



Analysis of the U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Title V Community Prevention Grant Program Administered by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, 2005 and 2006 Grant Awards

**Prepared for the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
© 2007 Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (07-C44)
School of Public and Environment Affairs
Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis
334 North Senate Avenue, Suite 300
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1708**



The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute Report Series, 2005-07

On January 26, 2006, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) contracted with the IUPUI Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) to perform descriptive assessments and evaluations of 12 federal grant programs administered by ICJI. ICJI asked the Center to examine subgrantee files maintained at its offices and assess the process of subgrantee grant applications and the extent to which reported performance of services is consistent with subgrantee proposals. The primary sources of data for these assessments are the subgrantee applications and their fiscal and performance reports, all of which are maintained as internal administrative records by ICJI. The major purpose of each assessment is to determine whether subgrantees are producing the services proposed in grant applications, as well as to compile any performance information contained within ICJI's internal subgrantee files.

The Center for Urban Policy and the Environment

The Center for Urban Policy and the Environment is devoted to supporting economic success for Indiana and a high quality of life for all Hoosiers. An applied research organization, the Center was created by the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs in 1992. The Center works in partnership with community leaders, business and civic organizations, nonprofits, and government. The Center's work is focused on urban and community development, health policy, and criminal justice research essential to developing strategies to strengthen Indiana's economy and quality of life.



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Title V Community Prevention Grants Program Description and ICJI Grant History	4
Title V Funding History	4
Title V Case Study Profiles	5
Case Study One (Allen County)	8
Case Study Two (Orange County)	14
Case Study Three (Perry County)	19
Case Study Four (Tippecanoe County) ..	25
Case Study Five (Wayne County)	29
Conclusion and Recommendations ...	34

List of Tables

Table 1: Indiana Federal Title V Awards by Year and Spending Rates, Number of Subgrants Awarded, and Mean Grant Size, FFY 2000-2006.	5
Table 2: Title V Subgrantees and Case Studies, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods	6
Table 3: FWYSP/FSC Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period	11
Table 4: FWYSB/FSC Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	13
Table 5: Hoosier Hills YSB Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period	16
Table 6: Hoosier Hills YSB Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	17
Table 7: Lincoln Hills YSB Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period	21

Authors

Rachel E. Thelin
Policy Analyst,
Center for Urban Policy
and the Environment

G. Roger Jarjoura
Associate Professor,
School of Public and
Environmental Affairs

Table 8: Lincoln Hills YSB Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	23
Table 9: Priorities Identified in Tippecanoe County Risk Assessment	25
Table 10: CFRC Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period	27
Table 11: Tippecanoe County Commissioners Health Children for Tippecanoe County Program Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	28
Table 12: Priorities Identified in Wayne County Assessment	29
Table 13: BGCWC Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period	31
Table 14: Wayne County Commissioners Project Learn Program Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	32





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From federal fiscal year (FFY) 2000 through FFY 2006, Indiana received over \$2.8 million in Title V grants, allocated by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), to support local juvenile delinquency prevention efforts. The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) is responsible for administering the state's Title V program. Funding is devoted to delinquency prevention projects initiated by a collaborative, community-based planning process focused on reducing risk and enhancing protective factors to prevent youth from entering the juvenile justice system. The largest award to the state was \$816,000 in FFY 2001 and the smallest was just over \$56,000 in FFY 2006. On average, between FFY 2000 and 2006, ICJI received roughly \$475,000 annually.

Through ICJI's Youth Division, nearly \$2.4 million in Title V subgrants has been awarded to local communities between FFY 2000 and 2005. Subgrants are awarded in 12-month increments for up to three years. According to award control reports provided by ICJI, during the FFY 2000-2005 period, ICJI awarded \$2,390,323 in subgrants. With the decline in federal funding, the number of subgrants also has decreased from 13 in FFYs 2000 and 2001 to five in FFYs 2004 and 2005. The mean grant size has remained relatively stable at roughly \$60,000 per subgrantee over the 5-year period. Based on funds expended, ICJI appears to invest the majority of Title V funds received.

The total number of Title V grants examined in this report consists of all five grants awarded during the 2005 operating period (October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006) and the continuing five projects supported

during the 2006 operating period (October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007). These five projects comprise the case study sample. The program assessments are based on a detailed examination of a number of sources of information: (a) subgrantees' original proposals; (b) continuation applications; (c) information provided by ICJI in the form of award control spreadsheets that include legal applicant and implementing agency names, project title, award amounts, county served, and grant numbers; and (d) all quarterly financial and progress reports submitted by Title V subgrantees in 2005 and 2006 to ICJI.

In evaluating the five cases, a simple qualitative rating scale of below average, average, and above average was used to summarize the overall assessment of each case. An average program was considered to be one that completed the grant application correctly, attempted to establish that a problem existed in the problem statement, offered a detailed program description, identified a reasonable program goal, objectives, and activities, submitted timely and accurate financial and progress reports, provided discussions of program activities in the progress reports, and appeared to have a somewhat positive impact on the problem the program attempted to address. Cases that did not meet this standard were called below average; those that exceeded it were considered above average. Using these criteria, four of the cases were classified as average and one was considered below average.

Analysis of the five case studies resulted in a number of key observations and recommendations that could improve overall Title V program administration.



These recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. Require applicants to provide detailed information on proposed model programs and implementation.

Currently, the Title V application does not ask potential subgrantees to supply detailed information regarding the content of proposed programs. ICJI should consider restructuring the application to require applicants to provide such detail on proposed evidence-based approaches.

Subgrantees should be able to offer a detailed explanation and concrete description of core program elements and implementation strategy—specifically how a proposed program would be integrated with other complementary/overlapping community initiatives. Overall, this would prove helpful to reviewers in determining whether the proposed program is an appropriate intervention and a good “fit” with the community.

2. Provide greater attention to program implementation and monitoring of outcomes.

All five programs identified a project goal that was tied to project outcomes. Where many struggled, however, was in proposing outcomes in measurable terms. Most subgrantees reported on activities without attention to proposed outcomes. Furthermore, once a model program is selected, there does not appear to be much attention to implementation. ICJI should engage in careful monitoring of program outcomes to ensure that subgrantees are on track to meet objectives and gauge whether results are in line with expected outcomes of evidence-based programs.

3. Require subgrantees to report on past performance and provide opportunity for program modification.

While Title V grants are awarded for up to three years, the application does not reflect evolution of the two- to three-year nature of projects. ICJI should require subgrantees to report on previous years’ activities, reflect on progress, and demonstrate a track record of performance. Currently, there appears to be no connection between performance and securing additional rounds of funding.

Subsequent applications should also provide opportunities for subgrantees to modify future plans based on initial experience.

4. Provide greater oversight of quality of reported data and technical assistance with performance measurement and evaluation.

Potential subgrantees are asked to identify goals, objectives, and performance measures (outputs and outcomes) as part of the application process. In many cases the goals and objectives do not meet the standards laid out in the instructions for the Title V applications. In addition, once a grant is awarded, there is often minimal attention to the quality of the goals and objectives. Progress reports are dutifully submitted by the subgrantees, yet there appears to be little oversight regarding the quality of data reported. It is important that funding be contingent on some level of proficiency in this area. ICJI should work with subgrantees to revise and improve goals, objectives, and performance measures as a condition of funding. ICJI should also consider providing technical



assistance to further develop subgrantee capacity in the areas of evaluation and development and measurement of appropriate program outputs and outcomes—specifically meaningful adaptation of OJJPD suggested performance measures. ICJI should also require subgrantees to provide more detailed evaluation plans, beyond checking off a list of assessment options.

5. Require detailed overall organizational budget and concrete sustainability plans.

With regard to the fiscal assessment, most subgrantees performed reasonably well. All submitted quarterly progress and financial

reports as required. The majority expended all funds awarded and expenses remained consistent with proposed budgets. However, most of the proposals lacked thoughtful, concrete sustainability plans to secure funding following Title V support. As part of the application, ICJI should consider requiring subgrantees to place Title V funding in some context and require a detailed overall organizational budget including other sources of funding. Subgrantees should also be asked to outline concrete steps for securing future alternate funding as well as progress toward this goal, particularly in light of decreased federal appropriations.



TITLE V COMMUNITY PREVENTION GRANTS PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND ICJI GRANT HISTORY

The federal Title V Community Prevention Grants Program was established with the 1992 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974.¹ Title V funds are administered to states by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Funding is devoted to delinquency prevention efforts initiated by a collaborative, community-based planning process focused on reducing risk and enhancing protective factors to prevent youth from entering the juvenile justice system.²

The Title V program provides a framework and tools for developing comprehensive juvenile delinquency prevention plans. Local community leaders are encouraged to initiate multidisciplinary, data-driven assessments of the risks and resources within their communities and develop comprehensive and collaborative prevention plans that employ evidence-based strategies to address their particular needs.³ According to the OJJDP Title V description, the program integrates six fundamental principles that when combined form a strategic approach to preventing juvenile delinquency. These principles include (1) comprehensive and multidisciplinary approaches, (2) research foundation for planning, (3) community control and decision-making, (4) leveraging of resources and systems, (5) evaluation to monitor program progress and effectiveness, and (6) a long-term perspective. Title V recipient communities are required to form a multidisciplinary community Prevention Policy Board (PPB) to help guide the overall process. Training opportunities associated with data collection and analysis, program development, evaluation, and performance measurement also are supported by the federal program.

Funds are allocated to states based on the juvenile population below the age of criminal responsibility—18 years in Indiana. ICJI is the designated state agency tasked with administering Indiana's Title V program. Awards to local communities are granted in 12-month increments (an October 1 to September 30 cycle) for up to three years. Eligible applicants include public entities, such as cities, counties, townships or other political sub-divisions. Eligibility is also based on potential grant recipients fulfilling the following requirements:

1. Receive Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group certification of compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 2002 core requirements;
2. Convene or designate a local Prevention Policy Board of 15 to 21 members;
3. Submit a three-year comprehensive community delinquency prevention plan; and
4. Provide 50 percent cash or in-kind matching funds. The federal program stipulates this requirement on the part of the recipient or state, aimed at encouraging collaboration and securing financial support to sustain long-term efforts.

Title V Funding History

Table 1 provides an overview of annual Title V federal appropriations to Indiana, including annual awards, fund expenditures, rates of spending for each grant, and the number of and average size of subgrants awarded. From federal fiscal year (FFY) 2000 through FFY 2006, Indiana received \$2,850,250 in Title V funds.⁴ The average annual award over the FFY 2000-2006 period was roughly \$475,000. Indiana

¹Hsia, H. M. (2001, May). An Overview of the Title V Community Prevention Grants Program. Retrieved May 20, 2007, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/fs200119.pdf>

²"About the Program." Title V Community Prevention Grants Program, OJJDP Homepage. Retrieved May 20, 2007, from <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/titleV/about.html>

³Title V Community Prevention Grants Program, 2003 Report to Congress. OJJDP Report. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved May 8, 2007, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/207694.pdf>

⁴Amounts awarded and spent for FFY 2000 through FFY 2005 are as of May 17, 2007.



did not receive Title V funding in FFY 2003. At the federal level, after accounting for earmarked grants, only \$2 million remained for Title V grants program that year. OJJDP deemed this amount insufficient to distribute nationwide on a formula basis.⁵ Since FFY 2001, annual Title V funds awarded to the state have declined from a high of \$816,000 in FFY 2001 to \$56,250 in FFY 2006. The most significant drop occurred from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006. The FFY 2006 appropriation represents 19 percent of the FFY 2005 level.

Based on funds expended, ICJI appears to invest the majority of Title V funds received. Burn rates (the rate of overall expenditure) are over 90 percent for the first four awards listed in Table 1. During the FFY 2000-2005 period ICJI awarded \$2,390,323 in subgrants. With the decline in federal funding, the number of subgrants also has decreased from 13 in FFY 2000 and 2001 to five in FFY 2004 and 2005. The mean grant size has remained relatively stable at roughly \$60,000 per subgrantee over the five-year period with a slight dip in FFY 2002 when awards averaged roughly \$49,000.

Title V Case Study Profiles

The following analysis of subgrants covers those awarded in 2005 (October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006) and 2006 (October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007). The total number of Title V grants examined consists of all five grants awarded during the 2005 operating period and the continuing projects supported during the 2006 operating period.⁶ In 2005 and 2006, subgrants awarded totaled \$301,000 and \$304,000, respectively. The breakdown of grants is shown in Table 2. These five projects comprise the case study sample. Furthermore, all of the implementing agencies are operating Youth Services Bureaus.

The program assessments are based on a detailed examination of various data provided by ICJI in the form of award control spreadsheets that contained legal applicant and implementing agency names, project title, award amounts, county served, and grant number; original grant proposals; continuation applications; and all quarterly financial and progress reports submitted to ICJI by the grantees.⁷

⁵Title V Community Prevention Grants Program, 2003 Report to Congress. OJJDP Report. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved May 8, 2007, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/207694.pdf>

⁶Some of the subgrantees have received Title V and/or other federal funding via ICJI prior to 2005.

⁷ICJI provided award control information for FFY 2000 through 2005 on May 17, 2007, and the FFY 2006 federal allocation amount was supplied August 21, 2007. Quarterly progress and financial reports for each case were collected as of July 31, 2007. Information for each case does not reflect reports that were not in the files on that date, subsequent subgrantee report submissions, or grant amendments.

⁸The amount spent is as of May 17, 2007, per ICJI 2005 Title V Award Control Report

⁹This represents the percentage of federal funds spent by ICJI from FFY 2000 and 2004 and does not take into account the FFY 2005 and 2006 awards.

Table 1: Indiana Federal Title V Awards by Year and Spending Rates, Number of Subgrants Awarded, and Mean Grant Size, FFY 2000-2006

Year (FFY)	Amount Awarded	Amount Spent	Burn Rate	Number of Subgrants Awarded	Mean Grant Size
2000	\$794,000	\$745,080	93.8%	13	\$57,314
2001	\$816,000	\$807,105	98.9%	13	\$62,085
2002	\$579,000	\$537,139	92.8%	11	\$48,831
2003	0			0	
2004	\$301,000	\$301,000	100.0%	5	\$60,200
2005	\$304,000	\$239,967 ⁸	78.9%	5	\$60,800
2006	\$56,250				
Total	\$2,850,250	\$2,390,323	96.0% ⁹		

Source: ICJI Title V Award Control Reports provided to the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, May 17, 2007 (FFY 2006 federal award amount supplied June 26, 2007)



Table 2: Title V Subgrantees and Case Studies, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods

Subgrantee	Implementing Agency	Project Title	2005 Federal Award	2006 Federal Award	County Served
Allen Superior Court, Family Relations Division	YMCA of Greater Fort Wayne	Family Support Conferencing	\$76,946	\$79,946	Allen
Orange County Board of Commissioners	Hoosier Hills PACT	Behavior Monitoring & Reinforcement	\$57,819	\$57,819	Orange
Perry County	Lincoln Hills Development Corp	Early Risers' Skills for Success	\$51,500	\$51,500	Perry
Tippecanoe County Commissioners	Community & Family Resource Center	Healthy Children for Tippecanoe County	\$50,000	\$50,000	Tippecanoe
Wayne County Commissioners	Boys & Girls Club of Wayne County	Project Learn	\$64,735	\$64,735	Wayne

Several items that Title V applicants are required to complete are relevant to the analysis, including the following:

1. Conduct a data-driven community assessment, including identification and prioritization of risk and protective factors;
2. Select an evidenced-based program for implementation;
3. Identify an overall goal and project objectives;
4. Include outputs and short- and intermediate-term outcomes that are achieved during or by the end of the program and 6 months to 1 year after program completion;
5. Indicate, by selecting from a checklist, parties responsible for evaluating the project—either agency personnel, independent evaluators, or others;
6. Select method(s) of evaluation such as
 - a. Collection and analysis of statistical data
 - b. Obtaining feedback on immediate and longer-term impact from participants and/or professionals, agencies and coordination among providers
 - c. Other, e.g., surveys, school reports; and
7. Provide a plan for sustainability, specifically how funding to support the project will be secured post Title V. What follows is a presentation of each case study according to the following:
 1. Program description;
 2. Examination of the problem statement, goals, and objectives as suggested by the implementing agencies, along with a description of the project activities;
 3. List of proposed performance measures and a summary of progress reported by the program;
 4. Fiscal assessment of the two operating periods;
 5. Review of the second year (2006) grant application and program



reporting during the most recent period; and

6. Overall assessment of each project.

The overall assessment involved a simple qualitative rating scale of below average, average, and above average. An average program was considered to be one that completed the grant application correctly, attempted to establish that a problem existed in the problem statement, offered a detailed program description, identified a reasonable program goal,

objectives, and activities, submitted timely and accurate financial and progress reports, provided discussions of program activities in the progress reports, and appeared to have some positive impact on the problem the program attempted to address. Cases that did not meet this standard were called below average; those that exceeded it were considered above average. Using these criteria, four cases were considered average and one was found to be below average.



CASE STUDY ONE

*Subgrantee: Allen County Superior Court
Family Relations Division*

*Implementing Agency: Youth Services
Bureau, YMCA of Greater Fort Wayne*

*Project Title: Family Support
Conferencing*

Title V grants: 04-JP-001, \$115,419

*(federal award: \$76,946; local match:
\$38,473)*

*05-JP-001, \$119,919 (federal award:
\$79,946; local match: \$39,973)*

Program Description

According to the YMCA of Greater Fort Wayne Youth Services Bureau (FWYSB) branch website, since 1982, FWYSB has “worked with troubled youth—dealing with truancy issues, runaways and helped with transitioning youth back into the community after incarceration.”¹⁰ The proposed Family Support Conferencing (FSC) project is an existing program within FWYSB that serves Allen County and targets children and youth identified as Children in Need of Services (CHINS) cases court ordered by the Allen County Superior Court Family Relations Division (ACSCFRD) to participate in FSC. CHINS cases referred to FWYSB from the court involve dependency cases, truants, and runaways. According to the 2005 application, the goal of FSC is establishing support networks for children and youth through communication, appropriate boundary-establishment (rules and consequences), and encouraging parents to take an interest in children’s school success. Once a “plan of action” to achieve these goals is established with program participants, the court reviews and adopts the proposed plan as a court order.

The grant examined in this profile is a new project, yet Allen County has been supported by Title V grants in previous years. According to information provided

by ICJI in the form of award control reports (FFY 2000 through FFY 2005), Allen Superior Court has received Title V grants since FFY 2000, in the following amounts: \$60,000 was awarded in FFY 2000, \$68,620 in FFY 2001, and \$75,000 in FFY 2002.¹¹

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

To establish that a problem exists and in accordance with federal guidelines, ICJI’s Title V grant application requires that the subgrantee conduct a community assessment, identifying risk and protective factors as well as gaps in needed resources to which funds would be applied. The community assessment included the requisite list of baseline data, in tabular format, obtained from various sources¹² on the following risk factors: 1) family history of problem behavior; 2) child victimization and maltreatment; 3) negative attitudes toward school; 4) teen parenthood and sexual activity; and 5) early onset of alcohol and drug use. From this list of five broad issues, FWYSB selected family history of problem behavior, teen parenthood and sexual activity, and early onset of alcohol and drug use as project priorities.

While the provision of tabular baseline data on risk factors met the application requirements and may have demonstrated the problem, the lack of narrative and connection to how FSC could be applied to specific issues weakened the overall problem statement. Additionally, the proposal did not address two of the three priorities FWYSB selected from the list of risk factors—teen parenthood and sexual activity and early onset of alcohol and drug use. It is also noteworthy that while the proposal included a great deal of discussion and components regarding truancy and school

¹⁰Retrieved June 12, 2007, from YMCA/FWYSB website: <http://www.fwymca.org/default.asp?ID=12>

¹¹Indiana did not receive a Title V allocation in FFY 2003 and did not award Title V subgrants that year.

¹²Data were gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau, the Indiana Department of Education, an unsourced Allen county profile, and other survey data.



disciplinary issues, “negative attitudes toward school” was not selected as a risk factor priority. Furthermore, FWYSB’s assertion that early intervention [in the form of FSC] with youth experiencing truancy or school discipline problems is critical to preventing delinquency lacked specificity and supporting evidence.

With regard to existing “protective factors,” FWYSB provided a list and supplemental referral and resource directory including contact information for numerous community agencies that offer a range of youth-oriented services. While the application also included references to collaborative relationships, community-based approaches to delinquency prevention, training local youth serving agencies on “strength-based practices and positive youth development,” and noted that “various” county agencies were using FSC, neither the list nor narrative was accompanied by further detail or discussion specifying how FWYSB would collaborate and engage in outreach efforts with these entities beyond being able to make referrals. The required gap assessment of needed resources dealt primarily with the lack of available staff within the court to review and identify CHINS cases for referral to FSC. The subgrantee proposed that a portion of funds be applied to hire personnel to review case files and increase referrals from the court to FSC.

The overall goal of the project was to “reduce risk factors and increase protective factors through the use of FSC throughout the community in conjunction with other local service providers.” This goal is rather vague and does not necessarily point to a specific outcome. Additional language in the application pertained to the FSC model goal of strengthening the families of children and youth referred by the court and Allen County schools due to truancy

or behavioral problems, by involving the families in the decision-making process so that they developed their own “plan of action.”

The project objectives included in the original 2005 application were:

1. Within 12 months of the adjudication have an established permanency plan for youth, and
2. Of the youth served through FSC, repeat truancy will be reduced by 40 percent.

However, a supplemental document titled *Allen Superior Court Family Support Conferencing Logic Model* that appears to have been provided subsequent to the original application, included more specific objectives, as follows:

1. Increase number of CHINS cases referred for FSC by 20 percent over the 18 families previously served to a minimum of 23 families served;
2. Within 12 months of adjudication, have a permanency plan established for 95 percent (21) of referred families;
3. Increase safety and reduce number or incidences of neglect for children whose families develop plans through FSC;
4. Increase use of FSC from one school system to all four Allen County school systems;
5. Use FSC techniques for resolution of truancy issues for approximately 30 percent (120) of 400 youth annually referred to FWYSB;
6. Reduce incidence of truancy by 40 percent for youth participating in FSC; and
7. Increase GPA and social competencies for youth participating in FSC.

This is a more appropriate list of



project objectives. These are measurable and consistent with priorities laid out in the problem statement and project goals.

A description and details of proposed project activities for this profile were gleaned from various components of the subgrantee's application and ICJI file. Overall, FWYSB's implementation strategy appears to have involved the continuation of previous activities with language and justification for funding focused on expansion to serve a greater number of youth. The subgrantee also identified two evidence-based practices and printouts from web-based descriptions of identified programs—Indianapolis Restorative Justice Project and a Police Family Group Conferencing Project based in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania—that were included in the file. A discussion of how aspects of these programs would be incorporated or inform adaptation of the FSC model was not included. It seems to be based on a model restorative justice program that features family group conferencing.¹³ The model involves the implementation of a conference during which the juvenile offender (assumes an offense has been committed, which is somewhat contrary to the plan to apply this approach for CHINS cases) meets with his or her victim and the families/supporters of each. By the end of the conference, the entire group generates a plan to address harm that has occurred. It appears that FWYSB planned to follow this model somewhat loosely.

The required *Three-year Delinquency Prevention Plan* included reference to various supports/protective factors and early intervention that would ameliorate identified problems. The following were mentioned as part of the plan, but with limited detail on implementation: 1) building new and maintaining existing collaborative relationships ACSCFRD and community service providers

established over the past five years that have contributed to developing county delinquency prevention programs; 2) adoption of a community wide asset-based approach to delinquency prevention; 3) the court's leadership on training to local youth serving agencies on strength-based practices and positive youth development; and 4) various county agencies that use FSC. Other resources cited included a bulleted list of FSC features, such as "strength-based," "highly individualized," "responsive to the family voice," and "matches family needs to community-based services in a flexible manner," however with minimal detail offered as to how these aspects of the program translate into addressing systemic problems.

While the original application included two basic objectives, supplemental documents provided more detailed and measurable goals. Although the proposed and reported project activities seemed reasonable, concrete, and appropriate, additional information regarding specific implementation strategies would have enriched the proposal. According to the application and FWYSB's *Three-year Delinquency Prevention Plan*, FSC is an established program and in an expansion phase, however minimal information was offered regarding how proposed activities would translate into broadening community-based approaches to preventing juvenile delinquency through reducing risk factors and enhancing protective elements.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

As with program objectives, the subgrantee supplied additional documentation beyond the application that included specific outputs and

¹³This assumption is based on the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) researcher's knowledge of FSC.



outcomes. A number of these more comprehensive and measurable objectives also were reported on in quarterly progress reports submitted to ICJI. Table 3 presents metrics gathered from the application and supporting documents in the subgrantee file.

There are some concerns with this set of performance measures. In particular, there is a lack of clear underlying logic regarding the identification of short-term and intermediate-term outcomes. As part of the services that are provided by the project, the families are involved in the development of permanency plans, and as such, the number of permanency plans should be a short-term outcome. It is also curious that the number of youth exhibiting desired changes in targeted behaviors appears as both a short-term and an intermediate-term outcome. It should be one or the other (it makes more sense that this is an intermediate-term outcome).

With regard to an evaluation plan, the applicant notes that data would be

collected by all youth serving agencies involved, “in the format that services agency best” and that performance measures will be reviewed upon completion of grant period. The subgrantee indicated that agency personnel would evaluate the program and that effectiveness would be assessed by the following three selected options from the application: collection and analysis of statistical systems data; obtaining participant feedback; and obtaining feedback on longer term impact on delinquency. As with other components of the application/file content, proposed evaluation techniques were garnered from a number of documents, including the *Allen Superior Court’s and YMCA of Greater Fort Wayne Youth Services Bureau’s Plan for Measuring Outcomes and Output*. The following were identified as proposed evaluation methods:

1. The number of CHINS families referred to FSC from the court would be logged in a data system

Table 3: FWYSB/FSC Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Number of youth served		
Number of youth developing a permanency action plan through FSC	Number of family members matched with local service providers, who help meet the family’s individual needs and support the FSC process with regard to permanency	Number of permanency plans established
Number of youth developing an action plan for solving problems at school through FSC	Number of family members matched with local service providers, who help meet the family’s individual needs and support the FSC process with regard to problems at school	Number of FSC program youth exhibiting desired change in school attendance (fewer referrals, improved GPA, and increased social competencies)
	Number and percent of FSC program youth exhibiting desired change in targeted behaviors	Number of trancies after FSC program compared to number before program implementation



administered by ACSCFRD personnel, and families received by FWYSB, including the number of truancy, runaway, and school disciplinary cases referred, also would be entered in the same system.

2. Surveys would be provided to participants for feedback on satisfaction with the process and outcome of FSC.
3. Youth and families would be monitored for 12 months after completion of FSC, to observe if subsequent referrals to the Court or FWYSB for issues similar to those that initiated the FSC were made. Such monitoring would involve examining Division of Child Services, court, school, and FWYSB records. The subgrantee indicated that a written report of results would be submitted to ICJI. To date, there is no record or reference to such a report in either the 2005 or 2006 case file.

FWYSB submitted all four required quarterly progress reports. The subgrantee reported on four of the seven objectives listed above. FWYSB met or exceeded two proposed objectives by serving 30 families and reported a 50 percent reduction in truancy among participants. Additionally, FWYSB nearly met a third objective by employing FSC techniques to address truancy issues among 111 (28.5 percent, just shy of the target, 30 percent) of youth served. According to the subgrantee, the second objective was not measurable within the grant period, given that permanency hearings are set approximately 11 or more months from case initiation. Objectives included in the application documents that were not reported on via progress reports included 1) increasing safety and reducing number

and incidence of neglect for children whose families develop a plan through FSC, 2) increasing the FWYSB/FSC service area from one to four county-wide schools systems, and 3) improving the GPA/school performance and social competencies among participating youth. FWYSB proposed to report on the incidence of neglect and on the number of new referrals for truancy. However, quarterly progress reports did not include these measures. In addition, given that the subgrantee emphasized truancy rate reduction, inclusion of baseline data would have provided evidence of not only an existing problem, but the potential impact of FWYSB/FSC.

Fiscal Performance

Based on quarterly reports and as shown in Table 4, actual expenditures were consistent with the approved budget. All requisite financial reports were submitted in a timely and accurate manner. There were no amendments and all funds were expended as approved by ICJI. The subgrantee's sustainability plan included in the application is limited. FWYSB indicated that it would apply for foundation funding, and cited the possibility of securing support from a court-related project and that the local Division of Child Services provides funding and personnel resources. Further details regarding a timeline and specific action items were not provided.

Assessment of Second Year (2006) Grant

The 2006 application is identical to the previous year's proposal in terms of the problem statement, goals, objectives, proposed activities, and performance metrics. The only slightly altered objective involves increasing the number of youth



Table 4: FWYSB/FSC Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006				2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$53,117	\$29,108	\$29,108	100%	\$30,563	\$30,563
Contractual services	\$15,544	\$20,139	\$20,139	100%	\$20,096	\$20,096
Travel	\$9,039	\$9,039	\$9,039	100%	\$10,008	\$10,008
Equipment	\$3,850	\$2,710	\$2,710	100%	\$3,400	\$3,329
Operating	\$18,450	\$15,950	\$15,950	100%	\$15,950	\$15,950
Total Federal Award	\$100,000	\$76,946	\$76,946	100%	\$80,017	\$79,946
Local Match	\$56,696	\$38,473	\$38,473	100%	\$41,696	\$39,973
Total Project	\$156,696	\$115,419	\$115,419	100%	\$121,713	\$119,919

served using FSC techniques to address truancy, runaway, and/or school disciplinary issues from 120 in 2005 to between 140 and 160 in the 2006-2007 operating period. This is of particular interest, given that during the prior grant period this was the only one of four reported objectives not completely achieved. The 2006 proposal does not include reference to activities, outcomes, or overall performance under the previous grant. Nonetheless, the subgrantee received a slightly larger award for the second year of funding. As of July 31, 2007, the file contained one quarterly financial and two quarterly progress reports. It is difficult to gauge intermediate progress as narrative reports do not include cumulative program data. As of the second quarterly report, 49 percent of project funds had been expended.

Overall Program Assessment

Overall, FWYSB should be considered an average program. The initial proposal met

the technical requirements of the Title V Request for Proposals (RFP). The subgrantee provided objectives that for the most part were clearly defined with quantifiable measures supported by empirical data and which were also consistent with the priorities laid out in the problem statement and goals of the project. Some inconsistencies were noted in the information contained in the subgrantee file regarding the needs assessment, and program elements such as goals, objectives, and performance measures. The subgrantee submitted timely and accurate financial and progress reports that included fairly detailed accounts of program activities. Budgetary expenditures also were consistent with program activities approved for the project. It appears that the project accomplished broadly what was planned and achieved the majority of proposed outcomes.



CASE STUDY TWO

Subgrantee/Legal Applicant: Orange County Board of Commissioners/Prisoner and Community Together (PACT), Inc.

Implementing Agency: Hoosier Hills PACT, Inc./Orange County Youth Services Bureau

Project Title: School-based Behavior Monitoring and Reinforcement Program

Title V grants: 04-JP-002: \$86,729 (federal award: \$57,819; local match: \$28,910)

05-JP-002: \$86,729 (federal award: \$57,819; local match: \$28,910)

Program Description

Hoosier Hills PACT, Inc./Orange County Youth Services Bureau (Hoosier Hills YSB) proposed to implement a NIJ endorsed, evidenced-based program titled “Bry’s Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program” (BMRP). The program was described in the application as a “secondary school-based, preventative intervention program that aims to prevent juvenile delinquency, substance use, and school failure among high risk middle or junior high school students.” The program is a two-year intervention effort which begins with student selection in the seventh grade. Student participation is based on demonstrated family problems, low academic achievement, and frequent or serious discipline referrals. Key elements include monitoring student actions, rewarding appropriate behaviors, and increasing communication between teachers, students, and parents. The proposed geographic service area encompasses Orange County with implementation initiated in one school district with expansion to all three county school districts over the course of the three-year grant period. The subgrantee indicated that the BMRP would be integrated with

other evidence-based programs already operating in the community, stating that the new program would address at-risk youth with negative attitudes toward school and more specifically, would “strengthen and formalize student selection criteria, systemize coordination with teachers, organize data collections, and improve accountability.”

In 2001, with support from an ICJI/Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG), Hoosier Hills PACT and the Orange County Probation Department introduced a program to address truancy. This is the first Title V award that Hoosier Hills YSB has received. The subgrantee refers to loss of JABG funding and associated impact on its ability to continue providing services and expand programming.¹⁴ The agency received accreditation as a Youth Services Bureau in 2003 and has since expanded in-school prevention programming.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

The subgrantee provided a narrative overview of the community/county supported by requisite risk factor data supplied in tabular format. The community assessment discussion addressed demographic information, crime and education statistics, economic conditions, and overall family problems (such as child abuse and neglect cases, divorce, and child support rates). From the various risk factors reported on, Hoosier Hills YSB prioritized economic deprivation, negative attitudes toward school, and community crime. The subgrantee asserted that behavioral issues and truancy leave the county’s middle school-age youth at risk of academic failure and progressively more serious problems as they enter adulthood. County-level school data reflected an

¹⁴Given that past JABG award control reports provided to the Center by ICJI do not include implementing agency information, it is not possible to determine whether a 2006 JABG award to the Orange County Commissioners also supports Hoosier Hills YSB programs.



increase in suspensions and expulsions of 30 percent between 2000 and 2004, with suspensions for truancy more than doubling from 2002 and 2004.

Additionally, school dropouts also increased by 43 percent from 2002 to 2003. With regard to the required analysis of resource gaps, the subgrantee stressed that while several county-wide programs serve children from birth to age five, there are a limited number of local programs that target young adolescents. Furthermore, guidance counselors in each of the three county school districts are over-burdened and none of the schools has an official truancy officer and are thus limited in their ability to adequately service youth and families experiencing problems. In assessing the community's protective factors, the applicant cited an overall safe environment and referenced data that the majority of children are raised in family homes, with fewer than 20 percent living in single parent situations. The presence of caring and supportive adults and schools were also considered protective attributes. While these are drawn from OJJDP performance measure guidelines, it is difficult to cite empirical data that support the presence of "caring and supportive adults and schools."

The overall goal of the proposed program was "to decrease antisocial behavior and school failure among high risk adolescents in Orange County junior high schools." Given the community needs assessment provided in the proposal, this goal is reasonable. Within the first year of programming, Hoosier Hills YSB planned to serve 30-40 juveniles. Two project objectives were included in the proposal, as follows:

1. Decrease seventh grade school suspensions by ten percent in participating school system(s).

2. Decrease number of seventh grade students retained in seventh grade by ten percent in participating school system(s).

The program is designed to be school-based and to supplement other cognitive-behavioral programs already serving youth struggling behaviorally in the school setting. Students are selected during the fall semester and begin program in the spring. Youth participate in group activities on a regular basis, in addition to being involved in summer programs. Teacher conferences are also held. Supplemental activities are incorporated based on the needs of the youth.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

Hoosier Hills YSB indicated that agency personnel would evaluate program effectiveness via the collection and analysis of statistical systems data (e.g., arrest reports) and obtaining feedback on the immediate impact of the program from participants and longer-term impact on professionals, agencies, coordination among service providers/agencies. While a number of local sources were identified as unable to produce relevant data, the subgrantee planned to inform these entities of data needs and seek their participation and commitment prior to implementation, and specifically the program planning and evaluation phases of the project.

The applicant proposed three outputs and four outcomes, as listed in the Table 5. The outcome measures appear appropriate to the goals and objectives of the program and are congruent with OJJDP Title V performance measures regarding delinquency prevention and school programs specifically.¹⁵

¹⁵OJJDP Performance Measures for Title V. Retrieved August 20, 2007, from http://www.dsgonline.com/Program_Logic_Model/titlev_pm.htm



Table 5: Hoosier Hills YSB Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Title V funds awarded for services	Number and percent of program youth exhibiting desired change in antisocial behavior	Number and percent of youth exhibiting desired change in antisocial behavior
Number of program youth served	Number and percent of youth completing program requirements	Number and percent of program youth exhibiting desired change in school attendance
Use of best practice model	Number and percent of program youth satisfied with program	Number and percent of youth completing program requirements

Not all of the performance measures are appropriate as defined here. The output indicator “Title V funds awarded for services” is appropriate for aggregate reporting across several programs, but not for individual programs. There is also overlap in the short-term and intermediate-term outcomes. The outcome indicators should fit in just one category—either short-term or intermediate-term—and should be based on a logic model that clarifies the order of expected outcomes.

All requisite quarterly narrative reports were submitted for the 2005 operating period. However, the submissions frequently referenced and reported activities related to a program titled “LifeSkills Training” which was not mentioned in the original application. It is difficult to determine the total number of BMRP participants, given that cumulative data on youth served was not consistently provided. It appears as though 18 students were referred and enrolled. By the end of the first-year grant period, the subgrantee reported the following:

1. Eighteen students participated in the BMRP at the first school. Changes in school administration delayed identification of a second school system during the initial year.

2. Seventy-six percent (220) of students expressed satisfaction with program. (Given the large denominator, it is assumed that these are results of the already established LifeSkills program.)
3. Ninety-four (17) percent of BMRP participants completed the program without being involved in a physical altercation at school.
4. The reported number of out-of-school suspensions decreased by 36 percent between the spring of 2005 and 2006 and the number of students suspended declined by 44 percent from 16 to 9 over the same period. Ninety-four percent of BMRP participants completed the school year without expulsion and earned required points. (An explanation regarding “required points” was not provided.)
5. Forty-four percent of BMRP students exhibited improved attendance. Additionally, none were retained in seventh grade.

In terms of overall performance, program administrators do not include baseline data in quarterly progress reports that would improve their ability to assess impact.



Fiscal Performance

As shown in Table 6, actual expenditures were consistent with the proposed and approved budget. All required quarterly financial reports were submitted and all grant funds were expended. During the grant period, the subgrantee requested an amendment to the budget—to move \$80 from equipment to operating expenses—that was approved.

The subgrantee's proposed sustainability plan was primarily based on participating schools providing partial funding and applying for support from local foundations and county government. While there is reference to the loss of JABG funding and consequences in terms of diminished service provision, there is no mention of the reason(s) why ICJI did not renew the grant. Hoosier Hills YSB included a 2004-2005 financial statement that provided context for Title V funding. At the end of fiscal year 2004 (ending June 30), the organization's net assets totaled over \$1.9 million and expenses equaled roughly \$2.6 million, with support/revenue of \$2.8 million in 2004 and \$3.1 million in 2005. The majority of

the organizations' assets came from grants and contracts which totaled \$2.0 million and \$2.1 million in 2004 and 2005. The largest awards/contracts were with the Federal Bureau of Prisons (over \$900,000 in both 2004 and 2005), followed by the Indiana Department of Correction (roughly \$500,000 in 2004 and 2005). Through ICJI, the third largest funder, the subgrantee received additional grants totaling \$426,867 in 2005, and \$331,145 in 2004. As reported in the financial statement for 2005, ICJI grants break down as follows (individual grant amounts are included in brackets): VOCA (\$207,565), JABG (\$34,536), BYRNE (\$112,500), TITLE II (\$38,987), and STOP (\$33,279). Hoosier Hills YSB should be commended for including financial statements that identify other funding sources and which place the Title V grant in context. In light of identical award amounts for the second year and the number of programs initiated, a more detailed sustainability plan that outlines concrete steps would benefit the subgrantee in making progress toward securing alternate funding.

Table 6: Hoosier Hills YSB Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006					2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Amended	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$45,719	\$45,719	\$45,719	\$45,719	100%	\$45,719	\$45,719
Contractual services	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	100%	\$1,000	\$1,000
Travel	\$1,700	\$1,700	\$1,700	\$1,700	100%	\$1,000	\$1,000
Equipment	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$920	\$920	100%	\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$8,400	\$8,400	\$8,480	\$8,480	100%	\$10,100	\$10,100
Total Federal Award	\$57,819	\$57,819	\$57,819	\$57,819	100%	\$57,819	\$57,819
Local Match	\$28,910	\$28,910	\$28,910	\$28,910	100%	\$28,910	\$28,910
Total Project	\$86,729	\$86,729	\$86,729	\$86,729	100%	\$86,729	\$86,729



Assessment of Second Year (2006) Grant

While most of the proposal is identical to the first application, the subgrantee updated the narrative to include recent risk factor data and a summary of activities under the initial grant. Hoosier Hills YSB also revised the proposal to include a description of the “LifeSkills Training” program that was not addressed in the previous application, but which the subgrantee reported quarterly activity and outcomes for. This program features general social skills, self management, and drug resistance skills training. Hoosier Hills YSB has implemented programs in the second school and plans to initiate programming with the third county school district, serve at least 30 students through BMRP, provide LifeSkills training to at least 300 students during the academic year and at least 20 students during the summer. The proposed objectives are also slightly amended to reflect continued participation of identified students in the eighth grade as well as a decrease in seventh grade school suspensions by five rather than ten percent under the previous award. Proposed outputs and outcomes remain unchanged from 2005.

As of July 31, 2007, the first two quarterly progress reports were found in the subgrantee file. Preliminary data regarding the LifeSkills training at the second school reflect a decline in suspensions by 36 percent and repeat suspensions by 66 percent. In addition, as of the second quarterly progress report (March 31, 2007), none of the BMRP participants had been arrested, 97 percent were not suspended, and none were involved in a school fight. The subgrantee

also reports that funding has been secured for a “school suspension” program through the Indiana Youth Service Association.

The 2006 proposed total project budget is unchanged, as is the subgrantee’s sustainability plan. As shown in Table 6, Hoosier Hills YSB proposed a reduction in travel and equipment expenses and a slight increase in operating expenses. The second and third quarterly financial reports were found in the subgrantee file. As of July 31, 2007, 73 percent of the total grant had been expended.

Overall Program Assessment

Hoosier Hills YSB is considered an average program. With regard to the problem statement and required overall community and risk assessments, Hoosier Hills YSB should be commended for including comparisons to state-level and trend data. Evidence to support community protective factors tends to be more anecdotal in nature. The project goal and objectives are fairly broad and as such are appropriate to the proposed program(s). Quarterly progress and financial reports were submitted as required. With regard to overall performance and gauging program impact, the subgrantee did not consistently delineate between results of the proposed BRMP and existing LifeSkills program in the first year. Early progress reports for the 2006 grant reflect a positive impact among both program participants in terms of school behavior. However, the newly-funded suspension program may further complicate how Hoosier Hills YSB determines which initiative impacts suspension rates.



CASE STUDY THREE

*Subgrantee/Legal Applicant: Perry County
Implementing Agency: Lincoln Hills
Development Corporation/Youth
Services Bureau*

*Project Title: Early Risers’ Skills for
Success*

*Title V grants: 04-JP-003 \$77,287
(federal award: \$51,500; local match:
\$25,787)*

*05-JP-003 \$77,250 (federal award:
\$51,500; local match: \$25,750)*

Program Description

Lincoln Hills Development Corporation/YSB (Lincoln Hills YSB) selected and proposed *Early Risers’ Skills for Success* (ERSFS) as a program aimed at youth development and leadership skills training for at-risk youth. The selected program targets elementary school children, aged 6 to 10, at risk for early development of conduct problems—including displays of early aggressive, disruptive, nonconformist behavior—as well as substance use. According to the application,

the enhanced competence gained through the program leads to the development of positive self-image, independent decision-making, healthy problem-solving, assertive communication, and constructive coping. Once acquired, these attributes and skills collectively enable youth to resist personal and social forces that encourage early substance use and potential abuse and dependency.

The premise of the program is that early, comprehensive, and sustained intervention is necessary to target multiple risk and protective factors. ERSFS interventions include the following:

1. Parent education and skills training;
2. Proactive parent-school consultation;

3. Child social skills training and strategic peer involvement;
4. Reading and math instruction and education enrichment activities;
5. Family support, consultation, and brief interventions to cope with stress; and
6. Contingency management of aggressive, disruptive, and noncompliant behavior.

The proposed geographic service area was Perry County and its three school corporations—Tell City, Cannelton, and Perry Centera. According to award information provided by ICJI, this was the first Title V grant this subgrantee has been awarded.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

The application included a great deal of tabular data on a variety of problems and the associated narrative discussion focused primarily on a general population overview. The limited availability of local-level data for specific age groups, in particular young children was noted. Additionally, evidence to substantiate some of the risk factors cited was anecdotal. The subgrantee made references to alcohol and drug use at the elementary level, yet acknowledged the lack of data to support this assertion, as reflected by the following excerpt:

the group [PPB] concluded that Perry County has a very ‘tolerant’ view of using alcohol, a high rate of alcoholism and that many youth are trying alcohol at the elementary level and becoming fairly involved in drinking at the junior high level. However, we don’t have current data to prove it.

The applicant’s community



assessment also drew attention to the issue of migration within Perry County between school corporations. Lincoln Hills YSB asserted that as a result of frequent migration, services for children and their families are often fragmented and discontinued until an event brings attention to a child and/or family. The subgrantee also noted that the number of children home-schooled is of concern in particular when parents withdraw students rather than dealing with problems. The proposal did not include discussion of the magnitude of either problem. The applicant further asserted that the lack of county-wide resources at the school level to address these problems limits communication between schools.

Risk factors the subgrantee selected to prioritize included the following:

1. Negative attitudes toward school, specifically persistent and chronic absenteeism and discipline problems;
2. In all three school corporations, child migration from school corporation to school corporation within the county resulting in lost services and enhanced problems;
3. Family management problems including positive parenting skills and positive school involvement; and
4. Early onset of drug and alcohol use, based on juvenile self-report of regular usage.

The subgrantee's assessment of protective factors and community readiness highlighted the presence of caring teachers, high expectations of youth, and strong attachment to family. Other relevant aspects of the community cited by the applicant included programs with a history of serving at-risk youth along with services for the adolescent population, school systems, and the

religious community. Noted gaps in service included limited early preventative and comprehensive services to at-risk students and their families at the elementary level and programs that work specifically with at-risk students to address the issues of building healthy self-concept, positive social skills, developing feelings of connectedness to school and peers as well as support programming for parent of elementary at-risk students.

The stated overall goal of the project was to "provide early prevention for elementary students in order to build positive behaviors and appropriate interactions with schools and families" and "to connect children, parents, and schools." The project objectives included the following:

1. 50 percent of ERSFS parents will show improved participation with the school during the first year;
2. 50 percent of ERSFS students will show improved reading skills at the end of the first school year of participation; and
3. By the end of the first school year of participation, 50 percent of ERSFS students will show 50 percent improvement in social competency skills.

Given the identified community risk factors and the emphasis of the selected intervention program, the goals that are proposed are reasonable. Based on the identified goals, the objectives make sense and are logically consistent.

As described above, ERSFS is a program that targets the enhancement of parenting skills and the social and basic education skills of children. This program is unique among the Title V programs in that the target is elementary school children, which is appropriate for a delinquency prevention program. Lincoln



Hills YSB would serve as the implementing agency, including provision of services (e.g., parenting classes), planning and activity coordination, performing functions related to program evaluation (such as defining relevant data and collection mechanism), all required program reporting, and budgetary overview. A number of these activities seem appropriate and likely to have a positive impact on student participants. However, the relationship between activities and proposed objectives is at times unclear. A brief summary of how the ERSFS approach differs from previous programming would aid reviewers and administrators in assessing program utility and long-term impact. Substantive details regarding integration of ERSFS into existing programming as well as selection criteria for identification of at-risk students were also somewhat vague. The subgrantee proposed to initiate programming in identified schools by February 1, 2006.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The subgrantee indicated that ERSFS methods of performance measurement will be made available to the program to evaluate effectiveness and that the evaluation would be completed by Lincoln

Hills YSB personnel and the PPB committee—via obtaining feedback regarding immediate impact from participants, school report, surveys of teachers and parents, and other ERSFS evaluation tools. Program implementation would include establishing an evaluation methodology, specifically defining data to be collected, measurements, and methods for of data collection. The applicant proposed three outputs and six outcomes, as listed in the Table 7. The metrics appear appropriate to the goals and objectives of the program and are congruent with OJJDP Title V performance measures regarding delinquency prevention and school programs specifically.

Overall performance and impact are not easily ascertained, due mostly to the lack of baseline data. While it may be difficult to obtain such information on parental participation and specific social competency skills, it seems feasible to obtain students' baseline reading scores and some approximation of social competency, such as overall grade/school expulsion and suspension rates. At a minimum, once the program has been implemented, Lincoln Hills YSB should be able to report baseline data from the first and second years. In the absence of baseline measures, it is unclear why the

Table 7: Lincoln Hills YSB Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
90 percent of ERSFS parents attend a workshop on building cooperation	60 percent of ERSFS parents will say they want to improve their relationship with school personnel	50 percent of ERSFS parents will initiate contact with the school at least once by the end of the school year
100 percent of ERSFS students will receive individualized reading assistance	70 percent of students will agree that reading is fun	50 percent of students will show an improvement in grades
100 percent of ERSFS students will participate in social competency skills	60 percent of students will improve social competency skills	50 percent of students will have fewer reports of disruptive behavior



targets for the outcomes were set as they were. Is a 50 percent rate on the intermediate-term outcomes a successful outcome? Is there a connection between 70 percent of the youth noting that “reading is fun” and only 50 percent showing improvement in grades? Likewise, is it reasonable that 60 percent of the youth would improve in social competency skills, and then only 50 percent would have fewer reports of problematic behaviors?

All four requisite quarterly progress reports were submitted in a timely manner. The program proposed to serve 30 students in the first year. Across the narrative reports, program administrators provided detailed accounts of classroom activities, yet consistent and relevant reporting on proposed objectives, outputs, or outcomes was often not included. The subgrantee submitted information about parents participating in program activities, and initiating contact with school personnel, yet progress toward state objectives or outcomes could not be discerned from these reports. With regard to student activities and outcomes, Lincoln Hills YSB provided a great deal of information on the content of reading assistance students received, results of student surveys, apparent improvement in reading scores (without baseline data or explanation of the metric(s), however) improved social competency skills, and ostensible decline in disruptive behavior. The final quarterly progress report also included results of nine student assessments as reported by teachers, though without explanation of the measures used. As with parental involvement, it was difficult to ascertain progress toward proposed goals and impact with regard to students from the information provided.

The subgrantee’s quarterly reporting often does not include the cumulative number of students served (denominator) which makes it difficult to determine broader program impact. There is also inconsistent reporting by teachers and/or program administrators. The final 2005 quarterly progress report included academic and behavioral information on nine student participants. The subgrantee did not offer explanation regarding the list of measures which were not consistently reported for all participating students. Program administrators also reported reading scores for four students, however, these were also presented without explanation or previous data to assess progress.

Fiscal Performance

Based on documentation in the file and as shown in Table 8, Lincoln Hills YSB requested and received approval of a budget amendment to shift personnel funds to cover travel and operating expenses. The subgrantee misunderstood the start date of grant to be January 1, 2006, and had developed the original timeline and budget accordingly. In addition, after completing ERSFS training, program administrators reported greater understanding of the program and restructured the budget to reflect this. Actual expenditures were consistent with the approved and subsequently amended budget. All requisite financial reports were submitted in a timely and accurate manner.

The subgrantee’s sustainability plan included in the application was limited. The applicant indicated that the PPB would seek funding from participating schools, local community foundations, and that positive media coverage would lead to additional opportunities. Further



Table 8: Lincoln Hills YSB Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006					2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Amended	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$41,354	\$41,354	\$34,243	\$34,243	100%	\$41,228	\$41,228
Contractual services	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	100%	\$1,300	\$1,300
Travel	\$2,620	\$2,620	\$4,583	\$4,583	100%	\$4,100	\$4,100
Equipment	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0	N/A
Operating expenses	\$1,526	\$1,526	\$6,674	\$6,674	100%	\$4,872	\$4,872
Total Federal Award	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$51,500	100%	\$51,500	\$51,500
Local Match	\$25,787	\$25,787	\$25,787	\$25,788	100%	\$25,750	\$25,750
Total Project	\$77,287	\$77,287	\$77,287	\$77,288	100%	\$77,250	\$77,250

details regarding a timeline and specific action items were not provided.

Assessment of Second Year (2006) Grant

While most of the application is identical to the original, the subgrantee amended language of the overall goal to “provide early, long-term prevention services to elementary students and families who have been identified to be at-risk, and connect children, parents, schools, and community.”

Objectives also are reorganized into four. In addition to the first original objective regarding parents, the following are the other second year objectives:

1. Reinstate students who migrated (three families). Lincoln Hills YSB has proposed documentation re-establishing services to include number of home visits, referrals, and attendance review.
2. Students will attain one goal from their “mentoring plan,” which will result in improved social, emotional, or behavioral skills, or enhanced academic performance.

3. Students will “learn to identify uncomfortable feelings, learn self control, develop new skills to help them integrate successfully into their everyday life.” (Evaluation of this objective will consist of student interviews and associated outcome measures are based on students’ abilities to identify feelings.)

The remaining two objectives are consistent with the previous year. The revised project goals objectives for the second year of funding appear broader and the objective regarding identifying feelings may be difficult to measure from an empirically sound standpoint. It is difficult to determine whether the goals and objectives are drawn directly from the ERSFS program, without a more in-depth description of program and evaluation components and/or samples of survey materials.

The first two required quarterly progress and financial reports were found in the file as of July 31, 2007. The first report included a detailed account of program/staff member activities and preliminary outcomes which tend to lack



concrete, empirical data. For instance, a statement based on personal observation indicated that participating students have received “very few yellow or red behavior checks during this quarter.” Reporting on other factors is somewhat more concrete. All migrant students (three) have been reinstated in the program. There has been progress toward attaining goals identified as part of mentoring plans, with all students exhibiting the ability to identify feelings. Seventy-three percent of participant parents (11 of 16) have participated in school-sponsored events and 100 percent of parents indicate these were favorable experiences. As of the second quarterly financial report, 35 percent of all funds have been expended.

Overall Program Assessment

Lincoln Hills YSB should be considered an average program. The subgrantee’s problem statement provided a general

demographic overview and the requisite tabular risk factor data was comprehensive. However, the proposal referenced significant program implementation details—including identification of evaluation methodology, measurements, and means and responsibility for data collection—that would be identified after the grant was awarded. Quarterly reports, however, included a considerable level of detail and description of classroom/instructional activities. While concerns regarding information provided via quarterly reports are noted, on the whole, these submissions indicate the program was probably beneficial.



CASE STUDY FOUR

Subgrantee/Legal Applicant: Tippecanoe County Commissioners

Implementing Agency: Community & Family Resource Center

Project Title: Healthy Children for Tippecanoe County

Title V grants: 04-JP-005: \$75,000 (federal award: \$50,000; local match: \$25,000)

05-JP-005: \$76,736 (federal award: \$50,000; local match: \$26,736)

Program Description

Healthy Children for Tippecanoe County grew out of a comprehensive community assessment. The plan was to incorporate an evidence-based program to local families from the county. “Creating Lasting Family Connections” (CLFC) has been identified as an evidence-based

program by SAMHSA, DOE, and OJJDP/CSAP. This model program involves strategies for recruiting families into the program, educating parents about drug issues and family management, connecting families with treatment resources as needed, and building resistance skills for youths regarding drugs and peer pressures. The goal of the program is to “delay onset and reduce frequency of alcohol and drug use among participating youth.” The implementing agency is the Community & Family Resource Center (CFRC), a Youth Service Bureau based in Lafayette.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, Program Activities

As required by the Title V program, the recently established Tippecanoe County

Table 9: Priorities Identified in Tippecanoe County Risk Assessment

Risk Factor	Baseline Data
Availability of Alcohol and Drugs	Local data indicate that 50 percent of CHINS cases removed from parents involved drugs and alcohol. In addition, there has been a significant increase in meth labs seized in the county.
Community Crime	Local data showed a 40 percent increase in juvenile case filings in the , county compared with a statewide increase of 2.5 percent over the same period (2000-2004). There are also media reports of recent increases in violent crimes in the county.
Social and Physical Disorder	The Hispanic population in the county has tripled over a recent 10-year period and one-third of them do not speak English. Homelessness is on the rise in the county, and there is disproportionate minority contact with regard to African-American youths and the juvenile justice system.
Inadequate School Climate	A recent survey of students in this county found that 57 percent reported being afraid while at school. At a time when suspensions across the state were on the decline, there was a nearly 30 percent increase in this county.
Family Management Problems	The number of children signing up for Hoosier Healthwise in this county has recently outpaced the state. There has been a significant increase in the monthly waiting list for child care vouchers in the county.
Child Victimization and Maltreatment	“Startling” increases in the county’s substantiated child neglect cases, post-ing year-to-year increases in excess of 20 percent in three consecutive years.
Family Conflict	The number of children being served in women’s shelters in this county has recently been increasing, and there was a 240 percent increase in the number of youths removed from their homes as CHINS.
Early Onset of Alcohol or Drug Use	With perhaps the least convincing data among the risk factors, it was reported that 30 percent of students in the county surveyed in 2001 reported that they drank alcohol within the previous 30 days.



Prevention Policy Board provided leadership for the Community Resource Assessment Inventory. Results of this assessment are summarized in the program priorities in Table 9.

A comprehensive assessment of risk factors in Tippecanoe County was achieved. They took the risk and protective factors and plugged them into a database of model programs and found that the “Creating Lasting Family Connections” matched 93 percent of the risk and protective factors. This was the best fit based on the criteria and was selected for implementation on this basis. Without access to the database and just by considering the eight risk factors found to be the biggest priorities by their community-wide assessment, it is not obvious that the selected program is designed to address the majority of the eight risk factors identified in Table 9.

It is also not obvious that the overall goal of the project would be “to reduce alcohol, tobacco, and other drug (ATOD) use and related problems among adolescents.” In considering the list of prioritized risk factors, it is unclear why the key outcome of a three-year delinquency prevention project would be to reduce substance use among young people. This goal is only somewhat consistent with the problem statement in the proposal. There are three objectives identified:

1. By the end of the grant period, 90 percent of youthful participants will not use substances during the 90 days following program completion;
2. By the end of the grant period 90 percent of parents will report increased bonding with their youth; and
3. By the end of the grant period 90 percent of parents will report

increased positive consequences for youth following important family rules and negative consequences for breaking important family rules.

These objectives are somewhat consistent with the project goal. The first objective is directly related to the overall goal and is straightforward. The other two objectives relate specifically to family management and relationships, with no explicit connection made to the prevention of substance use and abuse.

It should be noted that there is no discussion in the proposal for this project about the nature of “Creating Lasting Family Connections.” This is odd in that it is not a universally-known intervention model. To understand the program researchers searched the internet. Given what was learned about the model, it is possible to predict that the programming will have a good chance of contributing to the goals and objectives as defined in the proposal.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The program administrators have proposed three outputs and five outcomes as performance measures for their project (Table 10). These performance measures are adapted from the approved list developed by OJJDP. The output measures selected by this project are consistent with the problem statement and the stated goals and objectives of the project. Similarly, the outcome measures selected are consistent with the goals and objectives of the project.

There are some questions that are raised by these performance measures. First, it is noted that a relatively small number of clients is being targeted here for programming. It is not obvious that this is a labor-intensive or therapy-heavy



Table 10: CFRC Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
37 parents will participate in the parenting components of CLFC	30 parents will successfully complete the program	8 families will report improved bonding with one another
15 youth will participate in the youth component of CLFC	10 youth will successfully complete the program	13 youth will report decreased attitudes favorable to ATOD use
10 families will complete the parent-youth communications training	8 families will report improved bonding with one another	

approach. This appears to be a relatively expensive model for a delinquency prevention intervention.

Second, it is also curious that the target number of clients will be 15 youth, 10 families (shouldn't every youth be served along with his/her family?), and 37 parents. Many of the youth will only have one parent taking part in the program, so it is unclear how there will be 37 parents and only 15 youth. It should be noted that "8 families will report improved bonding with one another" is listed both as a short-term outcome and an intermediate outcome. That does not make sense in the absence of an explanation from the program administrators. Finally, it is curious that of 15 youth taking part in the program, only 10 are expected to complete the program successfully, yet 13 are expected to report decreases in attitudes favorable to ATOD.

The program administrators are asked to indicate whether they would evaluate the effectiveness of the program in any of four proposed ways. They indicate they will collect and analyze statistical systems data (e.g., arrest reports), will obtain feedback on immediate impact before participants leave the site of the service, and will obtain feedback on longer-term impact on delinquency. It is noted that the plan is to engage an independent evaluator.

Four quarterly progress reports for the first year of this project were found in the file for this grant. Through the end of the third quarter, it was noted that the program had yet to begin serving clients. The program hired the treatment staff in the third quarter and they began the training process with the developers of the curriculum. The first class for youth participants was set to begin in October 2006, after the close of the first year of the grant.

Fiscal Performance

Healthy Children for Tippecanoe County was funded for three years at the annual level of \$50,000 in federal funds and \$25,000 in local matching funds. Table 11 provides an overview of the budget.

In their proposal for the first year of the three-year grant, it was indicated that with the development of the Prevention Policy Board, the county was expecting to be able to leverage other funding streams. At the end of the first year, the program had yet to begin serving clients and had not expended 100 percent of their grant funds. In their final quarterly financial report, it was noted that there was a variance of \$9,971.78 from their original budget in unexpended funds. It appears from the documents in the file that the program was able to get permission from ICJI to expend the federal funds first, so



Table 11: Tippecanoe County Commissioners *Healthy Children for Tippecanoe County* Program Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006					2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Amended	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$52,125	\$52,125	\$35,179	\$26,854	76%	\$61,736	\$61,736
Contractual services	\$16,250	\$16,250	\$24,517	\$24,517	100%	\$15,000	\$15,000
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$6,625	\$6,625	\$15,304	\$13,657	89%	\$0	\$0
Total Federal Award	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,650	101%	\$50,000	\$50,000
Local Match	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$14,378	58%	\$26,736	\$26,736
Total Project	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$65,028	87%	\$76,736	\$76,736

that the balance of the unexpended funds would be from the match funds.

Assessment of Second Year (2006) Grant

The proposal for the second year grant was largely the same proposal from the previous year, with the exception that they proposed to serve 30 youth for the year. This was compared with the intention to serve 15 in the first year of the project. The performance measures were not revised in the second year, despite the increased target for number of clients. As of July 31, 2007, the program had submitted two quarterly financial reports (for the first and third quarters) and two quarterly progress reports (for the second and third quarters). Through the end of the third quarter, the project had expended 35 percent of the budgeted funds in personnel, and none of the budgeted funds in contractual services. In terms of progress, it was noted through the end of the third quarter that 15 youth had participated in the program, with 11

successfully completing it. No information was provided on whether family members were involved in the programming.

Overall Program Assessment

CFRC's Healthy Children for Tippecanoe County should be considered a below average program. The evidence presented to make the case for the needs in the community was thorough. The community assessment and discussion of the problem was nicely done, although it did not lead to a set of goals, objectives, and performance measures that were consistent with the needs assessment. There was no detailed description of the program that is to be implemented. The program had just begun to provide services in the final part of the first year, and so had not expended the funds awarded. Considering all of this, there is no sense at this time as to whether the implemented program will impact the identified problems in the community.



CASE STUDY FIVE

Subgrantee/Legal Applicant: Wayne County Commissioners

Implementing Agency: Boys and Girls Clubs of Wayne County

Project Title: Project Learn

Title V grants: 04-JP-005: \$ 103,145 (federal award: \$64,735; local match: \$38,410)

05-JP-005: \$97,103 (federal award: \$64,735; local match: \$32,368)

Program Description

Project Learn is a combined approach to positive youth development and delinquency prevention. It is among the portfolio of programs promoted by the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. Implemented by the Boys and Girls Clubs of Wayne County (BGCWC), the programming is designed to use out-of-school activities to facilitate “character and leadership development and education and career development.” There are five components to the model, including an alternative to suspension program, alcohol and substance abuse prevention programming, homework and

tutoring assistance, training in computer skills, and access to the public library. The program was designed to serve more than 400 youths from Wayne County.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, Program Activities

As required by the Title V program, the recently established Wayne County Prevention Policy Board provided leadership for the Community Resource Assessment Inventory. Results of this assessment are summarized in the table of program priorities rated urgent (Table 12).

A comprehensive assessment of risk factors in Wayne County was achieved using data from the Uniform Crime Reports, the Indiana Department of Education, the Kids Count Database, the Indiana Prevention Resource Center, and Wayne County Officials. Data were collected on 19 of the 24 risk factors on the master list published by OJJDP, with five being classified as urgent priorities.

As part of their Implementation Strategy from the proposal for the Title V grant, they proposed one set of goals and

Table 12: Priorities Identified in Wayne County Risk Assessment

Risk Factor	Baseline Data
Academic Failure	Local results from the ISTEP tests for 3rd, 6th, 8th, and 10th graders were compared to state averages and found to consistently be below average.
Negative Attitude toward School	Local data showed that the number of suspensions and expulsions due to weapons and/or drugs were more than would be expected based on statewide data. In addition, attendance rates for Wayne County schools are below the state averages.
School Dropout	When compared to state rates, the local dropout rates and the percent of freshmen graduating high school in 4 years are below average.
Teen Pregnancy and Sexual Activity	The teen birthrate and the percentage of babies born to mothers under 20 without a high school diploma for Wayne County are found to have “far surpassed the percent expected” based on statewide trends and population data. This has apparently been a long-term problem in the county.
Early onset of Alcohol or Drug Abuse	When 12th graders in Wayne County were asked about their use of marijuana and alcohol, it was determined that the prevalence of marijuana use was higher than the state average and that the underage use of alcohol was deemed to be a “serious problem.”



objectives. Then in the next section of the proposal, they laid out a different goal and set of objectives. As the second set is the one that they reported on during the grant period, it is presented here. The stated goal of the project is to “prevent juvenile delinquency through educational enhancement opportunities.” Based on the problem statement, the focus on educational enhancement fits. There are three objectives identified:

1. Increase organizational capacity;
2. Increase educational enhancement opportunities; and
3. Increase life skills training through alcohol, tobacco, and other drug (ATOD) and pregnancy prevention programming.

These objectives are somewhat consistent with the project goal. The first objective is hardly “specific” and does not suggest how it might be measured to assess whether the program met the objective. The other two objectives speak to the delivery of services, but do not provide any sense of the types of outcomes that might be tracked to assess the effectiveness of the program.

Programs funded under Title V must implement programming that has been identified as evidenced-based. It is noted in the proposal that the Title V Model Programs Guide and Database identifies the Boys and Girls Clubs as a model program. In addition, the authors of the proposal indicate that the NIJ list of What Works include the Boys and Girls Clubs. One of the most widely used programs by the Boys and Girls Clubs across the country includes the program Power Hour. This is one of the five components selected for inclusion in Project Learn. The full array of programming includes the following elements: Positive Alternatives,

a suspension alternatives program that requires the youths to go to the Boys and Girls Clubs when they are on suspension, during which time they will complete homework, participate in conflict resolution, and take part in community service; Smart Moves, a six-week curriculum to address alcohol and substance abuse prevention; Power Hour is designed to assist the youths with homework and tutoring; Computer and Technology Club builds skills in using computers for research and writing; and Youth Library, a special branch of the public library devoted to serving youths. The Boys and Girls Club of Wayne County also intends to provide programming throughout the summer months, to minimize the loss of momentum for the youths in their educational development.

These program elements appear to be directed at the risk factors that have been classified with urgent priority for this community, although it is not explicit that the programming here is designed to address attendance issues and there is no real sense that this combination of programming will address the issue of prevention of teenage pregnancy. Given the content of the programming, Project Learn seems to have a good chance of making an impact on the academic success of the youths, and as a result is likely to also have an impact on the dropout rate. It is possible, if the youths are experiencing educational success, they are going to be less likely to be truant from school or to risk suspension/expulsion by bringing drugs or weapons to school. There is not enough information to know whether Smart Moves will have the desired effect on alcohol and drug use. Many such ATOD prevention programs have been shown to have little impact on the future



drug/alcohol use behaviors of the participating youths.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

The program administrators have proposed two outputs and four outcomes for their project (Table 13). These performance measures are adapted from the approved list developed by OJJDP. The output measures selected by this project are consistent with the problem statement and the stated goals and objectives of the project. Similarly, the outcome measures selected are consistent with the goals and objectives of the project.

The authors indicate they will collect and analyze statistical systems data (e.g., arrest reports), will obtain feedback on immediate impact before participants leave the site of the service, and will obtain feedback on longer-term impact on delinquency.

Four quarterly progress reports for the first year of this project were found in the file for this grant. In general, while the program was technically in compliance for submitting the reports, the progress reports themselves are not very specific in providing information about the specific performance of the program. This appears to be a function of a number of factors.

First, the proposal for the project set three objectives that do not lend themselves to measurable performance indicators. ICJI did not require any changes to the objectives and so the quarterly reports were constrained by the original objectives. Second, the program administrators completing the report did not go beyond a very superficial discussion of progress and the project activities and there was not much difference in the narrative text from report to report. There was no sense of the cumulative nature of the population served from quarter to quarter. No effort was made to clarify where there was overlap in the counts between the quarters, so it is not possible to make any conclusions about the total numbers of youths served for the year.

That said, the program secured an external evaluation for the first year of the program. In general this evaluation, conducted by a Ph.D. (affiliation unknown), was very good. It was thorough and appropriately frank and critical in terms of the shortcomings of the program. The report was clear in identifying the areas in which there were no provisions made to measure the proposed outcomes. The report was also solid in terms of how measures were adapted to address the proposed short-

Table 13: BGCWC Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Title V funds allocated	80 percent completion rate completing program requirements	80 percent of those completing program will show improved results in school in next round of standardized testing.
Number of youth served by the program	80 percent of program youth will show measurable improvement in academic or life skills pre/post testing	80 percent of those completing the program will retain improved life skills abilities (drug/alcohol free, not pregnant, etc.)



term and intermediate-term outcomes. The evaluator clearly understands what she is doing and if the program were to bring her back at the end of the second and third years of the project and implement her recommendations, this has the potential for a high-quality program evaluation. One concern noted is the inability of the evaluator to determine the degree of overlap in the youths served by the five different components of the Project Learn model. It was noted that 995 youths were served by at least one of the different components, although there is every reason to believe that many youths participated in more than one component. Despite the limitations the evaluator faced, she was able to determine:

1. The program expected that 80 percent of the youths would complete the program requirements across the different programs, yet in three of the five components, there was not sufficient data on participation to assess this standard—it is critical that the program develop better performance measurement systems to capture this information more effectively;

2. Targets were met in terms of the number of youths with subsequent suspensions, attendance rates, and computer skill attainment; and
3. No data were available to assess the intermediate-term outcomes at this time.

Fiscal Performance

Project Learn was funded for three years at the annual level of \$64,735 in federal funds and \$38,410 in local matching funds. The matching funds were actually a combination of cash and in-kind. The program did a great job of sticking to their budget during the first year. Table 14 provides an overview of the budget.

In their proposal for the first year of the three-year grant, it was indicated that with the development of the Prevention Policy Board, the county was expecting to be able to leverage other funding streams. They anticipated that the capacity to be able to provide “a common, goal-oriented approach to dealing with comprehensive youth development issues” would be attractive to a number of private and public funders. Otherwise, the program

Table 14: Wayne County Commissioners *Project Learn* Program Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006				2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$52,620	\$52,620	\$52,620	100%	\$52,970	\$52,970
Contractual services	\$9,500	\$9,500	\$9,500	100%	\$5,500	\$5,500
Travel	\$935	\$935	\$935	100%	\$2,317	\$2,317
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Operating	\$1,680	\$1,680	\$1,680	100%	\$3,948	\$3,948
Total Federal Award	\$64,735	\$64,735	\$64,735	100%	\$64,735	\$64,735
Local Match	\$38,410	\$38,410	\$38,410	100%	\$38,410	\$32,368
Total Project	\$103,145	\$103,145	\$103,145	100%	\$103,145	\$97,103



administrators did not provide a detailed sustainability plan.

Assessment of Second Year (2006) Grant

The proposal for the second year grant was largely the same proposal from the previous year. It appears that ICJI directed the program to propose an exact 50 percent match in their budget. In the proposal, the program budgeted \$38,410 in matching funds. That was later changed in the award documents to \$32,367.50.

As of July 31, 2007, the program was up-to-date with their quarterly financial and progress reports. With three quarterly progress reports submitted, the main content in the progress section of the report has consistently been “progress will be evaluated in Year II Assessment Report—anticipated report date completion is September 2007.” Through the end of the third quarter, the project had expended 55 percent of the budgeted funds in personnel, 45 percent of the budgeted funds in contractual services, 30 percent of the budgeted funds in travel,

and 75 percent of the budgeted funds in operating expenses.

Overall Program Assessment

BGCWC’s Project Learn should be considered an average program. The proposal for this project provides a thoughtful community assessment and a reasonable plan to address the identified priorities. There is clear evidence of the problems in their community. This was well documented in the proposal. On the other hand, the program description was not very detailed and the reader is left with many questions about the nature of the programming they intended to implement. In addition, the objectives were not specific enough and were not expressed in measurable terms. The proposal lacked a thoughtful sustainability plan. Quarterly fiscal and progress reports were turned in as required. While the quarterly progress reports were lacking in some respects, the program did secure an external evaluation that filled in many of the gaps in information left by the quarterly progress reports.



CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report provides a review of Title V grants awarded in 2005 for a three-year period. Title V provides funding to communities for delinquency prevention projects exclusively. For this review, we provide an assessment of all five programs that were funded during the observation period.

It should first be noted that the structure of the Title V grant application is the strongest among the four Youth Division programs. To be able to successfully complete an application, the applicants must provide a descriptive overview of their “community” in which the community boundaries are clearly identified. Applicants must also provide evidence on the creation of a Prevention Policy Board, identify the membership of that board, and provide detail as to the proposed role of the board. Title V grant application requires that the subgrantee conduct a community assessment, identifying risk and protective factors as well as gaps in needed resources to which funds would be applied. The applicant must then select an existing evidence-based approach that is a good fit for the needs of their community.

While we did not have access to applications that were not funded, we can say that the five successful applications provided evidence of a comprehensive community assessment process. The planning that went into the development of these proposals is impressive. The community collaboration that was necessary to apply for a relatively small amount of funding—programs were awarded between \$50,000 and \$80,000—will no doubt lay the foundation for better community-wide programming and cooperation. The process of putting together these applications must be a very helpful process for the implementing

agency and the community advisors.

Five case studies were rated on five different dimensions for this review. First, they were assessed in terms of the goals and objectives of the project. Application instructions clearly request that one project goal be identified and that the goal be a key outcome of the proposed project. In general, the five applicants did a reasonable job of identifying the project goal, and the goals were generally tied to the expected outcomes of the projects. The objectives of the projects were supposed to lay out the outcomes in measurable terms such as how much and by when. Most of the projects struggled to meet this standard.

A second dimension on which the proposals were rated had to do with a fiscal analysis of the project. We looked at whether the grant funds were fully expended, whether the budget was followed, and whether the program showed intention of sustainability beyond the Title V funding. In general, the projects did reasonable well in this category. Where there were requests to modify the budgets, the amounts (and percentage of total budget) that were involved were relatively small. The third dimension of the review considered whether the program administrators submitted reports as required by ICJI. Across the board, we found that the programs had submitted all of the quarterly and fiscal reports as required. There was some evidence that the reports were not all submitted on time, but there were no patterns of tardiness found. For the current year, most of the programs were up-to-date on their reporting requirements.

The fourth dimension that was examined as part of this review focused on whether the programs reported on



outcomes. In most of the cases examined here, the programs reported primarily on their activities, with some attention to outcomes. There were some examples of original documents submitted that went above and beyond the requirements of ICJI. This is still an area where it would make sense for some training to be provided to all grantees so that they can all excel in tracking and reporting on outcomes. Finally, all of the cases were assessed based on the application and initial program reports for the 2006 grants. Given the nature of the Title V funding in three-year projects, it makes sense that the project proposals would not change much from year to year. It would have made sense to see the agencies speak to challenges from year one and what they plan to do to get back on track or the changes they want to make to their project design. We did not find much attention to the differences from year one in the 2006 proposals. This is something that should be built into the application guidelines.

We conclude this report with the following recommendations:

1. The structure of the grant application does not query the applicant to provide detailed information on the content of the proposed model programs they intend to adopt. As such, it is difficult to determine what the exact nature of the intervention strategy is going to be. As there is a great deal of assessment and planning that goes into the identification of the key community risk factors, there should be more information requested about the selected intervention strategy to allow for a determination as to the fit of the model to the needs of the community.
2. A lot of thought and planning goes into the selection of a model program to address the needs in that community. Yet, once the program is identified, there is little attention to the way in which the program is implemented and whether the results in the project site are in line with what is expected with an evidence-based program. The sites could really benefit if ICJI provided leadership to assist them in assessing the implementation to preserve program fidelity. Careful monitoring of program outcomes will also be important to ensuring that the implementing agency is on track to meet their objectives.
3. With a three-year project such as this, the application process should reflect the evolution of the program, so that in year 2 and year 3, the application should ask for reflection on the progress to date and provide opportunities for the grantee to make changes to their initial plans. The proposal should be restructured to request this information.
4. Programs are asked to identify goals, objectives, and performance measures (outputs and outcomes) as part of their application for funding. In many cases the goals and objectives do not meet the standards set out in the instructions for the Title V applications. After the grant is awarded, there is no attention to the quality of the goals and objectives. Progress reports are submitted by the programs, and there appears to be little oversight over the quality of data that is reported. It is important that the funding be contingent on some level of proficiency in this area. ICJI can work with grantees to revise and improve the goals, objectives, and performance measures as a condition



of funding. Technical assistance should be provided to the grantees to develop the capacity for performance measurement and evaluation. In particular, grantees should receive training in the development and measurement of appropriate outputs and outcomes for their programs. OJJDP provides suggested performance measures that should be customized for the individual programs—that is not currently happening across all the different programs, but could if more directed attention were paid to this issue at the beginning of the grants. Effective reporting of appropriate measures will benefit the state in being able to show the impact of the money they are distributing to programs through grants.

5. It is unclear how much weight is assigned to the proposed budget in making funding decisions, yet it would be in the best interest of both

the grantees and ICJI to gather more information to allow for more thoughtful consideration during the grant review process. Within the application, applicants should be asked to provide detail on the overall budget for their programs, other sources of funding, and how the proposed Title V funds fit into the larger picture. Applicants should be invited to explain how Title V funds are going to contribute to the development and facilitation of more effective programming, and it should be clear that when Title V funds are no longer available, that there is a plan to sustain the programming. Continuation projects should also be asked to provide details about their fiscal performance on earlier Title V grants, so that this information can be more deliberately considered in subsequent funding decisions by ICJI.