



Analysis of the U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program Administered by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, 2005 and 2006 Grant Awards

**Prepared for the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
© 2008 Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (08-C21)
School of Public and Environmental 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
Juvenile Accountability Block Grants	
Program Description and	
ICJI Grant History	4
JABG Funding History	5
JABG Case Study Profiles	11
Case Study One (Allen County)	13
Case Study Two (Hamilton County) ..	17
Case Study Three (Lake County)	21
Case Study Four (La Porte County) ..	26
Case Study Five (Marion County)	31
Case Study Six (Monroe County)	40
Conclusions and Recommendations ..	45
Appendix A: Juvenile Accountability	
Block Grant Purpose Areas	49

List of Tables

Table 1: Indiana Federal JABG Awards FFY 1998-2006 and Spending Rates, FFY 1998-2003	5
Table 2: Indiana Counties/Cities Eligible for Direct JABG Allocation, Allocation Amounts, and Whether Entity Applied for Funding, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods.....	6
Table 3: JABG Awards to Subgrantees by Purpose Area, 2005 and 2006	7
Table 4: FFY 2004 JABG Awards, 2005 Operating Period	8
Table 5: FFY 2005 JABG Awards, 2006 Operating Period.....	9-10
Table 6: JABG Case Studies, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods.....	11
Table 7: ACSCFRD Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period..	14
Table 8: ACSCFRD Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	15
Table 9: ACSCFRD Proposed Performance Measures, 2006 Operating Period..	16
Table 10: LEAPP Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period..	18
Table 11: LEAPP Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	19
Table 12: JABG Enhancement Program Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period.....	22

Authors

G. Roger Jarjoura

Associate Professor,
School of Public and
Environmental Affairs

Rachel E. Thelin

Senior Policy Analyst,
Center for Urban Policy
and the Environment

Table 13: JABG Enhancement Program Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	23
Table 14: JABG Enhancement Program Proposed Performance Measures, 2006 Operating Period.....	24
Table 15: JABG Enhancement Program Reported Performance Measures, 2006 Operating Period.....	25
Table 16: CJAP Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period..	27
Table 17: CJAP Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	28
Table 18: Marion County JABG Round VII Programs, Proposed Goals, Objectives, Output Indicators, Short- and Intermediate-term Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period	34-35
Table 19: Marion County JABG Projects Round VII Budget Overview, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods.....	36
Table 20: Marion County JABG Round VIII Programs, Proposed Goals, Objectives, Output Indicators, Short- and Intermediate-term Outcomes, 2006 Operating Period.....	38
Table 21: SHOCAP Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period..	41
Table 22: SHOCAP Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods	42
Table 23: SHOCAP Proposed Performance Measures, 2006 Operating Period..	43





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From federal fiscal year (FFY) 1998 through FFY 2006, Indiana received over \$28 million in Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) awards, allocated by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) is responsible for administering the state's JABG program. JABG funding supports states and communities address the problem of juvenile crime and strengthen juvenile justice systems. The program's overall goal is to reduce juvenile offending through accountability-based approaches focused on both offenders and state and local juvenile justice systems.

OJJDP awards block grants to states, which in turn distribute funds to local jurisdictions. Each state is required to subgrant at least 75 percent of the state's allocation to eligible units of local government. Allocation of funds to local agencies is based on a formula that takes into account local law enforcement expenditures and the level of violent crime. To assist JABG grantees to document and assess the effectiveness of their activities, OJJDP has developed a system of outcome-based performance measures appropriate for all JABG-supported activities.

States have up to three years to spend federal JABG awards and subgrants are awarded on a one year basis. The largest award to Indiana was nearly \$4.8 million in federal fiscal year (FFY) 1998 and the smallest was \$838,000 in FFY 2006. On average, between FFY 1998 and 2006, ICJI received roughly \$3.2 million annually. Based on funds expended, ICJI has invested the majority of JABG funds received. ICJI spent nearly 90 percent of awarded funds between FFY 1998 and 2004.

According to JABG control reports provided by ICJI, for the 2005 and 2006 operating periods (October 1 through September 30), \$438,906 was awarded to 11 subgrantees in 2005 and 34 subgrants that total \$816,994 were awarded in 2006. The total number of JABG subgrants examined in detail for this report consists of six grants awarded during the 2005 operating period and the six continuation projects supported during the 2006 operating period. These six 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 JABG subgrantees in 2005 and 2006 to ICJI.

In evaluating the six 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 rated below average; those that exceeded it were considered above average. Using these criteria, two of the



cases were classified as average programs and four of the cases were classified as below average programs.

Analysis of the six case studies resulted in a number of key observations and recommendations that could improve overall JABG program administration. These recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. Grantors should base continuation funding awards on track records. There should be evidence that the programs did what they planned to do, achieved the outcomes they proposed, and spent the money they were awarded. Yet there does not appear to be a connection between the performance of the grantee in one year and their success in securing additional funding in subsequent years. ICJI should explore ways to inform the grant selection process so that these issues are considered.
2. ICJI is encouraged to take a more directive role in the funding process. For instance, even in the direct appropriation counties, it should be possible to set guidelines on the kinds of projects that can be funded with JABG funds—ICJI may even set priorities for the kinds of programming they are looking to see implemented in those jurisdictions. In addition, it is important to ensure that the process is open and inviting to new projects in jurisdictions that have not historically received JABG funding.
3. 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 attention was directed 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.
4. ICJI is encouraged to revise the new progress report forms to provide careful instructions and to allow for qualitative information on the operation of the project and clarification as to the results provided.
5. The programs need technical assistance through the year to ensure that they are capturing information pertinent to their goals and objectives for reporting to ICJI at the end of each quarter.
6. As ICJI revises the grant application process, they are encouraged to schedule submission dates that would allow for funding decisions to be made and notice given to the programs in enough time to allow the projects to begin on the first day of funding.
7. In light of relatively low JABG burn rates, ICJI is encouraged to consider efforts aimed at soliciting more subgrantees in order to take advantage of full JABG allocations to the state.
8. 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 JABG funds fit into the larger picture. Applicants should be invited to explain how JABG funds are going to contribute to the development of more effective programming, and it should be clear that there is a plan to sustain the programming in the future in the absence of federal funding. Continuation projects also should be asked to provide details about their fiscal performance on earlier JABG

grants, so that this information can be more deliberately considered in subsequent funding decisions by ICJI.

9. ICJI is encouraged to consider ways to make the Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) and the use of graduated sanctions vital parts of the operating JABG projects. There should be some way for the program to report on the use of graduated sanctions and to document the involvement of the JCEC—this can be part of the quarterly progress reports.



JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY BLOCK GRANTS PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND ICJI GRANT HISTORY

¹The changes went into effect October 1, 2003. The DOJ Authorization Act for FY 2003 signed into law on November 2, 2002, placed the new JABG program under Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. The new provisions took effect FY 2004. Whereas JAIBG was funded as an annual appropriation only, JABG is now a program/line item within legislation. (OJJDP JABG Program Description. Retrieved November 26, 2007, from <http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/jabg/>)

²Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program Guidance Manual 2007, US DOJ, OJP, OJJDP, November 26, 2007. http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/jabg/files/2007_jabg_guidance_manual.pdf

³The JABG Technical Support Center provides states with the data required to calculate JABG allocations to local jurisdictions. Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) combines information from the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Part 1 violent crimes with data on local justice expenditures (such as direct operating expenditures for police, corrections, and judicial and legal services) from the Census Bureau's Census of Governments Survey.

⁴ICJI JABG Program Administrative Requirements. This document was provided to the Center by ICJI's Youth Division, February 20, 2007.

The Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) program is administered by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), within the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). First introduced in 1998 by Congress, as the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG) program, the word "incentive" was later dropped from the title when Congress revised and renamed the program as part of the November 2002 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act.¹ JABG funds are devoted to assisting states and communities address the problem of juvenile crime and strengthen their juvenile justice systems. JABG grants can be applied to support programs in 16 purpose areas (see Appendix A), all aimed at helping to hold both juveniles and the juvenile justice system accountable.

The overall goal of the program is to reduce juvenile offending through accountability-based approaches focused on both offenders and state and local juvenile justice systems. A key premise of the program is that youth who violate the law should be held accountable through a system of graduated sanctions imposed in proportion to the nature and severity of the offense, and which become more restrictive if the offender continues delinquent activities. According to the JABG Program Guidance Manual, "accountability means holding offenders responsible for their delinquent behavior through imposition of sanctions or other individualized consequences, such as restitution, community service, or victim-offender mediation." For the juvenile justice system, strengthening the system requires "an increased capacity to develop youth competence, to efficiently track juveniles through the system, and to provide enhanced options such as

restitution, community service, victim-offender mediation, and other restorative justice sanctions that reinforce the mutual obligations of an accountability-based juvenile justice system."²

OJJDP awards block grants to states, which in turn distribute funds to local jurisdictions. Each state receives a base amount of 0.5 percent of the funds available, with remaining funds divided among states based on a state's population under 18 years of age relative to the national population under 18. JABG funds may also be used to support program-related research, demonstration projects, program evaluation, training, and technical assistance activities. Each state is required to subgrant at least 75 percent of the state's allocation to eligible units of local government. Funds are allocated to local agencies based on a formula that takes into account local law enforcement expenditures and the average level of violent crime for the three most recent years for which data are available.³

The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) is the designated state agency tasked with administering Indiana's JABG program. Awards to local agencies are subgranted on a one year basis (October 1 to September 30 cycle). Eligible applicants include public entities, such as cities, counties, townships, or other political sub-divisions. Potential grant recipients must also fulfill the following requirements:

1. Establish a Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) that includes but is not limited to, individuals representing police, sheriff, prosecutor, probation, community corrections, juvenile court, schools, business, and religious affiliated, fraternal, nonprofit, or social service organizations involved with juvenile justice⁴



2. The JCEC is responsible for developing a Coordinated Enforcement Plan (CEP) to reduce juvenile crime
3. The applicant must include proposed expenditures that fall within the 16 program purpose areas
4. Provide a cash match of 10 percent of the total program (federal cost plus cash match). The cash match is 50 percent of the total program cost if the project involves construction of permanent juvenile corrections facilities

OJJDP also requires states and their subgrantees to assess JABG-funded program effectiveness. When applying for JABG funds, states must provide criteria they will use to measure the effectiveness of funded activities. To assist JABG grantees document and assess the effectiveness of their activities, OJJDP has developed a system of outcome-based performance measures appropriate for all activities supported with JABG funds.

JABG Funding History

Table 1 provides an overview of annual JABG federal appropriations to Indiana, including annual awards, fund expenditures, and rates of spending for each grant. From federal fiscal year (FFY) 1998 through FFY 2006, Indiana received over \$28.6 million in JABG funds. The average annual award over the FFY 1998-2006 period was nearly \$3.2 million. Since FFY 1998, annual JABG funds awarded to the state have declined from an average of \$4.7 million during the FFY 1998-2001 period to \$838,300 in FFY 2006. The most significant decline—67 percent—occurred between FFY 2003 and FFY 2004. States have up to three years to spend federal JABG awards. Based on funds expended, ICJI appears to invest the

majority of JABG funds received. Burn rates (the rate of overall expenditure) are over 85 percent for the first four awards listed in Table 1. In FFY 2002, the rate of spending rose to just over 100 percent and fell to slightly below 85 percent in 2003. The burn rate was substantially lower (57 percent) for FFY 2004 funds. This may be explained by the discontinuance of a fairly large subgrant in the amount of \$190,000 (04-JB-012). While the federal award declined between FFY 2004 and 2005, ICJI was able to grant a larger number of awards to local entities as a result of deferred funds from the previous year (see Tables 4 and 5). Considering all years covered here and all other major federal funding streams administered by ICJI, the burn rate for JABG funds is comparatively much lower, and deserves focused attention in the future in order to fully utilize available JABG allocations from OJJDP.

Table 1: Indiana Federal JABG Awards FFY 1998-2006 and Spending Rates, FFY 1998-2003

Year (FFY)	Amount Awarded	Amount Spent	Burn Rate
1998	\$4,774,300	\$4,081,669	85.5%
1999	\$4,747,300	\$4,191,974	88.3%
2000	\$4,547,900	\$4,264,837	93.8%
2001	\$4,743,500	\$4,293,092	90.5%
2002	\$3,982,300	\$3,985,456	100.1%
2003	\$3,068,400	\$2,606,387	84.9%
2004	\$1,014,000	\$573,655 ⁵	56.6%
2005	\$921,700	\$566,592 ⁶	61.5%
2006	\$838,300		
Total	\$28,637,700	\$24,563,663	89.3% ⁷

Source: ICJI JABG Award Control Reports provided to the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, March 15, 2007. FFY 1999 award amount supplied August 22, 2007; FFY 2002 federal award amount provided August 21, 2007.

⁵FFY 2004 JABG Award Control Report provided to the Center December 10, 2007.

⁶FFY 2005 JABG Award Control Report provided to the Center December 10, 2007.

⁷This represents the percentage of federal funds spent by ICJI from FFY 1998 through FFY 2004 and does not take into account the FFY 2005 and 2006 awards which ICJI has until September 30, 2008, and September 30, 2009 to expend.



Table 2: Indiana Counties/Cities Eligible for Direct JABG Allocation, Allocation Amounts, and Whether Entity Applied for Funding, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods

Direct Locality	2005 Operating Period		2006 Operating Period	
	Applied Allocation	Direct for Funding	Applied Allocation	for Funding
Allen County	\$37,406	✓	\$34,051	✓
Elkhart County	\$10,301	✓		
Gary City	\$11,610		\$11,040	
Hamilton County	\$13,201	✓	\$15,550	✓
Indianapolis City	\$194,748	✓	\$194,202	✓
Johnson County	\$10,083	✓		
La Porte County	\$10,772	✓		
Lake County	\$45,988	✓	\$34,634	
Madison County	\$14,877		\$12,532	
Monroe County	\$10,632	✓		
Porter County	\$11,160	✓		
St. Joseph County	\$19,903	✓	\$13,838	
Vanderburgh County	\$20,766	✓	\$18,513	
Vigo County			\$12,901	✓
Total	\$411,448		\$347,262	

Source: ICJI Indiana Direct Allocation Spreadsheet, 2005 and 2006, provided to the Center on December 11, 2007.

JABG grants made to Indiana agencies and organizations are examined in this report and cover two operating periods: 2005 (October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006) and 2006 (October 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007).⁸ According to ICJI and based on federal JABG formulae, units of local government whose allocation is determined to be \$10,000 or above are eligible to apply for a direct, noncompetitive JABG award from State. Eligible localities are listed in Table 2. In 2005, 11 eligible localities applied for direct allocation funding, while in 2006, only four of nine eligible counties/cities applied.

In 2005, as shown in Table 3, 11 JABG grants that totaled \$438,906 were awarded to Indiana subgrantees. In 2006, 34 grants

that amount to a total of \$816,994 were awarded—this included both direct and non-direct funding. The average size of grants awarded in 2005 was nearly \$40,000 but fell to just over \$24,000 in 2006.

As part of the JABG application process, subgrantees are required to select federally prescribed purpose areas that fit with proposed projects. (See Appendix A for a complete list and brief description of 16 JABG purpose areas.) In 2006, as shown in Table 3, ICJI awarded three-fold the number of awards granted in 2005 over a broader range of purpose areas. In 2005, the bulk of funds awarded (63 percent) supported programs that provided “accountability” programs. This is a fairly broad category covering projects

⁸According to ICJI’s Youth Division JABG webpage, (<http://www.in.gov/cji/youth/jaibg.htm>), a six-month extension has been provided to all 2006 subgrantees that are in compliance with their grant agreements and current with reporting requirements. This extension was granted in order to align JABG subgrants with the federal OJJDP grant award cycle of April 1 to March 30. The extension will provide 50 percent funding of the current grant award for six months between October 1, 2007 and March 31, 2008.



that “establish and maintain accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement.” Four grants for juvenile courts and probation programs accounted for nearly one-quarter of 2005 funds awarded. In 2006, six grants were made to subgrantees that listed multiple purpose areas, and represented more than one-third of funds. These were followed by 11 grants for juvenile courts and probation (25 percent of total funds), six grants for accountability (14 percent), three for school safety, and two awards for graduated sanctions. Between 2005 and 2006, school safety programs fell from 13 percent to 7 percent as a share of overall

funds awarded. Purpose areas not selected in either 2005 or 2006 included prosecutors (staffing), prosecutors (funding), training for law enforcement and court personnel, juvenile gun courts, and juvenile drug courts.

Tables 4 and 5 provide 2005 and 2006 individual subgrantee information including awards, funds expended, and burn rates. In 2005, the overall rate of spending was 89 percent. Only three subgrantees fully expended awards received. While final expenditures are unknown on the FFY 2005 award (2006 operating period), funds drawn to date and spending rates are included in Table 5. The overall burn rate as of November 2007 was 64 percent.

Table 3: JABG Awards to Subgrantees by Purpose Area, 2005 and 2006

Purpose Area	2005 Operating Period			2006 Operating Period		
	N	Total	Percentage	N	Total	Percentage
Accountability	5	\$274,746	62.6%	6	\$114,973	14.1%
Court Staffing and Pretrial Services				1	\$18,000	2.2%
Detention/Corrections Personnel				1	\$20,000	2.4%
Graduated Sanctions				2	\$40,000	4.9%
Information Sharing				1	\$20,000	2.4%
Juvenile Courts and Probation	4	\$106,754	24.3%	11	\$207,190	25.4%
Juvenile Records System				1	\$20,000	2.4%
Restorative Justice				1	\$16,800	2.1%
Risk and Needs Assessment				1	\$20,000	2.4%
School Safety	2	\$57,406	13.1%	3	\$60,000	7.3%
Multiple Purpose Areas				6	\$280,004	34.3%
Total	11	\$438,906⁹	100.0%	34	\$816,967¹⁰	100.0%

Source: ICJI JABG FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 Award Control Reports and subgrantee files

⁹This total differs from the amount awarded and spent in FFY 2004 listed in Table 1, which includes an ICJI administrative grant for \$ 101,440 (04-JB-000) and a discontinued grant for \$190,000 (04-JB-012).

¹⁰In 2006, ICJI's administrative grant totaled \$46,085 (05-JB-000).



Table 4: FFY 2004 JABG Awards, 2005 Operating Period

	Subgrantee	Implementing Agency	Project Title	Federal Award Amount	Funds Expended	Burn Rate
Accountability						
04-JB-002	Elkhart County	Elkhart County Court Services	Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program & JDC Improvement	\$19,998	\$19,998	100.0%
04-JB-004	Johnson County Community Corrections	Johnson County Community Corrections	Thinking for a Change	\$20,000	\$19,159	95.8%
04-JB-007	Madison County Commissioners	Madison County Juvenile Probation Department	R.E.S.P.O.N.D.	\$20,000	\$10,000	50.0%
*04-JB-008	Marion County Superior Court	Marion County Superior Court Juvenile Division	Marion County JABG Project Round VII	\$194,748	\$169,055	86.8%
*04-JB-009	Monroe County Government	Monroe County Probation Department	Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program	\$20,000	\$19,905	99.5%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$274,746	\$238,118	86.7%
Juvenile Courts and Probation						
*04-JB-003	Hamilton County Commissioners	Hamilton County Probation Department	Linking Early Adolescent Prevention Program (LEAPP)	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
*04-JB-005	Lake County	Lake County Juvenile Court	JABG Enhancement Program	\$45,988	\$45,879	99.8%
04-JB-010	Porter County Circuit Court, Juvenile Court	Family & Youth Services Bureau	Saturday Diversion Program	\$20,000	\$12,417	62.1%
04-JB-011	Vanderburgh County Superior Court, Juvenile Division	Vanderburgh County Superior Court, Juvenile Division	Start III	\$20,766	\$20,003	96.3%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$106,754	\$98,299	92.1%
School Safety						
*04-JB-001	Allen County Superior Court, Family Relations Division	Allen County Superior Court, Family Relations Division	JABG Quest Grant	\$37,406	\$37,406	100.0%
*04-JB-006	La Porte County Government/Board of Commissioners	La Porte County Circuit Court	Comprehensive Juvenile Accountability Program	\$20,000	\$18,393	92.0%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$57,406	\$55,799	97.2%
Total				\$438,906	\$392,215	89.4%

Source: ICJI JABG FFY 2004 Award Control Reports provided to the Center on March 15, 2007 and December 10, 2007

* Subgrantee selected for in-depth case study analysis



Table 5: FFY 2005 JABG Awards, 2006 Operating Period

Grant Number	Subgrantee	Implementing Agency	Project Title	Federal Award Amount	Funds Expended	Burn Rate
Accountability						
05-JB-010	Johnson County Juvenile Probation	Johnson County Community Corrections	Thinking for a Change	\$20,000	\$11,667	58.3%
*05-JB-016	Monroe County Government	Monroe County Probation Department	Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Plan and Intensive Supervision Probation	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
05-JB-020	Pulaski County Circuit Court	Pulaski Memorial Hospital	Pulaski County Alternative Education Program for Suspended/ Expelled Youth	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
05-JB-021	Putnam County Government	Putnam County Youth Development Commission, Inc.	Putnam County Government	\$20,000	\$15,000	75.0%
05-JB-026	Wabash County Government	Wabash County Probation Department	Wabash County Day Reporting Program	\$15,000	\$0	0.0%
05-JB-028	Whitley County Corrections Department	Whitley County Youth Improvement Center	Whitley County Youth Improvement Center	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$114,973	\$86,640	75.4%
Court Staffing and Pretrial Services						
05-JB-023	Starke Circuit Court	Starke County Probation Department	Juvenile Crime Deterrent Program	\$18,000	\$13,500	75.0%
Detention/Corrections Personnel						
05-JB-015	Marion Superior Court Probation Department	Marion Superior Court Probation Department	Juvenile Detention Consultant	\$20,000	\$11,000	55.0%
Graduated Sanctions						
05-JB-008	Harrison County Commissioners	Harrison County Prosecuting Attorney	Graduated Sanctions for Harrison County	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
05-JB-031	City of Linton, Mayor's Office	Linton City Police	Police as Mentors (PAM)	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$40,000	\$40,000	100.0%
Information Sharing						
05-JB-017	Monroe County Government	Monroe County Circuit Court-- Court Administration	QUEST License Purchase	\$20,000	\$0	0.0%
Juvenile Courts and Probation						
*05-JB-001	Allen County Superior Court-Family Relations Division	Allen County Superior Court-- Family Relations Division	JABG Quest Grant	\$34,051	\$29,833	87.6%
05-JB-002	Clay County Circuit Court	Clay County Circuit Court: Juvenile Probation Department	Helping Parents Help their Children	\$10,000	\$10,000	100.0%
*05-JB-006	Hamilton County Commissioners	Hamilton County Probation Department	Linking Early Adolescent Prevention Program (LEAPP)	\$15,550	\$0	0.0%
05-JB-011	LaGrange County Commissioners	LaGrange County Communities Youth Centers, Inc.	LaGrange County Youth Center	\$20,000	\$8,856	44.3%
*05-JB-012	Lake County	Lake County Juvenile Court	JABG Enhancement Program	\$34,634	\$31,869	92.0%

continued on page 10



continued from page 9

Grant Number	Subgrantee	Implementing Agency	Project Title	Federal Award Amount	Funds Expended	Burn Rate
05-JB-018	Montgomery County Commissioners	Montgomery County Probation Department	Montgomery County Juvenile Justice Accountability Coalition	\$15,000	\$14,619	97.5%
05-JB-022	Rush County Circuit Court	Rush County Probation Department	Truancy and Substance Abuse Licked (TASAL)	\$19,985	\$8,079	40.4%
05-JB-029	Bartholomew County Youth Services Center	Bartholomew County Youth Services Center	Aftercare/Community Liaison	\$7,470	\$7,470	100.0%
05-JB-030	City of Jeffersonville	Clark County Youth Shelter and Family Services, Inc.	Clark County Juvenile Justice Program	\$20,000	\$14,036	70.2%
05-JB-033	Noble County Probation Department	Noble County Probation Department	Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program	\$20,000	\$10,124	50.6%
05-JB-034	Ohio County Probation Department	Dearborn County Juvenile Center	Ohio County Probation Department	\$10,500	\$6,064	57.7%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$207,190	\$140,949	68.0%

Juvenile Records System

05-JB-009	Howard County	Howard Circuit Court, Office of Juvenile Services	Operation to Reduce Recidivism through Information Sharing	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
-----------	---------------	---	--	----------	----------	--------

Restorative Justice

05-JB-007	Hancock County Courthouse	Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring (AIM)	Restorative Empowerment Project for Adolescents through Reintegration (REPAIR)	\$16,800	\$16,000	95.2%
-----------	---------------------------	---	--	----------	----------	-------

Risk and Needs Assessment

05-JB-005	Floyd County Youth Services Bureau	Floyd County Youth Services Bureau	Floyd County Access Program	\$20,000	\$4,717	23.6%
-----------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------	---------	-------

School Safety

05-JB-003	Crawford County	Prisoner & Community, Hoosier Hills PACT, Inc.	Behavioral Monitoring & Reinforcement Program	\$20,000	\$19,370	96.9%
*05-JB-013	La Porte County Government	La Porte County Circuit Court	Comprehensive Juvenile Accountability Program	\$20,000	\$7,302	36.5%
05-JB-019	Orange County Commissioners	Prison & Community, Hoosier Hills PACT, Inc.	Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program	\$20,000	\$19,564	97.8%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$60,000	\$46,236	77.1%

Multiple Purpose Areas

05-JB-004	Floyd County Commissioners	Floyd County Juvenile Probation	Floyd County Juvenile Substance Use Evaluation and Education Program	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
*05-JB-014	Marion County Justice Agency	Marion County Justice Agency	Marion County JABG Project Round VIII	\$194,202	\$56,867	29.3%
05-JB-024	Vigo County Commissioners	Vigo County Juvenile Justice Center	Vigo County Justice Center Updates	\$12,901	\$12,764	98.9%
05-JB-025	Vigo County School Corporation	Vigo County School Corporation	Safe Schools/Smart Kids	\$12,901	\$11,800	91.5%
05-JB-027	Warren County	Metropolitan School District of Warren County	Bi-County Alternative School-Safety for Success	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
05-JB-032	Dearborn County Probation Dept.	Dearborn County Juvenile Center	Dearborn County Probation Department	\$20,000	\$20,000	100.0%
<i>Subtotal</i>				\$280,004	\$141,430	50.5%
Total				\$816,967	\$520,472	63.7%

Source: ICJI JABG FFY 2005 Award Control Reports provided to the Center on March 15, 2007 and December 10, 2007

* Subgrantee selected for in-depth case study analysis



JABG Case Study Profiles

For this report, the Center selected grants for review from the 2005 funding cycle awarded to projects that also received funding in the 2006 funding cycle. Of the 34 grants awarded in 2006, 7 were continuation projects from the previous year. However, one of the 2005 subgrantee files (04-JB-004) was missing for some time and once located, some items were still missing.¹¹ This grant is not included in the case study analysis. The six remaining projects, listed in Table 6, comprise the case study sample and represent 77 percent of grants awarded in 2005 and 39 percent of funded projects in 2006.

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 numbers;

original grant proposals; continuation applications; and all quarterly financial and progress reports submitted to ICJI by the grantees.¹² Several items JABG applicants are required to complete are relevant to the analysis, including the following:

1. Problem identification statement that includes the problem to be addressed along with supporting data and information regarding juvenile local needs and crime problems;
2. A project description summarizing the applicant's approach or remedy to the problem; specific population that will benefit from the program; the anticipated time for project results; and, if proposed project is a continuation, a brief summary of achievements to date;
3. Identify an overall goal and project objectives;

Table 6: JABG Case Studies, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods

Subgrantee	Implementing Agency	Project Title	2005 Federal Award	2006 Federal Award
Allen County Superior Court Family Relations Division	Allen County Superior Court Family Relations Division	JABG Quest Grant	\$37,406	\$34,051
Hamilton County Commissioners	Hamilton County Probation Department	Linking Early Adolescent Prevention Program (LEAPP)	\$20,000	\$15,550
Lake County	Lake County Juvenile Court	JABG Enhancement Program	\$45,988	\$34,634
La Porte County Government/Board of Commissioners	La Porte County Circuit Court	Comprehensive Juvenile Accountability Program	\$20,000	\$20,000
Marion County Superior Court	Marion County Superior Court Juvenile Division	Marion County JABG Project Round VII	\$194,748	
Marion County Justice Agency ¹³	Marion County Justice Agency	Marion County JABG Project Round VIII		\$194,202
Monroe County Government	Monroe County Probation Department	Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program	\$20,000	\$20,000

¹¹Email communication with ICJI Youth Division Director, August 21, 2007. On January 3, 2008, Center staff were informed that the complete file had been located. In addition to insufficient time to incorporate this case into the sample, it was not possible to determine if missing quarterly reports were due to lack of subgrantee submission or related to the file being missing.

¹²ICJI provided current award control information for FFY 2004 and 2005 on December 11, 2007. Quarterly progress and financial reports for each case were collected as of November 15, 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.

¹³The fiscal agent for the "Marion County JABG Project Round VIII" changed in 2006, from the Marion County Superior Court to the Marion County Justice Agency.



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 parties responsible for evaluating the project—either agency personnel or independent evaluators; and
6. Select method(s) of evaluation such as
 - a. Collection and analysis of statistical data, and
 - b. Obtaining feedback on immediate and longer-term impact from participants and/or professionals, agencies and coordination among providers.

What follows is a presentation of each case study according to the following:

1. program description;
2. an examination of the problem statement, goals, and objectives as suggested by the implementing agencies, along with a description of the project activities;
3. a list of proposed performance measures and a summary of progress reported by the program;

4. a fiscal assessment of the two operating periods;
5. a review of the subsequent year (2006) grant application and program reporting during the most recent period; and
6. an 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 rated below average; those that exceeded it were considered above average. Using these criteria, two cases were considered average and four was found to be below average.



CASE STUDY ONE

*Subgrantee: Allen County Superior Court
Family Relations Division*

*Implementing Agency: Allen County
Superior Court Family Relations
Division*

Project Title: JABG Quest Grant

JABG grants: 04-JB-001, \$41,147

*(federal award: \$37,406; local match:
\$3,741)*

*05-JB-001, \$37,834 (federal award:
\$34,051; local match: \$3,783)*

Program Description

Allen County Superior Court Family Relations Division (ACSCFRD) applied for a grant to support an existing alternative middle/high school in cooperation with three Allen County public school systems. ACSCFRD oversees a partnership between the three schools—East, Northwest, and Southwest Allen County—for an “alternative school of last resort” that offers middle and high school and GED preparatory curricula. This collaboration provides a safety net for high school and middle school students who otherwise have few educational alternatives. ACSCFRD may also exercise its authority to require parents to cooperate in the education of their children through the statutorily-authorized “parent participation plans.” The subgrantee asserted that continued cooperation between the schools and ACSCFRD would “include identifying those at-risk students who would normally be deprived of educational services for significant periods of time because they are facing suspension and/or expulsion from the school system.”

ACSCFRD has been supported by JABG grants for several years. According to information provided by ICJI in the form of award control reports (FFY 1998

through FFY 2005), ACSCFRD has received JABG grants since FFY 1998, in the following amounts: \$78,847 in FFY 1998, \$117,549 in FFY 1999, \$192,844 in FFY 2000, \$94,877 in FFY 2001, \$89,892 in FFY 2002, and \$66,077 in FFY 2003. The average size grant was \$106,687.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

To establish that a problem exists, ICJI’s JABG grant application requires that the potential subgrantee provide data and information regarding juvenile justice needs and crime problems. The subgrantee offered as a problem identification statement that “students who are suspended for significant periods of time or expelled from mainstream schools, are very often, suspended or expelled from alternative schools as well.” ACSCFRD’s assertions regarding the existing problem lacked specificity and supporting evidence. In addressing how the grant-funded project would ameliorate the problem, program administrators offered a broad description of project activities and the population they would benefit. ACSCFRD reported that the program would continue to be housed in the Allen County Juvenile Center, and as such, the removal of at-risk students from traditional settings would result in safer classroom environments. The applicant, however, did not provide baseline data—empirical or anecdotal—regarding, for instance, incidents that contribute to the unsafe environment. The subgrantee applied for funds under the school safety JABG purpose area.

The overall goal of the project was to “educate 60 high-school and middle-school aged juveniles with a goal of a 20 percent increase in educational aptitude and reintegration into a traditional high or



middle school.” The subgrantee proposed that funds be applied to hire one teacher, one teaching assistant, and support the purchase/maintenance of computer equipment. The project objectives included in the 2005 application were:

1. Provide educational services to 60 at-risk juveniles;
2. At-risk juveniles will show a 20 percent increase in educational aptitude based on standard curriculum grading for each grading period in core curriculum classes; and
3. At least 75 percent of at-risk juveniles will be returned to a traditional high school or middle school.

These objectives were measureable and consistent with project goals. The subgrantee indicated that all objectives would be achieved by the end of the grant period.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

Table 7 presents national JABG-approved metrics selected by the subgrantee. These performance measures fit with the program goals, although the intermediate-term indicator did not necessarily follow from the goal and objectives. There was no attention to the prevention of further juvenile justice system involvement in the project goal or objectives, although it makes sense that a JABG-funded project would seek to reduce further penetration

into the juvenile justice system. With regard to an evaluation plan, the subgrantee indicated that agency personnel would evaluate the program and that effectiveness would be assessed by obtaining feedback on immediate impact before participants leave the service site.

The subgrantee file contained three of the four required quarterly progress reports—the first quarterly report was not found. ACSCFRD reported on all three objectives listed above. If the total number of program participants reported in each quarter are taken into account—58, 57, and 19 in the first, second, and final reporting periods, respectively—ACSCFRD appears to have achieved the first objective of serving 60 at-risk juveniles. However, it is not possible to determine whether participants in each quarter were new or existing. With regard to the second objective, program participants reportedly exhibited an 85 percent improvement in grade average. In only one-quarter, from information included in available quarterly progress reports, did ACSCFRD attain the objective of 75 percent of at-risk juveniles being returned to a traditional school setting. ACSCFRD indicated that it serviced 100 percent of youth referred in all quarters. The subgrantee may have reported on additional JABG-specific statistics and input these data into OJJDP’s Data Collection Technical Assistance Tool (DCTAT) program. Any such information was not available for this assessment. The

Table 7: ACSCFRD Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *School Safety (Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs that are designed to enhance school safety)*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Number of different accountability programs operating	Number of school-justice partnerships	Number of target youth referred to the justice system



subgrantee did not report on participant feedback.

Fiscal Performance

Based on quarterly reports and as shown in Table 8, actual expenditures were consistent with the approved budget. Three of the four requisite quarterly financial reports were found in the subgrantee file. There were no amendments and all funds were expended as approved by ICJI. In the application narrative, ACSCFRD indicated its intention to request that partner public schools fund the two proposed teaching positions through normal school budgets beginning in the 2006-2007 school year. (The subgrantee's 2006 JABG grant application proposed funding for a new project and did not address this issue.)

Assessment of 2006 Grant

The 2006 application proposes a new project, specifically, funding for advanced technology for a Detention Alternative Program (DAP) and electronic monitoring (EM) officers to improve field effectiveness. The stated purpose of the

program is to reduce the number of pre-adjudication admissions to and population of the Allen County Juvenile Center.

The subgrantee's problem statement did not include empirical data for baseline comparison. However, the project description was more detailed. ACSCFRD proposes to equip three DAP/EM vehicles with technology to allow access to juvenile and adult records via a case management and law enforcement system. This would allow officers to not only pull warrants for juveniles being supervised, but also data on companions. Officers could also log activity in a more timely and accurate manner. The subgrantee also requested funding to support 1) additional technology upgrades including a GIS component to assist officers in planning efficient routes, the capability to access all juveniles on probation as well as those with outstanding warrants, and photographic images; 2) equipping officers with uniforms and point blank body armor; and 3) purchase/maintenance of office supplies and equipment. The 2006 proposal does not include reference to

Table 8: ACSCFRD Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006				2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	\$0	\$0
Contractual services	\$23,607	\$23,607	\$23,607	100%	\$13,633	\$13,633
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$13,799	\$13,799	\$13,799	100%	\$20,418	\$20,418
Total Federal Award	\$37,406	\$37,406	\$37,406	100%	\$34,051	\$34,051
Local Match	\$3,741	\$4,156	\$4,156	100%	\$3,783	\$3,783
Total Project	\$41,147	\$41,562	\$41,562	100%	\$37,834	\$37,834



activities, outcomes, or overall performance under the previous grant.

The project goal is to “provide DAP/EM services to 1,100 juveniles.” Project objectives, to be achieved by the end of the grant period, include the following:

1. Provide detention alternative (pre-adjudication) services to 800 at-risk juveniles;
2. Provide electronic monitoring program (post-adjudication) services to 200 at-risk juveniles; and
3. Provide additional services to 100 juveniles on the DAP/EM programs who require more restrictive release conditions.

Table 9 includes JABG-approved performance measures for the new grant. As of November 15, 2007, the file contained all four quarterly financial and progress reports. According to these submissions, 379 (between 40 and just over 50 percent) of total youth processed participated in the program over the grant period. Nearly 20 percent of youth in the program had revocation hearings over the year (only 12 percent in fourth quarter reporting period).

As of the fourth quarterly financial report, 89 percent of project funds had been expended. At the time of this review, the file did not contain additional information regarding whether program

administrators planned to apply for an extension on the grant to allow for the full expenditure of funds awarded.

Overall Program Assessment

Overall, ACSCFRD should be considered a below-average program. While the initial proposal met the minimal technical requirements of the JABG Request for Proposals (RFP), the subgrantee’s problem statement lacked specificity and empirical data. ACSCFRD provided objectives that for the most part were clearly defined with quantifiable measures and which were also consistent with the priorities laid out in the problem statement and goals of the project. However, the inclusion of baseline data would have provided evidence of not only an existing problem, but the potential impact of the project. According to subgrantee file contents, not all quarterly progress and financial reports were submitted. Budgetary expenditures were consistent with program activities approved for the project. With regard to the 2006 grant, an explanation for discontinuation of JABG-requested support for the original program would have been helpful to evaluators. In addition, given the lack of background and baseline data provided in the 2006 application, it is difficult to determine whether the subgrantee’s objectives are appropriate and achievable for the new project.

Table 9: ACSCFRD Proposed Project Outputs and Outcomes, 2006 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *Juvenile Courts/Probation Officers and Juvenile Accountability and Recidivism*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Number of different accountability programs operating	Number and percent of youth that through ACSCFRD or probation system participate in accountability program	Number and percent of modifications that resulted in more restrictive release conditions of target youth referred to the justice system (Number and percent of youth in the program that had revocation hearings)



CASE STUDY TWO

Subgrantee: Hamilton County

Commissioners

Implementing Agency: Hamilton County

Probation Department

*Project Title: Linking Early Adolescent
Prevention Program (LEAPP)*

JABG grants: 04-JB-003, \$22,222

*(federal award: \$20,000; local match:
\$2,222)*

05-JB-006, \$17,278 (federal award:

\$15,550; local match: \$1,728)

Program Description

The Hamilton County Linking Early Adolescent Prevention Program (LEAPP) is designed to provide services to elementary-school-aged children and their families when these children have been identified as exhibiting aggressive behaviors indicative of high-risk for serious juvenile offending in their teen years. The program provides interventions to enhance the parenting skills of the parents and programming geared at increasing behavior management for the children in their homes, school, and community.

The Hamilton County LEAPP has been supported by JABG grants for several years. According to information provided by ICJI in the form of award control reports (FFY 1998 through FFY 2005), Hamilton County has received JABG grants since FFY 1998, in the following amounts: \$83,347 in FFY 1998, \$71,719 in FFY 1999, \$59,546 in FFY 2000, \$72,858 in FFY 2001, \$ 66,367 in FFY 2002, and \$38,329 in FFY 2003. The average size grant was \$65,361.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

In the application for the 2005-2006 JABG grant, it was noted that since the

development of LEAPP in September 2000, there has been a relatively steady decrease in the number of juvenile delinquency and status offense filings for children aged 12 and under in the Hamilton County juvenile court system. While children aged 12 and under made up 12 percent of all delinquency and status offense cases filed in 2000, they were only 3 percent of the total cases in 2004. The problem statement also pointed to the appropriate literature as a basis for their intervention program. While the local data and the literature review are on target for laying the foundation for justifying the design of the intervention to be funded with JABG monies, there is very little detail as to the structure of the program or even how the youth will be identified and referred to the program. . .

The overall goal of the project was to “provide accountability programming that is accessible by all at-risk youth.” This goal is not at all descriptive, since all JABG programs should be accountability-based. This goal is also not a reflection of the specific nature of the types of youth served by LEAPP. Those youth are supposed to be of a certain age and to be exhibiting certain high-risk behaviors. All at-risk youth are not going to be eligible for services under LEAPP. This goal does not follow from the problem statement. There are three objectives presented for this project and they are as general and nondescript as the project goal:

- Determine appropriate accountability programs for youth referred
- Increase the numbers of youth who can participate in accountability programs
- Document the numbers of youth provided the opportunity of attending accountability-based programs, those



who attended vs. those who did not and the reasons stated

These objectives are inadequate and do not point to measurable concepts. More generally, the narrative portion of the proposal uses the word “accountability” in an ambiguous and gratuitous manner throughout. (e.g., “Funding for LEAPP to provide more youth the opportunity to participate in Accountability Programming is needed. Through providing the current services offered, we will be able to provide additional opportunities for youth to participate in programs to address youth being held accountable for their actions.”).

It is not possible from the proposal to understand what LEAPP consists of in terms of programming. The quarterly progress reports point to a list of external programs that are not operated by the LEAPP staff, such as Agape therapeutic riding camp for youth, Englishton Park Camp, Kids Club, and Boys and Girls Clubs. The budget also points to contractual services that provide training for parents in parenting skills. Funds are also used to provide transportation to programs and to provide afterschool tutoring.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

In addition to the project goal and objectives proposed by the grantee, there

is also an expectation that the grantee will select at least one output measure, one short-term outcome, and one intermediate-term outcome. These performance measures are to be selected from among a list of approved measures developed by OJJDP. Table 10 provides a breakdown of the performance measures selected by the grantee for this project. As the JABG grant is set at \$20,000, the assumption is that they will all be allocated to accountability programming, and so the output indicator selected is not really relevant to this project. The short-term and intermediate-term outcomes, on the other hand, make sense within the context of the proposed project. In terms of evaluating the effectiveness of the grant, the subgrantee indicated that agency personnel would conduct the evaluation. Their strategy for evaluation was to include obtaining feedback on immediate impact before participants leave the program, obtaining feedback on longer-term impact on delinquency, and obtaining feedback on longer-term impact on professionals, agencies, and related to the coordination among agencies.

The subgrantee file contained only one progress report, for the second quarter. This report was brief, indicating that 251 youth were being served by LEAPP and then describing some of the programming that the youth were taking part in. There was no discussion of data to address the objectives or performance

Table 10: LEAPP Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *Juvenile Courts and Probation (Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism)*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Amount of funds allocated to accountability programming youth	Number and percent of youth to have a behavioral contract developed at intake	Number and percent of youth to complete their justice requirements successfully



measures as identified by the grantee in their application. No other progress report information was available in the file for this project.

Fiscal Performance

The grantee proposed to expend most of the budget through subcontracts with other agencies providing a range of programming for the LEAPP. They also proposed to spend about one-quarter of the budget on supplies. Table 11 provides a breakdown of the proposed budget and the fiscal performance for this project. In April, the subgrantee applied for a budget amendment in which they proposed nearly all of the contractual expenses to cover the costs of project personnel. This change was approved. Financial statements were present in the file for all four quarters and there was also a final financial statement. Through the end of the third quarter, the reports indicated that 100 percent of the federal funds had been spent.

Assessment of 2006 Grant

The 2006 application provides data to show that over the six-year period in

which LEAPP had been operating, the numbers of younger youth (ages 12 and under) for which there were cases filed in juvenile court declined from 112 in 2000 to only 13 in 2005. This is impressive. The remaining sections of the proposal narrative were underdeveloped. The problem statement described the indicators of “at-risk” children, although the discussion was from the published literature on this topic, and not from any local data. The project description provided only broad characterizations about the program. It is not possible to tell what the intervention actually looks like in practice. The goal, objectives, and performance measures were unchanged from the previous year’s application. This is of concern, particularly given that the measures were not well constructed in the earlier application and that very little data was reported in the progress reports.

Another concern about the 2006 grant application has to do with the budget. In the previous year, the program proposed to use the federal funds to contract with other providers for services. Mid-way through the year, the program then applied for a budget modification and

Table 11: LEAPP Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006					2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Amended	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000	100%	\$0	\$0
Contractual services	\$17,250	\$17,250	\$2,250	\$2,250	100%	\$15,550	\$15,550
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$2,750	\$2,750	\$2,750	\$2,750	100%	\$0	\$0
Total Federal Award	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	100%	\$15,550	\$15,550
Local Match	\$2,222	\$2,222	\$2,222	\$2,222	100%	\$1,728	\$1,728
Total Project	\$22,222	\$22,222	\$22,222	\$22,222	100%	\$17,278	\$17,278



used the funds to pay for a staff member. For the new grant application, the program is once again proposing to use the entirety of the federal funds to contract with other service providers. Overall, it appears the proposal is not informed by the experiences of the program in the previous grant period.

At the time that we gathered the materials for this review, there were no quarterly progress reports and financial statements yet submitted for the current grant period. As such, there is no information to report on how the project was carried out during the 2006-2007 grant period.

Overall Program Assessment

Overall, the Hamilton County LEAPP program should be considered a below average program. The grant application provided an adequate problem statement, but lacked sufficient detail in the project description. The project goal and objectives were found to be problematic, although the administrators did select appropriate performance measures for the project. The subgrantee met the requirements of submission of financial reports, but only delivered one of four quarterly progress reports. The concerns that were noted with the 2005-2006 project period continued into the next project period.



CASE STUDY THREE

*Subgrantee: Lake County
Implementing Agency: Lake County
Juvenile Court*

*Project Title: JABG Enhancement
Program*

*JABG grants: 04-JB-005, \$51,098
(federal award: \$45,988; local match:
\$5,110)*

*05-JB-012, \$38,482 (federal award:
\$34,634; local match: \$3,848)*

Program Description

The Lake County JABG Enhancement Program is called Operation Nightlight. This project is a partnership between the police and probation to provide nightly surveillance to juvenile offenders. Of 17 police jurisdictions in Lake County, 15 of them participate in this program. The program focuses on field calls to youth on probation.

The Lake County project has been supported by JABG grants for several years. According to information provided by ICJI in the form of award control reports (FFY 1998 through FFY 2005), Lake County has received JABG grants since FFY 1998, in the following amounts: \$256,545 in FFY 1998, \$312,076 in FFY 1999, \$307,883 in FFY 2000, \$317,794 in FFY 2001, \$284,196 in FFY 2002, and \$216,993 in FFY 2003. The average size grant was \$282,581.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

In the application for the 2005-2006 JABG grant, the problem statement was six sentences in length. It was noted that there is a "large delinquent population" in Lake County, with over 3,000 delinquency cases processed by the juvenile court in the previous year. With a combined rural and urban population, and a wide range of

offenses represented, it was stressed that the court needed multiple strategies for dealing with the range of issues that the youth and community present. For a project that has been in place for several years, more detail and further development of the problem statement would have provided a justification for the design of the JABG initiative in this county. There was no discussion of the results from the previous years to justify a continued investment of JABG funds for this initiative.

The overall goal of the project was to "successfully release juveniles from probation by increasing surveillance via Operation Nightlight." This goal does not obviously follow from the problem statement. It does point to a reasonable outcome that can be expected to be affected by the intervention program, though. There is no real detail in the proposal to clarify the nature and the structure of the project—the project description is a total of four sentences in which the first sentence is "Lake County proposes to continue to participate in the JABG allocation we've received for 6 grant periods" and the final sentence is "We will watch for trends in reduction of delinquent behavior." It appears that the personnel in Lake County did not believe they needed to compete for the funding or to justify their use of the funds.

There are three objectives listed in the application and they follow from the overall goal of the project:

- Make at least 700 attempts to have face-to-face contacts with delinquent children annually via Operation Nightlight;
- Maintain a 60 percent successful release rate from Operation Nightlight; and



- Maintain no more than a 40 percent recidivism rate for Operation Nightlight participants

These objectives are all measureable. They are, however, somewhat confusing in the absence of further discussion in the proposal. For instance, in the first objective, is the intent to provide two contacts per night for each youth in the program (for a total of 700 per year per youth) or is there expected to be a total of 700 attempts across all youths in the program—there are projected to be 800 youth served during the year—which then works out to be less than one actual contact per youth per year?. We might not expect the intervention to have a significant impact if the latter is the case. Since Operation Nightlight appears to be an add-on to probation, it is unlikely that youth are released (successfully or otherwise) from Operation Nightlight.

It is not possible to get an accurate picture of the nature of the intervention from the proposal. From the quarterly progress reports, there is a better sense of the nature of the project. Probation officers are paired with police officers to make nighttime field calls. Each pair goes out for three hours at a time. The field calls do not take place on a nightly basis—within a three-month period there are between 43 and 78 occurrences of Operation Nightlight, with more than one happening on the same date in some instances. Based

on the results presented in the progress reports, it appears that 70 percent of the time they are able to have face-to-face contact with the youth they are trying to visit. As there are about five completed visits per hour of surveillance, the length of the contacts are, on average, less than 15 minutes. There is no indication, in any of the materials in the file, as to what happens if the field call does not find the youth at home. It does not appear, however, that youths are unsuccessfully released from the program if they are not home at the time of the field call.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

In addition to the project goal and objectives proposed by the grantee, there is also an expectation that the grantee will select at least one output measure, one short-term outcome, and one intermediate-term outcome. These performance measures are to be selected from among a list of approved measures developed by OJJDP. Table 12 provides a breakdown of the performance measures selected by the grantee for this project. Only the selected intermediate-term outcome makes sense within the context of the proposed project. There is no other indication that an objective of the project is to have an impact on caseload size of the probation officers. As Operation Nightlight is one program operated by the

Table 12: JABG Enhancement Program Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *Juvenile Courts and Probation (Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism)*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Number of different accountability programs in operation	Average number of youth per probation officer	Number and percent of youth to complete their justice requirements successfully



court, tracking the number of different accountability programs in operation does not really fit within the design of the project. In terms of evaluating the effectiveness of the grant, the subgrantee indicated that agency personnel would conduct the evaluation. Their strategy for evaluation was to include obtaining feedback on immediate impact before participants leave the program, and obtaining feedback on longer-term impact on delinquency.

There were four progress reports available in the subgrantee file. Progress reports had been submitted for all four quarters of the grant. Data in the progress reports were provided for each of the three objectives, but did not address any of the performance measures selected in the application. As noted above, while there were counts provided for the number of successful contacts during field calls, it was not clear if those were all independent youth or whether some of the youth were contacted more than once. Also, for each quarter, there was a breakdown of the youth who were released from the program—either successfully or unsuccessfully. There was no clarification,

though, as to how some youth were unsuccessfully released from the program. It is unclear whether the release was a response to what was found during the field call. Also, the progress reports indicate that unsuccessful releases were considered to be recidivists. There was no detail, though, to indicate whether recidivism refers to the commission of a new offense or if this could also include probation violations. Over the course of the grant period, the subgrantee reports that 814 youth were released from the program over the course of the grant period. Of those, 70 percent were successful releases and 30 percent were considered to be recidivists.

Fiscal Performance

The funds for this project were budgeted with 84 percent allocated for probation office personnel (to cover overtime for those officers taking part in the field visits), about 10 percent allocated for the liaison position with the police department, and the remaining 6 percent for equipment. Cash match funds were identified as paying for probation office personnel. Table 13 provides a breakdown

Table 13: JABG Enhancement Program Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006				2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$38,589	\$38,589	\$39,997	104%	\$30,434	\$30,434
Contractual services	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$4,800	100%	\$4,200	\$4,200
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$2,599	\$2,599	\$1,082	42%	\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Total Federal Award	\$45,988	\$45,988	\$45,879	100%	\$34,634	\$34,634
Local Match	\$5,110	\$5,110	\$5,110	100%	\$3,848	\$3,848
Total Project	\$51,098	\$51,098	\$50,989	100%	\$38,482	\$38,482



of the proposed budget and the fiscal performance for this project. At the end of August, the subgrantee requested an extension of the end date of the project because they were waiting for final budget information from the police department related to the contractual costs for this project. The new end date was approved as November 30 (from the original September 30). At the end of the project, there was \$109 of federal funds unspent by the project. All of the required financial reports were found in the subgrantee file.

Assessment of 2006 Grant

The 2006 application was very similar to the earlier grant application. The narrative sections of the proposal were quite sparse, as before. There was one notable update to the problem statement. In the 2005 grant application, it was noted that “Lake County Juvenile Court processed over 3,000 delinquent cases last year.” In the newer proposal, it was noted that “Lake County Juvenile Court processed over 4,000 delinquent cases last year.” That is a dramatic increase in cases over a one-year period and there was no indication that the subgrantee recognized the difference in the number of cases or that they were concerned about what this might imply about the effectiveness of the ongoing Operation Nightlight program.

The goals and objectives were

unchanged from the previous year’s application. They did, however, make a change to their proposed performance measures. As shown in Table 14, the output indicator was changed to “Amount of funds allocated to accountability programming.” This change would make sense if the program intends to allocate some additional resources to the project—based on the proposal, though, there is no real question about the amount of funding they will likely allocate to the project.

The budget for the new project period is very similar to the previous year’s budget. There is a somewhat smaller grant allocated to Lake County, yet the funds are being applied as before. About \$4,000 is to pay for some time from the liaison with the police department and the remaining funds (including the matching funds) are allocated to pay overtime to probation officers taking part in Operation Nightlight.

Four quarterly financial statements were found in the file. In the second quarter of the new year, the matching funds were expended. By the end of the fourth quarter, there were still \$2,065 (5 percent) of the federal funds unspent. It is not known if there was a plan to expend those funds completely. Four quarterly progress reports were found in the file. For the 2006-2007 program year, the program was using the new forms designed for reporting on the performance

Table 14: JABG Enhancement Program Proposed Performance Measures, 2006 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *Juvenile Courts and Probation (Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism)*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Amount of funds allocated to accountability programming	Average number of youth per probation officer	Number and percent of youth to complete their justice requirements successfully



measures they selected under their identified JABG purpose area. They reported on the short-term and intermediate-term indicators they identified in their proposal, but reported on the output indicator from the previous year, rather than the new indicator selected for the current year. The forms are designed to provide a cumulative accounting as the program goes from quarter to quarter, yet that does not appear to be how the program administrator used the forms. Consider the data shown in Table 15. The data are shown here exactly as reported by the program. Each quarter is treated as an independent observation and the totals at the end of the quarters never incorporate numbers from the previous quarter. Due to overlap between quarters and the manner in which the subgrantee reported this information, it is not possible to determine an accurate cumulative total.

Overall Program Assessment

Overall, County JABG Enhancement Program should be considered a below average program. The proposal that was submitted for the 2005-2006 program year was clearly insufficient. The problem statement and project description did not meet the requirements of those sections. The project goal and objectives were fair and the performance measures identified were reasonable. The program met all requirements with regard to financial and progress reporting. The progress reports themselves provided some detail on the project operation, but raised as many questions as they answered. The budget was expended as proposed. It was not clear that the project was having an impact on the problem identified. The 2006-2007 program year (including the proposal) reflected many of the same strengths and weaknesses as in the previous year's project.

Table 15: JABG Enhancement Program Reported Performance Measures, 2006 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *Juvenile Courts and Probation (Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism)*

		What was the average number of youth per probation officer (number of open cases/number of probation officers)?	How many and what percent of youth successfully completed their justice requirements (number of youth to successfully complete program requirements/ total number of youth served)?
Quarter 1	At the start of the quarter:	80	159/24%
	At the end of the quarter:	74	151/24%
Quarter 2	At the start of the quarter:	80	159/24%
	At the end of the quarter:	67	297/35%
Quarter 3	At the start of the quarter:	67	297/35%
	At the end of the quarter:	80	174/28%
Quarter 4	At the start of the quarter:	80	174/28%
	At the end of the quarter:	80	104/22%



CASE STUDY FOUR

*Subgrantee: La Porte County Government/
Board of Commissioners*

*Implementing Agency: La Porte Circuit
Court*

*Project Title: Comprehensive Juvenile
Accountability Program (CJAP)*

*JABG grants: 04-JB-006, \$22,222 (federal
award: \$20,000; local match: \$2,222)*

*05-JB-013, \$22,222 (federal award: \$20,000;
local match: \$2,222)*

Program Description

The La Porte County Comprehensive Juvenile Accountability Program (CJAP) is designed as a Day Reporting Program for students who are facing expulsion from school. As an alternative to expulsion, the youth are ordered to attend the Day Reporting Program for six weeks, followed by a 12-week monitoring program once the youth have transitioned back into their home school. Successful completion of the program would result in no official record of expulsion for those youth. In addition, there is also a Night Reporting Program and a Summer Reporting Program as part of CJAP. All of the Reporting Programs are geared to facilitating the continued productive enrollment of the youth in their regular schools.

The La Porte County CJAP has been supported by JABG grants for several years. According to information provided by ICJI in the form of award control reports (FFY 2001 through FFY 2005), La Porte County has received JABG grants since FFY 2001, in the following amounts: \$60,272 in FFY 2001, \$58,707 in FFY 2002, and \$36,537 in FFY 2003. The average size grant was \$51,839.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

In the application for the 2005-2006 JABG grant, it was noted that La Porte County

has a “significant juvenile delinquency problem” and that a key risk factor in that jurisdiction is the prevalence of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions. It was also noted that during the 2003-2004 school year, the county experienced “one of the highest suspension and expulsion rates in the state.” Juvenile court personnel had been concerned that once youth are suspended or expelled from school, they are using the unsupervised daytime hours for delinquent activity. Local data were provided to make the case for the volume of juvenile delinquency and school suspensions and expulsions in La Porte County. In the problem statement, it was also noted that the JABG funds have been making a difference in reducing the rates of suspensions and expulsions by over half within a one-year period after the implementation of the CJAP projects.

The overall goal of the project was to “continue the accountability-based programs facilitated by the School Judge that provide alternatives to suspension and expulsion and reduce truancy and poor school behavior.” Given the points raised in the problem statement, this goal is not really capturing what is apparently the key long-term change they are seeking to make. The problem statement leads one to believe the program is aiming to increase the retention of students in school, and to reduce juvenile delinquency. Yet, these are not identified in the project goal, which instead looks to reduce problem behavior in school and provide alternative programming. There are three objectives presented for this project, although they are not actually distinct from one another:

- The School Judge will hold students accountable for their behavior by court ordering them into an extended



day program that serves as an alternative to exclusion from school for suspension;

- Students facing expulsion will be ordered by the School Judge to participate in the Reporting Program, an alternative to expulsion located on the grounds of the Juvenile Services Center; and
- Reduce poor school attendance and truanancies through a collaborative program facilitated by the School Judge

These objectives do not follow the guidelines provided in the instructions to the application and do not point to measurable concepts.

CJAP is a partnership between the staff at the Juvenile Services Center, the School Judge, the La Porte Community Schools and the Michigan City Schools. The structured Day Reporting Program is staffed with accredited teachers and includes remedial assistance, a focus on “core academic skills” and training in anger management and behavior management. The long-term intention of the program is to keep at-risk and court-involved youth in school to reduce their involvement in delinquency and violence.

The program also seeks to keep the classrooms in the regular schools under control by removing the disruptive students until they are able to participate in the classroom appropriately.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

In addition to the project goal and objectives proposed by the grantee, there is also an expectation that the grantee will select at least one output measure, one short-term outcome, and one intermediate-term outcome. These performance measures are to be selected from among a list of approved measures developed by OJJDP. Table 16 provides a breakdown of the performance measures selected by the grantee for this project. While most of the selected performance indicators make sense within the context of the CJAP project, there are a couple of indicators that are not a good fit for this project. For instance, as the project appears to provide a relatively narrow range of programming within CJAP, it does not make sense to track the number of graduated sanctions slots per level. Also, it does not appear very useful to track the number and percent of staff participating in accountability programs,

Table 16: CJAP Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *School Safety (Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs that are designed to enhance school safety)*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Percent of time per week spent on accountability programming	Number of school-justice partnerships	Number of target youth referred to the justice system
Number of different accountability programs operating	Number and percent of staff participating in accountability programs	Number and percent of misconduct events handled using accountability sanctions/guidelines
Number of graduated sanctions slots per level	Number and percent of youth to receive a sanctions schedule at school orientation	



since there are a set number of staff working in the Reporting Programs. In terms of evaluating the effectiveness of the grant, the subgrantee indicated that agency personnel would conduct the evaluation. Their strategy for evaluation was to include the collection and analysis of statistical systems data, and obtaining feedback on longer-term impact on professionals, agencies, and coordination among agencies. With the possible choices of how to evaluate the program, the strategy they propose is not the best fit for their program design. It would make more sense to obtain feedback on the immediate impact before the participants leave the program and on the longer-term impact on delinquent behavior.

Quarterly progress reports were submitted to cover the entire grant period. Much of the content of the progress reports was narrative discussion about the operation of the program, with very little attention to the objectives and performance measures. In the final progress report, it was noted that there had been over 400 hearings conducted by the School Judge. This is an impressive number given that they proposed to serve

100 youth for the year. It was also noted that 79 percent of the youth going through the School Court increased their attendance rate. There was also a report that more than 50 percent of the youth going through the CJAP project stayed in school and were not expelled. One of the conclusions of the final progress report indicated that the CJAP staff were going to work on better matching between the youth and the different elements in the programming so that the success rate might climb even higher. There were no reports of specific data for the performance measures identified by the grantee in their application.

Fiscal Performance

The budget for the 2005-2006 project period indicated that the bulk of the funding (\$21,122 of the total \$22,222) would be expended for project personnel costs. The remainder of the budget was to be spent on contracting out the grant administration duties. In July, the subgrantee requested an extension of the project end date to December 31 (from September 30), and that request was

Table 17: CJAP Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

	2005-2006				2006-2007	
Category	Proposed	Approved	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$18,900	\$18,900	\$17,293	91%	\$18,900	\$18,900
Contractual services	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	100%	\$1,100	\$1,100
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Total Federal Award	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,393	92%	\$20,000	\$20,000
Local Match	\$2,222	\$2,222	\$2,222	100%	\$2,222	\$2,222
Total Project	\$22,222	\$22,222	\$20,615	93%	\$22,222	\$22,222



approved. At the end of September, the subgrantee requested a budget modification to allow for some of the funds to be spent on travel, equipment, and supplies. That request was denied on the grounds that those line items were nonexistent in the original budget. At the end of the extended project period, 8 percent of the federal funds were unspent. Table 17 provides a breakdown of the proposed budget and the fiscal performance for this project. All of the required financial reports were found in the subgrantee file.

Assessment of 2006 Grant

The 2006 application is a virtual copy of the previous year's proposal. . There were two places in the newer proposal—one in the problem statement and one in the project description—where data from the 2005-2006 school year has been inserted in place of data from the 2004-2005 school year in the previous application. There did not appear to be any plans to update or revise any portion of the programming.

The project goal and objective statements were identical to those found in the earlier proposal. The concerns raised above apply to the latter proposal as well. Similarly, the identified performance measures were the exact same measures selected in the previous year's application. With the new program year, there is now the requirement that programs submit their quarterly progress reports using a new form. The new format specifically asks about the performance measures that the program has selected. For the 2006-2007 program year, the first quarterly progress report was submitted using the old form. The reports for the remaining three quarters were all submitted using the new form. This provides an interesting contrast in the

utility of those forms. With the old form, the program was able to submit some detailed descriptions of their experiences. For instance, they note the following:

- From October 1, 2006 through December 21, 2006, the School Judge conducted 116 hearings involving the accountability based programs.
- Continued efforts have been made to use Juvenile Services Center staff, when possible...this allows us to most efficiently maximize the available resources
- The School Judge will continue to meet with school administrators to continually review the current programs.
- The Court also received a grant to purchase computers for the students in the mobile classroom to better assist with learning and remediation.
- The schools continue to evaluate a variety of factors in requesting the placement of students in the accountability based programs. These programs continue to increase student attendance and decrease the number of suspensions and expulsions for our schools.

In contrast, on the new form, they simply reported the number of youth in the program, how many different accountability programs were operating during the reporting period (six), what number of community partner agencies that were participating in the school accountability programming (eight), the number of justice partner agencies that were participating in school accountability programming (one), and the average time (in hours) from infractions to sanctions (it was one). Yet, these were not really the performance measures that the program identified on their application. There was



no explanation provided as to whether they were seeking to modify their performance measures and there was no indication that ICJI staff sought to have the program modify their reporting so that the data reported lined up with what was initially proposed.

The budget for the new grant year was fairly close in design to the budget from the previous year. Again, they proposed to contract with someone to administer the grant (a contract of \$1,100) and the remaining funds were allocated to personnel costs. There was a difference in the proposed staffing of the project that would be covered under the JABG funding. In the 2005-2006 year, they used the federal funds to hire two part-time youth specialist workers. In the new grant, they proposed to cover the costs of one part-time youth specialist worker and one part-time night reporting teacher. They started the new program year still trying to expend the funds from the previous grant, and so it was the second quarter of the year before they started expending funds from the new grant. By the end of the fourth quarter (what should have been the end of the program year), they still

had not spent \$12,700 (63.5 percent) of the grant funds. There was no indication in the file how they were going to resolve this matter.

Overall Program Assessment

Overall, the La Porte County CJAP should be considered an average program. They submitted a grant application in which the different narrative sections met the guidelines in the RFP. Some concerns were raised about the project goal and the objectives, and the program selected more performance measures than they appear to have the capacity to track. Yet, the quarterly progress reports were all submitted and addressed the key outcomes of the project directly. There is a sense from the documents in the file that this program is having the desired impact on the problem. The fiscal reports were all submitted as required. The program only expended about 90 percent of the federal funds in the 2005-2006 grant period and then proposed the identical proposal in the subsequent period without any attention to how they were going to ensure they spent the funds completely.



CASE STUDY FIVE

Subgrantees: Marion County Superior Court (2005) and Marion County Justice Agency (2006)

Implementing Agencies

2005: Reach for Youth (two programs), Indianapolis Police Department (IPD), Marion County Superior Court Probation Department, and Family Works

2006: Reach for Youth, IPD, Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring (AIM), Marion County Superior Court Probation Department, and Marion County Superior Court, Juvenile Division

Project Titles: Marion County JABG Projects Round VII (2005) and Round VIII (2006)

*JABG grants: 04-JB-008: \$216,387 (federal award: \$194,748; local match: \$21,639)
05-JB-014: \$215,780 (federal award: \$194,202; local match: \$21,578)*

Program Description

The Marion County Superior Court (MCSC) on behalf of the Marion County Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) proposed the seventh round of JABG funding for five programs across three purpose areas that would serve over 2,000 youth. Brief descriptions of each program, excerpted from the subgrantee application, are included below.

Marion County has been supported by JABG grants in previous years. According to information provided by ICJI award control reports (FFY 1998 through FFY 2005), Marion County has received JABG grants since FFY 1998, in the following amounts: \$962,030 in FFY 1998, \$1,039,268 in FFY 1999, \$995,616 in FFY 2000, \$1,070,567 in FFY 2001, \$1,030,449 in FFY 2002, and \$756,750 in FFY 2003. Award control documents for FFY 2001 and 2003 specify Marion County

Superior Court Juvenile Division. The average size grant was \$975,780.

Reach for Youth: Diversion Programs (RFYDP) (\$40,000)

Purpose Area: Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies

This program provides positive community-based alternatives for youthful first-offenders and students at risk of suspension or expulsion. Diversion Programs include Teen Court for first-time offenders ages 10 to 17 who have admitted guilt, Restorative Justice Conferencing (victim-offender reconciliation process), and Community Service (a program that includes mentor-supervised and strength-based community service projects). Additionally, workshops are available to assist youth in the diversion programs address issues connected with peer pressure, self-esteem, conflict resolution, and shoplifting. The program expects to serve 370 youth with JABG support—100 in Restorative Justice Conferencing, 170 through Teen Court, and 100 will conduct Community Service as part of sanctions.

Reach for Youth: Adolescent Sexual Offender Program (RFYASOP) (\$15,357)

Purpose Area: Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs

In collaboration with the Juvenile Court and Office of Family and Children, RFYASOP will provide a range of adolescent sex offender programs, following the graduated sanctions concept for boys, ages 12-17 who have acted out sexually or committed a sexual offense and have been identified as needing service from the Juvenile Court, Child Protective Services, Office of Family and Children or school.



This program employs a graduated sanctions model to reduce recidivism among adolescent sexual offenders through community-based treatment and education. The program offers a range of treatment options, individual and group, short and long-term options, for varying degrees of risk. The Adolescent Sexual Adjustment Program (ASAG) is an outpatient treatment program for low-risk offenders and parents. The Adolescent Sexual Offender Treatment Program (ASOTP) is outpatient treatment approach for youth at moderate to medium risk of re-offending and parents. The Residential Adolescent Sexual Offender Program (RASOP) is an in-patient treatment program for 12 to 17 males considered moderate to high risk of reoffending sexually with supplemental therapy available for family members. The Making Appropriate Choices Group (MAC) is designed to provide therapy/treatment to pre-adolescent (8-12) males at Lutherwood Residential Treatment facility who have been identified as sexually active.

Indianapolis Police Department: Indy Nite Lite (INL) (\$48,240)

Purpose area: Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism.

This program focuses on children between the ages of 10 and 17 who have been arrested, have made at least one court appearance, and are on formal or electronic home detention. Due to the seriousness of their crimes, the Juvenile Court has ordered that these children be only allowed to leave their homes for educational purposes. In a collaborative plan between the Marion County Superior Court Juvenile Division Probation, the Indianapolis Police Department (IPD) Juvenile Investigations

and the Marion County Sheriff, probation, police officers, and deputies make random evening and weekend checks on probationers between 7 p.m. and 12 a.m. The concept behind the program is for the Probation Department to become more involved in the community, partner with Police and Sheriff juvenile investigators, and enforce rules and regulations for probationers as set forth by the court, thus ensuring accountability.

Marion County Superior Court Probation Department: Restitution and Community Service Work Program (CSW) (\$66,842)

Purpose area: Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs

Indiana law allows the court to order restitution and community service work as part of a juvenile's probation. In conjunction with the Marion County Prosecutor's Office, the Marion Superior Court Probation Department (MCSCPD) proposed to continue CSW to increase accountability for delinquent acts, increase the amount of court ordered community service work, and compensate victims and the community for their collective losses. MCSCP proposed to serve 300 youth, generating 7,500 hours of community service work and \$38,000 in restitution during the grant period.

Family Works: Group Treatment for Girls who Sexually Offend (\$14,609)

Purpose Area: Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies

This Family Works (FW) program provides psycho-educational group therapy to female youth ages 12 to 17 referred for treatment of sexual behavior problems.



Problem Statement, Goals, and Objectives and Program Activities

The subgrantee should be commended for providing empirical data and information regarding juvenile justice needs and crime problems as part of its problem identification statement. The proposal included data regarding juvenile crime levels, substance abuse and drug crime, as well as attributes of crimes committed, such as types of cases as well as information regarding the increased incidence of girls entering the juvenile justice system without benefit of specialized programming. The application did not include selection criteria for proposed programs, nor connection between the problem statement, data, and proposed programs. Data were cited regarding the increase in number of girls entering the juvenile justice system and specifically the MCSC Juvenile Court. However, in light of two proposed program targeting sexual offenders, one of which was for females specifically, data regarding this specific population that could bolster program justification was lacking. As part of the overall problem statement, MCSC also cited the “insufficient coordination and communication among youth service providers within and beyond the juvenile justice system” where “providers function in isolation, unaware of services to individual at-risk youth” as an area in need of attention.

In addition to overall program descriptions, several of the five funded programs provided additional information regarding past activity. RFYDP cited low recidivism rates (less than 10 percent) as reported by independent research of evaluation juvenile court re-arrest rate data and satisfaction with probation officers program. RFYASOP also provided a brief summary of past activity and relative

performance under each program type mentioned in above description. INL offered a brief program history and cited support from JABG funds since Round II. INL implied that statistics regarding arrests, home detention, and probation violations demonstrated success. However, this was somewhat difficult to interpret, given the lack of baseline data and a clear statement indicating whether the increase or decline in these measures would demonstrate positive program impact. CSW also provided an account of past activities. FW offered a much less detailed program description than other programs and provided minimal specific information regarding the targeted population and treatment approach.

The overall application proposed to continue working toward three overarching goals originally established to guide the Marion County JCEC Coordinated Enforcement Plan to Reduce Juvenile Crime. (A copy of the latter was not included in the subgrantee file.) These three goals included 1) reducing recidivism, 2) reducing drug use, and 3) increasing collaboration and communication among service providers. In addition to meeting state and federal program area qualifications and reporting requirements, the JCEC required local projects to meet one or more of the above goals. Proposed goals and objectives for each program are included in Table 18. The majority of project objectives were consistent with program goals. Most also were quantifiable, with the exception of the FW’s objectives which were less concrete and would likely prove difficult to measure.

Measurements and Performance Metrics

Proposed output, short- and intermediate-term outcome metrics by program are listed in Table 18. All measures appear



Table 18: Marion County JABG Round VII Programs, Proposed Goals, Objectives, Output Indicators, Short- and Intermediate-term Outcomes, 2005 Operating Period

Implementing Agency & Program	JABG Purpose Area	Goal	Project Objectives	Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Reach for Youth: Adolescent Sexual Offenders Program	Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies.	To reduce recidivism of adolescent sexual offenders and pre-adolescents who act out sexually through community-based and residential treatment and education programs	<p>1. 100 percent of adolescents who successfully complete the ASOTP and ASAG programs will create a comprehensive re-offense prevention plan designed to prevent further inappropriate behaviors</p> <p>2. 80 percent of adolescents and pre-adolescents involved in the RASOP and MAC program will complete a comprehensive safety plan outlining necessary supervision requirements before recommended release from the residential facility</p> <p>3. 80 percent of adolescents who complete the ASOTP, ASAG and RASOP programs will demonstrate increased knowledge of legal and appropriate sexual behaviors as demonstrated by pre/post measures</p>	<p>1. Number of accountability program slots: ASOTP (24); ASAG (3-12); RASOP (12); MAC (8)</p>	<p>1. Number and percent of youth with a behavioral contract developed at intake into accountability program: 90 percent of clients will have behavior contracts. (Maximum number of contracts is 54)</p>	<p>1. Number and percent of youth to successfully complete their accountability program; 60 percent (25) of adolescents in ASOTP and ASAG program will successfully complete their accountability programs</p>
Reach for Youth: Diversion Programs	Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs	To reduce recidivism for first-time juvenile offenders and develop new knowledge and skills in the offending youth	<p>1. 80 percent of youth offenders referred to restorative justice conferencing will complete the program</p> <p>2. 80 percent of youth offenders will participate in a restorative justice conference</p> <p>3. 80 percent of youth offenders will complete restorative justice conferencing</p> <p>4. 70 percent of offenders referred to Teen Court will participate in community service</p> <p>5. 85 percent of offenders referred to Teen Court will participate in the Teen Court program</p> <p>6. 85 percent of offenders referred to Teen Court will complete the program and be successfully diverted from the juvenile court</p>	<p>1. Number and percent of target youth to receive restorative justice conferencing program</p> <p>2. Number and percent of youth to participate in Community Service</p>	<p>1. Number and percent of target youth to receive restorative justice programming</p> <p>2. Number and percent of target youth to receive Teen Court programming</p>	<p>1. Number and percent of youth to successfully complete restorative justice programming</p> <p>2. Number and percent of youth to successfully complete Teen Court requirements</p>



Implementing Agency & Program	JABG Purpose Area	Goal	Project Objectives	Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Family Works: Group Treatment for Girls Who Sexually Offend	Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies.	Increase personal accountability for sexually offensive behaviors among female adolescents exhibiting sexually offensive behaviors	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Youth participants will increase their understanding of cognitive distortions, how they are developed, and how they interfere with an individual's ability to take responsibility for her own offensive behavior toward others Youth participants will develop an individualized written "relapse prevention plan," which will identify personal triggers for acting out sexually toward others and ways to avoid or overcome personal triggers in the future Youth participants will increase the number of successful pre-social interactions with peers Youth participants will identify personal skills deficits and learn skills to replace them 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of accountability programs in operation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percent of youth with behavioral contract developed at their intake into accountability program 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of days of program participation per youth Number and percent of youth to complete accountability program successfully
Marion Superior Court Probation Department: Restitution and Community Service Work	Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs	Increase accountability of juvenile offenders to victims	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To increase the number of juvenile offenders who earn restitution that they owe through community service work To increase the percentage of juvenile offenders who fully satisfy their restitution obligations to the victim To increase the amount of restitution paid to victims 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of youth who complete community service work 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percentage of youth who completed ordered community service work 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percent of ordered and actual offenders to pay monetary restitution
IPD: Indy Nite Lite	Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing juvenile recidivism	Increase accountability and reduce recidivism in Marion County for offenders under formal home detention, intensive probation and electronic monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase collaboration between Marion County Juvenile Court, Probation, IPD, and the sheriff's department Increase compliance with probation and home detention release 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of accountability program slots 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of different accountability sanctioning options available 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percent of youth to complete their justice requirement successfully



appropriate to the goals and objectives of the program and are congruent with OJJDP JABG purpose area performance measures.¹⁴ The majority of 2005 quarterly progress reports were not found in the subgrantee file. In terms of overall performance, the inclusion of baseline data in program descriptions and/or the problem statement with specific connect to programs funding would have provided a frame of reference to assess impact.

All required RFYDP and CSW quarterly progress reports were missing from the file. The first two RFYASOP quarterly progress reports were submitted, in which program administrators reported on significant program challenges. The contractual relationship with the residential facility was terminated and as a result 11 clients were administratively terminated. In addition, a number of clients also were released unsuccessfully from the program. By the first quarter, 26 youth were served and one completed the program. Twenty youth were served during the second quarter and three were terminated unsuccessfully. All four participants who completed the program attained stated

intermediate outcomes. The first two FW quarterly progress reports were submitted. There was no activity reported in first quarter. By the second quarter, FW reported that two of three participants had completed the program. However, there were no new referrals/members and the group was temporarily suspended given insufficient participants. Three INL quarterly progress reports were submitted. Program administrators reported that that Marion County Juvenile Justice System underwent significant changes that hindered INL's ability to report the number of juveniles on home detention and/or intensive probation and recidivism rates. Progress reports included the number of sweeps and checks conducted as well as the number and percent of arrests and violations per check.

Fiscal Performance

As shown in Table 19, actual expenditures were somewhat inconsistent with the proposed and approved budget. In fact, during the grant period, the subgrantee requested an amendment to the budget. The request involved reallocating unused

Table 19: Marion County JABG Projects Round VII Budget Overview, 2005 and 2006 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006				2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$157,038	\$157,038	\$134,891	86%	\$136,648	\$136,648
Contractual services	\$34,164	\$34,164	\$34,164	100%	\$54,700	\$54,700
Travel	\$680	\$680	\$0	0%	\$0	\$0
Equipment					\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$2,866	\$2,866	\$0	0%	\$2,854	\$2,854
Total Federal Award	\$194,748	\$194,748	\$169,055	87%	\$194,202	\$194,202
Local Match	\$21,639	\$21,639	\$21,639	100%	\$21,578	\$21,578
Total Project	\$216,387	\$216,387	\$190,694	88%	\$215,780	\$215,780

¹⁴OJJDP Performance Measures for JABG. Retrieved August 20, 2007 from http://www.dsgonline.com/Program_Logic_Model/titlev_pm.htm



funds to enhance the Juvenile Court's case management system. The request was denied on the basis the reallocation would mean a significant program change and the new program also was not identified in the original application. All required quarterly financial reports were submitted for the 2005 operating period. Eighty-eight percent of grant funds were expended.

Assessment of 2006 Grant

The 2006 grant proposes that the Marion County Justice Agency assume responsibility for programmatic implementation and the MCSC would remain as co-implementing agency and undertake fiscal management. Similar to the 2005 grant, purpose areas covered by the 2006 grant include: 1) Juvenile Records System (\$20,000); 2) Accountability (\$44,032); 3) Restorative Justice (\$86,462); and 4) Juvenile Courts and Probation (\$34,008).

With regard to the inclusion of empirical data to substantiate that a problem exists, the 2006 problem statement is not as extensive as the previous year's. The 2006 grant funds three programs from the prior grant, including RFYDP, INL, and CSW, and proposed two new programs. Two programs from the previous grant that addressed the problem of adolescent sexual offenders were not included in the 2006 application, but without explanation. 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.

One of the new proposed projects is a Mentor Academy for the Marion County Juvenile Court provided by Aftercare by IUPUI through Mentoring (AIM). This effort will offer training and program

support for all mentoring programs providing services to youths referred from juvenile court. Additionally, the Mentor Academy will provide technical assistance to mentoring programs in Marion County in a variety of areas. The goal of the project is development of a Mentor Academy to increase the capacity of mentoring programs in Marion County to effectively serve youths referred by juvenile court.

The second new project involves enhancements to the Juvenile Court's case management system (Quest). A complete list of goals and objectives for all five 2006 projects is provided in Table 20.

As also shown in Table 20, proposed outputs and outcomes for continuing programs—RFYDP, INL and CSW—remain unchanged from 2005. All programs, including the two new initiatives, have selected JABG-endorsed performance measures. All required quarterly progress reports for each program have been submitted. RFYDP did not report on all output and short-term indicators. For instance, program administrators did not provide progress data regarding the number of youth to participate in and receive restorative justice and community service work/teen court programming. RFYDP supplied the number of hours of training about accountability program offered and the number and percent of youth with a behavioral contract developed at intake into program. It is unclear how these data related to the proposed metrics shown in Table 20. In terms of the percent of youth to successfully complete an accountability program, RFYDP reported close to or over 90 percent in each quarter. AIM consistently reported on all performance measures and indicated that all staff received training and 100 percent of youth referrals across departments and agencies. For the most part, INL



Table 20: Marion County JABG Round VIII Programs, Proposed Goals, Objectives, Output Indicators, Short- and Intermediate-term Outcomes, 2006 Operating Period

Implementing Agency & Program	JABG Purpose Area	Goal	Project Objectives	Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Reach for Youth: Diversion Programs	Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs	To reduce recidivism for first-time juvenile offenders and develop new knowledge and skills in the offending youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 80 percent of youth offenders referred will complete program 2. 80 percent of youth offenders will participate in a restorative justice conference 3. 80 percent of youth offenders will complete Restorative Justice conferencing 4. 70 percent of offenders referred to teen court will participate in Community Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number and percent of target youth to participate restorative justice conferencing program 2. Number and percent of youth to participate in community service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number and percent of target youth to receive restorative justice programming 2. Number and percent of target youth to receive Teen Court 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number and percent of youth to successfully complete the restorative justice program 2. Number and percent of youth to successfully complete Teen Court requirements
AIM: Mentor Academy	Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles	Development of a Mentor Academy to increase the capacity of mentoring programs in Marion County to effectively serve youths referred by juvenile Court	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Programs receiving technical assistance will demonstrate compliance with evidence-based standards for mentoring programs 2. 80 percent of trained mentors will establish a meaningful relationship with a juvenile offender 3. Mentoring programs will document the level of contact between mentor and mentee, level of satisfaction with relationship, and behavioral outcomes of youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number and percent of staff trained in accountability programs 2. Number of accountability programs in operation 3. Number of accountability program slots 	1. Number of supervision meetings per youth per month	1. Number and percent of youth referrals across departments, organizations, agencies, or units
Marion Superior Court Probation Department: Restitution and Community Service Work	Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs	Increase accountability of juvenile offenders to victims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the number of juvenile offenders who earn restitution that they owe through community service work 2. Increase the percentage of juvenile offenders who fully satisfy their restitution obligations to the victim 	1. Number of youth who complete community service work	1. Number and percentage of youth who completed ordered community service work	1. Number and percent of ordered and actual offenders to pay monetary restitution
IPD: Indy Nite Lite	Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing juvenile recidivism	Increase accountability and reduce recidivism in Marion County for offenders under formal home detention, intensive probation and electronic monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase collaboration between the Marion County Juvenile Court, Probation, IPD, and the sheriff's department 2. Increase compliance with probation and home detention release 	1. Number of accountability program slots	1. Number of different accountability sanctioning options available	1. Number and percent of youth to complete their justice requirement successfully
Marion County Superior Court, Juvenile Division: Quest Case Management System	Information sharing	Increase case flow efficiency and improve the services provided to system involved youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance the case management system to record when parties have checked in for cases and the paperwork has been completed for a case to be called 2. Enhance the case management system to run statistical reports 	1. Number of inter-agency information requests	1. Staff time required to access client data from outside agencies	1. Number of data elements shared among agency partners



consistently reported on performance measures. However, program administrators did not indicate the number of accountability sanction options available, but included information on the average number of youth per probation officer. CSW reported on all selected performance measures and indicated that the proposed intermediate outcome had been achieved by all youth offenders. Quest supplied information on all proposed output and outcome measures. However, without baseline data that provides some context for this new initiative, it is difficult to measure its impact.

The subgrantee requested a project modification which has been approved. The grant had been under spent by \$53,270 across the AIM/Mentor Academy and CSW programs and also in grant administration. The proposed modification would reallocate funds to benefit a Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) and supplement research for Disproportionate Minority Confinement, case processing, data entry, and further Quest enhancements. The subgrantee also requested a six month extension to utilize funds. As of the third quarterly financial report submitted September 14, 2007, 60 percent of the total grant has been expended.

Overall Program Assessment

Overall, the Marion County project should

be considered below average. The subgrantee provided a relatively strong problem statement that included requisite empirical data on juvenile justice needs and crime trends among the target population. The majority of program goals were appropriate for the proposed programs. With the exception of one program under the 2005 award, nearly all program objectives were consistent with program goals. Output and outcome measures reflected JABG-endorsed performance indicators. Unfortunately, the actual operation of the projects did not indicate that the programming was delivered at the high level we might expect given the application. A substantial number of quarterly progress reports were either not submitted or missing for several of the programs and in the case of two, none of these reports were found in the subgrantee file. As a result, it is difficult to assess the performance and impact of the 2005 projects. In terms of quarterly progress reporting, under new program administrators, the 2006 projects have demonstrated a marked improvement over 2005 with 100 percent report submission. These 2006 submissions indicate that most programs were probably beneficial and that projects broadly accomplished what was planned and achieved the majority of proposed outcomes.



CASE STUDY SIX

*Subgrantee: Monroe County Government
Implementing Agency: Monroe County
Probation Department*

*Project Title: Serious Habitual Offender
Comprehensive Action Program
(SHOCAP)*

*JABG grants: 04-JB-009, \$22,222
(federal award: \$20,000; local match:
\$2,222)*

*05-JB-016, \$22,222 (federal award:
\$20,000; local match: \$2,222)*

Program Description

The Monroe County Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program (SHOCAP) is designed to identify, treat, and control the most serious habitual juvenile offenders in the county. Youth that qualify for services under SHOCAP must meet a number of criteria and should have already received every opportunity to reform under traditional probation programming. SHOCAP provides intensive services coordinated by a team of professionals and guided by an individualized case plan. This program involves a strategy for greater accountability of the youth through the use of graduated sanctions. This program is a continuation program and involves an expanded program to provide additional support to youth deemed nearly eligible for SHOCAP.

The Monroe County SHOCAP has been supported by JABG grants for several years. According to information provided by ICJI in the form of award control reports (FFY 1998 through FFY 2005), SHOCAP has received JABG grants since FFY 1998, in the following amounts: \$64,670 in FFY 1998, \$71,108 in FFY 1999, \$58,759 in FFY 2000, \$51,417 in FFY 2001, \$49,013 in FFY 2002, and \$38,035 in FFY 2003. The average size grant was \$55,500.

Problem Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Project Activities

In the application for the 2005-2006 JABG grant, it was noted that despite a decline in juvenile offending overall, Monroe County was experiencing an increased number of high-rate juvenile offenders. In addition, it was noted that there was an “emerging group of youthful offenders not yet attaining SHOCAP status, but in need of a more intensive level of supervision not currently available.” These youth are referred to as “pre-SHO.” The problem statement in the application did not include any local data to justify the conclusion that there was an increased or emerging problem to address with the JABG funds. There was also no discussion of the results from the SHOCAP efforts over the previous years to justify a continued investment of JABG funds for this initiative.

The overall goal of the project was to establish “and maintain an accountability-based program designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies.” This goal is a word-for-word duplicate of the identified JABG purpose area that this program is identified as fitting. In addition, this goal is perhaps inappropriately broad, given that there was to be a careful screening process by the court to identify the youth to be served by SHOCAP. As a result, the youth they are going to track are not referred directly by law enforcement personnel. If the goal were narrowed to apply to those youth participating in SHOCAP, then it would follow from the problem statement and would make sense in the context of the proposal.

There are three objectives listed in the application and they all are consistent



with the overall goal of the project:

- During placement into SHOCAP and the Pre-SHO program, the average number of supervision meetings per month will increase 50 percent compared to an equivalent period of supervision in a non-accountability based program;
- During placement in SHOCAP and the Pre-SHO program, client referrals for new criminal or delinquent acts will decrease 50 percent compared to prior referral average; and
- During placement in SHOCAP and the Pre-SHO program, the time from violation to sanction will decrease 75 percent, compared to an equivalent event during traditional supervision

These objectives make sense in the context of this project. The first objective is a way to document that, in fact, the youth are receiving extra supervision. The second and third objectives provide alternative ways to track recidivism on a sample of juvenile offenders. They also set target amounts and benchmarks to provide for proper interpretation of the results relative to their standard. The objectives are all measurable.

SHOCAP is designed to provide intensive probation supervision in a way that allows the court to maintain the youth in the community. This is intended to facilitate the maintenance of family relationships, the utilization of community resources, and the development of new

support systems within the jurisdiction. A SHOCAP team evaluates the appropriateness of each case (both SHOCAP and pre-SHO). Information is shared among the team members to allow for the best assessment which leads to an individualized case plan. The team conducts regular reviews on the progress of each client. Rewards and sanctions are applied based on “individual progress, performance, and success.”

Measurements and Performance Metrics

In addition to the project goal and objectives proposed by the grantee, there is also an expectation that the grantee will select at least one output measure, one short-term outcome, and one intermediate-term outcome. These performance measures are to be selected from among a list of approved measures developed by OJJDP. Table 21 provides a breakdown of the performance measures selected by the grantee for this project. The performance indicators selected for this project all make sense and fit the program design well. In terms of evaluating the effectiveness of the grant, the subgrantee indicated that agency personnel would conduct the evaluation. Their strategy for evaluation was to include the collection and analysis of statistical data, obtaining feedback on longer-term impact on delinquency, obtaining feedback on longer-term impact on professionals and agencies, and the

Table 21: SHOCAP Proposed Performance Measures, 2005 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *Accountability (Establish and maintain accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies)*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Number of accountability program slots	Number of supervision meetings per youth per month	Time in hours from infraction to sanction



evaluation of case management records.

Three of the four quarterly progress reports were found in the subgrantee file—the third quarterly report was not found. The agency provided data on each of the different objectives and performance indicators. The number of contacts per youth was increased significantly, with results showing an average of one contact per day for each youth in the SHOCAP program. They also found that the number of delinquent referrals was very low for those youth in the program. Across the three quarters in which data has been found, there was a total of one referral for the combined group of SHOCAP youth (high-rate offenders previously). The data also showed that the time from violation to sanction was reduced significantly compared to youth not participating in SHOCAP. In only one area was there a lower level of performance demonstrated than was proposed and that was in the number of clients served. They proposed to serve 30 youth over the course of the year, but served fewer than 20 in total.

Fiscal Performance

There was one line item on the budget for

this project. The SHOCAP Field Officer was the only expense on the project budget. Table 22 provides a breakdown of the proposed budget and the fiscal performance for this project. Initially, the budget indicated that 100 percent of the costs would be for the salary of the Field Officer. The program requested an amendment during the grant period to be able to pay a portion of the fringe benefits from the budgeted amount. This change was subsequently approved and the funds were nearly fully expended by the end of the project period. At the end of the project, there was \$95 unexpended. The program expended only \$1,000 in the first quarter of the project period, but there is no indication in any of the progress reports that they were without a Field Officer for any portion of the project period. All of the required financial reports were found in the subgrantee file.

Assessment of 2006 Grant

The 2006 application represents an improvement over the previous grant application. The three narrative sections of the proposal are rewritten from the earlier application and in the newer application,

Table 22: SHOCAP Budget Overview, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 Operating Periods

Category	2005-2006				2006-2007	
	Proposed	Approved	Actual	Burn Rate	Proposed	Approved
Personnel	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$19,905	100%	\$20,000	\$20,000
Contractual services	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Travel	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Operating expenses	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	\$0	\$0
Total Federal Award	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$19,905	100%	\$20,000	\$20,000
Local Match	\$2,222	\$2,222	\$2,222	100%	\$2,222	\$2,222
Total Project	\$22,222	\$22,222	\$22,127	100%	\$22,222	\$22,222



they are stronger in their response to the specific questions in each section. In contrast to the 2005 grant application, the 2006 proposal provides a focused problem identification statement in which it clearly spells out the consequences for the county of not providing an effective strategy for working with the high-rate juvenile offenders. The problem statement explains the trends in Monroe County for high-rate juvenile offenders, although there is no provision of local data to validate their claims. There is a good discussion of the literature on serious, high-rate juvenile offending and the types of interventions that might be incorporated into the SHOCAP programming. The Project Description was also more responsive to the specific questions that were supposed to be addressed. As a continuation program, there was an expectation that there would be a summary of the achievements of the project to this point—there was only very limited data provided on this issue. Whereas the previous year’s application proposed to serve pre-SHO clients, there was no mention of this in the newer proposal.

The project goal was unchanged from the year before. There was one less objective, with the goal to reduce the time from violation to sanction being abandoned in the newer application. Similarly, the performance measures were the same with the one exception. For the intermediate-term outcome, rather than

tracking the time in hours from infraction to sanction, the program is now selecting a different measure. As identified in Table 23, the new intermediate-term outcome is proposed to be “Number and percent of youth to complete their accountability program successfully.”

Once again, the only item on the budget was the personnel costs for the SHOCAP Field Officer. Based on the fiscal performance of the program in the previous grant period, this budget makes sense and there is every reason to believe the program will actually follow through with the budget as proposed and approved. In fact, in the final financial report found in the file, the program had spent all but \$27 by the end of the project period. Progress reports were found in the file for the full year. The program began using the newly-available progress report forms that specifically mapped to the performance measures selected by the project. The progress reports were responsive to the specific performance measures selected in the application. Data provided in the reports documented the successful implementation of the project in terms of the number of contacts between the probation officers and the juvenile offenders. There were a very small number of clients served by this program over the course of the year, with fewer than 10 youth being served (out of a proposed 30 to be served during the grant period).

Table 23: SHOCAP Proposed Performance Measures, 2006 Operating Period

JABG Purpose Area: *Accountability (Establish and maintain accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies)*

Output Indicators	Short-term Outcomes	Intermediate-term Outcomes
Number of accountability program slots	Number of supervision meetings per youth per month	Number and percent of youth to complete their accountability program successfully



Overall Program Assessment

Overall, the Monroe County SHOCAP should be considered an average program. There were deficiencies noted in the proposal for the 2005-2006 grant period. The project goal was inadequate, but the project objectives were reasonable given the context of the project. The identified performance measures also fit well with the project. The program submitted a majority of their quarterly progress reports and the data they provided

pointed to a positive impact of the project—the project appears to do what it intended. All of the required financial reports were found in the file and the budget was expended as proposed in the grant application. The program showed growth from the 2005 grant period to the 2006 grant period, which was unusual among the cases we examined for this report. The program appears to operate as proposed with demonstrated impact for that jurisdiction.



CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report provides a review of JABG grants awarded in 2005 to units of local government who were also recipients of JABG grants in 2006. The overall goal of the JABG program is to reduce juvenile offending through accountability-based approaches focused on both offenders and state and local juvenile justice systems. In 2005, ICJI awarded 11 JABG grants that totaled \$438,906 to Indiana subgrantees and \$816,994 to 34 grantees in 2006. The number of JABG projects examined in this report consists of six grants awarded during the 2005 operating period (October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006) and the continuing six projects supported during the 2006 operating period (October 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007). These six projects comprise the case study sample.

The six 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 subgrantees did a poor job of constructing project goals. In addition to specifying a project goal, they were also supposed to identify up to three objectives. The objectives of the projects were supposed to lay out the outcomes in measurable terms such as how much and by when. Some of the projects also 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 budget was followed and whether the grant funds were fully expended. In general, the projects did reasonably 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. In this regard, we found mixed results. Many programs met the standard for submitting all of the required reports and we typically found all of the required financial reports in the files. Quarterly progress reports were sometimes missing from the files and many of the reports we found were lacking in their content.

The fourth dimension that was examined as part of this review focused on whether the programs reported on outcomes. We find that programs are good at reporting on their activities, but not so good at reporting on their outcomes. Even when using a form that directs the attention of the program staff to outcomes, there are still examples of programs that ignore those requirements. Finally, all of the cases were assessed based on the application and program reports for the 2006 grants. Most programs recycled their 2005 proposals with minimal changes and submitted those in 2006. While this appears to be the common practice among the subgrantees, that fact makes it that much more of a concern since it speaks to a potential perception on the part of the applicants that they do not actually have to compete for the grants. In fact, while there were only two cases that were rated as average (the other four were rated as below average), they were both from jurisdictions that did not receive direct appropriations.

We conclude this report with the following recommendations:

1. It is noteworthy that the six cases we examined had all been receiving JABG funding for several years. This has a



number of implications for the use of JABG funds. The typical proposal that we looked at for this review did not appear to be written in anticipation of a competitive process. Funding was provided to programs that did not appear to be worthy of funding based on their applications and this may condition the programs to believe it is not important to draft a convincing application. As long as these programs continue to receive funding, we wonder how likely it is that new programs will compete for and receive JABG funding. When projects are awarded continuation funding, this should be based on a track record. There should be evidence that the programs did what they planned to do, achieved the outcomes they proposed, and spent the money they were awarded. Yet there does not appear to be a connection between the performance of the grantee in one year and their success in securing additional funding in subsequent years. ICJI should explore ways to inform the grant selection process so that these issues are considered.

2. A related concern has to do with the process under which funding decisions are made for JABG grants. It appears that certain jurisdictions are going to receive direct allocations of JABG funding. Among other jurisdictions, there appear to be a number of programs that continue to receive continuation grants over extended periods time. ICJI is encouraged to take a more directive role in the funding process. For instance, even in the direct appropriation counties, it should be possible to set guidelines on the kinds of projects that can be funded with

JABG funds—ICJI may even set priorities for the kinds of programming they are looking to see implemented in those jurisdictions. In addition, it is important to ensure that the process is open and inviting to new projects in jurisdictions that have not historically received JABG funding.

3. 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 JABG 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.
4. At the beginning of the 2006-2007 project period, a new form was provided for the quarterly progress reports. These forms are customized for each purpose area and are designed to direct the subgrantees to report their performance measures. Yet, there are no detailed instructions with the form and so the reporting of performance measures is spotty at best. In addition, the new forms require only quantitative data and so the story of how programs are operating and why they are not meeting their objectives is missing from the progress reports. ICJI is encouraged to revise the new forms to provide careful instructions and to allow for qualitative information on the operation of the project and clarification as to the results provided.
 5. There is one additional issue related to the project goals and objectives. How is ICJI proposing to keep the programs accountable for achieving their proposed objectives and goals? Programs frequently identify goals and objectives and then never report on those measures throughout the year. The same programs then turn around and propose the exact same measures in the subsequent year, without any acknowledgement for ignoring those measures. The programs need technical assistance throughout the year to ensure that they are capturing information pertinent to their goals and objectives for the report to ICJI at the end of the following quarter.
 6. Given comparatively low JABG award burn rates—an average of 89 percent for FFY 1998 through 2004—ICJI should consider efforts directed at soliciting more subgrantees in order to take advantage of 100 percent of federal JABG allocations to the state.
 7. The timing of the grants appears to create difficulties for the programs in terms of their ability to deliver a full-year program in the 12 months allotted. Programs are notified right around October 1, with some funding out after October 1. The program is expected to begin on October 1 and a progress report is due by January 31. In many cases, the project was just getting under way at the end of the first quarter and in several cases the programs were applying for extensions to complete their projects, or expend their funds, while also facing the beginning of a new grant on October 1 of the following year. As ICJI revises the grant application process, they are encouraged to schedule submission dates that would allow for funding decisions to be made and notice given to the programs in enough time to allow the projects to begin on the first day of funding.
 8. 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 JABG funds fit into the larger picture. Applicants should be invited to explain how JABG funds are going to contribute to the development and facilitation of more effective programming, and it should be clear that there is a plan to sustain the programming in the future in the absence of federal funding.

Continuation projects should also be asked to provide details about their fiscal performance on earlier JABG grants, so that this information can be more deliberately considered in subsequent funding decisions by ICJI.

9. Finally, it is of special note that every JABG applicant is expected to identify a JCEC and to provide a graduated sanctions certificate. These are special requirements of JABG, yet there is no indication that there is an actual role for the JCEC or graduated sanctions within the project. ICJI is encouraged to consider ways to make these two components vital parts of the operating JABG projects. There should be some way for the program to report on the use of graduated sanctions and to document the involvement of the JCEC—this can be part of the quarterly progress reports.



APPENDIX A JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY BLOCK GRANT PURPOSE AREAS¹⁵

1. **Graduated sanctions:** Developing, implementing, and administering graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders.
2. **Corrections/detention facilities:** Building, expanding, renovating, or operating temporary or permanent juvenile corrections or detention facilities, including training of personnel.
3. **Court staffing and pretrial services:** Hiring juvenile court judges, probation officers, and court-appointed defenders and special advocates, and funding pretrial services (including mental health screening and assessment) for juvenile offenders, to promote the effective and expeditious administration of the juvenile justice system.
4. **Prosecutors (staffing):** Hiring additional prosecutors so that more cases involving violent juvenile offenders can be prosecuted and backlogs reduced.
5. **Prosecutors (funding):** Providing funding to enable prosecutors to address drug, gang, and youth violence problems more effectively and for technology, equipment, and training to assist prosecutors in identifying and expediting the prosecution of violent juvenile offenders.
6. **Training for law enforcement and court personnel:** Establishing and maintaining training programs for law enforcement and other court personnel with respect to preventing and controlling juvenile crime.
7. **Juvenile gun courts:** Establishing juvenile gun courts for the prosecution and adjudication of juvenile firearms offenders.
8. **Juvenile drug courts:** Establishing drug court programs to provide continuing judicial supervision over juvenile offenders with substance abuse problems and to integrate administration of other sanctions and services for such offenders.
9. **Juvenile records system:** Establishing and maintaining a system of juvenile records designed to promote public safety.
10. **Information sharing:** Establishing and maintaining interagency information-sharing programs that enable the juvenile and criminal justice systems, schools, and social services agencies to make more informed decisions regarding the early identification, control, supervision, and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit serious delinquent or criminal acts.
11. **Accountability:** Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies.
12. **Risk and needs assessment:** Establishing and maintaining programs to conduct risk and needs assessments of juvenile offenders that facilitate effective early intervention and the provision of comprehensive services, including mental health screening and treatment and substance abuse testing and treatment, to such offenders.
13. **School safety:** Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs that are designed to enhance school safety.

¹⁵Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program Purposes Areas. Retrieved November 26, 2007, from <http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/jabg/purpose.html>



14. **Restorative justice:** Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs.
15. **Juvenile courts and probation:** Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism.
16. **Detention/corrections personnel:** Hiring detention and corrections personnel and establishing and maintaining training programs for such personnel, to improve facility practices and programming.