY2013 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 blue ink, appearing to read "Anne Sheridan", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Anne Sheridan
Executive Director

cc: Shane Spencer, DBM
Richard Harris, DLS
Sarah Albert, DLS (five copies)

FY2013 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 provide 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 to meet the intent of SB882 and address Governor O'Malley's strategic policy goals. In FY2013, more than 100 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion programs at multiple sites were funded for \$10,074,800. 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. These programs are also aligned with the Governor's Strategic Goals including driving down violence against women and children.

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.

FY2013 At Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs Annual Report Summary

Conclusion:

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 who is 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.

**FY2013 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
	Substance Abuse Intervention for At-Risk Youth	53,950
	Mountain Ridge After School Program	68,721
	Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA)	28,514
	Jurisdiction Total	\$269,513
Anne Arundel	After School Program at Mills Parole	35,585
	Youth Services Bureaus	168,582
	Community Conferencing	31,000
	Behavioral & Emotional Support and Training (BEST)	189,837
	Youth Empowerment Services (YES)	115,914
	Treasure Hunter's Clearing House	23,319
	Gems and Jewels Mentoring Institute	43,775
	Keep A Clear Mind (KACM)	39,957
	Communitites Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA)	20,097
	YWCA STAR Academy After School Program	47,949
	Turning Point	47,949
	Brooklyn Park Middle School Teen Club	20,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$783,964
Baltimore City	Youth Services Bureaus*	380,236
	Out-of-School Time Program	1,212,208
	Safe Streets	52,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$1,644,444
Baltimore County	Functional Family Therapy	369,660
	Youth Services Bureaus*	284,692
	Jurisdiction Total	\$654,352
Calvert	Youth Services Bureaus	53,256
	Jurisdiction Total	\$53,256
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 Program	33,630
	Child & Family Behavioral Support Program	74,986
Jurisdiction Total	\$373,210	
Carroll	Youth Services Bureaus - Brief Strategic Family Therapy	118,737
	Cultural Navigator	27,601
	Jurisdiction Total	\$146,338

**FY2013 Community Partnership Agreement
At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

Jurisdiction	Program/Project Name	Funding Amount
Cecil	Advance	43,976
	Achieve	49,981
	Ascend	83,679
	Perryville Police Department Outreach Program	60,903
	Out-of-School Time Programs*	70,479
	Jurisdiction Total	\$309,019
Charles	Functional Family Therapy	51,518
	Youth Services Bureaus	131,080
	Summer Youth Achievement Program	23,677
	Summer/Mobile Meals	24,995
	Jurisdiction Total	\$231,270
Dorchester	Youth Services Bureaus	61,537
	Girls Circle	50,000
	Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA)	29,976
	School Based Behavioral Health Services	80,000
	TREK	74,000
	Teen Ambassadors	10,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$305,513
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 @ Grantsville	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
	Youth Services Bureau	105,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$308,966
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	76,438
	One Circle	66,030
	Kent County Diversion Program	62,583
	Early Morning Drop-Off	43,407
	Jurisdiction Total	\$248,458
Montgomery	Youth Services Bureaus*	105,544
	Excel Beyond the Bell Services	542,784
	Jurisdiction Total	\$648,328

**FY2013 Community Partnership Agreement
At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

Jurisdiction	Program/Project Name	Funding Amount
Prince George's	Youth Services Bureaus*	356,176
	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	\$1,251,880
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	112,355
	Mentoring	50,000
	Drug Screening	20,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$244,675
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*	55,000
	Voluntary Family Services	42,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$97,000
Washington	Tomorrow's Leaders	64,181
	Juvenile Delinquency Prevention & Diversion	176,000
	Family Centered Support Services	36,000
	Rural Out-of-School Time Initiative	125,000
	Positive Youth Development Coordinator	45,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$446,181
Wicomico	Building Foundations for Families (BFF)	192,000
	Family Empowerment Initiative	120,000
	Out-of-School Time (OOST) Initiative	272,487
	Jurisdiction Total	\$584,487
Worcester	Strengthening Adolescent Girls through Education and Support (SAGES)	73,860
	After School Academies Elementary Schools*	10,711
	Family Asset Building Initiative	40,970
	After School Academies Middle and High Schools*	4,640
	Just for Girls/Guys	54,020
	Jurisdiction Total	\$184,201
FY2012 Total Statewide		\$10,074,800

*Information provided in aggregate for multiple sites.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Juvenile Review Board (JRB)

Program Summary: The JRB offers meaningful alternatives to the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) system through early intervention strategies that are school and community-based and reflect offender responsibility. The Board consists of volunteers and typically includes people from family service agencies, churches, businesses and other leaders in the community.

Target Population: All first time non-alcohol or drug related juvenile non-violent offenders are offered the opportunity to participate in this program as an alternative to entering the juvenile justice system. The JRB receives referrals from DJS and from the Truancy Prevention Coordinator. The JRB Coordinator also works with the Coalition for Out-of-School Time in order to link at-risk youth to out-of-school time programs and to inform the coalition of gaps/needs in available out-of-school time programs.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: This program is a locally developed model that was modified from the Independence Youth Court (Teen Court program at the time of development). This program is also based on Restorative Justice best practices.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The juveniles referred to this program have exhibited delinquent behaviors. They are first time non-violent offenders. This program offers interventions to prevent further DJS involvement.

FY13 Funding: \$47,132

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Total number of misdemeanor referrals made to the JRB.	122	70	18	41	45	81
▪ Number of cases that referred back to the Department of Juvenile Services.^	29	10	1	5	5	5
▪ Number of cases managed informally by the Coordinator who do not appear before the board of community volunteers.^	72	40	4	3	5	1
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of misdemeanor offenders who are processed by the JRB who successfully complete the program.	93%	95%	95%	88% (36 of 41)	95%	100% (n=28)
▪ Percentage of cases that are diverted from the juvenile services system.	73%	90%	85%	36	85%	94 % (n=76)
▪ Percentage of client satisfaction surveys completed by parents of the youth served that rate the program as “satisfactory”.	100%	100%	100%	100% (of 12 Surveys returned)	95%	89 % (n= 73)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of participants who do not re-offend during the first 6 months after successful program completion.	85%	96%	93%	100% n=0	90%	70% (n=23)
▪ Percentage of participants who do not re-offend during the first 12 months after successful program completion.	78.7	83.1	*	83% n=1	75%	92% (n=22)
▪ Percentage of participants who are enrolled in school and/or community activities.	**	**	100%	78% n=11	60%	76% (n = 13)

*Not yet applicable.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

** Items not measured during this time period.

^For reasons including those that refuse the program (it is voluntary) or who do not successfully complete the program.

^^Based on the Coordinators assessment, some cases are deemed to require less intensive interventions and are handled informally by the Coordinator.

The amount of surveys returned total 28 of which all had a satisfactory report, the parents are given a survey to complete and return. Sometimes they are not returned.

During this period, a few re-offenders were truancy cases which this coordinator believes is due to health/medical issues not addressed or lack of parent effort to address the board of education. This staff would connect parent to sources, could not ensure the follow through.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Expanded Diversion Services

Program Summary: Expanded Diversion Services builds a continuum of early interventions to youth in middle school to prevent truancy and promote school attendance. This program focuses mainly on 6th graders who are transitioning into the middle school setting.

Target Population: Middle school age students at Braddock Middle School and Washington Middle School whose attendance is at or less than 93.4% days of school at any point throughout the year and are at risk of juvenile delinquency. There is a concentration on 6th grade students, who are exhibiting school attendance issues.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: This program is a locally developed program that is based on OJJDP's Chronic Truancy Initiative. However, our program coordinator begins earlier in the prevention level by informing all incoming sixth graders of attendance polices and consequences and makes the family contact from the beginning, including sending the first notification letter.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Poor school attendance and truancy are strongly linked to delinquent behavior.

FY13 Funding: \$71,196

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of students served at Level I and II (5-10 days unexcused absences).	284	333	350	332
▪ Number of students served at Level III (10-20 unexcused absences).	35	66	60	73
▪ Number of students referred to the JRB (after 20 unexcused absences).	4	11	15	16
How Well We Do It:				
▪ Percentage of client satisfaction surveys completed by parents/guardians of youth served that rate the program as satisfactory. Survey given at the close of the case or level reduction.	0	87.5% (n=7/8)	75%	100% (n=4)
▪ Percentage of participants in Level III who are engaged in school and/or community activities as measured by face-to-face communication between the coordinator, school personnel and the student.	25%	24% (n=16/66)	65%	40% (n=29)
▪ Percentage of participants in Level III who are linked to other supportive resources.	23%	38% (n=25/66)	85%	37% (n=27)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ Percentage of participants in Level II who do not require Level III program.	87.7%	80.2% (n=66/333)	83%	83% (n=57/332)
▪ Percentage of participants showing improved school attendance from the beginning of the school year to the end of the 2 nd marking period.	91%	64.81% (n=35/54)	85%	47% (n=35/73)
▪ Percentage of increase in the schools AYP rate from the prior year.				37% (n=27)
o Braddock Middle School (new site in FY12)	▪ n/a	93.5%	▪ .4%	
o Washington Middle School	▪ .5%	93.6%	▪ .4%	

How Much We do:

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

A positive was that fewer students needed contacted overall, meaning less students are missing school. Fewer students have less than 10 absences. However, more of the students contacted needed more intense services. Goals were met with regard to referrals to JRB and more intense cases.

How Well We Do It:

The parent surveys were sent, 65 were mailed with returned stamped envelope enclosed. Only 4 returned. The 4 returned were rated satisfactory by marking more agree or strongly agree to the questions than disagree or strongly disagree.

The goals were not met in each of the categories, school or community activity or supportive resources. However, 49 out of the 73 cases are involved in either a school/community activity or supportive resource. Combined 67% of the cases are involved in an outside group/agency. The program needs to do more research on what is available to youth outside of school hours in order to get more participants involved. The worker will continue to encourage the students to participate in some type of after school program. Challenges are finding appropriate after school programs that transportation is not needed. The students in the level III category have a hard time coming to school, trying to get them to stay after is a challenge.

Any Better Off

Projected 83% of the Level II needs Level III. This means out of the 332 (letters and phone calls at 5 unexcused days) 275 students would not need more intense services. More students contacted overall and more students needed more intense services. The goal was not met. On a positive, we are providing more services to more youth that are needed for the Youth in the middle schools and making strides to change the behaviors. Thirty-five of the 73 cases improved the attendance from first half to second half. An issue with calculating this data is not all students entered the first half of the year. Some cases enter in the later part of the year so a small amount of time to work with student and families, but calculated the same. Some increased the attendance a little, but some successes were very noticeable. Most of these students would not have improved if this program was not involved. As the data proves the whole attendance rate has increased steadily since the program was in existence.

Through Maryland Report Card, <http://www.mdreportcard.org/rschool.aspx?K=01AAAA&WDATA=school> data was found on attendance rate. The data is from 2012. I am giving the last three years of attendance rates for both city Middle Schools.

Year	Braddock	Washington
2009	94.3	92.4
2010	93.3	93.1
2011	93.5	93.6
2012	95	94.2

This program began in Washington Middle School in 2009 and Braddock Middle School in 2010.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Allegany Coalition for Out-of-School Time

Program Summary: A coalition of program providers, community members, youth, families, educators, faith-based organizations, and other interested out-of-school time program stakeholders to ensure that all school-aged, Allegany County youth have access to quality activities and learning opportunities during the out-of-school hours and ultimately reduce juvenile delinquency.

Target Population: Youth at Elementary, Middle, and High School levels who are at risk of juvenile delinquency due to lack of supervised, positive, pro-social activities.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Maryland Out of School Time Network

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serves youth who are at risk of juvenile delinquency due to lack of supervised, positive, pro-social activities.

FY13 Funding: \$43,664

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ Number of Coalition members.	27	15	32
▪ Number of Coalition meetings held.	4	6	6
▪ Number of organizations receiving Developmental Assets presentations.	10	10	9
How Well We Do It:			

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ Percentage of Coalition members in attendance at Coalition meetings.	69% (7/27)	75%	38% (12/32)
▪ Percentage of Coalition members who rate the Coalition as being effective as measured by a survey administered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mid-year and ○ Year-end. 	80% 90%	80% 90%	100% (24/24) 100% (24/24)
▪ Percentage of participants who received Developmental Assets presentations who rate the presentation “good” or “effective” as measured by a satisfaction survey.	90%	90%	99% (66/67)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ Number and percentage of JRB and Expanded Diversion participants identified as needed a community connection who are referred to OOST Coalition and successfully linked to an OOST program.	100%	90%	▪ 25% (19/76)
▪ Number and percentage of Coalition members who adopt the MOST Quality Standards Framework for their programs.	25%	25%	41% (7/17)
▪ Percentage of Coalition member programs that participate in the After-school Snack/Supper or Summer Nutrition program.	100%	50%	60% (9/15)

Each meeting attracts new members, but it is incredibly difficult to get a majority of coalition members to attend OOST coalition meetings. Most teach at school during the day and are at out of school time programs in the evenings. Night and weekend meetings are a possibility. However, when suggested, no one is interested. A meeting agenda is sent out prior to each meeting. When a coalition member finds something particularly relevant to their program, they work to re-arrange their schedule to attend or they review the minutes and notes from the meeting on the website: <http://ost.allconet.org>. As a result of a program reading the minutes from a meeting when a Department of Social Services (DSS) staff person spoke about reporting abuse and neglect, a referral was made to DSS. Many OOST members were unable to attend the meeting which discussed abuse and neglect and expressed interest attending a future meeting discussing this subject. As a result, a meeting will be scheduled later in the year.

When possible, JRB and Expanded Diversion cases are referred to OOST programs. Traditional “afterschool” programming is limited, not every school has one. Only one of the high schools has an afterschool program. As much as possible, referrals are made to non-traditional OOST programs, like: karate, dance, art, etc. Frequently, the youth referred to these diversion programs have limited transportation and Allegany County has limited public transportation. Without a private car, transportation is a major obstacle for county residents.

Nine of the fifteen sites that qualify utilize the After-school Snack/Supper and Summer Nutrition programs. Another site is in the process of completing paperwork and should be receiving meals by next month. Transportation of the meals is the obstacle. Several agencies are working together and making progress towards finding ways to have meals delivered.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Mountain Ridge After-School Program

Program Summary: Highly qualified teachers provide after school program activities related to music, art, recreation, social/living skills, career development & academics. Presentations provide information to participants concerning drug/alcohol prevention & gang awareness. Programming focuses on promoting young people’s personal & social development, and academic performance, ensuring that the youth are prepared to fully participate in their community both as an adult and as a youth.

Target Population: Mountain Ridge High School Students in grades 9-12, who are at risk of juvenile delinquency during the after-school hours, and their families. Emphasized recruitment efforts towards students demonstrating at-risk indicators, such as prior DJS involvement, poor school attendance, low academic achievement, and students who have had in-school suspensions, and repeated office referrals.

**FY2013 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: This program utilizes the Maryland Out-of-School Time Youth Program Quality Standards Framework

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program offers supervised, positive, pro-social activities during after-school hours, when delinquent behaviors are most likely to occur, to 9th 12th graders with an emphasis on students demonstrating at-risk indicators, such as prior DJS involvement, poor school attendance, low academic achievement, and students who have had in-school suspensions, and repeated office referrals

FY13 Funding: \$68,721

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.				1	1	1
▪ Number of youth enrolled.	156	130	189	110	100	101
▪ Number of youth who attend 30 days or more.	29	31	13	17	20	8
▪ Number of family members who attend at least one family event.	7	10	13	12	10	4
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of participants who attend 30 days or more.	19%	21%	32%	17%	20%	8% (n=8)
▪ Percentage of students who rate the program as “satisfactory” as measured by an end of year survey.			98%	99%	90%	100% (n=23)
▪ Average Daily Attendance			38	39	35	27
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.				4	4	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.				4	4	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.				4	4	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.				4	4	4
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above)				4	4	4
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who attend 30 days or more who improve in the following grades by changing one letter grade or more between the first and third nine-week period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Math ○ English ○ Science ○ Social Studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 18% ○ 16% ○ 19% ○ 14% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 16% ○ 29% ○ 10% ○ 32% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 19 % ○ 15% ○ 18% ○ 13% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 17 % ○ 26 % 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 20% ○ 20% ○ 20% ○ 20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 38% (n=3) ○ 38% (n=3) ○ 20% (n=2)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 19% o 37% 		20% (n=2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who attend 30 days or more who achieve satisfactory school attendance as defined by less than 8 days of absence during the school year. 	74%	94%	73%	53%	70%	75% (n=6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who report feeling safe in the program, as measured by an end of year survey. 				98%	90%	100% (n=23)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who report the program as being valuable, as measured by an end of year survey. 				96%	85%	100% (n=23)

Due to reporting and staffing issues, the program did not begin operation until January 2013.

At the beginning of the year, there were to be some reporting issues that delayed the start of the program. Once the reports were finally submitted and cleared to begin, we were nearly have way into the school year and we were informed that our budget was cut in half. Due to the budget being cut in half, we did not start the program until into February. Even with the budget cuts and the attendance being cut, we were still given the same goals as the previous year. It is extremely hard to get students to attend the 30 day goal when the program only meets half the time as the previous year. Therefore, that is why we only had 8 students meet the 30 day goal. It makes the grade improvement goal skewed when you are only talking about 8 students. The real numbers of attendance are that we had 28 students attend 10 or more times. That means that more than 25% of those that signed up attended 25% of the days. This is higher than previous years. The idea of starting a program in the middle of the winter had much to do with the lack of success of this year's program. It is hard to get students involved at that time and it is very hard to recruit staff as well. Those that attended this year may not have been able to boost the numbers to where they were last year, but the students definitely all enjoyed the program.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Substance Abuse Intervention for At-Risk-Youth

Program Summary: Substance abuse treatment will be made available to all students at the Eckhart Alternative School and the YMCA Pregnant Teen Program. An addiction counselor will be located at the Eckhart School. The substance abuse counselor will use cognitive-behavioral strategies as the primary therapeutic approach. Motivational interviewing and motivational enhancement strategies will be utilized with the counselor regularly assessing the "stage of change" of the patient. The patients will be seen primarily in a group setting on a weekly basis, individual and family sessions will be scheduled as needed.

Target Population: Students at the Eckhart Alternative School or the YMCA Pregnant Teen Program who are at-risk of juvenile delinquency and have been identified as having a substance abuse or dependence diagnosis, between 13 and 18 years of age.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Motivational Interviewing (MI), from Prochaska and DiClemente's transtheoretical model of change.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program serves students who are in the Eckhart Alternative School and Pregnant and Parenting Teen mothers who are at risk of Juvenile delinquency and have been identified as having substance abuse or dependence issue.

FY13 Funding: \$53,950

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ Number of students served.	55	62	50	70
▪ Number of students receiving at least one individual session.	21	40	10	52
▪ Number of students identified and referred by the MD Student Assistant Program (MSAP) who enroll in program.	**	0	40	40
How Well We Do It:				
▪ Number and percentage of students in the program that receive at least 2 urine screens while in treatment.	45%	47% (n=29)	75%	38/70= 54%
▪ Number and percentage of students in program retained in treatment for at least 60 days.	69%	69% (n=43)	60%	49/70=70%
▪ Number and percentage of students in the program who have at least one family session while in treatment.	38%	16% (n=10)	30%	25/70=36%
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ Percentage decrease in substance use among students completing the treatment program, from time of admission to time of discharge, as measured by SMART data.	84%	55%	75%	15/34=44%
▪ Percentage of DJS-involved participants who do not have a subsequent referral during program participation.	89%	95%	75%	29/33=88%
▪ Percentage of participants who have not already been involved with DJS, who do not have a referral during program participation.	** ¹	89%	75%	37/37=100%

The performance measure: the number of students in the program that receive at least 2 urine screens while in treatment is now at 54%. There are a few students (3) who were recently enrolled in the program that have not been in treatment long enough to complete 2 urine screens and a few students (7) have refused to provide urine screens as they report that they do not feel comfortable doing this at school. Several more students (7) were in treatment less than one month making it difficult to effectively monitor their use with 2 drug screens within that timeframe. Our incentive system to reward negative drug screens continues to be a motivating factor in students' willingness to provide urine screens and has steadily increased since implementing this. Our incentive system consists of a choice of movie passes, bowling passes, or a school book bag for every two, consecutive, negative drug screens. We plan to improve this area by consistently reminding students of the incentives for negative drug screens.

The performance measure: is anyone better off did not meet our target on decrease of substance use. There were several factors contributing to this. First we were able to successfully refer two students to inpatient treatment at the Jackson Unit. Two other students were referred however one received a VOP prior to his intake and was placed in detention. The other had no involvement with DJS or any other agency and refused the referral. Three other students received subsequent charges and were placed in either the youth camps or detention. Finally, one of the challenges in this area is that students are referred to the program by the school system knowing they need to participate but not necessarily complete treatment successfully in order to return to their home school. All students completing successfully are encouraged to enter our continuing care program to maintain contact following treatment and thus far 4 have agreed to do so. Continuing care is a program where a staff member calls students either weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly to see how they are doing, offer encouragement, or provide referrals if students are struggling with substance use or other issues

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

¹ ** Items not measured during this time period.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol

Program Summary: CMCA is a community-organizing program designed to reduce adolescent access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices, seeks both to limit youths' access to alcohol and to communicate a clear message to the community that underage drinking is inappropriate and unacceptable. The goals of these organizing efforts are to eliminate illegal alcohol sales to minors, obstruct the provision of alcohol to youth, and ultimately reduce alcohol use by teens

Target Population: Adolescents 13 to 20 years of age, who are at risk of substance abuse and therefore, juvenile delinquency, the general population of the community, community organizations/ vendors.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (Model). Mini-grants in this program are a local adaptation to the model.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program targets adolescents 13 to 20 years of age who are at-risk of substance abuse and therefore delinquent behavior. There is a strong focus on the youth who are engaging in the behavior of trying to access alcohol.

FY13 Funding: \$28,514

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of youth participating in mini-grant activities.	1126	401	500	306
▪ Number of alcohol related citations to youth.	6	9	4	40
▪ Number of community members trained.	28	28	25	33
▪ Number of alcohol sales compliance checks completed.	200	276	200	199
▪ Number of alcohol-related citations issued to youth.	2	9	10	40
How Well We Do It:				
▪ Percent of training participants who rate the training as “good” or “excellent.”	100% (n=28)	100% (n=28)	100% (n=25)	100% (n=33)
▪ Average score on Question #18 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	6.4	5.8	5	5.2
▪ Average score on Question #25 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	5	6	5	5.5
▪ Number and percentage of licensed merchants located in Allegany County who were included in alcohol sales compliance checks.	100% (n=200)	90% (n=150)	75%	100% N=199
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ Percentage of alcohol selling merchants, of those compliance checked by law enforcement, who were not cited for selling alcohol to under-aged persons	97%	89% (n=245)	85%	90% N=179
▪ % of training participants who demonstrate increased knowledge of the CMCA philosophy as measured by a post-evaluation.	100% (n=28)	100%	100%	100%
▪ # and % of increased compliance over first round of checks.	90%	100% (n=9)	100%	90%/ FY12 = 94%
▪ # and % of increased compliance over previous year's checks.	**	245/89% in 2 nd round of checks	100%	666% (N=40)
▪ # and % increase in the number of alcohol related citations issued to youth.	0% N=2	100% (n=9)	**	90% N=179
▪ # and % of increase in the number of alcohol related citations issued to youth over previous year.	**	450% (n=9)	200% (n=18)	100%

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

** Not measured during these time periods.

The Salvation Army, Community Unity in Action, and Our Lady of the Mountains Catholic Church Youth Group were the mini-grant awardees. Grantees did not reach the 500 youth as projected in the performance measures because only three organizations applied and were funded instead of the projected four.

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 (BITSEA) – determined to be reliable by Journal of Pediatric Psychology or Preschool/Kindergarten Behavior Scale (PKBS) – 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. Precursors to later frequent offending include poor child-rearing practices and poor parental supervision, criminal parents and siblings, low family income, large family size, poor housing, low intelligence, and low educational attainment (Zigler and Taussig, 2009, p 998),

FY13 Funding: \$189,837

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of children served.	573	695	512	199	271	195	246
▪ Number of children with formal assessments.	75	118	78	84	70	51	106
▪ Number of Center Environmental Assessments.	5	18	19	6	2	5	5
▪ Number of visits made by Behavioral Specialists to child care programs.	1037	1185	1187	1013	646	700	840
▪ Number of visits by Family Behavioral Specialist to homes.	453	341	519	355	251	200	239
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Ratio of Behavior Specialists to children with formal assessments.	1:25	1:39	1:26	1:28	1:23	1:25	1:35
▪ Average number of visits per child (families and centers).	8	7.4	10	11	12.8	5	6
▪ Average number of visits per Center.	8.5	6.2	5.5	4.5	5.5	3	3
▪ Percentage of children completing pre/post tests.	85% (N=75)	83% (N=69)	92% (N=55)	89% (N=41)	60% (N=42)	80%	78% (N=54)
Is Anyone Better Off:							
▪ Percentage decrease in problem behaviors of children with formal assessments.	96%	92%	93%	100% (N=46)	73% (N=16)	80%	79% (N=42)
▪ Percentage of children with formal assessments who showed an improvement in social skills.	99%	97%	91%	89% (N=41)	86% (N=19)	85%	93% (N=50)
▪ Percentage of children with formal assessments not involuntarily removed from childcare during program year.	71%	98%	95%	100% (N=46)	100% (N=24)	90%	93% (N=50)
▪ Percentage of Center Environmental Assessments that showed improvement in pre/post Assessments** during program year.	100%	100%	91%	100% (N=6)	100% (N=24)	90%	100% (N=5)

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

**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 child care programs as well as individual children and therefore does not reflect the intensive services that are provided to individual children.

What's the story behind the performance?

BEST continues to be a strongly performing program (and the only one in our jurisdiction serving this population). However, there were a few measures that did not meet their targets:

- 1) The ratio of Behavioral Specialists to children with formal assessments is skewed as funding has decreased (meaning less specialists available) but the need has remained the same.
- 2) The percentage of children with completed pre/post tests is slightly lower than the target for a myriad of reasons: families that move without leaving forwarding contact information (so post-assessments cannot be fully completed), non-compliance of parents or guardians, families with more intensive needs that end up with DSS involvement that complicates their ability to continue with BEST, as well as parents that discontinue services without completing the appropriate paperwork when a medical intervention is required for the child.
- 3) The data recorded does not always reflect the issues that arise when completing pre/post PKBS forms. There are several reasons the children may not be showing decreases in problem behaviors including: developmental/chronological changes in the child (i.e. a child crosses an age threshold while in the program); different people are completing pre and post data (teacher vs. parent); and children with special needs can show improvement in one area, but this often results in a regression in another.

Finally, families and centers often do not seek help soon enough to protect the child from being expelled. Occasionally, BEST is called as a way to cover all areas without the true desire to follow through.

**FY2013 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.

FY13 Funding: \$83,986

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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	57	94	42
▪ Family*	68	74	N/A	64	54	78	39
▪ Group*	4	7	8	1	3	16	0
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	161	156	86	60	61	78	78
▪ Family*	43	150	49	54	51	62	61
▪ Group*	4	12	0	0	0	0	0
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	41	21	54	0	53	62	50
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	4	4	4	N/A	4	5	N/A
# of individuals recommended for Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as a result of assessment.	**	**	**	**	57	20	78
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=52)	100%	100%	95% (N=40)
▪ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	92%	94%	93%	100% (N=30)	94%	90%	91% (N=22)
▪ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=4)	100%	100%	100% (N=5)
▪ % of individuals completing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as recommended.	**	**	**	**	86%	80%	87% (N=33)
Is Anyone Better Off?							

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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)	96%	90%	96% (N=32)
▪ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.	**	**	**	**	***	60%	71% (N=24)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	***	65%	67% (N=10)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	***	65%	67% (N=8)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	***	65%	86% (N=6)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	***	65%	73% (N=11)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	***	65%	50% (N=6)
▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.	**	**	**	**	***	65%	86% (N=6)
▪ # and % of individuals receiving Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) with an increased Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge.	**	**	**	**	***	80%	90% (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.

**This performance measure is new for FY12

*** This data was not collected

What's the story behind the performance?

From the AYSB:

The AYSB did not meet the established targets for formal counseling for a myriad of reasons including:

- Thirty (30) youth were served with the aid of a translator, which is a significant accomplishment. Mental Health has been suspect among the Latino community. This level of participation reflects the level of trust that AYSB has developed and achieved in the community. The challenge is that only about half the progress is made in each session. The end result is that these cases require as almost double the time of “other types” of cases. There is an acute shortage of Spanish speaking therapists in the county. Notwithstanding language barriers, youth and families have been making significant progress.
- There has been a marked increase in the number of depression, anxiety and sexual abuse related clients cases, all of which require more intensive involvement. Most of the youth have improved in those areas, as a result of treatment here.
- In FY 13, there were fewer referrals through the first six months than in any period in the past. This reflected a community wide trend: Referrals in DJS intake were down 30%. Also, AACPS (system wide) discipline referrals were down over 30%,
- The ACE program (suspended and expelled youth) did not receive referrals until January, 2013. AYSB provides the counseling service for all the participants. We would have expected 12-15 referrals from late September to December.

These factors combined meant that less individuals were able to be served this fiscal year. In addition, please note that there were no cases where referral to substance abuse treatment was appropriate.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Notwithstanding the above the Annapolis YSB has failed to meet outcomes again this year even after the issuance of request for a corrective action plan. The LMB is considering an RFP for Youth Services Bureaus in the next fiscal year.

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

FY13 Funding: \$84,596

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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	120	94	44
▪ Family*	139	101	90	40	44	78	36
▪ Group*	60	400	421	49	58	16	38
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	51	121	223	161	116	78	10
▪ Family*	151	57	52	30	155	62	5
▪ Group*	6	81	8		30	0	0
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	99	42	64	96	75	62	21
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	42	6	25	49			
# of Youth participating in Second Step curriculum.	***	***	***	***	58	50	0
# of Youth participating in CCPT.	***	***	***	***	35	20	10
# of Youth participating in TFCBT.	***	***	***	***	15	15	15
5							
▪ % 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% (N=222)	100%	100% (N=118)
▪ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	90%	93%	92%	91% (N=208)	92% (N=202)	90%	80% (N=22)
▪ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	87%	100% (N=15)	100% (N=15)	100%	100% (N=7)
▪ % of participating youth completing the Second Step curriculum.	**	**	**	**	96% (N=56)	80%	0% (N=0)
▪ % of participating youth completing Child Centered Play Therapy.	**	**	**	**	85%	80%	82%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
	**	**	**	**	(N=30) 100% (N=15)	80%	(N=40) 78% (N=15)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. ▪ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater ▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale. ▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale. ▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale. ▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale. ▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale. ▪ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale. ▪ % of youth exhibiting improvement in anger management/control as measured by Second Step pre and post-treatment testing. ▪ # and % of youth participating in CCPT with an increased Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge ▪ # and % of youth participating in TFCBT who exhibit a reduction in PTSD symptoms as measured by trauma pre and post screening instrument. 	90%	94%	95% (N=98)	100% (N=52)	98% (N=135)	90%	100% (N=118)
	**	**	**	**	69% (N=45)	60%	Not available
	**	**	**	**	66% (N=20)	65%	Not available
	**	**	**	**	51% (N=23)	65%	Not available
	**	**	**	**	77% (N=17)	65%	Not available
	**	**	**	**	77% (N=16)	65%	Not available
	**	**	**	**	64% (N=27)	65%	Not available
	**	**	**	**	65% (N=11)	65%	Not available
	**	**	**	**	96% (N=56)	80%	100% (N=38)
	**	**	**	**	86% (N=30)	80%	80% (N=33)
	**	**	**	**	100% (N=15)	80%	85% (N=39)

*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.

What's the story behind the performance?

Pascal YSB stopped providing service during the second half of FY13; no invoices were paid beyond the second quarter and remaining funds were returned to the state. The LMB's contract with this vendor has been terminated through the County Attorney's Office. A new YSB is being certified by DJS to serve this population in FY14.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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) Middle School.

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 aims 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.

FY13 Funding: \$47,949

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of students enrolled.	116	77	76	65	51	25	13
▪ Number of sessions offered.	100	100	77	98	91	92	77
▪ Number of program sites submitting program self-assessments	**	**	**	**	2	1	1
▪ Number of program sites submitting Program Improvement Plans	**	**	**	**	2	1	1
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.***	**	**	**	**	1	1	1
How Well We Do It:							
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	4.70	4	4.03
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	**	**	**	**	3.17	4	4.00
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	**	**	**	**	3.5	4	4.11
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	**	**	**	**	3.67	4	3.00
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	**	**	**	**	3.76	4	3.78
▪ # and % of program sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan	**	**	**	**	100% (N=2)	100% (N=1)	100% (N=1)
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by a 90% program attendance rate.	**	**	**	**	100% (N=2)	100% (N=1)	100% (N=1)
▪ Average daily attendance.	77% (N=89) *	81% (N=63) *	89% (N=68) *	84% (N=55) 84% (N=55)	83% (N=42) 80% (N=40)	80% 80%	77% (N=10) 77% (N=10)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level.	100%	95%	100%	100% (N=65)	100% (N=51)	80%	100% (N=13)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students absent from school less than 15 days during the academic year. 	100%	90%	100%	100%	98%	90%	100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program. 	98%	93%	100%	(N=65) 98%	(N=50) 94%	90%	(N=13) 100%

* New performance measure for FY11.

** New performance measure for FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

The Star Academy Program at George Fox Middle School has been a strong, successful program in an underserved area for several years. In January of 2013 the Program Coordinator at the YWCA resigned and her position was not filled. While the on-site staff worked hard to keep the program operating, the lack of support from the vendor created several issues that impacted program performance. At the end of this fiscal year the contract with this vendor was terminated and a new vendor was engaged in order to continue this much-needed program in the school.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Turning Point After School Program

Program Summary: Turning Point "Emerging Leaders" After-School prevention program, in collaboration with Anne Arundel County's Public School system, emphasizes healthy lifestyle choices to achieve both academic and personal success. This is accomplished through the utilization of an evidence-based curriculum, "Girl's Circle", homework help, academic tutoring, training in the Second Step Anti-Violence Curriculum, daily group discussions, daily recreation and other activities. Substantive topic areas include alcohol and substance abuse prevention, suicide awareness, cultural awareness, leadership characteristics, financial literacy, sense of self and academic success and planning.

Target Population: The program serves students in grades 9-12 attending Annapolis and Meade High schools.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Colorado #166 – Girl's Circles

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This school-based program aims to deter juvenile delinquency by providing personal accountability training and emphasizing healthy lifestyle choices for vulnerable students grades 9-12 who are at-risk for either failure or suspension/ expulsion due to poor academic performance or behavior problems.

FY13 Funding: \$47,949

Performance Measures	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students enrolled. 					24	18
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of sessions offered. 					78	28
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of program sites submitting program self-assessments. 					2	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of program sites submitting Program Improvement Plans. 					2	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training. 					1	1
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain. 					4.0	3.87
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain. 					4.0	3.83
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain. 					4.0	3.33
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain. 					4.0	3.33
<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). 					4.0	3.33
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA 					4.0	3.5

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
Basics training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # and % of program sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan ▪ Percentage of students enrolled in the program who have improved their knowledge about the effects of alcohol, drugs and tobacco on the body as indicated by the Second Step pre-post test. ▪ Average daily attendance. 					4.0	3.63
					100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)
					100% (N=2)	0%
					85%	33% (N=6)
					80%	33% (N=6)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of students who will show improvement in their GPA's between the first and fourth marking periods. ▪ Percentage of students with no unexcused absences from school during the academic year. ▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program. 					85%	33% (N=6)
					85%	28% (N=5)
					85%	28% (N=5)

New program for FY13.

What's the story behind the performance?

As discussed in the mid-year report, the two program sites – Annapolis High School and Ft. Meade High School – were chosen for both their student demographics as well as school investment in participation. However, despite significant recruitment efforts at both schools, enrollment was significantly lower than anticipated. In addition to this challenge, the Program Coordinator with the YWCA resigned in January further impeding the ability to recruit for the program. In February, the YWCA's Executive Director and CEO worked closely with AA Co Public Schools to revive the program at Ft. Meade High School as it was identified as the greater school of need. Despite extensive recruitment efforts on behalf of both agencies, as well as support from the LMB, the program was never able to achieve the targets agreed upon by the LMB and the vendor. Due to these challenges, the program has been discontinued for FY14.

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: This school-based program 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.

FY13 Funding: \$35,585

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of students enrolled ▪ Number of sessions offered ▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training. 	70 121 **	40 115 **	50 118 **	42 104 **	38 107 1	20 92 1	42 103 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. 	** ** ** ** ** ** 100% *	** ** ** ** ** ** 80% (N=32) *	** ** ** ** ** ** 84% (N=42) *	** ** ** ** ** ** 80% (N=34) 80% (N=34)	5.00 4.91 4.63 5.00 4.89 89% (N=34) 89% (N=34)	4 4 4 4 4 4 80% 80%	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 81% (N=34) 81% (N=34)
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% **	100% 100% 100% 100% **	100% 100% 100% 100% **	100% 100% 100% 100% ** (N=42) (N=42) (N=42) (N=42)	100% 92% 100% *** 82% (N=31)	80% 90% 90% *** 80%	100% 90% 100% *** 87% (N=28)

* New performance measure for FY11.

** New performance measure for FY12.

*** Old performance measure; data no longer captured. The measure that follows is the new, more appropriate measure.

What's the story behind the performance?

Mills-Parole ASP met or exceeded all performance measure targets for the fiscal year.

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This school-based after school program aims to deter 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.

FY13 Funding: \$43,775

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of students enrolled ▪ Number of sessions offered ▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training. 	34 92 **	56 92 **	23 92 **	20 100 **	20 99 2	20 92 1	20 95 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 students who successfully completed the program as measured by 90% program attendance. ▪ Average daily attendance. 	** ** ** ** ** ** 24%* (n=8) *	** ** ** ** ** ** 91% (n=51) *	** ** ** ** ** ** 87% (n=20) *	** ** ** ** ** ** 80% (N=16) 80% (N=16)	4.06 4.80 4.075 3.83 4.20 90% (N=18) 90% (N=18)	4 4 4 4 4 80% 80%	3.25 2.45 3.05 2.85 3.64 100% (N=20) 90% (N=18)
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 not involved in the DJS system during program period. 	100% 56% 100% 100%	100% 78% 100% 100%	100% 87% 91% 100%	100% 100% 90% 100% (N=20)	100% 80% 95% 100% (N=20)	80% 90% 90% 90%	100% 95% 90% 100% (N=20)

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

* New performance measure for FY11.

** New performance measure for FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

Gems and Jewels met or exceeded all targets for the fiscal year with one exception. As there are a different group of children participating each program year and there were some changes in program staff, the YPQA scores did slightly decrease this year.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Brooklyn Park Middle School Teen Club

Program Summary: An after school program offered four days a week to middle school-aged students in Brooklyn Park. 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: Brooklyn Park Middle School 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: This school-based program serves middle school-aged students at-risk for academic failure, suspension/expulsion, or juvenile delinquency.

FY13 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of students enrolled ▪ Number of sessions offered ▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training. 	136 4 **	98 4 **	129 4 **	75 4 **	127 4 1	100 4 1	117 4 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 the program as measured by 90% program attendance. ▪ Average daily attendance. 	** ** ** ** ** ** 98%	** ** ** ** ** ** 88%	** ** ** ** ** ** 95%	** ** ** ** ** ** 96% * (N=72) 96% (N=18)	4.58 3.86 3.83 4.00 4.07 98% 98% (N=125)	4 4 4 4 4 4 80% 80%	4.70 4.0 3.79 4.0 4.12 97% 97% (N=117)

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level.	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=75)	100% (N=127)	80%	100%
▪ Percentage of students absent less than 15 days during the academic year.	100%	99%	99%	100% (N=75)	98% (N=125)	90%	100%
▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=75)	100% (N=127)	90%	100%

* New performance measure for FY11.

** New performance measure for FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

BPTC met or exceeded all performance measure targets for the fiscal year.

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 them develop specific skills to refuse and avoid gateway drug use.

Target Population: Fifth grade students in Anne Arundel County Public Schools selected by teacher assessment of a need to increase protective and resiliency factors, and by subsequent parent approval.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$39,957

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of students enrolled.	1,325	1,727	1,876	3,032	1,396	900	1,800
▪ Number of students who participated in the pre- and post-test evaluation.	***	***	***	3,032	1,333	720	1,567
▪ Number of take home lessons for which materials were furnished.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed all four take-home lessons.	100% (n=1,325)	100% (n=1,727)	100% (n=1,876)	100% (N=3,032)	80% (N=1,067)	80%	93% (N=1,682)
▪ Percentage of students who completed the pre- and post-test evaluation.	****	****	****	100% (N=3,032)	95% (N=1,272)	80%	88% (N=1,567)
▪ Percentage of teachers orientated to the program who voluntarily administered the KACM curriculum.	****	****	****	71% (N=85)	84% (N=1,120)	80%	100% (N=81)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percentage of students who reported increased knowledge and awareness of ATOD as assessed by a post-test at completion of program.	91% (n=1,095)	97% (n=1,675)	***	98.2% (N=2,978)	76.8% (N=1,024)	80%	98% (N=1,532)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of parents who participate in the parent-child take home KACM drug education program, as measured by the completion of the lessons. 	****	****	****	86.4% (N=2,619)	75.6% (N=1,008)	80%	100% (N=1,160)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of parents who report that the KACM program would have a "Significant Impact" on reducing the likelihood that their child would use ATOD. 	**	**	**	**	83.8% (N=845)	80%	95% (N=391)

** New measure in FY12

*** Data not received from Evaluator.

****New measure in FY11.

What's the story behind the performance?

KACM met or exceeded all performance measure targets for the fiscal year.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$20,097

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of education, awareness, or outreach events held. 	19	14	32	31	21	10	29
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people who attended education, awareness and/or outreach events. 	5606	5430	4479	5169	7163	3000	6460
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of retail alcohol establishments monitored by AACo Police Department for selling alcohol to underage youth. 	160	120	**	**	**	**	**
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of monthly meetings facilitated by Community Mobilization organizer. 	12	12	12	12	12	12	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. 	83% (n=27)	18% (N=22)	**	**	**	**	**
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percentage of CMCA Core Strategy Team members attending monthly CMCA meetings. 	10	10	13	10	64% (N=12)	50% (N=10)	64% (N=12)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percentage of new community partners participating 	3	5	3	2	25%	25%	15%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> on the Core Strategy Team during current fiscal year. # and % of outreach event participants completing the exit survey 	*	*	*	*	(N=5) 90% (N=2,921)	(N=5) 80% (N=2400)	(N=3) 70% (N=4531)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percentage of event participants who self-reported an increased knowledge and awareness of ATOD after attending an event as 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)	100% (N=4,242)	80%	100% (N=4531)
	***	***	***	5%	5%	5%	5%
	*	*	*	*	100% (N=4,242)	80%	100% (N=4531)

* New measure in FY12

**Compliance checks funded by GOCCP beginning in 2010.

***New measure in FY11.

What's the story behind the performance?

CMCA continues to have a significant impact on under-age drinking and substance abuse in our community and met or exceeded most targets. While the percentage of participants completing an exit survey was lower than the target, the total number of participants and the number of those completing surveys were well in excess of set targets. In addition, while new community partners were recruited this year, not all new members had ideal attendance – an issue that will continue to be addressed by staff and the coalition in the coming fiscal year.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$115,914

Performance Measures	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants served. Number of hours a week students will be facilitated in participating in a 	65	64	48	25	47	24	34
	5	8	5	7.5	8	5	8

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
research-based prevention curriculum.							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of locations served. ▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.***** 	2 ***	2 ***	2 ***	2	2 2	2 1	2 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 	*** *** *** *** *** *** 65% 100% 50% **** *** ***	*** *** *** *** *** *** 85% 100%* 100% **** *** ***	*** *** *** *** *** *** 65% 100% 100% **** *** ***	*** *** *** *** *** *** 84% 100% 100% 72% *** ***	4.2 4.66 3.75 4 4.15 76% * * 88% 100% 100% (N=2)	4 4 4 4 4 75% * * 80% 100% (N=2) (N=2)	3.15 2.80 3.74 3.20 3.75 70% * * 70% 100% (N=2) (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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School attendance: ○ Grades (overall GPA) ○ School behavior** 	79%	81%	75%	84%	81%	75%	76%
				(N=21)	(N=38)		(N=26)
	61%	94%	75%	84%	83%	75%	76%
				(N=21)	(N=39)		(N=26)
	53%	88%	80%	84%	85%	75%	70%
				(N=21)	(N=40)		(N=24)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants promoted to the next grade level. 	85%	94%	100%	100%	100%	90%	80%
				(N=25)	(N=47)		(N=27)

* Data no longer collected.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

** School behavior is included in the report card data.

***New Performance Measure for FY12.

**** New Performance Measure for FY11.

What's the story behind the performance?

YES continues to be a strong, well-performing program each year. While a couple of the percentage targets were not met, including attendance, the overall number of students exhibiting success in the program is higher than the established target. The program is over-enrolled due to the high levels of need in both locations in the County; however, these youth often face internal challenges or challenges within their family settings that can impact attendance and participation. The vendor does everything in its power to mitigate these issues (by working with parents, providing transportation, etc.) but can often not resolve them entirely. With respect to YPQA: as there are a different group of children participating each program year and there were some changes in program staff, the YPQA scores did decrease this year. However, all of these areas have been identified in their improvement plan and we expect an increase in scores for the coming fiscal year.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Community Conferencing

Program Summary: Community conferencing is a conflict transformation and community justice 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

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

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

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

FY13 Funding: \$31,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of participants diverted from Juvenile Services. ▪ Number of conferences. ▪ Number of additional conference participants engaged in process (above and beyond victim and offender). 				7 3 **	91 59 230	30 30 22	85 55 205
How Well We Do It:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who successfully completed sanctions within the time period allowed. ▪ Percentage of Community Conferences resulting in agreements. ▪ Percentage of consumers expressing satisfaction with services as measured by post-conference survey. 				100% (N=7) 100% (N=7) 100% (N=7)	100% (N=91) 98% (N=58) 98% (N=58)	90% 80% 80%	95% (N=81) 96% (N=82) 96% (N=106)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who did not recidivate within 12 months of successfully completing the program. ▪ Percentage of compliance with Community Conference agreements at 1 month from creation of agreement. ▪ Percentage of compliance with Community Conference agreements at 6 				N/A* 100% (N=7) N/A*	95% (N=56) 95% (N=56) 100%	90% 90% 80%	92% (N=87) 96% (N=165) 96%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
months from creation of the agreement.							(N=40)

* As the program did not commence until the second half of FY11, all 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.

What's the story behind the performance? Community Conferencing exceeded all targets for FY13.

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: This program will supply mentors to youth serving programs targeting the k-12 population at risk for delinquency

FY13 Funding: \$23,319

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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 					125 12 28	75 50 25	76 19 25
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. 					100% ** ** 75% (N=6)	90% 90% 90% 90%	100% (N=47) 95% (N=28) 100% 100% (N=53)
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 * 					** **	90% 90%	Not reported Not reported

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants promoted to the next grade level. 					**	90%	Not reported
					**	85%	100%

New program in FY12

* School behavior is included in the report card data.

**This data was not available at the conclusion of FY12 as the program didn't launch until January 2012 and the first matches were not made until March and April of 2012 which did not allow the measurement of longevity of matches nor comparative report card data.

What's the story behind the performance?

In its first full year of operation, the Treasure Hunter's Clearing House has built on the success developed in the latter half of FY12. They are continuing to recruit and retain quality mentors providing much needed assistance to youth in Annapolis. One of the major issues faced this year is an inability to get mentors to track requisite report card data from their matches over the course of the school year. The Partnership has met with the vendor to address this issue for FY14 and they will be required to implement a written action plan to ensure compliance for the 2013-2014 school/fiscal year.

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 adolescents ages 11-17 and children ages 6-10.

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

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

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) at risk for future substance use. 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.

FY13 Funding: \$45,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children (6 -11) participating in the program. Number of adolescents (12-18) participating in the program. Number of parents participating in the program. 				40 40 55	35 41 67	30 30 36	61 52 69
How Well We Do It							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of children graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units). Percentage of adolescents graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units). Percentage of parents graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units). Percentage of parents satisfied with the program on completion as measured by program survey. 				65% (N=26) 80% (N=32) 80% (N=44) 93%	80% (N=28) 66% (N=27) 81% (N=54) 100%	60% 60% 60% 60% 90%	66% (N=40) 71% (N=37) 65% (N=45) 91%

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

				(N=28)	(N=29)		(N=29)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Percentage of parents who report increased school attendance. ▪ Percentage of parents who report increased family communication. 				94% (N=30)	95% (N=42)	75%	84% (N=56)
				91% (N=29)	93% (N=41)	80%	90% (N=60)
				88% (N=28)	80% (N=35)	80%	94% (N=63)

New Program in FY11

What's the story behind the performance? The Strengthening Families program met or exceeded all performance measure targets.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: B'More for Healthy Babies Home Visiting Programs

Program Summary: This comprehensive strategy is designed to facilitate the development, expansion, or enhancement of the 11 high-impact services within the targeted high risk communities.² Funding supports the provision of home visiting services, one of these 11 high-impact services.

Target Population: Adults of parenting age and their infants residing in Baltimore City communities demonstrating high risk for poor birth outcomes. Women will be identified for services by their primary care physician using the prenatal risk assessment tool.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Healthy Families America (HFA) model of home visiting.

Explain How the Program Services the SB 882 Population: Services are targeted to families who are at high-risk of their pregnancies to result in poor birth outcomes. These risk factors are confirmed through the prenatal risk assessment screening tool employed by the primary care physician (PRA is completed by the OB/Gyn at the first prenatal care visit.). As a result of participating in the services, it is expected that infants are born healthy and families are connected to needed resources to support and nurture healthy early childhood development.

FY13 Funding: \$329,500 (CPA) +\$595,143 (MSDE) = \$924,643

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY 13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of communities taking part in the Strategy to Improve Birth Outcomes. • # of home visiting programs in operation (funded by CCIF). • Total # of home visiting programs in operation throughout the initiative. • # of persons participating in home visiting services (funded by CCIF). 	3 1 5 51	3 1 5 263†	3 1 5 198	2 1 5 205	2 1 5 231
How Well We Do It:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of first home visits that occur either prenatally or within the first 3 months after the birth of the baby. 				80%	48% 94/197

²The 11 high-impact services include primary care in a medical home; obstetric care; home visiting; drug and alcohol treatment; intervention for domestic violence; mental health care; smoking cessation; family planning; nutrition support; breastfeeding promotion; and, safe sleep education.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY 13 Actual
% of pregnant women at 36 weeks that had a prenatal visit within the last 4 weeks				75%	41% 7/17
• % of children who kept their last well-child visit				75%	44% 7/16
• % of participants enrolled in home visiting services prenatally.	98% (N=50)	95% 55 of 58	96% 99 of 103		
• % of pregnant participants who attend all prenatal care visits as scheduled (recorded and tracked in ETO).++	**	56 of 115 / 49%††	84% 82 of 98		
• % of enrolled infants who receive primary health care in a medical home (as recorded and tracked in ETO).++	**	193 / 100%†††	81% 50 of 62		
Is Anyone Better Off?					
• % of full-term births for participants enrolled prenatally.	95% / 43 of 45	92% / 36 of 39	74% 45 of 59	90%	90% 35/39
• % of babies born above 2,500 grams for participants enrolled prenatally.	89.1% / 41 of 46 births	86% / 36 of 42	79% 49 of 62	95%	87% 34/39
• Of HV households where the safe sleep checklist was used, % of households observed to have a safe sleep environment§				90%	90% 45/50
• % of home visiting clients using a contraceptive method in past 6 months				75%	58% 22/38
• % of participants enrolled prenatally who have an infant mortality rate lower than the rate for all Baltimore City families.	*	*	0% 0 of 59		

**This measure was not identified in FY2010.

++The initiative is using Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) to capture data relevant to program implementation. The evaluation will pull this data to determine whether the targets have been met for each participating program. Data is tracked for each enrolled client receiving home visiting services.

† This includes families that carried over from FY2010 – services are fluid across fiscal years for some participants.

†† There were continued challenges with data collection related to this measure – the evaluators are reworking the performance measures for FY2012.

††† The number reflects all children served by the program in FY 2011.

§ - it is standard practice to implement the safe sleep checklist in households with a baby between the ages of 0-6 months. The number of households will be provided when the data is analyzed.

Story Behind the Curve:

The State of Maryland’s decision to align with the federal benchmarks for home visiting programs has required a major revision of the data collection methods, tools, and strategies for FY13. The data quality issues after a transition of this magnitude are expected – the evaluation team is engaged and assisting with troubleshooting efforts.

% of first home visits that occur either prenatally or within the first 3 months after the birth of the baby

% of pregnant women at 36 weeks that had a prenatal visit within the last 4 weeks

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

% of children who kept their last well-child visit: .

The data quality issues described during the semi-annual report continue to hamper our ability to extract reliable data from the web-based system. We do not believe these measures are indicative of service delivery. The Family League has received additional funding to enlist the support of evaluation consultants to pinpoint the issues and make corrections in data collection tools and practices so that the data is complete.

% of full-term births for participants enrolled prenatally

% of babies born above 2,500 grams for participants enrolled prenatally:

Births to women enrolled prenatally achieved the targeted measure of 90% (35 of 39) – this demonstrates a significant improvement over past years. While the % of babies born at a healthy birth weight did not meet the target of 95%, 34 of the 39 births were above 2,500 grams. This represents 88% of the births to women enrolled prenatally. The program has succeeded in their efforts to enroll women prenatally. However, maternal health and associated risk factors are always in play, regardless of the point of enrollment.

% of home visiting clients using a contraceptive method in past 6 months: the efforts of home visitors to ramp up their efforts to provide education and information regarding birth control options have had a positive impact – the percentage of women using contraceptive methods has risen since the semi-annual report period; however, this remains to be a personal choice.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Out-of-School Time (OST) 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 in school.

Target Population: Baltimore City youth in grades K-8. 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. In FY 13, the following programs have been selected for funding:

Program	Primary School	Primary Neighborhood(s)
Baltimore Curriculum Project, Inc.	Wolfe Street Academy	Upper Fells Point
Child First Authority, Inc.	Barclay Elementary School	Barclay
Child First Authority, Inc.	Bay Brook Elementary School	Brooklyn
Child First Authority, Inc.	Calvin Rodwell Elementary School	Howard Park
Child First Authority, Inc.	City Springs Elementary School	Washington Hill
Child First Authority, Inc.	Furman Templeton Elementary School	Upton
Child First Authority, Inc.	Guilford Elementary School	Guilford
Child First Authority, Inc.	Hilton Elementary School	Hanlon-Longwood
Child First Authority, Inc.	John Eager Howard Elementary School	Reservoir Hill
Child First Authority, Inc.	Liberty Elementary School	Central Forest Park
Child First Authority, Inc.	Westside Elementary School	Barclay

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: OST programs adhere to quality youth development principals, as measured through the validated Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) tool. Programs with 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.

FY13 Funding: \$1,212,208 (CPA) + \$4,527,483 (City of Baltimore) = \$5,739,691

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics Training			11	8	10	11
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.			11	8	11	11
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.				8	11	11
# of youth served.	995	1,178	969	978	1,100	1,714
# of meals served.			83,433	107,541	101,000	140,934
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily Attendance (ADA%) (ADA in the programs / number of youth programs are contracted to serve).	90.8%	109%	97.1%	104%	90%	99.13% 1,699/1,714
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			11/100%	8 of 8 100%	11 of 11 100%	11 of 11 100%
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.74	4.83	4.42	4.38
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			4.01	4.21	3.84	3.98
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			3.04	3.66	3.01	3.99
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			2.25	2.80	2.56	3.31
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site ³						
BCP, Wolfe Street			3.98	3.74	3.75	4.11
CFA, Barclay			4.06	3.86	3.75	3.85
CFA, Bay Brook			3.59	4.07	3.75	3.36
CFA, Calvin Rodwell			3.07	4.26	3.75	4.39
CFA, City Springs			2.61	4.38	3.75	4.56
CFA, Furman Templeton			3.96	4.18	3.75	3.75
CFA, Guilford,			3.64	3.37	3.75	3.86
CFA, Hilton				3.23	3.75	4.12
CFA, John Eager Howard					3.75	3.21
CFA, Liberty					3.75	3.59
CFA, Westside					3.75	3.89
YPQA Instructional Score as measured by external assessment (Average of Supportive Environment, Opportunities for Interaction, and Engagement)					3.0	3.76
% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.				8 of 8 100%	11 of 11 100%	6 of 11 55%

³ The programs selected for funding may change from year to year – the actual data for FY 11 and FY 12 is not representative of the FY 13 programs listed in this table.

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
# / % of programs that meet target for YPQA Instructional Score			2/5 (40%)	6/8 (66.7%)		
# OST staff who participate in base Professional Development (minimum 16 hours)				242	200	220
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of students who are regular attenders (not chronically absent) ⁴ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary • Middle School 			91.0% 85.1%	NA – data available at end of SY11-12	90% 85%	Data will be available by 10/31/13
% of youth who are high attenders ⁵ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary • Middle School 			NA ⁶ NA	NA - data available at end of SY11-12	30% 35%	Data will be available by 10/31/13
Youth have increased attitudes and assets (as measured on OST Surveys): <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%	92.5% 317 of 401 total responses 90.7% 362 of 399 89.5% 357 of 399 76.9% 310 of 403 88.1% 356 of 404 86.7% 359 of 414	90% 90% 85% 75% 85% 85%	86% 52 of 56 80% 45 of 56 75% 43 of 57 46% 26 of 57 82% 47 of 57 77% 43 of 56

*Actual data from 7/1/10-6/30/11 is preferred. If this data is not yet available, the actual data from 7/1-12/31/10 as reported in the FY11 Semi-Annual Report is acceptable. Please note for which time period the data is provided.

Note for FY 12 data:

The data for the two FY12 attendance measures has been released by BCPS to the Baltimore Education Research Consortium (BERC); however the analysis is still in process. The analysis is expected to be completed in late February/mid-March.

⁴ Youth are chronically absent if they miss 20 or more days of school during the school year.

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

⁶ Not Available – High Attender data is not available from Baltimore City Schools yet. Data will be reported when it is available.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Story Behind the Curve:

The out of school time providers taking part in the Family League’s Community and School Engagement (CSE) initiative continue to demonstrate strong performance. They are extremely successful in engaging and retaining youth – the Average Daily Attendance for these programs is 99.13%, well above the target measure of 90%. Strong quality is also demonstrated in the scores presented through the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA).

% of programs/sites with completed YPOA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan

In FY 14, the Family League will launch a Quality Improvement Team (QIT) cohort, where QI leads from the programs will meet quarterly with the Family League to ensure quality implementation of the YPQA. We expect this refined focus on program improvement will resolve the issues of lower than expected submissions of program improvement plans.

Youth have increased attitudes and assets (as measured on OST Surveys):

The Family League will administer the surveys much earlier in the programming year (most likely during 2nd or 3rd quarter) in an attempt to increase the number of surveys returned overall. This will also provide a vehicle to include youth voice in the ongoing oversight and quality improvement strategies that occur during the year.

With respect to the lower than expected youth attitudes and assets as measured by the OST surveys, the Family League will be offering additional trainings on the virtues, interactions between staff and youth, and creating a positive climate as part of our professional development support in FY 14.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Youth Services 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.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: 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.

FY13 Funding: \$201,733 (GOC CPA); \$39,776 (BPD)

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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	264	70	63
▪ Family*	62	86	85	172	0	18	20
▪ Group*	534	293	0	114	0	20	35
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ Individual*	143	60	67	149	195	0	0
▪ Family*	45	30	0	20	0	0	0
▪ Group*	6	0	0	0	0	60	146
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	347	493	151	76	41	70	63
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	20	12	11	35	33	30	12
# of formal counseling cases using a Best Practice/EBP model					7% 37 of 264	70	63
# of individuals referred/linked to community based services.					77	35	16
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%	184/70%	100%	95% 60 of 63
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	66%	74%	83%	174/83%	211/80%	70%	100%
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	92%	86%	100%	5/100%	6/100%	100%	100% N=3
% of formal case client surveys which the sum of the responses for the required three questions will equal 9 or higher.					No Data Availabl e		
# of individuals who attended the first appointment after referral.					No Data Availabl e	70% (24 of 35)	63% (10 of 16)
% of YSB staff trained in the implementation of the CAFAS						100%	100% N=3
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%	99%	271/80%	211/ 80%	70%	95% N=59

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					20/ 54%	57%	12 of 18 ⁷ 67%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					23/62%	65%	0 0%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					17/45%	48%	12 of 18 67%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					9/24%	27%	12 of 18 67%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					20/54%	57%	12 of 18 67%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					8/21%	24%	12 of 18 67%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					9/ 24%	27%	0 0%
					32/86%		
# and % youth who reduce identified behavior problems (showed improvement) by one or more levels listed above.						89%	12 of 18 67%
# and % of individuals who successfully completed linked services.					6/15%	18%	N=0 0%

*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.

**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.

What's the story behind the performance?

Total # of youth engaged in formal counseling: Engaging youth at the high school setting (Patterson Park High) continues to be a challenge – the staff of the YSB maintain a strong presence in the school and community and continue to promote the availability of the program to youth and their families.

Is Anyone Better Off: The data presented in the quarterly report is not in alignment with what has been extracted from the CAFAS FAS Outcomes system. The data collection strategies are implemented within individual case records/files – the Family League will be providing technical assistance in FY 14 to develop tools and processes that enable the program to more efficiently collect, analyze, and report data across the continuum of services. We have requested that the vendor run reports within the FAS Outcomes system so that we are in alignment with the mid-year data; when that becomes available, we will update the year end report.

⁷ Data in this performance measure has been generated from CAFAS Aggregate reports generated from the Functional Assessment Systems (FASOutcomes System). This is a data measure that can be verified through CAFAS FAS Outcomes System Reports.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Community Based Linkages: The program has not developed a comprehensive tracking system for referrals; this will be included in the technical assistance provided in FY 14.

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: 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.

FY13 Funding: \$201,733 (GOC CPA); \$39,776 (BPD)

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY 13 Target	FY13 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	109	62	75
▪ Family*	62	86	0	44	2	0	0
▪ Group*	534	293	204	323	175	60	90
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	143	60	0	0	17	0	0
▪ Family*	45	30	28	0	18	8	9
▪ Group*	6	0	609	0	102	100	132
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.					109	62	79
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	347	493	204	172	0	31	18
# of formal counseling cases using a Best Practice/EBP model					33% 36 of 109	62	75
# of individuals referred/linked to community based services.					3	31	1
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%	109/100%	100%	100% N=75
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	66%	74%	88%	21/100%	90/ 83%	88%	98%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY 13 Target	FY13 Actual
							N=63/64
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	92%	86%	100%	100%do you mean 6%?	4/100%	100%	100% N=4
% of formal case client surveys which the sum of the responses for the required three questions will equal 9 or higher.							
# of individuals who attended the first appointment after referral					64 of 109 58%	15 (50% of 31)	0% N=0
% of YSB staff trained in the implementation of the CAFAS						100%	100% 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.	499/93%	550/97%	100%	0/100%	109/ 100%	88%	100% N=75
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					No Data Available	30	90% 57/64
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					32 of 36 88%	91	97% 62/64
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					7 of 36 19%	22	94% 60/64
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					2 of 36 5%	8	92% 59/64
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					23 of 36 63%	66	94% 60/64
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					20 of 36 55%	58	90% 57/64
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					4 of 36 11%	15	92% 59/64
# and % youth who reduce identified behavior problems (showed improvement) by one or more levels listed above.					36 of 36 100%	80	90% 57/64
# of individuals who successfully completed linked services					No Data Available	15 (50% of 31)	0

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

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ # of in-person contact hours of direct serve provided?						3,840	2,391
▪ # of monthly participant activities provided to develop social skills of the participants						12	21
How Well We Do It:							
▪ % of community shootings that receive responses						100%	N=2 100%
▪ % of participant attendance of social skill activities						75%	Data not Available
% of participants who have signed Risk Reduction Plans						100%	N=86 100%
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ % reduction in non-fatal shooting from the prior year						10%	67% N=2 (FY13) reduced from N of 6 in FY 12
▪ % increase in homicides from prior year						0%	100% N=2 (FY13) up from N of 1 in FY 12
▪ % of youth not involved in crime during their year of participation						80%	N=48 80%

of in-person contact hours of direct serve provided: A full team of four was not in place until April, 2013.

% of participant attendance of social skill activities: Plans to collect this data were not implemented.

% increase in homicides from prior year: The community experienced 2 fatal shootings in FY 13 as compared to 1 fatal shooting in FY 12.

% of youth not involved in crime during their year of participation: this data point is not collected consistently across funded sites and is not a part of the overall evaluation strategy. Data presented at the semi-annual report was drawn from individual contact notes maintained by case managers. Since this wasn't done consistently (nor is this a standard question posed to each participant), it is not a reliable data point. Updated data for the second half of the year is not available.

LMB: Baltimore County

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Program Summary: 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.

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. Additionally, Lighthouse will continue to use the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS) to measure client progress achieved through counseling.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Lighthouse 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.

FY13 Funding: \$91,101.50

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	104	121	122	131	80	103
▪ Individual*	62	62	96	131	80	103
▪ Family*	89	115	116	124	80	96
▪ Group*	28	33	74	49	50	41
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	**	**	**	115	32	124
▪ Individual*	0	62	60	115	15	72
▪ Family*	41	25	58	26	15	45
▪ Group*	1	3	3	2	2	7
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	140	98	116	124	80	109
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	2	0	1	0	0	0
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services***	**	**	**	99	100	429
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% (n=122)	100% (n=131)	100%	100% (n=103)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	80%	77%	85% (n=103)	83% (n=108)	65%	90% (n=65)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100% (n=6)	100% (n=6)	100%	100% (n=6)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in TF-CBT***	**	**	**	100% (n=6)	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.	98%	99%	100% (n=186)	100% (n=131)	95%	98% (n=94)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.***	**	**	**	84% (n=46/55)	75%	71% (n=30/42)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.***	**	**	**	89% (n=34/38)	75%	84% (n=16/19)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.***	**	**	**	82% (n=33/40)	75%	81% (n=26/32)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.***	**	**	**	100% (n=1/1)	65%	NA
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.***	**	**	**	87% (n=33/38)	65%	59% (n=23/32)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.***	**	**	**	90% (n=46/51)	65%	72% (n=23/32)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.***	**	**	**	100% (n=2/2)	65%	100% (n=3/3)
➤ % of parents/caregivers reporting improvement in their child's behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.***	**	**	**	96% (n=43)	75%	85% (n=55/65)

*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.

***New performance measures established for FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

The CAFAS sub-scale scores were set up as a way to determine trends in quality of service delivery. For example, repeated lower percentages of improvement on a specific sub-scale performance measure might indicate the need to improve therapists training in that particular area. The sub-scale numbers listed here need to be tracked for a longer period of time to confirm any supposition.

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. Additionally, DYSC will continue to use the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS) to measure client progress achieved through counseling.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: DYSC 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.

FY13 Funding: \$108,183

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	94	104	85	73	95	48
▪ Individual*	94	104	85	73	95	48
▪ Family*	94	104	85	73	95	48
▪ Group*	0	6	0	0	0	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	**	**	**	8	38	9
▪ Individual*	47	53	22	8	28	9
▪ Family*	47	53	22	8	28	9
▪ Group*	0	0	213	0	10	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	141	157	107	81	117	48
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	0	3	0	0	1	0
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services.***				742	735	743
How Well We Do It:						
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	98%	100%	100% (n=85)	99% (n=72)	100%	100% (n=48)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	89%	93%	84% (n=49)	53% (n=26)	60%	40% (8/20)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100% (n=6)	100% (n=7)	100%	100% (n= 6)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in TF-CBT***				71% (n=4)	100%	80% (4/5)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	96%	100%	99% (n=84)	100% (n=73)	98%	100% (48/48)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.***				68% (n=32/47)	60%	90% (18/20)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.***				70% (n=23/33)	50%	64% (9/14)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.***				79% (n=26/33)	50%	69% (9/13)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.***				91% (n=10/11)	30%	NA
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.***				67% (n=26/39)	50%	50% (7/14)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or				71%	50%	63%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.***				(n=27/38)		(10/16)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.***				86% (n=6/7)	50%	100% (7/7)
➤ % of parents reporting improvement in their child's behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.***				**	75%	100% (2/2)

*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.

***New performance measure for FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

The number of formal counseling cases served by DYSC in FY13 was 48 compared to a target of 95. DYSC formal counseling numbers began to drop last year and that trend continued for FY13. One major reason for this fall may be that Catholic Charities opened a mental health clinic one block from DYSC in FY12, and Catholic Charities has actively pursued formal agreements with local schools for mental health referrals. DYSC has begun conducting outreach efforts with all the local school administrators, as well as local youth-serving agencies.

The CAFAS sub-scale scores were set up as a way to determine trends in quality of service delivery. For example, repeated lower percentages of improvement on a specific sub-scale performance measure might indicate the need to improve therapists training in that particular area. The sub-scale numbers listed here need to be tracked for a longer period of time to confirm any supposition.

LMB: Baltimore County

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

Program Summary: 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. Additionally, First Step will continue to use the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS) to measure client progress achieved through counseling.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: First Step 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.

FY13 Funding: \$85,407.50

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	66	89	85	100	80	135
▪ Individual*	66	89	85	100	80	135
▪ Family*	66	82	85	100	80	108
▪ Group*	0	0	0	0	0	53

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	**	**	**	38	20	44
▪ Individual*	31	22	23	38	20	44
▪ Family*	16	20	23	38	20	25
▪ Group*	0	0	0	0	0	10
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	97	89	0	100	80	135
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.		49	65	8	20	57
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services.***				362	200	265
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% (n=85)	100% (n=100)	100%	100% (n=135/135)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	75%	80%	86% (n=73)	86% (n=24/28)	80%	82% (n=53/64)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100% (n=10)	100% (n=8)	100%	100% (n=9/9)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in completing the CAFAS assessment.***				100% (n=8)	100%	100% (n=9/9)
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%	100%	100% (n=85)	100% (n=80)	100%	100% (n=64/64)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater. ***				71% (n=20/28)	80%	73% (n=47/64)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.***				53% (n=9/17)	80%	69% (n=25/36)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.***				63% (n=10/16)	80%	61% (n=19/31)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.***				100% (n=2/2)	80%	89% (n=17/19)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.***				58% (n=11/19)	80%	60% (n=14/23)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.***				73% (n=11/15)	80%	67% (n=24/36)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.***				67% (n=2/3)	80%	94% (n=33/35)
➤ % of parents reporting improvement in their child's behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.***				**	75%	82% (n=60/73)

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

**Data not available for this fiscal year.

***New performance measure for FY12.

What’s the story behind the performance?

The CAFAS sub-scale scores were set up as a way to determine trends in quality of service delivery. For example, repeated lower percentages of improvement on a specific sub-scale performance measure might indicate the need to improve therapists training in that particular area. The sub-scale numbers listed here need to be tracked for a longer period of time to confirm any supposition.

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.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$369,660 (\$20,713.00 CCIF + \$348,947.00 Earned Reinvestment/Fund Swap)

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of youth/families served.	89	76	83	92	95	81*
▪ Number of youth/family slots available at any one time.	**	**	35	36	32***	32
▪ Average duration of services (in days) for youth/families receiving FFT.	**	**	136	170	150****	176
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth/families who complete the intervention and are discharged from the program by mutual agreement.	65%	81% (n=59)	67% (n=31)	73% (n=70)	70%*****	76% (n=38)
▪ Minimum average dissemination adherence score required for an FFT team to be considered adherent to the model.*****				5.62	4	5.52
▪ Minimum average fidelity score required for an FFT team to be considered adherent to the model.*****				4.03	3	3.48
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)	98% (n=49)	90%	97% (n=31)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians reporting improvement in their parenting skills, as indicated by a score of 3 or higher on the COM-P.	**	**	100% (n=28)	98% (n=49)	90%	97% (n=31)
▪ 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)	86% (n=42) (note: 7 families declined)	80%	80% (n=28) 3 families declined YOQ

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

				assessments)	
--	--	--	--	--------------	--

**Data not available for this fiscal year.

***32 chosen is expected average (27 slots in 1st q, 32 in 2nd and 35 in 3rd and 4th – due to new therapist training and case build-up); 4th quarter only had 27 slots available due to a staff ‘s medical leave, then vacancy; therefore, slots remained below the funded capacity of 36.

****FFT model service duration is 120-150 days, so chosen target is 150 due to new therapist’s learning curve; due to several staff medical absences/vacancies, length of service increased as result of families waiting for their therapist to return from FMLA leave or being transferred to another therapist.

*****Percentage down as new therapist learns model.

NOTE: 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

What’s the story behind the performance?

The number of youth/families served by the program was 81 as compared to a 95 target. The shortfall in number served was caused by 2 staff vacancies. One vacancy has been filled and the other is in the process of being filled.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Local Access Plan (Family Navigation)

Program Summary: The Family Navigators assess the specific needs of families with children with intensive needs, and work to link those families with appropriate service providers, such as the regional CME. In addition, the Navigators conduct ongoing family support groups at a variety of sites around the County, as well as parent education workshops through the Family Resource Academy.

Target Population: Families with children with intensive needs related to a mental health or developmental disability-related issue.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: The Family Navigation service is a major element of the County’s System of Care Initiative.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Family Navigators assist families with children and youth at risk for developing chronic emotional and mental health issues that may lead to entry into or further penetration of the health, social service, and/or law enforcement-juvenile service systems.

FY13 Funding: \$131,903

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of families referred to a Family Navigator.	159	166	215	222	225	265
▪ Number of families served by a Navigator.	1	166	232	356	235	417
▪ Average number of referrals per family.	5	5	4	3.7	4	3 ^A
▪ Number of families with a completed family plan.	1	6	24	48	35	28 ^B
▪ Number of contacts with families through meetings, telephone or e-mails.**				535	450	681
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Average or median number of business days between referral and first person-to-person contact by Navigator.	2	1	1	1	1	1
▪ Number of completed CANS assessments used in developing a Family Plan.	1	4	10	39	35	26 ^C
Percent of families satisfied or higher with Navigation services (by subscale/question). Indicate number of surveys returned (N).						
▪ Respectful of family.						
▪ Concerned with the well being of family.	100%	91%/N=39	97%/N=85	99%/N=58	95%	97%/N=65
▪ Assisted in identifying both family strengths and needs.	100%	91%/N=39	98%/N=85	100%/N=60	95%	96%/N=64

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assisted family in setting its own goals. ▪ Effective in identifying services appropriate to meet family goals. 	100%	76%/N=28	95%/N=69	97%/N=49	92%	97%/N=60
	100%	79%/N=33	89%/N=62	97%/N=47	92%	97%/N=60
	100%	90%/N=36	92%/N=70	99%/N=60	95%	97%/N=63
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families reporting they understood how to contact the suggested agencies/organizations. 	100%	86%/N=34	92%/N=69	100%/N=56	95%	97%/N=65
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families who report success in contacting suggested agencies/organizations. 	100%	76%/N=32	89%/N=65	96%/N=47	88%	95%/N=61
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families who report success in receiving needed services or supports. 	100%	62%/N=26	76%/N=59	92%/N=45	80%	93%/N=55
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families reporting an increase in their ability to advocate for the needs of their child(ren) after receiving Navigation services. 	100%	83%/N=35	82%/N=64	97%/N=48	88%	97%/N=64
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families reporting a decrease in stress after receiving assistance from Navigation services. 	100%	83%/N=35	77%/N=64	97%/N=51	88%	96%/N=61
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families reporting that it was helpful to have a Family Navigator who was also the parent of a child with intensive needs. 	*	100%/N=39	92%/N=77	98%/N=61	93%	94%/N=58

*Data not available for this fiscal year.

**New performance measure for FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

All of the performance measures exceeded the targets set for the year with the exception of three:

^A Average number of referrals per family – Navigators have been receiving a higher number of referrals for direct funding assistance, as well as requests for financial assistance for basic needs, including food and energy, which do not fit the criteria for Navigator services as these families do not have a child with a developmental and/or mental health disability. Navigators attempt to help everyone that they can, but the average number of referrals for these families is smaller than those who meet the criteria. In the coming year, Navigators will continue to inform and remind the referral sources of the purpose and criteria for the program.

^B Number of families with a completed family plan – See below.

^C Number of completed CANS Assessments used in developing a family plan – See Below

During FY 13 there were fewer families who needed CANS assessments and written Family Plans than were projected for the year. This is strictly a function of the intensity of needs of the families who are referred to the Program and can be difficult to project. Referral sources are aware that the navigators are available for information and referral in addition to more intensive planning and assessment services. Navigators will continue in FY 14 to make referral sources aware that the navigators are available for these more intensive services.

LMB: Calvert County Family Network

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau (YSB)

Program Summary: The YSB provides delinquency prevention and youth development services to youth up to age 18 and their families in Calvert County. A Youth Development Interventionist provides counseling to individuals, conducts anger management and social skills groups, addresses truancy, school dropout, and youth crime. Youth development programs focus on asset development and strengthening families.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: Children in Need of Supervision (CINS) and their families living in North Beach, Chesapeake Beach, Owings, Sunderland, Dunkirk, Breezy Point, Plum Point, Huntingtown, Prince Fredrick, Hallowing Point, Brooms Island, St. Leonard, Calvert Beach, White Sands, Lusby, and Solomons in Calvert County, Maryland

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: The YSB utilizes Second Step and Cognitive Behavioral Therapy & Reconnecting Youth Curriculum.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The YSB 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 YSB 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.

F13 Funding: \$53,256 + \$19,00 County = \$72,256

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	29	40	67	36	48	73
▪ Family*	49	24	32	17	16	49
▪ Group*	7	36	11	124	55	93
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual*	41	40	11	55	55	85
▪ Family*	97	14	18	20	10	39
▪ Group*	88	233	359	198	150	154
Total# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.						
▪ Total# of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	27	14	63	58	25	74
# of formal counseling cases receiving information on community based services where appropriate.	1	4	43	51	35	142
# of formal counseling cases where referral was made to additional community based services.				40	24	86
Number of youth in Formal Counseling that are Second Step participants				35	24	30
Number of Youth in Formal Counseling Receiving Reconnecting Youth Curriculum					24	33
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%	83% N=83	100% N=110	100% N=177	85%	100% N=215
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	100%	68% N=68	88% N=97	100%	85%	94% N=69
% of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100% N=40	100% N=35	100%	85%	100% N=45
% of calls seeking information and referrals that are returned within 48 business hours.				100%	85%	86% N=384
% of youth (Formal) who complete the Second Step Curriculum.				100%	80%	95%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
				N=35		N=28
% of Youth (Formal) who complete the Reconnecting Youth Curriculum					80%	88% N=29
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%	82% N=82	85% N=94	100% N=36	60%	100% N=73
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.				100%	70%	100% N=73
# 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 Behavior Impairment.				81%	60%	100% N=158
# 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”).				83%	60%	85% N=134
# and % of youth who were identified as being Pervasively Behaviorally Impaired (PBI) at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment.				83%	60%	85% N=134
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on each of the eight CAFAS subscales.				86%	60%	85% N=73
# 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.				86%	60%	85% N=62
# and % of formal cases that followed up with referred service(s) as measured by letter or phone call to family at 3 months post-discharge						85% N=62
# and % of Reconnecting Youth graduates that do not recidivate within 90 days of program completion.					80%	100% N=33
# and % of Second Step Graduates that do not recidivate within 90 days of program completion.				100% N=35	80%	100% N=30

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.

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$58,529

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of public awareness venues.	7	7	7	9	15	7	10
▪ # of community workshops.*	45	122	55	31	11	10	14
▪ # of professional workshops.	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
▪ # of student workshops.**	0	0	89	132	129	50	251
How Well We Do It (all from pre-post survey):							
▪ # / % of professionals satisfied with the workshops.				27/100%	24/100%	#/75%	100% (N=26)
▪ # / % of students satisfied with the workshops.				3006/99%	2482/98%	#/75%	99.5% (N=2905)
▪ #/ % of community attendees satisfied with workshops.					119/99%	#/75%	99.5% (N=65)
▪ #/% of participants that report being more confident to apply the information learned in real life situations.					2572/98%	#/75%	99% (N=2991)
▪ #/% of students that report they have more knowledge on sexting.					483/96%	#/75%	99% (N=535)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ # /% of students with any improved scores on the knowledge survey (taken at end of classroom workshops).				3006/98%	2482/98%	#/90%	99% (N=2936)
▪ # / % of students with any improved scores on the attitude survey (taken at end of classroom workshops).				2747/96%	2482/97%	#80%	99% (N=2936)
▪ #/% of participants who report on the workshop survey they have more knowledge of current issues facing at-risk youth.					563/98%	#75%	99.5% (N=472)
▪ #/% of youth who report on the workshop survey*** using contraceptive methods.					393/99%	#/50%	100% (N=768)

*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 vendor tried numerous ways to get this component operational and met with no success. The student workshop or class presentation was added to capture the work being done in the schools.

***Survey given pre- and post-workshop.

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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 to this program by self referral, 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 drug and alcohol use or elimination of 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.

FY13 Funding: \$26,474

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of students (total unduplicated) receiving services.	123	144	60	96	65	70	49#
▪ Number of sessions.				551	237	200	315
▪ Number of prevention presentations.	9	10	8	4	11	10	22
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%	42/65%	#/60%	47%## (N=23)
▪ #/% of participants satisfied with quality of services as measured by survey given at end of program.	123/100%	144/100%	105/100%	11/73%	0/0%	#/75%	100% (N=3)
▪ #/% of participants who complete Teen Intervene as planned.				10/71%	0/0%	#/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%	65/100%	#/90%	100% (N=49)
▪ #/% participants not receiving alcohol related school suspension.					65/100%	#/85%	100% (N=49)
▪ # /% of participants not referred to DJS for drug use while in treatment.	15/12%	1/99%	59/98%	21/100%	65/100%	#/85%	100% (N=49)
▪ #/% of participants not referred to DJS for alcohol use while in treatment.					65/100%	#/85%	100% (N=49)
▪ #/% of participants demonstrating any increase on GAF between intake and discharge.	60%	19%	57/62%	11/73%	15/83%	#/60%	100% (N=3)

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

**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). It is a public domain instrument and may be used without permission.

Space continued to be a problem at North Caroline High School, the problem has been remedied for FY14 by one teacher allowing space in her classroom when there are no classes. The target will be lowered in FY14 to accommodate the state requirement of the number of students that may be treated by a counselor at one time.

treatment has just begun for several clients so none of them have completed more than 5 sessions, engaged in the full process of Teen Intervene or completed the satisfaction survey.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$25,468

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of students served (unduplicated total):							
▪ Lockerman	67	66	67	51	61	50	60
▪ Greensboro*				47	46		
▪ # of non-billable points of service:							
▪ Lockerman	1141	1,045	1377	649	1108	900	939
▪ Greensboro*				1188	995		
▪ # of billable points of service:							
▪ Lockerman	1,271	1,461	1763	751	1251	800	989
▪ Greensboro*				367	595		
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%	33/70%	#/75%	57%^ (N=29.3)
▪ Greensboro*				23/52%	33/72%		
▪ #/% of students who are satisfied with services on the annual consumer satisfactory survey:							
▪ Lockerman				7/86%	23/100%	#/50%	95% (N=18)

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

▪ Greensboro*				None received	5/100%		
▪ #/% of participants who have successfully achieved at least one of their short term goals identified in their plan at 6 month review.							60% (N=35)
▪ Lockerman					0/0%	#/50%	
▪ Greensboro					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:**							97.6% (N=31)
▪ Lockerman	64/96%	59/90%	98%	5/33%	23/93%	#/75%	
▪ Greensboro*				10/43%	22/67%		
▪ #/% of students attending 6 sessions who have no more than three office referrals while in the program:							94.3% (N=31)
▪ Lockerman				12/80%	31/950%	#/75%	
▪ Greensboro*				22/96%	33/100%		
▪ #/% of students who report the program has helped them better understand behavioral health on survey given at end of program							84% (N=16)
▪ Lockerman					21/92%	#/50%	
▪ Greensboro*					5/100%		
▪ #/% of students who indicate on annual consumer survey that their mental health has improved.							84% (N=16)
▪ Lockerman					21/92%	#/70%	
▪ Greensboro*					5/100%		

*Greensboro Elementary was added in the 3rd qtr. of FY11 through FY12. This site is not funded in FY13.

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

^ lower % due to caseload and scheduling, only students who attend 6 sessions are the ones who really need it.

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$33,630

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of mentor relationships (youth/mentor).	19	26	21	19	21	20	20/24
▪ # of mentor trainings.	4	3	4	1	4	4	4
▪ # of group activities.	4	6	6	3	10	5	10
How Well We Do It:							
▪ #/% of mentors who spend at least 8 hours per month mentoring their mentee.	95%	100%	(18) 95%	19/95%	19/91%	#90%	95% (N=19)
▪ #/% of mentor relationships that remains intact for six months.				17/95%	21/100%	#/75%	100% (N=24)
▪ #/% of Mentors/Mentees who attend group events.**					15/70%	#/80%	54%# (N=11)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ #/% of mentees who show improvement in overall GPA (from first marking period to last for the school year).*	50% improved 25% same	74%	85%	85%*	17/81%	#/75%	91.7% (N=22)
▪ #/% 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%*	21/100%	#90%	100% (N=18)
▪ #/% Mentees who report the relationship has made a difference in their lives at home and school - Caroline Mentoring Project Annual Evaluation Survey.					21/100%	#/90%	100% (N=18)
▪ #/% of participants who have no DJS involvement while involved in the program.					21/100%	#/80%	95.8% (N=23)

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

**Mentor Trainings will continue in the Spring

group events have had a low attendance in FY13 but the Mentoring Coordinator has developed new ideas to encourage more participation in FY14. The target will be lowered in FY14.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

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

Program Summary: Engage students & parents in after school activities that develop academic, social and life skills that benefit the students, their families and the community.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$109,876

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					6	5	5
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.					2	2	2
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.					2	2	2
▪ # of Middle School students served.	258	296	358	265	186	200	215
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School	164	209	201	165	86	125	106#
○ Lockerman Middle School	94	95	157	100	100	75	109
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Average Daily Attendance.				85%*	76%	60%	78%
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School				^^			
○ Lockerman Middle School				^^	82%	60%	77%
▪ #/% of students who attend the program 30 days or more.							
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School	38%	39%	40/53%	90/55%	91/60%	#/53%	71% (N=98)
○ Lockerman Middle School	38%	46%	100/50%	70/70%	56/81%	#/53%	68% (N=93)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					4.4	4	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					3.7	3.5	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.2	3	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					2.5	3	3
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).							
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					3.3	3.25	3.75
○ Lockerman Middle School					3.5	3.25	3.75

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ #/% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					2/100%	#/100%	100% (N=2)
▪ #/% of Parents participating in Family Events							
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					63/100%	#/50%	52% (N=55)
○ Lockerman Middle School					49/100%	#50%	52% (N=57)
▪ #/% of students satisfied with the program at the end of family events (survey administered at end of event)							
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School				292/88%	69/86%	#/75%	100% (N=39)
○ Lockerman Middle School					110/93%	#75%	100% (N=57)
▪ #/% of parents who indicate they are satisfied with the academic help provided for their child (survey)							
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					44/96%	#/80%	100% (N=16)
○ Lockerman Middle School					20/83%	#/80%	100% (N=3)
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%	25% ^ (N=2)
○ Lockerman Middle					^^^	#/75%	83% (N=5)
▪ #/% of students who attend 30 days or more with program entry grade of D or lower in math who increase the grade by at least one letter grade by the 3 rd Term							
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					3/100%	#/75%	25% ^ (N=1)
○ Lockerman Middle School					1/100%	#/75%	50% ^ (N=2)
▪ #/% 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.							
○ Colonel Richardson Middle School					1/100%	#75%	^^
○ Lockerman Middle School					1/100%	#/75%	^^

*The schools were not tracked separately in FY11.

^^^No one entered the program with a D or lower in Language Arts.

^ GRADES – Because there were so few students who registered a D or below on the first marking period, Also looked at students who received a C in the first marking period.

Below are the results and revised the number who maintained a C.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

CRMS	Increased	Maintained	Decreased
Language Arts	6/14 (43%)	8/14 (57%)	0/0 (0%)
Math	7/22 (32%)	10/22 (45%)	5/22 (23%)

LMS	Increased	Maintained	Decreased
Language Arts	6/15 (40%)	9/15 (60%)	0/0 (0%)
Math	8/16 (50%)	7/16 (44%)	1/16 (6%)

^^This data comes from the Public Schools and is not available to this date, it will be reported on the Mid Year Report for FY14

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

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

Program Summary: CFBSP 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. Families are referred to the program by DSS, DJS, teachers, guidance counselors, Family Support Center and the Judy Center.

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 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

FY13 Funding: \$62,596

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # Children referred to the program.	34	15	15	4*	25	14	23
▪ # Children participating in the program.	19	14	14	6*	18	11	24
▪ # of Educators provided with Consultation.				0*	22	4	15
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%*	9/90%	#/90%	95% (N=5)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ # & % of Caregivers that rate behavior at home as 3.7** or higher on the Satisfaction Survey at end of service.	31%	100%	(13)100%	100%	5/100%	#/90%	85%^ (N=8)
▪ # & % of Caregivers Satisfaction Surveys** that rate behavior at school as (3.7) or higher.	100%	100%	(13)100%	No cases received in school services*	5/100%	#/90%	85%^ (N=8)
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%*	5/86%	#78%	85% (N=8)
▪ #/% of children with improved scores on the CAFAS/PECFAS between intake and discharge.	100%	100%	(13) 100%	100%	7/77%^	#/75%	100% (N=5)
▪ #/% of care givers who now have the ability to identify why the problem behavior is occurring (Annual Care Givers Satisfaction Survey).					6/100%	#/75%	100% (N=5)

*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.

***Counting the occurrence of target behaviors.

^ The % is lower due to number of surveys being returned by caregivers, the vendor will use a different approach in FY14 to ensure caregivers realize the importance of returning the survey.

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: Teen Court serves school aged youth 11-17 years old and diverts them from DJS system and further delinquency.

FY13 Funding: \$44,247

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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	55>	80	67^
▪ # court sessions.	19	20	19	19	14>	15	17
▪ # Teen Court Volunteers.				40	40	40	30^^
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%	53/97.5%	#/75%	100% (N=67)
▪ #and % of teen volunteers that attend at least 10 court sessions during a year.				42/60%	40/100%	#/50%	87% (N=30)
▪ #and% of parents satisfied with the program (survey at end of court session).				87/98%	53/95.5%	#/80%	95% (N=64)
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%*	87/94%	#/75%	100% (N=67)
▪ #and% of Teen Court Respondents who are not suspended from school during the current school year.				93/100%	87/94%	#/80%	97% (N=65)
▪ #and % of Teen Court Respondents who report Teen Court Peers had an impact on them** (survey at end of court session).					40/96%	#/75%	91% (N=69)

*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.

^ Referrals to Teen Court and our local DJS are at an all time low this year. This may be in part to our Teen Court Program, 2 School Resource Officers and the new in school suspension policy. Although not good for our Teen Court program targets, it is a turn in the right direction for Juvenile crime!

^^ It was determined this year that the lower number of Teen Court Volunteers work better so volunteers are able to participate in the court sessions more. The target will be lowered in FY14.

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.

**FY2013 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: BSFT is rated Exemplary 2 from Strengthening America's Families, are effective programs 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 meet the at-risk youth prevention and diversion program in preventing or diverting youth from entering the juvenile justice system.

FY13 Funding: \$94,430 (YSB) + 24,307 (EIP) = \$118,737

Please note that columns for tables in your jurisdiction may vary as not all programs have been funded since FY08.

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:					49	60	56
▪ Individual*					0	0	0
▪ Family*					49	60	56
▪ Group*					0	0	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:					0	0	0
▪ Individual*					0	0	0
▪ Family*					0	0	0
▪ Group*					0	0	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.					49	60	56
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.					3	5	1
➤ Total individuals served			279	372	192	200	184
How Well We Do It:							

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.					100% (N=49)	80%	100% (N=56)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.					55.6% (N=17)	60%	74% (N=20)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.					100%	80% (N=6)	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)	100% (N=12)	85%	100% (N=10)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.					98% (N=47)	80%	100% (N=56)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					75% (N=3)	70% (N=14)	93% (N=14)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					75% (N=3)	70% (N=14)	100% (N=9)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					75% (N=3)	70% (N=14)	80% (N=12)

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.					100% (N=4)	70% (N=14)	100% (N=3)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.					75% (N=3)	70% (N=14)	73% (N=8)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.					75% (N=3)	70% (N=14)	85% (N=11)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.					100% (N=4)	70% (N=14)	100% (N=2)
Mc Master 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)	66% (N=10)	70%	82% (N=9)
➤ 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)	93% (N=15)	70%	91% (N=10)
➤ 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)	68% (N=11)	70%	100% (N=11)

What's the story behind the performance?

If the LMB or vendor is not on track to meet the target goal, describe the challenges encountered and any adjustments to be made during the second half of the fiscal year.

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT)

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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, are effective programs 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 meet the at-risk youth prevention and diversion program in preventing or diverting youth from entering the juvenile justice system.

FY13 Funding: \$94,430 (YSB) + 24,307 (EIP) = \$118,737

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of families that receive Brief Strategic Family Therapy.	67	52	62	60	49	60	56
▪ Total number of individuals served.			279	374	192	200	184
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)	100% (N=12)	85%	100% (N=10)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
Mc Master 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)	66% (N=10)	70%	82% (N=9)
▪ 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)	93% (N=15)	70%	91% (N=10)
▪ 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)	68% (N=11)	70%	100% (N=11)

*LMB consulted Olga Hervis, co-developer of BSFT, who suggested using McMaster Assessment tool to capture change in family system as opposed to individual. This evidenced based treatment looks to change acting out youth by changing maladaptive family interaction/functions. Tool is administered pre and post treatment and was implemented in FY 09.

What's the story behind the performance? If the LMB or vendor is not on track to meet the target goal, describe the challenges encountered and any adjustments to be made during the second half of the fiscal year.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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 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: Cultural Navigators 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.

FY13 Funding: \$27,601

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of calls received.	216	303	137	199	226	200	330
▪ Number of walk-ins.	27	91	43	170	213	125	183
▪ Number of callers/walk-ins given referrals to community resources.	243	381	363	592	331	250	432
▪ Number of outreach events.	15	15	18	11	16	10	12
▪ Number of contacts at outreach events.	400	1,800	1,672	1,025	1,930	1,000	875
▪ Number of referrals at outreach events.	N/A	17	73	118	134	75	85
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=21	5% N=15	4% N=14
▪ 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=21	5% N=15	4 N=14
○ Respectful of family	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%
○ Knowledgeable	80%	(N=33) 100%	(N=30) 100%	(N=17) 100%	(N=12) 100%	80%	(N=14) 100%
○ Understandable	80%	(N=33) 100%	(N=30) 100%	(N=17) 100%	(N=12) 100%	80%	100% (N=14)
○ Gave appropriate referral	80%	(N=33)	(N=30)	(N=17)	(N=12)		

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

		100% (N=33)	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=12)	80%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that they understood information or referral provided.	80%	100% (N=33)	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	80%	100% (N=14)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that they contacted the suggested referral.	50%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	80%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that referral was able to provide requested information or services.	40%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	80%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of contacts who were satisfied with the referred service.	40%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	80%	100% (N=14)
▪ Percentage of contacts who report increased confidence/competence in addressing future needs.	50%	100% (N=39)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	80%	100% (N=14)

What's the story behind the performance? If the LMB or vendor is not on track to meet the target goal, describe the challenges encountered and any adjustments to be made during the second half of the fiscal year.

LMB: Cecil County – Report not submitted to GOC.

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY13 Funding: \$51,518.00

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY 13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of Youth Served for the year.	7	10*	16	27	25	25
▪ Average Daily Capacity.				8	8	7
▪ Average duration of services (in sessions) for youth receiving FFT services.			18	12.8	12	12
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of attendees who complete counseling successfully (based on mutual termination).	100%	57% (N=4)	100% (N=3) †	100% (N=14)	100%	100% (N=19)
▪ Percentage of cases completing treatment with 50% of outlined goals attained (when comparing treatment plan goals from beginning to case closure).			100%	100% (N=14)	100%	100% (N=19)
▪ Percentage of families satisfied with services as measured by client survey completed after case closure.			100%	100% (N=14)	75%	100% (N=19)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of youth participants who are not placed outside the home during program duration.	100%	100% (N=7)	100% (N=16)	100% (N=14)	100%	100% (N=19)
▪ Percentage of participants who report improved family functioning as measured by the Client Outcome Measure (COM) administered at the completion of the program.	100%	75% (N=2)	100% (N=3)	100% (N=14)	87.5%	100% (N=19)
▪ 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=14)	75%	100% (N=19)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians reporting improvement in their parenting skills, as indicated by a score of 3 or higher on the COM-P.				100% (N=14)	75%	100% (N=19)
▪ 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.				100% (N=14)	75%	100% (N=19)

*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

Story Behind the Performance:

The program did not meet the target of Average Daily Capacity in FY 13. This was a result in position turnover in the late spring. Existing staff provided coverage for those cases remaining open but did not take on new clients as a result of this vacancy. The program has since filled this vacancy and the Average Daily Capacity target should be consistent in FY 14 as long as the position is maintained.

LMB: Dorchester County – Report not finalized.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$133,547 + County \$94,779 = \$228,326

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.^					8	6	7
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.^					5	5	5
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.^					5	5	5
School Year Component:							
▪ # of youth receiving OOS programming.	164	182	159	194	230	150	248
▪ # of hours of programming per week (5 sites total).	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5
Summer Component:							
▪ # of youth receiving summer programming.				**	36	25	28
▪ # of hours of programming per week (1 site).					52.5	32	51
How Well We Do It:							
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.						5 site average:	4.55
▪ Brunswick Middle School					4.60	4.2	
▪ Crestwood Middle School					4.41		
▪ Governor Thomas Johnson Middle School					3.97		

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monocacy Middle School ▪ West Frederick Middle School 					4.58 4.16		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment 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 					4.54 3.34 3.53 4.02 3.63	5 site average: 3.7	4.45
<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	5 site average: 3.0	4.54
<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	5 site average: 3.0	4.13
<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	5 site average: 3.4	4.42
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan. 					5	5	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training. 					100%	100%	100% N=5
School Year Component:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average daily attendance. 				72%	63%	70%	65%
<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	66% N=151	50%	50% N=124

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ % of middle school principals indicating satisfaction with the quality of the OOSP program as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in 3 rd quarter.	80%	80%	85%	100% N=3	100% N=5	80%	100% N=4
▪ % parents indicating satisfaction with the quality of their child's OOSP as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in 3 rd quarter.	75%	80%	85%	100% N=48	100% N=47	80%	100% N=91
Summer Component:							
▪ Average daily attendance				72%	78%	70%	72%
▪ % parents indicating satisfaction with the quality of their child's summer program, as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in August 2013.				100% N=21	100% N=12	80%	100% N=21
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	88% N=202	90%	90% N=224
▪ % of youth participating who do not experience school expulsion during program period.	100%	100%	99%	100% N=194	99% N=227	95%	99% N=246
▪ % of youth who do not experience new DJS involvement during program period.	100%	100%	100%	100% N=191	100% N=230	95%	99% N=245
▪ % 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	69% N=68	70%	84% N=89
○ Stay away from drugs.	82%	86%	94%	89%,N=85	89% N=87	80%	93% N=99
○ Feel better about themselves.	75%	70%	75%	79%,N=76	81% N=79	75%	83% N=88
○ Treat others with respect.				78%,N=75	85% N=83	75%	91% N=96
Summer Component:							
▪ % of youth who do not experience new DJS involvement during program period.				100%	100% N=36	95%	100%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stay out of trouble. ○ Stay away from drugs. ○ Have greater confidence in their academic ability. ○ Feel more prepared for school. 							
	*	*	*	86%,N=24	90%,N=26	70%	85%,N=22
	*	*	*	93%,N=26	90%,N=26	80%	92%,N=23
	*	*	*	71%,N=20	93%,N=27	75%	88%,N=22
	*	*	*	71%,N=20	83%,N=24	75%	80%,N=20

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

^New measure for FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

The average daily attendance percentage is below target due to transportation issues, members participating in other after school activities including athletics, tutoring, and organizations outside of school. All of these additional activities are encouraged in an effort to assist youth with identifying with pro-social peers and increasing feelings of connectedness to their school environment. Site Directors routinely communicate with youth and their parents/caregivers about the importance of attending the program on a regular basis, particularly on days when other afterschool activities are not scheduled. Site Directors have also enacted contests and incentive plans to encourage consistent attendance.

LMB: Frederick County

Program Name: Juvenile Entry Diversion Initiative (JEDI)

Program Summary: Case management and diversion services focusing on two core components: diverting juvenile offenders from the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) and redirecting pre-adjudicated Children In Need of Supervision (CINS) youth away from DJS to community-based services.

Target Population: Frederick County 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.

FY13 Funding: \$107,026

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of youth referred <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ # of Juvenile Offender referrals ○ # of pre-adjudicated CINS referrals ▪ # of youth served <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ # of Juvenile Offender referrals ○ # of pre-adjudicated CINS referrals 			
	79	120	318
	66		292
	13		26
	47^	90	368
	47		358
	0		10

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

▪ # of referrals made to community-based resources.	55	145	321
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)	92% N=9	75%	89% N=68
▪ % of families at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey).	100% N=4	80%	89% N=42
▪ % of youth at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey)	100% N=4	80%	100% N=9
Is Anyone Better Off:			
▪ % of diverted cases that satisfy all obligations to successfully complete the diversion program within 16 weeks.	80% N=8	80%	83% N=162
▪ % of diverted youth who avoid re-offending for one full year from case open date	N/A	70%	61% N=11
▪ % of CINS youth who avoid any adjudication for one full year from open date	N/A	70%	71% N=5

What's the story behind the performance?

The percentage of diverted youth who avoid re-offending for one full year from case open date is based on a small number of cases. The program did not begin until April 2012, therefore only 18 cases were served and closed one year ago. For FY14, the JEDI program will continue to offer high quality services and is confident that the goal of 75% will be met.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$300,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of families served, per FY	▪ 39	▪ 86	▪ 102	▪ 113	▪ 113	▪ 90	▪ 94
▪ # of target children born, per FY	▪ 23	▪ 26	▪ 36	▪ 29	▪ 74	▪ 40	▪ 25

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of completed home visits, per FY ▪ # of families that graduated (completed NFP), per FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 511 ▪ N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,226 ▪ N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,622 ▪ 19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,380 ▪ 26 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,340 ▪ 29 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,200 ▪ 25 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1215 ▪ 21
How Well We Do It:²							
<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% (187) ▪ a) 12% (20/167) ▪ b) 14% (19/134) ▪ c) 8% (8/104) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% ▪ a) 10% ▪ b) 10% ▪ c) 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (201) ▪ 13% (22/205) ▪ 17% (28/170) ▪ 8% (10/134)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of expected home visits completed³ <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 (<i>25+ on 32 pt. Likert scale</i>) 	<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% ▪ 65% ▪ 55% ▪ 100% (48/48) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a) 85% ▪ b) 83% ▪ c) 76% ▪ 100% (79/79) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a) 70% ▪ b) 65% ▪ c) 65% ▪ 90% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 86% ▪ 78% ▪ 73% ▪ 96% (25/26)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<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"> ▪ 97% (35/36) ▪ 90% (9/10) ▪ -16% (38 to 32) ▪ a) 25% (2/8) ▪ b) 48% (17/36) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 90% ▪ 90% ▪ -15% a) Monitor b) Monitor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 85% (147/173) ▪ 98% (79/81) ▪ -14% (43 to 37) a) 25% (2/8) b) 49% (28/57)

What's the story behind the performance? The number of target children born could be displaying a decrease due to a declining population of a child-bearing age group in the County. The number of families that have graduated may be a slight decrease in the target number dependent on where the population falls age-wise, families may have moved from the area, pregnant mothers may have miscarried, or decided to decline continued services through the program. The number of families discharged decreased during FY 13. The Healthy Families program proposed consideration in eliminating the NFP program from the CPA for FY 14. The proposed change involved replacing NFP with Early Care Healthy Families Garrett County program. Rationale for the program primarily focused on the issue of increased personnel and operational costs. The costs included licensing fees and training certifications that would be required to operate the NFP during FY 14. The Early Care Healthy Families program will serve all individuals who meet eligibility criteria for the NFP program.

**FY2013 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: 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: Garrett County aims to lower 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 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.

FY13 Funding: \$35,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of asset development trainings	▪ 89	▪ 45	▪ 5	▪ 6	▪ 5	▪ 5	▪ 8
▪ # of hours (actual) for HC/HY asset trainings facilitated by the HD:		▪ 59	▪ 12.25	▪ 30	▪ 78	▪ 40	▪ 56.5
○ Youth	▪ 107.8						
○ Adult	▪ 104.3	▪ 80.5	▪ 43.5	▪ 78	▪ 41.5	▪ 43	▪ 108
▪ # of HC/HY media activities	▪ 56	▪ 48	▪ 48	▪ 54	▪ 48	▪ 45	▪ 48
▪ # of PHLC activities (ATOD-free focus).	▪ 4	▪ 4	▪ 4	▪ 3	▪ 3	▪ 6	▪ 6
▪ # of PHLC youth participants.	▪ 1,566	▪ 1,073	▪ 260	▪ 197	▪ 500	▪ 60	▪ 46
How Well We Do It:							
▪ % of neighborhood members attending PHLC events who attend 50% of activities.						▪ 50%	▪ 41% (19/46)
▪ % of PHLC total participants satisfied with the planned event(s).						▪ 75%	▪ 100% (28/28)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ % of participating youth will display an increase in the number of self-reported Developmental Assets						▪ 50%	▪ 60% (3/5)
▪ % of participating youth will be able to name a trusted neighbor they can go to for help						▪ 50%	▪ 86% (6/7)
▪ % of adult community member participants reporting that neighborhood youth have taken action to improve the neighborhood						▪ 50%	▪ 80% (8/10)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
Secondary Indicators <i>(potentially impacted by the intervention)</i>							
% of 9 th graders reporting that they have at least 75% of the 40 Developmental Assets, annually	▪ 36.4%, NHS (43/118)	▪ 39.3%, SHS (136/346)	▪ 55.4% (46/83)	▪ 55.4% (46/83)	▪ 57% (64/113)	▪ 40%	▪ 84% (92/110)
% of 9th grade Asset Survey respondents reporting:							
“I feel safe at home, at school, and in the neighborhood”	▪ 87.3% (103/118)	▪ 85.8% (297/346)	▪ 95.2% (79/83)	▪ 95.2% (79/83)	▪ 89% (101/113)	▪ 70%	▪ 94% (103/110)
“I want to do well in school”	▪ 91.5% (108/118)	▪ 91.3% (316/346)	▪ 96.4% (80/83)	▪ 96.4% (80/83)	▪ 88% (99/113)	▪ 70%	▪ 93% (102/110)
“I feel good about myself”	▪ 84.7% (100/118)	▪ 84.7% (293/346)	▪ 89.2% (74/83)	▪ 89.2% (74/83)	▪ 88% (99/113)	▪ 75%	▪ 62% (68/110)

What’s the story behind the performance? Efforts to revitalize “Play Hard. Live clean.” Events in FY 12 had mixed results. Health Education and Outreach staff collaborated to re-evaluate the PHLC mission. The team decided they would like to try a new focus in FY 13 for the PHLC initiative, offering a more consistent and intensive initiative in a neighborhood with both adults and youth who demonstrate a lack of needed assets. The neighborhood chosen for the PHLC event(s) was in the town of Oakland and the % of neighborhood members attending PHLC events attending at least 50% of the activities was lower than predicted. Regarding “Secondary Indicators,” the % of 9th graders reporting they feel good about themselves on the 40 Developmental Asset survey, was 13 % lower than the predicted 75%.

The request was made, and granted, to change “PHLC” activities to “developmental communities” activities during FY 14. The activities will occur in a designated community within Garrett County.

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Partners After School @ Grantsville

Program Summary: Partners After School @ Grantsville operates five 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.

FY13 Funding: \$48,063

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of students served by PAS @ Grantsville, per SY	▪ 45	▪ 47	▪ 47	▪ 33	▪ 32	▪ 30	▪ 34
▪ # of students served 30 or more days, per SY	▪ 39	▪ 43	▪ 46	▪ 30	▪ 22	▪ 15	▪ 27
▪ # of parent/other adult volunteer hours, per SY (includes AmeriCorps tutors)	▪ 2,804	▪ 2,702	▪ 2,043	▪ 1,374	▪ 10.5	▪ 200	▪ 75.3

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training. 					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2
<p>How Well We Do It:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of PAS students attending 8+ days who attend at least 75% of the days they are scheduled, per SY ▪ % of students attending PAS 30+ days w/satisfactory school attendance (<16 days absent during the SY) ▪ % parents satisfied with PAS @ Grantsville, per SY ▪ % of students attending 30+ days with at least one parent attending two or more PAS activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 98% (43/44) ▪ 92% (35/38) ▪ 95% (42/44) ▪ 86% (25/29) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (46/46) ▪ 95% (41/43) ▪ 94% (33/35) ▪ 74% (28/38) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 98% (46/47) ▪ N/A ▪ 100% (36/36) ▪ 57% (26/46) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 75.8% (25/33) ▪ N/A from school ▪ 100% (14/14) ▪ 80% (24/30) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 73% (8/11) ▪ 91% (20/22) ▪ 100% (25/25) ▪ 64% (14/22) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 70% ▪ 70% ▪ 90% ▪ 60% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 56% (19/34) ▪ 88% (30/34) ▪ 90% (19/21) ▪ 19% (4/21)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average daily attendance (average daily attendance / number of program slots) ▪ 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). ▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 80% (32.1/40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 83% (33.0/40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 80% (31.8/40) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 72% (21.6/30) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 57% (17/30) ▪ 4.9 (24.5/5) ▪ 5.0 (30/6) ▪ 4.7 (18.7/4) ▪ 4.3 (13/3) ▪ 4.7 (18.9/4) ▪ 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50% ▪ 4.3 ▪ 4.3 ▪ 4 ▪ 4.3 ▪ 4.1 ▪ 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 53% (18/34) ▪ 5 (90/18) ▪ 3.84 (92/24) ▪ 3.84 (46/12) ▪ 4.0 (32/8) ▪ 4.2 (16.8/4) ▪ 1
<p>Is Anyone Better Off?</p>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 with a grade of "B-" or better in a) Reading/English and b) Math/Algebra ▪ % 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 69% (25/36) b) 64% (23/36) a) 69% (24/35) b) 63% (22/35) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 63% (24/38) b) 63% (24/38) a) 87% (33/38) b) 63% (24/38) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 75% (30/40) b) 70% (28/40) a) 100% (23/23) b) 91% (21/23) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 90% (27/30) b) 87% (26/30) a) 60% (18/30) b) 63% (19/30) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 70% b) 70% a) 32% (7/22) b) 32% (7/22) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 65% b) 65% a) 65% b) 65% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 57% (8/14) b) 79% (11/14) a) 71% (10/14) b) 79% (11/14)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ % 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)	▪ 93% (28/30)	▪ 100% (32/32)	▪ 90%	▪ 71% (10/14)

*The PAS@GV program has been in operation for more than 12 years, with funding from other sources. FY 2013 is the third year of funding by the Children's Cabinet.

What's the story behind the performance? According to Grantsville PAS program staff, they had difficulty obtaining volunteers from outside resources, participant parents' etc for many of their events. They did not utilize AmeriCorps staff during FY 13. PAS students attending 8+ days who attend at least 75% of the days they are scheduled, were less than predicted. Students attending 30+ days with at least one parent attending (2) or more activities was 41% less than expected. Regarding YPQA, Supportive Environment, Opportunities for Interaction, and Engagement domains were all a little less than expected. % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 with a grade of "B-" or better in Reading/English was 8% less than expected. Students with no disciplinary referrals, suspensions, or expulsions during the SY was a lower percentage than expected.

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Partners After School @ SMS

Program Summary: Partners After School @ Oakland operates five 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.

FY13 Funding: \$49,024

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of students served by PAS @ Oakland, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 23	▪ 72	▪ 61	▪ 40	▪ 62
▪ # of students served 30 or more days, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 13	▪ 48	▪ 40	▪ 20	▪ 48
▪ # of parent/other adult volunteer hours, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 33	▪ 1291	▪ 354	▪ 300	▪ 397
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training					▪ 2	▪ 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)	▪ 64% (38/59)	▪ 70%	▪ 58% (36/62)
▪ % 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)	▪ 98% (39/40)	▪ 70%	▪ 77% (48/62)
▪ % parents satisfied with PAS @ Oakland, per SY	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 100% (19/19)	▪ 100% (26/26)	▪ 100% (51/51)	▪ 90%	▪ 91% (30/33)
▪ % of students attending 30+ days with at least one parent attending two or more PAS activities			▪ 23% (3/13)	▪ N/A	▪ 88% (35/40)	▪ 60%	▪ 54% (20/37)
▪ Average daily attendance (average daily attendance / number of program slots)	▪ N/A	▪ N/A	▪ 15% (7.3/50)	▪ 50% (25/50)	▪ 71% (29/41)	▪ 50%	▪ 71% (29/41)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 with a grade of “B-” or better in a) Reading/English and b) Math/Algebra ▪ % 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 ▪ % of students served 30+ days with NO disciplinary referrals, suspensions, or expulsions during the SY ▪ 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 Environment domain. ▪ YPQA program self-assessment for Engagement domain. ▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below). ▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan. 	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) 91% (21/23) b) 91% (21/23)	a) 60% (24/40) b) 55% (22/40) a) 31% (18/59) b) 34% (20/59)	a) 65% b) 65% a) 65% b) 65% ▪ 90% ▪ 4.3 ▪ 4.3 ▪ 4 ▪ 4.3 ▪ 4.1 ▪ 100% (1/1)	a)63% (27/43) b)51% (22/43) a)56% (24/43) b)56% (24/43) ▪ 79% (34/43) ▪ 4.5 (86/19) ▪ 4.8 (116/24) ▪ 4.8 (58/12) ▪ 3.5 (28/8) ▪ 4.4 (17.6/4) ▪ 100% (2/2)

*The PAS@OK program has been in operation for more than 10 years, with funding from other sources. FY 2013 is the second year of funding by the Children’s Cabinet.

What’s the story behind the performance? PAS @ Southern Middle School had less than expected students attending 8+ days who attended at least 75% of the days they were scheduled. The percentage of students attending 30+ days with at least one parent attending (2) or more PAS activities was less than predicted by 6%. This result may be impacted by a parent’s work schedule. Percentage of students serving 30+ days in grades 3-8 with a grade of “B-“ or better in Reading/English was only slightly lower than predicted. However, those students with a grade of “B-“ or better Math/Algebra was decreased by 14%. Both performance measures of students who score *proficient* or *advanced* in Reading or Math on the MSA’s was each decreased 9% lower than their prediction. The percentage of students with NO disciplinary referrals, suspensions, or expulsions during the SY was also lower than expected.

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Summer Youth Employment Supplement (S-YES)

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.⁴ 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.

FY13 Funding: \$14,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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"> ▪ 82 ▪ 27 ▪ 27.63 (746 wrk hrs/27) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 25 ▪ 12 ▪ 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 26 ▪ 40 ▪ 23
How Well We Do It:							
<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 96% (X/Y)₅ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 73% (X/Y)₅ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 89% (X/Y)⁵ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (8/8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 89% (24/27) ▪ 100% (16/16) ▪ 26% (7/27) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 70% ▪ 70% ▪ 20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 83% (19/23) ▪ 100% (17/17) ▪ 35% (8/23)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth completing the S-YES who are <i>placed in employment or education</i> as of September 30 following program participation. ▪ % of high school students, identified at risk for drop-out, who return to school the next year, following completion of S-YES. ▪ % of participants who show <i>improvement in job skills and attitudes</i> as measured by the SCANS Evaluation (pre / post test). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Baseline data TBD</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Baseline data TBD</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Baseline data TBD</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 88% (7/8) ▪ 63% (5/8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 67% (8/12) ▪ 89% (24/27) ▪ 33% (4/12) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50% ▪ 70% ▪ 40% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TBD ▪ TBD ▪ 54% (7/13)

What's the story behind the performance? The S-YES program began in May 2013. The TBD data will be provided as soon as the data is available to answer the "Is Anyone Better Off?" performance measure quadrant.

⁴ Andrew Sum, Ishwar Khatiwada, Joseph McLaughlin, with Sheila Palma and Paulo Tobar. Developments in the Teen and Young Adult Market in Maryland, 2000-2007: Implications for Workforce Development Policy. Baltimore: Job Opportunities Task Force, 2008/2009. ⁵ Baseline data for FY's 2008-2010 is for all youth participating in the Western Maryland Consortium's Summer Youth Employment Program.

**FY2013 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: Juvenile Review Board

Program Summary: The Juvenile Review Board provides Garrett County youth, ages 11-17, with an intake diversion strategy to avoid formal involvement with DJS and the local Sheriff's office by providing youth with alternative community sanctions (meaningful consequences) to be completed within a thirty day time frame.

Target Population: This targeted at-risk youth prevention and diversion strategy is for youth ages 11-17 and offers intake diversion services to juveniles referred to Department of Juvenile Services for a first-time non-violent offense in hopes of avoiding further DJS involvement. The program also diverts first-time minor moving violation offenders (up to age 17) through local Sheriff's office from becoming a formal citation.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: This is an intervention strategy intended to reduce illegal behavior and is aimed at helping youth avoid further delinquent behavior and prevention of a criminal record with the juvenile justice system.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Eligibility criteria for the Juvenile Review Board targets juveniles ages 11-17 who commit a first-time violation. The JRB program acknowledges the offense and works to reduce continued delinquency and criminality and increase public safety. The goal of the JRB is to increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency by reducing recidivism and crime among juveniles continuing this philosophy into their transition to adulthood.

FY13 Funding: \$6,618

Performance Measure	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of youth meeting target population criteria referred to JRB ▪ # of JRB Advisory quarterly meetings held, per FY ▪ # of JRB hearing panels held, per FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 10 ▪ 4 ▪ 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12 ▪ 4 ▪ 11
How Well We Do It:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of JRB hearing panels scheduled within 15 days of contacting child's family member ▪ % of JRB hearing panels with at least 3 volunteer community members ▪ % of JRB juveniles referred who complete sanctions within 30 days of hearing panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 60% ▪ 70% ▪ 70% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (12/12) ▪ 100% (11/11) ▪ 92% (11/12)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth completing JRB sanctions within 30 days who do not have additional intake referrals to DJS for a period of 12 months afterward. ▪ % of youth completing JRB sanctions within 30 days who maintain placement and/or return to a family home setting within 12 month time frame within 12 months of completion of hearing panel. ▪ % of youth who complete the JRB sanctions who do not commit any juvenile felony offenses for a period of 12 months of completion of hearing panel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 70% ▪ 70% ▪ 70% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TBD ▪ TBD ▪ TBD

What's the story behind the performance? JRB has three performance measures in the "Is Anyone Better Off?" quadrant which will be determined 12 months beyond the initial juvenile review board hearing panel. "TBD" data will be completed within the appropriate time frame of the 12 month period. There were twelve referrals provided to the JRB by Department of Juvenile Services (DJS). All twelve referrals were scheduled for a hearing panel but one referral/participant failed to complete a hearing panel. Therefore, sanctions were never established nor completed for that juvenile.

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**

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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: CINS Prevention 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).

FY13 Funding: \$95,983

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of youth served	47	74	73	30	56	50	69
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)	89% (17/19)	100% (43/56)	80%	91% (63/69)
▪ 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)	100% (26/26)	80%	100% (N=23)
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)	100% (1/1)	85%	100% (N=12)
▪ 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)	88% (15/17)	100% (15/15)	85%	97% (67/69)
▪ 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)	86% (37/43)	85%	80% (16/20) **
▪ Percentage of youth who demonstrate increased functioning in two or more domains of the CANS as administered at the start, middle and close of service	100% (27/27)	100% (45/45)	97% (35/36)	100% (N=17)	94% (15/16)	90%	93% (64/69)

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

**Note that three families were provided with the staff version of the satisfaction survey, and therefore did not have this question to respond to.

What's the story behind the performance?

The CINS Prevention Program is meeting or exceeding the targets of the CPA. The only exception to this is the percentage of families who report an improved relationship with the school, based on parent survey at the close of service. There were three surveys filled out by families who were mistakenly given staff satisfaction forms. This question is not listed on those forms. They were taken out of the count (20 surveys counted instead of the total 23 collected). For the remaining four surveys not reporting an improved relationship, 2 answered "neutral" to this question and 2 answered that the question was "N/A or not applicable" to them. If you take out the two for whom the question did not apply, the percentage is 89% - which surpasses the target of 85%.

While there were only 23 family surveys received, school staff filled out 28 staff surveys. Staff members all reported seeing observable differences in the kids after the CINS Prevention Program intervention.

LMB: Harford County

Program Name: CINS Diversion Program

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$95,983

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Youth served with Level I Services (crisis only)	8	8	0	0	18	10	18
▪ Number of youth served	39	35	30	15	23	25	24
How Well Did We Do It:							
▪ From the returned surveys, percent of families receiving Level II services who were satisfied or higher (%/N)	100% (N=18)	95% (21/22)	92% (11/12)	100% (N=7)	100% (11/11)	75%	100% (N=1)
▪ Percentage of youth completing Level II services (# completed services/# admitted into program)	98% (39/41)	83% (35/42)	96% (23/24)	79% (15/19)	72% (13/18)	80%	88% (21/24)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ % of Level II clients diverted from formal DJS involvement	97% (38/39)	97% (34/35)	96% (22/23)	100% (N=15)	77% (10/13)	75%	96% (23/24)
▪ % 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).	88% (21/24)	97% (34/35)	100% (N=3)	100% (N=5)	100% (1/1)	88%	50% (1/2)
▪ % of Level II clients who maintained or improved school attendance during service delivery	87% (34/39)	97% (34/35)	100% (N=23)	87% (13/15)	69% (9/13)	50%	88% (21/24)
▪ % of Level II clients completing the program who maintained or improved their GPA during service delivery as compared to the previous marking period*	38% (15/39)	91% (32/35)	100% (N=23)	87% (13/15)	54% (7/13)	50%	83% (20/24)

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

What is the story behind the performance? The CINS Diversion Program is on target or surpassing its goals for the Community Partnership Agreement with the exception of the percentage of youth who exhibited running away behavior having a decrease of incidence during service delivery. Only two clients presented with such behavior and one had a decrease of incidence. The target for youth to be admitted for service was 25 and the actual number was 24. However, the number of crisis clients was almost double the target number of 10. Since CINS Diversion is housed in the Alternative Education High School, it may be more realistic that clients using crisis services would be higher and those admitted for on-going treatment would be lower. Students are placed at the school temporarily. So, this service may be more in demand than the 4-month term of service that on-going cases require.

At this time, one family satisfaction survey was received this year. On the other hand, 20 school satisfaction surveys have been received noting observable differences in the students served by the program.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$12,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ Number of youth offenders served by Teen Court	40	30	68
▪ Number of youth volunteers that participate in Teen Court	51	30	107
How Well Did We Do It:			
▪ Percent of clients completing Teen Court proceedings (# completed program/# accepted into the program)	99% (33/34)	75%	98.5 % (67/68)
▪ Percent of dispositions successfully completed (# dispositions completed/# dispositions assigned)	99% (108/109)	75%	99% (308/310)
▪ Percent of cases heard this FY year that are still open	17.6%	N/A	1.5 % (67/68)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ Percent of youth diverted from formal juvenile justice involvement at least 3 months following conclusion of Teen Court involvement	100% (25/25)	75%	100% N=27

What is the story behind the performance? Teen Court is on target to meet their goals for the Community Partnership Agreement.

LMB: Harford County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau

Program Summary: The YSB is a community-based, non-residential entity that provides delinquency prevention, youth suicide prevention, drug and alcohol abuse prevention, formal and informal counseling, crisis intervention, and youth development services to youth and their families.

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

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Licensed and trained YSB professionals utilize evidenced-based practices, widely recognized and accepted in the field of trauma as effective means of treatment. Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) and Trauma Focused- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT), as well as a multitude of other treatment modalities, such as play therapy, art therapy, storytelling and therapeutic books along with traditional counseling methods help children express their feelings/concerns and develop appropriate coping skills to process through their issues.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: YSB is offered as an alternative to criminal charges for a youth potentially entering through the juvenile justice system, and thereby works to divert youth from a pattern of criminal behavior while providing individual, crisis, group and family treatment.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY13 Funding: \$105,000

Performance Measure	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	80	127
▪ Individual*	80	127
▪ Family*	50	127
▪ Group*	1	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	50	26
▪ Individual*	50	26
▪ Family*	10	15
▪ Group*	1	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	80	127
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	10	0
➤ # Crisis Intervention services provided.	60	72
➤ # Non-core Services	20	19
How Well We Do It:		
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	85%	100% N=127
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	80%	75% (81/108)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100% N= 3
➤ % of YSB staff trained in evidence based practice-trauma informed –cognitive behavioral therapy.	100%	66.6% (2/3)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	85%	100% N=127
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.	80%	98% (41/42) ***
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.	80%	82% (31/38)***
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.	80%	85% (39/46)***
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.	80%	88% (28/32)***

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.	80%	87% (39/45)***
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.	80%	92% (47/51)***
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.	80%	80% (8/10)***
➤ % of formal counseling cases who showed improvement in a minimum of one life domain on the Child and Adolescent Strengths and Needs Tool (CANS).	85%	96% (70/73)***

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

***These numbers reflect the number of clients for which these CAFAS measures were applicable and for which they were able to be measured twice during the reporting period in order to show change.

What is the story behind the performance? The Youth Services Bureau is on target to meet or exceed targets for the Community Partnership Agreement with only a few exceptions. Informal counseling cases are significantly lower than the target of 50. Many of these informal counseling cases go on to become formal counseling cases. During the beginning of the year, there was a wait list for services due to a staff shortage. Group counseling options have been offered, but there has been little interest among clients. Substance abuse referrals have not been necessary at this point due to staff not having identified the need for such referrals. Due to staff changes, it took some time to get a new staff member fully trained in trauma-focused CBT which is reflected in the performance measure about evidence-based practice trained staff.

LMB: Dorchester County – Report not finalized.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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, 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, was the set-up and integration of AlcoholEdu 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.

FY13 Funding: \$76,438

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of children (total, unduplicated) receiving services.	33	56	37	27	30	23
▪ # of youth who participate in the Teen Intervene (TI) Program (included in the total number, above).			25	12	24	7
▪ # of parents who attend session 3 of Teen Intervene.			7	2	3	5
▪ # of youth who participate in the AlcoholEdu for High School online evidence-based program.				100	136	156
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 inc. TI)	22% (n=6/27)	60%	74% (N=17)
▪ % of students that complete all three TI sessions.			80% (n=20/25)	58% (n=7/12)	75%	100% (N=7)
▪ # and % of participants taking GAF*** pre and post-test.	64% (n=21/33)	94% (n=34/36)	100% (n=29)	59% (n=10/17)	75%	61% (N=14)
▪ # and % of youth who complete AlcoholEdu for High School program (Part One-two 50 minute sessions).				86% (n=86/100)	85%	96% (N=146)
▪ # 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).				67% (n=67/100)	65%	85% (N=132)
▪ % 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% inc. TI)	80% (n=8/10)	80%	86% (N=12)
▪ % of TI participants who show an increase in willingness to change between Sessions 1 & 2, as documented in worksheets completed with the			75% (n=15/20)	75% (n=6/8)	75%	71% (N=5)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
ASAC in Sessions 1 & 2.						

**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.

Story Behind the Performance:

Only seven students participated in the Teen Intervene program. The program is completely voluntary and at any time a student may decide to discontinue services. The counselor attempts to keep the student involved and to offer other possible services but the decision is ultimately up to the student who at the time may not be mentally ready for complete treatment. Some of the students who were referred, were seen unexpectedly and sporadically in which case they were not consistent enough to be considered in the TI program. This could also be the reasoning behind low percentages in the increase in willingness to change and GAF scores.

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 (may be court ordered, referred from child serving agencies, or may self-refer).

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: See target population, above.

FY13 Funding: \$ 66,0330

Performance Measure [†]	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of girls participating in Girls Circle program.	12	49	45	49
▪ Number of mother/daughter couples participating in Girls Circle Mother/Daughter program.	0	4	5	0
▪ Number of boys participating in Boys Council program.	8	42	45	57
How Well We Do It:				
▪ # and % of girls who attend at least 60% of group sessions.	12/100%	35/75%	75%	73% (N=36)
▪ # and % of mother/daughter couples who attend at least 60% of group sessions.	0/NA	3/75%	75%	(N=0)

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

▪ # and % of boys who attend at least 60% of group sessions.	5/62%	15/34%	65%	53% (N=41)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ % of girls who report increase in school engagement, as self-reported in pre/post survey.	**	92% (n=23/25)	80%	88% (N=43)
▪ % of mother/daughter couples who report increase in self-efficacy/self-image, as self-reported in pre/post survey.	**	75% (n=3/4)	80%	0% (N=0)
▪ % of boys who report increase in school engagement as self-reported in pre/post survey.	**	89% (n=23/26)	80%	0% (N=0)

**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.

Story behind the Performance: Though there was much effort put into recruiting mother/daughter pairs for the Mother/Daughter Circle Program, there were no participants this year. Because it seemed there was no interest, more emphasis was put into the Girls Circle and Boys Councils where there was more of the need.

As the data shows, the program was below targeted measure for the number and percentage of boys and girls who attended at least 60% of the sessions. This is a result of holding a Girls Circle/Boys Council program at our County's Intensive Behavior and Academic Learning Center (IBALC), where the participants attending were often shifted from the program back in to the school system multiple times.

There is no percentage given of boys who reported an increase in school engagement for several reasons including; the inconsistency of male staff to hold Boys Council leading in miscommunication and the use of substitutes throughout the sessions. This affected the number of Pre and Post surveys that were administered and turned in. Many of the same young men, who completed a Pre Survey, were not able to complete a Post survey. Some participants attended IBALC and were removed from placement, transitioned back to High School or placed in foster care without notice, so Post surveys were not able to be administered.

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.

FY13 Funding: \$43,407

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual*	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of students enrolled in Early Morning Drop Off.	199		106	199	130	196
▪ # of schools participating.	4		4	4	4	4

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.				1	1	4
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.				4	4	4
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.				4	4	4
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Average Daily Attendance (ADA) all student participants.	95.1%		95.2%	96%	95%	96%
▪ Percentage of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA basics.				0%	100%	100%
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.				5	5	5
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.				4	4	4.8
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.				3.8	4	4.4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.				2	3	3.5
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for all sites.				3.7	4	4.4
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Kent County Middle School.				3.8	4	5
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Garnett Elementary School.				3.8	4	4.4
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Galena Elementary School.				2.8	3	4.4
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Rock Hall Elementary School.				3.8	4	4
▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.				100% (n=4)	100% (n=4)	100% (N=4)
▪ % of parents who report that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the program**	97%		98%	100% (n=93/93)	95%	100% (N= 76)

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth participants who report that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” overall with the program on the program satisfaction survey. 				96% (n=75/79)	95%	98% (N=84)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with an ADA higher than their school grade ADA. 	85%		67%	62%	85%	78% (N=135)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with a GPA equal to or greater than their school grade GPA.*** 			67%	100%	60%	56% (N=79)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with a truancy rate lower than their school grade truancy rate.+ 				100%	80%	70% (N=138)

*** 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 the 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.

Story Behind the Performance:

In the “Is Anyone Better Off” section all three of our measures were not meeting our targets. In light of that, the reasoning is because the measures for the overall school grades were much higher this year making it more difficult to top. The percent of participants with an ADA higher than the school grade was below our target percentage for FY13, however was a significant increase from our actual performance in FY12.

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.

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 as suitable for this program 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.

FY13 Funding: \$62,583

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of youth participants.	15	25	20	27
▪ Number of evening reporting sessions completed.	60	92	80	136
▪ Number of venturing activities conducted.	33	38	35	32
How Well We Do It:				
▪ % of participants who attend at least 96% of evening reporting sessions (only one session missed) within 98 days.		68% (n=17/25)	70%	77% (N=17)
▪ % of participants who complete the KCDP 91-day program within 98 days. ⁸	90% (n=9/10)	68% (n=17/25)	65%	68% (N=15)
▪ % of participants who are satisfied with the Program as indicated on the exit survey.	100% (n=8)	94% (n=15/16)	85%	100% (N=22)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ % of participants who did not have a subsequent violation of criminal and/or a court order while participating in KCDP ⁹	78.3% (n=5/23)	100% (n=25/25)	85%	100% (N=27)
▪ % of participants not court ordered to detention or shelter placement for three months after completing the program.	100% (n=0)	100% (n=17/17)	85%	100% (N=22)
▪ % of participants who showed improvements in both pro-social and conflict resolution skills as measured by the pre/post assessment.	60% (n=3/5)	76% (n=13/17)	80%	86% (N=19)

Story Behind the Performance: The number of venturing activities conducted is 2 below our target for FY13. Most of the venturing activities are held outside, when weather permits. In a few cases of scheduled activity, severe storms did not allow for the activity to take place.

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: Excel Beyond the Bell (EBB) Services

Program Summary: Excel Beyond the Bell Services is comprehensive out-of-school time (OOST) 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.

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

⁸ 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.

⁹ The subsequent violation must be a new charge, not a 'basic' violation such as smoking or truancy.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$542,784

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1 – 6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					22	22	24
▪ # of programs submitting program self-assessments.					10	10	10
▪ # of programs submitting Program Improvement Plans.					10	10	10
▪ # of participants at professional development trainings.					306	300	659
▪ # of OOST options available for students beyond extracurricular school offerings.					44	50	57
▪ # of programming hours offered.					282	280	272.5 ¹
▪ # of youth served.	1471	1669	1009	786	744	700	841
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Average Daily Attendance.*				73%	77%	N= 200/75%	N=189 75%
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.				89%	91%	N=10 100%	N=10 100%
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					4.62	4	4.52
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					4.51	4	4.43
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.96	3.5	3.97
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					3.63	3.5	3.74
▪ # and % of programs with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					91%	N=10 100%	N=10 100%
▪ # and % of program participants who participated in programming 4 hours per week.					48%	50%	74%
▪ % of program participants satisfied or very satisfied with their program (sense of belonging, fun and safety) as measured by an average of all surveys administered at the end of each program session.	96%	78%	78%	84%	78%	75%	N=1457 91%
▪ % 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%	77%	75%	N=1420 89%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1 – 6/30/13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # and % of programs that report satisfaction with their overall involvement in EBB services: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 82% 2) 82% 3) 82%	1) N= 8;75% 2) N= 8;75% 3) N= 8;75%	1) N= 8; 80% 2) N= 8; 80% 3) N= 8; 80%
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of program participants that report contribution of program to positive social and personal skills: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 63% 2) 67% 3) 61%	1) 70% 2) 70% 3) 70%	1) 78% 2) 80% 3) 81%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of program participants who demonstrate : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 57% 2) 96% 3) 3.0 4) 88%	1) 60% 2) 95% 3) 2.5 4) 80%	1) 72% 2) 95% 3) 3.0 4) 91%

*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.

What's the story behind the performance?

If the goal was not met, describe the challenges, any adjustments made during the second half of the year in an attempt to meet the goal and changes to be instituted in FY14 (as applicable for continuing programs).

¹All objectives were met except for number of programming days. 2 days of programming was missed in October due to weather.

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

FY13 Funding: \$105,544

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 actual 7/1/12- 06/30/13
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	109	85	128
▪ Family*	72	91	87	79	54	55	60
▪ Group*	22	7	0	0	0	0	17
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	28	130	107	280	155	92	186
▪ Family*	49	35	28	6	44	20	58
▪ Group*	22	14	0	0	0	10	0 ²
➤ # and % of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	296	169	121	129	105	100	N=158 53%
▪ # & % of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	11	24	19	33	19	20	N=45 28%
➤ # of Social Skills/Conflict Resolution Programs held					59	25	42
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	96%	100%	92% N=185
➤ % & # of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	75%	90%	70%	88% N=21	71%	85%	86% N=146
➤ % & # of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	93%	70%	93% N=32	79%	85%	78% ³ N=12
➤ % and # of clients reporting satisfaction with services received (based on surveys administered quarterly).					97%	60%	98% N=165
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	100%	90%	99% N=157
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					48%	60%	62% N=94
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.					36%	60%	61% N=69
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.					36%	60%	58% ⁴ N=80

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Number of youth served by MST.	56	59	45	47	15	15	15	15
Average length of duration in days for youth receiving MST services.	128	104	112	134	112	93	90	119
Number of service “slots” available.**					6	6	6	5
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	73% N=11	70%	93% N=14
% of cases completing treatment with goals attained.	87%	80.49%	88%	81% N=38	86% N=13	87% N=13	80%	79% N=11
% 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	80% N=12	80%	93% N=14
Is Anyone Better Off?								
% of youth at home at case discharge.	87%	87.80%	84%	90% N=42	100% N=15	87% N=13	80%	80% N=12
% of youth attending school or working at discharge.	87%	80.49%	80%	87% N=41	86% N=13	73% N=11	70%	67% N=10
% of youth who do not experience arrest or re-arrest while receiving services.	91%	90.24%	89%	90% N=42	86% N=13	87% N=13	80%	93% N=14

**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 MST program was 7% shy of the target completion rate of 80% for cases completing treatment with goals attained. Of the 13 youth who were discharged during this period, 73% completed treatment, with some or all goals met. It should be noted that around 8% (one youth) moved out of the service area and 8% (one youth) were removed by the funding source (both things affecting completion rates that are outside of MST’s control). Statistically, having a smaller samples size (like only 13 participants) leaves more room for more extreme data outcomes. Such as with this year’s data, we would have exceeded the goal if not for those two cases. There were two youth who stopped due to lack of engagement, something that we were very regretful to see happen despite our best efforts. One family was experiencing significant crises with other family members (e.g. illnesses, evictions, etc.) and we could not get the mother to agree to sessions, but said she would be open to restarting MST when the situations got stabilized. The MST supervisor and program director both reached out to mother to encourage her to continue, but could not change her mind. The other youth was having significant behavior problems and facing placement in D.C. detention. The MST therapist, the MST supervisor, and program director all made significant effort to engage mother, but could not get her to continue. Completion rates with DJS youth were not an issue, and we speculate that the involvement of DJS workers and pressure of court orders certainly helps keep family members involved in MST. Eventually, nearly all reluctant families find benefits from MST. Because GOC youth do not have the same ultimatums or pressures to remain in MST, engagement can be more of an issue because of the time and effort required of parents.

The MST program was also 6% shy of the target for school/work success of 70%. It should be noted that most of those youth had truancy as main problems. While this target wasn’t met, the DJS youth had significantly more truancy issues than GOC youth. Particularly, an average of 3.25 of 5 active GOC cases had truancy issues, compared to average of 6.5 of 18 active DJS cases. This different might explain why GOC youth didn’t meet this target and DJS youth did. GOC youth also presented with more psychiatric issues (3 times more than DJS youth), making their needs more complex and challenging. Additionally, as was the case with completion rates, having a small samples size can inflate and deflate statistical outcomes. For example, one youth was not in school because he was detained at the time of discharge, but there had been significant progress made regarding that youth’s behavior and academics in school. If we counted that youth as having school success (which was the case until his detainment), then we would have again exceeded the target goal. Two of the youth without school success had substantial mental health problems, violent/self-harming behavior, and were at high risk of being removed from the home by parents. With MST’s assistance, they both stayed in the home and ran away less, but school/work success was not effectively resolved. School/work success is a major source of involvement for MST and is part of over-arching goals for nearly every client. MST therapists often attend

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

school meetings and advocate for needed services, so we continue to put tremendous effort into this area of need. As with completion rates, the DJS/court oversight of DJS youth is something MST therapists can capitalize on to increase school/work success, but the absence of that oversight with GOC makes that task more challenging.

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 shelters 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.

FY13 Funding: \$364,911

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual*	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:								
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					9	7	11	13
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.					3	3	4	4
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.					3	3	4	2
# of children/youth served in after school programs.	642	450	483	573	393	386	350	444
# of after school sites.	15	9	9	8	8	8	8	11
# of snacks served.						44,649	40,000	34,464
# of meals served.						40,137	40,000	37,913
How Well We Do It:								
Average Daily attendance.					71% N=279	80% N=257	80%	80% N=355
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.					100%	100% N=3	90%	100% N=4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					4.78	4.4	4	4.61
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					4.38	4.5	4	3.95
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.31	3.83	3	3.56
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					2.33	2.79	2	2.69

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					100% N=3	100% N=3	50%	50% N=2
# and % of participants who attend 90% of the total sessions.	95%	98%	76%	91% N=521	79% N=310	88% N=341	80%	% N=188
# and % of after school staff retained since the start of the school year.						93% N=22	90%	93% N=39
# and % of Youth Engagement Surveys where the student score was 7 or higher (administered quarterly).						86% N=332	80%	92% N=79
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	61% N=236	60%	49% N=85
% 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	54% N=207	50%	59% N=141
% of youth who show both improved emotional and 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	100% N=335	90%	92% N=297
% of participants whose school attendance improved from the 1 st quarter to the 2 nd or 3 rd quarter.***						67% N=259	60%	95% N=102

*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 the Phoenix Gang Prevention and Intervention model 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

FY13 Funding: \$73,243

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of times the curriculum is implemented in its entirety.	7	3	2	4	3	2
▪ Number of communities where trainings held.	16	13	6	5	5	6
▪ Number of outreach activities to communities.	48	50	21	6	4	4
▪ Number of youth participants in the rounds of curriculum implementation.	164	116	82	85	75	41
▪ Number of schools and other sites implementing the curriculum.^	^	^	^	3	3	2
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of participants who indicated on survey that they would recommend training to others.	100%	100% N=116	80% N=66	80% N=46/57	80%	100% N=41
▪ % of participants who indicate they are satisfied with the quality of service they have received.	**	**	96% N=79	94% N=54/57	90%	91% N=37
▪ % of participants who feel that services have helped them to deal with their problems more effectively based on post-test at end of curriculum.	^	^	^	75% N=43/57	75%	100% N=41
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of participants with any increase in their general conflict resolution skills as measured by the Rosenberg Scale.	47%	40% N=46	100% N=82	99% N=56/57	90%	61% N=25
▪ % of participants who have a “positive attitude change” toward gang membership/involvement as measured annually by the curriculum survey.	80%	100% N=116	90% N=74	80% N=46/57	80%	73% N=30
▪ % of participants who have a greater knowledge of gang issues based on post-test at end of curriculum.	^	^	^	85% N=48/57	80%	83% N=34

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

Story Behind the Performance: The vendor did not receive a ratified contract until October 2012 at which time the vendor began to hire a program coordinator. Unfortunately, the program experienced staff turnover with the coordinator resigning. A new coordinator was not hired until January 2013 which impacted the program tremendously. In order to meet as many program requirements as possible, the program operated on a compressed schedule. The effects off the delayed contract and staff turnover made it difficult to complete the targeted number of curriculum sessions, and retain the adequate amount of students in the program sessions. Changes in the school administration was the reason the curriculum was dropped from the third site which further reduced the opportunity to enroll more students in the program and increase the curriculum rounds. Due to the compressed schedule, there was a reduction in conflict resolution activities, as a result, participants did not meet the targeted goal for an increased knowledge in conflict resolution skills.

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: Kinship Pride Curriculum

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.

FY13 Funding: \$91,257

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:								
Number of families served.	111	109	143	117	81	59	70	98
Number of children served.					74	107	90	186
Number of referrals made to community resources.						130	100	340
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	98% N=40/41	90%	100% N=73
% 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	100% N=40/40	90%	100% N=73
% 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	94% N=46/49	90%	96% N=81
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	100% N=46/46	90%	99% N=184
% 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	98% N=45/46	90%	98% N=96
% 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	98% N=58/59	90%	100% N=47
% 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	98% N=58/59	90%	100% N=47

*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: CAFAS, 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.

FY13 Funding: \$130,890

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:								
Number of families served.*	40	212	140	233	50	181	140	64
Number of participants served.*	40	225	155	260	50	354	150	64
Number of trained school personnel.**	50	100	75	40	12	0	0	0
Number of referrals made to community resources.						91	100	137
Number of parent engagement activities							4	8
How Well We Do It:								
Staff to family ratio.	1:25	1:75	1:70	1:15 N=217	1:25 N=50	1:89	1:25	1:32
Percentage of assessments completed within 15 days of referral.	75%	75%	75%	93%	60% N=30	35% N=123	75%	100% N=64
Percentage 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.						43% N=153	50%	59% N=38
Is Anyone Better Off?								
Percentage of participants served who decrease number of days absent.	70%	95%	70%	64% N=149	34% N=17	34% N=121	50%	62.6% N=40
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	34% N=121	60%	63.5% N=40
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 						39% N=98/260 39% N=108/278	50% 50%	63% N=40 63% N=40
Percentage of participants who decrease number of days tardy.						53% N=70/133	50%	64% N=40

*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.

**Trained school personnel numbers are dropping in successive years as most personnel were trained in FY09. Over time, many of the school personnel who were trained were support staff such as PPWs and Parent Liaisons and many were let go as a result of the economic downturn and budget reductions. The number reported in FY11 are staff who have been previously trained and are still available to the program.

***The decrease in school behaviors measure was changed because the number of expulsions was zero and office referrals could not be tracked unless there was a suspension.

^For FY07-FY11, actual data reported is for assessments completed within 15 days of referral. The measure was changed to allow for more time to engage the families.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Story Behind the Performance:

The Truancy Prevention Program had a change in leadership around the beginning of the school year which presented challenges for the new person in charge to become knowledgeable about the program. The program is operated by the District Heights Family & Youth Services Center and the Director at the beginning of the fiscal year left abruptly. The new Director had to take over without the assistance of the previous Director. There were some challenges with obtaining MOUs with the Truancy schools that were identified to receive services and the schools seemed somewhat reluctant to refer the students to the Truancy program. The provider initially reported 153 unduplicated youth served in the Truancy Prevention program, however when the LMB reviewed the data for the Truancy students served by the target schools the total came to 64. Therefore, the FY'13 Actuals were revised to reflect this number. The service provider reported there were "90 students receiving informal/case management-type services for FY'13" but they were not reported as served through the targeted truancy schools so the LMB did not think they could count them.

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 Family 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.

FY13 Funding: \$356,176

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
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	149	100	116
▪ Family		297	350	358	462	346	300	308
▪ Group		62	58	85	88	59	50	30
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	659							
▪ Individual		511	295	317	374	274	250	266
▪ Family		241	250	265	296	260	200	170
▪ Group		29	4	123	66	8	5	25
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	403	402	521	536	558	790	700	721
▪ # of individual youth for who substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	35	74	87	77	122	138	100	78
# of formal counseling cases served in TF-CBT as a result of assessment						227	200	222

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
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	95% N=528	85%	93% N=178
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	68%	66%	71%	71% N=430	69% N=287	74% N=408	70%	68% N=103
% of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	50%	95%	99%	97% N=25	97% N=25	92% N=23	90%	88% N=12
% of individuals completing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as recommended.						89% N=480	80%	72% N=81
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	96% N=532	90%	99% N=240
% 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	81% N=449	80%	79% N=124
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.						79% N=438	75%	73% N=82
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.						82% N=454	80%	68% N=68
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.						83% N=460	80%	76% N=13
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.						88% N=488	80%	52% N=77

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.						82% N=454	80%	73% N=90
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.						93% N=515	90%	35% N=12
# and % of individuals receiving CBT with an improved Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge.						96% N=95	90%	96% N=111

Story Behind the Performance:

The Formal Group Counseling projection number should have been adjusted down to 25 as only 2 of the 5 YSBs conduct formal group counseling. The Informal Family Counseling was below target because 2 of the 5 YSBs did not reach their targets. The number of substance abuse assessment referrals was below target because 4 of the 5 YSBs were well below their targets. The “Terminate By Mutual Plan” target was not met because only 1 of the YSBs met their target. The CAFAS Total Score measure was only 1% below the target measure. The CAFAS School measure was only 2% below the measure. The CAFAS Home Behavior Toward Others sub-scales seemed to reflect an increase in family dysfunction and lack of respect or consideration for others. The CAFAS Mood sub-scale may be an indication of undiagnosed emotional or mental health disorders i.e. depression, ADD, etc. The Substance sub-scale may be an indication of the growing problem with substances such as alcohol, marijuana, inhalants and the inability to engage youth in traditional methods of treatment. The LMB will meet with all of the YSBs to provide technical assistance and explore in more detail the measures that were not met in FY’13. We will also take a look at the first quarter performance measures to gain a snapshot of which YSB s are on target and which ones are below target. Some of the measures may be adjusted i.e. Formal Group Counseling to come in line with past performances.

LMB: Prince George’s County

Program Name: Teen Court

Program Summary: 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.

FY13 Funding: \$60,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12 - 6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:			
Number of juveniles referred to Teen Court	255	200	407
Number of juveniles served through Teen Court	61	75	73
Number of volunteers recruited	214	200	726
How Well We Do It:			

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Percent of youth participants successfully completing Teen Court program during the 60 day time period.	86% N=22/24	80%	74% N=54
Percent of participants who earn student service learning hours while involved with Teen Court program.	100% N=214	90%	100% N=726
Percent of youth satisfied with the program as indicated on a survey administered as part of the discharge process.	100% N=24/24	90%	100% N=54
Is Anyone Better Off?			
Percent of youth not experiencing arrest, rearrest or any subsequent DJS involvement during program duration.	100% N=24/24	90%	99% N=72
Percent of youth whose charges were dismissed as a result of successful program completion.	86% N=22/24	80%	100% N=54
Percent of youth whose record was expunged as a result of successful program completion.	86% N=22/24	80%	100% N=54

If the youth are not enrolled and attending school they are either suspended, expelled or truant which increases the likelihood of further DJS involvement. This measure is one of the factors considered when interviewing youth for acceptance in the program. GPA is important because if the youth are not successful in school this creates a real potential for suspension, expulsion, truancy, dropout and juvenile delinquency of DJS involvement. Adults include the court personnel and staff from the State's Attorney's Office.

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 SB 882 Population: Through this program the students, 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.

FY13 Funding: \$52,244

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12-6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:							
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					1	2	3
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.					2	2	2
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.					0	2	2
# of middle school youth served:	377	323	290	320	307	240	337
▪ Matapeake					126	125	162
▪ Stevensville					182	115	175
How Well We Do It:							
Average Daily Attendance			82.8%	82.5%			
▪ Matapeake					84.7%	75%	87.3%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12- 6/30/13
▪ Stevensville					74.5%	75%	77.5%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.					0	50%	100% N=2
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					MMS 4.92 STMS 4.15	3 3	MMS 5.00 STMS 4.80
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					MMS 4.41 STMS 3.83	3 3	MMS 4.89 STMS 4.25
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					MMS 3.96 STMS 3.58	3 3	MMS 4.25 STMS 3.67
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					MMS 2.33 STMS 3.00	3 3	MMS 3.17 STMS 3.17
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).					MMS 3.91 STMS 3.64	3 3	MMS 4.33 STMS 3.98
# /% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.					0/0%	50%	100% N=2
#/% of Activity Instructors who grade the orientation as a grade B or higher as helpful in preparing them for the job (as per survey given at end of program).				7/100%			
▪ Matapeake					11/82% N=9	60%	100% N=16
▪ Stevensville					6/83% N=5	60%	83% N=12
#/% of parents/guardians that gave a grade of B or better to the Activity Instructors being responsive to their child's needs/requests (as per survey given at end of program).				10/100%			
▪ Matapeake					12/100% N=12	80%	100% N=24
▪ Stevensville					17/100%	80%	100%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12-6/30/13
					N=17		N=24
Is Anyone Better Off?							
#/% of participants that self-report positive personal change (as per annual survey given at end of program).	83.4%	261/81%	116/88%	88/80%			
▪ Matapeake					160/99% N=157	80%	89% N=118
▪ Stevensville					155/93% N=144	80%	90% N=117
#/% of full-time program participants who achieved school attendance of 94%.	69%	229/71%	95.45%	55/74.5%			
▪ Matapeake					11/73% N=8	70%	74% N=31
▪ Stevensville					20/80% N=16	70%	78% N=29
#/% of participants that self-report learning new skills (as per annual survey given at end of program).							
▪ Matapeake					154/97% N=149	80%	91% N=118
▪ Stevensville					155/93% N=144	80%	90% N=117

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 that are at-risk of juvenile delinquency.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: National Mentoring Partnership/Maryland State Mentoring Program

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 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.

FY13 Funding: \$25,360

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12-6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ # of youth served.	8	9 ¹	9	3 ¹
▪ # of mentors recruited.	5	10	5	13
▪ # of mentors completing at least one additional training for at-risk youth offered by the Local Management Board during the school year.	3	4 ²	4	1 ²

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

What/How Much We Do:							
# of youth served.	28	27	25	25	18	42	20 ¹
# of youth/families referred to community services.				15	10	10	16
# of referred youth who are matched with an Achievement Mentor.				5	3	42	20 ¹
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%	15/83% N=18	80%	85% N=17
#/% of participants who stay enrolled in the program for at least 3 months.	87%	26/96%	25/100%	20/80%	16/88% N=18	80%	100% N=20
#/% of mentors who meet with students at least 15 minutes per school week to acknowledge accomplishments.					2/66% N=3	66%	2/66% N=3
Is Anyone Better Off?							
#/% of participants with less than 8 behavioral referrals in the last 6 months.	84%	26/96% (N=26)	23/93% (N=23)	21/85% (N=21)	14/75% N=18	75%	80% N=16
#/% of participants that maintain at least a 90% school attendance.	52%	20/73%	19/76%	19/75%	13/71% N=18	75%	60% ² N=12
#/% of participants who have no Department of Juvenile Services referrals while enrolled in the program.	91%	25/92%	21/84%	21/85%	17/94% N=18	85%	90% N=18

1. The reason the number is not higher is that the case manager always pulls students during the last 15-20 minutes of class or at the very beginning of class unless it is a Unified Arts class. This is due to the fact that many of these students have severe truancy issues and their teachers want them to be in content area classes as much as possible, even though the case manager can only meet with them one to two times per week. In addition, the case manager must travel to a different school each day, with 5-6 periods to see a maximum of 6-7 students per school.
2. Many of these students have had attendance problems since elementary school. The guidance counselor, principal, assistant principal and nurse all are part of an attendance committee. We also would alternate calling home, investigating with the parent and child, but it is an on-going issue and process that takes a long time to correct. This year, more so than any other year in the past, the case manager had the highest rate of students referred to her with truancy as a number one and continuous concern.

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 Program/Evidence-Based Practice 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,

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$3,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12-6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of volunteer Character Counts coaches.	116	117	111	107	111	105	105
▪ # of months with bi-weekly press releases, cable coverage and/or participation in a community event.	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
▪ # of students served.				4295	4,777	4000	4,800
How Well We Do It:							
▪ #/% of classes with Character Counts coaches for grades 1-6.	88%	102/87%	150/92%	143/91%	107/86% N=124	85%	121/85% N=143
▪ #/Annual retention rate for Character Counts Coaches.	97%	63/54%	70/60%	70/65%	43/62% N=69	60%	74/71% N=105
▪ #/% of character coaches who present a monthly anti-bullying message to their class.					86/90% N=95	70%	100% N=105
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 admin every other year	4/67%	Survey admin every other year	6/100%	To be admin in 2013	25%	6/100%
▪ #/% of “Businesses of Character” that meet 100% of their Character Counts Plan of Commitment goals.	90%	40/85%	39/85%	40/85%	35/88% N=40	80%	40/82% N=49
▪ #/% 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 to deal with bullying concerns.				122/70%	24/15% N=162		
▪ #/% of 9 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 to deal with bullying concerns.						50%	129/37% ¹ N=346

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

1. Character Coaches present a monthly anti-bullying lesson as it is now included in our school district’s plan as a community measure to help in dealing with bullying awareness and education on strategies. As for Character Coaches influence on helping with anti-bullying measures – the 9th grade percentage is higher than their previous percentage in 8th grade (37% - 2013 vs.15% - 2012). But the percentages still show that regular contact with a character coach would increase the effectiveness.

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 Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: OJJDP Effective Program

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

FY13 Funding: \$57,616

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual 7/1/12-6/30/13
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of families served.	55	59	43	38^^	50	40	51
▪ # of developmental screenings.	84	81	71	78	119	75	114
▪ # of referrals to service.	64	80	157	175	288	200	203
▪ # of teen parents served (subset of # of families served).				12^^^	13	13	18
▪ # of referrals to service for teen parents.				62	78	60	107
▪ # of home visits.					611	500	614
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%	24/100% N=24	90%	29/100% N=29
▪ #/% of participants that maintain or reach the target range for “Use of Community Resources” using the Life Skills Progression Tool (new measure).				9/75%	11/79% N=14	70%	37/74% N=50
▪ #/% screened children that are identified as having a developmental delay.					0/0% N=37	<1%	5% 2/42 ¹
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%	46/100% N=46	85%	50/98% N=51
▪ #/% of participants that maintain or reach the *target range for “Family Relation-ships” using the Life Skills Progression Tool (new measure). *				8/67%^^^^	10/83% N=12	75%	44/88% N=50
▪ #/% of participant children who are fully immunized for the year.					45/98% N=46	90%	42/100% N=42

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

1. 2 children have had a developmental delay. The FSW detected it through the ASQ assessment and referred both families to early intervention services. Both families are receiving services.

LMB: St. Mary's County – Report not finalized.

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

FY13 Funding: \$140,784

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Total number of youth served.	86	125	197	80	108
▪ Total number of staff working with youth.					
○ Paid Staff			20	10	12
○ Volunteer Staff			25	5	15
▪ Number of EBP sessions provided.					
○ Positive Action			120	50	50
○ Too Good For Violence			82	50	50
▪ Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			2	2	2
▪ Number of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.			1	1	Exempt
▪ Number of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			1	1	Exempt
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)	88% (N=174)	80%	98% (N=105)
▪ Percent of youth who attend at least 80% of program days.		64% (N=80)	84% (N=165)	70%	84% (N=90)
▪ Percent of participating youth completing all EBP sessions successfully (workbook completion).					
○ Positive Action			89% (N=176)	70%	97%
○ Too Good for Violence			92% (N=182)	70%	(N=104 95% (N=102)

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ Average Daily Attendance			81% (N=160)	75%	85% (N=92)
▪ Percentage of program sites that have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			100%	100%	Exempt
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.26	4.47	Exempt
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			3.90	4.09	Exempt
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			2.83	2.97	Exempt
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			2.17	2.27	Exempt
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site: ○ Village Youth Center			3.29	3.45	Exempt
▪ Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			N=1 50%	N=1 100%	Exempt
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ Percentage of participants who decreased their total school disciplinary actions in the 3 rd and 4 th quarter of the previous school year as compared to their total school disciplinary actions in the 3 rd and 4 th quarter of the current school year.	3%	29% (N=37)	4.7% (N=10)	4%	3.1% (N=3)
▪ Percent of youth with prior offenses who have not re-offended during the program period.	No Prior Offenses	No Prior Offenses	No Prior Offenses	50%	No Prior Offenses
▪ Percentage of participants who increased their reading grades from the 3 rd and 4 th quarter of the previous school year as compared to their reading grades in the 3 rd and 4 th quarter of the current school year.			32% (N=63)	25%	29% (N=31)

*New program in FY10 – data not available for all measures.

What's the story behind the performance?

Because of the overall devastation and trauma experienced as a result of Hurricane Sandy, the level of disciplinary actions throughout the schools increased in comparison to previous years, and unfortunately was seen with the youth of this program as well. Support services and counseling have been put into place throughout the county, so the expectation is that these issues will be resolved in FY14.

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: 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, thereby preventing delinquent behavior as a result of substance use

FY13 Funding: \$25,435

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of alcohol sales compliance checks completed.	59	69	131	81	102	90	0
▪ Number of CMCA Team Members.	12	17	15	20	15	15	16
▪ Number of alcohol-related citations issued to youth.	11	13	19	47	19	21	4
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Average score on Question #18 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	4.75	5.1	5.6	5.6	5.6	5	5.6
▪ Average score on Question #25 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	6.75	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.2	5	5.2
▪ Percent of CMCA Task Force Team members who are community based, not agency-based.					47% (7 of 15)	50%	50% (8 of 16)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percent of increased compliance over first round of checks.	14%	15%	21%	100%	21.5% (N=22)	20%	0%
▪ Percent increase in number of alcohol related citations issued to youth.	0%	9%	46%	247%	0%	10%	0%
▪ Percent of Merchants receiving educational packets regarding underage drinking laws.					91% (32 of 35)	50%	94% (33 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.

What's the story behind the performance?

Unfortunately, our mid year report was in error regarding the number of compliance checks. There were staffing changes within the Maryland State Police, including the lead officer in charge of this program. Apparently the officer misunderstood the request during the mid year, and also misunderstood the requirements of the grant. In reality, no compliance checks were scheduled or completed in FY13. Party patrols to reduce underage drinking were completed, but few youth were found with alcohol. This may be the turn in the tide we have been working toward, but we will evaluate the results in FY14 to ensure this was not an anomaly.

The situation with the oversight of the program have been corrected, the barracks commander has reassigned an officer to the program, ensured he fully understands all requirements of the program, and have begun the process of developing and planning the first round of compliance checks to be completed in November. Additionally, the SCLMB will begin participating in the compliance checks via ride along to observe the operations. We had not done this in the past for fear of interrupting or otherwise compromising the operations, but after consideration and review of the apparent confusion in FY13, we feel the need to ensure complete compliance in the program operations far outweighs the concerns at this point.

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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)

FY13 Funding: \$42,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of families served (new families)	7	11	9	7	13	10	7
▪ # of families served (new & ongoing)	7	16	13	13	19	15	28
▪ # of contact hours per family per week, per phase:							
○ Intensive	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
○ Step-down		3	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)	93% (N=13/14)	85%	100% (8/8)
▪ % 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)	0% (N = 0)	25%	100% (1/1)
▪ % of families that are discharged from the program satisfactorily (met goals or stepped down to another less-intensive DSS service).					85% (N=11/13)	80%	88% (5/6)
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)	93% (N=25/27)	90%	90% (23/26)
▪ % 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% (N=27/27)	90%	91% (24/26)
▪ % of new participants who do not have a Child Protective Services report while receiving VFS.				94% (N=16/17)	100% (N=27/27)	90%	91% (24/26)

The Story Behind the Performance?

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$55,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	4	2	4
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	2	2	2
# of programs/sites submitting YPQA Program Improvement Plans.	1	2	2
# of youth served.	175	150	286
# of program/activities offerings (social, recreational, academic, etc.).	43	35	183
# of family activities offered		2	18
How Well We Do It:			
Average Daily Attendance.	96%	85%	91%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	100% (2/2)	100%	100(2/2)%
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	4.1	3.25	4.27
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	3.76	3.25	4.1
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3.02	3.25	3.61
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	3.52	3.25	3.82
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	Combined Average 3.6 (SM – 3.29 TAYA – 3.91)	3.25	3.92 TAYA– 3.91 SM – 3.98
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have a Program Improvement Plan.	50% (1/2)	100%	100% 2/2
% of participants attending at least 75% of their scheduled time.	86.9%	85%	91.6%
% reporting satisfaction with services as measured by survey each Spring			
o youth	100% (89/89)	90%	100% (73/73)
o parents	100% (60/60)	90%	100% (48/48)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
# and % of participants who attend school at least 95% of the time (at least 171 of 180 days).	78% (136/175)	80%	83% (262/272) TAYA - 156/168=93%

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
			SM – 70/104 = 69%
# and % of participants with final math grade of C or better.	96% (168/175)	80%	93% (209/224) TAYA – 156/168=80% SM- 53/56 = 95%*
# and % of participants with final/year-end reading or English or Language Arts grade of C or better.	95% (166/175)	80%	85% (191/224) TAYA – 136/168=81% SM – 55/56 = 98%*

*The LMB previously funded OOST in FY08-FY11 but the performance measures for those years are not applicable to FY12 strategies.

*Grades K-2 do not utilize a lettered grading system

The Story Behind the Performance?

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.

FY13 Funding: \$45,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of community partners/organizations that participate in the development and implementation of a County Wide Youth Development Plan. 	41	51	45	64 Individuals 44 Organizations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of middle/high school age youth receiving prevention education information, programming and/or services. 	2,942	3,177	3,200	3715
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of online contacts (via Teens Have Choices: website, Facebook fans, YouTube views, Twitter followers). 	6,013	7,121	7,000	9807
How Well We Do It:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of County Wide Youth Development Plan meetings in which 75% or more of 			50%	0%

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
the participating organizations are present.^				
▪ Percentage of youth who would recommend the prevention education program to a friend as measured by post program surveys.	80% N=888	84% N=1,079	80%	85% N=1,028
▪ Percentage of surveyed youth who report that the Teens Have Choices website provided useful information and resources related to their health.^		85% N=17	80%	83% N=51
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	82% N=1,870	80%	87% N=2,358
<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	48% N=22	50%	56% N=177
▪ Percentage of sexually active youth who report <u>never</u> having sex under the influence of drugs or alcohol.	86% N=49	59% N=29	60%	73% N=251
▪ Percentage of youth who report they have never have had five or more alcoholic drinks on one occasion.	75% N=43	59% N=54	60%	74% N=502

^ New measure in FY13.

^^ New measure in FY12.

What's the story behind the performance?

Percentage of County Wide Youth Development Plan meetings in which 75% or more of the participating organizations are present-

The vendor did not meet the above goal since many of the 44 organizations are not able to attend each meeting. In terms of our meetings, 8 organizations participated in September; 15 participated in November; 14 participated in January and in March; and 8 participated in the May training. We are averaging about 15-20 people at our recent meetings, which we are very excited about, but many organizations send multiple representatives. In addition, 19 organizations, 11 of whom do not regularly attend meetings, did participate in the Just Teens event.

The Grant Manager will work with the vendor in FY14 to develop a strategy to improve participation in these meetings or adjust the target if it is not reasonably attainable due to circumstances beyond the vendor's control.

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: 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. The Tomorrow's Leaders Program is specifically targeted toward meeting the needs of center city, disadvantaged youth.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY13 Funding: \$64,181

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of unduplicated youth served.	127	118	80	140
▪ 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	522	200	482
▪ Number of youth placed in internships/junior staff positions.^		88	60	126
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	83% N=73	75%	83% N=126
▪ Percentage of youth who would recommend the program to a friend (post program survey).	92% N=112	94% N=59	85%	93% N=100
▪ Percentage of youth who attend 80% or more (26 or more) of the onsite instructional sessions.^		76% N=53	65%	60% N=84
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	93% N=89	85%	87% N=93
▪ 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	98% N=61	80%	84% N=89
▪ Percentage of youth who disagree or strongly disagree that “being a teen parent would be ok with me” (per Sexuality component post-test.^^		97% N=61	85%	99% 114

^ New measure for FY12

What’s the story behind the performance?

The only measure not exceeded by the program during FY13 was the percentage of youth who attended 80% of program sessions. However, falling short of the percentage goal was due to the fact that the program served more youth as demonstrated by the actual number of youth that did participate in 80% of sessions (84). Challenges faced by the Boys & Girls Club with the 80% attendance rate included the longevity of the program, the number of teens who became employed during the year, and some club members relocating. While falling slightly short of this target, it is important to note that the number of children who attended 80% or more of the sessions exceeded the target for unduplicated youth served. This target will be re-evaluated for FY14.

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$36,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 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	106	100	116
▪ Number of children for whom childcare was provided.	50	97	83	88	87	85	105
▪ Number of children enrolled at center who receive an ASQ screening.^					74	75	90
▪ Number of families that attend literacy events.^						75	71
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	71% N=30	65% N=26	68%	66% N=35
▪ 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% N=74	85%	86% N=90
▪ Percentage of families who agree/strongly agree that the early childhood education services provided met their expectations as measured by the Family Center Evaluation of Services Survey administered at the end of their educational program.^					100 N=42	85%	100% N=41
▪ Percentage of families who agree/strongly agree that the programs offered increased their feelings of being in control of their life and of being self-confident and capable of making informed decisions.^						85%	84% N=36
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrate an				91%	91%	85%	92%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
educational gain as measured by passing a testing level or receiving a grade promotion.^^^^				N=63	N=44		N=61
▪ 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	41% N=18	40%	66% N=24
▪ Percentage of participants who complete their education program who apply to post- secondary education or training opportunity.^						15%	79% N=19
▪ Percentage of children developing on target as per ASQ collected every six months.^				97% N=86	95% N=70	92%	100% N=90
▪ Percentage of participants who agree/strongly agree that they have a better understanding of what is available in the community and how to access resources.^						85%	100% N=31

^ New measure for FY12.

^^ New measure for FY13.

^^^ New measure for FY10.

^^^^ New measure for FY11.

What's the story behind the performance?

If the LMB or vendor is not on track to meet the target goal, describe the challenges encountered and any adjustments to be made during the second half of the fiscal year.

Participant satisfaction surveys were limited due to the fact that the survey was not administered in December and many students were already finished before the survey was given. This will be remedied in the future.

More families enrolled and began attending the Nurturing Parenting program than anticipated. However with larger enrollment comes more non-completion. We are required by our primary funding source to have 23 parents complete the program each year. This year we had 35 parents complete the Nurturing Parenting Program.

The Family Center successfully assisted 26 participants receive their High School Diploma, either through Adult Education or High School Credit programs. Nineteen of the twenty-six graduates applied to post secondary education through Hagerstown Community College. Several students have already begun to take classes while the others are preparing to begin the fall semester.

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: Washington County 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). 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.

**FY2013 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.

FY13 Funding: \$176,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Total number of new youth served.	526	141	340	320	278	300	207*
▪ Total number of ongoing youth served by the program.	102	351	96	83	96		72
▪ 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	246	220	182*
▪ Number of CINS youth who agree to a Family Service Plan.	35	43	39	40	32	30	25**
▪ Number of mentors recruited, trained and actively working with youth. [^]				3	12	10	14 [^]
▪ Number of ongoing mentor/mentee relationships. ^{^^}						10	10 ^{^^}
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	73.6% N=38	65%	66.6%** N=30
▪ 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	100% N=95	85%	99.1% N=116
▪ Percentage of mentors who report that adequate training was provided per mentor phone survey conducted 4 to 8 weeks after initiation of mentoring relationship. [^]				0%*	100% N=12	85%	100% ^{^^} N=13
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	87.7% N=260	80%	86.8% N=213
▪ 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	73.3% N=308	70%	75.1% N=233
▪ 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	80.8% N=73	75%	85.7% N=35

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
▪ 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	57.8% N=38	50%	60.8% N=23
▪ 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%* N=10	100% N=10	80%	96% N=25
▪ Percentage of mentees who avoid adjudication while engaging in mentoring relationship.^						70%	92% N=25

^ New measure for FY11.

^^ New measure for FY13.

*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.

**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.

*Several youth have either not appeared for intakes, denied the alleged charge against them, or the victim denied participation in the program, forcing us to forward the case to DJS for further action. A total of 58 cases were returned to DJS due to the aforementioned reasons.

**There were 35 CINS petitions that were not opened due to failure to attend intake appointments, no longer in need of services, duplication of services, and/or youth refused to participate in services.

***There were an additional 5 youth referred for services, however, they are all on waiting lists with various mental health agencies in the community.

^One mentor had 2 youth.

^^Of the 10 ongoing matches from FY 2012, 8 continue to meet at FY 2013 year end.

^^^One mentor was unable to be contacted, as she moved approximately 3-4 weeks after the match and left no forwarding address or phone number

What's the story behind the performance?

If the LMB or vendor is not on track to meet the target goal, describes the challenges encountered and any adjustments to be made during the second half of the fiscal year.

There will be a new vendor for this program in FY14, the vendor feels confident that they will be able increase the number of youth served and CINS youth served by implementing additional follow-up measures which should result in more youth participating in the program in FY14.

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

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$125,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.^					4	4	4
▪ Number of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.^					3	3	3
▪ Number of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.^					3	3	3
▪ Number of unduplicated youth served.	79	76	58	178	173	150	158
▪ Number 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	2,551	2,160	2334.5
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Average Daily Attendance.^^				82% N=82	99% N=94	85%	99% N=94
▪ Percentage of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.^					100% N=3	100%	100% N=3
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.^					Cascade: 4.7 Hancock: 4.8 Williamsport: 4.2	4.5	4.8
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.^					Cascade: 3.6 Hancock: 4.2 Williamsport: 3.9	4	4.2
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.^					Cascade: 3.5 Hancock: 3.2 Williamsport: 3.2	3.5	3.4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.^					Cascade: 2.2 Hancock: 2.8 Williamsport:	2.5	3.5

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
					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	3.5	4.0
▪ Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan. [^]					N=3 100%	N=3 100%	3 100%
▪ Percentage 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	88% N=485	85%	86% N=468
▪ Percentage 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	97% N=94	85%	90% N=94
▪ Percentage of participants for whom a parent satisfaction survey is collected. ^{^^^}						60%	75% N=101
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percentage 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	80% N=78	80%	91% N=96
▪ Percentage of participants who can demonstrate or report peer pressure resistance skills (through role play or Smart Moves post-test). ^{^^}				97% N=99	92% N=89	90%	91% N=96
▪ Percentage of participants who can report two or more effective strategies to deal with being bullied (per post-test). ^{^^}				98% N=100	98% N=95	90%	95% N=100
▪ Percentage of participants who can report two or more safe internet practices (per post-test). ^{^^}				97% N=99	92% N=89	90%	98% N=103

[^] New measure for FY12.

^{^^} New measure for FY11.

^{^^^} New measure for FY13.

What's the story behind the performance?

The ROSTI was very successful in meeting its performance measures, only falling short of meeting one target. The target which wasn't met was the YPQA score for Opportunities for Interaction. FY2013 was the first year of utilizing the YPQA and the goals were set without historical trends to base them on. Goals may need to be adjusted for FY14.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$192,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Number of families served:	32						
o New		18	11	32	22	15	57
o Total		50	46	42	32	50	94
Number of students served	29						
o New		18	13	32	27	15	64
o Total		52	46	44	37	50	96
Number of school personnel trained by program	16	30	5	8	10	10	25
How Well We Do It:							
Staff to family ratio							
o System Navigation	1:15	1:40	1:36	1:35	2:35	1:40	1:40
o Intensive Navigation***	1:10	1:10	1:10	1:10	1:10	1:10	1:10
% Advisory Committee members who report medium to high satisfaction with delivery of program services as measured by survey administered.				Not Conducted	N=4 100%	80%	100% N=10
% 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.					N=4 100%	96%	100% N=8
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%	N=51 81 %	80%	87.5%
% 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%	N=51 71%	70%	83.3% N=18
% of families reporting success in receiving needed services and or supports as provided by program staff (as					N=51 92%	80%	100% N=16

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
measured by survey annually).							

Notes: ***Defined as intensive wraparound delivery of services available 24/7 which differs from the Wraparound model implemented by Maryland's Care Management Entities.

Story Behind the Curve:

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: LAM: The Family Connection Center

Program Summary: Hybrid: The Family Connection Center provides a pathway for families in the navigation of the service delivery system. Under a "no wrong door" policy, families are able to enter the LAM through referrals from existing agencies including the CME or through individual contact in order to access all available services to support family to remain in community.

Target Population: Wicomico families with extensive needs (i.e.: mental health, behavioral needs, family instability).

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Based on implementation of a System of Care with fidelity per SAMSHA guidelines.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The LAM will target the Safe Streets Area, and provide targeted mobile resources to ensure familiarity with services offered.

FY13 Funding: \$ 115,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Number of families referred to a System/Family Navigator	126	125	100	135	157	150	186
Number of families served by a Navigator			98	105	148	125	161
Average number of referrals per family	107	118	3	3	2	2	2
Number of referrals made	3	3	235	315	330	300	292
Number of families with a completed family plan	0	0	72	105	148	125	161
Number of calls or walk-ins			160	175	858	750	1345
How Well We Do It:							
Average number of business days between referral and first person-to-person contact by Navigator.	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Number of completed CANS assessments used in developing a Family Plan.	N/A	65	65	105	116	115	122
Percent of families satisfied or higher with Navigation services (by subscale/question). Indicate number of surveys returned (N).	100% (18/6 = 33%)	N=10	N=15	N=25	N=22	N=40	N=20
○ Respectful of family		100%	80%	95%	100%	80%	100%
○ Concerned with well being of family		100%	100%	95%	100%	80%	100%
○ Assisted in identifying both family strengths and needs		100%	100%	95%	100%	80%	100%
○ Assisted family in setting its own goals		100%	80%	95%	88%	80%	95%
○ Effective in identifying services appropriate to meet family goals.		100%	100%	95%	100%	80%	100%

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
Percentage of families reporting they understood how to contact the suggested agencies/organizations.	100%	80%	80%	95%	100%	80%	100% N=20
Is Anyone Better Off?							
Percentage of families who report success in contacting suggested agencies/organizations.	83%	100%	80%	90%	100%	80%	100% N=20
Percentage of families who report success in receiving needed services or supports.	100%	100%	80%	95%	100%	60%	100% N=20
Percentage of families reporting an increase in their ability to advocate for the needs of their child(ren) after receiving Navigation services.	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%	80%	100% N=20
Percentage of families reporting a decrease in stress after receiving assistance from Navigation services.	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%	80%	100% N=20

Story Behind the Curve:

Surveys: The Family Connection Center (FCC) has increased the frequency in which satisfaction surveys are distributed from semi annually to monthly in an effort to increase response rates. Despite these changes FCC has only met 50% of its yearly target in this category. The FCC continues to explore methods to mitigate this challenge, in an effort to increase the number of satisfaction surveys that are returned.

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: Family Empowerment Initiative

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.

FY13 Funding: \$120,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
# of family support activities.	25	32	28	4	8	5	5
# of parents/caregivers trained as Family Leaders (N).	17	38	7	43	17	10	14
# of family empowerment workshops.	21*	95*	156*	50*	13	6	13

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
# of parents who participate in family empowerment workshops (unduplicated count).	72	157	396	134	117	60	99
# of people reached with mobile family resources.				1371	2473	1500	2546
# of trainings held to train Family Leaders.				2	6	3	4
How Well We Do It:							
% of committee members who report satisfaction with the activities.	86%	98%	95.3%	100%	N=29 100%	80%	100% N=22
% of Family Leaders (N) who complete all trainings within one year of their start date.	50%	81%	74%	50%	N=24 62%	60%	94% N=16
% of parents enrolled in Family Empowerment Workshops who receive a certificate of completion during fiscal year.	37%	97%	98%	93%	N=102 87%	80%	81% N=80
% of leaders expressing satisfaction with their facilitation experience in the workshop setting through survey after facilitation of Active Parenting workshop.				100%	N=29 100%	75%	100% N=22
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% **	N=96 94%	70%	95% N=77
% 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 due to gaining skills from attending and completing workshop.	90%	89%	90%	80%	N=93 91%	80%	97% N=76
% 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%	N=97 95%	80%	97% N=79

*Workshops were measured by length of workshop sessions.

**Measure reworded for better clarity.

Story Behind the Curve:

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding: \$272,487

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Total number of youth enrolled in OOST programs receiving Children's Cabinet funding : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At Sites ▪ Programs/Clubs ▪ In Activities By Network Providers 	46 27	75 35	235	289 348	203 1214	225 300 500	211 463 1964
Number of hours of structured, supervised activities available (calculated as hours per day x number of operational days): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At Sites ▪ In Programs/Clubs ▪ In Activities by Network Providers 				930	1677	1200 400 500	1751 1073 684
Number of parents who participate in the program, defined as attending at least one activity per fiscal year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At Sites ▪ Programs/Club ▪ Network Provider**Attendance at a program/site Family Night 				238	385	150 200 5	220 80 2
# of site staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.					6	8	5
# of sites submitting program self-assessments.					3	5	4
# of sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.					3	5	4
How Well We Do It:							
Average Daily attendance of site participants (measured as total attending/total enrolled to get program capacity)				241/83%	N=117 85%	80%	73% N=151
% of students who attend after school site for 90% of school days	65%	90%	80%	182/86%	N=137 80%	80%	81% N=123
# and % of programs, sites, and network providers that meet or exceed goal of initiating minimum of 10 Developmental Assets in	2/75%	2/100%	1/100%	5/100%	N=5 100%	100%	100% N=17

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
program structure							
# and % of after school sites that participate in Youth Programming Quality Assessment (YPQA) Process				5/40%	N=3 60%	100%	100% N=4
# and % of program sites who have at least one program staff that completed YPQA Basics training.					N=4 80%	100%	100% N=4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.					4.30	4.4	4.70
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.					4.07	4.1	4.42
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.					3.43	3.5	3.76
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.					3.22	3.3	3.71
Is Anyone Better Off?							
Percentage of site participants who increase or maintain school attendance from first to last marking period as measured by school report card.	88%	95%	80%	173/91%	N=145 97%	90%	90% N=163
Percentage of site participants who do not have a DJS intake during the school year (measured by self-report @ 6-months and year-end).	100%	94%	0%	187/98%	N=183 99%	95%	96% N=177
Percentage of site and program participants reporting program helped them become more interested in going to school.					N=94 68%	80%	N=35 60%

Story Behind the Curve:

During the first half of FY13, WPFC awarded 17 OOST grants to programs/clubs, sites, and network providers. While many were able to begin in September, there are a handful of new programs that had January start dates, which impacted some of the statistics for the first half of the year and end of year. With the exception of a few measures, the majority of targets were far exceeded.

Our sites did not meet our targeted number of youth attending, missing the mark by only 14 students. One of the five sites funded was significantly underutilized, affecting number of students served and several other measures below as well. Parent involvement continues to be a challenge for our programs/clubs that tend to meet in schools and provide transportation home. This limits parent involvement significantly on a weekly basis. While two of our five network providers were able to attend a site family night, increased coordination/communication between WPFC and network providers/sites for FY14 will seek to improve this measure.

Average daily attendance is 12% lower than the target, partially a result of our one of our programs being underutilized. The majority of established programs were at or very near capacity. Percentage of students who attend 90% of school days is only 1% below the target. We have found that many of the middle and high school program students are members of multiple teams and clubs—which results in decreased attendance at the primary programs when they attend other school activities, impacting both measures above. Percentage of site participants reporting program site helped them become more interested in going to school is at 70%, rather than our target of 80%. This is a result of a large number of those surveyed choosing “neutral.” Site directors have indicated that many of their students who report satisfaction with the afterschool program do not translate this into having more interest in attending school, even if they do attend school regularly.

**FY2013 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: 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 one or more of the following: 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.

FY13 Funding: \$73,860

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of clients (child) enrolled	15	29	20	28	15	33
▪ Number of group activities by type:						
○ Tutoring	61	126	40	40	35	92
○ Education groups	53	136	39	61	50	138
○ Team meetings	12	18	6	7	5	22
○ Service projects	19	18	12	12	12	30
○ Field Trips	7	20	11	10	6	15
▪ Number of counseling sessions:						
○ Individual	546	1036	540	374	365	870
○ Family	120	240	131	88	90	183
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth completing program.*	100% (15)	93% (29)	92% (12)	96% (27)	90%	82%(27)
▪ Average percentage of attendance at each group activity.	94% (14)	95% (10)	98% (6)	84.5% (23)	80%	82%
▪ Percentage of SAGES staff attending State and local trainings offered.				100% (2)	80%	100%(2)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of youth showing any improvement on the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS).	100% (15)	100% (29)	100% (12)	100% (13)	90%	100%(24)
▪ Percentage of youth showing any increase in knowledge about sexuality measured by OWL Curriculum pre/post test.	100% (15)	100% (29)	100% (12)	100% (13)	90%	100%(26)
▪ Percentage of youth reaching goals as measured by CANS.	100% (15)	100% (29)	100% (12)	100% (13)	90%	100%(33)

*Percentage of youth completing the program and average percentage of attendance at each group activity-The program took on 3 girls that were considered high risk and had dual diagnosis. They required a higher level of care and were removed from the program. 2 girls moved away during the year and 1 dropped out. Attendance and percentage of completion are directly affected by these factors.

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: HIPPY

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

FY13 Funding:\$27,790

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Total number of children served.	29	28	29	26	25	27
▪ Total number of home visits.	743	789	617	530	550	575
▪ Total number of parent trainings.	12	11	11	17	7	8
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of families completing program.	93% (26)	97% (28)	100% (26)	100% (26)	85%	100%(22)
▪ Percentage of HIPPY USA Curriculum packets successfully completed.	87% (25)	93% (28)	88% (26)	86%	85%	87%(19)
▪ Percentage of HIPPY staff attending state and local trainings offered.	91% (3)	100% (3)	100% (3)	100% (3)	80%	100%(3)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of families showing improvement on the Parent Involvement Survey.	92%(24)	93% (27)	83% (10)	65% (15)	80%	80%(22)
▪ Percentage of children showing improvement on the Ages and Stages Questionnaire.	88% (25)	93% (27)	91% (11)	67% (17)	80%	90%(24)
▪ Percentage of HIPPY children entering kindergarten on time.	100%(28)	100% (28)	100% (29)	100% (26)	100%	100%(27)

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: Life Skills 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.

FY13Funding:BES \$2,861 PES \$7,850

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of students enrolled.*	540	121	164	170	150	132
▪ PES*	254	90	116	142	100	120
▪ BES*	286	31	48	28	45	12
Number of total academies offered.	16	10	10	11	8	9
▪ PES	12	9	8	9	6	8
▪ BES*	4	1	2	2	2	1
Average Number of weeks per academy.						
▪ PES	13	12	11	14	8	19
▪ BES	10	24	8	9	8	16
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.						
▪ PES				0	0	
▪ BES				0	0	
Number of programs submitting program self-assessments.				0	0	
Number of programs submitting Program Improvement Plans.				0	0	
How Well We Do It:						
Percentage of FARMS students participating						
▪ PES	54% (137)	64% (90)	82%(95)	68% (96)	50%	68%(82)
▪ BES	58% (166)	59% (31)	77% (37)	71% (20)	50%	66%(8 of 12)
Percentage rate of attendance overall:^						
▪ PES	83% (211)	92% (90)	84%(97)	89% (126)	83%	90%(108)
▪ BES	96% (275)	95% (31)	85% (41)	74% (23)	74%	89%(10)
Student/Staff Ratio.						
▪ PES	20:1	20:1	20:1	20:1	20:1	9:1
▪ BES	16:1	15:1	12:1	7:1	7:1	6:1
Average daily attendance.						
▪ PES			87% (101)	80% (113)	75%	85%(102)
▪ BES			85% (41)	84% (23)	75%	87%(10)
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						

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain. <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% (216) 77% (220)	90% (90) 60% (31)	95%(110) 50% (24)	95% (134) 78% (21)	74% 52%	92%(110) 100%(12)
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 	53% (56) 0% (52)	0% (56) 0% (72)	0% (109) 6%(68)	54% (77) 0% (0)	5% 5%	32%(52) 0 (no referrals)
Percentage of students achieving proficiency in at least one area of MSA.				100%	72%	100%

*Attendance may be below target due to other activities such as sports and other events.

**LMB staff met with After School Program Coordinators to discuss performance measures and strategies to meet the targets. Coordinators were given the opportunity to ask any questions.

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.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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. Recruitment Process: Teacher and/or counselor referral process and they will also look at academic data during this process.

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.

FY13 Funding:\$4,640

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of students enrolled	418	279	1022	1364	308	962
▪ PHS/SHHS	23	20	427	465	200	644
▪ PMS*	182	118	312	615	200	167
▪ SHMS*	213	151	283	284	200	151
Number of total activities	24	9	6	20	10	75
Number of hours spent on activities				163	90	135
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.						
▪ PMS						
▪ SHMS						
Number of programs submitting program self-assessments.						
Number of programs submitting Program Improvement Plans.						
How Well We Do It:						
Average daily attendance.						
▪ PMS**			35% (110)	21% (130)	75%	66%(110)
▪ SHMS**			63% (178)	70% (198)	75%	66%(100)
Percentage of eligible students who completed Driver's Education by the end of school year.						
▪ PHS	100% (13)	80% (4)	100% (4)	100% (1)	78%	100%(6)
▪ SHHS	100% (10)	100% (0)	100% (4)	100% (2)	78%	100%(4)
Percentage of eligible students who attended Career Exploration trips to local colleges.***	24% (95)	30% (6)	100% (13)	64% (184)	50%	47%(76)
Percentage of eligible students who attended Career Exploration trips to business.	37% (79)	55% (11)	70% (7)	34% (83)	20%	50%(88)
Percentage of program sites that have at least one program staff that completed YPQA Basics training.						
▪ PMS						
▪ SHMS						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.						
▪ PMS						

**FY2013 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 Actual	FY13 Target	FY13 Actual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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	89.1% (277) 100% (283)	No data 90%	80% 80%	90%(105) 98%(75)
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 	100% (13) 100% (10)	100% (4) 100% (0)	100% (4) 100% (4)	100% (1) 100% (2)	80% 80%	100%(6) 100%(4)
Percentage of students achieving proficiency in at least one area of MSA.				90%	80%	PMS 91%(106) SHMS 97%(74)

Story behind the data: *Number of students enrolled (Snow Hill Middle and Pocomoke Middle)- The decrease in the number of students enrolled may be due to many different factors. Many students partake in extracurricular activities outside of the school like Parks and Recreation sports, youth groups, and more. **Average Daily attendance (Snow Hill Middle and Pocomoke Middle)-The decrease in attendance may also be related to students participating in other activities such as sports outside of the school.

**FY2013 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

***The decrease in eligible students that attend Career Exploration Trips to local colleges may be due to students preparing for state testing, catching up on missed work, or uncontrollable circumstances.