

FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs Annual Report Summary

Overview:

In 2007, local jurisdictions, through each Local Management Board (LMB), developed 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 Article, Annotated, Title 8, Subtitle 6), each LMB convened a prevention planning entity to ensure that the relevant 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 communities in positive ways.

Since then, LMBs have continued to fund programs and strategies to meet the intent of SB882. In FY2014, more than 100 at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs throughout the State were funded in the amount of \$10,699,040 by the Children's Cabinet Interagency Fund (CCIF). Each LMB was required to submit a semi-annual and annual program report that included performance measures for each program funded by the CCIF. Information from each LMB's FY2014 annual report was compiled for each CCIF-funded program that met the requirements in the Human Services Article, and is included as Attachment 3.

Alignment of State Plans:

The importance of at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs is described in *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 (*i.e.*, programs that operate before or after school, during school holidays and school breaks), evidence-based programs, prevention programming, and support services for children are endorsed within the Strategic Plan and are supported by the work of the Children's Cabinet Agencies.

Highlights:

Although statistically significant conclusions cannot be 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.

FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs Annual Report Summary

Conclusion:

Data regarding at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs, as reported by the LMBs, supports that:

- Children who receive such preventive 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 such preventive programs are less likely to re-offend during service interventions.

Children and youth who are diverted from the juvenile justice system or who reject negative behaviors (*e.g.*, drug use, pregnancy, gang involvement, dropping out of school) represent a fiscal savings to the State. Participation in out-of-school time (OOST) programs reinforces positive behaviors and protective factors for young people, so investing in these programs is a cost-effective strategy. For every dollar invested in OOST programming, \$3.36 is returned to the State's economy.¹ The average cost of an OOST program is approximately \$1,800² per participant annually, as compared to \$34,590³ for a juvenile detention/out-of-home placement. Children and youth who have access to early intervention and prevention programming are likely to be more socially responsible, productive young adults who can contribute to the economy and are assets to the State.

¹ Maryland Out of School Time Network. *Expanding Opportunities, Improving Lives: Maryland's Afterschool & Summer Programs*. 2014.

² Maryland Out of School Time Network. (Unpublished data) 2013.

³ Governor's Office for Children. *State of Maryland Out-of-Home Placement and Family Preservation Resource Plan FY2013*. 2013.

**FY2014 Community Partnership Agreements
At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

Jurisdiction	Program/Project Name	Funding
Allegany	Juvenile Review Board	47,132
	YMCA Wave Runner's Program for Homeless Youth	33,350
	Substance Abuse Intervention for At-Risk-Youth	53,950
	Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA)	28,514
	Expanded Diversion Services	71,196
	Jurisdiction Total	\$234,142
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)	204,786
	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
	Strengthening Families Program	60,000
	Annapolis Youth Services Bureau (AYSB)	83,986
	Brooklyn Park Middle School Teen Club	20,000
	STAR Academy After School Program	51,949
	Jurisdiction Total	\$898,950
Baltimore City	Youth Services Bureaus*	403,466
	Out-of-School Time Program	1,212,208
	Baltimore Partnership to End Childhood Hunger	45,000
	Safe Streets	52,000
	B'More for Healthy Babies Home Visiting Programs	284,500
	Jurisdiction Total	\$1,997,174

Baltimore County	Functional Family Therapy	369,660
	Healthy Families	113,901
	Youth Services Bureaus*	284,692
	Jurisdiction Total	\$768,253
Calvert	Youth Services Bureaus	53,256
	Jurisdiction Total	\$53,256
Caroline	Teen Court	35,500
	Lifelong Learning Centers After School Program	144,084
	School/Community Program for Sexual Risk Reduction Among Teens	42,875
	Addictions Counselor in Schools	26,474
	School-Based Mental Health	24,120
	Caroline Mentoring Program	27,000
	The Gathering	20,000
	Child & Family Behavioral Support Program	68,744
	Jurisdiction Total	\$388,797
Carroll	Youth Services Bureaus - Brief Strategic Family Therapy	118,737
	Cultural Navigator	27,601
	Jurisdiction Total	\$146,338
Cecil	Advance	46,175
	Achieve	52,480
	Ascend	87,863
	Perryville Police Department Outreach Program	63,948
	Career Blast Program	20,000
	Out-of-School Time Programs*	76,399
	Jurisdiction Total	\$346,865
Charles	Functional Family Therapy	51,518
	Youth Services Bureaus	131,080
	Sheriff's 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)	29,272
	School-Based Behavioral Health Services	80,000
	TREK	74,000
	Teen Ambassadors	10,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$304,809
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
	Early Care Healthy Families	300,000
	Partners After School @ Southern Middle School	49,024
	Juvenile Review	14,533
	Summer Youth Employment Supplement	6,085
	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 Elementary School	22,500
	Cougar Time @ Harpers Choice	45,000
	5th Period @ Cradlerock Middle School	36,000
	Howard County Teen Time	18,000
	Education and Career Empowerment Center @ Oakland Mills (ECEC)	24,750
	Jurisdiction Total	\$280,433
Kent	Youth Outreach Program	16,113
	Healthy Families Mid-Shore	93,814
	Occupational Therapy Program at Radcliffe Creek School	45,000
	Truancy Diversion Case Manager	33,531
	Girls Circles and Councils for Boys & Young Men	20,000
	Evening School Program	20,000
	Kent County Diversion Program	20,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$248,458
Montgomery	Youth Services Bureaus*	105,544
	Excel Beyond the Bell Services	542,784
	Jurisdiction Total	\$648,328
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
	Achievement Mentoring fo At-Risk Youth	59,658
	Youth Mentoring	25,360

	Character Counts!	3,000
	Healthy Families	57,616
	Jurisdiction Total	\$197,878
St. Mary's	After-School Program	62,320
	Youth Services Bureaus	112,355
	Single Point of Access	20,000
	Mentoring	40,000
	Snack Pack Program	10,000
	Drug Screening	20,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$264,675
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	44,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$99,000
Washington	Tomorrow's Leaders	44,181
	Juvenile Delinquency Prevention & Diversion	174,625
	Family-Centered Support Services	35,700
	Rural Out-of-School Time Initiative	122,500
	Positive Youth Development Coordinator	44,650
	Jurisdiction Total	\$421,656
	Building Foundations for Families (BFF)	176,000
Wicomico	Family Empowerment Initiative	120,000
	Out-of-School Time (OOST) Initiative	288,487
	Jurisdiction Total	\$584,487

	Children's Resource Intervention Center "The Cricket Center"	33,500
Worcester	Comprehensive Parenting Program Initiative	58,219
	Integrated Services for Child Maltreatment	82,272
	Youth As One	38,000
	Jurisdiction Total	\$211,991
FY2014 Total Statewide		\$10,699,040

*Information provided in aggregate for multiple sites.

**FY2014 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 alternatives to the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) system through early intervention strategies that are school and community-based and reflect offender responsibility. The JRB consists of volunteers and includes 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$47,132

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Total number of misdemeanor referrals made to the JRB.	122	70	18	41	81	66
▪ Number of cases that referred back to the Department of Juvenile Services.^	29	10	1	5	5	4
▪ Number of cases managed informally by the Coordinator who do not appear before the board of community volunteers.^	72	40	4	3	1	0
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of misdemeanor offenders who are processed by the JRB who successfully complete the program.	93%	95%	95%	88% (n=15)	100% (n=28)	100% (n=18)
▪ Percentage of cases that are diverted from the juvenile services system.	73%	90%	85%	88% (n=36)	94 % (n=76)	93% (n=62)
▪ Percentage of client satisfaction surveys completed by parents of the youth served that rate the program as “satisfactory”.	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=12)	89 % (n=73)	88% (n=45)
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=36)	70% (n=23)	82 % (n=14)
▪ Percentage of participants who do not re-offend during the first 12 months after successful program completion.	78.7	83.1	*	83% (n=1)	92% (n=22)	72 % (n=43)
▪ Percentage of participants who are enrolled in school and/or community activities.	**	**	100%	78% (n=11)	76% (n=13)	55 % (n=11)

*Not yet applicable.

**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.

**FY2014 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: Expanded Diversion Services- Truancy Prevention Program

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$71,196

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of students served at Level I and II (5-10 days unexcused absences).	284	333	332	403
▪ Number of students served at Level III (10-20 unexcused absences).	35	66	73	98
▪ Number of students referred to the JRB (after 20 unexcused absences).	4	11	16	25
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)	100% (n=4)	n/a
▪ 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)	40% (n=29)	38% (n=37)
▪ Percentage of participants in Level III who are linked to other supportive resources.	23%	38% (n=25/66)	37% (n=27)	35% (n=34)
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% (n=57/332)	76% (n=403)
▪ 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)	47% (n=35/73)	71% (n=59/8)
▪ Percentage of increase in the schools AYP rate from the prior year.				
○ Braddock Middle School	▪ **	93.5%	37%	95%/95%
○ Washington Middle School	▪ .5%	93.6%	(n=27)	94%/94%

**New measure for FY12 because this school is new to the program in FY12.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$28,514

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Number of youth participating in mini-grant activities.	1126	401	306	500	420
▪ Number of alcohol related citations to youth.	6	9	40	4	15
▪ Number of community members trained.	28	28	33	25	10,500
▪ Number of alcohol sales compliance checks completed.	200	276	199	200	477
▪ Number of alcohol-related citations issued to youth.	2	9	40	10	70
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=33)	100%	100% (n=32)
▪ Average score on Question #18 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	6.4	5.8	5.2	5	5.8
▪ Average score on Question #25 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	5	6	5.5	5	5.2
▪ Number and percentage of licensed merchants located in Allegany County who were included in alcohol sales compliance checks.	100% (n=200)	90% (n=150)	100% (n=199)	75%	100% (n=200)
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)	90% (n=179)	85%	266% (n=437)
▪ % of training participants who demonstrate increased knowledge of the CMCA philosophy as measured by a post-evaluation.	100% (n=28)	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=32)
▪ # and % of increased compliance over first round of checks.	90%	100% (n=9)	90% FY12=94%	100%	138% (n=61)
▪ # and % of increased compliance over previous year's checks.	**	245/89% 2 nd round of cks	666% (N=40)	100%	205% (n=232)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ # and % increase in the number of alcohol related citations issued to youth.	0% (n=2)	100% (n=9)	90% (n=179)	**	28% (n=5)
▪ # and % of increase in the number of alcohol related citations issued to youth over previous year.	**	450% (n=9)	100%	300% (n=18)	-77.8% (n= -13)

**Not measured during these time periods.

The story behind the performance data:

Fewer youth were issued alcohol related citations in the current year. The Allegany County Health Department will continue to partner with local law enforcement agencies and merchants that sell alcohol and increase education and awareness of the importance of carding individuals purchasing alcohol in order to meet proposed targets in the coming year.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: YMCA Wave Runner’s Program for Homeless Youth

Program Summary: Qualified staff will provide program activities related to healthy behavior, social/living skills, and academics, including providing information to participants concerning drug/alcohol prevention, gang awareness, and bullying prevention. Programming will focus on promoting personal and social development and academic performance.

Target Population: Homeless children residing at the YMCA in their housing programs (transitional and permanent supportive housing)

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: 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, with an emphasis on at-risk youth including: drug and alcohol use, bullying, emotional and behavioral challenges, school issues such as poor school attendance, low academic achievement, and repeated negative interaction with other students and/or school personnel.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$33,350

Performance Measure	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:	
▪ Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	1
▪ Number of youth enrolled.	25
▪ Number of youth who attend 30 days or more.	10
▪ Number of family members who attend at least one family event.	19
How Well We Do It:	
▪ Percentage of participants who attend 30 days or more.	40% (n=10)
▪ Percentage of students who rate the program as “satisfactory” as measured by an end of year survey.	100% (n=10)
▪ Average Daily Attendance	7
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	2
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	4
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above)	3.25

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY14 Actual
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 	(n=1) ○ 10% ○ 10% ○ 10% ○ 10%
<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. 	Because of pgm. late start, 0 youth attended 30+ days.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who report feeling safe in the program, as measured by an end of year survey. 	100% (n=10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who report the program as being valuable, as measured by an end of year survey. 	100% (n=10)

LMB Name: 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).

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$204,786

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of children served. 	512	199	271	246	721
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of children with formal assessments. 	78	84	70	106	122
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of Center Environmental Assessments. 	19	6	2	5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of visits made by Behavioral Specialists to child care programs. 	1187	1013	646	840	876
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of visits by Family Behavioral Specialist to homes. 	519	355	251	239	251
How Well We Do It:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ratio of Behavior Specialists to children with formal assessments. 	1:26	1:28	1:23	1:35	1:30

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
▪ Average number of visits per child (families and centers).	10	11	12.8	6	5
▪ Average number of visits per Center.	5.5	4.5	5.5	3	3
▪ Percentage of children completing pre/post-tests.	92% (N=55)	89% (N=41)	60% (N=42)	78% (N=54)	75% (N=57)
Is Anyone Better Off:					
▪ Percentage decrease in problem behaviors of children with formal assessments.	93%	100% (N=46)	73% (N=16)	79% (N=42)	71% (N=40)
▪ Percentage of children with formal assessments who showed an improvement in social skills.	91%	89% (N=41)	86% (N=19)	93% (N=50)	75% (N=42)
▪ Percentage of children with formal assessments not involuntarily removed from childcare during program year.	95%	100% (N=46)	100% (N=24)	93% (N=50)	89% (N=51)
▪ Percentage of Center Environmental Assessments that showed improvement in pre/post Assessments** during program year.	91%	100% (N=6)	100% (N=24)	100% (N=5)	83% (N=5)

**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.

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$83,986

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:					
▪ Individual*	116	68	57	42	57
▪ Family*	N/A	64	54	39	42
▪ Group*	8	1	3	0	26
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:					
▪ Individual*	86	60	61	78	89
▪ Family*	49	54	51	61	40

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
▪ Group*	0	0	0	0	42
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	54	0	53	50	42
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	4	N/A	4	N/A	2
# of individuals recommended for Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as a result of assessment.	**	**	57	78	89
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%	95% (N=40)	100% (N=57)
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	93%	100%	94%	91% (N=22)	91% (N=30)
% of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100%	100%	100% (N=5)	100% (N=4)
% of individuals completing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as recommended.			86%	87% (N=33)	91% (N=30)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
% of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	93% (N=98)	95%	96%	96% (N=32)	98% (N=56)
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.			None	71% (N=24)	67% (N=38)
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.			***	67% (N=10)	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.			***	67% (N=8)	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.			***	86% (N=6)	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.			***	73% (N=11)	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.			***	50% (N=6)	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.			***	86% (N=6)	
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					83% (N=11)
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment					75% (N=6)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
("Improved") and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment ("Not Improved").					
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment ("Improved") and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment ("Not Improved"). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.					100% (N=1)
# and % of individuals receiving Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) with an increased Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge.			***	90% (N=38)	90% (N=29)

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

***This data was not collected in FY12.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: "The Peak" Youth Services Bureau

Program Summary: The Peak 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: The Peak targets the K-12 population at high risk for delinquency in Glen Burnie and the surrounding neighborhoods through family and group counseling services

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$84,596

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:		229			
▪ Individual*	196	140	120	44	19
▪ Family*	90	40	44	36	10
▪ Group*	421	49	58	38	N/A
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:					
▪ Individual*	223	161	116	10	19
▪ Family*	52	30	155	5	8
▪ Group*	8		30	0	N/A
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	64	96	75	21	25

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	25	49			5
# of Youth participating in Second Step curriculum.			58	0	N/A
# of Youth participating in CCPT.			35	10	N/A
# of Youth participating in TF-CBT.			15	15	N/A
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% (N=229)	100% (N=222)	100% (N=118)	100% (N=29)
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	92%	91% (N=208)	92% (N=202)	80% (N=22)	3% (N=1)
% of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	87%	100% (N=15)	100% (N=15)	100% (N=7)	100% (N=3)
% of participating youth completing the Second Step curriculum.			96% (N=56)	0% (N=0)	N/A
% of participating youth completing Child Centered Play Therapy.			85% (N=30)	82% (N=40)	N/A
% of participating youth completing TFCBT.			100% (N=15)	78% (N=15)	N/A
Is Anyone Better Off?					
% of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	95% (N=98)	100% (N=52)	98% (N=135)	100% (N=118)	100% (N=19)
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater			69% (N=45)	Not available	N/A
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.			66% (N=20)	Not available	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.			51% (N=23)	Not available	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.			77% (N=17)	Not available	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.			77% (N=16)	Not available	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.			64% (N=27)	Not available	
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.			65% (N=11)	Not available	
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI])					N/A

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).					N/A
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.					N/A
% of youth exhibiting improvement in anger management/control as measured by Second Step pre and post-treatment testing.			96% (N=56)	100% (N=38)	N/A
# and % of youth participating in CCPT with an increased Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge			86% (N=30)	80% (N=33)	N/A
# and % of youth participating in TFEBT who exhibit a reduction in PTSD symptoms as measured by trauma pre and post screening instrument.			100% (N=15)	85% (N=39)	N/A

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

What’s the story behind the performance?

The previous YSB for the northern part of the County, Robert A Pascal Youth & Family Services (“Pascal”), went out of business at the end of FY13. During the intervening months we worked closely with DJS to establish and certify a new YSB to serve this portion of our County. The Peak was certified in late January 2014 and opened its doors for service on March 1, 2014. Therefore, all “Actual” numbers for FY14 represent only three months of service and much of the CAFAS data was not obtainable due to the lack of available cases with an appropriate duration of service by the end of the fiscal year. However, based on our evaluation and close collaborative relationship with the new vendor, we anticipate this being an incredibly successful YSB in the coming months and years.

At the time of certification, The Peak did not have staff members trained in the Evidence Based Practices established with Pascal. Our staff monitor worked with The Peak’s Program Director and our partners at the Mental Health Agency to establish acceptable alternative EBP’s to be utilized with the population being served. The new EBP’s will be identified with the new targets in the FY15 Performance Measurement Plan under guidance from MAYSB. In addition, after a recent meeting with the Executive Director of MAYSB, we have determined that targets for both YSB’s in Anne Arundel County need to be adjusted to be more in line with other jurisdictions around the state and with current funding levels. Please note that new targets will be established for FY15.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: 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 George Fox Middle School in Pasadena.

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: Deters 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse, Childhood Hunger

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

FY14 Funding: \$51,949

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Number of students enrolled.	76	65	51	13	28
▪ Number of sessions offered.	77	98	91	77	81
▪ 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	2
How Well We Do It:					
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.70	4.03	4.6
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			3.17	4.00	4.9
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			3.5	4.11	4.3
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			3.67	3.00	4.5
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).			3.76	3.78	4.6
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			100% (N=2)	100% (N=1)	100% (N=1)
▪ # and % of program sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			100% (N=2)	100% (N=1)	100% (N=2)
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by a 90% program attendance rate.	89% (N=68)	84% (N=55)	83% (N=42)	77% (N=10)	96% (N=27)
▪ Average daily attendance.		84% (N=55)	80% (N=40)	77% (N=10)	86% (N=24)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level.	100%	100% (N=65)	100% (N=51)	100% (N=13)	100% (N=28)
▪ Percentage of students absent from school less than 15 days during the academic year.	100%	100% (N=65)	98% (N=50)	100% (N=13)	100% (N=28)
▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program.	100%	98% (N=64)	94% (N=48)	100% (N=13)	100% (N=28)

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Gems and Jewels Mentoring Institute

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

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

**FY2014 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: Colorado #320 EBP – Second Step

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse, Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$43,775

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Number of students enrolled	23	20	20	20	20
▪ Number of sessions offered	92	100	99	95	89
▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			2	2	2
How Well We Do It:					
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.06	3.25	3.25
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			4.80	2.45	3.05
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			4.075	3.05	3.85
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			3.83	2.85	4.00
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).			4.20	2.9	3.53
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by 90% program attendance.	87% (N=20)	80% (N=16)	90% (N=18)	100% (N=20)	80% (N=16)
▪ Average daily attendance.		80% (N=16)	90% (N=18)	90% (N=18)	80% (N=16)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level	100%	100% (N=20)	100% (N=20)	100% (N=20)	100% (N=20)
▪ Percentage of students absent less than 15 days during the academic year	87%	100% (N=20)	80% (N=16)	95% (N=19)	90% (N=18)
▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program	91%	90% (N=18)	95% (N=19)	90% (N=18)	90% (N=18)
▪ Percentage of students not involved in the DJS system during program period.	100%	100% (N=20)	100% (N=20)	100% (N=20)	100% (N=20)

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Brooklyn Park Middle School Teen Club

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

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

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

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This school-based program serves middle school-aged students at-risk for academic failure, suspension/expulsion, or juvenile delinquency.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse, Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of students enrolled	129	75	127	117	100	115
▪ Number of sessions offered	4	4	4	4	4	4
▪ # program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			1	1	1	1
How Well We Do It:						
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.58	4.70	4	4.42
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			3.86	4.0	4	4.43
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			3.83	3.79	4	4
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			4.00	4.0	4	3.96
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).			4.07	4.12	4	4.2
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by 90% program attendance.	95%	96% (N=72)	98% (N=125)	97% (N=115)	80%	98% (N=115)
▪ Average daily attendance.		96% (N=18)	98% (N=125)	97% (N=115)	80%	98% (N=115)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level.	100%	100% (N=75)	100% (N=127)	100% (N=117)	80%	100% (N=115)
▪ Percentage of students absent less than 15 days during the academic year.	99%	100% (N=75)	98% (N=125)	100% (N=117)	90%	100% (N=115)
▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program	100%	100% (N=75)	100% (N=127)	100% (N=117)	90%	100% (N=115)

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 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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$39,957

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ Number of students enrolled.	1,876	3,032	1,396	1,800	900	1,060
▪ Number of students who participated in the pre- and post-test evaluation.	***	3,032	1,333	1,567	720	814
▪ Number of take home lessons for which materials were furnished.	4	4	4	4	4	4
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed all four take-home lessons.	100% (N=1,876)	100% (N=3,032)	80% (N=1,067)	93% (N=1,682)	80%	100% (N=1,060)
▪ Percentage of students who completed the pre- and post-test evaluation.		100% (N=3,032)	95% (N=1,272)	88% (N=1,567)	80%	63% (N=663)
▪ Percentage of teachers orientated to the program who voluntarily administered the KACM curriculum.		71% (N=85)	84% (N=75)	100% (N=81)	80%	100% (N=58)
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.	***	98.2% (N=2,978)	76.8% (N=1,024)	98% (N=1,532)	80%	98% (N=650)
▪ 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)	100% (N=1,160)	80%	86% (N=907)
▪ 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)	95% (N=391)	80%	89% (N=210)

***Data not received from evaluator.

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$20,097

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of education, awareness, or outreach events held.	32	31	21	29	10	10
▪ Number of people who attended education, awareness and/or outreach events.	4479	5169	7163	6460	3000	5137
▪ Number of retail alcohol establishments monitored by AA Co Police Department for selling alcohol to underage youth.	**	**	**	**	**	**
▪ Number of monthly meetings facilitated by Community Mobilization organizer.	12	12	12	12	12	12
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Number and percentage of retail alcohol establishments that are not found to be	**	**	**	**	**	**

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
in violation for selling alcohol to underage youth after receiving a warning.						
▪ Number and percentage of CMCA Core Strategy Team members attending monthly CMCA meetings.	13	10	64% (N=12)	64% (N=12)	50% (N=10)	100% (N=15)
▪ Number and percentage of new community partners participating on the Core Strategy Team during current fiscal year.	3	2	25% (N=5)	15% (N=3)	25% (N=5)	20% (N=3)
▪ # and % of outreach event participants completing the exit survey.			90% (N=2,921)	70% (N=4,531)	80% (N=2,400)	60% (N=3,093)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ 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.	98% (N=213)	100% (N=744)	100% (N=4,242)	100% (N=4,531)	80%	100% (N=3,093)
▪ 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.		5%	5%	5%	5%	N/A
▪ % of parents who express disapproval of underage drinking as measured in outreach event exit surveys			100% (N=4,242)	100% (N=4,531)	80%	N/A

**Compliance checks funded by GOCCP beginning in FY2010.

What's the story behind the performance? CMCA continues to reach every corner of our community, having a significant impact on changing community/social norms around underage drinking and creating a culture within schools where underage drinking isn't "cool" or socially acceptable. Due to the continued declining participation in our annual Teen Summit, the Coalition developed a brand new mechanism for reaching students: the Student Athletes vs. Substance Abuse Basketball Challenge. Rival middle schools meet for a friendly, co-ed basketball match at their local high school. The athletes all sign anti-drug and alcohol pledges and all youth in attendance are encouraged to do the same. Participants are provided with educational materials and resources to take home and guest speakers provide information between quarters and at half-time.

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse, Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$115,914

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of participants served.	48	25	47	34	24	48
▪ Number of hours a week students will be facilitated in participating in a research-based prevention	5	7.5	8	8	5	8

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measures	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
curriculum.						
▪ Number of locations served.	2	2	2	2	2	2
▪ Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			2	2	1	2
How Well We Do It:						
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.2	3.15	4	3.25
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			4.66	2.80	4	3.25
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			3.75	3.74	4	3.75
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			4	3.20	4	4.25
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).			4.15	3.22	4	3.62
▪ Percentage of participants enrolled who complete a minimum of 12 wks. of the 16-wk. evidence-based Reconnecting Youth program while maintaining an attendance rate of 75% or better.	65%	84% (N=21)	76% (N=36)	70% (N=24)	75%	81% (N=39)
▪ Percentage of participants who self-disclose or exhibit characteristics of drug involvement who were referred to the appropriate substance abuse treatment services.	100%	100% (N=0)				
▪ Percentage of staff trained to teach the curriculum.	100% (N=8)	100% (N=5)				
▪ Average daily attendance.		72% (N=18)	88% (N=17)	70% (N=24)	80%	81% (N=39)
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)
▪ # and % of program sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)	100% (N=2)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of participants who demonstrated an increase in the following as indicated by a comparison of report card data for the marking periods before and after program participation:						
o School attendance:	75%	84% (N=21)	81% (N=38)	76% (N=26)	75%	81% (N=39)
o Grades (overall GPA)	75%	84% (N=21)	83% (N=39)	76% (N=26)	75%	79% (N=38)
o School behavior**	80%	84% (N=21)	85% (N=40)	70% (N=24)	75%	96% (N=46)
Percentage of participants promoted to the next grade level.	100%	100% (N=25)	100% (N=47)	80% (N=27)	90%	96% (N=46)

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

LMB: Anne Arundel County

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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: Diverts juveniles from the juvenile services system, promotes responsibility and preparation for adulthood.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$31,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Number of participants diverted from Juvenile Services.	7	91	85	30	102
▪ Number of conferences.	3	59	55	30	65
▪ Number of additional conference participants engaged in process (above and beyond victim and offender).		230	205	22	239
How Well We Do It:					
▪ Percentage of participants who successfully completed sanctions within the time period allowed.	100% (N=7)	100% (N=91)	95% (N=81)	90%	98% (N=102)
▪ Percentage of Community Conferences resulting in agreements.	100% (N=7)	98% (N=58)	96% (N=82)	80%	98% (N=65)
▪ Percentage of consumers expressing satisfaction with services as measured by post-conference survey.	100% (N=7)	98% (N=58)	96% (N=106)	80%	98% (N=150)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ Percentage of participants who did not recidivate within 12 months of successfully completing the program.	N/A*	95% (N=56)	92% (N=87)	90%	92% (N=122)
▪ Percentage of compliance with Community Conference agreements at 1 month from creation of agreement.	100% (N=7)	95% (N=56)	96% (N=165)	90%	98% (N=65)
▪ Percentage of compliance with Community Conference agreements at 6 months from creation of the agreement.	N/A*	100%	96% (N=40)	80%	96% (N=65)

*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.

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.

**FY2014 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: 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
Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$23,319

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of mentors recruited.	125	76	75	60
▪ Number of mentors who complete “Kids At Hope” mentor training.	12	19	50	10
▪ Number of mentors matched to mentees.	28	25	25	25
How Well We Do It:				
▪ Percentage of mentors still in place after 3 months.	100%	100% (N=47)	90%	100% (N=72)
▪ Percentage of mentors still in place after 1 year.	**	95% (N=28)	90%	90% (N=48)
▪ Number and percentage of Directors of enrolled youth-serving programs that indicate satisfaction with the Clearing House on the end of year survey.	**	100%	90%	100% (N=4)
▪ Number and percentage of matched mentors satisfied with their mentoring assignment as measured by the annual mentor survey.	75% (N=6)	100% (N=53)	90%	100% (N=5)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ Percentage of participants who improve in the “Hope” categories as shown by report card data on the following measures between 1 st and 3 rd quarter:				
○ School Attendance:	**	Not reported	90%	Not reported
○ Grades (overall GPA)	**	Not reported	90%	Not reported
○ School Behavior*	**	Not reported	90%	Not reported
▪ Percentage of participants promoted to the next grade level.	**	100% (N=53)	85%	Not reported

*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? Despite a strong beginning, the THCH has struggled to meet targets for the last two full years of operation. This is partially due to a decrease in support at the City level – the program was established under one Mayor but not considered a priority by his successor. In addition, as youth are matched through a variety of programs with their own internal mechanisms for capturing and reporting data, getting the requisite report card information for every participant was extraordinarily difficult. LMB staff worked closely with the program director to come up with viable solutions to this problem but with little success. Given these circumstances, the THCH program was terminated at the end of FY14.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Strengthening Families Program

Program Summary: 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Substance Abuse, Violent Crime, Violence Against Women & Children, Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$60,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do					
▪ Number of children (6 -11) participating in the program.	40	35	61	40	45
▪ Number of adolescents (12-18) participating in the program.	40	41	52	40	38
▪ Number of parents participating in the program.	55	67	69	48	55
How Well We Do It					
▪ Percentage of children graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units).	65% (N=26)	80% (N=28)	66% (N=40)	60%	60% (N=27)
▪ Percentage of adolescents graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units).	80% (N=32)	66% (N=27)	71% (N=37)	60%	68% (N=26)
▪ Percentage of parents graduating (attend at least 10 of 14 units).	80% (N=44)	81% (N=54)	65% (N=45)	60%	64% (N=35)
▪ Percentage of parents satisfied with the program on completion as measured by program survey.	93% (N=28)	100% (N=29)	91% (N=29)	90%	100% (N=18)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ Percent of graduates attending the 6 month reunion who report positive behavior changes on 50% of indicators (family meetings, family meals, status of parent, school attendance of child(ren) in the administrated survey.	94% (N=30)	95% (N=42)	84% (N=56)	75%	96% (N=65)
▪ Percentage of parents who report increased school attendance.	91% (N=29)	93% (N=41)	90% (N=60)	80%	94% (N=63)
▪ Percentage of parents who report increased family communication.	88% (N=28)	80% (N=35)	94% (N=63)	80%	91% (N=60)

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

risk communities.¹ 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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Infant Mortality

FY14 Funding: \$284,500 + \$595,143 (MSDE) = \$924,643

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
• # of communities taking part in the Strategy to Improve Birth Outcomes.	3	3	3	2	2	2
• # of home visiting programs in operation (funded by CCIF).	1	1	1	1	1	1
• Total # of home visiting programs in operation throughout the initiative.	5	5	5	5	5	5
• # of persons participating in home visiting services (funded by CCIF).	51	263†	198	231	205	264
How Well We Do It:						
• % of first home visits that occur either prenatally or within the first 3 months after the birth of the baby.				48% 94/197	80%	100% 80/80
• % of pregnant women at 36 weeks who had prenatal visit w/in last 4 weeks				41% 7/16	75%	57% 51/90
• % of children who kept their last well-child visit				44% 7/16	75%	60% 18/30
• % 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% 35/39	90%	82% 54/66
• % of babies born above 2,500 grams for participants enrolled prenatally.	89.1% 41 of 46	86% 36 of 42	79% 49 of 62	87% 35/39	90%	83% 55/66
• Of HV households where the safe sleep checklist was used, % of households observed to have a safe sleep environment.§				90% 45/50	90%	92% 60/65

¹The 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.

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
• % of home visiting clients using a contraceptive method in past 6 months.				58% 22/38	75%	69% 61/89
• % of participants enrolled prenatally who have an infant mortality rate lower than the rate for all Baltimore City families.			0% 0 of 59			

++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 meeting this standard will be provided as the “N” when the data is analyzed.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Out-of-School Time (OST) Programs

Program Summary: School and community-based 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 14, 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education

FY14 Funding: \$1,212,208 + \$4,645,155 (City of Baltimore) = \$5,857,363

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics		11	8	11	11	11
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.		11	8	11	11	11
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			8	11	11	8
# of youth served.	1,178	969	978	1,714	1,195	1,285
# of meals served.		83,433	107,541	140,934	160,000	297,725 ²
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily Attendance (ADA%) (ADA in the programs / number of youth programs are contracted to serve).	109%	97.1%	104%	99.13% 1,699/1,714	90%	97% 1,250/1,285
% 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%	100%	11 of 11 100%
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.		4.74	4.83	4.38	4.0	4.9
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.		4.01	4.21	3.98	4.0	4.6
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.		3.04	3.66	3.99	4.0	4.1
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.		2.25	2.80	3.31	3.0	3.0
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site ³						
BCP, Wolfe Street		3.98	3.74	4.11	3.75	4.82
CFA, Barclay		4.06	3.86	3.85	3.75	3.71
CFA, Bay Brook		3.59	4.07	3.36	3.75	4.23
CFA, Calvin Rodwell		3.07	4.26	4.39	3.75	4.56
CFA, City Springs		2.61	4.38	4.56	3.75	3.87
CFA, Furman Templeton		3.96	4.18	3.75	3.75	3.86
CFA, Guilford,		3.64	3.37	3.86	3.75	4.81
CFA, Hilton			3.23	4.12	3.75	3.92
CFA, John Eager Howard				3.21	3.75	3.35
CFA, Liberty				3.59	3.75	4.07
CFA, Westside				3.89	3.75	4.15
YPQA Instructional Score as measured by external assessment (Average of Supportive Environment, Opportunities for Interaction, and Engagement)				3.76	3.0	3.55
% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			8 of 8 100%	6 of 11 55%	100%	8 of 11 73%
# / % of programs that meet target for YPQA Instructional Score		2/5	6/8			

² Meals served includes 146,759 suppers, and 150,966 snacks, both provided through USDE/MSDE Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)

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.

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
# OST staff who participate in base Professional Development (minimum 16 hours)		(40%)	(66.7%)	220	200	N/A
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of students who are regular attenders (not chronically absent ⁴)						
• Elementary		91.0%	91% 1,477/ 1,623 ⁵	87.1% ⁶ (2,502/2,873)	90%	90% 1,419/2,248 ⁷
• Middle School		85.1%	87.8% 981/1,117	89.2% (785/880)	85%	87.6% 51/410
% of youth who are high attenders ⁸						
• Elementary		NA ⁹	43.3% 703/1,623	32.1% (923/2,873)	30%	36.9% 830/2,249 ⁷
• Middle School		NA	43% 480/1,117	40.5% (356/880)	35%	42.7% 175/410
Youth have increased attitudes and assets (as measured on OST Surveys):						
• # and % of youth reporting increased sense of possibilities for future.	86.4%	94.1%	92.5%,	86%	90%	81%
• # and % of youth reporting that participation in out of school time helped them feel safe.	85.6%	95.3%	317/401 90.7%	52 of 56 80%	90%	316 of 388 88%
• # and % of youth reporting connections to caring adults / youth respected by program staff.	85.7%	95.3%	362/399 89.5%	45 of 56 75%	85%	344 or 390 90%
• # and % of youth reporting positive peer relationships.	62.5%	77.0%	357/399	43 of 57	75%	354 of 393
• # and % of youth reporting improved academic skills.	88.2%	92.9%	76.9%	46%	85%	73%
• # and % of youth reporting improved non-academic skills.	81.1%	92.5%	310/403 88.1%	26 of 57 82%	85%	287 of 395 95%
			356/404 86.7%	47 of 57 77%		382 of 401 96%
			359/414	43 of 56		386 of 401

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

⁵ Total number of students in OST represents those for whom we had valid Baltimore City Schools student ID #s; elementary grade data does not include pre-kindergarten or kindergarten participants because there is not district-side comparison data available for these grades.

⁶ The data provided is based on a data file that has not been fully cleaned and finalized by Baltimore City Schools. We expect there to be modest corrections to these figures and will report corrected figures when the data set is finalized.

⁷ Data for chronic absence and high attendance includes OST participants at all Family League funded sites (not just those funded through GOC) for whom we have student ID# and parent consent to use data in evaluation.

⁸ Youth are high attenders if they miss fewer than 5 days during the school year.

⁹ We did not capture high attender data in FY11.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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).

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Violent Crime, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$201,733 + \$39,776 (BPD)

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	564	151	241	264	63	40	38
▪ Family*	86	85	172	0	20	15	23
▪ Group*	293	0	114	0	35	15	9
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	60	67	149	195	0	40	240
▪ Family*	30	0	20	0	0	15	7
▪ Group*	0	0	0	0	146	15	44
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	493	151	76	41	63	25	60
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	12	11	35	33	12	20	13
# of formal counseling cases using a Best Practice/EBP model				7% N=37/264	63	40	43
# of individuals referred/linked to community based services.				77	16	25	60
How Well We Do It:							
% of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	82%	80%	85% N=176	70% N=184	95% N=60/63	100%	100% N=44
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	74%	83%	83% N=174	80% N=211	100%	70%	83% N=54/65
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide	86%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
assessment and referral services.			N=5	N=6	N=3		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 Available			
# of individuals who attended the first appointment after referral.				No Data Available	63% N=10/16	50%	60% N=15/25
% of YSB staff trained in the implementation of the CAFAS					100% N=3	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.	97% N=550	99%	80% N=271	80% N=211	95% N=59	70%	100% N=44/44
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.				54% N=20	67% N=12/18 ¹⁰	70%	79% N=30/38
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.				62% N=23	0 0%		
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.				45% N=17	67% N=12/18		
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.				24% N=9	67% N=12/18		
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.				54% N=20	67% N=12/18		
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.				21% N=8	67% N=12/18		
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.				24% N=9	0%		
# and % youth who reduce identified behavior problems (showed improvement) by one or more levels listed above.				86% N=32	67% N=12/18		
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.						70%	79% N=30/38
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment ("Improved")						60%	100% N=13/13
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and						70%	79% N=30/38

¹⁰ 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.

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment (PBI) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.							
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”)						60%	100% N=13/13
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).						40%	0%
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.						65%	92% N=11/12
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.						35%	8% N=1/12
Youth receiving formal counseling with improved school attendance pre- and post-program participation						70%	51% N=33/65
# and % of individuals who successfully completed linked services.					15% N=6	0%	

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Youth Service Bureau – Treatment Resources

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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goals: Violent Crime, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$201,733 (CPA); \$39,776 (BPD)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	564	204	167	109	75	60	40
▪ Family*	86	0	44	2	0	5	3
▪ Group*	293	204	323	175	90	35	63
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	60	0	0	17	0	15	16
▪ Family*	30	28	0	18	9	5	3
▪ Group*	0	609	0	102	132	30	92
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.				109	79	60	117
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	493	204	172	0	18	6	23
# of formal counseling cases using a Best Practice/EBP model				33% N=36/109	75	60	138
# of individuals referred/linked to community based services.				3	1	6	15
How Well We Do It:							
% of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	82%	100%	39/100%	109/100%	100% N=75	100%	100% N=40
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	74%	88%	21/100%	90/ 83%	98% N=63/64	85%	96% 67/70
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	86%	100%	100%	4/100%	100% N=4	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%	0% N=0	50%	86% N=13/15
% of YSB staff trained in the implementation of the CAFAS					100% N=4	100%	100% N=4
# of individuals who successfully completed linked services.					0		
Is Anyone Better Off?							
% of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	550/97%	100%	0/100%	109/ 100%	100% N=75	95%	100% N=31
# and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					90% 57/64	90%	90% N=36/40

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.				32 of 36 88%	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%	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%	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%	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%	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%	92% 59/64		
# and % youth who reduce identified behavior problems (showed improvement) by one or more levels listed above.				36 of 36 100%	90% 57/64		
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.						90%	97% N=29/30
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”).						90%	97% N=29/30
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).						10%	3% N=1/30
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.						90%	100% N=1/1
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.						10%	100% N=1/1
Youth receiving formal counseling with improved school attendance pre- and post-program participation						80%	100% N=50

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

What’s the story behind the performance?

Formal Individual and Group Counseling: The target measures were transposed when the FY 14 performance measures were established – it should have projected 35 individuals and 60 families. With that correction being applied, the program met the targets for FY 14.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Safe Streets Program

Program Summary: Multi-faceted violence intervention strategy involving street outreach workers developing relationships with high risk youth and young adults, steering them toward more positive life choices. In FY 14, the program has transitioned from outreach to “violence interrupters” whose main goal is to identify and detect potential shooting events, individuals, and groups at the highest risk of involvement of shooting or killing and to interrupt the potential violence by mediating conflicts and preventing retaliations. This transition will allow the Interrupters to cover a larger area than a singular post and will allow them to spend the majority of their time in the streets. The site will use relationships already established with community-based organizations and agencies to ensure that the highest risk individuals will continue to be referred to necessary resources. The community relationships, built through years of partnership, will play a large role in linking to resources, the dissemination of public educational materials and the response to violence. **Target Population:** Youth and young adults residing in Cherry Hill

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Baltimore’s *Safe Streets* program is a replication of Chicago’s *CeaseFire* program (now called *Cure Violence*). A January 2012 evaluation of Baltimore’s program conducted by the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports, “We believe the *CeaseFire* program model represents a very promising strategy for reducing gun violence and changing social norms surrounding violence.” Further research is recommended to improve fidelity to the model and to discover the conditions under which the *CeaseFire* model can be most effective.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The *Safe Streets* program supported by GOC funds operates in Cherry Hill, an economically depressed, low-income, high crime area of Baltimore City. The program serves youth who are at high risk of becoming involved in drug abuse, gang violence or other crimes, and attempts to divert them from justice system involvement through development of Risk Reduction Plans, conflict mediation, and other community-based measures. GOC funding will be used only to serve youth under 21 years of age, who are the vast majority of their participants.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goals: Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$52,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:								
# of Key Individuals (defined as youth/young adults at high risk of being involved in violent behavior)						86	160	4,280
# of in-person contact hours of direct service provided						2,391		
# of monthly participant activities provided to develop social skills of the participants						21		
# of hours spent on the detection and intervention of potential violence							5,040	6,726
# of referrals to community-based partnerships							720	5,577
How Well We Do It:								

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
% of community shootings that receive responses ¹¹						N=2 100%		
% of participant attendance of social skill activities						Plans to collect data were not implemented		
% of participants who have signed Risk Reduction Plans						N=86 100%		
% of outcome measures for the subsections listed below exceeding expectations as measured through the monthly site review ¹² :								
▪ Identifying and Detecting Potential Violence							90%	100% N= 7
▪ Interrupting Potential Violence							90%	100% N= 3
▪ Changing Behaviors & Norms							90%	75% N=3
Is Anyone Better Off?								
% reduction in non-fatal shootings from the prior year ¹³						67% N=2 (FY13) reduced from N=6 in FY12	10%	0% N=3 (1 more than in FY13)

¹¹ The response to a community shooting is dependent upon the organization’s strong knowledge of and connections within the community. It is a multi-step process in which staff:

- Quickly come together, develop outreach plan, speak with key people in the community to determine whether it was a single incident or the start of something more dangerous
- Reach out to family of victim(s) to offer support
- Identify the root cause of the conflict, then figure out how to address it
- Speak with potential victims and potential perpetrators to find out what happened, try to defuse the situation
- Mediate the conflict where possible
- Within 24 hours, hold a community response event at the site of the incident: clergyman speaks, victims of crime discuss its impact, other speakers as appropriate, staff give out materials (t-shirts, buttons, posters) to reinforce the fact that “every life is valuable.”

¹² Each site is monitored monthly by the Baltimore City Health Department and assessed in these areas to ensure fidelity to the model – the target of 90% will be assessed through the scores given to each outcome measure and analyzed for each subsection .

¹³ ¹³ Targets for FY 13 (shootings and homicides) are based on FY 12 data – in FY 12, there were 6 shootings, with 1 resulting in a homicide.

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
% decrease in homicides from prior year						100% N=2 up from N=1 in FY12	50%	50% (1 less than in FY 13)
% of youth not involved in crime during their year of participation						N=48 80%		
% of conflicts resolved or resolved temporarily due to mediation							50%	90% N= 192 of 213

Program Name: Baltimore Partnership to End Childhood Hunger

Program Summary: The Partnership seeks to engage state and local agencies, community leaders, elected officials and other nonprofit organizations in concerted strategies to increase participation in five federal nutrition assistance programs.

Target Population: Children 18 and under in Baltimore City Public Schools that are eligible for free and reduced price meals

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: The Partnership is involved with Family League and Baltimore City Public Schools to accurately track number of meals served. The methods used are a promising practice.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Services are targeted to the 84% families in Baltimore City with school-aged children who are eligible for free and reduced meals and the 28% of households with children under 4 who are food insecure.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Reducing childhood hunger

FY14 Funding: \$45,000

Performance Measure	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
# of partners convened quarterly	22	22	22
# of monthly workgroup meetings facilitated	9	12	12
# of schools with alternative breakfast	42	80	90
# of mobile meals served	10,000	40,000	27,000
# of afterschool meal sites	147	200	210
How Well We Do It:			
▪ % new schools with alternative breakfast		90%	50% (90 schools of 180)
▪ % new summer meals programs		2%	22% (19 out of 86)
▪ % new after-school meal sites		30%	29% (55 new of 189 total)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ % of eligible students participating in a breakfast program	58%	60%	57% (26,611/46,778)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ % of eligible students participating in a summer meals program	52%	56%	Data available November, 2014
▪ % of eligible students participating in an after-school meals program	25%	30%	21% (9,854/46,778)

LMB: Baltimore County

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

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Violent Crime, Substance Abuse, Violent Crime Against Women & Children

FY14 Funding: \$123,526.50 (\$91,101.50 CCIF & \$32,425 County Match)

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	121	122	131	103	80	98
▪ Individual*	62	96	131	103	75	98
▪ Family*	115	116	124	96	40	60
▪ Group*	33	74	49	41	40	52
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	**	**	115	124	50	40
▪ Individual*	62	60	115	72	38	24
▪ Family*	25	58	26	45	10	13
▪ Group*	3	3	2	7	2	3
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	98	116	124	109	80	98
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	0	1	0	0	0	3
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services***	**	**	99	429	100	176
How Well We Do It:						
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
elements are developed before the 4 th session.		(n=122)	(n=131)	(n=103)		(n=98/98)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	77%	85% (n=103)	83% (n=108)	90% (n=65)	80%	86% (n=34/42)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100% (n=6)	100% (n=6)	100% (n=6)	100%	100% (n=5/5)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in TF-CBT***	**	**	100% (n=6)	100% (n=6)	100%	100% (n=5/5)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	99%	100% (n=186)	100% (n=131)	98% (n=94)	80%	100% (n=98/98)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater. ***	**	**	84% (n=46/55)	71% (n=30/42)	80%	92% (n=33/36)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.***	**	**	89% (n=34/38)	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)	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)	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)	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)	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)	100% (n=3/3)		
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					30%	92% (n=33/36)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).					60%	100% (n=6/6)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS					30%	100% (n=2/2)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.						
➤ % of parents/caregivers reporting improvement in their child’s behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.***	**	**	96% (n=43)	85% (n=55/65)	80%	86% (n=36/42)

*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.

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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Violent Crime, Substance Abuse, Violent Crime Against Women & Children

FY14 Funding: \$154,144 (\$108,183 CCIF & \$45,961 County Match)

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	104	85	73	48	73	48
▪ Individual*	104	85	73	48	58	48
▪ Family*	104	85	73	48	58	48
▪ Group*	6	0	0	0	15	1
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	**	**	8	9	15	17
▪ Individual*	53	22	8	9	15	17
▪ Family*	53	22	8	9	15	17
▪ Group*	0	213	0	0	0	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	157	107	81	48	68	48
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	3	0	0	0	0	4
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services.***			742	743	400	705
How Well We Do It:						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100% (n=85)	99% (n=72)	100% (n=48)	100%	100% (n=48/48)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	93%	84% (n=49)	53% (n=26)	40% (n=8)	60%	40% (n=12/30)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100% (n=6)	100% (n=7)	100% (n= 6)	100%	100% (n=5/5)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in TF-CBT***			71% (n=4)	80% (n=4)	100%	20% (n=1/5)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	100%	99% (n=84)	100% (n=73)	100% (n=48/48)	100%	100% (n=48/48)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.***			68% (n=32/47)	90% (n=18/20)	90%	56% (n=5/9)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.***			70% (n=23/33)	64% (n=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)	69% (n=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)	n/a		
➤ # 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% (n=7/14)		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.***			71% (n=27/38)	63% (n=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)	100% (n=7/7)		
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					90%	56% (n=5/9)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).					95%	n/a (no clients with severe impairment)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and					95%	n/a (no clients meeting PBI criteria)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Behavior Toward Others.						
➤ % of parents reporting improvement in their child's behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.***			**	100% (2/2)	90%	100 (8/8)

*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.

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Violent Crime, Substance Abuse, Violent Crime Against Women & Children

FY14 Funding: \$126,977.50 (\$85,407.50 CCIF & \$41,570 County Match)

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	89	85	100	135	100	142
▪ Individual*	89	85	100	135	100	142
▪ Family*	82	85	100	108	90	85
▪ Group*	0	0	0	53	50	56
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	**	**	38	44	35	152
▪ Individual*	22	23	38	44	35	152
▪ Family*	20	23	38	25	20	34
▪ Group*	0	0	0	10	10	18
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	89	0	100	135	100	294
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	49	65	8	57	30	142
➤ # of individuals served in all non-core services.***			362	265	200	72
How Well We Do It:						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100% (n=85)	100% (n=100)	100% (n=135)	100%	100% (n=142)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	80%	86% (n=73)	86% (n=24/28)	82% (n=53/64)	80%	83% (n=118/142)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	100% (n=10)	100% (n=8)	100% (n=9)	100%	100% (n=9)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in completing the CAFAS assessment.***			100% (n=8)	100% (n=9)	100%	100% (n=9)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	100%	100% (n=85)	100% (n=80)	100% (n=64)	100%	100% (n=142/142)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater. ***			71% (n=20/28)	73% (n=47/64)	70%	68% (n=49/72)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.***			53% (n=9/17)	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)	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)	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)	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)	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)	94% (n=33/35)		
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					70%	71% (n=51/72)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).					70%	63% (n=17/27)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and					70%	100% (n=7)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Behavior Toward Others.						
➤ % of parents reporting improvement in their child’s behavior on the parent satisfaction survey.***			**	82% (n=60/73)	75%	73% (n=11/15)

*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.

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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Violent Crime, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$369,660

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of youth/families served.	76	83	92	81*	95*	94
▪ Number of youth/family slots available at any one time.	**	35	36	32	32***	27
▪ Average duration of services (in days) for youth/families receiving FFT.	**	136	170	176	150	204
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth/families who complete the intervention and are discharged from the program by mutual agreement.	81% (n=59)	67% (n=31)	73% (n=70)	76% (n=38)	70%****	72% (n=68)
▪ Minimum average dissemination adherence score required for an FFT team to be considered adherent to the model.			5.62	5.52	4****	5.45
▪ Minimum average fidelity score required for an FFT team to be considered adherent to the model.			4.03	3.48	3****	3.25
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).	95.5% (n=35)	93% (n=28)	98% (n=49)	97% (n=31)	90%	88% (n=42/48)
▪ 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)	97% (n=31)	90%	94% (n=45/48)
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report improvement in their child’s behavior	91.5%	82%	86%	80%	80%	78%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
as measured by the Youth Outcome Questionnaire (Y-OQ 2.01) pre to post.	(n=35)	(n=28)	(n=42) 7 families declined assessments)	(n=28) 3 families declined YOQ		(n=35/45) 3 families declined

* Number of youth/families served is down due to a staff vacancy that hopefully will be filled during the 1st quarter. First quarter – 3 therapists/9 families = 27; 2nd quarter additional 5 for new therapist (mandatory number for beginning therapist); 3rd and 4th quarter, additional 3 as new therapist now carrying 8 cases

**Data not available for this fiscal year.

***32 is expected average (27 slots in 1st q, 27 in 2nd, 32 in 3rd and 36 in the 4th – due to new therapist training and case build-up).

****FFT model service duration is 120-150 days, so chosen target is 150 due to new therapist’s learning curve.

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

LMB: Calvert County Family Network

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau (YSB)

FY14 Funding: \$53,256

Information not provided as of the date of this report.

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 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.

FY14 Funding: \$42,875

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of public awareness venues.	7	9	15	10	7	7
▪ # of community workshops.*	55	31	11	14	10	8^
▪ # of professional workshops.	2	2	2	2	2	6

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ # of student workshops.**	89	132	129	251	50	112
How Well We Do It (all from pre-post survey):						
▪ # / % of professionals satisfied with the workshops.		27/100%	24/100%	26/100%	#/75%	6/100%
▪ # / % of students satisfied with the workshops.		3006/99%	2482/98%	2905/99.5%	#/75%	1778/100%
▪ # / % of community attendees satisfied with workshops.			119/99%	65/99.5%	#/75%	620/100%
▪ #/% of participants that report being more confident to apply the information learned in real life situations.			2572/98%	2991/99%	#/75%	2131/100%
▪ #/% of students that report they have more knowledge on sexting.			483/96%	535/99%	#/75%	2073/100%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ # /% of students with any improved scores on the knowledge survey (taken at end of classroom workshops).		3006/98%	2482/98%	2936/99%	#/90%	2073/100%
▪ # / % of students with any improved scores on the attitude survey (taken at end of classroom workshops).		2747/96%	2482/97%	2936/99%	#/80%	2073/100%
▪ #/% of participants who report on the workshop survey they have more knowledge of current issues facing at-risk youth.			563/98%	472/99.5%	#/75%	1305/100%
▪ #/% of youth who report on the workshop survey*** using contraceptive methods.			393/99%	768/100%	#/50%	264/100%

*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: The Gathering

Program Summary: This program is a comprehensive multi-faceted approach to community hunger. It will serve the youth in out-of-school time programs at a summer feeding site as well as serve a monthly meal during school to youth and community members who are nutrition deprived.

Target Population: Federalsburg Community youth and parent/guardians of all ages that are at risk of hunger and undernourishment.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: This is a Statewide Best Practice as called for in the Governor's End Childhood Hunger Initiative.

How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Reduces juvenile delinquency by making sure youth do not have to steal or commit crimes to provide for a meal.

FY14 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ # of youth served.	450	317^
▪ # of adults served	700	1489
▪ # of meals served.	18	18
How Well We Do It (all from survey at end of meal):		
▪ #/% of parent/guardians that report on the survey they were satisfied with	#/80%	1474/99%

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
the meal.		
▪ #/% of youth that report on the survey they were satisfied with the meal.	#/80%	253/80%
▪ #/% parent/guardians who report on the survey that they felt they had received a nutritiously balanced meal.	#80%	1474/99%
Is Anyone Better Off? (all from survey at end of meal)		
▪ #/% parents/guardians that report they were full before leaving the dinner.	#95%	1474/99%
▪ #/% of youth that report they were full before leaving the dinner.	#95%	317/100%
▪ #/% of participants who report they would return for the dinner	#95%	1806/100%

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Addictions Counselor in School

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

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

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence Based Practice Employed: Using the Teen Intervene model, an early intervention for youth that are not using on a daily basis that 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.

FY14 Funding: \$26,474

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of students (total unduplicated) receiving services.	60	96	65	49	45	81
▪ Number of sessions.		551	237	315	150	242
▪ Number of prevention presentations.	8	4	11	22	10	22
How Well We Do It:						
▪ #/% of participants attending at least 6 therapy sessions (based on youth strategies 5-year experience).	61/57%	48/96%	42/65%	23/47%	#/50%	40/67%
▪ #/% of participants satisfied with quality of services as measured by survey given at end of program.	105/100%	11/73%	0/0%	3/100%	#/75%	23/100%
▪ #/% of participants who complete Teen Intervene as planned.		10/71%	0/0%	0/0%	#/50%	23/56%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of participants <u>not</u> receiving a drug-related school suspension while in treatment.	61/100%	21/100%	65/100%	49/100%	#/90%	63/95%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ #/% participants not receiving alcohol related school suspension.			65/100%	49/100%	#/85%	66/100%
▪ # /% of participants not referred to DJS for drug use while in treatment.	59/98%	21/100%	65/100%	49/100%	#/87%	63/95%
▪ #/% of participants not referred to DJS for alcohol use while in treatment.			65/100%	49/100%	#/85%	66/100%
▪ #/% of participants demonstrating any increase on GAF between intake and discharge.	57/62%	11/73%	15/83%	3/100%	#/60%	23/100%

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

**GAF Global Assessment of Functioning

***The SOCRATES (Stages of Change Readiness and Treatment Eagerness Scale) is an experimental instrument designed to assess readiness for change in alcohol and drug abusers. It yields three factorial-derived scale scores: Recognition (Re), Ambivalence (Am), and Taking Steps (Ts). It is a public domain instrument and may be used without permission.

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.

FY14 Funding: \$24,120

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of students served (unduplicated total):	67	51	61	60	50	55
▪ Lockerman						
▪ Greensboro*		47	46			
▪ # of non-billable points of service:	1377	649	1108	939	900	1175
▪ Lockerman						
▪ Greensboro*		1188	995			
▪ # of billable points of service:			1251	989	800	972
▪ Lockerman	1763	751				
▪ Greensboro*		367	595			

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
How Well We Do It:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #/% of students that attend six behavioral health sessions (six is based on five years of Youth Strategies recommendations): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lockerman ▪ Greensboro* 	30/45%	16/45%	33/70%	29/57%	#/45%	70/45%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #/% of students who are satisfied with services on the annual consumer satisfactory survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lockerman ▪ Greensboro* 		7/86%	23/100%	18/95%	#50%	32/100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #/% of participants who have successfully achieved at least one of their short term goals identified in their plan at 6 month review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lockerman ▪ Greensboro 		None received	5/100%			
			0/0%	35/60%	#/75%	20/82%
			0/0%			
Is Anyone Better Off?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #/% of students attending six sessions that demonstrate any improved score or maintain improved (prior score that was improved) on the GAF:** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lockerman ▪ Greensboro* 	98%	5/33%	23/93%	31/98%	#50%	68/97.3%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #/% of students attending 6 sessions who have no more than three office referrals while in the program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lockerman ▪ Greensboro* 		12/80%	31/950%	31/94%	#75%	22/96%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #/% of students who report the program has helped them better understand behavioral health on survey given at end of program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lockerman ▪ Greensboro* 			21/92%	16/84%	#50%	22/100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #/% of students who indicate on annual consumer survey that their mental health has improved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lockerman ▪ Greensboro* 			21/92%	16/84%	#70%	22/100%
			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.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Program Name: Caroline Mentoring Project (CMP)

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

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

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

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

FY14 Funding: \$27,000

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of mentor relationships (youth & mentor).	21	19	21	20/24	20	22
▪ # of mentor trainings.	4	1	4	4	4	3^
▪ # of group activities.	6	3	10	10	5	9
How Well We Do It:						
▪ #/% of mentors who spend at least 8 hours per month mentoring their mentee.	(18) 95%	19/95%	19/91%	19/95%	90%	18/82%
▪ #/% of mentor relationships that remain intact for six months.		17/95%	21/100%	24/100%	75%	22/88%
▪ #/% of Mentors/Mentees who attend group events.**			15/70%	11/54%	50%	47/38%^
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of mentees who show improvement in overall GPA (from first marking period to last for the school year).*	85%	85%*	17/81%	22/92%	75%	21/95%
▪ #/% of mentees who see value in the relationship and want to continue as measured by Mentee – Caroline Mentoring Project Annual Evaluation Survey.*	100%	97.5%*	21/100%	18/100%	90%	6/100%
▪ #/% Mentees who report the relationship has made a difference in their lives at home and school - Caroline Mentoring Project Annual Evaluation Survey.			21/100%	18/100%	90%	6/100%
▪ #/% of participants who have no DJS involvement while involved in the program.			21/100%	23/96%	80%	22/100%

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: 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.

Target Population: Colonel Richardson Middle School and Lockerman Middle School students at risk of school failure and DJJ 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.

FY14 Funding: \$144,084

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			6	5	5	6
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.			2	2	2	2
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			2	2	2	2
▪ # of Middle School students served.	358	265	186	210	200	191^
o Colonel Richardson Middle School	201	165	86	106	100	95
o Lockerman Middle School	157	100	100	109	100	96
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Average Daily Attendance.		85%*				
o Colonel Richardson Middle School		^^	76%	78%	60%	90.5%
o Lockerman Middle School		^^	82%	77%	60%	81.7%
▪ #/% of students who attend the program 30 days or more.						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School	40/53%	90/55%	91/60%	98/71%	53%	72/75.8%
o Lockerman Middle School	100/50%	70/70%	56/81%	93/68%	53%	51/58%
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.4	4	4	LMS-3 CRMS-5
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			3.7	4	3.5	LMS-4 CRMS-5
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			3.2	4	3	LMS-3 CRMS-5
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			2.5	3	3	LMS-4 CRMS-3
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately)						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
below).						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School			3.3	3.75	3.25	4.5
o Lockerman Middle School			3.5	3.75	3.25	3.5
▪ #/% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			2/100%	2/100%	#/100%	2/100%
▪ #/% of Parents participating in Family Events						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School			63/100%	55/52%	#/50%	26/38% ^^
o Lockerman Middle School			49/100%	57/52%	#/50%	26/47% ^^
▪ #/% of students satisfied with the program at the end of family events (survey administered at end of event)						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School		292/88%	69/86%	39/100%	#/75%	45/95.7%
o Lockerman Middle School			110/93%	51/100%	#/90%	25/86% ^^
▪ #/% of parents who indicate they are satisfied with the academic help provided for their child (survey)						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School			44/96%	16/100%	#/80%	42/91%
o Lockerman Middle School			20/83%	3/100%	#/80%	31/100%
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						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School			^^^	2/25%	#50%	0/0% ^^
o Lockerman Middle			^^^	5/83%	#/50%	3/60%
▪ #/% 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						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School			3/100%	1/25%	#50%	2/29% ^^
o Lockerman Middle School			1/100%	2/50%	#50%	0/0% ^^
▪ #/% of students who were chronically absent (more than 20 days) in 2010-2011 school year who miss less than 15 days of school in 2011-2012.						
o Colonel Richardson Middle School			1/100%	#75%	#75%	Data not currently available ^^
o Lockerman Middle School			1/100%	#75%	#75%	Data not currently available ^^

*The schools were not tracked separately in FY11.

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: 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

FY14 Funding: \$68,744

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # Children referred to the program.	15	4*	25	23	14	13
▪ # Children participating in the program.	14	6*	18	24	11	19
▪ # of Educators provided with Consultation.		0*	22	15	4	6
How Well We Do It:						
▪ # & % Children successfully discharged with a functioning treatment plan (parent or educator is the plan with positive results).	(13)100%	3/50%*	9/90%	5/95%	#90%	3/100%
▪ # & % of Caregivers that rate behavior at home as 3.7** or higher on the Satisfaction Survey at end of service.	(13)100%	100%	5/100%	8/85%	#80%	3/100%
▪ # & % of Caregivers Satisfaction Surveys** that rate behavior at school as (3.7) or higher.	(13)100%	No cases received in school services*	5/100%	8/85%	#/80%	3/100%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of children whose targeted behaviors were reduced during course of treatment through frequency*** data collection.	(9) 78%	50%*	5/86%	8/85%	#/80%	3/100%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ #/% of children with improved scores on the CAFAS/PECFAS between intake and discharge.	(13) 100%	100%	7/77%^^	5/100%	#90%	3/100%
▪ #/% of care givers who now have the ability to identify why the problem behavior is occurring (Annual Care Givers Satisfaction Survey).			6/100%	5/100%	#75%	2/100%

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

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

***Counting the occurrence of target behaviors.

^^Youth being referred to the program have had much more intensive needs and behavioral issues in the past years, the program has actually performed in a case management capacity and some of the youth end up in placement.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Teen Court

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

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

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

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

FY14 Funding: \$35,500

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # 1 st & 2 nd time offenders diverted from the juvenile justice system (including tobacco & alcohol citations).	109	93	55>	67	60	62
▪ # court sessions.	19	19	14>	17	10	16
▪ # Teen Court Volunteers.		40	40	30	25	58
How Well We Do It:						
▪ # and % of participants who complete their Teen Court consequences by the deadline.	109/97%	93/100%	53/97.5%	67/100%	#75%	38/87%
▪ #and % of teen volunteers that attend at least 10 court sessions during a year.		42/60%	40/100%	30/87%	#50%	25/39%
▪ #and% of parents satisfied with the program (survey at		87/98%	53/95.5%	64/95%	#80%	62/97%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
end of court session).						
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of Teen Court respondents who do not re-offend (no DJS involvement) 12 months (FY) after completing the program.*	98%	100/92%*	87/94%	67/100%	#/75%	10/97.5%
▪ #and% of Teen Court Respondents who are not suspended from school during the current school year.		93/100%	87/94%	65/97%	#80%	62/100%
▪ #and % of Teen Court Respondents who report Teen Court Peers had an impact on them** (survey at end of court session).			40/96%	69/69%	#75%	52/90%

*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.

>The Teen Court Coordinator took disability leave in March 2012. In May 2012, a new Coordinator was hired to continue the program, resulting in fewer sessions and referrals.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau

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

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

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: BSFT is rated Exemplary 2 from Strengthening America's Families, 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.

FY14 Funding: \$94,430 YSB + \$24,308 EIP = \$118,737

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:		49	56	50	57
▪ Individual*		0	0	0	0
▪ Family*		49	56	50	57
▪ Group*		0	0	0	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:		0	0	0	0
▪ Individual*		0	0	0	0
▪ Family*		0	0	0	0
▪ Group*		0	0	0	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.		49	56	50	57
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.		3	1	0	1
➤ Total individuals served	372	192	184	160	229
How Well We Do It:					
➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed by the 4 th session.		100% (N=49)	100% (N=56)	80%	76.4% ¹ (42 of 55)
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.		55.6% (N=17)	74% (20 of 27)	80%	72.7% (32 of 44)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.		100% (N=6)	100% (N=6)	80%	100% (N=4)
➤ Percentage of parents/guardians who are satisfied with BSFT as indicated on exit survey.	95.2% (N=20)	100% (N=12)	100% (10 of 10)	85%	100% ² (13 of 13)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.		97.9% (47 of 48)	100% (56 of 56)	80%	98.2% (56 of 57)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater. (Note: 2a.)		75% (N=3)	93.3% (14 of 15)	70%	79.2% ³ (19 of 24)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention , the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments. (Note: 2b.)				70%	76.9% ⁴ (10 of 13)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention , the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). (Note: 2c.)				70%	100% ⁵ (13 of 13)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention , the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.				70%	No families who completed had a PBI at initial assessment
Mc Master Assessment Tool*					
➤ Percentage of families that demonstrate improvement with healthy effective verbal communication of information within the family when measured pre and post treatment.	100% (N=19)	66% (N=10)	81.8% (9 of 11)	70%	57.1% ⁶ (8 of 14)
➤ Percentage of families that demonstrate improvement with healthy approaches to resolve problems to a level that maintains effective family functioning when measured pre and post treatment.	100% (N=19)	93% (N=15)	90.9% (10 of 11)	70%	64.3% ⁷ (9 of 14)
➤ Percentage of families that demonstrate improvement with healthy appropriate roles by which family members fulfill family functions when measured pre and post treatment.	100% (N=19)	68% (N=11)	100% (11 of 11)	70%	71.4% ⁸ (10 of 14)

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.

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.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Security: Violence Against Women & Children; **Health:** Substance Use

FY14 Funding: \$ 94,430 (YSB) +24,307 (EIP) = \$118,737 same funding as prior project

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of families that receive Brief Strategic Family Therapy.	62	60	49	56	50	57
▪ Total number of individuals served.	279	374	192	200	150	229
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who are satisfied with BSFT as indicated on exit survey.	94% (N=90)	95.2% (N=20)	100% (N=12)	100% (N=10)	85%	100% (N=13)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Mc Master Assessment Tool*						
▪ Percentage of families that ended in the healthy range or improved by 10% or better with effective verbal communication of information within the family when measured pre and post treatment.	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	66% (N=10)	82% (N=9)	70%	57.1% (8 of 14)
▪ Percentage of families that ended in the healthy range or improved by 10% or better with healthy approaches to resolve problems to a level that maintains effective family functioning when measured pre and post treatment.	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	93% (N=15)	91% (N=10)	70%	64.3% (9 of 14)
▪ Percentage of families that ended in the healthy range or improved by 10% or better with healthy appropriate roles by which family members fulfill family functions when measured pre and post treatment.	71% (N=44)	100% (N=19)	68% (N=11)	100% (N=11)	70%	71.4% (10 of 14)

*LMB consulted with Olga Hervis, co-developer of BSFT, who suggested using McMaster Assessment tool to capture change in family system as opposed to individuals. This evidence based treatment looks to change acting out youth by changing maladaptive family interaction/function. Tool is administered pre- and post-treatment and was implemented in FY09.

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Opportunity: Job Education Skill

FY14 Funding: \$27,601

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of calls received.	137	199	226	330	200	339
▪ Number of walk-ins.	43	170	213	183	125	207
▪ Number of callers/walk-ins given referrals to community resources.	363	592	331	432	325	310
▪ Number of outreach events.	18	11	16	12	10	14
▪ Number of contacts at outreach events.	1,672	1,025	1,930	875	750	1,008
▪ Number of referrals at outreach events.	73	118	134	85	75	114
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of total contacts who participate in follow-up sample survey (%= survey sample/ total number of calls).	16% N=30	5% N=17	5% N=21	4% N=14	5% N=15	5% N= 17
▪ Percent of surveyed contacts satisfied or higher with CN services (by subscale/question). Indicate number of surveys completed (N).	16% N=30	5% N=17	5% N=21	4% N=14	5% N=15	5% N=17
○ Respectful of family	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=12)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
○ Knowledgeable	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=12)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
○ Understandable	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=12)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
○ Gave appropriate referral	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=12)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that they understood information or referral provided.	100% (N=30)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that they contacted the suggested referral.	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
▪ Percentage of contacts reporting that referral was able to provide requested information or services.	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	100%(N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
▪ Percentage of contacts who were satisfied with the referred service.	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)
▪ Percentage of contacts who report increased confidence/competence in addressing future needs.	100% (N=23)	100% (N=17)	100% (N=21)	100% (N=14)	80% (N=15)	100% (N=17)

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Achieve

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

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

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$52,480

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of youth served.	93	89	113	276	100	253 ¹
Number of classes offered per session.		10	12	11	10	12
Number of schools/programs served.		8	11	10	10	15
How Well We Do It:						
% of participants who successfully complete Life Skills Training (8 of 10 classes with satisfactory participation).	75% (N=70)	89% (N=79)	87% (N=98)	95% (N=130/137)	85%	96% N=155/161
% of participants involved in the creation of educational materials designed to teach prevention topics to their peers.		100% (N=89)	94% (N=106)			
% of youth who rate their satisfaction with the program as excellent, as measured by end-of-session surveys.				89% N=122/137	75%	90% N=145/161
% of sites served where administrators express satisfaction with the materials presented, staff professionalism and overall experience for students, as noted on year-end survey.			92% (N=11)	92% N=11/12	90%	93% N=14/15 ²
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of participants who demonstrate an increased knowledge of Life Skills topics as measured by pre- and post-tests.	100% (N=70)	89% (N=79)	98% (N=96)	90% N=248	80%	95% N=240/253
% of participants who demonstrate an increased knowledge of drug resistance skills as measured by pre-and post-tests at the beginning and end of each 10-week session.		80% (N=63)	94% (N=92)	91% N=99	80%	93% N=150/161
% of participants who demonstrated an increased knowledge of personal management skills as measured by pre-and post-tests at the beginning and end of each 10-week session.		84% (N=66)	92% (N=90)	87% N=95	80%	87% N=140/161
% of participants who demonstrated an increased knowledge of social skills as measured by pre-and post-tests at the beginning and end of each 10-week session.		85% (N=67)	90% (N=88)	88% N=96	80%	86% N=138/161

¹Had the opportunity to do 1- or 2-day sessions in additional schools during Health Classes, etc.

²One school did not respond.

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Advance/CINS (Children in Need of Supervision)

Program Summary: Advance is a prevention and intervention program that serves youth who are involved with the juvenile justice system, or who are at-risk for DJS involvement. The program supports improved school attendance, academic success and individual goal setting and achievement. During FY14, the program will continue the Children in Need of Supervision (CINS) component which began as a pilot program during FY2013, addressing the needs of youth for whom a CINS complaint has been made (ungovernable, truant, runaway).

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

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Violent Crime, Education, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$46,175

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of youth served:						
o Active	19	52	53	37	35	37
o CINS*				15	15	19
o Linked ^a	32	24	20			
Number of schools served.			15	15	12	15
Number of CINS and traditional participants who transitioned to aftercare (which involves less-frequent case manager interaction). ^d	40	17	20	6	15	1 ¹
How Well We Do It						
Percentage of participants who successfully complete Botvin Life Skills program. ^b		27%	28% N=15			
Percentage of participants who successfully complete 80% or more of their ISP objectives. ^c				45% N=17/37	45%	45% N=17/37
Percentage of participants who require and complete anger management classes.		76%	75% N=15/20	50% N=3/6	50%	62% N=8/13
Percentage of CINS participants who require and attend 50% of anger management classes.				43% N=3/7	50%	100% N=5/5
Percentage of participants who require and complete substance abuse classes.		72%	50% N=8/16	66% N=2/3	50%	100% N=5/5
Percentage of CINS participants who require and attend substance abuse classes.				50% N=1/2	50%	100% N=3/3
Percentage of CINS participants who require and attend 80% of scheduled individual counseling sessions.				63% N=5/8	50%	100% N=7/7
Percentage of parents of CINS participants who require and complete parenting classes.*				0% 0/9	25%	8% ² N=1/12
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of participants with prior DJS involvement who have no subsequent involvement for the duration of their program participation.	94%	98%	83% N=5	67% N=6/9	50%	33% ³ N=2/6
Percentage of participants who have no DJS involvement while participating.		100%	91% N=21	83% N=43/52	70%	84% N=31/37
Percentage of participants who had no school suspensions for the duration of their program participation.	71%	94%	89% N=47	73% N=38/52	60%	92% N=34/37

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Percentage of CINS participants who had no school suspensions for the duration of their program participation.				46% N=7/15	40%	100% N=19/19
Percentage of participants who show improved school attendance, evidenced by report card.			40% N=21	38% N=9/24	25%	87% N=13/15
Percentage of CINS participants who show improved school attendance, evidenced by report card.				27% N=4/15	15%	100% N=6/6
Percentage of participants who show improved grades, measured by GPA.			51% N=27	40% N=21/52	25%	60% N=9/15
Percentage of CINS participants who show improved grades, measured by GPA.				33% N=5/15	15%	67% N=4/6

Bold outline indicates programming provided by current vendor (Project Crossroad).

*New measures to reflect CINS pilot program in FY2013.

^aRemoving “Linked” services because it is very hard to define and to quantify with accuracy.

^bRemoving successful completion of Life Skills program because the nature of the Advance Program does not support group meetings, and youth are not completing the work on their own or in one-on-one sessions – it is designed for group participation.

^cAdded measurement of completion of ISP objectives because it is a better reflection of the youth’s progress towards meeting their goals.

^dNumber of participants transitioning to aftercare services began including traditional and CINS participants combined total as of FY2013.

¹Unlike prior years, we had several students move out of the area or withdraw completely before reaching a point where aftercare was appropriate. This was an anomaly we attributed to a more transient client base in FY2014.

²Although several CINS parents attended at least some parenting classes, only 1 completed the program. In the future we would offer incentives for each class completed, in addition to re-evaluating the time/day of classes to maximize participation.

³This number fell short by one client. We had several clients referred due to DJS involvement who had additional DJS contact early in our program. Fortunately, we saw great improvement after they had received several months of services.

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Ascend

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

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

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

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Jobs

FY14 Funding: \$87,863

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Number served.	170	78	57	80	50	71
Number of youth who transition to aftercare after receiving GED. ^a		*	4	4	5	5
Number of youth who transition to aftercare (which involves less-frequent case manager interaction).	79 new/91 aftercare					
Number of participants assessed by Cecil College for ABE/GED placement.			46	50	25	22 ¹
Number of youth who present with the need to obtain a State-issued identification card.		9	6	34	5	10
How Well We Do It:						
% of participants who complete vocational training. ^b	59%	15%	3.5% N=2			
Percentage of participants who require and complete computer literacy training. ^c				25% N=2/8	50%	50% N=3/6
Percentage of new participants who require and enroll in ABE/GED classes. ^d	61%	83%	79% N=15	70% N=3/5	70%	71% N=12/17
Percentage of participants who require and complete job readiness training. ^e	25%	45%	26% N=15	40% N=10/25	70%	61% ² N=20/33
% of participants completing the Life Skills Transitions Program. ^f		5%	0			
Percentage of ABE students who transition to GED.		33%	23% N=13	23% N=8	20%	14% ³ N=10/71
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of participants who obtain a GED.	23%	8%	7% N=4	8% N=6	5%	7% N=5/71
Percentage of clients who have obtained full- or part-time employment	33%	29%	16% N=9	18% N=15	10%	24% N=17/71
Percentage of clients who increased GED/ABE test level while working toward GED ^g	15%	92%	90% N=5	80% N=28	80%	24% ⁴ N=17/71
Percentage of clients who complete 80% of goals listed on their ISP. ^h	18%	22% N=17	23% N=13	48% N=38	25%	25% N=18/71
% of participants on target to meet goals of ISP within timeframe allotted. ⁱ		76%	72% N=			
Percentage of participants who have taken and passed GED pre-test.		15% N=12	5% N=3	23% N=8/35	25%	23% ⁵ N=16/71
% of youth in need of community services (e.g., transportation, housing, medical) who are connected to those services.			84% (N=16)	61% N=23	60%	60% N=21/35

* Transitional year for this program with the vendor. Because true enrollment started late in the fiscal year, youth did not transition into aftercare until after the end of FY11.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Bold outline indicates programming provided by current vendor (Project Crossroad).

^aChanged wording to provide more lucid definition of aftercare services.

^bVocational training is not available directly through this program, and is variable in availability and accessibility in Cecil County.

^cThis measure was already being used, but was in combination with Job Ready. Separated the two programs as they are unique in scope.

^dExpanded the definition to include Adult Basic Education (ABE) classes, where many of the participants must begin.

^eSee measure c.

^fEliminated this measure because the Ascend program is designed to the unique needs of each participant, and group meetings are not held. Participation in this program would require group meetings.

^gThe GED process requires many steps and can take two to three years; in light of this it makes sense to measure progress, not just the end result.

^hChanged this requirement to a more meaningful measurement, as achievement of 100% of goals in any one measurement period is nearly impossible.

ⁱEliminated this measure because it is impossible to determine accurate timeframes that are truly reasonable for individuals to accomplish ISP goals.

¹Number is lower due to the limited testing/availability of classes. Also weather-related closures made assessments difficult to reschedule.

²Although the case manager made job readiness available on an individual and group basis, participants were ‘no shows’ or did not take advantage of opportunities. In the future we would tie other services to the completion of this training. For example, we would pay for the student’s next round of GED classes, or their test, AFTER completion of job readiness training.

³Participants were either too low ABE level and they could not transition to GED level in the time period or participants presented at GED level and did not require transition.

⁴Many of the GED clients got a late start and were unable to increase their test level in the given time. The harsh weather and lack of transportation during the winter of 2013/2014 impacted enrollment, start dates and attendance. Cecil County Transit has a new bus line to Cecil College, making services for those without a car more available. We would utilize this option, along with pursuing the possibility of having an instructor work from our location with GED clients.

⁵Same as above.

LMB: Cecil Human Services Agency

Program Name: Out-of-School Programs, Elkton Middle School (EMS) and Bohemia Manor Middle School (BMMS)

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

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

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Botvin Life Skills, the Character Chronicles curriculum, 4-H Technology program, Functional Reading program, Door of Hope (abstinence training).

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The Middle School Out-of-School Programs work with middle school children at risk of engaging in drug abuse and/or juvenile crime.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$76,399

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number served.	110					
▪ EMS		34	22	36	30	38
▪ BMMS		65	44	46	40	46

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Number of parents who participate in the program, defined as attending at least one activity per fiscal year. ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS		2 9	4 8	8 19	5 10	18 13
Number of staff who have completed YPQA Basics training. ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS			4 2	4 2	4 2	4 2
Number of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.			2	2	2	2
Number of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans			2	2	2	2
How Well We Do It:						
Staff to Student Ratio. ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS	1:15	1:8 1:5	1:7 1:5	1:6 1:5	1:8 1:5	1:6 1:5
Percentage of students who attend program at least 50% of the time. ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS	39%	71% 26%	95% N=21 47% N=18	52% N=11/21 55% N=21/38	50% 40%	59% N=13/22 44% N=17/39
Average daily program attendance. ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS		38% 26%	68% N=15 36% N=16	57% N=12/21 47% N=18/38	50% 40%	50% N=11/22 42% N=16/38
Participants' average attendance in school, as measured by the inverse of the absences noted on report cards. ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS		93% 92%	91% N=20 94% N=5.7	91% N=163/180 93% N=167/180	80% 85%	88% N=159/180 95% N=171/180
Percentage of youth who rate their satisfaction with the program as excellent, as measured by semi-annual survey. ^a ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS		N/A (EMS) 33% (BMMS)	95% N=21 N/A	76% N=16/21 53% N=23/43	70% 40%	77% N=17/22 40% N=10/25
Percentage of parents who rate their satisfaction with the program as excellent, as measured by semi-annual survey. ^a ▪ EMS ▪ BMMS			50% N=4 N/A	29% N=6/21 67% N=4/6	30% 40%	36% N=8/22 83% N=5/6
Percentage of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			100%	100%	100%	100%
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain. ▪ EMS			4.4 4.42	4.2 4.5	3.0 4.0	4.7 4.5

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ BMMS						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.						
▪ EMS			4.3	4.3	3.0	4.3
▪ BMMS			4.65	4.4	3.0	4.4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.						
▪ EMS			4.0	3.7	3.0	3.2
▪ BMMS			4.21	4.3	3.0	3.9
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.						
▪ EMS			2.6	3.1	2.0	4.0
▪ BMMS			2.92	4.0	2.5	3.5
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by site.						
▪ EMS			3.8	3.8	3.0	4.0
▪ BMMS			4.05	4.3	3.3	4.1
Percentage of sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			100%	100%	100%	100%
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of participants who increase pro-social attitudes (anger management, group participation/teamwork, resist peer pressure, ask for help/advice when have a problem) as measured by self and staff pre and post-tests administered at the beginning and the end of each semester. ^b	56%					
▪ EMS		N/A*	100% N=22	81% N=17/21	70%	73% N=16/22
▪ BMMS		71%	57% N=7	71% N=17/24	50%	73% N=11/15
Percentage of student participants who improved English, Math or Reading scores.	55%					
▪ EMS		38% N=13	87% N=19	62% N=13/21	50%	64% N=14/22
▪ BMMS		47%	62% N=37	50% N=21/42	50%	71% N=22/31
Percentage of students who show any improvement on school grades as measured by quarterly report cards.						
▪ EMS		42% N=14	87% N=19	62% N=13/21	50%	68% N=15/22
▪ BMMS		39%	89% N=37	74% N=31/42	60%	84% N=22/26

Bold outline indicates programming provided at Elkton Middle School by current vendor (Project Crossroad).

*This program was awarded in late February 2011 and launched on March 15, 2011. It served students through June 3, 2011. Due to this shortened time frame, no measure of pro-social attitude changes was able to be completed at the beginning and end of the school year.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

^aIt is difficult to assess parents' and childrens' satisfaction with the program only at enrollment and ending, because the population shifts throughout the year. Measuring at least twice per year should offer more data.

^bFollowing the same logic as above, it is important to conduct pre-post measures of pro-social attitudes more frequently, to allow greater numbers to complete the test.

LMB: Cecil County, Human Services Agency

Program Name: Perryville Police Department Outreach Program

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

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

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

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Substance Abuse, Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$63,948

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of first-time offenders referred to DJS/local police Diversion Component.	7	35	29	22	20	7 ¹
Number of individual counseling sessions provided for youth in DJS/local police Diversion and Outreach Components.	41	202	113	136	120	115 ²
Number of group counseling sessions provided in DJS/local police Diversion and Outreach Components.	1	69	64	56	50	49 ³
Unduplicated number of walk-in youth participating in Outreach component.	3	86	118	82	100	163
Number of youth served in CINS diversion program.*				2		
How Well We Do It:						
Percentage of participating youth whose parent(s) or guardian(s) participated in no fewer than 50% of parent involvement activities.	7%	25%	21% N=25	16% N=18	15%	12% ⁴ N=15/127
Percentage of Outreach Component participants attending the program on a daily basis.		20%	21% N=25	29% N=16	20%	10% ⁵ N=13/127
Percentage of CINS participants who require and attend 50% of anger management classes.*				100% N=1/1		
Percentage of CINS participants who require and attend substance abuse classes.*				N/A N=0		
Percentage of CINS participants who require and attend 80% of scheduled individual counseling sessions.*				100% N=2/2		
Percentage of parents of CINS participants who require and complete parenting classes.*				0% N/0/2		

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Percentage of youth who rate their satisfaction with the program as excellent, as measured by semi-annual survey.					70%	83% N=35/42
Percentage of parents who rate their satisfaction with the program as excellent, as measured by semi-annual survey.					25%	80% N=4/5
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of Diversion Program participants with no DJS intake/referral 6 months after program participation ends.	N/A [^]	90%	93% N=27	91% N=14	85%	100% N=7/7
Percentage of Outreach Component program participants with no DJS intake/referral 6 months after program participation ends.	N/A [^]		97% N=115	93% N=76	90%	100% N=163/16
Percentage of CINS participants who had no school suspensions for the duration of their program participation.*				100% N=2		
Percentage of CINS participants who show improved school attendance, evidenced by report card.*				100% N=2		
Percentage of CINS participants who show improved grades, measured by GPA.*				50% N=1		
Percentage of Outreach Component participants who improve pro-social skills (anger management, group participation/teamwork, resist peer pressure, ask for help/advice when having a problem) as measured by pre- and post-tests administered at the beginning and the end of each program. ^a		80%	83% N=98	90% N=74	90%	92% N=26/28
Percentage of Diversion Program participants without subsequent DJS or police referral while involved in program.			93% N=27	96% N=15	85%	85% N=6/7

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

*New measures to reflect CINS pilot program in FY2013.

^a It is difficult to assess youth's measures of pro-social attitudes only at enrollment and ending, because the population shifts throughout the year. Measuring at least twice per year will allow greater numbers to complete the test.

¹ We didn't receive the anticipated number of referrals this fiscal year. We hope this is due to a decline in Juvenile offenders.

² Due to lack of referrals, the number of individual counseling sessions provided was slightly lower than our target goal.

³ Due to lack of referrals and parent participation, the number of group counseling sessions provided was slightly lower than our target goal.

⁴ Parent involvement has continuously been an aspect of the program to improve. Despite weekly and monthly parent activities, parent participation within the program is low.

⁵ Although we have an ample amount of active members, only youth who live with the town limits of Perryville are able to attend the program on a daily basis.

LMB: Cecil Human Service Agency

Program Name: Cecil County Public Schools & Cecil College Career Blast Program

Program Summary: Beginning in October of the eighth grade, a series of programs will be offered to promote the significance and value of a college education for middle school students. A critical element in the success of the program is to include parents from the onset so that students hear consistent messages at home and school. The program components include a College Value Workshop held at each of the six middle schools; a career fair held at Cecil College; web-based resources (Career Cruising) to support career awareness and selection; and a parent orientation conducted at each middle school.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: All 8th grade students enrolled in Cecil County Public Schools are eligible to participate in this series of events.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Career Blast is a locally developed program that provides College and Career planning and preparation knowledge for students and parents.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program is open to all 8th grade students. Specific invitations go out to students identified as at-risk of dropping out of school, to involve their parents in the evening session. These students are present for the in-school presentation and a passive permission slip is used for participation in the College Career Fair. Data is collected on the families of at-risk students that are present for the parent College Value Workshop.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
Number of participants in 8 th grade orientation (8 th grade enrollment).	1171	1153	1151
Number of families participating in parent night.	258	350	165 ¹
Number of Career Cruising hits.	4178	2700	3961
Number of Career Fair sessions	27	27	27
How Well We Do It:			
% of 8 th grade students attending Career Fair.	79.5% (N=1171)	80%	85% (N=975/1151)
Percent of 8th grade Career Fair attendees reporting sessions “Exceeded Expectations” on post-fair survey.	87% (N=1171)	85%	56% ² (N=1135/2042)
Percent of teacher Career Fair attendees reporting workshop as “Helpful” or “Very Helpful” on post-fair survey.	100%	85%	100%
Is Anyone Better Off?			
Percent of 8 th grade Career Blast participants passing from 8 th grade to 9 th grade.*	95% (N=1179)	95%	100% (N=975/975)
Percent of previous Career Blast participants passing from 9 th grade to 10 th grade.**	95% (N=1228)	95%	97% (N=1176/1212)
Percent of seniors self-reporting plans to attend either a 2-year or 4-year college after graduation.	71% (N=768)	75%	69% ³ (N=743/1081)

*It was untenable to measure youth who participated in ANY Career Blast activity against those who passed 8th grade. This measure actually reflects those who attended the Career Fair, and the measure will be changed for FY2015.

**Measure was not tracked in the first year of Career Blast. This measure reflects those of the entire 9th grade who passed to 10th grade, and is valuable because it is the critical time when most youth will drop out of school.

¹Parent night participation was likely reduced due to significant amounts of snow and bad weather over the winter. The sessions are held in January and February.

²Unsure as to why so few responses on survey indicated “Exceeded Expectations,” but survey will be administered differently next year, e.g., after each workshop not just once at the end of the night. The Career Fair consists of 20-30 minute workshops for approximately 400 youth at a time. Each youth attends 24-30 sessions.

³Post-graduation trend data not progressing as well as hoped.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Functional Family Therapy (FFT)

Program Summary: An intervention to families in need of services to maintain stability, providing 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 reduces out of home placements for at-risk youth offenders; and promotes positive outcomes for youths.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse; Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$51,518

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of youth served for the year.	10	16	27	25	25	32
▪ Average Daily Capacity.			8	7	8	8
▪ Average duration of services (in sessions) for youth receiving FFT services.		18	12.8	12	12	14
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of attendees who complete counseling successfully (based on mutual termination).	57% (N=4)	100% (N=3)	100% (N=14)	100% (N=19)	100%	90% (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% (N=19)	100%	100% (N=19)
▪ Percentage of families satisfied with services as measured by client survey completed after case closure.		100%	100% (N=14)	100% (N=19)	75%	100% (N=19)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of youth participants who are not placed outside the home during program duration.	100% (N=7)	100% (N=16)	100% (N=14)	100% (N=19)	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.	75% (N=2)	100% (N=3)	100% (N=14)	100% (N=19)	87.75%	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)	100% (N=19)	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)	100% (N=19)	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)	100% (N=19)	75%	100% (N=19)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Summer/Mobile Meals

Program Summary: A collaborative initiative to feed at-risk children during the summer months while school is not in session. The program addresses the contributory factors of low-income, prevention and awareness.

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

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

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$24,995

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Number of Meals Served	8,018*	6423	7324	5000	9569
○ Camps	3,255	2678	4236	3000	2019+
○ Mobile	4,764	3745	3088	2000	7550
▪ Number of mobile areas served (Geographic area eligible sites for free lunch as determined by MSDE & CCBOE).	13	12	20	12	24
▪ Number of “Second Meals” served to children. ▪		457	0	0	0
How Well We Do It:					
▪ Percentage of overall meals served through the mobile unit as compared to stationary sites (i.e. camps).	59%	58.3% (N=3,745)	42% (N=3088)	45%	79% (N=7550)
▪ Percentage of meal participation increase from the first week of meal distribution to the final week.	79%	98%** (N=924)	84%□ (N=726)	80%	-27% (N=341 decrease)
▪ Percentage of Second Meals served during program duration.		7% (N=457)	0% ▪ (N=0)	0%	0%
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ Percentage increase in number of mobile meals served in prior summer	100%	-21% (N=3,745)	-17%× (N=3088)	100%	144.5% (N=7550)
▪ Percentage increase in FARM identification or status as a result of information disseminated to participants during the distribution of meals for the program.	6%***	4%*** (N=351)	2% (N=632)	5%	5.2% (N=459)
▪ Percentage increase in Second Meals served from previous summer.		NA (N=457)	-100% ▪ (N=0)	0%	0%

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

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

*** One school year to another i.e. SY09-10 to SY10-11.

▪ Due to programmatic changes, the “Second Meal” option was not offered in 2014.

× Program operated for two weeks less than prior years which contributed to a lower number of meals being served between summers.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

□□□ The program duration was shorter running 6 weeks instead of 8. In addition there was a heat wave which caused a decrease in participation.

June 25 -August 3, 2012

+ This number represents stationary sites as camps were served with the mobile unit in 2014.

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Sherriff’s Youth Achievement Program

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

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

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

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse; Violent Crime; and Education

FY14 Funding: \$23,677

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of served.	70	82	83	76	65	76
▪ Number of days in operation.		20	20	21	20	19
▪ Number of sessions per day.		3	3	3	3	3
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Student to Staff ratio.	5 to 1	4 to 1	4 to 1	4 to 1	5 to 1	4 to 1
▪ Percentage of participants who attend 75% or more of the scheduled sessions.	91% (N=64)	73% (N=60)	80% (N=66)	89% (N=68)	90%	82% (N=62)
▪ Average daily attendance.		80% (N=66)	83% (N=69)	84% (N=64)	80%	80% (N=61)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ Percentage of youth who report improvement in their view of authority figures (Police, Principals, Vice Principals, etc.) as measured by the Pre and Post surveys.	28% (N=20)	55% (N=30)	75% (N=44*)	69% (N=40)	65%	64% (N=39)
▪ Percentage of students who feel connected to their school as measured by pre and post survey.	38% (N=27)	80% (N=44)	81% (N=48*)	81% (N=47)	60%	67% (N=41)
▪ Percentage of students not referred to DJS while in the program.	100% (N=70)	100% (N=82)	100% (N=83)	100% (N=76)	100%	100% (N=76)

LMB: Charles County

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

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

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

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse; Violent Crime; and Education

FY14 Funding: \$131,080

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	359	455	318	429	375	481
▪ Individual*	141	235	162	184	175	179
▪ Family*	164	81	36	101	70	94
▪ Group*	54	139	91	144	135	165
➤ Total number of Formal youth receiving Second Step Curriculum			45	91	42	106
➤ Total number of Formal youth receiving Reconnecting Youth Curriculum			74	88	42	59
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	387	460	552	446	395	510
▪ Individual*	110	184	128	168	160	180
▪ Family*	82	73	101	101	65	110
▪ Group*	195	203	323	177	170	220
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. †	87	151	147	143	140	154
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	4	6	1	12	23	25
➤ Number of formal counseling case receiving additional information on community based services where appropriate				108	108	232
➤ Number of Formal counseling cases where referrals were made to other community-based services±				81	81	101
➤ Number of cases receiving suicide intervention/prevention services					10	30
How Well We Do It:						
➤ Percentage of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	98.5% (N=139)	91% (N=214)	93% (N=187)	91% (N=167)	100%	96% (N=172)
➤ Percentage of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	78% (N=110)	64% (N=58)	58% (N=14)	61% (N=83)	50%	63% (N=31)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ Percentage of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	92.5% (N=6)	91% (N=20)	88% (N=21)	77% (N=30)	75%	95% (N=19)
➤ Percentage of calls seeking information and referrals that are returned within 48 business hours				82% (N=460)	85%	92% (N=357)
➤ Percentage and number of youth (Formal) who complete the Second Step Curriculum Program				87% (N=79)	80%	98% (N=104)
➤ Percentage and number of youth (Formal) who complete the Reconnecting Youth Curriculum				82% (N=72)	80%	97% (N=29)
➤ Percentage of suicide intervention cases for which a Safety Contract is developed					80%	81% (N=48)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	85%**	97%** (N=74)	99% (N=160)	96% (N=129)	75%	94% (N=46)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.		84% (N=76)	100% (N=162)	97% (N=230)	70%	78% (N=180)
➤ Number and percentage of youth who improved on at least one of 3 indicators between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments. Indicators include: meaningful and reliable improvement, # severe impairments, and Pervasive Behavioral Impairment.			100% (N=162)	100% (N=236)		
➤ Number and percentage of youth who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“improved”) and those who still had at least 1 severe impairment at most recent assessment (“not improved”).			81% (N=131)	81% (N=192)		
➤ Number and percentage of youth who were identified as being Pervasively Behaviorally Impaired (PBI) at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment.			84% (N=136)	77% (N=156)		
➤ Number of percentage of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. Or more on each of eight CAFAS subscales			84% (N=136)	75% (N=176)		
➤ Number and percentage of formal counseling participants who improved on each of the 8 CAFAS subscales. Improved = those with a mild impairment or higher with a score reduced by 10 pts at exit.			86% (N=139)	75% (N=176)		
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					60%	78% (N=133)
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).					60%	72% (N=38)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.					60%	91% (N=38)
➤ Number and Percentage of suicide intervention cases with Safety Contacts who report improvement within 90 days of development of Safety Contract.					80%	90% (N=26)
➤ Number and Percentage of Reconnecting Youth graduates that do not recidivate within 90 days of program completion.				94% (N=78)	80%	96% (N=46)
➤ Number and Percentage of Second Step graduates that do not recidivated within 90 days of program completion.				100% (N=84)	80%	100% (N=106)

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

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

†Based on youth who complete the voluntary assessment and are over the age of 10 as recommended by the Maryland State Department of Education (CRAFT assessment tool).

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

LMB: Dorchester County Local Management Board

Program Name: School Based Behavioral Health Services

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

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

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Cognitive Behavioral

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education

FY14 Funding: \$80,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:								
Total # of children served (unduplicated count).	100	101	118	119	156	127	125	109
Total # of new cases served.					5	8	10	10
# Of children participating in individual /family sessions.				43	61	49	50	54
# Of children participating in group sessions.				112	104	94	100	107
How Well We Do It:								
% of children served who attended eight or more behavioral health sessions (counted from the start of the fiscal year or from intake date not per quarter). N = number of children served.				85%	83% N=129	95% N=77	95%	90% N=98

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
% of parents who report overall satisfaction at case closure on satisfaction survey.	100%	85%	100% N=75	83%	100% N=7	100% N=8	100%	100% N=54
% of referring teachers who reported overall satisfaction on survey at case closure.	87%	85%	92% N=69	80%	88% N=63	100% N=60	85%	100% N=60
Is Anyone Better Off?								
% of children attending 8 or more sessions that maintain or improve function based upon the Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) administered to participants at start of fiscal year or at intake and every six months after/or case closure). N=total # of participants in 8 or more sessions.				80%	91.5% N=42	88% N=24	90%	82% N=38
% of program participants who attend 8 or more group sessions who demonstrate a gain in teacher rating of classroom behavior from pre & post-tests. N=total number of participants who attend 8 or more group sessions.				80%	48.5% N=29	90% N=21	90%	34% N=29
# And % of children with any improvement in the CAFAS total score at six months.					58% N=39	63% N=80	75%	82% N=38
# And % of children with any improvement in the CAFAS total score at discharge.					27% N=18	70% N=8/12	75%	82% N=38

*New measure for FY11. N/A is in place for the 1st and 2nd quarter because this is primarily a school based program and referrals don't really start until end of 1st quarter and into the second quarter, therefore cases would not have been closed.

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: Girls Circle

Program Summary: A best practice/evidence-based program implemented in Dorchester County as a comprehensive multi-faceted approach to addressing teen pregnancy.

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

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Girls Circle

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Education

FY14 Funding: \$50,000

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
# Of Girls Circle participants.	94	81	63	75	49
# of pregnant teen participants/parenting teens	51	36	3	25	10
# of sites where Girls Circle is implemented		4	2	2	2
How Well We Do It:					
% of participants that attend at least 6 sessions who show at least a 4 point increase on self-efficacy	43%	64%	91%	90%	89%

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
scale** at program exit. N=number of participants attending at least 6 sessions.		N=27	N=57		N=35
% of participants attending at least 6 sessions who show a 3 point improvement on healthy lifestyle scale** at program exit. N=number of participants attending at least 6 sessions.	47%	69% N=35	91% N=57	90%	90% N=32
% of participants who rate Girls Circle program at 21 points or higher on the Girls Circle Satisfaction Survey.	0*	93% N=75	91% N=57	90%	94% N=33
Is Anyone Better Off?					
% of pregnant teen participants who remain in school at least one year after birth of baby. N=number of pregnant teens.	72%	100% N=5	100% N=3	100%	100% N=7
% of participants that report positive changes in behavior on Girls Circle Satisfaction Survey (D11 of survey).	0*	61% N=49	100% N=63	80%	100% N=35
% of participants who self-report increased use of protection when having sex (B4) on Girls Circle Survey on pre/post-test scales administered at entry & exit of program.		N=12 of 42 29%	100% N=63	98%	100% N=35

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

LMB: Dorchester County Local Management Board

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol

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

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

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: CMCA

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Substance Use

FY14 Funding: \$29,272

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
# Of people who attend education awareness and/or outreach event.	850	330	425	500	295
# of alcohol sales compliance checks (includes multiple merchants being targeted during each compliance check).	33	37	18	50	44
# of under 21 alcohol citations/arrests (new in 2012)	78	4	6	25	59
# of under 21 alcohol DUI arrests (new in 2012)		1	0	5	0
# of new written policies/ordinances implemented to change the local environment in a way that makes it more difficult for young people to obtain alcohol and makes underage drinking less acceptable.	2	1	0	2	0
# of advertising/social marketing strategies implemented targeting underage drinking	5	5	3	5	14
How Well We Do It:					
Number and percentage of licensed merchants in Dorchester County who were included in at least two alcohol sales compliance checks.	58%	33% N=22	23%	75%	47% N=31

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Number and percentage of retail alcohol establishments that were in compliance for not selling alcohol to underage youth after receiving a warning (n=number of establishments receiving warning.)	5/80%	0	82% N=27	100%	81% N=26
% of parents who express disapproval of underage drinking as measured by outreach event exit survey.	55%	0	0	50%	0
Is Anyone Better Off?					
# And % of retail establishments showing increased compliance over first round of checks (n= total # of checks).	22/30%	1% N=37	85% N=23/27	90%	81% N=26
# And % increase in the number of alcohol related citations issued to youth.	78/No baseline to calculate increase.	1/0%	0/0	5/5%	N=59 100%
# And % of restaurants showing increased compliance over the first round of checks.	^	3/15%	N=1/5 20%	8/80%	100% N=2

*Target is significantly lower in FY12 because in FY11 only a small number of compliance checks were conducted in a short time period and only 1 of 4 law enforcement agencies participated.

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: TREK

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

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

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: MOST

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Education

FY14 Funding: \$74,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
# Of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	1	1	1	1
# Of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	3	2	2	2
# Of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.	0	0	1	0
# of participants	310 Total			
▪ # of males		185	200	150
▪ # of females		208	225	240
# of programs offered at each location:				
▪ Maces Lane	16	15	15	12
▪ North Dorchester Middle School	16	13	15	15
▪ YMCA	3	0	0	

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
How Well We Do It:				
Average Daily Attendance.	82%	81%	85%	87%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	100%	100%	100%	100%
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	4.4	4.5	5.0	4.6
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	4.6	4.6	5.0	4.6
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.0
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	3.6	4.0	5.0	4.0
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).	4.0	4.3	5.0	4.3
Available year end # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.	No plan required	0%	100%	100% year end
% of students who participate in at least 80% of all sessions.	90%	85%	90%	
Staff to Student Ratio	1:15	1:15	1:15	1:10
% of youth satisfied with the program as evidenced by satisfaction survey at program completion.	93% N=288	95% N=373	95%	60% N=234
Is Anyone Better Off?				
% of participating students who meet satisfactory school attendance standards of 94% (less than 11 days absent from school) as reported on quarterly report card.	95% N=295	96% N=377	96%	91% N=355
% of participating students with no DJS referral during program period.	100% N=25	91% N=358	90%	96% N=374
% of youth who are not suspended or expelled from school while involved in the program.	85% N=264	89% N=350	98%	75% N=293

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: Teen Ambassadors

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

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

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: MOST

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Education

FY14 Funding: \$10,000

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual*	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY 14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
# Of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.				1	1	1	1
# Of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.				1	1	1	1
# Of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.				Not required	0	100%	0

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY 14 Actual
# of participants	12	25	12			25	10
▪ # of males				4	4	10	4
▪ # of females				6	10	15	6
# of meals served through Supper Program.				30	40	50	130
How Well We Do It:							
Average Daily Attendance.			70%	75%	71%	85%	75%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.				100%	100% N=1	100%	100% N=1
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.				4	4.0	5.0	5.0
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.				3.6	3.6	5.0	4.0
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.				3	3	5.0	3
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.				1.6	3	5.0	3
YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).				3.0	3	5.0	3
# And % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.				Not required	0% Not required	100%	N/A
% of students who participate in at least 80% of all sessions.	100%	75%	69%	65%	76% N=11	75%	60% N=6
Staff to Student Ratio	1:10	1:12	1:10	1:10	1:10	1:10	1:10
% of youth satisfied with the program as evidenced by satisfaction survey at program completion.	Not Collected	Not Collected	75% N=10	60% N=6	70% N=10	75%	N/A
Is Anyone Better Off?							
% of participating students who meet satisfactory school attendance standards of 94% (less than 11 days absent from school) as reported on quarterly report card.	80%	80%	90% N=12	100% N=10	77% N=11	75%	80% N=8
% of participating students with no DJS referral during program period.	80%	80%	100	90% N=9	95% N=13	85%	100% N=10
% of youth who are not suspended or expelled from school while involved in the program.				80% N=8	85% N=12	85%	100% N=10

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau (YSB)

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

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Violent Crime, Education

FY14 Funding: \$61,537 + Required County Match \$ 15,000

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual^	FY09 Actual^	FY10 Actual^	FY11 Actual***^	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target
What/How Much We Do:							
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	136	72	101	180**	25	15	25
▪ Individual*	60	72	18	144	32	13	15
▪ Family*	75	0		5	2	1	5
▪ Group*	1	0	83	33	36	2	10
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	96	89	45		23	27	
▪ Individual*	40	89	18	101	3	20	30
▪ Family*	55	0	0	3	18	15	20
▪ Group*	1	0	27	16	7	0	10
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	6	5	5	1	21	16	0
# of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	unknown	2	2	7	0	0	3
# of students served at New Directions Learning Academy.					5	N/A	
# of students referred for mental health treatment.						4	
How Well We Do It:							
% of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. N= number of formal cases with service plans developed before 4 th session/total number of formal cases.	85%	100%	100%	100%	100% N=1	100% N=15	100%
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	85%	91%	75%	96%	94% N=34	20% N=3	95%
% of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	50%	100%	100%	100	100% N=4	100% N=1	100%
% and # of youth participants referred from New Directions Learning Academy that return to home school within 12 weeks.					30 % N=3		
% and # of youth participants referred for out-patient mental health treatment who attend sessions as scheduled by clinicians.						28% N=4	25%
Is Anyone Better Off?							
# and % of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	75%	98%	100%	95%	91% N=10	86% N=14	85%
# and % of formal counseling participants with an improvement in					100%	87%	85%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target
CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.					N=13	N=115	
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					92% N=12	67% N=10	75%
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).					69% N=9 improved 23% N=3 Not improved	80% N=12	80%
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.							40%
% and # of referred youth who are referred for mental health services and successfully complete YSB service planning within 3 months from referral date.						0	25%
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on each of the eight CAFAS subscales.					85% N=11	0	85%
# 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.					0	0	80%
# and % of New Directions youth who were identified as being Pervasively Behaviorally Impaired (PBI) at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent Assessment.					100% N=3		
# and % of New Directions participants that returned to home school and completed 12 weeks without a new referral.					20% N=2		
% and # of youth referred by DCPS that did not receive a new DJS referral while receiving services.							60%
% and # of youth referred that did not receive an office referral/suspension.							60%

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

[^]There is a new YSB in Dorchester County in FY12. Actuals reported for prior years reflect the activities of the previous entity.

**FY2014 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 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goals: Education, Childhood Hunger, and Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$133,547 + County \$94,779 = \$228,326

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			8	7	6	7
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.			5	5	5	5
▪ # of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			5	5	5	5
School Year Component:						
▪ # of youth receiving OOS programming.	159	194	230	248	150	203
▪ # of hours of programming per week (5 sites total).	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5
Summer Component:						
▪ # of youth receiving summer programming.			36	28	25	33
▪ # of hours of programming per week (1 site).			52.5	51	32	45
How Well We Do It:						
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.				4.55	5 Site Average: 4.2	4.62
▪ Brunswick Middle School			4.60			
▪ Crestwood Middle School			4.41			
▪ Governor Thomas Johnson Middle School			3.97			
▪ Monocacy Middle School			4.58			
▪ West Frederick Middle School			4.16			
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.				4.45	5 Site Average:	4.54

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
<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		3.7	
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	4.54	5 Site Average: 3.0	4.10.
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	4.13	5 Site Average: 3.0	3.97
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	4.42	5 Site Average: 3.4	4.31
<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	100% N=5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training. 			100%	100% N=5	100%	100% N=5
School Year Component:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average daily attendance. 		72%	63%	65%	70%	67%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth participating in the OOSP who are referred by child serving professionals or educators. 	50%	57% N=109	66% N=151	50% N=124	50%	50% N=101
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of middle school principals indicating satisfaction with the quality of the OOSP program as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in 3rd quarter. 	85%	100% N=3	100% N=5	100% N=4	80%	80% N=4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % parents indicating satisfaction with the quality of their child's OOSP as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in 	85%	100% N=48	100% N=47	100% N=91	80%	100% N=77

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
3 rd quarter.						
Summer Component:						
▪ Average daily attendance		72%	78%	72%	70%	72%
▪ % parents indicating satisfaction with the quality of their child's summer program, as measured by satisfaction survey administered by LMB in August 2014.		100% N=21	100% N=12	100% N=21	80%	100% N=15
Is Anyone Better Off:						
School Year Component:						
▪ % of youth who do not experience an out of school suspension during program period.	88%	92% N=178	88% N=202	90% N=224	90%	95% N=193
▪ % of youth participating who do not experience school expulsion during program period.	99%	100% N=194	99% N=227	99% N=246	95%	99% N=200
▪ % of youth who do not experience new DJS involvement during program period.	100%	100% N=191	100% N=230	99% N=245	95%	100% N=203
▪ % 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.	76%	67% N=64	69% N=68	84% N=89	70%	92% N=99
○ Stay away from drugs.	94%	89% N=85	89% N=87	93% N=99	80%	94% N=103
○ Feel better about them self.	75%	79% N=76	81% N=79	83% N=88	75%	86% N=91
○ Treat others with respect.		78% N=75	85% N=83	91% N=96	75%	95% N=102
Summer Component:						
▪ % of youth who do not experience new DJS involvement during program period.		100%	100% N=36	100%	95%	100% N=33
▪ % of youth indicating (on youth survey administered in August to youth present for at least 60% of the sessions that participating in the summer school program helps them:						
○ Stay out of trouble.	*	86%,N=24	90%,N=26	85%,N=22	70%	92%,N=22
○ Stay away from drugs.	*	93%,N=26	90%,N=26	92%,N=23	80%	100%,N=24
○ Have greater confidence in their academic ability.	*	71%,N=20	93%,N=27	88%,N=22	75%	100%,N=23
○ Feel more prepared for school.	*	71%,N=20	83%,N=24	80%,N=20	75%	80%,N=20

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

LMB: Frederick County

Program Name: Juvenile Entry Diversion Initiative (JEDI)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goals: Violent Crime and Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$ 107,026

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ # of youth referred	79	318	180	342
○ # of Juvenile Offender referrals	66	292		302
○ # of pre-adjudicated CINS referrals	13	26		40
▪ # of youth served	47	368	240	321
○ # of Juvenile Offender referrals	47	358		305
○ # of pre-adjudicated CINS referrals	0	10		16
▪ # of referrals made to community-based resources.	55	321	185	318
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	89% N=68	75%	96% N=85
▪ % of families at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey).	100% N=4	89% N=42	80%	89% N=50
▪ % of youth at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey).	100% N=4	100% N=9	80%	100% N=22
Is Anyone Better Off:				
▪ % of diverted cases that satisfy all obligations to successfully complete the diversion program within 16 weeks.	80% N=8	83% N=162	80%	83% N=167
▪ % of diverted youth who avoid re-offending for one full year from case open date	N/A	61% N=11	70%	79% N=230
▪ % of CINS youth who avoid any adjudication for one full year from open date	N/A	71% N=5	70%	80% N=16

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Early Care Healthy Families Garrett County

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Program Summary: Through ongoing home visits from registered nurses by registered nurses and trained paraprofessionals, low-income, at-risk mothers 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. The program provides and links an array of health, education, and support services to expectant mothers and families. Services continue until age five or the child transfers to another program.

Target Population: At-risk pregnant mothers and families with newborns up to age three months who reside in Garrett County.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Healthy Families America (HFA)

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serves mothers and babies at-risk for poor life outcomes by reducing child maltreatment, increasing prenatal care, improving parent-child interactions and school readiness, ensure healthy child development, promoting positive parenting and family self-sufficiency and decreasing dependency on welfare and other social services.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Reduce Infant Mortality

FY14 Funding: \$300,000

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ # of families served, per FY	36	163
▪ # of target children born, per FY	15	53
▪ # of targeted home visits, per FY	650	2,455
How Well We Do It:		
▪ % of eligible birth population screened and/or referred, per FY (# newly referred + 2 nd & 3 rd births for enrollees)	70%	74% (222/300)
▪ % of L1 mothers enrolling prenatally or within the first two weeks of birth, per FY referral cohort	75%	85% (29/34)
▪ % of CSQ-8 survey respondents satisfied with services, per FY (25+ on 32 pt. Likert scale)	75%	97% (137/141)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
▪ % of healthy birth weights (>/=2500 grams), for mothers, enrolling 1 st or 2 nd trimester per FY birth cohort	75%	89% (31/35)
▪ % of families with safe home environment, per FY served cohort with a follow-up Home Safety Scale result	75%	98% (119/121)
▪ % of enrolled children up to date with immunizations at age 2 (ages 19-35 months), per FY cohort served	80%	90% (28/31)
▪ % of Early Care target children with 8+ home visits who are “fully ready” for Kindergarten, as measured by the Fall Work Sampling System, per FY kindergarten cohort	Monitor	86.5% (45/52)

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Healthy Communities / Healthy Youth

Program Summary: A model prevention program that utilizes a community-focused asset development approach to promote healthy development. The Search Institute’s 40-developmental asset framework is integrated into activities by local community and youth groups and into the “Developmental Communities” 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.

**FY2014 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: 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: Part of a strategy 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. “Developmental Communities” teen activities and Developmental Asset education for youth and adults, access to supporting materials, and asset-rich activities for youth and families.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Reduce Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$35,000

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of asset development trainings	5	6	5	8	5	7
# of hours (actual) for HC/HY asset trainings facilitated by the HD:	12.25	30	78	56.5	40	64.5
o Youth						
o Adult	43.5	78	41.5	108	43	40.25
# of HC/HY media activities	48	54	48	48	45	47
# of Developmental Communities activities (ATOD-free focus).	4	3	3	6	5	6
# of Developmental Communities youth participants.	260	197	500	46	40	25
How Well We Do It:						
% of neighborhood members attending Developmental Communities events who attend 50% of activities.	55.4% (46/83)	55.4% (46/83)	57% (64/113)	41% (19/46)	50%	47% (8/17)
% of Developmental Communities total participants satisfied with the planned event(s).				100% (28/28)	75%	94% (16/17)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of participating youth will display an increase in the number of self-reported Developmental Assets				60% (3/5)	50%	100% (5/5)
% of participating youth will be able to name a trusted neighbor they can go to for help				86% (6/7)	50%	71% (10/14)
% of adult community member participants reporting that neighborhood youth have taken action to improve the neighborhood				80% (8/10)	50%	0% No adults
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				84% (92/110)	40%	48% (41/85)
% of 9th grade Asset Survey respondents reporting: ➤ “I feel safe at home, at school, and in the neighborhood”	95.2%	95.2%	89%	94%	70%	86%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ “I want to do well in school”	(79/83) 96.4%	(79/83) 96.4%	(101/113) 88%	(103/110) 93%	70%	(73/85) 89%
➤ “I feel good about myself”	(80/83) 89.2%	(80/83) 89.2%	(99/113) 88%	(102/110) 62%	75%	(76/85) 82%
	(74/83)	(74/83)	(99/113)	(68/110)		(70/85)

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Partners After School @ SMS

Program Summary: Partners After School @ SMS 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 @ SMS 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: (Goal 2) Improve Student Achievement/Career Readiness 25%

FY14 Funding: \$49,024

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual*	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of students served by PAS @ SMS, per SY	23	72	61	62	40	54
▪ # of students served 30 or more days, per SY	13	48	40	48	20	43
▪ # of parent/other adult volunteer hours, per SY	33	1291	354	397	300	604
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training			2	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	39% (9/23)	38% (26/64)	64% (38/59)	58% (36/62)	50%	74% (40/54)
▪ % of students attending PAS 30+ days w/satisfactory school attendance (<16 days absent during the SY)	N/A	78% (32/41)	98% (39/40)	77% (48/62)	60%	80% (43/54)
▪ % parents satisfied with PAS @ SMS, per SY	100% (19/19)	100% (26/26)	100% (51/51)	91% (30/33)	70%	97% (31/32)
▪ % of students attending 30+ days with at least one parent attending two or more PAS activities	23% (3/13)	N/A	88% (35/40)	54% (20/37)	50%	44% (19/43)
▪ Average daily attendance (average daily attendance / number of program slots)	15% (7.3/50)	50% (25/50)	71% (29/41)	71% (29/41)	50%	56% (23/41)
Is Anyone Better Off?						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-8 with a grade of “B-” or better in a) Reading/English and b) Math/Algebra	a) 69% (9/13) b) 62% (8/13)	a) 60% (31/52) b) 63% (33/52)	a) 60% (24/40) b) 55% (22/40)	a) 63% (27/43) b) 51% (22/43)	a) 50% b) 50%	a) 74% (32/43) b) 47% (20/43)
▪ % 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 PARCC	a) N/A	a) 91% (21/23)	a) 31% (18/59)	a) 56% (24/43)	a) 50%	a)58% (28/48)
	b) N/A	b) 91% (21/23)	b) 34% (20/59)	b) 56% (24/43)	b) 50%	b)45% (18/40)
▪ % of students served 30+ days with NO disciplinary referrals, suspensions, or expulsions during the SY	N/A	97% (57/59)	93% (37/40)	79% (34/43)	60%	93% (40/43)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.4 (22.1/5)	4.5 (86/19)	4.3	4.1 (74/18)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			4.3 (26/6)	4.8 (116/24)	4.3	4.9 (118/24)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities Environment domain.			4.3 (17.1/4)	4.8 (58/12)	4.0	4.8 (58/12)
▪ YPQA program self-assessment for Engagement domain.			3.2 (9.5/3)	3.5 (28/8)	3.5	4.3 (38/8)
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list programs/sites separately below).			4.1 (16.2/4)	4.4 (17.6/4)	4.0	4.5 (18.1/4)
▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			0	100% (2/2)	1	100% (1/1)

*The PAS@SMS program has been in operation for more than 12 years, with funding from other sources. FY 2014 is the third year of funding by the Children’s Cabinet. Data prior to FY12 is for PAS@Oakland, the previous site.

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.

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.

**FY2014 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: 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.¹⁴ 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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: (Goal 3) Increase Skills Training 20%

FY14 Funding: \$ 6,085

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of eligible youth who complete the S-YES application, annually	XX	58	82	26	25	31
▪ # of program days (program length), annually		8	27	40	12	35
▪ # of youth enrolled in S-YES, annually		34	27.63	23	12	25
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of youth that complete the S-YES, annually	89% (X/Y) ⁶	100% (8/8)	89% (24/27)	83% (19/23)	70%	84% (21/25)
▪ % 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)			100% (16/16)	100% (17/17)	70%	77% (17/22)
▪ % of youth who attend all scheduled program days, annually			26% (7/27)	35% (8/23)	20%	12% (3/25)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of youth completing the S-YES who are <i>placed in employment or education</i> as of September 30 following program participation.		88% (7/8)	67% (8/12)	91% (21/23)	50%	TBD
▪ % of high school students, identified at risk for drop-out, who return to school the next year, following completion of S-YES.		63% (5/8)	89% (24/27)	94% (15/16)	70%	88% (22/25)
▪ % of participants who show <i>improvement in job skills and attitudes</i> as measured by the SCANS Evaluation (pre/post-test).		63% (5/8)	33% (4/12)	54% (7/13)	40%	60% (15/25)

LMB: Garrett County Local Management Board

Program Name: Juvenile Review Board (JRB)

¹⁴ Andrew Sum, Ishwar Khatiwada, Joseph McLaughlin, with Sheila Palma and Paulo Tobar. *Developments in the Teen and Young Adult Labor Market in Maryland, 2000 - 2007: Implications for Workforce Development Policy*. Baltimore : Job Opportunities Task Force, 2008/2009.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Program Summary: The JRB provides Garrett County youth, ages 11-17, with an intake diversion strategy to avoid formal involvement with the Department of Juvenile Services (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 DJS 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 JRB 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, to increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency by reducing recidivism and crime among juveniles continuing this philosophy into their transition to adulthood.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: (Goal 4) Reduce Violent Crime 20%

FY14 Funding: \$14,533

Performance Measure	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
▪ # of youth meeting target population criteria referred to JRB	12	8	15
▪ # of JRB Advisory quarterly meetings held, per FY	4	4	4
▪ # of JRB hearing panels held, per FY	11	8	15
▪ How Well We Do It:			
▪ % of JRB hearing panels scheduled within 15 days of contacting child's family member	100% (12/12)	70%	100% (15/15)
▪ % of JRB hearing panels with at least 3 volunteer community members	100% (11/11)	60%	100% (15/15)
▪ % of JRB juveniles referred who complete sanctions within 30 days of hearing panel	92% (11/12)	70%	87% (13/15)
▪ Is Anyone Better Off?			
▪ % of youth completing JRB sanctions within 30 days who do not have additional intake referrals to DJS for a period of 12 months afterward.	100% (11/11)	60%	TBD
▪ % 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.	100% (11/11)	60%	TBD
▪ % 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.	100% (11/11)	60%	TBD

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

behaviors, improving parent engagement in their child’s education and promoting positive outcomes such as improved family functioning and school attendance. **Target Population:** Elementary age youth identified as in need of therapeutic intervention. Services specifically offered at schools in the geographic areas of Bel Air, Edgewood, Havre de Grace, Aberdeen and Joppatowne. Referrals can be made by agency or family.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Solution-focused Brief Therapy

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Improve student achievement and school, college, and career readiness by 25% by 2015; Reduce violent crime in Maryland by 20% by 2018.

FY14 Funding: \$95,983

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of youth served	73	30	56	69	50	61
▪ # of referrals to the program					60	62
▪ # of referrals for school attendance issues					10	4
▪ How Well Did We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth completing services (# completed services/# admitted into program)	77% (36/47)	89% (17/19)	78% (43/56)	91% (63/69)	80%	95% (58/61)
▪ Percent of families who indicate they are satisfied or better with the program (N=number of returned surveys)	94% (16/17)	100% (N=2)	100% (26/26)	100% N=23	80%	100% (11)
▪ Percent of families who state they are satisfied with the work of the clinician					80%	100% (11)
▪ 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	81% (17/21)	100% (1)	100% (1/1)	100% (12)	85%	100% (15)
▪ Percentage of children who maintained or improved school attendance during service delivery as it compared to the previous marking period*	100% (N=36)	88% (15/17)	100% (15/15)	97% (67/69)	85%	100% (61)
▪ Percentage of families who report an improved relationship with the school, based on parent survey at the close of service	81% (13/16)**	100% (2)	86% (37/43)	80% (16/20)	85%	91% (10/11)
▪ 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	97% (35/36)	100% (17)	94% (15/16)	93% (64/69)	85%	100% (61)

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

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

LMB: Harford County

Program Name: CINS Diversion Program

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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: Solution-focused Brief Therapy

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Improve student achievement and school, college, and career readiness by 25% by 2015; Reduce violent crime in Maryland by 20% by 2018.

FY14 Funding: \$95,983

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Youth served with Level I Services (crisis only)	0	0	18	18	15	22
▪ Number of youth served	30	15	23	24	25	18
▪ Number of youth referred to the program					45	49
How Well Did We Do It:						
▪ From the returned surveys, percent of families receiving formal counseling services who were satisfied or higher (%/N)	92% (11/12)	100% (N=7)	100% (11/11)	100% (1)	75%	100% (1)
▪ Percentage of youth completing formal counseling services (# completed services/# admitted into program)	96% (23/24)	79% (15/19)	72% (13/18)	88% (21/24)	70%	78% (14/18)
▪ From the returned surveys, the % of families receiving formal counseling services who were satisfied with the work of the clinician					75%	100% (1)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of formal counseling clients diverted from formal DJS involvement	96% (22/23)	100% (N=15)	77% (10/13)	96% (23/24)	75%	89% (16/18)
▪ % of formal counseling 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).	100% (3)	100% (5)	100% (1/1)	50% (1/2)	60%	100% (2)
▪ % of formal counseling clients who maintained or improved school attendance during service delivery	100% (23)	87% (13/15)	69% (9/13)	88% (21/24)	50%	78% (14/18)
▪ % of formal counseling clients completing the program who maintained or improved their GPA during service delivery as compared to the previous marking period*	100% (23)	87% (13/15)	54% (7/13)	83% (20/24)	50%	67% (12/18)

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

LMB: Harford County

Program Name: Teen Court

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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: Restorative Justice Model

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: As an alternative to criminal charges for a first time offender, it diverts youth from a pattern of criminal behavior.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Improve student achievement and school, college, and career readiness by 25% by 2015; Reduce violent crime in Maryland by 20% by 2018.

FY14 Funding: \$12,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of youth offenders served by Teen Court	40	68	50	67
▪ Number of youth volunteers that participate in Teen Court	51	107	50	58
How Well Did We Do It:				
▪ Percent of clients completing Teen Court proceedings (# completed program/# accepted into the program)	99% (33/34)	98.5% (67/68)	75%	97% (65/67)
▪ Percent of dispositions successfully completed (# dispositions completed/# dispositions assigned)	99% (108/109)	99% (308/310)	80%	96% (282/296)
▪ % of teen volunteers who attend at least three court sessions in the fiscal year			50%	62% (36/58)
▪ % of parents who report satisfaction with the program based on returned surveys			75%	92% (22/24)
▪ Percent of cases heard this FY year that are still open	17.6%	1.5% (1/68)		
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ Percent of teen court youth surveys indicating that teen court peers had a positive impact on them.			75%	77% (23/30)
▪ Percent of youth diverted from formal juvenile justice involvement at least 3 months following conclusion of Teen Court involvement	100% (25/25)	100% (27/27)	75%	84% (37/44)
▪ Percent of participants with positive drug screens when entering the program who are testing negative for drugs when completing the program. (#with negative drug screens at case closing/# with positive drug screens upon entry into the program)			75%	71% (5/7)

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 youth exhibiting/reporting traumatic incidents or behavior. Services targeted to the geographic areas of Bel Air, Edgewood, Havre de Grace, Aberdeen and Joppatowne. Referrals can be made by DJS, an agency or the family. Screening at time of intake will also ensure that clients are targeted by location.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Licensed and trained YSB staff utilize evidenced-based practices, widely recognized and accepted in the field of trauma as effective means of treatment - Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), Trauma Focused-Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT), and Solution-focused brief therapy.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: 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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Improve student achievement and school, college, and career readiness by 25% by 2015; Reduce violent crime in Maryland by 20% by 2018.

FY14 Funding: \$105,000

Performance Measure	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:			
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	127	130	117
▪ Individual*	127	80	97
▪ Family*	127	50	20
▪ Group*	0	1	0
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	26	30	70
▪ Individual*	26	30	57
▪ Family*	15	15	13
▪ Group*	0	1	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	127	80	117
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	0	5	7
➤ # Crisis Intervention services provided.	72		
➤ # Non-core Services	19		
➤ # of referrals made to the YSB from:			
○ DJS		20	4
○ CAC		20	94
○ DSS		15	10
○ SOAP		10	9
○ Other		15	11
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% N=127	85%	100% N=117
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	75% (81/108)	80%	68% (28/41)
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100% N=3	100%	100% (N=2)
➤ % of YSB staff trained in evidence based practice-trauma informed –cognitive behavioral therapy.	66.6% (2/3)	100%	100% (N=2)
Is Anyone Better Off?			
➤ Percent of clients who maintained or increased school attendance during treatment		80%	100% N=117

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	100% N=127	80%	98% (115/117)
➤ # and % of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.	98% (41/42)	80%	75% (37/49)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.	82% (31/38)		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.	85% (39/46)		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale.	88% (28/32)		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.	87% (39/45)		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.	92% (47/51)		
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment[PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.		80%	87% (34/39)
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.	80% (8/10)	80%	N/A
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“not improved”)		80%	88% (23/26)
➤ % of formal counseling cases who showed improvement in a minimum of one life domain on the Child and Adolescent Strengths and Needs Tool (CANS).	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.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Howard County Library Teen Time

Program Summary: For several years, the East Columbia library branch was overrun with middle school students from the Cradlerock School at dismissal time, and library staff received complaints on a daily basis from the other patrons about the unruly youth. This behavior as well as vandalism of the library building and property resulted in a uniformed police officer being placed at East Columbia every afternoon. The decision was made to work with the youth and create a structured environment in which they could benefit from the resources of the library while not interfering with the other library patrons.

Target Population: Middle school students identified by school staff as being at-risk of academic failure that rely on the library as a “safe” place to go after school.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Locally developed strategy with data that supports positive results/MOST Framework

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: Provides a safe, structured environment for at-risk children where they receive academic enrichment and character building activities after school. Library staff become informal mentors to the youth building the connection they feel to their community. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community and are less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$18,000

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:									
Number of youth served.	60	62	62	47	54	49	43	45	47
Number of workshops and special events.					14	9	4	5	10
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training.							0	1	0*
How Well We Do It:									
Staff/client ratio.	1:10	1:10	1:5	1:5	1:6	1:3	1:4	1:4	1:4
Percentage of students that attend the program three days or more per week. (N=Total number of youth served).	85%	85%	60%	78% (N=37)	70% (N=38)	86% (N=42)	81% (N=35)	85%	89% (N=42)
Average daily attendance (N=number of youth).					60% (N=32)	60% (N=29)	65% (N=28)	70%	60%** (N=28)
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).									
Is Anyone Better Off?									
Percentage of student participants not involved in library incidents. (N=Total number of youth served.)	80%	95%	99%	100% (N=47)	100% (N=50)	100% (N=49)	100% (N=43)	100%	100% (N=47)
Percentage of parental/significant adult involvement (based on attendance at workshops, events). (N=Total number of youth served.)	60%	50%	79%	83% (N=39)	90% (N=45)	72% (N=35)	80% (N=34)	80%	58% (N=27)
Percentage of students that report an improvement in their relationships with peers and teachers (based on surveys given in October and May). (N=Total number of youth served.)		55%	77%	68% (N=32)	75% (N=38)	75% (N=38)	88% (N=38)	90%	60%*** (N=28)

*We did not require staff to be trained in YPQA as we had planned to use external reviewers. We are working with MOST to identify the most efficient way to implement the standards and assessment piece of YPQA for FY15.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

**Average daily attendance is not a requirement of the program but overall attendance is above the target with 89% of youth attending three or more times per week.

***Youth report a higher improvement in peer relationships, but still do not see an improvement in relationships with teachers. This disconnect brings down reporting percentage.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Students Taking Action Reap Success (STARS) at Bollman Bridge Elementary School

Program Summary: After school program with academic intervention, enrichment and recreational opportunities.

Target Population: 3rd -5th graders at Bollman Bridge Elementary that are identified by school staff as most at risk of academic failure.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Locally developed strategy to address specific need within the school/MOST Framework

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: Intensive academic support is provided to a targeted group of 3-5th graders that are identified by school staff as most at risk of academic failure. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are therefore less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$22,500

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:								
Total number of youth served.	36	42	33	38	33	35	36	33*
Number of family nights.				4	3	4	4	2
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training.						1	0	0
How Well We Do It:								
Percentage of students attending the after school program at least two times per week. (N=Total number of youth served).	90%	99%	96%	96% (N=36)	98% (N=33)	96% (N=34)	96%	91%*** (N=30)
Percentage of families attending two or more family night events. (N=Total number of families.)				92% (N=35)	78% (N=26)	80% (N=28)	85%	n/a****
Average daily attendance.				99% (N=38)	92% (N=30)	92% (N=32)	95%	95% (N=31)
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).								
Is Anyone Better Off?								

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Percentage of student participants who show any improvement or maintain a “B” or better in Language Arts grades from 1 st to 3 rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth.)	70%	68%	51%	60% (N=21)	56% (N=18)	65% (N=23)	65%	59%*** (N=19)
Percentage of student participants who show any improvement or maintain a “B” or better in Math grades from 1 st to 3 rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth.)	80%	78%	72%	75% (N=26)	79% (N=26)	80% (N=28)	80%	74%*** (N=24)
Percentage of students that report an improvement in their relationships with peers and teachers (based on student surveys given in May). (N=Total number of youth served.)						80% (N=28)	80%	80% (N=26)

*Slightly lower number of students served this year.

**These students are often participating in other activities that are offered after school, which impacts their attendance on a weekly basis.

***These students are identified for participation in this program because of their high need for academic intervention. Grades are often maintained, but do not meet the standard of the performance measure.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: 5th Period at Cradlerock Middle*

Program Summary: An after school program located in the Owen Brown Community that provides supervised academic, recreational, cultural, social and health activities and encourages parental involvement. Program is available to all students with intensive academic focus for those students identified as at-risk of academic failure by school staff.

Target Population: Students in grades 6-8 from Cradlerock Middle School identified as most at-risk of academic failure by school staff.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Locally developed strategy/MOST Framework

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: 5th Period provides a safe structured environment for at-risk children where they receive academic enrichment and character building activities after school. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$36,000

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual**	FY08 Actual**	FY09 Actual**	FY10 Actual**	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:									
Total number of youth served.	200	287	176	236	108	86	85	86	84***
Number of “at-risk” youth served with targeted support (at-risk youth are identified by school staff as requiring significant intervention to prevent academic failure).	45	40	60	44	60	43	77	80	84
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training.							2	2	2
How Well We Do It:									
Percentage of student participants receiving intensive academic intervention. (N=Total number of youth)	63%	75%	75%	100% (N=236)	55% (N=60)	55% (N=60)	90% (N=77)	90%	100% (N=84)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
served).									
Percentage of families attending two or more Family Night activities. (N=Number of families.)							75% (N=64)	75%	75% (N=63)
Average daily attendance (N=Total number of youth served).					60% (N=65)	50% (N=43)	80% (N=68)		86% (N=72)
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).									
Is Anyone Better Off?									
Percentage of student participants receiving intensive academic intervention who show any improvement or maintain a “B” or better in Language Arts grades from 1 st to 3 rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served.)	n/a	80%	72%	36%	75% (N=38)	86% (N=37)	80% (N=68)	85%	82%*** (N=69)
Percentage of student participants receiving intensive academic intervention who show any improvement or maintain a “B” or better in Math grades from 1 st to 3 rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served.)	n/a	70%	85%	45%	70% (N=32)	66% (N=28)	80% (N=68)	83%	74%*** (N=62)
Percentage of all student participants not receiving office referrals during the current school year. (N=Total number of youth served.)	95%	93%	90%	95%	96% (N=104)	94% (N=81)	96% (N=82)	98%	100% (N=84)

*This program was shifted from Patuxent Valley to Cradlerock Middle School based on the need for academic intervention/support at this location. School staff/administration fully supported the shift of effort. Note: Patuxent Valley continues to have a program but it is a more general homework help/recreation program as opposed to a program that provides targeted academic support for students identified by teachers and staff as at risk of failure. For that reason, the shift in funding made sense based on demographics and identified need within the K-12 delinquency prevention efforts in the County. **Note: Data prior to FY11 reflects previous location results. ***A slightly lower number of students served than expected for FY `14, but all of the students in the program were identified as at risk, unlike previous years. The increased need of the population resulted in a slightly lower than expected percentage increase for grades in both Language Arts and Math.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Club LEAP (Learning English After School Program)

Program Summary: A partnership between FIRN, Inc and the Howard County Public Schools, Club LEAP provides trained volunteer tutors to conduct English enrichment activities with small groups of ESOL students. Club LEAP sessions take place directly after school in one of 6 participating sites.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Target Population: Students in grades K-8 who are performing below grade level as a result of limited English proficiency.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Local developed strategy/MOST Framework

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: Supports academic success of K-8 ESOL students by focusing on improving students' English proficiency and connecting their families to community resources, such as FIRN. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are therefore less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$14,033

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much Do We Do:								
Number of students served.	69	75	49	57	40	61	65	64*
Number of volunteers.	38	40	40	35	20	32	33	30
Number of Family Nights					2	0	2	1
How Well We Do It:								
Percentage of Club LEAP parents attending at least one Parent Night. (N=Number of parents).	50%	70%	65% (N=32)	60% (N=34)	80% (N=31)	0	75%	70%** (N=22)
Percentage of volunteers actively meeting with youth for one school year (Oct.-May). (N=Number of volunteers.)	90%	100%	90% (N=36)	100% (N=35)	95% (N=38)	79% (N=31)	80%	85% (N=27)
Average daily attendance (N=Number of students).				75% (N=43)	92% (N=37)	87% (N=53)	90%	90% (N=29)
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).								
Is Anyone Better Off?								
Percentage of student participants demonstrating increased English proficiency (based on pre- and post-tests). (N=Total number of youth served.)	55%	57%	50% (N=24)	55% (N=14)	70% (N=28)	70% (N=43)	75%	80% (N=51)
Percentage of students showing progression toward grade level performance standards (as determined by reading assessments/running records given monthly or as needed). (N=Total number of youth served.)	60%	76%	67% (N=33)	70% (N=18)	80% (N=32)	80% (N=49)	80%	80% (N=51)
Percentage of parents that report an improvement in their understanding of academic expectations based on end of					n/a	70% (N=43)	80%	n/a***

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
year survey. (N=Total number of youth served.)								

* Total number served target set just a bit too high based on past experience. Will re-assess target for FY15. **We did not require staff to be trained in YPQA as we had planned to use external reviewers. We are working with MOST to identify the most efficient way to implement the standards and assessment piece of YPQA in FY15. ***Survey was not given to parents in FY14 because of a staffing issue. The intent is to give the survey in FY15.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Cougar Time @ Harper's Choice

Program Summary: Operating as an extension of the school day, this unique partnership between the schools, Howard Co. Recreation and Parks and the Howard Co. Police Department provides students the opportunity to participate in targeted academic intervention along with more traditional afterschool recreational activities. Emphasis is also placed on developing appropriate peer interaction.

Target Population: Students in grades 6-8 identified as at-risk of academic failure by school staff and selected/referred by the Student Support Team.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Locally developed strategy to address specific need of a community/MOST Framework

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: At Cougar Time, students are provided a safe environment in which to improve their academic skills as well as building important social skills that foster positive social interaction. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$45,000

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:									
Number of students served.	60	75	80	81	68	70	86	90	82*
Number of students receiving intensive academic support.	30	30	36	18	25	30	44	45	82
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training						2	2	2	2
How Well We Do It:									
Percentage of students attending the after school program three times per week or more. (N=Total number of youth served)	50%	90%	95%	97% (N=59)	98% (N=66)	85% (N=61)	88% (N=76)	90%	81%** (N=66)
Average daily attendance. (N=Number of youth)					98% (N=66)	79% (N=29)	77% (N=66)	80%	80% (N=66)
Percentage of parents reporting satisfaction with their child's academic improvement based on receiving intensive academic support.(N= Number of youth receiving intensive academic support)					80% (N=20)	67% (N=48)	n/a	80%	93% (N=76)
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.									
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.									

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.									
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.									
YPQA total program self-assessment score by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).									
Is Anyone Better Off?									
Percentage of student participants who show one grade letter improvement or maintain a “B” or better in Language Arts grades from 1 st to 3 rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served.)	50%	59%	56%	37% (N=30)	n/a*	51% (N=37)	65% (N=56)	70%	40%*** (N=33)
Percentage of student participants who show improvement of one letter grade or maintain a “B” or better in Math grades from 1 st to 3 rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served.)	50%	50%	85%	29%	n/a*	63% (N=45)	65% (N=56)	70%	47%*** (N=39)
Percentage of students reporting more positive peer interactions as a result of program participation based on self-report at year-end. (N=Total number of youth served.)					72% (N= 49)	85% (N=61)	n/a	75%	78% (N=64)

*Slightly lower number of students served this year. ** These students are often participating in other activities that are offered after school, which impacts their attendance on a weekly basis. ***These students are identified for participation in this program because of their high need for academic intervention. Grades are often maintained, but do not meet the standard of the performance measure. The target will be re-assessed for FY15.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Bear Trax Police - Youth Programs

Program Summary: Bear Trax is an outreach program designed to enhance the relationship between police officers (HCPD) and youth in the Howard County Community. School administrators are the primary source of referral for the participants. Funding supports the summer component and outreach and mentoring through the school year.

Target Population: Youth in need of positive mentoring based on factors such as academic performance, low school attendance, poor peer relationships and/or youth in single parent homes that have been referred to HCPD by parents and or school staff.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: HCPD has adopted the two essential aspects of mentoring from OJJDP: 1) high level of contact between mentor and mentee; 2) a relationship that defines the mentor as a friend not an authority figure and prerequisites for a successful mentoring program: 1) communication and limit setting training for mentors and 2) intensive supervision and support for each match.

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: The youth participating in Bear Trax are provided an opportunity to connect to caring adults in the community that happen to be police officers, resulting in a more positive view of law enforcement officers. Youth are connected to resources within the community and given the chance to develop more positive peer relationships through the “camp” setting and activities. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are therefore less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$18,000

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:									
Number of youth served.	150	75	21	30	25	47	48	50	50
Number of group meetings.	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*	n/a*	11	10	10	10	12
Number of family events.					1	1	2	3	1*
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training.						1	1	1	0**
How Well We Do It:									
Percentage of officers meeting with their mentee outside of scheduled meetings.	83%	75%	100%	100% (N=30)	100% (N=25)	100% (N=47)	100% (N=48)	100%	100%
Percentage of families attending two or more Family Night activities. (N=Number of families.)								75%	n/a*
Percentage of participants needing mentoring who have had a rewarding experience (as measured by youth surveys). (N=Total number of youth served.)					100% (N=25)	80% (N=37)	95% (N=46)	98%	100% (N=50)
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).									
Is Anyone Better Off?									
Percentage of parents reporting an improvement in youth's ability to make positive choices (as measured by parent survey). (N=Total number of youth served.)			n/a	n/a	100% (N=25)	95% (N=45)	95% (N=46)	95%	100% (N=50)
Percentage of youth reporting more positive peer interaction (as measured by youth survey). (N=Total number of students.)					90% (N= 23)	90% (N=42)	97% (N=47)	98%	100% (N=50)
Percentage of youth able to identify a positive adult role model other than a parent or guardian as measured by youth survey (N= Total number of youth).	36%	30%			100% (N=25)	95% (N=45)	98% (N=47)	98%	100% (N=50)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

*The decision was made to increase the number of group meetings to monthly, to have more of a direct impact on participating youth. As a result of this decision, there was an increased cost of overtime for the officers so the number of family events were reduced. *We did not require staff to be trained in YPQA as we had planned to use external reviewers. We are working with MOST to identify the most efficient way to implement the standards and assessment piece of YPQA in FY15.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Alpha Achievers

Program Summary: This program fosters a positive learning environment to support African American males to attain and maintain a 3.0 GPA. This funding will support program operations as well as providing enhancement to the program by supporting a conference of all participating Alpha Achievers for a day of team building activities, workshops and leadership training.

Target Population: Alpha Achievers is open to African American males in grades 9-12 that have attained and maintained a GPA of 3.0 or better for two consecutive quarters.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Local chapter of national program (Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity)/MOST Framework

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: Promotes continued academic success in our high school's African American males. Many youth have expressed the concern that they are viewed differently and/or negatively by peers as a result of their success in the classroom. This program provides peer support and links to other successful youth while also encouraging members to reach out to youth that may not (currently) be as successful in school. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$11,250

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:								
Number of students served.	255	310	270	380	329	444	450	334*
Number of participating students registered for conference.	65	77	72	102	142	174	180	142*
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training.					0	0	0	0**
How Well We Do It:								
Percentage of participating students that were mentored by an Alpha Achiever in 8 th grade. (N=Total number of youth served)	60%	25%	75% (N=202)	50% (N=190)	50% (N=165)	n/a	25%	25% (N=84)
Percentage of families attending one or more Family Night activities. (N=Number of families.)							40%	85% (N=284)
Percentage of Alpha Achievers attending the conference. (N=Total number of youth served)	25%	25%	27% (N=72)	27% (N=102)	41% (N=135)	39% (N=174)	40%	42% (N=140)
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.								

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
YPQA total program self-assessment score by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).								
Is Anyone Better Off?								
Percentage of participating youth that maintain a GPA of 3.0 or better (N=Total number of youth)	90%	95%	100% (N=270)	100% (N=380)	100% (N=329)	100% (N=444)	100%	100%
Percentage of participating students reporting increased knowledge and skills as a result of attending the conference. (N=Number of youth attending conference.)	85%	91%	n/a**	92% (N=94)	100% (N=142)	95% (N=421)	95%	98% (N=327)
Percentage of students that report an improvement in their relationships with peers and teachers (based on surveys given in October and May). (N=Total number of youth served.)					90% (N=296)	89% (N=395)	90%	90% (N=33)

*Slightly lower numbers than expected this year, but reflects the trend of fluctuation of the last several years.**We did not require staff to be trained in YPQA as we had planned to use external reviewers. We are working with MOST to identify the most efficient way to implement the standards and assessment piece of YPQA in FY15.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Education and Career Empowerment Center @ Oakland Mills (ECEC)

Program Summary: The ECEC empowers youth to increase healthy behaviors and avoid negative behaviors through positive modeling of asset building behaviors, individual and group guidance sessions, leadership training and positive daily interactions.

Target Population: Students grades 9-12 at Oakland Mills High School that have been identified by parents and/or school staff as needing a structured environment after school.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Developmental Assets/MOST framework

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: ECEC promotes academic success and positive peer interaction to ensure that youth are connected to and successful within their school community. Individual education plans ensure that youth are working toward their own appropriate goals, rather than being held to standards of a group. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$24,750

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:									
Number of students served per quarter.	26	25	24	29	15	21	30	30	26*
Number of events scheduled for families of participating youth.					2	3	3	4	2**
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training.						0	0	1	0***
How Well We Do It:									
Staff/client ratio.	1:10	1:10	1:5	1:2	1:4	1:4	1:3	1:3	1:6***
Percentage of students that attend program three or more	n/a	100%	100%	93%	95%	90%	80%	85%	n/a****

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
days. (N=Total number of youth served.)				(N=27)	(N=14)	(N=19)	(N=24)		
Percentage of families attending two or more special events. (N=Total number of families.)					80% (N=12)	85% (N=18)	85% (N=26)	90%	0**
Average daily attendance					95% (N=14)	90% (N=19)	95% (N=28)	95%	100% (N=26)
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).									
Is Anyone Better Off?									
Percentage of participants who show any improvement or maintain a “B” or better in both Reading and Math grades between 1 st and 3 rd quarters. (N=Total number of youth served.)	85%	86%	90%	80% (N=23)	60%	70% (N=15)	80% (N=24)	85%	86% (N=22)
Percentage of participants who can identify a positive adult role model other than a parent or guardian as measured by youth surveys. (N=Total number of youth served.)	80%	75%	100%	100% (N=29)	75%	80% (N=17)	85% (N=26)	90%	90% (N=23)
Percentage of students that report an improvement in their relationships with peers and teachers based on surveys given in October and May. (N=Total number of youth served.)						70% (N=15)	75% (N=23)	80%	n/a^

A significant number of the performance measures for this program did not meet the target for a variety of reasons, including staffing issues resulting from reduced funding and a new school administration that was less welcoming to outside programming. The LCB will review this program’s funding in light of the reduced impact on the youth in the community.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Community Based Learning Centers @ Community Homes

Program Summary: An after school program at three of the Community Homes complexes where students will have the opportunity to receive academic support in addition to learning and experiencing cultural and social awareness.

Target Population: The program is open to all 4th, 5th and 6th graders residing in the Community Homes complexes that have been referred by their parent or guardian.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Locally developed strategy/MOST Framework

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: The Community Based Learning Centers provide a safe structured environment for at-risk children where they receive academic enrichment and character building activities after school. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are therefore less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$72,000

Performance Measure	FY07 Actual	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:									
Number of students served.	115	113	111	114	103	125	129	130	114*
Number of Family Nights.					13	17*	16	16	18
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basic training.						0	0	1	0**
How Well We Do It:									
Percentage of students needing academic support in Math and Reading skills. (N=Total number of youth served.)	57%	80%	80%	82% (93.48)	45% (N=46)	80% (N=100)	94% (N=121)	95%	100% (N=114)
Percentage of students who attend daily. (N=Total number of youth served.)	90%	89%	92%	91% (103.74)	91% (N=93)	86% (N=108)	94% (N=121)	95%	96% (N=109)
Percentage of families attending two or more Family Night activities. (N=Number of families.)					75% (N=77)	33% (N=41)	68% (N=88)	70%	80% (N=91)
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above.)									
Is Anyone Better Off?									
Percentage of students improving by one letter grade or maintaining a "B" or better in both Language Arts and Math grades between 1 st and 3 rd quarters. (N=Total number of youth served.)	50%	80%	88%	Data not available until 3 rd qtr.	86% (N=86)	70% (N=88)	80% (N=103)	85%	80%*** (N=91)
Percentage of participants at all sites who can identify a positive adult role model other than a parent or guardian (as measured by youth surveys). (N=Total number of youth served.)	n/a	80%	80%	89% (101.46)	90% (N=102)	88% (N=101)	92% (N=118)	95%	100% (N=114)
Percentage of students that report an improvement in						50%	70%	75%	70%^

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
their relationships with peers and teachers based on surveys given in October and May. (N=Total number of youth served.)						(N=63)	(N=90)		(N=80)

We did not require staff to be trained in YPQA as we had planned to use external reviewers. We are working with MOST to identify the most efficient way to implement the standards and assessment piece of YPQA in FY15. * Slightly lower attendance than set as target for FY14, as result of one of the locations being taken over by new management. *Our final data more closely aligns with previous years' results rather than the target. We will work with program staff to re-assess measure, in particular to look at breaking out Math and Language Arts rather than reporting on them in the same measure. ^ Youth report a higher improvement in peer relationships, but still do not see an improvement in relationships with teachers. This disconnect brings the reporting percentage down.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: The Drop-In

Program Summary: This program operates on a drop-in basis year-round and offers educational and recreational programs and activities to the youth living in the Oakland Mills Community. Located at the neighborhood's Village Center, the Drop-In offers programs that focus on problem solving, leadership skills and life skills.

Target Population: Youth ages 9-17 that live in the Oakland Mills Community and attending one of the following schools: Stevens Forest Elementary School (Title I), Talbott Springs Elementary School (Title I), Oakland Mills Middle School, or Oakland Mills High School are encouraged to attend the Drop-In. Each of the schools continues to struggle with low test scores, poor academic achievement and a significantly higher percentage of students receiving free and reduced meals that surrounding communities.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Locally developed strategy developed in partnership with the community/MOST Framework

How the Program Serves the SB882 Population: The village center where this program is located has been plagued by poor relationships between the merchants and the youth within the community. There were frequent complaints of youth loitering and driving away customers from the stores. Youth are given opportunities throughout the year to participate in the development of programming at the Center. Youth that are given authentic ways to participate in a community are more likely to develop positive connections to that community. These youth are therefore less likely to be involved with behaviors that have a negative impact on the community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$18,900

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:								
Number of youth served.	146	150	68	133	252	271	275	498
Number of hours of community service completed by participating youth per quarter.	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	10
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.						0	1	0
How Well We Do It:								
Average daily attendance (N=number of youth).				40% (N=53)	23% (N=58)	23% (N=62)	30%	15% (N=75)
Percentage of youth attending two or more times per week (N=total number of youth served).	75%	75%	100% (N=68)	99% (N=97)	80% (N=201)	98% (N=266)	98%	100% (N=498)
Percentage of youth participants satisfied with programs and activities as determined by survey results (given in October	60%	65%	96% (N=65)	100% (N=133)	97% (N=244)	97% (N=263)	98%	98% (N=488)

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
and May). (N=total number of youth served.)								
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 by program/site (avg. of 4 domains above).								
Is Anyone Better Off?								
Percentage of youth attending two or more times per week reporting improved leadership and problem solving skills as determined by survey results (given in October and May). (N=Total number of youth served).	55%	88%	98% (N=66)	100% (N=133)	98% (N=247)	98% (N=266)	98%	92% (N=458)
Percentage of parents involved with one or more activities through program participation or volunteering. (N=Total number of youth.)				78% (N=104)	50% (N=126)	86% (N=233)	90%	90% (N=448)
Percentage of students that report an improvement in their relationships with peers and teachers (based on surveys given in October and May). (N=Total number of youth served.)						93% (N=252)	95%	91% (N=453)

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

Program Name: Healthy Families Mid-Shore

Program Summary: Healthy Families Mid-Shore is an evidence-based, nationally accredited program that provides high-quality early intervention and prevention services to first time parents. An In Home Visitor will provide long-term voluntary support services to families using the Healthy Families program. Each family receives approximately 1-2 home visits per week or as the home visitor sees fit on a case by case basis.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Healthy Families of America, Growing Great Kids

Target Population: Adolescents/adults of child-bearing age usually aged 12-45, who are eligible for MCHIP, Medical Assistance or uninsured.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: The target population, above, is within the SB882 Population. This program focuses on assisting at-risk pregnant and parenting teens to reduce child maltreatment, ensure healthy child development, encourage school readiness, promote family self-sufficiency, and demonstrate positive parenting. Studies show that there is a significant relationship between exposure to adverse childhood experiences and pregnancy in adolescence. Of these teens that have been exposed to adverse experiences, they are at greater risk for depression, regular alcohol use, binge drinking, marijuana use and violence. The program works with these teens to “break the cycle” by focusing on prenatal care, labor and deliver infant care, etc. The home visitors build strong yet professional relationships with each participant so that the family can accomplish goals that they never thought were possible.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Infant Mortality, Education, and Violence against women and children

FY14 Funding: \$93,814

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ # of participants (Kent County families) served	15	23
▪ # of home visits completed	150	390
▪ # of Kent County children served	10	20
How Well We Do It:		
▪ # and % of participants who report they are satisfied or very satisfied with services	100%	100% (N=23/23)
▪ # and % of families enrolled prenatal.	55%	55% (N=11/20)
▪ # and % of children current with immunizations through age 2.	90%	100% (N=20/20)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
▪ % of participants without “indicated” child abuse/neglect findings while enrolled in the program.	80%	100% (N=21/21)
▪ % of participants who maintain or reach the target range* for “Use of Community Resources” using the Life Skills Progression Tool.	50%	96% (N=25/26)
▪ % of participants who maintain or reach the target range* for “Family Relationships” using the Life Skills Progression Tool.	50%	92% (N=24/26)
▪ % of families who enroll during the 1 st and 2 nd trimester who have a child weighing 2500 grams or greater at birth.	75%	67% (N=2/3)

*Target range of 4 or better on a scale of 1-5

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

Program Name: Girls Circle /Boys Council

Program Summary: Approximately 6-15 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education, Substance Abuse, and Violence against Women and children

FY14 Funding: \$20,000

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure ⁺	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ Number of girls participating in Girls Circle program.	12	49	49	20	33
▪ Number of mother/daughter couples participating in Girls Circle Mother/Daughter program.	0	4	0		
▪ Number of boys participating in Boys Council program.	8	42	57	20	30
▪ Number of Girls Circles groups convened				3	4
▪ Number of Boys Councils groups convened				2	3
How Well We Do It:					
▪ # and % of girls who attend at least 60% of group sessions.	12/100%	35/75%	73% (N=36)	75%	61% (N=20/33)
▪ # and % of mother/daughter couples who attend at least 60% of group sessions.	0/N/A	3/75%	(N=0)		
▪ # and % of boys who attend at least 60% of group sessions.	5/62%	15/34%	53% (N=41)	75%	77% (N=23)
▪ # and % of boys who reported they would participate in the Boys Council program again.				75%	90% (N=27)
▪ # and % of girls who reported they would participate in the Girls Circle program again.				75%	100% (N=29)
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ % of girls who report increase in school engagement, as self-reported in pre/post survey	**	92% (N=23/25)	88% (N=43)		
▪ % of boys who reported that they felt supported when making life decisions while participating in boys council as reported in the post Boys Council Satisfaction Survey.				55%	100% (N=30)
▪ % of mother/daughter couples who report increase in self-efficacy/self-image, as self-reported in pre/post survey.	**	75% (N=3/4)	0% (N=0)		
▪ % of girls who reported that they felt supported when make life decisions while participating in Girls Circle as reported in the Girls Circle Satisfaction Survey.				55%	86% (N=25/29)
▪ % of boys who report increase in school engagement as self-reported in pre/post survey.	**	89% (N=23/26)	0% (N=0)		
▪ % of girls who report being committed to school achievement and success as reported in the pre/post survey.				55%	100% (N=29)
▪ % of boys who report being more committed to school achievement and success as reported in the pre/post survey				55%	90% (N=27/30)
▪ % of boys and girls who report that they have not used alcohol or that their use of				30%	95%

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure ⁺	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
alcohol has decreased as reported in the pre/post survey					(N=56/59)
▪ % of <u>boys and girls</u> who report that they have not used tobacco or that their use of tobacco has decreased as reported in the pre/post survey				30%	92% (N=54/59)
▪ % of <u>boys and girls</u> who report that they have not used drugs or that their use of drugs has decreased as reported in the pre/post survey				30%	83% (N=49/59)

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

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

Program Name: Youth Orchestra Program

Program Summary: Offers musical training to children and encourages students/ families to participate in educational/ cultural activities that support success in school and in life.

Target Population: Children and youth in grades 3-8 from underserved schools and neighborhoods who otherwise might not have access to music lessons or the opportunity to participate in group activities such as recital and concerts.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: SEARCH Institute’s 40 Developmental Assets for Adolescents framework in their programming

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Population meets the at risk youth prevention and diversion program in preventing and diverting youth from entering the juvenile justice system. The targeted strategy will increase appropriate communication and social interaction, and reduce challenging behaviors. Children with challenging behaviors are more at-risk for negative academic and social outcomes.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education

FY14 Funding: \$16,113

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
Number of presentations/visitations in schools.	8	6
Number of children and youth served overall	400	309
Number of Group Lessons held	8	8
Number of youth who participate in Group Lessons	64	59
Number of Semi-private Lessons held	8	9
How Well We Do It:		
# and % of youth who attended at least 60% of scheduled Group Lessons	60%	84% (N=37/44)
# and % of youth who attend at least 60% of scheduled Semi-private Lessons	60%	100% (N=12/12)
# and % of youth who are satisfied or very satisfied with the Youth Orchestra program as reported on the Satisfaction survey	75%	96% (N=25/26)
# and % of parents/guardians who are satisfied or very satisfied with the program as reported on the Satisfaction Survey	75%	100% (N=18/18)
# and % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with a GPA at the end of term four, equal to or greater than their school grade GPA	50%	N/A

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
# and% of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with a ADA at end of term four, equal to or greater than their school grade ADA	50%	N/A
# and % of youth who report that they felt they could be successful while participating in the program as indicated in the Satisfaction Survey	50%	100% (N=29/29)
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 4 domains above) for all sites.		
YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Kent County Middle School.		
YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Garnett Elementary School.		
YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Galena Elementary School.		
YPQA Total program self-assessment score (avg. of 4 domains above) for Rock Hall Elementary School.		
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.		
Is Anyone Better Off?		
% of Phase 2 participants who move on to Phase 3	50%	32% (N=19/59)
% of youth who reach the level of recital performance by participating in both group and semi-private lessons	50%	87% (N=13/15)
% of youth who reported they were more committed to school achievement while participating in the program as indicated in the Satisfaction Survey	50%	62% (N=18/29)
% of youth who reported they felt like an important member of the group as indicated in the Satisfaction Survey	50%	90% (N=26/29)
% of teachers who felt that youth were more engaged while participating in the program as discussed in a end of the year focus group	50%	N/A

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 for this program by DJS 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education and Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$20,000

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ Number of youth participants.	25	27	16	17
▪ Number of evening reporting sessions completed.	92	136	25	65
▪ Number of venturing activities conducted.	38	32		
How Well We Do It:				
▪ # and % of participants who attend at least 96% of evening reporting sessions (only one session missed) within 98 days.	68% (n=17/25)	77% (N=17)	60%	88% (N=15/17)
▪ # and % of participants who complete the KCDP 91-day program within 98 days. ¹⁵	68% (n=17/25)	68% (N=15)	50%	59% (N=10/17)
▪ # and % of participants who are satisfied with the Program as indicated on the exit survey.	94% (n=15/16)	100% (N=22)	75%	100% (N=8/8)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
▪ % of participants who did not have a subsequent violation of criminal and/or a court order while participating in KCDP ¹⁶	100% (n=25/25)	100% (N=27)	80%	94% (N=16/17)
▪ % of participants not court ordered to detention or shelter placement for three months after completing the program.	100% (n=17/17)	100% (N=22)	80%	100% (N=17/17)
▪ % of participants who showed improvements in both pro-social and conflict resolution skills as measured by the pre/post assessment.	76% (n=13/17)	86% (N=19)		
▪ % of participants who reported they were better at handling issues without violence or fighting after completion of the Diversion Program as shown in the Pre and Post Surveys			70%	100% (N=8/8)

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

Program Name: Occupational Therapy Program at Radcliffe Creek School

Program Summary: The funding will allow for Radcliffe Creek School to hire a full-time Occupational Therapist. Occupational therapy services will be available to all Radcliffe Creek School students, including its preschool students. Services will also be provided to the Kent County Community-at-large through the schools Outreach Program, in-which non-Radcliffe Creek School student needs can be met through one on one tutoring and small group instruction.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Motivational Interviewing

Target Population: Children ages 6 weeks to 14 years who show a need for development in fine motor, social, life, cognitive and play skills.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: – Cognitive, behavioral and personality deficits predispose students to delinquency. An Occupational Therapist will facilitate a community-based "at-risk youth prevention and diversion program" for school-age youth who have sensory needs that interfere with their ability to “be present” in the classroom setting. The program will serve youth who may not have mastered certain basic academic, vocational, social and/or behavioral skills required to function successfully in

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ The subsequent violation must be a new charge, not a ‘basic’ violation such as smoking or truancy.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

school, the workplace, or the community. Academic failure can lead to disruptive and delinquent behavior as well as school dropout. Youth with disabilities who dropout are 5.9 times more likely to be arrested than students without disabilities (US Department of Education, 1999).

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education

FY14 Funding: \$45,000

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ # of children who attend Radcliffe Creek School served	40	17
▪ # of children served through the Outreach Program	10	0
▪ # of speaker sessions held	2	2
▪ # of teachers trained in how to incorporate occupational therapy and sensory integration techniques into their classrooms	4	13
How Well We Do It:		
▪ # and % of parents of children served that attended the speaker sessions	50%	100% (N=17/17)
▪ # and % of families who utilize the resource library	50%	12% (N=2/17)
▪ # and % of parents who reported they were satisfied or very satisfied with the Occupational Therapy program	75%	67% (N=6/9)
▪ # and % of children referred through the Outreach Program who received initial contact within a week of referral	75%	0% (N=0)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
▪ % Radcliffe Creek School children who showed improvement in occupational therapy and sensory integration skills as indicated in the evaluation tool used by the OT within 6 months of receiving services.	75%	94% (N=16/17)
▪ % of children served through the Outreach program who showed improvement in occupational and sensory integration skills as indicated through the evaluation tool used by the OT within 6 months of receiving services.	50%	0% (N=0)
▪ # and % of parents who felt that they saw improvement in their child after 6 months of involvement in the program	60%	56% (N=5/9)

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

Program Name: Truancy Diversion Case Manager

Program Summary: The program will employ one full-time case manager who will implement initiatives and interventions that will both educate all families in the school system about the importance of attendance and intervene with the most at-risk families. The case manager will provide these services with the assistance of the county's pupil's personnel worker. Services will include a county-wide awareness education program, early intervention steps for students showing signs of truant behaviors, connection of families in need to services from community agencies and follow-up support for families at risk .

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Program uses elements of Check and Connect

Target Population: Students ages 4-21 who exhibit the start of or ongoing poor school attendance.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Program will serve students and families showing indicators that put them at risk of being involved in the juvenile justice system. Truancy is identified as one of the early warning signs that youth are at-risk for potential delinquent activity, social isolation and/or educational failure.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education

FY14 Funding: \$33,531

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ # of families directly served by interventions, service coordination and follow-up support	50	55
▪ # of awareness events for families	2	2
▪ # mediation sessions attended.	20	22
How Well We Do It:		
▪ # and % of families who are referred for intervention who receive initial contact within 3 days of referral	75%	100% (N=55/55)
▪ # and % of families who are referred for intervention and coordination of services who enter follow-up support within 30 days of referral date.	50%	100% (N=55/55)
▪ # and % of parents/guardians who are satisfied with the Truancy Diversion Program	50%	100% (N=1/1)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
▪ % of families whose truancy cases were resolved out of court by accessing support services from Community Mediation or the Local Care Team	50%	42% (N=20/48)
▪ % of participants who did not have a violation of criminal and/or a court order while receiving services	50%	91% (N=50/55)
▪ % of students/families receiving services who met the county attendance standard for the marking period after the services were initiated averting the need for court action	50%	87% (N=48/55)
▪ % of youth and parents who reported they were more aware of the importance of school attendance on the Satisfaction Survey	50%	100% (N=1/1)
○ % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with an average daily attendance (ADA) at end of <u>term four</u> equal to or greater than their school grade ADA.	50%	87% (N=50/55)
○ % of participants with an improved average daily attendance rate (ADA) “post” program participation in comparison to their ADA prior to involvement of the Truancy Case Manager.	50%	53% (N=29/55)

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

Program Name: Evening School Program

Program Summary: Program will offer a second chance at credit acquisition for students who are over aged and under credited, returning to high school for a fifth year, re-entering high school after a prior drop out or at risk for an initial drop out

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: Life Skills Training

Target Population: Students in grades 9-12 (ages 14-21) who are failing in the traditional education system

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This school-based "at-risk youth prevention and diversion program" will serve youth from Kent County high school by creating the opportunity for students who are over-aged and under-credited and returning to the high school for a fifth year, re-entering after a drop-out, or at-risk of initial drop

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

out to meet the credit requirements to achieve a high school diploma. By creating this second chance for students who have not always been successful in a traditional school setting, they may become more actively engaged in their academic success; thereby diverting them from entering the juvenile justice system and making them ready for adulthood.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal(s): Education

FY14 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ # of students enrolled in the Evening School program	25	27
▪ # of referrals for graduating students to higher education or job skills agencies	10	0
▪ Average number of hours students spent logged into the online learning system per week	7	10.5
How Well We Do It:		
▪ # and % of 5 th year students who complete MSDE diplomas requirements within 1 year of enrollment.	90%	67% (N=2/3)
▪ # and % of participants (reported in aggregate by school grade) with an ADA the same or greater than their school grade ADA.	85%	N/A
▪ # and % of students who have dropped out and re-enrolled through this program who complete the MSDE requirements for a MD diploma within the service year	30%	78% (N=7/9)
▪ Average Daily Evening School Attendance, all participants	75%	87%
▪ # and % of students who report that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” overall with the program on the program satisfaction survey	75%	100% (N=13/13)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
▪ % of students enrolled who graduate within 5 years of high school attendance.	90%	90% (N=9/10)
▪ % of students enrolled who graduate within 4 years of high school attendance (with their cohort)	90%	100% (N=7/7)
▪ % of students enrolled who recouped enough credits to rejoin cohort by the end of the school year ending June 2014	90%	89% (N=24/27)
▪ # and % of students who obtain their MD diploma who indicate that they will pursue further education (college, tech school, etc.)	50%	71% (N=5/7)

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: Youth attending the following middle schools: Argyle, Clemente and Loiederman. Academic eligibility is not a criterion for participation in these programs.

Promising Practice/Model/EBP Employed: 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.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$542,784

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.				22	24	28	34
▪ # of programs submitting program self-assessments.				10	10	16	10 ¹
▪ # of programs submitting Program Improvement Plans.				10	10	10	10
▪ # of participants at professional development trainings.				306	659	670	592 ²
▪ # of OOST options available for students beyond extracurricular school offerings.				44	57	100	104
▪ # of programming hours offered.				282	272.5	216	250
▪ # of youth served.	1669	1009	786	744	841	900	1304
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Average Daily Attendance			73%	77%	75%	74%	76% N=300
▪ % of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			89%	91%	100%	100% N=16	100% N=10
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.				4.62	4.52	4.5	4.47
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.				4.51	4.43	4.0	4.29
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.				3.96	3.97	3.5	3.91
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.				3.63	3.74	3.0	3.56
▪ # and % of programs with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.				91%	100%	100% N=12	100% N=11
▪ # and % of program participants who participated in programming 4 hours per week.				48%	74%	70%	73% N=957
▪ # and % 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.	78%	78%	84%	78%	91%	80%	N=2730 90%
▪ # and % 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%	89%	85%	N=2712 89%
▪ # and % of programs that report satisfaction with their overall involvement in EBB services: 1) clarity of role and purpose. 2) nature and frequency of communication.				1) 82% 2) 82% 3) 82%	1) 80% 2) 80% 3) 80%	1) 75% 2) 75% 3) 75%	1) N=10; 90% 2) N=10; 90%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
3) problems/barriers adequately addressed. as measured by a survey administered at the end of the school year.							3) N=8; 73% ³
Is Anyone Better Off?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of program participants that report contribution of program to positive social and personal skills: <ul 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) 78% 2) 80% 3) 81%	1) 75% 2) 75% 3) 75%	1) 84% 2) 86% 3) 84%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of program participants who demonstrate : <ul 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) 72% 2) 95% 3) 3.0 4) 91%	1) 70% 2) 95% 3) 3.0 4) 80%	1) 74% 2) 95% 3) 3.0 4) 88%

What's the story behind the performance?

¹ This year, there is a mix of participants attending YPQA trainings that include MCCC funded programs and those funded through the Recreation Department. There were 6 program sites (school locations) and all had at least one person from all participating EBB organizations who attended YPQA Basics training. While EBB staff from the Recreation Department and Rec-supported EBB organizations also attended YPQA methods trainings, only MCCC EBB organizations completed the entire YPQA process, including entering data from YPQA assessments to create an improvement plan. This year, 10 EBB program managers received additional quality coaching and follow-up observation visits from 2 quality coaches.

²The number of participants attending trainings this year was lower than anticipated due to several factors: Since trainings are free, a number of people signed up and did not show up which prevented us from including those on the waiting list. Toward the end of the year, a new policy was developed that charged people a fee if they registered and did not attend the trainings. Attendance has increased dramatically as a result of this policy. The larger trainings from previous years were not as effective or as easy to facilitate. Class sizes were limited to allow more active participation.

³For FY15, there will be more frequent on-site meetings with key school staff to help address barriers that arise as well as the creation of more uniform policies shared across all sites.

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

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$105,544

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	109	91	81	109	128	90	174
▪ Family*	91	87	79	54	60	55	68
▪ Group*	7	0	0	0	17	10	15
➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:							
▪ Individual*	130	107	280	155	186	115	205
▪ Family*	35	28	6	44	58	25	28
▪ Group*	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	169	121	129	105	158	102	148
▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	24	19	33	19	45	25	25
*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.							
➤ # of Social Skills/Conflict Resolution Programs held				59	42	45	45
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%	70%	100%	96%	92%	100%	100% N=202
➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	90%	70%	88%	71%	86%	85%	95% N=198
➤ % of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	93%	70%	93%	79%	78%	77%	91% N=12
➤ % of clients reporting satisfaction with services received (based on surveys administered quarterly).				97%	98%	100%	97% ¹ N=201
Is Anyone Better Off?							
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	95%	93%	100%	100%	99%	93%	100% N=211
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.				48%	62%	57%	75% N=140
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment[PBI] between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.						88%	84% ² N=94

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).						92%	63% ³ N=67
➤ For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.						90%	95% N=65
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.				36%	61%		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Home sub-scale.				36%	58%		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Community sub-scale				2%	35%		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Behavior Toward Others sub-scale.				39%	32%		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.				44%	62%		
➤ # and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Substance sub-scale.				3%	10%		
➤ % and # of clients reporting an increase in their knowledge and ability to identify individual, family or common risk factors as measured by survey at the end of the year.				89%	100%	97%	95% ⁴ N=165

What’s the story behind the performance?

¹This reflects that not all or 100% of the families will be satisfied with services given/provided as they may have needs that are not/cannot be met by what the mandate is of the provider (for instance, the YSB cannot help with housing in this capacity, that is not its responsibility).

²All CAFAS scales are dependent on clients’ initial scores in the CAFAS subscales and the results are based on the initial baseline. There were some clients who saw no improvement in any of the three areas because of lack of engagement. The YSB will continue outreach efforts with families in hopes that improvement will be seen for all clients.

³There has been an increase in the level of risk behaviors and trauma affecting the clients due to social/ecological environments.

⁴While majority of the clients express a greater understanding of risk factors, some struggle in their efforts to identify them. The YSBs work diligently to help families/clients increase their knowledge in these areas.

LMB: Prince George’s County

Program Name: Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

Target Population: Children and youth involved with DJS.

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

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$175,403

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of youth served by MST.	47	15	15	15	15	14
Average length of duration in days for youth receiving MST services.	134	112	93	119	90	112
Number of service “slots” available.**		6	6	5	5	5
How Well We Do It:						
% of families satisfied with services per the client satisfaction survey at the completion of services.	85% N=40	100% N=15	73% N=11	93% N=14	70%	100% N=12
% of cases completing treatment with goals attained.	81% N=38	86% N=13	87% N=13	79% N=11	80%	79% N=11
% of parents with parenting skills necessary to handle future problems measured at termination by survey.	85% N=40	86% N=13	80% N=12	93% N=14	80%	100% N=12
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of youth at home at case discharge.	90% N=42	100% N=15	87% N=13	80% N=12	80%	100% N=14
% of youth attending school or working at discharge.	87% N=41	86% N=13	73% N=11	67% N=10	70%	64% N=9
% of youth who do not experience arrest or re-arrest while receiving services.	90% N=42	86% N=13	87% N=13	93% N=14	80%	100% 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.

LMB: Prince George’s County

Program Name: After School Programs

Program Summary: Safe, structured learning and enriching activities that promote physical, emotional, cognitive and social development for 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: 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 in the Capitol Heights, Forest Heights, Seat Pleasant, Mount Rainier and Landover areas that 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$364,911

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.		9	7	13	11	15
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.		3	3	4	4	11
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.		3	3	2	4	10
# of children/youth served in after school programs.	573	393	386	444	350	633
# of after school sites.	8	8	8	11	10	11
# of snacks served.			44,649	34,464	30,000	57,004
# of meals served.			40,137	37,913	35,000	68,464
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily attendance.		71% N=279	80% N=257	80% N=355	80%	86% N=332
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.		100%	100% N=3	100% N=4	90%	100% N=11
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.		4.78	4.4	4.61	4	4.63
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.		4.38	4.5	3.95	4	4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.		3.31	3.83	3.56	3	3.5
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.		2.33	2.79	2.69	2	3
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.		100% N=3	100% N=3	50% N=2	50%	100% N=11
# and % of participants who attend 90% of the total sessions.	91% N=521	79% N=310	88% N=341	74% N=189	80%	87% N=332
# and % of after school staff retained since the start of the school year.			93% N=22	93% N=39	90%	97% N=23
# and % of Youth Engagement Surveys where the student score was 7 or higher (administered quarterly).			86% N=332	92% N=79	80%	99% N=537
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.	55% N=315	50% N=197	61% N=236	49% N=85	50%	59% N=323
% 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.	50% N=287	51% N=200	54% N=207	59% N=141	50%	64% N=280
% 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).	92% N=478	73% N=287	100% N=335	92% N=297	90%	96% N=436
% of participants whose school attendance improved from the 1 st qtr. to the 2 nd or 3 rd qtr.			67% N=259	95% N=102	75%	98% N=546

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$73,243

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Number of times the curriculum is implemented in its entirety.	3	2	4	2	2	2
▪ Number of communities where trainings held.	13	6	5	6	5	7
▪ Number of outreach activities to communities.	50	21	6	4	4	6
▪ Number of youth participants in the rounds of curriculum implementation.	116	82	85	41	50	58
▪ Number of schools and other sites implementing the curriculum.			3	2	3	2
How Well We Do It:						
▪ % of participants who indicated on survey that they would recommend training to others.	100% N=116	80% N=66	80% N=46/57	100% N=41	80%	98% N=50
▪ % of participants who indicate they are satisfied with the quality of service they have received.		96% N=79	94% N=54/57	91% N=37	90%	100% N=51
▪ % 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	100% N=41	75%	96% N=49
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ % of participants with any increase in their general conflict resolution skills as measured by the Rosenberg Scale.	40% N=46	100% N=82	99% N=56/57	61% N=25	70%	96% N=49
▪ % of participants who have a “positive attitude change” toward gang membership/involvement as measured annually by the curriculum survey.	100% N=116	90% N=74	80% N=46/57	73% N=30	70%	100% N=51
▪ % of participants who have a greater knowledge of gang issues based on post-test at end of curriculum.			85% N=48/57	83% N=34	80%	96% N=49

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: Serves children/youth placed with relative caregivers because 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 the potential to become involved in the juvenile justice system.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Violence Against Women & Children

FY14 Funding: \$91,257

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of families served.	117	81	59	98	70	96
Number of children served.	203	74	107	186	150	168
Number of referrals made to community resources.			130	340	300	312
How Well We Do It:						
% of families with reduced stress upon completion of services based on Family Satisfaction Survey.*	97% N=113	100% N=59/59	98% N=40/41	100% N=73	90%	99% N=91
% of families with increased community support at end of services based on Family Satisfaction Survey.**	99% N=116	98% N=58/59	100% N=40/40	100% N=73	90%	99% N=91
% of families with a Plan of Care developed within 7 days.	97% N=112	96% N=57	94% N=46/49	96% N=81	90%	92% N=87
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of youth receiving kinship care services who are not placed out-of-home while participating in program.	95% N=111	100% N=78/78	100% N=46/46	99% N=184	90%	100% N=176
% of families who are not reported for abuse or neglect while involved in program services.	96% N=112	99% N=77/78	98% N=45/46	98% N=96	90%	100% N=97
% of youth receiving kinship care services who are not placed out-of-home a minimum of 6 months after completing the program.	100% N=69	95% N=128/135	98% N=58/59	100% N=73	90%	97% N=124
% of families who are not reported for abuse or neglect a minimum of 6 months after completing the program.	100% N=69	87% N=117/135	98% N=58/59	100% N=73	90%	91% N=124

*The reduction in stress on the family satisfaction survey is one question pertaining to the reduction of stress in general. The question: Have 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: To 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: Targets truants, and when not addressed can be a precursor to involvement with the juvenile justice system.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$130,890

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Number of families served.*	233	50	181	64	140	43
Number of participants served.*	260	50	354	64	150	85
Number of trained school personnel.**	40	12	0	0	0	0
Number of referrals made to community resources.	97	44	91	137	100	113
Number of parent engagement activities	6	3	5	8	4	4
How Well We Do It:						
Staff to family ratio.	1:15 N=217	1:25 N=50	1:89	1:32	1:25	1:31
Percentage of assessments completed within 15 days of referral.	93%	60% N=30	35% N=123	100% N=64	75%	80% N=68
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	59% N=38	50%	67% N=57
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of participants served who decrease number of days absent.	64% N=149	34% N=17	34% N=121	63% N=40	50%	69% N=59
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 	73% N=170	48% N=24	34% N=121	64% N=40	60%	65% N=55
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	50% 50%	69% N=59
Percentage of participants who decrease number of days tardy.		53% N=70/133	50%	64% N=40	50%	69% N=59

*The number of families/participants served for FY2009 and FY2010 reflects a reduction in truancy staff from three to two and also a reduction 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.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus

Program Summary: 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.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$356,176

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual	162	139	149	116	100	109
▪ Family	358	462	346	308	300	276
▪ Group	85	88	59	30	25	49
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:						
▪ Individual	317	374	274	266	250	157
▪ Family	265	296	260	170	150	231
▪ Group	123	66	8	25	5	63
# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	536	558	790	721	700	634
▪ # of individual youth for who substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	77	122	138	78	75	161
# of formal counseling cases served in TF-CBT as a result of assessment			227	222	200	228
How Well We Do It:						
% of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	94% N=569	93% N=642	95% N=528	93% N=178	85%	96% N=254
% of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	71% N=430	69% N=287	74% N=408	68% N=103	70%	78% N=123
% of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	97% N=25	97% N=25	92% N=23	88% N=12	85%	100% N=27
% of individuals completing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) as recommended.			89% N=480	72% N=81	70%	90% N=257
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling.	N=162 100%	97% N=520	96% N=532	99% N=240	90%	100% N=473
% of youth formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.	92% N=162	86% N=536	81% N=449	79% N=124	75%	69% N=130
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					70%	71% N=134
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and					70%	60%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
% who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).						N=41
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.					70%	68% N=44
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS School sub-scale.			79% N=438	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	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	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	52% N=77		
# and % of formal counseling participants who showed improvement of 10 pts. or more on the CAFAS Mood sub-scale.			82% N=454	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	35% N=12		
# and % of individuals receiving CBT with an improved Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score at discharge.			96% N=95	96% N=111	90%	81% N=86

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: Targets first time or non-violent misdemeanor juvenile offenders to prevent them from penetrating further into the juvenile justice system.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$60,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
Number of juveniles referred to Teen Court	255	407	200	200

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Number of juveniles served through Teen Court	61	73	75	68
Number of volunteers recruited	214	726	500	670
How Well We Do It:				
Percent of youth participants successfully completing Teen Court program during the 60 day time period.	86% N=22/24	74% N=54	75%	92% N=48
Percent of participants who earn student service learning hours while involved with Teen Court program.	100% N=214	100% N=726	90%	100% N=670
Percent of youth satisfied with the program as indicated on a survey administered as part of the discharge process.	100% N=24/24	100% N=54	90%	92% N=48
Is Anyone Better Off?				
Percent of youth not experiencing arrest, rearrest or any subsequent DJS involvement during program duration.	100% N=24/24	99% N=72	90%	86% N=62
Percent of youth whose charges were dismissed as a result of successful program completion.	86% N=22/24	100% N=54	80%	92% N=48
Percent of youth whose record was expunged as a result of successful program completion.	86% N=22/24	100% N=54	80%	92% N=48

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: MOST Network

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Education

FY14 Funding: \$52,244

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			1	3	2	4
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.			2	2	2	2
# of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			0	2	2	2
# of middle school youth served:	290	320	307	337	240	350

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ Matapeake			126	162	125	179
▪ Stevensville			182	175	115	171
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily Attendance	82.8%	82.5%				
▪ Matapeake			84.7%	87.3%	75%	89.2%
▪ Stevensville			74.5%	77.5%	75%	82.7%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			0	100% N=2	50%	100% N=2
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			MMS 4.92 STMS 4.15	MMS 5.00 STMS 4.80	MMS 3.00 STMS 3.00	MMS 5.00 STMS 4.93
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			MMS 4.41 STMS 3.83	MMS 4.89 STMS 4.25	MMS 3.00 STMS 3.00	MMS 4.92 STMS 3.83
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			MMS 3.96 STMS 3.58	MMS 4.25 STMS 3.67	MMS 3.00 STMS 3.00	MMS 4.58 STMS 2.54
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			MMS 2.33 STMS 3.00	MMS 3.17 STMS 3.17	MMS 3.00 STMS 3.00	MMS 3.67 STMS 1.50
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	MMS 4.33 STMS 3.98	MMS 3.00 STMS 3.00	MMS 4.54 STMS 3.28
# /% of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			0/0%	100% N=2	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	100% N=16	60%	92.8% N=28
▪ Stevensville			6/83% N=5	83% N=12	60%	86.3% N=22
#/% 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	100% N=24	80%	95.9% N=49
▪ Stevensville			17/100% N=17	100% N=24	80%	96.3% N=54
Is Anyone Better Off?						
#/% of participants that self-report positive personal change (as per annual survey given at end of program).	116/88%	88/80%				
▪ Matapeake			160/99%	89%	80%	98.1%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
			N=157	N=118		N=103
▪ Stevensville			155/93% N=144	90% N=117	80%	87.6% N=129
#/% of full-time program participants who achieved school attendance of 94%.	95.45%	55/74.5%				
▪ Matapeake			11/73% N=8	74% N=31	70%	96.9% N=51
▪ Stevensville			20/80% N=16	78% N=29	70%	95.6% N=39
#/% of participants that self-report learning new skills (as per annual survey given at end of program).						
▪ Matapeake			154/97% N=149	91% N=118	80%	98% N=103
▪ Stevensville			155/93% N=144	90% N=117	80%	85.3% N=129

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: Big Brothers/Big Sisters

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Education

FY14 Funding: \$25,360

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
▪ # of youth served.	8	9 ¹	3	4	13
▪ # of mentors recruited.	5	10	13	5	12
▪ # 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	1	1	4
How Well We Do It:					
▪ #/% of mentees that rate the program as increasing their attachment to school as measured by the Attachment to School Scale administered in the spring of every year.	4/50%	2/50% N=4	2/67% N=3	50%	4/80% N=5

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ #/% of mentors that indicate on the Mentor Survey** that the mentor orientation/training was satisfactory.	7/88%	6/86% N=7	3/23% N=13	50%	5/63% N=8
▪ #/% of volunteer mentors who participate in additional (non-required) training.		4/40% ³ N=10	1/7% N=13	50%	5/38% ¹ N=13
Is Anyone Better Off?					
▪ #/% of participants with no new involvement with the juvenile justice system while enrolled in the program.	3/100%	4/100% N=4	3/100% N=3	75%	6/100% N=6
▪ #/% of mentees that report a more positive view of their future as measured by the Mentee Survey administered in the spring of every year.			3/100% N=3	50%	4/80% N=5
▪ #/% of mentees that report any increase in the knowledge of the negative effects of substance abuse and benefits of non-use as measured by the Mentee Survey administered in the spring of every year.	2/25%	3/75% N=4			
▪ #/% of mentees that show any increase in school performance after 6 months in the program as measured by school records.	2/25%	3/75% N=4	2/67% N=3	50%	5/83% N=6
▪ #/% of mentees with a school attendance rate of 90% or higher for the school year.	4/50%	3/75% N=4	3/100% N=3	75%	6/100% N=6

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

LMB: Queen Anne's County

Program Name: Achievement Mentoring for At-Risk Youth

Program Summary: Case Management services at 4 middle schools for youth that coordinates youth/family connection to behavioral, academic, and social resources.

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

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: OJJDP Effective Program – Behavioral Monitoring & Reinforcement Program (BMRP)

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Education

FY14 Funding: \$59,658

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of youth served.	25	25	18	20	10	19
# of youth/families referred to community services.		15	10	16	8	12
# of referred youth who are matched with an Achievement Mentor.		5	3	20	10	3 ¹

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
How Well We Do It:						
#/% of parents updated on participant progress on a monthly basis during the school year.	23/92%	21/85%	15/83% N=18	85% N=17	80%	17/89% N=19
#/% of participants who stay enrolled in the program for at least 3 months.	25/100%	20/80%	16/88% N=18	100% N=20	80%	19/100% N=19
#/% of mentors who meet with students at least 15 minutes per school week to acknowledge accomplishments.			2/66% N=3	2/66% N=3	50%	16/84 N=19
Is Anyone Better Off?						
#/% of participants with less than 8 behavioral referrals in the last 6 months.	23/93% (N=23)	21/85% (N=21)	14/75% N=18	80% N=16	75%	15/79% N=19
#/% of participants that maintain at least a 90% school attendance.	19/76%	19/75%	13/71% N=18	60% N=12	75%	11/58% ² N=19
#/% of participants who have no Department of Juvenile Services referrals while enrolled in the program.	21/84%	21/85%	17/94% N=18	90% N=18	75%	18/95% N=19

LMB: Queen Anne's County

Program Name: Character Counts!

Program Summary: A national character development initiative that utilizes the six pillars of character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship. 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: Character Counts

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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goals: Education

FY14 Funding: \$3,000

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of volunteer Character Counts coaches.	111	107	111	105	100	100
▪ # of months with bi-weekly press releases, cable coverage and/or participation in a community event.	12	12	12	12	10	12
▪ # of students served.		4295	4,777	4,800	4,000	4,283
How Well We Do It:						

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ #/% of classes with Character Counts coaches for grades 1-6.	150/92%	143/91%	107/86% N=124	121/85% N=143	85%	109/76% ¹ N=143
▪ #/Annual retention rate for Character Counts Coaches.	70/60%	70/65%	43/62% N=69	74/71% N=105	60%	67/67% N=100
▪ #/% of character coaches who present a monthly anti-bullying message to their class.			86/90% N=95	100% N=105	75%	100% N=100
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	6/100%	Survey admin every other year	6/100%	25%	Survey to take place in 2015
▪ #/% of “Businesses of Character” that meet 100% of their Character Counts Plan of Commitment goals.	39/85%	40/85%	35/88% N=40	40/82% N=49	80%	40/82% N=49
▪ #/% of 8th 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.				129/37% N=346		
▪ #/% of 8 th grade student character coaches’ bi-monthly presentations that are effective with 5 th grade participants and their teachers. (This is a Pilot Program at Sudlersville Middle School). Measured through use of a Likert Scale.					50%	4/75% N=5

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

LMB: Queen Anne’s

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 eligible for M-CHIP who are at risk of poor parenting outcomes due to 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goals: Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$57,616

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ # of families served.	43	38^^	50	51	40	55
▪ # of developmental screenings.	71	78	119	114	75	127
▪ # of referrals to service.	157	175	288	203	200	225
▪ # of teen parents served (subset of # of families served).		12^^^	13	18	13	13
▪ # of referrals to service for teen parents.		62	78	107	60	68
▪ # of home visits.			611	614	500	806
How Well We Do It:						
▪ #/% of participants who report they are satisfied or very satisfied with services. (survey given at end of services).	20/100%	13/100%	24/100% N=24	29/100% N=29	90%	24/96% N=25
▪ #/% 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	37/74% N=50	70%	84/84% N=100
▪ #/% screened children that are identified as having a developmental delay.			0/0% N=37	2/5% N=42	<1%	1/2% N=47
Is Anyone Better Off?						
▪ #/% of participants without child abuse/neglect findings while enrolled in the Healthy Families program.	43/100%	37/97%	46/100% N=46	50/98% N=51	85%	47/100% N=47
▪ #/% 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	44/88% N=50	75%	82/82% N=100
▪ #/% of participant children who are fully immunized for the year.			45/98% N=46	42/100% N=42	90%	47/100% N=47

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

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 area 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

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Violent Crimes, Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$140,784

**FY2014 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 Actual*	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
▪ Total number of youth served.	86	125	197	108	80	114
▪ Total number of staff working with youth.						
○ Paid Staff			20	12	10	12
○ Volunteer Staff			25	15	5	8
▪ Number of EBP sessions provided.						
○ Positive Action			120	50	50	56
○ Too Good For Violence			82	50	50	57
▪ Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			2	2	2	2
▪ Number of Programs/Sites submitting program self-assessments.			1	Exempt	1	1
▪ Number of Programs/Sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			1	Exempt	1	1
How Well We Do It:						
▪ Percentage of youth who are “glad” they participated in the program, as measured by the end of program Satisfaction Survey.	97% (N=41 of 43)	95% (N=119)	88% (N=174)	98% (N=105)	80%	96% (N=109)
▪ Percent of youth who attend at least 80% of program days.		64% (N=80)	84% (N=165)	84% (N=90)	70%	76% (N=87)
▪ Percent of participating youth completing all EBP sessions successfully (workbook completion).						
○ Positive Action			89% (N=176)	97% (N=104)	70%	83% (N=95)
○ Too Good for Violence			92% (N=182)	95% (N=102)	70%	85% (N=97)
▪ Average Daily Attendance			81% (N=160)	85% (N=92)	75%	85% (N=97)
▪ Percentage of program sites that have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			100%	Exempt	100%	100% N=1
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.26	Exempt	4.47	4.36
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			3.90	Exempt	4.09	4.33
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			2.83	Exempt	2.97	2.92
▪ YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			2.17	Exempt	2.27	2.66
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site:			3.29	Exempt	3.45	3.55
○ Village Youth Center						
▪ Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			N=1 50%	N=1 (100%)	N=1 (100%)	N=1 (100%)

**FY2014 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 Actual*	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
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)	3.1% (N=3)	4%	3.5% (N=4)
▪ Percent of youth with prior offenses who have not re-offended during the program period.	No Prior Offenses	No Prior Offenses	No Prior Offenses	No Prior Offenses	50%	No Prior Offenses
▪ Percentage of participants who increased 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)	29% (N=31)	25%	31% (N=35)

*A waiver of certain YPQA requirements was approved for FY13 due to the disruption to the program caused by Hurricane Sandy.

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: Reducing alcohol access for youth will prevent delinquent behavior as a result of substance use.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Violent Crime, Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$25,435

Performance Measure	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:							
▪ Number of alcohol sales compliance checks completed.	69	131	81	102	0	90	*31
▪ Number of CMCA Team Members.	17	15	20	15	16	15	16
▪ Number of alcohol-related citations issued to youth.	13	19	47	19	4	21	*11
How Well We Do It:							
▪ Average score on Question #18 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	5.1	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5	**0
▪ Average score on Question #25 of the CMCA Team Member Survey.	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.2	5.2	5	**0
▪ Percent of CMCA Task Force Team members who are community based, not agency-based.				47% (7 of 15)	50% (8 of 16)	50%	50% (8 of 16)
Is Anyone Better Off?							
▪ Percent of increased compliance over first round of checks.	15%	21%	100%	21.5% (N=22)	0%	20%	*-33%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ Percent increase in number of alcohol related citations issued to youth.	9%	46%	247%	0%	0%	10%	275%
▪ Percent of Merchants receiving educational packets regarding underage drinking laws.				91% (32 of 35)	94% (33 of 35)	50%	*16% (5 of 31)

*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.

*Compliance checks were not completed as required due to staffing changes; without direction from SCLMB law enforcement vendors focused on traffic stops instead. **CMCA team meetings were not held in FY14 due to staffing changes.

LMB: St. Mary’s

Program Name: Tri-County Youth Services Bureau

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

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

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

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse; Violent Crime; Education; and Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$112,355

Performance Measure	FY08 Actual	FY09 Actual	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual**	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target
What/How Much We Do:							
Total number of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype:	780	506	359	455	415	315	270
▪ Individual*	380	120	141	235	132	130	110
▪ Family*	227	271	164	81	52	50	50
▪ Group*	173	115	54	139	231	135	110
Total number of youth in formal counseling (those referred or mandated to receive TCYSB assistance) receiving Second Step curriculum (12 youth per quarter; groups run 8 weeks).					102	65	46
Total number of Formal youth receiving Second Step Curriculum						42	48
Total number of Formal youth receiving Reconnecting Youth curriculum.						42	48
Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype:	742	565	387	460	515	345	250
▪ Individual*	527	94	110	184	217	155	75
▪ Family*	78	222	82	73	44	40	45
▪ Group*	137	249	195	203	254	50	130
Number of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments.	18	137	87	151	151	140	110

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target
▪ Number of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made.	4	9	4	6	26	20	15
Number of formal counseling cases receiving additional information on community based services where appropriate.					131	85	150
Number of formal counseling cases where referrals were made to other community based services						75	50
Number of cases receiving suicide intervention/prevention services							10
How Well We Do It:							
Percentage of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session.	100%	100%	98.5% (N=139)	91% (N=214)	100%	100%	100%
Percentage of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan.	90%	69%	78% (N=110)	64% (N=58)	77%	50%	65%
Percentage of YSB staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services.	100%	93.75%	92.5% (N=6)	91% (N=20)	100%	70%	100%
Percentage of calls seeking information and referrals that are returned within 48 business hours					100%	85%	90%
Percentage (and number) of youth receiving formal counseling who complete the Second Step curriculum as scheduled.					87% (89/102)	75%	90%
Percentage (and number) of youth receiving formal counseling who complete the Reconnecting Youth curriculum as scheduled.						75%	89%
Percentage and number of suicide intervention cases for which a Safety Contract is developed.							80%
Is Anyone Better Off?							
Percentage of youth receiving Formal counseling who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling (determined at termination).	80%**	82%**	85%**	97%** (N=74)	92%	75%	80%
Number and percentage of youth receiving Formal counseling participants with an improvement in CAFAS Total Score of 20 points or greater.				84% ◊ (N=76)	100% 132/132	75%	70%
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who improved on at least one of three indicators (Meaningful and Reliable Improvement, Number of Severe Impairments, Pervasive Behavioral Impairment [PBI]) between initial and most recent CAFAS Assessments.					100% 132/132	60%	60%
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who did not have any severe impairments at most recent CAFAS Assessment (“Improved”) and those who still had at least one severe impairment at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”).					81% (106/132) 19% (26/132)	60% 60%	60%
For formal counseling participants who have completed the intervention, the # and % who were identified as having PBI at initial assessment and no longer meet PBI criteria at most recent assessment (“Improved”) and those who still meet PBI criteria					83% (110/132)	60%	60%

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target
at most recent assessment (“Not Improved”). PBI criteria is defined as severely or moderately impaired on three CAFAS subscales – School, Home, and Behavior Toward Others.							
Number and percentage of Reconnecting Youth graduates that do not recidivate within 90 days of program completion. ****					83% (110/132)	60%	80%
Number and percentage of Second Step graduates that do not recidivate within 90 days of program completion. ****					69% (90/131)	60%	80%
Number and percentage of suicide intervention cases with Safety Contracts who report improvement within 90 days of development of Contract.					69% (90/131)	60%	80%

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

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

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

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

LMB: St. Mary’s County

Program Name: Afterschool Program

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

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

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

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

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$62,320

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
▪ # of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	7	7	5	5
▪ Number of children served.	44	40	45	37*
▪ Number of days of operation of the program.	85	70	70	60*
▪ # of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	1	1	1	1
How Well We Do It:				
▪ Average Daily Attendance.	83%	72%	80%	65%
▪ YPQA Total program self-assessment Score (avg. of the 4 domains above) by program/site (list	3.5125	3.825	3.9	4.575

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
programs/sites separately below).				
▪ # and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.	100% (n=1)	100% (n=1)	100%	100% (n=1)
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	100%	100%	100%	100% (n=1)
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	4.44	4.2	4.4	5
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	3.4	4.9	4.5	4.4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3.38	3.3	4.0	4.7
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	2.83	2.9	3.2	4.2
% of staff with formal training in youth development.	90%	100%	100%	100% (n=37)
% of participants attending 80% of the sessions.	80%	62%	70%	72% (n=27)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
Fact Fluency: % of participants who need remediation in fact fluency, who are fluent in addition, subtraction and multiplication facts from 0-12, measured pre/post-test.	83%	80%	85%	75% (n=28)
Reading Fluency: % of participants who increase their reading fluency rate by 20 words per minute, measured pre/post-test.	68%	71%	75%	85% (n=31)
Fitness: % of participants who improve their results on the "Fitness Gram" fitness test from the beginning of the program to the end.	70%	50%	60%	69% (n=26)
Percentage of participants who attended 30 or more days of the program who increase the attachment to school and increase academic achievement, measured pre/post-test.	91%	86%	75%	78% (n=29)

LMB: St. Mary's

Program Name: Mentoring

Program Summary: Provide at risk youth the opportunity to foster relationships to diminish at risk behaviors and increase resiliency.

Target Population: Elementary and middle school students deemed to be at high risk for substance abuse, delinquency and academic failure.

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

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program is identifying youth that potential could become involved with risky behavior and working with youth to learn how to move away from those risky behaviors and to becoming positive influences in their community.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$40,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
Number of youth served by the program	133	126	119	119
Number of sessions held per year, per school site:				
▪ Park Hall	25	25	25	24
▪ Lexington Park	25	25	25	20
▪ Carver	25	25	25	20

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ Green Holly	25	25	25	25 See note
Number of mentors in the program.	2	2	110	110
How Well We Do It:				
Percentage of participants who attend at least one trip or special event.	100% (N=133)	100% (N=126)	100% (N=119)	100% (N=119)
Percentage of mentors who continue for one full school year.	95% (N=126)	92% (N=116)	95% (N=113)	96% (N=114)
Percentage of students who successfully complete the program by attending 75% of the mentoring sessions.	87% (N=116)	91% (N=115)	87% (N=103)	92% (N=111)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
% of participants that maintain at least 80% school attendance*.	99.25% (N=132)	99.1% (N=125)	99.25% (N=118)	99.25% (N=118)
% of mentees who decrease or maintain their number of discipline referrals during the course of the school year.	94.7% (N=126)	88.1% (N=111)	94.7% (N=112)	91.6% (N=109) See note
% of participants who increase or maintain their GPA (comparing first marking period report card to the third quarter report card).	43.6% (N=58)	53.2%*** (N=67)	43.6% (N=51)	47.9% (N=57)
Percentage increase in each participant's developmental assets as measured by pre/post-test.	87% (N=116)	80% (N=101)	87% (N=103)	85% (N=104)

*More school that child/youth attends the less like they will become involved with juvenile system.

***The students mirrored the general population of the school with their increase. The percentage for this year is a 10% increase over last year. To be reflective of the population and the school, the percentage increase should be set around 55%.

The number of students who have maintained or reduced their discipline incidents is lower than expected. We correlate this with the disruptions in programming due to inclement weather. This lower than expected percentage also reflects that more challenging students have been selected for mentoring.

LMB: St. Mary's

Program Name: Drug Screening

Program Summary: A part-time van driver supports youth involved in both substance abuse treatment and Cove Recovery Center activities at Walden's California, MD location.

Target Population: Youth that are adjudicated and identified to be in need of assessment and drug/alcohol treatment.

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

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Serves youth already involved in the juvenile services system.

Governor's Strategic Goal: Substance Abuse

FY14 Funding: \$20,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
# of hours per week that the driver provides transportation			15	10

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
#of adolescents, per week, receiving transportation to treatment and recovery center activities.			10	5
Total # non-duplicated clients served per year			60	30
Total # of hours the addictions counselor will participate in juvenile court case deliberations.	300	152		
# of total treatment hours the addictions counselor will provide to juvenile clients, including individual appointments, group and supervision from a licensed alcohol and drug addictions counselor.	100	100		
Total # of clients served.	25	19		
How Well We Do It:				
% of clients requesting transportation who are transported.			90%	67% n=20
% of treatment clients engaged in ongoing recovery support activities (as documented by sign in log to recovery center and completion of monthly surveys measuring level of engagement and wellness status outcomes)			50%	50% n=15
% of clients who complete counseling recommendations			65%	63% n=19
% of referred clients who receive a drug screen at the court.	90%	100%		
% of mandated youth who have their first counseling appointment within 2 weeks of their initial screening.	79%	32%		
% of clients who complete counseling recommendation during timeframe prescribed.	65%	53%		
% of transported clients reporting satisfaction with recovery center activities			75%	80% n=24
Is Anyone Better Off?				
% of transported clients engaging in six weeks of services.			60%	60% n=18
% of transported clients reporting improvement or stability in wellness status outcome measures as measured on monthly surveys			60%	60% n=18
% of transported clients reporting increased participation in sober activities as measured by tracking individual participant engagement against baseline/entry survey data			60%	60% n=18
% of recommended clients who complete six weeks of treatment counseling.	60%	53%	60%	60% n=18
% of clients with a positive court drug screen who attend at least 5 sessions and has a negative random drug screening after the initial assessment test.	88%	37%		
% of mandated youth whose probation is not violated because of drug treatment or related issues, from entrance to completion of the program.	88%	58%		

LMB: St. Mary's

Program Name: Snack Sak

Program Summary: A backpack containing 7lbs. of nutritional snack food is given to children on Fridays, who have been determined to be at risk for not having enough food on the weekends, and the backpack is returned the following Monday. Starts in October and ends the first week in June.

Target Population: Low income, Free and Reduced meals, or families in crisis or facing hunger challenges. Student participation is confidential.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Research supports the fact that hungry children are not ready to learn. Therefore, providing needed nutrition over the weekend and during holidays supports students in returning to school ready to learn.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: This program is vital to children who are experiencing hunger insecurity. Having this food over the weekends and holidays relieves the stress of being hungry during these times. It also decreases inappropriate behaviors brought on by anticipating hunger over the weekends and holidays.

Governor's Strategic Goal: Childhood Hunger

FY14 Funding: \$10,000

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
Number of youth served by the program	40	40
Number of Friday food distribution days	34	34
Number of volunteers who implement the Snack Sak Program each Friday.	7	7
How Well We Do It:		
Percentage of students who receive their pack each Friday	98%	98% (n=39)
Percentage of volunteers who continue for one full school year.	98%	98% (n=39)
Percentage of students who received 75% of the packs.	90%	90% (n=36)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
% of participants that maintain at least 80% school attendance	85%	85% (n=34)
% of participants who had an increased GPA from the first marking period compared to last marking period.	80%	80% (n=32)

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: Voluntary Family Services (VFS)

Program Summary: Intensive support to families in their homes, improve family functions, and prevent out-of-home placements by allowing for a paraprofessional, parent aide to work in collaboration with a professional to provide an interagency approach to meet family needs.

Target Population: 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)

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Violence against Women and Children

FY14 Funding: \$44,000

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of families served (new families)	9	7	13	7	10	7
# of families served (new & ongoing)	13	13	19	28	15	27
# of contact hours per family per week, per phase:						
▪ Intensive	5	5	5	5	5	5

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
▪ Step-down	3	3	3	3	3	3
How Well We Do It:						
% of referrals for services vs. actually served.	82% (N=9/11)	70% (N=7/10)	93% (N=13/14)	100% (8/8)	85%	100% (7/7)
% of participants rating the services as satisfactory or better (N= number of surveys received).	N/A	N/A (0 of 7 returned)	0% (N=0)	100% (1/1)	25%	0%
% of families that are discharged from the program satisfactorily (met goals or stepped down to another less-intensive DSS service).			85% (N=11/13)	88% (5/6)	80%	70% (7/10)
Is Anyone Better Off?						
% of children from new families served who are NOT placed into foster care one year from start of services.	73% (N=16/22)	100% (N=17/17)	93% (N=25/27)	90% (23/26)	90%	88% (8/9)
% of participants who are not referred to DSS for abuse or neglect one year from start of services.	95% (N=21/22)	94% (N=16/17)	100% (N=27/27)	91% (24/26)	90%	95% (19/20)
% of new participants who do not have a Child Protective Services report while receiving VFS.		94% (N=16/17)	100% (N=27/27)	91% (24/26)	90%	100% (7/7)

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Violent Crime, Violence against Women and Children

FY14 Funding: \$55,000

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:				
# of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.	4	4	2	2
# of programs/sites submitting program self-assessments.	2	2	2	2
# of programs/sites submitting YPQA Program Improvement Plans.	1	2	2	2
# of unduplicated youth served.	175	286	225	783
# of program/activities offerings (social, recreational, academic, etc.).	43	183	50	132

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
# of family activities offered		18	10	18
How Well We Do It:				
Average Daily Attendance.	96%	91%	85%	96%
% of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.	100% (2/2)	100% (2/2)	100%	100% (2/2)
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.	4.1	4.27	4	4.34
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.	3.76	4.1	3.75	4.72
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.	3.02	3.61	3.25	4.32
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.	3.52	3.82	3.5	4.6
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)	3.92 TAYA– 3.91 SM – 3.98	3.5	4.49 TAYA - 4.36 SM - 4.61
# and % of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have a Program Improvement Plan.	50% (1/2)	100% 2/2	100%	100% (2/2)
% of participants attending at least 75% of their scheduled time.	86.9%	91.6%	85%	95% (745/783)
% reporting satisfaction with services as measured by survey each Spring				
▪ youth	100% (89/89)	100% (73/73)	90%	100% (78/78)
▪ parents	100% (60/60)	100% (48/48)	90%	100% (55/55)
Is Anyone Better Off?				
# and % of participants who attend school at least 95% of the time (at least 171 of 180 days), by site.	78% (136/175)	83% (262/272) TAYA 156/168=93% SM 70/104=69%	80%	76% (187/245) TAYA 97/118=83% SM 90/127=71%
# and % of participants with final math grade of C or better.	96% (168/175)	93% (209/224) TAYA 156/168=80% SM 53/56=95%*	80%	92% (175/190) TAYA 95/108= 88% SM 80/82=98%
# and % of participants with final/year-end reading or English or Language Arts grade of C or better.	95% (166/175)	85% (191/224) TAYA 136/168=81% SM	80%	93% (177/190) TAYA 97/108=90% SM

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
		55/56=98%*		80/82=98%

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

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse and Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$44,650

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
Number of community partners/organizations that participate in the development and implementation of a County Wide Youth Development Plan.	41	51	64 individuals/44 organizations	40	41
Number of middle/high school age youth receiving prevention education information, programming and/or services.	2,942	3,177	3,715	3,200	*1,788
Number of online contacts (via Teens Have Choices: website, Facebook fans, YouTube views, Twitter followers).	6,013	7,121	9,807	7,000	8,319
How Well We Do It:					
Percentage of County Wide Youth Development Plan meetings in which 10 or more of the participating organizations are present.			0%	50%	100%
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	85% N=1,028	80%	96% N=57
Percentage of surveyed youth who report that the Teens Have Choices website provided useful information and resources related to their health.		85% N=17	83% N=51	80%	*73% N=58
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	87.3% N=2,358	80%	*63% N=34
<i>Using the teen survey on sexual activity, knowledge and attitudes developed by Shattuck and Associates:</i>					

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Percentage of sexually active youth who report always using birth control/protection.	69% N=18	48% N=22	56.2% N=177	50%	*48% N=26
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	72.5% N=251	60%	*59% N=32
Percentage of youth who report they have never have had five or more alcoholic drinks on one occasion.	75% N=43	59% N=54	74.2% N=502	60%	74% N=40

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Substance Abuse and Skills

FY14 Funding: \$44,181

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:					
Number of unduplicated youth served.	127	118	140	50	68
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	482	200	302
Number of youth placed in internships/junior staff positions.		88	126	37	57
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	83% N=126	75%	91% N=52
Percentage of youth who would recommend the program to a friend (post program survey).	92% N=112	94% N=59	93% N=100	85%	95% N=39
Percentage of youth who attend 70% or more (22 or more) of the onsite instructional sessions.^		76% N=53	60% N=84	65%	69% N=49
Is Anyone Better Off?					

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Performance Measure	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
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	87% N=93	85%	92% N=37
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	84% N=89	80%	88% N=35
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	99% N=114	85%	98% N=42

LMB: Washington County Office of Community Grant Management

Program Name: Family Centered Support Services

Program Summary: Funds will be utilized to augment childcare staffing at the Washington County Family Center which will enable more parents to work toward their High School Diploma, GED or External Diploma. Childcare staff also complete developmental screens on the children attending the Center. Childcare staff must complete their required trainings. Childcare will also support parents in order to participate in other parenting programs at the Center.

Target Population: Children age 0-4 of parents receiving services from the Washington County Family Center, who are at increased risk for involvement in the juvenile justice services. The secondary population is pregnant and parenting teens who want to obtain their High School Diploma, GED or External Diploma.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Program that meets Friends of the Family support center standards at an exemplary level.

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education and Skills

FY14 Funding: \$35,700

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of participants engaged in self-sufficiency services (job readiness, education programs, parenting classes, etc.).	103	110	106	116	100	122
Number of children for whom childcare was provided.	83	88	87	105	85	111
Number of children enrolled at center who receive an ASQ screening.			74	90	75	97
Number of families that attend literacy events.				71	65	66
How Well We Do It:						
Percentage of participants who complete at least 10 of 12 sessions in the National Nurturing Program curriculum.	73% N=22/30	71% N=30	65% N=26	66% N=35/53	68%	*57% N=21/37
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	86% N=90	85%	87% N=97

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Percentage of families who agree/strongly agree that the childcare provided met their expectations as measured by the Family Center Evaluation of Services Survey administered at the end of their educational program.			100 N=42	100% N=41	85%	100% N=38
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.				84% N=36	85%	95% N=36
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of participants who demonstrate an education gain as measured by passing a testing level or receiving a grade promotion.		91% N=63	91% N=44	92% N=61	85%	88% N=73
Percentage of participants receiving a high school diploma, General Equivalency Diploma (GED) or Maryland External Diploma (ED).	42% N=24	54% N=17	41% N=18	66% N=24	40%	**37% N=22
Percentage of participants who complete their education program who apply to post- secondary education or training opportunity.				79% N=19/24	40%	45% N=10/22
Percentage of children developing on target as per ASQ collected every six months.		97% N=86	95% N=70	100% N=90	15%	100% N=97
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.				100% N=31	92%	***89% N=34

Story Behind the Performance:

*The length of commitment for the Nurturing Program (12 weeks) is often difficult for many of the families. In order to accommodate their needs the Family Center is able to offer the program 2x week for 6 weeks during the last program quarter. This change appears to be beneficial to the participants and the program. The Family Center will continue to monitor this requirement in the next program year. Additionally, we are offering a Parenting Plus program in the evenings for 6 weeks to meet the needs of the community who are not within the typical target population.

**Significant changes to the GED test required additional classroom time in order for participants to be ready for the GED test. Many participants needed to learn basic computer skills before they could navigate the practice GED website or GED prep activities. Changes to the External Diploma program hindered many of the adult education students from completing their EDP requirements before they moved to the “new” computer based program as well. The Family Center is developing a computer skill assessment for new students to determine their pre-class needs before enrolling. Students will be able to develop their computer skills at the Family Center as part of their educational program.

***The Family Center continues to use parent evaluation and surveys to develop programs that are responsive to the needs of the participants. The Family Center will continue to seek out community/speakers/agencies as workshop facilitators for participants while balancing the needs of both the teen parent population and the “older” adult education students.

LMB: Washington County Office of Community Grant Management
Program Name: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention & Diversion Initiative

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

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.

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: Targets school age youth at-risk for entry into the juvenile services system as first-time offenders and/or adjudication as a CINS youth.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$174,625

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of new youth served by the program.	340	320	278	207	275	*232
Total number of youth served in the prior year that are still enrolled in services.	96	83	96	72	80	*41
Number of eligible referrals that agree to diversion services (must meet <u>all</u> eligibility requirements and sign a diversion contract).	110	272	246	182	220	*197
Number of CINS youth who agree to a Family Service Plan.	39	40	32	25	30	35
Number of mentors recruited, trained and actively working with youth.		3	12	14	12	18
Number of ongoing mentor/mentee relationships.				10	9	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 referral made, appointment scheduled or added to wait list***).	75% N=54	67.6% N=68	73.6% N=38	66.6% N=30	65%	74% N=19
Percentage of families at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per satisfaction survey).	81.5% N =66	95.7% N=91	100% N=95	99.1% N=116	85%	97.6% N=124
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	100% N=13	85%	100% N=9
Is Anyone Better Off?						
Percentage of diverted cases that satisfy all obligations to successfully complete the diversion program.	86.5 (N = 262)	86.9% N=191	87.7% N=260	86.8% N=213	80%	87% N=176
Percentage of diverted youth who avoid re-offending for one full year from open date.	81.6% (N = 334)	75.8% N=567	73.3% N=308	75.1% N=233	70%	76% N=169

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
Percentage of CINS youth who avoid adjudication for one full year from open date.	74.5% N = 35	81.6% N=98	80.8% N=73	85.7% N=35	75%	89% N=27
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.	60%** N=3	51.4% N=35	57.8% N=38	60.8% N=23	50%	71% N=31
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%*	100% N=10	96% N=25	80%	94% N=18
Percentage of mentees who avoid adjudication while engaging in mentoring relationship.				92% N=25	70%	100% N=18

*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.

*** Definition of “successfully linked” clarified 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 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.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Skills, and Violent Crime

FY14 Funding: \$122,500

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of program staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			4	4	4	4
Number of programs/sites submitting program self-			3	3	3	3

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
assessments.						
Number of programs/sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			3	3	3	3
Number of unduplicated youth served.*	58	178	173	158	120 total 25 per site	170 Cascade 38 Hancock 88 Williamsport 44
Number of hours of structured, supervised activities available per child (calculated as hours per day x number of operational days).	661	2,163.5	2,551	2334.5	2,160	2,373
How Well We Do It:						
Average Daily Attendance.		82% N=82	99% N=94	99% N=94	85%	100% N=170
Percentage of program sites who have at least one program staff who completed YPQA Basics training.			100% N=3	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	Cascade: 4.9 Hancock: 4.8 Williamsport: 4.7	4.5	Cascade: 4.8 Hancock: 4.7 Williamsport: 4.9
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			Cascade: 3.6 Hancock: 4.2 Williamsport: 3.9	Cascade: 4.2 Hancock: 4.2 Williamsport: 4.3	4	Cascade: 4.4 Hancock: 4.5 Williamsport: 4.5
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			Cascade: 3.5 Hancock: 3.2 Williamsport: 3.2	Cascade: 3.1 Hancock: 3.4 Williamsport: 3.6	3	Cascade: 3.7 Hancock: 3.8 Williamsport: 3.7
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			Cascade: 2.2 Hancock: 2.8 Williamsport: 2.3	Cascade: 3.2 Hancock: 3.7 Williamsport: 3.5	2.5	Cascade: 3.0 Hancock: 2.8 Williamsport: 3.0
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	Cascade: 3.9 Hancock: 4 Williamsport: 4	3.5	Cascade: 3.98 Hancock: 3.95 Williamsport: 4.0
Number and percentage of programs/sites with completed YPQA program assessments that have submitted a Program Improvement Plan.			3 100%	3 100%	3 100%	3 100%
Percentage of operational days where attendance meets or exceeds 80% of capacity.	88% N=66 Cascade N=77 Hancock	50% N=213	88% N=485	86% N=468	85%	90% N=468

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
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	90% N=94	65%	96% N=105
Percentage of participants for whom a parent satisfaction survey is collected.				75% N=101	65%	68% N=108
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).	N/A	95% N=96	80% N=78	91% N=96	80%	92% N=100
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	91% N=96	90%	93% N=101
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% N=100	90%	94% N=102
Percentage of participants who can report two or more safe internet practices (per post-test).		97% N=99	92% N=89	98% N=103	90%	98% N=107

*In FY14 this measure was broken down to show both a minimum enrollment for total program and for each site

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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education

FY14 Funding: \$176,000

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Number of families served:						
New	11	32	22	57	15	45
Total	46	42	32	94	50	90
Number of students served:						
New	13	32	27	64	15	48
Total	46	44	37	96	50	93
Number of school personnel trained by program	5	8	10	25	10	25

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
How Well We Do It:						
Staff to family ratio:						
System Navigation	1:36	1:35	2:35	1:40	1:40	1:40
Intensive Navigation***	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%	100% N=10	80%	100% N=6
% 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%	100% N=8	96%	100% N=6
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.	92%	95%	N=51 81 %	87.5% N=18	80%	89% N=10
% 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.	69%	80%	N=51 71%	83.3% N=18	70%	N=10 80%
% of families reporting success in receiving needed services and or supports as provided by program staff (as measured by survey annually).			N=51 92%	100% N=16	80%	N=14 100%

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

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: Family Empowerment Initiative

Target Population: 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.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Violence Against Women & Children, Childhood Hunger, Infant Mortality

FY14 Funding: \$ 120,000

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
# of family support activities.	28	4	8	5	5	10
# of parents/caregivers trained as Existing Family Leaders	7	43	17	14	8	9
# of parents/caregivers trained as New Family Leaders (indicates parents/caregivers who complete the following for the first time: an Active Parenting Publishers Curriculum Training, FEI Protocol & Policy, Stewards of Children, & Criminal Background Check)					2	3
# of family empowerment workshops.	156*	50*	13	13	6	23
# of parents who participate in family empowerment workshops (unduplicated count).	396	134	117	99	60	149
# of people reached with mobile family resources.		1371	2473	2546	1500	2440
# of trainings held to train Family Leaders.		2	6	4	3*	4
How Well We Do It:						
% of committee members who report satisfaction with the activities.	95.3%	100%	N=29 100%	100% N=22	80%	100% N=15
% of Family Leaders (N) who complete all trainings within one year of their start date.	74%	50%	N=24 62%	94% N=16	60%	80% N=8
% of parents enrolled in Family Empowerment Workshops who receive a certificate of completion during fiscal year.	98%	93%	N=102 87%	81% N=80	80%	81% N=121
% of leaders expressing satisfaction with their facilitation experience in the workshop setting through survey after facilitation of Active Parenting workshop.		100%	N=29 100%	100% N=22	75%	100% N=15
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.	60%**	70%**	N=96 94%	95% N=77	70%	90% N=103
% 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%	80%	N=93 91%	97% N=76	80%	97% N=111
% 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.	97%	80%	N=97 95%	97% N=79	80%	93% N=107

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

*Workshops were measured by length of workshop sessions. **Measure reworded for better clarity.

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: Out-of-School Time (OOST) Initiative

Program Summary: Out-of-school programs/trainings that provide safe places with positive, structured activities for school aged children.

Target Population: School age youth grade K-12 at-risk for juvenile delinquent behaviors due to community and/or family factors.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Beginning in FY11, the Out of School Initiative has focused on enhancing existing sites as well as developing a network of providers to serve those sites. Following the After Zone Model in Providence, Rhode Island, the city has been divided into 3 service areas to focus resources within those communities.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Targets the Safe Streets area and provides targeted mobile resources to ensure familiarity with services offered.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education, Childhood Hunger, Violence Against Women & Children

FY14 Funding: \$288,487

Performance Measure	FY10 Actual	FY11 Actual	FY12 Actual	FY13 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:						
Total number of youth enrolled in OOST programs receiving Children's Cabinet funding :						
At Sites	235	289	203	211	200	254
Programs/Clubs		348	1214	463	300	1534
In Activities By Network Providers				1964	500	795
Number of hours of structured, supervised activities available (calculated as hours per day x number of operational days):		930	1677			
At Sites				1751	1200	1237
In Programs/Clubs				1073	500	859
In Activities by Network Providers				684	500	434
Number of parents who participate in the program, defined as attending at least one activity per fiscal year		238	385			
At Sites						
Programs/Club				220	150	139
Network Provider**Attendance at a program/site				80	60	176
Family Night				2	5	3
# of site staff who have completed YPQA Basics training.			6	5	8	9
# of sites submitting program self-assessments.			3	4	5	5
# of sites submitting Program Improvement Plans.			3	4	5	5
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%	73% N=151	80%	86% N=218

**FY2014 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 Actual	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
% of students who attend after school site for 90% of school days	80%	182/86%	N=137 80%	81% N=123	80%	76% N=193
# and % of programs, sites, and network providers that meet or exceed goal of initiating minimum of 10 Developmental Assets in program structure	1/100%	5/100%	N=5 100%	100% N=17	100%	100% N=14
# and % of after school sites that participate in Youth Programming Quality Assessment (YPQA) Process		5/40%	N=3 60%	100% N=4	100%	100% N=5
# and % of program sites who have at least one program staff that completed YPQA Basics training.			N=4 80%	100% N=4	100%	100% N=5
YPQA program self-assessment score for Safe Environment domain.			4.30	4.70	4.4	4.4
YPQA program self-assessment score for Supportive Environment domain.			4.07	4.42	4.1	4.0
YPQA program self-assessment score for Opportunities for Interaction domain.			3.43	3.76	3.5	3.6
YPQA program self-assessment score for Engagement domain.			3.22	3.71	3.3	3.1
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.	80%	173/91%	N=145 97%	90% N=163	90%	75% N=119
Percentage of site participants who do not have a DJIS intake during the school year (measured by self-report @ 6-months and year-end).	0%	187/98%	N=183 99%	96% N=177	95%	99% N=192
Percentage of site and program participants reporting program helped them become more interested in going to school.			N=94 68%	N=35 60%	60%	91% N=231

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Youth as One

Program Summary: Project that works towards keeping children safe in their families and communities through implementing evidence based services and programs to address youth mental wellness. The goals of the program are to increase quality of life for youth by empowering communications/behaviors that count oneself, others and issues, and reduce disempowering communications such as people pleasing, blaming, bullying, sarcasm, threats, carrying grudges, lecturing, disrupting, or being irrelevant through the Say It Straight(SIS) Program and Mentoring Services. Also provides training regarding Youth Mental Health First Aid to community members that interact with children to assist them to develop response options which are tailored to the needs of those with behavioral health issues.

Target Population: Say It Straight: Adolescents aged 10-14, who exhibit a need to build on their assets and protective factors by having at least one mental health risk. Youth Mental Health First Aid: Professionals and community members that consistently work with youth aged individuals.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Evidence Based: Say it Straight and Youth Mental Health First Aid

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Provides safe environment and resources for high risk youth during the “at risk” hours in attempt to prevent and divert entry into the juvenile justice system as well as promote positive relationships with family members and peers.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Education and Skills

FY14 Funding: \$38,000

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of Say it Straight (SIS) participants. ▪ Number of Youth Mental Health First Aid Participants. ▪ Number of mentoring participants. ▪ Number of Say it Straight Sessions. ▪ Number of Youth Mental Health First Aid Trainings held. ▪ Number of mentoring sessions held. 	16 24 5 2 2 120	30 57 3 5 3 116
How Well We Do It:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants that complete the SIS program as planned. ▪ Percent of Youth Mental Health First Aid participants who become certified in Youth Mental Health First Aid. ▪ Percentage of Worcester County Public Schools with staff certified in Youth Mental Health First Aid. 	90% 90% 75%	73.33% 100% 78.57% (N=22/30) (N=57) (11/14)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of program participants with no school suspensions after starting program. ▪ Percentage of youth mentoring participants who report relationship with parents to be "Good" or “Better”, measured by survey after three months of service. ▪ Percentage of Youth Mental Health First Aid participants who report increased ability to recognize signs of mental health challenges or crisis by the end of training. ▪ Percentage of Youth Mental Health First Aid participants comfortable with asking another young person whether he/she is considering suicide. ▪ Percentage of Say It Straight participants reporting improvement in confidence by the end of program. ▪ Percentage of Say It Straight participants reporting they are able to respect themselves and others by the end of the program. @ ▪ Percentage of Say It Straight participants reporting they are able to state their own decisions by the end of the program.## 	90% 80% 90% 90% 80% 80% 80%	83.33% 66% 100% 98.25% 86.36% 72.72% 59.09% (N=25/33) (N=2/3) (N=57) (N=56/57) (N=19/22) (N=16/22) (N=13/22)

LMB: Worcester County’s Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Integrated Services for Child Maltreatment

Program Summary: A co-located, integrated approach to working with families receiving assistance from the child welfare system and needing substance abuse treatment. The team will provide a range of comprehensive services that holistically address the parent and child’s needs, using the evidence based methods listed below.

Target Population: Worcester County families with a report of child maltreatment

**FY2014 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: Screening, Brief Intervention and Treatment, Motivational Interviewing, Cognitive Behavioral Family Counseling and Asset Building.

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Provides community based services to the identified and underserved population with critical needs in order to prevent and divert entry into the juvenile justice system by providing substance abuse and mental health services in an attempt to increase safety and stability.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Violence against women and children. Substance abuse

FY14 Funding: \$82,272

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Final
What/How Much We Do:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of families served. ▪ Number of joint staff meetings held. ▪ Average number of contact hours with DSS per family, per month. ▪ Average number of contact hours with peer support per family, per month. ▪ Average number of Behavioral Health treatment sessions per family, per month. ▪ Average number of home visits per family, per month. ▪ Number of staff trained in Screening Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) tool. 	50 4 60 60 8 8 15	17 4 81.37 50 4.3 0 0
How Well We Do It:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of program staff trained in Family Cognitive Behavioral Therapy ▪ Percentage of staff attending Family Engagement trainings including motivational interviewing. ▪ Percentage families with initial appointments with DSS within 24 working hours of referral. ▪ Percentage of families with initial appointments with addictions counselor within 48 working hours of referral. ▪ Percentage of participants satisfied at 6 months from intake. 	90% 90% 80% 80% 50%	0 100% (N=5) 62% (N=11) 100% (N=17) 88% (N=17)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families without a recurrence of child maltreatment within the first 12 months of program. ▪ Percentage of individuals reporting no substance use or decreased use within first 12 months of program. ▪ Percentage of children remaining in the community during participation in services with the program ▪ Percentage of participants that remain in treatment for 90 days or more ▪ Percentage families who increase Developmental Assets/Protective Factors during involvement with program. 	90% 50% 90% 50% 50%	100% (N=17) 70% (N=12) 100% (N=25) 88% (N=15) 50% (N=8.5)

**FY2014 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: The Cricket Center

Program Summary: Child Advocacy Center that investigates and prosecutes each case of child sexual abuse or assault, acute child physical abuse, and criminal neglect in Worcester County. Program uses a multi-disciplinary team approach by partnering with several agencies such as: Atlantic General Hospital, Life Crisis Inc., local law enforcement, Department of Social Services, and the States Attorney’s Office. Program allows each child’s time in the legal system to be expedited. An interview is done with the victim while professionals observe from a separate room. The interview is also recorded. This all is to help prevent the child from becoming re-traumatized while recalling the story to several individuals at separate times. A family advocate to support each family during the investigation will also be provided.

Target Population: Victims and families of child sexual abuse or assault, acute child physical abuse, and victims of criminal neglect.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: National Accredited Child Advocacy Program

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: Children involved in sexual abuse/assault cases are often times at a high risk for becoming the SB882 population. Many parents may have a history of being in the SB 882 population as well.

Governor’s Strategic Policy Goal: Violence against women and children

FY14 Funding: \$33,500

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of children interviewed. ▪ Number of support visits by Family Advocate to home/school. ▪ Average number of contacts with non-offending family members (per family). ▪ Number of cases where charges are filed by States Attorney. 	<p>85</p> <p>170</p> <p>12</p> <p>20</p>	<p>102</p> <p>157</p> <p>13</p> <p>7</p>
How Well We Do It:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percent of children who participate in trauma based therapy and/or group therapeutic services. ▪ Percent of families who receive ongoing services coordinated by Family Advocate through deposition. ▪ Percentage of non-offending caregivers who report in Satisfaction Survey that ongoing needs were met. 	<p>75%</p> <p>75%</p> <p>75%</p>	<p>70%</p> <p>(N=71/102)</p> <p>88%</p> <p>(N=90/102)</p> <p>98%</p> <p>(N=64/65)</p>
Is Anyone Better Off?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percent of children remaining in home or placed with non-offending family members (not placed into Foster Care) during involvement with the Center. ▪ Percent of non-offending caregivers who enroll in a support group and attend a certain number of sessions.** ▪ Percent of children who attend therapy as prescribed, as applicable. 	<p>80%</p> <p>25%</p> <p>50%</p>	<p>90%</p> <p>(N=91/102)</p> <p>16%</p> <p>(N=16/102)</p> <p>91%</p> <p>(N=93/102)</p>

LMB: Worcester County’s Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Comprehensive Parenting Program Initiative

Program Summary: Comprehensive Parenting Program Initiative utilizes evidence based models including: Nurturing Families and Fathers, Guiding Good Choices Program, and Parenting Wisely. This program provides high risk families with resources they need to be successful in keeping children safe in their families and communities, maintaining stable and economically independent families, and keeping children healthy. Classes will be offered at schools, homeless shelters, addiction centers, and anywhere there is a need.

**FY2014 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
Compilation of Community Partnership Agreement Annual Reports Submitted by LMBs**

The programs are flexible, diverse, nurturing. Families can attend group-based programs, home-based programs, or a combination of group and home based sessions. Lessons on DVD's, parent handbooks, and assessment inventories will be used to promote individual and family growth.

Target Population: Parents whose children are in CINA (Child in Need of Assistance) court and those at high risk of maltreatment and or removal from the home as identified by the Department of Social Services. The program will target the selective and indicated populations as identified by the Institute of Medicine's categories for prevention programming. These are high risk individuals that may already be engaged in unhealthy or illegal activities.

Promising Practice/Model Program/Evidence-Based Practice Employed: Nurturing Families and Fathers, Guiding Good Choices Program, and Parenting Wisely

Explain How the Program Serves the SB 882 Population: By providing community-based services for identified and underserved communities with critical needs and increase personal responsibility and self-sufficiency. The program empowers parents to become more involved with their children in home and in the community. The consistency and stability between parent and child provides a safe environment for children and decreases their chances for involvement in the criminal justice system.

Governor's Strategic Policy Goal: Education and Skills

FY14 Funding: \$58,219

Performance Measure	FY14 Target	FY14 Actual
What/How Much We Do:		
▪ Number of parents that participated in Comprehensive Parenting Program	50	116
▪ Number of Parenting Team meetings held	4	4
▪ Number of Nurturing Parenting Program sessions	10	61
▪ Number of Nurturing Fathers Program sessions	10	29
▪ Number of Guiding Good Choices Program sessions	10	10
▪ Number of Parenting Wisely Program sessions	5	10
How Well We Do It:		
▪ Average Attendance for Nurturing Parenting Program	75%	90% (N=276/306)
▪ Average Attendance for Nurturing Fathers Program	75%	84% (N=38/45)
▪ Average Attendance for Good Choices Program	75%	92% (N=88/95)
▪ Average attendance for Parenting Wisely Program.	75%	83% (N=40/48)
▪ Percentage of participants who complete the Comprehensive parenting Program.	75%	90% (N=90/100)
▪ Percentage of parents reporting they have a better understanding of skills and attitudes involved in being a nurturing parent.	75%	95% (N=86/90)
Is Anyone Better Off?		
▪ Percent of Nurturing Families participants who increase score on Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory, measured by pre- and post-test.	80%	100% (N=6/6)
▪ Percentage of individuals who have completed the evidence based parenting program that show overall improvement on pre/post-test.	80%	98% (N=83/84)
▪ Percentage of at risk families remaining together after 6 months of program.	80%	100% (N=7/7)