**OJJDP Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program (JABG)**

**Performance Measures Grid**

The following pages outline the performance measures for the OJJDP Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program (JABG). These pages show the performance measures and the data that the grantee must provide to calculate the performance measures. The calculations on the grid are performed automatically by the DCTAT with the values that are entered. Examples of calculated values include percentages, total amounts, and averages.

The performance measures are presented as outputs or outcomes. Output measures are the products of a program’s implementation or activities and are usually counts of things, such as amount of service delivered; staff hired; systems developed; sessions conducted; materials developed; or policies, procedures, and/or legislation created. Outcome measures are the benefits or changes observed or realized through the outputs and may include program completion, behavior, attitudes, skills, knowledge, values, conditions, or other attributes.

Grantees are required to provide data for the indicators in the column labeled “data the grantee reports.”

The performance measures for activities funded under JABG are reported in two formats: numeric data, and narrative questions that require a written response. Both formats are entered in the OJJDP Data Collection and Technical Assistance Tool (DCTAT) annually.

The activities funded by JABG are organized into 18 purpose areas:

* Graduated Sanctions
* Facilities
* Hiring Court Staff/Pretrial Services
* Hiring Prosecutors
* Funding for Prosecutors
* Training Law Enforcement/Court Personnel
* Gun Courts
* Drug Courts
* Juvenile Records
* Information Sharing
* Accountability-Based Programs
* Risk/Needs Assessments
* School Safety
* Restorative Justice
* Court/Probation Programming
* Hiring Detention/Corrections Staff
* Reentry
* Indigent Defense

The grantee is asked to select the purpose areas that correspond to the activities approved in each OJJDP application. The system then generates performance measures for each respective purpose area. The grid that follows is divided into the 17 purpose areas and the corresponding measures for each.

In addition to entering data in the DCTAT, the grantee is responsible for creating a *Performance Data Report* from the DCTAT in June of each calendar year. Each grantee then submits this report to OJJDP through the Grants Management System (GMS).

If you have any questions about the DCTAT or performance measures, please call the **OJJDP-DCTAT Help Desk at 1-866-487-0512,** or send an e-mail to: **ojjdp-dctat@csrincorporated.com**

For questions about JABG programs, please contact your OJJDP Program Manager.

All award recipients are required to provide data for each applicable OJJDP Core Measure shown below. The data entered as “data grantee reports” should represent **ALL** youth who participate in programs funded by OJJDP awards. The numbering represented here may not always match the numbering in the DCTAT system. All percentages will be auto-calculated for you, but they have been included here so you can see what the data are used for.

| **#** | **OJJDP Core Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Number and percent of programs/initiatives employing evidence-based programs or practices** | Report the number and percent of programs/initiatives employing evidence based programs or practices. These include programs and practices that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance abuse. Model programs can come from many valid sources (e.g., Blueprints, OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide, SAMHSA’s Model Programs, state model program resources, etc.). | 1. Number of program/initiatives employing evidence based programs or practices
2. Total number of programs/initiatives
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 2 | **Number and percent of youth with whom an evidence-based program or practice was used** | The number and percent of youth served with whom an evidence-based program or practice was used. These include programs and practices that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance abuse. Model programs can come from many valid sources (e.g., Blueprints for Violence Prevention, OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide, SAMHSA’s Model Programs, etc.). | 1. The number of youth served using an evidence-based program or practice
2. Total number of youth served during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3 | **Number of program youth and/or families served during the reporting period** | An unduplicated count of the number of youth (or youth and families) **served** by the program during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred data source. | 1. Number of program youth/families carried over from the previous reporting period
2. New admissions during the reporting period
3. Total youth/families served during the reporting period (A+B)
 |  |
| 4 | **Number and percent of program youth completing program requirements** | The number and percent of program youth who have **successfully** fulfilled all program obligations and requirements. This does not include youth who are still participating in ongoing programs. Program obligations will vary by program, but should be a predefined list of requirements or obligations that clients must meet before program completion.The total number of youth (the “B” value) includes those youth who have exited successfully and unsuccessfully.Program records are the preferred data source. | 1. Number of program youth who exited the program having completed program requirements
2. Total number of youth who exited the program during the reporting period (either successfully or unsuccessfully)
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | **Number and percent of program youth who OFFEND** (short term) | The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a delinquent offense during the reporting period. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source.The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for arrests or offenses. Ideally this number should be all youth served by the program during the reporting period. A youth may be ‘committed’ to a juvenile facility anytime that he/she is held overnight. Certain jurisdictions refer to adjudications as ‘sentences’. Other sentences may be community based sanctions, such as community service, probation etc.Example: If I am tracking 50 program youth then, ‘B’ would be 50. Of these 50 program youth that I am tracking, if 25 of them were arrested or had a delinquent offense during the reporting period, then ‘C’ would be 25. This logic should follow for ‘D’ and ‘E’ and ‘F’ values. The percent of youth offending measured short-term will be auto calculated in ‘G’.  | 1. Total number of program youth served
2. Number of program youth tracked during the reporting period
3. Of B, the number of program youth who had an arrest or delinquent offense during the reporting period
4. Number of program youth who were committed to a juvenile facility during the reporting period
5. Number of program youth who were sentenced to adult prison during the reporting period
6. Number of youth who received another sentence during the reporting period
7. Percent OFFENDING (C/B)
 |  |
| 6 | **Number and percent of program youth who OFFEND**(long term) | The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a delinquent offense during the reporting period. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source. The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for arrests or offenses 6-12 months after exiting the program. A youth may be ‘committed’ to a juvenile facility anytime that he/she is held overnight. Certain jurisdictions refer to adjudications as ‘sentences’. Other sentences may be community based sanctions, such as community service, probation etc.Example: A grantee may have several youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago, however, they are tracking only 100 of them, therefore, the ‘A’ value will be 100. Of these 100 program youth that exited the program 6-12 months ago, 65 had an arrest or delinquent offense during the reporting period, therefore the ‘B’ value should be recorded as 65. This logic should follow for ‘C’ and ‘D’ and ‘E’ values. The percent of youth offending measured long-term will be auto calculated in ‘F’.  | 1. Total number of program youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago that you are tracking
2. Of A, the number of program youth who had an arrest or delinquent offense during the reporting period
3. Number of program youth who were committed to a juvenile facility during the reporting period
4. Number of program youth who were sentenced to adult prison during the reporting period
5. Number of youth who received another sentence during the reporting period
6. Percent OFFENDING (B/A)
 |  |
| 7 | **Number and percent of program youth who RE-OFFEND** (short term) | The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a new delinquent offense during the reporting period. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source.The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for new arrests or offenses. Ideally this number should be all youth served by the program during the reporting period. Certain jurisdictions refer to adjudications as ‘sentences’. Other sentences may be community based sanctions, such as community service, probation etc.Example: If I am tracking 50 program youth then the ‘B’ value would be 50. Of these 50 program youth that I am tracking, if 25 of them had a new arrest or had a new delinquent offense during the reporting period, then ‘C’ would be 25. This logic should follow for ‘D’, ‘E’, and ‘F’ values. The percent of youth re-offending measured short-term will be auto calculated in ‘G’.  | 1. Total number of program youth served
2. Number of program youth tracked during the reporting period
3. Of B, number of program youth who had a new arrest or new delinquent offense during the reporting period
4. Number of program youth who were recommitted to a juvenile facility during the reporting period
5. Number of program youth who were sentenced to adult prison during the reporting period
6. Number of youth who received another sentence during the reporting period
7. Percent RECIDIVISM (C/B)
 |   |
| 8 | **Number and percent of program youth who RE-OFFEND** (long term) | The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a new delinquent offense during the reporting period. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source. The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for new arrests or offenses 6-12 months after exiting the program. Certain jurisdictions refer to adjudications as ‘sentences’. Other sentences may be community based sanctions, such as community service, probation etc.Example: A grantee may have several youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago, however, they are tracking only 100 of them for re-offenses, therefore, and the ‘A’ value will be 100. Of these 100 program youth that exited the program 6-12 months ago 65 had a new arrest or new delinquent offense during the reporting period, therefore the ‘B’ value should be recorded as 65. This logic should follow for ‘C’, ‘D’, and ‘E’ values. The percent of youth offending measured long-term will be auto calculated in ‘F’.  | 1. Number of program youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago that you are tracking
2. Of A, the number of program youth who had a new arrest or new delinquent offense during the reporting period
3. Number of program youth who were recommitted to a juvenile facility during the reporting period
4. Number of program youth who were sentenced to adult prison during the reporting period
5. Number of youth who received another sentence during the reporting period
6. Percent RECIDIVISM (B/A)
 |  |
| 9 | **Number and percent of program youth who are VICTIMIZED** (short term) | The measure determines the number of program youth who are harmed or adversely affected by someone else’s criminal actions. Victimization can be physical or psychological; it also includes harm or adverse effects to youth’s property. The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for victimization. Ideally this number should be all youth served by the program during the reporting period. Example:If I am tracking 50 program youth, then, the ‘B’ value would be 50. Of these 50 program youth that I am tracking, if 25 of them were victimized during the reporting period, then ‘C’ would be 25. The percent of youth who are victimized measured short-term will be auto calculated in ‘D’ based on ‘B’ and ‘C’ values.  | 1. Total number of program youth served
2. Number of program youth tracked during the reporting period for victimization
3. Of B, the number of program youth who were victimized
4. Percent VICTIMIZED (C/B)
 |  |
| 10 | **Number and percent of program youth who are VICTIMIZED** (long term) | The measure determines the number of program youth who are harmed or adversely affected by someone else’s criminal actions. Victimization can be physical or psychological; it also includes harm or adverse effects to youth’s property. The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for victimization 6-12 months after exiting the program.Example: A grantee may have several youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago, however, they are tracking only 100 of them, therefore, and the ‘A’ value will be 100. Of these 100 program youth that exited the program 6-12 months ago 65 had been victimized during the reporting period, therefore the ‘B’ value should be recorded as 65. The percent of youth who are victimized measured long-term will be auto calculated in ‘C’ based on ‘A’ and ‘B’ values.  | 1. Number of program youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago that you are tracking for victimization
2. Of A, the number of program youth who were victimized during the reporting period
3. Percent VICTIMIZED (B/A)
 |  |
| 11 | **Number and percent of program youth who are RE-VICTIMIZED** (short term) | The re-victimization measure counts the number of youth who experienced subsequent victimization. Victimization can be physical or psychological; it also includes harm or adverse effects to youth’s property.The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for re-victimization. Ideally this number should be all youth served by the program during the reporting period. Example:If I am tracking 50 program youth, then, the ‘B’ value would be 50. Of these 50 program youth that I am tracking, if 25 of them were re-victimized during the reporting period, then ‘C’ would be 25. The percent of youth who are re-victimized measured short-term will be auto calculated in ‘D’ based on ‘B’ and ‘C’ values.  | 1. Total number of program youth served
2. Number of program youth tracked during the reporting period for re-victimization
3. Of B, the number of program youth who were re-victimized
4. Percent RE-VICTIMIZED (C/B)
 |  |
| 12 | **Number and percent of program youth who are RE-VICTIMIZED** (long term) | The re-victimization measure counts the number of youth who experienced subsequent victimization. Victimization can be physical or psychological; it also includes harm or adverse effects to youth’s property.The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for re-victimization 6-12 months after exiting the program.Example: If I am tracking 50 program youth, then, the ‘A’ value would be 50. Of these 50 program youth that I am tracking, if 25 of them were re-victimized during the reporting period, then ‘B’ would be 25. The percent of youth who are re-victimized measured long-term will be auto calculated in ‘C’ based on ‘A’ and ‘B’ values.  | 1. Number of program youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago that you are tracking for re-victimization
2. Of A, the number of program youth who were re-victimized during the reporting period
3. Percent RE-VICTIMIZED (B/A)
 |  |
| **Select one of the following from 13A through 13L depending on the primary focus of the program.** |
| 13A | **Substance use** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a decrease in substance use during the reporting period. Self-report, staff rating, or urinalysis are most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13A | **Substance use** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited a decrease in substance use 6-12 months after exiting the program.Self-report, staff rating, or urinalysis are most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13B | **Social competence** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in social competencies during the reporting period. Social competence is the ability to achieve personal goals in social interaction while simultaneously maintaining positive relationships with others over time and across situations. Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for the target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13B | **Social competence** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited a desired change in social competencies 6-12 months after exiting the program. Social competence is defined as the ability to achieve personal goals in social interaction while simultaneously maintaining positive relationships with others over time and across situations. Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13C | **School attendance** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in school attendance during the reporting period.Self-report or official records are the most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for the target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13C | **School attendance** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited a desired change in school attendance 6–12 months after exiting the program.Self-report or official records are the most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |   |
| 13D | **GPA** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in GPA during the reporting period. Self-report or official records are the most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13D | **GPA** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited a desired change in GPA 6-12 months after exiting the program. Self-report or official records are the most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13E | **GED** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who earned their GED during the reporting period. Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13E | **GED** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who earned their GED 6-12 months after exiting the program. Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13F | **High School Completion** (short term) | The number of youth who have completed High School during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred data source. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13F | **High School Completion** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited an increase in high school completion 6-12 months after exiting the program.Program records are the preferred data source. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13G | **Job Skills** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited an increase in job skills during the reporting period. Self-report or staff rating is most likely data source. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13G | **Job Skills** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited an increase in job skills 6-12 months after exiting the program.Self-report or staff rating is most likely data source. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13H | **Employment status** (short term) | The number of program youth who have exhibited an improvement in employment status during the reporting period. Self-report or staff ratings are most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13H | **Employment status** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited an improvement in employment status 6-12 months after exiting the program.Self-report or staff ratings are most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13I | **Family relationships** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in family relationships during the reporting period. Such changes are positive ones that could be related to increased positive interaction with family members. Examples are improved communication and increased emotional and practical support. Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13I | **Family relationships** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in family relationships 6–12 months after exiting the program. Such changes are positive ones that could be related to increased positive interaction with family members. Examples are improved communication and increased emotional and practical support. Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13J | **Antisocial behavior** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in antisocial behavior during the reporting period. Antisocial behavior is a pervasive pattern of behavior that displays disregard for and violation of the rights of others, societal mores, or the law (such as deceitfulness, irritability, fighting, disruptive behavior, consistent irresponsibility, lack of remorse, or failure to conform to social norms).Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for the target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13J | **Antisocial behavior** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited a desired change in antisocial behavior 6–12 months after exiting the program. Antisocial behavior is a pervasive pattern of behavior that displays disregard for and violation of the rights of others, societal mores, or the law (such as deceitfulness, irritability, fighting, disruptive behavior, consistent irresponsibility, lack of remorse, or failure to conform to social norms).Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13K | **Gang resistance/ involvement** (short term) | The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in gang resistance behavior during the reporting period.Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for the target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13K | **Gang resistance/ involvement** (long term) | The number and percent of program youth who exhibited a desired change in gang resistance behavior 6–12 months after exiting the program.Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources. | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13L | **Cultural Skill building/Cultural Pride** (short term) | The number of program youth who exhibit increased knowledge and/or understanding of tribal background, history, traditions, language and/or values. | 1. Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth receiving services for the target behavior during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 13L | **Cultural Skill building/Cultural Pride** (long term) | The number of program youth who exhibit increased knowledge and/or understanding of tribal background, history, traditions, language and/or values 6-12 months after exiting the program.  | 1. Total number of youth who exited the program 6-12 months ago who had the noted behavioral change
2. Total number of youth who received services for the target behavior and who exited the program 6-12 months ago
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number of graduated sanctions policies instituted | Determine level of program development. Most appropriate for sites that are developing graduated sanctions and may have developed program guidelines or policies but not yet implemented the program fully. Report the raw number of graduated sanctions policies developed by the grantee site. | 1. Number of graduated sanctions policies
 |  |
| 3 | Number of juvenile justice units that are implementing graduated sanctions programs | Determine coverage of the graduated sanctions approach within the local juvenile justice system. Most appropriate for projects run through local units of government or tribal equivalent. Report the number of units within the local juvenile justice system that are implementing, or in the process of implementing, graduated sanctions programs in the process? Includes things like training staff on graduated sanctions, developing policies on the use of graduated sanctions, or developing sub-contracts with service providers in anticipation of program. | 1. Number of units implementing graduated sanctions programs
 |  |
| 4 | Number and percent of programs using graduated sanctions | Determine coverage of graduated sanction approaches within an agency or juvenile justice unit. Most appropriate for grantees that run more than one program for juvenile offenders. Report the raw number of different graduated sanctions programs implemented. Percent is raw number divided by the total number of programs run by the grantee. | 1. Number of different graduated sanctions programs implemented
2. Total number of programs run by the grantee
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of supervision meetings per youth in graduated sanctions programs | Determine whether graduated sanctions are being used as intended with the frequent use of supervision meetings. This measures system accountability. Appropriate for all programs implementing graduated sanctions programs. Report the total number of supervision meetings held with youth divided by the number of youth served through graduated sanctions programs during the reporting period. Meetings are not limited to face-to-face contact but may include other forms of contact with youth such as telephone calls. | 1. Number of supervision meetings held
2. Number of youth served
3. Number of meetings per youth in graduated sanctions
 |  |
| 6 | Number and percent of youth who had a behavioral contract developed when they entered a program that was part of a graduated sanctions approach | Determine whether graduated sanctions are being used as intended with the development of behavioral contract at youth intake. This measures system accountability. Appropriate for all programs implementing graduated sanctions. Report raw number of youth in graduated sanctions programs that had a behavioral contract developed when they entered the program. Percent is the raw number of youth with a contract developed at intake divided by the total number of youth to enter the graduated sanctions program. | 1. Number of youth with a behavioral contract developed when they entered the program
2. Number of youth to enter the program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 7 | Number of sanctioning options available at each level (immediate, intermediate, secure care, and aftercare/reentry)  | Determine coverage of the graduated sanctions approach within the local juvenile justice system. Most appropriate for projects responsible for justice supervision of youth (e.g., courts, probation departments, detention facilities). Report raw number of different sanctioning options by level. Different implies that the options either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals. | 1. Number of different immediate sanctioning options
2. Number of different intermediate sanctioning options
3. Number of different secure care sanctioning options
4. Number of different aftercare/reentry sanctioning options
 |  |
| 8 | Number and percent of staff trained on the use of graduated sanctions | To determine coverage of the graduated sanctions approach within an agency or unit of local government or tribal equivalent with regard to institutional investment as expressed through training provided. Appropriate for any agency or unit of government or tribal equivalent that directly serves youth and is implementing a graduated sanctions program. Report the raw number of staff trained during the reporting period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of staff who offer direct services to youth. Include both training that offers general information about the topics and practical training. Include training from any source and using any medium as long as the training receipt can be verified. Include staff that started training during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. | 1. Number of staff trained
2. Number of staff who offer direct services
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 9 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 10 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 12 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 13 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 17 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance during the reporting period.
2. Number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period.
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number and percent of sanctions that were successfully contested | Gain insight into the appropriateness of sanctions imposed based on the assumption that overturned sanctions were inappropriate or inappropriately applied. Most appropriate for programs that are implementing graduated sanctions programs. Report the raw number of sanctions that were overturned. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of sanctions applied. | 1. Number of sanctions overturned
2. Number of sanctions applied
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Number of hours of service received per youth | Measure the amount of service youth are getting through the graduated sanctions program. Appropriate for programs with implemented graduated sanctions programs. Report the total number of hours of service that youth in the program received divided by the number of youth in the program. Include both hours of service directly offered by the program as well as hours of service received due to program participation (e.g., hours of service received through agencies affiliated with, or that sub-contract to, the grantee). | 1. Number of hours of service to youth
2. Number of youth
3. Number of hours per youth (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Cost savings | Determine the efficiency of the graduated sanctions program based on the assumption that graduated sanctions reduce the penetration of youth further into the justice system and, therefore, cost less per youth. Most appropriate for a unit of local government or tribal equivalent, justice system, or large agency implementing a graduated sanctions program. Report the average total cost per comparable case (e.g., similar justice history and intake offense) to the grantee at the start of the reporting period subtracted by the average cost per case at the end of the reporting period. If several disparate programs are included under the grant, please report the figure per program (e.g., if the grant covers services offered through a pre-trial unit and a detention, facility, please report cost savings per program). For example, if it used to cost $1,000 to process a case through the pre-trial unit at the start of the reporting period, but only costs $800 dollars at the end, the cost savings would be $200 per case. | 1. Total cost per case not using graduated sanctions
2. Total cost per graduated sanctions case
3. Cost savings (A-B)
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent of cases that result in alternatives to detention | Determine if the program is working as intended by actually reducing the number of cases that result in detention. Most appropriate for a court or other program in which staff have the capacity to assign youth to detention. Report the raw number of program youth who were assigned to an alternative to detention that without the program would have been assigned to detention. Percent is the raw number divided by the raw number plus the number of youth assigned to detention. | 1. Number of youth who without the program would have been assigned to detention
2. Number of youth assigned to detention
3. Percent (A/(A + B))
 |  |
| 22 | Number and percent of cases that result in community service, monetary restitution, and direct service to victims | Determine whether the graduated sanctions program is being implemented as intended with regard to holding youth accountable using restorative justice approaches. Report the raw number of cases handled through the graduated sanctions program that resulted in one of the listed categories. Percent would be the raw number per type divided by the number of cases handled by the grantee. | 1. Number of cases to result in community service
2. Number of cases to result in monetary restitution
3. Number of cases to result in direct service to victims
4. Number of cases handled by the grantee
5. Percent of cases resulted in community service (A/D)
6. Percent of cases resulted in monetary restitution (B/D)
7. Percent of cases resulted in direct service to victims (C/D)
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of sanction changes that were from a less restrictive to a more restrictive sanction | Determine if sanctions are being applied appropriately based on the understanding that a well-run system will have a balance between increasing and reducing sanctions. Report the raw number of times sanction levels were changed to become more restrictive, and Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of sanction-level changes during the reporting period. | 1. Number of sanction-level changes to more restrictive
2. Number of sanction-level changes
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Time in hours from infraction to sanction | Determine if the program is becoming more efficient. It is based on the idea that graduated sanctions must be applied swiftly. Appropriate for any program implementing a graduated sanctions program. Applies to youths' infractions while in the graduated sanctions program funded with JABG/Tribal JADG funds. Report the cumulative number of hours from infractions by youth according to their behavioral contracts to the infraction being addressed with a sanction divided by the number of infractions. If there are infractions that have not resulted in sanctions, count the number of hours from the infraction until the end of the youth’s participation in the program. | 1. Cumulative hours from infractions to sanctions
2. Number of infractions
3. Average (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Number and percent of youth who were monitored according to the terms in their behavioral contracts | Determine if the program is becoming more accountable as shown by staff upholding their part of the behavioral contract (i.e., not acting capriciously). Appropriate for any program implementing a graduated sanction program. Report the raw number of youth for whom program staff followed the guidelines of that youth’s behavioral contract (e.g., made contact as required, responded to infractions as described in the contract, etc.). Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of youth in the program. | 1. Number of youth for whom staff followed the guidelines of the youth's behavioral contract
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26 | Number of non-compliant events (e.g., missing appointments) and percent of all events that were non-compliant | Determine if youth are acting more accountably as indicated by their fulfillment of their program requirements. Report the raw number of times youth did not do things they specifically had agreed to do in their behavioral contracts (or did things they agreed not to do). Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of things the youth were expected to do (or not to do). For example, if a youth was to attend school every day, each day missed would be a non-compliant event. Percent would be the number of school days missed divided by the total number of days school was in session during the reporting period. | 1. Number of non-compliant events
2. Number of youth requirements
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of new secure detention beds  | Determine the increase in secure detention capacity. Most appropriate for facilities that house juvenile offenders (e.g., detention centers, secure treatment facilities, etc.) that used the funds to build, expand, or renovate. Report the raw number of new secure residential beds or slots created. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of secure residential beds or slots prior to the addition. | 1. Number of new secure detention beds since last report
2. Total number of secure detention beds
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3 | Number and percent of new non-secure detention beds | Determine the increase in non-secure detention capacity. Most appropriate for facilities that house juvenile offenders (e.g., residential treatment facilities, etc.) that used the funds to build, expand, or renovate. Report the raw number of new non-secure residential slots created. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of non-secure residential slots prior to the addition. | 1. Number of new non-secure detention beds since last report
2. Total number of non-secure detention beds
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 4 | Number and percent of square feet of improved space | Determine the scope of physical plan improvements relative to the size of the facility. Most appropriate for facilities that used funds to expand or renovate. Report the raw number of square feet created by the expansion or renovation. Percent is the raw number divided by total square footage of the facility. For programs housed in their own buildings this would be the square footage of the facility; for programs that share a building, this would be the total square footage that the program had prior to the improvement. Please include interior and exterior space (e.g., playgrounds, picnic areas, seating areas, walkways). | 1. Number of additional square feet of operational client space since last report
2. Total Number of square feet of operational client space
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of square feet of operational client space | Determine the scope of physical plant improvements on space used by clients (rather than administration). Most appropriate for facilities that used the funds to build, expand, or renovate client space. Report the raw number of square feet of space that clients have access to (e.g., examination rooms, hallways, dining rooms, counseling rooms, waiting rooms) affected by the building, expansion, or renovations. Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of square feet of operational client space. | 1. Number of square feet of operational client space since last report
2. Total number of square feet of operational client space
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 6 | Number and percent of new client service slots (non-residential) | Determine change in program capacity. Most appropriate for non-residential facilities that serve juvenile offenders (e.g., day reporting centers, out-patient treatment facilities, etc.) that used the funds to build, expand, or renovate. Report the raw number of new service slots created (i.e., the number of additional clients the program can serve at any one time). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of clients the program could serve prior to the expansion. | 1. Number of new client service slots (non-residential since last report
2. Total client service slots (non-residential)
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 7 | Number and percent of staff salaries paid | Gain insight into the operational costs covered. Most appropriate for programs that are paying operating costs, specifically staff salaries. Report the number of staff positions paid. If full positions are not covered, report the number of full-time equivalents (FTE) paid for. To calculate FTE, divide the number of staff hours paid using JABG/Tribal JADG funds by 2000. Percent is the number of staff positions or FTE divided by the total number of program staff positions or FTE.  | 1. Number of staff positions or FTE paid with JABG/Tribal JADG funds
2. Number of staff positions (or FTE)
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 8 | Amount spent on program supplies and percent of total supply budget | Gain insight into the operational costs covered. Most appropriate for programs that are paying operating costs, specifically buying tangible program supplies (e.g., office supplies, outreach materials, or other materials needed to operate the program). Report the dollar amount spent on tangible supplies. Percent is the dollar amount above divided by the total amount spent on supplies during the reporting period. | 1. Dollar amount spent on program supplies
2. Total amount spent on supplies
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 9 | Amount spent on other operating costs and percent of total other operating costs | Gain insight into the operational costs covered. Most appropriate for programs that are paying operating costs that are not staff or tangible supplies. These would include things like utility costs or rent. Report the dollar amount spent on other operating costs. Percent is the dollar amount above divided by the total amount spent on other operating costs during the reporting period. | 1. Dollar amount spent by program on other operating costs
2. Total amount spent on other operating costs
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 10 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 11 | Number of technical assistance events HELD | Number of technical assistance events held during the reporting period. Technical assistance events include in-person, telephone, or on-line assistance. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of technical assistance events held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 12 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 13 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 14 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 15 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA.
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 18 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance during the reporting period.
2. Number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period.
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Amount and percent of staff time spent on security per week | Determine if project activities are improving staffing. Most appropriate for programs in operation, not programs that are still under construction. Report the raw number of hours per week that client staff (i.e., staff that work directly with clients) spend on security (e.g., searching clients, making sure the facility is secure). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of hours per week that that staffs work. | 1. Number of hours spent on security per week
2. Number of hours worked per week
3. Percent (B/A)
 |  |
| 20 | Amount and percent of staff time spent on behavioral management | Determine if project activities are improving staffing. Most appropriate for programs in operation, not programs that are still under construction. Report the raw number of hours per week that client staff (i.e., staff that work directly with clients) spend on behavioral management. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of hours per week that staff works. | 1. Number of hours spent on behavioral management per week
2. Number of hours worked per week
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Amount and percent of staff time spent on individual counseling |  Determine if project activities are improving staffing. Most appropriate for programs in operation, not programs that are still under construction. Report the raw number of hours per week that client staff (i.e., staff that work directly with clients) spend counseling clients (e.g., clinical counseling sessions, one-on-one time conducting assessments, talking with clients about their progress). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of hours per week that staff works. | 1. Number of hours spent on individual counseling per week
2. Number of hours worked per week
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Number of square feet per youth | Determine if overcrowding is an issue. Most appropriate for projects that built, expanded, or renovated their physical plant. Report the number of square feet of operational client space divided by the number of clients in the affected facility. | 1. Number of square feet operational client space
2. Number of clients
3. Number of square feet per youth (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Percent of capacity | Determine if overcrowding is an issue. Most appropriate for projects that built, expanded, or renovated their physical plant. Report the average number of youth served during the reporting period divided by the licensed facility capacity of the affected facility. If the licensed capacity changed during the reporting period, count the average number of clients served from the point that the capacity increased until the end of the reporting period divided by the capacity at the end of the period. | 1. Average number of youth at facility
2. Average number of youth facility is licensed for
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number and percent of youth fulfilling their court-determined length of stay | Determine if project activities are improving staff ability to control client length of stay. Most appropriate for programs in operation, not programs that are still under construction. Report the raw number of youth that left the facility at the end of their legally, or court-mandated, period. Include clients who left the facility based on new or emerging service needs, violations of program rules, or changes in their court dispositions. Exclude clients who were transferred from the facility or within the facility based on space considerations (e.g., to make room for other clients or to reduce crowding). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth to leave the facility during the reporting period. | 1. Number of clients to leave at court-determined time
2. Number of clients to leave the facility
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Number and percent of days operated at full capacity | Determine if the program has the resources to operate at full capacity. Most appropriate for programs paying for operating costs. Report the raw number of days the facility was able to serve the maximum number of youth, employed the required number of staff, and operated for the full number of hours per day. Days in which the facility operated under full capacity based on external issues (e.g., severe weather closures, there were not enough juveniles in the system), should be counted as being able to operate at full capacity. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of days the facility was expected to operate. For 24 hours a day facilities, that would be the total number of days in the reporting period, or since the facility opening (which ever was later). For facilities that operate on selected days (e.g., weekdays), the divisor would be the number of days that the facility was scheduled to be open. | 1. Number of days operated at full capacity
2. Number of days elapsed
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26 | Percent of space that is used as intended | Measure system accountability based on operating as intended. Most appropriate for programs that built, expanded, or renovated their physical plant. Report the raw number of square feet of facility space that is being used for its originally intended purpose. For example, dining halls are used for eating not housing youth, storage closets are used for supplies not administrative offices, and program offices are staffed and open. The percent is the raw number divided by the total number of square feet of the facility. | 1. Number of square feet used as intended
2. Number of square feet
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Number of safety violations | Determine if the facility is safer. Appropriate for any program. Report the total number of safety violations documented. Include violations reported by outside inspectors, youth, families, visitors, or facility staff. Include both physical plant and personal safety violations. | 1. Number of safety violations reported
 |  |
| 28 |  Number of disciplinary actions against youth | Determine if the facility is safer. Related to appropriate management of youth behavior. Appropriate for any operational program. Report the total number of disciplinary actions against youth (e.g., reductions in privileges, warnings, or citations). | 1. Number of disciplinary actions against youth
 |  |
| 29 | Number of disciplinary actions against staff | Determine if the facility is safer. Related to appropriate management of staff behavior. Appropriate for any operational program. Report the total number of disciplinary actions against staff (e.g., suspensions, warning or citations, negative events entered into staff employment records, dismissal for cause). | 1. Number of disciplinary actions against staff
 |  |
| 30 | Number of physical injuries to youth | Determine if the facility is safer. Appropriate for any operational program. Report the total number of physical injuries to youth from any cause. | 1. Number of physical injuries to youth
 |  |
| 31 | Number of physical injuries to staff | Determine if the facility is safer. Appropriate for any operational program. Report the total number of physical injuries to staff from any cause. | 1. Number of physical injuries to staff
 |  |
| 32 | Number and percent of youth held in secure detention | Measure use of secure detention. Appropriate for any operational program. Report the raw number of youth held in secure detention for any period of time. If a facility cannot hold youth in secure detention themselves, but refer youth to secure facilities, include those referrals in this count. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth served during the reporting period. | 1. Number of youth held in secure detention
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 33 | Number of hours youth were held in secure detention | Measure use of secure detention. Appropriate for any operational program. Report the raw number of hours youth were held in secure detention. If a facility cannot hold youth in secure detention themselves, but refer youth to secure facilities, include the number of hours of secure detention to result from those referrals in this count. | 1. Number of hours youth were held in secure detention
 |  |
| 34 | Number and percent of youth placed elsewhere because of lack of space.  | Determine if the facility is meeting community need. Appropriate for any program. Report the raw number of youth that would normally be assigned to the facility but could not be because there was no open slot. Percent is the raw number divided by the combination of the total number of youth served by the facility during the reporting period and the raw number. | 1. Number of youth diverted
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/(A + B))
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for system improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2  | Number and percent of each of the following types of staff hired: judges, probation officers, defenders, special advocates, pretrial service staff | Determine the distribution of the money. Appropriate for projects that hire staff. Report the raw number of staff hired by staff type. Percent is the raw number (by staff type) divided by the total number of staff (by type). | 1. Number of judges hired
2. Total number of judges
3. Percent (A/B)
4. Number of probation officers hired
5. Total number of probation officers:
6. Percent (D/E)
7. Number of defenders hired
8. Total number of defenders
9. Percent (G/H)
10. Number of special advocates hired
11. Total number of special advocates
12. Percent (J/K)
13. Number of pretrial service staff hired
14. Total number of pretrial staff
15. Percent (M/N)
 |  |
| 3  | Number of cases per staff member | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that serve youth. Report the number of cases open at any point during the reporting period divided by the number of client staff (i.e., staff that work directly with clients). | 1. Number of cases
2. Number of court staff
3. Number of cases per staff (A/B)
 |  |
| 4  | Number and percent of vacant positions for each of the following staff types: judges, probation officers, defenders, special advocates, pretrial service staff | Determine program operational capacity. Appropriate for programs with the type of staff listed. Report the raw number of vacant positions. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of positions (open and filed). | 1. Number of vacant positions
2. Total number of positions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5  | Number of different pretrial service types | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer pretrial services. Report the raw number of types of pretrial services offered. Include both service types directly delivered by the program as well as service types that youth have access through the program. Different types of programs would include those, for example, that offer different services, serve different populations, have different procedures or criteria for inclusion or operation, or are run by different people/agencies/organizations. | 1. Number of different types of pretrial services
 |  |
| 6 | Number of pretrial service slots | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer pretrial services. Report the raw number of different pretrial services slots that the program has at any one time. Include both services directly delivered by the program as well as services that youth have access to through the program. For example, if a program can assess 5 youth at one time and offers a drug education course for 10 youth per session, the number of slots would be 15. | 1. Number of pretrial service slots
 |  |
| 7  | Number of hours of training about pretrial services offered to staff | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs whose staff delivers pretrial services. Report the raw number of hours of training offered about pretrial services. Include in-house and external training and any training medium (classes, observations, on-line, etc.) as long as it can be verified that staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the period. | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 8  | Number and percent of staff trained in pretrial services (including screening) | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs whose staffs deliver pretrial services. Report the raw number of staff to receive some training about pretrial services. Include in-house and external training and any training medium (e.g., classes, observations, on-line, etc.) as long as training receipt can be verified. Include staff that started training during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of pretrial staff. | 1. Number of staff trained in pretrial services
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 9 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 10 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 12 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 13 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA.
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 17 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance during the reporting period.
2. Number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period.
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number of pretrial services received per youth | Measure of program implementation and coverage. Appropriate for any program offering pretrial services or serving pretrial youth. Report the number of pretrial services (e.g., individual services, not service types) divided by the number of youth served. | 1. Number of individual services delivered
2. Number of youth served
3. Number of services per youth (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Number of hours per week and percent of staff time spent directly serving clients | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for programs with any of the following types of staff: judges, probation officers, defenders, special advocates, and pretrial service staff. Report the average number of hours, by staff type, that staff spent in contact with youth (in person, by telephone, by e-mail, etc.) Percent is the average number of hours per week divided by the total number of hours those staff work per week. For example, if staff A spends 15 hours per week and staff B spends 35 hours per week, the average number of hours is 25 hours per week. If they each work 40 hours per week, the percent is 63 percent. | 1. Average number of hours judges spend in direct service per week
2. Average number of hours judges work per week
3. Percent (A/B)
4. Average number of hours probation officers spend in direct service per week
5. Average number of hours probation officers work per week
6. Percent (D/E)
7. Average number of hours defenders spend in direct service per week
8. Average number of hours defenders work per week:
9. Percent (G/H)
10. Average number of hours special advocates spend in direct service per week
11. Average number of hours special advocates work per week
12. Percent (J/K)
13. Average number of hours pretrial service staff spend in direct service per week
14. Average number of hours pretrial service staff work per week
15. Percent (M/N)
 |  |
| 20  | Number and percent of youth screened | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for programs that deliver services to youth or refer youth to services. Report the raw number of youth to receive a complete screening. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth in the program.  | 1. Number of youth screened
2. Number of youth in program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21  | Number and percent of youth assessed | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for programs that deliver services to youth or refer youth to services. Report the raw number of youth to receive a complete assessment. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth in the program. | 1. Number of youth assessed
2. Number of youth in program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Average time in hours from first contact to screening | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that conduct youth screening or refer youth to screening. Report the raw number of hours from determination that a youth needs a screening to the screening being completed. The determination can be based on a rule (e.g., all youth brought to the intake center must be screened) or a judgment (e.g., case managers evaluate which youth receive screening based on their clinical judgment). | 1. Average number of hours from determination of screening need to end of screening
 |  |
| 23 | Average time in hours from screening to assessment | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that assess clients or refer clients for assessment. Report the average number of hours from youths screening being completed (i.e., all screening data being completely collected) to their assessment being completed (i.e., all assessment data being completely collected). | 1. Average number of hours from end of screening to end of assessment
 |  |
| 24 | Number of youth to receive pretrial services | Measure of program implementation and coverage. Most appropriate for local government departments or agencies, including court or prosecution units through which pretrial youth are processed. Report the raw number of youth to receive at least one pretrial service. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth seen that meet the criteria for pretrial services. | 1. Number of youth receiving pretrial service
2. Number of youth that meet pretrial criteria
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Average time in days from case assignment to first meeting between staff member and youth or family | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that provide direct client services. Report the average number of calendar days from a case being assigned to the program and the first meeting between program staff and the youth and/or the youth’s family. | 1. Average number of days from assignment to first meeting with staff
 |  |
| 26 | Number and percent of complete case files | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that track clients or client information such as treatment providers, probation departments, or court units. Report the raw number of case files that have all of the required information. If there are no formal requirements, determine a minimum criteria for a compete file and use that as the requirement. Time dependent requirements are fine. For example, youth that have been in the program for 1 week must have a screening and assessment, while youth who have been in the program for 6 months should have a screening, assessment, at least one urinalysis, and six sets of case manager meeting notes. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of open cases. | 1. Number of complete files
2. Number of open cases
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Average time in days from referral to pretrial services to completion of pretrial processing | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that provide pretrial services. Report the average number of calendar days from a case being officially referred to pretrial services to the case being closed by the pretrial program. Referral can be an automatic event, such as the end of one phase triggering the start of the pretrial phase or a referral by staff based on judgment. | 1. Average number of days from referral to the completion of pretrial processing
 |  |
| 28 | Number and percent pretrial appointments missed by youth or families | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for programs providing or overseeing pretrial services. Report the raw number of pretrial appointments (e.g., assessments, case management meetings, court appearances, appointments for services arranged through the pretrial program) that have been missed by youth, or the youths family, assigned to the pretrial program. Include face-to-face and other meetings or appointments. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of appointments scheduled. | 1. Number of pretrial appointments missed
2. Number of pretrial appointments scheduled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 29 | Number and percent of youth to go through the system as intended (no service gaps, in the intended order, etc.) | Measure of system operations and accountability. Appropriate for operational pretrial programs. Report the raw number of youth whose progress through the program matched the intended client flow developed for the program. For example, this includes having events occur in the anticipated order (screening before assessment, before service referral), events occurring according to schedule (e.g., screenings occurring within 24 hours of program intake). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of clients in the program. | 1. Number of clients that flow through program as intended
2. Number of clients
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 30 | Number and percent of youth to receive mental health services | Measure of program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer pretrial services. Report the raw number of youth to receive a mental health service. Do not include mental health assessments. Do include clinical services that the client receives based on their participation in the program whether those services are delivered directly through the program or through a third-party provider. | 1. Number of youth to receive mental health services
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

|  | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for system improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of new prosecutors hired | Measure of infrastructure change. Most appropriate for programs that hired prosecutors. Report raw number of prosecutors hired during the reporting period. If full positions are not covered, report the number of full-time equivalents (FTE) paid for. To calculate FTE, divide the number of staff hours paid using JABG/Tribal JADG funds by 2000. Percent is the number of prosecutors hired or FTE covered divided by the total number of program prosecutors or prosecutor FTE. | 1. Number of prosecutors hired
2. Number of prosecutors
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3  | Number and percent of vacant prosecutor positions | Measure of program capacity. Appropriate for programs that staff prosecutors. Report the raw number of vacant prosecutor positions. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of prosecutors? Positions (open and filed). | 1. Number of vacant prosecutor positions
2. Number of total prosecutor positions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 4 | Number of cases involving violent offenders per prosecutor | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that staff prosecutors and handle violent offenders. Report the total number of cases involving violent offenders divided by the number of prosecutors that handled cases of violent offenders. | 1. Number of cases involving violent offenders
2. Number of prosecutors that handled cases involving violent offenders
3. Number of cases per prosecutor (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 6 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 7 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 8 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 9 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA.
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and/or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

|  | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 12 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance during the reporting period.
2. Number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period.
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 14 | Number and percent of specialized prosecutors | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that prosecutor specialization can speed case flow. Appropriate for larger prosecutors, offices or offices with prosecutor specialization. Report the raw number of prosecutors that handle specific types of cases or specialize in specific types of clients or crimes. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of prosecutors in the target office, unit, or program. | 1. Number of specialized prosecutors
2. Number of prosecutors
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 15  | Length of employment in months per prosecutor | Measure of program continuity based on the idea that staff consistency affects program quality. Appropriate for programs that staff prosecutors. Report the cumulative number of months of employment for the prosecutors in the target office, unit, or program divided by the number of prosecutors. If the program does not specifically employ prosecutors, but has them assigned to them, report the average number of months that the same prosecutors have been assigned to the program. Report actual months of employment, not solely number of months during the reporting period. | 1. Cumulative number of months of prosecutors employment
2. Number of prosecutors
3. Average length of employment (A/B)
 |  |
| 16  | Number and percent of court units restructured | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that offices or departments may need to be restructured in order to best serve clients. Appropriate for courts. Report the raw number of court units that have been or are in the process of being restructured. This includes things like changing staffing structures, client flow, work processes, assessment information accessed, and relevant policies. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of court units. | 1. Number of restructured court units
2. Number of court units
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number of staff per manager | Measure of infrastructure based on the idea that managers need a certain number of staff to work efficiently. Appropriate for programs that staff prosecutors. Report the number of prosecutors divided by the number of managers. | 1. Number of prosecutors
2. Number of managers
3. Number of prosecutors per manager (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Average number of days from arrest to first court date | Measure of system efficiency. Relates to the goal of a speedy trial. Appropriate for programs that have some control over when court dates are set. Report the number of calendar days from arrest to first court appearance for the arresting crime. | 1. Average number of days from arrest to first court appearance for the arresting crime
 |  |
| 19 | Average number of days from arrest to case disposition | Measure of system efficiency. Relates to the goal of due process. Appropriate for programs that have some control over how quickly cases are disposed of. Includes the base of dispositions (i.e., trials and plea bargaining or diversion agreements). Report the number of calendar days from arrest to when the relevant case is closed by the court unit slot (e.g., the youth is adjudicated, found not guilty, or assigned to a diversion program). | 1. Number of days from arrest to case disposition
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of days per youth spent in detention between arrest and case disposition | Measure of system efficiency. Relates to the goal of reducing youth confinement. Appropriate for programs that have some control over whether youth are held in custody. Report the cumulative number of days youth spent in detention between arrest and case disposition. Percent is cumulative number divided by the total number or days between arrest and case disposition (for all youth). | 1. Cumulative number of days in detention
2. Number of days from arrest to disposition combined for all youth
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| # | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2  | Amount of funds allocated to programs that help prosecutors address cases involving drugs, gangs, or youth violence | Measure of infrastructure based on the idea that programs need sufficient funding to operate. Appropriate for programs that have staff prosecutors. Report the dollar amount allocated for programs that support prosecutors that deal with drug, gang, or violence cases involving juvenile offenders. Include money spent on things like relevant training, program curricula or literature, evaluation support, and support staff or consultants. | 1. Number of dollars spend to support prosecutors dealing with drug, gang, and violence cases
 |  |
| 3 | Amount of funds spent on equipment for prosecution of cases involving drugs, gangs, or youth violence | Measure of infrastructure based on the idea that programs need sufficient equipment to operate well. Appropriate for prosecution programs that handle drug, gang, and violence cases involving juvenile offenders. Report the dollar amount allocated for equipment to support prosecutors that deal with drug, gang, or violence cases involving juvenile offenders. Equipment may include things like electronic monitors and drug testing kits. | 1. Number of dollars spent on equipment
 |  |
| 4  | Number and percent of prosecutors trained in topics related to drugs, gangs, or youth violence | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for programs that have staff prosecutors. Report the raw number of prosecutors to receive some training in the relevant topics. Include in-house and external training and any training medium (e.g., classes, observations, on-line, etc.) as long as training receipt can be verified. Include staff that started training during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of prosecutors that come in contact with drug, gang, and violence cases involving juvenile offenders. | 1. Number of prosecutors trained
2. Number of prosecutors
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of hours of training offered to prosecutors on topics related to drugs, gangs, or youth violence | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for programs that have staff prosecutors. Report the raw number of hours of training offered in the relevant topics. Include in-house and external training and any training medium (e.g., classes, observations, on-line, etc.) as long as it can be verified that prosecutors were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the period.  | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 6 | Number of hours of mentoring that new prosecutors receive in their first 6 months | Measure of infrastructure based on the idea that staff is supported are more effective. Appropriate for programs that staff prosecutors. Report the cumulative number of hours of mentoring that new prosecutors received divided by the number of new prosecutors. Include prosecutors that have transferred to new units or positions or who have been assigned new duties as well as new hires. | 1. Cumulative number of hours of mentoring
2. Number of prosecutors
3. Hours of mentoring per prosecutor (A/B)
 |  |
| 7 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 8 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 9 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 10 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 12 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA.
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and/or practice (A/B)
 |  |
| 13 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance during the reporting period.
2. Number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period.
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number and percent of prosecutors that handle cases involving juvenile offenders exclusively | Measure of system effectiveness based on the idea that specialization can lead to more effective staff. Appropriate for programs staffing prosecutors that can potentially handle adult or juvenile cases (this will probably be at the county/county village, rancheria, pueblo, reservation or jurisdictional level rather than the court unit level). Report the raw number of prosecutors in the program that prosecute only cases involving juvenile offenders or cases handled through the juvenile court. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of prosecutors. | 1. Number of juvenile-only prosecutors
2. Number of prosecutors
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number and percent of cases disposed involving drugs, gangs, or youth violence | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that prosecute drug, gang, or violence cases involving juvenile offenders. Report the total number of relevant cases disposed of (i.e., closed). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of relevant cases open during any part of the reporting period. | 1. Number of cases disposed
2. Number of cases
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number and percent of violent offenders cases prosecuted on a "fast track" | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that prosecute drug, gang, or violence cases involving juvenile offenders. Report the total number of relevant cases handled according to the rules of fast track prosecution. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of cases involving violent juvenile offenders open during any part of the reporting period. | 1. Number of cases fast-tracked
2. Number of cases
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Number of options available for handling cases involving drugs, gangs, or youth violence | Measure of program accountability based on the idea that it is important to be able to individualize case outcomes. Appropriate for programs through which cases involving drugs, gangs, or youth violence are processed. Include options for case handling (e.g., fast track prosecution or diversion) as well as case dispositions (e.g., participation in restorative justice programs, detention, and probation). Report the raw number of different options available at any point in the prosecution process. | 1. Number of options available
 |  |
| 20 | Time in hours spent per month by prosecution staff coordinating between other court units | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that system collaboration results in better service. Appropriate for programs that involve, or operate with, more than one court unit. Report the total number of hours per month for all prosecution staff spent coordinating between or collaborating with staff of other court units. This might include joint meetings, sharing reports or data, discussing methods for handling cases, and coordinating staff schedules across units for shared staff. | 1. Number of hours per month spent on coordination
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent of cases involving drugs, gangs or youth violence to be prosecuted using community prosecution principles | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that bringing the community into the prosecution process makes systems more accountable to the communities in which they operate. Appropriate for programs that prosecute drug, gang, or violence cases involving juvenile offenders. Report the raw number of cases handled using community prosecution principles. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of drug, gang, or violence cases involving juvenile offenders prosecuted by the grantee. | 1. Number of cases handled through community prosecution
2. Number of cases
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22  | Average time in days from a case being assigned to the prosecution unit to disposition for cases involving drugs, gangs, or youth violence | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that prosecute drug, gang or violence cases involving juvenile offenders. Report the average number of calendar days from a case assigned to the prosecution unit until it is closed by the prosecution unit.  | 1. Average number of days from assignment to closing a case
 |  |
| 23 | Ratio of senior staff to junior staff | Measure of infrastructure, based on the idea that there needs to a balance between senior and junior staff for an office to work efficiently. Appropriate for programs that staff prosecutors. Report the number of senior staff divided by the number of junior staff. | 1. Number of senior staff
2. Number of junior staff
3. Number of senior to junior staff (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Hours and percent of prosecutor hours per month spent on cases involving first time offenders | Measure of system operation. Helps determine where resources are being expended. Appropriate for programs that prosecute both first-time and repeat juvenile offenders. Report the average number of hours per month per prosecutor spent working cases involving first-time offenders. Divide the average above by the average number of working hours per month for those same prosecutors. For both calculations, include all prosecutors in the program or grantee, not just those handling first-time offenders. | 1. Number of hours per month on first-time offenders
2. Number of hours per month working
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of law enforcement staff trained in preventing or controlling juvenile crime | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for programs providing or facilitating training for law enforcement staff or programs, such as police departments, utilizing law enforcement staff. Report the raw number of law enforcement staff to receive any formal training about preventing or controlling crime during the reporting period (include both training that offers general information about the topics and practical training). Include training from any source and using any medium as long as the training receipt can be verified. Include staff that started training during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of law enforcement personnel in the pool from which those trained were selected. For example, if 10 law enforcement staff from a police department were trained, the total pool would be the law enforcement staff from the entire department. | 1. Number of law enforcement staff trained
2. Number of law enforcement staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3 | Number and percent of court personnel trained in preventing or controlling juvenile crime | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs providing or facilitating training for court personnel or programs, such as court, that utilize court personnel. Report the raw number of court personnel to receive any formal training about preventing or controlling crime during the reporting period (include both training that offers general information about the topics and practical training). Include training from any source and using any medium as long as the training receipt can be verified. Include staff that started training during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of court personnel in the pool from which those trained were selected. For example, if 10 law clerks from the district court were trained, the total pool would be the total personnel serving the district court. | 1. Number of court personnel trained
2. Number of court personnel
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 4 | Number of hours of training offered to law enforcement staff | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for programs providing or facilitating training for law enforcement staff or programs, such as police departments, utilizing law enforcement staff. Report the raw number of hours of training offered to staff during the reporting period. Include in-house and external training and any training medium as long as it can be verified that the target staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties.) Include training that started during the reporting period even if it did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. | 1. Number of hours of training offered to law enforcement staff
 |  |
| 5 | Number of hours of training offered to court personnel | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for programs providing or facilitating training for court personnel or programs, such as courts, that use court personnel. Report the raw number of hours of training offered to staff during the reporting period. Include in-house and external training and any training medium as long as it can be verified that the target staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if it did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. | 1. Number of hours of training offered to court personnel
 |  |
| 6 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 7 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 8 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 9 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 11 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |
| 12 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 13 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance during the reporting period.
2. Number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Number and percent of staff to rate the training received as helpful | Measure of program quality. Appropriate for programs offering training, whether directly or indirectly. Report the raw number of staff to rate the training as helpful. Programs will most likely need to use training evaluation forms. Programs do not need to report the specific rating level, just counts of people that found it at least minimally helpful. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of training attendees. | 1. Number of staff to rate training helpful
2. Number of staff trained
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number and percent of staff trained who take additional courses on prevention and control of juvenile crime | Measure of staff involvement and interest in the topic. This is a proxy for training quality based on the idea that if training was helpful, staff may elect to take additional training on the topic. Appropriate for programs, such as police departments or courts that use such staff or personnel. Report the number of staff to take at least a second or follow-up training on prevention and control of juvenile crime. Do not include mandatory retraining or refresher courses. | 1. Number of staff to take more training
2. Number of staff trained initially
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number and percent of sick days taken by law enforcement staff or court personnel | Measure of staff morale based on the idea that well-trained staff is happier in their jobs and, on average, less likely to take sick days. This is a proxy measure. Appropriate for programs, such as police departments or courts that use such staff or personnel, whose staff have received at least some training in crime prevention and control. Report the cumulative number of sick days taken during the reporting period. Percent is the cumulative number divided by the total number of possible workdays during the reporting period. | 1. Number of sick days taken
2. Number of workdays possible
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number and percent of days law enforcement staff or court personnel are late to work | Measure of staff morale based on the idea that well-trained staff are happier in their jobs and, on average, more likely to arrive for work on time. This is a proxy measure. Appropriate for programs, such as police departments or courts, whose staff have received at least some training in crime prevention and control. Report the cumulative number of late arrivals during the reporting period. Percent is the cumulative number divided by the total number of possible workdays during the reporting period. | 1. Number of days staff were late to work
2. Number of workdays possible
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19  | Number and percent of law enforcement staff or court personnel rated as improved by supervisors | Measure of training benefit based on the idea that properly trained staff will perform better in their jobs. Appropriate for programs, such as police departments or courts, whose staff have received at least some training in crime prevention and control. Report the raw number of law enforcement staff or court personnel to receive either the highest possible rating or an improved rating on the staff evaluations with regard to their general performance. If the evaluation has a place to rate knowledge or implementation of new concepts covered in the trainings, that category should be used in place of a general performance category. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of such staff evaluated during the reporting period. | 1. Number of staff improved
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of law enforcement staff or court personnel to leave the office/unit | Measure of staff satisfaction based on the idea that staff training can positively impact staff turnover. This is a proxy measure. Appropriate for programs, such as police departments or courts, whose staff have received at least some training in crime prevention and control. Report the raw number of staff to leave the program during the reporting period. Do not include staff that was promoted out of the program. Percent is the raw number divided by the staff positions in the staff pool. For example, if 10 law clerks from the district court were trained, the total pool would be the total personnel serving the district court. | 1. Number of staff to leave the program
2. Total number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21  | Number of staff/youth conflicts | Measure of program operations. Based on the idea that staff training can improve operation and reduce conflict. Appropriate for programs, such as police departments or courts, whose staff have received at least some training in crime prevention and control. Report the raw number of conflicts between staff and youth recorded within the program. For example, this may include conflicts that result in youth punishment or revocations or staff reprimands or demerits. | 1. Number of staff/youth conflicts
 |  |
| 22 | Number of staff reprimands | Measure of program operations. Based on the idea that well-trained staff will receive fewer reprimands. Appropriate for programs, such as police departments or courts, whose staff or personnel have received at least some training in crime prevention and control. Report the number of reprimands recorded during the reporting period. Reprimands include things like notes in staff files, meetings with supervisors to discuss problematic behaviors, and changes in duties based on problematic performance. | 1. Number of staff reprimands
 |  |
| 23 | Number of complaints about staff filed by youth | Measure of program operations. Based on the idea that well-trained staff will receive fewer complaints. Appropriate for programs such as police departments or courts, whose staff or personnel have received at least some training in crime prevention and control. Report the number of complaints recorded during the reporting period. Include only formal complaints filed or for which the filing process was started. | 1. Number of complaints about staff filed by youth
 |  |
| 24 | Number and percent of policies based on a public health approach to crime control and prevention | Measure of program quality based on the idea that current research shows the value of public health approaches to crime control and prevention. Appropriate for any grantee under this purpose area. Report the number of policies, rules, or regulations that incorporate public health ideals and approaches. Percent is the number of policies, rules, or regulations filed during the reporting period.  | 1. Number of policies that incorporate public health approaches
2. Number of policies filed
3. Percent (a/b)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only)  | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of staff trained on gun court procedures | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for any grantee working with or administering a gun court. Report the raw number of staff to receive formal training on gun court related topics. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of staff in the pool from which those trained were selected. For example, if 10 staff from a probation department were trained, the total pool would be the staff from the entire probation department. | 1. Number of staff trained
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3 | Number of hours of training on gun court procedures offered | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for any grantee working with or administering a gun court. Report the raw number of hours of training offered to staff during the reporting period. Include in-house and external training and any training medium as long as it can be verified that the target staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if it did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 4 | Number and percent of arrests for gun offenses in which a juvenile offender is assessed for participation in the gun court | Measure of program operation level. Appropriate for any gun court program or larger jurisdiction that includes a gun court. Report the raw number of arrests for any type of gun-related offense that results in the juvenile offender being assessed for participation in the gun court. Include face-to-face assessments, review of records, or any other process used to determine appropriateness for gun court participation. The unit of measurement is the case, not the individual youth. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of arrests of juveniles for gun-related offenses. | 1. Number of gun court assessments
2. Number of gun-related arrests of juveniles
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5  | Number and percent of families of youth charged with gun offenses who are assessed | Measure of program operation level. In part, based on the idea that family participation has an effect on youth outcomes. Appropriate for any gun court program or larger jurisdiction that includes a gun court. Report the raw number of families who have at least one member (other than the offender who is participating in the gun court) assessed through the gun court. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth involved in the gun court. | 1. Number of families assessed
2. Number of youth enrolled in the gun courts
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 6 | Number of agencies involved in the gun court | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty court success is based on providing coordinated services. Appropriate for any gun court program. Report the raw number of agencies or groups with which the gun court (or gun court lead agency) has a formal partnership agreement. Such agreements can take the form of a memorandum of understanding, formal procedures for referrals between the agency and the gun court, or any other document that outlines how the agency will work with the gun court. | 1. Number of agencies involved in the gun court
 |  |
| 7  | Number of gun court slots | Measure of program scope. Appropriate for any gun court program. Report the number of youth that can participate in the gun court simultaneously. | 1. Number of gun court slots
 |  |
| 8 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 9 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 11 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 12 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |
| 14 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 15 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Time in days from arrest to enrollment in the gun court | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for any gun court program. Report the raw number of calendar days from the arrest of a juvenile offender to his/her first participation in the gun court. For example, this might be the youth/family signing consent to participate, engaging in a gun court assessment, or a meeting between the family and the gun court staff to explain the requirements of the gun court.  | 1. Number of days from arrest to enrollment
 |  |
| 18 | Number of treatment (clinical) slots available to the gun court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the number of clinical treatment slots to which the gun court can refer youth. For example, if the court is able to refer 10 youth to residential drug treatment, 15 youth to outpatient mental health services, and 30 youth for physical examinations at any one time, the program would report having 55 slots. | 1. Number of clinical treatment slots
 |  |
| 19 | Number of types of treatment (clinical) offered through the gun court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the number of different types of clinical treatment to which the gun court can refer youth. Include treatment types for which there are an agreement or history of referral, not treatment types that the court can refer to if a need arises. Clinical treatment includes services provided by a licensed professional such as a medical doctor, psychologist, licensed social worker, certified family counselor, or certified addictions specialist. | 1. Number of types of clinical treatment available
 |  |
| 20 | Number of service (non-clinical) slots available to the gun court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the number of non-clinical service slots to which the gun court can refer youth. For example, if the court is able to refer 10 youth to life skills training, 15 youth to vocational training, and 30 youth for GED classes, the program would report having 55 slots. | 1. Number of non-clinical service slots
 |  |
| 21 | Number of types of service offered through the gun court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the number of different types of non-clinical services to which the gun court can refer youth. Include service types, for which there is an agreement or history of referral, not service types that the court can refer to if a need arises. For example, services may include transportation, food vouchers, housing assistance, help getting back into school. | 1. Number of types of non-clinical services
 |  |
| 22 | Number and percent of eligible youth to enter the gun court | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that the system has a responsibility to serve as many eligible youth as possible. Appropriate for any gun court or larger jurisdiction that includes a gun court. Report the raw number of juveniles who actually become enrolled in the gun court. Enrollment may include things like signing a participation agreement, assignment of a gun court case specialist, or appearing before a gun court judge. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of juveniles who meet minimal gun court eligibility. For example, if eligibility is based on the commission of a certain group of crimes and 100 youth commit at least one of those crimes, and the gun court enrolls 30 people, the percent would be 30. | 1. Number of youth enrolled
2. Number of youth eligible
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number of judicial contacts per youth per month | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty courts require strict monitoring of their participants. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the average number of judicial contacts with gun court participants per month. Specifically, take the number of judicial contacts with gun court youth in a 1-month period. Divide that number by the number of youth enrolled during any part of that month. | 1. Number of judicial contacts with youth
2. Number of youth enrolled in the gun court
3. Number of contacts per youth (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number of hours of treatment received per youth participating in the gun court | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty courts result in higher levels of treatment receipt than do traditional courts. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the average number of clinical treatment hours received per youth per month. Specifically, take the number of clinical treatment hours that gun court youth receive in a 1-month period. Divide that number by the number of youth enrolled during any part of that month in clinical treatment, which include services provided by a licensed professional such as a medical doctor, psychologist, licensed social worker, certified family counselor, or certified addictions specialist. | 1. Average number of hours of clinical treatment received
2. Number of youth enrolled in the gun court
3. Number of clinical hours per youth (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Service intensity | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty courts result in higher levels of service receipt than do traditional courts. Appropriate for any specialty court (e.g. gun court or drug court). Report the average number of days a non-clinical service was received by number of days enrolled in specialty court across youth. For example, services may include transportation, food vouchers, housing assistance, or help getting back into school | 1. Average number of days of service per youth while enrolled
2. Average number of days youth are enrolled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26  | Number and percent of families of participants to actually participate in at least one recommended service (not including court appearances) | Measure of client accountability. Appropriate for any gun court program. Report the raw number of families with a member enrolled in the gun court to participate in at least one gun court service or treatment. Do not include appearances by family members at court dates or family members who solely drop youth off for their gun court requirements. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of families that have a member enrolled in the gun court. | 1. Number of families to participate
2. Number of families with a youth enrolled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Average number of different services and treatments received by youth gun court participants | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the average number of different types of service or clinical treatment received by gun court participants. For example, if a participant received outpatient mental health treatment, transportation services, and literacy counseling, that would count as three services. But, for example, if a participant received medical treatment from two different providers or on two different occasions that would count as one treatment unless the treatment was for different conditions (e.g., a broken leg and a pregnancy). | 1. Average number of types of service received per client
 |  |
| 28 | Number of days of youth enrollment in the gun court | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the average number of calendar days that youth enroll in the gun court. Enrollment includes things like signing a participation agreement, assignment of a gun court case specialist, or appearing before a gun court judge. Include active enrollment, not days on court rolls but where youth cannot be located or are otherwise non-participants (e.g., have moved out of the jurisdiction, but the paperwork to close the case has not been processed). | 1. Average number of days of court enrollment per youth
 |  |
| 29 | Number and percent of youth to successfully complete treatment/services referred to as part of the gun court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that well-operated gun courts with appropriate resources will have higher rates of treatment/service completion than would poor-quality programs. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the raw number of youth that successfully complete all of the treatment and service programs that they enter as part of the gun court. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth to enter at least one service or treatment through the gun court. | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete their treatment/service requirements
2. Number of youth enrolled in treatment/service
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 30 | Number and percent of youth to successfully complete their gun court requirements | "Measure of program quality based on the idea that well-operated gun courts with appropriate resources will have higher rates of completion than would poor-quality programs. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the raw number of youth that successfully complete all of their gun court requirements (service, treatment, and legal). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth to enroll in the gun court. Enrollment includes things like signing a participation agreement, assignment of a gun court case specialist, or appearing before a gun court judge. " | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete their gun court requirements
2. Number of youth to exit the gun court
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 31 | Cost savings per case | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the average cost in dollars to adjudicate a youth through the gun court subtracted from the average cost for adjudication of equivalent cases by the regular court. | 1. Average cost per gun court case
2. Average cost per equivalent non-gun court case
3. Cost savings (B-A)
 |  |
| 32 | Number and percent of court appearances missed by gun court participants | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the raw number of court appearances missed by gun court participants. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of court appearances scheduled. | 1. Number of missed court appearances
2. Number of appointments
3. Percent (a/b)
 |  |
| 33 | Number and percent of gun court participants for whom a bench warrant is issued | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for any gun court. Report the raw number of gun court participants to be issued a bench warrant. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of gun court participants enrolled during any part of the reporting period. | 1. Number of participants issued a bench warrant
2. Number of participants
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| # | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of staff trained on drug court procedures | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for any grantee working with or administering a drug court. Report the raw number of staff to receive formal training on drug court related topics. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of staff in the pool from which those trained were selected. For example, if 10 staff from a probation department were trained, the total pool would be the staff from the entire probation department. | 1. Number of staff trained
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3  | Number of hours of training on drug court procedures offered | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for any grantee working with or administering a drug court. Report the raw number of hours of training offered to staff during the reporting period. Include in-house and external training and any training medium as long as it can be verified that the target staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if it did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 4  | Number and percent of youth charged with drug offenses, who are assessed for participation in the drug court | Measure of program operation level. Appropriate for any drug court program, or larger jurisdiction that includes a drug court. Report the raw number of arrests for any type of drug-related offense that results in the juvenile offender being assessed for participation in the drug court. Include face-to-face assessments, review of records, or any other process used to determine appropriateness for drug court participation. The unit of measurement is the case, not the individual youth. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of arrests of juveniles for drug-related offenses. | 1. Number of drug court assessments
2. Number of drug-related arrests of juveniles
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number and percent of families of youth charged with drug offenses, who are assessed for participation in the drug court | Measure of program operation level. In part, based on the idea that family participation has an effect on youth outcomes. Appropriate for any drug court program, or larger jurisdiction that includes a drug court. Report the raw number of families who have at least one member (other than the offender who is participating in the drug court) assessed through the drug court. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth involved in the drug court. | 1. Number of families assessed
2. Number of youth enrolled in the drug court
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 6 | Number of agencies involved in the drug court | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty court success is based on providing coordinated services. Appropriate for any drug court program. Report the raw number of agencies or groups with which the drug court (or drug court lead agency) has a formal partnership agreement. Such agreements can take the form of a memorandum of understanding, formal procedures for referrals between the agency and the drug court, or any other document that outlines how the agency will work with the drug court. | 1. Number of agencies enrolled in the drug court
 |  |
| 7 | Number of drug court slots | Measure of program scope. Appropriate for any drug court program. Report the number of youth that can participate in the drug court simultaneously. | 1. Number of drug court slots
 |  |
| 8 | Time in days from arrest to enrollment in the drug court | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for any drug court program. Report the raw number of calendar days from the arrest of a juvenile offender to his/her first participation in the drug court. For example, this might be the youth/family signing a consent to participate, engaging in a drug court assessment, or a meeting between the family and the drug court staff to explain the requirements of the drug court.  | 1. Number of days from arrest to enrollment in the drug court
 |  |
| 9 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 10 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 12 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 13 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA.
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and/or practice (A/B)
 |  |

 **Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| # | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 17 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance during the reporting period.
2. Number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period.
3. (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number of clinical treatment slots available to the drug court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the number of clinical treatment slots to which the drug court can refer youth. For example, if the court is able to refer 10 youth to residential drug treatment, 15 youth to outpatient mental health services, and 30 youth for physical examinations at any one time, the program would report having 55 slots. | 1. Number of clinical treatment slots
 |  |
| 19 | Number of types of treatment (clinical) offered through the drug court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the number of different types of clinical treatment to which the drug court can refer youth. Include treatment a type for which there is an agreement or history of referral, not treatment types that the court can refer to if a need arises. Clinical treatment includes services provided by a licensed professional such as a medical doctor, psychologist, licensed social worker, certified family counselor, or certified addictions specialist. | 1. Number of types of clinical treatment available
 |  |
| 20 | Number of service (non-clinical) slots offered through the drug court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the number of non-clinical service slots, to which the drug court can refer youth. For example, if the court is able to refer 10 youth to life skills training, 15 youth to vocational training, and 30 youth for GED classes, the program would report having 55 slots. | 1. Number of non-clinical service slots
 |  |
| 21 | Number of types of non-clinical service offered through the drug court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that for a specialty court to be effective, it has to have adequate ability to refer youth to needed services. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the number of different types of non-clinical services to which the drug court can refer youth. Include service types for which there is an agreement or history of referral, not service types that the court can refer to if a need arises. For example, services may include transportation, food vouchers, housing assistance, or help getting back into school. | 1. Number of types of non-clinical services
 |  |
| 22 | Frequency of drug testing | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that drug testing is a tool available to drug courts and can affect youth outcomes and system responses to youth. Report the ratio of number of drugs tests given by the number of days participating in the drug court. For example, if the drug court offered 500 tests and served 30 youth who averaged 120 days of drug court participation, the result would be an average of 17 tests per youth (500/30) or one test per youth every 7 days (120/17). | 1. Number of drug tests given
2. Number of drug court participants
3. Average number of days of drug court participation per youth
4. Frequency (C/(A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of eligible youth to enter the drug court | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that the system has a responsibility to serve as many eligible youth as possible. Appropriate for any drug court or larger jurisdiction that includes a drug court. Report the raw number of juveniles who actually become enrolled in the drug court. Enrollment may include things like signing a participation agreement, assignment of a drug court case specialist, or appearing before a drug court judge. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of juveniles who meet minimal drug court eligibility. For example, if eligibility is based on the commission of a certain group of crimes and 100 youth commit at least one of those crimes, and the drug court enrolls 30 people, the percent would be 30 percent. | 1. Number of youth enrolled
2. Number of youth eligible
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number of judicial contacts per youth participating in the drug court | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty courts require strict monitoring of their participants. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the average number of judicial contacts with drug court participants per month. Specifically, take the number of judicial contacts with drug court youth in a 1-month period. Divide that number by the number of youth enrolled during any part of that month. | 1. Number of judicial contacts with youth
2. Number of youth enrolled in the drug court
3. Number of contacts per youth (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Number of hours of treatment received per youth participating in the drug court | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty courts result in higher levels of treatment receipt than do traditional courts. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the average number of clinical treatment hours received per youth per month. Specifically, take the number of clinical treatment hours that drug court youth receive in a 1-month period. Divide that number by the number of youth enrolled during any part of that month. Clinical treatment includes services provided by a licensed professional such as a medical doctor, psychologist, licensed social worker, certified family counselor, or certified addictions specialist. | 1. Number of hours of clinical treatment received
2. Number of youth enrolled in the drug court
3. Number of clinical hours per youth (A/B)
 |  |
| 26 | Number and percent of youth to test positive for drug use | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the raw number of youth to receive at least one positive drug test result. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth tested. | 1. Number of youth to test positive
2. Number of youth enrolled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Service intensity | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that specialty courts result in higher levels of service receipt than do traditional courts. Appropriate for any specialty court (e.g. gun court or drug court). Report the average number of days a non-clinical service was received by number of days enrolled in specialty court across youth. For example, services may include transportation, food vouchers, housing assistance, or help getting back into school | 1. Average number of days of service per youth while enrolled
2. Average number of days youth are enrolled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 28 | Number of families of participants to actually participate in at least one recommended service (not including court appearances) | Measure of client accountability. Appropriate for any drug court program. Report the raw number of families with a member enrolled in the drug court to participate in at least one drug court service or treatment. Do not include appearances by family members at court dates or family members who solely drop youth off for their drug court requirements. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of families that have a member enrolled in the drug court. | 1. Number of families to participate
2. Number of families with a youth enrolled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 29 | Average number of different services received by youth drug court participants | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the average number of different types of services or clinical treatment received by drug court participants. For example, if a participant received outpatient mental health treatment, transportation services, and literacy counseling, that would count as three services. But if, for example, a participant received medical treatment from two different providers or on two different occasions that would count as one treatment unless the treatment was for different conditions (e.g., a broken leg and a pregnancy). | 1. Average number of types of services received per client
 |  |
| 30 | Number of days of youth enrollment in the drug court | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the average number of calendar days that youth participate in the drug court. Enrollment includes things like signing a participation agreement, assignment of a drug court case specialist, or appearing before a drug court judge. Include active enrollment, not days a youth appears on case rolls but cannot be located or is otherwise a non-participant (e.g., the case is closed but the paper work has not yet been processed). | 1. Average number of days of court participation per youth
 |  |
| 31 | Number and percent of youth to successfully complete treatment/services referred to as part of the drug court | Measure of program quality based on the idea that well-operated drug courts with appropriate resources will have higher rates of treatment/service completion than would poor-quality programs. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the raw number of youth that successfully complete all of the treatment and service programs that they enter as part of the drug court. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth to enter at least one service or treatment through the drug court. | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete their treatment/services requirements
2. Number of youth enrolled in treatment/services
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 32 | Number and percent of youth to successfully complete their drug court requirements | Measure of program quality based on the idea that well-operated drug courts with appropriate resources will have higher rates of completion than would poor quality programs. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the raw number of youth that successfully complete all of their drug court requirements (service, treatment, and legal). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth to enroll in the drug court. Enrollment includes things like signing a participation agreement, assignment of a drug court case specialist, or appearing before a drug court judge. | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete their drug court requirements
2. Number of youth enrolled in the drug court
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 33 | Cost savings per youth | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the average cost in dollars to adjudicate a youth through the drug court subtracted from the average cost for adjudication of cases by the regular court. | 1. Average cost per gun court case
2. Average cost per equivalent non-gun court case
3. Cost savings (B-A)
 |  |
| 34 | Number and percent of court appearances missed by drug court participants | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the raw number of court appearances missed by drug court participants. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of court appearances scheduled. | 1. Number of missed court appearances
2. Number of court appearances schedule
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 35 | Number and percent of drug court participants for whom a bench warrant is issued | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for any drug court. Report the raw number of drug court participants to be issued a bench warrant. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of drug court participants enrolled during any part of the reporting period. | 1. Number of participants issued a bench warrant
2. Number of participants
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement Only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2  | Number and percent of units of local government (ULG) or tribal equivalent that have automated data systems | Determine level of automated data system. Most appropriate for State, county-level grantees, Tribal, or regional grantees or grantees that encompass more than one ULG or tribal equivalent. Report the raw number of ULGs or tribal equivalent that have at least partial automation of their juvenile justice data systems. This could include things like electronic youth assessment processes that do not require hardcopies, electronic data request procedures, centralized databases that multiple systems can access, electronic consent forms that once completed automatically allow data access to the specified person(s). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of ULGs or tribal equivalent under the grantee. | 1. Number of ULGs with automation
2. Number of ULGs
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3 | Number and percent of cases that are in the automated systems | Determine the scope of the automation. Most appropriate for grantees that have some level of automation of the juvenile justice records. Report the raw number of justice cases (not individual youth) that have at least some information entered into the data system. This includes things like locator information, screening or assessment data, case management information, probation meeting summaries, or results of drug tests. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of cases opened or handled by the grantee. | 1. Number of cases with automated information
2. Number of cases total
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 4 | Number and percent of data elements that are automated | Determine the efficiency of the system. Appropriate for grantees that have at least partial data automation. Report the raw number of data elements in the system. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of data elements that exist. For example, each variable could be one of the responses to assessment questions, the responses on forms required for a cases record (e.g., notations about probation or case management meetings), information about treatment, information about the arresting crime, justice charges, judicial status, and service referrals, and youth and family locator information. | 1. Number of variables in system
2. Number of variables total
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5  | Number and percent of staff trained to use the automated systems | Determine system accountability based on the idea that for the system to be useful, staff must be trained to use it. Appropriate for grantees with at least partially automated systems. Report the raw number of staff that have received any amount of formal training about the automated systems. Training can be in any format or medium as long as its receipt can be verified. Training can be from any source as long as it was at least facilitated by the JABG/Tribal JADG funds. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of grantee staff. | 1. Number of staff strained
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 6 | Number of hours of training provided on the automated systems | Determine system accountability based on the idea that for the system to be useful, staff must be trained to use it. Appropriate for grantees with at least partially automated systems. Report the raw number of hours of training provided. Training can be in any format or medium as long as it can be verified that staff were aware of the training and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., it was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Training can be from any source as long as it was at least facilitated by the JABG/Tribal JADG funds. | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 7 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 8 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 9 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 10 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 12 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
|  15 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number and percent of case files that are completely automated | Determine the level of operationalization of the automation. Appropriate for grantees with at least partial data automation. Report the raw number of case files (not individual youth) that are completely automated (i.e., all required data about that case are entered in the automated system and ready for use). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of cases processed or handled by the grantee. | 1. Number of completely automated cases
2. Number of cases total
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 17  | Number and percent of staff with access to the automated system | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that for the system to work, relevant staff needs to be able to access the system. Appropriate for grantees with at least partial data automation. Report the raw number of staff that can access the data system as needed. Do not include people who do not have passwords or system authorization or staff who do not have the needed training or equipment to access the data system. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of grantee staff that would need data access to perform their jobs. | 1. Number of staff with access
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number and percent of programs about which the data are complete | Measure of operational scope. Most appropriate for county-level grantees or grantees that comprise more than one program (e.g., more than one court unit, more than one level of probation). Report the raw number of programs about which all of their data has been entered into the automated system. This includes each of their clients and the full data about each of those clients. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of grantee programs. | 1. Number of programs that are automated
2. Number of programs
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Number of complaints about data accuracy (including timeliness) | Measure of system quality. Appropriate for any program that has at least partial automation. Report the number of reports of data inaccuracy. Include data change requests or other changes to data made after they have been made available to staff for use or reporting. Do not include errors found during the quality assurance process before the data are available for staff use. | 1. Number of complaints
 |  |
| 20 | Time in hours from contact to information being entered into the system | Measure of system efficiency. Appropriate for grantees with at least partial automation. Report the average number of hours from information being gathered to it being entered into the automated system and ready for use. Include data entry and quality control time. If data are entered into the system as they are being collected, the time required would be zero. | 1. Average number of hours from data collection to complete automation
 |  |
| 21 | Staff time required for client administration | Measure of system efficiency. Appropriate for any grantee with at least partial automation. Report the raw number of hours staff spend on client administration per month divided by the number of hours of staff work. For example, entering client data, verifying school or justice records, compiling assessment or screening data, or tracking client referrals. Do not include time spent in direct contact with client or time providing services or treatment. Time spent arranging or scheduling service or treatment should be counted. | 1. Number of hours staff spend on administration
2. Number of hours staff work
3. Percent of hours on administration (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Percent of redundant assessments/intakes performed | Measure of system efficiency. Appropriate for grantees with at least partial automation. Determine the average number of assessments that clients receive as part of the program. Report number of repeat assessments administered to clients divided by the average number of assessments clients must complete as part of the program. Repeat assessments include youth assessed on the same issues, such as to determine level of drug use or for personal locator information, more than once in a 90-day period. It does not include intentional periodic re-assessments for clinical reasons or re-assessments conducted because of a change in client circumstances. For example, if a client had been assessed regarding treatment and service needs by the pretrial unit before adjudication, as well as by the probation officer post adjudication and the two programs to which the probation officer refers the youth, this youth would have 75 percent redundancy in assessment. | 1. Number of repeat assessments
2. Number of total assessments
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of requests for missing information about a youth or case | Measure of system effectiveness. Appropriate for grantees with at least some level of automation. Report the raw number of repeat requests for information or requests for additional detail in existing information. Also include requests for client information that would be expected to be in the automated system but is missing. Percent is the raw number divided by all requests for client information. | 1. Number of repeat information requests
2. Number of information requests
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number and percent of data/information requests that must be submitted more than once | Measure of system effectiveness. Appropriate for grantees with at least partial automation. Report the raw number of times that the same data must be submitted to the system. Includes data that are lost after submission, and data that become unusable after submission or data that must be resubmitted because of system revisions or changes. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of data submissions. Count batch submissions (e.g., routine submissions of a week’s worth of client assessments) as single submissions regardless of the number of variables or cases included. | 1. Number of repeat data submissions
2. Number of data submissions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Number and percent of units with agreements to use common intake/assessment forms | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that the use of a single form increases system efficiency and reduces the burden on clients. Appropriate for most grantees under this purpose area. Report the number of different entities that require youth assessments and that have agreements to use the data from the same assessment. Include both entities that have formal agreements to this effect or those who have a history of sharing their assessment data. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of entities that clients are in contact with. If multiple groups share assessment data among themselves but not with each other, report the number that is the larger of the two as the raw number. | 1. Number of entities that have assessments to share
2. Number of entities that use assessments data
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26 | Number of data queries | Measure of system use and a proxy for data usefulness. Appropriate for grantees with at least partial automation. Report the number of separate times that authorized users access the automated data. Do not include access for the purpose of data entry. | 1. Number of times data are accessed
 |  |
| 27 | Number of different standard reports that are programmed into the system | Measure of system accountability to staff. Appropriate for grantees with at least partial automation. Report the number of different standard reports that users can create with the system. Standard reports are those that are routinely required of users or are choices programmed into a report menu offered to users. Do not include custom reports that users can create individually. | 1. Number of standard reports possible
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only)  | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number of partner agencies | Measure of collaboration. Appropriate for any grantee involved in at least one partnership. Report the number of agencies that have formal partnership agreements (e.g., memoranda of understanding, contracts, or letters of agreement) with the grantee. | 1. Number of partner agencies
 |  |
| 3 | Number of data elements shared among partner agencies | Measure of collaboration. Appropriate for any grantee with at least one partnership. Report the number of different pieces of information that are shared by the grantee and its partner agencies. Different pieces of information might be each of the responses to an assessment, case manager reports, results of drug tests, or informed consent. | 1. Number of shared data elements
 |  |
| 4  | Number and percent of youth about whom there is a complete case file | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that require client information from outside sources (e.g., school records, public health records) under this purpose area. Report the raw number of grantee case files (not individual youth) that are complete (i.e., all required data about that case are in the case file). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of case files that are active, and processed or handled by the grantee. | 1. Number of complete case files
2. Number of case files
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number and percent of staff trained in information sharing | Determine system accountability based on the idea that for the process to be useful, staff must be trained to use it. Appropriate for most grantees under this purpose area. Report the raw number of staff that have received any amount of formal training about information sharing (include both general information and agency specific information). Training can be in any format or medium as long as its receipt can be verified. Training can be from any source as long as it was at least facilitated by the JABG/Tribal JADG funds. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of grantee staff. | 1. Number of staff trained in information sharing
2. Number of staff total
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 6 | Number of hours of training provided about the information sharing | Determine system accountability based on the idea that for the process to be useful, staff must be trained to use it. Appropriate for most grantees under this purpose area. Report the raw number of hours of training provided. Training can be in any format or medium as long as it can be verified that staff were aware of the training and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., it was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Training can be from any source as long as it was at least facilitated by the JABG/Tribal JADG funds. | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 7 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 8 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 9 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 10 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 12 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 14 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 15 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
|  16 | Number of interagency information requests | Proxy for system usefulness. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the number of requests for information both to the grantees agency from staff at partner agencies or from the grantees agency to staff at partner agencies. | 1. Number of interagency information requests
 |  |
| 17 | Average time in hours from information request to information receipt | Measure of system efficiency. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the number of hours from the time interagency information is requested to the time it is received by the requestor. Include time for initial data receipt as well as any additional time for follow-up requests based on missing, unusable, or confusing data. | 1. Number of hours from request receipt to request fulfilled
 |  |
| 18 | Number and percent of youth that are referred for similar services through different agencies or staff (i.e., redundant referrals) | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the raw number of youth who receive redundant referrals (i.e., referrals for the same type of service or treatment from multiple sources or from the same agency as part of the same case). Do not include referrals for cause (e.g., a new problem arises, a new provider must be found, or the problem reoccurs). Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth served by the grantee. | 1. Number of redundantly referred youth
2. Number of youth
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Number and percent of youth on waiting lists for treatment or service | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the raw number of youth put on a waiting list for treatment or service at any point in their process through the system and for any length of time. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of clients handled or processed by the grantee. | 1. Number of youth put on a waiting list
2. Number of youth
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of days youth spend on waiting lists for treatment or service | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the cumulative number of calendar days any client is on a waiting list for service or treatment. Percent is the cumulative number of calendar days divided by the total number of days that clients were served by, or the responsibility of, the grantee. | 1. Number of days clients are on waiting lists
2. Number of days clients served by the grantee
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent of youth who cannot receive identified services (e.g., slots full, service not provided locally) | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the raw number of youth who for any reason do not receive the service or treatment indicated as needed by their assessment. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of clients served by, or the responsibility of, the grantee. | 1. Number of youth that did not receive treatment
2. Number of youth served by the grantee
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Percent of staff time required to access client data from outside agencies | Measure of system efficiency. Appropriate for grantees that require client information from outside sources (e.g., school records, public health records) under this purpose area. Report the percent of staff hours spent on gathering client data from outside entities per month. For example, getting school attendance data or probation status. Include time required to get data from clients that other entities may already have, but do not include time gathering unique information directly from client. | 1. Number of hours staff spent on gathering data per month
2. Number of hours staff worked per month
3. Percent of time spent on gathering data (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of youth about whom information is shared across agencies | Measure of system scope. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the raw number of grantee clients about whom the grantee either receives from or distributes information to partner agencies. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of grantee clients. | 1. Number of clients about whom data is shared across agencies
2. Number of clients served by the grantee
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number and percent of youth to enter services or treatment to which they are referred | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the raw number of youth who are referred to a service or treatment and who receive at least one session of that service or treatment. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth referred to at least one service or treatment. | 1. Number of youth to enter treatment or services referred to
2. Number of youth referred to treatment or services
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Number and percent of services and treatments successfully completed by youth | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the raw number of services and treatment for which the enrolled youth successfully complete all of the requirements of that service or treatment. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of services or treatments in which youth are enrolled. There may be multiple entries per youth. | 1. Number of treatments/services successfully completed
2. Number of treatments or services in which youth are enrolled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26  | Average time to service (days) | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational information sharing programs. Report the average number of days from the time a client is assessed as needing a service to the first receipt of that service. There may be multiple entries per youth. | 1. Average number of days from assessment to first service
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | Number and percent of staff trained in accountability programming | Determine system accountability based on the idea that for the process to be useful, staff must be trained to use it. Appropriate for most grantees under this purpose area. Report the raw number of staff that have received any amount of formal training about accountability programming (include both general information and agency specific information). Training can be in any format or medium as long as its receipt can be verified. Training can be from any source as long as it was at least facilitated by the JABG/Tribal JADG funds. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of grantee staff. | 1. Number of staff trained
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 2  | Number of hours of training about accountability programming offered | Determine system accountability based on the idea that for the process to be useful, staff must be trained to use it. Appropriate for most grantees under this purpose area. Report the raw number of hours of training provided. Training can be in any format or medium as long as it can be verified that staff were aware of the training and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., it was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Training can be from any source as long as it was at least facilitated by the JABG/Tribal JADG funds. | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 3  | Number of accountability programs in operation | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that have accountability programs in operation. Report the number of different accountability programs that are operational (e.g., serving clients). Include programs that are partially and fully operational. Different programs would be those, for example, that offer different services, serve different populations, have different procedures or criteria for inclusion or operation, or are run by different people/agencies/organizations. | 1. Number of accountability programs operating
 |  |
| 4 | Number and percent of justice agencies providing accountability programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that encompass multiple justice agencies. For example, a county justice system, a county government, or a service provider that works throughout the entire justice system. Report the raw number of different justice agencies that have at least one operational accountability program. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of justice agencies in the local area (e.g., if the grantee is a county, the divisor would be the total number of justice agencies in the county). | 1. Number of agencies with an operational accountability program
2. Number of justice agencies
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of accountability program slots | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer accountability programming. Report the raw number of accountability programming slots that the program has at any one time. Include both services directly delivered by the program and services that youth have access to through the program. For example, if a program can process victim impact statements for 5 juvenile offenders and serve 25 youth through a victim empathy class, the number of slots would be 30. | 1. Number of accountability slots
 |  |
| 6 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 7 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 8 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 9 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 10 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 13 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
|  14 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Number of supervision meetings per youth per month | Measure of program quality. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of times participating youth met with a representative of the justice system in the preceding month. Depending on the program, it may be youths' probation or parole officer, a specialty court judge, or the staff at the detention or day reporting center that monitors youths' progress towards fulfilling their justice requirements. | 1. Average number of supervision meetings per youth per month
 |  |
| 16 | Time in days from offender intake into the accountability program to receipt of a sanctions schedule | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of calendar days from youth intake in the accountability program to their receiving a sanctions schedule. Intake can include things like signing a participation agreement or assignment of a program case specialist. | 1. Average number of calendar days from enrollment to receipt of a sanctions schedule
 |  |
| 17 | Number and percent of youth with a behavioral contract developed at their intake into the accountability program | Determine whether graduated sanctions are being used as intended with the development of behavioral contract at youth intake. This measures system accountability. Appropriate for all programs implementing graduated sanctions. Report raw number of youth in graduated sanctions programs that had a behavioral contract developed when they entered the program. Percent is calculated by dividing the number of youth with a contract developed at intake by the total number of youth to enter the accountability program. | 1. Number of youth with a behavioral contract at intake
2. Number of youth to enter the program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Average time in hours from infraction to sanction | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of hours from when a youth does something that violates the behavioral contract, the program rules, school behavior rules or guidelines to that youth receiving a sanction. Include only closed cases (i.e., those in which a sanction has been administered or the case dismissed). | 1. Average number of hours from infraction to sanction
 |  |
| 19 | Number and percent of sanctions that are successfully contested by youth or their families | Measure of program accountability based on the idea that procedures for contesting sanctions are a vital part of accountability programming. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the raw number of sanctions that are overturned, reversed, or revised. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of sanctions enacted. | 1. Number of sanctions successfully contested
2. Number of sanctions imposed
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of youth referrals across departments, organizations, agencies or units | Measure of system collaboration. Appropriate for grantees that work with other agencies to provide client services. Report the raw number of client referrals (to or from the grantee) that involve other departments, organizations, agencies, or units). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of client referrals. | 1. Number of cross-agency client referrals
2. Number of client referrals
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent of eligible youth entering an accountability program | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that the system should meet the identified need for service. Appropriate for grantees that oversee youth, such as court systems or probation departments. Report the raw number of youth enrolled in accountability programs during any part of the reporting period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth processed by the grantee during any part of the reporting period that met the criteria for inclusion into an accountability program (e.g., they were not arrested for an excluded crime). | 1. Number of youth in accountability programs
2. Number of youth processed by grantee
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Number and percent of youth to receive aftercare services | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for operational accountability programs or grantees that oversee youth (e.g., case managers, probation, or parole officer) who participate in accountability programming. Report the raw number of youth to receive aftercare programming as part of the accountability program. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth to participate in an accountability program. | 1. Number of youth to receive aftercare
2. Number of youth to participate in an accountability program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 23  | Average percent of days youth received treatment/services | Measure of system accountability and program implementation. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of calendar days that youth receive an accountability program treatment or service divided by the total number of days they were enrolled in the program. Include clinical, non-clinical, and supervision treatment services. | 1. Average number of days youth receive a service
2. Average number of days youth are enrolled in accountability programming
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number and percent of youth assigned to alternatives to detention | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that youth should not be placed in detention unnecessarily. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the raw number of program youth who were assigned to an alternative to detention that, without the program, would have been assigned to detention. Percent is the raw number divided by the raw number plus the number of youth assigned to detention. | 1. Number of youth assigned to alternatives to detention
2. Number of youth to receive detention
3. Percent (A/(A+B))
 |  |
| 25 | Average number of days of program participation per youth | Measure of program scope. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of calendar days youth participate in the program (i.e., from intake to completion). Include both clients who complete successfully and those who do not. | 1. Average number of days youth are enrolled in the program
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | Number and percent of intake units using valid and reliable risk assessments | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that oversee more than one unit, department, or entity that conducts youth intake procedures. Report the raw number of units that use a risk assessment tool (with at least 80 percent of the youth they process) that has been determined through research or evaluation to be valid and reliable. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of intake units overseen by the grantee. | 1. Number of units that use a validated risk assessment tool
2. Number of units
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of intake units using valid and reliable needs assessments | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that oversee more than one unit, department, or entity that conducts youth intake procedures. Report the raw number of units that use a needs assessment tool (with at least 80 percent of the youth they process) that has been determined through research or evaluation to be valid and reliable. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of intake units overseen by the grantee. | 1. Number of units that use a validated needs assessment tool
2. Number of units
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3  | Average number of sources used in assessment process | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that the more sources used, the more accurate the assessment will be. Appropriate for grantees that conduct youth assessments. Report the average number of data sources used in the assessment process (e.g., school records, parental reports, justice records, face-to-face assessments, behavioral observation). If members of a youth’s family are assessed separately, count them as different sources, but if they are interviewed together or more than one interview is required to fill in missing information, count them as one source. | 1. Average number of data sources used per youth assessment
 |  |
| 4  | Number and percent of assessment staff with specialized training | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff provides better service. Appropriate for grantees that conduct assessments. Report the number of staff who conduct assessments, have either received specific training about conducting assessments, or have specialized degrees or certifications (such as being Certified Addictions Specialists, or licensed social workers). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of staff who conducts assessments. | 1. Number of assessors with specialized training
2. Number of assessors
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 6 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 7 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 8 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 9 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 10 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 12 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 14 | Number and percent of youth fully assessed using risk and needs assessments | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that conduct youth assessments. Report the raw number of youth to have complete assessment files (i.e., all assessments were completely administered and there are no missing data). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth processed by the grantee. | 1. Number of youth with complete files
2. Number of youth
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Of the total number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment, the percent identified through the screening/assessment process | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that effective assessment systems will catch the majority of youth with the targeted service needs. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment through the assessment process divided by the total number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment. | 1. Number of youth assessed as needing substance abuse treatment
2. Number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Of the total number of youth identified as needing mental health services, the percent identified through the screening/assessment process | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that effective assessment systems will catch the majority of youth with the targeted service needs. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of youth identified as needing mental health treatment through the assessment process divided by the total number of youth identified as needing mental health treatment. | 1. Number of youth assessed as needing mental health treatment
2. Number of youth identified as needing mental health treatment
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Average time in hours from screening to assessment | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that assess clients or refer clients for assessment. Report the average number of hours from youths screening being completed (i.e., all screening data being completely collected) to their assessment being completed (i.e., all assessment data being completely collected). | 1. Average number of hours from screening completion to assessment completion
 |  |
| 18 | Average time in days from assessment to first service receipt | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that serve clients or refer clients for service. Report the average number of calendar days from youths assessment being completed (i.e., all assessment data being completely collected) to their first receipt of service. | 1. Average number of days from assessment completion to first service
 |  |
| 19 | Number and percent of referrals to primary prevention services | Measure of program operation. Appropriate for grantees that generate client referrals or oversee the referral process (e.g., a county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation grantee spending the funds on building accountability capacity in a probation department). Report the raw number of referrals (not individual youth) for a primary prevention service. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of referrals generated. | 1. Number of referrals for a primary prevention service
2. Number of referrals total
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of referrals to secondary prevention services | Measure of program operation. Appropriate for grantees that generate client referrals or oversee the referral process (e.g., a county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation grantee spending the funds on building accountability capacity in a probation department). Report the raw number of referrals (not individual youth) for a secondary prevention service. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of referrals generated. | 1. Number of referrals for a secondary prevention service
2. Number of referrals
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Number of different service referrals per youth | Measure of program operation. Appropriate for grantees that generate client referrals or oversee the referral process (e.g., a county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation grantee spending the funds on building accountability capacity in a probation department). Report the average number of referrals received by program participants while they are in the program. Different programs would be those, for example, that offer different services, serve different populations, have different procedures or criteria for inclusion or operation, or are run by different people/agencies/organizations. | 1. Average number of referrals per youth
 |  |
| 22 | Average time in hours from first justice contact for current offense to youth screening | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that screen clients or refer clients for screening. Report the average number of hours from youth entering the system (e.g., being referred to the system by their school, being arrested, etc.) to their screening being completed (i.e., all screening data being completely collected). | 1. Average number of hours from first justice contact to screening completion
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of times services identified through youth assessment are actually received by the assessed youth | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that if the system identifies a service need, it has the responsibility to meet that need. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of times a youth enrolls in, or receives, a service that they were assessed as needing. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of services that youth were assessed as needing." | 1. Number of times youth receive referred service
2. Number of services youth were assessed as needing
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number and percent of cases assigned to alternatives to detention | To determine if the program is working as intended by actually reducing the number of cases that result in detention. Most appropriate for grantees that include detention in their list of potential sanctions. Report the raw number of program youth who were assigned to an alternative institution and who would otherwise have been assigned to detention. Percent is the raw number divided by the raw number plus the number of youth assigned to detention. | 1. Number of cases assigned to an alternative to detention
2. Number of cases assigned to detention
3. Percent (A/(B +B))
 |  |
| 25 | Number and percent of youth who cannot receive identified services (e.g., slots full, service not provided locally) | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of youth who do not receive the service or treatment indicated as needed by their assessment. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth assessed as needing service. | 1. Number of youth that do not receive services they are assessed as needing
2. Number of youth assessed as needing services
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | Percent of time per week spent on accountability programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for schools implementing or developing accountability programming or grantees that work with schools on accountability programming. Report the average number of hours per week that school staff spends on accountability programming. Percent is average time spent divided by average number of hours worked per week. Compute averages by school. If a grantee is computing for more than one school, report the average across schools. | 1. Average number of hours per week staff spend on accountability programming
2. Average number of hours per week that staff work
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of school staff trained to implement accountability programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for schools implementing or developing accountability programming or grantees that work with schools on accountability programming. Report the raw number of staff that have received any amount of formal training about accountability programming (include both general information and agency specific information). Training can be in any format or medium as long as its receipt can be verified. Training can be from any source as long as it was at least facilitated by the JABG funds. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of school staff. | 1. Number of staff trained
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3 | Number of different graduated sanctions options per level (immediate, intermediate, secure care, aftercare) | Determine coverage of the graduated sanctions approach within the local juvenile justice system or comprehensive programs. Most appropriate for projects with operational accountability programs. Report raw number of different sanctioning options by level. Different implies that the options either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals. | 1. Number of immediate sanctioning options
2. Number of intermediate sanctioning options
3. Number of secure care sanctioning options
4. Number of aftercare/reentry sanctioning options
 |  |
| 4 | Number of different accountability programs operating | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that have operational accountability programs. Report the number of different accountability programs that are operational (e.g., serving clients). Include programs that are partially and fully operational. Different programs would be those, for example, that offer different services, serve different populations, have different procedures or criteria for inclusion or operation, or are run by different people/agencies/organizations. | 1. Number of different accountability programs operating
 |  |
| 5 | Number of graduated sanctions slots per level (immediate, intermediate, secure care, aftercare) | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the number of youth that the program(s) can serve simultaneously at each sanction level. | 1. Number of immediate sanction slots
2. Number of intermediate sanction slots
3. Number of secure care sanction slots
4. Number of aftercare/reentry sanction slots
 |  |
| 6 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 7 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 8 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 9 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 11 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

##

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
|  14 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Number and percent of staff participating in accountability programs | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that programs require full staffing to work appropriately and a larger percent of staff involvement implies more institutionalization. Report the raw number of school staff working on, participating in, or contributing to accountability programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of school staff. | 1. Number of staff participating in accountability programming
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number of school-community partnerships | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that program success depends on providing coordinated services. Appropriate for most grantees under this purpose area. Report the raw number of community agencies or groups with which the school (or school district) has a formal partnership agreement. Such agreements can take the form of memorandums of understanding, formal procedures for referrals between the agency and the school, or any other document that outlines how the community agency will work with the school. | 1. Number of community partner agencies
 |  |
| 17 | Number of school-justice partnerships | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that program success depends on providing coordinated services. Appropriate for most grantees under this purpose area. Report the raw number of justice agencies (e.g., probation departments, police departments, community policing units, day reporting centers) with which the school (or school district) has a formal partnership agreement. Such agreements can take the form of memorandums of understanding, formal procedures for referrals between the agency and the school, or any other document that outlines how the justice agency will work with the school. | 1. Number of justice partner agencies
 |  |
| 18 | Number of different school safety programming options in place | Determine coverage of the school safety approach. Most appropriate for schools, school districts, county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation offices that work with schools/education issues. Report raw number of different school safety programs in operation. Different implies that the options either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals.  | 1. Number of different school safety programs in operation
 |  |
| 19 | Number and percent of youth to receive a sanctions schedule at school orientation | To help determine whether accountability programming is being implemented as intended with the distribution of the sanctions schedule at school orientation. This measures system accountability. Appropriate for schools, school districts, county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation departments that oversee schools/education. Report raw number of youth that received a sanctions schedule at school orientation. If there is no formal orientation, use the start of classes as the time point. Percent is calculated by dividing the number of youth to receive a sanctions schedule at orientation by the number of youth to enter the school(s). | 1. Number of youth to receive a sanctions schedule at orientation
2. Number of youth served/enrolled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Average time in hours from infraction to sanction | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of hours from when a youth does something that violates the behavioral contract, the program rules, school behavior rules or guidelines to that youth receiving a sanction. Include only closed cases (i.e., those in which a sanction has been administered or the case dismissed). | 1. Average number of hours from infraction to sanction
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent of misconduct events handled using accountability sanctions/guidelines | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the raw number of infractions to result in the prescribed sanctions (the type of sanction, the timing of the sanction, etc.). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of infractions. | 1. Number of infractions to result in prescribed sanction
2. Number of infractions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Number of target youth referred to the justice system | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the raw number of youth who are receiving or participating in accountability programming (including those bound by accountability sanctions schedules even if they are receiving no direct services) to be referred to the justice system from the school. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth who are receiving or participating in accountability programming (including those bound by accountability sanctions schedules even if they are receiving no direct services). | 1. Number of youth referred from the school to the justice system
2. Number of youth participants in accountability programs
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number of formal incident reports | Measure of youth accountability based on the idea that incident reports partially represent youth misbehavior. Appropriate for programs that serve youth. Report the number of incident reports made to the school. Include reports to the school administration about accidents, fights, non-attendance at class, or other forms of misbehaviors. Also, include any other formal notations about misbehaviors such as warnings issued or notices to parents. | 1. Number of formal incident reports
 |  |
| 24 | Number of crimes reported to the police | Measure of youth accountability based on the idea that crime reports partially represent youth misbehavior. Appropriate for programs that serve youth. Report the number of crimes reported to police that involves crime affecting school personnel, school property, or students. For reports of crime against people, include events that occur on school property, involve students (or recent students) as perpetrators, or are otherwise related to the school. | 1. Number of crimes reported to the police
 |  |
| 25 | Number and percent of teachers threatened at school | Measure of youth accountability. Most appropriate for schools or school districts. Report the raw number of teachers that receive threats from students (actual or presumed). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of teachers. | 1. Number of teachers threatened
2. Number of teachers
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26 | Average number of hours youth spend out of learning activities | Measure of system operation, based on the idea that students should remain in a learning environment when possible. Appropriate for schools or programs providing education or training. Report the average number of hours youth spend outside of learning activities (e.g., lectures, presentations, field trips, or other activities designed to meet the instructional goals of the program/school) per week divided by the total hours of instruction possible per week. | 1. Average number of hours spent out of class per week
2. Number of hours of possible class time
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Number of weapons seized | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for programs that serve youth. Report the number of weapons (e.g., guns, knives, sticks) seized from youth.  | 1. Number of weapons seized
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | Number of different restorative justice programs implemented | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that administer more than one restorative justice program. Report the maximum number of different restorative justice programs in operation simultaneously. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals | 1. Number of different restorative justice programs in operation
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of youth to participate in any of the following events: victim offender mediation/dialogue; family group conferencing; peacemaking circles; restitution; personal services to victims; community service; apologies; victim/community impact panels; community/neighborhood impact statements; victim empathy groups/classes | Measure of program operation. Appropriate for most restorative justice programs. Report the raw number of youth to participate in any of the following events: victim offender mediation/dialogue; family group conferencing; peacemaking circles; restitution; personal services to victims; community service; apologies; victim/community impact panels; community/neighborhood impact statements; victim empathy groups/classes. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth served by the slots | 1. Number of youth to participate in any of the listed events
2. Number of youth served by grantee
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3  | Amount of funds allocated to restorative justice programming | Determine the distribution of the money. Appropriate for any project paying for restorative justice programming. Report the raw dollar amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds spent on restorative justice programming. | 1. Number of dollars spent on restorative justice programming
 |  |
| 4 | Number of restorative justice program slots | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer restorative justice programming. Report the raw number of restorative justice programming slots that the program has at any one time. Include both programs directly delivered by the grantee as well as programs that youth have access to through the grantee. For example, if a program can process victim impact statements for 5 juvenile offenders and serve 25 youth through a victim empathy class, the number of slots would be 30. | 1. Number of restorative justice slots
 |  |
| 5  | Number of hours of restorative justice training offered to justice staff by type (orientation, continuing education, cross training with community-based organizations) | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs whose staff offer restorative justice programming. Report the raw number of hours of training offered about restorative justice (by topic). Include in-house and external training and any training medium (classes, observations, online, etc.) as long as it can be verified that staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the period. | 1. Number of hours of orientation training offered
2. Number of hours of continuing education training offered
3. Number of hours of cross training offered
 |  |
| 6 | Number of hours of community outreach about restorative justice programming | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that offer or promote restorative justice programming. Report the number of hours of outreach activities conducted by staff or on behalf of staff. For example, if someone made a presentation at a PTA meeting for 1 hour, count 1 hour plus travel and administration time; if someone dropped off flyers at a PTA meeting, count the actual time spent delivering the flyers. | 1. Number of hours of community outreach about restorative justice programming
 |  |
| 7 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 8 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 9 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 10 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 11 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 12 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance |  | 1. Number of organizations that receive training and technical assistance during the reporting period
2. Number of those served by TTA during the reporting period
 |  |
| 15 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number and percent of times restorative justice is part of case dispositions of juvenile offenders | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for entities that use restorative justice programming such as courts (whether they actually deliver it themselves or not). Report the raw number of case dispositions that include restorative justice programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of case dispositions. Include diversion, formal adjudications, warrant hearings, and all other methods of resolving cases against juvenile offenders. | 1. Number of case dispositions that include restorative justice
2. Number of case dispositions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number and percent of target youth to receive restorative justice programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for entities that use restorative justice programming (whether they actually deliver it themselves or not). Report the raw number of youth to participate in restorative justice programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth served by the grantee. | 1. Number of youth to participate in restorative justice
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Number of different restorative justice sanctioning options available | Determine coverage of the restorative justice approach. Most appropriate for grantees implementing or referring youth to restorative justice programming. Report raw number of different restorative justice sanctions available. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals. | 1. Number of restorative justice sanctions options available
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of offenses for which restorative justice is an option | Determine coverage of the restorative justice approach. Most appropriate for programs that refer youth to restorative justice programs. Report the raw number of juvenile justice offenses (criminal, statutory or civil) for which restorative justice programming may be considered as an option. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of offenses on the books. | 1. Number of offenses for which restorative justice is an option
2. Number of offenses on the books
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent of crime victims to participate in restorative justice programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for entities that use restorative justice programming (whether they actually deliver it themselves or not). Report the raw number of victims of juvenile crime to participate in restorative justice programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of victims processed by the grantee. | 1. Number of crime victims to participate in restorative justice
2. Number of crime victims
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Average time in hours from crime report to first contact between victim and victim advocate | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that deliver or oversee restorative justice programming. Report the average number of hours from a crime being reported to the crime victim being contacted by a victim advocate (e.g., staff who work to restore the victim rather than staff who work to legally process the crime). | 1. Average number of hours from crime to first contact with a victim advocate
 |  |
| 23 | Average time in hours spent by victims’ advocates with victims | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that deliver or oversee restorative justice programming. Report the average number of hours that victim advocates spend with crime victims from first encounter through their last encounter. Include any form of direct contact such as in-person meetings, telephone calls, or e-mails. | 1. Average number of hours victim advocates spend with each victim
 |  |
| 24 | Average number of contacts between victim and victim advocate | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that deliver or oversee restorative justice programming. Report the average number of times that victim advocates contact crime victims from first encounter through their last encounter. Include any form of direct contact such as in-person meetings, telephone calls or messages, letters, or e-mails. | 1. Average number of times victim advocates contact victims
 |  |
| 25  | Number and percent of cases in which victims had input into the offender's disposition | Measure of system accountability. Most appropriate for court units or other entities that process juvenile justice cases. Report the raw numbers of cases in which victims were able to have input into an offender’s sentence. Include making victim impact statements, defining the restitution owed, or other forms of affecting the resolution of a juvenile justice case. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of cases processed. | 1. Number of cases in which victims had input into offender disposition
2. Number of cases processed
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26 | Number and percent of cases in which community members had input into the offender's sentence | Measure of system accountability. Most appropriate for court units or other entities that process juvenile justice cases. Report the raw number of cases in which community members (i.e., not the victim(s) of the crime or family member of the offender) were able to have input into an offender’s sentence. Include making community impact statements, defining the restitution owed, or other forms of affecting the resolution of a juvenile justice case. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of cases processed. | 1. Number of cases in which community members had input into the offender disposition
2. Number of cases processed
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Number and percent of ordered and actual offenders to pay monetary restitution | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for restorative justice programs or those using restorative justice principles. Report the raw number of offenders ordered to pay monetary restitution and the raw number to pay, at least some, restitution. Percent ordered is the raw number ordered divided by the number of youth processed by the grantee. Percent to comply is the raw number to pay divided by the number of youth ordered to pay restitution. | 1. Number of offenders ordered to pay restitution
2. Number of offenders that pay restitution
3. Number of offenders processed
4. Percent ordered (A/C)
5. Percent to comply (B/A)
 |  |
| 28 | Number and percent of offenders to receive skills building training | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for pre-release and post-release programs. Report the raw number of offenders to actually attend skills building training as part of their pre-release and post-release program (include offenders that complete at least part of the training). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of offenders whose cases are handled by the grantee. Do not include educational programs required by the state. | 1. Number of offenders to receive skills-building training
2. Number of offenders handled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 29 | Number and percent of youth to successfully complete their restorative justice requirements | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for restorative justice programs or using restorative justice principles. Report the raw number of offenders to successfully fulfill the requirements of the restorative justice program in which they are participating. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of offenders who participate in restorative justice programming. | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete their restorative justice requirements
2. Number of youth to have restorative justice requirements
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1  | Number of different accountability programs in operation | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that administer more than one accountability program. Report the maximum number of different accountability programs in operation simultaneously. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals | 1. Number of different accountability programs in operation
 |  |
| 2 | Number of types of accountability programs | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer accountability programming. Report the raw number of types of accountability offered. Include both service types directly delivered by the program and service types that youth have access to through the program. | 1. Number of types of accountability programs in operation
 |  |
| 3 | Amount of funds allocated to accountability programming | Determine the distribution of the money. Appropriate for any project paying for accountability programming. Report the raw dollar amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds spent on accountability programming. | 1. Number of dollars spent on accountability programming
 |  |
| 4 | Number and percent of court/probation units with accountability programs in place | Determine coverage of the graduated sanctions approach within court and probation departments. Most appropriate for projects run through local units of government or tribal equivalent. Count would be the raw number of courts or probation departments that are implementing or in the process of implementing an accountability program (in the process includes things like training staff on accountability, developing policies on the use of accountability principles, or developing sub-contracts with service providers in anticipation of the program). Percent is the raw number divided by the number of cast/probation units in operation. | 1. Number of units with accountability programming in operation
2. Number of units
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of accountability program slots | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer accountability programming. Report the raw number of accountability programming slots that the program has at any one time. Include both services directly delivered by the program and services that youth have access to through the program. For example, if a program can process victim impact statements for 5 juvenile offenders and serve 25 youth through a victim empathy class, the number of slots would be 30. | 1. Number of accountability slots
 |  |
| 6 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 7 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 8 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 9 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 11 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance abuse. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Number and percent of cases for which accountability options are used as part of the court/probation process | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the raw number of case dispositions that include accountability programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of case dispositions. Include diversion, formal adjudications, warrant hearings, and all other methods of resolving cases against juvenile offenders. | 1. Number of case dispositions that include accountability programming
2. Number of case dispositions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number and percent of cases for which the judge has complete youth case files prior to sentencing | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for court programs. Report the raw number of case files that have all of the information the judge needs to sentence a youth (e.g., needs assessments, victim impact statements, juvenile justice history). If there are no formal requirements, determine a minimum criteria for a compete file and use those criteria as the requirement. | 1. Number of cases for which judges have complete assessment data prior to sentencing
2. Number of cases sentenced
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number and percent of youth that through the court or probation system participate in accountability programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for entities that use accountability programming (whether they actually deliver it themselves or not). Report the raw number of youth to participate in accountability programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth processed by the grantee. | 1. Number of youth to participate in accountability programming
2. Number of youth processed
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number of different accountability sanctioning options available | Determine coverage of the accountability approach. Most appropriate for grantees implementing or referring youth to accountability programming. Report raw number of different accountability sanctions available to youth. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals. | 1. Number of different sanctions available to youth
 |  |
| 19 | Number and percent of juvenile justice offenses for which accountability programs are an option | Determine coverage of the accountability approach. Most appropriate for programs that refer youth to accountability programs. Report the number of juvenile justice offenses (criminal, statutory, or civil) for which accountability programming may be considered as an option. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of offenses on the books. | 1. Number of offenses for which accountability programming is an option
2. Number of offenses on the books
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Average number of youth per probation officer | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that have probation officers. Report the number of open cases divided by the number of probation officers. | 1. Number of open cases
2. Number of probation officers
3. Average number per officer (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Average number of supervision meetings per youth per month | Determine whether accountability programs are being used as intended with the frequent use of supervision meetings. This measures system accountability. Appropriate for all programs implementing accountability programs. Report the total number of supervision meetings held with youth in the preceding month divided by the number of youth served through accountability programs during that month. Meetings are not limited to face-to-face contact but may include other forms of contact with youth such as telephone calls. | 1. Number of supervision meetings in preceding month
2. Number of youth served in preceding month
3. Average number of meetings (A/B)
 |  |
| 22 | Number and percent of non-compliance events (e.g., missed court dates, positive drug tests) | To determine if youth are acting more accountably as indicated by their fulfillment of their program requirements. Report the raw number of times youth did not do things they specifically had agreed to do in their behavioral contracts or according to their sanctions schedule or did things they specifically agreed not to do. Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of things the youth were expected to do (or not to do). For example, if a youth was supposed to attend school every day, each unexcused day missed would be a non-compliant event. Percent would be the number of school days missed divided by the total number of days school was in session during the reporting period. | 1. Number of non-compliance events
2. Number of youth requirements
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of probation contacts that are proactive | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for programs that staff probation officers. Report the raw number of probation contacts with clients that were not specifically required by law (e.g., not based on a court date or based on a youth committing an infraction). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of probation contacts with youth. | 1. Number of proactive probation contacts
2. Number of probation contacts
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24  | Number and percent of youth to have a behavioral contract developed at intake | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the raw number of you to have a behavioral contract developed at intake. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth to go through intake. | 1. Number of youth with a behavioral contract at intake
2. Number of youth to go through intake
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Average time in hours from infraction to sanction | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of hours from when a youth does something that violates the behavioral contract, the program rules, school behavior rules or guidelines to that youth receiving a sanction. Include only closed cases (i.e., those in which a sanction has been administered or the case dismissed). | 1. Average number of hours from infraction to sanction
 |  |
| 26 | Number and percent of modifications that resulted in more restrictive conditions | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for grantees that can modify a youth’s conditions of release or probation requirements. Report the raw number of times that modifications include more restrictive conditions on youth (e.g., moving from monthly drug testing to weekly). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of modifications to conditions of release. | 1. Number of times modifications were for more strict sanctions
2. Number of modifications to release conditions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Number and percent of youth to complete their justice requirements successfully | To determine if youth are acting more accountably as indicated by their fulfillment of their program requirements. Report the raw number of youth to complete the program successfully. Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of youth served. | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete program requirements
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 28 | Number and percent of youth to have revocation hearings | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for grantees that can revoke a youth's release or probation. Report the raw number of youth to have revocation hearings. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth in the program | 1. Number of youth to have revocation hearings
2. Number of youth in the program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Report** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2 | Number and percent of staff hired | Measure of infrastructure change. Most appropriate for programs that hired detention and corrections personnel. Report raw number of personnel hired during the reporting period. If full positions are not covered, report the number of full-time equivalents (FTE) paid for. To calculate FTE, divide the number of staff hours paid using JABG/Tribal JADG funds by 2000. Percent is the number of detention and corrections staff hired (or FTE covered) divided by the total number of program detention or corrections staff (or FTE). | 1. Number of staff hired
2. Number of staff positions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 3 | Number and percent of vacant positions | Measure of program capacity. Appropriate for programs that staff detention or corrections staff. Report the raw number of vacant detention or corrections staff positions. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of detention or corrections positions (open and filled). | 1. Number of vacant positions
2. Number of positions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 4  | Ration of youth to staff | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that serve youth. Report the number of youth served at one time divided by the number of staff. | 1. Number of youth
2. Number of staff
3. Ratio (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number and percent of programs with vacant staff positions | Measure of program operational capacity. Appropriate for grantees with multiple programs/units/divisions/ departments that staff detention or corrections personnel. Report the raw number of programs/units/divisions/ departments that have at least one vacant position. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of programs/units/divisions/departments. | 1. Number of programs with vacant staff positions
2. Number of programs
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 6  | Number and percent of staff trained in improving facility practices and/or programming | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that staff detention or corrections personnel. Report the raw number of staff to receive any training about improving facility practices or programming. Include in-house or external training and any training medium (classes, observations, online, etc.) as long as training receipt can be verified. Include staff that started training during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of detention or corrections staff. | 1. Number of staff trained
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 7 | Number of hours of training offered in improving facility practices and/or programming | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that staff detention or corrections personnel. Report the raw number of hours of training offered about improving facility operations or programming. Include in-house and external training and any training medium (classes, observations, online, etc.) as long as it can be verified that staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if it did not conclude before the end of the reporting period. | 1. Number of hours of training offered
 |  |
| 8 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 9 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 11 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 12 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA.
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 16 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Staff time spent on security | Determine if project activities are improving staffing. Most appropriate for grantees that have completed at least one activity (hiring or training). Report the raw number of hours per week that staff (i.e., staff that work directly with clients) spent on security (e.g., searching clients, making sure the facility is secure). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of hours per week that those staff worked. | 1. Average number of hours per week staff spend on security
2. Average number of hours staff work per week
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number and percent of staff to rate the training received as helpful | Measure of program quality. Appropriate for programs offering training, whether directly or indirectly. Report the raw number of staff to rate the training as helpful. Programs will most likely need to use training evaluation forms. Programs do not need to report the specific rating level, just counts of people that found it at least minimally helpful. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of training attendees. | 1. Number of staff to rate training helpful
2. Number of staff trained
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 19 | Number and percent of staff trained who take additional courses on improving facility practices and programming | Measure of staff involvement and interest in the topic. This is a proxy for training quality based on the idea that if training was helpful, staff may elect to take additional training on the topic. Appropriate for programs that have detention or corrections personnel. Report the raw number of staff to take at least a second course or follow-up training on improving facility practices or programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of people initially trained (i.e., the pool of people that could have potentially taken additional training). Do not include mandatory retraining or refresher courses. | 1. Number of staff to take additional training
2. Number of staff trained
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of sick days taken | Measure of staff morale based on the idea that well-trained and supported staff is happier in their jobs and, on average, less likely to take sick days. Appropriate for programs that have detention or corrections personnel. Report the combined number of sick days taken by detention or corrections staff during the reporting period. Percent is the combined number divided by the total number of possible workdays for all relevant staff during the reporting period. | 1. Number of sick days taken
2. Number of possible workdays
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent days employees are late to work | Measure of staff morale based on the idea that well-trained and supported staff are happier in their jobs and, on average, less likely to arrive late for work. Appropriate for programs that have detention or corrections personnel. Report the combined number of days that detention or corrections staff arrived late for work during the reporting period. Percent is the combined number divided by the total number of possible workdays for all relevant staff during the reporting period. | 1. Number of late arrival days
2. Number of possible workdays
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 22  | Number and percent of staff rated as improved by supervisors | Measure of training benefit based on the idea that properly trained staff will perform better in their jobs. Appropriate for programs that have detention or corrections personnel or that utilize staff or personnel who have received at least some training in improving facility practices or programming. Report the raw number of staff to receive either highest rating or an improved rating with regard to their general performance on the staff evaluations. If the evaluation has a place to rate knowledge or implementation of new concepts covered in the trainings, that category can be used in place of a general performance category. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of such staff evaluated during the reporting period. | 1. Number of staff improved
2. Number of staff evaluated
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of staff to leave the office/unit | Measure of staff satisfaction based on the idea that staff training can positively impact staff turnover. This is a proxy measure. Appropriate for programs that have detention or corrections personnel or that utilize staff or personnel who have received at least some training in improving facility practices or programming. Report the raw number of staff to leave the program during the reporting period. Do not include staff that was promoted out of the program. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of such staff in the staff pool. For example, if 10 corrections officers from the boys training school were trained, the total pool would be the total number of correctional officers at that facility. | 1. Number of staff to leave program
2. Number of staff in program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number of hours that youth are held in isolation | Measures use of secure detention. Appropriate for any operational program. Report the raw number of hours youth were held in isolation. If a facility is not permitted to hold youth in isolation but refers youth to other facilities, include the number of hours of isolation to result from those referrals in this count. | 1. Number of hours youth are held in isolation
 |  |
| 25 | Number and percent of youth exhibiting the desired change in targeted behaviors | Must select at least one measure between 2A and 2M. Selection should be based on program goals and activities. | 1. Number of youth held in isolation
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 26 | Average time in hours from infraction to sanction | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the average number of hours from when a youth does something that violates the behavioral contract, the program rules, school behavior rules or guidelines to that youth receiving a sanction. Include only closed cases (i.e., those in which a sanction has been administered or the case dismissed). | 1. Average number of hours from infraction to sanction
 |  |
| 27 | Number and percent of available accountability programming options used | Measure of system accountability (i.e., are staff using all the tools available to them and are the available accountability options appropriate for the site). Appropriate for grantees with operational accountability programs. Report the raw number of different accountability options used at least once during the reporting period. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of different accountability options. Different implies that the options either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals. | 1. Number of accountability options used
2. Number of accountability options available
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 28 | Number and percent of sanction changes that were from a less restrictive to a more restrictive sanction | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for grantees that can change youths' sanction level. Report the raw number of times that youth are moved from a less restrictive sanction level to a more restrictive level (e.g., moving from monthly drug testing to weekly). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of modifications to sanctions. | 1. Number of modifications of sanctions to more strict
2. Number of modifications to sanctions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds awarded for system improvement**(Mandatory for System Improvement only) | The amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds in whole dollars that are awarded for System Improvement during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred source. | 1. Funds awarded to program for services
 |  |
| 2  | Number of different pre-release and post-release programs implemented | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that administer more than one pre-release and post-release program. Report the maximum number of different pre-release and post-release programs in operation simultaneously. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals | 1. Number of different pre-release and post-release programs in operation
 |  |
| 3 | Amount of funds allocated to pre-release and post-release programming | Determine the distribution of the money. Appropriate for any project paying for pre-release and post-release programming. Report the raw dollar amount of JABG funds spent on pre-release and post-release programming. | 1. Number of dollars spent on pre-release and post-release programming
 |  |
| 4  | Number of pre-release and post-release program slots | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer pre-release and post-release programming. Report the raw number of pre-release and post-release programming slots that the program has at any one time. Include both programs directly delivered by the grantee as well as programs that youth have access to through the grantee. For example, if a program can process victim impact statements for 5 juvenile offenders and serve 25 youth through a victim empathy class, the number of slots would be 30. | 1. Number of pre-release and post-release slots
 |  |
| 5 | Number and percent of staff trained on pre-release and post-release program procedures | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff can provide better service. Appropriate for any grantee working with or administering a pre-release and post-release program. Report the raw number of staff to receive formal training on pre-release and post-release related topics. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of staff in the pool from which those trained were selected. For example, if 10 staff from a probation department were trained, the total pool would be the staff from the entire probation department. | 1. Number of staff trained
2. Number of staff
3. Percent (a/b)
 |  |
| 6 | Number of hours of pre-release and post-release training offered to justice staff by type (orientation, continuing education, cross training with community-based organizations) | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs whose staff offers pre-release and post-release programming. Report the raw number of hours of training offered about pre-release and post-release (by topic). Include in-house and external training and any training medium (classes, observations, online, etc.) as long as it can be verified that staff were aware of the training opportunity and were able to avail themselves of it (e.g., the training was not cost prohibitive or offered at a time that conflicted with other necessary duties). Include training that started during the reporting period even if the training did not conclude before the end of the period. | 1. Number of hours of orientation training offered
2. Number of hours of continuing education training offered
3. Number of hours of cross training offered
 |  |
| 7 | Number of hours of community outreach about pre-release and post-release programming | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that offer or promote pre-release and post-release programming. Report the number of hours of outreach activities conducted by staff or on behalf of staff. For example, if someone made a presentation at a PTA meeting for 1 hour, count 1 hour plus travel and administration time; if someone dropped off flyers at a PTA meeting, count the actual time spent delivering the flyers.  | 1. Number of hours of community outreach about pre-release and post-release programming
 |  |
| 8 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 9 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 11 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 12 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance use. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 15 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number and percent of target youth to receive pre-release and post-release programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for entities that use pre-release and post-release programming (whether they actually deliver it themselves or not). Report the raw number of youth to participate in pre-release and post-release programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth served by the grantee. | 1. Number of youth to participate in pre-release and post-release
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number of different pre-release and post-release options available | Determine coverage of the pre-release and post-release approach. Most appropriate for grantees implementing or referring youth to pre-release and post-release programming. Report raw number of different pre-release and post-release options available. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals.  | 1. Number of pre-release and post-release options available
 |  |
| 19 | Average number of different services and treatments received by youth pre-release and post-release program participants | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for any pre-release and post-release program. Report the average number of different types of service or clinical treatment received by pre-release and post-release program participants. For example, if a participant received outpatient mental health treatment, transportation services, and literacy counseling, that would count as three services. But, for example, if a participant received medical treatment from two different providers or on two different occasions that would count as one treatment unless the treatment was for different conditions (e.g., a broken leg and a pregnancy). | 1. Average number of types of service received per client
 |  |
| 20 | Number and percent of offenders to receive skills building training | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for pre-release and post-release programs. Report the raw number of offenders to actually attend skills building training as part of their pre-release and post-release program (include offenders that complete at least part of the training). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of offenders whose cases are handled by the grantee. Do not include educational programs required by the state. | 1. Number of offenders to receive skills-building training
2. Number of offenders handled
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Number and percent of youth to successfully complete their pre-release and post-release requirements | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for pre-release and post-release programs or using pre-release and post-release principles. Report the raw number of offenders to successfully fulfill the requirements of the pre-release and post-release program in which they are participating. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of offenders who participate in pre-release and post-release programming. | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete their pre-release and post-release requirements
2. Number of youth to have pre-release and post-release requirements
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Output measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Number of different indigent defense programs in operation | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that administer more than one indigent defense program. Report the maximum number of different indigent defense programs in operation simultaneously. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals.  | 1. Number of different indigent defense programs in operation
 |  |
| 2 | Number of types of indigent defense programs | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer indigent defense programming. Report the raw number of types of indigent defense programs offered. Include both service types directly delivered by the program and service types that youth have access to through the program. | 1. Number of types of indigent defense programs in operation
 |  |
|  3 | Amount of funds allocated to indigent defense programming | Determine the distribution of the money. Appropriate for any project paying for indigent defense programming. Report the raw dollar amount of JABG/Tribal JADG funds spent on indigent defense programming. | 1. Number of dollars spent on indigent defense programming
 |  |
| 4 | Number and percent of court/probation units with indigent defense programs in place | Determine coverage of the graduated sanctions approach within court and probation departments. Most appropriate for projects run through local units of government or tribal equivalent. Count would be the raw number of courts or probation departments that are implementing or in the process of implementing an indigent defense program (in the process includes things like training staff on indigent defense, developing policies on the use of indigent programming principles, or developing sub-contracts with service providers in anticipation of the program). Percent is the raw number divided by the number of cast/probation units in operation. | 1. Number of units with indigent defense programming in operation
2. Number of units
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 5 | Number of indigent defense program slots | Determine program scope. Appropriate for programs that offer indigent defense programming. Report the raw number of indigent defense programming slots that the program has at any one time. Include both services directly delivered by the program and services that youth have access to through the program. For example, if a program can process victim impact statements for 5 juvenile offenders and serve 25 youth through a victim empathy class, the number of slots would be 30. | 1. Number of indigent defense program slots
 |  |
| 6 | Number of training requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of training requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of training requests received during the reporting period.
 |  |
| 7 | Number of technical assistance requests RECEIVED | This measure represents the number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period. Requests can come from individuals or organizations served. | 1. Number of technical assistance requests received during the reporting period
 |  |
| 8 | Number of program materials developed during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of program materials that were developed during the reporting period. Include only substantive materials such as program overviews, client workbooks, lists of local service providers. Do not include program advertisements or administrative forms such as sign-in sheets or client tracking forms. Count the number of pieces developed. Program records are the preferred data source.  | 1. Number of program materials developed
 |  |
| 9 | Number of planning or training events held during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period. Planning and training activities include creation of task forces or inter-agency committees, meetings held, needs assessments undertaken, etc. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of planning or training activities held during the reporting period
 |  |
| 10 | Number of people trained during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people trained during the reporting period. The number is the raw number of people receiving any formal training relevant to the program or their position as program staff. Include any training from any source or medium received during the reporting period as long as receipt of training can be verified. Training does not have to have been completed during the reporting period. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of people trained
 |  |
| 11 | Percent of those served by training and technical assistance (TTA) who reported implementing an evidence based program and/or practice during or after the TTA. | Number and percent of programs served by TTA that reported implementing an evidence-based program / and or practice during or after the TTA. Evidence based programs and practices include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance abuse. | 1. Number of programs served by TTA that reported using an evidence-based program and / or practice.
2. Number of programs served by TTA
3. Percent of programs served by TTA that report using an evidence-based program and / or practice (A/B)
 |  |

**Grantees are required to select at least one Outcome measure for each Program Area selected.**

| **#** | **Outcome Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12 | Number of program policies changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of cross-program or agency policies or procedures changed, improved, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include polices that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Preferred data source is program records. | 1. Number of programs policies changed during the reporting period
2. Number of programs policies rescinded during the reporting period
 |  |
| 13 | Percent of people exhibiting an increased knowledge of the program area during the reporting period | This measure represents the number of people who exhibit an increased knowledge of the program area after participating in training. Use of pre and posttests is preferred. | 1. Number of people exhibiting an increase in knowledge post-training.
2. Number of people trained during the reporting period.
3. Percent of people trained who exhibited increased knowledge (A/B)
 |  |
| 14 | Percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations based on training and technical assistance (TTA). | The number and percent of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service. | 1. The number of organizations reporting improvements in operations as a result of TTA one to six months post-service
2. The total number of organizations served by TTA during the reporting period
3. Percent of organizations reporting improvements (A/B)
 |  |
| 15 | Number and percent of cases for which indigent defense options are used as part of the court/probation process | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational indigent defense programs. Report the raw number of case dispositions that include indigent defense programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of case dispositions. Include diversion, formal adjudications, warrant hearings, and all other methods of resolving cases against juvenile offenders. | 1. Number of case dispositions that include indigent defense programming
2. Number of case dispositions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 16 | Number and percent of cases for which the judge has complete youth case files prior to sentencing | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for indigent defense programs. Report the raw number of case files that have all of the information the judge needs to sentence a youth (e.g., needs assessments, victim impact statements, juvenile justice history). If there are no formal requirements, determine a minimum criteria for a compete file and use those criteria as the requirement. | 1. Number of cases for which judges have complete assessment data prior to sentencing
2. Number of cases sentenced
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 17 | Number and percent of youth that through the court or probation system participate in indigent defense programming | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for entities that use indigent defense programming (whether they actually deliver it themselves or not). Report the raw number of youth to participate in indigent defense programming. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth processed by the grantee. | 1. Number of youth to participate in indigent defense programming
2. Number of youth processed
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 18 | Number of different indigent defense program options available | Determine coverage of the indigent defense approach. Most appropriate for grantees implementing or referring youth to indigent defense programming. Report raw number of different indigent defense sanctions available to youth. Different implies that the programs either employ different techniques or activities, target different populations, or have different goals. | 1. Number of different sanctions available to youth
 |  |
| 19 | Number and percent of juvenile justice offenses for which indigent defense programs are an option | Determine coverage of the indigent defense program approach. Most appropriate for programs that refer youth to indigent defense programs. Report the number of juvenile justice offenses (criminal, statutory, or civil) for which indigent defense programming may be considered as an option. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of offenses on the books. | 1. Number of offenses for which indigent defense programming is an option
2. Number of offenses on the books
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 20 | Average number of youth per probation officer | Measure of infrastructure. Appropriate for programs that have probation officers. Report the number of open cases divided by the number of probation officers. | 1. Number of open cases
2. Number of probation officers
3. Average number per officer (A/B)
 |  |
| 21 | Average number of supervision meetings per youth per month | Determine whether indigent defense programs are being used as intended with the frequent use of supervision meetings. This measures system accountability. Appropriate for all programs implementing indigent defense programs. Report the total number of supervision meetings held with youth in the preceding month divided by the number of youth served through indigent defense programs during that month. Meetings are not limited to face-to-face contact but may include other forms of contact with youth such as telephone calls. | 1. Number of supervision meetings in preceding month
2. Number of youth served in preceding month
3. Average number of meetings (B/A)
 |  |
| 22 | Number and percent of non-compliance events (e.g., missed court dates, positive drug tests) | To determine if youth are acting more accountably as indicated by their fulfillment of their program requirements. Report the raw number of times youth did not do things they specifically had agreed to do in their behavioral contracts or according to their sanctions schedule or did things they specifically agreed not to do. Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of things the youth were expected to do (or not to do). For example, if a youth was supposed to attend school every day, each unexcused day missed would be a non-compliant event. Percent would be the number of school days missed divided by the total number of days school was in session during the reporting period. | 1. Number of non-compliance events
2. Number of youth requirements
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 23 | Number and percent of probation contacts that are proactive | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for programs that staff probation officers. Report the raw number of probation contacts with clients that were not specifically required by law (e.g., not based on a court date or based on a youth committing an infraction). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of probation contacts with youth. | 1. Number of proactive probation contacts
2. Number of probation contacts
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 24 | Number and percent of youth to have a behavioral contract developed at intake | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational indigent defense programs. Report the raw number of youth that have a behavioral contract developed at intake. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth to go through intake. | 1. Number of youth with a behavioral contract at intake
2. Number of youth to go through intake
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 25 | Average time in hours from infraction to sanction | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees with operational indigent defense programs. Report the average number of hours from when a youth does something that violates the behavioral contract, the program rules, school behavior rules or guidelines to that youth receiving a sanction. Include only closed cases (i.e., those in which a sanction has been administered or the case dismissed). | 1. Average number of hours from infraction to sanction
 |  |
| 26 | Number and percent of modifications that resulted in more restrictive conditions | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for grantees that can modify a youth’s conditions of release or probation requirements. Report the raw number of times that modifications include more restrictive conditions on youth (e.g., moving from monthly drug testing to weekly). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of modifications to conditions of release. | 1. Number of times modifications were for more strict sanctions
2. Number of modifications to release conditions
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 27 | Number and percent of youth to complete their justice requirements successfully | To determine if youth are acting more accountably as indicated by their fulfillment of their program requirements. Report the raw number of youth to complete the program successfully. Percent would be the raw number divided by the total number of youth served. | 1. Number of youth to successfully complete program requirements
2. Number of youth served
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |
| 28 | Number and percent of youth to have revocation hearings | Measure of youth accountability. Appropriate for grantees that can revoke a youth's release or probation. Report the raw number of youth to have revocation hearings. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth in the program | 1. Number of youth to have revocation hearings
2. Number of youth in the program
3. Percent (A/B)
 |  |